UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 107—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1961, TO JANUARY 26, 1961
(PAGES 1 TO 1356)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1961

J
11
.R
v.107
pt.1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1961

The 3d of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the 1st session of the 87th Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, Thou only art our strength and our hope, our shelter from the stormy blast of these tumultuous days, and our eternal home.

In this first moment of a new convocation in this forum of a people's will, with contrite hearts seeking Thy guidance we would write at the top of the record begun this day "In the beginning, God."

As we come to this hour, we are conscious of a cloud of witnesses out of heroic yesterdays who look down upon us from the sacred spaces beneath the white dome of this national temple of governance, as, on this day of beginnings, the ancient vow is uttered, "So help me God." To that solemn affirmation may there echo in the heart of every legislator the sound of a great "Amen."

May those who, in this day of destiny, sit in the exalted seats of this historic Chamber think, without confusion, clearly and speak always with due caution and humility, with a sense of their high calling, knowing that their words are not their own, but that they wing their way to hopeful and also to hostile ears that listen in all the earth.

So, in a volcanic day, with the earth aflame, when the precious things we hold nearest our hearts are threatened by sinister forces without pity or conscience, grant Thy benediction as these dedicated servants of the Republic turn now to the momentous matters awaiting them, with the solemn realization that:

We are watchers of a beacon
Whose light must never die.
We are guardians of an altar
That shows Thee ever nigh.

We are children of Thy free men
Who sleep beneath the sod.
For the might of Thy arm we bless Thee,
Our God, our fathers' God.

In the dear Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

DEATH OF SENATOR HENNINGS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I regret to announce the death of the senior Senator from Missouri, Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., on September 13, at his home in Washington.

Later in the day I expect to present a resolution for a memorial service for Senator HENNINGS.

DEATH OF SENATOR-ELECT THOMSON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I regret to announce the death of Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON, of Wyoming. He died on the 9th of December, of a heart attack, rather soon after his election to the Senate.

Later during the deliberations of the day, I plan to introduce a formal resolution in commemoration of Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON.

CREDENTIALS—APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION CERTIFICATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain appointment and election certificates to fill vacancies and for regular terms, which appear to be in proper form. Without objection, after they have been announced by the Chair, they may be printed in the RECORD without being read. They are as follows:

Certificates of appointment and election of EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator HENNINGS.

Certificates of election of Mrs. MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon, for both short and long terms.

Communication from former Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, enclosing a copy of his resignation sent to the Governor of that State.

Certificate of appointment of BENJAMIN A. SMITH II to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Kennedy.

Certificate of the appointment of J. J. HICKEY, of Wyoming, to fill the vacancy in the term beginning at noon today.

Without objection, they may be printed in the RECORD without being read. The Chair hears no objection.

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Missouri, I, James T. Blair, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint EDWARD V. LONG a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., is filled by electiton as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor James T. Blair, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Jefferson City, Mo., this 23d day of September, in the year of our Lord 1960.

J. T. BLAIR, JR.,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ROBERT W. CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City.

To Honorable FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I, James T. Blair, Jr., Governor of the State of Missouri, hereby certify that at a special election held in the State of Missouri on the 8th day of November 1960, as provided by law, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., the following-named person was elected to the office named, as shown by the returns of the election certified to me by Hon. Robert W. Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Missouri:

Senator in Congress, EDWARD V. LONG, Clarksville, Mo.

In witness whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and cause the great seal of the State of Missouri to be affixed at the city of Jefferson, State of Missouri, this 20th day of December A.D. 1960.

J. T. BLAIR, JR.,
Governor.

Attest:
ROBERT W. CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oregon a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending January 2, 1961, occasioned by the death of Hon. Richard L. Neuberger.

Witness His Excellency our Governor Mark O. Hatfield, and our seal hereto affixed at Salem, Oreg., this 1st day of December 1960.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HOWELL APPLING, JR.,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oregon a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness His Excellency our Governor Mark O. Hatfield, and our seal hereto affixed at

Salem, Oreg., the 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The Vice President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am today forwarding to the Honorable Foster Furcolo, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DECEMBER 22, 1960.

Hon. FOSTER FURCOLO,
Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I herewith resign my seat in the United States Senate as of this date.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Statehouse, Boston, December 27, 1960.

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I have appointed BENJAMIN A. SMITH II of Gloucester in said Commonwealth a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of John F. Kennedy, is filed by election as provided by law.

I enclose a certified copy of the appointment, the original commission of which has been given in hand to the said Senator.

Very truly yours,

FOSTER FURCOLO,
Governor.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Wyoming, I, Jack R. Gage, the Acting Governor of said State, do hereby appoint J. J. "JOE" HICKEY a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term commencing at 12:00 noon January 3, 1961 and ending at 12:00 noon January 3, 1963, to fill the vacancy occurring in that office for said period.

Witness His Excellency our Acting Governor Jack R. Gage, and our seal thereto affixed at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 2d day of January in the year of our Lord 1961.

THOMAS C. BOGUS,
Deputy Secretary of State.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JACK R. GAGE,
Acting Governor.

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Denver, Colo., December 14, 1960.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, GORDON ALLOTT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Steve McNichols, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, Colo., this 14th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

By the Governor:

STEVE MCNICHOLS,
Governor.

Attest:

GEORGE J. BAKER,
Secretary of State.

[SEAL] By F. J. SERAFINI,
Deputy Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, CLINTON P. ANDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, John Burroughs, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1960.

JOHN BURROUGHS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] J. C. COMPTON,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.
BETTY FIORINA,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, E. L. BARTLETT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alaska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, William A. Egan, and our seal hereto affixed at Juneau, Alaska, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

[SEAL] HUGH J. WADE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Dover.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, J. CALEB BOGGS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from the said State to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. CALEB BOGGS, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 5th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

J. CALEB BOGGS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] GEORGE J. SCHULZ,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, STYLES BRIDGES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Wesley Powell, and our seal hereto affixed at Concord, this 30th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

WESLEY POWELL,
Governor.

By the Governor, with advice of the council:
[SEAL] ROBERT L. STARK,
Acting Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, CLIFFORD P. CASE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Robert B. Meyner, and our seal hereto affixed at Trenton, this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Frankfort, Ky., December 16, 1960.

Mr. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Pursuant to your request, we are glad to furnish you with the following certificates of election of the U.S. Senator from Kentucky for a full 6-year term as a result of the election held November 8, 1960:

"To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kentucky a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

"Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Bert Thomas Combs, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 16th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960."

BERT COMBS,
Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HENRY CARTER,
Secretary of State, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, CARL T. CURTIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Dwight W. Burney, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, PAUL H. DOUGLAS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. William G. Stratton, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 15th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, HENRY DWORSHAK was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Robert E. Smylie, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise, this 27th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Idaho. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 185th.

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JAMES O. EASTLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ross R. Barnett, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson, Miss., this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

ROSS R. BARNETT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, ALLEN J. ELLENDER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Jimmie H. Davis, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1960.

JIMMIE H. DAVIS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota:

I, Joseph L. Donovan, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, and chairman of the State canvassing board, do hereby certify:

That on the 22d day of November 1960, there was duly constituted and convened, according to law, a State canvassing board to canvass the election returns of the votes cast at the general election of November 8, 1960, in the State of Minnesota;

That said State canvassing board, so constituted and convened, tabulated and summarized the certified copies of election returns made by the 87 county canvassing boards; and

That said State canvassing board duly declared that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and have caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be hereunto affixed, at the capitol in St. Paul, this 22d day of November A.D. 1960.

[SEAL] JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, LYNDON B. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor of Texas, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

PRICE DANIEL,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ZOLLIE STEAKLEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
RALEIGH.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, B. EVERETT JORDAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Luther H. Hodges, and our seal hereto affixed at Raleigh, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Governor of North Carolina.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, ESTES KEFAUVER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Buford Ellington, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 28th day of November in the year of our Lord 1960.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Oklahoma City, November 30, 1960.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, ROBERT S. KERR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Howard Edmondson, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, this 30th day of November in the year of our Lord 1960.

J. HOWARD EDMONDSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILLIAM N. CHRISTIAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

PROCLAMATION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Orval E. Faubus, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, PATRICK V. MCNAMARA was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 20th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1960.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, LEE METCALF was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Hugo Aronson, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 12th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK MURRAY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
December 13, 1960.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JACK MILLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Herschel C. Loveless, and our seal hereto affixed at Des Moines, Iowa, this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

HERSCHEL C. LOVELESS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] MELVIN D. SYNHORST,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, KARL E. MUNDT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Ralph Herseth, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, the capital of said State, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

RALPH HERSETH,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SELMA SANDNESS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND &
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Providence.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, CLAIBORNE DEB. PELL, of Newport, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Christopher Del Sesto and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R.I., this 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

CHRISTOPHER DEL SESTO,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of the county of Randolph, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on the 3d day of January next.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State of West Virginia, this 20th day of December 1960.

CECIL H. UNDERWOOD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE F. BURDETT,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

This is to certify that at a meeting of the State board of elections, held in its office on November 28, 1960, on an examination of the official abstract of votes on file in that office it was ascertained and determined that at the general election held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November 1960, for U.S. Senator, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly elected United States Senator from Virginia for the term prescribed by law.

Witness the following official signatures and the seal of office at Richmond, this 28th day of November 1960.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
A. M. HARMAN, Jr., *Chairman.*
LEVIN NOCK DAVIS, *Secretary.*

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia as a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, S. Ernest Vandiver, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta, Ga., this 28th day of November in the year of our Lord 1960.

S. ERNEST VANDIVER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November, 1960, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Foster Furcolo, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston this 13th day of December in the year of our Lord 1960.

FOSTER FURCOLO,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November, 1960, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George Docking, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 8th day of December in the year of our Lord 1960.

GEORGE DOCKING,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MAINE

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greetings:

Know ye, that MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Skowhegan, in the County of Somerset, on the 8th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960, was chosen by the electors of this State, a U.S. Senator to represent the State of Maine in the U.S. Senate, for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of State to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at Augusta, the 28th day of November in the year of our Lord 1960, and in the 185th year of the Independence of the United States of America.

JOHN H. REED,
Governor.
[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John Patterson, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery, this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

JOHN PATTERSON,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] BETTYE FRINK,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, STROM THURMOND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ernest F. Hollings, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1960.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 8th day of November 1960, KEITH THOMSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1961.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. J. "Joe" Hickey, and our seal hereto affixed at 10 a.m., this 2d day of December in the year of our Lord 1960.

J. J. "JOE" HICKEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JACK R. GAGE,
Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senators to be sworn in will present themselves at the desk, in groups of four, as their names are called in alphabetical order.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur) called the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BOGGS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CURTIS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. COTTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. HRUSKA, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and

they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. ELLENDER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. LONG of Louisiana, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JORDAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. ERVIN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from Melvin C. Perkins, of Baltimore, Md., relative to the seating of J. J. HICKEY as a Senator from the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCCLELLAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. HAYDEN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. MUNDT.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HART, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. ROBERTSON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. BYRD of Virginia, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CARLSON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. THURMOND.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. JOHNSTON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

SENATOR FROM TEXAS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will now read communications from Senator JOHNSON of Texas which were sent to the Senate and Governor of Texas:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1960.

The Honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose a copy of a letter addressed by me to the Governor of Texas tendering my resignation as U.S. Senator from that State for the term beginning at noon January 3, 1961, effective immediately after I have taken and subscribed to the required oath in open Senate.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DECEMBER 31, 1960.

The Honorable PRICE DANIEL,
Governor of Texas,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR GOVERNOR DANIEL: I hereby tender my resignation as U.S. Senator from the State of Texas for the term beginning at noon January 3, 1961, effective immediately after the oath required by the Constitution and prescribed by law has been taken and subscribed by me in open Senate as provided by rule II of its standing rules.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication and telegram from the Governor of Texas.

The communications are as follows:

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., December 31, 1960.

Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having received notice of resignation from Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON effective after his taking the oath of office on January 3, 1961, I hereby appoint WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY, of Dallas, Tex., to the office of U.S. Senator to suceed Senator JOHNSON upon his resignation January 3, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE DANIEL,
Governor.

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 3, 1961.*

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Confirming my letter of December 31, I hereby appoint WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY, of Dallas, Tex., to the office of U.S. Senator to succeed Senator JOHNSON upon his resignation effective after his taking the oath of office today. Certificate of appointment being mailed.

PRICE DANIEL,
Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator designate will present himself at the desk to take the constitutional oath of office.

Mr. BLAKLEY, escorted by Mr. YARBOROUGH, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and he subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ervin	Miller
Allott	Fong	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Bartlett	Gore	Morton
Beall	Gruening	Moss
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Blakley	Hayden	Neuberger
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Hickey	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Prouty
Bush	Holland	Proxmire
Butler	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Russell
Cannon	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston	Schoeppel
Carroll	Jordan	Scott
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Kuchel	Sparkman
Clark	Lausche	Stennis
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Cotton	Long, La.	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Thurmond
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wiley
Dodd	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Douglas	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McNamara	Yarborough
Eastland	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry M. Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and Clair Engle.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and John A. Carroll.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and Thomas J. Dodd.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Oren E. Long.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Frank Church.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and R. Vance Hartke.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Jack Miller.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—John Sherman Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—John M. Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachuetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Benjamin A. Smith II.

Michigan.—Pat McNamara and Philip A. Hart.

Minnesota.—Hubert H. Humphrey and Eugene J. McCarthy.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio.—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne deB. Pell.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and William A. Blakley.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and William Proxmire.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and J. J. "Joe" Hickey.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the members of the committee on behalf of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 3), as follows:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Friday, the 6th day of January 1961, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their Presiding Officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter "A", and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the established practice, no bills may be introduced or other morning business transacted until after the President has delivered his annual message. I thought that this subject should be called to the attention of the Senate, in view of the fact that it is our usual practice, and that announcement of it should be made at this time. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I have no idea as to when the state of the Union message will be delivered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only speculate, but I heard that there was a likelihood that the state of the Union message would come to us on January 12. However, I have no authentic information on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I would say that we had better play this by ear, so to speak, for the next day or so, because the 12th of the month is a rather long way off, and I would not want to hold up the business of the Senate in the meantime. I should like to suggest that the Senate conduct its business as expeditiously as possible. In that connection, I would suggest that the chairmen of the various committees and the committees give consideration to the possibility of holding hearings on the nominees of the President-elect, so that as soon after the inauguration as it is possible we may have those nominations brought to the Senate for debate and consideration, and, I would hope, approval.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That subject was discussed this morning. The hope was expressed that perhaps hearings would not be held until the beginning of next week, because during this week we will have a rather full calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate that. I agree with the minority leader. I believe the suggested procedure will give the committees plenty of time. I would hope that beginning Monday of next week the committees will be able to start their hearings, so that we will be ready to consider the nominations as soon after the inauguration as possible.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which declares that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 4) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the third paragraph of subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out the words "two-thirds" and inserting in lieu thereof "three-fifths".

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I object.

Mr. ANDERSON. I therefore send to the desk a motion to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and ask that it be read. I submit it in behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND RULE XXII

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely: By striking out the words "two-thirds" in the third paragraph of subsection 2 of rule XXII and inserting in lieu thereof "three-fifths."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is: To provide for bringing debate to a close by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting after full and fair discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not understand the reading of the motion by the clerk. Was that notice given under rule XL or rule L?

The CHIEF CLERK. Rule XL.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand, the request of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution for amendment of the rules was objected to, and that he has now filed a motion for a rule change.

On behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, and other Senators who have indicated their support, I wish to offer for consideration by the Senate an amendment to section 3 of rule XXII of the Senate and ask that it be read. I shall supply the names of the other cosponsors of the resolution.

The additional cosponsors are as follows: Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FONG, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. HART, Mr. DODD, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. ENGLE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The amendment was read, as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE XXII

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, we hereby give notice in writing that we shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by amending subsection 3 thereof to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 16th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And, if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide, in addition to the provisions for closing debate set forth in subsection 2 of rule XXII, that a constitutional majority of the Senate may vote to close debate 15 calendar days after the presentation of a motion to close debate signed by 16 members, and that thereafter the Senate shall come to a vote on the substantive issues on which cloture has been voted after each Senator has had an opportunity to speak for an additional hour.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that it does not come with any great surprise to the Senator from Minnesota for me to say that I object.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, and on behalf of sundry other Senators, I send to the desk a notice of a motion, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read for the information of the Senate.

The notice was read as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely:

Section 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for bringing debate to a close by a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn after full and fair discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I recall with great pride the constitutional opinion which the present occupant of the chair rendered in the last Congress and prior thereto, in which he stated, as his opinion to the Senate, that at the beginning of each new Congress the Senate, by a majority vote, has a constitutional right to determine the rules which will guide it in debate. Do I state the opinion of the Chair correctly in that paraphrase?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the ruling might more appropriately come from the Chair. I realize that the distinguished senior Senator from California, who is the minority whip, represents, in part, the State of California. However, it seems to me that we might understand a little better an official ruling coming from the Presiding Officer rather than from the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the distinguished occupant of the chair indicate his views with respect to the right of the Senate to adopt rules?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has indicated his opinion that at the beginning of each new Congress a majority of the Members of the Senate have the constitutional right to determine the rules under which the Senate will be guided. Once that decision is made, or once the Senate proceeds to conduct business under rules adopted in previous Congresses, those rules will then be in effect.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the notice of motion which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I, and other Senators, have just had read for the information of the Senate available for a vote on the next legislative day by a majority of Senators?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator would have a right to submit the resolution pursuant to the notice which the Senator has given.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, if the notice were read, as it has been read, and if the resolution contained in that notice were before the Senate tomorrow, do I understand the distinguished occupant of the chair to say that by a majority vote the resolution might be adopted in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the ruling the Chair would make.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield the floor?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Notice having been given to the Senate under the rule, does that, within what the Chair has just said, mean that the Senate is prevented thereby from proceeding under the Constitution tomorrow, according to the Chair's ruling? Or—and this is my parliamentary inquiry—is it not a fact that the Senate may proceed tomorrow, notwithstanding the invocation of rule XL, under the Constitution of the United States, to deal with the resolution, on which notice has just been given both by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], rather than under the rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's ruling.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield for a parliamentary ruling.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Since the Vice President's ruling, to which attention has been called, referred to the beginning of the session, would it make any difference, or would the right to consider these presented rule changes be lost, if the Senate were to adjourn tonight, or must the Senate recess in order to preserve the beginning of the session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would rule that the Senate would have to recess rather than adjourn to preserve the right to invoke the procedure described by the Senator from New York.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must insist that we follow the regular order. I know of no rule by which, without unanimous consent, Senators can farm out the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would point out that the distinguished former majority leader of the Senate always exercised that right. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to change that procedure?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I do not think that if we have fallen into error, as the Chair has done previously on many occasions, we should persist in those errors from day to day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator believe that another rule should apply to the Republican side of the aisle than applies to the Democratic side?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not. If any Republican ever raised the issue that a Senator cannot farm out the floor for the purpose of permitting other Senators to ask questions exclusively on one side of the aisle, the Chair should have sustained the point of order, if he had been fulfilling my notion of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Two independent motions have been filed under rule XL. Do they enjoy a status of priority, by virtue of the fact that the Anderson motion was filed first; or is it a question of recognition when they are called up?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Priority generally is determined by whichever Senator gets recognition when the motions are called up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the fact that one motion was offered prior to another does not give it any preferred status when the matter is finally considered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not. The Chair may say to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Chair obviously will enforce the rules to the letter when a Senator requests that that be done. However, as the Senator knows, over a period of time a custom has been established under which the majority leader or any other Senator can, if there is no objection, hold the floor and yield it to other Senators, as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that if no objection is interposed, that is the case. However, I have interposed objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia does object?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I object to a Senator holding the floor and yielding it exclusively to Senators on one side of the aisle.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to understand the opinion of the Chair completely. Is it the opinion of the Chair that if the Senate were to adjourn today and go over to a new legislative day tomorrow, a majority of Senators would not have the right to change the rules pursuant to the constitutional provision involved?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's opinion unless the provisions of rule XL were complied with.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether we might obtain from him an expression of his judgment in the matter. Does he contemplate making a motion to have the Senate recess tonight, so that we would have our rights preserved to us, or does he contemplate making a motion to have the Senate adjourn?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be my hope that we would not take up any of these measures today, but that we would be able to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I can only speak personally. However, I hope that that desire will meet with the approval of my colleagues.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I want to make certain that I understand the ruling of the Chair, assisted by the Senator from California, with respect to this matter.

I understood the Vice President to say that if we had taken any proceedings under the rules as they obtained at the beginning of the session, he would hold that the rules had been applied, and therefore we would have to proceed in the manner prescribed in the rules to change them. Was my hearing faulty? I am asking the Official Reporters to have that statement transcribed immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Georgia has correctly stated the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. What interpretation does the Chair place on the fact that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] requested consent to file a motion under rule XL, and did file it under rule XL, and sought further proceedings thereon, under rule XL; but objection was raised? The Chair was aware of that fact, was he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was aware of that fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will not the Chair consider that proceedings under the rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that any rule adopted in a previous Senate which would inhibit the right of a majority of the Members of the Senate in a new Congress to adopt its rules is not applicable. And, as the Chair has made his ruling previously, the Chair would hold that in this instance the filing of the motion under rule XL, as the Senator has indicated he would desire to proceed, is proper; but that any section of the rules, other than rule XL, which would inhibit the right of a majority of the Members of the Senate to determine its rules, would not be applicable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is the Chair aware of any rule that requires larger than a majority vote at any time to change the rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair's opinion has been, he thinks, quite clearly stated in that respect. The Chair stated that at the beginning of a new Congress a majority of the Members of the Senate can, either by positive action or by waiver of the right to take such action proceed to adopt its rules; but if the Senate proceeds, without objection, under rules previously adopted, to the conduct of business, it is the Chair's opinion that then the rules adopted in previous

Congresses will apply to the Congress in which this Senate is sitting.

On the other hand, if at the beginning of a Congress, before other business is transacted, a majority of the Members of the Senate desire to change the rules under which the Senate has been operating, it is the opinion of the Chair that the majority rule will apply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must confess that I am a trifle lost, because under the rules of the Senate, as I have always understood them and as they have been applied during the 28 years I have been here, only a majority vote is required in order to change the rules at any time; that is all that is required—a majority vote, at any time, to change the rules of the Senate.

But now the Chair is stating that if we engage in some proceeding under a rule that relates to a change of the rules, that is not applying the rules; but that if we engage in a proceeding under some rule which does not relate to the rules, then we are regulated by the old rules.

Let me ask the Chair whether he has given any attention to the provisions of paragraph 2 of rule XXXII, which was adopted by the Senate no later than January 12, 1959?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is aware of that provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me ask, Mr. President, that the clerk read that provision; it is to be found on page 43 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the provision will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Rule XXXII, section 2:

The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair hold that that provision is unconstitutional?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair rules that that is unconstitutional?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair may complete his opinion: As the Chair pointed out in his advisory opinion during a previous session of the Senate, any provision of the rules adopted by the Members of the Senate in one Congress cannot, in his opinion, inhibit the constitutional right of a majority of the Members of the Senate in any new Congress to adopt their rules by majority vote.

As the Senator from Georgia has properly pointed out, only a majority vote is required to change the rules, if the Senate reaches the point of voting.

What the Chair held as, in his opinion, unconstitutional was the attempt of the Senate in a previous Congress to inhibit the right of the Senate in a practical sense to get to the point where it could adopt rules by majority vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the rule which the Chair thinks unconstitutional in the body of the Senate rules is the one to be found in rule XXII?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The rest of them the Chair deems to be constitutional?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me, for a brief question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, let the Chair answer the question which has been asked by the Senator from Georgia.

The Chair has held that in his opinion the Senate does not have a right in any one Congress to adopt any rule which would restrict the right of a majority of the Members of the Senate to adopt its rules at the beginning of a new Congress. In the Chair's opinion, the section of rule XXII which bears the name of the Senator from Georgia—the Russell amendment—would so restrict that right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President, the Russell amendment has long been extinguished; it was wiped out years ago, I say with profound regret, for I think the Senate made a mistake.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me, for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a minute, please; I wish to protect my rights here.

Of course, Mr. President, the Chair would not hold at a subsequent time, if this matter were then presented concretely with respect to a matter pending before the Senate, that the Senator from Georgia had waived his right of appeal by not entering an appeal at this time, would he?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair would not under any circumstances deny the right of the Senator from Georgia to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are now discussing the matter in the abstract, rather than in the concrete; and the Chair would not rule that it would be unconstitutional, later, for the Senator from Georgia to enter an appeal when the matter was presented to the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would actually expect an appeal to be made from the ruling of the Chair in this instance, because, as the Chair has pointed out, what has been referred to as the ruling of the Chair was not a ruling; it was an advisory opinion made following a parliamentary inquiry, as the Chair recalls, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Chair's recollection is completely correct about that; it was an advisory opinion, and I do not believe the Chair actually passed on the matter at all at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And there is no necessity for the Chair to pass on it now. However, I do not desire to waive any right I have, because under rule XL it is not absolutely essential that we pass on it now.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I address my question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The Vice President, in his advisory opinion, has stated that, in his opinion, the Senate has the constitutional right at the beginning of a new Congress to determine what its rules shall be. Does the Senator from Georgia think that the Vice President could rule in any other way on the constitutionality of rule XXXII? In effect, would the Senator from Georgia imply that the Vice President would rule that a Senate rule could amend the Constitution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I did not mean to imply that. But, as the Senator from South Dakota well knows, there has been before the Seante the issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body; and the distinguished occupant of the Chair has very fairly and frankly stated on a number of occasions that this was his view, but that if the Senate expressed another view, the Senate would be completely within its rights, although contrary to the view of the Vice President.

I raised the question for the reason that there has previously been before the Senate the issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body. I did not expect the Vice President to express his view as to the constitutionality of any of the rules, unless it was done in the light of the determination that the Senate is a continuing body. That determination was had by majority vote, I believe, only 2 years ago. That was subsequent to the time when the Chair made his ruling and we discussed it. That is the reason why I raised the question.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. JAVITS, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Georgia allow the Chair to comment on his statement, since, as the Senator from Georgia has properly pointed out, we are trying to keep the record straight as to the ruling the Chair has made or the opinions the Chair has rendered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair in his advisory opinion did hold that the Senate was a continuing body and that the rules of the Senate did continue except for any rule adopted by the Senate which, in the opinion of the Chair, would inhibit the constitutional right of a majority of the Members of the Senate to change its rules or adopt new rules at the beginning of a new session of the Senate. This was the basis of the Chair's advisory opinion. The Chair's opinion was not that it was not a continuing body and that it began with no rules at all at the beginning of a new Congress. It is the opinion of the Chair that, at the beginning of each new session of Congress, the Senate does operate under and begins its business with the rules adopted in previous sessions of the Senate; but the Chair holds that any provision of the rules previously adopted which would restrict what the Chair considers to be the constitutional right of the majority of the Members of the Senate to change the Senate's rules, or to adopt new rules, would not be applicable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very happy for the Chair to make that statement. I did not intend to misquote the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I am sure the Senator did not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not read the advisory opinion of the Chair for some time. I must confess I subjected it to rather detailed study at the time it was made. I believe it was made in 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 1957.

Mr. RUSSELL. My memory of it was much better then than it is now, but I studied it carefully at that time. Many things have occurred since then. We have had other parliamentary situations created in the Senate since that time to which it was necessary that I address myself.

I do suggest, with all deference to the Chair, that it is most unusual for the Chair to select any one rule and say the Senate is not a continuing body, but then say another rule can go over with the other rules to another session of Congress. I will discuss that, perhaps, in more detail, at a later time. It is a matter of opinion. I was of the opinion that the Senate ought to adopt all new rules or, if we were a continuing body, that all rules would carry over. While I, of course, view this with a rather jaundiced eye, it did seem to be more logical than for the Vice President, representing the Executive, to select one rule of the Senate and hold it unconstitutional and to hold the other rules constitutional.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Presiding Officer ruled on the constitutionality of rule XXXII? Did not the Chair make a ruling on the constitutionality of the rule. In response to an interrogatory by the Senator from Georgia, did not the Chair today express a ruling on the constitutionality of rule XXXII?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair expressed his opinion that the provisions of rule XXXII which would inhibit the right of a majority of the Members of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to change its rules by majority vote would be unconstitutional.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whether it was expressed as an opinion or not, the Senator from South Dakota understood it to be a ruling; but, under the practice of the Senate, whether a ruling or whether merely the question was raised, should not that question be referred to the Senate at this time as to its constitutionality?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question as to constitutionality can be referred to the Senate for decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia with the Vice President has been very helpful. So far as my recollection is concerned, it is accurate. The Chair is not making a formal ruling on these particular matters of procedure relating to the rules of the Senate. The Chair has laid down an advisory opinion, as he did in 1957, relating to the rules of the Senate, and as he is doing today, relating to that part of section 32 which reads as follows:

> The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

As I understand, the only way we can have a decision reached on rule XXXII is for the Chair to make a ruling on a parliamentary inquiry or on a point of order, and then place it before the Senate, on motion of a Senator, to determine whether or not the ruling of the Chair is sustained. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that we may understand the parliamentary situtation for tomorrow, if the majority leader would, as he has indicated, move to recess, rather than to adjourn, would it be the situation that if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico gains recognition, under his motion of notice to bring up a change in the rules, that motion for a change in the rules would be in order tomorrow, would be subject to debate, and could be resolved either by motion to table or the previous question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's opinion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Chair rule the previous question could be applied on something brought up under rule XL of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's ruling, because, in the Chair's opinion, the right of a majority of the Members of the Senate to adopt its rules in the beginning of a session would include the right to bring the matter to a vote by moving the previous question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the previous question ruling be under Robert's Rules of Order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the previous-question motion be guided by Robert's Rules of Order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, Robert's Rules of Order would be applicable to the extent that they might apply, but also having in mind the previous procedures of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair, because Robert's Rules of Order provide for a two-thirds vote in moving the previous question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if I may continue the interrogation, in response to what has just been said, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] submitted a notice of intention to submit a resolution to change the rule relating to what we call a majority of those qualified and having been sworn, referred to as a constitutional majority. The senior Senator from Minnesota had given notice of intention to make a motion. If the Senate recessed, as it has been indicated it would do, would the motion of the Senator from Minnesota be in order as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, providing the Senator from New Mexico obtained the floor first?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Minnesota would not be in order, because it embraces more propositions than are contained in the perfecting amendment offered by the Anderson resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We lay down this assumption: there is a motion on the part of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to modify, to amend, or to change rule XXII in substance; namely, that three-fifths of those Senators present and voting shall be able to apply cloture rather than two-thirds.

Do I correctly understand that the Presiding Officer is giving us an advisory opinion to the effect that if the Senator from Minnesota or any other Senator should offer an amendment which would provide, in substance, that a majority of those Senators qualified and sworn, having taken the oath of office, could apply cloture, it would not be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The perfecting amendment would have precedence over the substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then would it be possible for the Senator from Minnesota to offer his motion as a perfecting amendment to the Anderson motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The difficulty with that procedure would be that the Senator would be embracing material which was not included in the original Anderson proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say, most respectfully, to the Presiding Officer, that I have never known the day, when a motion in the first degree was offered as an amendment to an existing rule or to an existing bill, when we in the Senate were denied the opportunity to offer a motion in the second degree. I hope that we do not get an advisory opinion which would deny a Member of the Senate under any circumtances the right to offer a motion in the second degree in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proper way for the Senator to proceed would be to get action on the perfecting amendment first. Then the Senator could proceed to get action on his proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the Presiding Officer mean by that? Does the Presiding Officer call the Anderson amendment a perfecting amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the method in which it is offered, that is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So what the Presiding Officer is saying is that we would first vote upon the Anderson amendment as a perfecting amendment. Then, if the Senator from Minnesota wished to offer his amendment, he would have to offer it as a second measure to be voted on after the Anderson amendment. Is that what the Presiding Officer is saying?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Once the Anderson amendment is disposed of, then the Senator can offer his amendment as a substitute to the original proposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have examined the form and the text of each of these proposals. The Anderson proposal is a simple resolution to strike out "two-thirds" and to substitute "three-fifths." As I look at the form of the Kuchel-Humphrey proposal, it will be

amendatory of the Anderson proposal with additional text and additional changes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would not preclude it from first consideration, as I see it, because it is perfecting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say, most respectfully, to the minority leader and to the Vice President, that 2 years ago, I recall, we had very much this same situation before us, with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] being privileged to have his motion placed before this body. The then majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], offered his change in the rules as a substitute for the Anderson proposal. As we know, this was carried.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. [DIRKSEN], the minority leader, has simplified this matter and has made it quite clear that what the Anderson proposal would do is to change the arithmetic, so to speak, of rule XXII, and what the Kuchel-Humphrey and other cosponsors' amendment would do is not only to change the arithmetic but also to change the basic substance of rule XXII, and therefore is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it possible now to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the suggested resolution which the Senator from Minnesota, and I, and other Senators have submitted? If so, Mr. President, in what fashion may a motion be made to bring our proposal befor the Senate for debate and action?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the question of the distinguished minority whip is answered, may I invite to his attention what amounts to a tentative agreement arrived at earlier, whereby I thought with the approval of the Senators on this side of the aisle, and I assumed with the approval of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, we would not bring up any of these three measures today but would recess tonight and bring them up tomorrow.

Since then I have discovered, from talking with the Parliamentarian, that it would be better to adjourn tonight, and that the right to bring up those three measures or any others would be protected and would not be impinged on in any way.

I wished to get that clear. I hope the understanding is that these proposals will not be brought up today, but will be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate what my friend the able majority leader has to say.

I trust that the matter can go over until tomorrow. In that connection, if I may have the permission of my friend, when the able Vice President made his ruling in the previous Congress he suggested in part that a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Congress have power to adopt rules at the opening of the new Congress.

Would the Vice President rule that if we go over to a new legislative day, we will still have "the opening of a new Congress" before us, so that we can apply our rights under the Constitution, which, in his opinion, we have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the opinion of the Chair that so long as no substantive business is undertaken by the Senate the opening of the new Congress still is in effect, so that the Senate would be able to adopt its rules under the majority procedure which the Chair has described.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Vice President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, with the proviso, of course, that all of these protections are allowed, so that these bills could be considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, of course there is no question that it would be necessary for the Senate to adjourn to ever get the Anderson motion before the Senate, because the rule requires 1 legislative day.

I wish to know about all of these protective measures, and whether I am waiving any rights in regard to them. I have not been keeping up with all of this side discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There really are no protective measures, except an assurance that these measures which have been introduced today by various Members will be considered tomorrow or some time thereafter. There is the right to have those measures considered, which would not be forfeited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there is no question, under the rules, on the matter of adjournment. In order to move to proceed to take the Anderson resolution from the table and consider it an adjournment is required. I should like to find out exactly what these unconstitutional rules are. I do not know exactly what protective measures are involved in the Senator's statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator may recall that, in response to a question from the senior Senator from California, I stated that in view of what I thought was an advisory opinion laid down by the Presiding Officer we would have to recess tonight to protect the Senator's right to have this proposed legislation considered, but I find since, from talking with the Parliamentarian, that it would be more advisable to adjourn. I wanted to make sure, on the basis of the agreement we entered into earlier, that these measures could be considered and debated on their merits.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suppose it is an admission against interest for me to suggest that unless the Senate did adjourn, it would be impossible ever to proceed to the consideration of the Anderson proposal, because the rule requires that it lie over 1 legislative day, and adjournment is required to establish a legislative day.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have surely had a prolonged procedural discussion on this subject. I would like to attempt to simplify the procedure, if I may, so we can get on with our work.

I understood it was the expressed desire of the majority leader that the Senate adjourn tonight, and that with adjournment no rights would be lost to proceed tomorrow to the consideration of amendments, resolutions, or motions relating, in this instance, to the rules of the Senate. For example, if the Anderson proposal were called up for consideration, it would be subject to debate and there would be no requirement that it lie over an extra day. Is my understanding correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the same rule apply to the amendment of Senators HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, and others?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand there are two procedures that the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues might use. One would be to offer our amendment without any reference to the Anderson amendment, and to seek recognition so that we can have it voted upon first, if we desire to have it voted upon; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier a notice of motion to amend rule XXII, made pursuant to rule XL of the present Standing Rules of the Senate, was read for the information of the Senate. It was offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself and other Senators. If we proceed to adjourn the Senate tonight, would a motion be in order by any Senator to make the proposed resolution the pending business tomorrow?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senator could make such a motion, provided there was not other business before the Senate which would be in conflict with it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not wish to repeat myself, but if such a motion were made, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer, would Members of the Senate be drawing on their rights under the Constitution to consider and debate and then vote on the resolution, as the distinguished occupant of the Chair previously outlined it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's opinion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader had to leave the Chamber momentarily.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Chair recognize the Senator from Minnesota, so that I may address a parliamentary inquiry to him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. The Chair made some mention of Robert's Rules of Order. Would the Chair also give us his view as to the applicability, within the context of the Chair's ruling on the constitutionality, of Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice?

Mr. RUSSELL. If we are going to have a ruling, may we have concrete cases stated? Jefferson's Parliamentary Manual covers a wide range of occasions and procedures.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Chair desire to have the specific instance cited in Jefferson's Manual to which I refer? If so, specifically I refer to section 34, which deals with the previous question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the Chair's opinion, the Senate has the right at the beginning of any new Congress, by majority vote, either to change its rules or to adopt such new rules as it desires.

The Chair has indicated that in his opinion the Senate is a continuing body and that the rules adopted by the Senate in one Congress carry over to the next Congress, except for any rule which would inhibit the constitutional right of a majority of the Members of the Senate in a new Congress to adopt or change its rules.

In the opinion of the Chair, when the Senate, at the outset of a new Congress, considers its rules, it is, of course, necessary for the Senate to have some rules under which to operate. As has been indicated, such rules as have been adopted in a previous Congress will be applicable, to the extent that they are not unconstitutional.

Where, as in this instance, the Chair believes the Senate has adopted, in a previous Congress, a rule which would inhibit the right of a majority of the Senate to work its will on rules, then it is necessary to look to other rules which may guide the Senate and the Presiding Officer in the course of considering rules changes. Consequently, it is the opinion of the Chair, as the Chair stated in responding earlier to a parliamentary inquiry by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that Robert's Rules of Order could apply to the extent that they also meet the standards which the Chair has described.

The Chair believes, however, that the Senate, in order to work its will with regard to its rules by majority vote, must also have the right to bring the matter of its rules changes to a vote by a majority vote, which means the right to move the previous question. This is what the Chair will rule as his opinion.

The Chair recognizes that this opinion is not shared by some Senators, and a constitutional question would be raised once an appeal from the opinion of the Chair was taken. That constitutional question could be submitted to the Senate for a decision, since the Senate decides constitutional questions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry was whether the Chair would couple in its opinion Robert's Rules of Order with Jefferson's Manual, so that the Chair could refer to whatever the Chair felt was consistent with its opinion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the effect of the Chair's ruling.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Anderson resolution makes a very simple change in rule XXII. If I read correctly the Humphrey-Kuchel or the Kuchel-Humphrey proposal, it is a perfecting amendment, or an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which, if it were adopted, and on which action would have to take place first, would displace the Anderson amendment and would extinguish, in fact, the Anderson resolution. Is my understanding correct or not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Kuchel proposal were acted upon first, that would, in effect, be the will of the Senate in this particular matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could we avoid acting on the Kuchel-Humphrey proposal first? It looks to me as if it is a perfecting proposal, on which the first action must be had; and if it were adopted, the Anderson amendment or proposal would be out of court and could not be reinstated again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the proposal of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is offered, as the Senator had indicated he intends to offer it, as an independent proposal, it would be acted upon first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How can that be avoided? It has been offered under rule XL as an independent motion, but it is a perfecting amendment, and it would not be possible to recur to the Anderson amendment until perfecting amendments had been disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not yet; I should like to have the Chair respond to my inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that is the desire of the Chair, I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that the purpose of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, and other Senators who have associated themselves with the so-called majority rule provision, is as follows: It was the understanding among some of us who had discussed the matter of a rules change that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would offer his modification of rule XXII. A number of Senators are very much in favor of what we call majority rule, under rule XXII. It was our desire to offer an amendment or a resolution in the nature of a substitute for the Anderson proposal, so that we could first vote on majority rule. If that should not succeed—we hope it shall, and shall work for its success—then the Senate could move next to the second step, to the consideration of the Anderson proposal providing for a vote by three-fifths of Senators present in order to terminate debate. That was our desire.

The ruling of the Chair, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, is to the effect that the motion or the amendment presented by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, and other Senators, is not in the nature of a substitute; and that, therefore, the first vote would have to be upon the Anderson proposal. Then we would come, secondly, to the proposal that we have offered for majority rule.

I submit that this should not be a matter which is irreconcilable. We are seeking to provide a rather simple procedure; namely, to have a vote on majority rule without precluding the right to a vote upon a three-fifths majority, if the proposal for majority rule does not succeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not make any difference what the understandings were, and it does not make any difference what attitude may be taken as to the nature of the Senator's proposal. It has to speak for itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We thought it did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it an amendment in the nature of a substitute? It does not even have to recite that fact. If by implication or as a matter of fact it is a substitute, it has to be so considered under Senate rules, no matter what I think or what anybody else thinks. I contend, on the basis of the form and the text in which the Senator offered it, that it has to come first; and if it comes first, as an amendment to the Anderson resolution, that is the end of the Anderson resolution. Then the only problem we have is a question of majority vote as against the existing rule in the Senate rule book. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's interpretation is correct. What we seek—what the Senator from California has suggested in his notice of motion—is not an amendment to anything except rule XXII. It is a resolution to change rule XXII, and will stand in its own right, not as a substitute, not as a perfecting amendment, but as a substitute for the existing rule XXII.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the difficulty is that in the form in which it was offered it is clearly contained in a form sheet labeled "an amendment." It is an amendment to Senate bill —, waiting for the Anderson resolution to be assigned a number. That is done in parentheses, and it can mean only one thing, namely, that it is a perfecting amendment; and if it is, the vote on it must come first, regardless of what I think or what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished Senator from California, the minority whip, or anyone else thinks. The rules are clear on that point. That is where the first vote must come. If it should prevail, that is the

end of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out, perhaps in the form of a parliamentary inquiry, that the Humphrey-Kuchel resolution is offered as a new section, subsection 3, to rule XXII, and that if it is accepted by majority vote, then subsection 2 of rule XXII is still in order.

If subsection 2 of rule XXII is amended by the Anderson resolution, then we would have a three-fifths majority vote—or a two-thirds majority vote, as it now is—upon a certain procedure.

Then we have subsection 3, a new subsection, which creates an entirely new formula for a constitutional majority to prevail. Therefore, as I see it, either it is necessary to wipe out the first three paragraphs of subsection 2, if the constitutional majority prevails, or there will be two procedures which will be in conflict with each other.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not in the form in which they were offered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will put that statement in the form of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; I yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I make that as a parliamentary inquiry, because it seems to me that if the contention is correct that if the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment comes first the Anderson amendment cannot be offered, that still leaves subsection 2 of rule XXII unchanged. If that be true, will we then vote on subsection 3, or will we vote on the new subsection 3, or will we vote on the procedure under subsection 2? They are in conflict with each other.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I be heard on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I must yield. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, it is the desire of those who are sponsoring this rule change to maintain the present right of the Senate to invoke cloture by a two-thirds vote 2 days after a cloture petition is filed. But it is also the desire of those who sponsor this rule change—to which I have affixed my name, along with the names of other Senators—to provide that after 15 days of debate, Sundays and holidays excluded, a majority may invoke cloture.

But, Mr. President, in addition to that comment, I should like to say that, if it would make more clear the desire which the Senator from Minnesota and I and other Senators have, I hold in my hand a proposed Senate resolution, on the proper printed form, which I do wish to send forward, if I may, so that the regrettable error—namely, that what we here term a Senate resolution was on an amendment form—may be eliminated from consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would the Senator like to withdraw his previous resolution, and to submit this one in its place?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes—either that or by way of addition; it makes no difference to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question? If that is offered as section 3, as a new section, in the form of a resolution, what will become of the language which already has been voted?

Mr. KUCHEL. Section 2 would remain as a part of the present rule, and would continue to give two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, after a cloture petition had been filed and had been at the desk for 2 days, the right to conclude debate and invoke cloture. But what we hope to persuade the Senate to do is to provide an additional procedure whereby, after a cloture petition lies at the desk for 15 days, a constitutional majority of the Senate would then be able to approve it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, there will be two steps under rule XXII?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, two available procedures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under rule XXII?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has had the floor, but has indicated his willingness to yield to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has left the floor; and the Senator from South Dakota is now recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, basically, what the Chair has indicated as his opinion is that the first business of the Senate, in a new Congress, can be modification of the rules coming over from the last Congress. That is basically what the Chair has suggested; namely, that the first business can be modification of the old rules.

It seems to me that a corollary of that is that if at any time, under that procedure, the Senate proceeds to some other business, then what the Chair has indicated as his opinion would be the case; namely, that the Senate would then have exhausted its right to change its rules; that if it had the opportunity to change them, but proceeds to some other business, then it passes beyond that opportunity. However, until the Senate has transacted some other business, it has a continuing right to change the rules.

I make this observation because it seems to me that part of the confusion arises from the assumption that if a motion to change the rules in one particular were adopted, that would preclude an opportunity to change the rules in some other particular. It is my opinion that the rules could be changed in many particulars, provided the Senate had not then proceeded to some other business. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota has correctly stated the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that be so, then if the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] wished to get priority after the Senator from New Mexico had been recognized, all they would have to do to obtain a vote on the question of a majority vote, as opposed to a question of a two-thirds or a three-fifths vote, would be to offer to the Anderson motion a simple amendment changing the three-fifths vote provision to a simple majority vote provision. That would bring up that issue at that time.

If they then desired to deal with some other provision of the rules or to proceed in another way to change the rules, if no other business had been transacted they could still seek to amend or to change the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some might consider that a change in rule XXII should then be made; others might consider that a change should then be made in the rule pertaining to the size of committees. If some Senator sought to make a motion, after proper notice, to make a change in the rule pertaining to the size of committees, if no business other than procedure to change the rules had been engaged in, I assume such a motion would be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the opinion of the Chair, and the Chair would so rule.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is wholly consistent with the position the Chair has taken in his advisory opinion—namely, that the Senate has a right, under the Constitution, to be the judge of its own rules; but if it once waives that right or, after acting under it, proceeds to other business, it then has waived that right for that particular session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair add that the opinion of the Chair, expressed in 1957, was that once the Senate conducts substantive business under rules previously adopted, it by acquiescence adopts those rules in their entirety. The Chair would also add that once the Senate so proceeds, it also adopts any rules it previously may have adopted, affecting changes in the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thoroughly agree with the opinion expressed by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair may further spell out the opinion: Once the Senate proceeds to conduct substantive business without acting upon its rules or after declining to act, as the Senate did at the beginning of the last Congress, then after that point the rules cannot be changed except under the rules previously adopted by the Senate, whenever they may have been adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is to say, after proper notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And under whatever rules may then have been adopted and may be in effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If, tomorrow, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is first recognized, obviously his motion will be entitled to be voted upon prior to the taking of votes on other motions, unless a true perfecting amendment is offered to the amendment

submitted by the Senator from California. Is that correct? Once he is recognized, his proposal will be the first to be voted upon, unless a perfecting amendment is offered to his motion. Is not that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I be heard?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. KUCHEL. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the desire of the Senator from Minnesota, myself, and other Senators, let me say that we desire to reoffer the text of our proposed change, and to do it as a clear resolution proposing a change in rule XXII; and I wish to advise the Chair that with respect to the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the able Senator from South Dakota—who, if I correctly understood him, asked whether such a resolution, when offered, would be subject to amendment——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, that is a rather simple proposition: that if such a resolution is offered, it certainly will be subject to amendments which would normally be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in light of the explanation which has been made by my associate in this matter [Mr. KUCHEL], I will now offer a separate resolution which will relate to an amendment to section 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate. This resolution is offered in its own right, and, in light of the explanation given by the Senator from California, is not to be considered as a substitute for or a perfecting amendment to any other matter before the Senate.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], myself, and a number of other Senators, the names being attached, and ask that the names and the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I also ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have the resolution read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senate ought to be apprised of what we are being asked to consider. It was once the rule that resolutions had to be read. I hope that elementary rule will be observed, whether we proceed under Robert's Rules of Order, or whatever procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 5) offered by Mr. HUMPHREY for himself and other Senators, was read as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this section, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over, under the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want it quite clear that this resolution, as I describe it, stands on its own right or its own feet. There was also another notice of intent to call up another resolution that had been submitted earlier, and notice had been given by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. It is my understanding the Senator from California will now offer another motion of intention to act tomorrow upon this particular resolution, without vacating his original.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is correct, I will say to my friend.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice of motion to amend a part of the rules of the Senate, submitted by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], myself, and sundry other Senators, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely:

Section 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for bringing debate to a close by a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn after full and fair discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, do we not have three resolutions pending at the desk, or two?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, is he correct or is he not? Is it three or two?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are three propositions on the desk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are three propositions on the desk.

A further inquiry, Mr. President. Are there three motions of intent pending at the desk to move tomorrow?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So we have three resolutions before us and three motions, all independent of each other. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the rule, I would take it that the Senator first recognized would get the floor and the resolution offered by such Member of the Senate would be the first to be considered. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those propositions that go over under the rule would come down in the order in which they have been offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under that ruling, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would

be the first to be automatically recognized for consideration of his resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had thought of withdrawing the first resolution by agreement. I intend this afternoon to substitute a full resolution, offering the entire text of rule XXII.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that were done and the full text were submitted, then either one of the two alternate resolutions pending at the desk could be offered.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In that event, the first action of the Senate would come on either one of the alternative resolutions offered either by the Senator from California or by the Senator from Minnesota. I think the Senator has offered both of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senator could call up either of them as perfecting amendments or substitutes. So in that way he might be recognized. That would establish the circumstances under which either proposal would first have to be considered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that if the Senator from New Mexico offers a new resolution that takes the full text of rule XXII and modifies it with a three-fifth requirement which he intends to place in that amendment, then it would be subject to an amendment in the nature of a substitute as has been presented to the Senate, and lies on the desk, on the part of the Senator from California, the Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is not a parliamentary inquiry, but I think we ought, for the information of the Senate, understand from the Senator from New Mexico whether he does today propose to offer this, because if he does not, under rule XL, we could not act on it tomorrow.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Illinois, I do intend to propose it. If the Senate started to recess I should have to read the rules of the Senate until the text arrived. As soon as the text arrives I shall propose it, I will say to my friend from Illinois, and it will be before the Senate, and there will be a motion to bring it before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Members of the Senate can accept, as the order of business tomorrow, the full text will be before the Senate, and the substitutes or amendments in the nature of substitutes can be offered?

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as the Senator from New Mexico is concerned that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. CLARK, addressed the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to offer a notice in writing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had not yielded the floor, but I believe I will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yields the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I hereby give notice in writing it is my intention to hereafter submit a resolution proposing to amend rule XIX, relating to debate, by inserting, after paragraph No. 1 of the said rule a new paragraph No. 2, and I ask that it be read.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for the consideration and germaneness of amendments, together with debate thereon, to a matter pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) read as follows:

During the consideration of a bill, resolution, or other matter which has been pending before the Senate for 7 calendar days or more, it shall be in order to offer motions that the Senate proceed with the consideration of amendments which motions shall be privileged and decided with not more than 1 hour of debate, to be equally divided between opponents and proponents.

If such a motion shall be determined in the affirmative, any amendment thereafter received, together with debate thereon, and all debate under the order for pending business shall be required to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. All questions of relevancy under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided without debate.

Change the numbers of the succeeding paragraphs of the rule.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit the resolution for myself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. It is a resolution pertaining to germaneness, and I trust it will not be confused with the other resolutions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I also intend to propose a rule pertaining to germaneness as soon as I can get the floor. Perhaps we can get together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 6) is as follows:

Resolved, That rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to debate, be, and it is hereby, amended by inserting after paragraph numbered 1 of said rule a new paragraph numbered 2, as follows:

"2. During the consideration of a bill, resolution, or other matter which has been pending before the Senate for seven calendar days or more it shall be in order to offer motions that the Senate proceed with the consideration of amendments, which motions shall be privileged and decided with not more than one hour of debate, to be equally divided between opponents and proponents.

"If such a motion shall be determined in the affirmative, any amendment thereafter received, together with debate thereon, and all debate under the order for pending business shall be required to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. All questions of relevancy under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided without debate."

Change the numbers of the succeeding paragraphs of the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we had a number of rulings today of one kind and another. I wish to make one thing very clear: If any of these resolutions are laid down and are made the pending business by the Senate, they will be subject to amendment by any Senator who wishes to propose any change in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that correct, Mr. President?

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. I inquired of the Chair: If any of these resolutions are handed down and become the pending business before the Senate, will they not be open to amendment by any Senator who desires to propose any change in the Standing Rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the germaneness rule——

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The germaneness rule would not apply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. There is no rule of germaneness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We should make that clear.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, if the Senator from South Dakota desired to propose an amendment as an amendment to the proposition of the Senator from New Mexico, he would have the right to offer it as an amendment, would he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He would have a right to offer an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has a number of suggested amendments which he has espoused very vigorously to the Senate, would likewise have a right to offer his amendments as amendments, would he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator repeat that inquiry? There is some conversation at the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad I can see over the participants and can see the Presiding Officer. I cannot hear him very plainly. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Pennsylvania has a number of amendments which he has discussed in the public press and over television.

Mr. CLARK. And on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. And on the floor of the Senate, in the last session. The Senator has also mailed them to all the Members of the Senate. Any one of those amendments would be in order, would it not, if any one of these resolutions should become the pending business of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would hold that if the rule which the Senator desired to amend were not related to the Anderson proposal, for example, that notice would be required under rule XL.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if notice were given under rule XL, then any amendment to the rules would be in order as an amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we have had a number of rulings today, and anyone would be hard put not to be pleased by some of them—as well as highly displeased by some of them—because they meet each other coming back on occasion. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that no point of order as to any of these rulings, whether in conflict or not, has been waived by any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so holds.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Presiding Officer holds that any point of order as to any of these rulings would be preserved and could be raised prior to final action on the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that includes the question of constitutionality of the Presiding Officer's ruling?

The VICE PRESIDENT. By all means.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Presiding Officer proposes to submit the question of constitutionality to the Senate for determination, if that point is raised?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under Senate precedents that is the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to know we are following the precedents in some instances even if we have departed completely from them in others.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been attempting to get the floor for some time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the majority whip.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that it would be desirable at this time to read the list of cosponsors of the two resolutions which have been offered on behalf of the Senator from California and myself and other Senators, and the two notices which were also given to the Senate.

The cosponsors are as follows: Senators DOUGLAS, AIKEN, CLARK, BUSH, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, PROXMIRE, JAVITS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, KEATING, NEUBERGER, SCOTT, HART, BEALL, DODD, FONG, RANDOLPH, SALTONSTALL, MCCARTHY, MORSE, and ENGLE.

Mr. President, the names of Senators were read, one Democrat and one Republican, without any relation to their seniority or to the listing on the bill. There may be other Senators who will wish to join with us, but I desired to have the record clear today as to the number of cosponsors for the so-called majority resolution and the amendment which may be offered in case the Senator from New Mexico offers his resolution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I send to the desk written notices of motions I shall hereafter make to amend certain standing rules of the Senate and to amend, with respect to the Senate only, certain provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Unless other Senators desire to have these proposed rules changes read I do not intend to ask that they should be read. They are, in general, the rules changes which I have been arguing in public, on the floor of the Senate, and elsewhere, for quite a long while. It would take several minutes to read them. I hope no Senators will feel they should be read. If Senators so feel, however, I shall ask that they be read.

The changes proposed by Senator CLARK are as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE XXIV

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"3. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee".

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to incorporate in the Standing Rules of the Senate the democratic principle set forth in section 17 of Cleaves Manual that a simple majority of Senate members of a conference committee must be sympathetic to the prevailing view of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)), enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, with respect to the Senate, to read as follows:

"(b) No standing committee of the House, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit, without special leave, while the House is in session."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to repeal the provision in section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act which has been interpreted to authorize a single Senator by entering objection to prevent all 130 Senate standing committees and subcommittees from meeting during Senate sessions.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE XXV

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following respects:

In paragraph (h) (dealing with the Committee on Finance) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one"; and

In paragraph (k) (dealing with the Committee on the Judiciary) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" on the first line of the said paragraph and insert in lieu thereof "seventeen."

The purpose of the amendments is to increase the size of the Finance Committee from 17 to 21 members and to increase the size of the Judiciary Committee from 15 to 17 members.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE III

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend subsection 1 of rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the commencement of daily sessions) to read as follows:

"The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Journal of the preceding day shall be in order, and any such motion shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of. Unless a motion to read the Journal of the preceding day, which is nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to delete the obsolete provision in rule III which makes it possible for a single Senator to demand that the Journal of the preceding day be read and to tie up the Senate for long periods by doing so. Instead it is proposed that "unless a motion to read the Journal of the preceding day, which is nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE XIX

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XIX by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"8. During the consideration of any measure, motion or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for a rule of germaneness in debate to be invoked by majority vote on a nondebatable motion, so that the will of the Senate can be effectively carried out on urgent legislative matters.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)), enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to add the following new subsections at the end thereof, which shall be applicable with respect to the Senate only:

"(d) Each standing committee of the Senate shall meet at such time as it may prescribe by rule, upon the call of the chairman thereof, and at such other time as may be fixed by written notice signed by a majority of the members of the committee and filed with the committee clerk.

"(e) The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee of the Senate shall be determined in accordance with its rules, and any other measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee shall be considered at such meeting that a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation of written notice filed with the committee clerk.

"(f) Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee of the Senate has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than 5 hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yea-and-nay vote. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter, that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of 30 minutes."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to amend section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the Senate, to provide a "bill of rights" for Senate standing committees. The proposal would permit a majority of members of any standing committee of the Senate (1) to convene meetings of the committee; (2) to consider any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee; and (3) to end committee debate on a given measure by moving the previous question after full and fair debate of the issues.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a matter of legislative history, and as a sponsor of these proposed rules changes and of the rule changes with respect to rule XXII which have been proposed by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from California, I wish to say that I do not acquiesce in the present rules of the Senate.

I do not consider that if we adjourn tonight instead of recessing I have waived my rights to propose rule changes in accordance with the advisory opinion of the Vice President.

Moreover, it is my hope that a majority of Senators share my view that no acquiescence has taken place. I make the statement merely for the purpose of the legislative record, so that it may not be successfully contended tomorrow that if the Senate shall adjourn tonight, any Senator acquiesced in having the rules of the Senate continued as they were in the 86th Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should first like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to tell us how many rule changes he contemplates as to which notice has been filed.

Mr. CLARK. Six.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the Senator briefly paraphrase or express to the Senate what rule changes he contemplates proposing?

Mr. CLARK. The purpose of the first proposed amendment is to incorporate in the Standing Rules of the Senate the democratic principle set forth in section 17 of Cleaves Manual that a simple majority of the Senate members of a conference committee must be sympathetic to the prevailing view of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House.

The Senator will recall that we have argued that subject at some length before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely what does the Senator mean?

Mr. CLARK. I mean that the conferees on behalf of the Senate must be in favor of the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the proposed amendment an expression of the sense of the Senate, or a binding proposal under which a Senator could not serve on a conference committee if he did not take the prevailing majority view as the bill or resolution left the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. The proposed amendment is to rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and requires that a majority of the members of the Senate conferees should be in sympathy with the action taken by the Senate. I do not wish to argue the subject now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply want to be sure that we clearly understand what our distinguished friend proposes.

What is the second proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. The purpose of the second proposed amendment is to repeal the provisions of section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which has been, in my judgment, erroneously interpreted to authorize a single Senator, by entering an objection, to prevent all Senate standing committees and subcommittees from meeting while the Senate is in session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, that rule of dispensation, at the pleasure of a single Senator, would go out of the Senate rules. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the distinguished Senator propose as an alternative or substitute?

Mr. CLARK. I propose that a majority of the members of the committee may meet at any time they so desire, subject to a majority of the Senate ruling that they may not meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So if a request were to come to the Senate for a committee to meet while the Senate is in session, it would be necessary for the Senate to express its will upon that request yes or no. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. No. The committee would meet. If any individual Senator should raise a question as to the right of the committee to meet at that time, he could come to the floor of the Senate and make an appropriate motion, which, if supported by a majority, would break up the meeting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it would require a wholly negative instead of an affirmative approach, and whatever a committee would do would be fully consonant with the rules, unless a recalcitrant Member would come to the Senate floor and manage to get enough support to offset that action. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

The next proposed change is one which I have not mentioned before, so perhaps I should state it now. It is proposed to change rule XXV of the Senate by increasing the size of the Finance Committee from 17 to 21 members, and the size of the Judiciary Committee from 15 to 17 members. The Senator from Illinois is astute enough to read between the lines.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely.

Mr. CLARK. The purpose of the next amendment is to delete the provision in rule III which makes it possible for a single Senator to demand that the Journal of the preceding day be read, and thus to tie up the Senate business for long periods. Instead, it is proposed that unless a motion to read the Journal of the preceding day, which is nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approval.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that if the reading of the Journal is dispensed with, the only action which the Senate could take would be an affirmative action rather than action on the objection of a Senator?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. As the Senator from Illinois well knows, the custom has been to ask unanimous consent that reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. If the proposed rule change were adopted, such procedure would no longer be necessary.

The next proposed rule change provides that a rule of germaneness of debate may be invoked by majority vote on a nondebatable motion so that the will of the Senate could be carried out on legislative matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the proposed change provide that a motion to table would be debatable if a majority of the Senate so desired?

Mr. CLARK. No; the proposed rule would have no effect on a motion to table. It merely provides that if one Senator were to move that hereafter debate on pending business shall be germane, the motion would be put to a vote without further debate. If that motion were agreed to, then further debate on the measure must be germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose the basic objective of the proposed rule is to shut off all irrelevant speeches which have no relationship to the business before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I believe there would be plenty of time for Senators to sound off on other matters, unless we were approaching the point where it would be desirable to have the debate limited to germane subjects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senate determine whether or not the debate was relevant and germane?

Mr. CLARK. In the first instance, determination of germaneness would be by the Chair, and the ruling of the Chair would be subject to appeal to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What would be required? Would we be required in every case to ask that the stenographic transcript be sent to the Senate floor, and to have it read to determine whether or not a speech had some bearing upon the subject under consideration?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will excuse a lighter touch, let us assume that the Senator from Illinois were making one of his justly famous speeches about mother and the flag.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Let us assume, further, that the Senator from Pennsylvania were to rise and suggest that that whole discussion was not germane to the pending business. The Senator from Illinois perhaps would vigorously deny it was not germane. The Chair would rule in the first instance, and there could be an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Suppose a Senator should rise and speak about the Cradle of Liberty in the State of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, and the tradition of Gettysburg, relating the subjects of heaven, home, and mother. Who would determine whether such discussion were germane or not?

Mr. CLARK. First the Chair; second, there could be an appeal to the Senate.

The final proposal is to amend the Reorganization Act so as to provide a bill of rights for certain standing committees. This proposal would permit a majority of the members of any standing committee of the Senate, first, to convene meetings of the committee; second, to consider any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee; and, third, to end debate within the committee on a given measure by moving the previous question after full and fair debate had been had within the committee.

The Senator from Illinois may be particularly interested in this proposed rule change, because he will recall some of the proceedings in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the minimum wage bill last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that proposed rule change designed to convoke a meeting of the committee even though the chairman of the committee may have other ideas?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, if the proposed rule change were adopted, a majority of the members of a committee could override the chairman.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we understand now what our very distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has in mind. I should like to ask one additional question. Is it proposed now to call up all of these proposals? The Senator is filing all the motions under rule XL, as I understand.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And all the text of the rule changes?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the intention of the Senator from Pennsylvania then to call up all of his proposed rule changes?

Mr. CLARK. Not until after rule XXII has been disposed of one way or the other. I reserve the right to determine, as we see how the situation develops with respect to rule XXII, whether I call all of them up or only some or none.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND RULE XXII

Mr. ANDERSON for himself and Mr. MORTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to amend rule XXII, section 2, to read as follows:

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The purpose of the amendment is to amend rule XXII so as to be able to invoke cloture by a three-fifths vote instead of two-thirds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Earlier in the day I gave notice of a motion in somewhat different language. If that comes up tomorrow in the regular order of business, would I have the right to modify it by including the language just now sent to the desk?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator would have that right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could that be done without unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without unanimous consent. The Senator from New Mexico may modify his own motion.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, perhaps a question I have in mind has been asked and answered already, but in the confusion and in my negotiations with regard to this matter, I did not hear the answer, if one was given previously. May I understand that it is the Chair's view that if the notice of the Senator from New Mexico is amended as he last suggested, in accordance with the alternative notice he has given, then the motion to amend the rules, made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators, may be offered as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That, then, will be voted on first, before the motion of the Senator from New Mexico?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. That is the Chair's understanding.

DEATHS OF SENATORS HENNINGS AND THOMSON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me briefly?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask unanimous consent, with the permission of my colleagues in the Senate, that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be recognized very briefly.

Mr. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether that would constitute the transaction of any substantive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, it would not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader. I have a resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 7), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., late a Senator from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do now adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be reported.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 8), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. KEITH THOMSON, late a Senator-elect from the State of Wyoming.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do now adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions be placed in the RECORD just prior to adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 4, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1961

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Book of Exodus (33: 15) the prayer of Moses when the children of Israel were starting on their journey to the unknown country:

If Thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence.

Almighty God, something deep and haunting within our souls now compels us to turn to Thee in prayer although we cannot fully understand its meaning and measure its power.

As Thou hast set before us an un known year and an untraveled way, may we seek Thy kindly light to lead us and Thy divine strength to sustain us.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, our chosen Representatives, and all Government employees may enter upon this 87th Congress inspired with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

May we sincerely resolve to maintain and perpetuate, with conviction and courage, those noble principles and ideals of our high vocation to which we are giving our allegiance.

Hear us as we unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace:

Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever.

Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The CLERK. Representatives-elect to the 87th Congress, this is the day fixed by the Constitution of the United States for the meeting of the 87th Congress.

As directed by law, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect. Certificates of election covering the 437 seats in the 87th Congress have been received and are now on file with the Clerk of the 86th Congress. The names of those persons whose credentials show they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of their several States and of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will answer to their names to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The reading clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin	Rains	Jones, Robert E.
Andrews	Selden	Huddleston
Roberts	Elliott	

ALASKA

Rivers, Ralph J. (at large)

ARIZONA

Rhodes, John J. Udall

ARKANSAS

Gathings	Trimble	Alford
Mills	Harris	Norrell

CALIFORNIA

Miller, Clem	Gubser	Smith, Allen H.
Johnson, Harold T.	McFall	Hiestand
	Sisk	Corman
Moss	Teague, Charles M.	Doyle
Mailliard		Lipscomb
Shelley	Hagen, Harlan	Rousselot
Baldwin	McDonough	Roosevelt
Cohelan	Bell	Sheppard
Miller, George P.	King, Cecil R.	Saund
	Hosmer	Wilson, Bob
Younger	Holifield	

COLORADO

Rogers, Byron G.	Dominick	Aspinall
	Chenoweth	

CONNECTICUT

Daddario	Sibal	Kowalski (at large)
Seely-Brown	Monagan	
Giaimo		

DELAWARE

McDowell (at large)

FLORIDA

Cramer	Fascell	Haley
Bennett, Charles E.	Herlong	Matthews
	Rogers, Paul G.	
Sikes		

GEORGIA

Hagan, G.	Flynt	Davis, John W.
Elliott	Davis, James C.	Blitch
Pilcher		Landrum
Forrester	Vinson	Stephens

HAWAII

Inouye (at large)

IDAHO

Harding Pfost

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Yates	Arends
O'Hara, Barratt	Collier	Michel
	Pucinski	Chiperfield
Murphy	Finnegan	Findley
Derwinski	Church	Mack
Kluczynski	Hoffman, Elmer J.	Springer
O'Brien, Thomas J.	Mason	Shipley
	Anderson, John B.	Price
Libonati		Gray
Rostenkowski		

INDIANA

Madden	Roudebush	Harvey, Ralph
Halleck	Bray	Bruce
Brademas	Denton	
Chambers	Wilson, Earl	

IOWA

Schwengel	Kyl	Jensen
Bromwell	Smith, Neal	Hoeven
Gross	Coad	

KANSAS

Avery	McVey	Breeding
Ellsworth	Shriver	Dole

KENTUCKY

Stubblefield	Chelf	Siler
Natcher	Spence	
Burke, Frank W.	Watts	
	Perkins	

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Passman	McSween
Boggs	Morrison	
Willis	Thompson, T. A.	
Brooks, Overton		

MAINE

Garland	Tupper	McIntire

MARYLAND

Johnson, Thomas F.	Garmatz	Mathias
	Fallon	Friedel
Brewster	Lankford	

MASSACHUSETTS

Conte	Lane	McCormack
Boland	Macdonald	Burke, James A.
Philbin	Keith	
Donohue	Curtis, Laurence	Martin, Joseph W.
Morse		
Bates	O'Neill	

MICHIGAN

Machrowicz	O'Hara, James G.	Bennett, John B.
Meader		
Johansen	Harvey, James	Diggs
Hoffman, Clare E.	Griffin	Dingell
	Cederberg	Lesinski
Ford	Knox	Griffiths
Chamberlain		Broomfield

MINNESOTA

Quie	Judd	Blatnik
Nelsen	Marshall	Langen
MacGregor	Andersen, H. Carl	
Karth		

MISSISSIPPI

Abernethy	Williams	Colmer
Whitten	Winstead	
Smith, Frank E.		

MISSOURI

Karsten	Randall	Ichord
Curtis, Thomas B.	Bolling	Cannon
	Hull	Jones, Paul C.
Sullivan	Hall	Moulder

MONTANA

Battin Olsen

NEBRASKA

Weaver	Beerman	Martin, Dave
Cunningham		

NEVADA

Baring (at large)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow Bass, Perkins

NEW JERSEY

Cahill	Frelinghuysen	Rodino
Glenn	Dwyer	Addonizio
Auchincloss	Widnall	Wallhauser
Thompson, Frank	Joelson	Gallagher
	Osmers	Daniels

NEW MEXICO

Montoya (at large) Morris (at large)

NEW YORK

Pike	Multer	Fino
Derounian	Rooney	Dooley
Becker	Ray	Barry
Halpern	Powell	St. George
Addabbo	Lindsay	Wharton
Holtzman	Santangelo	O'Brien, Leo W.
Delaney	Farbstein	
Anfuso	Ryan	King, Carleton J.
Keogh	Zelenko	
Kelly	Healey	Stratton
Celler	Gilbert	Kilburn
Carey	Buckley	Pirnie

NEW YORK—Continued

Riehlman	Ostertag	Dulski
Taber	Miller,	Pillion
Robison	William E.	Goodell
Weis		

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Scott	Alexander
Fountain	Kornegay	Jonas
Henderson	Lennon	Whitener
Cooley	Kitchin	Taylor

NORTH DAKOTA

Short (at large) Nygaard (at large)

OHIO

Scherer	Ashley	Bow
Clancy	Moeller	Ashbrook
Schenck	Cook	Hays
McCulloch	Devine	Kirwan
Latta	Mosher	Feighan
Harsha	Ayres	Vanik
Brown	Moorehead,	Bolton
Betts	Tom V.	Minshall

OKLAHOMA

Belcher	Albert	Jarman
Edmondson	Steed	Wickersham

OREGON

Norblad	Green, Edith	Durno
Ullman		

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Flood	Saylor
Granahan	Fenton	Gavin
Byrne, James	Schweiker	Kearns
A.	Rhodes,	Clark
Nix	George M.	Morgan
Green,	Walter	Fulton
William J.	Mumma	Moorhead,
Toll	Schneebeli	William S.
Milliken	Whalley	Corbett
Curtin	Goodling	Holland
Dague	Van Zandt	
Scranton	Dent	

RHODE ISLAND

St. Germain Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers, L.	Dorn	McMillan
Mendel	Ashmore	
Riley	Hemphill	

SOUTH DAKOTA

Reifel Berry

TENNESSEE

Reece	Evins	Murray
Baker	Loser	Everett
Frazier	Bass, Ross	Davis, Clifford

TEXAS

Patman	Thomas	Kilgore
Brooks, Jack	Thompson,	Rutherford
Beckworth	Clark W.	Burleson
Rayburn	Thornberry	Rogers, Walter
Alger	Poage	Mahon
Teague, Olin	Wright	Kilday
E.	Ikard	Fisher
Dowdy	Young	Casey

UTAH

Peterson King, David S.

VERMONT

Stafford (at large)

VIRGINIA

Downing	Tuck	Smith,
Hardy	Poff	Howard W.
Gary	Harrison,	Jennings
Abbitt	Burr P.	Broyhill

WASHINGTON

Pelly	Hansen	Tollefson
Westland	May	Magnuson

WEST VIRGINIA

Moore	Bailey	Kee
Staggers	Hechler	Slack

WISCONSIN

Schadeberg	Reuss	Johnson,
Kastenmeier	Van Pelt	Lester R.
Thomson,	Laird	O'Konski
Vernon W.	Byrnes, John	
Zablocki	W.	

WYOMING

Harrison, William Henry (at large)

The CLERK. Four hundred and twenty-nine Members-elect have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. The Clerk would like to state that credentials have been received showing that the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN has been elected Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Nominations are now in order.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress the name of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Clerk, by authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, a Representative-elect from the State of Indiana to the 87th Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, a Representative-elect from the State of Indiana, have been placed in nomination.

Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the following to act as tellers: the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SCHENCK; the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN; and the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. MAY.

The tellers will come forward and take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—258

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Dingell
Abernethy	Buckley	Donohue
Addabbo	Burke, Ky.	Dorn
Addonizio	Burke, Mass.	Dowdy
Albert	Burleson	Downing
Alexander	Byrne, Pa.	Doyle
Alford	Cannon	Dulski
Andrews	Carey	Edmondson
Anfuso	Casey	Elliott
Ashley	Celler	Everett
Ashmore	Chelf	Evins
Aspinall	Clark	Fallon
Bailey	Coad	Farbstein
Baring	Cohelan	Fascell
Barrett	Colmer	Feighan
Bass, Tenn.	Cook	Finnegan
Beckworth	Cooley	Fisher
Bennett, Fla.	Corman	Flood
Blatnik	Daddario	Flynt
Blitch	Daniels	Fogarty
Boggs	Davis,	Forrester
Boland	James C.	Fountain
Bolling	Davis, John W.	Frazier
Bonner	Davis, Tenn.	Friedel
Boykin	Dawson	Gallagher
Brademas	Delaney	Garmatz
Breeding	Dent	Gary
Brewster	Denton	Gathings
Brooks, La.	Diggs	Giaimo
Gilbert	Loser	Roberts
Granahan	McCormack	Rodino
Gray	McDowell	Rogers, Colo.
Green, Oreg.	McFall	Rogers, Fla.
Green, Pa.	McMillan	Rogers, Tex.
Griffiths	McSween	Rooney
Hagan, Ga.	Macdonald	Roosevelt
Hagen, Calif.	Machrowicz	Rostenkowski
Haley	Mack	Rutherford
Hansen	Madden	Ryan
Harding	Magnuson	St. Germain
Hardy	Mahon	Santangelo
Harris	Marshall	Saund
Harrison, Va.	Matthews	Scott
Hays	Miller, Clem	Selden
Healey	Miller,	Shelley
Hébert	George P.	Sheppard
Hechler	Mills	Shipley
Hemphill	Moeller	Sikes
Henderson	Monagan	Sisk
Herlong	Montoya	Slack
Holifield	Moorhead, Pa.	Smith, Iowa
Holland	Morgan	Smith, Miss.
Holtzman	Morris	Smith, Va.
Huddleston	Morrison	Spence
Hull	Moss	Staggers
Ichord	Moulder	Steed
Ikard	Multer	Stephens
Inouye	Murphy	Stratton
Jarman	Murray	Stubblefield
Jennings	Natcher	Sullivan
Joelson	Nix	Taylor
Johnson, Calif.	Norrell	Thomas
Johnson, Md.	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Mich.	Thornberry
Karsten	Olsen	Toll
Karth	O'Neill	Trimble
Kastenmeier	Passman	Tuck
Kee	Patman	Udall
Kelly	Perkins	Ullman
Keogh	Peterson	Vanik
Kilday	Pfost	Vinson
Kilgore	Philbin	Walter
King, Calif.	Pike	Watts
King, Utah	Pilcher	Whitener
Kirwan	Poage	Whitten
Kitchin	Powell	Wickersham
Kluczynski	Price	Williams
Kornegay	Pucinski	Willis
Kowalski	Rains	Winstead
Landrum	Randall	Wright
Lane	Reuss	Yates
Lankford	Rhodes, Pa.	Young
Lennon	Riley	Zablocki
Lesinski	Rivers, Alaska	Zelenko
Libonati	Rivers, S.C.	

HALLECK—170

Alger	Curtis, Mo.	Laird
Andersen,	Dague	Langen
Minn.	Derounian	Latta
Anderson, Ill.	Derwinski	Lindsay
Arends	Devine	Lipscomb
Ashbrook	Dole	McCulloch
Auchincloss	Dominick	McDonough
Avery	Dooley	McIntire
Ayers	Durno	McVey
Baker	Dwyer	MacGregor
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Mailliard
Barry	Fenton	Martin, Mass.
Bass, N.H.	Findley	Martin, Nebr.
Bates	Fino	Mason
Battin	Ford	Mathias
Becker	Frelinghuysen	May
Beermann	Fulton	Meader
Belcher	Garland	Merrow
Bell	Gavin	Michel
Bennett, Mich.	Glenn	Miller, N.Y.
Berry	Goodell	Milliken
Betts	Goodling	Minshall
Bolton	Griffin	Moore
Bow	Gross	Moorehead,
Bray	Gubser	Ohio
Bromwell	Hall	Morse
Broomfield	Halpern	Mosher
Brown	Harrison, Wyo.	Mumma
Broyhill	Harsha	Nelsen
Bruce	Harvey, Mich.	Norblad
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey, Ind.	Nygaard
Cahill	Hiestand	Osmers
Cederberg	Hoeven	Ostertag
Chamberlain	Hoffman, Ill.	Pelly
Chambers	Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion
Chenoweth	Hosmer	Pirnie
Chiperfield	Jensen	Poff
Church	Johansen	Quie
Clancy	Jonas	Ray
Collier	Judd	Reece
Conte	Kearns	Reifel
Corbett	Keith	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cramer	Kilburn	Riehlman
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Robison
Curtin	Knox	Roudebush
Curtis, Mass.	Kyl	Rousselot

St. George	Sibal	Wallhauser
Saylor	Siler	Weaver
Schadeberg	Smith, Calif.	Weis
Schenck	Springer	Westland
Scherer	Stafford	Whalley
Schneebeli	Taber	Wharton
Schweiker	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Schwengel	Thomson, Wis.	Wilson, Calif.
Scranton	Tollefson	Wilson, Ind.
Seely-Brown	Tupper	Younger
Short	Van Pelt	
Shriver	Van Zandt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Halleck Rayburn

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 430, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, received 258, and the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, received 170. Two voted "present."

Therefore, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is the duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 87th Congress, having received a majority of the votes cast.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana.

(The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House of Representatives.

First of all, I think I should thank my Republican friends for their loyal support of me, but I want to say at the outset that this is one contest I did not expect to win. However, will you permit me to say that we have narrowed the gap a little bit. But whatever disappointment I may have experienced as the result of the loss of this election is alleviated by the fact that I am here presenting a distinguished gentleman whom we must all concede is highly qualified for the job. He has served longer as Speaker than any other man in the history of the Republic. That record alone is eloquent testimony of his fairness, his competence, his vigor, and his honesty. Today is the 10th time Speaker RAYBURN has been elected Speaker. Now, very shortly we are going to wish him many happy returns on his birthday—I do not know how many he has had, but I shall be happy to join in those sentiments, although wishing him many happy returns of this occasion is another matter. In any event, I am happy to say that we are all devoted to SAM RAYBURN as a person; we esteem him as a public servant; we respect his integrity; we admire his talents, and envy his experience. Moreover, we all appreciate the heavy burdens of the speakership, an office second only to the Presidency of the United States.

These are troubled times in which we live. There will be difficult decisions for us to make in the years ahead. Many of the actions we take will have to do with the maintenance of the free world, and we all must share the task of arriving at the best answers to the problems before us.

There will be times in these next 2 years, as there have been in the past, when there will be some disagreement here, and that is as it should be, so long as we have a two-party system. I trust that the time will never come when men of good will cannot have honest differences of opinion on occasion, but let me give to those of you on the right side of the aisle and the country my assurance that we in the opposition shall maintain a responsible opposition. We shall not be guilty of any negative approach. We shall cooperate to build the economic and military strength of our country. If the security of our country is threatened, we shall demonstrate to everybody the unity and purpose of a resolute people.

Having said as much, it is now my great privilege to present to you our distinguished Speaker, a great American, a great citizen from the great State of Texas, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. My friend, Mr. HALLECK, I thank you for your most generous words in presenting me again to my colleagues, to occupy this high and distinguished position.

To my colleagues all in the House of Representatives, I thank you for your gracious courtesies of the past. I shall try to merit your kindness and your friendship in the years that lie ahead.

To my colleagues on the Democratic side of the House, I cannot but be deeply touched by this further evidence of your confidence and your esteem. To be sworn into this great office 10 times is an honor that never came to any other American. In a few months I will have doubled the term of Henry Clay who had served longer as Speaker than any other man in the history of our country.

I feel a deep sense of humility, because my talents are not beyond those of the average Member of the House or the average American citizen. They are all good folks and I am proud that after more than 50 years as a legislator and as an officeholder, who has been buffeted sometimes by the waves of politics, I still have a deep and an abiding faith in people. I know that people are good folks; and I know that when they are geared to having faith and confidence in you, you are the only one who can destroy that faith and that confidence.

As was just said by my friend, Mr. HALLECK, we live in troubled times. I think that not only America, but Christian civilization today stands in the greatest danger it has faced since a lowly man walked these shores nearly 20 centuries ago preaching peace. There is peace in the world but it is an uneasy peace. Some foolish or some overambitious man may start a flame that will consume all of us.

When the ingenuity of man begins the task of creating an agency of construction he reaches a high level. But when that same hand and mind are devoted to the task of creating an agency of destruction, then they become just as efficient. Today, the hand and mind of man have created agencies having the danger of unspeakable destruction. So we in this House, in my opinion, face a serious situation at a time as dangerous as this or any other country has ever looked into the face of. It is my prayer, and shall be my constant prayer, that we will live up to the tremendous, I might say the appalling, responsibility that rests upon each and every one of us.

I do believe when critical hours arise the Members of this House will do as they have done in the past, rise to the occasion and show to the world that whether Republicans or Democrats we are all Americans and love and want to protect, defend, and perpetuate the institutions of this, the best, the mightiest, and the freest government that ever blessed mankind in all the world.

I make no promises except to say that every man and woman in this House will be treated like every other Member of the House and have all the rights of every other Member of the House, because you are chosen by the people, you are a selected group. There is not a district in this country where many men and women would not like to sit where you sit today and would run against you any time they thought they could defeat you either in the primary or in the general election.

I shall be just, I shall be fair, and lead as the lights are given to me, as I have in the past, being proud to be a Member of this House. As I have said to you so often, the House of Representatives has been my life, and it is today and it always has been my love.

Again, I thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart.

Now I am ready to take the oath of office, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will administer it.

Mr. VINSON then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the precedent, the Chair is now ready to swear in all Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on my responsibility as a Member-elect of the 87th Congress, I object to the oath being administered to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GEORGE O. CHAMBERS]. I base this upon facts and statements which I consider to be reliable.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect from Indiana will remain in his seat when other Members take the oath.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, upon my responsibility as a Member-elect of the 87th Congress, I object to the oath being administered to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER]. I base this upon facts and statements made to me which I consider to be reliable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Missouri will remain in their seats while the other Members take the oath of office.

The Members-elect and the Resident Commissioner-elect rose and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them.

QUESTION OF CONTESTED ELECTION IN FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, INDIANA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 1), as follows:

Resolved, That the question of the right of J. Edward Roush or George O. Chambers, from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, to a seat in the 87th Congress be referred to the Committee on House Administration, when elected, and said committee shall have the power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to the subject matter of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That until such committee shall report upon and the House decide the question of the right of either J. Edward Roush or George O. Chambers to a seat in the 87th Congress, neither shall be sworn.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question, does that cut off debate on the resolution?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the previous question is voted down; would it be in order then under the precedents of the House for a resolution to be offered as an amendment or as a substitute which would provide for the swearing in of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Chambers] who has a certificate of election from the sovereign State of Indiana so that he then would go on the payroll and the matter could then be referred to the Committee on House Administration for determination?

The SPEAKER. The amendment would be in order if the previous question is voted down.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 166, not voting 8, not sworn 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—252

Abbitt	Burke, Mass.	Downing
Abernethy	Burleson	Doyle
Addabbo	Byrne, Pa.	Dulski
Addonizio	Cannon	Edmondson
Albert	Carey	Elliott
Alexander	Casey	Everett
Andrews	Celler	Evins
Anfuso	Chelf	Fallon
Ashley	Clark	Farbstein
Ashmore	Coad	Fascell
Aspinall	Cohelan	Feighan
Bailey	Cook	Finnegan
Baring	Cooley	Fisher
Barrett	Corman	Flood
Bass, Tenn.	Daddario	Flynt
Beckworth	Daniels	Fogarty
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, James C.	Forrester
Blatnik	Davis, John W.	Fountain
Blitch	Davis, Tenn.	Frazier
Boggs	Dawson	Friedel
Boland	Delaney	Gallagher
Bolling	Dent	Garmatz
Bonner	Denton	Gary
Brademas	Diggs	Gathings
Breeding	Dingell	Giaimo
Brewster	Donohue	Gilbert
Brooks, La.	Dorn	Granahan
Brooks, Tex.	Dowdy	Gray
Burke, Ky.	Downing	Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.	McDowell	Rodino
Griffiths	McFall	Rogers, Colo.
Hagan, Ga.	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
Hagen, Calif.	McSween	Rogers, Tex.
Haley	Macdonald	Rooney
Hansen	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Harding	Mack	Rostenkowski
Hardy	Madden	Rutherford
Harris	Magnuson	Ryan
Harrison, Va.	Mahon	St. Germain
Hays	Marshall	Santangelo
Healey	Matthews	Saund
Hébert	Miller, Clem	Scott
Hechler	Miller, George P.	Selden
Hemphill	Mills	Shelley
Henderson	Moeller	Sheppard
Herlong	Monagan	Shipley
Holifield	Montoya	Sikes
Holland	Moorhead, Pa.	Sisk
Holtzman	Morgan	Slack
Huddleston	Morris	Smith, Iowa
Hull	Morrison	Smith, Miss.
Ichord	Moss	Smith, Va.
Ikard	Multer	Spence
Inouye	Murphy	Staggers
Jarman	Murray	Steed
Jennings	Natcher	Stephens
Joelson	Nix	Stratton
Johnson, Calif.	Norrell	Stubblefield
Johnson, Md.	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Taylor
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thomas
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, La.
Karsten	Olsen	Thompson, N.J.
Karth	O'Neill	Thompson, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Passman	Thornberry
Kee	Patman	Toll
Kelly	Perkins	Trimble
Keogh	Peterson	Tuck
Kilday	Pfost	Udall
Kilgore	Philbin	Ullman
King, Calif.	Pike	Vanik
King, Utah	Pilcher	Vinson
Kirwan	Poage	Walter
Kitchin	Powell	Watts
Kluczynski	Price	Whitener
Kornegay	Pucinski	Whitten
Kowalski	Rains	Williams
Landrum	Randall	Willis
Lane	Reuss	Winstead
Lankford	Rhodes, Pa.	Wright
Lennon	Riley	Yates
Lesinski	Rivers, Alaska	Young
Libonati	Rivers, S.C.	Zablocki
Loser	Roberts	Zelenko
McCormack		

NAYS—166

Alger	Derwinski	McCulloch
Andersen, Minn.	Devine	McDonough
Anderson, Ill.	Dole	McIntire
Arends	Dominick	McVey
Ashbrook	Dooley	MacGregor
Auchincloss	Durno	Mailliard
Avery	Dwyer	Martin, Mass.
Ayres	Fenton	Martin, Nebr.
Baker	Findley	Mason
Baldwin	Fino	Mathias
Barry	Ford	May
Bass, N.H.	Frelinghuysen	Meader
Bates	Fulton	Merrow
Battin	Garland	Michel
Becker	Gavin	Miller, N.Y.
Beerman	Glenn	Milliken
Belcher	Goodell	Minshall
Bell	Goodling	Moore
Bennett, Mich.	Griffin	Moorehead, Ohio
Berry	Gross	Morse
Betts	Gubser	Mosher
Bolton	Hall	Mumma
Bow	Halleck	Nelsen
Bray	Halpern	Norblad
Bromwell	Harrison, Wyo.	Nygaard
Broomfield	Harsha	Osmers
Brown	Harvey, Ind.	Ostertag
Broyhill	Harvey, Mich.	Pelly
Bruce	Hiestand	Pillion
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Pirnie
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Poff
Cederberg	Hoffman, Mich.	Quie
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Ray
Chenoweth	Johansen	Reece
Church	Jonas	Reifel
Clancy	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Collier	Kearns	Riehlman
Conte	Keith	Robison
Corbett	Kilburn	Roudebush
Cramer	King, N.Y.	Rousselot
Cunningham	Knox	St. George
Curtin	Kyl	Saylor
Curtis, Mass.	Laird	Schadeberg
Curtis, Mo.	Langen	Schenck
Dague	Latta	Scherer
Derounian	Lindsay	Schneebeli
	Lipscomb	Schweiker
	Springer	Weaver
	Schwengel	Taber
	Weis	
	Scranton	Teague, Calif.
	Westland	
	Seely-Brown	Thomson, Wis.
	Whalley	
	Short	Tollefson
	Wharton	
	Shriver	Tupper
	Widnall	
	Sibal	Van Pelt
	Wilson, Calif.	
	Siler	Van Zandt
	Wilson, Ind.	
	Smith, Calif.	Wallhauser
	Younger	

NOT VOTING—8

Alford	Chiperfield	Jensen
Boykin	Colmer	Stafford
Buckley	Ellsworth	

NOT SWORN—10

Adair	Moulder	Utt
Chambers	O'Konski	Wickersham
Grant	Rabaut	
Horan	Teague, Tex.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK), there were—ayes 205, noes 95.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. CON. RES. 1

Concurrent resolution to provide for the counting on January 6, 1961, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution of a preferential nature and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 2) as follows:

Resolved, That the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. MORGAN M. MOULDER, be now permitted to take the oath of office.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Would the effect of this resolution, if adopted, be to seat the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER]?

The SPEAKER. The resolution plainly speaks for itself, and the answer is "Yes."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I make one further parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is adopted, would that preclude and foreclose any further contest of these elections before the Committee on House Administration?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would have all the rights he would have under the law.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) of a preferential nature and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. VICTOR WICKERSHAM, be now permitted to take the oath of office.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. MOULDER, Mr. WICKERSHAM, and Mr. O'KONSKI appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, has been selected as the minority leader of the House.

ELECTION OF CLERK, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 4) which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That H. H. Morris, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D. of the District of Columbia, be, and he is nereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a substitute to the resolution, but before offering the substitute I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

The question was taken; and that portion of the resolution referring to the election of the Chaplain was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute resolution offered by Mr. HOEVEN:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That Harry L. Brookshire, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

"That William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

"That Tom J. Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

"That Beecher Hess, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 5

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 6

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF HON. SAM RAYBURN AS SPEAKER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 7

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES GOVERNING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 8

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was iaid on the table.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 9

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 3, 1961, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Harry L. Brookshire and William R. Bonsell, to receive gross compensation of $17,737.50 per annum, respectively; Tom J. Kennamer, to receive gross compensation of $14,781.25 per annum; and Beecher Hess, to receive gross compensation of $13,007.50 per annum.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

DECEMBER 6, 1960.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, effective midnight, December 31, 1960.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. BOSCH,
Member of Congress.

RESIGNATION AS A DELEGATE TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

NOVEMBER 14, 1960.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Because of the extreme press of business at the present time it is impossible for me to attend the NATO Parliamentarians Conference to be held in Paris this week. Therefore, I hereby submit my resignation from the House contingent.

I wish to take this opportunity to express to you my gratitude for your confidence in me in appointing me. If I may be of service to you in any way I am yours to command.

Most cordially yours,

MERWIN COAD,
Representative in Congress.

RESIGNATION AS A DELEGATE TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

NOVEMBER 14, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I sincerely regret that I must tender my resignation as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference for the year 1960.

I appreciate very much your having appointed me.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Member of Congress.

APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ORDER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the order of the House of August 31, 1960, empowering him to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on November 15, 1960, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appoint as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. JAMES B. UTT

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas JAMES B. UTT, a Representative-elect from the State of California, from the 28th District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said JAMES B. UTT at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES B. UTT.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 12) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas GEORGE M. GRANT, a Representative-elect from the State of Alabama, from the Second District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said GEORGE M. GRANT at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said GEORGE M. GRANT.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

Whereas LOUIS C. RABAUT, a Representative-elect from the State of Michigan, from the Fourteenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said LOUIS C. RABAUT at Detroit, Michigan, and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said LOUIS C. RABAUT.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 13, 87th Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] to administer the oath of office to the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 14) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means:

WILBUR D. MILLS (chairman), Arkansas; CECIL R. KING, California; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; BURR P. HARRISON, Virginia; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri; A. S. HERLONG, JR., Florida; FRANK IKARD, Texas; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Pennsylvania; JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky; AL ULLMAN, Oregon; JAMES A. BURKE, Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President of the United States requested that the committee state that he would communicate to the Congress a message in writing on January 12, 1961.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Friday, the 6th day of January 1961, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements

of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter "A", and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1961, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

APPOINTMENT OF DEMOCRATIC WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House, and my announcement is a great pleasure to me both as an official and a personal announcement, the appointment as the Democratic whip for the present Congress of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JANUARY 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on January 6, 1961, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF JAMES P. GRIFFIN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 15) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, the following-named person, effective January 3, 1961, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk), shall receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all the bills that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so that Members of the House may understand.

EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION OF COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 16) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That standing committees of the House shall have authority to approve the employment and compensation of committee employees (other than special and select committee employees) from the effective date of the beginning of each Congress, or such subsequent date as their service commenced.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 17), as follows:

Whereas by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission: Therefore be it

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of any court in the United States or a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That during any recess or adjournment of the 87th Congress, when a subpena or other order for the production or disclosure of information is by the due process of any court in the United States served upon any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, directing appearance as a witness before the said court at any time and the production of certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives, that any such Member, officer, or employee of the House be authorized to appear before said court at the place and time named in any such subpena or order, but no papers or documents in the possession or under the control of the House of Representatives shall be produced in response thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That when any said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers or documents called for in the subpena or other order, then said court, through any of its officers or agents shall have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings before said court and at a place under the orders and control of the House of Representatives and take copies of the said documents or papers and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents that the court has found to be material and relevant, except that under no circumstances shall any minutes or transcripts of executive sessions, or any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto, be disclosed or copied, nor shall the possession of said documents and papers by any Member, officer, or employee of the House be disturbed or removed from their place of file or custody under said Member, officer, or employee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Clerk of the House to any of said courts whenever such writs of subpena or other orders are issued and served as aforesaid.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 40 United States Code 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 18), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE KEITH THOMSON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 19) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, a Representative of the State of Wyoming.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 20) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., a Senator of the United States from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 4, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communication was submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 86th Congress, 2d session, pursuant to House Resolution 645, 86th Congress.

2436. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting short-form report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company, fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 458); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed pursuant to House Resolution 645, agreed to September 1 (legislative day, August 31), 1960.

[*Submitted January 3, 1961*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 103 and 104 of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

3. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report for the period ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the findings resulting from initial review of the ballistic missile programs of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

5. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 27th Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a report by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems on its activities during the period July 1 to December 31, 1959, pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the text of International Labor Organization Recommendation (No. 109), which was adopted at the 41st (maritime) session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva on May 14, 1958, pursuant to article 19 of the constitution of that organization (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Agate Dam and Reservoir, Talent division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a plan of development for the proposed Crater-Long Lakes division, Snettisham project, Alaska, pursuant to the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618) (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

10. A letter from the National Adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting reports and proceedings of the Disabled American Veterans held at their national gathering in Seattle, Wash., August 22 through 26, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

11. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copy of Resolution No. 40 of the City Council of the City of Bacolod, Republic of the Philippines, expressing the gratitude of the council for the increase in the amount of sugar authorized for importation into the United States from the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

12. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copy of Resolution No. 1021 of the Provincial Board of Negros Occidental, Republic of the Philippines, expressing the gratitude of the board for the recent increase in the amount of sugar authorized for importation into the United States from the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, United States Code, title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

14. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill entitled, "a bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

15. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements concluded during September 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

16. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

17. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements concluded August 1960 Under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

18. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements concluded during November 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Congress), as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

19. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements concluded during October 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal

year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

21. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for an additional supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation out of the postal fund for "Transportation" for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

23. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Defense for "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard" for the fiscal year 1961 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for increased pay costs, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

24. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," for the fiscal year 1960, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

25. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

26. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of State for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter dated December 27, 1960, showing that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, U.S. Secret Service" for the fiscal year 1961, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for increased pay costs, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

28. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter dated September 10, 1960, reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources Management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

29. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

30. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees' Compensation," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

32. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Department of Labor for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees' Compensation" for the fiscal year 1961, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, as required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

33. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," for fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

34. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

35. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance," for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

36. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Forest protection and utilization," Forest Service, of the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

37. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator," Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

38. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, trahsmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

39. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation, claims and expenses," for the fiscal year 1961, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

40. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of violations of obligations during the fiscal year 1960 in excess of the amount available in the appropriation for that fiscal year, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

41. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the April 1960 report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

42. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the May 1960 report of the General Sales Manager, Commodity Credit Corporation, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

43. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the June 1960 report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

44. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the July 1960 report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting several reports covering violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive

7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(1)(2) of the statute; to the Committee on Appropriations.

46. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of violations of administrative control of funds procedures in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from two of the appropriations, as of June 30, 1958, and December 31, 1959, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

47. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Eden project, Wyoming, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

48. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Almena unit and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

49. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Florida project, Colorado, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

50. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Stone Corral Irrigation District and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

51. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification that soils survey and land classification information is available in sufficient detail to determine that the lands to be irrigated from the Yellowtail unit, Lower Bighorn division, Missouri River basin project, Montana and Wyoming, are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

52. A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of the violation of the Panama Canal Company 1960 allotments, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

53. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a request for approval to proceed with projects which include taxiway construction, strengthening of existing parking apron and transition areas, and modification of existing washrack at Van Nuys Municipal Airport, California, for the Air National Guard, pursuant to section 601(4), Public Law 86-500; to the Committee on Armed Services.

54. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report "Real and Personal Property of the Department of Defense," as of June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 410, the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

55. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major, together with flight pay for the period of July 1 to December 31, 1960, pursuant to the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U.S.C. 118a-1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

56. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1960, pursuant to section 201(c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

57. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 201(c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 405, Public Law 86-149, 86th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

59. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter to inform the Congress of the intention of the Department of the Navy to give certain obsolete ordnance material to the State of Washington, pursuant to section 7545, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

60. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending September 30, 1960, pursuant to subsection 201(1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

61. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 37th report on property acquisitions, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, pursuant to subsection 201(h), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

62. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 38th report on property acquisition, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, for the quarter ending September 30, 1960, pursuant to subsection 201(h), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

64. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on contracts awarded during the period January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 557, 82d Congress, 2d session, approved July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

65. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a letter relative to the proposed transfer *Flasher* (SS-249) to the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

66. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting semiannual report from January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, military construction contracts, pursuant to section 405, Public Law 86-149, 86th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

67. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code, covering the first quarter of fiscal year 1961 (September 30, 1960); to the Committee on Armed Services.

68. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting copy of the annual reports of officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with report of audit by Haskins & Sells, certified public accountants, for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

69. A letter from the Acting Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

70. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting copy of the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Actions Report," for the period January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

71. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period January 1-June 30, 1960, listing contracts negotiated under the authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

72. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of proposed disposition of quinidine now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

73. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of proposed disposition of magnesium scrap now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

74. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of a proposed disposition of cobaltiferous materials now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

75. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of proposed disposition of low-grade domestic metallurgical chromite ore and concentrates and various ferrochrome alloys now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)) to the Committee on Armed Services.

76. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to comply with the provisions of the RFC Liquidation Act (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., as amended), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

77. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a "Report on Borrowing Authority" for the quarter ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

78. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (supply and logistics) transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

79. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting the fifty-third quarterly report, covering the third quarter 1960, required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

80. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting the Fifth Report of the Attorney General on Competition in the Synthetic Rubber Industry, covering the industry's operation under private enterprise in the calendar year 1959, pursuant to Senate Report 117, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

81. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Report to the Congress on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, Treasury Department Activities for the period ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

82. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Report to the Congress on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, Treasury Department Activities for the period ended September 30, 1960, pursuant to (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

83. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

84. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

85. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1960, pursuant to (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

86. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 10(b) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

87. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

88. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the 14th Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between January 1 and June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 10(a) of the Small Business Act of 1958, as amended (Public Law 85–536); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

89. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

90. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report showing lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1960, in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 6, 1924 (renumbered sec. 13, Public Law 592, approved July 19, 1952); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

91. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, in accordance with section 15 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

92. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

93. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report entitled "Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers," pursuant to the provisions of the act creating the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

94. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 24th semiannual report on the educational and cultural exchange programs of the Department of State, during the first half of the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

95. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the 14th report on operations of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), together with covering letters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

96. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 12th semiannual report as of June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; 50 U.S.C. App. 2001–2016), as amended, and of sec. 3(c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U.S.C. 1621–1627), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

97. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 14th semiannual report, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress, for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report to the Secretary of the Interior on the audit of the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (3 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

99. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of selected activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the Lower Colorado River Basin for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

100. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of airplane wings purchased from the Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., under Department of the Air Force negotiated fixed-price incentive contract AF 33(600)–29841, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

101. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of certain activities of the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

102. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the development and procurement of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

103. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of certain activities of the government of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

104. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of rental payments negotiated for the commercial use of Government-owned facilities furnished under Department of the Air Force contract AF 33 (038)–25718 with Avco Corp., Lycoming Division, Stratford, Conn., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

105. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the target price negotiated for Sidewinder missile guidance and control units under Department of the Navy fixed-price incentive contract NOrd–16483 with Philco Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

106. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of subcontracts issued to Reaction Motors Division, Thiokol Chemical Corp., Denville, N.J., by Convair, San Diego, Calif., under Department of the Air Force prime contract AF 04(645)–4, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

107. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958 and 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

108. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected operations of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau

of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in region 8, Portland, Oreg., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

109. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of policies and procedures relating to the leasing of space for Government activities, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, July 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

110. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the need for procurement of electric and telephone line construction trucks by the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

111. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of air item supply operations at the Transportation Materiel Command, Department of the Army, St. Louis, Mo., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

112. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the automatic data processing system at the Transportation Materiel Command, Department of the Army, St. Louis, Mo., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

113. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the general supply fund, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 383; 5 U.S.C. 630g(e)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

114. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of an audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U.S.C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

115. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Southwestern Power System and related activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

116. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property under title IV of such act, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

117. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

118. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a copy of a letter dated August 9, 1960, to the Comptroller General of the United States setting forth his position with regard to the findings and recommendations contained in the report of a review of the policies and practices of the Department of Labor and the States regarding unemployment compensation payments to retired Federal employees who are receiving retirement annuities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

119. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration; transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to provisions of the RFC Liquidation Act (Public Law 163, 83d Cong.; 67 Stat. 230, 231), as amended, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Government Operations.

120. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 30, 1947, to require wholly owned Government corporations and Federal activities financed from trust funds to pay rental for assigned space, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

121. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 11th Annual Report on Operations of the General Services Administration for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 212, Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

122. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 302(c)(11) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

123. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting from the executives of various States certificates of ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in each of the States on November 8, 1960, pursuant to provisions of section 6, title 3, of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of three orders and supporting documents covering such cancellations and adjustments to adjust or eliminate reimbursable charges of the Government of the United States existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

125. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of all laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands to the Congress of the United States as required annually, in its regular and special sessions, pursuant to the requirements of section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

126. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report as of September 30, 1960, of the activities of the Department acting under title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide aviation war risk insurance, pursuant to section 1309 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting an annual report on commissary activities outside the continental United States, submitting a negative report for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

128. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

129. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

130. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

131. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

132. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of July 31, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 12, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

133. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting several documents and publications relating to activities of public utilities in the United States for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

134. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during fiscal year 1960 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act and pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the requirements of section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department of Justice covering the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

137. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report listing the tort claims approved for payment in the fiscal year 1960 and setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount awarded, and a brief description of each claim, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting their annual report of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America for the year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 792, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

139. A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., National Shrine to the Jewish War Dead, transmitting a copy of a statement of the audit of the Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., for the fiscal year April 1, 1959, to March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 13(b), Public Law 85–903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

140. A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting their audit report pursuant to section 14(b) of congressional charter, Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

141. A letter from the national adjutant paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting a copy of the minutes of the 37th Annual Convention of the Marine Corps League held in Grand Rapids, Mich., August 16–20, 1960, also financial report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of all claims paid during the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673), part 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. A letter from the Deputy General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting copies of the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission concerning claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U.S.C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, by the Department of the Air Force, for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during fiscal year 1960, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting (1) annual certified public accountant's audit of the books of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, for the fiscal year 1960; and (2) annual report of the activities of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 15(a) and section 16 of Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, as amended, by the Department of the Air Force, for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 2732(f) of title 10, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims settled under the Federal Tort Claims Act by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as codified and amended (28 U.S.C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting two certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *Wah Chang Corporation* v. *The United States*, No. 124–55, pursuant to Private Law 997, 83d Congress, 2d session (ch. 1251, 68 Stat. A288 (1954)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, also a list giving the names of the aliens covered, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, also a list giving the names of the aliens covered, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copy of order suspending the deportation in the case of Salvatore Paladino, A8657594, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(2)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered in the case of a certain alien, Shou Eng Koo, A6148267, under the authority of section 13(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to section 13(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

157. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of activities of the Department acting under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide war risk insurance and certain liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, pursuant to section 1211 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

158. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from July 1, 1960, through September 30, 1960, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

159. A letter from the chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the 12th Annual Report of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission for the year 1959, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 232, 80th Congress, chapter 316; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

160. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relating to changes in and the status of various specified positions in the Department, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

161. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relating to changes in and the status of various specified positions in the Department under the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U.S.C. 14); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the feasibility of establishing the President Adams Parkway, pursuant to the act approved September 21, 1959 (Public Law 86–328, 86th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

164. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Round Pond Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

165. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 3, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., authorized by Public Law 435, 85th Congress, approved March 24, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

166. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Holdens Creek, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

167. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the period from January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 2304(e) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

168. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the 10th annual report in accordance with the provisions of section 12(c) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

169. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, United States of America, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Renegotiation Board, pursuant to section 114, Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

170. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 12th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission

on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to section 350(e)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

171. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, both inclusive, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 102, of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

172. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

173. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 264), and section 114 of the act of September 12, 1950 (31 U.S.C. 66b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

174. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on a proposed Presidential archival depository to house papers and other historical materials of former President Herbert Hoover, pursuant to section 507(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended by the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 695); to the Committee on Government Operations.

175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fourth annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to section 6 of the Authorizing Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

176. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to indemnify its contractors against nuclear and other unusually hazardous risks, to limit the liability of contractors so indemnified, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

177. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

178. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

179. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

181. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation by the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nevada, for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

182. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in overseas areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

183. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended October 1, 1960, pursuant to section 791(c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

184. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 26th Annual Report of Activities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports of committees on public bills and resolutions were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 86th Congress, 2d session:

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on the congressional apportionment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report maintaining the integrity of the civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report panel on Science and Technology, second meeting (Rept. No. 2226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report pertaining to life science and space (Rept. No. 2227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report pertaining to Communist-led riots against the Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. No. 2228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report pertaining to noise; its effect on man and machines (Rept. No. 2229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on proprietary rights and data pursuant to House Resolution 51 (86th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business in the dairy industry (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business in the aluminum industry (Rept. No. 2232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business problems in the petroleum industry (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. A report on small business problems in food distribution (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report of the Select Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 2235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report of Campaign Expenditures Committee pursuant to House Resolution 589 (86th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. The annual report for the year 1960 of the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to House Resolution 7 (86th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Report on Independent Regulatory Commissions pursuant to House Resolution 56 (86th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 1. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 2. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 4. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 7. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8. A bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated overall Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 13. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 14. A bill to promote the efficient, fair, and independent operation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 15. A bill to provide for the establishment of a special $18,500,000 7-year program of Federal scholarship and fellowship grants to individuals, and a $2,500,000 program of grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for the education of exceptional children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 16. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 17. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 18. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 19. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 20. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 21. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 22. A bill to amend section 4 of the Submerged Lands Act to approve and confirm the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 23. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 24. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 25. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 26. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold $10 pieces and gold $5 pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 27. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 28. A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 29. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 30. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 31. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of William Holmes McGuffey; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 32. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 33. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 34. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 35. A bill to require annual appropriations to pay the interest on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 36. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 37. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that the base year for determining any quota shall be 1950, to provide that the unused annual quota of any quota area be made available for use in quota areas where the annual quota is oversubscribed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 38. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 39. A bill to amend the Act to Promote the Education of the Blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 40. A bill to authorize a program of balanced agricultural production, to assure producers a fair economic return and consumers an adequate supply of commodities at fair prices, to conserve soil, water, and wildlife resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 41. A bill to provide additional pay at the rate of $100 per month for certain scientists serving on active duty with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 42. A bill to facilitate the recruitment of trained and experienced employees in departments of Government; to retain trained employees in Government, and to correct inequities under the Civil Service Retirement Act through crediting service under Federal-State cooperative programs or certain Federal programs financed directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by Federal funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 43. A bill to provide that three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate shall be members of the American Battle Monuments Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 44. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $200,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 45. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 46. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 47. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 48. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 18, 1941, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the United States from certain recreational activities in connection with lands required for flood control shall be used first for construction of certain hard surface connecting highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 49. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 50. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 51. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 52. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 53. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 54. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 55. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 56. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 57. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 58. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 59. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 60. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 61. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 62. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 63. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-percent increase in the education and training allowances paid to individuals pursuing educational programs under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 64. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 65. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 66. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 67. A bill to repeal the maximum limitations which apply for purposes of the income tax to the deduction for medical care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 68. A bill to promote economy in Government by reducing the rate at which individual income taxes are withheld at the source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 69. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 70. A bill to require jukebox operators to pay royalty fees for the use of the musical property of composers, authors, and copyright owners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 71. A bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 72. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, to establish standards for the organization and operation of Government advisory groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 73. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act, relating to interlocking directorates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 74. A bill to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 75. A bill to amend section 2103 of title 28, United States Code, relating to appeals improvidently taken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 76. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 77. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 78. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to tax cigars having manufactured wrappers at rates no lower than those applicable to cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 79. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 80. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 81. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 82. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing a program of atomic and disaster shelters in the Nation's schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 83. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 84. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 85. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 86. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 87. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 88. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize a decrease in the premium charged for the insurance of mortgages under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 89. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to increase the amortization period for mortgages on cooperative housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 90. A bill to extend and expand the conservation reserve program, to authorize the use of payments-in-kind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 91. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 92. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 93. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 94. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hos-

pital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 95. A bill to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for its application in the case of certain rental housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 96. A bill relating to the application of the excise tax on club dues to the amounts paid for certain capital improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 97. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 98. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and to volunteer rescue or lifesaving organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 99. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 100. A bill to amend burial benefit provisions of chapter 23, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 101. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 102. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute for the United States a civil action for preventive relief whenever any acts have been committed which would give rise to a cause of action under section 1980 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 103. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 104. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 105. A bill to prohibit the use of Government property by any organization practicing segregation on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 106. A bill to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 107. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9(a) to provide that the Veterans' Administration will transport the body of a veteran, who dies in a State home for disabled soldiers and sailors, to the place of burial within the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities; and to permit for 1 year veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total to obtain disability income protection under national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 109. A bill to amend section 311 of title 38, United States Code, so as to afford a conclusive presumption of soundness under certain conditions in wartime cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 110. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 111. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Aquarium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 112. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 113. A bill to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to accommodations at places for holding court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 114. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina holding court at Fayetteville, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 115. A bill for the allocation of costs on the Wapato-Satus unit of the Wapato Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 116. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm and define the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 117. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 118. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 119. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 120. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL (by request):

H.R. 122. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish a committee on safety regulations under the Civil Aeronautics Board for the purpose of reviewing safety regulations issued by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 123. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 124. A bill to amend the Clayton Act as amended, to strengthen our competitive enterprise system by providing for competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 125. A bill to amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraint and monopolies by providing that violations of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 126. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 127. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 128. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 20 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, and who die after 1956 shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 129. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in recognition of governmental and private efforts to promote highway safety; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 130. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit a Representative in Congress to nominate as a candidate to a service academy, a person domiciled at any place in the State from which such Representative is elected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 131. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 132. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 133. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to establish a national accident prevention center; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 134. A bill to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in the interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 135. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to remove a limitation on grants for construction of treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 136. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to

independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 137. A bill to amend section 1263 of title 18 of the United States Code to require that interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors be accompanied by bill of lading, or other document, showing certain information in lieu of requiring such to be marked on the package; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 138. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the District of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 139. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 141. A bill to provide that tips and other cash gratuities received by an individual in the course of his employment (or self-employment) may be considered self-employment income for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 142. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 143. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 144. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress, and to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 145. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 146. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 147. A bill to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 148. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to increase sugar quotas for domestic producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 149. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide that future increases in sugar quotas will be allocated to domestic beet sugar producers in a manner which will assure new growers a fair share of such increase; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 150. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 151. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 152. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 153. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 154. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 155. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 156. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to grant a pension of $100 per month to all veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 157. A bill to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey Small Craft Harbor, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 158. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital at 2615 Clinton Avenue, Fresno, Calif., the B. W. Gearhart Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 159. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of turkeys and to assure consumers an adequate supply of turkeys and turkey products of wholesome quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 160. A bill to implement section 4 of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 161. A bill authorizing construction of the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 162. A bill authorizing construction of the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 163. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 164. A bill to amend section 134 of title 28, United States Code, so as to restrain any district judge from performing regular duties in the management of business corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 165. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 166. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that volunteer fire companies which are exempt from tax under section 501 of such code shall be subject to tax on their unrelated business income but shall not lose their exemption because of such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of "disability"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 170. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the recalculation and reaward of annuities which have been paid in a lump sum on a commuted-value basis to take account of annuity increases becoming effective after such payment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 172. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 173. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to codify certain recent public laws relating to the postal service and to improve the code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 174. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 175. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 176. A bill to amend section 331 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 177. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 178. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 179. A bill to amend sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that misbehavior in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall constitute a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 180. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 181. A bill to amend sections 3253 and 8253 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 182. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 183. A bill to provide for the construction of a public building in Philadelphia, Pa., for the use and accommodation of the U.S. courts; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 184. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 185. A bill to improve the working conditions of migratory and other farm labor in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 186. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 187. A bill to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 188. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 189. A bill to amend section 1861 of title 28, United States Code, in relating to the qualifications of jurors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 190. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to allow the courts discretion in awarding damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 191. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 192. A bill to amend sections 212, 310, 340, and 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 193. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 194. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 195. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, home nursing service, and diagnostic out-patient hospital services for persons eligible for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 196. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 197. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate deductions due to home ownership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that all transportation furnished to members of the Armed Forces (instead of only transportation costing 2½ cents per mile or less as under present law) shall be exempt from the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 199. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 200. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 201. A bill to define the status of retired officers of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 203. A bill to authorize the construction and equipping of three Coast Guard cutters designed for icebreaking in the Arctic and Antarctic regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 204. A bill to confer on the Federal Maritime Board the authority to determine postal rates for ocean mail transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 205. A bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 206. A bill to facilitate administration of the fishery loan fund established by section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 207. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide for limitation of liability for vessel owners in suits by third parties based upon the warranty of seaworthiness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 208. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 209. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 210. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 211. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide life insurance in the amount of $100,000 for individuals while training for or performing, the flight of man in space; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 212. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of $100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 213. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 214. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 215. A bill to amend chapter 137 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for certain reports from contractors with the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 216. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 218. A bill to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 219. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14 of the United States Code to provide that cadets and midshipmen entering the service academies hereafter shall agree to serve 8 years on duty after graduation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.R. 220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the excise tax on transportation of persons as applied to payments for sightseeing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 221. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 222. A bill to insure greater consistency among Federal loan programs, to avoid hidden subsidies, and to achieve more effective coordination between Federal loan programs and the fiscal and credit policies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 223. A bill to restrict military aircraft maintenance, overhaul, and modification function in Government-operated facilities to performance of strictly military requirements that cannot be procured from private enterprise; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 224. A bill to prescribe a standard of loyalty to the U.S. Government for military personnel, to prescribe procedure for the determination of the loyalty of such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 225. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to eliminate the conflict and duplication between that act and

the several labor standards acts applicable to persons doing business with, or engaged in activities assisted by, the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 226. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, so that the amount of such assistance will reflect taxes paid on personal property in which the United States has an interest; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 227. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 228. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interefere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 229. A bill to further amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 230. A bill to repeal sections 5 and 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 232. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books to certain public and private institutions of higher education for his education or the education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that rebuilt parts and accessories shall be exempt from the manufacturers excise tax on automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 235. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which widows' benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 236. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 237. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education and high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 239. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 10 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 240. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 241. A bill to terminate the retailers and manufacturers excise taxes (other than taxes for the highway trust fund and taxes for fish and wildlife purposes) and the excise taxes on facilities and services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 242. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide for cancellation of student loans for service as a teacher in a private school as well as for such service in public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 243. A bill to provide for a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $800, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend section 301 of the World War Veterans Act, 1924, to provide that certain term insurance held by World War I veterans shall be considered as fully paid when the insured reaches the age of 65; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 246. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 247. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 248. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 249. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 250. A bill to amend section 1552 title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board of the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 251. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions or inventions made by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations in the general field under the supervision of the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 252. A bill to authorize the establishment of a youth camp recreation program to assist those organizations which have for their purpose the providing of healthful outdoor and camp training for indigent children and to inculcate the principles of Americanism and loyalty to the Republic in these children who are its citizens of the future; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 253. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 254. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 255. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 257. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 258. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act so as to increase the rate of tax imposed on gross receipts from certain sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 259. A bill to recognize certain national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organizations, for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 260. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 261. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 262. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 263. A bill to eliminate discrimination and segregation in the National Guard and Air National Guard, and to prohibit the use of the National Guard and the Air National Guard to aid or abet the violation of Federal law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 264. A bill authorizing appropriations for the operation of public schools in the several States which would otherwise be closed by State action intended to prevent compliance with certain orders of courts of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 265. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain individuals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 266. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Academy of Advanced Sciences and Research Coordination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend section 224 of the Social Security Act to provide that there shall be no offset against social security benefits for disabled persons on account of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 268. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 269. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the practicability and desirability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 270. A bill to assist States in the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of buildings of State or territorial soldier's homes by providing grants to subsidize

in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 271. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 272. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 273. A bill to establish an effective Federal-State program to aid in alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 275. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the allocation of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 276. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 277. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 278. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 279. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 280. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 281. A bill to provide that certain real property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Army and made a part of Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 282. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to permit judicial review of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 283. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 284. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the tariff treatment of cotton card laps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 286. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 287. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 289. A bill to declare nonmailable certain communications intended to incite racial hostility; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 290. A bill to prohibit the transmission of coins in the mails under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 291. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 292. A bill to permit Federal employees to repay indebtedness to or purchase shares of Federal credit unions through voluntary payroll deductions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 293. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 294. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation and other disposal of property to tax-supported public recreation agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 295. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation of officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall hereafter be fixed and adjusted by wage boards on the basis of prevailing rates and practices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 296. A bill to provide increases in annuities of certain individuals retired prior to April 1, 1948, under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 297. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the award of contracts by the United States to certain persons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 298. A bill to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 299. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 300. A bill to provide for site acquisition and construction of a general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 301. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions, and to provide for the establishment of a commission on metropolitan problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 302. A bill to prohibit, under certain conditions, for 2 years, the employment of a former employee of the Federal Government by any person, concern, or foreign government with which certain transactions were handled; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 303. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 304. A bill to provide a practical means of reducing the national debt by designating the obligations to be retired by certain payments received by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 305. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum wage rate applicable to migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 306. A bill to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office for Senior Citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 307. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 308. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed service to receive benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without relinquishing their retirement pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 309. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the public library system of the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 310. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 311. A bill to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the proceeds of certain crimes shall be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 313. A bill to provide a program for an Operation Bootstrap for the American Indian in order to improve conditions among Indians on reservations and in other communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 314. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 315. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 316. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 317. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 318. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of property acquired from a decedent who died before January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 320. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day over Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (by request):

H.R. 321. A bill to provide that no officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof shall be charged with loss of salary or compensation or with loss of annual leave with pay for any time taken which has required his or her attendance upon court proceedings, including travel time to and from, whether in State, territorial, or Federal courts and whether said officer or employee is a party plaintiff, a party defendant, or a witness, and whether or not the Government or the District of Columbia is a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 322. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 323. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 324. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no documentary stamp tax shall be imposed with respect to conveyances to which a State or political subdivision thereof is a party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 326. A bill to prohibit the charging of discounts in connection with mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 327. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 328. A bill to amend section 102(b)(1) of title 28 of the United States Code to provide that a term of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan shall be held at Lansing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 329. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands to the village of Flushing, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 330. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 63 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer with adjusted gross income of $7,500 or less a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 332. A bill to provide for two judicial districts and the appointment of an additional Federal judge for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 333. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 334. A bill to permit the free marketing of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 335. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the ownership by an individual of his home shall not be taken into account in determining his need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 336. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 338. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 339. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the Senate and House of Representatives on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 343. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to reduce in certain cases the age which an individual must attain to qualify for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to reduce the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 344. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 345. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 346. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (by request):

H.R. 347. A bill to incorporate the Indoor Sports Club, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 348. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 349. A bill to provide for the reorganization of administrative procedures and practices in Government operations for improving their economy and efficiency, to provide for the organization of machinery to coordinate and administer such procedures and related practices; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 350. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 351. A bill to establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings of record; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 352. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the fifth circuit, and two additional judges for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 353. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions of a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 354. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 355. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 356. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 357. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of assistance to individuals in nonpublic mental institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 359. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 360. A bill to repeal the ban on filling the vacancy in the judgeship for the middle district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 361. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 362. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 363. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 364. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 365. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 366. A bill to provide a 30 percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 367. A bill to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether the child is a dependent for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 368. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 369. A bill to grant the natives of the Dependency of Malta unlimited access to the immigration quota for Great Britain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 370. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 371. A bill to reduce the depletion allowance for oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 372. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 373. A bill to prohibit the importation of pork and other agricultural commodities and products from the Soviet Union, Poland, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 374. A bill to amend section 481(b)(4)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 375. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit existing cooperatives to obtain additional insurance thereunder for capital improvements and replacements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 376. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize the creation of mutual mortgage funds for the FHA premiums paid by cooperative corporations established under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 377. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of mortgages purchased under special assistance functions by the Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 378. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 379. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons regardless of age, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 380. A bill to amend section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 381. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 382. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,500 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 383. A bill to provide that where a person has paid State or local property taxes and been reimbursed therefor by the United States under contract, and such taxes are thereafter required to be refunded, and such person has agreed to accept rebate of such taxes in installments over a 5-year period, such person may repay to the United States the amount of such reimbursement in similar installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 384. A bill to encourage equity investment in new and small business, to relieve unemployment and provide additional revenue to the Federal Government to be applied to debt reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of sales and exchanges of real property held for more than 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to deny tax exemption to rural electric cooperatives which engage in propaganda; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 387. A bill to authorize certain investigative officers of the United States, with the approval of the Attorney General, to intercept and disclose under stated conditions wire and radio communications in the detection and prosecution of offenses against the security of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 388. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide more effectively for immigration and passport security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 389. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 390. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 391. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 392. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 393. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 394. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 395. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 396. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 397. A bill to provide that for the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, gain from the sale of a home by a beneficiary shall not be considered as income; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 398. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 399. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 400. A bill to revise the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to deductions from gross income for percentage depletion in the case of mines, wells, and other natural mineral deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 401. A bill to permit bad debt deductions for payments by guarantors of corporate obligations which had become worthless; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 402. A bill relating to the tax on certain transportation of coal to the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 403. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 404. A bill to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 405. A bill to incorporate the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 406. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the acquisition of real property by trade-in shall in certain cases constitute a nontaxable exchange for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 408. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce the duty on the importation of paprika; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 409. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 410. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education which involve pupil testing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 411. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Kalamazoo, Mich., by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 412. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to facilitate the freedom of association of professional personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 413. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 414. A bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 415. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment in small business, for distribution to the owners and management of small business, and to all other employees of small business certain amounts of corporate income of small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 416. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment in small corporations engaged in manufacturing businesses employing fewer than 250 employees, and for distribution to the owners and management; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 417. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 418. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain nonprofit clubs organized and operated for the purpose of paying benefits to the members and their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 420. A bill to provide for a program of Federal loans to assist certain areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 421. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of stimulating economic growth and activity, providing additional jobs for the growing labor force, and permitting the replacement of obsolete and inefficient machinery and equipment by the allowance of reinvestment depreciation deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 423. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 424. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 425. A bill to provide that for estate tax purposes a donor's gross estate shall not include certain property which he transferred before his death for the benefit of minors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 426. A bill to amend section 212(b) of the Internal Revenue Act of 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 427. A bill to amend section 341(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 428. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 429. A bill to prohibit the registration of trademarks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1914, commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act, to make it applicable to sales of commodities made to governmental agencies for resale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 431. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 432. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 433. A bill to provide facilities for the mediation of disputes between Federal employee organizations and agencies of the U.S. Government, to equalize legal responsibilities of employee organizations and agencies of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 434. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant retirement credit for certain service in the U.S. merchant marine in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 435. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase by an additional one-half of 1 percent the annuity computation formula for determining annuities for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 436. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 437. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to provide retention preference to certain blind employees in cases of reductions in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 438. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize assistance thereunder for the commercial and industrial development of nonresidential areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 439. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 440. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.15 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 441. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 442. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 443. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 444. A bill to provide for a Federal lottery to raise funds for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 445. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 446. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 448. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the provisions which presently restrict the deduction for medical expenses to those exceeding 3 percent of gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 449. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 450. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a

spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 451. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make available for the retirement income credit housewives, disabled individuals, and other individuals who are age 65 or over but ineligible for such credit by reason of the 10-year work test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 452. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 453. A bill to provide that tips and gratuities received from customers of an individual's employer may be included as part of such individual's wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for repair, maintenance, alterations, and additions to his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 455. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of certain adopted children, and other relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 456. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 457. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age assistance otherwise payable to an individual thereunder shall not be reduced on account of certain increases in any insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 459. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, "Patents," to provide for extension of terms of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 460. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 461. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 462. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 463. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day over the grave of Capt. William Driver in City Cemetery, Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 464. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 465. A bill to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the U.S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 466. A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 467. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 468. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 469. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 470. A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 471. A bill to provide for a program of weather modification to be carried out by the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, to increase substantially the annual average of usable supply of water available in the Colorado River drainage basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 472. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the negotiated lease of certain excess real property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 473. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 474. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to increase the permissible loan-to-value ratio and maturity in the case of mortgages covering rental housing designed for elderly persons, and to establish a special revolving fund to be used by the Federal National Mortgage Association in purchasing such mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 475. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of prevailing wage-rate employees, to provide longevity compensation for such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 476. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a 3-year carryover for medical and dental expenses in excess of the maximum deduction allowable under section 23(x); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 478. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 479. A bill to amend section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding thereto a new chapter imposing an excise tax in respect of tips; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding thereto a new section imposing a tax in respect of tips and gratuities whenever election is made to have them included in the basis for benefits under the insurance system, established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 482. A bill to terminate excise taxes on facilities and services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 483. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 484. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 485. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 486. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 487. A bill to increase to $700 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 488. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 489. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 490. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 493. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 494. A bill to establish a Department of Public Information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 495. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 496. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 497. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 498. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 499. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 500. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the affiliate or subsidiary status of a business concern in an economically depressed area shall not be taken into account in determining whether

such concern is eligible for assistance under such act in securing Government procurement contracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 501. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 502. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 503. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the refund of duties paid on certain merchandise stolen while in the custody of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 505. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 506. A bill to provide that communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which disclose information concerning such taxpayer's income or tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 507. A bill to provide income tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 510. A bill to establish reciprocal import quotas upon the importation of confectionery and chocolate into the United States from foreign countries which impose quotas upon imports of confectionery and chocolate from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 512. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 513. A bill to provide a method for determining Presidential inability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 514. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of U.S. savings stamps for trade promotion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 515. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 516. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer certain additional credits, exclusions, exemptions, and deductions for income tax purposes, which may hereafter be referred to as the citizens' hardship tax relief bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 518. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 519. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 520. A bill to provide for the granting of a nonquota immigrant status to certain immigrants who are the mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 521. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 522. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 523. A bill to provide voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 524. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 525. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 526. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 527. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 528. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 529. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 530. A bill to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for additional State and local taxes imposed for school purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 531. A bill to provide a tax incentive for the employment of older workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 532. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 533. A bill to amend the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to fellowships with respect to cases in which fellowship holders discontinue their study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 534. A bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 535. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that an assault upon more than one person shall be punishable as more than one offense in certain cases involving the commission of a battery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 536. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 537. A bill to amend section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 538. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 539. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 540. A bill to secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 541. A bill to assure to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States full and equal privileges with respect to public conveyances and places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, amusement, assemblage, and institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 542. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 543. A bill to grant natives of British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, and the West Indies Federation unlimited access to the immigration quota for Great Britain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 544. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 545. A bill to provide that the people of the Virgin Islands be represented by a Delegate in the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 546. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 547. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 548. A bill to prevent discrimination in any public or semipublic transportation against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 549. A bill to amend section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that individuals born in British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, or the West Indies Federation shall be nonquota immigrants under that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 551. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and

other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 553. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide for the payment of unemployment compensation in amounts determined by the average wages of the unemployed person and of all other wage earners in the State in which he resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 554. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 555. A bill for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 556. A bill to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to authorize length of service credit for periods of employment by agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and to provide that annual leave unused at the end of a leave year shall be credited to the employee's sick leave account; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 557. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 558. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 559. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 560. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 561. A bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota visas to eligible orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 562. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 563. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement disability funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 564. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 565. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 566. A bill authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Old Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 567. A bill to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Torres-Martinez Reservation in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 568. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 569. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 570. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 571. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 572. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 573. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimp and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 574. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 575. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 576. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 577. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 578. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 579. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide a 20-percent increase in widows' annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 580. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain deductions from a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 581. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 582. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 583. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 584. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair (including painting and papering) of his home to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 586. A bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission; to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 587. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 588. A bill to amend the act to prohibit State plan provisions requiring transfer to State of title or control of property or a lien or other encumbrance for purpose of recovery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 589. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 590. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 591. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 592. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 593. A bill to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 594. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide for insurance to be granted thereunder to certain employees of States whose positions are financed entirely from Federal funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 595. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 596. A bill to amend the Communist Control Act of 1954 to prohibit interference by certain persons with the free movement of defense materials in foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 597. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against

unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discrimination is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 598. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 599. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 600. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 601. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 602. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 603. A bill to repeal the special tax imposed on amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and other similar places; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 604. A bill to provide that tips and gratuities received from customers of an individual's employer may be included as part of such individual's wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 605. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 606. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 607. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 608. A bill to provide that section 352(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the loss of nationality by a naturalized national of the United States through residence in a foreign state, shall not apply with respect to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 609. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time during which naturalized citizens of the United States may reside in certain foreign countries without losing their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 610. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transmission through the mails of communications intended to incite hostility among individuals and groups of individuals on account of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 611. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the bombing of a church, synagogue, or other public building with an explosive transported in interstate or foreign commerce a crime punishable by death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 612. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 613. A bill to require the filing of a registration statement with the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to each pistol possessed by any private person in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 614. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 615. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocations of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 616. A bill to provide for grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 617. A bill to provide that when a family's home is being acquired by the United States, in determining the price to be paid for such home the agency acquiring such home may take into account the same considerations as would be taken into account by such family in determining whether or not to sell their home voluntarily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 618. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for its clarification with respect to cases where two or more employers are contributing to the wages of one employee; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 619. A bill to provide pensions for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War I and World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 620. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 621. A bill to provide that the former owners of land acquired by the United States shall, in certain cases, have the right to reacquire the mineral rights in such land when it is sold by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 622. A bill to amend section 510 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to authorize the granting of hospital care to veterans in need thereof; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 623. A bill to amend section 402 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 with respect to determinations of permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 624. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase in certain cases the minimum acreage allotment for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 625. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 626. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide minimum acreage allotments for recognized peanut farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 627. A bill to amend section 8 of title 13 of the United States Code to except certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 628. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain veterans shall be furnished hospital care without regard to administrative limitations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 629. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits, to an individual otherwise qualified therefor, from the beginning of such individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 630. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 631. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for certain individuals who have paid social security taxes as employers but have not themselves become entitled to such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 632. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for the unmarried dependent sister of an individual who dies leaving no other survivors eligible for benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 633. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed tree farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 634. A bill to amend section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to eliminate the ceilings on the use of foreign currencies for informational and educational activities carried on with funds provided under authority of that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 635. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by provision of a deduction for expenditures for reconversion of structures in a slum clearance program or rehabilitation project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 637. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that moving expenses paid by an employer for a new employee shall not be included in the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 639. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 640. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 641. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope and an LKB Intermediate Image Spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 642. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 643. A bill to provide increases in annuities granted under the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 644. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 645. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to assist in the establishment and improvement of certain television broadcasting facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 646. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 647. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 648. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 649. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 650. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 651. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 652. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids for Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 654. A bill to establish rules of interpretation of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases; and to provide that confessions and other evidence shall be admissible in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 655. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for certain investigations and studies by the Surgeon General of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 656. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 657. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 658. A bill to provide a new farm program for basic agricultural commodities under which excessive and burdensome Federal controls on agriculture will be eliminated, and under which American agriculture will be restored to a free-enterprise basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 659. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of polluted shellfish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 660. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that workmen's compensation payments shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 661. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 662. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 663. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 664. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 665. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the preservation and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 666. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 667. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 668. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 669. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 670. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 671. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 672. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 673. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 674. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 675. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; and to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 676. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 679. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 680. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 681. A bill to permit persons who suffered damage to their lands or other private property by reason of flooding along the Arroyo Colorado in October of 1958 due to the diversion of floodwaters of the Rio Grande to file claims under the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 682. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 683. A bill to authorize the Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Donna, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 684. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow gas tax refunds due for gasoline used by aerial applicators serving farmers to be refunded to the aerial applicators providing such service to farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund of manufacturers excise taxes in certain cases where the articles are exported by persons other than the manufacturers, producers, or importers of the articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 687. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for certain employers who employ individuals 50 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 689. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the tax on long-distance telephone service simultaneously with the termination (presently provided for) of the tax on local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 692. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may earn up to $1,200 a year without losing his entitlement to disability insurance benefits or the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 693. A bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 694. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 696. A bill to provide that, notwithstanding the termination by Presidential proclamation of the period within which veterans of service subsequent to June 27, 1950, may accrue eligibility for wartime benefits, such period shall not terminate while individuals may be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 697. A bill to liberalize the pension programs for disabled veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 698. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to insert an additional subparagraph (7) to exclude commercial life insurance payments not in excess of $10,000 in the consideration of annual income for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 699. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 700. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities; and to permit for 1 year veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total to obtain disability income protection under national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 701. A bill to authorize gratuitous benefits for a remarried widow of a veteran upon termination of her remarriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 702. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 703. A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 704. A bill to amend section 312, title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 705. A bill to increase the amount of damages awarded for unjust conviction and imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 706. A bill to increase the maximum rate of mileage allowance for U.S. marshals traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 707. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make surveys with respect to floods aggravated by intense and unusual storms in the areas of Winthrop, Nahant, and Revere, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 708. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 709. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorze the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 710. A bill to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 711. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 712. A bill to provide that veterans age 65 shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 713. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 714. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 715. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 716. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 717. A bill to provide credit facilities for the use of fishermen's cooperative associations through establishment of a Bank for Fishermen's Cooperative Associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 718. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 719. A bill to provide a program of grants and scholarships to encourage education and training in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 720. A bill to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 721. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 722. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 723. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 724. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to interest on certain governmental obligations, and section 10 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, relating to annual contributions in assistance of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Bridge Canyon project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 726. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 727. A bill to amend Public Law 361, 77th Congress, to provide for admission of certain combat veterans to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities pending adjudication of service connection of the disabilities for which they need treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 728. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, 79th Congress, chapter 869, 2d session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 729. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide additional Federal support to States and certain nongovernmental agencies to enable them to carry out adequate demonstration programs for the vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 730. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 731. A bill to exempt from the Federal income tax income received by individuals who have reached age 65 if their adjusted gross income does not exceed $3,500 in the case of married couples or $2,000 in the case of single individuals; and to increase all personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 732. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $50 per month of an individual's earned income shall be disregarded by the State agency in determining his need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income, certain amounts paid as life insurance premiums, and to provide more liberal income tax treatment for amounts paid for hospitalization insurance and amounts paid under voluntary medical care plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 735. A bill to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 736. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 737. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to exemptions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax amounts paid for admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 739. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide that coverage by referendum for State and local employees shall be decided by a majority of those actually voting rather than by a majority of those eligible to vote; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 740. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, and certain other articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 741. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 742. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 744. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 745. A bill to permit local taxation of the private interest in personal property and work in process and inventories of material acquired by the Federal Government for military security and the national defense but in the possession of contractors with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 746. A bill to repeal section 1701(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from tax admissions to certain events conducted for the benefit of religious, educational, and charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 747. A bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 748. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired list of persons retired for disability after 30 years' service or more; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 749. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 750. A bill to adjust the compensation of officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 751. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 752. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 753. A bill to provide for the erection in Arlington National Cemetery of an equestrian statue of General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 754. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the county of Orange, or the county of Rockland, State of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 755. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 756. A bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 757. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 758. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide maximum benefits for individuals who, although deaf and mute, have acquired insured status by continuing in covered employment or self-employment during their working years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 759. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the deletion, from the records of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of any entries showing wages paid for service as an employee of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 761. A bill to prohibit the importation of Cuban sugar for so long as the price which U.S. importers are required to pay for such sugar is above the world market price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 762. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that while butter is in surplus supply, it shall be part of the ration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 763. A bill to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 764. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N.Y., may tap the West Point water supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 766. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 767. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 768. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 769. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 770. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 771. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the Signers for Freedom stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 772. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp bearing the phrase "Highway Courtesy Is Contagious"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 773. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 774. A bill to permit awards of both readjustment pay and disability compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 775. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 776. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 777. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 778. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 779. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 781. A bill to amend the national defense amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 783. A bill to supplement the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act by prohibiting automobile manufacturers from engaging in the businesses of financing and insuring automobiles purchased by consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 784. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that clergymen who are naturalized citizens shall not lose their nationality by residence abroad, even though they are not representatives of American organizations, if they devote full time to their clerical duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 785. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 786. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States,

Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 787. A bill for the relief of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 788. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to require every agency of the Federal Government to furnish to certain additional persons copies of certain notices or communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 789. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 790. A bill to prevent discrimination in any public or semipublic place or by any public or semipublic transportation against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 791. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 792. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide that savings-type investors shall have priority in the allotment of certain bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 793. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 795. A bill to amend section 608 of the National Housing Act to prevent the charging of excessive rents, resulting from unduly high estimates of costs, in the case of property covered by a mortgage insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 796. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 797. A bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide direct loan funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 798. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the interest on certain obligations issued by the States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 799. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that any article imported by a State or political subdivision for governmental purposes shall be free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 800. A bill to provide voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 801. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military service of a veteran entitled to a civil service retirement annuity may be counted for social security purposes if he irrevocably elects to exclude such service from the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 802. A bill to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 803. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 804. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932 (relating to dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia), to create a presumption in connection with the possession of certain dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 805. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for a college scholarship program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 806. A bill to require dogs to be kept under leash when they are in the streets or other public places in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 807. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 808. A bill to protect the integrity and independence of national banks by strengthening the laws relating to ownership of stock in such banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 809. A bill to establish a body corporate within the Department of Commerce to extend financial assistance to State or local governments or public authorities operating or providing transit and commuter service in our major metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 810. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 811. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the deduction of medical expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 812. A bill relating to the practice of law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 813. A bill to provide for a dual banking system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 814. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 815. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E U.S. savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 816. A bill to equalize income tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 817. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 818. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 819. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 820. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 821. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for the holding of public hearings in connection with the issuance of certain certificates and the making of certain findings and determinations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 822. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 823. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that a small-business concern may not be denied assistance thereunder solely because of the type of business in which it is engaged, if such business is lawful in the community where such concern is located; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 824. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small-business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 825. A bill to authorize Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 826. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 827. A bill to establish an emergency community facilities and public-works program in the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 828. A bill to authorize the President, under certain conditions, to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances for the purpose of protecting and preserving the health of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 829. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 830. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 831. A bill to provide an additional remedy for persons having a claim against the United States arising out of contracts relating to certain vessels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 832. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 833. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 834. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 835. A bill to fortify the antitrust policy of the United States against concentration of economic power and the use or abuse of that power to the detriment of the national economy by preventing manufacturers from financing the sales of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 836. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 837. A bill to amend chapter 119 of title 28, United States Code, to provide that clergymen shall not be competent to testify with respect to certain communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 838. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 839. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest; to the Committee on the Juidiciary.

H.R. 840. A bill to amend section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, to permit suits

against the United States arising out of contracts entered into by nonappropriated fund activities of or under departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 841. A bill to require the establishment of congressional election districts composed of contiguous and compact territories, and to require that the districts so established within any one State shall contain approximately the same number of inhabitants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 842. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 843. A bill to amend section 1963 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the registration of that portion of divorce decrees providing for the payment of money or the transfer of property which have been entered in certain district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 844. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States except the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 845. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 846. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 847. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 848. A bill to amend section 1502 of title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation to certain veterans in need thereof to overcome the handicap of a disability incurred in or aggravated by active service after World War II and before the Korean conflict, or after the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 849. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to impose additional requirements on certain veterans seeking hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 851. A bill to amend sections 712 and 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit waiver of premiums and payment of total disability income benefits to veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 852. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish medical advisory panels to resolve conflicts of evidence in questions involving service connection of disabilities or deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 853. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to insure more adequate medical care for veterans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 854. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a double-indemnity feature in national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 855. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain the new $10 per $1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 856. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 857. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that cases appealed to the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall contain a brief statement of the facts of the case appealed, with a citation and application of the law, together with the recommendations of the office appealed from, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 858. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 859. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 860. A bill to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 861. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 862. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 863. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an additional compensation to veterans whose lifespan has been reduced by 5 or more years by serious service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 864. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment to veterans suffering from seriously disabling service-connected disabilities a lump-sum settlement as compensation for the reduction in their expected lifespan attributable to such disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 865. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional disability compensation for seriously disabled veterans as partial compensation for the reduction in their life expectancy because of their disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 866. A bill to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 867. A bill to amend section 4105 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals must meet certain requirements; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 868. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that pension for non-service-connected disability or death, or for age, shall not be paid under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any alien who is not a resident of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 869. A bill to amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to pension who are being maintained in State homes shall receive pension at the rate of $30 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 870. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 871. A bill to encourage employment of veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workman's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans of service after October 7, 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 873. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans of service after October 7, 1940; to provide a double indemnity feature in national service life insurance; to extend the total disability income and waiver of premiums features of national service life insurance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 875. A bill to amend section 312(4) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 876. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for the psychoses which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 877. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for malignant tumors (cancer) which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 878. A bill to amend section 523(b) chapter 15 of title 38 of the United States Code to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation found payable for their wartime service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 879. A bill to increase rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a) through (j) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 880. A bill to increase rates of wartime compensation payable for disability statutory awards by amending section 314 (k) through (s) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 881. A bill to amend sections 210(c) and 355 of title 38, United States Code, to stabilize and "freeze" as of January 1, 1961, the "Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities," 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 882. A bill to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for dependents in cases

rated by the Veterans' Administration as not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 883. A bill to amend section 416(b) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the granting of death compensation to certain widows and parents notwithstanding a prior election to receive dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 884. A bill to increase and equalize all rates of wartime disability compensation and to provide for payment of additional compensation to veterans with dependents when rated less than 50 percent in degree on the same basis as for those rated 50 percent or more in degree; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 885. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 886. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 887. A bill to amend section 312(3) of title 38, United States Code, to include the reinfection type of pulmonary tuberculosis in the provision relative to presumptive service connection for active tuberculosis disease, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 888. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Jefferson Davis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 889. A bill to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission, to provide for more effective research programs designed to expand markets for agricultural and forestry products, to reduce surpluses, to increase farm income, and to benefit consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 890. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agricultural.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 891. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 with respect to the bartering and exchange of agricultural commodities for needed strategic and other materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 892. A bill to provide for the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 893. A bill to extend the conservation reserve of the soil bank for 3 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 894. A bill to implement section 4 of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 895. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to shelled walnuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 896. A bill to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress and officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 897. A bill to provide travel pay and compensatory time off with respect to certain time in travel status for certain civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 898. A bill to provide for the determination of the compensation of firefighting personnel in accordance with prevailing rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 899. A bill relating to the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 900. A bill to amend section 105 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to require that value to the national defense be included in certain survey reports made by the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 901. A bill to provide for the construction on a site in Jacksonville, Fla., of a hospital for the use of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 902. A bill to establish an immediate program to aid in reducing the public debt by providing that certain receipts from the sale of capital assets of the Government shall be used for such purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 903. A bill to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 904. A bill to provide for the establishment of an effective Federal aid program to assist States in the development of certain outdoor recreational resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to provide assistance to the States for certain workshops, rehabilitation facilities, and rehabilitation evaluation services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 906. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 907. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by adding nutshell charcoal and lignite briquets, to be sold for cooking purposes, to the dutiable list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 908. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by transferring wood charcoal from the free list to the dutiable list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 909. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 910. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 911. A bill relating to the leasing of certain submarginal lands on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 912. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 913. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 914. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be reduced from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 915. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to increase sugar quotas for domestic producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 916. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide that future increases in sugar quotas will be allocated to domestic beet sugar producers in a manner which will assure new growers a fair share of such increases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 917. A bill to extend certain reduced third-class postage rates to volunteer organizations of firemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 918. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 919. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 920. A bill to safeguard the employment benefits of custodial employees in the postal field service by providing for the retention of such employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 921. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund in additional cases for certain widows and widowers by reducing the required period of marriage from 5 years to 2 years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 922. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 923. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 924. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 926. A bill to extend and expand the conservation reserve under the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 927. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 928. A bill to amend section 445 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide an exclusion from income for veterans' survivors eligible for pensions, for amounts paid by them for debts of the veteran and expenses of his last illness and burial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 930. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 931. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration

hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 932. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 933. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1950, relating to exclusion from the mails of obscene articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 934. A bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 935. A bill to amend the Passport Act of July 3, 1926, to authorize certain restrictions and limitations with respect to the issuance and validity of passports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a reduction in the manufacturers' excise taxes on passenger automobiles and automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 937. A bill relating to the treatment of certain advertising, sales promotion, and similar items in determining price and price readjustments for purposes of the Federal manufacturers' excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 938. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 939. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income of the proceeds of a scholarship, fellowship grant, or student assistantship without regard to whether it (or any part thereof) represents payment for services rendered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 942. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide that marketing agencies shall not be liable for selling livestock mortgaged under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 943. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 944. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 945. A bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 946. A bill to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 947. A bill to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 949. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize annuities for survivors of employees who die after completing at least 5 years of civilian and military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 951. A bill to assist institutions of higher education to market and retire bonds issued by them to finance the construction of college facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 952. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 953. A bill to provide an allowance for work clothing for certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 954. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 955. A bill to provide for stabilization and orderly marketing in the poultry industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 956. A bill to repeal section 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that special equipment for disabled individuals shall not be subject to the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 958. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 959. A bill to facilitate administration of the act authorizing cooperative research in education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 961. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 962. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 963. A bill to provide for a study of the advisability of establishing the West Coast Skyline National Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 964. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 965. A bill to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges and in adult training programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 966. A bill to permit the absence from duty for a minimum period of 2 hours of certain Federal employees for the purpose of voting in person in certain elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 967. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 968. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 so as to change the interest rate applicable to loans and to provide for the payment by borrowers of a fee to assist in paying the administrative costs incident to loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 969. A bill relating to the premiums to be charged for insurance issued by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 970. A bill to terminate acreage controls and price supports on basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 971. A bill to limit the size of payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 972. A bill to establish a Central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedure for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 973. A bill to provide standards for the issuance of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 974. A bill to repeal the dual employment statute and amend the dual compensation statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 975. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 976. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 977. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 978. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to authorize the optional purchase of additional amounts of group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance by individual employees in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 979. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for physically handicapped persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 980. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 981. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 982. A bill to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 983. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books to certain public and private institutions of higher education for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 984. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a student attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 985. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for certain foster children and others with respect to whom an insured individual stands in loco parentis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 986. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 987. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 988. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 989. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 990. A bill to establish the seniority status of employees in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 991. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 992. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 993. A bill to provide study periods for post office clerks and terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 994. A bill to raise the price of manufacturing milk for the marketing year ending March 31, 1962, and thereafter, by providing for an improved method of computing parity prices for manufacturing milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 995. A bill to recognize the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for the purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 996. A bill to establish an agricultural program which imposes limitations on agricultural production directly rather than indirectly through acreage controls; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 997. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 998. A bill to amend section 9(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, relating to computation of annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 999. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1000. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1001. A bill to provide for the reclassification of certain distribution clerks at airport mail facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1002. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1003. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1004. A bill to grant longevity pay step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1005. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1006. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1007. A bill to modernize certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to immediate retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1008. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1009. A bill to strengthen the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1010. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to provide a formula for guaranteeing a minimum increase when an employee is promoted from one grade to another; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1011. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1012. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to encourage the establishment of free democratic governments in the nations of central and eastern Europe which are presently under Soviet domination and control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 1013. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 1014. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 1015. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the board of education of the school district of the city of Hamtramck, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1016. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 1017. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1018. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1019. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1020. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1021. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1022. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1023. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1024. A bill to provide increases in compensation for food service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 1025. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1026. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 1027. A bill relating to the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 1028. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1029. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a 3-year presumption of service connection for active tuberculous disease cases in peacetime; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 1030. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1031. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1032. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to confine within a conduit a portion of Dunlap Creek in Brownsville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1033. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1034. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1035. A bill to provide for the grading of meat and for informing the ultimate user of such grade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1036. A bill to encourage and promote the establishment of an Inter-American Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1037. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere police force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1038. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1039. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1040. A bill to provide that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall develop a program of economic controls to stabilize the economy and safeguard the national defense in time of emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1041. A bill to establish an emergency program of grants to accelerate the construction of State and local public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1042. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 769 of the 83d Congress, entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1043. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require U.S. obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1044. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act to prohibit the approval by the Federal Reserve Board of bank holding company operations unauthorized by State law or disapproved by State authorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1045. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1046. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the retirement of Federal Reserve bank stock and the substitution of interest-bearing deposits in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend section 402(a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1048. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize longevity step-increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 15 of the general schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1049. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes to provide that lists of the shareholders of national banks shall be available for inspection by committees of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1050. A bill to authorize the regulation of the solicitation of proxies in respect of securities issued by certain banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1051. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for the holding of public hearings in connection with the issuance of certain certificates and the making of certain findings and determinations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1052. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1053. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1054. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1055. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1056. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1057. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 1058. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1059. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1060. A bill to provide for Federal participation and cooperation with States and local interests in developing water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1061. A bill to provide for a more comprehensive development and utilization of natural water resources in plans and construction of reservoir projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1062. A bill to extend veteran benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces between November 12, 1918, and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 1063. A bill to establish an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1064. A bill to amend the Annual Sick Leave Act of 1951 to prevent loss of annual leave by employees in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1065. A bill to amend section 6(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the retirement of employees engaged in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of violations of the criminal laws of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 1066. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1067. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1068. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1069. A bill to reduce the spouse benefit age under the Railroad Retirement Act to 62; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 1070. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1071. A bill to authorize the issuance of savings bonus bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1072. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that scholarships received by a student shall not be taken into account (regardless of such student's relationship to the taxpayer) in determining whether he is the taxpayer's dependent for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 1075. A bill to establish an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1077. A bill to repeal the laws imposing Federal control on agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1078. A bill to amend section (9)(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1079. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 1081. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for the training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 1082. A bill to amend section 102 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to extend for 1 year the options presently available to cotton farmers under that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 1083. A bill to establish an effective Federal-State program to aid in alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1084. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 1085. A bill to provide increases in compensation for food service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1086. A bill to provide standards for the issuance of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1087. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1088. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide that priority shall be given in sales of surplus property to persons planning to utilize such property in areas of substantial labor surplus in such ways as to increase employment in such areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1089. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1091. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1092. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of futures trading in coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1093. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1094. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 1095. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1928, relating to the issuance of patents to tracts of public land held under color of title, to provide that patents may be issued under such act without reservation of minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1096. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand research, extend State and interstate water pollution control program grants, and strengthen enforcement procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1097. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide additional opportunity to employees to use their annual leave in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1098. A bill to amend section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a flag shall be furnished to drape the casket of each deceased veterans of Mexican border service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1099. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 1100. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide that a census of population, unemployment, and housing shall be taken in the year 1960 and every fifth year thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1101. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1102. A bill to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1103. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States shall be made a part of the Saguaro National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1104. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1105. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1106. A bill to amend certain sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend the applicability and coverage of marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 1107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1108. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, so as to provide that, to the maximum extent practicable, the procurement of articles, materials, and supplies by the Federal Government shall be limited to articles, materials, and supplies domestically produced or manufactured; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 1109. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1110. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the U.S. Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1111. A bill to amend the Czechoslovakian claims fund law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1112. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1113. A bill relating to life insurance taken out to cover estimated liability for the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1114. A bill to amend section 4 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1115. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the basic salaries of postal field service employees on a regional basis in accordance with prevailing wage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1116. A bill to limit the size of payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1117. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1118. A bill to provide for the assessment and collection of fees to cover the cost of operation of certain regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1119. A bill to provide for an open air assembly area in the Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1120. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to add thereto provisions with respect to through bills of lading and liability for loss, damage, or injury to property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1121. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to classify yardmasters with train- and yard-service employees for the purpose of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the designation of air freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1123. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss upon certain distributions of stock made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Internal Reve-

nue Code of 1939 to provide that no documentary stamp tax shall be imposed with respect to any conveyance to which a State or political subdivision is a party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1125. A bill to create a Department of Urbiculture, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1126. A bill to create a Department of Transportation and Communications, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1127. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1128. A bill amending the act of February 20, 1931, as amended, with respect to a rail transit crossing across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 1129. A bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1130. A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1131. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to prohibit a rate increase from becoming effective, subject to bond, before a pending rate increase proceeding has been finally determined; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1133. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 1134. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, to create a National Museum of Naval History, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1135. A bill to prohibit, under certain conditions, for 2 years, the employment of a former officer or enlisted man in the armed services, or a former civilian employee in the Department of Defense, by any person, concern, or foreign government with which certain transactions were handled by such officer, enlisted man, or employee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1136. A bill to facilitate the procurement of doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry for the Armed Forces by providing grants and scholarships for education in the medical and dental professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1137. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to improving management and technical personnel in the support activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1138. A bill to establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings of record; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1139. A bill to provide that where Federal law authorizes an officer or agency of the United States to fix attorney's fees in administrative actions, the fees so fixed in any particular case shall be in an amount which represents reasonable compensation for the services rendered in that case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1140. A bill to give the former owners of certain property of the United States located in South Dakota the right to repurchase that property when it is no longer needed by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 1141. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding and false advertising of decorative hardwood and simulated hardwood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1142. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 1143. A bill to provide residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 1144. A bill to provide for payment of a death gratuity in certain cases involving deaths of members of the uniformed services after June 27, 1950, and before January 1, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 1145. A bill to provide for the preservation of audio recordings of historical importance; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1146. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1147. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 1148. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 1149. A bill to prohibit advertising in commerce of articles produced in any foreign country unless the advertisement clearly states that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 1150. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1151. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 1152. A bill to convey Fort Amezquita Military Reservation, P.R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1153. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 1154. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the placement of recording devices in certain aircraft as an aid to air accident investigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1156. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires that bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1157. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1158. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1159. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 1161. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight and other unlighted cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 1162. A bill to strengthen the procedures governing the allocation, and to provide for more efficient utilization, of the radio spectrum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 1 year the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1164. A bill to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of national networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1165. A bill to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to place certain additional limitations on the transfer of broadcast licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 1166. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 1167. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 1168. A bill to remove time limitations imposed for applying for correction of military records, review of discharge and dismissals, and review of decisions of retiring boards and similar boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1169. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 1170. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 1171. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 1172. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property to the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 1173. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, to regulate and restrict the printing of certain extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to limit the number of insertions of extraneous matter in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 1175. A bill to provide for the designation, under the provisions of section 1109(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, of the Port Erie Airport, Erie, Pa., as a port of entry for civil aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1176. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 1177. A bill to organize the Department of Defense and to provide for the administration thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 1178. A bill to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 453 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1179. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 1180. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1181. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1182. A bill to create the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1183. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 1184. A bill to provide judicial review of agency orders concerning biological products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 1185. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of amounts payable to aliens under trust funds created by American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 1186. A bill to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 1187. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1188. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1189. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall furnish weather reports to certain air-pollution control agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 1191. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1192. A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 1193. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1194. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14 of the United States Code to provide that cadets and midshipmen entering the service academies hereafter shall agree to serve 10 years on duty after graduation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1195. A bill to promote certain prisoners of war in Korea upon their discharge from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1196. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1197. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1198. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to provide retired pay for reservists who have 10 or more years of satisfactory Federal service and who performed active duty for 5 or more years in the aggregate during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1199. A bill to amend section 15 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to permit certain enlistments in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1200. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1201. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the U.S. Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1202. A bill to establish a board (outside of the Department of Defense) to review and correct discharges and dismissals of former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1203. A bill to protect the position of the Government under Government-insured ship mortgages and to prevent unfair competition in the carriage of cargo preference shipments by certain vessels having Government insured ship mortgages; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the carriage by U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargo in excess of the 50 percent gross tonnage limitation contained in such section; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1205. A bill to require the Surgeon General to undertake a special research program with respect to cystic fibrosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1206. A bill to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of plastic bags unless such bags are labeled or manufactured in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, to make it unlawful for broadcasters to make unauthorized deletions from certain matter submitted for broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1208. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to the practice of "overbooking" passenger space reservations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1209. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1210. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1211. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require officers and directors of any issuer of registered securities to periodically report the extent to which, and the purposes for which, their holdings of such securities are pledged, hypothecated, or loaned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1212. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements between man-

ufacturers of motor vehicles and their franchised dealers, to permit the establishment of exclusive representation by dealers and to restrict franchised dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1213. A bill to amend title 15 of the United States Code with respect to the operation of speedometers on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1214. A bill to prevent the sale of automobiles with unauthorized equipment, parts, and accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1215. A bill to provide for the regulation of motor vehicles on the highways of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1216. A bill to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1217. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1218. A bill to amend section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933 so as to remove the exemption of securities offered for sale and sold in only one State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1219. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual with 40 years' service may retire regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1220. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers by railroads engaged in interstate commerce by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1221. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1222. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representative to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 1223. A bill to amend section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relative to the discontinuance or change of the operation of certain trains or ferries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1224. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1225. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1226. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1227. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1228. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 1229. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1230. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1231. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 1232. A bill to recognize the Ryan-Hemet Airport as a public airport for the purpose of the Federal Airport Act, and to provide for reimbursement for damage to such airport in accordance with such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 1233. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1234. A bill to amend section 311 of the Communications Act of 1934, to restrict the granting of permits and licenses to persons having criminal records; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1235. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to amend certain labeling provisions of the food, drug, and cosmetic chapters; prohibit worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; require adequate controls in drug manufacture; require new drugs to be shown efficacious and new therapeutic devices to be shown safe and efficacious before they are marketed commercially; make other improvements with respect to new drug control; require all antibiotics to be certified; provide adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and stimulant drugs; require cosmetics to be shown safe before they are marketed commercially; clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; make additional provisions of the act applicable to carriers; provide for administrative subpenas; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1236. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1237. A bill relating to the retired pay of certain retired officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1238. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, to regulate and restrict the printing of certain extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to limit the number of insertions of extraneous matter in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 1239. A bill to designate the Lincoln Air Force Base at Lincoln, Nebr., as George W. Norris Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1240. A bill to amend the Miller Act of August 24, 1935, to provide that persons entitled to protection under State laws relating to mechanic's or materialman's liens who have furnished labor or materials for public works shall have a right to receive payment out of payment bonds furnished by the prime contractor on such public works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1241. A bill to amend section 406(b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide that if it is determined that a domestic trunkline carrier is not entitled to subsidy for any period such carrier shall thereafter be ineligible for subsidy with respect to its domestic operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1242. A bill to require that at least 50 percent of the passenger and cargo air transportation requirements of the Government of the United States be obtained from civil air operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1243. A bill to prohibit the introduction of merchandise into interstate commerce if a guarantee is made with respect to such merchandise unless the merchandise bears a complete return address; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1244. A bill to simplify payroll administration in the House of Representatives by providing that the salaries of certain employees of the House and the clerk hire allowance of Members, shall consist of aggregate annual amounts rather than basic annual amounts plus additional amounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, to place certain restrictions on the use of the stationery allowance of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the provisions of law which permit the granting of immunity from prosecution in certain cases where testimony is compelled, so as to include cases involving matters affecting interstate or foreign commerce or the free flow thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1247. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to permit actions on tort claims to be brought in the judicial district in which the act of omission complained of occurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for the cost to a taxpayer of certain increases in commuting transportation fares; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1250. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1251. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for depletion of human resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1253. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise

permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1254. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased deductions for employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1256. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue identifying numbered receipt upon the filing of income tax returns in order to aid in the collection of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1257. A bill to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government retired under section 1(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1258. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the owners of civil aircraft to be financially responsible for damages arising out of the operation of such aircraft for which they are liable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1260. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1261. A bill to provide further means of securing and protecting the right of persons within the jurisdiction of the several States to the equal protection of the laws and other civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1263. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1264. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers by railroad engaged in interstate commerce by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1265. A bill to repeal section 9(c)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1266. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1267. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in employment which exposes employees to radioactive material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1268. A bill to prohibit the use of Government property by any organization practicing segregation on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1270. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1271. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1272. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1273. A bill to provide for the issuance of a national health research stamp for the support of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1274. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase by an additional one-half of 1 percent the annuity computation formula for determining annuities for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1275. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to provide three additional longevity step-increases for officers and employees subject to such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1276. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1277. A bill to provide that an individual who is not eligible upon reaching retirement age for old-age insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act may obtain a refund of the social security taxes which he has paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1278. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits thereunder and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled while both were living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 1279. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1280. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1281. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for loss of earnings resulting from jury duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals over retirement age, who are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1284. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals who are 70 years of age or over and are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1285. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 1341. A bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to establish a free and universal franchise throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to provide for the development of a program for controlling the production of cotton on a bale basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential inability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to establish December 15 of every year as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclu-

sive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution designating the month of February of each year as National American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to interpret the application of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, to recommend modifications and improvements therein, as well as in criminal or other statutes relating to ethics, to investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Law Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Mutual Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution relating to the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the clerk hire of members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to qualifications for voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to authorize the reimbursement of not more than two employees in the office of each Member of the House of Representatives for travel to the Member's congressional district; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution providing for the prominent display of the flag of the United States of America on or near diplomatic establishments of the United States in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the second week in October as National Poison Prevention Week, in order to aid in bringing to the American people the dangers of accidental poisoning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission To Assist in the Unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the A. A. Sprague Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil and property rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim June 4, 1961, as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the first Sunday in June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing a different method for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution providing for a Commission on Educational Standards to investigate standards in public primary and secondary educational systems in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from discriminating on the basis of residence in taxing income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to authorize a transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the death penalty under the laws of the United States, any State, or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to establish December 15 of every year as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an equitable depletion rate for oil shale with those depletion rates now allowed for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to limit the power of courts of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to continue certain studies on the quality of water of the Colorado River and related matters, and to report thereon to the Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that certain unsuccessful candidates for the office of President shall be Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER (by request):

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution designating the Luther Burbank shasta daisy as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide that a continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government is to promote reasonable stability of the level of consumer prices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a pilot project of assistance to veteran's organizations operating centers for disabled veterans to gain experience in the practicability of such a program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution regarding the right of self-defense of the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in forestalling intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the closing of Indian hospitals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the reconsideration of the criteria to be applied under the Buy American Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 412, 85th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution relative to the exercise by the President of the

United States of veto powers over items in certain bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress desiring freedom of speech and freedom of press in countries receiving mutual security aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a "Veterans' Benefits Calculator"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to promote peace through the reduction of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 21. Resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserve at Fort Knox and other places; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 22. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 23. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 24. Resolution to provide for the reporting of 1962 appropriations in one consolidated bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 25. Resolution to name and dedicate the three House Office Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 26. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 27. Resolution to provide equal access for all news media before proceedings of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 28. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr GROSS:

H. Res. 29. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 30. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 31. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 30; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 32. Resolution to amend clause 6 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 33. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Independent Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the commitment of persons to mental institutions; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 35. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 34; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 36. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study and investigate the disposition of certain Federal funds; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 37. Resolution amending the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H. Res. 38. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the seizure and detention of American citizens in foreign countries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. Res. 39. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 40. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 41. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the more frequent display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 42. Resolution creating a select committee on consumer interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 43. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 44. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 45. Resolution to increase personal income tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 46. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POFF:

H. Res. 47. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 48. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to the real property owned by the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 49. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations and studies; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 50. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 49; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 51. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 53. Resolution providing for the commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski on October 11 of each calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. Res. 54. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Res. 55. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 56. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 57. Resolution to provide that the Committee on Education and Labor shall conduct investigation and study of discrimination in employment against persons 40 or more years of age; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 58. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study safety of design of motor vehicles used in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 59. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct a special investigation and study with respect to the employment, utilization, and retention of older workers in the civilian service of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 60. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 61. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 60; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 62. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the Committee on Banking and Currency shall have jurisdiction over all consumer problems; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 63. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the struggle of the African peoples for independence and nationhood, and recognizing April 15, 1959, as African Freedom Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H. Res. 64. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the various proposals for amending the Constitution of the United States with respect to the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide in the Constitution and laws of the United States that all members of the Federal judiciary either shall be elected or that their appointment shall be for a stated period of time and not for life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States for the control and operation of the public school system in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass emergency legislation providing for Federal grants to the States for the extension of unemployment compensation benefits for at least 3 months beyond the expiration of regular benefits provided under the State system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 1286. A bill for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1287. A bill for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Isabelle A. Samaha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Ernest Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Oakley O. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Monique M. Gibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Tomo Vidmar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Sidina Walters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Frederick Hing Lung Fung and Christopher Hing Kui Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud A. Provoost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Juliana Poleac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Domenica Riccobono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Epaminondas Dariagiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Theresa Asphar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Vilma D. Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fortune Kurkjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Jung Hae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Alvin C. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 1306. A bill for the relief of Magda Kusen Canjuga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Tim Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Dr. Salvatore Zannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1309. A bill for the relief of George Paschos, his wife, Demetra Paschos and their minor child, Paraskevi Paschos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Dr. John A. Kastretsios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Dr. M. I. H. Aleem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1312. A bill for the relief of Domingo Pabustan Garcia, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Eddis G. Elizey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pagona Loukakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie J. Beamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL

H.R. 1316. A bill for the relief of Howard F. Knipp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Jung Yee Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Fuk Lum Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko Zittle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1320. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1321. A bill for the relief of Anna Toezser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1322. A bill for the relief of Georges Khoury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Kwong Fuk Lum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Sum Seto and wife, Yee Sun Kam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seto Yiu Kwei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 1326. A bill for the relief of William H. Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William H. Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Shoji Hirose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Roukous Salimon Roukous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Matilda M. Schwarzmer and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1333. A bill for the relief of A. N. Deringer, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Helen Chan Chu (nee Yin-Lun Chan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 1335. A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Anna Catania Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Amelia Andreoli D'Attorre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1338. A bill for the relief of William W. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Irma T. Demeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1340. A bill for the relief of Monika Itryna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos T. Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Panagioto Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1344. A bill for the relief of SFC (E-7) Frederick W. Heedt, RA1627914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 1345. A bill to authorize Otto K. Olesen, the postmaster of the U.S. post office at Los Angeles, Calif., to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 1346. A bill for the relief of John Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Adolf M. Bailer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1348. A bill for the relief of William Burnice Joyner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Fong Houck Pong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 1350. A bill for the relief of Guerino Venditti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Donica Dopudja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Max Bleier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1354. A bill for the relief of Issac V. Caracocly and Albert Caracocly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Anthony Flambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1356. A bill for the relief of Smilyko Andres and Josip Tomac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Gola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Bryant David Virmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Prokop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 1361. A bill for the relief of James M. Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Calogera Virone Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Ezekiel Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1364. A bill for the relief of Mark Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Jean Malandrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1367. A bill for the relief of Mina and Henek Sznaider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H.R. 1368. A bill for the relief of Maurice Devlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 1369. A bill for the relief of Zsuzsanna Reisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Martin Albert Maidenbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 1371. A bill for the relief of Mario L. Minichini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1372. A bill for the relief of Rocco Cambrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1373. A bill for the relief of Rosa Perna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1374. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 1375. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 1376. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Nalbandian (also known as Serwart Nalbandian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1377. A bill for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an exchange of certain land in Madera County, Calif., with Mary Saunders Moses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 1379. A bill for the relief of the dependents or estate of Carroll O. Switzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1380. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of William R. Hartung against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1381. A bill for the relief of Helena Szlank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1382. A bill for the relief of Gerald Levine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1383. A bill for the relief of Hyacinth Louise Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Colangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1385. A bill for the relief of Serafima Afrakova Ponomaroff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1386. A bill for the relief of Ernest Delle Femine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1387. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelina Augusta Fernandes Gorgulho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1388. A bill for the relief of Tai Ja Lim and Tai Chung Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1389. A bill for the relief of Vito Antonio, Mattia Caterina, and Guiseppe Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Jung Ngon Woon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wong, Lau Sau Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Carlos Ernesto Schaps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mr. Earl H. Pendell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 1394. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Hamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1395. A bill for the relief of Sydney Gruson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Constantin Magafas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1397. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1398. A bill for the relief of Juan Reys Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Louie Sui Doon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Miriam Mermelstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1402. A bill for the relief of Maria Domenica Donata Taddeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Maria Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina and her children, Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Dahlia Giscombe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1406. A bill for the relief of George K. Lee, Sophie Lee, and their children, David, Irene, and Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Minoru Tanaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Anna Koukoula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Norman R. Tharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Margaret P. Copin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rulon F. Sheers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Caparrini Guasti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1415. A bill for the relief of Emilio Dussich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Mary Minniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Wladyslawa Jarzmik-Stempniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1418. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Therios and George Therios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Casmir Wodzisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Mordini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Bedros Eurdekian, Aghavni Eurdekian, and Zabel Eurdekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 1422. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Yazicioglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Bay Kow Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1425. A bill for the relief of Marian Walczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Marya Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1427. A bill for the relief of Miss Anka Grahovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Alberto Martinez Miciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1429. A bill for the relief of Thanos Thanopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Jesus Alvarna Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Maria Lagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Jozef Wypasek, Krystyna Wypasek, and Wladyslaw Wypasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Terry Shirley Stueber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Ashley, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Jacinto Machado Ormonde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Adelaide Lamanna Fava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1437. A bill for the relief of Agostino Aurilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Sonia Gregoriades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Myra Knowles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Mary O'Brien Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 1441. A bill for the relief of Adam and Edmund Wojtowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Synowiecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Eva Anna Marchewka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Niezabitowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Eugeniusz Kubicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Bronislawa Francuz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Partolome Sorisantos Regino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Maria Odelia Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1452. A bill to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Isidor Sturm and his wife, Olga Sturm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Dominador D. Galdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Danica Canjar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Miss Josefa Castrelos Cabalerio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Lee Dock On; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1459. A bill for the relief of EN/2 Hideo Chuman, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 1460. A bill for the relief of James Walter or Wongo Alfonso Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Pedro Bigornia Bandayrel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Diomey S. Pondoc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Josephine Abuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Demitrios P. Georgantas and Maria Asianidis Georgantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Julia and Alfredo Javier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo I. Garcellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Joseph Salvatore LoMedico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie M. Paterson, Janet Paterson, and Mary Paterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Howard Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Thelma and Romeo Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Amsih Moussa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Volliladou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Ngoon Nim Kung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Oliva del Rio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Oliva del Rio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Miss Marie E. Mark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Masaki and Yaeko Ouchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Geidl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Rosemary B. Patmour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Priscillo Jose Sisson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Sisson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 1485. A bill providing for the extension of Patent No. 2,331,420; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vicenta A. Messer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Amador Caceres, Maria Caceres, and their children, Josephine, Yolanda, Fernando, Emma, and Ricardo Caceres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Miss Linda B. Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Salvatori Pronzo and Rosa Pronzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Emperatriz M. Nacional and Susan M. Nacional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Ernest John Large; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chrisoula Peristeraki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Lum Shee, also known as Lum Wun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Natividad Bontia, Liliosa Uy Bontia, and Proceso Bontia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Feliciana and Carmen M. Lafrades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Benjamin I. Felicitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1499. A bill for the relief of Manuel Nido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Sada Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Fowler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Adelaida Madayag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Furtado Cardosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Federico P. Regino and Alberto P. Regino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Pinhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Yoshinori Yamai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 1507. A bill for the relief of Capt. Jacob Haberle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Combs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Bashir Ahmed Masoodi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pai Suey Lee Pai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Antonio C. Abelon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1512. A bill for the relief of Arturo L. Espinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1513. A bill for the relief of Stephanus H. Kleynhans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 1514. A bill for the relief of John Kwan-lu To and Mrs. Ling Fai To; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Moni Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 1516. A bill for the relief of Joe Ho Kwong and Alverne Joe (Goon) Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Jedlicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Marian Gazda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1519. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Horvat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Emma Grund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1521. A bill for the relief of Radmilo Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Chul-Hi Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1523. A bill for the relief of Kazimiera Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 1524. A bill for the relief of Isidoro E. Halila and Doreta E. Halila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Ilona Salamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1526. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Talento, Elisa Talento, Gennaro Talento, Aniello Talento, and Adriana Talento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1527. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1528. A bill for the relief of Domenico Busetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1529. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard

Lopez Fortuny and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 1530. A bill for the relief of Christopher McLennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1531. A bill for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Jeanine Ruth Tabacnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1533. A bill for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 1534. A bill for the relief of Hugo Robert Baversjo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 1535. A bill for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Nakhle Nasrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Ana Santos Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Christos George Kanellopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Emily Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1540. A bill for the relief of John Edwin Perrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Amatuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Kaye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1543. A bill for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buencamino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Felididad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Munston Electronics Manufacturing Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1545. A bill to provide tax relief for the pension fund of the slate, tile, and roofing industry in New York City and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1546. A bill for the relief of Fay Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1547. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1548. A bill for the relief of Jose Soriano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1549. A bill for the relief of Paraskevi Stamadianou; to the Committee on the Juciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 1550. A bill for the relief of Jesus Graza Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Kim-Ok Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1552. A bill for the relief of Justo Sanchez Resendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1553. A bill for the relief of Raymond A. Garms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John C. Chamberlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Yung Ping Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1556. A bill for the relief of Abdul Aziz Said; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 1557. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maurice Oudiz and his wife, Cecil Oudiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 1558. A bill for the relief of George Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 1559. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Tummino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1560. A bill for the relief of Mariantonia Bavaro and Salvatore Bavaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 1561. A bill for the relief of Dr. Agatangelo Z. Claustro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1562. A bill for the relief of Dr. Saud Ilisa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1563. A bill to provide for the remuneration of artistic services rendered by Trygve A. Rovelstad in the creation of certain designs for the "American Roll of Honor," a memorial book, now reposing in the American Memorial Chapel of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, England; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1564. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmine Jandrisits (Serra); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Victoria Escobar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1566. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 1567. A bill for the relief of Ivan Hajnoczy, Serena Hajnoczy, and Marianna Csuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1568. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jelena Dordevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1569. A bill for the relief of Isei Sakioka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1570. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. H. Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1571. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yasu Mino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda, Mr. Seiichi Yasuda, and Mrs. Tsuru Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1573. A bill for the relief of Edgar Allen Gallegos and Ana Gloria Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1574. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Maud Alcock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1576. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Asuncion Y. Colvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1577. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Sanguedolce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Mah Quock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 1579. A bill for the relief of Capt. Arthur L. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 1580. A bill for the relief of Marie Tchernosvitoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1581. A bill for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1582. A bill for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H.R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Alfonso H. Patero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Teodora Ricu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Hisoe Iwata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Sutton Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Fong Kai Dong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 1589. A bill for the relief of Lina Bohl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1590. A bill for the relief of Penelope Pappatheodorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Toros Tchalian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Eugeniusz Ruszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 1593. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Mingari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mohjen Liu Tseng and her minor children, Ying, Tsung, Chad, and Siang Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1596. A bill for the relief of Antonio Folliero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Morris B. Espenscheid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Michael Dedetsinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Marrella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Aristidis Veloudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Gert Forsthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1603. A bill for the relief of Chin Ziang Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Spencer E. Hewitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1605. A bill for the relief of Arlie T. Sinks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1606. A bill for the relief of Mitchell C. Chutuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1607. A bill for the relief of Concepcion V. Banaag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Julian Osuna-Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Dunis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Nikita de Kanel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ernest Hay, Wamego, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovcic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 1616. A bill for the relief of Ridkert & Laan, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 1617. A bill for the relief of David and Hilda Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1618. A bill for the relief of William E. Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 1619. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Socoro Vazquez Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Berberian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Aziz Elias Kassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Pinghui Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Princess Anne County School Board, Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Matsuyo Ishida Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Stefan Bryttan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Marton and Szidonia Weisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1632. A bill for the relief of John L. Afros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Judy Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Frank De Nardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joann Konwinski and her children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Mah Ney Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Ng Thiat Hor and Ng Thiat Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Aida Jaramillo Mendoza and Tranquilino Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Klaus Dieter-Herbert Burmeister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 1640. A bill for the relief of the next of kin of certain merchant seamen who lost their lives in an airplane crash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ilona Szmuk and her daughters, Flora and Silvia Szmuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Gloria M. Dudley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1644. A bill for the relief of Moses Brukner, also known as Moses Broker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Madge Wisdom Collier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Joan Josephine Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1647. A bill for the relief of Bryan Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Bartlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Gaetano DiChiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Irene Kemeny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Adela Glicman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1652. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali A. Kawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1653. A bill for the relief of William Falby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 1654. A bill for the relief of Weronika Godlewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 1655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Luisa D. Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1656. A bill for the relief of Francesco Parrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1657. A bill for the relief of Irene Charapis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Amelia Lawrynowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1659. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Foley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1660. A bill for the relief of Margaret MacPherson, Angus MacPherson, Ruth MacPherson, and Marilyn MacPherson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Hala Bechara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Scarano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1663. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 1664. A bill for the relief of John Mullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Domenico Tallarita Pelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Constantinos (Kosta) E. Mouharemis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Mola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Wanda T. Musialowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Manuail Asso Kallabat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Faustino Caballero-Corral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shahen A. Hovanessian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Tak Wa Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Mary Philip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samuel Ribacoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Stulberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Elie Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Jacques Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Smirlis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Chehebar, his wife, Marcelle Levy Chehebar, and their minor children, Albert, Zakia, Zaki, Jacques, and Joseph Chehebar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Samuel Lienwand and his wife, Mollie Lienwand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1684. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of Mollers' Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., the Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd., and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Teresa Piantedosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1686. A bill for the relief of Herbert Otto Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H.R. 1687. A bill for the relief of World Games, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Nicholacacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1689. A bill for the relief of Iolanda Iebba Altimari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Salim Arrab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Elaine Veronica Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Johann Czernopolsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Lee King Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Zofia Kejdau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Doumouliakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1696. A bill for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Teresa Rosa Panesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1699. A bill for the relief of Nick George Boudoures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Jaime Abejuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kikue Yamamoto Leghorn and her minor son, Yuichiro Yamamoto Leghorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Jovito Batas Bacugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1703. A bill for the relief of Maximo B. Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Won; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1705. A bill for the relief of Yee Tip Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1706. A bill for the relief of Adela Michiko Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Victoria M. Poquiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Fung Kai Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1709. A bill for the relief of Rosalinda Tacdol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Zondek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Wiktor Golik and Jozsef Kelemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. Katsaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Joseph Michael Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Giorgina Raniolo Infantino and her children, Georgio Infantino, Angelo Infantino, and Giovanni Infantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1717. A bill for the relief of Angelo Li Destri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Jaime E. Concepcion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1719. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suad J. Khuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Paul Vassos (Pavlos Veizis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susie Lacacio and her son, John Peter Lacacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Joao Ferreira and Maria Ercilia Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 65. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Estelle A. Waller; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Free Federation of Labor of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sugar industry in Puerto Rico and in other American territories; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2. Also, petition of Luis Bada, Cabangan, Zambales, Philippine Islands, relative to supporting House Resolution 30 from the State of California, relating to compensating the Philippine Scouts for their servces rendered in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3. Also, petition of Dr. Santiago S. Calo, Butuan City, Philippines, relative to a grievance relating to the roster of guerrilla units which was processed upon liberation of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4. Also, petition of Elealeh Kern O'Toole, Paradise, Butte County, Calif., relative to a redress of grievances regarding all Federal, State, and educational loyalty oaths; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5. Also, petition of the secretary, the Society of the War of 1812 in the State of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., relative to opposing the deletion of the Connally amendment from the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6. Also, petition of the chaplain, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., conveying a message of gratitude and commendation for the late Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts; to the Committee on House Administration.

7. Also, petition of representatives of city of Alpine, Chamber of Commerce and Brewster County, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution, with reference to establishing a transportation system between Alpine, San Antonio, and El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8. Also, petition of George Allen and others, Sherman, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9. Also, petition of Mrs. A. M. Davis, Sr., and others, Denison, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10. Also, petition of J. E. Rodgers and others, Belton, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. C. C. Bee, Jr., and others, Dallas, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

12. Also, petition of Paul Rush and others, Dallas, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

13. Also, petition of Vonda Chandler and others, Dallas, Tex., relative to opposing all pay TV schemes and proposals as being contrary to the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

14. Also, petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a grievance as to why the House of Representatives has not given him any relief in regard to a criminal conspiracy and attaching a copy of a letter to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, petition of J. Milton Edwards Post No. 2238, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Shreveport, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to demanding that Judge J. Skelly Wright be tried by a court of proper jurisdiction for treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. Also, petition of Harold Eisten, Cortland, N.Y., relative to a grievance relating to an appeal for personal damages award; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. Also, petition of Theodosia Terwilliger, Portland, Oreg., relative to the proposed removal of the regional post office from Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

18. Also, petition of Victor Lyon and others, Portland, Oreg., relative to the proposed removal of the regional post office from Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

19. Also, petition of Robert J. White, and others, Hillsboro, Oreg., relative to the proposed removal of the regional post office from Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

20. Also, petition of John Hughes and others, Hillsboro, Oreg., relative to the proposed removal of the regional post office from Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

21. Also, petition of Wiley W. Smith, and others, Portland, Oreg., relative to the proposed removal of the regional post office from Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

22. Also, petition of the president, the Woman's Club of Westfield, Inc., Westfield, N.J., relative to commending the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and urging the Congress to enlarge rather than curtail its activities; to the Committee on Rules.

23. Also, petition of the president, Westfield Women's Republican Club, Westfield, N.J., relative to commending the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and urging Congress to continue the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

24. Also, petition of Mrs. William E. Stilwell, Jr., and others, Glendale, Ohio, relative to the continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

25. Also, petition of Martin Weiss and others, Elmont, N.Y., relative to endorsing the petition by Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn relating to a redress of grievance pertaining to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

26. Also, petition of Harriet Levine and others, New York, N.Y., relative to endorsing the petition by Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn relating to a redress of grievance pertaining to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

27. Also, petition of H. L. Thatcher and others, Auburn, Calif., relative to the citizens of Auburn and Placer County, Calif., urging the influence of Congress against the purging of certain Democratic Congressmen; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, bowing at this wayside shrine which our fathers reared, we bring to Thee the stress and strain of these testing times, praying that our jaded souls may find in Thy presence the peace of green pastures and the still waters of the spirit.

We acknowledge that the wise provision of those who knelt about the cradle of our liberty, regarding the separation of church and state, did not decree the separation of religion and the state, knowing that spiritual verities are the very breath of the Republic.

In all the tangles of living together in the maze of human relationships through which, in legislative halls, those here chosen by the people grope their way,

teach us anew by this moment of devotion that at its heart every great issue of life is spiritual.

Grant to Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs the will to match vast needs with mighty deeds. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, January 3, 1961, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, attended today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT OF JUNIOR SENATOR FROM TEXAS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of appointment of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. Without objection, the certificate will be read and placed on file.

The certificate of appointment was read, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

JANUARY 3, 1961.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Texas, I, Price Daniel, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of LYNDON B. JOHNSON, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Price Daniel, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin this 3d day of January in the year of our Lord 1961.

PRICE DANIEL,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ZOLLIE STEAKLEY,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled, and that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to provide for the counting on January 6, 1961, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message further informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Speaker appointed Mrs. KELLY of New York and Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1961.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) that effective January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, 86th Congress, continue and have same powers as conferred by said resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., late a Senator from the State of Missouri.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Keith Thomson, late a Representative from the State of Wyoming, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT—MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives yesterday to notify the President that quorums of the two Houses have assembled, and are ready to receive any communication he may desire to make, have performed that duty, and now report that the President will submit in writing his annual message to the Congress on January 12, 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the message will not come up until some time next week, that, beginning tomorrow, we permit morning business, and allow for the introduction of bills.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I believe he is agreeable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield gladly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I see no benefit in deferring until January 12 the introduction of bills, in view of the fact that in the House of Representatives bills are being introduced at the present time; and since the message from the President will not come to the Congress until some time next week, it would work an undue restriction if we withheld introduction of bills and delayed them until the message from the President came to the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield, so that I may propound an inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think what is proposed would be the sensible thing to do, but I think it is very important that those of us who are interested in getting changes in rules brought to a conclusion should understand that such transaction of morning business would not be taken as indicative of our acquiescence in the present rules of the Senate.

I wonder if the Vice President is prepared to rule that we may agree to the transaction of morning business without having acquiesced in the present rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the Chair's ruling, in view of the fact that it is a unanimous-consent request the majority leader has propounded.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on the basis of the statements made, I am prepared to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 2]

Aiken	Ervin	Miller
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Bartlett	Gore	Morton
Beall	Gruening	Moss
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Blakley	Hayden	Neuberger
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Hickey	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Prouty
Bush	Holland	Proxmire
Butler	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Russell
Cannon	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston	Schoeppel
Carroll	Jordan	Scott
Case, N. J.	Keating	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Kuchel	Sparkman
Clark	Lausche	Stennis
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Symington
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Wiley
Dodd	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 4, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the third paragraph of subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out the words "two-thirds" and inserting in lieu thereof "three-fifths".

Mr. ANDERSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ANDERSON. First I should like to modify the resolution.

Mr. President, I modify the resolution by striking out everything after the resolving clause and substituting language which is shown on page 18 of the RECORD for yesterday, amending the entire rule XXII.

I so modify my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's resolution will be modified as requested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for information, may we have the resolution as modified read to the Senate in its entirety?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the resolution, as modified by the Senator from New Mexico.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and other cosponsors who are listed on Senate Resolution 5, an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as modified, and I ask that the amendment designated "1–3–61—A" be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"4. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor in any further printing of the amendment and that it be so noted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the other sponsors of the pending amendment to Senate Resolution 4, I ask that the amendment be modified to have the resolving clause read:

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

And on line 3 inserting "4" in place of "3".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

The amendment as modified is as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"4. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without futher debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is what we call the majority-rule amendment. It has been offered in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I understand that the majority leader wishes to make some announcements to the Senate, and I should like to yield to the majority leader without losing my rights to the floor, if that is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader I renew my request that there be a morning hour tomorrow for routine morning business and the introduction of bills. I do so because of the fact that the President's annual message will not be sent to the Congress until a week from today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, I have no objection; but I should like the RECORD to show again that the proposed action on the unanimous consent request does not involve any acquiescence in the present rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INAUGURATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object may we have a ruling from the Chair on the following parliamentary inquiry: In view of the fact that the proposed rules changes are now at issue and are subject to amendment, will the Chair rule that any intervening business now transacted, whether by unanimous consent or otherwise, does not change the situation as ruled upon by the Vice President preliminarily, and that we are proceeding under the Constitution insofar as those rules changes are concerned rather than under the rules of the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to be heard upon that request, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have no objection whatever to having such consent given with respect to the business now proposed, but to have it given in the general and broad terms suggested and requested by the Senator from New York would, I think, be entirely inappropriate, and I would not agree to it because, as stated by him, the provision would be that any business of any kind intervening would not be ruled to be business transacted under the rules. I trust that the Senator realizes his request is much too far reaching for us to be able to agree to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is withdrawn. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the majority leader will postpone his withdrawal, I should like to add that the Senator from Florida was not objecting in any way to the request of the majority leader nor to any reasonable request that would exempt action upon the resolution offered by the majority leader, but was objecting to the general and all-inclusive terms of the request made by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota still has the floor, but has yielded to the Senator from New York, who is recognized at the moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that I was not making a unanimous-consent request. There appears to be a misapprehension on the part of my friend from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from New York was propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Chair, of course, is correct, as is the Senator from New York. But the objection made by the Senator from Florida is just as valid when made to the parliamentary inquiry as it would have been if it had been made to a unanimous-consent request. This is because the Senator from New York, whether knowingly or otherwise, had predicated the words used upon such a general statement as to foreclose the raising of any question as to whether any business being transacted, no matter what kind, comes under the rules of the Senate, if it intervened between now and the passage on the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the withdrawal of the resolution, does the Senator from New York withdraw his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I again submit the concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. May the concurrent resolution be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read again.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution that effective January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, Eighty-sixth Congress, continue and have same powers as conferred by said resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, I propound the following parliamentary inquiry: Will the adoption of this resolution in any way change the procedural situation before the Senate in respect of the resolution to change rule XXII and any substitute therefor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida wish to discuss the answer to the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely wish to state that my prior remarks, addressed to the generality of the former request of the Senator from New York, have no application to the present request, which is specific and not objectionable, as was the former request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair would rule that consideration of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would change the situation in regard to the rules of the Senate, unless there is a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that it shall not do so. The present occupant of the Chair must in frankness inform the Senate that for the first time in his 6 years of service he is making a ruling from the Chair which is not entirely in accord with the advice of the Parliamentarian, who is inclined to believe that because this resolution is in the nature of a privileged resolution, having to do with the inauguration of the President, it might not have that effect. However, the occupant of the Chair does not dare to make that ruling. The ruling of the occupant of the Chair, unless it is overruled by the Senate, is that, in the absence of an agreement, this would change the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Again I withdraw the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has not the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] been duly laid before the Senate as business coming over from the previous day, under rule XL?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been so laid down.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then how is the question raised with reference to that resolution, when it is already before the Senate? It seems to me we are engaging in vigorously kicking a dead horse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not clear as to what resolution the distinguished Senator from Georgia has reference to. Is he referring to the resolution which was submitted and withdrawn by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not. I am referring to the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair understood. That resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is now pending before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Having been laid down as business coming over from the previous day, under rule XL. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Again I utterly do not understand the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. We are belaboring a dead issue and kicking a dead horse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This has to do with a different resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me that the privileged resolution twice advanced by the distinguished majority leader and twice withdrawn is of such a privileged nature and so necessary in connection with the inauguration that it ought to be considered under unanimous consent and should not change in any way the status of the pending situation now before the Senate. The Senator from Florida seriously suggests to the majority leader that such course is open and available. The Senator from Florida, by raising the question he raised a moment ago, did not in any way want to be considered as interrupting or interfering with the adoption of the necessary resolution in connection with the approaching inauguration. I am sure that the Senator from New York also would not wish to interfere with it in any way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that one has to play games on the floor of the Senate. Therefore I should like to respond to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The point, Mr. President, is this: This resolution would be entirely in order today under rule XL. The question which will pinch will come up when there is an effort made to close debate, and the question will be, Do the rules of the Senate apply, or are the rules to be applied by the Chair, because this is a procedure under the Constitution? It is at that time that the real issue will arise, which can be laid before the Senate as a constitutional question. Then every technical question will arise, including whether the Senate has or has not transacted other business; or whether it is that we comply very thoroughly with the advisory opinion given by the Vice President now for the third time—1957, 1959, and 1961.

So long as I am on the floor, whether or not other Members might think that this is unnecessary, I shall seek to protect those rights. That was the only purpose of my parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that if the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] asks unanimous consent, it will not alter the situation. If he does not do so, the Chair adheres to the ruling that it might affect the situation before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from New York, I will endeavor to be as objectionable as he has tried to be. I object to the consideration of the resolution by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution has been withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, until we have time to clarify this rather confusing situation, it might be well to proceed with something that is a rather noncontroversial subject, such as the proposed change in the rule relating to extended debate in the Senate.

It seems to me that this will be a very much more understandable subject than the one we have just discussed.

I am very happy and proud to be one of the sponsors of the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico.

The present rule XXII, starting with section 2, provides:

> 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:
>
> "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"
>
> And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

What that technical language really boils down to is simply this: That upon a cloture petition having been filed, and 2 days thereafter, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting may terminate debate.

The amendment which has been presented by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], one of the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party, and the senior Senator from Minnesota, together with a number of other Senators, would alter this situation by providing that a majority of Senators duly qualified and sworn, commonly referred to as a constitutional majority, could—15 days after filing a motion for cloture—bring the debate to a close.

We do not provide for repeal of section 2. Section 2 provides for a 2-day period after the filing of a motion for cloture, and then for two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The amendment now before the Senate provides that after a 15-day period, a majority of Senators duly qualified, chosen, and sworn shall be able to terminate debate. In other words, this is the second stage, so to speak, in providing an effective means of terminating debate. Then, of course, we provide for 1 hour of debate for each Senator—100 hours of debate—after the 15 days have elapsed.

So if in 100 hours of debate, plus 15 days after the filing of a cloture petition, it is not possible to bring debate to a close without having denied any Senator who has something which he would like to offer to the motion the opportunity to speak, then, indeed, the question must be more complex than discoveries in outer space.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is my understanding correct that 16 Senators who wish to ask for cloture can either debate the measure under section 2 and go forward in that way, which is according to the present rule, or can file a motion under subsection 3, which is the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota is now suggesting? Can the 16 Senators proceed on one or the other basis, by adopting the second subsection procedure or the third subsection procedure?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They have a choice.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have a choice. If they fail on the first one, or subsection 2, then I assume they could go forward under subsection 3, which is the new section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is actually subsection 4, because it is not proposed to repeal subsection 3, which relates to rule VIII. The proposal before the Senate would be the second position.

Let us assume a situation where there was extended debate. Several Senators might say, "We ought to bring the debate to a close." Suppose 16 Senators then signed a cloture petition, which would be before the Senate for 2 days. Then suppose an attempt were made to bring the debate to a close. The Presiding Officer would place the question before the Senate, and the yeas and nays would be called for. Then suppose two-thirds of the Senators present and voting said it was the sense of the Senate that the debate should be brought to a close. That would be it. The debate would be brought to a close.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Suppose the motion failed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it failed, it would be necessary to wait 15 days after the signing of a petition by 16 Senators before a vote could be taken to make cloture by a constitutional majority of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would have to be a new petition, would it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would have to be a new petition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So an alternative procedure is provided, and 16 Senators can proceed under whichever plan they prefer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Masachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If they are defeated on the first procedure, then they may use the other procedure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Subsection 4, or the new proposal being offered, does not, I repeat, repeal anything in the existing Senate rule. The existing Senate rule would remain as it is, to be applied at the discretion of the Members of the Senate. What we are seeking to provide by the new subsection is a further method of terminating debate, but recognizing that 15 days are added following the filing of a cloture petition. That means that much more debate is allowed, and therefore, the number of Senators required to bring that debate to a close would be reduced from two-thirds of those present and voting to what is called a constitutional majority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the resolution being offered by the Senator from Minnesota as a substitute for the resolution offered by the Senator from New Mexico prevails, then the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico cannot be voted on. If the substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota fails, then there can be a vote on the Anderson substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Massachusetts is again correct. While I surely have no special right to explain the purposes of what, for simplicity, we might call the Anderson resolution, the Anderson resolution does not add a new subsection. The Anderson resolution is a rewriting of the existing subsection 2.

In substance, what it does is to change the arithmetic from two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

The amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle, and the Senator from Minnesota and many of his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, would leave section 2 as it is, and would add a new section, section 4, which would provide an alternative method of concluding debate on a question on which there has been very extended debate.

I raise the point again that our proposal requires that after a cloture petition has been filed by 16 Senators, under the rules of the Senate 15 calendar days must elapse before the Presiding Officer can place before the Senate the question: Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate should be closed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The justification for the reduced number of Senators necessary to bring the debate to a close is the 15 days of debate plus the length of time which must elapse after the motion has been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is again correct. His comments and questions have been very helpful in explaining the proposal. So that there will be no misunderstanding, let me make it clear, so that those who may take part in the argument or may be in opposition will understand the position of the proponents of the amendment, we are not seeking to gag the Senate. As a matter of fact, the procedure which is established makes it mandatory that 15 days elapse after the cloture petition, signed by 16 Senators, has been filed; and that after 15 days, 100 hours more of debate shall be available. So I repeat that the 15 days plus the 100 hours of debate—the latter amounting to approximately 4 more days of 24 hours each, or 12 days of 8 hours each, or whatever number of days it is desired to break the hours into—would provide a tremendous amount of time to explore and explain fully the issue before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Theoretically, the provision of 100 hours is to enable each Senator to speak for 1 hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Could any Senator speak more than twice under this proposal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the proposed amendment, each Senator shall have 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate. He is entitled to speak only 1 hour. He may possibly speak twice in that 1 hour. It does not mean that he may speak only once. He may divide his time.

Some other suggestions have been made. I may say that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] very favorably impressed me with a suggestion he made on a television or radio program, or in a press interview. I presume he may later want to speak on this subject himself. The Senator from New York attempted to afford a little more flexibility in the allocation of time, and to make it absolutely certain that one-half of the time would be allotted to the proponents of a particular proposal and one-half of the time for the opponents, regardless of the number of Senators who might participate in the debate. Do I correctly understand the proposal of the Senator from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct. I appreciate his comments. It has always seemed to me that the present rule providing for 1 hour for each Senator after cloture is illogical. It has no historical basis and does not make sense. There might be many Senators who would want to use less than an hour, whereas there might be Senators, particularly in the minority, who might want to consume more than the 1 hour allotted to each Senator.

Therefore, it has seemed to me that it would be more reasonable both to the minority on the particular issue and to the orderly procedures of the Senate if the time were divided between the majority leader and the minority leader and if, under the rule, they in turn were required to allocate their time among those who favored and those who opposed the particular issue before us.

At the appropriate time I intend to offer my proposal as an amendment to the pending substitute. I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, if the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for the purpose of the propounding of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from California, and several other Senators is open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is open to amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

I say frankly to the Senator from Minnesota that I would not be inclined to press my proposal if it were highly controversial; as the Senator knows, I do not wish to do anything to interfere with our principal effort. This proposal is a little off the beaten track; but while we are considering this subject, perhaps we should act on its other aspects. It may be that my suggestion would appeal to all sides here. It really is in the nature of an effort to compromise our differences. It seems to me that those who were in the minority on a particular issue would prefer to have the time divided equally between those who favored their position and those who favored the majority position, instead of having each Senator be permitted to speak for 1 hour.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall be prepared to offer this as an amendment at whatever seems to be the appropriate time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the 1-hour restriction also apply to the majority whip; or will he be permitted to use the unused time allotted to other Senators?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to respond to my friend. Of course we believe in equal treatment under the rules; and although it would be unfortunate for the majority whip to be restricted to 1 hour, because I am sure I shall be able to edify my friend considerably, nevertheless I shall try to be brief and to give my friend a concentrated, consolidated dose on the issues in a limited period of time. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that in making my suggestion I had in mind not only the minority Senators, but also, and specifically, the Senator from Minnesota. In fact, we would be glad to have him use 50 percent of the available time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York is extremely kind; and it is the solicitous attitude on his part that endears him to me. I want him to know that I shall always be responsive to such treatment.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In fact, I would be agreeable to having only one-half of the 50 percent. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I believe the proposal of the Senator from New York has great merit, and I hope he will offer the amendment.

The reason why the present amendment in the nature of a substitute did not go into that matter was that we had presented the same amendment in the nature of a substitute 2 years ago, and

we did not have time to contact every sponsor before it was drawn up this time. So it seemed to me that it might be better to have this open discussion about the Senator's amendment here on the floor. Therefore, I think that at that time his amendment will be proper, and I think it is a very desirable one.

Mr. KEATING. I agree entirely with the Senator's views. Again I say that I would not be disposed to press this matter if there were great opposition from any side. The amendment is really intended to promote the acceptability of majority rule and not to complicate the issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I desire to make only one or two other observations.

The general argument used against the majority rule provision to apply a limitation to debate is that it would limit free speech, that it would gag the Senate, that it would constitute a denial of full opportunity for expression. But, Mr. President, the duty of the Congress, under the Constitution, is to act and to do business. In the constitutional article which relates to the Congress, almost the first words of section 5 are these: "A majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Mr. President, we are here to do the business of the Government, to represent the interests of our people, and to conduct the business of the legislative branch of the Government.

Furthermore, although I am sure that some of my colleagues will go into this matter in a more scholarly manner and with great research, if my memory is correct most of the great parliamentary bodies of the world have a way to terminate debate by majority rule, after extended debate.

Let me say that many of the State legislatures—in fact, the legislatures of many of the States which are so ably and effectively represented here by some of our colleagues who support what we call the filibuster or extended debate—have rules pertaining to their State senate or their State house of representatives to bring debate to a close by majority rule. In other words, this is no great innovation or no radical departure from tradition in our legislative bodies. It is not what I might even call very far on the new frontier, I say to my friends on the other side. It is really old, established ground; and the Senate should be catching up with what I believe to be well-established tradition in many legislative bodies.

Furthermore, I want it to be very, very clear that before a cloture petition ever is filed in this body, Senators are reluctant to sign such a petition. Every Senator is jealous of his rights. My good friend, the Senator from Idaho, was concerned about the amount of time I might wish to utilize on one of these issues; and that is a justifiable concern, let me say, in light of the extended service we have had here. I can appreciate that people might have some reason to be concerned about that. I can assure my colleagues that under no circumstances would I wish to sign a cloture petition until there had been plenty of time properly to discuss any issue before the Senate. Every Senator feels very keenly about this matter.

So we are relying, first of all, on the tolerance, the understanding, the experience and, I believe, the sense of fair play of every Senator. Certainly if there is anything that characterizes the Senate, it is fair play. Whatever may be any Senator's view on any issue, before any cloture petition would ever be signed by 16 Senators, to be presented to the Presiding Officer, even under the existing rule XXII, many days of debate would have been had.

My colleagues will recall our experience with this matter a year ago. Long debate was had on the question of the civil rights issue; and in the history of the Congress there has been long debate on issues relating to a host of subjects—not only civil rights, but also matters of national security, tariff, and finance. We do not propose to change the rules in order to have the Senate pass any one piece of legislation. Instead, we are discussing a proper change of rules in order to insure more effective, responsive, and responsible operation of the Senate.

So I repeat that we have that background of tradition which restrains us in terms of any premature cutting off of debate. We have that background of experience and tradition which restrains us from any premature filing of a cloture petition; and under the provisions of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, now before us, we provide for 15 days of debate after the petition has been filed before the Senate is asked the question, "Is it the sense of the Senate that debate should be brought to a close?"

If anyone deems that to be a denial of the right of free speech, then indeed I believe that person has extended the concept of free speech beyond what is the requirement for a responsible and effective legislative body.

Mr. President, there are going to be many other Senators who will want to be heard on this subject. I merely opened the debate in order to place it before the Senate.

I wish to thank my colleagues who have joined in the cosponsorship of the proposal. They are men who have given considerable thought to this particular situation. Many of the Members of the Senate who have joined as cosponsors are Senators who in the past have not always looked upon this proposal with favor. They have come to an understanding of its acceptability and its need through experience in this body.

I want to pay particular thanks to my colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL], with whom I have had the privilege of working on this matter; and, if I may, to all those Senators on both sides of the aisle who have given so much time to the subject.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who have done, really, all the basic research, insofar as this side of the aisle is concerned, on this particular matter; and the two Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I know I leave out other Senators, but those four will be the leaders in the effort to modify, in a sensible, responsible, and moderate manner, the rules of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator from Minnesota tell me when last a majority voted to shut off debate, and that debate was not cut off for lack of a two-thirds vote?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I cannot; I am sorry. I shall be more than happy to ascertain if that situation ever prevailed. I am not prepared to give the Senator an answer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct that during the last 6 years there has never been a case where a majority of the Senate has voted to end debate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my friend, who, I have a suspicion, may not enthusiastically vote for this proposal—I do not think he is going to vote for it at all, enthusiastically or not—he has resolved some of his own doubts because he may now be able to give us a vote if he feels a majority will not really be able to exercise the power which would be granted under the modification of rule XXII.

I say in all respect now that I do not think it is very important whether or not, in the last 6 or 8 or 10 years, a majority has curbed or limited debate in the Senate after the filing of a cloture petition. I do not believe that is the issue. I think the issue is whether or not to have in our kit, in our rulebook, a rule that is fair, a rule that is workable, a rule that, if the situation so develops that it is needed, we shall have available to deal with the problem.

For example, the Government of the United States has spent billions of dollars on missiles, and they are supposedly for our defense. I might ask: Can any Senator show me that we have ever used any of these missiles in the defense of this country? Have we ever fired one at an opponent or an enemy? The answer, of course is "No." But that does not mean we should not have an arsenal of missiles. It does not mean we should rely on missiles; we should have an arsenal of a variety of weapons.

The analogy may be farfetched; but it is necessary that the rule book, the rules that govern the operations of the Senate, may be used for the purpose of orderly debate or discussion, in order to enable us adequately to meet whatever situation may develop, in order to properly process needed legislation.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana has given one of the best arguments we have in our favor, namely, that the Senate is, indeed, very reluctant ever to cut off debate. But I want to be sure that, in the critical days in which we live, if we have had weeks of time to properly discuss an issue and if there is a great

need to terminate debate, in the public interest, we have the equipment to do the job.

I respectfully point out that I do not recommend the repeal of section 2. I voted, as a second alternative, for the 66⅔ percent provision, that is, two thirds of Senators present and voting. I also stated that was an improvement over the previous rule. I felt that the majority leader of the Senate, soon to be Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON did a great service for this body when he proposed a much advanced and improved rule that applied to every motion and measure before the Senate, even a motion to bring up a change in the rules. As Senators will recall, the old rule had a loophole in it which denied us an opportunity to apply cloture to any motion to bring up a change in the rules.

The then Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, gave us a new rule, with, of course, concurrence of the majority of the Senate. It did not go as far as I thought it should, but I said it was a substantial improvement. I received some criticism for being as complimentary as I was. But I expect that. A Senator is seldom able to satisfy anybody in this body. He is lucky to be able to satisfy himself. The minute a Senator makes an adjustment to reality, there is always someone ready to "clobber" him.

There are some who are always ready to say that the real test of a great man is to be able to say "No." I do not believe that. I think the great test is making progress. I think we made progress. Therefore, I do not believe in tearing down the house that we made. It was a good edifice, a good structure. It did not do everything I thought it ought to do, but it was a great improvement.

So the proposition advanced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] does not abolish section 2 of rule XXII. We do not want to take the legislative excavator and rip up what we did. What we do is call upon the skilled craftsmen of this body to build a new and a better edifice that is required for possibly a new situation.

I think we have exemplified reasonableness. I believe our proposition is sound from every point of view. It destroys nothing. It contributes something. It may not be everything we shall want in the days ahead. But we build as we go along.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point? I have the figures before me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The last date on which a majority voted for cloture was July 26, 1954. The issue at that time had nothing to do with civil rights, but, as the Senator has suggested, with an entirely different subject, the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. That fact, to my way of thinking, adds importance to what the Senator from Minnesota is saying. There is a tendency to emphasize the issue of civil rights in this discussion. Actually, the action to which I have referred had to do with an entirely different subject; namely, atomic energy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. As I said before, he has done a great deal of research on this matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator recognize that one of the greatest services that has been performed in this body in the last 20 years was what started out to be an effort by a minority on this side of the aisle in opposition to a giveaway of the patent rights of this Government to private concerns under the Atomic Energy Act? Was not the battle won simply on that basis? There was a temporary majority. After the Members of the Senate heard the debate, the majority was no longer a majority. There was a majority seeking to ram its views down the throats of a minority. The minority held the floor for a while.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota was part of the minority which held the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was indeed. I was present on that particular occasion, in that particular situation, as I remember, for either 28 or 30 days. It was one or the other, either 28 or 30 days.

I wish to point out that before a cloture petition was filed, a month of debate had taken place. Incidentally, if one cannot teach Senators about the facts of life in a month, there must be too many slow learners in this body. I think we ought to be able to catch on in a month.

One may not wish to understand. One may have an entirely different philosophical point of view; and, therefore, from one's individual viewpoint one may not be able to be convinced, or to be convincing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator permit me to complete my statement? If we debate for 30 days before we have a petition signed by 16 Senators, who feel it is about time to draw the debate to a close, under the present rule 16 Senators can file a petition and 2 days later the Presiding Officer will have no choice, but must, from the Chair, ask the question stated in rule XXII, which is:

> Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

That is it. If two-thirds of the Senators who are present and voting say "Yes," the debate will stop.

What is the proposal before us, which we advance today as a substitute for the Anderson resolution? What would it do? It would provide that 16 Senators could file a petition, and 15 days after they filed the petition if a constitutional majority should vote to terminate the debate, then the issue would be voted upon after each Senator was allowed to utilize an hour in debate.

It would not say to Senators, "You are going to vote my way." It would simply say, "You have talked long enough. If you have not been able to explain the subject in the 2 months in which you have been arguing about it now, you will possibly never be able to come to any closer decision, so you should either say 'Yea' or 'Nay.' You do not have to vote 'Yea.' You do not have to vote 'Nay.' You may vote what your conscience and your enlightenment and your own perception of the issue tells you to vote."

I repeat: I remember the occasion. The Senator from Louisiana was very active in the atomic energy fight. The Senator did a great service for his country. I hope I did a little something, also.

I remember what was done by other Senators. The distinguished former Senator from Colorado, the former Governor, Ed Johnson, was very active, I remember, in that debate. I mention it because he used to sit in a chair near where the Senator from Louisiana is standing.

I remember very well how we battled for days in the Senate to protect what we thought was the public interest.

After weeks of the fight a cloture petition was presented. I have forgotten who initiated the cloture petition, but 16 Senators said, "Look, we have had enough. We are going to try to draw this debate to a close." Sixteen Senators signed the petition, and 2 days later it was laid down for a vote.

Under the Kuchel-Humphrey proposal, this bipartisan proposal we have before us today, we would not demand that Senators vote 2 days after the cloture petition was filed. We would say, "Very well. You have had 30 days to argue already. We will give you 15 days more. Anyone, during those 15 days, may say anything he wishes to say. Anyone may argue as much as he wishes to, or speak as long as he wishes to, during those 15 days. Then, after the 15 days, we will give 100 hours more."

I wish to say that the Senator from Louisiana can convince nearly anyone I know of of almost anything in less than 100 hours, or 15 days. I have great respect for the Senator. In fact, one of the worries I have had about this generous proposal is that if it were to be utilized by a man of such a sweeping intellect and charm as the Senator from Louisiana I am afraid he might talk me into something into which I should not be talked—but I will take the gamble.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield briefly, I appreciate all of these high compliments, but I think it is well that those who are present in the galleries should know what the Presiding Officer well knows, which is that the rules will not let the Senator from Minnesota refer to me in any other respect. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is one of the reasons why I believe we ought to have good rules in the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The same thing is true with respect to the Senator's statement that Senators are not slow learners. The rules will not let a Senator say Senators are slow learners. The rules require that a Senator must always speak out with all deference and say nothing that any Senator could take offense at, which means a Senator has to be something of a mindreader when he does not agree with somebody.

I will say to the Senator that if the rule as advocated had been in effect when

this tremendous national service was effected for this country in 1954, the victory never would have been won. I take no credit for that. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I think, probably rendered the greatest service to this Nation at that time. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] contributed mightily.

A great national service was provided, but that victory never would have been won, to preserve for the public the billions upon billions of dollars of investments, from special interests who wanted to grasp the patent rights to everything the Government had paid for for the benefit of the people, under a rule such as is advocated. That great victory was won because those who were trying to force this thing down the throats of an unwilling minority were compelled to recognize that the minority could carry on for quite a while, and there was no assurance the debate ever could be brought to a close unless there was recognized what was happening, which was that the minority had a case which had to be considered and that the majority was going to have to make some concession.

I believe, if the Senator will reflect he will recall perhaps the greatest accomplishment of that debate was the fact that an administration, fresh in power, with what was regarded as a mandate to do anything it pleased and anything it thought wise, was compelled to yield to the views of some who have been proved to have been right on a matter of enormous consequence to this country.

The Senator from Minnesota, I know, has never been in favor of the rule we have at present. The Senator may have voted to take it, on one occasion, as the lesser of a number of evils.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am curious to know what argument the Senator would direct to those of us who voted for the rule, to convince us that we should now move in a manner which, in my judgment, would do violation to the rules and to the traditions of the Senate? That is what would happen if we were to adopt a new rule without trying the old one.

The Senator made reference to a missile. I can see that a missile is necessary in terms of defense, but I would not be able to understand why, if we spent a great amount of our energy and wealth constructing a very fine missile, we should discard it without ever trying it to see if it worked. I would push the button to see.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not advocating discarding the missile of subsection 2 of the rule. Not at all. I say we will keep that. Apparently some Members of the U.S. Senate feel that is a very, very sound rule.

I wish to make the record clear. I think it was an improvement. I do not think it is as good a rule as we need.

I have been a supporter of majority cloture, and I believe a majority ought to be able to act in this body. The Constitution of the United States specifically provides those areas where a majority is not all that is required, where more than a majority is required, such as with respect to the approval of treaties and the overriding of vetoed bills and resolutions.

For a considerable period of the history of this country, in some of its greatest hours and in some of its greatest decades, a majority constituted a quorum for the purpose of doing business, including the shutting off of debate in the U.S. Senate.

We have had men like Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, and other great men who lived under rules which provided a majority could cut off debate. I do not think it will do any damage to the U.S. Senate if we provide that a majority shall again apply for the purpose of cutting off debate, particularly if we require that 16 Senators, all of whom wish to have an opportunity to speak as long as they feel there is any need to speak, must sign a petition, and that petition must lie on the desk for 15 days, during which 15 days Senators can argue to their hearts' content, and then after 15 days have expired there shall be 100 hours more of debate permitted, so that each Senator will have a chance to participate in the debate. It seems to me, Senator, that the public interest will be well guarded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think the record should show that if at the time of the atomic energy discussion or filibuster, if my friend from Louisiana would prefer to use that word, the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota, I, and others are sponsoring now was a rule of the U.S. Senate, cloture would not have been invoked. Our rule would require a constitutional majority of 51. All that the proponents of cloture could muster in favor of their motion during the debate or filibuster on atomic energy was less than a majority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Forty-four to forty-two.

Mr. KUCHEL. In my judgment, the argument of the Senator from Louisiana is not a reason to oppose the resolution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What assurance can the Senator from Minnesota offer us, if his proposed amendment is adopted, that it will be the last we shall hear of the subject?

Since the day I first came to the Senate the first matter of business has always been an attempt to change the rules of the Senate to limit and restrict free debate in the Senate. What assurance do we have, if we should accept the proposed amendment of the Senators, that it would be the end of the discussion, and that we would not be again confronted with the same subject next year. It may lead to the kind of situation we have in the State legislature of my State, whereby a legislator could make his speech and move the question after a single speech had been made. It might be good practice for that legislature, but I do not think it would be good practice for the U.S. Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no assurance that any Senator can give at any time anywhere that if the Senate should adopt the proposed rule embodying the majority principle which has been advocated first, I believe, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], former Senator Lehman, and many others, some other Senator may not come back later and say, "I think the rules should be changed." Perhaps some Senators will say, "We do not like the rule. Perhaps the rule should require a vote of three-fourths of those present and voting."

We cannot bind future Congresses. We must rely on the good judgment, restraint, and experience of Senators, the traditions of this body, and our understanding of the need of free and open discussion. I submit that the history of this country indicates that when we did not have a rule requiring a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, as the present rule requires, when there was a rule requiring a simple majority to cut off debate, there were great Senators, and great public issues were decided. The Republic was not destroyed. The Senate was a mighty institution.

I merely say there is good reason to believe that the existing body of rules known as the Senate rules which are now in the Senate manual ought to be amended, not to destroy what we have built, but to add an additional protection for what we call responsible representative government, in order to make it possible for a majority of Senators who have been elected by the people of the United States and the people of the respective States to do business, because the Constitution requires that a majority shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of doing business.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to confirm what the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] said a few moments ago in regard to the filibuster on the atomic energy bill in 1954. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I participated in that filibuster. In fact, I believe I am the only liberal in the Senate who admits he filibusters. The remainder of my liberal colleagues talk about prolonged debate. But I have never filibustered to prevent a vote from ever occurring on a piece of legislation, and I never shall. But sometimes liberals should filibuster long enough to see to it that the public is informed as to what the Senate is up to.

Sometimes we need a few watchdogs in the Senate to keep the public informed as to what the Senate is up to. On that particular occasion the Senate was up to defeating the rights of the American public by way of a steamroller which the then majority leader sought to impose upon the Senate that afternoon. I remember it as though it were yesterday.

He asked for a unanimous consent agreement to vote on that proposed bill on that day or we could start talking. The bill did not reach the floor of the Senate until that afternoon. My recollection is that the bill was about 110 pages long. I never start to filibuster without preceding it with an offer of the Morse antifilibuster resolution. The Morse antifilibuster resolution, which I have introduced year after year and will offer again this afternoon before adjournment or recess, provides for the

basic principles contained in the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators have offered on this occasion. I am a cosponsor of that resolution, too.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, we should consider the various antifilibuster resolutions, whether it is the Morse resolution, the Lehman resolution, the Humphrey resolution, the Douglas resolution, the Javits resolution or any of the rest, and see that not only are the rights of the minority for full and adequate debate protected, but also that the American people are protected from the operation of a steamroller in the Senate that seeks to deprive the American people of their substantive legislative rights. That is exactly what was attempted in the 1954 atomic energy debate.

Instead of giving a unanimous-consent agreement that afternoon on that issue, we debated the subject for 13 days and 6 nights, as I recall; I have a pretty good recollection about it because I held down the "graveyard shift" through 2 long nights of that filibuster. We protected the American people and we protected the minority. We changed a minority into a majority on a series of amendments that were added to the atomic energy bill in 1954, not a single one of which would have been passed had we as a Senate surrendered that afternoon to the unanimous-consent agreement to pass the bill on the afternoon it came to the Senate. The House had received the bill that day and passed it, as I recall, after less than 2 hours of debate. Then it came through the door of the Senate, and the majority leader, after it was laid down in the Senate, suggested an immediate vote on the measure that afternoon.

I shall go along with a fight in this session of Congress to adopt antifilibuster legislation that will protect minority rights but, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, what was good enough for Webster, Clay, Calhoun, and the Senators of that day ought to be good enough for the Senate in 1961. They were willing to operate under a majority-rule principle.

There has been much reference in debate over the years to the fact that we do not always have majority rule under our form of government and under our Constitution, but the Constitution specifies when majority rule shall not apply, and so the argument by analogy that is constantly being used in the Senate is a typical non sequitur fallacy.

I am often interested in the tendency of Senators to use an analogy in argument and think that they have drawn a sound conclusion because there are some similarities, overlooking the great differences that are involved almost every time they use an argument by analogy. This is a good example of it. The fact, in my judgment, that the Constitution made perfectly clear when majority rule should not apply raises a presumption, I believe, that we ought to follow the majority rule principle.

I am going to leave my liberal friends in the Senate on one facet of the debate; I am not going along with them on a 60-percent provision. There ought to be a prolonged debate on the subject. The American people ought to be educated on the proposal for a 60-percent vote in the Senate. I happen to think that it is better in the long-range interest of the American people that we stand firm on the majority vote principle and take our beating again this year, as I think we probably will if we stand for that principle, rather than to go along with what I consider to be the very unsound compromise that would follow a defeat on the majority rule, namely, a 60-percent proposal.

I shall not only vote against it, but I shall be very happy to educate the American people in regard to the importance of that provision. It may take some time to get that educational lesson across to the American people. I thought the Senator from Louisiana would be particularly interested in the position the Senator from Oregon is taking on that proposal. I shall continue in the Senate along these lines until I get the American people fully informed on the importance of their legislative rights and of the necessity that their rules be changed in the Senate.

These rules do not belong to us as Senators. They belong to the American people. Unless the American people understand the direct relationship between their substantive legislative rights and a denial of their procedural rights in the Senate, we will never get majority rule in the Senate.

I believe that we liberals have made an exceedingly poor record over the years in carrying this issue to the country. We have not succeeded in educating the American people on the issue and on the relationship between the rules of the Senate and the legislative rights of the people in the Senate. There have been liberals before us who did much better than we have done in educating the American people on great issues that confronted them in the Senate in their day. We had great liberals in the Senate, such as Hiram Johnson, William Borah, La Follette, and Norris, who used to take the record of the Senate out to the platforms of America and read the record to the constituency of America. Once they got the American people educated as to the need of a great piece of legislation, they got the legislation.

Those liberals, Mr. President, did not compromise their principles. Once they became satisfied that it was in the interest of the American people that a certain proposal be adopted in the Senate, they fought for it until they won. They did not shortchange the people with promises that set them back for decades.

If we adopt the 60-percent proposal in this session of Congress, we may never get a majority rule in our lifetime.

Therefore, Mr. President, I close by saying to my liberal friends that the time has come to rally round the standard for majority rule in the Senate, and to settle for nothing else. If we get beaten on the majority rule principle, then let us try again and again and again, until we win out.

When I make my speech on the issue as to the 60-percent proposal, I will be able to show that it does not make much difference whether it is 60 percent or 66 percent, as it now exists, as far as stopping filibusters in the Senate is concerned. The only time we will really be successful in stopping filibusters or at least in most instances, is when we bring to the floor of the Senate the basic principle of democratic government that a majority shall have the right to speak for the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With all due deference to my great and able friend from Oregon, I would suggest that the rule he proposes fits very well the speeches of the Senator from Oregon and I suppose what most people stand for from where they are standing themselves.

The Senator from Oregon has spoken on the floor of the Senate longer than anyone else in the history of the Senate. I well recall that he was the most considerate and polite Senator in this body, on the occasion when he spoke for 22½ hours, because when he started he invited all Senators to go home and come back the next day, and that it would not be necessary for anyone to get up early the next morning; that we could come back in the afternoon, and the speech would still be going on.

I submit, however, that when we start tearing down and denying the rights of Senators and begin to control discussion, we cannot stop there.

Those who do not make long speeches would be inclined to say, "If 20 Senators are denied the right to make long speeches, then perhaps five or six long speakers will make speeches of 24 hours or longer."

Reference has been made to liberals like Johnson and Borah and La Follette. Those great liberals were in favor of free speech. They did not like some of the things that were going on in those days, and they were willing to fight against them. It was important to them, however, that the rules of the Senate should give them the right to carry on extended debate.

My father, Huey Long, made a great fight on the floor of the Senate, together with former Senator Elbert Thomas, on the preservation of the State banks of the Nation. He made the fight against what would have resulted in an entirely Federal system of banks. Today that is regarded as a very wise statute. I say to the Senator that if the rule the Senator is advocating here had been in effect at that time, it would have been possible to cut off debates at that time by this type of procedure.

The Senator has referred to the right of persuading other Senators. He knows as well as I do the difficulty all of us have in trying to get Senators to come to listen to a speech. The junior Senator from Louisiana made a fight on the floor of the Senate a year ago for a mental health program, when the Senator from Minnesota was kind enough to come to the Chamber to listen to a part of his speech, at least. The Senator knows what usually happens when once a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into to limit debate. Everyone

goes home. Everyone leaves the Chamber. No one remains in the Chamber except a Senator or two who is firmly against the point of view of the speaker and remains in the Chamber to see that the speaker does not get very far with his argument. At the present time there is only one Republican Senator on the floor. I was worried for a moment that the Republican Party did not have anyone on the floor during this debate. Other than those I have mentioned, there are usually only one or two doorkeepers present. Once a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate is entered into, the debate is all over. There is just so much time remaining, and it is a matter, from then on, of merely going through the motions, so far as persuading anyone is concerned.

Does not the Senator agree with the junior Senator from Louisiana that once it is agreed that debate will be closed at a certain time and that the Senate will vote at a certain time, there is very little chance of persuading anyone?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say, honestly, that there is considerable validity in what the Senator has said. However, I might add that one of the reasons for the difficulty of having Senators come to the Senate when they know there is going to be extended debate is that they all know it is going to be extended. When we set a time of day when we are going to vote, say, at 2 o'clock on Friday, and we agree that time will be parceled out from 12 o'clock on Wednesday, for instance, then from Wednesday until 2 o'clock on Friday Senators are in the Chamber and they are listening and paying attention, and they are studying the subject under debate. The administrative assistants of the Senators are on the floor with the Senators, and they are earnestly trying to find out what the facts are.

The point the Senator is making is illustrated by what happened when the Senator from Louisiana spoke on his mental health program. He did a wonderful job on the floor of the Senate. I voted with the Senator. I did not know at first that I was going to vote with him. The Senator convinced me.

I remember also the great work done by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the senior Senator from Tennesee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as well as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], on the atomic energy bill some years ago. One of the purposes of extended debate, which would include the 15 days that we provide for under the amended resolution, is not only to convince Senators by the logic of our own arguments, by our eloquence, but we are talking to the members of the Press Gallery, who will report the news to the constituents. We are talking to the citizens who fill these galleries to watch the business of government—sometimes, I gather, somewhat unhappily. Nevertheless, we are trying to get our message out to the American people. I venture to say that while Senators may have spoken in this Chamber when there has not been any other Senator present except a representative of the majority or of the minority and the Presiding Officer, those speeches may very well have provoked a reaction in the country which caused Senators or Members of the other body to change their minds, or at least to be alerted to an issue.

We are not here simply to debate with one another. The U.S. Senate is a great public forum. It provides an opportunity for those who have been elected by their fellow citizens in the respective States to be heard, not merely as individuals, but as a force or a voice or an articulation of a point of view.

I know of many times in this Chamber when no attention has been paid to a speech which was being made by a Member of the Senate. Yet his words were carried in the press, over the great news services, and on the radio and television and in publications. Almost immediately telegrams started to come into the office. The telephone started to ring. Letters began to come from home. Visitors came to the offices of Senators and said, "I heard on the radio that Senator So-and-So said the following. What is your reaction to it?" Or, "I am for what he said."

I should say that many times some of the important speeches in this body are made by Senators who are not orators, who have no audience, and who are not even looking for an audience, but who find an opportunty to use the forum of the U.S. Senate as a platform from which to pronounce their points of view or to alert the American people to a particular issue.

Many of the country's great resources have been saved in this forum. Public opinion has been aroused on a host of subjects because of this forum when not a corporal's guard of Senators were present.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. Before doing so, I ask that the name of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. In answer to those who express a strong desire to be heard at length on any issue which concerns the welfare of the American people, is it not true that one thing of which we are losing sight, and which I think is quite important, is that there will already have been prolonged debate even before a petition is circulated, let alone before the petition rests upon the desks of Senators?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. As he knows, we are not abolishing section 2 of the existing rules; we are providing a second step, which is that even after that prolonged debate and the filing of a cloture petition—and it is no small job to get 16 U.S. Senators to sign a cloture petition—it is necessary to have a pretty good case. It is necessary to have a mighty sound argument. It is necessary for Senators to be mighty tired and mighty worried before they will sign a petition which will say to their colleagues, which ultimately may say to us, and may again say to us, "No more debate."

Every one of us lives here on the sufferance of our colleagues. We treat each other as responsible, decent human beings, because that is the way we want to be treated. The rule of tolerance and the rule of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" certainly apply in this body. The minute any Senator violates those rules, he gets just what he deserves.

Mr. President, I believe a very strong case can be made, and has been made, and a better case will be made, for what we call majority rule, principally in the matter of closing debate.

I shall yield the floor now. Before doing so, I ask that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] also be added as a cosponsor of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate, at very long last, has now an opportunity to eliminate an undemocratic and ugly practice which has long plagued its deliberations. Available to a majority of us is a vote to eliminate the filibuster.

The filibuster is an anachronism. In the 8 years that I have had the honor to represent, in part, the people of the State of California, I have seen many filibusters in this Chamber, when varying and divergent issues were before the Senate. I have seen the leadership of whichever party was in the majority compelled to keep Senators in constant session, 24 hours a day, day in and day out, in order, physically, to exhaust a minority of filibustering colleagues whose sole and only goal was to prevent the majority from having the opportunity to pass judgment upon and to approve the business pending before the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has reflected on other Senators. I should think he would at least yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not yield, Mr. President. I shall yield to my beloved friend a little later. I first wish to make some comments; then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

My first vote in the Senate, in 1953, 2 or 3 days after I took my oath of office, was with respect to this subject. In 1953 I voted against filibusters. Intermittently I have had additional opportunities to reflect upon that judgment, and my judgment has been constant.

It seemed to me, as I came into the Senate originally, that what I had heard about filibusters was true; that filibusters were evil; that the highest parliamentary body in the Government of the United States ought not to be stultified by them. Time has demonstrated, I think, the wisdom of that position.

It is not a very pretty picture, based on the theory of self-government in

America, to find the Senate compelled to remain in continuous session, never stopping, day in and day out, week in and week out, and to observe some Senators who are able to stand and speak for 10 hours, 15 hours, 20 hours, or more, simply to prevent the Senate from working its will.

In 1953 Senators filibustered on the subject of the tidelands controversy. That filibuster went on and on. Finally, through exhaustion, and because one of the Senators who opposed the measure was about ready to suffer a heart attack, the filibuster was finally broken, and the Senate passed the measure which was then pending.

Mr. President, during one of the previous debates I made a statement later read into the hearings of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which was appointed to consider this subject during the 85th Congress. I said:

> What is a filibuster? My definition would be that it is irrelevant speechmaking in the Senate, designed solely and simply to consume time, and thus to prevent a vote from being taken on pending legislation. To my mind a filibuster is an affront to the democratic processes and to the intelligence of the people of the United States.

I believe that today. To see Senators answering a quorum call at midnight, at 2 o'clock in the morning, and at 4 o'clock in the morning; coming into the Chamber unshaved, unkempt, many of them without neckties, and bleary-eyed from lack of sleep, at 6 o'clock in the morning; knowing that they faced another 24-hour day, and one more, and one more, and one more after that, is a sad commentary on the ability of the people of the American Republic to represent themselves through elected legislators of their own choice.

Our opportunity today is a unique one. We can shear away a rule which permits regrettably extended talkathons. We can do it because of a courageous, logical, and constitutional opinion handed down on two occasions by the Vice President of the United States. When Vice President NIXON was first confronted with this problem in 1957, he had before him a set of rules which many Senators contended continued into the next Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and morning business is concluded; and the resolution goes to the calendar, under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the Senator from California still has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. At this point will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask my colleague to yield to enable me to propound a parliamentary inquiry; and I ask unanimous consent that he may not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. My parliamentary inquiry is as follows: If we are proceeding, under the Constitution, to consider new rules for the Senate, and if there apply only such rules as do not inhibit that process, is it not then proper that the 2 o'clock rule shall not apply in this instance to this situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the usual rule and the precedents of the Senate, a resolution of this type is, at the conclusion of the morning hour, placed upon the calendar, subject to being called up at a later time. However, it would be proper to request unanimous consent to proceed without regard to that rule.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate Resolution 4, as modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withhold it temporarily.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from California cannot hold the floor and permit another Senator to make a motion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Chair explain the parliamentary situation? If I have the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor, and may proceed if he desires to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from California cannot prevent me from suggesting the absence of a quorum after a motion is lodged before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the making of a motion?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object; and I shall object unless there is an agreement that we may have a quorum call after the motion is lodged—as is usually the case in the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection, except that I am in the midst of some comments which I wish to make on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from California from proceeding with his remarks. He does not have to yield for this purpose. But if he yields and if a motion is made, it is certainly proper to suggest the absence of a quorum—if the Vice President has not declared that rule of the Senate unconstitutional.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota; and I ask that after the quorum call is had, I may be permitted to resume my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the quorum call, the Senator from California be permitted to continue his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate resolution 4, as modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call of the quorum may be dispensed with, in order that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] may proceed with his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in his first opinion on the capacity of the majority of the Members of the Senate to govern themselves by adopting rules at the beginning of each Senate session, the distinguished Vice President of the United States had before him the rules of the preceding Congress which had been adopted by the Senate to guide him.

With respect to the problem of full and free debate finally being concluded, so that Senators would have the responsibility of answering the rollcall on the merits of the pending issue, the Vice President had before him language of the prior Senate rules which would have prevented any type of cloture whatsoever with respect to a motion to change the rules—I repeat, no cloture whatever was available in those days—to prevent an endless talkathon against changing the rules.

But, in addition to that, the Vice President had before him a provision of the Senate rules which went on to say that cloture could not be invoked unless a constitutional two-thirds of the Senate voted in favor of the cloture.

The Vice President, however, had before him something else. He had before him the American Constitution, the basic law of this land, and he had particularly section 5 of article I, which, in part, provides:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Thereafter the distinguished Vice President of the United States said this to the Members of the Senate:

> It is the opinion of the Chair that while the rules of the Senate have been continued from one Congress to another, the right of a current majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to adopt its own rules, stemming as it does from the Constitution itself, cannot be restricted or limited by rules adopted by a majority of the Senate in a previous Congress.
>
> Any provision of Senate rules adopted in a previous Congress which has the expressed or practical effect of denying the majority of the Senate in a new Congress the right to adopt the rules under which it desires to proceed is, in the opinion of the Chair, unconstitutional.

I applaud the clarity and the courage of the Vice President of the United States in rendering that advisory opinion.

He further said:

It is also the opinion of the Chair that section 3 of rule XXII in practice has such an effect.

That, I observe parenthetically, Mr. President, was the provision by which the Senate rules purported to preclude any kind of cloture against a motion to change the rules.

I proceed further with the reading of the advisory opinion:

The Chair emphasizes that this is only his own opinion, because under Senate precedents, a question of constitutionality can only be decided by the Senate itself, and not by the Chair.

At the beginning of a session in a newly elected Congress, the Senate can indicate its will in regard to its rules in one of three ways:

First. It can proceed to conduct its business under the Senate rules which were in effect in the previous Congress and thereby indicate by acquiescence that those rules continue in effect. This has been the practice in the past.

Second. It can vote negatively when a motion is made to adopt new rules and by such action indicate approval of the previous rules.

Third. It can vote affirmatively to proceed with the adoption of new rules.

Turning to the parliamentary situation in which the Senate now finds itself, if the motion to table should prevail, a majority of the Senate by such action would have indicated its approval of the previous rules of the Senate, and those rules would be binding on the Senate for the remainder of this Congress unless subsequently changed under those rules.

If, on the other hand, the motion to lay on the table shall fail, the Senate can proceed with the adoption of rules under whatever procedures the majority of the Senate approves.

In summary, until the Senate at the initiation of a new Congress expresses its will otherwise, the rules in effect in the previous Congress in the opinion of the Chair remain in effect, with the exception that the Senate should not be bound by any provision in those previous rules which denies the membership of the Senate to exercise its constitutional right to make its own rules.

Mr. President, I repeat: In my judgment the Vice President of the United States is eternally sound constitutionally in this opinion. He indicated with clarity what in his judgment the Constitution of the United States gives to the Senate in each Congress with respect to a right to adopt rules by which to govern its orderly parliamentary procedures, and to do it by majority vote.

Would it not be foolish, Mr. President, to argue that if one Senate years ago had ruled that the rules of the Senate could not be approved except by a unanimous vote that this would serve to handcuff all future Senates through all eternity? How foolish that would be. Is there anyone in this Chamber who would argue that a U.S. Senate in some prior Congress which adopted such rules could tie the hands of and manacle the Members of the Senate until doomsday against changing the rules, which all Members of the body might wish to approve with one exception? I do not think so.

Thus, we have at the opening of this new Congress a unique opportunity available to us to eliminate what I think may properly and accurately be called an ugly and undemocratic procedure by which Senators may talk indefinitely not for the purpose of adding one scintilla of wisdom to the debate on the pending issue, but simply to prevent Senators from exercising their constitutional duty of standing on this floor and voting up or down the pending question.

Mr. President, I think a point ought to be made in this debate that both great American political parties this past year in their national conventions promised the American people that democracy would prevail in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am proud that the Republican National Convention, meeting last year in the city of Chicago, said:

We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

There is a firm commitment to the people of the United States by the great political party to which I have the honor to belong. It is a commitment promising that Republicans will seek to change rule XXII under which filibusters these many years have been conducted.

I congratulate those who gathered in the city of Los Angeles in my State of California representing the Democratic Party, for in its platform the Democratic National Convention said:

In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

They also said:

To accomplish these goals will require Executive orders, legal actions brought by the Attorney General, legislation, and improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule.

Thus, it was, Mr. President, that some of us at the opening of this session of the Congress, some of us in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, believing devoutly that in this modern era filibusters have no place in orderly American Government, believing that the commitments made by the Republican and Democratic Parties to the American people represent something specific which ought to be done, have joined together to sponsor the resolution which is now before us on a motion that it be made the pending business.

Mr. President, by reason of the rules of the Senate as amended and as adopted in the last Congress, provision has been made for a cloture petition signed by 16 Senators to lie over at the desk for 2 days and then, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting approve of it, debate shall be ended, except for an additional 100 hours to be parceled out 1 hour each to every Member of the Senate.

What some of us are urging the Senate to do now is to add an additional or an alternative means of eliminating long-drawn-out "talkathons" by providing for a cloture petition, to be likewise signed by 16 Senators, but providing further that if such petition lies on the desk of the Senate for 15 days and is thereafter approved by a constitutional majority of Senators—that is to say, 51—debate then will have to come to a close, subject again to 100 additional hours available, 1 each to every Member of the Senate. We retain the two-thirds provision after 2 days, but we add a 51-vote provision after 15 days, excluding Sundays and holidays.

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator from California yield to me for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry on that subject?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose.

Mr. KEATING. I know that the distinguished Senator from California has correctly stated the intention of those of us who have offered the proposed amendment. It has come to my attention that perhaps there is a little confusion on the subject, and I therefore propound this parliamentary inquiry.

Does the proposal now made by the group of us headed by the distinguished Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota, by its wording retain the existing provisions of rule XXII relating to the two-thirds requirement for cloture? Is it an addition to rule XXII or does it, in fact, repeal that rule and substitute the 51-percent requirement for the two-thirds requirement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question which would be before the Senate when the resolution is up for consideration is the Humphrey amendment to the Anderson resolution as modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not a bit unkind, while the distinguished Senator from California is occupying the floor and pleading so fervently in behalf of the proposed amendment, that notwithstanding the list of Senators who coauthored the proposed amendment the Chair should refer to the amendment as the Humphrey amendment? I do not think the Chair should exclude the Senator from California. He is on his feet diligently urging the adoption of the proposed amendment. He appears as a coauthor. I believe he should be entitled to some little recognition. I do not think he is entitled to any credit, but I believe he is entitled to some recognition.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let us use the legal phrase "and others," Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Humphrey "and others" is the proposed amendment.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield further, I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair on my parliamentary inquiry. I am aware of the fact that the Humphrey-Kuchel and others amendment is pending to the Anderson amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not mean to exclude the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the unfailing courtesy of my friend from Georgia. My problem is this: The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have both pointed out that we are trying to add something to rule XXII without disturbing the old two-thirds section as it

now exists. It has been suggested, however, that because of the form of the substitute, we may in fact, be doing away with the two-thirds section. This most certainly is not the intention and I am seeking some clarification.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think I can allay the apprehension of my able colleague. I should like to state affirmatively that the resolution which pends before the Senate under a motion to make it the pending business refers to and seeks to amend section 3 of rule XXII, and we do not seek in any fashion, nor do we say that we seek, to amend section 2 of rule XXII.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order that the question as to the effect of an amendment, strictly speaking, is not a parliamentary question. That is a legal question. I do not know that the Chair is in any way authorized to rule on the legal effect of an amendment. That is something upon which every Senator must pass for himself. Who is bound by a ruling of the Chair as to the legal effect of an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to the question of the Senator from New York, the Chair will state that the Chair does not seek to interpret the meaning of an amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am arguing in favor of what we seek to do. I wish affirmatively to say what the intent of the coauthors is. I think the language speaks for itself. The intent of our resolution, which is offered in the nature of a substitute, is to add a new section to rule XXII, and since the language does speak for itself, and since we have indicated that we do not, by the language of our substitute, touch subsection 2, but seek to amend section 3, I think it is perfectly clear what the intention of the sponsoring Senators is.

I wish to proceed, if I may.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator having yielded, I must ask the Chair either to rule or to decline to rule in the light of the representations made by the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will comment that the Kuchel-Humphrey, et al., amendment, as modified, adds a new section to rule XXII, which would probably be section 4.

Mr. KUCHEL. Can anyone believe that a future Senate can or should be restricted in its actions by the dead hand of a past Senate? Was it not a great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who queried:

> Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead.

Students of government, Congress, and the Supreme Court have likewise recognized that no legislature can pass what Judge Cooley once described as "irrepealable laws." Thus, to permit a two-thirds requirement, such as that which exists in the present rule XXII, enacted by a previous Senate to hinder the expressions of a majority of a successor Senate would violate every canon of our Constitution and American political theory. A filibuster to prevent a change in the filibuster rule which itself was adopted by a majority vote would have such a result. This was the unreasonable situation in which the Senate found itself as a result of the rules changes of 1949. At that time, the Senate had ruled that there could be no cloture on any proposal to change the rules of the Senate. Although this section was eliminated in the 1959 revisions, a section with similar effect was added. Consequently, the present section 2 of rule XXXII reads:

> The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

Any attempt to sanction a filibuster under such a rule which would prevent a majority now from exercising its will must be unconstitutional under article I, section 5.

In the brief prepared for the Vice President we stated:

> A majority in 1959 cannot give a minority in 1961 the right to prevent the majority in 1961 from exercising its democratic will (pp. 24–25).

To believe otherwise is to reach the obvious extremes which would permit future amendments to the rules only by unanimous consent or to pass a rule that no equal-rights legislation could be considered for a specified number of years. To permit such a rule to survive is not to facilitate Senate business but to hinder it; in effect, it is to mask substance as procedure since its continuation would prevent majority action on substantive issues.

In prior years, a majority of the Senate adopted its own rules without being obstructed by actions and rules of an earlier Senate. For example, in 1819, a joint resolution authorized each House to choose the printer for the next succeeding House. Two decades later, in 1840, a Democratic Senate chose the firm of Blair and Rives as printer prior to being succeeded by a Whig Senate. Despite claims by Senators Allen of Ohio and Buchanan of Pennsylvania that the Senate could not dismiss the printer because, as a permanent and continuous body, it was bound by the Senate of an earlier Congress, the resolution to dismiss was adopted 26 to 18.

For 87 years from 1789 to 1876, the House and Senate had acquiesced in the continuation of various joint rules. In 1865, a rule concerning the method of counting the electoral votes was adopted. Four years later, the two Houses disagreed as to the rule's effect. The Senate, despite long accepted practice of continuing the rules without voting, now voted to reject a substitute resolution which treated the rules as in force and accepted the initial resolution which was based on the theory that no joint rules existed at the opening of the new Congress.

An analysis of the operations of the U.S. Senate shows that with the possible exception of the rules, all legislative and executive activity of the Senate begins again with a new Congress. And I submit that the adoption of the rules which are carried over is in reality a matter of convenience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart entitled "Analysis of the Operations of the U.S. Senate" be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Analysis of the operations of the U.S. Senate

Activity	Senate acts anew in each Congress	Senate bound by Senate of preceding Congress	Comment
1. Introduction of bills	X		See Senate rule XXXII.
2. Committee consideration of bills	X		Do.
3. Debate on bills	X		Do.
4. Voting on bills	X		Do.
5. Election of officers	X		While the old officers carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carry over. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.[1]
6. Consideration of validity of senatorial elections	X		Although credentials of a Senator-elect are often presented to the Senate prior to the beginning of his term, the validity of the credentials can only be considered by the Senate to which he was elected and not before.
7. Consideration of treaties	X		See Senate rule XXXVII(2).
8. Submission and consideration of nominations	X		See Senate rule XXXVIII(6).
9. Election of committee members	X		See Rule XXV. While old committees carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carry over. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.
10. Adjournment	X		Adjourns sine die. When Congress ends at noon of a particular day, and a special session of the Senate of the new Congress is called, the Senate adjourns at noon, and 1 minute afterward opens the new session.
11. Rules	(?)	(?)	Past practice of Senate on rules is ambiguous. It can be explained as acquiescence in past rules, which can either be repeated at the opening of the Senate of any new Congress by beginning to operate under them or which can be refused by the adoption of new rules in whole or in part.

[1] Similarly, the fact that the President pro tempore carries over until there is a change of party control of the Senate is no evidence of rules carryover. On the contrary, the fact that an election of a President pro tempore automatically follows a shift in party control (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, p.9) is evidence that the Senate of each new Congress responds to the will of the majority of the Senate of that Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, because two-thirds of the Senate carries over does not mean that the bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations considered in the previous Congress carry over. They do not. But clearly the continuing nature of the Senate is irrelevant if its rules conflict with the Constitution. To assume that the rules carry over because two-thirds of the Senators do is to assume that the two-thirds carryover would always carry a majority in favor of the existing rules. Yet one-third of the Senate could conceivably be elected for the first time every 2 years, and still others could change their views in the meantime.

Perhaps the experience of the House of Representatives is pertinent here. Senators on both sides of the rules issue have admitted that the House is not a continuous body. Yet for 30 years between 1860 and 1890, the House acquiesced in past rules rather than formally adopting new rules at the beginning of each Congress. The rules were continued under a resolution which held that the 1860 rules would be in force unless otherwise ordered. As the result of Speaker Thomas Reed, a majority of Congress, operating under general parliamentary law at the beginning of a new Congress, adopted new rules. Acquiescence for 30 years did not prevent the majority from acting. Both the Senate and House organize their work on a 2-year basis. The difference is only in the length of terms of the Members.

The authority by which the House of Representatives first acquiesced in prior rules over many Congresses, and then in its determination that it would adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress, stems from exactly the same language in the Constitution which the Vice President has applied in his advisory opinion to the Senate and which some of us hope will be appealing to a majority of the Members of the Senate, so that we can take action which was promised the American people by both political parties and which, in the judgment of many of us, is long, long overdue.

Furthermore, the present two-thirds requirement of rule XXII is in violation of the Constitution which established majority rule as the operating principle of our Government except in five specifically enumerated instances. The five include first, the power of Congress to override the veto; second, the ratification of treaties by the Senate; third, the initiation by Congress of constitutional amendments; fourth, the power of impeachment; and fifth, the expulsion of Members of either the House or Senate. The Constitutional Convention rejected efforts to impose the two-thirds requirement on questions of interstate and foreign commerce, navigation, and the attainment of a quorum.

Mr. President, in those unhappy and tragic instances when Congress has responded to the request of the Chief Executive to declare war, each House of Congress has acted under the Constitution, by which a declaration of war may be adopted by a majority vote of each House of Congress. That indeed is the general rule. The Presiding Officer and I and the other Members of the Senate, when we sit in judgment on such urgent matters as the amounts of money needed for America's defense, decide the issue by a majority vote, and no more.

When we determine all the important issues which come before us each year, as to what is necessary and what is in the interest of the American people, a majority vote is all that is required except in those five specific instances which I have previously noted.

During the past century there have been over 40 leading filibusters which have consumed endless days of Senate time. Some have been coordinated efforts by a group of Senators while others have been a more lonely crusade. The Senate has not always been plagued with this cancer. When the first Congress assembled in New York in 1789, the Senate adopted on April 16, rule IX, which permitted the previous question to be moved and seconded. Once done, the Presiding Officer queried: "Shall the main question be now put?" If the nays prevailed, the main question was not then put and debate continued. If it was in the affirmative, a vote was at once taken. When the Senate rules were revised in 1806, the previous question was omitted. It had been moved only four times and used only three times during the previous 17 years. Abuse as a result of its elimination was not immediately noted since the Presiding Officers were strict concerning the germaneness of speeches.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the previous question, to which he refers, was, in the First Congress, a debatable issue, and was debated? Does the Senator know that the minutes of the First Congress show that considerable debate took place, after the previous question was moved, as to whether or not the previous question should be voted on? I can get some of the original minutes of that Congress, if it is necessary to convince the Senator, to show that debate was held after the previous question was moved in the Senate under that original rule.

Mr. KUCHEL. If that is true, I did not know it. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

On the eve of America's entry into the First World War, a successful filibuster of the so-called armed-ship bill caused President Wilson to call the Senate into extraordinary session and resulted in the cloture provision similar to the present rule XXII, whereby two-thirds of the Senators present and voting could limit debate.

Both political parties in this period showed concern for the filibuster abuses. In 1916 and 1920, the Democratic platform stated:

> We favor such alteration of the rules of procedure of the Senate of the United States as will permit the prompt transaction of the Nation's legislative business.

In 1922, the Senate Republicans, in a party conference, voted 32 to 1 for majority cloture on revenue and appropriation bills. A resolution to that effect was offered in 1926.

In 1939 and 1945, an antifilibuster rule was made a part of the Reorganization Acts. Debate on a resolution to disapprove a Presidential reorganization proposal was limited to 10 hours.

In this instance, as in others, the Senate severely limited its right of free speech well in advance of any knowledge as to the issue. Between 1949 and 1959, cloture could only be invoked if a constitutional two-thirds agreed. Thus, during this period, it required a greater number of Senators to limit a Senator's speech than to expel him. In 1959, rule XXII was amended to two-thirds of those present and voting. But because of the high attendance on a vote as crucial as that of cloture, it was a relatively meaningless change.

Since 1917, there have been 23 cloture votes. A two-thirds majority was secured in four cases—the last being in 1927. On 9 occasions a majority of the entire Senate membership was obtained; while on 15, a majority of those present and voting was secured. Seven cloture attempts received the support of only a minority of those present and voting; and one resulted in a tie vote. Thus, cloture failed 19 out of 23 times. It is interesting to note that under a majority of the entire membership rule, which we are here advocating, cloture would have failed 14 out of 23 times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks three tables entitled "Legislation Delayed or Defeated by Filibusters," "Later Action on 35 Filibustered Bills," and "Senate Votes, 1919–60, on Invoking Cloture Rule," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1, 2, and 3.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no one has claimed that State senators are undemocratic or do not protect minority rights. In the State senate in which I had the honor to serve before the war, we could proceed, by majority vote, to move the previous question. Forty-five of the forty-eight States forbid filibustering in the upper houses of their legislatures. In most cases, the limitation on debate is imposed by majority vote.

Listen to the words of the late Henry Cabot Lodge. They are as fitting today as when he uttered them several decades ago. Of the abuse of parliamentary discussion and legislative decorum which we know as the filibuster, he said:

> There must be a change, for the delays which now take place are discrediting the Senate, and this is greatly to be deplored. The Senate was perhaps the greatest single achievement of the makers of the Constitution, and anything which lowers it in the eyes of the people is a most serious matter. A body which cannot govern itself will not long hold the respect of the people who have chosen it to govern the country.

Mr. President, the late Senator Lodge, the grandfather of our distinguished former Ambassador to the United Nations, displayed a prescience which is as

applicable today to the Members of the U.S. Senate as it was in the hours in which he first uttered them.

The Senate, I regret to say, by the filibusters which have taken place in this Chamber during the few years I have been here and have seen them, has, in my judgment, lowered itself in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may incorporate at this point in my remarks the comments of the late Charles G. Dawes, Vice President of the United States, whose words I used in a prior session in discussing this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I will state the principal objections to the Senate rules as they stand:

1. Under these rules individuals or minorities can at times block the majority in its constitutional duty and right of legislation. They are therefore enabled to demand from the majority modifications in legislation as the price which the majority must pay in order to proceed to the fulfillment of its constitutional duty. The right of filibuster does not affect simply legislation defeated but, in much greater degree, legislation passed, continually weaving into our laws, which should be framed in the public interest alone, modifications dictated by personal and sectional interest as distinguished from the public interest.

2. The Senate is not and cannot be a properly deliberative body, giving due consideration to the passage of all laws, unless it allots its time for work according to the relative importance of its duties, as do all other great parliamentary bodies. It has, however, through the right of unlimited debate surrendered to the whim and personal purposes of individuals and minorities its right to allot its own time. Only the establishment of majority cloture will enable the Senate to make itself a properly deliberative body. This is impossible when it must sit idly by and see time needed for deliberation frittered away in frivolous and irrelevant talk, indulged in by individuals and minorities for ulterior purposes.

3. The rules subject the people of the United States to a governmental power in the hands of individuals and minorities never intended by the Constitution and subversive of majority rule under constitutional limitation. In the words of Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania:

"The Senate, by sanctioning unlimited debate and by requiring a two-thirds vote to limit it, has in effect so amended the Constitution as to make it possible for a 33-percent minority to block legislation."

4. The present rules put into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President of the United States, and enabled them to compel the President to call an extra session of Congress in order to keep the machinery of Government itself in functioning activity. The reserved power of the States in the Constitution does not include the power of one of the States to elect a Senator who shall at times control a majority or even all the other States.

5. Multiplicity of laws is one of the admitted evils from which this country is suffering today. The present rules create multiplicity of laws.

6. The present rules are not only a departure from the principles of our constitutional Government but from the rules of conduct consistent therewith which governed the U.S. Senate for the first 17 years of its existence and which provided for majority cloture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator ever had occasion to read the views of one of his distinguished predecessors, the late Senator Hiram Johnson, on the statement by Vice President Dawes?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, but I should be very glad to see it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to supply it for the RECORD. In those days, Senators were very proud of all the prerogatives of the Senate. Vice President Dawes evoked the unstinted criticism of not only the Democrats but also of Hiram Johnson, William Borah, George Norris, and, almost in a state of apoplexy, Senator Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin, who, in those days, were supposed to be liberals. However, the times and conditions have changed. The liberal position at that time was in favor of full and free debate. Now those who claim to be the real liberals in the country are in favor of very drastic limitations on debate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Georgia. In that connection, the only thing I recall about our late illustrious California Senator, the great Hiram Johnson, is that for many years he tried to obtain a vote in the U.S. Senate to approve proposed legislation which he sponsored to construct the great Hoover Dam. The bill was filibustered to death in the Senate again and again and again. The people of California were denied what a majority of the Members of the Sente were prepared to approve, until finally, years later, the late great Senator was able to overcome the filibustering opposition, and the Senate approved what the House of Representatives had approved, and the great dam at Boulder Canyon began to be constructed.

I do not remember—I have had no opportunity to know of—any comments which our late great California Senator may have made on this subject, but the recollection I have just related came to my mind.

Mr. President, I believe in full and free debate. I believe that minorities have rights which ought to be protected. I believe majorities have rights which, likewise, ought to be protected. The Senate ought to be able to have sufficient time in which to discuss, fully and relevantly, each great issue as it comes before us. But when the discussion and the debate, having been full and free, are replaced by speeches not designed to add wisdom to the listening Senators or to the country, but are designed exclusively for the purpose of preventing a vote from being taken, then the Senate ought to have the means by which to conclude debate and to go forward to the great responsibility we have of passing our own judgment, with our votes, up or down, on whatever question may be pending before us.

This is the sole opportunity for the next 2 years for a majority of Senators, under the opinion of the Vice President, to eliminate the filibuster and to go forward in the fashion in which some of us have urged in the resolution now before us.

Mr. President, I hope that what should have been accomplished by the Senate years ago will be accomplished now.

EXHIBIT 1

Legislation delayed or defeated by filibusters [1]

Bills	*Year*
Reconstruction of Louisiana	1865
Repeal of election laws	1879
Force bill (Federal elections)	1890–91
River and harbor bills (3)	1901, 1903, 1914
Tristate bill	1903
Colombian Treaty (Panama Canal)	1903
Ship subsidy bills (2)	1907, 1922–23
Canadian reciprocity bill	1911
Arizona-New Mexico statehood	1911
Ship purchase bill	1915
Armed ship resolution	1917
Oil and mineral leasing bill and several appropriation bills	1919
Antilynch bills (3)	1922, 1935, 1937–38
Migratory bird bill	1926
Campaign investigation resolution	1927
Colorado River bills (Boulder Dam project) (2)	1927, 1928
Emergency officers retirement bill	1927
Washington public buildings bill	1927
National-origins provisions in immigration laws, resolution to postpone	1929
Oil industry investigation	1931
Supplemental deficiency bill	1935
Work relief bill ("prevailing wage" amendment)	1935
Flood control bill	1935
Coal conservation bill	1936
Antipoll tax bills (4)	1942, 1944, 1946, 1948
Fair employment practices bills (2)	1946, 1950

[1] Thirty-six bills appear in this incomplete list, not including the many appropriation bills that have either been lost in the jam that resulted from filibusters or were talked to death because they failed to include items that particular Senators desired for the benefit of their States or because grants they made were considered excessive. Several successful filibusters have sought and achieved the enactment of legislation favored by the filibusters. Filibusters have succeeded not only in preventing the passage of legislation, but also in preventing the organization of the Senate, the election of its officers, and the confirmation of Presidential appointees. They have also succeeded in modifying the terms of legislation; in delaying adjournment of Congress; in forcing special sessions, the adoption of conference reports, of neutrality legislation, and of a ship subsidy; in postponing consideration of legislation, and in raising the price of silver. Legislation has also often been defeated or modified by the mere threat of a filibuster. All the bills listed above, however, except the force bill, the armed ship resolution, and the so-called civil rights bills, were eventually enacted, in some form.

Numerous appropriation bills. For a partial list of 82 such bills that failed from 1876 to 1916, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1916, pages 10152–10153.

Of the 36 measures listed above, all but 11 eventually became law, in some cases after compromises had been made in their provisions following the failure of cloture. The table below, prepared at the direction of Senator HAYDEN, shows the later action on 35 filibustered bills.

The 36th measure (the second FEPC bill) was filibustered in 1950, subsequent to the table that follows.

EXHIBIT 2

Later action on 35 filibustered bills

Bills	Filibustered	Passed	Not passed (10)
Reconstruction of Louisiana	1865	1868	
Election laws	1879	1909 (repealed)	
Force bill	1890–91		X
River and harbor bills (3)	1901, 1903, 1914	At intervals	
Tristate bill	1903	1907, 1912	
Colombian Treaty	1903	1903 [1]	
Ship subsidy bills (2)	1907, 1922–23	1936	
Canadian reciprocity bill	1911	1911 [1]	
Arizona-New Mexico statehood	1911	1912 (admitted)	
Ship purchase bill	1915	1916	
Armed ship bill	1917		X
Mineral lands leasing bill	1919	1920	
Antilynch bills (3)	1922, 1935, 1937		X
Migratory bird conservation bill	1926	1929	
Campaign investigation resolution	1927	1927 [1]	
Colorado River bills (2)	1927, 1928	1928 [1]	
Emergency officers retirement bill	1927	1928	
Washington public buildings bill	1927	1928	
Resolution to postpone national-origins provisions of immigration laws	1929	1929	
Oil industry investigation	1931	1935	
Supplemental deficiency bill	1935	1936	
Prevailing wage amendment to work relief bill	1935	1936	
Flood control bill	1935	1936	
Coal conservation bill	1936	1937	
Antipoll tax bills (4)	1942, 1944, 1946, 1948		X
FEPC bill	1946		X

NOTE.—Numerous appropriation bills—at intervals—passed in special or later sessions.

[1] In special or subsequent sessions.

Source: Limitation on Debate in the Senate. Hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration. U.S. Senate. 81st Cong., 1st sess. On resolutions relative to amending Senate rule XXII relating to cloture. January and February 1949, p. 42.

EXHIBIT 3.—*Senate votes, 1919–60, on invoking cloture rule* [1]

No.	Congress	Session	Date	Subject	Senator offering motion	Yeas		Nays	Congressional Record		Cloture
						Number	Percent		Volume	Page	
1	66	1	Nov. 15, 1919	Treaty of Versailles	Lodge	76	82.6	16	58	8555, 8556	Yes.
2	66	3	Feb. 2, 1921	Emergency tariff	Penrose	36	50.7	35	60	2432	No.
3	67	2	July 7, 1922	Fordney-McCumber tariff	McCumber	45	56.2	35	62	10040	No.
4	69	1	Jan. 25, 1926	World Court	Lenroot	68	72.3	26	67	2678, 2679	Yes.
5	69	1	June 1, 1926	Migratory-bird refuges	Norbeck	46	58.2	33	67	10392	No.
6	69	2	Feb. 15, 1927	Branch banking	Pepper	65	78.3	18	68	3824	Yes.
7	69	2	Feb. 26, 1927	Disabled World War I officers retirement	Tyson	51	58.6	36	68	4901	No.
8	69	2	do	Colorado River development	Johnson	32	35.1	59	68	4900	No.
9	69	2	Feb. 28, 1927	Public buildings in District of Columbia	Lenroot	52	62.6	31	68	4985	No.
10	69	2	do	Customs and Prohibition Bureau's creation	Jones (Washington)	55	67.0	27	68	4986	Yes.
11	72	2	Jan. 19, 1933	Banking Act		58	65.9	30	76	2077	No.
12	75	3	Jan. 27, 1938	Antilynching (CR No. 1)	Neely	37	42.0	51	83	1166	No.
13	75	3	Feb. 16, 1938	Antilynching (CR No. 2)	Wagner	42	47.7	46	83	2007	No.
14	77	2	Nov. 23, 1942	Antipoll tax (CR No. 3)	Barkley	37	47.4	41	88	9065	No.
15	78	2	May 15, 1944	Antipoll tax (CR No. 4)	do	36	45.0	44	90	2550, 2551	No.
16	79	2	Feb. 9, 1946	FEPC (CR No. 5)	do	48	57.1	36	92	1219	No.
17	79	2	May 7, 1946	British loan	Ball	41	50.0	41	92	4539	No.
18	79	2	May 25, 1946	Labor disputes	Knowland	3	3.7	77	92	5714	No.
19	79	2	July 31, 1946	Antipoll tax (CR No. 6)	Barkley	39	54.1	33	92	10512	No.
20	81	2	May 19, 1950	FEPC (CR No. 7)	Lucas	52	61.9	32	96	7300	No.
21	81	2	July 12, 1950	FEPC (CR No. 8)	do	55	62.5	33	96	9982	No.
22	83	2	July 26, 1954	Atomic Energy Act	Knowland	44	51.2	42	100	11942	No.
23	86	2	Mar. 10, 1960	Civil rights (CR No. 9)	Douglas	42	44.2	53	106	5118	No.

[1] Many cloture petitions have also been withdrawn or held out of order since 1917.

COMMENTS

Number of cloture votes 1917-60, 23.

Number of successful cloture efforts, 4 (last time: Feb. 28, 1927). If the cloture rule had permitted debate limitation by simple majority action instead of ⅔, cloture would have been invoked 15 times; if the rule had required a constitutional majority, 9 times; if the rule had required 60 percent of those present and voting, 8 times; 60 percent of all Senators, 5 times; 55 percent of those present and voting, 12 times.

Number of civil rights cloture efforts, 9; successful, 0. If the rule had required a simple majority, 4 civil rights cloture efforts would have been successful; if a constitutional majority had been required, 2; if 60 percent of those present and voting, 2; if 60 percent of all Senators, 0.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to resume the consideration of Senate resolution 4, as modified.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I simply desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to permit other Senators to come to the Chamber and hear the debate. If the Senator from Oregon desires to address the Senate, I shall be happy not even to claim the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Georgia. Previously I requested permission to discuss another matter. I assure the Senator from Georgia that I shall be brief.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure we shall be glad to hear whatever the Senator from Oregon has to say.

Mr. MORSE. Only time will tell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

SEVERING OF U.S. DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night the U.S. Government broke diplomatic relations with Cuba. I think it unfortunate that, insofar as I know, thus far there has been no comment in the Senate in regard to this matter since the action taken last night by the executive branch of our Government.

However, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have received many inquiries as to my reaction. Therefore, I think it proper to inform the Senate that I have recommended that at a very early hour—today, if possible; but if not today, certainly tomorrow—the State Department be invited to attend a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee at

least to brief the committee on the situation which led to the action the administration has taken.

Mr. President, I shall await the presentation of those facts before reaching any final evaluation of them.

However, I have served for 3 months as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations; and on the basis of that experience I have feelings of great apprehension about the course of action our Government has followed in breaking diplomatic relations with Cuba.

It may very well be that course of action is very precipitous. It may very well be that there are very serious questions as to whether it was in the best longtime interest of U.S. relations in the Western Hemisphere. I say that because we must remember that we are dealing with a government which obviously is being administered by a top leader who gives every evidence of being very impulsive and very unstable, and obviously is surrounded by advisers and governmental officials who give every evidence of being much influenced by the totalitarian philosophy of communism.

AID TO BATISTA DAMAGED AMERICAN PRESTIGE

I believe these observations are justified, because in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, quite some time before the fall of the Batista government in Cuba, I opposed the support which the U.S. Government was giving to the Batista government. It was perfectly clear to me that the Batista government could not remain in power without the military assistance our Government supplied it, which enabled it to maintain the police-state control of that country that the Batista government maintained.

It was in January 1958, as I recall, that my subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee conducted public hearings dealing with the subject matter of Cuba, with particular reference to the Batista government. Those hearings brought from the State Department the admission that in all probability the Batista government could not remain in power without U.S. military assistance.

Following that, there was a persistent insistance on the part of many, including some members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Members of the Senate, that a reappraisal be made of our support of the Batista government.

What was the final cause for the course of action the administration followed, I do not know; but I am inclined to assume that the constant calling of attention in the Halls of Congress to the support of the Batista government might have been helpful to the administration in reaching its decision in March 1958, when it announced that it was withdrawing any further support of the Batista government from the standpoint of military aid. I believe that was a wise decision, because I have no doubt that the U.S. support of the Batista government and other totalitarian regimes in Latin America had greatly injured the prestige and the standing of the United States among the masses of the Latin American people.

CASTRO SETS UP NEW POLICE STATE

No one could have been more shocked and saddened than I was when, once the new administration of Cuba came into power, it proceeded immediately to substitute one police state for another. From the very beginning, Dr. Castro demonstrated that he, too, would resort to the strong-arm tactics that are characteristic of police-state policy. Mr. President, you will recall that immediately upon Castro's coming into power, he proceeded with so-called military executions of hundreds of people in Cuba.

At first he professed that they were receiving military trials. However, the members of our subcommittee were well aware—based upon intelligence information supplied to us—that those victims did not receive the benefits of trials. In many, many instances, within 45 minutes to 1 hour after they were taken into custody by the rifle squads, they were corpses in trench graves.

My record is perfectly clear, Mr. President. Once I was satisfied I had my facts—and my facts were verified over and over again—I walked to this desk and made the first speech on the Castro administration in which I protested the blood baths of the Castro administration.

For that speech I was castigated and criticized by a substantial amount of the press of this country, particularly in my own State. There were those in the Congress who did not know the facts who proceeded to criticize that speech; and I answered the criticisms, again supporting the proposition that the Castro administration was adopting totalitarian, police-state methods.

Mr. President, I said on that occasion, and repeat again today, that it is not difficult to judge the forms of government that any administration adopts, if one gives heed to the procedures that are applied in administering the government; and the procedures of Dr. Castro, from the very beginning of his administration, were police-state procedures, bound to deny the fundamental rights of freedom and liberty to his people.

When he placed under house arrest President Urrutia, the first president of Cuba under his regime, I was satisfied in my own mind, Mr. President, that we could look for the kind of police-state procedures that subsequently followed. President Urrutia was a noted and distinguished judge of Cuba, a man with a distinguished legal record, a man who believed in guaranteeing to individuals basic procedural safeguards in determining guilt or innocence.

I mention this, Mr. President, because the record is perfectly clear that I have been critical, and still am critical, of the policies followed by Dr. Castro.

POSITIVE POLICY TOWARD CUBA NEEDED

Mr. President, our relations with Cuba have deteriorated sadly in the last 8 years; and I think it is unfortunate that, in the closing days of this administration, it goes out of office possibly leaving for the new administration a time bomb. If the facts so dictated that, in order to protect the honor of my country, it was necessary to break diplomatic relations with Cuba, I certainly would not propose that diplomatic relations be continued. But these are relative things, Mr. President. Our relations with Cuba have been exceedingly bad for some months.

I regret that the administration has not seen fit to present positive, affirmative proposals in an endeavor to demonstrate to the rest of the world that we were willing to submit all the issues that exist between Cuba and the United States to judicial procedures and processes either through the Organization of American States or the United Nations, and let those organizations pass an evalued judgment on the course of action that we should take.

It is pointed out in the press today that Peru has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba, and the newspaper stories indicate that possibly some other Latin American countries may do so in the future. Whether that action is offered as a rationalization or justification for a course of action on the part of the United States, I find it unacceptable unless we wish to suggest a joint action in regard to Cuba through the Organization of American States, as was done at Costa Rica in regard to the Dominican Republic.

CASTRO INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA

What concerns me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—speaking only for myself, Mr. President—is that, in my judgment, such a joint consultation might have been highly desirable prior to a unilateral course of action on the part of the United States. I would have the Senate keep in mind the fact that most of the people of Latin America have within their populations strong Castro followers, principally because they do not know the facts, principally because the Communist Party has done a tremendous propaganda job in many parts of Latin America.

Only 4 days ago I sat through a luncheon with a vice president of a Latin American country and his ambassador, and the day preceding I sat with the foreign minister of another Latin American country and his chief delegate to the United Nations, and I listened to their warnings as to what, in their opinion, would happen among the masses in many Latin American countries if the United States proceeded with a so-called unilateral course of action against Cuba. The vice president of that country said, "Senator, you know, many, many people in Latin America regard Cuba and the United States as they do David and Goliath."

Then I tried to argue with him, to get him to see what would happen if the philosophy of Castroism should spread throughout Latin America, to the free institutions of his own country. He said, "I understand that, but what many of you Americans do not seem to recognize is that the masses of our people do not understand it."

Then, too, I think we need to keep in mind the fact that there is a great difference between levels of public knowledge in Latin America and in the United

States, as a result of the great forces of enlightenment which we as free men and women are able to have. For example, illiteracy in the United States has almost been wiped out, whereas to the masses of the people of Latin America it is the common level of education. The overwhelming majority of them do not have very much education. In fact, in some parts of Latin America, the illiteracy of the whole population of a country is as high as 85 percent or more.

In Bogotá in September, when I was a delegate to the Bogotá Conference, in one of the discussions concerning educational problems in Latin America, justifying greater American assistance to educational projects in Latin America, it was pointed out by one of the Latin America spokesmen that an overwhelming majority of all the people in Latin America have less than a fourth grade education. That is a statistic difficult for me to accept, yet I understand from checking I have made upon it since coming back from Bogotá he probably is nearly correct.

I mention this because when the United States deals with Cuba it does not deal with Cuba alone. In a very real sense, when we deal with Cuba, we are dealing with a whole complexity of Latin American problems.

Therefore, I sincerely trust that an overwhelming case can be made in support of the course of action which has been taken in breaking diplomatic relations with Cuba.

None of us likes to be insulted, and Castro is a deliberate insulter. None of us likes to be even figuratively slapped in the face, but that is Communist stock in trade. That is part of the Communist technique.

I watched Castro in New York. I observed his antics. He was not making an appeal to the American people, any more than is Khrushchev. They do not hope to change our viewpoint. They are making their appeals to the masses of Africa, of Latin America, and of Asia. We had better not stick our heads in the sand and assume they are not making any converts. We have a tremendous job of educating people to an understanding of the preciousness of freedom and liberty and what it means to them as individuals.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, does the Senator find it convenient to yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. On this subject matter?

Mr. JAVITS. On this subject.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I recall with the greatest of interest and with some quickening of pulse the fact that when the policy on Cuba was announced by President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter some months ago the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with this area, arose and with, I think, very commendable statesmanship, because he had been a strong critic of the President, commended this expression of policy.

As I recall, the Senator from Oregon was especially pleased with the idea advanced in the policy that we would move in coordination with the other American states and would utilize the machinery of the Organization of American States to the full.

I feel, as does the Senator, about what has occurred, that it is almost impossible for us sitting here, without knowledge on the spot, to assess the validity or the invalidity of the rather drastic action which was taken. There are two points, as to which I should deeply appreciate the Senator's comments.

First, we, too, have a right to use our own techniques in order to call upon the outraged conscience of the world, as it were. If the way to do that is to break diplomatic relations, then within the context of modern times it may not have quite the implications it had in other days.

The question I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon is whether he would feel with me, that we ought to, at the earliest possible moment, repair to the forum of the Organization of American States in the effort to at least try to concert a policy with them in order to pursue this line of policy, which, as I recall, the Senator so much approved when it was announced some months ago?

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York. The Senator will recall that I made exactly the speech to which he referred. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that in the speech I made the plea that the administration proceed to give consideration to a proposal I have made for quite some time—that all the issues which exist between us and Cuba ought to be turned over to a tribunal of the Organization of American States. If Castro is unwilling to do that, I would be willing to suggest that the issues be turned over to the United Nations. I have repeated that suggestion today. I am very much of the opinion that it ought to be our course of action.

That also carries with it the answer to the second part of the Senator's question.

What has happened has happened. I always ask myself the question: Where do we go from here?

Diplomatic relations have been broken. I think we ought to make it very clear—which would be very reassuring to the world—that we are working now to have this very delicate and difficult situation involving Cuba and the United States passed upon, as far as the judgment of others is concerned, either by joint action of the Organization of American States, as occurred at Costa Rica when the Dominican Republic issue was before the Costa Rican conference last summer, or by the United Nations, by setting up a tribunal to consider the matter there.

I stress that, Mr. President. I have not heard what has happened or what is happening at the Security Council today. I surmise that probably what Cuba is doing is what it attempted to do at Bogotá and what it attempted to do at the recent meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which is to make a whole series of completely false charges against the United States, charging us with all manner of wrongdoings against Cuba, including a threatened invasion, because that is a good scare argument with the unenlightened.

If Cuba can create the impression in Latin America, in Africa, and in Asia that the little country of Cuba is standing up all alone against the "giant from the north," the "great colossus of the north," as we are referred to, "the great imperious tyrant of the north"—I use the phrases they used in attacks on the United States in the various international meetings occurring recently—they can make some "political hay," may we say, so far as international propaganda is concerned.

They are not going to fool the leaders of governments, because they are not fooling the leaders of the governments of Latin America at this very hour. Not only Peru, but five other nations in Latin America have broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. Others may soon do the same.

Mr. President, I wish to invite attention——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves this subject, will he yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to ask the Senator whether we agree that in international affairs there can be not only a tyranny of strength but also a tyranny of weakness?

It is this tyranny of weakness from which Castro is trying to profit. He has a little nation, and he says, "Come and beat me down." He loves the idea.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the other small nations are not going to be "taken in" by any such transparent subterfuge.

Mr. MORSE. The governments will not be, but I am not so sure the people will not be.

It is my understanding that Nicaragua, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Paraguay, and Peru have already severed relations, and other countries are seriously considering doing so.

Mr. President, I wish to stress that Cuba cannot be contained—to use that term—except by joint action. Cuba cannot be contained by a unilateral course of action followed by the United States and other nations. Therefore, we should continue to look to the Organization of American States and to the United Nations to keep Castro from exporting his revolution, because I happen to think that is a great threat to the Latin American countries. For the time being, we have to try to keep him in isolation. That does not mean, Mr. President, that we should keep his people in isolation.

FRIENDSHIP WITH PEOPLE OF CUBA

I wish to dwell upon that distinction for just a moment. I am very much concerned about the people of Cuba. We all know that it is difficult to find a more friendly people. They are people with a basic love for the United States and our people. The people of Cuba know very well that their original independence from Spain was partly caused by the great friendship of the United States and

the people of the United States for Cuba, and I think we have a great reservoir of good will upon which we can draw within Cuba in spite of its present dictatorial leadership.

Before I was interrupted by the Senator from New York—and I welcomed the interruption—I was saying that none of us like to be slapped in the face, figuratively or otherwise. Such a tactic is a part of the Communist tactics. We saw it exemplified in the speeches of Castro in New York and at the United Nations. We have seen it in most of his speeches in Cuba. But what concerns me about the unilateral course of action outside of joint action within the Organization of American States or through the United Nations is what is going to happen to the people of Cuba. We must not forget that to rule a country under police state methods rulers need not have the support of a large percentage of the people. For many decades in Russia an exceedingly small percentage of the people have controlled, dominated, and subjugated the masses of the Russian people under a Communist regime, even though the total percentage of members of the Communist Party in Russia is a small percentage in comparison with the total population of Russia.

But if a ruler controls the armed forces of a state and the police, if the population is disarmed, and if the people are willing to follow a police state policy of liquidating the opposition, then rulers of such police states can remain in power for a long time. We see it in Red China, we see it in Russia, and we are seeing it today in Cuba.

What concerns me is whether or not, following the slap in the face that we received when Castro in effect said, "Reduce your embassy staff to 11," from the exaggerated number that he claimed, stinging as that insult was, we followed a wise course in a sudden break in diplomatic relations. A new administration is about to take office in the United States. The question arises whether we could not have withstood for a while longer that insult until we formally, at least, proposed to the Organization of American States or to the United Nations the joint action about which I speak.

In March tentative plans are that there will be a Latin American conference at Quito, Ecuador, and undoubtedly the whole program of what is happening in Latin America with regard to the spread of communism in Latin America will be a matter of great concern to the delegates participating in the Quito conference.

What worries me is whether or not this break in diplomatic relations will result in a tightening of the police-state methods in Cuba, and give Castro the excuse, the alibi, and the rationalization for greater brutality.

Furthermore, I would like to know what the facts are in regard to the implications of this action concerning Guantanamo Bay and our naval base there. When we deal with Communists, we deal with ruthless men. I happen to be of the point of view that Communists do not hesitate to follow a course of action that forces military action. We saw this in Korea.

In my judgment we are running great risks at the present time. We are greatly concerned now about the situation in Laos. We have not been briefed yet on the facts as to what is going on in Laos. We are led to believe that the French, the British, and perhaps some others are not enthusiastic about any course of action on the part of the United States that might be interpreted as unilateral action in Laos.

This can very well be another time bomb left by this administration for a new administration to deal with.

So I raise my voice this afternoon on the floor of the Senate urging caution, and point out some of the fears I have as to what might happen to the Cuban people as a result of this break in diplomatic relations.

We continually say that we wish to help the Cuban people. I am not sure that this course of action will help the Cuban people. It may result in imposing upon them greater and greater police-state restrictions and abuses. I am concerned with whether or not the leader of the Cuban Government, who I am satisfied is completely irresponsible in his international policy, might become so desperate as to take some action toward Guantanamo Bay that would give the impression to the world that we are resorting to military force in order to protect our rights.

It is difficult to discuss the subject matter such as the one which I am now discussing because someone may say, "Wouldn't you follow such a course if attacked?" My answer is, "Of course." But we ought to be very careful that we do not help to lay the groundwork for an attack upon us, knowing that we are dealing with desperate men who do not have the same high moral principles as to the value of human life that we have.

Do not forget that it was not so very many months ago that the head of Red China was reputed to have said something to the effect that they could lose many millions of people in a nuclear war and still survive. Human life means so little in the Communist philosophy that in dealing with Communists, we must remember that they might resort to some act of violence that would put us in a position where we would seem to have no other course of action but to use our military power to defend what we considered to be our international rights.

Therefore I sincerely hope that this administration will present to the American people, who, after all, own American foreign policy, and not this administration, and will present to the Congress of the United States, first, the facts that justify the action taken last night, and, second, present their plan for handling the Cuban situation. I certainly hope it will be a plan short of any proposal for military action, because if we become unilaterally involved in military action in Cuba, in my judgment we will create great difficulties for many friendly governments throughout Latin America.

Many Latin American governments are beginning to recognize that the social progress and reforms for which they are working are threatened by subversion from Cuba. They have been toughening their attitude toward Cuba.

But if the United States acts in just the way Castro has claimed we will, and as he may very well hope we will, these governments may find their people resurging to Castro's support.

We may be surprised at the sudden uprisings which will occur throughout Latin America in protest against a course of military action on the part of the United States against Cuba, bad as that situation is. We are a big, powerful nation. We are big enough and we are powerful enough, I believe, for a time longer to turn the other cheek until at least we have exhausted every procedure available to us in finding a solution to the Cuban problem short of unilateral action on the part of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Oregon is addressing himself to a subject of the greatest importance to our people and our country. So often there exists the very condition we now observe in this Chamber, when a Member is addressing himself to an historic event of the greatest importance to our survival. Somehow or other there is not the attendance, and it does not receive the attention, at least here on the floor, which it deserves. I do not say that the Members of the Senate are at fault in this instance. This happens to be a very early day in the new Congress, and Members are very fully occupied. I am sure that our colleague's words will have the attention they deserve.

I should like to mark and underline his remarks for their importance. I hope that perhaps the Senator from Oregon, with whom I agree so much in respect of this great issue, will join me in what I am about to say.

There is always the danger that what he has said will be considered by the press of our country and perhaps by the press of other countries as some criticism, some disagreement, some sense of dissent from what is being done.

This is a problem of the greatest delicacy, and will require delicate handling in the next few weeks by this administration, which, whether it likes it or not, is here, and must act; and if any overt act is committed, such as at the base, it will have to act, no matter how unhappy everyone may feel that it should happen now, with the administration having only 1 or 2 weeks remaining in office.

Therefore, I would hope that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, whose words are listened to, in Latin America, too, might join in the certification of the fact that his views are cooperative and ancillary to what the administration is doing or trying to do, and that we are not—and there is no question about the fact—engaged in any hassle about American policy.

The Senator has every right, of course, to object strongly to what the administration has done. However, if he does not, and if he feels that what he is saying are words of direction, which is more than welcome and entirely justified, con-

sidering his position and knowledge, I do hope, before he sits down he will put the whole matter in proper focus, because I know there will be a reading of the lines and a reading between the lines as well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, most of what the Senator from New York has just stated constitutes a lifting from the conclusion of my speech. I thank him for having put it in even better language than I had put it, or can put it. As I have stated, one cannot discuss a subject matter such as this without others getting the impression that one is criticizing the Government. I am not criticizing my Government. I am saying to my Government that I want it to come forward immediately with the facts about this matter, and what our future course of conduct is going to be in regard to our Cuban relationships.

I certainly need offer no defense for myself, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in cooperating with the administration time and again in connection with Latin American problems, and other foreign relation problems. I have on some occasions criticized the administration when I thought it was wrong.

All I purport to do is to say to the administration, "You must not stop with the breaking of diplomatic relations, because I am concerned with what that will do to the Cuban people. I am not sure it will result in helping them, but may impose further hardships on them by their masters."

I am also concerned as to what the leaders of Cuba might do out of desperation. I did not mention this point, but I am also concerned as to what the Communist Party around the world may seek to do in using the Cuban situation as a device to attack the United States and seek to push us into a position where we might be misunderstood in many areas of the world. We have to do a tremendous job in the next few years, in getting the people of Africa and Latin America and Asia to understand that they have everything at stake in the very cause that we are seeking to fight for them in this great contest between totalitarianism and freedom around the world.

I said earlier that we ought to be on guard against ruthless men following a course of action such as, for example, at Guantanamo, resulting from our use of military might.

One of the impressions I carried away with me from the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York was that Castroism did not get anywhere with the Western nations. However, if we think that Castroism is not making progress among the masses of many nations in the world, we are mistaken.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am very glad that I have been able to listen to the argument of the Senator from Oregon. He is correct. There is reason to worry about the sufferings of the Cuban people under Castro. There is also reason to worry about what Castro will do about the matter.

The main point, in my opinion, when we are dealing with Latin America, is what people are thinking of Latin America. I think I know Latin America—I can say the Hail Mary in Spanish—and I believe I understand the Latin-American people. I compliment the Senator from Oregon for taking the time to discuss the matter.

The difficulty with Latin America and our standing in Latin America is this: It was not Latin America that first recognized Castro. After we stood with Mr. Batista and helped him for years and years, overnight we recognized Mr. Castro, instead of acting as sensible human beings and at least waiting 90 days or 6 months in which to form a judgment as to what Mr. Castro was doing. We did not do that. We were so anxious to recognize him that as soon as we were against Mr. Batista, overnight we recognized Mr. Castro. That is why Mr. Castro is now in Latin America. I hope Senators will not believe that there is communism in Latin America. The Communists take advantage of the situation.

I would advise the Senator from Oregon that hunger, poverty, and illiteracy have more to do with the thinking of the rank and file of Latin Americans than all the Communists in the world. Latin Americans are not by nature Communists. They do not want to be Communists; but the poverty and actual hunger in Latin America lend themselves to communism. They are factors which breed Communists. Of course, the situation could be improved by education and reason. But it is not possible to reason with a hungry body. It simply cannot be done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I pay tribute to him. He has been of help to me, time and time again, in my work on foreign relations, because he is a keen student of Latin-American affairs. I shall continue to rely very heavily upon his judgment.

I also thank the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania after I have made one more observation.

I hope I may be wrong in my evaluation, but I am inclined to think that it was mighty important to keep the Stars and Stripes flying over our Embassy in Habana, even though only 11 Americans were in the Embassy. I think it was important from many standpoints, but first from the standpoint of symbolism, to keep the great flag of freedom flying in an area where thousands upon thousands of people are being subjected to police-state methods. The very flying of the United States flag might very well have done more to inspire the Cuban people and given them more help than the breaking of diplomatic relations. It is with regard to that issue and others similar to it that I think the administration has the clear obligation to the American people to justify its course of action.

Let me say this by way of warning. An incident such as this is a start which may very well lead to greater and greater troubles in Latin America. We may find ourselves in the not too distant future plagued with uprisings throughout Latin America which will endanger the governments of many friendly nations because Communists are getting by with the charge that the United States seeks only to clothe them with materialism and policies of exploitation. We know that that is wrong, but I have listened to that harangue in the United Nations on the part of the Commies so much during the last 3 months that I think I owe it to the Senate to say that we had better take a look to see what actually is happening among the masses of the people of Latin America, and not play into the hands of the Communist apparatus by seeking to impose restrictions on Castro through the breaking of diplomatic relations which may make him a martyr in Latin America.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With that understanding, I should like to have 2 minutes.

I recommend to Senators, if they wish to understand the propaganda which is taking place in Cuba, the reading of a book written first in Spanish, and then translated into English: "El Tivuron y La Sardina"—"The Shark and the Sardine." The book points out that the United States is the shark and Latin America is the sardine which may be swallowed by the shark. I recommend its reading to all Senators who are interested in understanding the propaganda of communism in Latin America.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday I sent to the desk notices of motions to make six proposed changes in the rules of the Senate. This material appears on pages 18 and 19 of the RECORD of Tuesday, January 3, 1961. However, my motions were not given Senate resolution numbers, nor have they been printed.

I now ask that each such proposed rules change be given a Senate resolution number and be printed, as was done with the comparable motions submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] yesterday, and go over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON in the chair). The request of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be granted; but he must first send the resolutions to the desk.

Mr. CLARK. They are already at the desk. I sent them to the desk yesterday. The identical text is there. Is it necessary for me to have them typewritten all over again? The Senator from South Dakota had his proposal printed without any difficulty. I do not wish to make a Federal case out of this. If the Assistant Parliamentarian wishes me to have them typed up again, I shall do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no opposition, they will be prepared in the correct form and will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his characteristic courtesy.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. CLARK were received, ordered to be printed, and to lie over under the rule, as follows:

S. RES. 9

Resolved, That rule XXIV be amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"3. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee."

S. RES. 10

Resolved, That section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No standing committee of the House, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit, without special leave, while the House is in session."

S. RES. 11

Resolved, That rule XXV be amended in the following respects:

In paragraph (h) (dealing with the Committee on Finance) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one"; and

In paragraph (k) (dealing with the Committee on the Judiciary) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" on the first line of the said paragraph and insert in lieu thereof "seventeen."

S. RES. 12

Resolved, That rule III, subsection 1, be amended to read as follows:

"The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Journal of the preceding day shall be in order, and any such motion shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of. Unless a motion to read the Journal of the preceding day, which is nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved."

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That rule XIX be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"8. During the consideration of any measure, motion or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate."

S. RES. 14

Resolved, That section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)), enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives be amended, to add the following new subsections at the end thereof, which shall be applicable with respect to the Senate only:

"(d) Each standing committee of the Senate shall meet at such time as it may prescribe by rule, upon the call of the chairman thereof, and at such other time as may be fixed by written notice signed by a majority of the members of the committee and filed with the committee clerk.

"(e) The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee of the Senate shall be determined in accordance with its rules, and any other measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee shall be considered at such meeting that a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation of written notice filed with the committee clerk.

"(f) Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee of the Senate has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than 5 hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yea-and-nay vote. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter, that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of 30 minutes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further desire on the part of any Senator to speak this afternoon, I ask, first, that the usual morning hour be held tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Montana whether it would not be possible to get a vote on the pending motion this afternoon, so that we could continue to debate the matter which is really before us, and which is majority cloture. The reason why no other Senator wishes to speak this afternoon is, perhaps, that the motion should be disposed of before we speak further on the principal business before us. I regret having to make this comment on the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator desires to proceed in that way, we can endeavor to do so; but I point out that the motion I am about to make protects the rights which are already inherent in the presentation of these resolutions. Many Senators wanted to leave at a reasonable hour this afternoon, some to hold meetings, some to honor other commitments. So long as this subject would be pending business once the morning hour was concluded, I thought this would be the easiest way out of a difficult problem.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator may well be correct. I had the idea—I could well be wrong—that if the pending motion were put to a vote, it would pass by a voice vote without any difficulty. I do not see in the Chamber any of our Southern friends who might enlighten us on the subject, but I would hazard a guess that what I have suggested might happen.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as I know, there are no other speakers, on our side, on the motion to take up the resolution. It seems to me that the motion could be dealt with. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is quite correct in saying that we might ascertain from our Southern friends if they intend to speak on the motion. I am certain that no Senator desires to foreclose them from doing so; but if they do not wish to speak, we would be at least one step further along in the progress of the debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If the present motion were to be adopted, as I hope it will be, I am prepared to speak this afternoon, even to an empty Chamber, on majority cloture, in the hope that by doing so the final disposition of the matter will be expedited.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; but before the roll is called, I ask the attachés of the Senate to notify all Senators that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow we have the usual morning hour.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Montana include in his unanimous-consent request an additional request that such an arrangement shall not effect any change in the pending business, which is the motion to take up these resolutions?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to speak on that question. After discussing the matter with the Parliamentarian, that is clearly understood; and it is tied with the fact that I intend to request that today the Senate take a recess, rather than adjourn. If an adjournment were had, it would mean that the resolutions in their present form would die. But by taking a recess, they will remain, in their present form, in order in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow we have the usual morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 5, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Book of Leviticus (26: 12) this promise of God: *I will walk among you and be your God, and ye shall be my people.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, who hast opened unto us the gateway to a new year, may we hear and heed Thy voice of confidence and hope lest we meet our tasks and responsibilities with a paralyzing sense of fear and frustration.

Grant that we may accept and follow the leading of Thy divine spirit with humility of heart and simplicity of faith, assured that the future is as bright as the promises of God.

Give us the rapture of the forward look and help us to lay hold of the perplexing problems of each day with resolute determination and wholehearted dedication.

Hear us in the name of Him who is the Author and Finisher of our faith. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., late a Senator from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, late a Senator-elect from the State of Wyoming.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE], and acting for him, I offer a bill he has introduced (H.R. 1723) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I have discussed this with the minority leader. It has been screened and cleared by him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand this calls for no additional money?

Mr. McCORMACK. It does not. The purpose of the bill is to extend from the 3d of January to some date in June the time for the committee to make its report to Congress.

Mr. GROSS. But no additional money is involved?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am acting for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is my understanding there is no additional money involved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the joint resolution of July 14, 1960, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States" (Public Law 86-650), as amended by Public Law 86-788, is amended by striking out "January 3, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 28, 1961".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF DAVID M. ABSHIRE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1960.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as an employee of the minority staff of the House of Representatives, and request that this resignation become effective as of the end of business on the last day of December 1960.

I was appointed to this position by House Resolution 218, approved March 19, 1959.

It has been a pleasure to serve in this capacity and to be associated with the Members and employees of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE LATE JOHN E. RANKIN

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce to the House the passing of the Honorable John Elliott Rankin. He departed this life at his home in Tupelo, Miss., on November 26, 1960, the victim of a heart attack.

For 32 years Mr. Rankin served in this body as the Representative from the First Congressional District of Mississippi. His length of service is a record for Members from my State and is surpassed by only a few from other sections of the country.

Our former colleague was born of humble but proud parentage in Itawamba County, Miss., on March 29, 1882. He was educated in the public schools of the county and graduated from the Law School of the University of Mississippi in 1910. He first entered the practice of law in West Point, Miss., but soon moved to Tupelo where he continued his practice and served as prosecuting attorney for the county.

In 1920 Mr. Rankin was elected to the 67th Congress and to each Congress thereafter through the 82d. He served here with distinction and was credited with many beneficial achievements for the good of his district, State, and country.

While interested in many programs and movements, his greatest interests were in the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration. He vigorously fought for the passage of legislation creating these Federal agencies and for their perpetuation.

For years he served as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and was credited with having authored more legislation for the benefit of veterans, their widows, orphans, and dependents than any other Member of the House of Representatives.

He was a strong believer in the Democratic Party, in constitutional government, the perpetuation of our democracy and States rights. He fought communism wherever he found the slightest evidence of it, and was the proud author of an amendment to the rules of the House

creating the permanent Committee on Un-American Activities.

An eloquent debater, learned in the rules of the House, and a vigorous and fiery competitor, he was a colorful and effective Member. He gave no quarter and sought none. Small of stature but full of fire when attacked, he stood firmly for what he believed to be right even if he stood alone. He never gave ground—not an inch. He was a master in debate and most of those who dared to challenge him later wished they had not.

He was one of the best read men ever to serve in this great body. He was particularly well known as a student of poetry and literature. He filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of his day with appropriate quotations lifted from the writings of the world's most noted authors. His retentive mind always amazed his listeners.

Although he retired from this body in January of 1953, his interest in the Congress, in national and international affairs, and in the progress and development of the area he served so long never ceased. Infirmity finally overtook him but as was characteristic of his long and illustrious career it was not without a struggle.

The memory of John Elliott Rankin will live with this body and among the people of my State for years and years to come. He left behind a record of accomplishment and achievement for the good of his fellow man.

Surviving are his lovely widow and a charming daughter. I am sure that every Member of this House, particularly those of you who served with Mr. Rankin, join with me in praising the service of our former colleague, mourning his passing, and in extending sympathy to his surviving loved ones.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague in paying tribute to the late John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, who passed to his reward in late 1960.

Mr. John, as we knew him, was a senior Member of this Congress when I came here and was one of the most active among us.

He was possessed of a bright and energetic mind and memory. A talented speaker, in debate he held the attention of this House perhaps better than any Member with whom I have served.

A strong advocate for the development of our own country, he did a great job for his district, his State, and Nation. John Rankin sincerely believed that to dissipate our resources over the world was to invite disaster. Truly, he could foresee our present unhappy and dangerous plight. Unfortunately, his warnings were largely ignored by the majority. Certainly he did his part.

On the home front, he, perhaps, more than anyone else, could foresee that appeal to minority votes would lead to instability and weakness. He firmly believed it would lead this country, both politically and economically, to the condition which plagues so many nations in South and Central America. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a lasting monument to his efforts.

John E. Rankin was a man of talent, a man of energy, one who had strong convictions, who made his contribution to this Congress and to his Nation.

To his fine wife and daughter, and other members of his family, we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members be granted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the recess death claimed one of the most colorful Members ever to serve in this body, former Representative John Elliott Rankin, who was chairman of one of the predecessor committees of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from 1930 until his retirement from the Congress several years ago.

While I did not see eye to eye with Mr. Rankin on some veterans' legislation, I want to express at this time my real appreciation for his long and devoted service to the veterans of this Nation. He presided ably and well as chairman of the Committee on World War I Veterans' Legislation and also over the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which was organized at the beginning of the 80th Congress.

Surely he was one of the ablest parliamentarians ever to serve in the House. He was a many sided man. He could literally quote Shakespeare by the hour and the same was true of many passages from the Bible. All who knew him loved to hear him tell his amusing—and, on some occasions, side-splitting—stories.

The people of his district and of the South generally will ever be in his debt for what he did in connection with the legislation creating the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration. The furnishing of electricity to his constituents and the people of his beloved Southland was a project which always merited his greatest concern and he was in the forefront to provide electricity for his people. I heard him remark once that when he came to Congress in 1920, 2 percent of his district was electrified and that when he left, slightly less than 99 percent had electrical power. Much of this advance was due to the legislation which Mr. Rankin sponsored.

A man of fierce loyalties, he served only briefly in World War I but that brief period of service made him always appreciate the problems which veterans had and continued to experience over the years. Any veteran who needed assistance could always count upon receiving a ready and sympathetic hearing from the gentleman from Mississippi. We who knew him will always cherish his memory.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, regardless of party, I am sure that we were all grieved to learn of the recent passing of our former colleague, the Honorable John E. Rankin, of Mississippi. John Rankin was a Member of this body with many years' service when I came here as a freshman in 1933. Nature had endowed him with many talents which he had sharpened by his hard work and studious habits. While his colleagues did not always agree with him, they nevertheless respected his sincerity of purpose and his devotion to his State and his country. No man with whom I have served in this House had a better knowledge of parliamentary procedure or a more alert mind or quicker wit. At repartee he was unexcelled. Those who were bold enough to cross lances with him in debate rarely ever encountered him a second time.

John Rankin served a useful purpose in this House. His long service here will not soon be forgotten.

I join with my colleagues here today in paying tribute to his brilliant mind, his great service to his country and expressing anew my sympathy to his beloved wife and daughter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear friend and former colleague, Hon. John E. Rankin, marked the end of an era in Mississippi's public affairs. Perhaps no man who ever represented my State in this body could point to a greater record of legislative achievement than Mr. Rankin. His monumental work in behalf of legislation creating both the TVA and REA programs will not be soon forgotten by the people of America. As a member of the old Dies committee, and later as the one most responsible for making the Un-American Activities Committee a permanent committee of the House of Representatives, he made his mark in history as a relentless fighter for America, and a formidable foe of everything un-American. As everyone knows, the veterans of America's wars had no better friend or benefactor than John Rankin. As an individual, he was one of the most colorful persons ever to serve in this distinguished body and, indeed, one of the most able. He was a gifted orator and had no peers in the art of rough and tumble debating. He was a master at repartee, and his knowledge of parliamentary rules and law was unsurpassed.

Mr. Rankin and I became fast friends when I first arrived to serve in this body some 14 years ago. Although he was then a senior Member and a highly respected leader of the House, he was never too busy to lend me a helping hand, nor to counsel with me on matters affecting my service here. I shall be indebted forever to John Rankin for the wonderful friend that I knew him to be.

I think it can be said truthfully that John Rankin was missed by every Member who had served with him in this body. Few Members make such a lasting impression on their colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a dear friend, and America has lost a great leader in the passing of John Rankin. To Mrs. Rankin and their devoted daughter and grandchildren, I join their thousands of friends in extending deepest and most heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. Speaker, many times I have heard Mr. Rankin recite a favorite poem, "Invictus," which, in these words, describes him better, perhaps, than any other:

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the Captain of my soul.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of Hon. John Rankin, who served as a Member of this House from Mississippi for 32 years. His death marked the passing of a good, personal friend and one of the most courageous men I have ever known. He was truly one of Mississippi's outstanding citizens and one of the Nation's real statesmen.

Mr. Rankin will long be remembered by servicemen and veterans for his effective efforts in their behalf while he was chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Always alert to their rights and needs, Mr. Rankin never lost an opportunity to lead the fight for veterans' benefits.

As a stanch supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he contributed in a remarkable way to the health, happiness and well-being of thousands of families throughout the South. His interest in people knew no bounds and he never lost his sympathetic regard for his fellow man. To him the welfare of the average man was of paramount importance.

He was at one time instrumental in preventing the abolishment of the House Un-American Activities Committee. As a member of this committee, he constantly fought for its existence as a safeguard against communism in this country.

The name of John Rankin will be long remembered—not only in Mississippi and the South, but throughout the Nation. I am certain that Mrs. Rankin, his loyal and devoted wife, and their lovely daughter, Annie Laurie, will find much comfort and consolation in the knowledge that he lived a full and worthwhile life.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Elliott Rankin, an illustrious Member of the House of Representatives for 16 consecutive terms, who died on November 26, 1960, will be remembered as one of the outstanding public servants of our time.

John Rankin represented with distinction the old First District of Mississippi for 32 years—years which were exceedingly critical in our country's history—years that literally reshaped the political and economic life of the United States.

Mr. Rankin will be remembered, with the late Senator George Norris, Republican of Nebraska, as coauthor of the bill that created the Tennessee Valley Authority. He served his constituents and his Nation with unselfish zeal.

There are innumerable enviable qualities to be found in the character of John Rankin, but I should like to emphasize two in particular which he exhibited with fiery courage.

I recall an incident in 1941 when an oil painting of Chairman John Rankin was presented to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. There were numerous veteran organizations present and there were many words of praise offered to our illustrious chairman, John Rankin. But the response to those words of praise made by Mr. Rankin contained—among others—the two qualities in his character I wish to recall to our minds today.

First, he regarded the obligations of Congress toward our veterans as a sacred trust.

I quote Mr. Rankin's words of February 6, 1941, as follows:

This tribute is to the committee. It is to those Members who have fought with me, and who are still fighting with me for justice for the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. We know it costs money. We do not deny that. We knew it would cost money when the war was over. It has always cost money. But, in my opinion, there is no greater investment America can make at any time than to take care of the disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of those veterans who fight in the defense of our country.

The second quality of our late colleague's character found in his response to the presentation in 1941 was his deep and abiding love for his fellow man. We all know that John Rankin's friendship departed from party lines. Again I quote from his remarks:

Someone has said that those friendships that spring up between the members of the two political parties in the Congress are the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics. I want to say to you that they afford some of the finest friendships I have known.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I find myself in the position of believing that the finest tribute I can accord our deceased colleague is to repeat his own words.

I rejoice that it was my privilege to serve in the Congress and on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs with John Rankin. He will be remembered with admiration and with affection. The courage with which he carried his convictions was exemplary, indeed. To his wife and daughter I extend profound sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was with much sadness that I learned during the recess of the Congress of the passing of our former colleague, the late Honorable John E. Rankin, of Mississippi.

Congressman Rankin served in the House of Representatives for 32 years before his retirement in 1953 and was one of the most colorful, forceful, and dedicated Members to serve in the House. John Rankin was a champion of the people of his area—the South—and a firm and devoted advocate of improving and bettering the way of life of the people of our Nation. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration were among his great interests. He was active in fighting for legislation to create these two important Federal agencies and always was a vigorous supporter for the full development of the TVA and the rural electrification program.

He served as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs for many years and was a powerful and effective chairman. During my early years of service in the Congress, I was honored to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee while Congressman Rankin was chairman of this great committee. No Member of Congress ever surpassed Congressman Rankin in their stout advocacy and championship of the veterans of this Nation. He was a strong believer in adequate bneefits for all of our veterans, their widows, orphans, and dependents.

Congressman Rankin will long be remembered as one of our strong characters who served in this body and his achievements will continue to shine brightly.

I wish to join with the other Members of the House in conveying an expression of my most sincere sympathy to his widow and daughter and members of his family.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay proper tribute to the late John Elliott Rankin, for 32 years a Representative in the Congress from the State of Mississippi. His entire adult life was spent as a servant of the State of Mississippi and the United States, both of which he served with dedication and distinction. His was a service of devotion to what he believed to be right, to his constituents, his State, and his country.

John Rankin's contributions to his State and Nation were many, but he will always be remembered as the "Father of TVA." He was always a champion of the TVA and REA which meant so much not only to his own section of the country but to our entire Nation. His efforts and work will remain a shrine, a living memorial to him for all of those who come after him.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rankin and his daughter.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so many good and true things have been said about the late John Rankin, of Mississippi, that it is difficult to add to these tributes. However, I must say a word, because John Rankin increased my knowledge and added to the joy that is mine as a Member of Congress.

I am especially indebted to him for the help he gave me in the matter of ridding our Great Lakes of the lampreys. His knowledge of communism and of the Communist infiltrations into this country were of inestimable help to me, and I shall never cease to be grateful for his generosity in all these matters.

Those who never heard him quote from everything, from the Bible and Shakespeare to some of the great speeches of the Congress have missed something rich and rare.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in these few words of appreciation of a man who served here with all of his heart and mind. To his widow and his daughter do I extend my sympathy as they mourn his going, even though they rejoice that he has gone free.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, our mutual dear friend, the Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, paid a great tribute to our beloved colleague, who has gone to his reward, Congressman John Rankin, of Tupelo, Miss.

Well, I doubt if anything can be added to what TOM ABERNETHY had to say, but

I agree with TOM ABERNETHY that everything he said about our good friend and colleague, John Rankin, was true. I worked with him a quarter of a century and what a worker he was, and what a thinker. I remember one day somebody mentioned something on the Republican side about the mockingbird, and John Rankin just really popped up or shot up on our side of the aisle and went to the microphone and recited that great poem about the mockingbird. I still have it, and if I could find it right now, I would include it with these remarks. There are so many things and so many sayings, and so much poetry, so much that we could say about John Rankin. He did serve his district, he did serve his State and this Nation well, and for a long, long time. His wonderful wife and daughter were right here by his side, your side and my side, and we all loved and respected the great John Rankin from the wonderful, wonderful State of Mississippi.

THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle will bear with me if I take a minute to pay a word of tribute to our incomparable campaign manager, chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. The large majorities which our party has been able to maintain in the House of Representatives have been due in no small measure to the political skill, hard work, good sense, and sound judgment of MIKE KIRWAN.

A great deal has been said about the fact that the Democratic Party lost a few seats in the last election. Yet I would like to point out that the majority which we have in this Congress is the third largest since the beginning of World War II, and that it has been 32 years since the Republican Party has sent a majority to the House of Representatives comparable to the Democratic Party majority in the 87th Congress. Our membership in the present Congress is identical with that enjoyed after the great Democratic victory of 1948. No one in the Congress or in the country is due more credit for this accomplishment than the chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee, Mr. KIRWAN and his committee, which in my opinion is the most effective and important political committee within the Democratic Party.

Every Member of the House knows that MIKE KIRWAN is not only a great campaigner, he is also a great legislator. He presides over the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that probably has more to do with the development of American resources than any other committee on the Congress. His legislative service may be characterized as that of a great builder. Projects completed or under construction in every section of the United States attest to the constructive congressional service of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN.

It may be truly said of the gentleman from Ohio that during his long years in this body he has rendered tremendous service to the great Democratic Party. More important still, he has rendered tremendous service to the United States of America.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, in his great tribute to our colleague, MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio. MIKE has been a friend of mine for many years and has been a most loyal and able Democrat. He has never been too tired to take the trail again. There is no more loyal and capable Democrat in Congress than is our colleague, Mr. KIRWAN.

And MIKE has done all of this without shirking in any sense his congressional duties. In handling the affairs of a great Appropriations Subcommittee, he has provided for development projects of great interest to every section of the Nation. He has always been most readily available to his colleagues to fairly discuss and appraise any project throughout the Nation. He has done a great job in a legislative way and, at the same time he has not completely overlooked the political complexion of a legislative party that is dedicated to a two-party system.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma has made the remarks he has about our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. There is no more dedicated Member of the House of Representatives than MIKE KIRWAN. He is not only a great American, but he is also a great Democrat.

I know my Republican friends will not feel offended in any way when I pay tribute to MIKE KIRWAN from a party angle and say that the fact that there are so many Democrats on this side at this time and have been in past Congresses in the main is due to the leadership and the work of MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio.

Broader than that, as I have said, he is a great American and a dedicated legislator. He has made a marked contribution to the legislative history of our country. I am very happy to join with my friend from Oklahoma in the remarks he has made and which the gentleman from Ohio so properly deserves. He enjoys the respect of all Members of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, for the splendid work performed by him for the Democratic Party in the recent campaign.

Mr. KIRWAN is a highly respected Member of this great body. I do not know of anyone who is held in higher esteem and greater respect than the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN. He is particularly admired by the Democrats for the fine job he did last year. Certainly, by reason of his standing in this House and his standing in the country, he is entitled to great credit for the victory that was won by the Democrats in 1960.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Oklahoma in paying tribute to the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. I do not know whether it is generally known, but the Democratic congressional campaign committee came into existence some 120 years ago, and although I have not researched the matter, my impression is that this committee is the oldest political committee in the world today. I feel that its recent successes are in no small measure due to the outstanding work of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I include in this tribute also the work of his distinguished committee headed by Kenneth M. Harding, director. I feel that they have made a team which has been effective, and above all, which has been fair. They have many problems, of course, in allocating financial aid to various candidates. In doing this they must be fair, and they have been fair. In that fairness I feel lies the secret of their success. I therefore join in paying tribute to this distinguished gentleman, and to his committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman from Utah. I yield at this time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my friend from Oklahoma and my colleagues who have said these kind words about MIKE KIRWAN. My reason for adding my tribute is not only because of his leadership in the recent campaign on behalf of the Democratic candidates for Congress, but because MIKE had the good judgment to be born and raised in my congressional district. He began when a small child as a slate-picker in our anthracite coal mines. He worked in the mines. Then he moved out to the beautiful State of Ohio where he became a distinguished statesman. Not only as a politician but as a statesman we admire him and respect him for his tremendous integrity, particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee for the Interior Department of the Committee on Appropriations. We all know that when MIKE KIRWAN goes down into the well of that House, if he is "agin" you you are in very bad shape. We admire MIKE and respect him and I am happy to add my tribute to the words of the

distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the whip on the Democratic side.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I should like to associate myself with the very fine compliments that have been paid to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He is a hard worker, loyal to the Democratic Party; but above all, may I say, having traveled with him, that he is one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever known. His loyalty to his church has been an inspiration to me.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleagues in this tribute to our colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

I have known many men in the House of Representatives. I have never known a better or more effective Member of this House than is MIKE KIRWAN. When he brings in his bills before the House, he is capable of explaining them and letting the House know just exactly what is contained in the measures that he presents. He is deservedly popular in the House because he is a man of the highest character, faithful to duty and who loves and wants to serve his country.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, may I wholeheartedly join with my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, and my many other colleagues in paying tribute to the tireless and most effective efforts of MIKE KIRWAN in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee during the last election.

Chairman KIRWAN was not content only with paper work in his job, but he actually went all over the country in his quest for success. The reports on his efficiency and wonderful reception throughout the grassroots are well known to all of us. This was a tough campaign and all of us are deeply indebted to MIKE KIRWAN and to his exceptionally capable staff for an outstanding job.

Mr. HECHLER. I am honored to have this opportunity to join in a richly deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, for the outstanding job which he has done as chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee. It is highly appropriate that we call attention to these accomplishments on the floor of the House of Representatives because the very composition of Congress is determined by the relative vigor and effectiveness of the congressional campaign committees and those who man them. The noble profession of politics is what got us here, and as practitioners of the art of politics MIKE KIRWAN ranks with the best of them. He is fair, he is firm, he knows what he is doing, he is direct in his approach, and he always keeps his word. Most important, he produces results and to use a combat expression, "the battle is the payoff."

I want to pay tribute also to Ken Harding, who is following in the footsteps of his late father, the beloved "Cap" Harding. Ken and his efficient, charming staff help MIKE KIRWAN carry the ball and perform the effective work which the congressional campaign committee does.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] in paying tribute to a man who is not only a great Democrat, but a great American, MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

His services as chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee have contributed a great deal to our party, and through it to the Nation. I know that the younger Democratic Members of this body are particularly grateful for his advice and assistance, not only in our campaigns, but in our work here in the Congress.

Those of us from the West are especially grateful to Congressman KIRWAN for his outstanding work on the Appropriations Committee, and particularly on the subcommittee dealing with Interior appropriations. He is one of our country's foremost authorities on resource development and he has proved himself a great friend of the West.

He has traveled in my own congressional district, and I know that he has traveled through most of our part of the country and that he has personal familiarity with our problems. He has drawn on his experience and his capabilities to render great service to the cause of multiple-purpose development of our land and water resources, and in these brief remarks I just want to express some of the appreciation of all of us from the West.

This, the opening week of the 87th Congress, is a most fitting time to pay tribute to this outstanding American, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma for his able remarks and to thank him for giving me this opportunity to associate myself with them.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the House, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, known to all affectionately as "MIKE." To pay tribute to MIKE is to pay tribute to the American way of life for he, more than anyone else I know, is a symbol of this way of life.

From a very modest beginning, through sheer determination, perseverance and hard work, MIKE has climbed the ladder of success. We honor him today for the great job he did as chairman of the congressional campaign committee. During the recent campaign he worked tirelessly to aid and assist Members running for reelection as well as candidates running for the first time. With MIKE at the helm we came through again with a resounding Democratic majority in the House of Representatives for the 87th Congress. He has been chairman of the congressional committee since 1947, and since he assumed the leadership of that committee only once—that short 2-year period between 1952 and 1954—have the Democrats not controlled the House. MIKE KIRWAN is not only a great campaigner, he is a distinguished legislator, having served in the House of Representatives since 1936, a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee since 1942 where he has served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. I salute you, MIKE, as a campaigner of renown; as a legislator with a reputation of accomplishment, a high-minded Christian gentleman and a truly great American.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the congratulations and warm praise being given to our colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, for his outstanding work as chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee. The campaign in 1960 was perhaps more effectively organized than at any time in recent years. In a hard campaign in every section of the country, the work of the Democratic congressional committee resulted in Democratic victories in many close elections.

MIKE KIRWAN is one of the real statesmen in the House of Representatives. No Member has a greater respect for the priceless heritage of natural resources and has done more to aid in their sound development. MIKE KIRWAN is, of course, interested in the affairs of his own district in Ohio, but he sees all of our problems as national and he has given his great energy and valuable time in assisting others of us in all parts of the country in helping to properly develop these resources. Few men with whom we serve in the Congress have done more to benefit the sound development of our great country.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my many colleagues in paying tribute to one of the truly outstanding Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio.

In paying tribute to MIKE KIRWAN, we are paying tribute to the "American promise" of unlimited opportunity to those who have the will, patience, and sweat to improve themselves. From a very humble beginning, MIKE KIRWAN has risen to great and deserving heights. But he, like all great Americans, has made greater effort to help others instead of himself. He has been a legislative father to many of us, especially the younger freshmen Members. He has been our adviser, our guide, and many times our conscience.

As chairman of the congressional campaign committee, MIKE KIRWAN has made it possible for many of us to conduct winning campaigns. I join others in thanking him for assisting us to receive the privilege of representing our constituencies in the Congress.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, MIKE KIRWAN has always offered his sympathetic ear to the problems of Hawaii. I am certain that the grateful people of Hawaii join me in thanking MIKE KIRWAN for

his assistance in guiding the growth of Hawaii.

I salute you, MIKE KIRWAN—legislator, statesman, campaigner, gentleman, and great American.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning one of the great leaders in this House, and everywhere else he goes, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader of the Democratic side of the House, made a speech. It is a wonderful speech, about another outstanding leader and another great and good friend, and last but not least, an everlasting, outstanding, true-blue Democrat, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, you know MIKE KIRWAN; we all do. He is a very quiet man; he is a very hard worker; he is a very serious man; he is a deep thinker; he has a great brain and such an understanding heart; and he doesn't talk much on the floor or anywhere else, but when he does, like you, what he says counts.

Well, I just want to say that everything that my beloved friend and our leader on the Democratic side, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, said was true—more than true—and I wish there were something else that we could add to that. But not only the Democrats, but the Republicans, know they can count on MIKE KIRWAN just as they can on you when you tell them anything. I have known him so long and so well, and I think it was so wonderful for our leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, to say the wonderful things that he had to say about our great colleague and leader, MIKE KIRWAN.

Again, I will say that MIKE KIRWAN has served his district, his great State of Ohio and this Nation well. Whatever he does, he does well, and wherever he goes and wherever he is known, and the people he works with, I mean all right-thinking people, will love and respect this great American, MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio.

CARDINAL CUSHING HONORED BY THE ORDER OF FRIAR HERMITS OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston is noted for his inspirational zeal and the good works that have flowed from it. "He has gone out among the people" and they have responded to his purposeful vision with the dynamic cooperation that has financed many charitable programs and has built many new hospitals and schools throughout Massachusetts.

One of his greatest achievements was the building of Merrimack College in North Andover, Mass.

Thirteen years from the day when he had presided at the mass opening the college, this tireless prelate was made an honorary member of the Order of Friar Hermits of St. Augustine in the Collegiate Church of Christ the Teacher, at Merrimack College.

Commenting on the progress of the college during that 13-year span, His Eminence said:

> In this age of science and technology we all realized from the beginning the pressing need for a school of engineering under Catholic auspices. * * * There was no engineering school in all New England identified with any Catholic college. It is a splendid tribute to the courage and ingenuity of the Augustinian Fathers that they have developed a youthful, promising and modern engineering school that aspires to become one of the outstanding engineering schools on the eastern coast.

By his tremendous faith in education, Cardinal Cushing is doing a great service to his church, to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to the Nation.

In recognition thereof, I include in the RECORD the following account of the cardinal's enrollment into the order, and the address he gave on that occasion. It is titled: "Cardinal Honored at Merrimack College" from the September 23, 1960 edition of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, published in Lawrence, Mass.:

CARDINAL HONORED AT MERRIMACK COLLEGE

"I have come to Merrimack College on many occasions, for various reasons and in behalf of many causes. None of these visits can compare with that of this day when we give thanks to Almighty God for the great blessings that He has bestowed upon me through my enrollment as a member of the Augustinian Order."

These were the opening remarks of His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing Thursday morning where, before a standing room crowd of students, laymen, and clergy in the Collegiate Church of Christ the Teacher, he was made an honorary member of the Order of Friar Hermits of St. Augustine, a ceremony said to be one of the most important in the 15-year history of Merrimack College.

Prior to the enrollment of the cardinal into the order, the procession of priests filed into the church following the entire student body and prominent members of the lay world. Very Rev. James A. Donnellon, O.S.A., prior provincial, Province of St. Thomas of Villanova, celebrated the Mass with Rt. Rev. Francis R. Rossiter acting as master of ceremonies and Rev. Edward L. Daley as assistant master of ceremonies.

During the Mass, the cardinal sat to the left of the altar flanked by Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O.S.A., and Rev. John A. Klekotka, O.S.A., president of Villanova University.

Among those attending were: Rev. John Lane, North Reading; Rev. Edmund W. Croke, Wilmington; Rev. John A. Keegan, Haverhill; Rev. James Glennon, O.S.A., St. Mary's; Rev. Bernard O'Dowd, O.S.A., St. Augustine's; Rev. Alfred M. Natali, O.S.A., St. Augustine's; Rev. Cipriano Vicente, O.S.A., the following Merrimack College priests:

Rev. Mariano Arconada, O.S.A., Rev. Thomas A. Burke, O.S.A., Rev. Edward J. Burns, O.S.A., Rev. Donald X. Burt, O.S.A., Rev. William G. Cullen, O.S.A., Rev. Edward L. Daley, O.S.A., Rev. Ezra J. Fenton, O.S.A., Rev. Joseph A. Flaherty, O.S.A., Rev. Michael T. McGinnis, O.S.A., Rev. Henry J McIntyre, O.S.A., Rev. Henry J. Matthews, O.S.A., Very Rev. Arthur B. Maxwell, O.S.A., Rev. William T. Monahan, O.S.A., Rev. Joseph P. Murray, O.S.A., Rev. William Murray, O.S.A., Rev. Christian A. Retera, O.S.A., Rev. Patrick J. Rice, O.S.A., Rev. Paul C. Thabault, O.S.A., and Rev. Thomas F. Walsh, O.S.A.

M. Vale, representing St. Joseph's College in Maine; Sister Irene Marie of Anna Maria College, Paxton; Mrs. Doris Sterner Buonomo, Sister Mary Alice, president of Regis College, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph P. Burke, J.C.D., pastor of St. Patrick's Church; Rt. Rev. Timothy F. O'Leary, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph David, Ph. D., pastor of St. Anthony's Church; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis M. Juras, pastor of St. Francis Church; Rt. Rev. Peter T. Linehan, V.F.P.P., Rt. Rev. John J. Murray, Rt. Rev. M. P. Stapleton, St. John's Seminary, Brighton; Rt. Rev. John J. Twiss, Rt. Rev. William F. Reilly, Rt. Rev. Lawrence J. Riley, Brighton; Rt. Rev. L. A. Sikora, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Abouzeid, B.S., pastor of St. Joseph's Church; Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., Boston College president; Rev. Richard H. Sullivan, Stonehill College; Very Rev. Gerald F. McCarthy, O.F.B., prior, St. Anselm's Abbey, Manchester, N.H.; Rev. James E. Fitzgerald, Fairfield University; Rev. Clarence Laplant, O.F.M., St. Francis College, Biddeford, Me.; representing Very Rev. Raymond Swords, S.J., president of Holy Cross, was Rev. Patrick J. Higgins; Rt. Rev. John S. Seton. Very Rev. Henry B. Smith, O.S.A., St. Augustine's, Andover; Brother Hugh E. Sheridan, F.M.S., Central Catholic High School; Rev. Daniel G. Sullivan, Sacred Heart, Bradford; Rev. James A. Wenzel, O.S.A., St. Augustine's Andover; Very Rev. Charles E. Bauman, O.S.A., Jamaica, Long Island and Very Rev. Francis L. Dennis, O.S.A., Augustinian College, Washington.

Very Rev. John J. Coffey, O.S.A., Novitiate, Staten Island, N.Y.; Rev. Thomas Dillon, O.S.A., New Hamburg, N.Y.; Rev. Joseph A. Duffey, O.S.A., Villanova University; Very Rev. William T. Eagan, O.S.A., Bonner High School, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Rev. Daniel P. Falvey, O.S.A., Villanova University; Rev. Joseph J. Gildea, O.S.A., vice president in charge of academic affairs, Villanova; Very Rev. James M. Hurley, O.S.A., St. Nicholas of Tolentine, N.Y.; Rev. Denis J. Kavanaugh, O.S.A., St. Nicholas of Tolentine, N.Y.; Very Rev. C. C. McHale, O.S.A., representing Very Rev. John L. Seary, O.S.A., provincial of Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O.S.A., Villanova; Very Rev. Edward A. Moran, O.S.A., Chestnut Hill, Pa.; Rev. Ernest J. Autch, O.S.A., Church of the Assumption; Rev. Thomas J. Blessington, St. Mary's; Rev. C. F. Cahill, St. Joseph's, Salem, N.H.; Rev. James I. Carroll; Rev. John V. Casey, O.S.A., St. Mary's; Very Rev. Edward J. Carney, O.S.A., pastor of St. Mary's Parish; Brother Claver, Secred Heart School, Shawsheen; Rev. Samuel E. D'Angelo, O.S.A., St. Mary's; Rev. Francis J. Dinan, St. Patrick's; Rev. P. Forestier, S.M., chaplain, Bon Secours Hospital; Rev. James E. Hannan, O.S.A., St. Laurence's; Rev. James J. Hession, St. Michael's, North Andover; Rev. Francis J. Horgan; Very Rev. John Jadaa, rector, St. Basin's Seminary, Methuen; Very Rev. Paul M. Judson, O.S.A., pastor of St. Augustine's Church; Very Rev. Wilbert Kirk, O.S.A., St. Laurence's Church; Rev. Guy A. LeBel, S.M., St. Theresa's Church, Methuen and Rev. William A. Long, pastor of St. Michael's, North Andover.

Rev. James J. McCusker, O.S.A., St. Mary's; Rev. Louis A. McMenamin, O.S.A., St. Augustine's; Brother Gilroy, St. John's Preparatory School, Danvers; Rev. Eugene P. McNamara, St. Patrick's; Rev. Forrest S. Donahue, S.J., Campion Hall; Rev. Edward M. Sullivan, S.J., Campion Hall; Rev. William S. Mullen and Rev. John A. M. Walsh, O.S.A. of Holy Rosary Parish.

Highlights of the Cardinal's exceptional address:

"Through the kindness of the prior general at Rome, the Most Reverend Lucian Rubio, and the prior provincial of the Province of St. Thomas of Villanova, the Very Reverend James A. Donnellan, I have been invested with the habit of the Friar Hermits, thereby entitling me to a share of all the

spiritual merits and fruits of the works and prayers of Augustinians throughout the world.

"The father general and the father provincial have been most generous in expressing their gratitude for what we, as archbishop of Boston, have done for the Augustinians through our interest in Merrimack College. They have conferred upon me the greatest gift from their spiritual treasures. I shall cherish the honor for time and eternity.

"In undertaking the foundation of Merrimack College the Augustinians gave more than all others. They gave their heart's blood. Responding to my earnest appeal, they started from nothing and put into the erection of this institution of higher learning, their best administrators, their younger and most highly trained scholars and teachers. They have continued year after year to replace and increase the religious staff and to advance financial aid whenever necessary. This has involved many sacrifices on their part with the result that the Archdiocese of Boston is blessed with a higher institution of learning devoted to the special needs of Merrimack Valley and elsewhere.

"As cofounder of Merrimack College I recall that it was just 13 years ago today when I presided at the mass opening the college. On a rainy, chilling morning I proceeded over the rough roads to bless and dedicate the first classroom building. Then, as now, Merrimack College was eager to advance and to meet any program that called for prompt action. At that time there were 165 students in one building. It was a humble but courageous beginning. There were many difficulties to overcome, many obstacles in the way of success, but God blessed the endeavor and the infant institution developed and matured.

"The forward progress has been incredible, breathtaking in rapidity and brilliant in execution. The growth in the student body has been even more spectacular. It has increased almost twentyfold in a little more than a decade. Most significant of all, the high academic standards and scholastic achievements have not suffered in this unprecedented multiplication of physical facilities, but have increased and brought forth gratifying results. Some 1,500 men and women have been graduated from these halls; many of these have pursued advanced studies in the best universities of the country and have merited the highest degree of scholarship—doctorates in chemistry, medicine, biology, philosophy, economics and the arts.

"This is my great day at Merrimack when they honor me with the privilege of wearing in my own right the religious habit of their great order. But it is also their great day for without them there would be no Merrimack College.

"In this age of science and technology we all realized from the very beginning the pressing need for a school of engineering under Catholic auspices. We knew the academic requirements were stringent, the financial demands overwhelming—for no collegiate institution can support itself, let alone expand, on tuitions alone. Yet the need was there. There was no engineering school in all New England identified with any Catholic college. It is a splendid tribute to the courage and ingenuity of the Augustinian Fathers that they have developed a youthful, promising, and modern engineering school that aspires to become one of the outstanding engineering schools on the eastern coast. This accomplishment adds special lustre to the academic excellence of Merrimack College and augurs well for the prosperity of the future of this part of our country. I hope that as this school of engineering grows to full maturity, and strives to meet all the demands of modern scientific progress, it will merit the financial aid of business, scientific, and industrial corporations that have expanded throughout this area in recent years. The progress of Merrimack School of Engineering is associated with their progress.

"Ours is an age of science and technology. Communism today, shows what may happen when science and progress turns away from God. Men forget their loyalties, become enamored with materialism and its accomplishments, strive to become masters of their own destiny and conquerors of the world. We need scientists. We need technologists. We need engineers. But we need God loving and God fearing men who while plumbing the depths of scientific knowledge and enlarging the horizons of engineering accomplishments, know and realize that man is a creature of God, made to know love and serve God in this life and to be happy forever with Him in eternity. Well-trained, competent, able, and learned scientists and engineers are greatly needed today to meet the threats and force of materialism and atheism. Here at Merrimack they are trained to be saints as well as scholars; loyal citizens of the city of God as well as city of man.

"By recalling the spiritual and academic tradition of the Augustinian Order we can appreciate that Merrimack College, the joint enterprise of the Augustinian Fathers and the archbishop of Boston, has a parallel with the genius of St. Augustine. He was a bishop of one of the greatest dioceses in the early church, the diocese of Hippo in north Africa; he was an able administrator, the founder of a religious order to help carry out the divine mission of the church, signifying the close association of the Augustinians with the successors of the Apostles and in the present instance with the archbishop of Boston in carrying out the works which the diocese needed and for which they were specially qualified.

"The close association of the Augustinians with the work of the episcopate is characteristic of the Order of St. Augustine. Her missionary and academic labors in Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador, the Philippines, Japan, China, India, Persia, Armenia, Georgia, Indochina, Malaya, Africa, Bolivia, and Australia are historic and heroic. Today, the most reverend prior general, rules over a total of over 3,800 Augustinians, distributed throughout 400 houses in 24 provinces and 10 vice provinces.

"Here in America over 700 Augustinians serve in 17 dioceses staffing 3 colleges, several seminaries, numerous high schools and parishes. They have sent missionaries to Japan and chaplains into the armed services. Locally the Augustinians have labored in the archdiocese of Boston for over a hundred years. Many of them such as Father James T. O'Reilly have contributed mightily to the religious life of the area. Merrimack College is but the latest flowering of the labors of many sons of Augustine who have labored in this area, true to the spiritual, academic and missionary tradition of their father, St. Augustine.

"It was Augustine, too, who said that there is no standing still; either we push upward or we go downward. And so while I look with great satisfaction at the truly herculean accomplishments of this college I see before us other tasks that call for action.

"The men of Merrimack and the ladies of Merrimack, those who have answered the appeals, all whom we embrace as benefactors. As cofounder with my brethren of the Augustinian Order, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to all these and other friends of the college who have seen it grow from helpless infancy to a strong maturity. Their vision and encouragement, their confidence and generosity are prominent in my thoughts and prayer today. Let us all go forward. We are on the threshold of greater accomplishments. We must not stand still. Pray daily that God may continue to bless our endeavors, as I pray that He will bless and be with you and yours today and forever. Amen."

Rev. Joseph P. Murray, O.S.A. of Merrimack College, read the decree of affiliation in Latin and Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O.S.A., Ph.D., president of the college read it in English. The decree was read as the cardinal changed from his habit to that of a member of the Order of St. Augustine.

The decree:

"The Most Reverend Lucia Rubio, prior general of the Order of Friar Hermits of St. Augustine to His Eminence the Most Reverend Cardinal Richard James Cushing, archbishop of Boston.

"It is fitting that we bestow upon those who have merited the praise and gratitude of our Augustinian family whatever extraordinary favors we are empowered to give.

"Wherefore by virtue of this decree, humbly imitating the perfect dispensers of God's manifold graces, and by virtue of the authority of our office, we affiliate you as one who has shown by special affection and love for our order. We welcome you to our brotherhood and consider you a spiritual guardian of Augustinians.

"By indult of the Holy See, we joyfully grant to you participation both in life and after death, in all the masses, prayers, fasts, in every spiritual work performed with God's help, by the brothers and sisters of our order, wherever they may be in the whole Christian world.

"Granted in Rome, at the general curia on the feast of Saint Augustine, August 28, 1960.

"Father LUCIAN RUBIO,
"Prior General, O.E.S.A.
"Father SALUSTIANUS MIGUELEZ,
"Secretary of the Order."

Rt. Rev. Francis R. Rossiter acted as master of ceremonies and Rev. Edward L. Daley, O.S.A., assistant master of ceremonies.

Following a talk by the cardinal which lasted close to an hour, the procession of visiting priests and clergy taking part in the colorful and solemn ceremonies, formed once again and proceeded to the new men and women's dormitories where they were blessed and dedicated by the cardinal.

AREA OF REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House the new area redevelopment bill for the distressed economic areas of the Nation. This will be the new administration bill and will have the support of President-elect Kennedy, who has repeatedly urged the passage of this legislation.

Similar legislation was twice vetoed by President Eisenhower.

At high noon on the first minute of the first hour of the first day of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, in keeping with my pledge to do so, I introduced the new Flood-Douglas bill. Senator DOUGLAS will introduce the bill in the Senate today.

The bill, as is well known, deals with problems of areas of chronic unemployment. President-elect Kennedy said on January 2, 1961, upon receiving the report of the special committee named by

him to consider these problems, on which committee I served as adviser:

It would be a mistake to consider the problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment solely in the context of the areas directly affected. The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality.

After the long, hard fight of the past several years to pass the Flood-Douglas bill, I am more than happy now to sponsor the new bill with the approval of the President-elect and to feel certain that the bill will speedily pass the Congress and finally be signed into law. The bill, in its broad purpose, strikes at the desperate problems of chronic unemployment in specified areas of the Nation and, of course, applies directly to the situation in Luzerne County, Pa.

The bill is basically the same as the one passed twice by the Congress heretofore and twice vetoed by President Eisenhower.

The total amount called for is $389.5 million. It provides $100 million in the loan fund for private projects. The period of the loan will be for 25 years; the interest rate will average about 4½ percent, figured on the comparable rates of U.S. Government obligations of the long-range type of 10 years and over, plus one-half of 1 percent divided into one-quarter for administrative purposes and one-quarter for sinking fund generally intended to meet defaulting obligations. There is a second $100 million of loans for areas of underemployment with the term of the loan and the interest rates the same as set up for the loans for private projects. There is a third $100 million earmarked as loans for public facilities such as the development of industrial parks, which I believe, in the Luzerne County area, can be utilized for the filling of mine strippings and abandoned workings to be made suitable for industrial parks as well as acquisition of these sites and other sites to be cleared for industrial parks. This loan section will also include sewers, water lines, and other public utilities essential to industrial development under the strict conditions that have appeared in all former Flood-Douglas legislation.

A third provision is for $75 million, in this case, grants instead of loans, also for public facilities under very rigid restrictions to communities as spelled out in the bill.

The interest rate on the public facility loans is slightly different than on the other loan provision. The public facility interest rate will be computed on the basis of both the long-term and short-term comparable rates of such Government obligations and will come out at about 3¼ to 3½ percent, something like the so-called college rate on college loans.

There is another provision for technical assistance to plan and aid in planning for the depressed area communities, $4½ million annually, and another provision which, in my judgment, is one of the most important in the bill, a $10 million provision to retrain workers in the area and to train unskilled workers to take their places in the new plants and developments or in the expansion of existing facilities in the depressed areas.

I have every reason to believe that the Flood-Douglas bill will be the first of the so-called must bills of President-elect Kennedy's new administration and, I know, this will gladden the hearts of my people of Luzerne County, Pa., who have been hoping and praying for this recognition of Federal responsibility to help our people help themselves and to provide jobs for men who want to work.

Mr. Speaker, the new area redevelopment bill which I introduced today will be today introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who served as chairman of the Task Force on Area Redevelopment, appointed, as you will recall, by President-elect Kennedy. The report was made to Mr. Kennedy, and as the result of that report this bill was prepared. It will be known as House bill No. 5. I will repeat the number, House bill No. 5.

I urge and request that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in sponsoring this bill. You can obtain a copy of the bill at your leisure, but I will be grateful if as soon as possible as many of you as care to will get a copy of this new area redevelopment bill. I repeat, it is H.R. 5.

AMENDING THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I have joined the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] and other Members in introducing legislation to amend the Sugar Act of 1948.

Briefly stated, the legislation would increase by about 250,000 acres the acreage allotment for domestic sugar beet producers, and provide an equitable formula for distributing the additional acreage among growers in old and new growing areas.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is to provide additional acreage for domestic producers of our country.

Under the present legislation, we are, for all practical purposes, barred from expanding acreage.

Even with the removal of acreage controls on sugar beets we cannot look for any expansion. There simply does not exist the refining capacity to handle any additional production in our area.

I believe the permanent changes provided in this legislation will be an incentive for private companies to build new refining capacity. They need assurances of permanency in any changes. After all, they must know their large investments in new plants will not be jeopardized by a reduction of any new domestic acreage allotment to satisfy the demands of some foreign producers.

The Sugar Act expires on March 31 of this year. There is not much time. I hope the Agriculture Committee will get right to work on this difficult problem.

SMALL BUSINESS REPORTS AVAILABLE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the reports issued just recently by the Small Business Committee are now available for distribution to the Members and their constituents. One of these reports is the committee's final report which describes the results of the investigations and studies conducted by the committee during the 86th Congress. It is about 200 pages long but the conclusions and recommendations chapter is quite brief. It lists the committee's 29 recommendations in behalf of small business.

In addition to its final report, the committee has released eight additional reports, each of which deals with a specific type of problem facing small business at this time.

Copies of these eight additional reports are also available to the Members and their constituents. A listing and brief description of each of these eight reports follows:

LIST OF REPORTS IN ADDITION TO THE COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT ISSUED RECENTLY BY HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE NOW AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS AND CONSTITUENTS

I. STATUS OF SMALL BUSINESS IN RETAIL TRADE

This is a staff report which describes how various types of small business retailers are faring in their efforts to compete against the chains. It shows that the chain organizations, and especially the big ones, have increased substantially their share of the total retail market in certain areas of retail trade. In 30 big cities, according to the report, the chains have captured from 80 to 90 percent of all retail business.

The report is highly objective and based upon data obtained within the past 2 or 3 months from the Bureau of the Census. It supplies interesting information concerning many different classes and types of retail trade.

II. CONCENTRATION IN BANKS AND SMALL BUSINESS

A staff report dealing with the transition that has occurred in the commercial banking business in this country from the traditional independently owned unit bank to the present dominance of chain banks and branch banks. It shows that concentration in commercial banking has climbed to a point where the independent unit banks have only about 30 percent of the Nation's total banking deposits and loans. In some States branch banks and holding company banks control more than 90 percent of the total commercial bank resources and loans. According to the report, 65 giant commercial banks control more than 40 percent of the deposits.

This report is highly objective and based upon data prepared within about the past 2

months by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

III. SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY (H. REPT. 2231)

This report describes the competitive climate in which the Nation's small dairies are endeavoring to compete and survive. Pricing practices of the large chain organizations are documented together with other information showing that in many cases these pricing practices are threatening to make it impossible for a locally owned, hometown, small business dairy to remain in business. The report also explains why legislation is needed to afford relief to the hard-pressed independent small business dairy.

IV. THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (H. REPT. NO. 1252)

This report describes and explains the various duties of the agency and points out those areas in which it has discharged these duties in a (1) good, (2) acceptable, and (3) unsatisfactory manner. The report discusses and recommends the type of legislation believed to be needed to assist the agency to perform its various tasks. In the report emphasis is placed upon the new Small Business Investment Act and explains fully how this act can be of great benefit to small business. Part II of the hearings lists the number of loans granted by the agency in each congressional district.

V. PROPRIETARY RIGHTS AND DATA (H. REPT. NO. 2230)

This report provides a constructive discussion of problems associated with the protection of proprietary rights in design, technique, and know-how developed by small business concerns at their own expense. It shows how the procurement regulations of the Department of Defense disregard the proprietary rights in data of the small business concerns. One of the recommendations advanced calls for the creation of an ad hoc committee to revise the procurement regulations.

VI. SMALL BUSINESS IN THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY (H. REPT. NO. 2232)

This document explains the plight of nonintegrated small business fabricators and processors in the aluminum industry. It explains the inequitable price structure between the basic metal and the finished or semifinished product. This alleged price squeeze is described as posing a serious threat to the small business members of this growing industry. The report explains also those problems stemming from the increased amounts of aluminum scrap being exported from the United States. In addition the report discusses the competitive impact felt by small business members of the industry as a result of the sale of molten aluminum to the large automobile manufacturers.

VII. SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN FOOD DISTRIBUTION (H. REPT. NO. 2234)

This report describes the results of a searching investigation and the related series of hearings at which testimony was developed from both small business and big business regarding the retail grocery trade. In the report emphasis is placed upon (1) the buying practices of big chains, (2) the acquisition of food processing plants, meatpacking plants, etc., by the big chains, and (3) legislation needed to remedy the competitive handicaps being faced by the small business members of the industry.

VIII. SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY (H. REPT. NO. 2233)

This two-page report, as approved by the committee, recites that further hearings should be held to resolve the conflicting testimony developed at recent hearings held by the subcommittee. Appended to the report, however, are two statements, one of which describes in some detail the individual views of the subcommittee chairman, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT. The other statement describes fully the personal views of Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, a minority member of the subcommittee. In this form the report deals primarily, and in some detail, with the alleged efforts of the major oil companies to require the lessee-operators of their stations to handle only those brands of tires, batteries, and accessories sponsored by the major oil company. As indicated, the testimony is in conflict but the entire document explores fully the problem presented.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, known in the last Congress as the Forand bill.

I am so strongly convinced of the need for legislation of this type that I felt compelled to introduce Mr. Forand's bill in this session.

The whole question of medical and hospital care has taken on new significance in the light of rapidly increasing costs in this field. I am acquainted with friends and constituents who have suffered chronic illnesses necessitating extended hospitalization, and their entire life savings have been eaten up by these costs.

We are proud of our medical system—the greatest in the world. Our doctors are the most dedicated and among the best. They work under our free system, like nearly everyone else in our economy, and that is the way it should be.

In my humble opinion, the present social security benefits and the present voluntary medical insurance plans, most of which are too costly, cannot adequately discharge the ensuing obligation of providing proper medical and hospital care for most of our senior citizens.

This problem is also beyond the means of local and State governments. Therefore, Congress must consider some action to make certain that our American people will have adequate medical and hospital care without bankrupting themselves. We no longer can ignore the plight of our aged citizenry.

I earnestly hope that appropriate steps will be taken in this Congress to provide the help that is so urgently needed by the majority of our aged population.

BILLS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BILLS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress opened yesterday, January 3, I introduced several bills designed to help small business. They are H.R. 11, H.R. 123, H.R. 124, H.R. 125, and H.R. 127.

AMENDMENT TO ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

H.R. 11 contains the same provisions as a bill carrying that number and introduced by me in the 86th Congress and in the 84th and 85th Congresses. It reaffirms the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated antitrust laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination. It will aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement, strengthen the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act and the protection which it affords to independent business. The Congress reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields.

These objects and purposes would be accomplished through an amendment to the Clayton Antitrust Act so as to provide that any person, partnership, or corporation selling goods, wares, or merchandise in interstate commerce at discriminatory prices would have an absolute defense to a charge that such discriminatory prices violate the Robinson-Patman Act unless the effect of such discriminatory pricing would be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. This legislation has become necessary because the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Standard Oil Company of Indiana* (340 U.S. 231), held that any large firm such as the Standard Oil Company of Indiana is immune from prosecution under our antitrust laws for discriminating in prices, even though the effect of such discriminations destroys small business and creates monopolies, so long as that large firm can show that it was discriminating in price to meet the prices of some small competitor.

SELLERS REQUIRED TO PUBLISH PRICES

H.R. 123 would amend section 2(a) of the Clayton Antitrust Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, to provide for and require sellers of goods, wares, and merchandise in interstate commerce to publish their prices, terms, and conditions of sale. Many of the difficulties now faced by small business firms stem from the practices of certain sellers in granting and extending secret rebates, discounts, and other under-the-table benefits to certain customers in order to divert business from honest, competing small business firms. This practice has been particularly rampant in the sale and distribution of dairy products. House Report No. 2713 in the 85th Congress and House Reports No. 714 and No. 2231 in

the 86th Congress, as made by the Small Business Committee relating to small business problems in the dairy industry, have reported upon and emphasized how this practice of secret rebates, terms, discounts, and conditions of sale are destroying small business firms and creating monopolies to the detriment of producers, small business firms and the consuming public. For example, at page 79 of House Report No. 2231, issued by the House Small Business Committee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, December 22, 1960, is the recommendation of the Small Business Committee that appropriate legislative committees of the Congress consider the recommendations of independent dairymen of proposals for legislation to require publication of prices, discounts, rebates, allowances, commissions, loans and gifts by all sellers. It is believed that this legislation deserves serious and favorable consideration early in this term of the Congress.

CURBS COERCION BY BIG BUYERS

H.R. 124 would amend subsection (f) of section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act so as to make it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to receive, directly or indirectly, a price, payment, allowance, service or facility prohibited by other provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act where the person receiving such prices and payments knows, should know, or has reason to believe that such prices or payments are in violation of these other provisions of the law.

One of the principal provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, as approved June 19, 1936, was the prohibition set forth in subsection (f) of section 2 of that law. It made it unlawful for any of the large buyers to induce or knowingly receive a price discrimination prohibited by other sections of the Robinson-Patman Act. That section of the law had been designed for use as a basis in proceeding against large and powerful buyers who were using their economic power to coerce small and even large sellers into granting them discriminatory pricing benefits not available to other customers. It was thought that this provision of the law would help make effective the Robinson-Patman Act where large buyers were involved and many small sellers had been coerced in violating the act. It was thought that through a few proceedings against the large buyers, much of the problem would be cleaned up. However, the Supreme Court of the United States in 1953 in the case of the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *the Automatic Canteen Co.* (346 U.S. 61), riddled and made ineffective that section of the law by imposing almost impossible burdens of proof upon the Government in proceedings under that section. In view of that no really important cases against large buyers in the food industry have been sustained under that section of the law.

The present bill, H.R. 124, would help remedy this situation by making the enforcement of subsection (f) of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act more effective and more easily enforcible by providing that the Government need only show that the person or firm receiving the discriminatory prices knows, should know, or has reason to believe that the prices, payments, and allowances received are in violation of the law.

SMALL BUSINESS GIVEN RIGHT TO SUE FOR DAMAGES

H.R. 125 would amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies by providing that violations of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws. The Supreme Court of the United States on January 20, 1958, in the case of National Milk Co. against the Carnation Co., and Vance against the Safeway Co., by a 5 to 4 decision, held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is not available to small business firms as a basis for private litigation by them in suits for damages sustained from price discriminations and sales at unreasonably low prices, including those at levels below cost.

An important feature of the bill provides that small business concerns injured as a result of the things forbidden in the bill may proceed to enjoin the practices and sue for treble damages for injuries sustained. Today, small business concerns are not permitted to utilize section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act against monopolistic pricing practices in private litigation (*Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Co.* (U.S. 373) and *Safeway Stores* v. *Vance* (355 U.S. 389)). Hence the first result through the enactment of H.R. 125 would be to remedy that situation.

SALES BELOW COST PROHIBITED

H.R. 127 would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing that sales at unreasonably low prices, particularly those at levels below cost, are unfair methods of competition and in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

At the Federal level, what can be expected under existing provisions of other laws to help protect small business firms from the ravages and the devastation visited upon them as a result of these predatory practices of large, multiple-market operators in selecting first one area and then another in which to sell at prices below cost until all competition in each of such areas is eliminated? One time there was hope that section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act could be relied upon for help in that respect. However, largely because a Federal court in 1919 (see the case of *Sears, Roebuck & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (258 Fed. 307)), held that section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act was not applicable to sales at prices below cost, the Federal Trade Commission since that time has been reluctant to attack the practice unless it was shown to be coupled with a showing of intent to destroy competition. In other words, the Commission now considers that in applying that law to the practice we are discussing requires a standard of proof equivalent to the showing of criminal intent to destroy competition. The Commission and the Department of Justice do not consider that under the existing law they are authorized and empowered to proceed against the practice of selling at prices below cost simply upon the showing that the effects and results are the substantial lessening of competition and tendency to create monopoly.

Many of the States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. The courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. The need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent.

This does not mean that a majority of our States have not tried to do their best to meet this problem. More than 30 of the States have laws on this subject. The statutes in only two or three States have been found to contain defects sufficiently for the courts to hold them invalid. Those in the other States which have been upheld have been applied in a number of instances. Officials of the States understand the need for effective action to meet this problem. For example, the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, in its action on a statute against sales at prices below cost, in 1958, stated:

> Whereas it is the intent of the legislature to prevent the economic destruction of many dairy farmers, dairy plants, ice cream dealers, and resale merchants as a result of discriminatory trade practices by certain business organizations financially strong enough to sell below their own costs for an extended period of time, which presents a situation detrimental to the health, welfare and economy of the people of this State, * * *

The Legislature of Oklahoma, in passing a similar statute, included the following statement:

> Legislative intent. The practice being conducted by many dairy processing, wholesaling, and distributing plants in Oklahoma, in the subsidization of retail dealers, through secret discounts, and the furnishing of equipment is forcing numerous dairy plants out of business, and is a practice which adversely affects the stable economy of Oklahoma. Such practice tends to reduce the price paid to the dairy producer, increase the price paid by the consumer, and is detrimental to welfare of the State.

Early this year, the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado rejected the contention that the Colorado law prohibiting sales at prices below cost was unconstitutional. It held that the terms "cost" and "cost of doing business," are not so indefinite and uncertain within the meaning of the appropriate rule as to provide no basis for the adjudication of rights.

On April 14, 1960, a release from the office of Gov. Foster Furcolo, statehouse, Boston, Mass., with reference to a decision made at that time by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, questioning and invalidating the powers of the Massachusetts Milk Control Commission to absolutely fix the prices at which dairy products are to be sold, made the following statement:

> The question of the milk control commission's powers has been somewhat clarified, but we cannot sit by and see ruinous price

wars destroy the milk dealers, if such price wars are caused by unethical sales below cost. Such price wars inevitably result in monopolies and exorbitant prices to consumers. This has been well established by the Congressional Small Business Subcommittee. We have always maintained that the proper way to end price wars is by proper law enforcement.

Wisconsin's State attorney general, John W. Reynolds, in referring to criminal actions brought by his State under its own law against three large multiunit dairy processors, commented as follows:

There are many who feel that unless the illegal practices of some multiunit dairies can be stopped, most, if not all, of the independent dairies in Wisconsin will eventually be forced to sell out.

Communities which lose their independent dairies end up paying higher prices for milk. Jobs are lost, taxes are lost, and the right and power to make decisions which affect the welfare of that community are transferred to the distant centers where the capital of that industry is controlled.

Thus, we are informed by responsible officials who are members of legislatures, the chief legal officers, and high executives of our State governments, that legislation against the practice of selling at prices below cost is in the public interest. They point out that legislation preventing sales at prices below cost can serve producers, small business firms, and consumers through the preservation of our private competitive enterprise system. The House Small Business Committee on July 27, 1959, in House Report No. 714, 85th Congress, recommended early consideration by the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress of proposals which would, among other things, prohibit price discriminations having the effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly.

The practice of making sales at prices below cost was dramatically brought to light during the course of the hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, under the chairmanship of Hon. TOM STEED, and in hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 on Small Business Problems in the Food Industry, under the chairmanship of Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT. It will be recalled that during these hearings one witness after another, as officials of big business firms, admitted using the great resources of their companies in making sales at prices below cost to the detriment of small business.

The practice continues unabated with devastating effects. Subsequent to the conclusion of the hearings before the House Small Business Committee's Special Committee on Dairy Problems, we received information that the large firms are continuing to make sales at prices below cost to eliminate small business firms. On May 14, 1960, a representative of small business complained to Members of the House that the National Dairy Products Corp.—Sealtest—was selling dairy products in Kentucky at unreasonably low prices, and, in that connection, stated:

The unreasonably low price at which these products are being sold would seem to be for the sole purpose of destroying competition, especially independent dairies such as ourselves. This can be very easily done by a large national concern such as Sealtest who operate in many different geographical localities and are able to finance and subsidize a price war against small dairies who sell in competition.

By using these unfair competitive practices they would in effect force us out of business within 30 to 60 days. Therefore, the urgency for action is of the most importance. We ask that you help us eliminate these unfair practices as quickly as possible by contacting Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, and asking him to supply this information to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.

These charges by representatives of small firms are similar to complaints received from representatives of other small firms doing business in other parts of the country. In some of the areas where the nationwide distributors have gained monopoly control of prices, the public is paying higher prices than those which prevailed before competition was eliminated. Therefore, it should be emphasized that the proposals we are making for legislation have as their principal objective the maintenance of competition. Only through preservation of competition can the public be assured of the low prices provided through competition. Prices representing sales made temporarily at levels below cost provide the public only with temporary advantages. These advantages are paid for by other members of the public at the same time or by the same members of the public at other times. It is for that and the other reasons we are discussing that we favor legislation which would prohibit sales at prices below cost. We are against that monopolistic practice because it leads to monopoly controlled prices at high levels. In other words, by fighting for legislation which would prohibit sales at prices below cost, we are fighting against high prices as the inevitable result of monopoly control.

THE GOLD QUESTION—REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN ADDRESSES THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION; REPRESENTATIVES JOHNSON AND REUSS REPORT ON THEIR STUDY TRIP

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the question of our gold outflow has continued to engage the attention of members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

During November and December 1960, a study trip to the major countries of Western Europe was undertaken by Representative Byron L. Johnson, of Colorado, and myself, as members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to inquire into the problems surrounding our balance of payments and gold outflow. Our report has been made, under date of December 22, 1960, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. In the hope that the report and recommendations will contribute to the discussion of Members concerning this most important subject, the report follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1960.

Subject: Recommendations on our balance of payments and gold outflow.

To: Hon. BRENT SPENCE.

From: BYRON L. JOHNSON and HENRY S. REUSS.

In the past 3 weeks, we have talked to financial and monetary authorities, public and private, in the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. From these talks, we conclude that fundamental confidence in the dollar, and in the potential strength of our economy, is not impaired.

Two extremes are to be avoided. On the one hand, intemperate talk and hysterical action concerning the dollar can only help to provoke a real crisis.

On the other hand, it will not do to regard our balance of payments and gold outflow as mere temporary phenomena, which will right themselves with no effort on our part. While recently public attention has been focused on short-term matters, such as the movement overseas of bank balances and the gold price flurry in London and Zurich, the main problem is a continuous one. Our persistent payments deficit over the last 7 years has been caused by the total size of U.S. capital investment abroad, tourism, and our military and economic aid programs.

In the short run, these payments can be financed by building up the dollar and gold holdings of other nations.[1] In the long run, however, they must be financed out of a surplus in our trade and service account.

If nothing is done, the situation could well get worse rather than better. With full employment at home, and with an increasing consumer taste for imports, our imports could well increase. The initial impact of the Common Market and the European Free Trade Association may well be to erect barriers against American exports to that area. If the current European boom levels off, so would our exports. The gap in productivity between ourselves and other manufacturing countries is considerably narrower than in recent years; thus our exports may encounter increased competition everywhere. Each one of these possibilities could increase our balance-of-payments deficit.

The following recommendations are designed to alleviate this continuing imbalance in our foreign economic relations. Obviously, no effort can be made to strike a perfect balance—the situation is much too fluid for that.

We emphatically do not recommend:

1. That we sacrifice maximum economic growth and maximum employment at home in order to combat balance-of-payments difficulties.

2. That we depart from our policy of an expanding liberalized world trade.

3. That we abdicate our international responsibility for defense and for economic development.

4. That we impose restrictions on American tourism abroad, or on the export of American capital abroad.

5. That we devalue the dollar. Indeed, we should indicate our determination that the value of the dollar be preserved, and accompany this by a broad program of action that will prove that we mean what we say.

---

[1] It should be noted that the U.S. dollar and gold position is still the strongest in the world, and that at least some of our recent dollar and gold outflow has been necessary to improve the reserve position of other nations.

Our recommendations are as follows:

OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

I. On current account

A. Controlling Our Outflow

1. Military commitments and assistance:

Our foreign military posture requires review on its own merits. The domestic budget has always been taken into account; now our foreign balance of payments must be considered, too. Certain questions need to be asked:

Are we relying as fully as we might on the economy of the host country for supporting personnel and services?

Have our troop dispositions been adjusted to changing technologies, and changing world circumstances? Have we examined the effects of our military support policies upon domestic political developments in the host country?

The question of the best organization and financial support for military requirements should be under recurring national and international review in every area of the world where we are committed. Undoubtedly patterns could be developed which would be more efficient and economical on their own merits, and at the same time reduce the pressure on our balance-of-payments position.

West Germany should not be singled out for special treatment. The question is global.

2. Foreign economic aid:

(a) We should step up our efforts, mostly by quiet but firm diplomatic pressure, to get other nations to contribute more than they are contributing today to the development of underdeveloped areas, in both grants and loans. The newly formed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development offers a hopeful vehicle for spreading the developmental burden. Multilateral aid, particularly in areas such as Africa and Latin America, is usually to be preferred over unilateral aid; it tends to be more acceptable to the recipient country, and freer of political opportunism. Moreover, multilateral aid makes easier a clear comparison of the efforts made by each contributor.

(b) So long as a massive balance-of-payments deficit continues, the United States' main contribution may have to be in the form of goods, not in the form of foreign exchange or gold. Thus the Presidential order of November 23, 1960, tying foreign aid purchases wherever possible to American goods, seems justified at the moment. But we should make it very clear that we intend to untie our foreign aid as soon as our balance-of-payments position permits us to do so—in the interest of letting the borrower buy where it is cheapest. This, as our stated position, would help our efforts to induce other countries with balance-of-payments surpluses, which are embarking on foreign aid programs, not to retaliate by tying, but instead to permit their foreign aid purchases to be made in the United States.[2]

3. American tourism overseas:

We should not attempt to curtail our exchange of persons abroad. Two marginal balance of payments points, however, should be made:

(a) The "business expense" deduction under the Federal income tax needs to be tightened so as to disallow frivolous use of the entertainment deduction in any event. To the extent that this curtails offering a tax incentive for American travel abroad, it will help on our balance of payments.

(b) Congress some years ago increased the amount of duty-free purchases which an American abroad may bring home from $200 to $500, in order to diminish the dollar gap. Now that our surplus has become a deficit, we should consider reducing somewhat the $500 amount by further congressional legislation—exempting, however, purchases in countries which are willing to grant a similar exemption to their own nationals on purchases in the United States.

B. Increasing Our Inflow

1. Increasing exports:

Presently, our exports are running at the encouraging rate of more than $20 billion annually. Executive branch projections are for a slight decrease unless further steps are taken. The following steps are strongly recommended:

(a) Vigorous diplomacy at GATT to reduce foreign tariffs generally. Particularly, we must ask the Common Market and EFTA countries to adopt progressively lower external tariffs.[3] The United States in the postwar years has given more than reciprocity in liberalizing trade; it is now entitled to ask for more than reciprocity in return.

(b) Price increases in exports from the United States have been 8 percent since 1953, compared to a decline of 13 percent for Italy, 5 percent for France, and 2 percent for continental Europe as a whole.[4] This suggests that wage-price increases in heavily concentrated United States industries, such as steel, are mainly responsible for our unfavorable export price performance since 1953. Accordingly, we recommend the use of Presidential publicity to attack wage-price increases which are inconsistent with national economic stability. H.R. 6237, a bill to authorize such procedures, was favorably reported out of committee in the House of Representatives in June 1959, but has been denied consideration on the floor by the House Committee on Rules.

(c) A further way of increasing our exports is to accelerate the rate of productivity increase in the United States. Tax reform, with greater depreciation and obsolescence allowances for new plant and equipment, is indicated, with the lost revenue to be recouped by plugging income tax loopholes.

(d) Our American agriculture is potentially the most efficient industry of all. Rather than price ourselves out of the world market by high price supports, it would be advantageous to get prices of export commodities competitive on world markets, and improve the income of the family-sized farmer who practices sound conservation methods by direct production payments.

(e) Offer full cooperation of the executive branch to American industry to determine further steps to be taken to expand our exports on a continuing basis.

2. Increasing tourism:

We can and should vastly increase foreign travel in the United States. Foreigners are now spending around $900 million annually in the United States, compared with the almost $3 billion that American tourists spend abroad. Expanded United States tourism will require reduced travel costs, and very likely a new rate structure for off-peak airloads between Europe and the United States for European travelers. It will require accelerated programs for expanding our national parks and forests, which would be a mecca to Europeans. It will require simplifying our visa and customs restrictions. The bulk of the program should be borne by the private American tourist industry, with particular attention to hotels and to passenger travel by rail, road, and air. It is recommended that a high-level coordinator be appointed by Executive order, to get the program moving at once, and then suggest any needed legislation, which would include a vigorous U.S. Tourist Office.

II. On capital account

A. Controlling Our Outflow

1. Short-term movements:

While we should not become unduly upset by such movements, they should be held to a minimum.

The principal cause of flight of capital, we believe, is diminished confidence in the dollar. This stemmed in part from apprehension concerning the continuing deficit in payments, and in part from statements in the election campaign that Democratic policies would debase the currency. A fiscally sound policy by the new administration designed to create full employment without inflation is the best way to restore confidence in the dollar.

A contributing cause of the recent short-term capital outflow is the discrepancy in short-term interest rates between the United States and Western Europe, principally the United Kingdom and West Germany.[5] The remedy here is to reduce the discrepancy in short-term interest rates on both sides as far as possible without impairing the countries' ability to combat either recession or inflation. Thus we can do our part to narrow the present discrepancy. The doctrinaire insistence by the Federal Reserve System on its "bills usually" policy means that the short-term interest rate in the United States is lower than it would be, and the long-term interest rate higher than it would be, were the Fed to purchase U.S. securities (as it does at a time when it is expanding the money supply, as at present) without regard to maturities. Abandonment of the "bills usually" policy would tend to raise slightly the short-term interest rate, and thus inhibit the flight of short-term capital, while at the same time facilitate, by lower long-term interest rates, needed investment in homes, schools, and business plant, and thus combat our current recession.

As for our European friends, we should attempt—diplomatically—to get them to adopt interest rates as low as will be consistent with their efforts to arrest internal inflation, having in mind that a tight tax and fiscal policy may enable certain of them to adopt lower interest rates than would otherwise be the case.[6]

---

[2] We are gratified at the assurances by West German authorities that their upcoming foreign aid program will be untied.

[3] It has been suggested that the Common Market, with a common external tariff, presents difficulties for American exports much greater than does EFTA, where each member retains its own external tariffs. The use of an average for the Common Market external tariffs will raise tariffs against us by some of our best European customers, such as the Benelux countries and West Germany. The barrier effect of this Common Market external tariff may be accentuated if the high tariff countries such as France and Italy succeed in keeping the Common Market external tariff higher than it would otherwise be. The Common Market will be under constant pressure from its high tariff members to keep the external tariff high. EFTA members, on the other hand, will be under pressure from its successful low tariff members to reduce their tariffs. In the light of our export needs, our evident preference for the Common Market over EFTA may need reexamination. A 13-nation European free trade area, without any raising of tariffs such as occurs under the Common Market, would certainly seem preferable from the standpoint of American exports.

[4] International Financial Statistics, IMF, November 1960. It should be noted that the United Kingdom's percentage increase during this period was 10 percent.

[5] That the discrepancy in interest rates is only a contributing cause is evident from the recent massive short-term capital movement to Switzerland as well, despite the very low Swiss bank rate of 2 percent.

[6] Recent helpful steps toward lower interest rates have been taken by the United Kingdom and Western Germany.

2. Long-term movements:

We should not attempt to limit American foreign investment abroad, except:

(a) No new Federal tax incentives for American foreign investment (except perhaps in underdeveloped areas) seem to be required. Indeed, the long overdue reexamination of our tax structure should inquire into the operation of our present tax provisions for American foreign investment, and for repatriation of earnings. These provisions now encourage aggressive and increasingly unwelcomed U.S. investment in heavily industrialized foreign countries, to the embarrassment of both our balance of payments (we lose exchange both on the original investment and on the failure to repatriate earnings) and of the host country's balance of payments (the capital inflow can be inflationary).

(b) Through diplomatic channels, we should urge those Western European countries where technology is advanced which offer special inducements for new industry, such as remission of local property taxes, or long-term, low-interest governmental loans, to refrain from offering such incentives to runaway American plants.

B. Increasing Our Inflow

1. Through diplomatic channels, we should endeavor to secure the repeal of clogs placed by foreign countries against investment by their nationals in the United States, both with respect to direct investment, and indirect investment by purchasing American securities in the United States.

2. A policy of maximum employment in the United States, plus a growth rate of 4 to 5 percent annually as contrasted with the 2.3 percent growth rate of recent years, will greatly contribute to attracting foreign investment in the United States.

THE GOLD OUTFLOW

I. Converting foreign-held dollar balances into gold

To the extent that foreign central banks keep larger balances in dollars, and convert them less into gold, our gold loss situation is improved. We believe, however, that the best way to induce foreign central bankers to adopt a ratio of gold purchases favorable to us is by vigorously pursuing the substantive measures here recommended. If we pursue them, foreign central bankers will surely want to do their part to maintain confidence in the dollar. Furthermore, since gold earns no interest, but dollar balances do, the maintenance of investor and banker confidence will make possible the reassertion of the desire to earn interest.

II. The 25-percent gold cover

Our present law requiring a 25-percent gold cover on currency and reserve deposits tends to immobilize almost two-thirds of our present gold supply. This restricts our gold reserve for international claims, and may act as an incentive for foreign central banks to convert dollar balances into gold. Since American citizens are forbidden to acquire monetary gold in any event, the gold cover law has limited meaning. Its repeal at an appropriate time would be generally welcomed abroad by responsible monetary authorities, as a method of expanding our gold reserves against international claims, and thus helping to maintain confidence in the dollar. Recently, officials of at least two important New York banks have publicly concurred.

As a practical matter, the administration should review our future domestic and foreign needs for gold, and submit to Congress its recommendations for legislation in this field. The timing of the change should be geared to significant accomplishment in improving our international payments position. We should be acting from a position of strength, so that modification or repeal of the gold cover law is not a substitute for more constructive steps, but is only a further step to improve international confidence. Otherwise, there could be panicky misinterpretation of the action.

The action would benefit the international trade position of the United States, for it would be under less strain as the supply of gold for international payments is increased. Our main trading partners, whose cooperation is essential if our goals are to be achieved, also benefit from the increased assurance of our capacity to honor all claims.

III. Treasury action and the price of gold

Flurries in the price of gold in the London and Zurich markets, such as the recent ones, hurt confidence in the dollar all out of proportion to their volume. The best way to prevent future flurries is by pursuing a balance of payments-gold outflow action program such as that here recommended.

But such a program should include an affirmation by the administration that it will not hesitate, in the event of another flurry, to use its legal powers to sell gold. We have confidence in the dollar. We should not hesitate to bet on it publicly and promptly.

GOVERNMENTAL MACHINERY FOR SUPERVISING BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Our current balance of payment troubles suggest that a continuing review of our international payments be centralized in one place within the executive branch. Apparently, no one is currently responsible for this vital task. It is a responsibility long since assumed by other countries more accustomed than we to living with balance of payment problems. We recommend that responsibility for a continuing review of payment problems be centralized, perhaps in the Director of the Budget (who now supervises our flow of appropriations and revenues), or in the Secretary of the Treasury (working with the National Advisory Council), in order to help coordinate the affairs of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Commerce, Agriculture, the International Cooperation Administration, the Federal Reserve System, the Council of Economic Advisers, and others.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], also a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, made an important speech on the subject of gold to the evening meeting of the National and State Bank Divisions, American Bankers Association, at the Mayflower Hotel, Chinese Room, Washington, D.C., on December 5, 1960. The text of his speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, two questions very much in the public mind today are, of course, the gold question and the question whether the incoming President will assume all of the executive powers, or only those powers which can be exercised without respect to monetary policies.

The pleasant aspect of talking with you about gold is that this is a subject on which everybody is manifestly an expert. Everybody makes proposals, and the diversity of the proposals being made is exhilarating, to say the least. On the subject of gold, a cat can look at a king, so perhaps a politician can amuse a distinguished gathering of bankers.

Last week Mr. Henry Alexander made a suggestion, at your meeting in Florida, that Federal law be amended to do away with any requirement that the Government store some quantity of gold in fixed proportion to the Federal Reserve's currency and deposit liabilities. Such an action would make available an additional $12 billion of gold for dollar sales to foreign central banks, over and above the quantities already available for this purpose.

It is fortunate that this suggestion has come from so distinguished a banker as the chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. I am sure that it will receive careful consideration in Congress. The proposal will have my support, for what that may be worth. It is to be hoped that whether or not this proposal is accepted, we can find ways of bringing about a better distribution of the gold reserves among the Western nations and having the other nations share, on a continuing basis, more of the interest losses which holding the gold entails.

As you well know, the fractional gold requirement was never anything more than a psychological nest egg, and one which we never really needed. When this requirement was being proposed, in 1935, the House Committee on Banking and Currency naturally sought the views of the late Senator Robert L. Owen, one of the chief architects of the Federal Reserve Act, and a man whose banking experience then covered a span of 42 years. When asked what he thought of the requirement then being proposed, Senator Owen said, "I think it is a joke. * * * We do not need any gold behind our money."[1]

Senator Owen then added what we all know, which is that the value of the dollar rests, not on gold, but on the fact that it is the money of a great industrial nation. It will buy all kinds of goods and services, including gold, and including also the energy sources which will do the work formerly assigned to man and beast. By law, the dollar is good for the payment of debts and taxes, and that is backing enough.

During these past 25 years, gold has not only been sterilized from our money; it has also been sterilized from our thinking. In this period, our citizens could not exchange their dollars for gold, and would not have done so if they could have. In brief, we have demonstrated to everybody's satisfaction that the dollar is not on the gold standard, but gold is on the dollar standard.

In truth, our practical experience on this matter runs for a great deal more than 25 years. At no time in the several centuries past has any Western nation had a quantity of gold, or silver—or any other commodity—with which to convert more than a minute fraction of its money in circulation at the time. In these centuries, commercial bankers in the Western World have been creating money against pledges of all varieties of valuable assets—business inventories, productive machinery, consumer durables, and all other kinds of real wealth. The results have been most fortunate for all concerned.

Furthermore, the present fractional gold requirement does not serve to limit the expansion of our money supply—nor should it. We are agreed, I think, that the money supply must be decided on the basis of what seems appropriate to the volume of goods and services being produced and distributed—not on the basis of the quantity of any one commodity which we happen to have stored away.

The recent outflow of our gold is, of course, a symptom of some bad economic policies which should be, and must be, corrected.

On the other hand, I cannot, for the life of me, understand the reasoning which leads to the suggestion that our balance-of-payments situation has suddenly reached a crisis, or that it calls for hysterical measures. Such things as summoning the National Security Council to Augusta, ordering home the families of our troops abroad, and urgent missions to the governments of Europe, all create the impression that our Government is a great deal more concerned about its gold hoard than it has any right to be.

---

[1] Banking Act of 1935, hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 5357, pp. 559–560.

These dramatic and highly publicized moves will have very little effect on our balance of payments. On the other hand, they will have a temporary effect of undermining confidence in the dollar, thus causing foreigners to use their dollar holdings to purchase more of our gold than they otherwise would. This result, while evidently not intended, seems all to the good. We could wish, however, that the same result could have been brought about without causing hardships to the families of our military personnel. Frankly, I hope that the President's order will be carefully reconsidered.

The United States still holds about half the Western World's monetary gold. At the same time, we are paying to foreign holders of dollars a tremendous interest bill. Indeed, we are paying out about $400 million a year in interest charges to foreigners just on their holdings of Federal debt obligations. This is no small item in our balance-of-payments deficit. Foreign central banks wishing to exchange their interest-bearing dollar claims for gold should be encouraged to do so.

It occurs to me that in the new Congress one of the appropriate committees—perhaps the Joint Economic Committee—should explore the feasibility of adopting some method of settling international balances of payments which will make less use of gold. Considering the world problems with which we are faced, isn't it time to ask whether the nations of the Western World cannot, collectively, wean themselves away from faith in gold, just as most of these nations have already done individually in the conduct of their domestic affairs?

It would be distressing to see this great industrial Nation, blessed as it is with resources and know-how of all kinds, paralyzed in both its domestic and foreign policies by a resurgence of the ancient superstitions about gold. Why should any Western nation suffer convulsive fears of losing some of its store of metal which is in great surplus relative to any foreseeable economic use? So far, there are no signs that the requirements of the space age will place any large demand on gold.

There are signs, however, that if we continue our gold support policy, sooner or later we will be laying ourselves open to mischief from the Soviets.

There is every reason to think that we will win our contest with the Communist bloc if the contest continues, as it should, on the basis of production of real wealth. We would not like, however, to be forced into a position of having to put more of our productive resources into gold mining, simply because the Soviets might decide to put more of their resources into such a venture. Nor would we like the contest decided by the accidents of nature which may have placed greater quantities of this relatively useless metal on one part of the globe than the other. What the commercial price of gold would be if governments did not purchase half of the annual production at the artificially fixed floor price, and bury these quantities away, we cannot, of course, be sure. Some authorities estimate that the price presently fixed at $35 an ounce is about four times the true commercial price. Nor can we appraise the reports of the newly discovered gold field in Russia, but this could well prove to be one of the historic gold strikes.

In any case, let us ask ourselves this question: Is it wise to adhere to a policy which could enable the Communist countries to add to their productive equipment, possibly by as much as a billion dollars annually? Does it make sense to help the Sino-Soviet bloc obtain from the Western nations particular kinds of capital equipment which they could not obtain except for the fact that we support the price of Russian gold?

Is it wise to adhere to a gold policy which deters us from building up our own capital equipment? One suggestion for correcting our balance of payments which does not seem debatable is that we adopt policies to speed up modernization of our productive facilities and thus reduce costs. Where, then, will the incentives to modernize come from if we are to continue monetary policies which are at least halfway aimed at preserving our gold hoard?

By the traditional prescription of Lombard Street, when a nation is losing gold, the appropriate action for its central bank to take is to raise interest rates. According to the theory, increased interest rates will depress business and bring down prices, thus increasing exports and reducing imports. One might guess that the Federal Reserve policy we are witnessing today is one caught halfway between the theory of the past and the reality of the present. It is a policy which leaves us on dead center. It is neither preserving the gold, on the one hand, nor, on the other hand, is it permitting the modernization needed to correct the causes of the gold outflow.

Let us contemplate for a moment the possibility of pursuing the theory wholeheartedly, and we see what has been wrong all along with monetary policies as an instrument of economic regulation. Manifestly, the supposed efficacy of these policies hinges on a 19th century conception of the price system. Prices must be very sensitive to changes in supply and demand, much like the prices of farm products in an auction market, and wages must go up and down accordingly.

Obviously, this is not the kind of world in which we live. I suspect that you find that even in the banking business your lending rates are somewhat tardy in responding to changes in the supply and demand for credit.

Certainly, monetary policies have been given an exhaustive test during these past several years and the test has not demonstrated much success for these policies. Quite aside from human errors in timing, the monetary weapon has proved to be highly selective in its impact, and it has hit practically every target except those at which it has been aimed.

It is thus that the Federal Reserve authorities have not only overruled, at times, general policies adopted by the Congress and the President; they have, on occasions, vetoed specific programs adopted by the Congress and agreed to by the President. Laws have been enacted which were intended to make relatively more credit available to small business. Simultaneously, the Federal Reserve has pursued policies which resulted in relatively less credit for small business. Laws have been enacted to stimulate homebuilding. Simultaneously, monetary policies have been adopted which retarded homebuilding.

This raises a question whether those who entertain an ambition that we will have, practically speaking, two governments in the new administration, ought not to take a serious second look at that ambition. An independent Federal Reserve going in one direction, and the duly elected, constitutional Government going in the other direction, can lead only to chaos and a weakening of our position in world affairs.

Arguments for an independent Federal Reserve, deciding monetary policies without responsibility to, or coordination with, the rest of the Government seem to me to miss the mark by a wide margin.

In the first place, the Federal Reserve's powers are not great enough to checkmate the elected Government, assuming the elected Government actually did wish to embark on a program of inflation.

Second, the ancient banker notion of a populace clamoring for a raid on the Public Treasury and pressuring elected officials for inflationary actions to cancel out the debt which the debtor classes owe the creditor classes is at considerable odds with the mid-20th century.

It would be hard to find a practicing politician today who does not know that more votes are to be lost than gained by inflation. Indeed, the public has been willing to accept the high-interest policy of recent years, with its attendant redistribution of the income and high unemployment, only because popular and trusted leaders have assured the public that this policy is necessary to avoid inflation.

If important spending measures have been enacted despite frantic warnings of inflation, one of the reasons is that those who have appointed themselves spokesmen for the sound dollar have pitched their case on the proposition that we cannot have a stable dollar without large-scale unemployment, amounting to 4, 5—or as now—6 percent of the labor force, and perhaps more.

In short, the public and the Congress have been offered a choice between an unsound dollar and an unsound economic system. The voters in my part of the country, at least, are not persuaded that the economic system is so unsound as has been suggested.

Incidentally, there is a legal point which might be considered a minor detail in some quarters. It is that the Federal Reserve's authority to decide monetary policies has evidently been acquired through divine right, as this authority has never been given the system by any legislative enactment.

You may recall that the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 adopted what is sometimes called the full convertibility theory. This was the day of the 6-day workweek when bigger factories, taller skyscrapers, longer ocean liners, and bigger and better amounts of everything were waiting to be built. Conservatives of the day told auto drivers to get a horse, but there was then no thought that we might produce too much.

The idea that economic activity should be restrained by conscious manipulations of the money supply is a much newer idea than the 1913 Federal Reserve Act. This act anticipated that the money supply would be automatically determined by the amount of economic activity taking place. Member banks were to obtain whatever credit was required to meet the needs of industry and commerce, through advances and discounts of eligible paper with the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

Furthermore, in the compromise of the controversy over public versus private management of the system, the member banks were given the privilege of selecting the managements of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, but the management of the Reserve banks were not given control over the discount rate. This control was lodged in the Board of Governors.

The Federal Open Market Committee was first set up on an informal basis. It was sanctioned by law in 1933 and again authorized as it exists today by the more general revision of the act made in 1935. Yet even in 1935, it was not anticipated that a consciously determined money supply would replace an automatic money supply. Nor was it anticipated that open market operations would replace discount window activities and that practical control over interest rates would thus pass from the Board to the Open Market Committee.

The revised Federal Reserve Act contains no such terms as "monetary policy," or "monetary controls." It is devoid of any reasonably clear inference that monetary policies, as we understand the term, are to be used as a means of economic regulation, or even as a means of trying to stabilize prices.

It is Congress' prerogative to delegate its monetary powers, without doubt, either to the executive branch or to an independent

agency. But the Supreme Court has generally held unconstitutional enactments making other grants of the legislative powers where Congress has failed to spell out objectives and limitations to govern the use of these powers. There seems no doubt that if a legal challenge were ever raised to the Federal Reserve's monetary policies the courts would hold them unconstitutional.

Legal authority for "monetary policies," in the modern sense of the term, exists only in the Employment Act of 1946, not in the Federal Reserve Act. The 1946 act declares that it shall be a continuing responsibility of the Government "to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources" to the ends stated in the act. As House author of the Employment Act of 1946, it was my understanding that "to coordinate and utilize" all of the Government's "plans, functions, and resources" necessarily meant including the resources of the money system and the Government's plans and functions relative thereto. Indeed, monetary and other Government policies were coordinated at the time, and it seemed a foregone conclusion that they would continue so.

In any case, the language of the statute seems clear enough. Neither the Federal Reserve Board nor the Open Market Committee has the authority for determining monetary policy. The Chief Executive has the authority; and he has the responsibility, under article II of the Constitution, to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

How the President will carry out this responsibility is, of course, left to his judgment. Normally, however, we would expect the President to appoint a committee made up of the Cabinet officers and other top officials who are most concerned with fiscal, debt management, and monetary problems, as well as with overall economic policies, to recommend monetary policies to the President and carry out such monetary policies as he may direct. I would hope that such a committee would include the Secretaries of Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, the Budget Director, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, as well as Federal Reserve officers.

Like all the other regulatory boards and commissions, the Federal Reserve has certain quasi-judicial powers and duties, and the decisions reached under these powers are reviewable only by the courts. But deciding monetary policies is not among these powers.

As I said at the beginning, a cat can look at kings and it has been my hope that a politician might amuse bankers.

LESS THAN HONORABLE DISCHARGE BILL

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because inquiry was made of me on yesterday and today by Members as to whether or not I was going to file again in this 87th Congress the text of H.R. 88, which was passed unanimously by this House during the 86th Congress dealing with the subject of less than honorable discharges, I desire to state and give notice that I will file said bill on Friday, next. The text and content will be exactly the same as that of H.R. 88 which passed this House unanimously during the 86th Congress.

A bill was filed by me on this subject on January 3, 1961. But, by inadvertence, some language was contained therein which I had not intended to include. Because the House adjourned so promptly today, January 4, 1961, my secretary did not have time to make the corrections and prepare the revised bill in time for me to file it on January 4.

Therefore, to you, distinguished colleagues who have asked about it and expressed desire to file exactly the same bill as mine in your own names, although I cannot file it until Friday next, because the House will not be in session until Friday and I cannot tell you what the number thereof will be, I cordially invite you to take the same bill, as hereinafter set forth, and file it in your own names and join in a vigorous, meritorious effort in this 87th Congress to have this statutory provision enacted into law. This bill is intended to be for the benefit of several thousands of American veterans who have been administratively discharged for comparatively minor offenses while in the military; and yet, who have since receiving said less than honorable discharges without ever appearing before a court-martial, made outstandingly good in civilian life and achieved exemplary conduct for a period of more than 3 years. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they have found to their own sadness, and the sadness of their families and loved ones, and the community in which they live, that such less than honorable discharge received for such comparatively minor offenses while in the military have been like a stone around their necks and have made them economic liabilities without a chance to obtain dignified employment.

The Doyle bill, H.R. 88, in the 86th Congress, having passed the House unanimously reached the Armed Services Committee of the other body, and I can report that the chairman of that distinguished committee, I believe, has expressed vigorous and live interest in the merits thereof if such bill reaches that committee again.

The text of my corrected bill, which I will file on Friday next, is as follows:

A BILL TO AMEND CHAPTER 79 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE THAT CERTAIN BOARDS ESTABLISHED THEREUNDER SHALL GIVE CONSIDERATION TO SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE RELATING TO GOOD CHARACTER AND EXEMPLARY CONDUCT IN CIVILIAN LIFE AFTER DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL IN DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT TO CORRECT CERTAIN DISCHARGES AND DISMISSALS; TO AUTHORIZE THE AWARD OF AN EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATE; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1552 is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Under uniform procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of any military department, acting through boards of civilians of the executive part of that military department, may correct any military record of that department when he considers it necessary to correct any error or remove an injustice.";

(B) by adding the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): "When it considers the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this sentence, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board shall take into consideration the reasons for the type of that discharge or dismissal, including—

"(1) the conditions prevailing at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal;

"(2) the age of the person at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal;

"(3) the normal punishment that might have been adjudged had that incident, statement, attitude, or act occurred or been made in civilian life; and

"(4) the moral turpitude, if any, involved in the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal."; and

(C) by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(g) In the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this subsection, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board may, with the approval of the Secretary concerned, issue to that person an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date it is issued, if, after considering the reasons for that discharge or dismissal, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of subsection (a), it is established to the satisfaction of the board that he has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years.

"(h) Applications and reapplications for correction of records under subsection (g) may be filed at any time, but not before three years after that discharge or dismissal.

"(i) For the purposes of subsection (g), oral or written evidence, or both, may be used, including—

"(1) a notarized statement from the chief law enforcement officer of the town, city, or county in which the applicant resides, attesting to his general reputation so far as police and court records are concerned;

"(2) a notarized statement from his employer, if employed, attesting to his general reputation and employment record;

"(3) notarized statements from not less than five persons, attesting that they have personally known him for at least three years as a person of good reputation and exemplary conduct, and the extent of personal contact they have had with him; and

"(4) such independent investigation as the board may make.

"(j) No benefits under any laws of the United States (including those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under subsection (g) unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal. Except as otherwise provided in this section or section 1553 of this title, no Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate may be issued except under subsection (g), and after a specific finding by the board that it is issued under that subsection.

"(k) The Secretary of Defense for the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under subsection (g), and the

number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued under that subsection."

(2) Section 1553 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1553. Review of discharge or dismissal

"(a) The Secretary concerned shall, after consulting with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, establish boards of review, each consisting of five members, to review, under uniform procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of a military department, the discharge or dismissal of any former member of an armed force under the jurisdiction of his department upon its own motion or upon the request of such former member, or if he is dead, his surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative.

"(b) A board established under this section may, subject to review by the Secretary concerned, change a discharge or dismissal, or issue a new discharge, to reflect its findings.

"(c) A review by a board established under this section shall be based on the records of the armed force concerned and such other evidence as may be presented to the board, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(a) of this title. A witness may present evidence to such a board in person or by affidavit. A person who requests a review under this section may appear before such a board in person or by counsel or an accredited representative of an organization recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 59 of title 38.

"(d) In the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this subsection, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board may, with the approval of the Secretary concerned, issue to that person an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date it is issued, if after considering the reasons for that discharge or dismissal, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(a) of this title, it is established to the satisfaction of the board that he has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years.

"(e) Applications and reapplications for correction of records under subsection (d) may be filed at any time, but not before three years after that discharge or dismissal.

"(f) For the purposes of subsection (d), oral or written evidence, or both, may be used, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(i) of this title.

"(g) No benefits under any laws of the United States (including those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under subsection (d) unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal. Except as otherwise provided in this section or section 1552 of this title, no Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate may be issued except under subsection (d), and after a specific finding by the board that it is issued under that subsection.

"(h) The Secretary of Defense for the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under subsection (d), and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued under that subsection."

SEVERING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH CUBA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 185 years ago a courageous group of men signed their names to a document that stands as an indestructible monument to the courage and fortitude of the American people. And in that Declaration of Independence the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were called inalienable rights and "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

Mr. Speaker, at long last the President of the United States has seen fit, and properly so, to sever diplomatic relations with the modern-day Blackbeard, Fidel Castro.

I discussed in the House of Representatives, on June 25, 1960, the onrush of communism on the island of Cuba.

Previously, in the summer of 1958, I said that Fidel Castro was either a Communist, Communist-inspired, or the tool of the Communists.

Now, 2 years later, and within 90 miles of our own shores, we are confronted with Soviet-built equipment, Soviet-manned airfields, Soviet-trained technicians, and a Communist-trained Cuban Government dedicated to the concept that America must be eliminated as the leader of the free world.

To paraphrase the Cicero of ancient Rome, I say now, and I measure my words carefully—Castro must be destroyed. He must be destroyed, and all that he stands for must be blotted from the Western Hemisphere.

Certainly we have little cause to criticize other nations for Communist infiltration where there is a mote in our own eye.

Cuba stands as an insult to American prestige, a challenge to American dignity and a glaring refutation of our ability to constrain communism in its rampant march for world domination.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment President Eisenhower for his latest move in regard to Cuba, but I would be less than candid if I did not say that it comes very late in the season.

As far as I am concerned, we reached the limit to what the United States, in self-respect, could endure the day that bearded dictator seized American property in a country that was conceived by America, delivered by America, nurtured by America, educated by America and made a self-governing nation by America.

When ingratitude on the part of a nation reaches the point that it has in Cuba, it is time for American wrath to display itself in no uncertain terms.

And let us not be lulled into the complacent thought that this is simply a Castro-sponsored government. Someone beside Castro is supporting these diatribes that are emanating each day from the Pearl of the Caribbean.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not be too quick to forgive and forget when Castro finally receives his just reward.

I hope we will remember those who had the courage to throw the scoundrel out of Cuba, but I also hope that in our efforts to help those who overthrow Castro we do not adopt a massive forgive and forget general amnesty for those who have welcomed the initiation of communism in Cuba.

There are many Cuban refugees now in the United States. These are the men and women who forsook their native land, their occupations, and worldly possessions, to live in freedom in America. They represent the Cuba we once knew.

This is the Cuba that we should now recognize.

This is the Cuba that will bring about the demise of Fidel Castro and communism in the Western Hemisphere.

But if we continue to turn the other cheek to this depraved idiot who now rules Cuba with an iron fist, we shall only find the situation going from bad to worse. If we are so weak as to fear Russian retaliation when we clean the trash out of our own backyard, then we no longer deserve to live as a free nation.

I would rather see this Nation go down in defeat in one mighty blow rather than suffer the agonies of Communist cancer, which most assuredly will engulf the Nation if Cuba is allowed to fester as the cell from which this cancerous growth will spread.

Let us lance this pestiferous boil now by helping in every tangible and intangible way those Cuban nationals who represent the true Cuba, and who are willing and anxious to return to their native land to once again enjoy the inalienable rights of man that we vested in them in 1898.

A PERMANENT ORPHANS ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1957, the Congress enacted the first orphans immigration law. This act provided for the issuance, on a temporary basis, of special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans who had been, or were to be, adopted by a married American citizen.

Since that time the Congress has twice extended that act on a yearly basis.

Under the provisions of the Orphans Act over 6,000 orphans have been admitted to the United States. Many of them left backgrounds of deprivation and destitution to find refuge in the American homes of their adoptive parents. Some had been left homeless and friendless by the death or desertion of both their natural parents; others had only one remaining parent who, burdened by illness or poverty, was unable to give them proper care and attention. Because of the provisions of the Orphans Act they were all able to find new homes and a new future in the United States.

I can think of no provision of our immigration law which was more humanitarian in concept or more rewarding in practice than this Orphans Act of 1957, which has given fresh hope to so many homeless children. I believe it is time we put this law on a permanent basis.

The present system whereby Congress, in the last rushed days of the session, moves to extend the act for one additional year, is haphazard, uncertain, and unnecessary. Only last June, I was approached by a family which wished to adopt an orphan child in Poland; I had to advise that family that the applicable law was due to expire in a few weeks, and that unless Congress extended the law past June 30, 1960, there was no possibility of issuing the child a nonquota visa. Fortunately, we acted just before that date to extend the act for yet another year.

Where a law has proved as meritorious as this one has, I see no point in proceeding in this ad hoc manner. The Orphans Act was originally passed on a temporary basis because it was not then known how well it would work out in practice. The act has since passed its period of probation with flying colors, as is well demonstrated by the fact that the Congress has seen fit to extend its provisions with consistent regularity.

I believe we should make the Orphans Act a permament part of our immigration law, and I am therefore introducing a bill for this purpose today.

THE FORGOTTEN CITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at least two-thirds of our population live today in urban areas. Rapidly increasing urbanization has brought with it a host of new problems which were unknown and unheard of by our rural ancestors. These problems have become too vast and too complex to be dealt with on the municipal level; they cross local and State lines and are truly national in scope and implication.

Although a number of Federal programs have evolved in response to some of the most pressing urban needs, our urban population is seriously underrepresented in the Federal Government. There is no central activity to which urban needs can be presented, at which they can be evaluated and assessed, and for which long-term solutions can be developed. There is no central agency to coordinate these pressing problems or to insist that they receive the attention they require from the Federal Government.

The obvious answer is one which has been made many times during the last decade: The establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs. I am introducing a bill for this purpose today in the hope that this long-overdue step will yet be taken during the current session of Congress.

Under my proposal, the new Department would undertake to deal with the whole gamut of urban problems: Elimination of blight, problems of mass transportation, solutions to air and water pollution, water supply, and others.

All the functions of the various agencies concerned with housing and urban renewal would be transferred to the new Department.

Incorporated in this Department, also, would be the interests of the consumer, who now has no spokesman anywhere in the executive department and who now often loses out in comparison with other, more fairly represented groups. A vital function of the Secretary of Urban Affairs, in my opinion, would be to press for greater consumer recognition in the competing activities and policies of the Federal Government.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks in the RECORD in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce two bills—one to repeal section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the so-called motor-carrier agricultural commodities exemption, and the second to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend to the railroads a condition exemption from economic regulation comparable to that provided for motor carriers when engaged in the transportation of ordinary livestock, fish, or agricultural commodities.

It will be seen immediately that these bills embody objectives that directly clash with one another. They are intended to do so. And I offer them not to confuse my colleagues but to give you a clear choice as to which path to choose in eliminating a grave inequality of treatment as between different modes of transportation which exists in the present law.

These bills are being introduced because it is believed that this exemption from regulation has been extended far beyond its original and only justifiable purpose, which was to help the farmer by exempting from economic regulation the initial movement of his products from the farm to the first market.

Because of the steady broadening of this exemption to include even factory processed products moving in commercial channels, regulated carriers such as the railroads find themselves severely handicapped in competing for traffic in agricultural commodities. Their rates are rigidly controlled and are required to be openly published, while the rates of exempt motor carrier haulers are not subject to any control and need not be made public. The regulated carriers thus have no clear idea of the kind of competition that they are up against—though the exempt hauler precisely knows. As a consequence, large, and ever-growing volumes of important traffic have been diverted to exempt carriers. And the impact on the Nation's basic carrier—the railroads—grew more and more serious as the courts expanded still further the scope of this exemption.

Proposals to remedy this situation have been advanced by a number of public interests, including the Interstate Commerce Commission and various shipper groups. These suggestions were discussed during the course of hearings conducted in 1958 by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As a result the Transportation Act of 1958 included a provision which amended that section 203(b)(6) to halt further expansion of the exemption and to return to economic regulation the transportation of frozen fruits and vegetables and imported agricultural commodites.

This was constructive action. But it was only one short step forward. While the 1958 amendment presumably has halted further significant expansion of the agricultural commodities exemption list, the widespread diversion of traffic in products already exempted from regulated carriers to exempt carriers continues.

There are two ways to resolve this intolerable, unequal competition. One is to repeal the exemption outright and allow the traffic by all carriers to be regulated equally. The other is to extend to the railroads the same kind of exemption from economic regulation now granted exempt motor carriers now engaged in the transportation of ordinary livestock, fish, or agricultural commodities. I offer separate bills to accomplish each of these objectives.

I originally entered these two bills during the 2d session of the 86th Congress; however, no action was taken. Since that time the situation has become more critical. The loss of weekly carloadings to regulated carriers has increased unemployment. In the railroad industry alone at the end of 1960, employment has dropped below 800,000, which is the lowest ever experienced.

I shall ask the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to schedule early hearings on this legislation and I urge that the House of Representatives give these proposals every consideration in the interest of establishing conditions of fairplay and equal opportunity for all transport competitors.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no more important issue will come before this Congress than the matter of fiscal responsibility. We are fast reaching a point where there will simply be no additional sources to tap for revenue to run the Government. Congress must face up to this problem and adopt whatever means necessary to control spending while, at the same time, making it possible to perform the necessary functions of government. Spending must be controlled. We must live within our means. This is just commonsense.

In former Congresses it has been my privilege to introduce a bill to force a yearly balanced budget and I do so again now. I cannot predict what the progress of the bill will be through the House, but I can predict financial disaster for our country unless we take concrete steps to hold down inflation, protect the solvency of the dollar, and make it possible to give tax relief to our people. This bill would accomplish these purposes. This bill in no way endangers national defense, nor those necessary services which the Government must render the people. It does provide the means by which much conspicuous waste and unnecessary spending may be eliminated. Short of war, or national emergency, this bill forbids Congress to spend more money in any fiscal year than it anticipates taking in.

It is as simple as that. It is doing as a Government what we must do as individuals and as families—just live within our income.

The bill does not limit spending as such. If Congress wants to appropriate more money than the Government expects to receive in taxes, this amendment would not allow Congress to adjourn until it levied the additional taxes necessary to provide the money. It is a much more honest approach to our fiscal problems than by spending without regard to income and then passing the burden on to future generations.

I believe in a balanced budget. I hope the incoming administration believes in a balanced budget. To prevent any administrators from yielding to the temptation of deficit spending in order to impress voters, this bill should be passed. Administration programs may then be planned according to what we can properly expect to be able to pay and the people will know exactly what their Government is costing them because the bills will be paid every year.

I hope my colleagues will share my concern with fiscal responsibility and will join in this move to have a forced balanced budget as a constitutional amendment.

COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958 I introduced into the 85th Congress a proposal for Federal assistance to the States to expand community junior colleges. The response to my proposal from educators and college administrators across the country, as well as from others concerned with this vital field of higher education, was extremely gratifying. Early in the 86th Congress, I again introduced this proposal and I was very pleased that the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee found time in its busy schedule to have 1 day of hearings on the proposal. The response of these able members to my proposal was encouraging. Yesterday, I again introduced for the consideration of my colleagues this proposal to provide a 5-year program of assistance to the States in expanding their community junior college facilities.

The 2-year college movement is growing faster than any other branch of U.S. education. It has been estimated that more than 750,000 young men and women and adults are currently receiving training in the liberal arts and technology at 677 such junior colleges. Dr. James B. Conant has called for a very considerable number of 2-year community colleges so that advanced education may be widely available throughout the Nation. It is because I share Dr. Conant's concern that advanced training be more widely available to our young people and because I agree with him that community junior colleges furnish an important means of achieving that goal, that I continue to press for Federal action in this field.

Junior colleges are not a replacement for 4-year colleges, nor are they the only answer to our educational needs. They are, however, an important part of the answer in my opinion. Community colleges are generally economical to attend, being located close to the homes of their students and having, as a rule, moderate tuition fees. They are responsive to local needs and provide a flexible but thorough program of studies. Through their adult study programs they furnish an important opportunity for continuing education.

Junior colleges help to ease the pressure on our 4-year institutions, but the more important point, in my estimation, is that they encourage more of the Nation's high school graduates to pursue further education. They furnish training beyond the high school level to thousands of young people who would not otherwise receive it. Junior colleges thus make educational opportunity more democratic and result in the greater utilization of that most fundamental resource, the human mind.

The bill which I have introduced would provide financial assistance to participating States for the initial establishment and the expansion of existing community junior colleges. It combines a flat grant with a matching fund grant, the latter to be allocated among the various States on the basis of their secondary school enrollment—which is a measure of the need for higher education facilities. No issue of Federal control is involved since participating States will plan the program of expansion for their own junior college systems. The bill requires that consideration be given to areas remote geographically from other State colleges and universities and exhibiting a desire for junior college facilities together with an effort commensurate with their financial abilities. Within these broad guidelines, the planning of the program would rest with the States. Naturally, the actual administration of the colleges established would continue to be in accordance with the laws of each State.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this proposal to my colleagues. It is a sound proposal in an area which is, I know, of vital concern to all of us: education in the United States in the challenging years ahead. I sincerely hope that further hearings on this measure can be scheduled in this Congress and that full consideration will result in action along the lines I have outlined in my bill. It is, I believe, a good bill and it represents a sound and forward-looking concept. I seek constructive consideration of my proposal and hope that the 87th Congress will act upon it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from a recent edition of Look magazine to be made a part of my remarks. It answers a number of frequently raised questions about junior colleges and I believe that my colleagues will find it of interest:

[From Look, Dec. 6, 1960]

WHO SHOULD GO TO JUNIOR COLLEGE?—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE FASTEST-GROWING BRANCH OF U.S. EDUCATION

As our college-age population explodes, the junior college becomes more and more the best hope for higher education of many high-school graduates in the 1960's.

The 2-year-college movement is growing faster than any other branch of U.S. education. Right now, 677 2-year colleges—both private, independent institutions like Christian College and the so-called "community colleges"—are educating more than 750,000 young men and women and adults in the liberal arts and technology. More than $650 million in public and private funds has been invested in them. And their number is likely to continue growing.

Dr. James B. Conant has called for a "very considerable number of 2-year community colleges so that advanced education may be widely available throughout the Nation." All this should encourage parents and high-school students to consider the junior college as an alternative to the senior-college admissions rat race, and inspire young people who might not otherwise go to college to look into the junior college in or near their local community. (If there isn't one, they might well ask their elders why.)

Still, the notion that junior-college education is second best, if not second rate, persists in many parts of the country. The following questions and answers clarify some misconceptions:

What is a junior college? It is an institution of higher learning, usually covering 2 years, whose tuition can be as high (Christian College tuition is $1,900) or as low (many community colleges are free) as tuition at a 4-year college. Faculty, facilities, and student bodies can, and often do, compare favorably with many senior colleges at the freshman-sophomore level. The size of junior colleges, in general, is often thought to be small, but some of them are incredibly big—Long Beach City (junior) College in California has about 40,000 students. Thus, junior colleges can only be defined in terms of the services offered to students. And these services are what parents and students should consider in deciding whether or not a junior college meets their needs.

What services do junior colleges provide? First, junior colleges provide general education for high school graduates who want 2 additional years and no more.

Second, junior colleges provide the equivalent of freshman and sophomore liberal arts education for high school graduates who intend to transfer into the third year of senior college and work for bachelor's degrees.

(Community colleges, which now educate the bulk of our junior college students, also make a valuable contribution to adult education in many localities. Moreover, some junior colleges offer 3-year nursing courses, and others provide 1-year business curriculums.)

Who are the terminal students? The young man who seeks a semiprofessional career, and the young woman who frankly states that marriage is her ultimate goal, will find that junior college can provide a rewarding general education after high school. Besides, the courses at many junior colleges are designed so that a terminal student can change his mind and decide to become a transfer student.

The technological demands of industry in the sixties and beyond can only increase. The young man who expects to take advantage of the demand will find that junior college training can be invaluable.

For young women, junior college offers preparation for careers, community service and marriage, as well as laying the groundwork for continuing study in a chosen field when their children are grown.

There are emotional benefits for terminal students too. Junior colleges award degrees—associate in arts, associate in science, etc.—and give students the pleasure of a graduation that can be shared with family and friends. Compare this to the experience of the student who drops out of a senior college after 2 years—for work or marriage—and who often has little to show for his efforts.

Who are the transfer students? Young people who benefit from a guided transition into senior college work are perhaps the core of the junior college movement. They are often, as President Kenneth Freeman of Christian College describes them, "the academically talented who might not otherwise go to college." Some are, like Patti O'Berg, in search of direction and feel they have a better chance to find themselves in the atmosphere of the junior college. Many from lower-income families take advantage of low tuition rates at community colleges and the opportunity to live at home; their savings in 2 years enable them to go away to school for their degrees. Others turn to the junior college as a last resort, having used poor strategy in applying to senior colleges and hoping to make a record that will open the doors in the third year.

In general, what are the advantages for both terminal and transfer students? Two years well spent at a junior colleeg can help mature a youth, enabling him to handle a job or a university situation that he might otherwise fumble. Those who are undecided about careers may find that the counseling services of junior colleges are often superior to those at senior colleges or that are otherwise available in the community.

What are the advantages for the U.S. system of higher education? In educating transfer students, the junior colleges assume some of the burdens of the 4-year colleges. They help to relieve pressures that afflict university faculties and facilities by sending on students with a strong foundation for doing good work in their third and fourth years, while weeding out those who would drop out by the third year anyway.

Many 2-year graduates develop leadership qualities and a sense of responsibility that make them more valuable citizens of the senior-college campus. Many, during their junior-college life, go through the agonizing appraisal of their lifetime goals and are ready, when they arrive at the 4-year institution, to move ahead more decisively.

How good are the junior colleges? In many 2-year institutions, the student has a real advantage over his peers in some of the smaller colleges and State universities. Small 4-year colleges often have less funds than junior colleges to maintain adequate faculties for freshmen and sophomores. (Of course, there is a shortage of well-trained teachers almost everywhere.) State universities, on the other hand, often use inexperienced instructors to teach the lower classes. Many junior colleges, however, hire only teachers with master's degrees, which results in their students having better teachers sooner than their counterparts in 4-year schools.

The relative academic equality of junior colleges with universities at the freshman-sophomore level has been indicated by studies in California (where nearly half of all junior-college students are enrolled), Minnesota and other States. In 1953, 50,000 students were graduated from junior colleges in California. Of those who went on to the University of California, 4,800 could have entered as freshmen, but chose the junior-college experience instead. When they were graduated from the university, their grade-point average was higher than that of the students who had attended the university for 4 years. Some 7,200, who would not have been eligible as freshmen, also entered at the junior year. Over 80 percent were graduated, and their grade-point average was a respectable C-plus.

Who should go to junior college? Anyone whose needs can be fulfilled by at least 2 years of education beyond high school. The junior college is a place where young people can make intelligent decisions about the future. More and more students are seeking its advantages. Perhaps it is an omen that last year Christian College had 1,500 applicants for its freshman class of 250. Community colleges are crowded too. Unless Dr. Conant's plea for more 2-year colleges is answered, the question may soon be not who should go, but, once again, how to get in.

MASON DAM PROJECT

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to a project of particular importance to my district. I also introduced yesterday a bill to authorize the construction and operation of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project in Baker County, Oreg. I take this opportunity to comment briefly on this important project.

The proposal embodied in this bill has been under study for amost 30 years. It has the strongest local support and interest and the Bureau of Reclamation is currently preparing its report on the proposal. I confidently expect that the Secretary of the Interior will recommend to the President favorably on it at an early date and that this favorable report will be in the hands of the Congress early in this session.

The irrigation features of the project will furnish water for a total of about 18,000 acres. In addition, the projected 100,000 acre-feet of storage will provide substantial flood control benefits, important recreational benefits, and improved fish and wildlife conditions. The proposed 180-foot rock and earth-fill Mason Dam will provide sufficient storage for complete control of the Powder River and will be a major step toward comprehensive development of the valley. The project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.24 to 1. My bill provides that the portion of the irrigation costs which are not within the financial ability of the water-users to repay within a 50-year period will be met from surplus power revenues from the Bonneville system.

As I have indicated, the people in the Baker Valley have been working for this project a long time. It is of great importance to their economy and its supporters are understandably anxious to see their years of effort and waiting bear fruit. It is a worthwhile project and fully consonant with our established and traditional policies of resource development on multiple-purpose lines. I commend the proposal to the consideration of my colleagues in the House and urge that early and favorable consideration be given to this measure.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of my bill as a part of my remarks, and that similarly, the following letters of support from local people be made a part of the RECORD:

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE UPPER DIVISION OF THE BAKER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of providing irrigation water, controlling floods, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and providing recreational benefits, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation

laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon. The principal works of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir, pumping plants, and related facilities.

SEC. 2. The period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U.S.C. 485h), for repayment of the construction cost properly chargeable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by irrigators, may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of any development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block or to as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable repayment plan as is provided therein. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within the repayment period determined under the provisions of this section shall be returned to the reclamation fund from net revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration, which are over and above those required to meet any present obligations assigned for repayment from such net revenues.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the upper division of the Baker project, to construct minimum basic public recreation facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate State or local agency or organization. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works authorized by this Act as he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661–666c, inclusive), and the portion of the construction costs allocated to these purposes and to flood control, together with an appropriate share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs therefor, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Before the works are transferred to an irrigation water user's organization for care, operation, and maintenance, the organization shall have agreed to operate them in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to achieving the fish and wildlife benefits, and to return the works to the United States for care, operation, and maintenance in the event of failure to comply with the requirements to achieve such benefits.

(c) The works authorized in this Act shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSED UPPER DIVISION IRRIGATION PROJECT

Baker County's Soil Conservation District supervisors representing the four districts encompassing the entire land area favor the immediate development of the upper division irrigation project with the construction of Mason Dam on Powder River. This facility will provide a reservoir for water storage extending water supplies season long for irrigation of 20,000 acres of agricultural lands located in Baker Valley. This project will not contribute to the production of surplus crops nor will it provide irrigation water for land not now irrigated.

This development contains all of the multiple use principles of resource development. It contains in addition to irrigation, flood control, recreation, domestic, game and wildlife uses.

The dam is located high in the drainage system and will contribute to the principle of controlled stream flows.

We therefore request your support and urge you to extend your efforts to secure this much needed water resource development.

WILLIAM H. TRINDLE,
Chairman, Baker Valley Soil Conservation District.
WALTER SHAMWAY,
Chairman, Burnt River Soil Conservation District.
W. W. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Keating Soil Conservation District.
JOHN M. MCCORMICK,
Chairman, Eagle Valley Soil Conservation District.

BAKER, OREG., *February 19, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The city of Baker believing that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

PAUL R. REVIS,
City Manager.

BAKER JAYCEES,
Baker, Oreg., February 16, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Baker Junior Chamber of Commerce believing that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclammation reports.

Very truly yours,
KEITH A. STUBBLEFIELD,
Secretary.

POWDER RIVER SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
Baker, Oreg., February 16, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Powder River Sportsmen's Club, Inc., believing that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing it's construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT C. WICKAM,
President.

ANTHONY LAKES POST 3048,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 15, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, State of Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Anthony Lakes Post 3048, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States, believing the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

Very truly yours,
WALTER C. MCGUIRK,
Post Commander.

BAKER, OREG., *February 12, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT ULLMAN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you use influence to secure authorization Baker Valley project. Project will not add to surplus crops. Will contribute much toward strengthening overall economy. Benefits will extend water supplies for irrigation of forage and pasture crops to season-long basis utilized by beef cattle and sheep. Will also control spring floods this area.

LEROY C. WRIGHT,
Secretary, Baker County Livestock Association.

BAKER, OREG., *February 12, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Baker County Retail Credit Association, a local organization, represents 90 leading Baker merchants. This group believes that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be a great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

RUSSELL L. BRADEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Baker County Retail Credit Association.

BAKER, OREG., *February 12, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I feel that the Mason Dam will benefit Baker County and the State at large by providing needed irrigation, drainage, and flood control. I fully recommend it.

RIVES WALLER.

BAKER, OREG., *February 12, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT ULLMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: We hope you will be able to secure passage of the bill to build the Mason Dam. Nothing could happen in Baker County that would add as much to the economy of the farmers under the project or to the county as a whole over a long period of time as furnishing full supply of water to land within the district.

For many years past all water for irrigation is completely gone by July 1. That leaves 70 days of our best growing season without any water. The flood control feature of this project will be of great benefit, not only to the lands under the Baker Valley Irrigation District but land under the Thief Valley project. Two to three years out of every five, flood waters stand on large portions of the farmlands 1 to 3 feet deep and from 1 to 3 weeks at a time, doing thousands of dollars damage to crops. This water coverage kills all clovers and other good grasses, and only leaves the sour-water grasses which are very low in protein.

As you know our project is not one that will grow surplus crops. Practically all farm income in the valley comes from livestock, hay, and pasture. There are not to exceed 300 to 400 acres of wheat grown on the project. That is grown on a rotation plan and would only be in wheat every fourth or fifth year.

The project will not face problems experienced by many new projects where they are

unable to finance themselves until they get started. These landowners have their buildings and livestock and are going concerns.

You must have had several letters by this time from various groups in Baker and Baker County favoring the project, as some 20 different groups and organizations have volunteered their desire to go along with the building of the dam.

Practically all groups are participating, including banks, merchants associations, civic clubs, county court, in fact everyone is taking an active part in the project.

The Baker Production Credit Association has furnished funds to 90 percent of the land owners under the project for their annual operation expenses for the past twenty five years. They have always liquidated their obligations. Not one of them has defaulted. They are deserving people and are entitled to stored water from Mason Dam.

We hope you will be able to get an appropriation as well as approval of the project.

Thanking you for your assistance in the matter we are,

Respectfully yours,

F. A. PHILLIPS,
President, Baker Production Credit Association.

BAKER, OREG., *February 11, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Baker Lions Club believing that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE E. COOK,
Secretary, Baker Lions Club.

CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC UTILITIES CO.,
Baker, Oreg., February 11, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: We have been informed by Mr. F. A. Phillips, chairman of the irrigation committee for the Baker County Chamber of Commerce, that the proposed Mason Dam has been approved by the Bureau of Reclamation at Boise and Denver and is now before the Commissioner of Reclamation at Washington, D.C.

We urge that you do everything possible to get the project approved this session of Congress.

This irrigation project will not only be beneficial to the farmers of Baker Valley but will improve the economy of our entire area.

Yours truly,

L. G. GRAY,
District Manager.

BAKER, OREG., *February 9, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Baker Rotary Club believing that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

GEORGE W. GWILLIAM,
President, Baker Rotary Club.

BAKER COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Baker, Oreg., February 9, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: It is the understanding of the merchants committee of the Baker County Chamber of Commerce that legislation is being considered in the form of a bill which you will introduce into the House, authorizing construction of the Mason Dam in Baker County.

We know of no one project which would do more for the city and county of Baker than this dam.

We understand this project, according to bill being drafted by you and the Bureau of Reclamation, would receive power revenue from either McNary or John Day Dam, which would make it feasible from the standpoint of payment by the farmers coming under the project.

We urge your continued effort in the passage of this bill, and that you work toward an appropriation for the building of Mason Dam.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD KIRBY,
Chairman, Retail Merchants Committee.

BAKER, OREG., *February 8, 1960.*

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Representative, Second Congressional District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: We have been advised that your office is drafting a bill for the authoriation of the Baker Valley project. We are delighted to hear that this legislation has a chance of being considered by the present Congress and wish to advise that if you need any assistance from this board in furnishing information or other help, please advise us.

Very truly yours,

BAKER VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
CONRAD ALLEN.
CLYDE WARD.
CHAS. M. CAETON.

BAKER KIWANIS CLUB,
PACIFIC NORTHWEST, DIVISION NO. 17,
Baker, Oreg., February 8, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The Baker Kiwanis Club by vote of its directors believes that the construction of the Mason Dam on the Powder River in Baker County will be of great benefit to the entire county and State, and urges you to use your best efforts to introduce legislation authorizing its construction in accordance with Bureau of Reclamation reports.

Yours very truly,

LYLE L. BARE, *President.*

KEATING, OREG., *February 6, 1960.*

Representative AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: The Lower Powder Irrigation District would like to go on record as heartily favoring the Mason Dam and Baker Valley project.

As you already know, we suffer a great deal of flood damage in lower Powder every spring. The submerging of our meadows for so prolonged a period has killed out the clovers and more palatable grasses until many of the meadows are of doubtful value either for hay or pasture. The main canals are often broken or filled. As the flood ebbs the fields are littered with debris and unwanted silt. All of this plus erosion adds to a large sum over a period of years. There is no question that the Mason Dam would be of great help in controlling this damage.

With Baker Valley irrigated, we would also derive benefit from their waste waters, supplemental water in late summer for our present storage system.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. WEBER,
President Lower Powder Irrigation District.

BAKER, OREG., *February 5, 1960.*

Hon. ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: The county court of Baker County believes that the construction of the Mason Dam on Powder River in Baker County will be beneficial to our economy. This will bring a greater production to some 19,000 acres, thereby increasing the tax basis of our county. We, therefore, urge you to introduce legislation to authorize the construction of the Mason Dam.

Sincerely,

BAKER COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON,
LLOYD REA,
County Judge.
R. M. PHIPPS,
County Commissioner.
GILL C. WRIGHT,
County Commissioner.

PANAMA FLAG OVER CANAL ZONE RAISES CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, when addressing this body on August 31, 1960, about the San José Conference of American States, which had been attended by Secretary of State Herter and Foreign Minister Moreno, of Panama, I expressed the following view:

That the minute this Congress adjourns sine die there will be an Executive order issued by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State to permit the Republic of Panama to fly its flag * * * over the Panama Canal Zone.

On two previous occasions, June 25 and 28, I had made this same prediction.

Were these prophecies fulfilled? It is indeed a barren satisfaction to state that they were and under circumstances that are incredible, and with which you no doubt are familiar. Nevertheless, the facts bear repetition.

On September 17, 1960, a day officially designated as Constitution Day, the President, on advice of the Department of State and against the mandates of the Congress, signed an Executive order authorizing the formal display of the Panama flag at one place in the Canal Zone as visual evidence of Panamanian titular sovereignty over the zone.

The people of the United States were truly shocked at this symbolic surrender of our position of exclusive sovereignty over the constitutionally acquired territory of the Canal Zone. Not only that, hundreds of our citizens from various parts of the Nation and abroad have written strongly worded criticisms of the flag-raising order to the President, the Secretary of State, and to Members of the Congress, both House and Senate. Moreover, many of the writers have sent me copies of their letters.

As any competent student of the subject could foresee, this ill-advised surrender to mob-dictated demands in Panama has not had the desired effect of ending anti-U.S. agitations in Panama or elsewhere, but rather just the opposite.

In Panama, it has been taken as a complete reversal of the U.S. position on the question of sovereignty and as formal recognition of Panamanian basic sovereignty over the Canal Zone; also, as supplying a lever for wringing additional future concessions of major character from the United States.

In other countries, it has made the United States a diplomatic laughing stock. It encouraged Premier Castro of Cuba in his arrogant demands for possession of our naval base at Guantanamo and forced our Government to take precautionary defense measures.

These measures, Mr. Speaker, included the planting of mine fields around the naval base, increase of its garrison, and establishment of a strong Caribbean naval patrol force.

When one ponders recent Caribbean events in the perspective now possible and in the light of clarifications made to the Congress over a period of years, it is truly tragic that our Government failed to take a definite stand on the Panama situation, which has been simmering since 1956.

As it now stands, Mr. Speaker, the precedent set on September 17, 1960, in defiance of officially expressed views of the Congress, raises constitutional issues of the gravest importance for the future conduct of our foreign policy and the rights of our people to govern themselves without dictatorship.

In addition, the President's action on September 17 brings up the question of the identity of the influences that led him to sign the flag-raising order against the wishes of the Congress and view of important elements in the Defense and other executive departments.

So far the persons responsible have not been determined but a start has been made on this task in the form of an inquiry by the Committee on Government Operations into subversive activity in the State Department. This inquiry, Mr. Speaker, should be pressed with vigor until the situation in that Department is fully clarified, the influences identified, and corrective actions taken.

In this connection, let me now repeat what I have so often said on this floor: that the exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone conferred by treaty on the United States was in nowise a coercive action but was deemed and found to be absolutely necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal by the United States. What has been true for more than half a century of canal history must likewise prove true so long as the United States continues to exercise the responsibility of maintaining, operating, and protecting the canal. A divided or diluted sovereignty would bring utter confusion and chaos. This may be the goal sought by communistic influences but can never be the desire or purpose of the free nations of the world.

Because of their bearing on the situation, three of my press releases, September 21, October 5, and December 3, 1960, are quoted as parts of my remarks:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1960.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, commenting on President Eisenhower's order authorizing the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Panama Canal Zone, made the following statement in Washington today:

"The voluntary and unilateral action of President Eisenhower on September 17, 1960, on the eve of Premier Khrushchev's arrival, in ordering the flag of Panama to be flown with the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone is a disregard of the limits of the President's power under our law and of the rights of our people to govern themselves without dictatorship. The chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, as quoted from his home in New Hampshire, was surprised and deeply shocked and saw 'absolutely no valid reason for the flag-flying order.'

"It is a cowardly yielding on the part of the Executive to the pressure of mob rule in Panama comparable to hoisting the Soviet flag on U.S. territory. The ill-advised step, taken with the hope of placating Panamanian radicals, can only incite them to increase their demands. Furthermore, it is a contemptuous defiance of the Congress and a flagrant ignoring of the advice of the executive departments most directly concerned with the heavy responsibilities of maintaining, operating, and protecting the Panama Canal, the lifeline of our country.

"The Congress has been long aware of the fact that subversive influences are in control of important areas in our Department of State. It is the gradual growth and spread of this subversive influence that has alarmed the Congress.

"The Communist-inspired demand that the Panama flag be flown in the Canal Zone was designed to appeal to emotional nationalism of Panamanian radicals. It has had that effect.

"Associated Press dispatches from Havana, dated September 20, 1960, make it clear that Acting Prime Minister of Cuba, Raul Castro, notorious Communist brother of Prime Minister Fidel Castro, who is now at the United Nations in New York with other Red leaders, declared: 'It is within our possibilities in a determined moment to reclaim that piece of our national territory, the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay in eastern Cuba.' This is the first effect of the chain reaction set in motion with the President's authorization on Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

"Now we have here the case of one man without the power of any authority taking an action which is in betrayal of the vital interests of our Nation in defiance of the expressed will of the people. Thus, we have one more example of the spread of the power of these subversive influences.

"It is especially to be noted that the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, in the Gross amendment, provided that no part of the Department of Commerce appropriations should be used for the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

"In addition, the House of Representatives, on February 2, 1960, in House Concurrent Resolution 459 passed by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, took the stand that acceding to Panamanian demands for display of the Panama flag in the Zone would be a 'major departure from established policy' and 'should not be accomplished through Executive fiat' but 'only pursuant to treaty.' (See H. Rept. 2218, 86th Cong., Aug. 31, 1960.)

"The use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone was granted by Panama in the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Canal Convention to the United States 'in perpetuity' in order to induce the United States to construct the Panama Canal and to undertake its perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection. As a further inducement, the 1903 Convention granted all the rights, power, and authority within the zone which the United States would possess and exercise as if it were sovereign. Moreover, this Convention, by specific terms, provided for the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority.

"It is inconsistent with the sovereign powers of any nation to fly the flag of another nation under duress or pressure. The extortionate demands upon the United States do not come from the fine citizens of Panama who are noted for their high sense of honor and restraint in dealing with the rights of others, but has been fanned by well-trained agents of international Communist influences as part of a general corrupting program to tear down the moral fiber of all free nations.

"In this connection, we should recognize that an inexcusable policy of compromise and placation has made our Canal Zone the tinderbox of the Caribbean. We are dealing with a Soviet-organized plan for conquest of the Caribbean, which has the Panama Canal as its key objective. Such conquest by the Soviets would be but a prelude to their intended conquest of the United States.

"The situation presented by the President's order, which, in effect, will aid and abet these subversive influences toward their prime target, represents a challenge to the sovereign people of the United States and their Congress that must be met if our Nation is to remain independent and its people are to remain free.

"The President's order has lifted the lid to a Pandora's box. After having acceded to mob rule demands in 1959 and 1960, what answer shall we give to further demands for concessions not supported by treaty? Also our failure to stand up now for our undiluted sovereignty in the Canal Zone when the issue is clear cut, opens the door to the final loss of the Panama Canal through the machinations of these international forces.

"As an example, the following is a quotation as translated from the front page of the Panamanian newspaper, La Hora, of September 12, 1960:

" 'We will not rest in our struggle toward our sovereignty over the Canal Zone, that is a fact, real and unquestionable, and it shall be full and effective in all of its multiple aspects such as the fiscal, the juridical, the political, and the economic, and at the same time we demand that our flag shall fly in the Canal Zone as a juridical symbol of that sovereignty, and that the Republic be recognized as participating equally and justly in the profits of the canal, one who has all of the right as one of the two nations who made its construction possible.'

"Certainly, the timing of the President's order immediately prior to the arrival in this country of prominent Communist leaders for conferences has a significance that is most impressive as emphasizing a surrender of national pride and a jesture of yielding to dedicated enemies of our system of government.

"This feverish surrender by Mr. Eisenhower bodes ill for the administration's standing up for America in the face of Khrushchev and the other heads of Communist governments in the coming weeks. The congressional inquiries into subversive activities in the Department of State, which are now under way, should be pressed with increased vigor to the end that these influences may be identified and corrective actions taken by the Congress to repudiate the President's ill-advised action of surrender. I appeal to the people of the

United States to make their views on this crucial issue known to their Senators and Representatives."

OCTOBER 5, 1960.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said today that the recent addresses by Soviet Premier Khrushchev and Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro before the United Nations General Assembly "are powerful appeals for world revolution, tending to obscure the crucial situation in the Caribbean."

FLOOD stated that the program for Communist conquest of that strategic portion of the Western Hemisphere, with the Panama Canal as its key target, "is well advanced."

"Cuba is a Soviet satellite, Venezuela a beachhead for subversion, and the Panama flag is flying in the Canal Zone with agitations already started in Panama for additional concessions," FLOOD emphasized.

"It is indeed strange that the President of the United States, when authorizing display of the Panama flag over the Zone, chose Constitution Day (September 17, 1960) as the occasion for issuing his unconstitutional flag display order, counter to mandates of the Congress," FLOOD pointed out.

"Since that ill-advised action by the President, the situation in the Caribbean has continued to deteriorate with a submarine base under construction at Cayo Largo in Cuba, and Soviet technicians and organizers arriving in alarming numbers in the Republic of Haiti, just as they did in Cuba prior to the Communist takeover of that island country.

"As stated by me to the House of Representatives on August 26, 1960, Soviet China and the Kremlin have already selected and indoctrinated their candidates for supreme power in Haiti and the adjoining Dominican Republic. The last, which is strongly anti-Communist, is now under political attack by leftist Latin-American governments and the United States, creating a far more serious dilemma.

"The grave questions facing Haiti and the Dominican Republic will be solved through the aid of friendly representative governments or we shall have two more Castros installed and two new staging areas for subversion and an all-out assault on the Panama Canal.

"The international conspiratorial plan is clear: It is encirclement of the Caribbean by pro-Communist governments as a prelude to the intended conquest of the United States.

"While the people of the United States must not relax in respect to the grave situation of the Congo they should also focus on matters closer at home in the Caribbean. I appeal to our people to make known their views on Caribbean and isthmian questions in the strongest possible terms to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress and to the President."

DECEMBER 3, 1960.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), a member of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations and one of the Nation's leading authorities on Caribbean policy questions, warned today that unless this country takes drastic countermeasures to stem the Communist-led drive by Castro's Cuba in Central and South America, the United States "may find the Red-dominated areas extended to the borders of the Panama Canal," the vital waterway which the United States operates and controls, under treaty, in perpetuity.

FLOOD is considered by his colleagues to be the foremost congressional defender of this Nation's sovereign position in the Canal Zone, and has repeatedly sounded the warning that our position at Panama is becoming steadily and increasingly weakened because, he has said, "we have not stood firm and have continuously made concessions to the radical elements in Panama which we should not have made."

FLOOD's formal statement on the crisis in the Caribbean follows:

"The action of the Navy Department, on orders of the President, in establishing a Caribbean patrol force has attracted national attention to what has become a fourth front of the international Communist conspiracy against the United States.

"It is fortunate for all nations of the Western Hemisphere that Presidents Ydigoras of Guatemala, Somoza of Nicaragua, and Chiari of Panama, are keenly aware of the perils of the Communist beachhead in Cuba and are courageous defenders of their countries against Bolshevist invasions.

"President Somoza has recently warned that the United States should take heed of the Red threat in Central America if our Government does not wish to find the borders of Communist-dominated areas extended to the banks of the Panama Canal.

"Current revolutionary operations in Guatemala and Nicaragua, hatched in Fidel Castro's Cuba on orders from Moscow to subvert Central American governments, are the first phase in a program for isthmian conquest.

"The final objectives of this program are twofold: (1) A large-scale Communist invasion of Panamanian territory from Costa Rica and, (2) provocation of intervention in Panama by U.S. forces now protecting the Panama Canal.

"All of these developments are inevitable consequences of the President's opening a Pandora's box of diplomatic difficulties when, on September 17, 1960, under pressure of communistic-inspired demands of radicals in Panama, and in a contemptuous defiance of mandates of the Congress, he directed the formal raising of the Panama flag over our constitutionally acquired Canal Zone territory.

"This notorious action in striking the flag of the United States, taken on advice of the State Department, has aided and abetted the subversive forces behind the current program for Caribbean conquest. In this, the Panama Canal has long been the prime target of Bolshevist attack.

"The difficulties in the Caribbean, now erupting violently in Venezuela, are following the well-established pattern of Castro-Kremlin intervention in Latin-American affairs. Because of this they raise serious questions as to the identity and extent of the subversive influences in the State Department responsible for the long-continued failures in our Caribbean policies.

"The mounting gravity of the situation, which has already required the strengthening of our defenses at Guantanamo Bay and other measures, demands that our people should be fully alerted to the possibility of dramatic events. We should remember the *Maine*, sunk in Havana Harbor by external explosion obviously in an effort to involve the United States in a war with Spain, and take forthright countermeasures.

"I appeal to our people to write their views on Caribbean and isthmian questions in the strongest possible terms to their Senators and Representatives, urging full inquiry into the subversive influences in our Government that must be held accountable for the deplorable situation that now exists."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Monday, next.

Mr. ULLMAN, to address the House for 10 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), to address the House for 30 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT.

At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the following Members were granted permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. CELLER.

(At the request of Mr. NELSEN, and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. KEITH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Friday, January 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

185. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the approporiation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance," for the fiscal year 1961, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

186. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement," for the fiscal year 1961, had been reapportioned indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for increased pay costs, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

187. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

188. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tirbunals"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

190. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

191. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of Air Force, transmitting the U.S. Air Force Flying Pay Report for the 6-month period March 1 through August 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

192. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes,' approved March 1, 1899, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

193. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

194. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

195. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 4, 1925"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

196. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

197. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 1, 1906, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

198. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

199. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "An act to authorize payment to the Government of the Philippines"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

200. A letter from the Deputy Coordinator for Mutual Security, Department of State, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1960 on changes in the mutual security program from the program presented for approval to the Congress, pursuant to section 513 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

201. A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greeley, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

203. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 24, 1948, which establishes special requirements governing the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

205. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

206. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes"; to the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs.

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

209. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

210. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 26th annual report to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting an interim report, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 657, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

212. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

213. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report entitled "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid Systems," pursuant to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended by section 2 of the act approved August 28, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

214. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting copies of certificates of ascertainment, pursuant to section 6, title 3, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 1724. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1725. A bill to establish a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of loyalty and allegiance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 1728. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 1729. A bill to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the admissions tax in the case of events for the benefit of a society for the prevention of cruelty to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend section 6, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1733. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1734. A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1735. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1736. A bill to extend further the periods during which elections may be made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 by active members of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1737. A bill to amend section 302 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 with respect to the method of foreclosure of mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 1738. A bill to create a body corporate known as Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that certain individuals entitled to an annuity thereunder shall receive an increased annuity if they have a child in care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1740. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 1741. A bill to designate the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans., as the Willard J. Breidenthal Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1743. A bill providing for the design of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1744. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1745. A bill to control the future expansion of bank holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1746. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare, posthospital treatment program for drug addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend the Elkins Act, as amended, to prohibit expressly rebates to oil pipeline shipper-owners by the payment of dividends; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to strengthen the effectiveness of the Federal Communications Commission in assuring that broadcast licensees, filing renewal applications, continue to operate in accordance with the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1749. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 1750. A bill to increase from $600 to $900 the income tax exemption allowed each taxpayer, each dependent, and $1,200 for a dependent child (until said dependent reaches 24 years of age) while attending any accredited business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in providing rental housing specially tailored to the needs of elderly persons under a program which is separate and distinct from the regular rental housing program contained in section 207 of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1752. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 25 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1754. A bill to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1755. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, to provide for a determination of whether certain sites, buildings, or other objects are of national historical significance, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for highway purposes which damage or destroy national historical sites, buildings, or other objects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1756. A bill to provide that compensation of an individual for services performed while engaged in commerce, or as an officer or employee of the United States, shall be subject to State and local income taxes only in the State and political subdivision in which such individual is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1758. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1759. A bill to provide a 1-year moratorium on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortages, with the Federal Government assuming the required mortgage payments (both principal and interest) for mortgagors in economically depressed areas who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1760. A bill to amend section 744 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran has paid in premiums an amount equal to or greater than the face value of a policy of U.S. Government life insurance, the policy of such insurance shall be paid up; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H. R. 1761. A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1762. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1763. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, certain portions of shoreline areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1764. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 1766. A bill to amend section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of an additional allowance to certain physicians assigned to duty at Veterans' Administration facilities where it is difficult to recruit or retain physicians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 1767. A bill to extend and amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance for individually owned units in a multifamily structure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1768. A bill to convey certain properties to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 1769. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the retirement of the public debt by setting aside the first 5 percent of the budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year for the sole purpose of retirement of obligations counted as part of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1771. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1772. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 1773. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements relating to understanding the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1775. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1776. A bill to provide for the gathering, evaluation, and dissemination of information, and for the formulation of plans, which will aid in the maintenance of a high level of prosperity in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 1777. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the counterfeiting of State obligations in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1778. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war, national disaster, emergency, or economic depression, and to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1780. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1781. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 1782. A bill to adjust the retirement benefits of certain retired district judges for the district of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1783. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances to judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1784. A bill to provide that the people of Guam shall be represented by a Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1785. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1787. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to provide insurance against volcanic eruption damage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1789. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1790. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to eliminate the distinctions in such act with respect to dependent and nondependent husbands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1792. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, or in Hawaii; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1793. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1794. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Hawaii and to the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1795. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $200,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1796. A bill to provide a method of regulating and fixing wage rates for ungraded employees in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1797. A bill to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1798. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make real estate mortgage loans on leased lands in Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available under such acts to persons holding leasehold interests in lands in the State of Hawaii and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a price-support program for coffee produced in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1801. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1802. A bill to authorize the use of air carriers to facilitate the expeditious transportation of first-class mail to and from Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1803. A bill to provide a price support program for coffee produced in the State of Hawaii based upon a moving 5-year average of the prices received by the producers of such coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1804. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to restore to certain veterans in Alaska or Hawaii the right to receive hospital care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 1805. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit corporations to qualify as real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 1807. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 1808. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1809. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 1810. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 1811. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1812. A bill to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1813. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 so as to extend in certain cases the provisions of such section which provide salary protection in cases involving downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1814. A bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1815. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 1816. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 1817. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1818. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1820. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 1821. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 1822. A bill to adjust the amount of funds available for farm operating loans made pursuant to section 21(b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 1823. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to extend to the railroads a conditional exemption from economic regulation comparable to that provided for motor carriers engaged in the transportation of ordinary livestock, fish, or agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1824. A bill to provide for the economic regulation of certain motor vehicles

heretofore conditionally exempt therefrom under the provisions of section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 1825. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 1826. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 1827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 1828. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 1829. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to $1,000 for 1959 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1830. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1831. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 1832. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 1834. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits and wildlife development resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1835. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1836. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1838. A bill to include as creditable service, for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, certain unused sick leave to the credit of an employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1839. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the White River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development, for the control of floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1840. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend section 1478, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1842. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 1843. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such a spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1844. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1845. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1846. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 1847. A bill to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of government to finance the development by such States and local units of government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1848. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to enter into agreements with friendly Latin American countries for the indemnification of lenders in those countries against loss arising out of mortgage loans made on residential or farm property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend section 704 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide that the Secretary of State shall provide special monetary incentives for Foreign Service personnel who acquire proficiency in esoteric foreign languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1850. A bill to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide for a program of exchange visits from Latin American countries of labor leaders, college professors, and persons in news media; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the retirement of the public debt by setting aside the first 5 percent of the budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year for the sole purpose of retirement of obligations counted as part of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide that future increases in sugar quotas will be allocated to domestic beet sugar producers in a manner which will assure new growers a fair share of such increase; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1853. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940, to provide that the 10-year statute of limitations applicable to claims against the United States shall not bar the payment of such claims where they are filed with an appropriate agency of the United States during such 10-year period; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status-of-Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to authorize the Attorney General to establish an Institute of Corrections for the training and instruction of corrections personnel selected by States and their municipal subdivisions in the field of correctional methods and techniques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a Commission to determine the inability of a President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim the Tuesday following the second Monday in June of each year as "National Fraternal Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to create a Federal Committee on Tariff Revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 66. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of methods for developing and expeditiously carrying out an effective program of civil defense shelter construction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 68. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. Res. 69. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to conduct a study of the issuance of milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 70. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 71. Resolution to authorize payment from the contingent fund of the House for procurement of a marble bust of Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 72. Resolution to authorize payment from the contingent fund of the House for procurement of a marble bust of former Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 73. Resolution to rename and dedicate: The House Office Building to the Honorable Joseph Cannon, the New House Office Building to the Honorable Nicholas Longworth, and the additional House Office Building to the Honorable Sam Rayburn; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Res. 75. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 76. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 75; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 77. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 78. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 79. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 78; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 80. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1856. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 1857. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Dabrowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 1858. A bill for the relief of Sp4c. Florencio R. Villarba, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Aurelia Bitu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Jovenal Gornes Verano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Moussa Cohanim and Farzaneh Cohanim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 1862. A bill for the relief of James G. Baldwin, Sr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Watson B. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Thomas Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Efstratios Handrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Bishara Hanna Iqal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Anna Guerra and Amata Guerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Sun Lok Yen (also known as Pauline Sun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Nolan Sharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Min Ja Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Petronella Mundhenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Dorothy and Douglas Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Sih Chuen Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Alberto Rodriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1877. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Peter Ernst Fritze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wong Ship Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Taman Toufie Korban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Georgios Dastamanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Francesco Pagano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Emilia Suppa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Antonio Selvaggi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Leonila Tolentino and Gloria Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Kui Bor Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 1891. A bill for the relief of En1c. William J. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Eduardo S. Molarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Sp4c. Adriano P. Principe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Henry and Edna Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 1896. A bill for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Maria Varkanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Isabel Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Stavros Mourkakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1900. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gaetano Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Georgia J. Makris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Louis Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amina Youssif Cosino (nee Simaan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Talamantes-Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Desiderio Camarillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyun Mo Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Arsenia C. Baltazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taka Iwanaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Florante M. Dulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Francisco P. Pascua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Crisanta Cabanting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rufina Cabebe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Tamie Shimoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Unta Shimabukuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Marquez, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of John D. Morton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Hideo Iwasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sabri Sami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. Res. 81. Resolution favoring the advancement to the grade of captain of Commander Edward White Rawlins, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Seashore on Cape Cod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today legislation to create a national seashore on Cape Cod.

Senator SALTONSTALL, President-elect Kennedy, and I spent several months drafting the bill prior to its introduction in the last session, and came up with, in my opinion, an excellent piece of legislation.

Upon introduction of this bill early in September of 1959, I explained that in dealing with Cape Cod, we are not concerned with the usual, relatively undeveloped national park area. Several well-developed and prosperous communities are involved in this proposal. Therefore, any legislation creating a national seashore on the Cape must recognize the unique character of the area and its problems.

I believe that our bill does this. It is more than a statement of the principle that preserving shoreline areas deserves our Nation's support. It embodies a knowledge of the distinct nature of the area, the people, and the character of the Cape.

Of course, I do not have to tell the Congress that there is tremendous national interest in reserving for future generations the scenic, historic, and scientific treasures of our Nation. Cape Cod provides rich opportunities for appreciation of these values, but it is a compact area, containing communities developed to a greater degree than is usual in national parks.

In drafting our original legislation, therefore, we took pains to spell out in detail our provisions—many of them unique in park legislation—unique in order to satisfy an unusual situation. We are hopeful that our proposal will serve to enhance the establishment of other national seashores in the future, for it recognizes many of the problems inherent in the conserving of areas of national significance in this era of tremendous population growth.

Following the introduction of our bill, the Department of the Interior sent to the Congress a report which recommended changing or eliminating some of its essential features.

At this time I would like to say a few words about the Department's recommendations which I feel could create rather than resolve problems.

Our original bill provided that, in order to keep the six towns involved in the proposal self-sufficient and dynamic, 10 percent of the land taken in each town would be returned to that community as needed for its normal expansion and growth.

The Department of the Interior has recommended that this provision be stricken. Furthermore, there was some feeling among the bill's sponsors and the towns that the administration of the clause would be cumbersome.

The towns, recognizing that the provision would be stricken from the bill in all probability, have requested, therefore, that a small amount of the land be eliminated from the area of the seashore prior to enactment of the legislation. The officials of each of the six towns presented their cases very effectively to the House Subcommittee on Public Lands last month. The subcommittee came down to the Cape in December, toured the area, and conducted extensive and thoughtful hearings. I know that the committee is giving careful and conscientious study to the views of the town officials, and I hope that my colleagues will also give this testimony their serious consideration.

In several of these towns a very substantial portion of the revenue-producing property is recommended for inclusion within the park. The sponsors of the bill feel very strongly that the towns need the revenue from this property in order to maintain their economies; and, therefore, provided for Federal payments in lieu of taxes. Although the Department of the Interior recommended against such payments, we have retained this provision.

Our bill provides for an advisory commission to help the Federal Government in its policy decisions affecting the park and the surrounding towns. This would permit and encourage the proposed seashore's administrator and the town governments to exist harmoniously and act in unison. The Department's recommendation that the Commission be terminated after 10 years tends to destroy its very purpose—long-range cooperation. I hope the Congress will give serious attention to making the Commission permanent.

The Department of the Interior also recommended the elimination of a clause in our bill which would allow expediency in the acquiring of property from landowners who would want to sell to the Federal Government as soon as possible. I feel very strongly that this clause should be retained, and hope my colleagues here will support my view.

There are some who fear that our bill may have overemphasized recreation. I want to make it clear, for the record, that the major intent of the sponsors is conservation. Last year, the National Park Service furnished a report on how the area would be administered. This statement confirmed our long-standing belief that the Park Service would only intend to make recreational activity available within controlled areas—that the major emphases would be on conservation and preservation. I would like to call this report to the attention of my colleagues.

I feel very strongly that the original principle written into legislation by Senator SALTONSTALL, President-elect Kennedy, and myself must not be sacrificed. I am hopeful that the Congress will agree that the major provisions and purposes of our bill should be enacted into law.

The cape is a growing community. Its population has increased almost 50 percent in the last 10 years. There is, therefore, considerable pressure to develop, both commercially and residentially, that area which we are here seeking to preserve. These pressures were anticipated by the sponsors of the legislation by a provision in the bill that property developed subsequent to September 1959 could be subject to condemnation by the Secretary of the Interior. In spite of this provision, there has been some commercial development within the area of the proposed seashore. Delay by the Congress will further impair the quality of a national seashore on the cape, and will cause further hardship to the residents of the area.

The House subcommittee has visited the site of the proposed seashore, and is acquainted with its problems and the need for prompt action. I hope, therefore, that this legislation will be taken up early in this session.

Twenty Elections in the Second District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the 87th Congress there has come to me, due to the generous and appreciated graciousness of my constituents at election times, the distinction of representing the Second District of Illinois in this historic body longer than any Representative in its history with the sole exception of the Honorable James R. Mann, who served from 1897 to his death in November of 1922.

At the special election to fill the Mann vacancy the Honorable Morton D. Hull was the successful Republican nominee. I was the unsuccessful Democratic nominee. Mr. Hull served with great distinction in five Congresses. He died in 1937. It was not until 11 years after his death that I came to the Congress. It is with a sense of humility and deep gratitude that I contemplate that good health, good fortune, and the warm friendships of my fine constituents had extended my tenure as the Representative of the Second District to a period second only to that of Congressman Mann.

In 1924 Congressman Hull, a Republican, was reelected with a majority of 75,867. In 1960, I, a Democrat, was reelected with a majority of 51,507. These are the 2 highest majorities given winning nominees in the last 20 elections in the Second District. For such interest as they may hold to students of election trends and statistics, I am extending my remarks to include the official vote cast in the Second District of Illinois in these elections, 1923–60, as furnished me by the Honorable Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of state of Illinois.

Representation in Congress, 2nd District

Year	Republican candidate	Vote	Democratic candidate	Vote	Winner's majority
1923 (special)	Morton D. Hull	56,355	Barratt O'Hara	42,427	13,928
1924	do	113,349	Frank A. Wright	37,482	75,867
1926	do	71,750	Michael C. Walsh	37,518	34,232
1928	do	126,005	do	76,909	50,096
1930	do	76,665	do	63,341	13,324
1932	P. H. Moynihan	113,447	Victor L. Schlaeger	102,099	11,348
1934	do	81,034	Raymond S. McKeough	104,479	23,445
1936	do	130,197	do	163,198	33,001
1938	Noble W. Lee	108,483	do	129,620	21,137
1940	P. H. Moynihan	146,927	do	155,698	8,771
1942	Thomas J. Downs	106,552	William A. Rowan	110,069	3,517
1944	do	138,579	do	186,089	47,510
1946	Richard B. Vail	156,697	do	148,995	7,702
1948	do	85,119	Barratt O'Hara	91,648	6,529
1950	do	83,023	do	71,945	11,078
1952	do	89,080	do	94,253	5,173
1954	do	49,970	do	80,016	30,046
1956	George B. McKibbin	69,892	do	86,386	16,494
1958	Harold E. Marks	34,203	do	75,691	41,488
1960	Bernard E. Epton	52,028	do	103,535	51,507

A Bill To Change the Name of the Present Air Force Base at Lincoln, Nebr., to the George W. Norris Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a bill which I have introduced changing the name of the present Air Force base at Lincoln, Nebr., to the George W. Norris Air Force Base. I am making this move in a bipartisan spirit in an effort to commemorate the late, internationally known, Senator from Nebraska.

There is not a single major military installation nor a single major Federal installation in the State of Nebraska which bears the Senator's name. To me this is a grave oversight, that in his own home State of Nebraska there should be no such installation bearing Senator Norris' name. The bill I have introduced, if favorably considered by the Congress, would remedy that.

Mr. Speaker, Senator George W. Norris devoted his life to the development of our natural resources on a nationwide scale. His far-sighted and often controversial views on resource development commenced previous to World War I. This has made it possible to a large extent for the Middle West and Far West to play the important role they have played in the development of our industrial might during and since World War II.

Without the water and power resources which have evolved in this vast area of the country, the United States would have been poorly prepared to undertake the great industrial push required to win World War II and place us in the commanding role we now hold as leaders of the free world in the continuing struggle against world communism.

Senator Norris began early in his 40-year career in the Congress to fight for the orderly, logical and complete development of our natural resources. He was interested in water not only for irrigation purposes but as a source of competitively priced power as well. He fought for this goal year by year, often against great odds.

It seems to me highly appropriate that a major Federal installation in his home State of Nebraska, such as the Lincoln Base, should be named in his memory.

The Lincoln Army Air Force Base, as it was originally called, was established early in 1942. The decision to place a major military installation just to the northwest of Lincoln, Nebr., was reached on January 20 of that year. By May 9, 1942, the base was under construction and it was activated 9 days later. The Lincoln base started out as an Air Force mechanics' school and, during the World War II period of operation as such, more than 31,000 men were trained. Meanwhile, other functions were assigned to the base and it was used for processing pilots and aircraft.

As with many other bases, after World War II the Lincoln base dwindled in size and activity. But with the resurgence of our military preparedness program early in the last decade, the Air Force once more entered Lincoln and it has become a Strategic Air Command base of vital importance to our Nation's defense posture.

Increasingly important missions have been assigned to Lincoln with the advent of our intercontinental ballistic missile program. It has become the site for an Atlas missile squadron which is now under construction and which will become operational in the not-too-distant future.

Just as Senator Norris played a major role in the development of our national economy so has the Lincoln base played a major and increasingly important role in our national defense posture.

A military base of such major importance deserves an illustrious name. The bill I have introduced, changing its name to the George W. Norris Air Force Base, would accomplish just that.

The Captive Sales Finance Company—Threat to Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, study, and consideration by Members of this session of Congress, a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from handling the retail installment sales contracts and insurance of their products.

The purpose of this bill is to divorce General Motors Acceptance Corp. from General Motors Corp. and to restore free competition to the American automobile market.

My study of the automotive industry convinces me that General Motors Corp. has tremendous monopolistic powers, some of which stem from the corporation's ownership and use of General Motors Acceptance Corp. My study shows that these monopolistic powers operate to the detriment of the U.S. economy, to the detriment of the automotive industry and to the detriment of the American car-buying public.

The only way to remove these monopolistic powers of General Motors Corp. is to divorce this giant from its finance subsidiary, General Motors Acceptance Corp., and to let the finance company operate as an independent sales finance company in a completely free market.

Enactment of my bill will accomplish the following important objectives among others:

Restore free competition in the U.S. automobile market.

Reduce automobile prices to the car-buying public by removing the powers which General Motors has to establish price patterns for the entire industry.

Reduce finance charges. The entry of General Motors Acceptance Corp. into the free market, as an independent finance company, would stimulate the competition which keeps prices to car buyers at the lowest possible levels.

Restore the United States to its leading position in the world automobile market.

Restore full employment to the U.S. automobile industry.

Let me make it clear that this bill is not an attack on big business. I have never said or implied that bigness is necessarily badness. My concern is with the monopolistic powers which are now held by General Motors Corp. and its finance subsidiary, General Motors Acceptance Corp. Separate these two giants and our entire economy will benefit. Consumers, whether they buy Chevrolets or Cadillacs, Fords or Lincolns, Plymouths or Imperials, Ramblers or Larks, will save money and have a greater freedom of choice when they buy automobiles.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, I would insert in the RECORD at this point an address made by me on November 11, 1960, before the American Finance Conference. The address is entitled "The Captive Finance Company—Threat to Free Enterprise":

It is a privilege to be the guest of the American Financing Conference and to address the members of an industry that has made such a truly significant contribution to American free enterprise. Even as competition is the life of trade, so credit is its lifeblood. Our economy in all its impressive proportions owes a great debt to the independent sales finance companies. Their enterprise and vision have made possible many new businesses and a greatly expanded consumer credit system. Nowhere is this more graphically illustrated than in the history of the greatest of all our basic industries—that of the automobile.

We have come a long way since the days, in 1907, when a new car cost the equivalent of 3 years' earnings of an average worker. In those days, car manufacturers lacked the means to sell on credit; dealers, too, required cash; banks were unable or unwilling to lend money for the purchase of cars. Car ownership was the privilege of the wealthy. It was the independent finance companies that bridged this gap. By lending money to dealers for their purchase of cars from the factory and by purchasing from dealers at a discount the installment obligations incurred by car buyers, they brought the automobile within the reach of the people and thus made possible the miraculous economies of mass production. These have remained the functions of sales finance companies over the years, and today the total consumer credit outstanding for financing the sale of automobiles exceeds $16 billion.

But you have not assembled today to hear your praises sung. You are here, I suspect, to take stock and to discuss ways and means for improving and expanding the services which your industry renders. And I am here not primarily to praise, but to warn that there are forces at work in our economy which, left unchecked, must end by destroying our American free enterprise system and annihilating the vital segment of the American financial community for which your conference speaks.

I refer to the threat of monopoly and monopolization by which the very largest of our American corporations have been swallowing competitors and taking on ever new functions—functions formerly performed by independent specialists.

Grover Cleveland in his message to Congress in 1888 said:

"As we view the achievements of aggregated capital, we discover the existence of trusts, combinations, and monopolies, while the citizen is struggling far in the rear or is trampled to death beneath an iron heel. Corporations, which should be the restrained creatures of the law and the servants of the people, are fast becoming the people's masters."

How prophetic. We must remove that iron heel. We must wave back these giant corporations and make them the servants, not the masters of the people.

Recent years have seen unprecedented growth of concentration in the American economy. We must ever bear in mind that giant monolithic operators which result from mergers and consolidations are imitators—they do not originate. The giants claim that efficiency, mass production, and the division of labor require them to be as big as they are—but this is not true. Almost every one of them owes its size to the fact that it acquired and took advantage of the means, in one way or another, to expand. What is more, giant monopoly is a threat to democracy. It subordinates individuals, sacrifices the free market, establishes industrial totalitarianism. Its repeated mergers and consolidations throw men out of work, create ghost towns, and work havoc among the suppliers and customers of merged enterprises.

Today I want particularly to stress the drive toward concentration of the manufacturing and banking functions in the automobile industry—a drive long recognized, but most difficult to control. I refer to the practice of General Motors since 1919—only this year resumed by Ford—of automobile manufacturers maintaining their own captive sales finance companies.

This practice, I am convinced, is not only disastrous to the independent sales financing industry, but spells trouble for many other economic groups and for the entire competitive system. It is destined, unless checked, to impair competition in the automobile manufacturing industry, competition which is already at a low ebb, with only five significant manufacturers of passenger cars in the market. It must further depress the condition of ostensibly independent retail dealers to one of economic serfdom and ever-growing dependency on the factories. It subjects the consumer to manipulation by concealed but fluctuating credit charges, to the point where he is ever less able to determine how much he is paying for credit and whether he can afford the obligations he assumes. It is, in short, a practice whose indulgence makes big business the foe of economic freedom.

Adequate appraisal of the consequences of factory-controlled car financing requires a brief review of its history. In 1919 General Motors established a wholly owned subsidiary, General Motors Acceptance Corp., to finance the sale of GM products at both the wholesale and retail levels. Ford and Chrysler followed suit by acquiring financing associates of their own. Independent finance companies normally discount dealers' installment paper without recourse. Factory affiliated sales finance companies, by contrast, normally retain dealer responsibility in case of default. In 1925, to tighten its control of the financing of GM products, GMAC inaugurated a dealer reserve for repossession losses. Under this technique, the dealer imposes a charge on the customer to defray the cost of defaults. He also participates in the financing profit by pocketing the amount by which this reserve exceeds losses actually experienced."

It is notorious that this reserve has always exceeded losses by a wide margin and has thus become an added source of dealer profit. Indeed, over the years GMAC distributions to dealers from this reserve have equaled $3,000 for each car repossessed. This is extremely useful to General Motors in holding dealers, although, as A. P. Sloan, president of GM, himself admitted, any appreciable excess over actual repossession losses is unfair to competing finance companies. With the approach of the depression, manufacturers tended to force delivery of cars to dealers. To move these cars, dealers were forced to grant excessive used car trade-ins. In an attempt to recoup their losses they frequently resorted to loading or packing their finance charges to consumers, that is, increasing this charge beyond the actual cost of financing, even including the reserve for losses.

Some independent nonrecourse companies attempted to meet the competition of GMAC's dealer reserve by paying a bonus to dealers for their business. Reputable independents, however, regarded both the repossession loss reserve and the bonus as forms of commercial bribery, and in 1933, during the NRA, your conference was formed to protect the legitimate interests of the independents.

In the 1930's, also, the financing practices of automobile manufacturers began to cause concern among law enforcement agencies. In 1939, the Federal Trade Commission ordered General Motors to cease and desist from advertising as a "6-percent plan" a plan of financing that actually cost almost twice that sum in simple interest. Ford, Chrysler, and other manufacturers, had agreed to cease and desist from this practice, and the order against General Motors was upheld on appeal.

Meanwhile, automobile manufacturers' practices affecting finance companies and car dealers engaged the attention of the Department of Justice. In 1938 antitrust indictments were obtained against the Big Three and their financing affiliates, charging coercion of dealers at both the wholesale and retail levels in a conspiracy to monopolize financing. It was alleged that in order to compel dealers to use captive financing, the manufacturers resorted to cancellation or threat of cancellation of franchises and a whole catalog of discriminatory practices against uncooperative dealers and independent finance companies. Here again Ford and Chrysler submitted to consent decrees, but General Motors insisted on a trial. In 1940, after General Motors and four affiliates had been convicted of conspiracy and their convictions and fines upheld on appeal, the Government started a civil suit to require GM to divest itself of GMAC. World War II interfered with the prosecution of the case. In 1952 this litigation was settled without divestiture, a result which the Government recognized as inadequate, but to which it submitted because of the difficulty of proving activities then 14 years old. As is often the case, time had come to the rescue of monopoly. There the matter has rested, with General Motors in undisturbed possession of its captive financing subsidiary. Recently, however, Ford has reentered the field of factory-controlled car sales financing, claiming that it no longer can do without the advantages which GMAC affords General Motors. Ford, in other words, also desired the fruit of a poisoned tree. Thus, in 1960, the independent sales finance companies are confronted with a well-entrenched competitor, owned by the largest automobile manufacturer in the world, and by a newly founded finance company owned by the second largest.

The domination of the automobile manufacturing industry is well known. Three concerns, General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, divide more than 90 percent of the market. General Motors alone accounts for about 50 percent of all new car sales. It has been noted that there are only a few States in the Union that have gross income comparable to that of General Motors—a gigantic, privately controlled, economic state, with self-perpetuating officers and directors, that has just announced it is about to spend a billion and a quarter dollars in a single year. In this dominated market environment, the business of GMAC—that of financing General Motors' products—has had a continuous growth. To illustrate: in 1958 GMAC financed more than 80 percent of all new car installment contracts sold by General Motors' dealers to finance companies—as compared to less than 50 percent in 1941. It purchased about 40 percent of the installment contracts sold by all dealers to finance companies in 1957 and 1958—as compared to less than 30 percent in 1952. GMAC's retail credit extensions in 1957 were 106 percent greater than in 1952; those of independents only 16.6 percent greater. In the period from 1953 to 1956, the percentage growth of GMAC's share of the car financing market was 41.7, or almost double the 21.7 increase in General Motors' share of total car sales.

GMAC's steady growth has brought phenomenal profits to General Motors. During the years from 1950 to 1957 GMAC averaged 18.7 percent net profit after taxes on stockholders average investment. By 1954, the company's total current assets exceeded $2½ billion and its net income exceeded $33 million. In 1957 GMAC reported net income after taxes of $46 million. This income to General Motors from GMAC alone, amounted to more than one-half of Ford's earnings from all operations.

But profit, however large, is but one of the great unnatural advantages which General Motors' ownership of GMAC gives the combination—both in the finance business and in the automobile business. Comparison of the operations of GMAC with those of independent sales finance companies reveals the important respects, not explainable by size alone, in which this financial giant enjoys special privileges, largely by virtue of its GM parentage.

The more borrowed money a finance company uses in its business—in addition to using its own capital—the greater is the ability to compete and the greater will be the profits on its common capital. A company with a large barrowings-to-capital ratio can accept a much smaller net return on volume and still profit on its own investment as much as or more than its competitors. In this borrowings-to-capital ratio, or leverage as it is called, GMAC's parentage has given it an unequaled position. Major insurance companies and institutions have entered into an agreement which allows GMAC to issue subordinated debt to an amount equal to 200 percent of its capital, but only as long as General Motors remains its owner. If General Motors ownership were to end, the ratio would be reduced to 133 percent, the agreement provides. This privilege is double that of most independents. In consequence of this privilege, not available to any other finance company, GMAC has had outstanding between 1953 and 1958 subordinated debt ranging between 129 and 166 percent of its capital and surplus. On the strength of this subordinated debt, which operates like capital as a cushion for senior debt, GMAC has been able to achieve a total debt-to-common equity ratio in excess of 20 to 1—more than double the ratio enjoyed by its three largest competitors. Without General Motors ownership, this unnatural competitive advantage in access to risk capital would have been impossible. Under the 52 percent Federal corporate income tax, a company holding an exclusive borrowing privilege which is double that of its competitors, as is the case with GMAC, is in the same competitive posture as if it, alone, were exempt from income tax.

Apart from the financial power given by this leverage, GMAC appears also to have been able to borrow money at interest rates lower than those paid by the sales finance industry generally. Little wonder that GMAC's net profits have far exceeded the industry's average.

The unparalleled financial position of GMAC, due in large part to its ownership by General Motors, has not only enabled it to saturate the market but also to offer the most attractive terms to General Motors' dealers. At both the wholesale and the retail level its interest and discount charges are measurably less than those of its competitors. But this does not necessarily reflect efficiency. In the first place, GMAC requires dealers to remain responsible for payments and to share in the function of evaluating credit, while most independents assume the entire credit responsibility and function. Beyond this, GMAC's low rates are a natural consequence of the unparalleled leverage and uniquely favored credit position enjoyed by GMAC through its affiliation with General Motors. Indeed, it has been stated that General Motors, through GMAC, could still further reduce the cost of credit and further extend its domination of the market, but is deterred by the fear that this would destroy the existing oligopoly among car manufacturers.

The monopolistic advantages of GMAC in competition with independent sales finance companies do not end with plentiful available risk capital, profitability, and low rates. An invaluable additional advantage that also arises out of its ownership by General Motors is GMAC's favored position in acquiring business. To a General Motors dealer, the factory is the source of supply on which he depends for survival and growth. GMAC's position as General Motors' chosen instrument for financing time sales is very clear to him. His response to this preference has been firmly conditioned by an elaborate system of rewards and punishments which had their origin in 1925, when General Motors adopted the principle that the factory should control the dealers' wholesale and retail financing practices and that GMAC should share financing income with the dealer. From the beginning, as I have noted, General Motors resorted to coercive practices to bring its dealers in line with these principles so that they would do business with GMAC exclusively. Risk of loss of the valuable General Motors franchise has been a prime deterrent to would-be defectors. The consent decree of 1952, lacking provisions for divestiture, failed utterly to protect against these abuses, much less to undo the results of their coercive thrust.

Persuasion and rewards, too, have played a large part in providing GMAC with a ready market among General Motors' dealers. Dealers in General Motors' products typically enjoy five separate sources of income: the retail mark-up in the price of the car; the dealer reserve for repossession loss; commission on car insurance; repair and parts business when an insured car suffers damage; and, finally, loading or packing of finance charges. Two of these sources—the dealers' reserve and the repair and parts business—are deferred in nature and thus serve to deter dealers from switching to other makes of car on pain of losing these profit elements. Loading or packing, tolerated if not expressly recommended by GMAC, is the practice of adding a financing charge over what the dealer pays which is immediately returned to the dealer when GMAC purchases the installment contract at a discount. Information in my possession indicates that the newly formed Ford financing affiliate similarly enables its dealers to exact excessive

financing charges and thus to augment their immediate profit. The peculiarly entrenched position of GMAC, however, lies in the fact that it does not need to make expenditures to acquire business. Business of General Motors dealers is almost automatically directed to it.

The advantages of these arrangements to the parent General Motors Corporation are manifest. Through its captive finance company General Motors is enabled to maintain ostensibly independent but actually captive sales organizations of General Motors dealers. There are upward of 10,000 automobile dealers, classified as independents, who are actually under the absolute domination of General Motors, which fixes their costs, selling prices, quotas, investments, and sales practices. General Motors also retains the capacity to manipulate car sales credit as an aspect of its sales policies. These advantages necessarily increase its dominance in the industry, give it an inestimable advantage over its competitors, and inevitably lead to monopoly. As GMAC itself has declared: "It must be obvious that the parent corporation can hardly justify investment of its capital in a corporation designed primarily as a competitive discounting or financing agency, fundamentally designed as an independent aid to distribution and sales." GMAC is, and has always been, an instrument of General Motors factory sales policy.

Against this background of substantial monopolistic advantages to GMAC and General Motors, which arise from their affiliation, may be viewed the injury and competitive disadvantage suffered by other elements of the automotive and financing industries and by the economy as a whole. Manufacturers, unable to compete with the glitter of the five separate profit pockets which GMAC affords its dealers, must ultimately suffer impairment of what is left of their share of the market or must, like Ford, resort to similar expedients. Dealers tend more and more to become economic serfs, totally dependent on and responsive to the dictates of the factory. The economy, as a whole, faces the monopolization of its largest industry. Independent finance companies are forced more and more to abandon automobile time sales financing. When this happens, the economy as a whole will be at the mercy of the manufacturing oligopoly—more interested in sales and profits than in the safety of credit extensions. A recent story in the Chicago papers dealing with the credit dilemma of J. I. Case, a great farm machinery manufacturer, illustrates the danger of overloading when the manufacturer finances sales through its own finance company. Ninety-one banks had to agree to a standstill agreement to avert disaster.

The time has come to realize that it is impossible for the time sales financing industry to survive part free and part slave. We are at a crossroad. One alternative will produce an automobile oligopoly in which each manufacturer is forced to maintain its own financing affiliate, and the independents are driven out of the industry altogether. The other envisages the elimination of captive financing and the restriction of automobile manufacturers to the business of making and selling cars. Under this alternative the contribution of independent finance companies whose interest is in the safety of investments as well as profits will be restored to the industry. GMAC and the Ford financing subsidiary would become independent—their resources made available to all dealers and to the financing of products of new and resurgent manufacturers. The second is the only alternative consistent with our antitrust policies and traditions. In the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 4256, a bill to prevent manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing or insuring the sales of their products. Similar bills were introduced in the Senate. In the coming Congress it is essential that legislation of this kind be pressed to an early enactment. At the opening of the new session I shall reintroduce my bill. It should become the new bill of rights of the automobile sales finance industry, restoring competition to that industry and freeing it from monopolistic engulfment. Existing antitrust laws have proved themselves wholly inadequate to cope with this problem. Congress must act. Prompt divestiture by General Motors and Ford of their finance subsidiaries and prohibition of the institution of similar arrangements by other manufacturers are, I am convinced, of first priority if we are to preserve free enterprise competition in this great industry.

Congress Should Act To Implement Kennedy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 87th Congress, I introduced numerous bills to implement the domestic program recently reindorsed by President-elect Kennedy.

After the frustrations and disappointments suffered in the 86th Congress, the sabotaging of vitally needed legislation, and the ever-present threat of a presidential veto, I look forward to serving and working in the 87th Congress, with the bold, strong leadership we are certain to have under our Democratic President. I predict that the 87th Congress will establish an enviable record of hard work and constructive, beneficial legistion enacted.

Legislation providing for medical care benefits for the aged under social security, Federal aid to education, school construction and increase in teachers' salaries, aid to economically depressed areas, housing—including construction of additional public housing units—increase in the minimum wage to at least $1.25, is of prime importance, and I have introduced bills covering these benefits, which are long overdue our people.

My bill providing for medical care for the aged under the social security program is comprehensive and liberal. Living costs are at an all-time high; increased rents and cost of necessities impose real hardship upon those existing on their small social security benefits and they cannot afford necessary medical care. Their plight must be recognized and relief must be given them without further delay.

The civil rights bill which was passed last year accomplishes very little in the light of the great evils of discrimination which exist, and which are a blot upon our honor as a democratic nation. I have reintroduced my bills which would eliminate discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin, and shall continue to strive for passage of strong, effective, civil rights legislation.

There are millions of underpaid workers in our country today who are merely existing under substandard conditions. Those in the low-wage brackets cannot meet their family obligations in the face of high-spiraling living costs, high taxes, increased medical costs. I shall push passage of my minimum wage increase bill.

I have also introduced bills providing for revision of our immigration laws, tax relief, to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the Social Security Act, to assist our youth and help control juvenile delinquency, to assist our veterans, to assist our government employees, as well as other bills necessary to the well-being of our people.

I believe that the prospects of great progress nationally and internationally, and in the interest of peace, under the Democratic administration ahead, have given our people new hope and courage.

I, for one, as a Member of the 87th Congress, pledge my untiring and best efforts in behalf of our people. I urge that the Congress take swift, favorable action on our new President's recommendations and on all legislation providing necessary assistance to those who must rely upon us for help.

Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following article entitled "Prestige":

PRESTIGE

During the campaign we heard many arguments pro and con on the question of prestige. Let's just examine some of the issues that have led us to this new level of world prestige. First of all, as your Representative, you know where I have stood since my first few days in Congress on the questions of trade and aid as it is now instituted and administered. I have contended all along that you cannot buy prestige, friendship, or peace. I have contended that we cannot build competitive industry abroad to sell in both our foreign as well as our domestic market without wrecking our own economy.

How true this is can best be proven by the wild and panicky actions of our Government since election, in issuing come home orders to the families of GI's in foreign countries and the futile mission of Secretary Anderson, Under Secretary of State Dillon, to Germany, France, and England pleading with them to bail us out of the gold mess we are in. How did this all come about? It takes too long to cover the whole course followed by our Government to get to this sorry state, but a few of the main routes can be explained. Let us start by admitting the worthiness and soundness of the original proposals for foreign aid and reciprocal trades agreements. Simply stated, foreign aid was established under a plan devised by Congress to help our Allies to get back to the same economic position they were in prior to World War II. This was done for a dual

purpose. One was to keep the Communists from gaining ground in the so-called free nations because of economic conditions. The second was the realistic view that unless these nations were helped to get back to their normal economic states, both industrially and agriculturally, they would never be able to compete in the free world as free nations. Foreign aid was born as an aftermath of World War II, the Communist threat made it sound logical; people were, and are, sick of catastrophic world wars and were willing to make most any sacrifice short of military service to buy peace. It sounded good, and in reality it really worked for a while. We watched devastated nations, like Germany, Japan, Italy, France, England, all their friends start to provide jobs, grow their own food supplies, and to resist communistic infiltration. Then we found out that nations are just like people everywhere. Long after we had passed the goal set by Congress when it enacted the first foreign aid bill, we found our friendly Allies demanding more and more and with the help of the mistaken group in our State Department, the whole program became virtually a grab bag with almost every civilized country on earth getting some cut out of the American taxpayers. As it became apparent that this program was a free for all and more permanent than temporary in nature, some of the former opponents of the legislation became interested and from then on the real problem started to develop.

Some of our big industries, urged on in some cases by a desire to lessen the union pressures at home, found that they could very advantageously join with German, Japanese, and other manufacturers who could get low interest, easy credit money from one or more of the many agencies set up by this Government for construction and expansion of foreign dominated industries. Suddenly we find the President of the United States calling upon Congress to make it easier and taxwise beneficial for Americans to invest overseas. In his message to Congress, the President held out the promise of reduced taxes here in America if we could get more American private enterprises to invest in foreign countries.

American industries were coaxed by the ICA to build plants all over the world with taxpayers' moneys with 90 percent guarantees against losses under certain conditions. In the meantime, all of our know-how, patents, trade marks, and trained manpower was being made available to foreign competitors who soon were able, with American money, know-how, and their cheap labor, to not only take away our foreign markets, but they started to flood our own domestic home market with consumer goods at sums we could not touch.

Although both candidates shied away from the subject, I have said before and repeat now that the balance was so close between the two candidates that if either one would have come out flatfooted on the question of importation of cheap made goods in competition with our standard of living, the election would have been a landslide. I predict now, that short of war, this is the issue that will make or break the incoming administration. It isn't a question of whether we want to live alone or that we are not aware of our obligations as a member nation in our free world society, it's a question of survival in an economic jungle where nations have become the tools of powerful groups whose interests are high and whose principles are gold.

For instance, the farmer is sold on foreign aid because it is supposed to provide the money to foreign countries that buy his farm products. What he isn't told is that in most cases, it is bought with money provided by the farmer himself as a citizen taxpayer, and when any nation gets to where it produces its needs, we cannot even give our products away without being accused of flooding the markets. Right now, at this moment our friendly allies, the Canadians, are working on a plan to increase the duty and tariff on American fruits and vegetables shipped into Canada from the U.S. farms. One of the largest American soup canning companies is building the largest canning plant in the world in Mexico. With help from our foreign aid programs, the Mexicans are growing more and cheaper vegetables than we can produce here in the United States. What is even more serious is that these canned foods will be shipped to the United States to be sold in our markets with the American trade name prominently displayed.

The American worker is sold the foreign aid program on two promises, one that it means world peace, and another that we export more than we import and it means more jobs for us than we lose. Of course statistics can prove anything, but even a second grader knows that if you sell $100 million worth of cotton to Japan and you buy back $100 million worth of dresses, pajamas, nightgowns, and hundreds of their consumer items you are not even in man hours, payrolls, or market basket money in the housewives' pockets. On the high level of international banking we have been told we had made a good deal. You can buy two packs of cigarettes for $1 and get a Japanese lighter for free, although the lighter itself made in America would cost between $1 and $1.50. You cannot have Canada putting an additional $300 tariff on an American made automobile and still allow Canadian goods to come in under the tariff wall. You cannot allow Japan to sell automobiles in the United States while at the same time place an embargo on American cars in Japan.

Mexico has joined the rest of our friendly neighbors and allies and is rapidly forcing every American company to produce in Mexico or be shut off by either an embargo or a prohibitive tariff wall.

The trouble with us is that we have lost sight of the real purpose of passing both Foreign Aid and Reciprocal Trades Acts. "Reciprocal trade" means just what the name implies. We are supposed to buy what we need and can get from countries who have things we cannot make or mine for ourselves at the free trade counter, and other countries are supposed to get the same from our manufacturers and producers. What has really happened over the past decade though has been a complete perversion of the whole program. We are importing goods that we have in surplus, and in many instances goods that are made by the same manufacturer operating both here and abroad. No other nation actually has lowered its tariff walls except in the instances where our price was so high our competition was not practical.

For instance almost every American car producer produces cars overseas either by actual manufacturers or by manufacturing and/or sell agreements. The argument advanced is that our wages are too high, our taxes are too high, our transportation, our everything is too high. In fact, the argument is growing that our standard of living is too high. Is this true in the sense that it is used by our American industries? They say we cannot compete because of this high cost of living so they are forced to go abroad to produce for the foreign market. Of course, they fail to say that wage differentials always existed between foreign and American labor. They fail to say that our standard of living has always been higher and that you cannot compete with yourself and stay in business. As one merchant friend said to me, "This will be the moniest and merriest Christmas the Japanese ever had if we sell all the stuff made in Japan that is on our shelves."

How do we correct the situation? What do we do? Do we build tariff walls and let the American producer gouge the American housewife, do we withdraw all of our foreign aid and let the Communists gobble up every nation, do we build a wall around us and cut ourselves off from the world? These are the questions that are hurled at any critic who questions foreign aid and trade. In my humble opinion, we should answer all questions on these subjects with common sense and moderation. We should never build up prohibition tariffs walls. We should, and sooner or later must, build up cost of production protections for both American labor and American industry. This would take into consideration mandated costs of production such as Federal, State, and local taxes, social security, workman's compensation, unemployment compensation, welfare and health programs. It would give consideration to basic wage and man-hour production differentials just as most of our competing foreign countries do right now.

Did you know that one of our ally nations doesn't allow an American TV set to come in even as a gift because they are trying to build up their own TV industry? We must stop the taxbreak for runaway American industries and investors. You cannot sell American products made in America in competition with American products made in foreign countries. American industry must get every consideration in its needed expansion and modernization. Lower rates of interest on needed capital, better programs taxwise for amortization of costs and more realistic depreciation rules. No American producer must be allowed to sell foreign-made goods here in America under American trade names. It is a pipe dream on the part of those in Government who believe we can recapture the foreign market. The foreign market now belongs to a great extent to some Americans, bankers, investors, importers, exporters, and industries, but not to the American merchant who some day will be a natural goat because he will have a store full of foreign made products and a street full of foreign made unemployment. A merchant in Jeannette cannot sell much to a Tokyo glassworker, and if the window glass plant stays closed in Jeannette while our merchants sell foreign made glass how do we get the money to buy the glass? Some say, well, the rubber works will buy it. That is true until the unemployed glassworker has to let his car stand in the garage and cannot buy tires and the tire plant shuts down.

If our wages are higher than they are in Japan and Europe, remember they always were. The most important item is that our production has always been able to take care of the higher wages until the importation of foreign made goods produced by cheap labor, low taxes, and low interest rates caused a breakdown in the relationship between what was paid to produce goods and what the producer could get for the goods. This goes deeper than the housewares and consumer goods. We now find American suppliers of tool steel and fabricating tools, machinery and equipment faced with the same dilemma that has caused the almost complete liquidation of the American watch, lighter, bicycles, clothing, tile, glassware, binoculars, cameras, and other consumer goods industries.

It will get worse before it gets better. Some say, "Are you for a high tariff to protect our high economy and high costs of living?" I can only answer simply but truthfully. I am for anything that will maintain our way of life. If we are satisfied to live like the Japanese workers, then of course we can compete on the wage level. However, I don't believe the American worker or the American employer wants to go back to the days of sweatshops, child labor, long hours, and low pay.

Let's look at the problem from the viewpoint of what we started out to accomplish. We started out to help our allies gain their

former economic stature as of the pre-World War II days. We have gone beyond that. We have made not only our allies, but also our former enemies stronger economically than we are ourselves. If this isn't so, why are we pleading for help to pay our overseas bills to which we have committed ourselves? We started out to make ourselves so well liked that all the nations in the world would run to our side in case of trouble with Russia. Have we succeeded? Ask Castro, Lumumba, Mobutu, and Kasavubu. Check on Laos, Nepol, the Philippines, Indonesia, South and Central America, in fact, everywhere in the world we find the chant "Go Home Yank." Why? Simply because we have dealt with the money-hungry leaders, instead of the people. We were right at first, we gave seed, trucks, tractors, and even industrial machinery to help those people get back economically and agriculturally. What happened now is that too many of our own people have joined with foreign exploiters and are doing what we fought against so long and so hard in this country. They are making exorbitant profits with underpaid workers. When we measure our prestige, measure it in the masses of the peoples, not the directors' rooms of the international bankers and trusts.

Another handicap that is seldom mentioned that confronts the American manufacturer and the American worker is foreign government ownership. In this country a loud protest is raised against Government producing goods for sale in competition with private enterprise. No one seems to care about Americans having to compete with enterprises abroad owned or controlled by foreign government. In this country we have antitrust and antimonopoly laws, but no one seems to mind the fact that Americans have to compete with countries whose major production is by trusts and monopolies.

Some say this is the way to raise wages in foreign countries and will eventually make things right. Whom are we kidding? Labor unions are not kidding themselves on this score. We have only 17 million organized in America out of a potential of 50 million or more. We have migrant workers who are working under conditions that are considered a shame in some States and areas. We have millions of conditions here in America after all our strife, strikes, lockouts, legislation, and a liberal Constitution, how can anyone honestly say we can in the near future raise the standards to make competition reasonable between import and domestic products.

I once supported, and still believe, in aiding countries to make them self-sufficient. I think it is good to help Japan produce refrigerators, cars, clothing, and the nicer things of life for the Japanese people, but I think it is an economic joke, better still a tragedy, to help them produce these things for our use when we have a surplus of all these items. How do we raise these standards if their workers cannot even earn enough to buy a reasonable amount of their own production? Insofar as building a wall around us in the area of trade, we needn't worry about that too much. It is being done for us by others. The wall is made out of cheap labor, American capital, American know-how and in many cases, the American domestic market. Those fearful of gouging by American producers must not believe what we have been told about competition, antimonopoly, and antitrust laws that protect the American citizen from profiteers and exorbitant prices.

One thing we must also do in the not too far distant future and that is to establish some kind of ground rules on stock splits, options, and dividends. If 100 men put $1,000 each into a plant producing 100,000 units a year employing 1,000 men and later expand with borrowed money or company profits to produce 10,000 units with 3,000 men, increase the wages of the workers 50 percent while at the same time vote themselves two shares of stock for every one they had, pay the same or an increased dividend, is this an equitable portion of profit for industry and for labor? If in a 10-year period this process is repeated four more times and the stockholder now has 10 shares for every 1 while the labor is producing 20 percent more units per man and has received pay raises to where he is receiving three times as much as before, is this still equitable and is labor forcing Americans out of the foreign market? On the other hand, is corporate profit, paper, or real driving us out of the market?

I don't know the answer, but it might be interesting for the new President's advisors on such matters to look into these phases of our economy: Original investment, original wages, original selling prices, original taxes, stock splits, dividend relationship to original cost.

This isn't meant as a criticism since the case just given is a hypothetical one and just posed to get an answer, if we can, to our growing dilemma of American made versus foreign made, American trade versus foreign trade, and American dollars versus counterpart or foreign currency.

I am a profound believer in our American way. I believe in freedom of enterprise to make a realistic profit. I believe in freedom of labor to join together to bargain for a full day's pay for a full day's work. I believe each of us has a right to protection by our Government in all matters, militarily, economically, legislatively, administratively, and judicially.

It is time we remove our rose-colored foreign-made glasses and start looking through American-made bifocals at the small print in our economy.

It might surprise some of us to find out how bad a contract we have with our friendly allies.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a saddened heart that we pay tribute to a lovely and gracious lady who died on September 10, 1960, in Massachusetts.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was elected to the House in 1925 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, Representative John Jacob Rogers who had served the Fifth District of Massachusetts for six terms. She was the first woman ever sent to Congress from New England, and the only woman to have served 35 years in the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS served with the American Red Cross overseas in World War I, and since that time her greatest concern was the welfare of our veterans. During World War II Mrs. ROGERS was one of the prime movers in pressing for legislation which later become known as the GI bill of rights. She also introduced the measure which set up the Women's Army Corps during the period of World War II. At the time of her death, she was ranking minority member of the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs, and had previously served as chairman of the committee. She was the first woman to receive the Distinguished Service Cross of the American Legion.

Mrs. ROGERS was an outstanding legislator, a loyal and dedicated friend, and a generous and noble lady. May she now rest in peace.

A Milestone in Service by the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues of the House of Representatives a new milestone in service to the disabled victims of our Nation's wars.

The Disabled American Veterans has now passed the 1,500,000-case mark in the number of veterans who have benefited directly and individually from the nationwide service program of the DAV, since the end of World War II.

As you may know, the DAV maintains a staff of fully trained service officers, thoroughly experienced in every facet of veterans' legislation, in Veterans' Administration regional offices throughout the Nation. This staff, the largest such supported at the national level by any national veterans organization, is maintained at an annual cost to the DAV in excess of $1 million.

These skilled and dedicated attorneys-in-fact in the complex field of veterans law, meet with individual veterans and their families or survivors, to examine the facts of each case—often possible only through lengthy research and voluminous correspondence—and to prepare and properly document claims for hospitalization, compensation, survivor benefits, pensions, medical care and other badly needed rehabilitation services.

Without their skilled and patient services hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans would, in all probability, have been entirely unable to document and prove their right to the well-deserved benefits which they now enjoy and which they need so badly for their own well-being and for the happiness and economic security of their families.

Nor is this the end of the many free services provided by this unique, congressionally chartered service organization.

The DAV is one of the few national service-charitable organizations to provide distinct and valuable service for everyone to whom they turn for financial support.

The DAV's unusual and hard-working Idento-Tag miniature license plate program, which annually provides key-chain-sized replicas of individual auto licenses to nearly 40 million American motorists, is solely responsible for the

return of nearly 50,000 sets of lost keys and thousands of dollars in other valuables to their rightful owners each year. In all, since the beginning of the Indento-Tag program, the DAV has returned more than 1,500,000 sets of lost keys to motorists throughout the Nation.

But, perhaps, the greatest service to the Nation provided by this service-conscious organization is an indefinite and indirect one, directly beneficial to the American taxpayer, which is not easily apparent to the casual observer.

For it is impossible to estimate the enormous amount of processing work in the Veterans Administration—and the consequent expense to the taxpayers—which has been eliminated by the skill and competence of DAV service officers.

Each day thousands of veterans with tens-of-thousands of questions, each a possible claim for veterans' benefits, turn to DAV service officers for advice and assistance. If it were not for these capable and experienced men—who are themselves all disabled veterans—the VA would be forced to provide a great number of additional personnel to deal with this added influx of daily visitors at, of course, a great additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Nearly half of the problems brought to DAV service officers, never even reach the VA for processing. They are handled directly by these competent intermediaries through their own vast experience with all applications of the laws and regulations governing veterans' benefits. Those cases that are passed onto the VA for action have been carefully prepared and thoroughly documented for easy and rapid processing, saving the VA—and the taxpayer—enormous additional amounts of time and expense that would be necessary to screen, research, prepare and process these claims if they had been presented by individual veterans, inexperienced in the preparation of such material.

And, finally, the DAV works conscientiously and steadily with the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in the preparation and consideration of veterans' legislation. Recognizing that there is only a limited amount of money which can be allocated to all veterans' benefits, the DAV, as the official spokesman for all disabled veterans, works—not so much for increased expenditures—but, rather, to insure that every dollar spent for veterans' benefits is spent as wisely as possible to bring the maximum aid to the largest number of disabled veterans at the lowest possible cost to the Government.

Much of this outstanding record of service is well known by my colleagues, many of whom, like myself, take great pride in our life membership in this dedicated service organization.

But it is, perhaps, not known that this remarkable record of service is now in grave and growing jeopardy.

The DAV is in dire financial straits.

For many years it has been the financial policy of the DAV to support its administrative expenses from the dues of its member and to rely on its Idento-Tag program to provide the funds to support its million-dollar-a-year service program. It receives no Federal funds for the free service it offers to all veterans.

The DAV's Idento-Tags are manufactured in, and mailed from, the DAV's own plant, staffed almost entirely by disabled veterans and their dependents, widows, and orphans. All of the net proceeds—over and above the cost of manufacturing and mailing—are used by the DAV to support its million-dollar-per-year service program.

These proceeds are, however, not enough. The DAV has been caught in a vicious pinch between ever-rising costs of operation and steadily shrinking revenue.

The natural tendency of Americans to forget the horrors of war and the grimness of the sacrifices which it demanded from those who served, has greatly reduced the public response to this very worthy cause, placing the future of the DAV's valuable and vital service program in grave doubt, at a time when it is needed more than ever before since the days immediately following World War II.

Statistics available to my Veterans' Affairs Committee show that the average age of veterans of World War I, is now 66. This means that this aging group is now entering a period when they are becoming progressively less able to cope with their handicaps and must rely more heavily on their veterans' benefits and on the DAV service officers who help them with their problems.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who know of the magnificent work that has been done, that the DAV is an organization with an inherently noble and unselfish role to play—a role that is of growing importance to millions of disabled veterans.

The DAV is, I am personally convinced, one of the soundest, most efficient and most competently operated of our national service organizations.

Yet the very future of the DAV hangs in the balance.

The DAV needs two things: a wider membership base, and a greater share of the traditional generosity of the American people.

At the present time 200,000 disabled veterans are members of this organization. This number must be increased in the years ahead.

The DAV needs an increased return from its Idento-Tag program; it needs the sympathetic attention of the Nation, at a level equal to that shown while the horrors of war were fresh in our minds.

There is, of course, nothing that this body can, or should, do as a group to solve the problems of this vitally important institution which was organized under a charter from the Congress of the United States.

There is, however, much that we can do as individuals of some influence in our own areas and on the national scene.

Many of us in these Chambers today are members of the DAV. Many more are eligible. All of us have thousands of constituents who have benefited directly and indirectly from the services of the DAV.

We cannot, I firmly believe, allow this essential program of service for those who gave so much in their Nation's defense, to falter and die at a time when it is needed most.

Let us cooperate with each other and with DAV leaders to bolster this organization of those who sacrificed so much in the Nation's defense to its rightful position as the proud, self-sufficient spokesman for, and servant of, our war disabled.

A Legislative Program for Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1960, I was privileged to participate in a panel discussion at the 15th annual meeting of the American Rocket Society, held at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington. The subject of my talk was "A Legislative Program for Astronautics," which aroused a good deal of comment and interest.

Sooner or later, we in Congress will have to devote more time to this subject, to keep abreast of developments in this field, and to legislate as the need arises. For this reason, I feel that my colleagues will be interested to know what is currently under consideration. I am, therefore, inserting the text of my address before the American Rocket Society and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR ASTRONAUTICS

(By Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Member of Congress, New York)

In discussing astronautics as a legislator, I should like to begin by taking a broad view of the subject. Astronautics is not an isolated activity. Its roots and offshoots are certain to reach into nearly every corner of national and personal life. It will draw on its vital juices from almost every domain of science—and, indeed, from many fields of knowledge that are not regarded as scientific at all.

In the following remarks, therefore, I desire to stress the unity of science and astronautics. Effective legislative support of astronautics must include scientific research and education on a wide scale.

As you may know, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member, has always taken an appropriately broad view of its responsibilities. The resolution creating the committee states that its jurisdiction shall include not only astronautics in the strict sense but the regulation of activities in outer space, science scholarships and scientific research. It is fortunate that Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and others who led the way in legislative support of astronautics, were able to exercise so much foresight and to make provisions for an effective legislative program.

Many Members of Congress have received letters from young people asking how they can get started on a career in astronautics. An honest answer—though vague and probably not what the questioners have in mind—would be that they could very well start almost anywhere, according to their own talents and inclinations. The point

can be made by reading a partial list of the subjects and occupations already involved in astronautics:

Acoustics, aerodynamics, aeronautical engineering, astronomy, astrophysics, biochemistry, biophysics, ceramics, crystallography, electrical engineering, electronic engineering, gyroscopics, hydraulics, information theory, inorganic chemistry, mathematics, mechanical computation, mechanical engineering, medicine, metallurgy, nuclear physics, oceanography, organic chemistry, physical chemistry, psychology, solid-state physics, and thermodynamics.

The list that I have just read could easily be extended to several times its present length.

The unity of science and astronautics can be seen, also, in the reciprocal relation between space experiments and many, many fields of scientific research and development.

In the present stage of astronautics, space vehicles are still primarily research tools for gathering scientific and technical information. The recent ionosphere satellite, Explorer VIII, launched on November 3, 1960, provides a good example. Explorer VIII is gathering data needed for space communications and for the design of nuclear and ion rockets. It carries a micrometeorite experiment that will help solve the problem of dissipating heat from nuclear and ion rockets in space. The radiators that cool such rockets must be designed for protection against micrometeorites. In addition, the ionospheric measurements made by Explorer VIII will add to our knowledge of how radiowaves are carried around the earth, and so help us choose frequencies for long-range space communciations.

From this example of Explorer VIII, it is apparent that scientific and technical knowledge determines the planning of space experiments, and, in turn, depends on them for its own further progress.

There is current evidence of the recognition and support given by Americans to the national space effort and especially to its scientific basis and payoff. In an opinion survey of nearly 2,000 business executives, Prof. Raymond A. Bauer of the Harvard Business School found that most of them want a vigorous space program even if it means higher taxes. Eighty-nine percent see no limit on what the space program can achieve. I am happy to say that 59 percent believe politicians who favor a bigger space program put scientific progress ahead of political profit.

The most interesting result of the survey, from the standpoint of our present discussion, reveals what people expect as the payoffs from the space program. Five general reasons for supporting the space program are listed: (1) Political and military considerations; (2) economic payoffs (in the survey, more than 50 percent regard accurate long-range weather forecasts and improve communications as almost certain); (3) the sense of adventure; (4) the increase of knowledge; and (5) competition with the Soviet Union. In order of priority, pure science is listed as the single outstanding reason for space research.

With this background, it is easy to understand the need for better and more broadly available education as a part of our national space program. The need is emphasized by our lag compared with the USSR in the annual number of graduates in engineering and even in many fields of science. In 1959, for example, the U.S.S.R. produced about three times as many graduate engineers as the United States. The figures given by our National Science Foundation show 48,000 graduating in the United States, compared with 106,000 in the U.S.S.R. More surprising still, the United States is lagging even in the total number of professional engineers: 850,000 compared with the Soviet figure of 894,000. In graduates specializing in purely scientific studies, apart from engineering, the only field in which we lead the U.S.S.R. at the present time is the physical and mathematical sciences.

Early in the last Congress, I introduced a bill (H.R. 4986) to establish a National Science Academy. The subcommittee of which I am chairman conducted hearings on the bill in May of 1960.

The proposed Academy would offer four years of training in science and engineering. Graduates would be required to spend at least five years in the civilian or military service of the United States. A limited number of foreign nationals from friendly countries would be eligible to attend. The bill would also establish a Scientific Career Service to attract and retain qualified scientific and technical personnel. The Scientific Career Service would be open to graduates of other institutions as well as the Science Academy.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I opened the hearings with the following statement:

"A National Science Academy would provide additional incentives for our young people to pursue careers in science and engineering. It could focus public attention, arouse interest, and stimulate career motivations. Perhaps this is the most important step this country can take to make up the present shortage of qualified personnel for science teaching and for Government service in the natural sciences and engineering.

"A Science Academy would also extend the opportunities for higher education in these fields to many able students of both sexes who now, for economic reasons or otherwise, fail to complete such training under our present educational system."

It was never my intention that the Science Academy should exclude or even restrict additional scholarships, fellowships, and loan funds, or compete with further direct aid to existing educational institutions. The Science Academy is proposed as only one of many concurrent ways of meeting our pressing national problems in science and engineering education. No one should suppose that it could solve the entire problem by itself.

As a result of the hearings, I intend to revise the Science Academy bill, and to reintroduce it in the next session of Congress. Several of our distinguished witnesses recommended that the Science Academy provide instruction on the graduate level, and establish a research center and research institutes in order to attract and hold a first-rate faculty. Accordingly, I will propose the founding of a "science city" with ample facilities and opportunities for research including advanced research institutes.

We were told that some 10,000 more scientists and engineers are needed each year than our schools are graduating. Yet nearly 100,000 high school graduates of college ability fail to enroll in college every year for financial reasons, and perhaps an additional 100,000 do not enter college because of lack of interest. By providing additional opportunities and incentives, a Science Academy would help substantially to fill this critical gap in our national life.

A major new incentive for scientific achievement was created last year, when the President signed a bill (H.R. 6288) to establish a National Medal of Science. This was my bill. I feel proud and happy that it has become a law, and I believe it will greatly encourage our people to undertake training and careers in science and engineering. However, the original bill authorized the President to make money awards, not to exceed $10,000, to each individual awarded the Medal of Science. Congress eliminated this provision. It is my earnest conviction that the Medal of Science awards will provide far greater incentives in support of our continued national progress and supremacy in science and engineering, if the honor of the award is reinforced by a substantial payment of money. For that reason, I plan to introduce, during the next session of Congress, a bill which would authorize the President to make such payments. Should the Congress again reject this provision, I hope that American commerce and industry, in their own interest, will make the necessary funds available.

Next, I should like to discuss some other requirements of a legislative program for astronautics. In the interests of brevity, I will confine myself to two: adequate authority and organization in the executive branch of the Government; and the level of funding.

During the last session of Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics held extensive hearings on a bill (H.R. 12049) introduced at the request of President Eisenhower to make certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Although reported favorably by the committee and passed by the House, the bill was never brought up in the Senate. There is little doubt that some of its major provisions will be reconsidered when the new Congress convenes next January.

First, the bill abolished the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee. These organizations were created to bridge the gap between the separate civilian and military space programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act. The Council had the still broader purpose of integrating our national space policy with our national policy as a whole. It was the intended function of both organziations to facilitate the planning and conduct of space activities so as to avoid duplication, coordinate areas of common interest, identify problems and exchange information. In my judgment, these coordinating and integrating functions are essential. The only question is whether the Space Act provided appropriate machinery.

In practice, as many witnesses have testified, the Eisenhower administration made little use of either the Space Council or the Liaison Committee. It did, however, establish a new liaison committee to replace the one created by statute—thereby acknowledging the importance of the function.

Without venturing to predict whether the Kennedy administration will keep, abolish or change the Space Council or the Liaison Committee, I believe steps will soon be taken to ensure that their intended integrating and coordinating functions will be properly performed. During his campaign, President-elect Kennedy made the following statement:

"We must have more effective centralized direction and coordination of our missile and space programs, which would assign goals to the various military and civilian agencies concerned, clarify their roles, and integrate research and development into overall national planning in the light of overall national needs. This coordination of effort would combat waste, duplication, and confusion, and would provide the programs with the impetus, heretofore lacking, which only intelligent direction can supply." (As reported by Space Age News on Oct. 24, 1960.)

Secondly, the proposed National Aeronautics and Space Act Amendments of 1960 would have relaxed the present provisions relating to patents. Under the present law, the Administrator is required to take title to inventions made in the performance of research and development contracts, unless he determines that a waiver of the Government's rights would serve the best interests of the United States. Clearly, the present law puts its emphasis on taking title. The proposed amendment would give the NASA a greater measure of discretion.

I favor this change, because it would enable the NASA to adapt its patent policies

and practices to suit particular circumstances. There may be cases where Government ownership will be necessary—for example, a scientific breakthrough or a medical discovery that should be available to everybody. On the other hand, the NASA should be free to enter into research and development contracts, on terms attractive to the contractor, where the interests of the Government do not require acquisition of title.

Under the proposed amendment, the Government would retain a royalty-free license to use all inventions made in the course of NASA contracts. Furthermore, whenever the Administrator found that the national security or the public interest so required, he could take full title to the patent rights. At the same time, however, private enterprise would have greater incentives to enter into NASA contracts, and to develop inventions and discoveries that might be patentable. I believe this amendment would protect both the public interest and the equities of the contractor.

Now I should like to mention a third, relatively minor, feature of the National Aeronautics and Space Act amendments. The provision authorizing the NASA to conduct a program of international cooperation in astronautics would be made mandatory. I favor such a change. It is true that the NASA has conducted a program of international cooperation. But there have been doubts, which I share, whether the program was adequately conceived or carried out. The proposed change would emphasize the intent of Congress that the NASA should conduct a vigorous and effective program of international astronautics.

Lastly, we come to the question of funding. As you know, the current NASA budget is almost $1 billion. In the 10-year budget forecast which the NASA presented to Congress during the last session, the projected average level of funding is roughly $1.5 billion a year. Only the future can tell us for certain whether this amount will be large enough. However, many qualified observers believe that the 10-year goals set by NASA—the schedule of events—may be too modest and too conservative. For example, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, has said that "Federal funding of the space program must of necessity increase year by year"; and has described the NASA 10-year budget forecast as unrealistic "(the Place of Government in the Utilization of Space," address at the University of California, Los Angeles, April 13, 1960). My personal view is that the level of funding projected by the NASA will prove to be too low either to meet our Soviet competition or to exploit the possibilities of advancing technology.

In conclusion, let me once more stress the unity of science and astronautics. Many people are used to thinking that astronautics merely competes with other fields of science for money and resources. But astronautics and the basic sciences also reinforce each other. For example, the director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Laboratory has said that more astrophysical information was gathered during the first few weeks of the space age than had been accumulated in the preceding century. Let us therefore take counsel of the ancient faith that the universe we live in is all one piece, and that what we learn about any part of it will help us understand the whole. By promoting astronautics we will inevitably promote all science and, to a significant extent, all knowledge.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1961

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1961)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art love and light and truth, we turn unfilled to Thee. In a world where the very foundations seem to be shaken, we cherish this hushed and hallowed moment which so long ago the Founding Fathers set apart as an altar of prayer at the day's beginning.

Here, with contrite hearts, we would be sure of Thee and of spiritual resources before facing the high solemnities of waiting tasks. Grant that those who in this fateful day by the people's choice have been called to high places of state, facing responsibilities as heavy as the servants of the commonwealth have ever borne, may be filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge, and the fear of Thee.

In an hour when such vast issues are at stake for all the world, may those who here serve, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand, rise to greatness of vision and soul, as the anxious eyes of all the nations are fixed upon this Chamber.

Together, with full purpose of heart, in Thy might unafraid, send us forth to meet the issues of this crucial year as in the name of the Lord, our God, we set up our banners. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 4, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1723) to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1723) to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 1948)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 26, 1960, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, on December 30, 1960, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Government Competition With Business: Refrigerated Warehousing"; which was printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS: REFRIGERATED WAREHOUSING," SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS—PART 2 OF REPORT NO. 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the attached views of Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which views are supplemental to Senate Report 1948, "Government Competition With Business: Refrigerated Warehousing," and that the views be made part 2 of this report and be dated December 31, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES FOR OFFICIAL COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, adopted on Tuesday, the Senate and the House will meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock on Friday, for the official count of electoral votes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent order entered yesterday, there will be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. At the conclusion of morning business, the Senate will return to the consideration of the business before it when it took the recess on yesterday—the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate Resolution 4, Senator Anderson's resolution, as modified. Pending before the Senate is the Humphrey-Kuchel substitute for the Anderson resolution.

Mr. President, I assume that, as usual, the 3-minute limitation will be observed during the course of the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume that, impliedly, that is a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any discussion during the course of the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I wish to state that I hope we can phrase this request so that the time—3 minutes—is the limit on each Senator, regardless of the subject matter or the number of items he may wish to present.

We remember all the grousing there was in the last session because a Senator would address himself to a specific matter for 3 minutes; and then would say, "Mr. President, I have another matter," and then would take another 3 minutes; and when that was compounded for quite a number of Senators, it developed a real inconvenience for those who had friends from home, who had luncheon engagements, or who had other engagements.

I believe it should be made crystal clear now, since this is not a rule of the Senate—it is only an understanding of accommodation, as a matter of fact—so there will be a clear limit of 3 minutes on each Senator, regardless of the number of items he has to dispose of, and so that the time limit will be strictly enforced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I am in wholehearted accord with what the distinguished minority leader has said; and I state further that it is my hope, and I hope my colleagues will agree with me, that insofar as recognition is concerned, from now on it will not be on the basis of whose name is at the desk of the Presiding Officer, but will be on the basis of who is first on his feet, addresses the Chair, and is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that the suggestion made by the minority leader is part of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make it part of the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me ask whether I correctly understand that the 3-minute limitation applies to routine business, such as the presentation of memorials and petitions and the introduction of new matter, but does not relate to any consideration of any general business before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It applies only to routine morning business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Chair ruled on the unanimous-consent request, as modified, by the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet between the hours of 2 and 3 o'clock today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Ascertainments of Electors for President and Vice President

Two letters from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, official copies of ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President from the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming (with the accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

Report on Contracts Negotiated by National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering contracts negotiated by that Administration, for the period January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Amendment of Act Relating to Superior National Forest, Minn.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports of General Sales Manager, Commodity Credit Corporation

Four letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the months of April, May, June, and July 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Liquidation of Stocks of Agricultural Commodities and Expansion of Markets for Surplus Agricultural Commodities

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of Agriculture entitled "Orderly Liquidation of Stocks of Agricultural Commodities Held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Expansion of Markets for Surplus Agricultural Commodities," dated October 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports on Agreements Concluded Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act

Three letters from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on agreements concluded during the months of August, September, and November 1960, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the month of October 1960, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of National Forest Reservation Commission (S. Doc. No. 3)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

Reports on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in the Bureau of the Census, during the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee of Appropriations.

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 40 reports covering 46 overobligations of appropriations within that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, certain violations of administrative control of funds procedures in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from an appropriation of that Department, as of June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, certain violations of administrative control of funds procedures in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from two of the appropriations of that Department, as of June 30, 1958, and December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, C.Z., reporting, pursuant to law, the violation of Panama Canal Company 1960 allotments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

Nine letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated August 15, September 29, September 29, October 3, November 7, December 6, and December 23, 1960, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Thirteen letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 3, September 10, September 10, September 14, September 27,

October 3, October 3, October 3, October 3, October 3, November 4, December 27, and December 29, 1960, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 4)

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended October 1, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that department on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, during the period January 1, through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF ARMY OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO HEADQUARTERS AGENCIES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Two letters from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff as of June 30, 1960, and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF OBSOLETE ORDNANCE MATERIAL TO STATE OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, the proposed transfer of certain obsolete ordnance material to the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SUBMARINE TO U.S. SUBMARINE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, the proposed transfer of the submarine *Flasher* to the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Materiel), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, during the period January 1, 1960, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD AT VAN NUYS MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction, strengthening of existing parking apron and transition areas, and modification of existing washrack at Van Nuys Municipal Airport, Calif., for the Air National Guard at an estimated cost of $476,000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense relating to real and personal property, as of June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INDEMNIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS AGAINST NUCLEAR AND OTHER UNUSUALLY HAZARDOUS RISKS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Defense to indemnify its contractors against nuclear and other unusually hazardous risks, to limit the liability of contractors so indemnified, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECOMPUTATION OF RETIREMENT OR RETAINER PAY OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF COSTS FOR CERTAIN U.S. NATIONALS BEFORE FOREIGN TRIBUNALS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committe on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the period January–June 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUINIDINE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the proposed disposition of approximately 453,000 ounces of quinidine now held in the national stockpile, and published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN MAGNESIUM SCRAP

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the proposed disposition of approximately 2,624 short-tons of magnesium scrap now held in the national stockpile, and published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN COBALTIFEROUS MATERIALS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 168,808 pounds of cobaltiferous materials now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN METALLURGICAL CHROMITE ORE AND FERROCHROME ALLOYS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 89,750 long tons of low-grade domestic metallurgical chromite ore and concentrates and approximately 151,000 pounds of various ferrochrome alloys now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION CONTRIBUTION

Two letters from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, quarterly reports on civil and defense mobilization contributions, covering the quarters ended June 30 and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Two letters from the Director and Acting Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Office, for the quarters ended June 30, 1960, and September 30, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ARMY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, purusant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NAVY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Acting Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Navy research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1, through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of

that Department entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Actions Report," covering the period January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1961, September 30, 1960, there were 2,309 officers of the Air Force assigned to the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON COMPETITION IN SYNTHETIC RUBBER INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third quarter, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON AWARDS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACTS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the month of June 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the months of July, August, and September 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

Two letters from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the periods April 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, and from July 1, 1960, through September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision for war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting a negative report for fiscal year 1960, on commissary activities outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGULATION OF DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING OF AIR CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on licensed hydroelectric projects and personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Four letters from the Chairman and Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of June 30, 1960, July 31, 1960, August 31, 1960, and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate copies of the following publications of that Commission: "Map, Major Natural Gas Pipelines in the U.S., June 30, 1960," "Maps, Principal Electric Facilities, 1960," "Electric Utility Depreciation Practices, 1958," "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1959," "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1959," "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1959," "Typical Electric Bills, 1960," "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Public Utilities and Licensees, Classes A & B," "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies, Classes A & B" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oregon, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON GENERAL OF THE ARMIES JOHN J. PERSHING CENTENNIAL

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the observance of the centennial celebration of John J. Pershing, General of the Armies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act, during fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CODIFICATION OF MILITARY LAW

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON PAYMENT OF TORT CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department of Justice, during the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that one claim was paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Agency, during fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering claims paid during the 6-month period ended June 30, 1960, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the activities of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Legion, for the period July 22, 1959, to August 15, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COURT OF CLAIMS OPINION IN CASE OF WAH CHANG CORPORATION *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of *Wah Chang Corporation* v. *The United States*, No. 124–55, rendered on October 5, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Illinois, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings and activities, together with a statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF SALVATORE PALADINO

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Salvatore Paladino, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to the case and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of order entered in behalf of Alice G. Palmer, relating to adjustment of her immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD FOR FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

A letter from the firm of Ross, McCord, Ice & Miller, of Indianapolis, Ind., signed by Harry T. Ice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report and audit of the Board for Fundamental Education, for the year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS, U.S.A., NATIONAL MEMORIAL, INC.

A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that memorial, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Department for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF STUDY BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ENTITLED "PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN APPLYING A FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE TO AGRICULTURAL WORKERS"

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a staff study made by that Department, entitled "Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO WAR ORPHANS OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the Ambassador of the Philippines, the views of the Philippine Government on the desirability of amending title 38 of the United States Code as it affects war orphans in the Philippines eligible to participate in an educational assistance program of the U.S. Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ALLOTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF PAY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES PLACED IN CERTAIN SALARY LEVELS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the limitation on the number of postal employees who can be placed in salary levels PFS–17 through PFS–20, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON BONDING OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSED CRATER-LONG LAKES DIVISION, SNETTISHAM PROJECT, ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan of development for the proposed Crater-Long Lakes division, Snettisham project, Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESIDENT ADAMS PARKWAY, MASSACHUSETTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility of establishing the President Adams Parkway, to extend from Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., to Plymouth, Mass., via Quincy, Mass., in memory of John Adams and John Quincy Adams, second and sixth Presidents of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS ON SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Two letters from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions within that Department, for the calendar year 1960; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Chairman of the Board, and Vice Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wilson Dam, Ala., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND—TREASURY DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, dated September 23, 1960, and December 21, 1960, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund—Treasury Department Activities, for the quarters ended June 30, 1960, and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank for the year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS BY PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON LIQUIDATION OF ASSETS FORMERLY HELD BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND TRANSFERRED TO SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, dated September 30, 1960, and November 22, 1960, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 for the quarters ended June 30, 1960, and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 14th semiannual report of that Administration covering operations between January 1, 1960, and June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority for the quarter ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON LIQUIDATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, WAR, AND RECONVERSION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., dated September 2, 1960, and November 30, 1960, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarters ended June 30, 1960, and September 30, 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS BY NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing lands acquired by that Commission, during the fiscal year 1960, for the development of the park, parkway and playground system of the National Capital and its environs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the Vice President, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

A letter from Eric G. Jansson & Co., certified public accountants, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Conference of State Societies, for the fiscal year July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTION OF PROVINCIAL BOARD OF NEGROS OCCIDENTAL, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, Resolution No. 1021 of the Provincial Board of Negros Occidental, Republic of the Philippines, expressing gratitude of the board for a recent increase in the amount of sugar authorized for importation into the United States from the Republic of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program for the period July 1958 through June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the fiscal year July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the educational and cultural exchange program, for the period July 1–December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAYMENT TO GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment to the Government of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROL PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the strategic trade control program, 1957–60, Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission as of June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council for the period July 1–December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the period January 1 to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, enclosing a copy of his letter to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a review of the policies and practices of the Department of Labor and the States regarding unemployment compensation payments to retired Federal employees who are receiving retirement annuities, issued by the Comptroller General on April 26, 1960 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO CERTAIN HEALTH AND EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIL DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to Public Health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the period July 1 through September 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ALLOCATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY UNDER CONTROL OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical & Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Lower Colorado River Basin Water Resources Development Program, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1957–1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the General Supply Fund, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southwestern Power System and Related Activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years

1958 and 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the policies and procedures relating to the leasing of space, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, as of July 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of certain activities of the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, dated November, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of development and procurement of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army, dated November 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of certain activities of the Government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the need for procurement of electric and telephone line construction trucks by the Department of the Air Force, dated November 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Federal-aid highway program, region 8, Portland, Oreg., Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, as of October 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of air item supply operations at the Transportation Materiel Command, Department of the Army, St. Louis, Mo., dated August 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the automatic data-processing system at the Transportation Materiel Command, Department of the Army, St. Louis, Mo. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON CERTAIN EXAMINATIONS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of subcontracts issued to reaction motors division, Thiokol Chemical Corp., Denville, N.J., by Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., under Department of the Air Force Prime Contract AF 04(645)-4, dated October 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of F-101 airplane wings purchased from the Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-29841, dated November 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the target price negotiated for sidewinder missile guidance and control units under the Department of the Navy fixed-price incentive contract Nord-16483, with Philco Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., dated October 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of rental payments negotiated for the commercial use of Government-owned facilities furnished under Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33(038)-25718, with Avco Corp., Lycoming Division, Stratford, Conn., dated September, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SHORT FORM REPORT ON AUDIT OF COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form report on the audit of the Columbia River Power System and Related Activities, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PROPOSED PRESIDENTIAL ARCHIVAL DEPOSITORY OF CERTAIN PAPERS OF FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed presidential archival depository of house papers and other historical materials of former President Herbert Hoover (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENT, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND AT NELLIS AIR FORCE RANGE, NEV.

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for withdrawal and reservation by the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND AT LUKE-WILLIAMS AIR FORCE RANGE, YUMA, ARIZ.

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LONG RANGE PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC LANDS—PROJECT TWENTY-TWELVE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the long range program for public lands—Project Twenty-Twelve, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

READJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF DEBTS AGAINST INDIVIDUAL OR TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, orders for the adjustment or cancellation of debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, for the fiscal year 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report on the status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AGATE DAM AND RESERVOIR, ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Agate Dam and Reservoir, Talen division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1959 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATIONS OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEYS AND LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Weber Basin project, Utah (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Eden project, Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Florida project, Colorado (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Almena unit, Kanaska division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Yellowtail unit, Lower Bighorn division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana and

Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Stone Corral Irrigation District, Calif. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE DELUZ DAM, SANTA MARGARITA RIVER, CALIF.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction, operation, and maintenance of the DeLuz Dam, Santa Margarita River, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures under section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

"Whereas members of the Federal judiciary on the district court and all other levels are appointed to office, and such appointment is for life during good behavior; and

"Whereas the powers vested in and/or exercised by Federal district judges are great, affecting as they do the life and liberties of all of the people and, in many instances, in practice being the final tribunal before which many issues are litigated since large numbers of questions arising in their courts never are appealed to higher Federal courts; and

"Whereas the powers vested in and/or exercised by Federal judges of all levels are of such magnitude that the best interests of the people of this Nation cannot always be served by appointment for life during good behavior, without adequate recourse for the people where it is determined that, perhaps despite so-called "good behavior," the judicial determinations of any of such judges are consistently not in the best interest of the people or are based on unclear and/or unreasonable interpretations of the U.S. Constitution and the laws of the land, or for any other reason fail to maintain that quality which the people have a right to expect of their judges; and

"Whereas while it is recognized that procedures exist for the removal of Federal judges for causes relating to good behavior, such procedures virtually deny to the people any means for such removal because of their difficulty of accomplishment; and

"Whereas the legislative and executive branches on all levels of government are elected by the people to serve for stated periods of time, thus affording the people periodic opportunity to review the actions of such officials and to either endorse or reject actions by the reelection or defeat of said officials; and

"Whereas the procedure followed for the legislative and executive branches is in keeping with the best traditions of a truly republican form of government: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned, urged, and requested to initiate and take such steps as are necessary to provide in the Constitution and laws of the United States that all members of the Federal judiciary either shall be elected or, should it be determined that appointment of such judges should be the method of their selection, then that their appointment shall be for a stated period of time and not for life; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress.

"_____ _____,

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

"_____ _____,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, the Congress shall call a Convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution; and,

"Whereas the Legislature of Louisiana, by the enactment of Act No. 2 of the first extraordinary session of 1960, interposed the sovereignty of this State to preserve and protect the powers reserved to Louisiana and to its people by the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States against the usurpation asserted by the Supreme Court of the United States and the U.S. district courts of Louisiana pursuant to the decision of the former in *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education;* and

"Whereas said Act No. 2 of the first extraordinary session of 1960 provides that said act shall remain in effect only until such time as the Constitution of the United States may be amended by the process set forth therein to grant to the Federal Government the powers usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education,* decided May 17, 1954, and other decisions of the Federal courts pursuant thereto; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the house of representatives and the senate concurring), That, by means of this resolution the Legislature of Louisiana does make application to the Congress to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to the end that the determination shall be made as to whether the State of Louisiana or the Federal Government is to control and operate the public school system in this State; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the house of representatives to the Vice President, in his capacity as President of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives with the request that they be laid before the Congress for appropriate action; and be it further

"Resolved, That the copies of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the house of representatives to each Member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

"_____ _____,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"_____ _____,

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted at the Ninth Annual Conference of the United States Civil Defense Council, relating to an adequate civil defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Resolutions adopted at the 82d General Conference of the National Guard Association of the United States, at Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to ways and means whereby that Association can actively participate in countering the Communist threat, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Federacion Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R., relating to sugar; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Society of the War of 1812 in the State of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., signed by E. Richard Coleman, secretary, notifying the Senate that that society had adopted a resolution opposing the deletion of the Connally amendment from the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the 61st Annual National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo., relating to the erection on Corregidor Island of a suitable memorial to those servicemen who served in the Pacific theater during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, at Chicago, Ill., relating to the policymaking powers of State legislatures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A paper in the nature of a petition from the representatives of the city of Alpine, Tex., the chamber of commerce, and Brewster County, Tex., relating to matters of interest in that area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Albany, N.Y., relating to certain congressional actions on the effectiveness of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the officers of the Railroad Division of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, relating to the Pennsylvania Railroad strike insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Andrew J. Easter, of Washington, D.C., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Elmer J. Berset, of Los Angeles County, Calif., relating to the repeal of certain acts concerning the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Woodrow G. Besonen, of Jackson, Mich., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the J. Milton Edwards Post No. 2238, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Shreveport, La., relating to certain charges against U.S. District Judge J. Skelly Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Crusade for God and Freedom, Los Angeles, Calif., signed by Thos. Wyatt, chairman, and Steve Foote, past State commander, American Legion of California, relating to the dangers of communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, of Charleston, S.C., relating to the filling of vacancies occurring on the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of E. L. Marsh, of Roanoke, Va., relating to his application for a pension under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Walter S. Sheppard, of Richmond Hill, N.Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION FOR SUBMISSION TO THE PEOPLE OF THE PROPOSED 23D AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in my remarks a petition sent to me by Miss Marie Fredenburg of 5037 Northeast Alberta Street, Portland, Oreg. The petition speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE:

I, the undersigned citizen of the United States of America, hereby exercise my right to petition the Congress of the United States, through you, my duly elected representative of my State, Oregon, to submit to the people for ratification the proposed 23d amendment to the Constitution, now pending in Congress as House Joint Resolution 23, and already approved by Wyoming, Texas, and Nevada, which provides that:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 23

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

I certify that I am a citizen of the United States of America and am of legal voting age.

MARIE FREDENBURG.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BYRD of West VIRGINIA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BEALL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HART, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BURDICK, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BLAKLEY):

S. 3. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of Acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 4. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 5. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of extended unemployment compensation benefits to be payable during periods of high unemployment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 6. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 7. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 8. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. FONG, and Mr. MORTON):

S. 9. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies and create new employment opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

My Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 10. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 11. A bill to amend the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 12. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 13. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the development of irrigation in connection with non-Federal municipal and industrial water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 14. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 15. A bill to retrocede to the State of Utah concurrent jurisdiction over certain lands within such State, which are under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 16. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Soil and Water Conservation Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 17. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 18. A bill to provide fishery conservation measures on the Provo River, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 19. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takimi Yamada; and

S. 20. A bill to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 21. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 22. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the

direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 23. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 24. A bill to authorize cooperative associations of milk producers to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 25. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Great Salt Lake National Park in the State of Utah; and

S. 26. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 27. A bill to amend section 491 of title 18, United States Code, prohibiting certain acts involving the use of tokens, slugs, disks, devices, papers or other things; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 28. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michael Stone;

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Ok Nyu Choi (Ann Wollmar);

S. 30. A bill for the relief of Miss Andreina Viselli;

S. 31. A bill for the relief of Miss Hazel Tseng; and

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Jenno Becsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 33. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

S. 34. A bill to amend section 16(a) of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to permit loans insured thereunder to be insured for the full value of the farm, less any prior lien indebtedness;

S. 35. A bill relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat;

S. 36. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; and

S. 37. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Spring wheat quality research laboratory in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 38. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Geographic Center of the North American Continent National Monument;

S. 39. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands;

S. 40. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to receive from the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Reservation, N. Dak., a deed conveying certain property on such reservation to the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 41. A bill to provide that the United States shall return to the former owners oil and gas rights in certain lands acquired for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project, North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras;

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Doctor Fang Luke Chiu; and

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Freda Feller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 45. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to increase certain amounts authorized therein for grants for sewerage treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 46. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of basic public recreation facilities at the Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoir areas, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 47. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 48. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

S. 49. A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 50. A bill to authorize the making and enforcement of regulations at water supply projects in the District of Columbia and environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 51. A bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 52. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act so as to exclude therefrom service performed in the employment of certain political committees; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 53. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes by making available to them surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 54. A bill to grant 81 acres of public domain to the Cocopah Indians in Arizona; and

S. 55. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 56. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the broadcasting of returns of presidential elections to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the last above mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 57. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to school assistance in federally affected areas, so as to limit payments under such laws to situations involving tax-exempt Federal property; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 58. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; and

S. 59. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 60. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 61. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; and

S. 62. A bill to provide scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans and other individuals from interest resulting from the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the repayment from such funds of certain American war claims against Germany and Japan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 63. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the southern district and the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 64. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

My Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 65. A bill to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 66. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Kay Addis;

S. 69. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas;

S. 70. A bill for the relief of Mah Ngim Hay (Joe Mah); and

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Mah Ngim Bell (Bill Mah); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 72. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fort Scott National Historic Site, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 73. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 74. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for recomputation of annuities where persons designated to receive survivor annuities predecease the annuitants;

S. 75. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to eliminate the provisions requiring termination of annuities of surviving widows or widowers upon remarriage; and

S. 76. A bill to extend the second-class mailing privilege to bulletins of State industrial development agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 77. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 78. A bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission; to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 79. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands located in Burleigh County, N. Dak., to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 80. A bill to provide increases in compensation for food service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 81. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide that any annual leave credited to an employee at the end of a leave year which is in excess of the maximum amount which can be carried over into the next leave year shall be credited to the employee's sick leave account; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Naoko Ishiwatari White;

S. 83. A bill for the relief of Maria Carraro;

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 85. A bill for the relief of Rosario Barrena Villachoia, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 86. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 87. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; and

S. 88. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to the settlement of labor disputes involving common carriers by air; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 89. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the exclusion, in computing the average monthly wage of certain veterans, of certain periods during which they were on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 90. A bill for the relief of James V. Williams; and

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sue Pyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 92. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; and

S. 93. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 94. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Martin Prada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 96. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate any discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 97. A bill to promote the utilization of Indian-owned resources by Indians of the three affiliated tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation;

S. 98. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide water and sewage disposal facilities to the Medora area adjoining the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; and

S. 99. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 100. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 101. A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 102. A bill to establish a Commission to study and propose improvements in the methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 104. A bill to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico enabling act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico;

S. 105. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Elephant Butte Reservoir area, New Mexico; and

S. 106. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44; 25 U.S.C. 636), to better promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 107. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial state of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 108. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 109. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 110. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the occupancy and use by the Congressional Club of certain lands in the District of Columbia which are under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. McGEE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 111. A bill to authorize public land States to select certain public lands in exchange for land taken by the United States for military and other uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 112. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall establish a national cemetery in Fort Reno, Okla., on certain lands presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 113. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 114. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 115. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 116. A bill to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to

reenter the United States without payment of visa fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 117. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 119. A bill to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CASE OF South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 120. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 121. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any Federal water resources project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish a 27½ percent depletion allowance for minerals mined as a source of synthetic oil or gas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 123. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to threats or injury to Federal officers in the discharge of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Amaran Bin Jamil;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Elorriage;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gil-Carrasco and Jesus Torrado-Espana;

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Victor Echevarria Zubieta;

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Tashiko Gima and her minor child, Kentaroo Gima; and

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Ioannis F. Kostakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Orlando Gonfiantini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 132. A bill for the relief of Man-Yeh Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 133. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Constantin Zarna and his wife, Eva Zarna, and their two sons, Pavel Zarna and Constantin Zarna;

S. 135. A bill for the relief of Janis Papulis;

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Dinko Dorcic;

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Borivoje Ilic;

S. 138. A bill for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Krste Angeloff;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Vladimir (Talevic) Talevski;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Chrysostomos Pascali (Paschalis); and

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Ferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 143. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 144. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make the maintenance of a reasonably stable price level an explicit aim of Federal economic policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 145. A bill to provide that the Secretaries of State and Commerce shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 146. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 147. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a recreation area in connection with the Shawnee National Forest in Pope County, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

S. 148. A bill for the relief of Silvana Dibiasio Fiacco;

S. 149. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich;

S. 150. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office; and

S. 151. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine and Maritime Service Veterans' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Hee Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 153. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 154. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 155. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 156. A bill for the relief of Bum-Nai Eddie Ham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 157. A bill providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the District of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 158. A bill to confer upon the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 159. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gerald E. Helmer; and

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 161. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to certain employees engaged in hazardous activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. FONG, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 162. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 163. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Myrtle Beach, S.C., for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 164. A bill for the relief of Cherie Helen Bratton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 165. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 166. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes;

S. 167. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes;

S. 168. A bill to make the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized team sport of baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes;

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rodolfo De Oca;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eugenio De Lacruz and his wife, Josefa Ancheta Lacruz;

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Braganza; and

S. 172. A bill for the relief of Chi Yan Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the first three above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 173. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 174. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 175. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act with respect to the protection of national parks and monuments under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 176. A bill for the relief of Robert Roberts;

S. 177. A bill for the relief of Hadji Benlevi; and

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 179. A bill to amend section 201 of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 610), to provide for the nutritional enrichment and the sanitary transportation and storage of rice distributed under certain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. MORSE):

S.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to study the nonmineral public land laws of the United States to facilitate the enactment of a more effective, simplified, and adequate system of laws governing the transfer of title to public lands to individuals, associations, corporations, and to State and local governments or their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the adjournment of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of Whitsunday of each year as Hernando de Soto Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to study and propose improvements in the methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a term of 4 years for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. BLAKLEY):

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States concerning residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States;

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution;

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections;

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President;

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives;

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO VETO ITEMS IN CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, effective at the beginning of the second session, Eighty-seventh Congress, paragraph numbered 1 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local

nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized.": so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCE ON TARIFF MODIFICATIONS

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas the present imbalance of dollar payments which has resulted in a serious drain on the gold reserves of the United States has been caused in large part by concessions in tariffs negotiated through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

Whereas conferences which may lead to further tariff concessions through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are now being held in Geneva, Switzerland; and

Whereas participation by the United States in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has never been approved by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the participation by the United States in the conferences seeking further modifications in our tariffs through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should be terminated immediately and all representatives of the United States at such conferences should be recalled.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMPACT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES AND OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND THEIR EFFECT ON AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the impact of labor-management disputes and of collective bargaining generally on the national economy, and the effects thereof on the well-being of the American public as a whole, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the national economy and to safeguard the interests of the public.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall consist of eight members to be appointed by the Vice President, selected in equal numbers from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and two members from each committee shall be members of the majority and two of the minority Members of the Senate. At its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, the select committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman, and adopt rules of procedures not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1962, inclusive, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

(b) Upon the filing of its final report the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) take such testimony; (5) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (6) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it may deem necessary and appropriate; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $, and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HENNINGS OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., late a Senator from the State of Missouri, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the area redevelopment bill; and I am very happy to have been joined by 43 other Senators as cosponsors.

I shall try to follow the injunction of my colleagues, so as to confine my remarks to 3 minutes.

Mr. President, this is the fourth Congress in which I have introduced an area redevelopment bill. The Senate has approved such a bill on three occasions. I hope the 87th Congress will consider the bill favorably and with a sense of urgency.

The need for this bill has increased during the 5 years since the Senate first approved the distressed area bill. Rising unemployment and inadequate economic growth have accentuated the problems of unemployment throughout the Nation. The number of distressed areas has increased. There are nearly 100 such areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. In these areas, there are at least 15 million people and over 600,000 unemployed. Unemployment throughout the Nation now exceeds 6 percent, but unemployment in the distressed areas is nearly twice as high, and in about a score of communities it exceeds depression proportions of 15 percent or more.

There are also hundreds of counties in predominantly rural areas where incomes are extremely low and unemployment is extremely high. These counties have an additional population of from 4 to 7 million.

The express purpose of the bill is to establish an effective program for reducing substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in the distressed areas of the country and to help maintain a continuing high level of economy throughout the United States.

This economically unhealthy situation creates hardship to many individuals and their families and impairs the national welfare by wasting human resources. This bill will assist communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in distressed areas to achieve lasting local improvements by the development of new employment opportunities.

It is now generally accepted that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help assure maximum employment. This principle is now a part of the law of the land, through the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946. The persistence of high unemployment and underemployment in many areas should be fought by the Federal Government, not only because it causes great human

suffering in these areas, but also because these conditions are a threat to the general welfare of the Nation. The bill which we offer recognizes this responsibility to the areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment and provides for a program which will help the people in these areas expand their economic activities. The bill proposes a program which will stimulate these areas to help themselves.

I am encouraged by the growing acceptance of the principles underlying the bill.

President-elect Kennedy, who was a great champion of the bill when he served in the Senate, has given the bill a high priority in his legislative program. In receiving the task force report last Sunday, the President-elect endorsed the principles of this bill, and stated:

It would be a mistake to consider the problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment solely in the context of the areas directly affected. The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality. This problem is especially critical today, for 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States lives in an area that now feels the impact of chronic unemployment or underemployment.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of the bill, a digest of the bill, the latest U.S. Department of Labor list of substantial and persistent labor surplus areas, and an editorial from the Washington Star of January 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, digest, list, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detract from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

AREA DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the same rate as that prescribed by law for an assistant secretary of an executive department.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: the Administrator as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the General Services Administration; Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Small Business Administration; and the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry, including agriculture, which has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment or underemployment in the several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The Administrator may also call upon representatives of interested governmental departments and agencies, together with representatives of transportation and other industries, to participate in any conference convened under authority of this subsection whenever he determines that such participation would contribute to a solution of the problems creating such unemployment or underemployment. The representatives at any such conference shall consider with and may recommend to the Administrator plans and programs to further the objectives of this Act with special reference to the industry with respect to which the conference was convened.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(1) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in subparagraph (2) below; and

(2) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two years. Any area in which a substantial part of the employment is or most recently was in an industry adversely affected by the reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, with respect to which the President has reported to the Administrator under subsection (f) of this section, and meeting the standards of unemployment set forth in this section shall be entitled on application to a priority of consideration by the Administrator for designation as a redevelopment area.

(b) The Administrator shall also designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas (including Indian reservations) within the United States which do not meet the requirements set forth in subsection (a) but which he determines are among the highest in numbers and percentages of low-income families, and in which there exists a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment, the extent of migration out of the area, and the proportion of the population of each such area which has been receiving public assistance from the Federal Government and/or from the State or States in which such area is located or from any municipality therein.

(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Interior are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as a redevelopment area and may include one or more States, one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

(f) In any case in which the President is required (1) under the provisions of subsection 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 to transmit a message to the Congress identifying an article with respect to which a trade agreement has caused or threatened to cause serious injury to a domestic industry, or (2) under the provisions of subsection 7(c) of such Act to submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments in the rates of duties, imposed such quotas, or made such other modifications, as are found and reported by the United States Tariff Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to a domestic industry, he shall notify the Administrator and shall send him a copy of such message or report.

LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including, in exceptional cases, machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, for the construction of new buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial or commercial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a) shall not exceed $100,000,000 (but not to exceed $30,000,000 prior to July 1, 1962), and (B) with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b) shall not exceed $100,000,000 (but not to exceed $30,000,000 prior to July 1, 1962);

(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) Subject to section 12(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Administrator as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(8) Such loans shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9 of this Act, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the outstanding principal amount of any loan made under this section shall be allocated from the payments received by the Administrator in the form of interest on such loan to a sinking fund to cover losses on loans under this section;

(9) Such assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including, in exceptional cases, machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, as equity capital or as a loan;

(C) That in extending financial assistance under this section with respect to a redevelopment area, the Administrator shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources;

(D) That any Federal financial assistance extended under this section in connection with a particular project shall be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full. If any Federal financial assistance extended under this section is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Administrator an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

(c) If there is no agency or instrumentality in any State, or political subdivision thereof, qualified to approve applicants for assistance under this section as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), the Administrator shall, upon determining that any area in such State is a redevelopment area, appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a "local committee") to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, commercial, industrial, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. In appointing any such local committee, the Administrator may include therein members of any existing local redevelopment committees. Financial assistance under this section in connection with projects located in a redevelopment area, for which a local committee has been appointed under this section, shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved by such local committee.

(d) Of the funds authorized to be raised under section 9 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a), and not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b).

LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 65 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 12(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than forty years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9 of this Act, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

(d) Any loan made under this section in connection with a particular project shall be repayable only after other loans made in

connection with such project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full. If any loan made under this section is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(e) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

(f) Of the funds authorized to be raised under section 9 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section: *Provided,* That not more than $30,000,000 shall be deposited in such fund prior to July 1, 1962.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 8. (a) The Administrator may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section.

The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 7 of this Act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

(c) The Administrator shall by regulation provide for the supervision of carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $75,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided,* That not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be appropriated for such purpose prior to July 1, 1962.

FUNDS FOR LOANS

SEC. 9. To obtain funds for loans under this Act, the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000: *Provided,* That the amount of such notes and obligations which are outstanding prior to July 1, 1962, shall not exceed $90,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public debt transactions of the United States.

INFORMATION

SEC. 10. The Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 11. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000 annually.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 12. In performing his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Admistrator;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall

not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Administrator, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, comprising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classifications laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 14. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Area Redevelopment Administrator certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a 'municipality') is situated in an area designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act as a redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposition of such land under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to asume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 15. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated by the Area Redevelopment Administrator under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as redevelopment areas or (B)".

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Administrator, shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in, or who were last employed in, redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That any vocational training or retraining provided under this section shall be designed to enable unemployed individuals to qualify for new employment in the redevelopment area in which they reside or were last employed.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeships, and to promote journeyman and other job training in the area.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Administrator shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located, under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act. Such payments shall be made only during the period the individual is receiving vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act, but not in any event to exceed sixteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PENALTIES

SEC. 18. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administrator, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administrator, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Administrator or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administration, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administrator, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or

assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administrator, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administrator which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administrator, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 19. No loan shall be made by the Administrator under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administrator the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Administrator for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Administrator to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Administration, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Administrator shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

RECORD OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 20. The Administrator shall maintain as a permanent part of the records of the Administration a list of applications approved, which shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Administration. The following information shall be posted in such list as soon as each application is approved: (1) the name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applications, the names of the officers and directors thereof, (2) the amount and duration of the loan for which application is made, (3) the purposes for which the proceeds of the loan are to be used, and (4) a general description of the security offered.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

SEC. 21. The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 22. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Administrator, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Administrator such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 23. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 24. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 25. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this Act.

APPLICATION OF ACT

SEC. 26. As used in this Act, the term "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The digest, list, and editorial presented by Mr. DOUGLAS are as follows:

DIGEST OF S. 1, AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section would provide that the act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act."

SECTION 2. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

This section would declare it to be the purpose of the bill to provide Federal help for areas needing economic redevelopment so that they can expand their economic activities and alleviate the substantial unemployment and underemployment that prevail within such areas. This would be accomplished by assisting communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals to create new employment opportunities by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources, without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

SECTION 3. AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

This section would establish an Area Redevelopment Administration as an independent agency within the executive branch of the Government. The Administration would be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate. The Administrator would receive a salary of $20,000 a year.

SECTION 4. ADVISORY BOARD

Subsection (a) would create an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board to advise the Administrator in the performance of his functions under the bill. The Board would be composed of the Administrator, as Chairman, and 11 other department and agency heads whose functions are related to (or could assist in) the improvement of economic conditions in redevelopment areas. Any member of the Board could designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board. The Chairman could invite other interested officials in the executive branch to participate in the functions of the Board.

(b) would require the Administrator to appoint a 25-member National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment, to be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the general public, one of whom would be designated as Chairman by the Administrator. This Committee would be required to meet twice a year and make recommendations to the Administrator from time to time, to assist him in carrying out his duties under the bill.

(c) would authorize the Administrator to call together, confer with, and receive recommended plans and programs from, representatives of any industry which has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in the areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The Administrator would also be authorized to call upon representatives of interested governmental agencies, together with representatives of transportation and other industries, to participate in any conference called under this subsection.

SECTION 5. REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The bill recognizes two types of redevelopment areas which will be eligible to receive Federal assistance under this bill.

Under subsection (a) an area may be designated a redevelopment area in any one of the following ways: (1) the Administrator may, at his discretion, determine that a given area has been subject to substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time and designate the area an industrial redevelopment area; or (2) the Administrator must designate an industrial area as an industrial redevelopment area—

(1) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 percent or more and has averaged at least 6 percent for the qualifying time periods specified in subparagraph (2) below; and

(2) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least (a) 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, or (b) 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years, or (c) 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 years.

Areas adversely affected by trade agreements concerning which the President has notified the Administrator under section 5(f) are given priority in consideration of designation as industrial redevelopment areas.

(b) sets forth the criteria for other redevelopment areas (including Indian reservations). The Administrator is directed to designate as redevelopment areas which he determines are among the highest in numbers and percentages of low-income families, and in which there exists a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making these designations the Administrator is required to consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas in the United States, the proportion such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment and the proportion of the population receiving public assistance.

(c) provides that in making determinations concerning redevelopment areas the Administrator is to be guided, but not conclusively governed, by studies made and the available information compiled by the various Federal agencies, State and local governments, universities and private organizations.

Under (d) the Administrator may also request from the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior special studies and such information and data as he deems necessary to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator is required to reimburse these agencies for expenditures which they incur in connection with filling his requests.

(e) defines the term "redevelopment area" to mean any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as a redevelopment area. This provision limits the benefits of the act to the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(f) requires the President to notify the Administrator when he reports to the Congress under the peril point procedure or when he reports to the Ways and Means and Finance Committees under the escape clause procedure of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

SECTION 6. LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

Under subsection (a) the Administrator is authorized to make loans (including participations), to assist in the purchase or development of land and facilities (including in exceptional cases machinery and equipment) for industrial use, or for the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial plants. This assistance shall not be extended for working capital or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

Subsection (b) imposes the following restrictions:

(1) The total amount of loans and participations outstanding at any one time in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a) must not exceed $100 million, but not to exceed $30 million prior to July 1, 1962. Similar provisions are made for redevelopment areas designated under 5(b).

(2) The assistance may only be extended to applicants which have been approved for the purpose by an agency of the State or its political subdivision concerned with problems of economic development in the State or subdivision.

(3) The project will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment.

(4) The assistance may only be extended if such financial assistance is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms.

(5) An immediate participation is to be preferred to a loan.

(6) There must be reasonable assurance of repayment.

(7) The length of the loan may not exceed 25 years, plus an additional 10 years in the course of liquidating the loan.

(8) The interest must be one-half of 1 percent above the amount paid to the Secretary of the Treasury. One-quarter of 1 percent must be placed in a sinking fund to cover losses on loans.

(9) The assistance must not exceed 65 percent of the cost to the applicant, excluding other Federal aid, and the following conditions must be observed:

(A) Enough funds must be available to complete the project;

(B) At least 10 percent of the cost must be supplied by the State or a subdivision, community or area organization, as equity capital, or as a loan;

(C) In the case of a project in a redevelopment area designated under 5(a) not less than 5 percent of the cost must be supplied by nongovernmental sources;

(D) The Federal financial assistance must be repayable after other loans made in connection with the project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full.

(10) An overall program for the economic development of the area must have been approved by the Administrator and a finding must be made by the State or a subdivision that the project is consistent with the program.

(c) provides that if there is no agency or instrumentality in a State or subdivision qualified to approve applicants under this section, the Administrator may appoint a local redevelopment committee consisting of seven or more residents of the area representing labor, commercial, industrial and agricultural groups and the residents of the area generally.

(d) creates a revolving fund of $100 million for projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a) and another revolving fund of $100 million for projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b).

SECTION 7. LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

(a) Loans for public facilities may be made upon the application of a State or a political subdivision thereof, or an Indian tribe, or a private or public organization or association representing a redevelopment area. The loan may be made for the purpose of financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within the redevelopment area.

(1) The project must provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment, and must tend to improve the opportunities in the area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities.

(2) The loan may not be granted if funds are available from other sources on reasonable terms.

(3) The amount of the loan plus other available funds must be sufficient for completion of the project.

(4) There must be a reasonable expectation of repayment.

(5) The area has an approved economic development program.

(b) The loan is limited to 65 percent of the aggregate cost of the project, and it must mature within 40 years. The interest rate is to be one-quarter of 1 percent above the rate of interest paid by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) The Administrator must require that at least 10 percent of the cost of the project shall be supplied by the State (or any political subdivision thereof) as equity capital, or as a loan.

(d) The Federal loan is to be subordinate to other loans made in connection with the project and in accordance with this section.

(e) Prohibits financial assistance to a public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

(f) A revolving fund of $100 million is set up, from funds borrowed from the Treasury. But not more than $30 million shall be deposited in the fund prior to July 1, 1962.

SECTION 8. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

Subsection (a) authorizes the Administrator to make studies of the needs for public facilities in the various redevelopment areas and to make grants for the acquisition or development of land for public facility usage in redevelopment areas, and for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of public facilities in such areas.

(b) A grant may be made only pursuant to a proposal (showing the proposed project, its cost, and the proposed local contributions) received from the State or local government, Indian tribe, or from a public or private organization representing the redevelopment area.

Before the Administrator approves a grant he must find that (1) the proposed project will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the area, and will tend to promote industrial or commercial development, (2) the entity requesting the grant will contribute to the cost of the project in proportion to its ability, and (3) the project is urgently needed in the area and could not be undertaken without such a grant. No such grant could exceed the difference between the total cost of the project and the amount available for it from other sources (including loans under sec. 7 of the bill).

(c) directs the Administrator to issue regulations to insure that Federal funds made available for public facility projects under this section are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) imposes a restriction on grants for public utilities like the restrictions imposed on loans under subsection 7(e) described above.

(e) authorizes an appropriation not exceeding $75 million for public facility grants under this section, of which $10 million shall be appropriated prior to July 1, 1962.

SECTION 9. FUNDS FOR LOANS

This section would authorize the Administrator to obtain funds for making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the bill by borrowing from the Treasury in amounts not exceeding $300 million outstanding at any one time. The amount of such notes and obligations shall not exceed $90 million prior to July 1, 1962. The interest rate on the notes and obligations representing this borrowing would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate not greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The amounts thus obtained from the Treasury would be used to establish the revolving funds provided for in sections 6 and 7 of the bill.

SECTION 10. INFORMATION

The Administrator is authorized to extend to firms located in redevelopment areas technical information, market research data, and other forms of assistance obtainable from the various Federal agencies which might be useful to the areas in expanding employment.

In addition, the Administrator is directed to furnish Federal procurement agencies addresses of businesses located in redevelopment areas desirous of obtaining Government contracts. The lists shall specify the supplies and services in which the designated firms are engaged.

SECTION 11. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

This section authorizes the Administrator to offer technical assistance to redevelopment areas. Such technical assistance might consist of data concerning the resources and the economic potential of the areas and other information that may help the economic growth of these areas. The assistance may be provided directly through members of the staff of the Area Redevelopment Administration or through contracts with private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or institutions. An amount not to exceed $4.5 million is appropriated under this section.

SECTION 12. POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

This section provides the Administrator with the administrative powers needed to carry out the area redevelopment program under the bill. The Administrator is authorized by this section to engage in such business transactions, and to take such action to acquire, dispose of, and otherwise deal with both real and personal property and to enforce any rights, claims, and obligations, as may be necessary or appropriate in connection with the performance of his duties under the bill; and to establish such rules and regulations as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

SECTION 13. TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

Under this section the Administrator is required to terminate the eligibility for area redevelopment assistance when he finds the economic conditions within the area have improved to the extent that the area is no longer eligible for designation under section 5.

An area may be redesignated as a redevelopment area, if the economic conditions within the area deteriorate to qualify again for redevelopment assistance. No action in terminating the eligibility of an area to receive aid under this bill will affect the validity of any contracts entered into prior to the termination of eligibility.

SECTION 14. URBAN RENEWAL

This is an amendment to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and will be designated as section 113 of that act.

Subsection (a) provides financial assistance to local public agencies in any otherwise eligible municipality where the Area Redevelopment Administrator certifies to the Administrator (HHFA) that—

(1) the municipality is situated in an area designated as a redevelopment area, and

(2) there is a probability that such assistance will contribute to more than temporary improvement in economic development.

Subsection (b) waives the "predominantly residential" requirement of section 110(c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, but prohibits assistance to areas in which the Administrator determines that relocation of business operations from one area to another would result in increasing unemployment in the area of original location.

(b) amends section 110(c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to include as an additional type of exemption industrial or commercial redevelopment areas as defined in section 112(a). This would require that Federal capital grants for all nonresidential projects, including the new exemption, be limited to 10 percent of total capital grant authorizations.

(c) permits financial assistance to an area containing primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan.

(d) authorizes disposition of land under this section to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition provided that—

(1) such disposition shall be made to the public agency or nonprofit corporation at not less than fair market value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

(2) subsequent purchasers shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949. (Sec. 105(b) requires developer to proceed with development or redevelopment promptly and in accordance with an approved plan.)

(e) permits the Administrator to continue financial assistance to complete a project even though the area in which the project is located may no longer be a redevelopment area.

SECTION 15. URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

This section amends section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 so as to make planning grants available to communities in redevelopment areas with a population in excess of 25,000.

SECTION 16. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

This section provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the training or retraining needs of the labor force in a redevelopment area.

(a) If the Secretary of Labor finds that additional training or retraining facilities are needed in a redevelopment area, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to assist the State vocational agency in requiring the needed vocational facilities or services. The Secretary of HEW may also enter into contracts, after due consultation with the State vocational agency, with public or private educational institutions to provide the needed facilities or services. The additional training or retraining provided under this subsection must be designed to enable the unemployed to qualify for new employment opportunities in the redevelopment area.

(b) The Secretary of Labor is required to provide technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship training facilities.

SECTION 17. RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

(a) The Secretary of Labor shall enter into agreements with States where redevelopment areas are located providing for weekly subsistence payments to unemployed persons undergoing retraining, who are not eligible to receive unemployment compensation. The subsistence payments made to any individual are limited to 16 weeks and shall be equal to the average weekly unemployment compensation benefits paid in the State.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator shall prescribe the rules and regulations needed to carry out the provisions of subsection (a).

(c) An annual appropriation not to exceed $10 million is authorized for retraining subsistence payments.

SECTION 18. PENALTIES

Subsection (a) makes it a crime to knowingly make a false statement or willfully overvalue a security for the purpose of obtaining a loan or of influencing any action of the Administrator or to obtain money, property, or anything of value under the act.

Subsection (b) makes it a crime for any employee or agent of the Administrator to embezzle or misapply any money or securities, or make any false entries, or to issue or assign notes or other documents with intent to defraud, or to participate or share in any loan or contract made by the Administrator with intent to defraud, or to give out any unauthorized information about the actions or plans of the Administrator, or to invest or speculate in the securities of a company receiving assistance from the Administrator.

Violation of the above is punishable by a fine not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

SECTION 19. EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

This section provides that a loan may not be made to a business enterprise unless the names of the attorneys and agents expediting the application and the fees paid to them are certified to the Administrator and unless an agreement is executed requiring the firm to refrain from employing or offering to employ or retain the professional services of an employee of the Administrator who exercised discretionary power at the time the assistance was granted or during the preceding year.

SECTION 20. RECORD OF APPLICATIONS

The Administrator is required to keep a public record of the approved applications, with the name or names of the applicants and the amount, duration and purposes of the loan, and the security given.

SECTION 21. PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND 40-HOUR WEEK

This section requires the Administrator to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under the act (1) be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act and (2) receive time and one-half for hours worked during a week in excess of 40.

SECTION 22. ANNUAL REPORT

This section would require the Administrator to submit a detailed and comprehensive annual report to the Congress, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. The report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas; and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. The various procurement agencies, upon the request of the Administrator, are directed to furnish the Administrator such information as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his duties under this section.

SECTION 23. APPROPRIATIONS

This section provides authorization for appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

SECTION 24. USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

This section requires the Administrator to use available services and the advice of other Government agencies on a reimbursable basis, to the extent practicable and with their consent. It also requires Government agencies to exercise their powers, duties, and functions so as to assist in carrying out the objectives of the act.

SECTION 25. RECORDS AND AUDITS

This section requires borrowers under sections 6 and 7 to keep records of their activities and to allow the Administrator and the Comptroller General access to their records.

SECTION 26. APPLICATION OF THE ACT

The terms of this act are applicable to the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT LABOR SURPLUS, NOVEMBER 1960

MAJOR AREAS

Indiana: Evansville, Terre Haute.
Massachusetts: Fall River, Lawrence-Haverhill, Lowell, New Bedford.
Michigan: Detroit, Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.
New Jersey: Atlantic City.
Ohio: Lorain-Elyria.
Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton.
Puerto Rico: Mayaguez, Ponce, San Juan.
Rhode Island: Providence-Pawtucket.
West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling.

SMALLER AREAS

Alabama: Florence-Sheffield, Jasper.
Alaska: Anchorage.
Connecticut: Bristol, Danielson, Norwich.
Illinois: Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Mount Vernon.
Indiana: Vincennes.
Kansas: Pittsburg.
Kentucky: Corbin, Hazard, Hopkinsville, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paducah, Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Pikeville-Williamson.
Maine: Biddeford-Sanford, Lewiston-Auburn.
Maryland: Cambridge, Cumberland, Hagerstown.
Massachusetts: North Adams.
Michigan: Adrian, Bay City, Iron Mountain, Marquette, Monroe, Port Huron.
Missouri: Flat River.
Montana: Butte, Kalispell.
New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch.
New York: Amsterdam, Auburn, Elmira, Gloversville, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone.
North Carolina: Fayetteville, Mount Airy.
Ohio: Portsmouth-Chillicothe.
Oklahoma: McAlester, Muskogee.
Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Butler, Clearfield-Du Bois, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewistown, Meadville, New Castle, Pottsville, St. Marys, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville.
Tennessee: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.
Washington: Aberdeen, Anacortes, Port Angeles.
West Virginia: Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Logan, Morgantown, New Martinsville, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch.

Areas officially classified as "areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security, which meet the additional criteria for designation as areas with "substantial and persistent" unemployment as summarized below:

SUMMARY OF CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATING "AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT LABOR SURPLUS"

1. Unemployment is now 3 percent or more of the labor force, discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate[1] in the area has been:

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years; or

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years; or

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

[1] Unemployment rate: Unemployment or a percent of the labor force.

National average unemployment rates

Year:	*Rate*
1956	4.2
1957	4.3
1958	6.8
1959	5.5

Data on annual average unemployment rates for individual areas are based on information compiled from area labor market reports prepared by State employment security agencies in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's regular program for the classification of areas according to the relative adequacy of labor supply. Reports containing such unemployment and labor force data are generally available on a bimonthly basis for the major areas, and semiannually for smaller areas. Preliminary data were utilized in some instances in determining the annual average unemployment rates.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Area Labor Market Trends, November 1960, pp. 18, 19.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 3, 1961]

OF HIGHEST PRIORITY

The need for some sort of governmental assistance to areas that are suffering deep and prolonged economic distress is one that is above and beyond partisan politics. It is, on the whole, a two-part need—calling for something in the nature of emergency relief for many individuals and for longer term efforts to rehabilitate many areas. The special labor-management-governmental study group headed by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has recognized these essentials of the problem and its recommendations to President-elect Kennedy contain constructive and worthwhile proposals. Mr. Kennedy, in turn, has promised the most important domestic priority to the matter, with the likelihood that congressional action in this field will be one of the first implementations of his campaign pledges.

Perhaps the simplest of the Douglas committee proposals, and one that presumably could be activated most promptly, is that of making additional surplus foodstuffs available for distribution in centers where long unemployment has left families with little or no means of self-support. Many such commodities are available, and the cost of their distribution would be insignificant in relation to the need. The committee also is on sound ground, while referring to unemployment insurance as a first line of defense against the hardships of joblessness, in proposing that there should be temporary Federal supplementation of the insurance funds in certain States, with a later effort to work out a "general improvement" in this portion of the social security system.

As a long-term proposition, it is evident that a massive revitalization of certain areas is essential if they are to escape a permanent state of depression. West Virginia, with its overwhelming dependence upon the suffering soft-coal industry, is a prime example but not the only one. As the Douglas committee points out, the problem of attracting new industries or reviving existing ones in such regions will require the thoughtful cooperation of all levels of government, from local to Federal, as well as imaginative private initiative.

Quite logically, no price tag has been placed on this overall attack on a problem of importance to the entire Nation. It is, in any case, a job that must be done and which should be tackled without hesitation. On both humanitarian and economic grounds, the need is urgent and the returns can be great.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, shortly after last fall's election, President-elect Kennedy appointed a task force to deal with problems of areas of chronic unemployment. The task force consisted of 22 members and 6 consultants. The task force submitted its report to President-elect Kennedy. The committee met at Charleston, W. Va. and in Washington, D.C. In addition, the task force had available 7 subcommittee reports and nearly 50 reports from local committees throughout the Nation appointed by President-elect Kennedy to survey their needs and to recommend programs for new jobs and new growth. The report, which was filed on December 29, was a unanimous report. I ask unanimous consent that the comments of President-elect Kennedy on receiving the report may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be a mistake to consider the problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment solely in the context of the areas directly affected. The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality. This problem is especially critical today, for 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States lives in an area that now feels the impact of chronic unemployment or underemployment.

I know I express the appreciation of the entire Nation for the services of the distinguished group of citizens who have participated in this project. It was not easy; all of them had to devote themselves completely to this task on a crash basis.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the index and the text of the report may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the index and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY TASK FORCE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 27, 1960

Introduction.

PART I. RELIEF OF PERSONAL HARDSHIP

1. Food.
2. Unemployment compensation.
3. General assistance.
4. Emergency public work projects.

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF LONG-TERM JOB OPPORTUNITIES

1. Area redevelopment legislation.
(a) Technical assistance.
(b) Loans for private projects.
(c) Loans and grants for public facilities.
(d) Training, retraining, and subsistence.
(e) Secondary market for industrial mortgages.
(f) Loan insurance.
2. Federal procurement.
3. The development of human resources.
(a) Raising of educational standards.
(b) Training, retraining, and placement.
(c) Services to persons with special employment problems.
(d) Manpower studies.
4. The development of physical resources and use of other special inducements.
(a) Highways.
(b) Forests.
(c) Parks.
(d) Agricultural conservation.
(e) Fuels and minerals.
(1) Coal and fossil fuels research.
(2) Minerals.
(3) National fuels policy.

(f) Other public works.
(g) Youth Conservation Corps.
(h) Consideration of special tax amortization.
5. Special regional development problems.
6. The prevention of distressed areas.

KENNEDY TASK FORCE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 27, 1960

(Introduction)

The Task Force on Area Redevelopment was appointed by President-elect John F. Kennedy to formulate a program of action to assist people in economically distressed areas.

These areas include (a) nearly 100 labor markets classified by the U.S. Department of Labor as areas of "substantial and persistent labor surplus," and (b) three to four hundred of the lowest-income rural-small urban areas plagued by underemployment.

A distressed area is typically a pocket of chronic unemployment which persists even during relatively prosperous times in the rest of the Nation. It is especially hard hit in times of recession. Currently, when the unemployment rate nationally is over 6 percent, the distressed area rate is over 10 percent, and in some instances as high as 20 percent. General economic recovery can be expected to reduce the unemployment rate in distressed areas somewhat, but not enough to enable them to enjoy a fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

Changes in consumer demand, depletion of resources, changes in defense procurement or in location of defense facilities, decentralization of production, lack of industrial diversification, and technological change are the most important causes of depressed economic conditions in the labor surplus areas.

The use of gas and oil rather than coal for home heating and railroad power is an example of changed consumer demand. This shift in consumer preference, accompanied by mechanization of mining operations, resulted in serious unemployment in large areas of Indiana, Illinois, the region of the Upper Great Lakes, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, and many other communities along the Appalachian Range. Decreased consumer demand for wool textiles as a result of the development of synthetic fibers, as well as changes in plant location, have similarly left the textile towns of New England in a depressed condition.

The social impact of chronic unemployment is staggering. In September, 3.2 million persons obtained a distribution of Government surplus, amounting to a retail value of about only $9.36 per month per family of 4 persons. The number relying on surplus foods increases sharply in winter months. Along with the school lunch program, these surplus foods constitute the last line of resistance against malnutrition for hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans. In West Virginia alone, in October, 281,000 people, out of a total population of 1.8 million, depended upon surplus food in order to sustain life.

There is wide bipartisan agreement that the distressed area problem cannot be resolved by private initiative alone. Government can lend a helping hand—local and State government as well as the Federal Government. It is also generally recognized that no one solution—no one plan or legislative enactment—can do the whole job for all distressed areas.

In the recommendations that follow, a diversity of programs is suggested. Some are urgent and demand immediate action, such as the relief of personal hardship, and the passage of an area redevelopment bill. Others refer to the priorities which should be assigned to the areas of chronic unemployment within existing or contemplated programs. Still others are recommendations which may be accepted or rejected, expanded or contracted, as experience is gained. Some are immediate and short term. Others are long range programs which cannot be carried out in a single year. Altogether, they serve as an arsenal from which specific weapons to combat the particular problems of a region or area which may be selected.

PART I. RELIEF OF PERSONAL HARDSHIP

1. Food

At present, flour, lard, dried eggs, dried milk, meal, and rice are on the surplus food distribution list. To improve the diet of needy persons in distressed areas, we recommend executive action to make additional surplus commodities available (such as butter, oatmeal, and peanut butter); to improve the distribution of surplus commodities with funds, personnel, storage space, and trucks; to assure that surplus commodities are made available regardless of State residence requirements; and to improve the management of the school lunch program so that it reaches every school in a distressed area.

We further recommend both executive and legislative action to permit the use of available funds to acquire foods temporarily not in surplus but necessary to provide a minimum balanced diet to those eligible for food grants; and both executive and legislative action to develop a food stamp plan, initially on a pilot basis, in the areas of greatest need.

2. Unemployment compensation

The current high national rate of unemployment has intensified the difficulties in the distressed areas. Unemployment insurance benefits have become the most significant first line of defense to eligible jobless wage earners. Our unemployment insurance legislation is in need of general improvement in the amount, duration, and financing of benefits. Pending such improvement, however, early action is necessary to meet the problems created by the exhaustion of unemployment insurance benefit rights for hundreds of thousands of wage earners.

To meet that problem, we recommend a temporary emergency unemployment insurance program along the general lines of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. We urge, however, that the Federal funds advanced to the States should be in the form of grants rather than loans.

In addition, a Federal reinsurance program should be given high priority in the next Congress in order to protect States with a high proportion of distressed areas. Further increases in the taxes to finance unemployment compensation in those States will hinder efforts to attract new industry and will also discourage the growth of existing industry.

3. General assistance

The Federal system of grants-in-aid for public assistance does not provide any aid for the able-bodied, needy citizens and their families who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits. State programs for general assistance vary widely and most systems are inadequate to meet the needs. In 17 States, local funds are the only sources available to pay relief benefits to the employable needy, and the areas where the need is greatest often have the least economic resources from which to raise such funds.

We therefore recommend legislation to provide grants-in-aid to the States to help them finance adequate general assistance programs or, alternatively, an extension of the Federal aid-to-dependent-children program so that it will include children in need because their parents are unemployed.

4. Emergency public work projects

The question of whether a nationwide program of emergency public works projects should be undertaken as an antirecession measure is under consideration by another presidential task force. If such a program is authorized we believe that an appropriate portion of the available funds should be set aside for the distressed areas, and that among the authorized public works projects should be those for such purposes as local and regional access roads. These will be particularly helpful to distressed areas in overcoming their disadvantages in location and transportation. Distressed communities might also be relieved of some or all of any matching requirements, depending upon the extent of their resources. Also there should be projects which will enable these areas to develop their forest, water, and other resources.

If no national emergency public work programs are undertaken, then we recommend an emergency program of small public work projects limited to the distressed areas. The chronic low income in most of these areas has forced a chronic neglect of needed public works. Yet, without such improved public facilities, the private economy of these areas will probably never be successfully revived.

In the early 1930's, when we were struggling to overcome a national depression, we engaged in a great debate as to the relative desirability of public work projects as against direct relief. The decision was for public work, and for many reasons. The monuments of that decision—schools, improved forest and recreational areas, dams, roads, bridges—are now a part of our national wealth.

While we were then dealing with a national depression, an analogous situation exists when we are dealing—as we are now—with localized depressions. And for all of the reasons which contributed to a national decision for national public works to take people off the relief rolls and combat a national depression, we believe that a national decision should now be made for localized public works to take people off the relief rolls and combat localized depression.

Although eligibility standards for such aid must be drawn with great care, we believe that for the most distressed communities in the country there is no other adequate or self-respecting way to relieve long-standing hardship and begin the process of recovery.

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF LONG-TERM JOB OPPORTUNITIES

The proposals for improved programs for the distribution of surplus food, unemployment compensation, public assistance, and emergency public work projects—while imperative to alleviate immediate hardship—are not the ultimate answers to the problem of the distressed areas.

From the standpoint of long-term public policy, the need is for permanent jobs.

Jobs sustain the morale of individuals and communities. Jobs add to individual and national wealth. When a job is provided for a man on relief, a taxpayer is substituted for a recipient of public assistance expenditures.

And jobs, not relief, are what the people of the distressed areas want.

This task force assumes that prompt and energetic measures will be taken by the new administration to create conditions under which the Nation will return to an adequate rate of economic growth. We further assume that recommendations for countering the current recession and stimulating expansion of the national economy are beyond the scope of our assignment. But nothing, from the standpoint of our own mission, is more important. Unless the national economy begins to grow at a rate fast enough to reduce substantially the current excessive national rate of unemployment, any special measures to benefit the distressed areas will be little more than palliatives.

The measures to insure adequate growth are varied. Some of them will operate quickly to provide job opportunities in the distressed areas; others will do so only over a longer period. But a many sided program should be enacted now to channel national growth, in greater degree than in the past, into areas of high and persistent unemployment and underemployment. Even in a period of more rapid economic growth, supplementary measures will still be necessary to develop and rehabilitate these areas. Only then will these areas be able to share fully in the rising volume of national production, and, in turn, contribute to national growth.

1. Area redevelopment legislation

The most immediate need is for legislation which will encourage new industry to locate, and existing industry to expand, in industrial areas of chronic unemployment, and in underdeveloped rural and small urban areas of underemployment which require a better balance of industry and agriculture.

Bills specifically designed for this purpose passed the Congress in 1958 and in 1960. They were thoroughly considered in extensive hearings by congressional committees, and there is wide agreement as to the general approach. In view of the need for quick action, it is recommended that an area redevelopment bill be enacted promptly by the Congress, and sent to the President for his signature.

The area redevelopment bill should propose a coordinated effort by the Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise to redevelop the economies of areas with chronic unemployment and underemployment.

Such a bill should contain these main features:

(a) Technical Assistance

Careful programing is essential to successful efforts for economic redevelopment. Technical assistance must be provided to local bodies to enable communities and areas to plan intelligently their long-term economic development, explore fully the most constructive lines for their expansion, and create new locational advantages within their communities to attract private and public enterprise. Financial provisions should be contained within the legislation to enable the Administrator to assist these communities in programing their development course.

(b) Loans for Private Projects

The construction of industrial and commercial buildings, including tourist facilities, at attractive financial terms is frequently essential to the economic redevelopment of distressed areas and the creation of jobs. The evidence is conclusive that conventional lending facilities in distressed areas cannot provide fully for the long-term credit needed for such construction. The area redevelopment bill, therefore, should provide for loans that will attract business firms to these areas. Because the Federal Government should not subsidize these loans, the interest rate should therefore be fixed somewhat higher than the Federal Government pays on loans of comparable maturities. The bill should require that at least 35 percent of the capital investment come from non-Federal sources.

The purpose of financing these new projects is to assist in the creation of new enterprises rather than in the relocation of established firms.

(c) Loans and Grants for Public Facilities

Modernized public facilities are often prerequisites to the establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. Some communities are unable to support the needed public facilities because of limited financial resources resulting from the deterioration of the tax base or chronic low income.

A loan program is needed to realize these facilities in such communities. In extreme cases it will be necessary to provide grants to enable communities to provide the facilities, such as access roads, industrial water, industrial parks, and public utilities where lacking, to make them attractive for industrial or commercial facilities. In most cases it is anticipated that grants will be related to the ability of the community and the State to contribute to such ventures.

(d) Training, Retraining, and Subsistence

It is also essential for a successful redevelopment program that the Federal Government, in cooperation with State, local, and private organizations expand the facilities and opportunities for training and retraining the labor force in the distressed areas in the new skills required in industry and commerce.

To make it financially possible for workers to undertake the training and retraining, those who are not entitled to or have exhausted their unemployment insurance should be paid subsistence payments during the period of training and retraining.

(e) Secondary Market for Industrial Mortgages

Many communities which have suffered heavy unemployment over a long period have invested large sums, including funds raised by popular subscription through community development organizations, in long-term industrial mortgages. But these communities, some of which pioneered in self-help operations, now find their available risk capital tied up in these mortgages, and are running out of financial resources. In order to free their funds for new investment in enterprises which will create the required new jobs, the Area Redevelopment Administrator should study the feasibility of allowing financial institutions in distressed areas, especially community development groups, to rediscount their industrial mortgages with some agency of the Federal Government. This could follow the general pattern established for the purchase of real estate mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(f) Loan Insurance

The Administrator should also study the desirability of establishing a program of loan insurance to supplement the direct loan program contemplated in the area redevelopment program.

2. Federal procurement

We are deeply concerned that only about 1 percent of the value of all military prime contract awards is assigned to areas of substantial labor surplus as a result of any action by the military departments to assist these areas.

(a) We recommend that there be established at the requirements planning levels of defense and defense-related agencies positions to be filled by highly qualified technicians, employed by a different agency of the Federal Government, with responsibility to recommend ways and means to most effectively utilize production and manpower capabilities in areas of substantial labor surplus, including small businesses, in these areas.

We recommend that the President direct procurement agencies to require prime contractors to submit in their proposed bids detailed information regarding the maximum use of manpower and facilities located in substantial and persistent labor surplus areas. The procurement agencies should then require successful bidders to carry out such plans.

(b) It should be the policy of the Federal Government to encourage firms in distressed areas to participate fully in Government procurement. We recommend that the President direct Federal procurement agencies to make maximum use of competitive bids and set-asides. We also recommend that procurement agencies energetically implement the provisions of Defense Manpower Order No. 4 by assuring that firms in distressed areas participate to the maximum extent in Government procurement activities.

(c) If a general Government policy is adopted looking toward the additional dispersal of plants for defense production and defense-related installations, we believe that labor surplus areas should be given preferred consideration in the choosing of these new sites. The same principle should apply with respect to the dispersal, relocation, or new location of nondefense agencies and facilities of the Federal Government.

(d) In view of evidence submitted to the task force that some distressed areas have been deprived of some of their markets when other more expensive fuels have been offered to Government-owned installations, we recommend that an Executive order be issued which will require all Government-owned installations which are now in existence, or which may be constructed, should use that fuel which is most economical on the basis of an accurate, realistic, and impartial cost survey.

3. The development of human resources

The long-continued low income levels in some of the Nation's distressed and underdeveloped regions have also resulted in a relative underdevelopment of human talent. Local financial resources have not been sufficient to provide educational opportunities which are equal to those of other areas, and a large proportion of the more highly educated individuals have left their home communities for the more prosperous sections of the country. This migration has in turn handicapped these areas in their efforts to attain a healthy role of economic growth.

To reverse this trend requires outside help.

(a) Raising of Educational Standards

The educational lag in these regions cannot be overcome without Federal aid. It is the assumption of this task force that Federal aid on a nationwide basis will be instituted during the coming year. We recommend that such a program should embody an equalization formula to assure additional assistance to the poorer areas. Once such a program is enacted, we recommend that the President instruct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine what further legislation may be needed to enable these areas to provide educational opportunities equal to those offered citizens who live elsewhere, and to deal in the immediate future with the special education and training problems which currently limit the opportunities of young people in these areas.

(b) Training, Retraining, and Placement

Studies have shown that even in areas of high unemployment and even in the midst of recessions there are jobs for those with the right skills. Moreover, the possession of a skill which is in demand can enable an unemployed person to leave the area to find employment elsewhere.

Pending new legislative authority, a supplemental appropriation should be sought under the Vocational Act of 1946 earmarked for this specific purpose in order to permit a beginning to be made in the fiscal year 1961.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor should investigate the feasibility of providing funds to defray the cost of transportation to jobless workers while undergoing training.

Entering upon a retraining program should moreover not disqualify for unemployment compensation a person who is otherwise eligible.

In addition, the Secretary of Labor should make a special study to see how the functions of the employment service may be improved, so that available workers can be more effectively matched with available jobs.

(c) Services to Persons With Special Employment Problems

A person looking for work may have a special disadvantage if he is too old or too young, if he is unskilled or has the wrong skill, if he has a physical handicap, or if he is colored. While the problems of "hard to place" persons are national in scope, they are always more severe in areas of heavy unemployment.

The Employment Service has a smaller staff today than 13 years ago (10,460 compared to 12,124). We recommend placing additional specially trained vocational counselors in key employment offices in redevelopment areas to serve workers who have special employment problems. We also recommend sending task forces of experts in counseling, guidance, and job development into a community whenever a major unemployment crisis such as a mine or plant shutdown either occurs or threatens to occur.

To ease the burden of unemployment on the older workers, we recommend the amendment of the Social Security Act to permit retirement of male workers at age 62 with correspondingly reduced annuities.

We further recommend that the President establish a Committee on Special Problems of the Labor Force, and assign its responsibility for a program of educational and community planning and action to break down arbitrary barriers to the employment of all the groups of disadvantaged workers.

(d) Manpower Studies

We believe that responsibility should be clearly placed upon an existing or new unit in the Executive Office of the President to provide the leadership for and the coordination of the activities of the Federal Government in the entire area of manpower and the development of human resources.

4. The development of physical resources and use of other special inducements

Many of the Nation's distressed communities are located in underdeveloped regions with a rich natural resource potential. Yet, because of disadvantages of transportation, location, and topography, often amounting to inaccessibility, these resources have not been developed as rapidly as those of other areas. Lack of development has resulted in relatively low income, which, in turn, has resulted in a deficiency of capital. To reverse this downward spiral requires outside capital. In some cases the resource, such as a forest, has been depleted and is no longer an adequate source of employment in the production of timber, water development, and outdoor recreational facilities.

As resources are rehabilitated income and capital will be generated locally, providing the base for needed economic growth.

The emergency public work programs, the area redevelopment legislation, and other programs and actions proposed in this report should be administered with a view to their maximum contribution to the long-term development of the natural resources of the distressed areas. In addition, Federal assistance on a long-term basis is needed in several specific resource categories:

(a) Highways

The curtailment of the Federal-aid highway program throughout the Nation by imposition of contract controls has had a particularly injurious effect on States containing distressed areas because these are the States which, because of relatively low income, have lagged in highway construction. We recommend that the President take Executive action to terminate the restrictions which have prevented the States from making use of the full amount of Federal-aid highway funds legally available to them.

We recommend further that the President urge the several States, wherever feasible within the framework of prescribed criteria, to give priority to highway improvement projects located in or near economically distressed areas.

Special emphasis should be given to bringing chronically distressed areas into the mainstream of economic life through feeder road construction where isolation of large numbers of people prevents modern economic development.

The criteria for highway routing and capacity should take into account how economic growth can be stimulated, particularly in areas which have lagged in growth.

(b) Forests

As part of the program for emergency public works, a supplemental appropriation should be made to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year to permit timber-stand improvement, reforestation, trail and road construction, watershed improvement, erosion control, and development of recreation facilities in national forests in or adjacent to distressed areas.

For a longer range program, we recommend that the President direct the Secretary of Agriculture to present to the Congress during 1961 a plan for forest development in distressed areas, to include restoration of productivity and income-producing capability of the small private forest lands and strip-mined forest areas.

In addition to accelerating the conservation work on the national forests at once, their long-range plans should be adjusted and accelerated in a way that will give emphasis to the work needed in distressed areas over the next several years. There should also be fully utilized the authority to create new national forests where this solution is indicated.

(c) Parks

Similarly, a supplemental appropriation should be made to the National Park Service for Mission 66 projects in areas of economic distress with special emphasis upon facilities which will encourage the tourist industry.

To help promote the tourist industry in distressed areas, special authorization and appropriation should be provided to assist States to develop recreational facilities, such as roadside parks and campsites. The program would be administered by the National Park Service in cooperation with the States.

(d) Agricultural Conservation

As part of the emergency program, a supplemental appropriation should be made for the current fiscal year to the Soil Conservation Service for a land conservation work program to be administered through local soil conservation districts. The work to be stressed would include reforestation on farms and strip mine spoil areas, stream bank stabilization and erosion control, and small water control structures.

As a long-term measure, funds in the agricultural conservation program should be earmarked for permanent conservation practices providing maximum local employment in distressed areas, such as forestry on private land held by low-income landlords, with up to 100 percent of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. Manpower would be obtained from local unemployed personnel, and the work to be stressed should be timber-stand improvement and erosion control.

(e) Fuels and Minerals

(1) Coal and fossil fuels research

The coal and fossil fuel rich areas need basic and applied research to provide new uses to maintain existing uses and to promote stability of employment.

We recommend an additional appropriation for the new Office of Coal Research and the intensification of cooperative studies with State and private groups.

(2) Minerals

In some areas higher quality minerals have been exhausted while elsewhere they are being neglected because methods have not been developed economically to extract and process certain low quality ores, or sufficient economic uses have not yet been discovered for other minerals.

We propose, therefore, that the minerals research program of the Bureau of Mines be expanded.

(3) National fuels policy

We recommend development of a national fuels policy. The lack of a national fuels policy is an underlying reason for some of the existing conditions of distress in the coal producing regions and in some independent oil producing communities. A national fuels policy would help alleviate prevalent distress, would help improve the economic health of these industries, and would be beneficial to the Nation's security.

(f) Other Public Works

A supplemental appropriation should be made to initiate construction of authorized projects for clear streams, navigation and flood control, pollution abatement, sealing of abandoned mines, public buildings, and other public works projects in or near areas of economic distress.

The agencies should be instructed to initiate or accelerate planning on new projects which provide opportunities for economic development in distressed areas, and to submit for Presidential approval projects on which planning is complete and which are ready for authorization.

The U.S. Army Engineers should be urged to take a new look in labor surplus areas at water resource projects previously classed as inactive so as to determine the possibility of their being placed again in the active category, and proper consideration should be given to all factors, including even flow and employment benefits in the selection of projects for authorization.

(g) Youth Conservation Corps

We recommend enactment of a bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps as provided by S. 812, passed by the Senate in 1959. Such a corps would provide manpower to expedite some of the kinds of projects of the type discussed earlier for National and State forests and parks while drawing enrollees locally to the greatest extent feasible and giving priority to locally experienced men as supervisors.

(h) Consideration of Special Tax Amortization

As additional encouragement to private industry to locate branch plants in chronic and persistent labor surplus areas and to expand existing enterprises in these areas, consideration should be given to the question of whether special tax amortization providing for accelerated writeoffs of plant and equipment would help to encourage industries to locate or expand production facilities in such areas.

5. Special regional development problems

We believe that in some regions of the country, where economic problems are particularly deep-seated and severe, the resource development activities described above need to be coordinated into broad regional developmental programs.

A region where such an approach is appropriate may be defined as one which, although it may contain islands of prosperity, suffers retarded economic growth in the region as a whole, has a level of income well below those of surrounding regions, and experiences a general underutilization of its labor force.

One such region is easy to identify—the Appalachian area which extends from New York to Alabama and contains portions of 11

States. The economy of the region suffers from the decline of the coal industry, disadvantages of topography, transportation, and highway deficiencies, and isolation from major population centers.

Other regions with special problems include the textile region of New England and upper New York; the region of declining timber and iron ore production of the upper Great Lakes States; certain underdeveloped rural and small-town areas of the South, Southwest, and Far West; and the coal region of southern Illinois and Indiana.

We urge a program of regional development commissions to attack the special problems of each region and to propose means for formulating and carrying out comprehensive development programs.

As an immediate step, we recommend that the President appoint such a commission for at least one of these major areas. Both because of its size and the severity of its problems, we believe that such a commission might well be set up first for the Appalachian region. This in turn could serve as a possible pilot project for similar efforts in other regions.

6. The prevention of distressed areas

Our recommendations thus far have related to the alleviation of distress and economic revival within areas now classified as distressed.

Of perhaps equal importance, though infinitely more difficult, is the development of an early warning system to detect the beginning of trends which lead to localized depressions and the development of measures for the correction of such trends before the problem becomes acute.

It is now apparent that the automation of particular industries, such as the steel industry, may result in a new group of distressed areas.

We therefore recommend that the President give consideration, through whatever agency he deems appropriate, to the problem of structural changes in the economy which produce unemployment, with particular emphasis on automation and with the job of devising such an early warning system together with remedial measures.

KENNEDY TASK FORCE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, chairman, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Myer Feldman, secretary, care of Senator John F. Kennedy, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

William L. Batt, Jr., Secretary of Labor and Industry, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.; residence, 119 North 27th Street, Camp Hill, Pa.

Earl T. Bester, director, District 33, United Steel Workers, Room 609 Providence Building, Duluth, Minn.; residence, 9211 Highway 61, West, Duluth, Minn.

Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary, Tennessee Municipal League, 226 Capitol Boulevard, Nashville, Tenn.

Harry A. Boswell, Jr., chairman, Maryland Economic Development Commission, 3718 Rhode Island Avenue, Mount Rainier, Md.

Thomas H. Bride, Jr., Federal Products Corp., 1144 Eddy Street, Providence, R.I.; residence, 138 Mary Brown Drive, Warwick, R.I.

Dr. Clyde L. Colson, dean, College of Law, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

William R. Davlin, secretary of commerce and chairman, Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

Wayne C. Fletcher, director of industrial development, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Huntington, W. Va.

Dr. William Haber, Department of Economics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; residence, 530 Hillspur Road, Ann Arbor.

Arthur L. Hamilton, executive secretary, Chamber of Commerce, 1421 West Cherry Street, Herrin, Ill.

Harry G. Hoffmann, editor, the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va.

John A. Kosinski, president, Industries for Amsterdam, Inc., 29 East Main Street, Amsterdam, N.Y.

Dr. W. George Pinnell, associate dean, School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Don B. Potter, president, Monongahela Power Co., Post Office Box 1392, Fairmont, W. Va.

John P. Robin, chairman, Pennsylvania State Planning Board, Harrisburg, Pa.; residence, Philadelphia, Pa.

Burl A. Sawyers, 961 Mathews Avenue, Charleston, W. Va.

Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, 1624 Kanawha Boulevard, East, Post Office Box 646, Charleston, W. Va.

Charles H. Stoddard, Resources for the Future, Inc., 1579 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Laurence E. Tierney, Jr., president, West Virginia Coal Association, Bluefield, W. Va.

John D. Whisman, executive director, Eastern Kentucky Regional Planning Commission and special assistant to the Governor of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.

Michael F. Widman, Jr., assistant to the president, United Mine Workers of America, United Mine Workers Building, Washington, D.C.

CONSULTANTS

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Sol Barkin, Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

Milton P. Semer, counsel, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 5304 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at an appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I consider my cosponsorship of the area redevelopment bill, introduced today by the learned and devoted senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to be both a privilege for which I am grateful and a responsibility I owe to my constituency.

Beyond these personal and parochial considerations, I believe it is incumbent upon me as a U.S. Senator to support and to work diligently for the enactment of the measure as introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] because I construe it to be legislation in the national interest.

Earlier this week, President-elect John F. Kennedy released the report of a task force he had appointed to deal with problems of areas of chronic unemployment. Upon receiving the report, the President-elect is quoted as having stated in a press release:

It would be a mistake to consider the problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment solely in the context of the areas directly affected. The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality. This problem is especially critical today, for 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States lives in an area that now feels the impact of chronic unemployment or underemployment.

I communicated to the President-elect my concurrence with his statement, and I reminded him that I have spoken frequently in the Senate concerning my view that there is erosion of the total economy growing out of inattention to conditions of chronic labor surplus and areas of unemployment and underemployment.

It is my purpose not only to refer approvingly at this time to the area redevelopment bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with my cosponsorship and that of a substantial number of our colleagues, but also, I reiterate the portion of my message to the President-elect in which I stated:

I am privileged to support fully the most helpful report and sound recommendations of the Kennedy task force on area redevelopment. There is widespread appreciation by West Virginians for the constructive method of approach you sponsored in efforts to seek solutions for the problems of our State. Likewise, I have the feeling that there is similar national acceptance of and gratification with the broader representative pattern you so properly established in the courageous and necessary search for means to alleviate human suffering and joblessness in all chronic labor surplus areas and over the Nation as a whole.

After the task force recommendations have been evaluated by you, and when the new administration's program in this vital area of national concern has been formulated, be assured that it will be my desire and intent to work cooperatively and diligently with you and your staff, and with others who will be in places of authority in the Government under your wise, vigorous, and forthright leadership. We must bring this program to fruition.

As one who served in consultative capacity with the Kennedy task force dealing with problems of areas of chronic unemployment, I join you in paying deserved tribute to the distinguished chairman (the senior Senator from Illinois) and members of that outstanding group for their patriotic and unselfish services. The excellent product of their labors will serve as guidelines for progress on the new frontier.

In this connection, I commend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. [CLARK] and wish to associate myself with his comments concerning the same task force when, earlier today, he inserted the text of its report in the RECORD.

A vital portion of that report deals with the subject of area redevelopment legislation in the development of long-term job opportunities. I agree with the task force finding that:

Proposals for improved programs for the distribution of surplus food, unemployment compensation, public assistance, and emergency public work projects—while imperative to alleviate immediate hardship—are not the ultimate answers to the problem of the distressed areas. From the standpoint of long-term public policy, the need is for permanent jobs. And jobs, not relief, are what the people of the distressed areas want. Unless the national economy begins to grow

at a rate fast enough to reduce substantially the current excessive national rate of unemployment, any special measures to benefit the distressed areas will be little more than palliatives.

Even in a period of more rapid economic growth, supplementary measures will still be necessary to develop and rehabilitate these areas. Only then will these areas be able to share fully in the rising volume of national production, and, in turn, contribute to national growth.

The most immediate need is for legislation which will encourage new industry to locate, and existing industry to expand, in industrial areas of chronic unemployment, and in underdeveloped rural and small urban areas of underemployment which require a better balance of industry and agriculture. In view of the need for quick action, it is recommended that an area redevelopment bill be enacted promptly by the Congress, and sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. President, the measure introduced today by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is an adequate bill—a very necessary item of legislation—and I cosponsor it enthusiastically and will support it vigorously.

Mr. President, I am grateful that the bill which has been presented by my able colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators will receive early and favorable consideration by the Members of this body. It is important that we realize the fact that thrice the Senate of the United States has passed legislation to aid the distressed areas of the Nation, the deep pockets of poverty and unemployment and labor surplus throughout the country.

On two occasions Congress passed area redevelopment legislation. In the first instance the legislation received a pocket veto in 1958, and in the second instance there was a veto by the President in 1960. The Senate did not override.

The essence of the earlier legislation, included in the current bill, should be passed early this session, and then the measure will go to the White House. We already have a positive assurance, a pledge made during a vigorous campaign by our President-elect that he, as Chief Executive, if he were chosen by the electorate of this country, would sign such a bill.

There is an urgency about the situation, and, as already indicated, these remarks should be printed at an appropriate place in the RECORD, which I believe will be in connection with remarks made by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] earlier today.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of distressed areas legislation directed particularly toward those areas of chronic unemployment which have suffered, which have not shared the general prosperity enjoyed by much of the rest of the country over a number of years.

I have supported depressed areas legislation when I was a Member of the other body and in this body. I believe the first bill I introduced in the 86th Congress was on that subject.

I have today introduced S. 6, my first bill in the 87th Congress. It is a bill substantially similar to the bill known last session as the Scott-Van Zandt bill. The Scott-Van Zandt bill provided for expenditures of $200 million. S. 6 would provide for $214 million.

I have spoken to the Senate previously with regard to the proposals contained in my bill, and I have also submitted an analysis of the bill, which I commend to all Senators. In my judgment, the bill is one which deserves serious consideration. I should like to have it considered in the course of the debate on the subject.

The bill had the support of the Vice President during speeches he made in the past year. It will be introduced in the other body, in my opinion, by certain Members of the House.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for their great interest in this matter. I hope that from among the several proposals submitted we may be able to get a workable, effective bill which will meet the views of the other body and which can be signed by the next President. I sincerely hope the bill will be pointed directly toward the objective of depressed areas assistance—the retraining of personnel to provide them with new skills; assistance to industry to move in without endangering existing industry in another part of the country; and help to the communities which, because of changing economic conditions, through no fault of their own, have not kept pace with the general forward economic growth and prosperity of the United States.

I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I respond by simply stating that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had a very genuine concern for the passage of proposed legislation in this field. We have disagreed as to some of the particulars, but it is important for me to remember today, as I do, that in the 86th Congress and prior to that Congress there was a very vigorous effort on the part of the Senator from Pennsylvania to meet this problem and to be realistic in the solving of a very tragic situation in certain areas, sections, and States within the Republic. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the able Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while the two distinguished Senators who have spoken are present in the Chamber I should like to express an opinion, which I think is not only an opinion entertained by the Senator from Florida but also an opinion entertained by many other Senators.

I do not think there is anyone in the Senate who does not wish to be duly sympathetic with grave problems of continued unemployment, poverty, ill health, and other things which go with depressed areas, with all the deterioration of morale. The trouble has been that the bills we have had under consideration have not dealt directly with those problems in such a way as to give relief where it was needed, and to stay away from the problem of setting up a tremendous organization to go into other areas where there was nothing like such distress.

The Senator from Florida knows what he is talking about, because, as was admitted on the floor of the Senate by our distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, the last bill included four counties of the State of Florida as distressed areas.

I pointed them out on the map. In no sense of the word were they distressed or depressed. They were among our highly prosperous counties; namely, Leon County, in which our capital city of Tallahassee is located; Escambia County, where the great naval air station is located; Gadsden County, where wrapper leaf tobacco is raised, and where agriculture is probably more prosperous on the average than in any other county in our State; and Alachua County, where the great University of Florida is located, in addition to numerous other important institutions.

It is not necessary to put out a sop to the Senators from Florida or, I am confident, to Senators from any other State to vote for legislation which realistically deals with this problem. The Senator from Florida has been in a part of the coal area in West Virginia and has been in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania; and he knows perfectly well that there is great distress and tremendous depression in those areas. Certainly he would like to do something to help that situation.

The Senator from Florida handled in subcommittee, in full committee, on the floor of the Senate, and in conference the measure under which food was made available and under which such foods as flour, grits, and meal were processed and packaged in such form that they could reach the recipients.

It is quite possible that that measure did not go far enough, and certainly the Senator from Florida would want to see it go as far as it was designed to go—that is, to give a reasonable measure of satisfying food to the people who are affected—and he would like to go further in the various ways that have been suggested on the floor. But he hopes with all his heart that these two Senators who have introduced bills and others who are so vitally interested in this program will not again bring to the floor of the Senate legislation which includes areas which have no problem with these depressed and distressed areas, many of whose forlorn people are forced to leave the areas in which they have long resided. It is to that point the Senator from Florida wished to address himself at this time. I am sure that every Senator and Representative would like to show by his vote, sympathy and helpfulness in a practical and reasonable way. I hope that the proposal which reaches the floor of the Senate will be one which does not simply try to give something to every State, no matter how prosperous it might be. I hope I may be able to cooperate in the fullest measure with my two friends, the

distinguished Senators who are now on the floor. I hope to be in a position to support the proposed legislation. If it is in the form in which it was at the last session, I shall not be able to do so.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to clarify something referred to by the senior Senator from Florida. I am sure the distinguished Senator will be interested in the fact that the criteria contained in my bill are the same criteria which were contained in the bill which I introduced in the last session and in the administration compromise bill known as S. 3569. I am very pleased that the new Douglas bill has adopted the same unemployment criteria as were contained in my previous bill and as are contained in the present bill. These could be referred to as tighter criteria, a more careful delimitation of the target areas involved. The main difference between the Douglas bill and the Scott bill, although there are other differences, in my mind is the difference in the amounts of money appropriated for certain specific propositions contemplated in those two bills. The tighter criteria are embodied in the bill, and were embodied in S. 722, but were not in the original Douglas bill.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS BY ALLOWING CERTAIN DEDUCTIONS FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for a tax adjustment for small and medium-size businesses. The bill is identical to S. 59 of the last Congress, in which I was joined by 15 of my esteemed colleagues as sponsors, including 8 members of the Senate Committee on Small Business.

Today I am particularly pleased that all 17 members of the Small Business Committee are joining in sponsoring this important bill. The full list of cosponsors reads as follows: Senators LONG of Louisiana, HUMPHREY, SMATHERS, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MOSS, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, JAVITS, COOPER, SCOTT, PROUTY, BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, DODD, GRUENING, KEFAUVER, NEUBERGER, and YARBOROUGH.

The need for enactment of this tax adjustment to enable smaller concerns to finance growth and expansion is clear and pressing. We are all too well aware of the deficiencies of our capital markets in the long-term debt and equity capital areas in meeting the financial needs of small business. Tax adjustment provided in this measure would provide a remedy for this gap in our financial structure by utilizing the reinvestment of earnings of principal to enable small firms to obtain the required funds to finance their growth and thus maximize their contribution to our economic well-being. The bill would accomplish this objective by authorizing as a deduction from taxable net income an amount equal to the aggregate addition to capital represented by reinvestment in depreciable asets, inventory, and accounts receivable except that the maximum deduction would be 20 percent of net income or $30,000, whichever is the lesser.

Too much stress cannot be placed upon the underlying principle on which the provisions of the bill are based. Utilization of the reinvestment-of-earnings principle recognizes the undisputed fact that historically new business and smaller concerns have had to place maximum reliance upon retained earnings to secure and retain a foothold in our economy. Generally placed at the bottom of the credit worthiness scale by lenders and investors because of their newness or size, small businesses have had to rely on retained earnings to provide the funds to increase assets and finance expansion. The tax credit provided by the bill would be available only to the extent that additional aggregate investments in modernization and inventories were made.

Mr. President, the convening of this Congress in the midst of the challenges of the 1960's hardly requires a restatement of the importance of small business to our country or a reevaluation of the role played by small business in the success of our dynamic capitalism. No greater tribute has been given to our reliance upon the reinvigorating benefits of their contributions than that paid by that great American, Woodrow Wilson, when he said:

> No country can afford to have its prosperity originated by a small controlling class. The treasury of America does not lie in the brains of the small body of men now in control of the great enterprises. It depends upon the inventions of unknown men, upon the ambitions of unknown men. Every country is renewed out of the ranks of the unknown, not out of the ranks of the already famous and powerful in control.

Our dependence for continued economic resurgence upon the vitality of the small and unknown is no less today. The spawning ground for constant renewal of our economic capacity for growth remains the 4 millions of small businesses serving every segment of the American economy. The broad-based participation in our economic life by small business underscores the importance of this segment of the business community to the efficient functioning of our national economy. And it likewise underscores a constant recognition that a favorable climate must exist for these concerns, as well as new entrepreneurs, to grow and expand lest we slip unknowingly into a posture where inventive creativity is restricted and incentive becomes the victim of effective paralysis.

The overwhelming need of small business for access to capital in order to grow and expand in a competitive economy has been extensively documented in recent years. Case history after case history was presented to the Senate Small Business Committee during its nationwide hearings in the fall of 1957. Without exception, witness after witness graphically portrayed the inability of their small business concerns to obtain long-term funds from the capital markets on either a debt or equity basis. And where longer term loans might ordinarily have been available, the prospects of repayments were dependent upon the ability to retain earnings which the tax structure just did not permit. Although worthwhile amendments were made to the Internal Revenue Code in 1958, it is recognized that they did not go far enough. Our present income tax structure places a disproportionately heavy burden on small concerns. In addition, the difficulties in obtaining needed capital have acted as a drag on the growth of many smaller concerns. Relief based upon the reinvestment of earnings principle is needed by these concerns and is absolutely vital to their survival and growth. Otherwise, we will see more and more small firms declining, first to marginal operations and then finally to oblivion.

Some may claim that the more than 14,000 business failures in 1959 or the more than 15,000 in 1960 should be expected in an economy as competitive as ours. They might likewise claim that the losses sustained by these businesses of almost three-fourths of a billion dollars in 1959 and more than $1.5 billion in 1960 were a small price to pay, easily bearable by an economy with a $500 billion gross national product. However, no matter what measure one selects to weigh the importance of these business deaths to our total economic activity, we cannot escape the fact that in recent years the rate of business failures, as well as the dollar losses, have both soared. It is worth pointing out that such an acceleration in business failures or dollars lost did not prevail during the period from 1921 to 1933.

I have long been concerned with the increasing wave of mergers sweeping the business community in recent years. As a result of this activity, hundreds of true independent companies each year have lost their independent status and become subsidiaries of larger corporations. While I am willing to grant that there may be good mergers as well as bad mergers, I am unable to convince myself that this recent epidemic of mergers can possibly work to the advantage of small and independent businesses in the long run. To the degree that business deaths and mergers are caused by inability to secure adequate financing for growth and expansion and thus remain in the competitive stream, tax adjustment based upon reinvestment of earnings will provide effective relief.

We should be under no illusions about the challenges of the years ahead. A strong, broad-based, virile and enterprising business community is absolutely vital to our dynamic economy to insure continued growth to serve an ever-expanding domestic population as well as underpin our economic strength in meeting the tremendous and complex assaults upon the security of the freedom-loving nations throughout the world.

In recent months, economic forecasters have become increasingly alarmed over mounting unemployment, increasing idle productive capacity, and widening pockets of regional and area depressed economic activity. Steel production is running at less than 50 percent of capacity, capital goods orders are down, housing starts are off more than seasonally and inventory liquidation seems to

be the order of the day. While we sincerely hope that these trends will be brief in extent and duration, we know that renewed confidence would be expressed by new orders for stock in trade and new expenditures for modernization.

The tax adjustment provided for in this bill will result in increased purchases of inventories and increased investment in capital goods and modernization of facilities. It can serve the dual purpose of providing long overdue relief to small and medium-sized businesses in financing their growth and expansion and also providing a well recognized counterstimulant to the current economic ills of increased unemployment and greater unused industrial plant capacity. It is my earnest hope that the measure will receive early and favorable consideration by this Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the table for 1 week in order that additional Senators may cosponsor it.

I further ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and will lie on the desk as requested; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and the name of the Senator from Rhode Island will be added as a sponsor.

The bill (S. 2) to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 181. ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE ASSETS, INVENTORY, AND ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount measured by the additional investment in such trade or business for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—The deduction under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) $30,000, or

"(2) an amount equal to 20 percent of the taxable income of such trade or business for the taxable year (computed without regard to this section).

"(c) ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the additional investment in a trade or business for a taxable year means the amount (if any) by which—

"(1) the aggregate, computed as of the close of the taxable year, of the adjusted bases of—

"(A) all property used in the trade or business of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167,

"(B) all stock in trade and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, and

"(C) all accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of trade or business; exceeds

"(2) a similar aggregate, computed as of the beginning of such taxable year.

"(d) SPECIAL RULE—LIMITATION OF AFFILIATED GROUP.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) All members of an affiliated group shall be treated as one taxpayer; and

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate shall apportion the limitation contained in subsection (b) among the members of such affiliated group in such manner as he shall by regulations provide.

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUP DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to it by section 1504, except that, for such purposes, the phrase 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 80 percent' each place it appears in section 1504 (a)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 181. ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE ASSETS, INVENTORY AND ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION GOVERNING QUESTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

This bill is identical in language with the amendment in the nature of a substitute which many of us offered to Senate bill 654, the so-called Bridges bill, on August 20, 1958, in the 2d session of the 85th Congress. It will be recalled that a motion to recommit that bill was carried by a vote of 41 to 40.

The measure that I am introducing is also the same as S. 3 of the Congress just passed, which I introduced on January 8, 1959. It is likewise identical with H.R. 3, which has passed the House of Representatives twice, in both the 85th and 86th Congresses under that number designation.

This bill is known as the Federal anti-preemption bill. I shall not discuss it in detail, but I point out that it is designed to correct the situation which exists under present rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, to the effect that when Congress has enacted legislation on any subject, the States are deprived of the power to enact or to enforce similar laws on the same subject, even though not in conflict with a Federal statute.

To correct this situation the bill would do two things. First, acts of Congress would not repeal State laws or nullify them, or preempt a field of legislation unless Congress specifically so provided.

Second, State laws would not be declared by the Supreme Court as being ineffective and incapable of enforcement, unless they were in irreconcilable conflict with the Federal law.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the close of business on next Tuesday, January 10, in order that other Senators who may desire to do so may join as sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk until the close of business Tuesday, January 10.

The bill (S. 3) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BLAKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] introduced a bill, S. 3, to provide rules to guide courts in their construction of existing statutes and future enactments. I am indeed proud to join as a cosponsor of this measure, which is popularly known as the anti-preemption bill.

In recent years we have seen a disturbing extension of the Federal preemption doctrine to many areas of concurrent Federal-State jurisdiction, and as a result many worthwhile and constructive State laws have been nullified and voided.

As a lawyer I have long seen the need for the establishment of clear and concise guide rules for interpreting the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. I, therefore, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, and I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will give the measure early and favorable consideration.

THE PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREA; INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR ITS CREATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment of a National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island, Tex.

To begin with, it might clarify matters to trace the recent history of this proposal. First in the 85th Congress, 1958, and again in the 86th Congress in January 1959, I introduced bills providing for the establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area. Thousands of Texans and others across the Nation have endorsed and are supporting this project.

This bill provides for public preservation of an 88-mile section of Padre Island in accordance with the recommendation of the field investigators of the National Park Service contained in a report of February 1959. Adoption of the bill would mean that the substantial portion of America's longest, southernmost natural beach would be preserved for public recreation.

In December 1959, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] held public hearings in Corpus Christi, Tex., on this proposed project. Some 50 witnesses testified for the Padre Island National Seashore project and less than half a dozen opposed the project.

This led National Parks Director Conrad Wirth to comment that it was the most overwhelmingly favorable endorsement of such a park project that he had ever seen.

A few of the organizations, National, State and local, which have passed resolutions endorsing the project include: Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; Izaak Walton League of America; Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America; National Parks Association; National Council of State Garden Clubs; Texas Ornithologist Society; Southwestern Association of Naturalists; American GI Forum of United States; Texas Conservation Council; National Audubon Society; National Conference on State Parks; and American Planning & Civic Association.

The National Parks Advisory Board has unanimously approved the project.

This Nation now has only one national seashore area, which is Cape Hatteras, N.C., and the opportunity for acquiring others is fast disappearing.

Mr. President, under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the 1930's a survey of the possibilities for creating these national seashore recreation areas was conducted, and the survey showed that there were 14 such areas which should be established. Mr. President, that was not done. Eleven of those areas have already been developed, either industrially or for private residences, and they are no longer available. The areas which might be acquired for national seashore recreation are now very limited.

Mr. President, in addition to the fact that the National Parks Advisory Board has unanimously approved the project, the Texas Legislature in 1959 passed enabling legislation for establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area, and late last year the joint open beaches study committee of both houses of the Texas Legislature voted unanimously in favor of an 88-mile Padre Island Seashore Park.

Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton and Secretary of Interior designate Stewart Udall have voiced strong support for the project. Secretary Seaton proposed an allocation of $8.1 million for land acquisition, development and operations over a 5-year period.

The acquisition of this land and establishment of a Padre Island Seashore Recreation Park will cost much less now, and the people of America will realize much more for their money, than they will later. A decade or so ago this same land, and more, could have been acquired for perhaps $1 or $2 million. That day is gone, and so is much of this choice warm gulf coast beach. If we delay further, the people of this Nation will pay more tax money for less beach area. Waiting will mean false economy and lost opportunity.

With the national population explosion, with tens of millons or more Americans with more leisure hours wisely turning to outdoor recreation, we must look beyond our legislative noses. We must act today if our grandchildren and theirs are to have much of the great outdoors which was our inheritance, and which should be theirs.

Along the 3,700 miles of the Atlantic and gulf coast, only 265 miles have been set aside for public beaches and parks. If this trend continues, if we turn our heads or bow to private exploitation, we will contribute to building only a land of great cities, where highways simply lead from one asphalt-paved, man-made canyon to another, and where Americans are fenced away from the sea.

If we allow this to happen, we will permit many Americans to lose a vital part of the heritage of a great land and of a great people.

In urging the establishment of Padre Island National Seashore, in urging consideration and action on many park and natural resource projects in America, I am not speaking for the new frontier. Instead, I plead for what many conservationists, many Americans, consider and what really is, geographically, the last frontier.

Unless we act now, it will be the lost frontier.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill providing for the establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of the national seashore set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The area comprising the portion of the land and waters of Padre Island situated in the coastal waters that is described below is designated for establishment as the "Padre Island National Seashore":

Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about three and five-tenths miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey chart numbered 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts numbered 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately eighty-five miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway at a point northerly of Three Island; thence northerly following the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway as indicated by channel markers in the Laguna Madre to the point of beginning.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act or which lies within the boundary of the seashore as established under section 4 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as "such area"). Any property, or interest therein, owned by the State of Texas or political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay for any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act their fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, provided that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

SEC. 4. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in the area described in section 2 of this Act, that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the area as a national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the seashore which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of

such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the State of Texas and to the governing body of each of the political subdivisions involved; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which circulate in each of the localities; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for the county involved.

SEC. 5. (a) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of his property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of twenty-one, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. In any case where such an owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right may during its existence be conveyed or leased, in whole, but not in part. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" shall mean a private noncommercial dwelling, including the land on which it is situated, whose construction was begun before September 1, 1959, and structures accessory thereto (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "dwelling"), together with such amount and locus of the property adjoining and in the same ownership as such dwelling as the Secretary designates to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of such dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use and occupancy. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use and occupancy in which the dwelling and such adjoining property has usually been enjoyed by its owner or occupant. The amount of such adjoining property to be so designated by the Secretary shall in no case be less than three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as there may be, except that the Secretary may exclude from the amount of adjoining property so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

(c) When acquiring land, waters, or interests therein for the Padre Island National Seashore, the Secretary may permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the minerals in such land or waters, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; except that no more than $4,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, since coming to the Senate, I have vigorously supported programs for redevelopment, rehabilitation, and relief in depressed areas of our country. The first bill I introduced upon coming to the Senate in 1959 was for this purpose, and I supported earlier legislation in the House.

S. 268, which I introduced in the 86th Congress, was very similar to the area redevelopment bill finally approved by the House and the Senate. This has encouraged me to believe the same result might be forthcoming in the 87th Congress.

Mr. President, I was concerned when recent press reports indicated that the task force, appointed by President-elect Kennedy and headed by the senior Senator from Illinois, might be expected to concentrate its efforts in West Virginia.

On December 8, the senior Senator from Kentucky and five Republican members of the Pennsylvania delegation in the House, joined me in sending a telegram to the distinguished chairman of the task force, expressing the hope that other distressed areas will not be forgotten.

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 8, 1960.—The following is the text of a telegram to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of a special group to consider problems of distressed areas, signed by Senators HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky; Congressmen IVOR D. FENTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania; ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia; and Congressman-elect WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania:

"We have read with a great deal of interest of your appointment as chairman of a special group to consider problems of distressed areas. We who have worked for many years for aid to our chronic areas of unemployment in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and elsewhere, are pleased to know that President-elect Kennedy considers this problem to be urgent enough to become one of his first orders of business.

"As you know, along with others vitally interested in this type of legislation, we have felt for some time that we should not use a pork barrel approach, but rather aim such legislation to correct those longstanding areas of chronic distress such as exist in the coal regions of Pennsylvania and Kentucky. Certainly West Virginia is greatly in need of an effective program of assistance. However, there are also a number of chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and elsewhere. The character of assistance needed in one State may differ in some respects from that needed in another.

"Please be assured of our desire to cooperate with you and your committee in any way possible in order to secure passage of workable and effective legislation to provide assistance to longstanding chronically depressed areas. May we assume that such cooperation will be welcomed in the future as in the past?"

I was glad to be reassured that the task force would develop plans to include Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other States having depressed areas. I have worked earnestly with my colleagues from West Virginia, and know they would want Pennsylvania and Kentucky to share in any remedial programs developed.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois was good enough to furnish me with a draft of his proposed area redevelopment bill. While not all of the figures were filled in on the committee print, I could estimate the total cost would be in line with bills he has previously offered.

Not only on this point, but upon other and perhaps more fundamental issues, I differ with my friend from Illinois.

I recommend that area redevelopment programs be financed out of appropriated funds, and not by back-door Treasury financing.

I recommend that Commerce is the logical Department to have the major responsibility for coordinating this program. Time will be saved in staffing, and its organization is geared to deal with problems of business and industry.

I recommend a maximum Federal loan participation of 50 percent, with the State, local government, and private sources sharing the matching 50 percent.

I recommend a revolving loan fund of $200 million—$100 million for industrial loans, $50 million for rural redevelopment, and $50 million for public-facility loans. This will provide a substantial basic program to stimulate local and community efforts.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, similar to the one I introduced in January 1959. Two revisions and one addition have been made in my new proposal.

First. A more workable unemployment criteria has been adopted. It is the same criteria approved by the Senate in 1959, and used in the administration's compromise bill of last August. It has the effect of concentrating industrial loans in areas of serious and long-term unemployment.

Second. Ten million dollars has been added for retraining subsistence. In the hard-hit areas of Pennsylvania, workers have been stranded due to technological changes, shifts in demand, and migrations of industry. With unemployment benefits exhausted, vocational training or retraining is beyond reach. Retraining subsistence will provide a new incentive.

Third. With an increase of from $3.5 to $4 million for technical assistance, my bill now calls for a total of $214 million.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted as part of my remarks, a more complete analysis and the text of the area redevelopment bill I have introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 6) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment which causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. To assist areas in the United States designated hereinafter as redevelopment areas, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. To assist the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), there is hereby established within the Department of Commerce an Area Economic Redevelopment Administration which shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Economic Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board," which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

(b) The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Secretary as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Secretary plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this Act.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "industrial redevelopment areas" those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any industrial area—

(1) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

(2) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

(b) The Secretary shall also designate as "rural redevelopment areas" those rural areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(d) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area, and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

LOANS AND PARTICIPATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchases of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas shall not exceed $100,000,000, and (B) with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas shall not exceed $50,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

(3) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(4) No loan shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

(5) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(6) Subject to section 11(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(7) Such assistance shall not exceed 50 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or

area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder; and

(C) That in making any loan under this section with respect to an industrial redevelopment area, the Secretary shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources.

(8) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

(c) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas, and not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 11 (5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than thirty years after the date such loan is made.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Secretary shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Secretary shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

(d) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act, not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

APPROPRIATION FOR LOANS

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $200,000,000 to provide funds for loans under this Act.

INFORMATION

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 10. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and development potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,000,000 annually.

POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 11. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Secretary shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise as in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deed of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classifications law, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a

redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

SEC. 13. Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at prices no higher than those paid on the balance of such procurements;

(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 14. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"SEC. 113. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a 'municipality') is situated in an area designated under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as an industrial redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structure suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposition of such land under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for loans under section 102 or for capital grants under section 103 shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 15. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "counties which" the following "(A) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (B)".

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeyman, and other job training needed in the locality.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located, under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act. Such payments shall be made only during the period the individual is receiving vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act, but not in any event to exceed sixteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

SEC. 18. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 19. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal,

deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security thereof, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 20. No loan shall be made by the Secretary under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Secretary occupying a position or engaging in activities with which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 21. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3, of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Secretary, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Secretary such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 22. In addition to appropriations hereinbefore specifically authorized, there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 23. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

RECORDS AND AUDITS

SEC. 24. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this Act.

The analysis presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

1. Authorizes appropriation of a total of $200 million for revolving fund loans: $100 million for industrial areas; $50 million for rural areas; and $50 million for public facilities.

2. Provides for maximum Federal loan participation of 50 percent; minimum State or local government participation of 10 percent; and minimum participation from nongovernmental sources of 5 percent.

3. Provides for loans over a period of 30 years.

4. Places program under Department of Commerce which has primary responsibility for business and industrial development. Administrator will have Assistant Secretary status.

5. Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to determine realistic rates of interest on all loans.

6. Authorizes loans to industrial areas with the following unemployment levels: 6 percent at time of application and 6 percent average throughout qualifying period, and 50 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 preceding years; or, 75 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 preceding years; or, 100 percent above national average for 1 out of 2 preceding years. There are different criteria for rural areas and public facility loans.

7. Contains a special urban renewal section to permit Housing and Home Finance Agency to give financial assistance to urban renewal projects in municipalities, without regard to the predominantly residential requirements.

8. Contains Davis-Bacon Act provision to assure prevailing rate of wage and 40-hour week on contracts under area redevelopment.

9. Provides that vocational training or retaining needs of unemployed shall be made available through existing programs, under direction of Secretary of Health, Education, Welfare, and Secretary of Labor.

10. Authorizes appropriation of $10 million for retaining subsistence payments to unemployed individuals who have been certified for vocational training or retraining, and who have exhausted unemployment compensation benefits.

11. Authorizes appropriation of $4 million, annually, for technical assistance to redevelopment areas, for surveys and other evaluation studies.

12. Requires State or its instrumentality to establish local redevelopment plans.

13. Establishes a Cabinet-level Advisory Board and 25-member Public Advisory Committee.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce and send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a program of Federal grants for school construction and teachers' salaries.

There are few legislative subjects that have commanded as much attention as has Federal assistance for our country's elementary and secondary schools. There appears to be agreement on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress that the Federal Government must place its resources and prestige behind the fight for better schools. The question is, how should this be done?

The bill that I introduce is in all respects a duplicate of S. 8, the measure which passed the Senate in 1960. It provides Federal grants to each State, to be used as each State decides either for construction or salaries or for a combination of both. The average grant across the Nation would be equal to $20 per school-age child. Each State's per pupil grant would vary, since the money is to be allocated on a formula which relates the State's per capita wealth to the per capita wealth of the Nation.

The same imperative facts which caused the Senate to pass this bill last year are still with us. All too many of our children receive their education in buildings that are overcrowded, underlighted, poorly ventilated, and lacking in minimum sanitary facilities. The most recent figures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare demonstrate that we still have a shortage of more than 130,000 classrooms.

The salaries that are paid to the majority of the Nation's teachers are still inadequate to attract the gifted people we need in the profession.

The latest estimate of the National Education Association shows that the average salary for teachers in the school year 1960–61 will be slightly above $5,000 a year. The average beginning salary for teachers is clearly far below that amount. We can never expect to recruit the talent we must have in the teaching profession when the beginning salaries

do not match even factory wages, not to mention professional salary rates.

The establishment of a Federal school-assistance program has been a goal of mine since I first came to the Senate. I introduced my first general school-aid bill in 1957; and the passage of S. 8 last year was a good omen for the final adoption of such a program.

I offer my bill this year as a continued expression of my deep concern for our schools and as a starting point for what I trust will be the Senate's passage of a Federal education program.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 8) to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 8

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

This section provides that it may be cited as the "School Construction Act of 1961."

SECTION 2—DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

This section declares that it is the purpose of the bill to provide for a 2-year program of Federal grants to the States to assist them in constructing urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities in local communities and for teachers' salaries.

SECTION 3—ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

This section provides that in the administration of the act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

SECTION 4—APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

This section authorizes annual appropriations of an amount equal to $20 times a number equal to the school age population of the United States, as defined in sec. 5(b)(4).

SECTION 5—ALLOTMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO STATES

Subsection (a) provides that the funds appropriated in any year would be allotted among the States on the basis of relative school-age population as weighted by relative income per school-age child. These allotments would be subject to the effort for school purposes of the respective State (effort index) after the first year of the program.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education would allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the funds appropriated for the year as the product of (1) the State's school-age population multiplied by (2) the State's allotment ratio, bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

Subsection (b) provides the definitions of the terms used in subsection (a). A State's allotment ratio would vary inversely with the ratio which exists between the income per child of school age for the State and the income per child of school age for all the States, with the ratio for a State at the national average being 0.50. In no case would an allotment ratio for a State be less than 0.25 or more than 0.75. The allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would be set at 0.75.

The income per child of school age for any State would be the total personal income for the State divided by the number of school-age children in the State. The income per child of school age for all the States would be similarly computed. Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would be excluded from these computations inasmuch as their allotment ratios are specified.

Subsection (c) provides that as soon as possible after appropriated amounts are available for payment the Commissioner shall pay each State which has submitted a proper application the amount allotted to it subject to any adjustments or reallotments made under the effort index provided for in section 6.

SECTION 6—MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL FINANCING (EFFORT INDEX)

This section provides that for the second year of the program, the allotment of any State would be reduced by the percentage (if any) that the State's school-effort index is less than the national school-effort index. The total of the reductions would be reapportioned among the States not subject to such reductions by increasing proportionately the sum of the amounts originally apportioned to them for the year.

The State index would be deemed equal to the national index in the case of (1) Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia and (2) any State whose expenditures per public school child in average daily attendance were not less than those for all the States.

A State's school-effort index would be determined on the basis of the ratio of school expenditures per public schoolchild in average daily attendance to the State's income per child of school age. The national school-effort index would be based on comparable figures for all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia).

The school expenditures are expenditures by the States and subdivisions for elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources as determined by the Commissioner of Education for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data from the States are available to him. The number of children in average daily attendance would be similarly determined.

The income per child of school age for any State and for all the States (mentioned above) would be determined on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

SECTION 7—STATE APPLICATIONS

A State education agency which desires to receive an allotment and payment under this program must submit to the Commissioner of Education an application which (a) provides assurance that the State education agency will be the sole administering agency for the funds received; (b) sets forth procedures to insure that funds will be allocated among projects within the States so that priority is given to local education agencies, which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities; (c) provides assurance that every applicant whose application for funds is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency; (d) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control as may be necessary to assure proper distribution of funds under this act.

When a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable the provisions of this section to the extent he deems such action appropriate because of such special governmental and school organization of the State.

SECTION 8—MATCHING BY STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Subsection (a) provides that in the second year of the act, a State in order to receive its second year grant, must have increased its own expenditures by an amount not less than the product of (a) the State's share and (b) the expenditures of the State and local communities in the base school year of 1960–61. The subsection further provides that a State's second year grant will be reduced by the amount which the State fails to match the prescribed amount, and provides that such reduction shall be reallotted among the remaining States.

Subsection (b) defines the "State's share" as 5 percent of the remainder of $1 less that State's allotment ratio (sec. 5) except that in no case shall the ratio be less than 0.33⅓ or more than 0.66⅔.

Subsection (c) defines "expenditures for elementary and secondary education."

Subsection (d) provides that a State shall be considered to have matched its Federal funds in any year in which its school-age population is less than its school-age population in the base school year 1960–61.

Subsection (e) provides that if a State should fail to receive funds under this act in any given year, for the purposes of the matching provisions, the State will be considered to have received Federal funds under this act in that year.

SECTION 9—PERIOD FOR USE OF FUNDS AND CERTIFICATION BY STATES

Subsection (a) provides that when funds are received under this act by the State they shall be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended not later than the end of the following fiscal year.

Subsection (b) provides that prior to the termination of such following fiscal year each State education agency receiving funds under this program is to (1) certify to the Commissioner the amount of such funds received which have been so distributed and expended, and (2) pay to him any amount of these funds which have not been so expended.

Subsection (c) provides that any funds paid back to the Commissioner shall be reallotted during the next fiscal year.

SECTION 10—LABOR STANDARDS

A State education agency must give adequate assurance to the Commissioner that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors who work on school construction financed under this act will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Davis-Bacon Act.

In respect to labor standards for the performance of work as specified above the Secretary of Labor shall act in accord with Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1954.

SECTION 11—DEFINITIONS

This section defines the terms "Commissioner," "State," "State education agency," "local education agency," "school facilities," "construct," "constructing," and "construction."

The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, unless otherwise designated in the act.

The term "school facilities" is defined so that Federal assistance would be used to provide classrooms and related facilities for education in a State which is provided by a school district for elementary or secondary

education at public expense and under public supervision and direction. This includes furniture, equipment, machinery, utilities, and instructional materials (other than textbooks). The term "instructional materials" would include, among other things, audiovisual equipment, films, film strips, and reference works for school libraries. It also includes interests in land including site, grading, and improvement. It does not include, however, athletic stadiums, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged.

The terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public elementary or secondary school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

AID TO DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to aid distressed areas.

In the 2d session of the 86th Congress, on May 18, 1960, 5 days after the President vetoed Senate 722, I and five of my Republican colleagues introduced Senate bill 3569, which provided for an outlay of $180 million, including $100 million in public facility loans. Senate bill 722 had called for an outlay, in one form or another, of about $389 million. Senate bill 722 passed the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46 in 1959. That means that it secured a majority of only 3 votes out of a total of 95 votes. In amended form it passed the House on May 4, 1960, by a vote of 202 to 184. This was a majority of only 18 votes out of a total of 386 votes. On May 6, 1960, the Senate voted 45 to 32 to accept the House amendments. On May 13 this measure was vetoed. The veto message languished for 6 weeks and then was called up for consideration. The veto was sustained on June 24 in the Senate by a vote of 45 to 39.

Two months later, on August 18, 1960, a 1-day hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The subcommittee consists of nine members. The hearing was spirited, but fruitless. It recessed at 4:30 p.m. on August 18.

Senate bill 3569, which I had introduced, was before the subcommittee at that time, and with it there was the appeal of the President in his veto message for legislation in this field. I deem it of such importance that I shall include the entire veto message in this statement.

The key expression in the veto message is found in paragraph VI:

> My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted.

But a majority of the subcommittee thought otherwise, and hence the Presidential entreaty was ignored. I believe it was fair and reasonable, therefore, to assume that the Democrat majority actually preferred an issue to some accomplishment in this field. But the problem and the challenge which the administration has recognized for more than 5 years is like the little man on the stair, and will not go away.

Certain it is, judging from campaign and possible campaign statements, that this matter is scheduled for early congressional action. To this end we have reconsidered Senate bill 3569 and the other legislative proposals dealing with this problem and we now introduce a bill which we regard as a sound, fair, and effective approach.

This bill embodies the basic provisions of S. 3569. It provides for an outlay of $180 million, but in this bill all of this outlay will go for the aid of distressed areas and assistance in developing the economic growth potential of this country.

This bill is based on the philosophy that the Federal Government, with all of its many complexities, should not step willy-nilly into our economy, but should deal only in areas where people want to help themselves but have problems too large for solution on the local level without assistance.

This bill does not hold out illusory promises of aid for depressed areas which have been bereft of their economic well-being by the circumstances of time and change. These areas would get no aid under those proposals which require redevelopment on the spot, because of the requirement that before any aid can be given there must be reasonable assurance that the aid can be paid back. What if the coal is gone and the whole population cannot be supported by new industry? Are those areas to be left without aid because the aid must be on the spot and must pay out? Any assistance program must be made broader and more flexible if it is to solve the problem. The solution must not be restricted to a particular area. To do so may be to create not permanent improvement of opportunity, but a permanent dole.

On November 28 there appeared in Time magazine a well-rounded article on this subject with emphasis on this thesis:

> Government aid, if it is forthcoming, will not work without the will of a city to revitalize itself.

I believe this article merits inclusion in this statement.

The bill contains another significant feature. Because it is a bill to authorize the appropriations of Federal funds to provide greater employment opportunities, it also requires that such funds shall not be used where restrictive work practices exist. Those who seek Federal assistance should be ready to permit everyone to do a fair day's work and those who seek to provide Federal assistance should stand ready to require that everyone does a fair day's work.

It is to be assumed that this whole problem of distressed area assistance will have further consideration by the committee, and I trust the solution embodied in the bill which I introduced for myself and my colleagues will command favorable consideration by the committee.

The testimony of the Secretary of Commerce, Frederick Mueller, on August 18, is so much to the point that it deserves a place in these remarks in order to round out the whole story, and I request consent to have this testimony, the Time article, and the President's veto message made a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, this is the whole story, and this can then become, I think, for every Member of the Senate, if he so desires, a reference piece that he can clip and put in his notebook, because I was very careful and made sure that the dates of the rollcalls and the vote on the veto measure were quite correct.

I ask that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk for the next 2 days for such Members of the Senate as may want to cosponsor the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statements will be printed in the RECORD; and the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 9) to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies and create new employment opportunities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Assistance Act of 1961."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, even during periods of prosperity for the Nation as a whole, some of our communities suffer substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources and that the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should take effective steps to reduce the substantial and persistent unemployment in such areas by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and the creation of new employment opportunities.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, may designate as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment any area certified as eligible for such designation by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) To assist in reducing substantial and persistent unemployment in such areas in the United States so designated the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to make grants for technical assistance in accordance with the provisions of section 106 of this Act; and

(2) to provide loans in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary is also authorized to extend the full cooperation of the Federal Government—

(1) through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies to all areas in the United States to promote the more effective use of local resources, the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and to expand existing industries.

(2) through grants made in accordance with the provisions of section 106 of this Act, to towns predominantly dependent on one industry and to rural areas to help them to develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies.

(d) The Secretary shall coordinate his functions under this Act with those of the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials administering Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

(e) The Secretary shall not provide any assistance under this section if it is reasonable to believe that any persons who will benefit, directly or indirectly, from such assistance engage in, urge, seek or promote any restrictive work practices.

(f) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

(2) The term "State" refers to an individual State, the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico; and

(3) The term "loan" includes loans, immediate participation in loans, and purchase of evidences of indebtedness.

(4) The term "restrictive work practices" includes failing or refusing to perform any work in an efficient and economical manner and requirements that unnecessary work be performed or unnecessary positions of employment created or continued.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Secretary, or any appropriate State agency or political subdivision, certify areas as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of available labor force data or studies, that—

(1) the current rate of unemployment in the area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is 6 per centum and

(2) the annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least—

(A) 6 per centum for the period set out in the applicable provision of subsection (B) and

(B) (i) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(ii) 75 per centum above the national average of two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(iii) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

(b) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in the preparation of, studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of an area necessary to determine whether such area should be certified under this section.

(c) When the labor force in an area designated under section 101 is not utilizing its full human resources and skills, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve such utilization by the labor force.

(d) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in an area designated under section 101 and when such area has an economic development program as provided in section 107(b)(5), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to assist the State vocational education agency in providing such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing, when necessary and appropriate, financial assistance under this subsection.

AUTHORITY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 103. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new heading and section at the end of title I:

"AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (all hereafter referred to as 'municipality' in this section) is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Area Assistance Act of 1961 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Assistance Act of 1961 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) of this title that the project area clearly be predominantly residential in character or become predominantly residential under the urban renewal plan.

"(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposal of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposal of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That the purchaser from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) hereof.

"(e) After any contract for financial assistance under this section has been executed with respect to any project, the Administrator may complete such project notwithstanding any subsequent determination that the area in which the project is located is no longer an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after June 30, 1960, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 202(c) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In processing applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give (1) priority to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Assistance Act of 1961 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and (2) a first priority above all others to applications for financing needed public facilities in connection with, and that will directly serve, a project eligible under section 107 of the Area Assistance Act of 1961."

(b) The first sentence of section 203(a) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to finance activities under this title, the Administrator is authorized and empowered to issue from time to time to the Secretary of the Treasury notes and other obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time not to exceed $100,000,000, provided that such limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding an aggregate of $100,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "Cities, other municipalities, and counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of the Area Assistance Act of 1961, or (B)."

GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 106. The grants for technical assistance which the Secretary is authorized to make by sections 101(b)(1) and 101(c)(2), may include grants for studies to determine the needs of the areas designated under section 101(a) for the development of their economic growth potential. These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529). Appropriations are hereby authorized for these grants in an amount not to exceed $3,500,000 annually. To the extent he may deem reasonable, taking into account the financial ability of the grantee and other relevant considerations, the Secretary shall obtain from the grantee contributions to the costs of projects undertaken under section 101(c)(2).

LOANS

SEC. 107. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(2) of this Act the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make or participate in loans to aid in financing any project within an area of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, and for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or enlargement of buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be used for working capital, for the purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section shall not exceed $75,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, whether private or public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

(3) No loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, made hereunder may have a term exceeding thirty years and no evidences

of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor or to extensions or renewals for additional periods not to exceed a total of ten years, if such extensions or renewals will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loans or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(4) Each loan shall bear interest at a rate one-half of 1 per centum higher than the rate currently payable under section 108(e) on advances from the Treasury.

(5)(A) Not less than 15 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to its terms and any security for any such loan shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder;

(B) Not more than 35 per centum of such aggregate cost to the applicant may be loaned by the Secretary under the terms of this Act and security for such a loan may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens which secure any loan or financing other than funds required by section 107(b)(5)(A).

(C) No loans shall be made hereunder unless other funds are available in an amount which, together with assistance provided hereunder and funds required by section 107(b)(5)(A), shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost; and

(6) The Secretary first shall find that—

(A) It is reasonable to believe that the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the area of substantial and persistent unemployment in which it is, or will be, located;

(B) The financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(C) A participation loan cannot be arranged;

(D) There is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(E) The project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with an overall program approved by the Secretary for the economic development of the area and a finding to that effect has been made by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof.

(7) That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

AREA ASSISTANCE FUND

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the Area Assistance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall be available to the Secretary for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the loans authorized under section 101(b)(2).

(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not to exceed $75,000,000.

(c) Receipts arising from the loan program shall be credited to the fund.

(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at rates which shall be determined at the time the advances or commitments for advances are made, by the Secretary of the Treasury who shall take into consideration the current average market yields to maturity of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary from such fund.

(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, in amounts determined annually by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, in amounts determined annually by the Secretary of Labor, for benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Such determinations shall include the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 101(a) of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act, with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered an area of substantial and persistent unemployment: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall—

(a) prevent any such area from again being designated an area of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or

(b) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

BUDGET AND AUDIT

SEC. 110. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties, vested in him by section 107 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(a) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(b) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That the Secretary with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 101(b)(2) shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

AREA ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 111. There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

POWERS

SEC. 112. In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary or his delegate may—

(a) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

(b) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(c) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 102, hereof, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided*, That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 101(b)(2) hereof or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules, and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

(d) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell with or without notice at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any contract, claim, personal property, security or evidence of debt assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this title, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(e) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title;

(f) pursue to final collection by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by him as a result of loans made under this title if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the

provisions of this title may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for the purpose;

(g) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 101(b)(2) of this Act; and

(h) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities acquired under the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That no attorney's services shall be produced by contract if an attorney or attorneys can be economically employed full time to render such service.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 113. To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Assistance Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized to participate in the activities of the Board. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

SEC. 114. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agent. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 115. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act:

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary—

(1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or

(2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or

(3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or

(4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(c) As used in this section, the term "Secretary" shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under this Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 116. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

CONSULTANTS

SEC. 117. The Secretary is authorized to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 118. As soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January the Secretary shall make a comprehensive annual report of his operations under this Act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30, to the President for transmission to the Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 119. In addition to appropriations specifically authorized by sections 106 and 108, appropriations are further authorized for the carrying out of other provisions and purposes of this Act.

The matters presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

VETO MESSAGE—AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT, S. 722, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

For 5 consecutive years I have urged the Congress to enact sound area assistance legislation. On repeated occasions I have clearly outlined standards for the kind of program that is needed and that I would gladly approve.

In 1958 I vetoed a bill because it departed greatly from those standards. In 1959, despite my renewed urging, no area assistance bill was passed by the Congress.

Now in 1960, another election year, a new bill is before me that contains certain features which I find even more objectionable than those I found unacceptable in the 1958 bill.

The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

S. 722 is seriously defective in six major respects which are summarized immediately below and discussed in detail thereafter.

1. S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill. In consequence, communities in genuine need would receive less Federal help for industrial development projects than under the administration's proposal.

2. Essential local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by the excessive Federal participation that S. 722 would authorize.

3. Federal financing of plant machinery and equipment is unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help.

4. The Federal loan assistance which S. 722 would provide for the construction of sewers, water mains, access roads, and other public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under an existing Government program. Outright grants for such a purpose, a provision of S. 722, are wholly inappropriate.

5. The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

6. The creation of a new Federal agency is not needed and would actually delay initiation of the new program for many months.

I

The most striking defect of S. 722 is that it would make eligible for Federal assistance areas that don't need it—thus providing less help for communities in genuine need than would the administration's proposal. S. 722, as opposed to the administration bill, would more than double the number of eligible communities competing for Federal participation in loans for the construction or refurbishing of plants for industrial use—the main objective of both bills. Communities experiencing only temporary economic difficulty would accordingly be made eligible under S. 722 and the dissipation of Federal help among them would deprive communities afflicted with truly chronic unemployment of the full measure of assistance they so desperately desire and which the administration bill would give them.

II

Lasting solutions to the problems of chronic unemployment can only be forthcoming if local citizens—the people most immediately concerned—take the lead in planning and financing them. The principal objective is to develop new industry. The Federal Government can and should help, but the major role in the undertaking must be the local community's. Neither money alone, nor the Federal Government alone, can do the job. The States also must help, and many are, but in many instances and in many ways they could do much more.

Under S. 722, however, financing of industrial development projects by the Federal Government—limited to 35 percent under the administration's proposal—could go as high as 65 percent, local community participation could be as low as 10 percent, and private financing as little as 5 percent. Furthermore, although S. 722 conditions this assistance on approval by a local economic development organization, if no such organization exists one can be appointed from Washington.

III

S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment

are unnecessary, unwise, and costly. Much more money would be required and unnecessarily spent, much less money would find its way into truly helpful projects, and manufacturers would be subsidized unnecessarily vis-a-vis their competitors.

IV

S. 722 would authorize further unnecessary spending by providing both loans and grants—up to 100 percent of the cost—for the construction of access roads, sewers, water mains, and other local public facilities.

Grants for local public facilities far exceed any appropriate Federal responsibility. Even though relatively modest at the start, they would set predictably expensive and discriminatory precedents.

With regard to loans for such purposes, exemption from Federal income taxes makes it possible today for local communities in almost every case to borrow on reasonable terms from private sources. Whenever such financing is difficult to obtain, the need can be filled by the existing public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—a program which S. 722 would needlessly duplicate and for which an additional $100 million authorization has already been requested.

V

S. 722 would make a minimum of 600 rural counties eligible for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in such areas. The rural development program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low-income rural areas. Increasing the impact of these two activities, particularly the rural development program, is a preferable course.

VI

Finally, S. 722 would also create a new Federal agency and would, in consequence, mean many unnecessary additions to the Federal payroll and a considerable delay in the program before the new agency could be staffed and functioning effectively. None of this is necessary, for all that needs to be done can be done—much better and immediately—by the existing Department of Commerce.

Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the administration bill.

Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged, and aid to education, to mention but a few.

Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interest of all our people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 13, 1960.*

[Time Magazine, November 28, 1960]

THE DEPRESSED-AREA PROBLEM—THE CURE MUST BEGIN AT HOME

The weather was dreary and drizzling one morning last week as 500 people filed into the silent Ackermann plant of the Wheeling Steel Corp. in Wheeling, W. Va. The men were not workers arriving for the morning shift but guests at a funeral. They came to bid at an auction to liquidate the plant. In 18 hours of bidding, they bought $5 million worth of idle equipment that once had hummed busily under the hands of 1,200 workers. To Wheeling, the auctioneer's machinegun chant was an old familiar dirge; for years, thousands of its skilled workmen have looked on helplessly as, one after another, the gates of its plants have closed for good. Once-thriving Wheeling is a prime example of an urgent problem: the depressed area.

By Government reckoning, a depressed area is one in which at least 6 percent of the workers are unemployed and the total has run at least 50 percent above the national average for 4 of the last 5 years. The United States has 19 major depressed areas and dozens of minor ones scattered from Washington to Maine, most of them concentrated in the industrial East. They account for more than half a million unemployed workers for whom recession is a year-round, inescapable fact, even when the Nation's economy is booming. Both parties introduced bills to aid depressed areas in the last Congress, but squabbled them to death. The cost was comparatively small: $180 million for the administration bill against $251 million for the Democratic bill. Now President-elect John F. Kennedy has put a depressed-areas bill at the top of his list of "must" legislation.

The Nation's pockets of economic blight are caused by the fact that industries that once provided the major payrolls have either left the area, collapsed, or severely cut back their work force under the stress of technological change or competition from more efficient plants elsewhere. The textile industry has moved out of New England for the South's lower wages. In Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky automation in the coal mines and a national shift from coal to oil and gas have thrown thousands out of work. Modernization of the steel industry, abetted by a slump in steel sales, is pushing Youngstown and Pittsburgh toward the depressed category.

Most depressed areas are not economic skeletons incapable of revival; they need only saving infusions of new industry. While they deserve a helping hand from the Government, chiefly in the form of loans and grants to encourage new plant building and new public facilities, it is a fact that Government help can do little good unless depressed areas first go to work to cure their own problems. Many have already arrested the decline, even made healthy comebacks by aggressively working to attract industry, but others are so badly depressed that they lack even the "seed money" to make a fresh start.

Pennsylvania has set up the strongest program to aid local communities in their battle for survival. With about a fourth of all U.S. depressed areas within its borders, the State 5 years ago launched an industrial development program. Its heart was a $20 million revolving fund authorized to make loans to nonprofit development agencies for the construction of new plants in distressed areas. Result: the plan has attracted 389 plants (including Radio Corp. of America, Fruehauf Trailer and Chrysler Corp.) providing 106,000 factory jobs, encouraged the expansion of 700 existing firms, put to work 391 idle plants.

At the city level, Scranton has come up with one of the most imaginative programs. Hit by a cut in mining workers from 17,910 in 1940 to about 2,220 this year, Scranton set out to attract new employers by offering to build them a modern factory to meet their specifications. The city paid for all construction, charged the company only rent. The plan was first financed by the sale of municipal bonds, but the public has chipped in willingly with outright donations to keep the fund going. About 30 community-financed plants have been built at a cost of nearly $20 million, providing jobs for more than 10,000 people. One secret of the plan's success: low wage rates, which 81 percent of the new industries admitted were what made the area attractive to them.

Many plants have closed up or moved away from depressed areas largely because area workers cling to high wage rates out of line with other regions. But as their savings melt away, workers have lowered their sights. The loss of the Ackermann plant so upset Wheeling workers that a jobless steelworker, Thomas Elliott, set up a "save-a-plant" movement, signed up more than 700 unemployed workers who are willing to take much lower wages.

Industrial development agencies have found that one of the most valuable investments they can make is a complete survey of a depressed area's facilities and natural resources. A geological survey of the area around Freedom, Ind., turned up the presence of gypsum; it took little urging to persuade a gypsum mine and mill to locate in the area. More and more depressed communities are setting up training programs to re-educate workers for new jobs. Pennsylvania spends $500,000 a year retraining unemployed workers. Though it costs about $140 to train one worker over a course of several weeks, the State figures that it easily gets that back in taxes within a year.

Instead of concentrating solely on industrial plants, many communities now realize that their biggest hope is to create or attract more service industries. Pennsylvania's service industry employment has steadily increased, jumped from 79,000 in 1950 to 103,900 this year. By attracting enough factories to employ 10,000 people, Scranton figured that it created 17,000 additional jobs in the service industries, retail businesses, and professions. One reason: an average of three people leave the relief rolls for every new job created, thus increasing the market for services.

By working in partnership with the State, local businesses, and—most important—with the workers themselves, local communities can do at least as much as Lawrence, Mass., which, by careful planning and aggressive selling of its assets, has cut its unemployed from 25,000 to 4,500 since most of its textile mills left. All the areas that have worked on curing their own problems agree on one basic fact: Government aid, if it is forthcoming, will not work without the will of a city to revitalize itself.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FREDERICK H. MUELLER ON AREA ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AUGUST 18, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of subcommittee, I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you proposed legislation to provide authority for an effective and sound Federal program of loans and grants to assist areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in their efforts to establish stable and diversified local economies.

I welcome this hearing, too, because people—their personal problems, their individual well-being, their future prospects—are the constant concern of the administration. We are proud of our record of promoting "Government for the people"; and that the encouragement of a climate favorable to private enterprise has helped develop widespread prosperity, a prosperity which no other nation at no other time in history has ever matched.

However, we shall never be satisfied—and I am sure this committee agrees—until men and women in areas of chronic unemploy-

ment also have an opportunity for a larger share of this country's prosperity.

And they can.

I am here to urge again immediate action to create new opportunities for the jobless and for industries—especially small business in these areas. I propose sound measures aimed at genuine solution. I think that is what the public hopes will be initiated rather than unrealistic plans based on excessive spending and bureaucratic confusion that would turn out to be disappointing to the unemployed.

We can begin now—this year—to help these deserving people. All that is necessary for a start is cooperation in the public interest by the executive and legislative branches. I sincerely believe the public wants prompt progress in a further contribution to healthy economic growth. So does the administration. So—I am confident—do the majority of Members of Congress.

Let us remove the roadblocks that have delayed needed legislation. For 5 years, the President has sought effective and sound legislation in this field and, as late as August 8, the day that the Senate reconvened, he urged that such legislation be enacted at this time. He characterized this as one of the items which should not await the selection and assembly of a new Congress and a new administration. He stressed his desire to cooperate with the Congress in enactment of items listed in his message, and I am pleased therefore at this occasion to work with your committee in its consideration of proposals in this field.

The President's message of May 13, returning without approval S. 722, set forth in detail the reasons for that action. He urged enactment of legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree and pledged his cooperation to that end. A legislative proposal was introduced within 5 days thereafter by Senators DIRKSEN, BUSH, BEALL, KEATING, MORTON, and JAVITS (S. 3569) and by Congressmen WIDNALL and SILER in the House. This proposal was intended to provide a program on which the two branches of Government could agree. At the time of its introduction this proposal was publicly acknowledged to be the administration's program, and we urged then and urge now speedy congressional approval. It should be noted that the administration's bill represented a sincere attempt to effect compromises leading to speedy action.

In your letter inviting me to appear today you mentioned your intention to explore in detail S. 722 as passed by this Congress; S. 1064, the earlier proposal endorsed by the administration; S. 3568; and S. 3569, to which reference was made above.

The veto message pointed out that S. 722 made eligible areas that were not chronically distressed. Communities in temporary economic difficulty should not be included. That they were included in the vetoed measure is made abundantly clear by the fact that, since passage of the measure by Congress, 12 areas (9 major and 3 smaller) eligible thereunder would no longer be eligible for benefits. Based on current figures from the Department of Labor, there are 31 major and 105 smaller communities which are eligible under S. 722; and 18 major and 74 smaller of such communities eligible under S. 3569.

The other detailed reasons for not approving S. 722, given by the President in his veto message, do not, in my opinion, need further explanation, but I would like to list and comment on them in a summary manner.

1. Under S. 722, the major role of solving these problems would be undertaken by the Federal Government. This takes the form of Federal participation in loans in amounts in excess to that needed.

We believe that a much more satisfactory way to accomplish local industrial growth and expansion is to concentrate the main effort with those close to the situation, who are familiar not only with the problems but also are aware of local assets and local efforts that can be developed. Experience and logic demonstrate that local private initiative is the key to sustained interest of the community and to lasting benefits. Federal Government should supplement and cooperate, but the prime impetus is local endeavor.

2. Machinery and equipment loans would be provided. Such loans are available, from manufacturers, other private sources, and the Small Business Administration and under the Small Business Investment Act. We believe therefore that authority for such loans would result in unnecessary and unwarranted duplication by the Federal Government in a field where the service is either already provided by nongovernment sources or by SBA when not available privately.

3. The loan program of S. 722 for public facilities again duplicates an existing program for assistance in the construction of basic public works, and the grants which would be authorized by the proposal are not within the scope of the program of assistance to the community as we visualize it. Such grants are disruptive to competition between businessmen and communities and more properly should be the responsibility of State and local agencies. It is neither equitable nor wise to use one type of area development to affect adversely the economic stability of other areas.

4. The rural area program proposed by S. 722 introduced problems entirely different from those found in the industrial communities sought to be assisted by this legislation. Other means of Federal assistance are available and are being used. The rural development program is giving special attention to these areas and is demonstrating positive results. It is widening the opportunities for off-farm jobs, helping the living conditions of low-income farm families, and providing job training and health services. If more assistance is necessary in rural areas, it should be through the medium.

5. Further, the proposed establishment of a new and independent agency is contrary to good administrative practice. Studies and reports by unbiased commissions over recent years have repeatedly stressed the inability of separate agencies of this type to have proper administrative control.

In order to assure top priority of direction and wide cooperation among all agencies of the executive branch that can contribute to the solution, the area development agency should be under a Cabinet department responsive to the President.

In brief, gentlemen, we have opposed S. 722 because by its diffusion of Federal funds and its lack of concentration of aid it has failed to meet the objective which all of us are seeking; namely, the providing of assistance to the Nation's areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. It should be emphasized in this connection that there are major differences between the low-income rural areas on the one hand (such as those sought to be aided by S. 722) and urban industrial areas of chronic unemployment on the other. The urban-industrial areas are those which once had a functioning economy, but which have experienced a severe and lasting unemployment shock. These towns have municipal facilities such as water and sewage systems, they have banks and other commercial facilities, and in general have a concentration of capital investment, human resources, and social institutions which need to be conserved and which provide a base for industrial development. Admittedly rural low-income areas have significant problems but these are not problems of substantial unemployment; nor do those areas have the broad base on which industrial development can immediately take place. These two different types of areas clearly call for different types of treatment and that is why the administration supports separate programs addressed to the two types of areas.

I would like to illustrate in more specific terms how the loan funds for industrial areas provided under the criteria of S. 722 would not be as effective for the areas of real need as they would be under S. 3569. Although I recognize that area assistance loans will not, under either S. 3569 or S. 722, be based solely on the extent of unemployment in the areas for which the loans are sought, yet your subcommittee might be interested in a brief comparison of the two bills based on unemployment criteria alone. Each of the measures provides $75 million for loans to depressed industrial areas. Under the criteria of the administration's bill, S. 3569, there were as of March this year 88 areas that would qualify (17 major and 71 smaller areas). Under S. 722, the vetoed bill, there would be 142 areas (40 major and 102 smaller areas). If the $75 million provided by each bill were prorated proportionately among the distressed areas there would of course be more dollars available per distressed area under the administration's bill than under S. 722. Illinois, which has no major depressed areas, has four minor areas under the tests of S. 3569 and five such areas within the terms of S. 722. The allocation of funds so prorated would be somewhat as follows:

Name	Number unemployed (March 1960)	S. 3569	S. 722
Centralia	1,750	$262,500	$120,000
Harrisburg	4,600	682,500	322,500
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort	12,050	1,785,000	840,000
Mount Carmel-Olney	1,375		97,500
Mount Vernon	2,850	427,500	195,000

On the foregoing comparative basis four of the Illinois needy areas would be entitled to twice as much money under the administration's bill than under the vetoed bill. A fifth area, Mount Carmel-Olney, whose unemployment is less than 1,400 persons, would not qualify under S. 3569.

Turning to West Virginia, a State critically in need of area assistance, there are three major depressed areas. Here, using the same yardstick, there would be more than double the amount of funds available for these needy communities under the administration's proposal than under S. 722.

Name	Number unemployed (March 1960)	S. 3569	S. 722
Charleston	8,150	$1,215,000	$570,000
Huntington-Ashland	11,900	1,777,500	832,500
Wheeling	10,300	1,537,500	720,000

The same results hold true for West Virginia's smaller areas. Based on the March figures, 11 such areas would qualify for a total of $2,733,500 under the vetoed bill; whereas under S. 3569 9 of these areas would qualify for $6,016,500. Both in totals and in averages per community the criteria of the administration's bill would provide more aid for West Virginia's depressed communities than would S. 722.

In Pennsylvania, the story is much the same. In March of this year it had five major areas of distress under the criteria of S. 3569 and eight such areas within the terms of S. 722. The principal differences being that Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and York with

less persistent unemployment would not meet the tests of S. 3569. In the five areas which would qualify under both bills, the aid under S. 722 would be less than half that available under the administration's measure. The figures are as follows:

Name	Number unemployed (March 1960)	S. 3569	S. 722
Altoona	4,700	$697,500	$322,500
Erie	9,700	1,447,500	675,000
Johnstown	10,100	1,507,500	705,000
Philadelphia	119,300	----------	8,302,500
Pittsburgh	75,700	----------	5,265,000
Scranton	13,200	1,957,500	922,500
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	19,800	2,947,500	1,380,000
York	6,700	----------	465,000

Based on the latest figures from the Department of Labor, I would like to point out that Philadelphia and York are no longer areas of critical unemployment under the standards of either bill. With respect to smaller areas in Pennsylvania, 15 would meet the tests of S. 722 and 11 would qualify under S. 3569. Here again in both totals and averages the vetoed bill would provide considerably less aid than would S. 3569.

If the object of this legislation is to provide material assistance for industrial areas suffering from chronic unemployment, very clearly S. 722 is found wanting—its scattershot approach encompassing communities with temporary, seasonal or mild unemployment problems can mean only that less aid will be available for those unfortunate communities faced with the specter of persistent unemployment.

So much in respect to the previous bill. But the areas with persistent unemployment need not be left neglected in the months ahead. The Congress can act now on an acceptable measure that will bring relief. I refer to S. 3569, which was introduced because the foregoing features of S. 722 prompted a veto in the public interest and because necessity demands a new attempt to pass a bill on which all who want to reduce chronic unemployment can agree.

S. 3569 is a more comprehensive bill than its predecessors. It seeks to gear together all the public and private forces that generate area development and to lay the foundation for permanent economic progress.

This bill provides broader criteria than those provided by S. 1064, the earlier administration proposal considered by the Congress along with S. 722. Such a modification was referred to by the President in his veto message when he stated that he would accept changes in these criteria in the interest of agreement on a proposal.

The sum of $1.5 million annually is authorized to be used in helping State vocational education agencies in vocational training and retraining to assist eligible areas. The earlier bill (S. 1064) provided authority for this activity but did not expressly set out authorization which might serve as a measure of the need for this aspect of the program.

S. 3569 not only provides for priority for eligible areas in obtaining community facilities loans, as did S. 1064, but also expressly provides for the authorization of an additional $100 million in funds to be available for these loans.

Funds available for grants to provide technical assistance would be increased from $3 million annually to $3.5 million annually; $1.5 million would (as in S. 1064) be available annually for areas eligible generally and $2 million would be available annually for towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of low-income areas, and other low-income areas to help them develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies.

The maximum term of loans to industrial areas authorized by section 101(b)(2) of S. 3569 would be increased to 30 years from the 25-year maximum provided in S. 1064. The total amount of such loans which may be outstanding at any one time has been increased to $75 million from the $50 million provided for in S. 1064. I must emphasize that the true significance of such an adjustment will obviously be evaluated better on the basis of experience under the program. You may be assured that the budget process, executive and legislative, will arrive at realistic figures. Finally, S. 3569 would make more definite the interest rate to be charged on these loans. The establishment of a more precise formula would assure favorable charges to borrowers.

I have undertaken to describe to this committee in some detail the changes which have been made in the proposed program in the interest of seeking out a proposal on which agreement might be reached. In your letter of invitation, you also asked for detail on the provisions of S. 3568, which was also introduced after the veto of S. 722 as a measure on which agreement might be reached. While we are very appreciative of the thought that went into this latter proposal, we prefer the program to be provided by S. 3569 and have not, therefore, thought it necessary to go into detail with respect to S. 3568.

S. 3569 can be a trailblazer. After initiating a course of action, time will tell whether further adjustments are needed to improve its operation. However, I should like to point out that the President and the administration have been constantly mindful of the problems of the areas of acute unemployment. Since his veto message, the President has personally urged that the various Federal agencies do their utmost within their present authorities and appropriations to assist such areas. Under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce, member agencies of the Interdepartmental Committee coordinating the Federal assistance programs have made tangible progress. I am submitting for the record three documents summarizing this assistance.

In closing, I should like to reemphasize a fundamental in respect to any approach to permanent relief and lasting progress:

Money which the taxpayers send to the Treasury is not the sole instrument for use in area development. Excessive Federal funds unwisely spent by officials in Washington, unfamiliar with local conditions, could create duplications and confusions that defeat the purpose and might even cause injury to other sections. Action with any assurance of success must be a cooperative undertaking tailored to fit local conditions. It must stimulate local initiative and must fit into the pattern of private enterprise.

And such action is possible through S. 3569.

HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] a bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation.

The purpose of this Commission would be to make a top-to-bottom review of our tax system, to develop recommendations for providing more equitable tax laws, and to try to find ways and means by which the country can (a) more effectively meet its fiscal needs; (b) assure fair treatment of our citizens under the law; and (c) spur, not stunt, economic growth and progress.

The Nation, I believe, could benefit from creation of a realistic, long-range tax philosophy to serve—and preserve—our free-enterprise system, as well as development of a more equitable system of laws to reflect that philosophy.

Economically, we now exist on a kind of hand-to-mouth practice of levying new laws, and continuing ones that threaten to expire; rarely do we repeal laws, though some continue long beyond their originally intended time.

This results in taxes for economic expediency, rather than adherence to a system of principles designed to meet the long-range needs of the economy and the country.

My colleagues will recall that I introduced a similar measure in the previous Congress. Then, I was gratified by the many Members who joined in cosponsoring the Tax Commission bill.

To give other Senators an opportunity, again, to cosponsor the measure, I request unanimous consent that the bill remain on the desk for 1 week.

At this time, I also request unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 10) for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the general policy of the Congress—

(a) to strengthen the private enterprise system of the United States in terms of its changing needs, requirements, and opportunities, and thereby to advance the freedom and well-being of the American people;

(b) to provide the soundest basis for the collection of adequate revenue to meet the obligations of the Federal Government;

(c) to promote respect for and observance of Federal revenue laws and regulations; and

(d) toward the accomplishment of these objectives, to promote efficiency, stability, economy, clarity, simplicity, consistency, equity, and justice in the tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

It is the purpose of this Act to establish a medium for the comprehensive implementation of this general policy through the establishment of a Commission to study and investigate the fundamental tax policy and the tax structure of the Federal Government and their application to the people on an individual basis as well as to the various segments of the national economy in order to improve the existing tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Federal Taxation (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of

an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall study and investigate the present tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government, the kinds of direct and indirect taxes imposed thereunder (with particular reference to the Federal income tax and its impact on individuals and on enterprises—small, medium, and large), and the nature and extent of the application of such taxes generally and specifically (including the imposition and collection of taxes), in order to determine what changes in such tax policy and tax structure, and in the application and administration thereof, are necessary in its opinion to carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times as it deems necessary and shall submit to the Congress on or before January 1, 1962, its final report of the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations. Such final report may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administration actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. On the sixtieth day after the date of submission of such final report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon requests made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several colleagues, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, with reference to equality of opportunity. The bill would make more effective the act's prohibitions against price discrimination by eliminating the defense of meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor in those instances where it is affirmatively shown that the price discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. Where the effect of the discrimination is not so severe as this, meeting competition in good faith would continue as a defense.

The necessity for the bill arises from the 1951 decision of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case (340 U.S. 231). In this decision the Court held that price discriminations, unlawful under section 2(a) of the Clayton Act because of their substantial adverse effect upon competition, could be continued upon a showing that the discriminations were made in good faith.

This decision stands for the proposition that substantially lessening of competition or tendency toward monopoly is in the public interest if the business practices which produce these results are done in good faith.

The bill, on the other hand, is based on the proposition that substantial lessening of competition or tending toward monopoly is not in the public interest regardless of whether the business practices which produce those results are done in good faith or bad faith. The bill says that good faith monopoly is as repugnant to America as bad faith monopoly.

This is the fourth time I have introduced this bill in the Senate. A similar bill is being introduced also for the fourth time in the House by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act and a lifelong friend of small business. This proposed legislation has been numbered H.R. 11 in the House and S. 11 in the Senate in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses and is known as the equality of opportunity bill.

Having failed of enactment in the three preceding Congresses, the bill is obviously highly controversial. In the 84th Congress, the bill passed the House by a vote of 393 to 3, but was never considered in the Senate having been caught in the closing days. In the 85th Congress, the bill was reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, but again was caught in the closing days. The bill was not acted upon in the 86th Congress.

The bill which I have introduced is in the form in which it was introduced in the 86th Congress.

As I have stated, the bill is controversial. The issue involved is whether good faith monopoly shall continue to be permitted under the Standard Oil of Indiana case, or whether good faith monopoly as well as bad faith monopoly shall be condemned under the bill.

In order that all Senators who believe with me that good faith as well as bad faith monopoly must be prevented may have an opportunity to add their names as cosponsors, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 1 week as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 11) to amend the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF IRRIGATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my self and my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for Federal assistance on water resources. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 13) to provide for Federal assistance in the development of irrigation in connection with non-Federal municipal and industrial water projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the purpose of this Act is to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects proposed to be constructed primarily for municipal and industrial water development and to encourage thereby the planning and construction of water resources developments on a multiple-purpose and comprehensive basis. To implement this purpose there are hereby authorized loans by the United States for those portions of the costs of constructing such projects which are properly allocable to irrigation and grants by the United States for those portions of the costs of constructing such projects which are properly allocable under the Federal reclamation laws to nonreimbursable functions, provided that no Federal loan or grant shall be made for any of the purposes referred to in this Act unless the estimated economic benefits including direct and indirect benefits exceed the costs allocated to that purpose.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "project" shall mean a development proposed primarily for supplying municipal and/or industrial water.

(b) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, a municipal water district, water users' association, or similar nonprofit public organization which has capacity to contract with the United States.

(c) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this Act shall, if the major part of the assistance requested is based upon irrigation or the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, submit its project proposal and application for assistance to the Secretary of the Interior who shall, if the request also involves flood control or navigation, transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Army for his consideration. If the major part of the assistance requested is based upon flood control or navigation, the organization shall submit its project proposal and application to the Secretary of the Army who shall, if the request also involves irrigation or the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration. Each project proposal shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated costs and benefits in detail sufficient to permit a determination as to project economic and engineering feasibility; shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all rights, pursuant to applicable State law, to the use of water necessary for the successful construction and operation of the project; shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to project functions under which costs for facilities used for a single purpose are allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose are so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities; shall have been submitted for review by the State of the drainage basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887); and shall be accompanied by a payment of $1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, upon determination that a requested loan for irrigation constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, is hereby authorized, after submission of his findings and recommendation to the Congress, to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization which shall set out among other things—

(1) the maximum amount of the loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which is properly allocable to irrigation;

(2) a plan for (i) repayment by the organization of the amount lent to it within not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the loan first became available, (ii) repayment in the same period of any costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in making and administering the loan which are not covered by such portion of the prepayment of $1,000 required by section 3 of this Act is properly attributable to the irrigation aspects of the project proposal, and (iii) payment of interest each year on that pro rata share of the amount lent which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in that year to lands held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres. The interest rate shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be equal to the average annual yield to maturity (adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum), on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May next preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month of May; and

(3) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary and proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan as aforesaid and to assure that the contemplated irrigation benefits (including, particularly, the benefits of interest-free money) will be realized.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, upon determination that any proposed allocations to flood control or navigation are justified, is hereby authorized, after submission of his findings and recommendations to the Congress, to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization which shall set out, among other things—

(1) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization with respect to the functions aforesaid and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed those portions of the estimated cost of constructing the project which are properly allocable to flood control and navigation; and

(2) such provisions as he shall deem necessary and proper to assure that the benefits upon which such grant are predicated are attained.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, upon determination that the proposed allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife is justified, is hereby authorized, after submission of his findings and recommendations to the Congress, to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization which shall set out, among other things—

(1) the maximum amount of the grant to be accorded the organization with respect to the function aforesaid and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which is properly allocable to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife; and

(2) such provisions as he shall deem necessary and proper to assure that the benefits upon which such grant are predicated are attained.

SEC. 5. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided,* That no funds shall be appropriated for a loan or grant under this Act, and no contract under section 4 shall be executed, until such loan or grant has been approved by the Congress.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ENGLE is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The field hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources during the past year have revealed widespread interest throughout the country in some means of obtaining Federal assistance in multipurpose water projects being developed by municipal and local agencies. I want to encourage cities and public districts to make the fullest use of their water resources and to include such functions as irrigation, flood control, fish and game preservation at the same time they build water systems for domestic and industrial use.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill, which the Clerk tells me again will have the identification of S. 13, to authorize loans by the United States for irrigation development and grants for flood control and other nonreimbursable functions, in connection with non-Federal water projects. My California colleague, Senator KUCHEL, is a coauthor of this legislation.

EXPANSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. The bill is one which passed the Senate in the last session of the 86th Congress. I introduce it today for myself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that it may remain at the desk for 48 hours and that other Senators may add their names if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill

will lie at the desk for 48 hours as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 22) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT RELATING TO BROADCASTING OF RETURNS OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on election night just past, the radio and television stations of the eastern part of the United States were broadcasting results of the election in precincts, cities, and States before the polls had closed in California and other Western States. I think it takes unfair advantage of the time difference in the United States.

Therefore, I have had prepared a bill that would prohibit any radio station—which means also television station—from broadcasting, prior to 12 midnight eastern standard time on the day of an election for President or Vice President, reports of the election in any one or more precincts in any State.

I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 56) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the broadcasting of returns of presidential elections, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I again introduce my proposal for taking effective steps to tackle a persistent challenge to our country—the financing of adequate medical care for the retired aged of today and of tomorrow.

Fortunately, I am introducing my bill under quite different circumstances than prevailed last year. A new administration has been elected to office on a party platform that included the following commitment:

> The most practicable way to provide health protection for older people is to use the contributory machinery of the social security system for insurance covering hospital bills and other high cost medical services.
>
> For those relatively few of our older people who have never been eligible for social security coverage, we shall provide corresponding benefits by appropriations from the general revenue.

The Democratic Party platform of 1960 considered this commitment a first priority and, what is more, it became a major theme in the campaign itself.

President-elect Kennedy himself, time after time, made such statements as the following:

> I am convinced that only by the use of the social security system can we have true health insurance for older people.

Mr. President, the words of the Democratic platform and of President-elect Kennedy were not motivated by political expediency. They were based on solid evidence, evidence which shows the great need for health protection for our elderly citizens, and which shows that an insurance program utilizing the social security system is the most logical way of accomplishing this.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging I have helped to compile this evidence and have taken a personal interest in the development of sound legislation to meet the challenge.

It is my firm belief that the program I introduce today does meet the challenge.

I ask unanimous consent that a description and analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection the description and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 65) to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The analysis presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT INTRODUCED BY SENATOR PAT McNAMARA

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

This bill is an amendment to title II of the Social Security Act to provide medical insurance benefits to aged beneficiaries under the OASDI program.

Section 101(a) of the bill provides for a new section in the Social Security Act under which provision is made for the payment of medical insurance benefits to aged beneficiaries under the OASDI program.

MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 226(a)(1): Eligibility for benefits: Retired persons eligible to OASI benefits would be eligible for medical insurance benefits under this bill if they have reached the age of 62 for women and 65 for men.

A spouse who receives more than one-half support from his or her eligible spouse for a year which began no earlier than the calendar year preceding the dependent spouse's attainment of age 62 for women, age 65 for men, would be eligible for medical insurance benefits.

An application for payment must be filed in the form and manner, and by such person as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of HEW.

Section 226(a)(2): Kinds of benefits: Medical insurance benefits are to include hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, diagnostic outpatient services, and expensive drugs.

Section 226(a)(3): Definition of retirement: The bill defines a retired OASI beneficiary as (a) anyone who had total earnings of less than $2,400 in a calendar year preceding illness, or (b) anyone in the above ages who did not earn more than $100 in wages and was not self-employed in 3 months in a calendar year preceding his illness, or (c) had attained age 72. The calendar year could not be earlier than the calendar year preceding attainment of age 62 for women and 65 for men.

For purposes of the definition of retirement under this section an individual shall be deemed not to have engaged in self-employment in any month in which he renders services in his business in less than 8 days during that month.

Section 226(a)(4) Amount of benefits:

Hospital services, 90 days in any calendar year.

Recuperative nursing home services, 180 days.

Home health services, 240 days.

Diagnostic services to the extent established by regulation of the Secretary of HEW after study and consultation with the Advisory Council.

Expensive drugs only to the extent set by the Secretary in regulations after study of the subject and consultation with the Advisory Council.

This paragraph also defines one unit of service as (a) 1 hospital day or (b) 2 days of nursing home service or (c) 2⅔ days of home health services. No person can receive more than 90 units of services of any combination of hospital, nursing home, or home health services in any calendar year.

Section 226(a)(5) Referral and recertification by physician: To be eligible for benefits an individual must be referred to the hospital, nursing home, or home health service agency by a physician who certifies that such services are required for the individual's medical treatment. Periodic recertification at specific intervals—to be established by the Secretary—would be required as a condition of continuing eligibility during the period of illness. Referral would not be necessary in emergency cases.

Section 226(a)(6) Applications for payment: Applications for the payment of medical insurance benefits, except for expensive drugs, may be filed no earlier than 3 months before or no later than 12 months after the beginning of a period in which covered health services were furnished. With respect to expensive drugs, application would have to be filed within such time as the Secretary of HEW would by regulation prescribe.

Section 226(b) Determinations of eligibility: The Secretary would have authority to make and review determinations of eligibility for medical insurance benefits. Payment of monthly OASI benefits other than disability insurance benefits would be conclusive evidence of the attainment of retirement age.

Section 226(c) Definitions:

1. Hospital services: These are inpatient services including all of the regular services provided by a hospital. Provides for semiprivate accommodations, unless other accommodations are required for medical reasons, medical service, nursing and such other services customarily provided by hospitals. Does not include services provided in connection with cosmetic or plastic surgery for beautification.

2. Nursing home services: This includes skilled nursing care, related medical and personal services and bed and board furnished an individual as an inpatient for a condition, certified by a physician, for which the patient had been hospitalized, prior to transfer to the nursing home.

3. Home health services: These are visiting nurse and allied services provided by a nonprofit home health service agency in the patient's home. They include various kinds of therapies, medical social services, and homemaker services.

4. Diagnostic outpatient services: These are X-ray, laboratory, and other diagnostic services provided by a hospital on an outpatient basis as prescribed by a physician.

5. Expensive drugs: These refer to drugs prescribed by a physician using generic names, including drugs for repeated use over a period of time, and the cost of which is in excess of an amount fixed by the Secretary.

Section 226(d)(1) Agreements with providers of health services:

This paragraph provides that the Secretary shall publish lists of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health service agencies, licensed pursuant to State law, which meet standards prescribed by him. Such institutions are eligible for payment under this section if an agreement to make no charge to eligible individuals for covered services is filed with the Secretary. This paragraph provides that the Secretary may take account of standards set by nationally recognized accrediting bodies. He may also delegate responsibility to appropriate State agencies to assist in determining whether standards are being met.

Agreements may be terminated by providers or by the Secretary under regulations to be established.

Services furnished by mental and tuberculosis hospitals are excluded.

(d)(2) Payments may be made to hospitals not listed by the Secretary for emergency services furnished to eligible persons.

(d)(3) Payments to hospitals for hospital service and outpatient diagnostic service would be equal to the cost of rendering the service, and the method of determining such cost shall be prescribed by regulations after consultation with the Advisory Council.

(d)(4) No payments can be made for hospital services where the patient is entitled to hospitalization under workmen's compensation legislation, except in special situations where entitlement under workmen's compensation has not been finally determined and arrangements have been made for reimbursement of the trust fund if the claim under workmen's compensation law is sustained. No payment can be made for hospital services if the hospital is obligated by law or by contract with a political entity to furnish service at public expense and without employing a means test.

(d)(5) Payment to nursing homes and for home health services shall be based on the reasonable cost of rendering service.

(d)(6) This paragraph provides for the payment of only that part of the cost of expensive drugs which exceeds the amount fixed by the Secretary. Payment is to be based on reasonable cost of the drugs, plus such percentage as may be determined by the Secretary after consultation with the Advisory Council to provide adequate compensation to the pharmacy for its services in furnishing the drugs. Payment may be made to any licensed retail pharmacy which has entered into an agreement with the Secretary.

(d)(7)–(9) No interference in administration: This is a definite statement—that no supervision or control over the administration or operation of any agency which has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under this section is permissible.

(d)(10) Payment for covered services would be made from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

SECTION 266. (e) Free choice by patient: This subsection asserts the absolute free choice of an individual to secure hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, or diagnostic services, from any facility which he selects and which is listed by the Secretary as eligible to provide the class of services. It also asserts that he may obtain expensive drugs from any pharmacy which has entered into an agreement with the Secretary.

Section 226(f)(1) Creation of National Medical Insurance Benefits Advisory Council: This section provides for the creation of the National Medical Insurance Benefits Advisory Council composed of the Commissioner of Social Security and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service as cochairman, and 12 members appointed by the Secretary, 4 of whom would be representatives of the general public, and the remaining members outstanding people in the hospital and health field. Each is to have a term of 4 years on a staggered basis. The Advisory Council is authorized to appoint special committees for particular purposes and will meet as necessary, but not less than once a year.

(f)(2). The Advisory Council or a technical committee appointed by the Council would have the duty of studying the operation of this section of the act.

Section 226(g)(1). Use of private, nonprofit organizations: It is within the discretion of the Secretary to use the services of private, nonprofit organizations in the administration of this section of the act.

(g)(2). Method of payment for health services: Payments to participating private, nonprofit organizations for costs incurred in the administration of the program, and as reimbursement for amounts paid to providers of service, would be made from the Federal medical insurance trust fund.

Section 101(b) of the bill—Creation of Federal medical insurance trust fund: This section creates the Federal medical insurance trust fund in addition to the OASI trust fund and the disability trust fund. It provides for the allocation of a specified portion of social security taxes to this new trust fund. The section authorizes for fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, to December 31, 1971, appropriations to the medical trust fund of revenue derived from a one-half of 1 percent increase in the OASI tax, three-fourths of 1 percent beginning January 1, 1972. On self-employed the tax would be three-eighths of 1 percent until January 1, 1972, and nine-sixteenths of 1 percent thereafter.

Section 101(c) of the bill sets forth the phasing schedule with respect to the effective dates of the various benefits.

Hospital services: Not earlier than July 1, 1962, or later than January 1, 1963.

Nursing home services: Not earlier than January 1, 1964, or later than July 1, 1964.

Home health services: Not earlier than January 1, 1963, or later than July 1, 1963.

Diagnostic outpatient services: Not earlier than July 1, 1962, or later than January 1, 1963.

Very expensive drugs: Not earlier than July 1, 1963, or later than January 1, 1964.

TITLE II—MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR RETIRED AGED NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SUCH BENEFITS UNDER TITLE I OF THIS ACT

This title creates a new title XIV in the Social Security Act to provide medical benefits for those aged persons not eligible for benefits under the OASI program.

Section 201(a) of the bill amends the Social Security Act by adding a new title.

Section 1601(a) provides that persons not eligible for OASI benefits may be eligible for medical insurance benefits if they are residents of the United States, have attained retirement age and meet the retirement test as provided in section 226 of title II of the act. The amount and kind of benefits payable and the conditions under which they would be paid are the same as provided in section 226 of the act.

Section 1602: This section authorizes appropriations to the Federal medical insurance trust fund necessary to meet payments for persons eligible to receive benefits under this section; i.e., retired persons not eligible for OASI benefits. Appropriations would come out of general revenues.

Section 1603: Payments made under this title would be made from the Federal medical insurance trust fund.

Section 1604: This section excludes: Those eligible to an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act; those eligible to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act and their spouses; physicians; those eligible to receive annuities under State and local retirement systems which were covered by OASI. However, title IV of the bill is a declaration of policy which states that it is the intent of the Congress to make available, as soon as possible, to those receiving railroad retirement and civil service retirement annuities the same type of services made available by this act to those receiving OASI benefits.

Title III: Amends appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so that the total social security tax can include the additional tax authorized in title I of this bill.

Title IV, section 401: This section is a declaration of policy by the Congress to include as soon as possible persons receiving annuities under Railroad Retirement Act and Civil Service Retirement Act.

Section 402. Research and demonstration on health needs: This section directs the Secretary to conduct a continuing study and investigation of the health needs of older individuals and the means for meeting these needs most effectively and efficiently. It also authorizes appropriate demonstration programs in this field.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE BURNS CREEK DAM AND POWERPLANT IN BONNEVILLE COUNTY, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the 86th Congress and in the 85th Congress, my senior colleague and I were joined in the sponsorship of legislation which would authorize the construction of the Burns Creek dam and powerplant in Bonneville County, Idaho.

Bills to accomplish this purpose were passed in this body in each of these sessions and once again, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Idaho, I introduce it for appropriate reference. The bill which we are introducing had the support of the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure that it will have this support from the new administration and I am hopeful that once again, the Senate can act favorably upon it.

The Burns Creek dam and reservoir and powerplant would be located on the Snake River in Bonneville County, Idaho, about 30 miles downstream from Palisades Dam. It would be integrated electrically, hydraulically, and financially with the existing Palisades reclamation project. The prime purpose of this development is reregulation of releases from Palisades, but in addition 100,000 acre-feet of its 234,000 acre-feet of reservoir capacity will be available for long-term holdover irrigation storage and a 90,000-kilowatt powerplant will be built. The holdover storage would in effect provide insurance water to be used during extreme drought periods. All of it has been contracted for use on the irrigated acres along the Snake River upstream from Bliss, Idaho, by the users

who heretofore have contracted for Palisades water.

The reregulation of Palisades releases will make possible an integrated operation which will more than double the prime power output from the Palisades powerplant alone. A very favorable cost benefit ratio has been reported.

The bill has the virtually unanimous support of the water users, the power users and all other interested parties in the State of Idaho.

When we joined in the introduction of this bill on January 14, 1959, I said:

I know of no project which is so well able to stand on its own merits as this one, not only in terms of the supplemental irrigation benefits, but also in terms of the power it will produce, as well as in fiscal terms. It will not be a cost to the Federal Government. Rather, it will be an additional investment in the development of reclamation and related purposes which will more than repay the Treasury with interest, from power revenues alone, within a reasonable pay-out period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 66) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXPANSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 100) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a serious problem exists in many areas of the country today because natural fresh water supplies have remained relatively constant while population and the consumption of fresh water have increased tremendously;

Whereas the areas in which water shortages exist may be expected to increase at an alarming rate if reliance is placed solely upon natural fresh water supplies;

Whereas as the limit of the natural fresh water supplies is approached, this country will become increasingly dependent upon the conversion of salt and brackish waters for its supplies of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses;

Whereas the Federal Government has been conducting a limited program to develop lower cost means of converting saline waters into water suitable for beneficial consumptive purposes;

Whereas although some significant progress has been made under that program, the answers to low-cost conversion of saline waters have not been found as yet;

Whereas a considerable expansion of a cooperative Federal program of research, development, and demonstration, and of aid to public bodies in practical application, could yield enormous dividends to the Nation in terms of lowered saline water conversion costs and new supplies of beneficial water to a growing number of needy areas; and

Whereas the future well-being and development of this country, its civil and military defense, its world prestige, and the well-being of its friends and allies in the free world, require a sharp acceleration of the national effort to develop lower cost methods of converting sea or other saline waters into water suitable for beneficial consumptive uses: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—SALINE WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"Policy and purpose

"SEC. 101. In view of the acute shortage of water in many areas of the Nation, and in recognition of the increasing importance of finding new sources of supply to meet the present and future water needs of this country, the Congress reaffirms and declares its policy to assist in the development of practicable low-cost means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water of a quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses on a scale sufficient to determine the feasibility of the development of such production and distribution on a large scale.

"Administration

"SEC. 102. The provisions of this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to in this title as the 'Secretary') acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he deems appropriate.

"Functions

"SEC. 103. (a) STUDIES AND RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall conduct research and make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs and the best designs and conditions of operation to accomplish the purposes of this Act. Such research shall include, but not be limited to (1) the use of small conversion units, (2) methods of extraction and use of byproducts, (3) an evaluation of various materials for use in construction, and of types of components and equipment, (4) methods of overcoming or lessening corrosion, (5) the use of atomic energy in conversion systems, (6) methods of preventing scale, (7) the development of improved membranes, and (8) the advancement of scientific data on thermodynamics, polarization, properties of solutions, ion exchange, absorption, and brine disposal. In connection with studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, the Secretary shall consider and evaluate methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from and incident to the production of water by the conversion of sea and other saline waters for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the costs of water production in any area by the commercial utilization of such byproducts.

"(b) PROCESS DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct technical development work to determine the results of research by laboratory and pilot plant testing with a view to developing processes to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale. Such development work shall include the laboratory or pilot plant testing of saline water conversion processes, including (1) distillation processes, (2) freezing processes, (3) membrane and ion-exchange processes, (4) solar distillation processes, and (5) other promising processes, such as gas hydrates and solvent extraction. The Secretary shall also, subject to the provisions of section 105, undertake the laboratory or pilot plant testing of saline water conversion systems suitable for civil defense purposes.

"(c) INVESTIGATION, COORDINATION, AND CORRELATION OF SCIENTIFIC DATA.—The Secretary shall, with a view to obtaining and making available the most advanced information concerning saline water conversion developments—

"(1) assemble and maintain pertinent and current scientific literature, both domestic and foreign, and issue periodically bibliographical data, with respect to such literature;

"(2) cause on-site inspections to be made of promising projects, domestic and foreign, and cooperate and participate insofar as practicable, in their development;

"(3) provide for the calling of, and sending representatives to, national and international conferences relating to saline water conversion;

"(4) stimulate, by grant or otherwise, pioneering research in matters relating to saline water conversion by educational institutions, scientific organizations, and industrial and engineering firms; and

"(5) coordinate, correlate, and publish information obtained with a view to advancing the development of low-cost saline water conversion projects.

"(d) ECONOMIC STUDIES.—With a view to clarifying the economics of saline water conversion and thereby stimulate development, the Secretary shall undertake economic studies and market surveys to determine (1) present and prospective comparative costs of natural fresh water, and potable water by the leading saline water conversion processes in various, representative areas, and (2) present and prospective markets for saline water conversion equipment.

"Powers

"SEC. 104. (a) In carrying out his functions under section 103, the Secretary may—

"(1) acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, secret processes, technical data, invention, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and any interest in land (including water rights, easements, and leasehold interests), plants and facilities, and other property or rights: *Provided*, That the land or other property acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry out experiments and demonstrations authorized by this title;

"(2) make research grants to and enter into noncompetitive contracts with any educational institution, scientific organization,

or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work to be carried out under this title;

"(3) acquire the services of chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary;

"(4) utilize the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories;

"(5) establish and operate a central laboratory and test site, serving both sea and brackish water, for the purpose of conducting the continuous research, testing, development, and programing necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title;

"(6) negotiate contracts with any States, territories, possessions, political subdivisions or agencies thereof, or publicly owned utilities organizations, hereinafter called organization, for use of organization's saline water conversion plant facitities to further the sea and brackish water conversion research and demonstration program; and

"(7) evaluate loan applications made by any State or political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the construction of saline water conversion plants for the purpose of certifying to said Agency the reliability and economic potential of the proposed process, and to make such recommendations as may be necessary as to engineering, design, and capacity of said plant.

"(b) All research within the United States which has been contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored or authorized under authority of this Act, shall be provided for in such a manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public.

"This subsection shall not be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating hereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

"Cooperation with other agencies

"SEC. 105. The Secretary shall, in carrying out the purposes of this title, cooperate with other Federal, State, or municipal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, and with interested persons, firms, institutions, and organizations. Research activities undertaken by the Secretary shall be coordinated or conducted jointly with the Department of Defense to the greatest practicable extent compatible with military and security limitations to the end that research and developments under this title which are primarily of a civil nature will contribute to the defense of the Nation, and that research and developments in the same field which are primarily of a military nature and are conducted by the Department of Defense will be made available to advance the purposes of this title and to strengthen the civil economy of the Nation. Similarly the fullest cooperation by and with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Defense Administration in research shall be carried out in the interest of achieving the objectives of this title.

"Disposal of water and byproducts

"SEC. 106. The Secretary is authorized, for the sole purpose of this title, to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of his operations under this title pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. Nothing in this title shall be construed to alter existing law with respect to the ownership and control of water.

"Disposition of money

"SEC. 107. All moneys received for products of the plants under this title shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Reports

"SEC. 108. The Secretary shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this title. Any such report may include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 109. The Secretary may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"Authorization for appropriations

"SEC. 110. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated any unappropriated funds authorized by the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951), and such additional sums not exceeding $20,000,000, as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years 1961–1965, inclusive, with such funds to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds available in any one year for research and development may be expended in cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries in the development of processes useful to the program in the United States: *And provided further,* That contracts or agreements made with public or private agencies in foreign countries shall provide that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the United States for the use of the United States throughout the world and for the use of the general public within the United States.

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CONVERSION PLANTS

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to stimulate the construction of plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water, of water that is suitable for municipal or other beneficial consumptive uses, and thereby make maximum use of the research for the development and utilization of saline waters that is authorized by title I of this Act, and maximum use of the demonstration plant program authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706).

"Applications for financial assistance

"SEC. 202. (a) Any State, or political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization (any such entity being hereinafter referred to as 'organization') may submit to the Secretary of the Interior, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, an application for a loan, or an offer to sell to the United States securities of the organization, to finance the design and construction of a plant to produce, from sea water or brackish water, water that is suitable for municipal, industrial, domestic, or other beneficial consumptive use.

"(b) Any application for a loan or offer to sell securities hereunder shall include a showing that the organization (1) holds or can acquire, pursuant to State law, all lands and interests in land, and rights to the use of water, which are necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and (2) is ready, able, and willing to finance by other means the portion of the cost of design and construction that is not covered by the loan application or offer to sell securities.

"(c) No application for a loan or offer to sell securities under this section shall be made in an amount which exceeds 90 per centum of the estimated cost of design and construction (exclusive of land and water costs), or $1,000,000, whichever is smaller.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'State' includes any of the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any of the territorial possessions of the United States.

"Submittal to Congress

"SEC. 203. (a) If the Secretary of the Interior approves an application or offer submitted under section 202, after finding that the proposed construction is feasible and that the loan or purchase of securities would be a reasonable risk, he shall transmit to the Congress the application or offer, his approval, and his findings.

"(b) No appropriation shall be made for a loan to, or a purchase of securities from, the organization prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the date on which the Secretary's findings and approval are submitted to the Congress and then only if, within said sixty days, the Congress does not disapprove the application or offer by concurrent resolution.

"Terms applicable to loans or purchases

"SEC. 204. Either concurrently with the submission to Congress of an application or offer, or after the time for congressional disapproval has expired without the adoption of a resolution of disapproval, the Secretary of the Interior may negotiate and execute an agreement with the organization which shall set out, among other things:

"(1) the maximum amount of the loan or the securities to be purchased;

"(2) the time and method for making the money available to the organization;

"(3) a plan for the repayment of the loan in not more than forty years in periodic installments that need not necessarily be in equal amounts, and for the payment of interest on unamortized balances, beginning three months after the plant first commences operation, at a rate determined by the Secretary which shall not exceed the average rate of interest computed as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date on which such loan is made, borne by all outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; or, in the case of an offer to sell securities, a plan of redemption that is consistent with the foregoing requirements with respect to a loan;

"(4) provisions for assuring and securing the prompt repayment of the loan and interest or for the redemption of the securities; and

"(5) provisions making the liability of the United States under the agreement contingent upon the availability of appropriations for the purpose.

"Use of plants for which assistance is extended

"SEC. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with a borrower under this title for the use of the borrower's plant facilities to further the research and demonstration programs authorized by title I of this Act, and the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706), and to provide in the contract for a credit on the organization's loan, or for a cancellation of its securities, in an amount up to 25 per centum of the original amount thereof as compensation to the borrower for the use made of its facilities in connection with such programs.

"Unavailability of other financing

"SEC. 206. No loan or purchase of securities shall be made pursuant to this title if the Secretary determines that in his judgment the organization can obtain funds on reasonable terms from other sources.

"Authorization for appropriations

"SEC. 207. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $20,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be nec-

essary to carry out the provisions of this title, and any such appropriation shall remain available until expended."

COMMISSION TO STUDY METHODS OF NOMINATING AND ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission To Study and Propose Improvements in the Methods of Nominating and Electing the President and Vice President.

The 1960 election, with its close popular vote and the uncertainties concerning electors in some of the States, has focused renewed and widespread attention on the electoral college system and brought demands for its abolition or reform. My bill would create an 11-member Commission, appointed by the President from among experts in private life, without regard to political affiliation. The Commission would submit its findings to Congress by the beginning of the next session, in ample time for legislative action before the 1964 Presidential election. This approach would give Congress the benefit of the thinking of some of the best minds on the subject of electoral reform. Its members could apply to the complicated problem the kind of study and concentrated attention which it requires.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 102) to establish a Commission To Study and Propose Improvements in the Methods of Nominating and Electing the President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Presidential Electoral System (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of eleven members appointed by the President from individuals in private life, chosen without regard to political affiliation.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and investigation to determine what changes, if any, should be made in the existing method of nominating and electing the President and the Vice President. In the course of such study and investigation the Commission shall consider any proposals that have been suggested for modification of the existing method of the selection of candidates for, and the election of, President and Vice President, and any other matters relating to the nominating and electoral processes which the Committee may deem it advisable to consider.

(b) Not later than the beginning of the second regular session of the Eighty-seventh Congress the Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a complete report of the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

POWERS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this Act, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(c) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

(d) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. The members of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, and in addition shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

EXPENSES

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

EXPIRATION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of the report provided for in section 3(b).

AUBURN–FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Central Valley project in California is one of the great reclamation projects of our time. It has a long history of successful operation and profitable repayment. It is a constantly growing project to meet the expanding water and power needs and the rapidly increasing population of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

The next logical addition to the Central Valley project is the Auburn–Folsom South unit of the American River division. I am introducing a bill today to authorize the construction of that unit. I wish to point out that the engineering reports on the Auburn Dam and powerplant and on the Folsom South Canal have been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation and combined into one report by the Department of the Interior for current review by State and Federal agencies. The report will reach the Congress this spring. The need for the Folsom South Canal to serve lands in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties is urgent. Ultimately the Auburn Reservoir will be required to supply the water for the Folsom South Canal. Electric energy from the Auburn powerplant is needed as soon as possible in the Central Valley area.

The Auburn-Folsom South unit is a logical and feasible addition to the Central Valley project.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 103) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the principal purpose of increasing the supply of water available for irrigation and other beneficial uses in the Central Valley of California, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate and maintain, as an addition to, and an integral part of, the Central Valley project, California, the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, in general accordance with plans of the Department of the Interior prepared pursuant to the Act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) and adopted by the Secretary of the Interior on December 8, 1960. The works authorized to be constructed shall consist of—

(1) the Auburn Dam and Reservoir, a major storage reservoir having a storage capacity of approximately one million acre-feet, to be constructed on the American River near the city of Auburn, California;

(2) a hydroelectric powerplant at Auburn Dam with a generating capacity of approximately one hundred and sixty thousand kilowatts and necessary electric transmission system for inter-connection with the Central Valley project power system;

(3) a reservoir or reservoirs with necessary diversion works, conduits, and other appurtenant works of adequate capacity for the

delivery of water supplies to approximately 15,000 acres of the Forest Hill Divide area in Placer County;

(4) Folsom South Canal and related operating structures, including pumping plants, regulating reservoirs, floodways, channels, levees, and other appurtenant works for the diversion and conveyance of water of the American River from an appropriate point upstream of Nimbus Dam on said river to such point in San Joaquin County as the Secretary of the Interior determines will best serve the needs of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties, and in the construction of such canal and related operating structures, the Secretary is authorized to provide, in such manner as he deems necessary and economically feasible, for the future construction of the east side division of the Central Valley project, now under study as a means of providing supplemental water on the east side of the Southern San Joaquin Valley;

(5) Folsom-Malby Canal with necessary pumping plants and a regulatory reservoir of approximately twenty-five thousand acre-feet, located near Malby Crossing on Carson Creek six miles south of Folsom, California, to serve approximately ten thousand acres of land below an elevation of five hundred feet lying in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the operation of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, shall be integrated and coordinated, from both a financial and an operational standpoint, with the operation of other features of the Central Valley project, as presently authorized and as may in the future be authorized by Act of Congress, in such manner as will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the water resources hereby made available. The Auburn Dam shall be operated for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army as provided for in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887). Minimum basic facilities may be provided for the accommodation of the visiting public at Auburn Reservoir and its shoreland if responsible local interests agree to assume the operation and maintenance thereof. The costs of such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 3. In locating and designating the works authorized for construction by the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior through the Commissioner of Reclamation shall give due consideration to the reports upon the California water plan prepared by the State of California, and shall consult the local interests to be affected by the construction and operation of said works through public hearings or in such manner as in his discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed by implication or otherwise as an allocation of water, and in the studies for the purposes of development plans for disposal of water as herein authorized the Secretary of the Interior shall make recommendations for the use of water in accord with State water laws, including but not limited to such laws giving priority to the counties and areas of origin for present and future needs.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $181 million, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuation in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction authorized in this Act, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit.

PROGRAM OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND EVALUATION OF RECREATIONAL BENEFITS FROM CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills. The first bill provides for a more effective program for water pollution control. The second bill makes the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any water resources project an integral part of project planning. I ask unanimous consent that these two bills may lie on the desk until following the opening of next Monday's session in order that other Senators who care to do so may join as authors of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bills introduced by Mr. KERR are as follows:

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 120. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 121. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any Federal water resources project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make the maintenance of a reasonably stable price level an explicit aim of Federal economic policy.

Mr. President, I also submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the joint rule of the House and Senate to give the President item veto powers over appropriation bills and nonappropriation bills which contain authorizations to borrow money directly from the Treasury.

I am privileged to have the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] as cosponsors of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the resolution may lie on the desk until the close of business next Tuesday, January 10, so that other Senators may join in sponsorship of either or both if they so desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill and the concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD after these remarks, followed by the texts of the two measures.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, the concurrent resolution, and the announcement will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 144) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make the maintenance of a reasonably stable price level an explicit aim of Federal economic policy, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by deleting the final nine words and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and to maintain a reasonably stable price level."

(b) Section 3(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(4) current and foreseeable trends in price levels prevailing in the economy and the steps, if any, which have been taken to maintain a reasonably stable level of prices; and (5)."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Act is amended by deleting the final seven words of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "purchasing power, and to maintain a reasonably stable level of prices under free competitive enterprise."

(d) Section 4(c)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "end purchasing power;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Purchasing power, and a reasonably stable price level;".

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) giving the President of the United States the power to veto items in certain bills was received, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) No bill or joint resolution making appropriations or authorizing the borrowing of money directly from the Treasury shall be reported to or considered in either House unless it contains a section which shall read as follows ((1) in the case of any bill (or joint resolution) making an appropriation or (2) in the case of any bill (or joint resolution) authorizing the borrowing of money directly from the Treasury):

"(1) SEC. . When this bill (or joint resolution) shall have been presented to the President as required by section 7 of article I of the Constitution, the President shall have power to disapprove any amount or any provision, whether or not related to an amount, which is contained herein, in the same manner as he may, under said section 7, disapprove as a whole any bill so presented to him. The provisions of said section 7 which relate to reconsideration shall also apply to any amount or provision or part thereof so disapproved to the same extent as

they apply to a bill that has been disapproved in its entirety.

"(2) SEC. . When this bill (or joint resolution) shall have been presented to the President as required by section 7 of article I of the Constitution, the President shall have power to disapprove any authorization for borrowing money directly from the Treasury, which is contained herein, in the same manner as he may, under said section 7 disapprove as a whole any bill so presented to him. The provisions of said section 7 which relate to reconsideration shall also apply to any authorization or part thereof so disapproved to the same extent as they apply to a bill that has been disapproved in its entirety."

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 5.—U. S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH introduced today two measures which he said were intended to help the Kennedy administration combat inflation and to exercise fiscal responsibility in the National Government.

They were:

1. A price stability amendment to the Employment Act of 1946.

2. A concurrent resolution to give the President item veto power over appropriations bills, and bills authorizing direct borrowings from the Treasury.

Senator BUSH was joined in sponsorship of the price stability amendment by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, Utah, and in sponsorship of the item veto bill by Senators HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, Delaware, the ranking minority member of that committee.

"The new administration will take office at a time when the United States faces a unique and disturbing crisis," said Senator BUSH, a member of the Senate Banking Committee and ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.

"The continued drain upon our gold reserves, resulting from a deficit in our international payments, has weakened confidence in the dollar.

"It is essential that the administration and Congress give first priority to reversing this dangerous trend, and to restoring full confidence in the credit of the United States. Upon that credit depends not only our economic strength, but also our military power, which must remain unquestioned in these times of tension and danger.

"We must make clear to the world our intention to avoid inflationary practices, and to adhere to sound fiscal policies."

The Employment Act is the basic congressional directive to Federal policymaking officials concerning national economic policy. The proposed amendment would add the maintenance of "a reasonably stable price level" to the act's present objectives of "maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

It would also require the President to include in his annual Economic Report to the Congress a statement of "current and foreseeable trends in price levels prevailing in the economy and the steps, if any, which have been taken to maintain a reasonably stable price level."

Both the price stability amendment and the bill to give the President item veto power were introduced in the previous Congress by Senator BUSH.

"It is unfortunate that the Congress did not see fit to act upon these recommendations when they were made by President Eisenhower," Senator BUSH said. "However, these are long overdue reforms which should not be the subject of partisanship. Now that a new administration is assuming office, I hope Congress will grant to the President-elect the added authority he will need to control inflation and keep our fiscal house in order."

PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for an investigation by the Secretaries of State and Commerce of the feasibility of establishing in Honolulu a Pacific International House. This would be a center expressly designed to facilitate international trade. Its facilities would include exhibit space, offices and meeting rooms, multilingual secretarial and translation services, a foreign trade reference library and offices for operating a foreign trade zone.

This proposal builds upon the highly successful experience of New Orleans in operating a similar establishment. The New Orleans foreign trade zone, and International House and International Mart have greatly stimulated our trade with Latin America, the commerce flowing throughout the Mississippi basin.

Similar facilities in Hawaii, I am confident, would significantly increase our trade with the nations of Asia and the Pacific basin. In Hawaii merchants from East and West can meet to their mutual advantage in a setting conducive to good business relations.

Since trade and political connections are so intimately related, I also see in the proposed Pacific International House an instrument for strengthening our bonds with the non-Communist nations of the Pacific area. This aspect of the proposed facility has led me to seek the recommendations of the Secretary of State, as well as those of the Secretary of Commerce.

For several years leaders of the Hawaii community have advocated the use of Honolulu's central position for an international business facility. Former Delegate John Burns has proposed creating a foreign trade zone. Lorrin Thurston, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, has repeatedly urged the establishment of an International House. This proposal, which also has the support of the Hawaii Chamber of Commerce, combines both ideas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 145) to provide that the Secretaries of State and Commerce shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am today introducing a bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children. I am joined in sponsorship of this measure by Senators AIKEN, CHURCH, HART, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MUNDT, SYMINGTON, TALMADGE, WILEY, YOUNG of North Dakota, MCCARTHY, PROUTY, KEATING, CARROLL, YOUNG of Ohio, KEFAUVER, YARBOROUGH, CARLSON, COOPER, and JACKSON.

This bill would extend the special milk program for children for 1 year beginning July 1, 1961, and would increase the funds available by $10 million, from $95 million to $105 million. It would continue and enlarge a deservedly popular program, and it is fitting that it be presented to the Senate with wide cosponsorship at the first possible opportunity.

It is a special privilege for me at this point to welcome as a cosponsor of this bill the senior Senator from Minnesota and newly chosen majority whip, Senator HUMPHREY, who has been the principal sponsor and spokesman for this program since it was started in 1954. He has been the leader in getting the special milk program for children underway, and in making sure that it developed and grew into the fine, broad program we have today.

Over the years this program has enabled millions of children throughout the country to drink milk each day, at school and in summer camps. Over half of the Nation's children benefit from it. The program is administered locally, with a minimum of redtape. It is of great nutritional value, bringing the benefits of fresh, whole milk to children at an age when they most need it to promote healthy growth.

The special milk program has established a proud record of growth and development. Each year more schools participate, more half pints of milk are distributed, and more children benefit. Each year the amount of funds available through the Commodity Credit Corporation has been increased.

Through this program we have encouraged ever larger numbers of children in more and more schools to drink more milk regularly. The number of schools and child care institutions participating is now over 85,000, and the number of half-pints of milk distributed under the program in the fiscal year 1960 was 2,395 million. The rising popularity of the program is evidenced by the fact that it has grown at the rate of 9 percent per year for each of the past 3 years.

Unfortunately, the program has had a history of running out of funds. Only a year ago schools around the country were informed that the rate of reimbursement paid for each half pint of milk would be cut by half a cent. Fortunately, quick congressional action prevented this reduction, and the growth of the program was able to continue without check.

The bill I am today introducing would extend the program for another year, and would increase the funds available from $95 million to $105 million. A recent Department of Agriculture survey of State school administrators has indicated that the popularity of the program is continuing to rise, and that it can be expected to continue to grow at an annual rate of 9 or 10 percent. The increase of $10 million provided in my bill would enable the program to continue to grow. It would make it possible for

additional schools and more children to participate without danger that funds may be exhausted.

I am pleased to introduce this bill at this time and I ask consent that it may be allowed to lay on the table for 48 hours so that additional Senators may add their names as cosponsors, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk for 48 hours, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 146) to extend and increase the special milk program for children, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of the Act entitled "An Act to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools", approved July 1, 1958, as amended (7 U.S.C., sec. 1446 note), is amended by inserting immediately after "$95,000,000," the following: "and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, not to exceed $105,000,000,".

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

The objective of this proposed legislation is to reinstate the power of the President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, which, unless disapproved by either the House or the Senate within 60 days after submission, become law.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 was approved by the Congress as a method of expediting reorganizations within the executive branch of the Government. The 1949 act, which was primarily directed toward effecting prompt action on the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission, gave much greater authority to the President than did the 1945 act which had terminated in accordance with its provisions. As approved by the Congress, the 1949 act gave the President much wider latitude in reorganizing the executive branch, permitting him to submit reorganization plans for the creation of new departments within the executive branch at the Cabinet level.

The act was extended after its original expiration date on April 1, 1953, for 2-year periods in 1953, 1955, and 1957. The latter extension was to June 1, 1959.

The President recommended, on January 19, 1959, that the act be extended "to permit further timely improvements in the structure of the executive branch." Pursuant to this recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget transmitted draft legislation to the Congress which proposed that the act be amended to grant the reorganization authority to the President on a permanent basis.

The Committee on Government Operations reported the bill submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, with an amendment extending the provisions of the act for 2 years after its expiration date, or to June 1, 1961. The House of Representatives approved a bill identical to the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, but both bills died on the calendar at the end of the 86th Congress and, unless a further extension is approved by the 87th Congress, the incoming President will be denied the authority to present plans designed to reorganize the Government as he may determine to be appropriate, which authority has been granted in various forms to all Presidents since 1932.

Under provisions of the act, as proposed to be amended by the bill now being filed, such reorganization plans as may be submitted to the Congress by the President before June 1, 1963, would become law unless disapproved by a majority of either the House or the Senate by the passage of a resolution of disapproval within 60 calendar days after submission to the Congress.

Since enactment of the basic statute in 1949, the Committee on Government Operations, as well as its predecessor, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has taken the position that the Congress should not surrender nor abrogate its legislative jurisdiction over matters of such significance on a permanent basis.

In its report to the Senate in the 86th Congress—Senate Report No. 239—the committee stated that it was "the consensus of the committee that the present Congress should not commit succeeding Congresses to the provisions of the Reorganization Act, but that each Congress should have the right to extend this authority to the President or to withdraw it as the necessity dictates at the time."

It is my understanding that both President Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy will recommend extension of the Reorganization Act, and therefore, it is proposed that the Committee on Government Operations will give early, and I am confident, favorable action on the proposal I have submitted today so that this authority may be made available to the incoming President soon after his inauguration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 153) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. MOSS], I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States, which may be better administered by State authorities, and to establish as congressional policy that the Federal Government will acquire only such jurisdiction as may be necessary in connection with future land procurement.

Under well established principles of law, once legislative jurisdiction has been vested in the United States, it cannot be revested in a State other than by operation of a limitation imposed by the State at the time the State ceded jurisdiction, or by an act of Congress.

The bill specifically declares it to be the policy of the Congress that, first, the Federal Government shall receive or retain only such measure of legislative jurisdiction over federally owned or operated land areas within the States as may be necessary for the proper performance of Federal functions; and, second, to the extent consistent with the purposes for which the land is held by the United States, the Federal Government shall avoid receiving or retaining concurrent jurisdiction or any measure of exclusive legislative jurisdiction. An overall objective of the bill is to provide that, in any case, the Federal Government shall not receive or retain any of the States' legislative jurisdiction with respect to the qualifications for voting, education, public health and safety, taxation, marriage, divorce, descent and distribution of property, and a variety of other matters, which are ordinarily the subject of State control.

The proposed legislation would authorize the head or authorized officer of any department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government to relinquish to the State in which any Federal lands or interests therein under his custody or control are situated, such measure of legislative jurisdiction over such lands or interests therein as he may deem desirable. The bill provides that, with respect to future acquisitions of property, no more jurisdiction than is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the acquiring agency should be obtained. Any relinquishment of the Federal Government will be subject to acceptance by the State in such manner as the law of such State might provide.

Other provisions of the bill would authorize Federal department and agency heads to issue necessary rules and regulations for the governing of public buildings and other areas under their charge and control, and to provide such reasonable penalties, within prescribed limits, as will insure their enforcement; permit

such heads to utilize the facilities of existing law-enforcement agencies for the enforcement of any such regulations; authorize the General Services Administration to detail special policemen for the protection of Federal property under the charge of other departments and agencies; extend the authority of U.S. commissioners to try and sentence persons committing petty offenses in any place under the charge and control of the United States; extend the right of States and their political subdivisions to serve and execute process in areas under the legislative jurisdiction of the United States, while making it clear that such process may not be served contrary to rules and regulations issued by authorized Federal personnel for the purpose of preventing interference in carrying out Federal functions; and to amend or repeal obsolete or inconsistent Federal statutes.

This proposed legislation was originally drafted by the staff of the committee with the cooperation of the Department of Justice, in order to implement recommendations contained in a report by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, a committee appointed by the President for the purpose of finding means of solving the problems arising out of the uncertain jurisdictional status of Federal lands situated within the several States. The committee was composed of representatives of eight executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Bureau of the Budget, which had a principal interest in the problems involved. Twenty-five other agencies of the Federal Government furnished information concerning their properties and problems relating to legislative jurisdiction to the committee. In addition, the Interdepartmental Committee had the assistance and cooperation of the National Association of Attorneys General in its conduct of the study.

Following the introduction of the bill in its original form in the 84th Congress—S. 4196—the Committee on Government Operations forwarded copies to the Governors and attorneys general of the several States and to all interested Federal agencies for comments and recommendations. Reports were received from 36 States—31 State Governors and 29 State attorneys general—all of whom endorsed the objectives of the bill and recommended favorable committee consideration. Certain of the Governors and attorneys general of the States requested that the committee withhold action in the 84th Congress, however, until a study of the provisions of the bill could be completed by the State Committee on Legislative Jurisdiction of the Council of State Governments. That committee was appointed by the president of the council pursuant to a resolution adopted by the States for the purpose of considering this legislation. The committee appointed for this purpose was directed to give consideration to certain suggested amendments to the original bill, and to determine whether or not it would be feasible to extend its provisions beyond its original intent by incorporating certain suggestions made by various State officials.

Upon completion of the study made by the Committee on Legislative Jurisdiction, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations arranged conferences between the representatives of the Council of State Governments and of the Department of Justice for the purpose of perfecting the bill by incorporating appropriate amendments. Following a number of such conferences, during which consideration was given to the various recommendations of the Governors, attorneys general, and the Council of State Governments, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the language incorporated in the original bill was drafted, with the unanimous approval of representatives of the States and the executive branch of the Federal Government. Consideration was given to all recommendations submitted to the committee by the Governors of the States, and by the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Tax Administrators, and Federal agencies interested in the bill, which were consistent with the objectives of the proposed legislation.

Some of the suggestions submitted to the Committee on Government Operations by certain of the State officials and by the National Association of Tax Administrators dealt with tax matters which were considered to be outside of the scope of the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States. Such suggestions were largely concerned with tax problems, such as payments by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes, and so forth, which the committee felt would be considered in separate legislation dealing exclusively with those problems. Specific proposals pertaining to those problems were incorporated in other legislation approved by the committee, and which passed the Senate in the 86th Congress.

The bill I am introducing today is not concerned with tax matters, except to the extent that a transfer of legislative jurisdiction may involve transfer of a power to tax—other than the Government or its property—and also to the extent that there are preserved certain Federal consents to State and local taxation, as embodied in such statutes as the Buck Act and the Lea Act.

In the 86th Congress the committee approved a bill, S. 1617, incorporating the amendments which were considered to be desirable, and in accord with the recommendations of the groups which had cooperated in drafting the bills in the 84th and 85th Congresses, including clarification of the provisions of the bill as they related to civil rights, conservation, Alaska, and Indian lands. Pursuant to a directive from the committee, the staff had contacted officials of the Department of Justice and representatives of the Council of State Governments who assisted in the preparation of the proposed legislation in order to verify that all of them were fully in accord with its provisions.

On May 11, 1959, the committee received a memorandum from Assistant Attorney General Perry W. Morton, clarifying the points raised to the satisfaction of the committee, and on June 18, 1959, the committee ordered S. 1617 reported. Details concerning these and other matters including background and agency comments will be found in Senate Report No. 405 of the 86th Congress.

The measure was debated further on May 27, 1960, and, after the adoption of one clarifying amendment offered by Senator JAVITS, which related to the service of civil and criminal process in Federal areas subject to Federal rules and regulations, the bill was passed without opposition. On May 31, 1960, S. 1617 was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations which took no further action.

The bill I am introducing is identical to the bill approved by the Senate last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 154) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

TO PROVIDE EQUITABLE REIMBURSEMENT TO NEW YORK AND OTHER STATES IN THE FIELD OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide equitable reimbursement to New York and those other States which took the initiative in the field of highway construction without waiting for the Federal highway program of 1956. My bill would provide Federal aid for additional highway construction in any States which had already built more than 10,000 miles of highway approved for incorporation in the nationwide interstate network before 1957. I introduced a similar bill in the House in 1957 and the Senate in 1959.

It is hardly fair, Mr. President, that those States which were the leaders in highway building should today be penalized by paying doubly through tolls or local taxes, as well as Federal taxation for their interstate roads. This bill would rectify a patent inequality by allowing Federal payments up to 90 percent for substitute mileage to be added to the system in addition to roads completed before 1957.

In New York State about 580 miles of the original 1,200-mile interstate mileage allotment would qualify. These highways were built at an original cost of over $1 billion. Under the terms of my bill about $822,800,000 of this would be repaid to New York State for additional road construction as reimbursement for the pre-1957 State expenditures.

New York State would not be alone in benefiting from this bill, which would reward the initiative of every State in highway construction programs on an equal basis. On a national level nearly $5 billion could be reallocated to the various States in substitute mileage credits.

Mr. President, in all fairness, this legislation should be passed so that all of those States which moved ahead on their own, with foresight and determination, are not penalized today by a double taxation on their roads and highways. This bill would make it possible for many States to construct much needed roads in addition to those already planned. It would be a shot in the arm to various parts of the country and the economy. It would enable our Nation's highway system to meet overall national requirements with greater efficiency.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 155) to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System

"(a) In the case of each State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, on application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title, which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed toll roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5a on pages 28 and 29 of House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as a part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost.

"(b) In the case of each State having a free road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such free roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed (1) 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed free roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5b on pages 30 and 31 of House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable under this title for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost, (2) less all amounts received as the Federal share on account of such free highways, bridges, or tunnels under any provision of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), or of any Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "plus the total of all mileage approved as part of the Interstate System under section 132 of this title."

SEC. 3. Paragraph 5 of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the last sentence.

SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System."

GERALD E. HELMER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of the estate of Gerald E. Helmer. Gerald E. Helmer was a young man who resided in Sweet Home, Oreg. On his 25th birthday, while in the employ of the U.S. Forest Service, he died in a tragic airplane accident, that not only took his life but the lives of three other employees engaged in combating forest fires in the Okanogan National Forest in Washington State.

Gerald was employed on a temporary basis in a hazardous activity, his job being designated as "Fire Control Aide (smokejumper)." There were no living witnesses to the accident that took the lives of four fine young men, but the report submitted by the Board designated to investigate the accident indicates that about 6:45 p.m. on June 23, 1958, a U.S. Forest Service twin-engine Beech airplane was on a mission carrying paracargo to forest firefighters in the Okanogan National Forest when they crashed into a ridge, apparently due to a severe downdraft. After crashing, the airplane burned, resulting in the deaths of all on board and the complete destruction of the plane.

Gerald's father, Mr. Fred G. Helmer of Sweet Home, Oreg., brought this sad occurrence to my attention. In the course of our correspondence and our conversations, I was deeply concerned when I learned that the father had applied as a beneficiary under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, only to be advised that the benefits of the act would not apply to Gerald's survivors.

The exclusion of benefits for Gerald's parents in this case was based upon a technical interpretation of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and was explained by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in this language:

> The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 authorized the Commission to exclude by regulation those employees "on the basis of the nature and type of employment or conditions pertaining thereto such as, but not limited to, short term appointments, seasonal or intermittent employment, part-time employment, and employment of like nature." In the exercise of this directive, the Commission excluded (among others) "Employees serving under appointments limited to 1 year or less," with one exception not here material.
>
> The act further stipulated that no employee or group of employees should be excluded solely on the basis of the hazardous nature of employment. This shows congressional intent that hazardous duty personnel should be treated equally with other employees and no such exclusion has, of course, been effected. However, there is no indication in the law or its legislative history that the Congress intended or expected such persons to be placed in a preferred category over others holding similar temporary appointments.

On Septembr 14, 1960, I wrote to Chairman Roger W. Jones of the Civil Service Commission inquiring whether upon further consideration of this case, the Commission could take administrative action to extend coverage of the act to this case. Under date of October 17, 1960, Executive Director Warren B. Irons of the U.S. Civil Service Commission advised:

> We could not take favorable administrative action to extend insurance coverage to the late Gerald E. Helmer who died in June 1958. Were the law not specific in directing exclusion of persons serving under short-term appointments so that a regulation change in this area might be considered, such change could not operate prior to its date of issuance.

Previously, Mr. Fred Helmer had explored the possibility of receiving compensation for the death of his son under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. This effort proved to be of no avail. On March 5, 1959, the Bureau of Employees Compensation issued an order rejecting Mr. Helmer's claim upon the basis that "the claimant-father did not allege that he was either wholly or partially dependent upon the decedent at the time of the death."

It seems to me that upon the merits of this case, the least our Nation could do on behalf of those who survived Gerald Helmer is to provide some compensation by way of an insurance payment resulting from the death of this Government employee while performing official duties of a hazardous nature in protecting extremely valuable natural resources against the ravages of fire.

This case warrants serious and sympathetic consideration by the committee to which it is referred. I hope the committee will act favorably and promptly on this private relief bill.

EXTENSION OF INSURANCE COVERAGE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES

Mr. President, the sad case of the late Gerald Helmer, which I have just discussed, brings to mind a serious gap in the coverage of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

As the law is presently drafted and interpreted, temporary Federal employees are not protected by the group insurance program. Where temporary employees are engaged in hazardous activities, as was the late Gerald Helmer, it seems to me that the existing law is deficient to a high degree.

If any employees need Federal group life insurance benefits, those engaged in hazardous activities have that need. The fact that employees work only temporarily on hazardous Federal jobs, such as those in the Forest Service fighting fires, does not by one whit diminish the need. An employee engaged in hazardous temporary employment is just as much in need of life insurance benefits as Federal employees engaged in hazardous activities on a permanent employment basis.

It seems to me that the law on this subject has been drafted but with one principal thought in mind; namely, that certain additional expense to the Government and certain administrative inconvenience may result if we provide group life insurance coverage to temporary employees engaged in hazardous activities. By taking this attitude, we demonstrate that in this type of case we are placing human values far below economic and administrative values. To me, this is unthinkable.

In order to correct the existing glaring deficiency in the law relating to Federal employees group life insurance coverage for temporary employees engaged in hazardous activities, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the existing act so as to extend insurance coverage to certain employees engaged in hazardous activities.

It is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred will give it serious and favorable consideration, because it is designed to correct a glaring deficiency in the present law. Therefore, I send to the desk these two bills, one dealing directly with the case of Gerald E. Helmer, and the other seeking to amend, for the benefit of any future employee who suffers the same tragedy or similar tragedy, an amendment to the act itself. I ask that the two bills be printed at this point in my remarks.

In concluding my comment on this problem, I should like to say that governmental functions have so changed over the decades that today we find the Federal Government unquestionably the largest employer in America in activities that in a very real sense can be considered at least only quasi-governmental, if not 100 percent proprietary, and I respectfully submit that when the Forest Service is engaging in firefighting activities and employing people to risk their lives in protecting not only private property but public property as well, the Federal Government has the same moral obligation as a private employer would have to see to it that during the course of that employment, whether it is temporary or permanent, all employees are treated alike when it comes to protecting them in connection with the risks they run in a hazardous occupation.

What do Senators think would happen by way of criticism if a private industry of this country, such as United States Steel or Ford Motors, or any other large employer in this country, had one policy for protecting the lives of their employees who are on the permanent payroll and no protection for their employees on a temporary payroll, although they were doing exactly the same kind of hazardous work? Can we not hear the criticism, and rightly so, that United States Steel and Ford Motors would receive from the American public?

Let me point out to the American taxpayers that they are the employers of the Gerald Helmers. Through their Government the taxpayers have the moral obligation to see to it that the Government, through law, follows a course of action which carries out what anyone will agree is a clear moral obligation.

All I have done this afternoon is to point out this injustice in an individual case and this defect in a law which will apply generally to similar cases in regard to temporary employees in hazardous jobs.

I make my plea that the Government recognize, through the Congress, its moral duty to see to it that justice is done to the estate of Gerald Helmer, and that justice be done to all other employees who may suffer such a tragedy as Mr. Helmer suffered.

Before I ask to have the bill referred, I wish to make it very clear that I have no intention in any way of complicating the procedural situation which now confronts the Senate. It has been suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in a note which they have handed to me, that I should ask parliamentary instruction whether or not, if I ask for the introduction and referral of the bill outside the morning hour, it might be considered as being acted upon as other business, which will imperil the rule debate. So I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may offer the bill without it in any way imperiling the rulings which have already been handed down with regard to the fact that this business can be transacted and not be considered proceeding under that rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred as indicated, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.159. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gerald E. Helmer.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Gerald E. Helmer, formerly of Sweet Home, Oregon, who suffered accidental death in consequence of an airplane crash which occurred at Winthrop, Washington, on June 23, 1958, incident to his temporary employment with the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, an amount equal to the amount which would have been payable to his estate if, at the time of his death, he had been entitled to benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and had designated his estate as the recipient of such benefits: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 161. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to certain employees engaged in hazardous activities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091(a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and in no event shall any employee regularly engaged in a hazardous activity be excluded on the basis of his serving under a short term appointment, seasonal or intermittent employment, part-time employment, or under any other employment of a like nature.".

JURISDICTION FOR THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HEAR AND DETERMINE THE ADOPTION PETITION OF MARIE TALIAFERRO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a private bill to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro.

The facts of the matter, as I was given to understand them, are that under

existing law the court lacks jurisdiction to hear the petition filed by Marie Taliaferro for the adoption of a child to whom she has given shelter and provided custody for the past 7 years.

The bill, if enacted, would not interfere with the discretion of the court in the disposition of the case; it would merely afford the court an opportunity to hear the case, an opportunity which it does not presently enjoy.

This is another example of asking our Government to do those humane things that we expect people to do in human relations. The Government, in my judgment, has the same obligation to correct such injustices. It is a very simple bill. It is a bill which speaks for itself so far as its humanity is concerned. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks, under the previous ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 158) to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render a final or interlocutory decree of adoption upon, the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro and now pending before such court (adoption No. A52–60).

(b) Proceedings for the determination of such petition shall be in the same manner as in the case of a petition for adoption regularly filed under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia," approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 240), except that the provisions of section 4 of such Act providing that no petition shall be considered by the court unless petitioner's spouse, if he has one, joins in the petition shall not be applicable.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as directing the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to grant the petition for adoption referred to in the first section of this Act.

THOMAS O. TATE, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the same understanding of the parliamentary situation indicated before, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Mr. Thomas O. Tate, Jr., of Rogue River, Oreg. Mr. Tate retired as a temporary chief warrant officer from the U.S. Navy, holding a permanent enlisted rank. In other words, he held a dual status as a permanent enlisted man and temporary officer. While in that status, he was appointed by the Camp White Domiciliary, Camp White, Oreg., as a stationary boiler fireman. This assignment became effective on January 4, 1960. Personnel officials at the Camp White Domiciliary considered his appointment to this position as proper and not a violation of dual compensation procedures. In reaching this conclusion, they relied upon instructions under the act of June 30, 1932 as amended.

Subsequent to this appointment, Mr. Tate received a letter from the U.S. Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, under date of February 24, 1960, advising him that in the Navy Department's opinion his appointment violated the dual appointment restriction of the act of July 31, 1894. The letter indicated that his employing agency, the Camp White Domiciliary, had been so advised, because the appointing officer of that agency maintained final authority over the determination concerning a possible violation of the dual appointment restriction.

Mr. Tate, after receiving this information, acted in complete good faith. He discussed the problem with the personnel officer at Camp White. The personnel officer advised Mr. Tate that it was his opinion that the appointment was not a violation of the act of 1894, but came under the act of June 30, 1932, and that the Naval Finance Center would be so informed.

Under date of March 18, 1960, the Camp White Domiciliary received a naval speed letter stating that Mr. Tate's appointment was in violation of the act of 1894. Mr. Tate again discussed the matter with Camp White officials and continued in his employment for several days pending a decision from the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., on his case. The Veterans' Administration central office then ordered his removal and termination of salary. The General Accounting Office, subsequent to this action, ordered the Camp White fiscal officer to collect $912.71, the net amount paid to Mr. Tate during his employment at the domiciliary.

Mr. President, I have reviewed my file of correspondence with Mr. Tate and feel that it would be a grave injustice for him to repay the Government the wages he earned during his employment at the Camp White Domiciliary. To enforce a repayment penalty against one who acted in good faith in accepting an appointment and who performed services for the Government pending the ironing out of a difficult legal point by Government experts on statutory construction, would be to impose a grave injustice on a person who acted honestly and without the slightest attempt to conceal a single fact.

I have received a very favorable report on this subject from the Comptroller General's office which states:

Concerning the matter of relief legislation, ordinarily, we do not favor legislation which grants preferential treatment to a single individual over others similarly situated. Since it appears, however, that the dual compensation payments in this case were due to a misunderstanding by the Veterans' Administration of the law and our decision, and since Mr. Tate does not appear to have been at fault, our Office would interpose no objection to the enactment of such legislation.

The bill is drafted in such form as to relieve Mr. Tate from all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,062.92, representing his total salary during the period from January 4, 1960, through April 1, 1960, while he was an employee of the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the committee, to which this bill is referred, will agree with me that there are strong equities in favor of Mr. Tate and that action to relieve him from this potential liability would be in the interest of fairplay and justice.

I ask that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 160) for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr., introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Thomas O. Tate, Junior, chief warrant officer, United States Navy, retired, of Rogue River, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,062.92, representing salary paid him during the period from January 4, 1960, through April 1, 1960, while he was an employee of the Veterans' Administration, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 162), as amended, the said Thomas O. Tate, Junior, having been erroneously advised by the Veterans' Administration prior to his employment that such Act was not applicable to him.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Thomas O. Tate, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the salary payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

CHERIE HELEN BRATTON

Mr. MORSE. Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), in accordance with the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into by the Senate, I proceed now to introduce another private bill.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Cherie Helen Bratton, the adoptive daughter of Miss Nancy Bratton of Creswell, Oreg.

Miss Bratton is a former Texan who came to Oregon to teach in the public school system of Springfield, Oreg. She is a remarkable lady who obtained a college education through sheer perseverance and hard work while assisting in the support of her mother.

Recently she learned that it might be possible for her to adopt, by proxy, a Korean minor child through the Child Placement Service, Seoul, Korea. Through the service she adopted 5-year old Cherie Helen and now wishes to bring her to the United States. My bill is designed to achieve that objective.

Madam President, I have reviewed carefully my file of correspondence with

Miss Bratton and the many fine character references on her behalf. All of these documents indicate that Miss Bratton is a most admirable person and one who will provide an excellent home for Cherie Helen. As I told Chairman EASTLAND of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary when I wrote to him on October 21, 1960, relative to this case, it represents one of the most genuine manifestations of Christian charity that it has ever been my pleasure to consider.

On August 31, 1960, I introduced a comparable bill, S. 3919 of the 86th Congress, to enable the subcommittee to proceed with its investigation as promptly as possible. As a result, the staff of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has done a considerable amount of preliminary work on the case.

This bill has great merit, and I trust that the Committee will be able to issue a favorable report in the very near future.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 164) for the relief of Cherie Helen Bratton, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Cherie Helen Bratton, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Nancy Bratton, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Cherie Helen Bratton shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PROPOSED REPORTING OF FINANCIAL ASSETS AND SOURCES OF INCOME

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, beginning in 1946, I have introduced into each Congress legislation requiring that each Member of Congress make public his financial assets and sources of income. Recently, I have added to my original bill that every person on the Federal payroll receiving a salary in excess of $10,000 a year, and certain officers of our political parties, make public his or her sources of income, including any gifts or other assets received by someone else to be held in trust for the individual who is in Government or party employ. In a moment, I shall introduce this legislation again.

This is a problem that we hear most about when some scandalous situation occurs, usually involving a degree of conflict of interest in some part of the executive branch of the Government. It is invariably discussed when Cabinet appointments are made, and it will be discussed again this year as we pass upon the qualifications of the new Cabinet appointees.

With the nomination of Robert McNamara to be Secretary of Defense, the subject matter my bill deals with arises again. Press reports indicate that in order to comply with the laws against conflict of interest, Mr. McNamara must dispose of several million dollars of assets he owns, or anticipates he would receive, in the Ford Motor Co. He must dispose of these assets in order to qualify for a job which pays $25,000 a year.

On December 18, 1960, there appeared in the Washington Post an article by Mr. Joseph R. Slevin of the Herald Tribune news service concerning the conflict of interest problem and our failure to deal with it adequately. The author comes to the same conclusion I came to in 1947 when I first prepared this legislation. Mr. Slevin states in part:

> Washington long has been cynically aware that the same Congressmen who are so determined to shield appointive officials from conflicts of interest build no such fences around themselves. * * * But it is no more possible—or desirable—to legislate integrity among Congressmen than among appointive officials. If there is to be an antidote, perhaps the best solution would be a disclosure law that would apply equally to Congressmen, Senators, and appointive officials.

Madam President, I am hopefully introducing my full disclosure bill once again. I say "hopefully" because I hope there will be some action on it or a similar measure before we hear again about the use of public office for private gain in some branch of the Federal Government.

I wish to make very clear, Madam President, that I will accept any modification of this bill or amendment of this bill that hearings can show is justified and would improve the situation from that which my bill itself would create. The main thing, Madam President, in my judgment, is to pass some legislation on this subject, so that the public will have full disclosure of the sources of income and the amounts of income of their public servants. I do not consider that such a law would be an invasion of privacy, because the decision to enter public service is reserved to the individual, and I believe the public has a right to know what may be the sources and amounts of income of any public servant, so that the public may judge for itself whether there is any cause-and-effect relationship between the income of the individual employees and the action of public officials.

Madam President, I send this bill to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask that the text of it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 165) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

PREMERGER NOTIFICATION BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to reintroduce today in the 87th Congress the so-called premerger notification bill. This bill was introduced in the 86th Congress by Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, our beloved former colleague, who worked long and untiringly to obtain legislation designed to stem the dangerous trend toward increased concentration in American industry. Similar bills were introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses. It was my privilege to join with Senator O'Mahoney in sponsoring this legislation and in conducting the extensive hearings which were held on these various bills by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

With one minor exception this bill provides only for procedural changes in the Clayton Antitrust Act designed to fortify the authority of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission in their antimerger work. First, it would require corporations of significant size to provide advance notice of proposed mergers and acquisitions and to wait for a period of 60 days before consummating the transaction. Secondly, the bill vests the Federal Trade Commission with authority to secure preliminary court injunctions to restrain proposed mergers before their consummation or to maintain the status quo.

The only substantive change in the Clayton Act which would be brought about by this bill is the provision making section 7 of the act applicable to transactions where either the acquiring corporation or the corporation from which stock or assets are acquired is engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. At present, the Clayton Act is applicable only where the corporation from which stock or assets are acquired is engaged in such commerce.

Legislation of this kind has in the past received the active support of President Eisenhower, the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, the Attorney General, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, and the Small Business Administration. In the Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress in January of 1960 a strong recommendation was made to improve the antitrust laws by requiring firms of significant size to notify the antitrust agencies in advance of their proposals to merge. The report also recommended that the Federal Trade Commission be authorized to seek preliminary injunctions in merger cases where a violation of law is likely.

Another recommendation contained in this report for improving the antitrust laws would authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of antitrust laws. I introduced the bill S. 716, referred to as the civil investigative demand bill, to accomplish this latter purpose. After extensive hearings the Senate approved this legislation. No action was taken in the House before the 86th Congress adjourned. It is my strong belief that the premerger notification bill I am now introducing is a necessary adjunct to the authority which the Senate approved last year in the civil investigative demand bill. The authority provided in each of these bills effectively supplements each other in strengthening the hands of the antitrust enforcement agencies.

President-elect Kennedy has announced his firm determination to proceed vigorously in enforcing the antitrust laws. The enactment of this legislation will represent a vital step in advancing the New Frontier on the economic front. The new administration is pledged to improving the prestige of the United States abroad. An essential part of this mission will be to improve the operation of our free enterprise system at home.

In the 1960 yearend report to the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division announced that the enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act "ranks among our most important activities, absorbing a good portion of the Antitrust Division's resources." For the fiscal year 1960, the Department of Justice examined over 1,100 mergers and began investigations into 146 of these. Thirteen cases were filed. In the previous year, 950 mergers were examined, resulting in 107 investigations and 6 merger cases filed. The Federal Trade Commission reported that 776 mergers were examined in the first 9 months of 1960.

With increased emphasis upon antimerger activity in both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, it is urgent that the Congress act speedily to give these agencies the necessary tools to do the most effective job. Heretofore, the Congress has been dilatory in proceeding with proper speed to enact this needed legislation. However, I feel confident that, with more vigorous leadership at the executive level, the Congress will join forces with the President in moving full speed ahead.

When this bill came before the Judiciary Committee in the 86th Congress, it was sent back to the Antitrust Subcommittee for additional hearings to supplement those previously held in the 85th Congress. As a result of these additional hearings, the Antitrust Subcommittee voted to approve this bill. It is not my purpose today to describe in detail the specific provisions of the bill or the changes which were recommended by the Antitrust Subcommittee, and which are incorporated in this bill. I believe it is sufficient for our purposes to state only that the changes were designed to minimize the hardships upon the business community of the notification and waiting requirements. Excluded from the bill's scope are a large number of business transactions engaged in by small and medium size corporations which have no significant impact upon competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 166) to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws and for other purposes.

In the first session of the 86th Congress I introduced S. 716 which was very similar to the bill I am now introducing. S. 716 was reported by the Judiciary Committee with some amendments. The committee recommended that the bill as amended pass. The bill I am introducing today is identical with the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee to the floor of the Senate.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to enable the Attorney General or the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to obtain documentary evidence needed in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws in civil cases. As the law now stands, the civil investigations in which the involved parties refuse to cooperate in furnishing necessary documentary evidence, the Attorney General must either authorize the holding of a grand jury and use the subpena power of the grand jury to obtain the withheld evidence or he must risk filing a civil complaint without having complete information and undertake to obtain necessary evidence after the filing of the complaint through the use of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure such as interrogatories, motions to produce documents, depositions, et cetera.

It seems to me that the holding of a grand jury investigation and the use of criminal subpena power for the development of a civil case is a harsh method for the procurement of civil evidence, resulting in delay and inconvenience for the Government and probable embarrassment to businessmen against whom there does not appear to be any just cause for criminal proceedings. Under the alternative of filing a civil complaint and then proceeding under the Rules of Civil Procedure to obtain necessary information and evidence, the Department of Justice must proceed at a considerable risk of having to dismiss a complaint because their belief of a civil violation is not supported when all of the evidence has been obtained. Since the Department in such a case is proceeding without full information, it may become necessary to further delay the prosecution of the civil case by substantial amendments to the complaint in order to make it conform to the evidence which the Department should have had prior to the filing of the complaint.

This bill which I am introducing, and which was recommended by the Judiciary Committee in the 86th Congress, in my opinion, would remedy this weakness in the enforcement of the antitrust laws by the Department of Justice and make its civil enforcement of those laws much more effective.

It has been my observation in my work in the antitrust field in the Senate, and persons of long experience in antitrust enforcement also have told me, that obtaining evidence for the enforcement of the antitrust laws has become much more difficult than in the early years of the antitrust enforcement program. One of the reasons for this situation is the inadequacy of the power of the Attorney General to obtain access to documentary evidence expeditiously and at the most appropriate time—that is, before a decision must be made on whether a complaint should be filed and before the filing of the complaint.

I believe that this bill should be passed and would be in the public interest. Mr. President, I request that the bill lie on the table for 5 days in order that any other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may have the opportunity of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SHERMAN ACT AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT APPLICABLE TO BASEBALL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to make the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized team sport of baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes. This bill is the same as S. 3483 which I introduced in the 86th Congress. It has two principal purposes; namely, the correction of the discriminations and inequities which were created by the conflicting decisions of the Supreme Court in applying the antitrust laws to the different sports and the granting to each of the four professional team sports exemptions from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act which are believed necessary to allow those sports to exist without undue legal harassment.

The bill is divided into two titles. Title I grants exemptions from the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to the professional sports of football, basketball, and hockey. Title II places professional baseball under the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act since the Supreme Court held that professional baseball was not a business within the application of those acts, and in later decisions indicated its belief that the reversal of the Supreme Court's old decision by placing baseball under the antitrust laws should be left to the Congress since the Congress was in better position to do so. Title II then exempts from the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act certain agreements and actions by professional baseball which are needed for the continued success and growth of the professional sport.

The exemptions as to all of the sports include actions and agreements necessary to permit the organized sports to provide for, first, the equalization of competitive playing strengths; second, the employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts; third, the right to operate within specific geographic areas with certain limitations on that right; and, fourth, the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

The exemption for the sport of baseball with respect to the reservation, selection or assignment of player contracts has certain limitations which are not applied to the other sports due to circumstances with respect to players which are peculiar to organized baseball and do not exist in the other sports.

The bill also provides with respect to all of the sports named in it an exemption from the antitrust laws to which I have referred with respect to telecasting of professional games. This exemption is so qualified as to prevent the destruction of college football by telecasting professional games into the home territory of a college game when the college game is being played without the consent of the colleges holding the game. Since the sports other than baseball do not have minor league clubs, the destruction of college games is the only problem involved in telecasting by the professional clubs in those sports. However, in baseball there is a minor league system which appears to be necessary to the success and growth of the major leagues. It, therefore, is necessary to give protection to the minor leagues in the telecasting of major league games. This protection is afforded in title II of the bill. A major league club may not telecast in the home territory of a minor league game during the time when that game is being played without written consent of the minor league club. In order that a minor league club which may desire to permit telecasting provided they are compensated for the losses incurred through such telecasting by the major league, the bill provides that organized baseball can work out agreements with respect to the distribution of all or any part of the revenues received from telecasting any or all contests in the sport of baseball.

The similar bill introduced in the 86th Congress received the support of the National College Athletic Association, and the sports affected by the bill other than organized baseball. In the hearings on the bill in the 86th Congress the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has repeatedly suggested to organized baseball that it should adopt rules which would remedy the situation with respect to player control. It has been my hope that baseball would take such action but thus far no adequate action in this respect has been taken, in my opinion. You, I am sure, have read in the press the difficulties which confronted the proposed Continental League and which have recently confronted the new teams which have been added to the existing American and National Leagues. It does not appear too promising at this time for the success of the four new teams during the coming season, which, in my opinion, results very largely from the monopoly situation with respect to players now existing in organized professional baseball.

Mr. President, I hope that this bill will pass, and I request that it lie on the table for 5 days in order to afford any other Senators who desire to cosponsor it that opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 168) to make the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized team sport of baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill together

with the attached statement regarding wildernesses be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 174) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 174

A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act."

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

Statement of policy

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a national wilderness preservation system to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Definition of wilderness

(b) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive, and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Extent of system

SEC. 3. (a) The national wilderness preservation system (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "wilderness system") shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

National forest areas

(b) (1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within fifteen years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendation with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as part of such recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area included, to exclude portions not predominantly of wilderness value or to add any adjacent area of national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11) and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

National park system areas

(c) (1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park monument or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 535, 16 U.S.C. 1 and following). The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C 461 and following).

National wildlife refuges and game ranges

(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act, and such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges added to his jurisdiction after such date but not later than fifteen years following such date as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within two years following the date on which such refuge or range was added to his jurisdiction. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Modification of boundaries

(e) Any proposed modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Effective date of President's recommendations

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representa-

tives; but only if prior to such adjournment the Congress did not approve a concurrent resolution declaring that the Congress is opposed to such recommendation. Any such concurrent resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z–12—133z–15) for a resolution of either House of Congress.

Effect of public notice of proposed addition to wilderness system

(g) The public notice by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Congress of a concurrent resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

Addition or elimination not provided for in this act

(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED LANDS WITHIN THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction.

GIFTS OR BEQUESTS OF LAND

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Other provisions of law

SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. The wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

Prohibition of certain uses

(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

Special provisions

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within national forest areas included in the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. In addition such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including exploration for oil and gas), mining (including the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where well established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the manner provided in section 3(e).

(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

(5) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or game range existing on the effective date of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

RECORDS AND REPORTS

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and description of areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON THE WILDERNESS BILL

Some three dozen years ago a young forest supervisor in New Mexico enlisted me in the cause for wilderness preservation. That was Aldo Leopold, who became one of the eminent conservationists of our generation. As I have said before, I shall never forget how he poured out his heart on the subject of primitive tracts which seemed likely to be destroyed with the development of the auto, the truck, and speedier methods of transportation.

I talked with Aldo Leopold many times about wilderness, where it would be possible to preserve scenic beauty and the natural accompaniments of areas unspoiled by manmade changes, the fish and wildlife which had once owned these areas themselves, the forests and mesas, the canyons and open parks, the whole environment in which we ourselves can often feel most deeply refreshed, inspired in the scenes of our own distant beginnings.

THE NEW BILL

Today I have the privilege of seeking to advance in a very significant way this cause of wilderness preservation, as I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes. This is the wilderness bill.

It is 5 years now since the distinguished and far-seeing Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] first introduced such a measure to this body. Through two Congresses, our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered this proposed legislation. Extensive hearings have been held both in Washington, D.C., and in the field. Four volumes of printed testimony have been assembled. The constructive criticism of the executive agencies concerned with the lands involved has been received and studied. Objections of various groups have been met with

revisions, eliminations of undesirable features, and the inclusion of various special provisions, to meet particular needs and to avoid the disruption of established practices or interference with private rights or with necessary developments in the public interest.

After 4 years of such constructive revision, and in response to an increasing public support and a deep sense of urgency in our realization that we must act promptly or run the risk of losing much of our opportunity, it seems to me that we should now proceed to act.

Accordingly, I have with great care prepared the new bill that I now introduce, a streamlined revision based on our committee's experience during the past two Congresses and on a comprehensive study of the requirements of such legislation and the best ways for meeting them with due regard for all the interests involved.

It is my purpose to do all that I can to advance this legislation, and I urge it upon the Senate at the beginning of this Congress as an outstanding opportunity to accomplish an enduring benefit in establishing a sound national policy and program for preserving a precious and significant resource of wilderness.

REASONS FOR WILDERNESS

There are profound and various reasons that give great importance to our concern with preserving areas of wilderness. These reasons are not solely concerned with our recreation, vital as this can be to the health of individuals or a nation. There also are educational and historical values, and it may be that the scientific values related to our human understanding of natural processes in relation to our own enterprise may prove to be the greatest of all.

BENCHMARKS

In the wilderness are the benchmarks of reference for the civilization that we still are perfecting. Dr. Luna B. Leopold, Chief of the Water Resources Division of the U.S. Geological Survey, distinguished and worthy son of the pioneer conservationist Aldo Leopold, has recently emphasized these "benchmark" values of wilderness in connection with the question of falling water tables. Dr. Leopold points out that "the lack of a datum increases greatly the difficulty of appraising the volumes of water available, and the rates of recharge, and of understanding the implication of changes of water tables; further, it makes very difficult the prognosis of future status of an individual aquifer."

Thus one engineer and scientist stresses the reference values of areas of wilderness. "We take it for granted," says Luna Leopold, "that there is some social gain in the erection and maintenance of a museum of fine arts, a museum of natural history, or even a historical museum. Sooner or later we ought to be mature enough to extend this concept to another kind of museum, one of which you might call the museum of land types, consisting of samples as uninfluenced as possible by man."

FOR THE WHOLE PEOPLE

The comparison of wilderness areas to museums is a valid enlightening one in various ways. Not only does it illustrate Dr. Leopold's evaluation of wilderness for scientific reference purposes as well as for educational and recreational purposes, it also illustrates the fact that our areas of wilderness are for everyone, for the whole people, for anyone, not for a selected few. Like our museums and our art galleries, our wilderness areas may at any given time be visited by a relatively small percentage of our people, yet they are available to any who will use them, part of our cultural resource as well as our natural heritage. We should regard them as such and cherish them.

WILDERNESS RECREATION

Yet we must recognize and emphasize more than we have, the values of wilderness recreation in providing for the health and vigor of our citizens.

"Physical fitness is the basis of all the activities of our society," and I say this in the words of President-elect John F. Kennedy writing thus in last week's (Dec. 26, 1960) issue of Sports Illustrated. In an article entitled "The Soft American," this great and vigorous leader warns that this "age of leisure and abundance can destroy vigor and muscle tone as effortlessly as it can gain time."

"Many of the routine physical activities which earlier Americans took for granted," he points out, "are no longer part of our daily life. A single look at the packed parking lot of the average high school will tell us what has happened to the traditional bike to school that helped to build young bodies. The television set, the movies, and the myriad conveniences and distractions of modern life all lure our young people away from the strenuous physical activity that is the basis of fitness in youth and in later life."

"Thus," declares our soon-to-be President, John F. Kennedy, "the physical fitness of our citizens is a vital prerequisite to America's realization of its full potential as a nation, and to the opportunity of each individual citizen to make full and fruitful use of his capacities."

The Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, with whom I am pleased to be associated on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, a recreation and wilderness champion in the House of Representatives, has made this same emphasis on physical fitness by quoting the Director of Selective Service, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, as saying: "We are not inherently a nation of softies, but it is a harder fight for us to stay fit than for a lot of less privileged people."

"Our kids are all right," said General Hershey, "but autos, innerspring mattresses, and regulated heating make it tougher for us to stay fit." Mr. SAYLOR agreed with General Hershey's comment that "we've got to stay vigorous and still enjoy our luxury," and he added the suggestion that our wilderness areas give us a chance to develop physical fitness and adventurous habits of mind, as well as find relief for jaded minds, tense nerves, and soft muscles.

WITHOUT DAMAGING OTHER INTERESTS

It is not too late in our land-management history, Mr. President, to meet these needs for wilderness and realize its benefits without damaging other interests or requiring sacrifices. If we act promptly we can provide for a system of wilderness areas that will preserve this resource without taxing any other in any foreseeable future, and we can do this with the confidence that if our successors ever do foresee such need they will find that we have saved for them the wilderness and have not needlessly destroyed it ourselves.

Our peculiar opportunity lies principally in the fact that within our national forests, national parks, refuges, ranges, and other areas dedicated to some kind of preservation purpose there are areas of wilderness that can be preserved as such without interference with the other purposes which the areas now serve. It is this opportunity that we propose to realize in establishing the policy and program of this wilderness bill.

PRINCIPLES OF THE BILL

Recognizing "that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas * * * except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition," this bill declares a policy of securing "for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource."

For this purpose the bill would establish "a national wilderness preservation system to be composed of federally owned areas * * * to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness."

It is a key declaration of the measure, at the outset of its section on the use of wilderness, that "nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, national wildlife refuge, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area."

A RELATIVELY SMALL PART OF OUR LAND

The reasonableness of such a policy and program is further emphasized by an understanding of the relatively small part of our land area that is thus affected. All the lands that could possibly be now thus dedicated to wilderness use and protection—and they would be within already established national forests, refuges, parks or similar Federal areas—would make up only about one-fiftieth of our land.

Only about 5 percent of our Federal estate would be thus preserved, and for the most part it would be in the high country of the national forests, the back country of the national parks, in areas not now open to exploitation. Only by act of Congress would new areas beyond those provided for in this act be established. At such little cost we can attain such great ends.

THE SOURCES OF OUR SPIRITUAL WELFARE

It is my purpose now to conclude these remarks with the observation that while we must deal here in the Congress with these matters as subjects of carefully designed programs and policies determined in the light of economic and other governmental realities, we should likewise recognize that we are dealing with the sources of our spiritual welfare also, with the esthetics of our common life, not with bread alone, but with our inheritance of a great outdoors resource.

For some 3 years now our Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has been studying these resources and our needs. We are approaching the time of our recommendations. The enactment of this wilderness legislation will help this Commission in its work. It will provide procedures by which the recommendations of the Commission with reference to wilderness can effectively be carried out, and the existence of these procedures can indeed facilitate the very formulation of such recommendations.

This legislation will establish a policy and program regarding wilderness which will give shape and orderliness to the Outdoor Recreation Commission's considerations relating to wilderness. To all our concerns with the preservation of all the great values of wilderness the measure here presented will contribute the advantage of a carefully considered, sound, and enduring orderly policy and program—a practical way of dealing with both idealism and reality, which here come close together.

WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION

Six years ago last September it was my privilege to dedicate a memorial erected by the Wilderness Society in cooperation with the Forest Service in honor of my early mentor, Aldo Leopold, at a beautiful windswept

New Mexico site "overlooking," in the words of the bronze tablet itself "overlooking the Gila Wilderness, which he helped establish—first national forest area so designated—dedicated as a tribute to him for the national wilderness preservation system he helped create." I said then:

"The work of Aldo Leopold has been done. We now become trustees of his inheritance. Those of us who may visit within the wilderness and who are able to rest and be restored in our peace of mind and body by the quiet that it will always possess have nonetheless an obligation to see that the work of one generation shall not be sacrificed by those that come after. We have an obligation to make sure that this area (and others like it) may remain untouched for generations and perhaps centuries to come. We cannot take our burdens as trustees lightly if we are to keep faith with those who struggled so mightily to achieve these precious spots within the confines of a busy continent. The erection of this memorial—reminds each of us that our lives as well can contribute to the things that mean beauty for the eye and rest for the spirit. We, too, can preserve the wilderness."

These words of 6 years ago at a memorial for one of our pioneers I am glad today to recall and iterate with regard for all of those who through the years have contributed to the opportunity we now face and cherish. We can preserve wilderness, and I commend to you this wilderness bill as a sound, reasonable, considerate, but effective charter for doing so.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier I introduced a so-called wilderness bill. I find that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desires to be a cosponsor of the bill; and there may be other cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 2 days, so that the names of additional sponsors may be added to the bill, if that is desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTION OF NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS UNDER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Law 485 of the 84th Congress, the Upper Colorado Storage Project Act, to remove the provisions requiring that the Secretary of the Interior construct so-called protective works to prevent impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument in southern Utah from the waters of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River.

I firmly believe that a serious mistake was made in writing these provisions into the act at the time it was passed, and that we must now move to correct that mistake. Otherwise we will spend at least $25 million needlessly, we will scar the primitive beauty of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, and we will fail to make this spectacular natural wonder as accessible as it should be to the public.

In the 86th Congress, I sponsored a bill identical to the one I am now introducing. However, work on the Glen Canyon Dam had progressed to the point where it would be possible to start filling the Lake Powell Reservoir in 1962. Therefore, the Secretary of the Interior, as required by the act, had requested funds to start construction of the protective works to prevent the waters from the dam from backing up under the monument, and, if I was to forestall that construction, I had to direct my energies to stopping the appropriation. Both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees agreed that so-called protective works were unnecessary, and the funds should not be appropriated in the fiscal 1961 bill.

To clarify the problem, let me give a little background. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument was created by Presidential proclamation in 1910. It comprises an area of 160 acres in San Juan County, Utah, 5 miles north of the Arizona border, and 30 miles from the Glen Canyon damsite. At the present time it can be reached only by mule pack over a 15-mile trail from the Utah-Arizona border, or by a 6-mile hike from the Colorado River.

It is the largest known natural bridge in the world, rising 309 feet above the canyon floor. The arch was formed by the waters of Bridge Creek cutting through a narrow neck of Navajo sandstone to shorten their course to neighboring Aztec Creek and on into the Colorado River. The entire area is brilliantly colored, and filled with breathtaking, upflung architecture.

Not long ago a National Park Service and U.S. Geological Survey field party determined that even at high water season when Lake Powell was full, not more than a sliver of water would back up in the creekbed, and that this water would be 21 feet below the left abutment of the bridge and 33 feet below the right abutment of the bridge.

There would, therefore, be no impairment of the arch, and it takes little imagination to see that the monument itself would be enhanced. The water would add to the scenic lure, and provide practical and easy access to the area by boat.

Although I was not in the Senate in 1956 when the upper Colorado River bill was enacted, I can well understand what happened. The inclusion of the Echo Park Dam in the bill had stalled the entire vast resource development project on dead center in the House Interior Committee. Certain conservationist and outdoor groups saw in Echo Park the destruction of the entire national park system. They further feared that allowing even a small manmade pool to form itself many feet below the abutments of the Rainbow Bridge in that national monument would put another crack in what they considered the crumbling foundations of the park and monument program.

The Echo Park Dam was removed and the bill was amended, in separate sections, to provide first, that the Secretary of the Interior take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from the waters backed up by the Glen Canyon Reservoir; and second, that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of the act shall be within any national park or monument.

In my opinion, both actions were indefensible. I will not take the time here to go into the Echo Park controversy, but I believe the case has now been fully made that it would be a defenseless waste of the taxpayers money to build expensive protective works to keep the water—or even the sediment which would drop from the water into the streambed—out of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument in southern Utah. This session, I hope, therefore, that we will not have to resort to the circuitous, back-door method of refusing to appropriate the funds for a barrier dam. We should admit that it was unnecessary to write the protective works requirement into the Upper Colorado River Storage Act when it was passed, and remove that requirement.

It is gratifying to be able to say that Interior Secretary-designate UDALL has made a report which agrees with me in general on Rainbow Bridge.

Last summer the Secretary-designate, as a Congressman and a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Representative JOHN SAYLOR, also a member of the committee, made an inspection trip to study the problem.

In his official report to Chairman ASPINALL, Congressman UDALL outlined three alternatives from which he felt Congress might choose: First, a two-dam plan, which would consist of a downstream barrier dam outside the monument to hold back the lake waters, and an upstream dam outside the monument to catch the downstream seasonal flash flood runoff; second, an upstream dam only; and third, to allow the water to back up under the arch in the natural streambed.

Let me quote directly from Congressman UDALL's report:

After the most careful study and after extensive discussion with the conservationists who know this extraordinary national monument best, I have come to the firm conclusion that the last alternative would best serve the longrun interests of this park, and of the conservation movement itself.

Although the lake water offends a basic principle of park conservation, it is my conviction that the construction of any manmade works within 5 miles of the present monument boundaries would do far greater violence to the first commandment of conservation—that the great works of nature should remain in their virginal state wherever possible. The natural setting of Rainbow embraces a much larger area than the boxlike artificial "monument"; and it is a gross mistake to detach the arch itself from its environment.

As I conceive it, from my study of the history of conservation in America, the one overriding principle of the conservation movement is that no works of man (save the bare minimum of roads, trails, and necessary public facilities in access areas) should intrude into the wonder places of the national park system. A corollary of this principle is that even the waters of a manmade lake or reservoir constitute an unwarranted park invasion. Therefore, as I see it, building either of the two proposed dams near the artificial boundaries of the monument would sacrifice the cardinal principle in order to save its corollary.

Following a glowing appraisal of the grandeur of the monument and the country surrounding it—an appraisal

which led the Congressman to recommend that the boundaries be extended to include the arch in its natural backdrop, Congressman UDALL wrote:

Congress should resolve this issue by a conscious choice, and not create ill will by a default decision through the expedient of refusing to appropriate funds for the measures promised in the act of 1956. If a majority of our colleagues feel protective works should be constructed, the earlier promise should be kept and necessary funds should be appropriated.

On the other hand, if the conclusion I have come to is the right one I believe Congress should clear itself of any imputation of bad faith by passing an appropriate resolution spelling out, in terms of sound conservation principles, the reasons why protective steps were not taken. If this course is followed, I would also urge that strenuous efforts be made to persuade the conservation spokesmen of this country to make a further study of this problem on the hope they might concur in this action.

I find that last sentence most interesting. The position of the conservationists, and their responsibility in the Rainbow Bridge controversy, was also referred to by Dr. Angus Woodbury, professor emeritus of biology, University of Utah, in his article "Protecting Rainbow Bridge," which appeared in the August 26, 1960, issue of Science. After a penetrating discussion of the issues involved, in which he reaches almost the same conclusions as Congressman UDALL, namely, that protection would do more harm than good, Dr. Woodbury states:

This is a case which calls for conservationists to do a little soul searching. The fallacy of joining a crusade without a realistic appraisal of the facts should be obvious by this time. It is a fact that the presence of the Glen Canyon Reservoir will open up to the general public, by way of boating on Lake Powell, a thousand enchanting nooks, glens, and alcoves in the tributaries that lead into Glen Canyon, many of which are inaccessible without the lake. It will open the vast scenic resources of the interior of the rough country of the Southwest to regular use under the control of the National Park Service.

Conservationists recognize that in a world faced with a population bomb there is as great a need to conserve water for the arid lands of the earth as there is to conserve scenic landscapes. They also realize that there are many other resources that should be conserved and that the relative values must be weighed carefully. They should support both the movement for conservation of water in Glen Canyon and the National Park Service in developing the by-products of the lake as national recreational resources. In addition to opportunities for boating, fishing, photography, and the like, construction of the lake will provide access to areas of magnificent scenery, and all these opportunities are bound to be appreciated in the years to come.

As the years pass into centuries, deltas at the mouths of incoming streams will help to fill the reservoir with sediment. Long before it is completely filled, the lengthening deltas may be used for some purpose or other. What use will be made of these newly made lands remains for the future to decide. If they are maintained as parts of national recreation areas, they may well serve as centers from which visitors can explore the thousand side canyons and scenic attractions that radiate from the main Glen Canyon. Without any barrier dams in Bridge Canyon, Rainbow Bridge would be as accessible as any of the other scenic marvels of the Glen Canyon tributaries.

The major objective of sincere conservationists is to leave the people of the future with a heritage of wisely used resources which will continue to serve mankind through many additional generations.

I well realize, Mr. President, that Rainbow Bridge poses a real dilemma for many of those concerned. It poses a dilemma for the Department of the Interior which, under the law, must ask for funds to begin the unnecessary protective works. It poses a dilemma for Congress which must reexamine the action it took in the strained and emotional atmosphere when the original bill was passed. And it poses a serious dilemma for the leaders and members of the conservation and outdoor groups who, I sincerely hope, will search their consciences and ask themselves whether a manmade pool far down under the arch of a bridge would not be far more desirable than any manmade dam, plus the thrusts of access roads, plus the other impedimenta of civilization which would blot the primitiveness of the area.

Mr. President, no one is more dedicated than I to honest conservation and protection of our natural resources, and to appropriating the money necessary to do so. But, now that the facts are in on Rainbow Bridge, I am convinced that to let the water take its natural course up the streambed is the best way to insure that this remarkable scenic wonder will be preserved in all of its primitive glory.

By no criterion do I feel that the expenditure of millions of Federal dollars for the construction of a barrier or diversion dam, or a combination of both, can be justified.

If by any chance, the Congress does not choose to act on the bill I am introducing today—or take action to reach its objectives—I shall again ask the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to delete any funds which may be requested for the construction of protective works at Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 175) to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act with respect to the protection of national parks and monuments under the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASED USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes and for the development of new crops.

In 1958 several Senators, including myself, introduced proposed legislation on this subject. The Senate Agriculture Committee took the various bills introduced and combined the better qualities of each into a committee bill. This committee bill passed the Senate practically without dissent. The House failed to act; but it is my understanding that the Agriculture Committee in the House was going to take up the bill, for consideration, when Congress adjourned.

Again in the last Congress I introduced this bill and I was supported by several Senators. The Senate Agriculture Committee reported the bill unanimously and in 1960 the Senate passed the bill with only one or two dissenters despite opposition from the administration.

In the House of Representatives the administration was more successful and the House substituted its version for the Senate bill. I realize there must be compromise in legislation, but in this situation there was no compromise, in my opinion, had the Senate agreed to the House substitute. Therefore we did not meet in agreement in conference and the legislation died with the end of Congress.

All real friends of the farmer are going to concentrate on ways of helping him, rather than on dissipating their energies on details of how we help him. Aid for agriculture is the thing; if we enjoy the luxury of differing as to method, we must not hinder progress toward assisting our national agricultural industry. I am sure that all of us are in agreement on this basic idea: Our Nation's farmers are the backbone of the national economy; and in helping him, we help ourselves. I may feel that my ways of rendering assistance are better than the next fellow's; but this is not going to deter me one whit from giving my wholehearted support to a compromise program that carries with it the hope of bettering agriculture. But the House substitute offered last year did not carry out the research we need and would not institute the recommendations of the bipartisan commission of 1957 which was hailed by all sources upon its release.

Research is the key that unlocks many doors. When we view the surpluses of agricultural products, we realize the urgent need of wider and more intensive research for new uses for those products and for new products that will yield paying crops.

Research is a multiplier that increases multiple uses of basic products. I never cease to wonder at the work of George Washington Carver, whose genius was able to develop more than 100 byproducts from the humble peanut. Who knows what untapped secrets nature has stored up in other everyday products.

Yes, research is a creative force, generating progress, sparking productivity, promoting comfort, adding to total living. Research creates wealth through inventiveness, and ministers to man's welfare.

Behind any successful manufacturing company we find a substantial research program. The more successful the company, the more funds are being poured back into the business through the medium of research. Fiscal analysts tell us one of the best ways to determine the future prospects of any given company is to read its financial statement and learn what part of its earnings is being plowed back in the form of research. Companies that fail to provide adequate

research programs soon wind up "in the ditch." The leading corporations are strong on research.

Mr. President, we must do for research in agriculture what industry does for its research. We cannot, in national self-interest, afford to do less. Every dollar invested in agricultural research will come back manyfold, and the beneficial effects will pour into all segments of the economy.

Judging by commercial standards, the ratio of expenditures for research to the total dollar value of the Nation's agricultural products is relatively small. More, much more, needs to be done.

The bill I now introduce contains certain authority that is not now available to the Department of Agriculture, but which I believe is necessary if agricultural research is to produce the expected results. This includes authority for research grants, student fellowships, scholarships, and similar aids to strengthen graduate training.

There is widespread recognition that a prosperous agricultural industry is one of the basic necessities of a strong America. Farmers are one of the most important consumer groups in America. For our Nation to be prosperous, the farmer has to be in a position to buy the products of industry. It is true that the number of farmers in America has decreased in recent years, but statistics show that purchases by farmers for production and consumption have increased.

The Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products stresses the economic importance of the farmer in the following words:

> Two-fifths of the Nation's total economic activity arises from agriculture and related business functions.

Mr. President, the broad objectives of the measure we are now considering were outlined in the report of the aforementioned Commission. After a thorough study and survey of the agricultural industry, the Commission made major recommendations looking toward comprehensive research to bring about the greatest possible industrial uses of agricultural products.

In its report, the Commission said:

> In the past 25 years agriculture often has been researched right out of its natural domain. Industry will continue to explore the unknown in search for new products and new uses for old products. Nothing is plainer in the economic pattern of today than that agriculture must compete in areas of basic and applied scientific research. Agriculture should be enabled to compete as an equal, in the contest for consumer acceptance. It is now losing by default.

The Commission was created in accordance with section 209 of Public Law 540, 84th Congress. It filed an interim report on April 17, 1956, and its final report on June 15, 1957.

Altogether, the Commission made 8 pertinent recommendations, and also obtained suggestions through correspondence with experiment station directors and more than 350 industrial executives. The work of the Commission was well planned and comprehensive.

In its report, the Commission stated it found it necessary to obtain quickly, first, an adequate assessment of the current state of industrial utilization research; second, a sound appraisal of its possibilities; and third, adequate understanding of the obstacles to further development.

To this end, the Commission set up task groups or special committees in the following areas: corn wet milling, cotton, crop residues, industrial alcohol from grain, industrial uses for grain other than alcohol, dairy products, forage crops, forest products, fruits and vegetables, hides, skins, and animal by-products, new and special crops, oilseeds and animal fats, poultry products, rice, sugar, tobacco, white potato products, wool and mohair.

Not the least important of the Commission's conclusions of its studies was the last, which reads:

> The dynamic forces which created American industrial development must be motivated in the farm economy.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy that the Commission's first recommendation called for a substantial increase in research funds, and did so in the following language:

> The Commission proposes as its first and most necessary recommendations that the funds for industrial uses research be increased to not less than three times the amounts ($16,145,000) currently available; and that additional sums be provided, as herein suggested, for new crop research, trial commercialization, development, and incentives.

Immediately following this, the Commission recommended that the facilities of the Department of Agriculture be fully utilized in furthering the research program, as well as land-grant colleges, experiment stations, universities and colleges, private research organizations, and foreign institutions. There followed a recommendation for research grants and fellowships, scholarships, and similar aids that, while furthering research projects, would also increase the supply of trained scientists.

Special emphasis was put by the Commission on the new crop projects with the purpose of creating durable, additional markets, and for rapid disposal, through industrial channels, of accumulated surpluses.

The Commission found that the current industrial outlets for the products of the total farm acreage, estimated to be less than 7 percent, are undeniably small.

One of the most encouraging leads to be developed by the Commission was the prospect of a major crop for the South—bamboo. This product has shown great potential in the paper field, as well as in furniture and plastics. I am pleased to report that preliminary experimentation and work with this crop have already been started in South Carolina and Georgia by private firms, and through the Clemson College Edisto Experiment Station, near Blackville, S.C.

A whole regional economy can be uplifted and transformed through the development of some such good, new pay crop. We all know what has been accomplished with the soybean—the commercial markets it commands, the jobs it has created, the payrolls it accounts for. Who knows how many such undiscovered commercial products await in the darkness that can be pierced only by the searchlight of research. Is it any wonder that we approach this research program with enthusiasm and great expectations—holding, as it does, vast vistas of opportunities?

In my opinion, no proposed legislation that has come before the Senate in recent years is more important from the farmers' standpoint.

We must enact this bill in order to step up our research. The Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for foreign aid; much of it has gone for research in foreign countries. It is inconceivable to me that this opportunity to help our own people and our own economy would not be availed of.

I hope this agriculture research bill will pass Congress this session. There is tremendous need for agriculture research. Such research can help our farmers and industries find new sources of income and production.

The bill I introduce is the same as the one the Senate Agriculture Committee reported and is identical with the one passed in the 85th Congress by the Senate. I hope we shall be able to expedite this measure, so it will be in the hands of the House of Representatives for early action.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week, in order that Senators who may wish to cosponsor it with me may have an opportunity to do so. I have received several requests regarding cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 173) to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NUTRITIONAL ENRICHMENT AND SANITARY TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF RICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 201 of the act of September 21, 1959, to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary transportation and storage of rice distributed under certain programs. It may be recalled that I introduced a similar bill last year, which became law. However, it does not go quite far enough.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 179) to amend section 201 of the act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 610), to provide for the nutritional

enrichment and the sanitary transportation and storage of rice distributed under certain programs, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON

In 1959 the Congress enacted legislation providing for the enrichment of cornmeal, corn grits, and flour so as to meet the regulations promulgated under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. These food commodities, which are distributed to school lunch cafeterias over the entire Nation, have contributed much to the welfare and well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren.

Prior to 1959 these foods were not enriched before they were sent to the schools. This legislation has very capably caused these foods to meet minimum standards before they reached the children. However, rice, one of the very basic food commodities in practically every State, was not included.

Laws in a vast majority of the States require the enrichment of rice but the Federal Government has, since the inception of the School Lunch Act, distributed unenriched rice to the schoolchildren.

It has been the procedure of the millers to ship some of these foods in 100-pound burlap bags. The State nutritional board in South Carolina has brought to my attention the fact that this method of shipment is very unsatisfactory. The foodstuffs, particularly rice, are not sanitary when they reach the school cafeterias. I feel that it would be beneficial to the schoolchildren and the Federal Government if these foodstuffs were packaged in small and sanitary containers. I have particular reference to rice.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation which would provide for the nutritional enrichment and proper packaging of rice distributed by the Federal Government. The cost will be very small compared to the value received. I hope the Senate will see fit to pass this proposal at an early date.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution, which proposes to abolish the Electoral College and replace it with a direct popular vote system for electing the President and Vice President of the United States and I ask that it be left open on the desk until the close of business on January 10, 1961, for any other Senators who may wish to join in cosponsorship of the resolution.

For the convenience of those interested in this legislation, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the provisions and purposes of this resolution. It is an analysis which I published on December 25, 1960.

In introducing this joint resolution, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the majority leader for his generous kindness in this matter in his wish that, although he has legislative proposals of his own on this same subject, my resolution go in first, and for his thoughtfulness in permitting my resolution to be Senate Joint Resolution 1. This is so typical of him and is a forerunner of the kind of cooperation that can be expected of him in his new and richly deserved role of leadership in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid for all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be nominated and elected as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. The official candidates of political parties for President and Vice President shall be nominated at a primary election by direct popular vote. Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, but, in the primary election each voter shall be eligible to vote only in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation. The time of such primary election shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such primary election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in August in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of President and Vice President. No person shall be a candidate for nomination for President or Vice President except in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation, and his name shall be on that party's ballot in all the States if he shall have filed a petition at the seat of the Government of the United States with the Secretary of State, which petition shall be valid only if (1) it is determined by the Secretary of State to have been signed on or after the first day of January of the year in which the next primary election for President and Vice President is to be held by a number of qualified voters, in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least 1 per centum, but not more than 2 per centum, of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President (or, in the case of the primary election first held after the ratification of this article, for electors of President and Vice President) in the most recent previous Presidential election, and (2) it is filed with the Secretary of State not later than the first Tuesday after the first Monday in June of the year in which the next primary election for President and Vice President is to be held. No person's name shall appear on the ballot in any primary election as a candidate for nomination for both President and Vice President; but the foregoing shall not, except in the case of a runoff election, prohibit the name of a candidate for nomination for President, or the name of any other person, from being written on the ballot by the voters for nomination for Vice President or the name of a candidate for nomination for Vice President, or the name of any other person, from being written on the ballot by the voters for nomination for President.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this article a political party shall be recognized as such if at any time within four years next preceding a primary election the Secretary of State determines such party has had registered as members thereof more than 5 per centum of the total registered voters in the United States.

"SEC. 4. Within fifteen days after such primary election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons of each political party for whom votes were cast, and the number of votes for each such person, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the government of the United States directed to the Secretary of State, who shall forthwith open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for presidential nominees by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation shall be the official candidate of such party for President throughout the United States; and the person receiving a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for vice presidential nominees by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation shall be the official candidate of such party for Vice President throughout the United States. If no person receives a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for presidential nominees by the voters of a political party, a runoff election to determine the nominee of such political party for President shall be conducted throughout the United States on the twenty-eighth day after the day on which the primary election was held. Such runoff election shall be between the two persons who received the greatest number of popular votes cast for presidential nominees by the voters of such political party in the primary election. If no person receives a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for vice presidential nominees by the voters of a political party, a runoff election to determine the nominee of such political party for Vice President shall be conducted throughout the United States on the twenty-eighth day after the day on which the primary election was held. Such runoff election shall be between the two persons who received the greatest number of popular votes cast for vice presidential nominees by the voters of such political party in the primary election. No person ineligible to vote in the primary election of any political party shall be eligible to vote in a runoff election of such political party. Within fifteen days after a runoff election for the nomination of a political party for President or Vice President, the chief executive of each State shall, in the case of a runoff election for nomination for President, transcribe on an appropriate document the names of the two persons on the party's ballot for nomination for President and the number of votes cast in such State for each, and, in the case of a runoff election for nomination for Vice President, transcribe on an appropriate document the names of the two persons on the party's ballot for nomination for Vice President and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which documents shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the govern-

ment of the United States, directed to the Secretary of State, who shall forthwith open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving the majority of popular votes for President in a runoff election to elect a nominee for President shall be the official candidate of such political party for President throughout the United States. The person receiving the majority of popular votes for Vice President in a runoff election to elect a nominee for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such political party for Vice President throughout the United States.

"SEC. 5. In the event a person shall receive in any such primary election, as the result of write-in votes, a majority of the total number of votes cast by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation for nominees for President and a majority of the total number of votes cast by such voters for nominees for Vice President, such person shall declare which nomination he accepts; and a runoff election shall be conducted for the nomination such person does not accept between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such nomination.

"In the event a person shall receive in any such primary election, as the result of write-in votes, the highest or second highest number of votes cast by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation for nominees for President (and no person receives a majority) and the highest or second highest number of votes cast by such voters for nominees for Vice President (and no person receives a majority), such person shall declare the office for which he will be a candidate in the runoff election provided for in section 4 of this article and such person may not be a candidate for nomination for the other office. The runoff election for the nomination for such other office shall be between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such other office.

"In the event a person shall receive in any such primary election, as the result of write-in votes, a majority of the total number of votes cast by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation for nominees for President and the highest or second highest number of votes cast by such voters for nominees for Vice President (and no person receives a majority), or such person receives a majority of the total number of votes cast for nominees for Vice President and the highest or second highest number of votes cast for nominees for President (and no person receives a majority), such person may, in either such case, accept a nomination for the office for which he received a majority of the votes cast, and a runoff election shall be conducted for the other office between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such office; or, such person may refuse the nomination for the office for which he received a majority of the votes cast and declare himself a candidate in the runoff election provided for in section 4 of this article for the office for which he received the highest or second highest number of votes. If such person refuses the nomination for an office for which he received a majority of the votes cast, a runoff election shall be conducted for such office between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such office. Any runoff election provided for in this section shall be conducted at the same time, and the results thereof certified in the same manner, as provided for runoff elections under section 4 of this article.

"If, in any case in which a runoff election would otherwise be held, only one candidate of a party remains for nomination for President or Vice President, as the case may be, such candidate shall be the official candidate of such party for such office and no runoff election shall be conducted for such office.

"SEC. 6. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for President, the person nominated by such political party for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such party for President. In the event of the deaths or resignations of the official candidates of any political party for President and Vice President, or in the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for Vice President, a national committee of such party shall designate such candidate or candidates, who shall then be deemed the official candidate or candidates of such party, but in choosing such candidate or candidates the vote shall be taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purposes shall consist of a delegate or delegates from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 7. The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected at a general election by the people of the several States by direct popular vote of the qualified voters in each State who shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The time of such election shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President. The names of candidates officially nominated in primaries as herein provided, and only such names, shall appear upon the official ballot in every State for the offices of President and Vice President; but the foregoing shall not, except in the case of a runoff election, prohibit the names of a candidate for President, or the name of any other person, from being written on the ballot by the voters for Vice President or the name of a candidate for Vice President, or the name of any other person, from being written on the ballot by the voters for President.

"SEC. 8. Within fifteen days after such general election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which list shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the Secretary of State, who shall forthwith open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for President shall be President, and the person receiving a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for Vice President shall be Vice President. If no person receives a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for President, a runoff election to choose the President shall be conducted throughout the United States on the twenty-eighth day after the day on which the general election was held. Such runoff election shall be between the two persons who received the greatest number of popular votes for President cast in the general election. If no person receives a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for Vice President, a runoff election to choose the Vice President shall be conducted throughout the United States on the twenty-eighth day after the day on which the general election was held. Such runoff election shall be between the two persons who received the greatest number of popular votes for Vice President cast in the general election. Within fifteen days after a runoff election to choose a President or Vice President, the chief executive of each State shall, in the case of a runoff election for President, transcribe on an appropriate document the names of the two persons on the ballot for President and the number of votes cast in such State for each, or, in the case of a runoff election for Vice President, transcribe on an appropriate document the names of the two persons on the ballot for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which document shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the Secretary of State, who shall forthwith open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving the majority of popular votes for President in a runoff election for President shall be President. The person receiving the majority of popular votes for Vice President in a runoff election for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President.

"SEC. 9. In the event a person shall receive in any such general election, as the result of write-in votes, a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for President and a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for Vice President, such person shall declare which office he accepts; and a runoff election shall be conducted for the office such person did not accept between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such office.

"In the event a person shall receive in any such general election, as the result of write-in votes, the highest or second highest number of popular votes cast for President (and no person receives a majority) and the highest or second highest number of popular votes cast for Vice President (and no person receives a majority), such person shall declare the office for which he will be a candidate in the runoff election provided for in section 8 of this article and such person may not be a candidate for the other office. The runoff election for such other office shall be between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such other office.

"In the event a person shall receive in any such general election, as the result of write-in votes, a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for President and the highest or second highest number of popular votes cast for Vice President (and no person receives a majority), or he receives a majority of the total number of popular votes cast for Vice President and the highest or second highest number of popular votes cast for President (and no person receives a majority), such person may, in either such case, accept the office for which he received a majority of the votes cast, and a runoff election shall be conducted for the other office between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such office; or, such person may refuse the office for which he received a majority of the votes cast and declare himself a candidate in the runoff election provided for in section 8 of this article for the office for which he received the highest or second highest number of votes. If such person refuses the office for which he received a majority of the votes cast, a runoff election shall be conducted for such office between the two persons who received the next highest number of votes for such office. Any runoff election provided for in this section shall be conducted at the same time, and the results thereof certified in the same manner, as provided for runoff elections under section 8 of this article.

"If, in any case in which a runoff election would otherwise be held, only one candidate remains for the office of President or Vice President, as the case may be, such candidates shall be deemed elected to such office

and no runoff election shall be conducted for such office.

"SEC. 10. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 11. The Congress shall have power to provide by appropriate legislation for cases in which two or more persons receive an equal number of popular votes for President or Vice President in any such primary or general election.

"SEC. 12. The Congress shall have power to provide by appropriate legislation for methods of determining any dispute or controversy that may arise in the counting and canvassing of the votes for President and Vice President in any such primary or general election. The places and manner of holding such primary or general election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

"SEC. 13. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

The statement presented by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, is as follows:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

Since her public statement made in addresses in Maine on November 21, 1960, that at the outset of the 87th Congress she would introduce legislation to abolish the electoral college and replace it with direct primaries and elections for the nominations and elections of President and Vice President, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH has been working closely with the office of the Senate Legislative Counsel on the drafting of a Senate joint resolution to provide a constitutional amendment to accomplish this objective.

With the completion of the drafting of that proposed constitutional amendment on December 16, 1960, Senator SMITH by letter has invited all other Senators to join her in cosponsorship of the proposed constitutional amendment. The specific proposals of the constitutional amendment are:

(a) Abolish the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President;

(b) Provide for election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote;

(c) Abolish the national convention system of nominating the presidential and vice presidential candidates of political parties;

(d) Provide for the nomination of presidential and vice presidential candidates of political parties by direct primaries (first Tuesday after first Monday in August);

(e) Provide for run-off elections in both the general election and the primary in the event that no candidate received a majority of the total number of votes cast (to be held 28 days later);

(f) Require that in order to qualify as a candidate in the direct primary, a person must file a petition signed by at least 1 percent of the total vote cast in the last presidential general election (this would require 688,327 signers for the 1964 primary) to be filed not before January 1 and not later than 2 months prior to the primary election; and

(g) Require that a political party have a registered membership of more than 5 percent of the total registered voters in the United States in order to qualify to get on the ballot.

In a letter to each of the other 99 Senators and Senators-elect of the 87th Congress, Senator SMITH pointed out that (1) for a long time she had supported proposals to replace the electoral college system with a direct popular vote system; (2) that the closeness (a difference of only 112,801) of the 1960 presidential election had dramatized the possibility of the election of a President by the electoral college although an opposing candidate had received a greater direct popular vote (49.8 percent); (3) that again as in 1948 the election result had produced a minority President and that the recurrence of this should be avoided in the future through a runoff election by which a clear-cut majority President would be elected; (4) that the selection of party nominees should be more responsive to the people than under the present nomination by convention system and should be by direct primary; (5) that future candidates for President should follow the example set by President-elect Kennedy and openly declare their candidacy with an opportunity for direct expression in the nomination process given to the people through the direct primary system, which would be far more meaningful than either the convention system or the presidential preferential primaries held in a few States; (6) that the position of Vice President had become so important that it should not be relegated to the status of "consolation prize" nor should it be decided by the vote of one person (the presidential nominee) to the exclusion of the votes of tens of millions of Americans; (7) that one of the beneficial byproducts of her proposal would be to shorten the general election campaign—an objective desired by candidates and public alike; and (8) that a recent national public opinion poll had shown that an overwhelming majority of the American people desired that the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President be abolished.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

This joint resolution is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 200 of the 80th Congress, which was reintroduced during the 81st Congress and subsequently favorably acted upon by the Senate. A volume of hearings has been held on this subject, and similar proposals have been introduced in the Congress since as early as 1797, when Representative William L. Smith, of South Carolina, offered to the Congress the first Constitutional amendment proposing reform of our procedure for electing the President.

My personal opinion is that our present system of electing President and Vice President is antiquated and in great need of overhauling by means of a Constitutional amendment similar to that which I am proposing. Despite the mass of hearings that have been held in the past on this subject, I feel it is necessary that the two Houses of Congress again hold hearings on the matter. Times have changed, and conditions may have changed which would result in the bringing out of new facts at such hearings.

I introduced this same amendment last year. At that time I fully realized that no action could be forthcoming during that session of Congress. However, I felt that by offering this resolution some Members of the Senate would have an opportunity to give this proposed legislation consideration. As I promised then, I now reintroduce this resolution and invite cosponsors.

Briefly, the reforms which this proposed constitutional amendment seeks to effect are threefold in nature:

First. It abolishes entirely the office of presidential elector. The electoral vote per State—equal to the total number of Representatives and Senators, as under the existing system—is retained, but purely as an automatic counting device.

Second. It eliminates any possibility of an election being thrown into the House of Representatives.

Third. It does away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes. Under the existing system, the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State, regardless of how infinitesimal the plurality. Under the proposed system, the electoral votes in each State are automatically divided among the candidates in direct proportion to the popular vote.

For example, a State has 12 electoral votes. Of the 2,400,000 popular votes cast in that State, "R," the Republican, received 1,600,000. "D," the Democrat, received 600,000. "T," the third party candidate, received 200,000. Under the present system, all of the State's 12 electoral votes would go to "R," the Republican. Under the proposed system, the electoral vote would be divided in proportion to the popular vote as follows: Eight electoral votes for "R"; three electoral votes for "D"; and one electoral vote for "T".

The electoral votes are computed to three decimal places. In the very remote, but mathematically possible, event of a tie, it is provided that the candidate receiving the greatest number of popular votes wins the election.

The electoral votes which each candidate receives, therefore, represent his proportional strength in the State. These votes are then taken and added to the electoral votes received in all the other States. The candidate having the greatest number of electoral votes wins the Presidency. Votes for Vice President are counted in precisely the same manner.

Since 1797, when the first constitutional amendment proposing reform of our procedure for electing the President was offered, hardly a session of Congress has passed without the introduction of one or more resolutions of this character. All these proposals recognized, as does the reform embodied in this Senate joint resolution which I offer, that the so-called electoral college system has never functioned as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention were, for the most part, definitely opposed to electing the President by direct popular vote, agreeing with George Mason, of Virginia, that "it were as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper character for Chief Magistrate to the people, as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." The delegates distrusted the ability of the average citizen of that day to decide ques-

tions of such great gravity. Moreover, the discussions of the convention reveal that the delegates did not believe that it was possible for a voter in one State to know anything about the ability or character of public men in the other States scattered along our 1,500-mile shore line. In addition, those representing the smaller States believed that popular election would somehow increase the power and prestige of the more heavily populated States.

These considerations, after probably the most prolonged debate of the convention, led to adoption of the indirect method of electing the President. Under this plan, the States were to select well-informed public men who were to look the field over and elect a President and Vice President. In selecting these electors, each State was left free to use any procedure it might see fit to adopt—direct popular election of the electors on a general blanket ticket—the procedure used in all States today—or by single member districts; or by the vote of the legislature itself—a procedure which all the States had abandoned by 1860.

The electors so selected by each State should meet, it was decided, on a given date at a designated place within the State and vote by ballot for two persons. They were required to send a list of all persons voted for and the number of votes for each, to the President of the Senate, where, on a date fixed by law, they were to be opened in the presence of the two Houses, and the vote counted.

The person having the largest number of votes was to be declared President if such number were a majority of all the votes cast. The runner-up should be declared Vice President whether he had a majority or not—later modified by the 12th amendment.

This is the system which, modified by the 12th amendment, has continued in effect up to the present time. It has retained the original form even though all reason for this form has long since disappeared. The historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, recently wrote in his book, "Paths to the Present":

> What demoted the electoral college from a deliberative body to a puppet show was the rise of political parties. As people began taking sides on public questions, they were unwilling to leave the crucial choice of the Chief Executive to a sort of lottery. Instead, each party publicly announced its slate of electors and the candidate they would support. This usurpation of the electors' functions, though peaceably achieved, amounted to a coup d'etat. It was an amendment of the written Constitution by the unwritten Constitution. The electors, while retaining the legal status of independence, became henceforth hardly more than men in livery taking orders from their parties.

Individual Members of Congress, of course, have always been mindful of the fact that this indirect method of electing the President stood in need of modernization. As stated before, the first legislative proposal for reform came in 1767, only 10 years after the Constitutional Convention itself. In the 70-year period between 1889 and 1960, more than 125 amendment proposals relating to the election of the President have been introduced in Congress. Prior to that time, proponents of the 12th amendment were successful in their efforts to correct the situation created by the Jefferson-Burr electoral-vote tie in 1800. Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, with the strong support of President Andrew Jackson, made this a prime object of his concern over a period of 20 years in the 1820's and 1830's. Senator Oliver H. P. Morton, of Indiana, led the fight in the 1880's. The late Senator George W. Norris was the principal proponent of reform in more recent times; his proposal for direct popular election of the President failed to command the necessary two-thirds of the Senate in 1934. In both the 72d and 73d Congresses, House committees unanimously reported resolutions calling for abolition of the electoral college. In the 80th Congress another unanimous House Judiciary Committee report was submitted.

A side effect or advantage of this type of election reformation would be to reduce the emphasis now placed by candidates of various parties for public office on the solicitation of minority group votes. Nothing would do more to remove race, creed, and color from our national elections than for this election reformation to be approved.

As it has been pointed out, under the present system, one vote can deliver all the electoral votes of a large State into the hands of one candidate, these in turn being sufficient to swing the election of the whole country. Under the reformation I offer, this misrepresentation of the people's will would be eliminated. The one-vote vantage from a minority group would no longer exist, and the petty politics now played by politicians who prey on differences of men's race and religion would no longer enter the political arena.

I also believe the system outlined in the amendment offered will certainly create for us a more democratic method of electing our President and Vice President, for under this system every man's vote will be counted in the selection of President and Vice President.

I hope every Member of Congress will give this matter serious consideration for I certainly believe the day for reformation in this field is long overdue.

I want no one to think that my advocacy of this measure is prompted by, or in any way influenced by, the 1960 election.

I have proposed and supported such a change in our electoral college system ever since I became a Member of the U.S. Senate. It is only that the closeness of the recent election has stimulated thought in this direction and focused editorial and public opinion on the matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an

amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO REVISION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which provides for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the election of the President and the Vice President.

The amendment which I offer would require that the electoral vote in each State be divided according to the percentage of the popular vote cast for each candidate. The candidate receiving the most electoral votes would be elected President, provided he received at least 40 percent of the total. In the event that no candidate received the required 40 percent, the President would be chosen from the two candidates with the highest electoral vote, by both Houses of Congress acting jointly, each Member of Congress having one vote with an absolute majority required for election.

There are four major defects in the present electoral college system that this amendment would remedy.

First, the American people, in increasing numbers, feel that some sleight-of-hand small print is depriving them of a direct and meaningful voice in the selection of a President. They want to have their votes count in the electoral college. The present system seems unfair and abnormal. The proportional plan would seem fair and normal to the average citizen. This at the outset gives us a valid reason for preferring the change since we not only want our election process to be fair, we also want it to seem fair and to be understood and respected by the people.

Second, the present system produces artificial distortions of our political process. The winner-take-all aspect in each State places an inordinate value upon the result in the several large States. The shift of a few thousand votes in these States would have elected Dewey in 1948. The shift of a few thousand votes in Illinois and New Jersey could have changed the result of an election as close as this past one. There is something wrong with an election system which hinges, not on the vote of 70 million, but on the vote of several thousand in a few key States.

Third, the present system artificially discourages the growth of the two-party system in States that are predominantly one-party today. There is little reason for the Republican in Georgia or the Democrat in Vermont to bother to vote on election day. There is no incentive for people to do the job of organizing, proselytizing, and propagandizing that must be done if minority parties are ever to grow into majority parties. A technicality which distorts the public will is holding back natural political developments.

Fourth, the present system drastically inflates the power of various blocs and pressure groups which are highly organized and which may hold the pivotal vote in the larger industrial States. Under the proposal I offer, the influence of these groups would be no greater and no smaller than their size warrants.

There are strong points in the present electoral college procedure which we must be careful not to undermine in our attempt at reform.

The present system usually produces a clear winner with a substantial majority in the electoral college; the size of the normal electoral margin is so decisive that the electors themselves are in no position to cause any mischief; and the growth of third parties has been discouraged, a fact which has contributed greatly to the stability of American politics.

If the electoral vote is made to conform exactly to the popular vote, the margin of victory will often be razor-thin and the winner will frequently have less than 50 percent of the electoral vote. From 1824 to the present about half of the Presidential winners have received less than a majority of the total popular vote.

This proposed amendment, therefore, contains provisions which preserve the stable aspects of our political system. It abolishes the electoral college while retaining the electoral vote. Each State would have the same number of electoral votes as at present and these votes would be automatically cast. There would be no individual electors.

It abolishes the present requirement that the victor receive more than 50 percent of the electoral vote. The Presidency would go to the man who received the most electoral votes, providing he received at least 40 percent. It is unlikely that third- or fourth-party candidates could attract enough electoral votes to reduce the percentage of the winner below 40 percent. This safeguard would prevent third and fourth parties from exercising a decisive effect and there would be no more incentive for their development than at the present time.

There will always be the problem of an inconclusive result which will throw the election of a President into the Congress, just as there is under existing law. In the event this occurs, I believe the proposed amendment offers an improvement over the current procedure. The present system gives one vote to each State and that one vote is arrived at by the unit rule balloting of each State's House delegation. Giving Nevada an equal voice with New York seems to me to be carrying concern for the prerogatives of small States to an absurd degree. My proposal would give each Representative and each Senator an individual vote in the selection of a President. Thus the proper strength of each State would be reflected.

In summary, I believe this proposal would give to each voter full participation in the election of a President. It would preserve the Federal principle and the protection which the Founding Fathers accorded to the smallest States when they conceived the electoral college. It would preserve the stability of our election process and would enhance rather than hurt the two-party system. And it would eliminate all the evils arising from the artificial importance which the unit rule system gives to a few large States and the pivotal blocs which spell victory or defeat in those States.

I do not wish to claim any originality for this proposal. There have been about 200 constitutional amendments introduced to revise the electoral system since the founding of the Republic. Many of these have been debated and voted upon by the Congress. There is nothing new in this field.

The amendment which I introduce today is drawn from previous proposals and represents what I feel to be the soundest approach and that most likely to be enacted into law.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committe on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendments shall be as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law

appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 per centum of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have at least 40 per centum of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JEROME C. HUNSAKER AS CITIZEN REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the attached statement about Dr. Hunsaker from Who's Who in America, 1960–61 at page 1423.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 6) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA—1960–61

Hunsaker, Jerome Clarke (hŭn'să kĕr), aeronautical engineer; born Creston, Iowa, August 26, 1866; son of Walter J. and Alma H. Clarke; graduate U.S. Naval Academy, 1908; master of science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1912, doctor of science, 1916; doctor of science, Williams College, 1916; Adelphi College, 1955; engineering doctorate, Northeastern University, 1945; married Alice Porter Avery, June 26, 1911; children: Mrs. Sarah Porter Swope, Jerome Clarke, James Peter, Mrs. T. A. Bird. Officer, later advancing to commander, Construction Corps, U.S. Navy, 1909–26; instructor of aeronautic engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1912–16; in charge of aircraft design, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., designed airship *Shenandoah*, and flying boat NC–4 (first to fly Atlantic), 1916–23; assistant naval attaché, London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, 1923–26; assistant vice president, Bell Telephone Laboratories (wire and radio services for airways), 1926–28; vice president, Goodyear-Zeppelin Corp., 1928–33; head of Department of Aeronautical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1933–51, now professor emeritus; director, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Shell Oil Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; member, advisory board, Sperry-Rand Corp.; scientific advisory council, Chrysler Corp.; director, Tracer-lab, Inc.; member, board of trustees, Boston Museum of Science; regent, Smithsonian Institution. Captain, USNR (retired); Chairman, National Advisory Commission on Aeronautics, 1941–56. Awarded Navy Cross, Medal for Merit (United States); Legion of Honor (France); Daniel Guggenheim Medal, Franklin Medal; Wright Bros. Memorial Trophy; Godfrey L. Cabot Trophy, 1950; Langley Medal, 1955; Gold Medal of Royal Aeronautical Society (Great Britain), 1957; Navy award for distinguished public service, 1958. Fellow, American Physical Society, American Academy of Arts and Sciences; honorary fellow, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, Royal Aeronautical Society of Britain, Imperial College of Science (London); honorary member, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Institute of Mechanical Engineers (London); member, American Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, American Society of Automotive Engineers, National Academy of Science, American Philosophical Society, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Sigma Xi. Clubs: Century (New York City); Army and Navy (Washington); St. Botolph (Boston). Contributor to journals of professional societies. Home: 10 Louisburg Square, Boston. Office: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for a term of 4 years for Members of the House of Representatives. This joint resolution has been particularly worked out to take into consideration the problem of an equal division between the odd-numbered and even-numbered districts following congressional reapportionments due to the census. I think the joint resolution is workable and practical and one that deserves adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a term of 4 years for Members of the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL SYSTEM FOR CHOOSING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], I introduce a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment to set up a congressional system for choosing presidential electors.

In my belief and the belief of those who join with me in cosponsoring the joint resolution, this amendment offers a simple and sound way of providing the electoral college reform that many Americans feel should be made, without losing the values inherent in the electoral college.

This amendment, known for a number of years as the Mundt-Coudert amendment, makes no change in the fundamental Federal structure of the Republic, as it was established by the Constitution of the United States. This is not true of any of the other proposals which have been advanced to change the system of voting for President.

This congressional system would guarantee equality in voting for President to every voter in every State. Each voter, no matter where he lived, would vote for three, and only three, presidential electors who would represent him in the electoral college just as he is represented in Congress by two Senators and one Representative.

The central provision of the proposed amendment reads:

The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single-elector districts established by the legislature thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitles the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken.

This provision for compact and contiguous territory and for nearly equal populations eliminates any chance of gerrymandering for partisan purposes, as is now permissible for congressional districts. This would be true no matter what party controlled a State's legislature. As originally introduced, the Mundt-Coudert amendment did not include this antigerrymandering provision.

The proposed amendment maintains the majority requirement for election of the President by the electoral college. This is the true source of our two-party system. The amendment provides that if no man receives a majority of the electoral vote, the President shall be chosen, from among the men having the three highest totals of electoral votes, by a joint session of Congress, each Senator and each Representative having one vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, since its text is brief, appear at that point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be chosen an elector.

"The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single-elector districts established by the legislature thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken. In choosing electors of President and Vice President the voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors chosen; and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such a number be a majority of the whole number of electors chosen.

"If no person voted for as President has a majority of the whole number of electors, then from the persons having the three highest numbers on the lists of persons voted for as President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as individual members of one body, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President; a quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice; if additional ballots be necessary, the choice on the fifth ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest number of votes on the fourth ballot.

"If no person voted for as Vice President has a majority of the whole number of electors, then the Vice President shall be chosen from the persons having the three highest numbers on the lists of persons voted for as Vice President in the same manner as herein provided for choosing the President. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President or a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 3. This article supersedes the second and fourth paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution and section 4 of the 20th article of amendment to the Constitution.

"SEC. 4. This article shall take effect on the first day of July following its ratification, but shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said:

Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), it is a pleasure for me to make this statement during the time my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, is presiding over the Senate for her first time.

Madam President, it is my sincere hope that in 1961 a proposed constitutional amendment will be submitted by Congress to the State legislatures for their consideration in order to remedy the obvious defects of the electoral college system. Although the method of election of a President was probably the most generally accepted feature of the Constitution when its adoption was being considered, it has proved to operate less as intended of all the provisions of that basic document and, from almost the beginning of its operation, has been the subject of vigorous and valid criticism.

Of all the numerous proposals for change in the electoral college system, the one embodied in the resolution we introduce today is best calculated to remedy the defects of the existing system in a manner consistent with the guiding principles established in the Constitution, which have provided an immeasurable bounty to generations of Americans.

The advantages of this proposal are numerous, and I shall take time to list only a few of them.

In the first place, the district system proposed in this resolution more nearly reflects the will of the people than does the present system. Rather than a mere plurality in each State determining the electoral vote for the entire State, under the district system the plurality over an entire State will determine only 2 electoral votes, and the remaining 435 electoral votes will each be determined by a plurality in 1 district. This system will provide an added incentive to individuals to exercise their ballots in presidential elections, as electors in districts would be as close to the people as their Representative in Congress. The district system is also calculated to broaden interest nationally in obtaining the best qualified persons possible as candidates for President and Vice President, since availability would no longer be limited to persons from large pivotal States.

Because the district system would provide the same form of constituency for the President as the entire Congress now has, it would increase the probability that the administration and the Congress, at least in the first 2 years of a new administration, would be of the same political party.

Madam President, the district system would, in fact, reinstitute, to a large extent, the intention of the Founding Fathers in designing the electoral system, for in the early days of our Republic the district system was used almost exclusively for the election of presidential electors. While retaining, both in theory and practice, the concept of federalism, which is the foundation of our governmental system, the district system would at the same time equalize the voting power of each citizen regardless of the size or total electoral vote of his home State, for under this proposal each citizen in each State would cast a ballot for three presidential electors.

Madam President, it is my sincere hope that the press of day-to-day crises will not cause the relegation of this vital procedural reform to the well-known pigeonhole. Action on this matter is long overdue, and I sincerely hope that the committee will act promptly on this proposal.

I may say that this joint resolution is the same as that which was introduced in, I believe, 1957 by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]; our present majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; and the junior Senator from South Carolina.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks appear at the conclusion of the remarks made today on the same subject by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution just referred to by the Senator from South Carolina, and any other measures

which may be introduced this afternoon in this discussion, may be introduced under the same understanding as was granted to the Senator from Oregon with respect to the introduction of my bills a few minutes ago; namely, that such introductions will in no way change the parliamentary situation in the Senate with regard to the parliamentary rulings which we have had concerning the conduct of business in the Senate. It will be understood that the introduction of these measures does not mean that we will be doing business under the old rules of the Senate in any manner that will affect the rule of debate which is now going on in the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I wanted to be certain that my remarks will follow those made earlier today on the same subject by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FEDERAL ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce seven joint resolutions, each of which contains a proposed constitutional amendment with respect to our Federal electoral system. I ask that these resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee, but, before they are so referred, I ask unanimous consent that their text be printed at this point in my remarks and that they lie on the table until the close of business, Monday, January 8, to permit other Senators, who might so wish, to join in sponsorship of one or more of these resolutions by giving their names to the bill clerk.

Mr. President, as you know, during the 86th Congress, two-thirds of both Houses of Congress agreed on an amendment to enfranchise the District of Columbia in presidential elections. This proposal is now before the State legislatures for ratification. I, for one, hope it will receive prompt affirmative action and the people of the District will be able to vote in 1964.

Two other electoral reforms were passed by a two-thirds vote in the Senate but died in the House. One of these relates to the abolition of the poll tax, and its passage in the Senate was due primarily to the energetic leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. When he introduces the proposal this year, I hope it will be my honor to be included among the cosponsors.

The Senate also adopted but the House also failed to act on a proposal of mine to empower Governors to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives temporarily in case the membership of the House drops below 50 percent as the result, for example, of a nuclear attack. I am reintroducing that resolution today.

These reforms, as important as they are, represent improvements in the periphery of the Federal electoral system.

Every Member of this Senate will agree that the Constitution should be amended only upon a clearly demonstrated need. I believe that almost every Member, if not every Member, will agree that such a need for reform of its central provisions dealing with our Federal electoral system has been demonstrated on numerous occasions—most recently this fall.

Probably the most urgently needed reform is to rid ourselves of the antideluvian electoral college. This can be done without scrapping the electoral vote which is weighted slightly in favor of the less populous States. One of my present proposals would accomplish this purpose by dividing a State's electoral vote proportionately among the candidates according to their popular vote in that particular State.

The second most urgently needed reform is to establish a system of national primaries. The present system of hit-and-miss primaries in a few States is probably worse than none at all. Rather than attempt to set out the details for national primaries in the proposed amendment itself, I would urge adoption of an enabling amendment, whereby Congress would be empowered to enact legislation establishing and regulating national primaries. Thus, there would be flexibility for trial-and-error improvements in the system.

We also have the serious problem of disenfranchisement of a large number of Americans because of the mobility of our way of life. In the last presidential election, it has been estimated that more than 1 million Americans were not permitted to vote because they could not meet the residence requirement of the State into which they moved and they were not permitted to vote by absentee ballot in the State from which they moved. One of my proposed constitutional amendments would remove this inequitable situation from our system.

Another proposed change would reduce the voting age in Federal elections to 18 years. It is undoubtedly trite to say, "If a man is old enough to fight for his country, he is old enough to vote." But, trite or not, it is true.

During the last session, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] joined me in sponsoring an amendment to solve the problem of presidential disability. I hope he will continue his support of the resolution this year. This is one problem that should not be permitted to go unsolved any longer. The details of the plan have been refined and refined many times and should be acceptable to the vast majority of both Houses.

I am also reintroducing the resolution to repeal the 22d amendment. The people of this country should be able to put aside the two-term tradition in case of an emergency. Once the circumstance arises, it is too late, because repeal takes time and that would be the one missing but essential ingredient. I urge prompt repeal of the 22d amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolutions will lie at the desk until the close of business on Monday, January 9, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee; and be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were severally received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States concerning residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"The residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President shall be residence within one of the several States for a period not to exceed one year. A qualified voter changing residence from one State to another shall be entitled to vote for President and Vice President by absentee ballot in the State from which he moves for a period of two years after the change of residence, provided he is not qualified to vote in another State within that period."

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The twenty-second article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"The Congress shall have power to provide for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections to be held in each State, the District of Columbia, and the territories, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution this provision."

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each

House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computation, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 per centum of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person has at least 40 per centum of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification."

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of sixty days thereafter the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 2. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 3. If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that such inability exists, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon, notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall assume the discharge of such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) the Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended, (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended, or (3) the President's term ends.

"SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this article upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

S.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"The right of citizens of the United States, who have reached the age of eighteen years, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Address entitled "This Is My Country," delivered by Senator MUSKIE at a recent meeting of the Florida Civil Liberties Union, in Miami, Fla., emphasizing that differences among peoples of this Nation can be a source of strength rather than a source of weakness.

By Mr. WILEY:

Special economic report by him.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday marked the opening of the 184th

session of the New York State Legislature.

Governor Rockefeller personally delivered his annual message to the legislature, outlining his legislative program for the State. This was an outstanding message, covering a wide range of important issues and problems. It reflects again the great quality of leadership and the great concern for the welfare of the people for which Nelson A. Rockefeller is already renowned.

This morning's New York Times and New York Herald Tribune both commend the Governor's forward-looking approach to the problems facing the Empire State, and pay high tribute to the contents of the Governor's inspiring remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials appearing in the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 5, 1961]

ROCKEFELLER PROGRAM: DIRECTION FORWARD

Governor Rockefeller, in his first 2 years at Albany, got the State's fiscal house in order by raising taxes and returning to pay-as-you-go financing.

Now that Mr. Rockefeller enters the second half of his first term, where is he heading?

In yesterday's message to the legislature the Governor covered, as is customary, a lot of ground. He did considerable generalizing, leaving many specifics for later in the session. But the program is nevertheless a positive one, liberal in outlook, which clearly means to keep the State of New York moving forward.

More spending is in prospect. The Governor wants educational opportunity expanded; the people have already heard how college facilities need to be tripled by 1985. A tremendous increase in highway construction and other public works is projected. There will be renewed encouragement of industrial expansion and job opportunity. Medical aid to the needy over age 65, largely through available Federal funds, is recommended.

Of most immediate interest, of course, is the reaffirmation of a flat 10-percent refund on personal income tax for 1960 earnings. The Democratic minority dislikes the across-the-board formula, but we believe Mr. Rockefeller is right in insisting on the same percentage of relief for every taxpayer. He also urges equal tax treatment for nonresidents on itemized deductions, an old grievance on which there should be no further boggling for any reason.

The ailing commuter railroads are recommended for more and faster assistance, but the service must continue and improve. Here the Governor also mentions the full-crew laws, which the railroads call featherbedding, and tentatively calls for adjustment.

On rent control, Mr. Rockefeller favors another 2-year extension with modifications intended to eliminate inequities and abuses. Someday, perhaps, this State will get around to more fundamental consideration about how long a temporary emergency can be allowed to continue.

This year the Governor again says he wants an antidiscrimination law for sales and rentals of private housing in developments. He couldn't get it at the last session, but on civil rights Mr. Rockefeller is an extraordinarily determined man.

There is much more in the message—for instance court reorganization, a possible salary raise for some State employees, and a more realistic Condon-Wadlin law against public strikes. But there is no mention of fallout shelters or new methods of school taxation. The Governor seems content to let unpopular bygones rest.

In short, there is so far a minimum of the controversial but plenty of constructive action in prospect. It should be a busy and productive winter in Albany.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1961]

THE ROCKEFELLER MESSAGE

Having dramatically restored New York State's fiscal integrity in his first 2 years in office, Governor Rockefeller in his third annual message is able to turn away from the issue of sufficient taxation and address himself more completely to helping people meet their problems through creative leadership of government. He puts it this way: Government must have a heart as well as a brain.

Education of youth, concern for the welfare of the family, attention to the needs of senior citizens—these are basic among the challenges facing State government. A solvent State has no meaning if tax revenues are not wisely expended to serve these fundamental aspirations. The Governor's recurrent theme is initiative for close partnership between State and local governments, with establishment of a new executive office of urban development a feature of this collaboration.

The dimensions of the Rockefeller program on education and higher education remain to be defined later, but the direction is unmistakable for vastly larger State expenditure. The Governor's interest in health, housing, fair pay for State employees, migrant labor, a wide range of youth problems, the enlargement of employment opportunities and improvement of business climate, control of water pollution, court reorganization, voting law revision, the social problems left in the wake of greater automation, the wise control of billboard advertising on highways, suggests the generous scope of subject matter proposed to the legislature.

The Governor is determined to press forward to a solution of railroad problems. He girds for the fight on featherbedding laws, and makes it rail labor's duty to join in rescue of the railroads. He states well the case for revision of the Condon-Wadlin law, noting that even the "threat" of a strike by governmental employees is "wrong in principle."

Despite proposing the largest capital construction program ever undertaken, Mr. Rockefeller foresees a budgetary situation permitting the 10 percent income tax refund promised earlier. The Governor's budget message in early February will offer the opportunity for further comment on many phases of yesterday's message where evaluation depends on the amount of money put behind them.

Mr. Rockefeller returns aggressively to the battle against discrimination in sale and rental of private housing. Here as on other controversial matters he speaks with courage and determination as he asks the legislature to join him in getting on "with our important work." This is a message long with problems, warm with its understanding of human needs, and intelligent in its offered solutions.

THE CASE AGAINST REFORMING OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on November 21, 1960, I had the honor of addressing the New England Society in New York City. The speech dealt with some questions which are being widely discussed at the moment, the proper role of political platforms, party caucuses, party discipline, legislative compromises, and the doctrinaire approach to political problems.

These remarks prompted editorial comment from a number of newspapers which throws added light on the subjects discussed.

In the hope that the speech and the editorial comment will prove useful to others, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST REFORMING OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD, at the annual festival dinner of the New England Society in the city of New York, Monday, Nov. 21, 1960)

I open my remarks tonight with what may be my first and last specific reference to New England, a quotation from a famous native son of Boston, Benjamin Franklin. As he left the final session of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Franklin was asked by an onlooker, "What have you given us?" He replied, "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it."

The keeping of this Republic has seemed to me one of the great romances and adventures of all history. It has, like a chariot in headlong flight, careened through tempestuous decades, swerving past the pitfalls of tyranny by the few and tyranny by the many, surmounting the divergent obstacles of centralization and of disunion. In every generation it has been in danger of overturning, as it always will be, as it is today.

The survival of a republic depends upon its being understood and appreciated. I fear it is less understood and less appreciated today than it has been for a century and I take up the subject tonight, against the background of our recent election, in the hope that I will lessen and not add to the confusion.

A republic, as we all know, is a form of government in which sovereign power is exercised by elected representatives; not by tyrants, not by the people, but by elected representatives. A republic is better than a tyranny or an oligarchy for obvious reasons. It is better than pure democracy because pure democracy on any wide scale always leads to dictatorship, for the simple reason that a great mass of people cannot be sufficiently informed and has no effective means of registering its will. On come the crowd manipulators, the Julius Caesars and the Robespierres, to assume dictatorial powers on the pretense that they speak in the name of the people. And those powers will eventually be formalized and placed in the hands of an emperor, an Augustus or a Napoleon. There is thus a terrible serpent lurking in the flowery verbiage which adorns democracy.

There are three essentials to republican government: representatives with limited powers freely chosen by the people; institutions which give the people a true and honest voice in their selection; and safeguards which protect legislatures against usurpation and insulate individual representatives from intimidation.

Conservatives have traditionally erred when they have resisted attempts to make the system truly representative. Liberals have erred when they have, in the name of the people, sought to impair the independence of elected representatives.

The conservatives were wrong when they resisted such measures as the extension of

the voting franchise, the direct election of Senators, and the State primary system, measures intended to make our system truly representative by abolishing the frauds and manipulations which resulted in minority rule.

The liberals were wrong when they promoted such schemes as the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, which substituted plebiscites for the action of legislatures and which sought to intimidate elected officials with the threat of dismissal for opposing the popular sentiment at any given moment.

And I think the liberal innovators are wrong today when they try to whittle away at the deliberative process, when they attack the committee system of the Congress, when they condemn its rules as antiquated, when they talk speciously of mandates, when they propose binding party platforms, and binding party caucuses that are to take primacy over the independent judgment of the elected official.

After every election the air is filled for a time with talk of a mandate from the people. The winning party, its supporters in the press, on the campus and elsewhere, will claim that the election was a public mandate for the carrying out of some specific, far-reaching program of action. The losing party will either deny this or remain silent dependent upon whether the election was close or decisive. But there seems to be a tacit acceptance by both sides that mandates are part of our system. This is nonsense, and it is nonsense that holds great danger for a republican form of government.

A mandate, according to Mr. Webster, is an authoritative command. A mandate implies that the discretion of elected representatives has been superseded by the will of the people, supposedly registered in the election, which must be automatically carried out. The trouble with the mandate theory, aside from the constitutional objections, is that it presupposes a number of conditions that do not exist. It presupposes that the candidates of a party are uniformly committed to a set of proposals outlined in a party platform, that the party platforms offer a distinct choice to the people, that the people carefully study the opposed platforms and that on election day they vote for the platform rather than for the man.

Perhaps the fallacy of this approach can best be demonstrated by a realistic look at what really happens in an election. Let us take the case of a relative newcomer to politics who is running for the U.S. Senate for the first time.

He starts off with a party affiliation which will predispose a minority of the voters in his favor and a like minority against him. This affiliation gives the people a vague idea of his general approach to problems but rarely enough of an idea to obligate or commit him to specific actions. His main task is to make himself known to the people and he is told that it is more important to distribute his picture than his platform. When he is quoted in the press, his words are as apt to be out of context as in context. It is his attacks rather than his proposals that are printed.

Though he may start campaigning with a set of serious speeches on the issues, he will soon find that they will not hold the interest of his audiences. His jokes will get more response than his philosophy. His homely illustrations will make more points than his most profound observations. Therefore, he quickly changes his approach and evolves a standard speech which covers just about everything in the most general terms. He will talk more about Franklin D. Roosevelt or Abraham Lincoln than about his blueprint for the future. Much of the time he will be invading factories and shopping centers to shake hands and introduce himself. If he is robust enough to endure more of this than his opponent, he has a distinct advantage that has nothing to do with his political views.

A politician instinctively knows that it is the public estimate of his personal qualities rather than his political dogma that will win or lose the election. That is why candidate Jones will design his 10-second television "spots" and his billboards something like this:

"Vote for Jones—Honest, courageous, independent."

He will not say:

"Vote for Jones—Galbraith's economics, Schlesinger's politics, bound by the Los Angeles platform."

And so, on the day after election when the candidate honestly tries to figure out how he happened to win, if he is frank with himself he finds it all an enigma.

Was it his politics or his profile that won the election? Was it his rhetoric or his religion, his ethics or his economics? Was it because the people liked him or because they disliked his opponent? Was it what he was known for or merely that he was known? Was there a mandate for what his party proposed to do or a protest against what the other party had already done? Was he elected on his own or was he pulled in by the popularity of another candidate for another office?

He will never really know the answers. All he can know for certain is that he has been lawfully chosen by the people to act as their representative for 6 years and at the end of those 6 years, he will have to submit himself to them once more.

How foolish then, how pompous, for him to alight in Washington 2 months later, claiming that he has a mandate to carry out this or that program.

Let us follow our candidate through a couple of terms. As he casts hundreds of votes, his philosophy becomes clearer to those few who care to study it. I am told there are a large number of my constituents in the audience tonight but I'll bet there is not a man here who knows how I have voted on 10 issues out of the hundreds I have voted on.

As the incumbent Senator becomes identified with this or that cause, he is apt to be judged by the public in terms of the manner in which he makes his fight rather than the fight itself, and in terms of personal qualities rather than political issues. For example, Senator Taft was loved and trusted, not so much for his program as for the sturdy integrity and candor with which he fought for it. The man who is always in the midst of heated controversy may leave an impression of either courage or of rashness but he is unlikely to leave a clear understanding of his total philosophy. If he fights for the underprivileged, his supporters will credit him for his compassion rather than his sociology. If he fights for a stable currency, he will be hailed for his soundness and his responsibility but his views about the Federal Reserve System will ever remain a mystery to the general public. And opposite traits of character will be assigned to the hapless politician by those to whom he does not appeal.

It is this tendency of the public to judge a candidate in terms of his character that confounds the neat classifications of the political theorists. Thus in 1952 the people of Massachusetts gave huge majorities to Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy. Thus in 1956 the people of Oregon gave record landslides both to President Eisenhower and to his most conspicuous critic, Senator WAYNE MORSE. And we could find dozens of similar examples in the recent election, such as the victory for Kennedy and Saltonstall in Massachusetts, or the victory for Nixon and Maurine Neuberger in Oregon.

"What a way to run a country," the critic will say. And it does seem somewhat illogical until you recall that the representative principle intends the people to vote, not for ideologies or factions, but for flesh-and-blood men. The true representative principle consists of this: you pick a man to make your legislative decisions on the basis of his character and his specialized knowledge, just as you pick a lawyer or a doctor to make your legal or medical decisions on the same basis. You aim at a general result. You cannot ascertain the rightness or wrongness of everything which your representative or your lawyer or your doctor does, but you can judge the result. If the result is good, you will keep him on. If it is bad, you will drop him. And if he is a good man, he will not let you boss him around while he is on the job.

Abraham Lincoln gave voice to this sentiment once when he was being attacked from all sides and was being urged to defend himself and his policies. He said, "I will do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right will make no difference."

What is the function of the elected representative? To be sure, the fact that he seeks office under the auspices of a political party obligates him to pursue a certain general attitude, an attitude which he voluntarily embraced when he joined that party in the first place. But if pitching is 75 percent of a baseball game, as Connie Mack once said, party conformity is only 25 percent of the political game.

Political affiliation gives him a certain insight, a certain approach to the hundreds of issues of the time but it does not give him the concrete practical answers. Those he must seek out for himself, based on individual examination. And he should be let alone by his party and by the public in arriving at his decision. Party ideology and private self-interest hold no magic answers to the agricultural problem, to the question of nuclear arms, to the problems of sound currency or full employment or foreign policy or any of the other complicated issues before us. Therefore, in conscience, in theory and in practical fact, the elected representative can assume his duties free from any commitments except those which he has freely made himself. And I say that he should violate even those commitments, should his reason lead him to do so in the national interest.

What is the function then of the people with respect to their representatives? Aren't the people the boss after all? I would put it this way. The people have the right to hire and fire but they do not have the right to give on-the-job direction. They can and should give advice. They should let their man know what they think and why, but they should not try to intimidate him and he should not submit to intimidation.

This is the essence of the representative system. I think the American people prefer it this way. It is only the extremists, the vested interests, the doctrinaires, the organizers of blocs who would undermine representative government and make of their elected representatives so many rubber stamps.

The humble party platform of old so long neglected and lampooned, has like Cinderella, suddenly come upon better days. For long decades, party platforms were ambiguous and friendly documents which tried to please everyone and which were, like the customs described in Hamlet, "more honored in the breach than in the observance." Platforms excited little interest in the land and passed from the scene quietly and unmourned after each convention, forgotten

except by students of historical curiosities and occult phenomena. But this happy condition is passing.

One of the most popular criticisms of our system today is the oft-heard complaint that party platforms don't mean anything. If this were merely the assertion of a fact, I would not be disturbed. But the implication usually present is that party platforms ought to mean something, that they ought to be translated into law. Should this attitude become widely held it would constitute a grave threat to representative system. And it is becoming widely held.

One of our favorite political shell games is the brandishing of a party platform under the nose of an opponent in debate while pointing out, to that fellow's embarrassment, that his party platform pledged him to do something he did not do. Unfortunately, the victim of this game will usually reply that he really is carrying out the platform in his own way or that he just needs more time or different circumstances. What ought to be said is that the resolutions adopted by a political convention can never be more than advisory and that any attempt to make them more than advisory is an attempt to usurp the legitimate function of elected representatives.

The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and the Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee.

This is not meant to cast any reflection on the platforms of either party or on the fine and able men who drafted them. It is an attack upon the contention that party platforms can have any sort of binding nature upon elected representatives.

The party platform is written by persons who are never chosen for that task by the people. Though a minority of convention delegates are chosen by some form of primary election, most are not, and none are elected for the specific task of deliberating upon a platform.

I have served on platform committees in two conventions and I know something of how they operate. For 4 or 5 days committee members sit wearily listening, while a hundred witnesses hurry through their written texts in unbroken monologues. Occasionally the spectacle will be enlivened by the cheers or boos that may greet a controversial witness but this does nothing to elevate the process. At any given time a large number of platform committee members will be absent and even those who brave it through have no time or opportunity for assimilating the conflicting testimony. There is no real confrontation of opposed views.

While the show is going on out front, a small group of experts in the back room, consisting mainly of staff members who are not even delegates, writes the party platform. In the end, it is the result of the back room work that is presented to a sleepy platform committee in the wee hours of the morning, a committee that has neither the time nor the means to dispute more than one or two of the hundreds of platform planks. Thus the platform committee adopts the platform without anything that could be seriously called deliberation. And a few hours later the whole convention ratifies it in a perfunctory manner except for the traditional brief squabble over civil rights. Under the latest innovation, the platform is not even read to the delegates before they pass upon it. Instead, they are shown a dramatized version filmed weeks or months previously which covers some of the highlights. That is how a party platform comes into being.

I agree with a good deal that is in the Democratic platform (and the Republican platform, for that matter). I will support many of its principles. But I would never entertain the suggestion that I or any other Senator was obligated to support any section of it merely because it was adopted by our party convention. The concept that a convention platform is binding upon elected Representatives in the Congress is absolutely inimical to our system of Government. Theirs, and theirs alone, is the final responsibility for legislating.

I believe that party platforms, except for a general statement of goals and attitudes, ought to be done away with. They are anomalies that have no legitimate status under our Constitution. So long as they are not taken seriously, they are a source of cynicism about the integrity of our political process. And so soon as they are taken seriously, they will start to undermine our republican form of government.

A presidential candidate ought to announce his own platform, describing his general approach, as of the moment, to basic issues. I think each candidate for Congress or the Senate ought to do the same. But any attempt of a party convention to dictate to a President or a Congress concerning constitutional responsibilities cannot be countenanced.

Ever and anon, there arises the mournful lament that our political institutions are antiquated. It seems we are out of date. We are still in the 18th century. We must revamp our institutions to make them reflect more accurately and more swiftly the public will. Whenever I hear this sort of introduction, I am pretty sure that some dreadful outrage upon our representative system is about to be proposed. And I am seldom disappointed.

"We must speed up the legislative process," so the experts say. "We must give more representation to the urban centers and less to the small States and rural areas. We must overhaul the committee system of Congress and do away with obstructionism. We must develop party caucuses in Congress that will be binding on all party members. And above all, we must have more party responsibility."

There is one standard which I apply to all of these proposals. Do they enhance or detract from the independent functioning of the individual Representative? Some of them, such as proposals to reform the House Rules Committee practices, do enhance the independence of the average legislator because they return to him powers that are now being exercised in his name by the Rules Committee. And I support proposals to limit filibusters in the Senate because, through this device, a minority of my fellow Senators restrict my independent functioning by depriving me and the majority of my colleagues from the opportunity to vote our convictions. So, I would welcome some changes. But most of these proposals are dangerous in the extreme to republican government.

Speeding up the legislative process means depriving the individual legislator of an opportunity to influence the final decision. Any radical change in the system of representation in favor of big city areas would pose a serious danger to minority rights which need some advantage if they are to be protected and would further subject the Congress to the intimidation of the organized groups, lobbies and blocs that are characteristic of urban society.

The abolition of the seniority system would deprive the legislator of that security of tenure on a committee which enables him to pursue his independent judgment, free from the fear that colleagues who disagree could deprive him of his position.

The growth of the party caucus system ought to be resisted. If the day comes when party caucuses are binding upon legislators, independent judgment will go out the window and the majority of the Congress will be dictated to by that minority which happens to control one of the two party caucuses.

The term "party responsibility" is one of the most sonorous and misleading euphemisms of political parlance. What it really means is a party control. And party control is incompatible with independent individual judgment. I believe in that kind of party responsibility and party unity which finds men with voluntarily shared common principles banded together to carry them out. This is the only kind of party unity compatible with our constitutional system.

Many of our political theorists look longingly on the British system of parliamentary government in which party discipline is so effective, in which dissidents are so thoroughly whipped into line, that a party which has a majority of only three or four seats can rule unchallenged for several years and win every vote, however controversial, by an identical margin. The British Member of Parliament is merely a tool of his party leaders and his function in the Parliament could be performed just as well by a lamppost which on each occasion lighted up to record the decision of the party leadership. What a fall there is here from the immortal principles of representative government and independent judgment set forth in the British Parliament by Edmund Burke 200 years ago. And this is the inevitable end result of the piecemeal surrender of independence that is implied in most proposals to modernize our representative system.

We are now witnessing the beginnings of the growth of party machinery which, if carried forward, raises a new danger to independence.

I have already discussed the growing emphasis being placed upon party platforms, which are completely foreign to the legislative process. In recent years there has evolved the so-called Democratic advisory council in which a body predominantly composed of private citizens, chosen by other private citizens, presumes to promulgate the policy of the Democratic Party.

The advisory council is broken into a number of committees based on subject matter and these committees rely heavily on the judgments of experts—scientists, economists, professors who, competent though they may be, are even further removed than the committee officials from any valid representative status. If these committees are considered merely as research bodies gathering data to lay before elected representatives, there is no objection to them. On the contrary, their help should be welcomed.

But since there is a presumption that the positions of the Democratic advisory council represent the positions that Democrats ought to hold, I regard this council as an ominous departure from past custom.

A third and more effective device of party discipline is the fundraising activities of the national committee and the congressional campaign committees of both parties. Up to now these activities have posed no real threat to the independence of legislators or of Presidents, because of the small amounts they were able to disperse and because of the character of the men in charge. But each year the fundraising activities of the national committee and the congressional campaign committees are prosecuted more effectively and successfully. I can, therefore, envision a time when these committees will be able to say to the candidates of their party, "We have $100,000 for you that will help you get elected if you are the right kind of man who will cooperate with the party leadership." This is one of the control devices of the British parties and it is extremely effective.

New Senators and Congressmen could thus be pledged to a certain program of action before they ever assumed office, and incumbents would face the unsettling prospect that any deviation from party orthodoxy

could result in the denial of campaign funds when they ran for reelection. This of course is only one aspect of the whole problem which fundraising poses for free government.

All fund raising, to a certain extent, save for the small contributions of scattered thousands, threatens the independence of the elected representative. Large contributions by labor organizations or by manufacturers' groups, under whatever guise, pose a danger. The only real answer to this problem is the answer proposed by Theodore Roosevelt more than 50 years ago that the Federal Government pay the cost of campaigns for all Federal elective offices. Even if we were to suppose that the total cost of campaigning for Federal office would amount to $50 million or $100 million every 2 years, this would be an insignificant portion of our total budget—less than one-tenth of 1 percent, and it would remove one of the gravest threats to the independence of elected representatives.

Another though less obvious menace to representative government is the frequently voiced distrust of political compromises. This attitude is ominous because it reveals a lack of understanding of the essential nature of the democratic process and it is dangerous because it tends to promote a doctrinaire rigidity which would divide our people into those hostile political camps which divide other countries.

I recall during the recent campaign, an "Open End" discussion on television, moderated by David Susskind and featuring a panel which included Steve Allen, Shelley Winters, Pamela Mason and other students of the political process. It was a rather melancholy performance. Susskind started the ball rolling by saying that he tried to provide his children with the proper atmosphere for their moral growth but that his attempts were being undermined by such spectacles as the convention rapprochement between Kennedy and Johnson or that between Nixon and Rockefeller. How can we expect our children to grow up with integrity and conviction, Susskind declaimed to the sympathetic panel, when they witness such cynical underhanded compromises by national leaders?

This is at least a refreshing twist. I have heard Senators accuse the movie industry of debauching the morals of children. But this is the first time I have ever heard movie stars accuse Senators of the same thing.

Let us get away from the personalities on the program, who are able and sincere people and most of whom are fellow Democrats, and take up this assumption that political compromises are cynical and underhanded. Take the point in question. LYNDON JOHNSON has been the Democratic leader of the Senate by unanimous choice for many years. He had delegate strength at Los Angeles which represented approximately 40 percent of the Democratic Party. For Senator Kennedy to ask him to accept the vice-presidential nomination was not only a natural thing and an act of political sagacity, it was also an act of statesmanship which recognized that doctrinaire rigidity cannot succeed in American politics and that it ought not to succeed. The same can be said of Vice President NIXON's handling of the Rockefeller incident. Each of these actions recognized the fact that our political parties, like the nation they represent, are made up of diverse interests and that the happiness and welfare of our people can best be advanced through a government which, if not completely satisfactory to almost anyone, is tolerable for almost everyone.

Underlying this downgrading of compromise is the tacit assumption that the elected representative ought to be bound by a doctrinaire ideology rather than free to accept or reject or deviate from that ideology with each new decision. Those who decry political compromise, whether at a national convention or during a legislative battle, unwittingly give voice to that ugly sentiment upon which all totalitarian systems are built; and that is that there is in politics a rigid, undeviating orthodoxy of truth and all philosophies and individuals that differ ought to be steamrollered, anathematized and excluded.

After each election we are apt to hear the doleful cry that "political parties do not mean anything any more," that they do not offer the voter a clear choice between opposed doctrines. The extreme liberals in the Democratic Party and their conservative counterparts in the Republican Party are fond of issuing manifestos calling for a repudiation of the moderate elements of each party and thus presenting the voters with a clear choice between diametrically opposed sets of candidates.

This sort of complaint, which is fairly common, is based on the assumption that there ought to be a fundamental conflict between the two parties, a down-the-line division. It implies that every Democrat ought to stand for one set of distinct policies and every Republican for an opposed set. I hope that most of those who make this criticism of our party system do not grasp the real implications of what they are saying.

We live in a country which has an essentially sound system of government, a basically just social system, a growing and prosperous economy, a happy relationship between church and state, a satisfactory arrangement between workers and employers, and the absence of bitter conflict between the so-called classes.

Why then should there be a doctrinaire division, a fundamental conflict between the two parties? Why should people resent the fact that our parties offer similar solutions to most problems? Why should there be a call for disagreement merely for the sake of disagreement?

It is the doctrinaire ideologues at the extreme of each party who most vociferously deplore the similarity of the parties and the lack of venom and hostility which characterizes the conduct of most elected officials. I say that the similarity of our parties is evidence of the success of our system and not an indication of weakness. And I would hope that people would think twice before they commit themselves to a theory of irreconcilable party combat which is the hallmark of a system that is failing.

It was my good fortune during the recent campaign to travel through Connecticut for the better part of 2 days in the same car with Senator Kennedy. I have vivid recollections of those days, recollections of tens of thousands of people densely packed along narrow streets while an unprotected man, standing in an open car, rode among them, a man whose future decisions could be crucial matters for all who watched him. As I saw the smiling, friendly faces of thousands of Americans, I reflected upon the bitter, hate-filled, rioting crowds that we are so used to seeing in newsreels from abroad, where politics is often regarded as mortal combat. The only danger posed to the safety of Senator Kennedy was the danger that he might be bruised by a demonstration of affection. Scattered throughout the crowd one would see affable Republicans holding pro-NIXON or anti-Kennedy banners and of course these dissenters were in no way molested, or taunted by the majority. If there was a rare outbreak of hooliganism during the campaign, if one or another of the candidates got the egg or tomato treatment, it was an exception deplored by virtually everyone. When I thought of the courteous, friendly receptions being repeated in every State in the land as Senator Kennedy and Vice President NIXON campaigned, I could not help but think what a tribute this was to the success of our representative system of government. There are few places in the world where opposed candidates for Chief of State can go among the people unprotected at the height of a critical campaign without fear of riot or assassination. This essential stability, this public satisfaction with our institutions was brought home even more forcibly by the aftermath of the election.

Here was a contest of earth-shattering importance decided by one-tenth of 1 per cent of the popular vote, by a majority of less than 200,000 out of almost 70 million. In any other great nation in the world, such an election would result in some degree of chaos. In some nations it would result in civil war as the losing side refused to accept the judgment. In most of the parliamentary nations the victor would find it impossible to form a government. In still other nations the losing party would dedicate itself to frustrating and hobbling the victor until his government was brought down, with no regard for the welfare of the country.

But the American people immediately accepted the decision as though it had been a decision based upon a majority of 10 million. No one need fear a remorseless party combat in Congress aimed solely at discrediting the new President and frustrating his administration. As soon as Vice President NIXON could be sure that he had in fact been defeated by the narrowest of margins, he issued a statement that he had run the contest under the rules, that he accepted the rules, that he accepted the decision of the people and that he wished every success for his victorious opponent. This is the happy consequence of a system which places its trust in free men with limited powers, rather than in party dogmas which brook no compromise and resist all restrictions.

On the last day of the recent Congress, in almost the last hour, the Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN, rose to make his farewell remarks to a packed Senate at about 4 o'clock in the morning. As he concluded, he turned to his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle and said: "in due course I shall go back to the hustings, and in the nature of things I shall have to recite all of the sins of those on the other side of the aisle. I shall recite the sins of omission and the sins of commission. * * * But I wish to say to the majority leader and all Senators that whatever our utterances may be, they shall not be tainted with malice. * * * Other people would think that we were so beset with selfishness and venality and political aggression that we would be ready to tear each other to shreds. But we live together. We disagree together. And somehow or other the Republic goes forward.

"* * * So, au revoir. We shall see you on the home diamond somewhere; and when it is all over, on the morning of November 9, all the healing waters will somehow close over our dissidence, and we shall go forward as a solid phalanx once more."

This is the American system which we have evolved and in which each of us can take pride. Why then should we change it, or modernize it or dogmatize it? Let us rather rejoice in it and cherish it.

If we could speak across the centuries to Benjamin Franklin tonight, we could fairly say that we have kept our Republic. It is my hope that there will never be a time when the people of this country cannot say as much.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 22, 1960]

IN THE NATION—SOME CANDID TRUTHS ABOUT NATIONAL PARTY PLATFORMS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—Senator DODD of Connecticut interrupted the current self-seeking chatter that national party platforms are a set of specific commands on all

those elected to office in Washington, by telling some truths about these documents. And he made the interesting suggestion that henceforth national platforms shall be accepted by the candidates and understood by the party and people as merely advisory.

In the course of his speech to the New England Society in New York tonight the Senator fortified this suggestion with a blunt account of the circumstances in which platforms are composed and approved that demonstrates the sham of the contention that they are binding, word for word. He accurately described these products as "written by persons never elected specifically to perform the task." For "Four or five days," he said, "committee members sit wearily listening. With a large number often absent * * * [while] a small group of experts in the backroom, consisting mainly of staff members, who are not even delegates, writes the party platform. * * * And under the latest innovation, the platform is not even read to the delegates before they pass on it.

"A presidential candidate * * * and each candidate for Congress ought to announce his own platform, describing his general approach, as of the moment, to basic issues. Any attempt of a party convention to dictate to a President or a Congress concerning constitutional responsibilities cannot be countenanced."

But, though the Senator drew an accurate picture of national platform procedures, he omitted one of major importance at Los Angeles and Chicago in 1960. In each case individuals or special-interest blocs whose support the leading presidential candidate believed to be essential to his nomination and/or election insisted on inserting their programs into the platforms as party pledges. At Los Angeles this insistence by the spokesmen for union labor, for Federal enforcement of the most extreme equal rights proposals and for greatly enlarged Federal spending programs was almost completely successful. And Vice President NIXON's visit to Governor Rockefeller prior to the Chicago convention was for the purpose, which it accomplished by agreed drafts of major platform planks, of assuring the Governor's active support of the Republican ticket.

THE LARGE FACTOR OF RISK

Once presidential and congressional candidates have been chosen, they would certainly be free, as Senator DODD suggested, to "announce their own platforms." But in the situations in which Senator Kennedy and Vice President NIXON found themselves, the risk they would have assumed in following his suggestion is apparent. The platforms precede the nominations, and Senator Kennedy at that stage of his convention was not absolutely certain of being chosen on an early ballot, after which his strength was sure to diminish. And if Vice President NIXON had not come to platform terms with Governor Rockefeller, he would have been confronted with the prospect of a divisive fight in the convention that would have carried into the campaign.

Except, however, for this lapse from political realism, Senator DODD put these manifestos in their proper proportion. This was a service to the President-elect, the Vice President-elect and many Democratic Members of Congress who are being admonished by various pressure groups that they are under a popular "mandate" to follow without deviation both the generalities and the specifics in the platform. The Connecticut Senator demolished this as follows:

"The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole-hog the convention platform of the victorious party, and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee.

"But perhaps the worst aspect of the political sham is that Presidential candidates nearly always feel it necessary to commit themselves to these effusions. They usually try to protect their mental reservations and their group vote investments at the same time by making their commitments in general terms. But the end result is that public estimate of political morality drops a few more degrees."

[From the Hartford Times, Nov. 23, 1960]

SENATOR DODD, THE LONER

In his speech to the New England Society, Senator THOMAS J. DODD seems to be paving his way for a bolt from the Democratic Party platform. He falls short of complete disavowal, yet with enough hint of disaffection to stir new uncertainty concerning his intended political affiliation in the coming session of Congress.

When the Senator says that he "agrees with a good deal that is in the Democratic platform" and "will support many of its principles" the measure of his words leaves strong indication that he does not endorse the greater part of either platform or principles.

To a considerable extent the Senator's speech is an argument against the necessity for party responsibility, and it leaves up in the air as well the matter of political predictability when applied to candidates who seek election in party guise.

In trying to fight clear of binding platform pledges the Senator holds that "they have no legitimate status under our Constitution. So long as they are not taken seriously they are a source of cynicism about the integrity of our political system * * * so soon as they are taken seriously they will start to undermine our representative form of government."

It is the Senator's view that platforms adopted by conventions should never be considered more than advisory.

This churns a wide wake of considerations.

Inherent in the Senator's position is the belief that the electorate so well knows the personality and ability of each candidate that it may turn him loose, except for the check of the next election, to shape personal policy in large part as occasions arise. In the case of new candidates particularly, we doubt that voters would feel they want to convey that much freedom.

It is rather difficult to support a party system of responsibility in government, at the same time to support the flouting of party policy by its members who then may act capriciously, but always can solemnly advert to some matter of personal principle as the basis for their action.

We take issue with the Senator on much of his legislative philosophy.

Frankly, we do not trust the unlimited inclinations of Members of Congress any more than he seems to trust the supremacy of the popular voice in democratic government. The Senator would go far toward the setting up of a legislative elite that would arrogate to itself a right to know, better than the people, what is best for the Nation. Surely that is as undesirable as a legislative branch which—as the Senator appears to fear—might have its integrity compromised by the lash of partisan political bosses.

One need not plead for slavish organizational regularity, but yet be aware of a political requirement for organized unity of purpose and some sense of unity in program.

Senator DODD asks for the abolition of party platforms except for a general statement of goals and attitudes.

The Senator himself has done well that way, more or less at war with the Connecticut Democratic organization. Yet, it must be pointed out that there are also thousands of voters here who will not support him on his personalized, generalized basis.

They do not go for freewheeling candidates but, rather, insist on being represented, joining in a platform as instruction to those who would carry out the public will.

Apparently somewhat at odds with the Senator, we believe that this is representative democracy. The people delegate their vote; they do not abdicate their power.

One may be certain that the people have sense enough to recognize the force of changing practical situations and the possibility of altered occasions. They accept the need for an element of adaptability in political platforms without yielding to cynicism. The people also are able to recognize when a real doublecross occurs and when their political faith is made light of. The Senator worries too much about the onset of cynicism.

When Senator DODD fears that, carried to an extreme, the dictates of platform or policy might unduly hobble the individual legislator, we are with him.

But led to the other extreme of what might be called high-principled irresponsibility, we could spawn legislators standing not much of anywhere for not much of anything.

[From the Hartford Times, Dec. 9, 1960]

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE—DODD'S VIEWS ON PARTY PLATFORMS

To the EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

I would like to reply to a recent Times editorial which I received while in Europe, expressing basic disagreement with my views on the role of an elected representative.

My position is this: A U.S. Senator should not be the controlled tool of a partisan political platform. He is the representative of all the people of his State, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. He must work for their welfare and for the welfare of the Nation. He can best do this by studying each issue carefully and honestly, by seeking the advice of his constituents and of the experts, by considering his party platform and the position of his party leaders, by following committee hearings and Senate debate, and then by making an independent decision on the basis of his own judgment and conscience.

The Times disputes this view. You say that party platforms are binding, that a Senator should not exercise independent judgment on each issue, that he should be controlled by the actions of political conventions. You say that the popular will is represented by the platform and that its "instructions" must be carried out if the public will is to be served.

But is the victorious party platform a real expression of the public call? Do you contend that when the people of Connecticut voted for Senator Kennedy they also expressed a clear preference for each of the 400 points in the Democratic platform? Must I vote, for instance, for higher subsidies for wheat and corn when I know this is bad for Connecticut farmers and consumers, and when I feel it is bad for the Nation? I think not.

Party platforms are written once every 4 years by party functionaries who are not elected by the people for that task. These platforms are ratified by a voice vote of convention delegates who do not have time even to read them, let alone understand and deliberate upon them.

Not one voter in a hundred reads the platform of either party. On election day the people vote not for platforms but for men, on the basis of what they seem to be, what they have done and what they say they will do.

Therefore, party platforms cannot represent the precise instructions of the people. You cannot explain the fact that in 1956 the people elected a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, or that many States continue to elect and reelect one Senator from each party, unless you concede that people vote on the basis of many factors, and that party platforms rank low on the scale.

You say that I distrust the supremacy of the popular voice. I reply that I fully trust the popular voice, but that the popular voice is better interpreted by elected living representatives than by dead platforms.

You prefer what you call "party responsibility" to the independent judgment of unbossed representatives. I reply that the only true party responsibility is that which comes from men of commonly shared principles voluntarily cooperating to carry them out. If this cooperation is forced, you have party dictatorship, not party responsibility.

You say that I would "turn loose" the legislator from public control to govern on the basis of his "unlimited inclinations." I reply that the legislator is limited by the Constitution, by party primaries, and by general elections. If the people of his party or of his State disapprove of him they will replace him. Any control beyond this, such as dictation by political conventions, is unconstitutional and would undermine the very basis of our form of government.

You imply that my political affiliation is now uncertain. I reply that I am a Democrat today and will be tomorrow for the same reasons that have guided me for 30 years. I will support most of the programs in the Democratic platform, as I have supported them in the past, not because I have to but because I want to, not because of dictation but because of conviction.

You say "the people delegate their vote; they do not abdicate their power." I agree. It is not the source of power, but its exercise that is at issue. You recommend that the President and Congress abdicate their exercise of the people's power by surrendering their judgment on basic issues to party platforms and political conventions. I recommend adherence to our Constitution which invests the exercise of power in lawful elected representatives of the people.

You hedge, in the end, by saying that the dictates of platforms or party policy should not be "carried to an extreme" and that you are not for "slavish, organizational regularity." I reply that this undermines your previous contention that platforms are binding, which I thought was the basis of our disagreement. You cannot have it both ways. A platform is binding or it is not. If you admit that a platform is not binding and that a Senator may accept or reject the various parts of it, then we agree after all, and I am puzzled by your editorial criticism.

You say that I am a "loner" and that thousands of voters will not support me. I reply that this is for the people to decide. I continue to hope and believe that the people of Connecticut prefer elected representatives who try to rise above narrow partisanship and who make their decisions on the basis of independent judgment and personal conscience rather than blind obedience to party control.

Senator DODD has amplified his views in an interesting manner. As our editorial fully explained, we believe in the party system and that the people are entitled to statements of party programs, called platforms, and to predictability concerning the candidates who use party as an adjunct of their campaigns.

We do not think that legislative freewheeling is necessarily lofty. It can be an excuse for irresponsibility, or an excuse for personal caprice.

We hold that the process of party platform drafting should be improved; we even said so just before, instead of just after, the election.

As we recall the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles, Senator DODD did not disdain the importance of platforms then as much as he seems to now. He created quite a stir from the floor, insisting on the inclusion of a matter in the platform in which he had—we believe rightly—a personal and principled interest.—Editor.

[From the New Haven Register, Nov. 23, 1960]

PARTY PLATORM PURGE PROPOSAL

If political party platforms are to remain as they are—a phony array of something-for-everyone phrases—then, we say, Connecticut's Senator TOM DODD is right.

And, we say, away with them.

But, do party platforms need to be cynical, meaningless, something to lure the unwary voter and then tossed into a post-election discard?

Need they be abolished?

We think not.

We agree with the militant Senator DODD when he says they have no status under the Constitution.

We go along with him when he says that, for so long as those who draft them do not intend them to be taken seriously, platforms compromise the integrity of our political system.

But we do not agree that, of necessity, a party platform can undermine our representative form of government.

Give a political platform sincerity, meaning, and reality and it should be a constructive, not destructive, thing.

Senator DODD would substitute for the party platform a sort of personalized platform. He would have, for example, a presidential candidate platform, a senatorial candidate platform, a representative's platform, and so on, right down the line. But this, too, could emerge as a mish-mash—one beyond understanding and leaving the voter puzzled beyond repair.

In our opinion there was too much emphasis on charm, personality, and the individual in the past election.

There was, we feel, too vast an area of voter opinion that the parties, and that goes for both, did not really stand for anything that was definite—and worthy.

Without platforms—and genuine ones—we fear they never will have a measurable purpose of their own.

We agree that party platforms, as concocted through such prenomination maneuvering as the Nixon-Rockefeller get-together or the even more flagrant bargaining that the Democrats conducted with a variety of pressure groups, are catchalls for special interest manipulation. But we feel that the fault is with the platform-making procedure in such cases—not with the platform itself.

Senator DODD may be wholly realistic when he claims that no candidate can be expected to live up to platform pledges under today's conditions. But unless the parties are willing to accept some coherent and comprehensive statement of purpose the voter is reduced, still further, to picking men on the basis of their good looks, their effective delivery on TV, or by some other superficial gage.

There's still a place for the political platform in every party, and in every election. The problem is to get the voters, as well as the candidates, to study such platforms.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 24, 1960]

WHY NOT SCRAP THEM?

Resolutions for better conduct are often made in the cold, gray dawn of the morning after the night before. Something of the same sentiment may be detected in the spate of suggested electoral reforms that follows the end of a political campaign. Some of the suggestions have merit. It is too bad that, 4 years hence, most of them will have been forgotten.

Senator DODD of Connecticut has addressed himself very ably to one of the most exaggerated forms of political hokum—the convention platforms. He thinks they should be abolished, in favor of a general statement of party goals and attitudes. Television may help to achieve that desirable end. It is inconceivable that the American electorate will continue indefinitely to submit itself to watching and attempting to swallow the concentrate of hyperbole in party platforms.

Senator DODD's main point, however, is that "The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

There is not much likelihood that such betrayal of trust will occur, or that it will be attempted. The greater danger, in our opinion, lies in the effort by candidates to create the impression during a campaign that a platform commits them to its promises. This is a form of deception rationalized by political folklore as being justified because it is supposed to help win an election. It is a deception, nevertheless, which breeds cynicism and distrust. Senator DODD is to be commended for saying that he is not committed to any part of the Democratic platform merely because the convention adopted it. We hope he wins converts among his colleagues to his theory that a convention platform commits no elected official, for it would be wrong and bad for the country if elected officials relied on platform planks rather than their own sense of responsibility to determine their course of action.

[From the West Hartford News, Nov. 24, 1960]

SENATOR DODD ON PARTY PLATFORMS

There is a good deal of common sense behind what West Hartford's Senator THOMAS DODD has to say this week about the national party platforms. He thinks we could skip them, substituting a platform written by the candidates themselves—a sort of personal avowal of purpose.

When life, and politics, was simpler; when party identification was clearer; when communication was slower—then the platform had more relevance and meaning. But gradually, as Senator DODD says, the platform became an exercise in semantics by elements in the party whose talents ran to historical documents. Between the piety of the platforms and the performance of the party in power is a gap so great you could drive a third party through it.

The undercurrent of the Senator's remarks is the intraparty cleavage which so vastly separates men like Mr. DODD and Mr. BOWLES, men like Senator DOUGLAS and Senator JOHNSON. But while there may be a personal political basis for Mr. DODD's stern notice that he doesn't feel bound by the liberal Democratic platform, he is merely being frank about what the past says the future of the Congress will be. Nobody pays any attention to the platform. Never will that be more true than in the next session.

By the time a man has emerged sufficiently on the scene to be considered seriously for the nomination for the Presidency, he has long since built a platform upon revelations and deeds. The fact is, however, that if these were to be codified and published as his campaign aims, he never could be nominated. There is such a liberal-conservative split in both parties that the only way a man can get the nomination is to straddle. Some more than others, but straddle, they all do.

Upon nomination, however, it should be possible for a candidate to develop his particular catechism. It could contain the irreducible minimum of his legislative hopes and a maximum of the operating principles which will guide him.

The platform which commits the whole party to a course of action kids nobody. At heart politicians are mavericks. But the candidates' statements of principles would be an effective replacement for the outmoded platform technique.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 25, 1960]

PARTY PLATFORM PLEDGES—SENATOR DODD WOULD ABOLISH THEM

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON.—By vowing that he will, in his Senate voting, pay no attention to the Democratic national platform, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, supplied a clear note of reality concerning the approaching session of Congress.

Said Senator DODD:

"The concept that a convention platform is binding upon elected representatives in the Congress is absolutely inimical to our system of government. Theirs, and theirs alone, is the final responsibility for legislation."

Declaring that party platforms ought to be abolished "except for the general statement of goals and attitudes," Senator DODD continued:

"The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and the Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

Those declarations not only reflect unalloyed commonsense, but accord with all past American history. Hardly anybody can remember an instance when a party declaration, in national convention, has materially guided any outcome, national or international.

Rather, shaping of policies actually has rested almost completely between occupants of the White House and the Congresses of their times.

Most recent demonstration of this truth in the U.S. was in the Congress of the last 2 years where a self-named Democratic committee on party policy, led by Paul M. Butler, the national chairman, won scarcely a smell of support among the huge Democratic congressional majority.

And even more significant was the lead up to repeal of national prohibition in the presidential campaign of 1932.

That year, platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, as drafted originally, declared foursquare for continuance in force of the 18th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which for 13 years had prohibited manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States.

REPEAL VOTES

At nomination time in 1932, President Hoover led for his party in sustaining that provision, and so did Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic presidential nominee, whose main opponent had been Alfred E. Smith, overwhelmingly defeated at the polls 4 years earlier largely because of his wet stand.

The Democratic Convention in 1932, however, spurned Mr. Roosevelt's advice by voting for outright repeal. And the lameduck Congress, elected in 1930, voted to repeal the 18th amendment, 63 to 23 in the Senate, February 16, and 289 to 121 in the House, February 20, 1933.

By the time Roosevelt took office March 4, there was nothing left for him to do in that matter, and on December 5, 1933, the repealer became effective by ratification of legislatures in 36 of the 48 States.

SCORES DICTATION

Listen further to Senator DODD:

"A presidential candidate," he said, "ought to announce his own platform, describing his general approach, as of the moment, to basic issues. I think each candidate for Congress or the Senate ought to do the same. But any attempt of a party convention to dictate to a President or a Congress concerning constitutional responsibilities cannot be countenanced."

A case in point just now has been provided in Great Britain.

Following a devastating defeat at the polls, a national conference of the Labor Party adopted narrowly a demand that Great Britain go it alone in national defense, especially excluding basing of U.S. atomic weapons on British soil.

This move not only was in defiance of the party leader, Hugh Gaitskell, but subsequently the minority of popularly elected Laborites sitting in the British Parliament voted 166 to 81 to retain Gaitskell as party leader.

Gaitskell had said before that vote that the test was not himself as a personality but the policies he stood for.

[From the Bridgeport Post, Nov. 25, 1960]

WHAT PRICE PLATFORMS?

A dim view of modern-day party platforms is taken by Senator DODD, of Connecticut. His concern is based on the increasing tendency to take them seriously, considering the haphazard manner in which they are drafted.

There is much to be said for the Senator's point of view in this matter. As he says, the day has ended when party platforms were "ambiguous and friendly documents which tried to please everyone, excited little interest in the land, and passed from the scene quietly and unmourned after each convention."

During the last convention, much weight was placed on the platforms which figured, particularly in the case of the Republicans, in the eventual choice of a candidate. Vice President NIXON had to deal with rivals in connection with platform stands.

Senator DODD understandably is disturbed by the fact that nonelected members of a party platform committee come up with a program foisted on a President. It is entirely possible that under the stress and strain of trying to gain the nomination, a President-to-be commits himself to policies which he does not actually believe in. To go back on them later is a betrayal of trust to the party; to stick with them betrays the voter.

In all honesty, what possibility is there that a candidate actually agrees entirely with the detailed, sweeping views of the party platform? Not much. Senator DODD believes a candidate ought to announce his own platform and basic approach to issues.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 27, 1960]

SAWDUST PLATFORMS

Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut, has provided his party's President-elect with a convenient excuse for disregarding most of the spread-eagle pledges of the Democratic platform. Senator DODD spoke in seeming candor to the New England society in New York when he said that platforms were only dangerous when people begin to take them seriously as a binding set of promises to be redeemed.

"The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit," said the Democratic Senator, "would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and the Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

For, said Senator DODD, while the members of the platform committee sit out in front listening to pleas about what should be put in the platform, a small group of experts in the back room, consisting mainly of staff members who are not even convention delegates, is actually writing the platform. The platform committee, half asleep, adopts this document without serious deliberation, and it is whooped through the convention without being read.

"I would never entertain the suggestion," said Senator DODD, "that I or any other Senator was obligated to support any section of it merely because it was adopted by our party convention. The concept that a convention platform is binding upon elected representatives in the Congress is absolutely inimical to our system of government. Theirs, and theirs alone, is the final responsibility for legislating.

"I believe that party platforms, except for a general statement of goals and attitudes, ought to be done away with. They are anomalies that have no legitimate status under our Constitution. So long as they are not taken seriously, they are a source of cynicism about the integrity of our political process. And so soon as they are taken seriously, they will start to undermine our republican form of government."

Thus, said the Senator, the talk of a mandate to carry out some specific, far-reaching program of action is nonsense. If, as defined, a mandate is an authoritative command, it implies that the discretion of the elected representatives has been superseded by the will of the people, supposedly registered in the election. It presupposes that the candidates of a party are uniformly bound to a set of proposals outlined in a party platform, that the party platforms offer a distinct choice to the people, that the people carefully study the opposed platforms, and that on election day they vote for the platform rather than for the man.

This analysis is, to a degree, true, except that the platform of Mr. DODD's party was carefully contrived as vote bait, containing promises of all sorts and of a sweeping order to every possible group of voters who could be gulled by the vision of pie in the sky.

But the platform as it emerged from Los Angeles is also a severe handicap to Senator John F. Kennedy. It is the most radical ever offered by any major party. Of its nature, much of the platform can never be delivered, not only because of the divisions within the Democratic Party, but because conservatives of both parties in Congress cannot be induced to honor pledges which would invite inflation and national insolvency.

Mr. Kennedy's muddy mandate is another factor. He is headed for the White House on a mere handful of votes. Half of the people want neither him nor what he offers. Senator DODD has presented an escape hatch from the embarrassment of trying to make good. If Mr. Kennedy is a prudent man, he will avail himself of the opportunity to start backpedaling from the New Frontier.

[From the Bridgeport Post, Nov. 27, 1960]

WASHINGTON CLOSEUP

(By Carey Cronan)

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, who called recently for the resignation or forced ouster of the U.S. attorney and U.S. marshal and the collector of the port of Bridgeport, looks forward to a sort of political honeymoon in the early weeks of the coming congressional session.

Senator DODD believes that Democrats from both sides of the Mason-Dixon line will work together to enact the Kennedy legislative program and he scoffs at any effective alliance between Republicans and southern conservatives already predicted by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, GOP House leader.

With a Democrat in the White House, the Senator feels that the threat of the veto will be gone and he believes that one of the first major bills will provide for medical care for the aged tied in with the social security system. He looks forward to what he calls "good legislation" dealing with defense, aid to education, tax revision and also a new minimum wage law in line with the campaign waged by President-elect John F. Kennedy.

The Senator forecasts a parallel with the early days of the Roosevelt New Deal when the famed "hundred days" changed the legislative face of the Nation and turned the Government to many Democratic reforms.

PLATFORMS NOT COMMITMENTS

A few nights ago in New York, addressing the New England Society at the Plaza Hotel, Senator DODD declared that the platforms adopted by political conventions should not be binding upon successful candidates.

He pointed out in speaking of platforms that "they have no legitimate status under our Constitution. So long as they are not taken seriously they are a source of cynicism about the integrity of our political system and as soon as they are taken seriously they will start to undermine our representative form of government. A presidential candidate ought to announce his own platform, describing his general approach, as of the moment, to basic issues. I think each candidate for Congress or the Senate ought to do the same. But any attempt by a party convention to dictate to a President or to Congress concerning constitutional responsibilities cannot be countenanced."

BOTH GROUPS ERRED

The Senator said that "Conservatives have traditionally erred when they have resisted attempts to make the system truly representative. Liberals have erred when they have, in the name of the people, sought to impair the independence of elected representatives. The conservatives were wrong when they resisted such measures as the extension of the voting franchise, the direct election of Senators, and the State primary system, measures intended to make our system truly representative by abolishing the frauds and manipulations which resulted in minority rule."

Senator DODD added that "the liberals were wrong when they promoted such schemes as the initiative, the referendum and the recall, which substituted plebiscites for the action of legislatures and which sought to intimidate elected officials with the threat of dismissal for opposing the popular sentiment at any given moment. And I think the liberal innovators are wrong today when they try to whittle away the deliberative process, when they attack the committee system of the Congress, when they condemn its rules as antiquated, when they talk speciously of mandates, when they propose binding party platforms, and binding party caucuses that are to take primacy over the independent judgement of the elected official."

PERSONALITY WINS

Discussing campaigns, the Senator maintained that "a politician instinctively knows that it is the public estimate of his personal qualities rather than his political dogma that will win or lose the election . . . He will never really know the answers. All he can know for certain is that he has been lawfully chosen by the people to act as their representative for 6 years and at the end of those 6 years he will have to submit himself to them once more. How foolish then, how pompous, for him to alight in Washington 2 months later, claiming that he has a mandate to carry out this or that program. As he casts hundreds of votes, his philosophy becomes clearer to those few who care to study it. The man who is always in the midst of heated controversy may leave an impression of either courage or rashness but he is unlikely to leave a clear understanding of his total philosophy."

CONFORMITY NOT PRIMARY

"If pitching is 75 percent of a baseball game, as Connie Mack once said, party conformity is only 25 percent of the political game," declared the Senator, "political affiliation gives him a certain insight, a certain approach to the hundreds of issues of the time but it does not give him the concrete practical answers. Those he must seek out for himself based on individual examination. Party ideology and private self-interest hold no magic answers. Therefore, in conscience, in theory and in practical fact, the elected representative can assume his duties free from any commitments except those which he has freely made himself. The people have the right to hire and fire but they do not have the right to give on-the-job direction. They should let their man know what they think and why, but they should not try to intimidate him and he should not submit to intimidation. This is the essence of the representative system. I think the American people prefer it this way. It is only the extremists, the vested interests, the doctrinaires, the organizers of blocs who would undermine representative government and make their elected representatives so many rubber stamps."

Speaking of party platforms, the Senator said, "The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and the Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

[From the Evening Record and Courier-Tribune, Nov. 28, 1960]

PLATFORM NO STRAITJACKET

"The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of a victorious party and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and the Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

Many elected officials may believe this, but few would say it so outspokenly, as did Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, at a dinner meeting of the New England society in New York recently.

DODD would abolish party platforms except for a statement of goals and attitudes. He would have the presidential candidate announce his own platform, describing his general approach to basic issues; and each candidate for Congress or the Senate do the same. He would not countenance any attempt of a party convention to dictate to a President or a Congress concerning their Constitutional responsibilities.

Of course, DODD is right. Under our system, we elect a President and a Congress to govern, not a party. Ours is not the parliamentary system of Europe, where the elected members of parliament choose their party leader to head up both the legislative and executive branches in the person of the Premier, the Prime Minister or the Chancellor. Parties were not even thought of when our Constitution was adopted, and they are not mentioned once in that basic document.

The electorate pick a man to make legislative decisions on the basis of his character and his specialized knowledge, just as you pick a lawyer or a doctor to make your legal or medical decisions on the same basis, DODD maintains. You aim at a general result, if the result is good, you keep him on; if it is bad, you will drop him.

In these days of instantaneous communication, the man has become as DODD says, the main consideration, not the party platform. It should make for independent thinking and personal responsibility in government, which is all to the good.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier, Dec. 10, 1960]

THE GREAT PLATFORM FRAUD

We are all indebted to Senator DODD, of Connecticut, for reminding us in a speech in New York last week that national party platforms are quite meaningless so far as any binding commitments on elected officials are concerned.

These platforms, he insisted, are a sham and a fraud callously designed to "sell" candidates to the electorate. Said he:

"The worst betrayal of trust that any President or Congress could commit would be to accept whole hog the convention platform of the victorious party, and to subordinate the 4-year deliberative process of the President and Congress to the 4-day drafting process of nonelected members of a party platform committee."

We have frequently pointed out that platform promises about civil rights, fair play, nondiscrimination, voting equality, and all the rest of it, have no practical value and are, in truth, worthless save for propaganda purposes; and the bickering over which platform is the best reveals depressing naivete.

And yet, we presume, when the inevitable disillusionment sets in, those interests who appeared before the platform committees and pleaded for sundry strong planks to be included will be demanding that these empty promises be carried out.

DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I joined in cosponsoring a depressed areas bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This is consistent with the position that I have taken for several years, ever since 1954, when there was a moderate recession. I then urged assistance for depressed areas. In 1957 or 1958 I joined in a bill which was introduced at that time in support of such legislation. In 1959 the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked me to be one of five chief cosponsors of the depressed areas bill, which I supported, and I supported it with all my strength and heart, to the extent of voting to override the President's veto.

Recently the senior Senator from Illinois was kind enough to ask me, as he said, to be the principal Republican cosponsor of the bill. I am glad to be such cosponsor. I know that other bills will be introduced. I have had the opportunity to study those bills, including a bill which was introduced on behalf of the administration known as the Scott bill. I studied the three bills. From my own knowledge of the situation in the depressed areas in my own State, which I am sure reflects conditions in other States, I believe this bill is most adequate and will be most effective. I will speak upon it later. I am happy to join in this introduction. I hope it will soon come before the Senate, that it will be passed by both the Senate and the House, and become law.

Mr. RUSSELL. My President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT PRICE COMPETITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is highly desirable to have a truly flexible trade

policy which will not be linked to impossibly high trade barriers that could lock out the exports of nations which currently import increasing amounts of U.S. goods. The strength of our export position is frequently misunderstood because of confusion with other factors affecting our international balance of payments. The New York trade publication Purchasing Week seeks to set the export picture straight in an analysis published in its issue of October 31, which points out that the greatest threat to our foreign markets comes from productivity gains by foreign producers and not, as commonly supposed, from wages paid American workers; and from failure to meet competitive credit terms.

I ask unanimous consent that this study, entitled "Export Pace Shows U.S. Prices Aren't Prohibitive," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT PACE SHOWS U.S. PRICES AREN'T PROHIBITIVE

NEW YORK.—A new look at United States versus foreign costs, prices and exports debunks the common belief that we are pricing ourselves out of world markets. Recent trends add up to this brighter picture:

Exports: U.S. shipments overseas have increased faster than imports over the past year.

Wages: U.S. wages have had a lower percentage increase than most other industrial countries over the past decade.

Prices: U.S. prices have risen higher than those of other industrial nations. But that's because foreign productivity shot up faster than ours did in the postwar years, starting as it did from a smaller base. However, it now shows signs of abating.

EXPORT PATTERN

The current U.S. export picture is perhaps the most direct proof that American producers are not losing out to foreign competition.

So far this year, for example, overseas shipments are running a whopping 22 percent ahead of 1959. Imports, on the other hand, show only a fractional 1 percent rise.

On the import side, the fact that purchases have not risen is further proof that U.S. producers are holding their own in the worldwide competitive battle.

Even in the relatively poor export years of 1958 and 1959, there was little to indicate serious decline in our competitive position. True, exports declined in these 2 years from previous peaks, but there were good reasons for this.

The record of previous years (1956 and 1957) was distorted by transient political factors. Thus, abnormally high cotton shipments in these earlier years were almost entirely due to an administrative decision to revise export prices.

WHEAT AND SUEZ

Also, the tremendous amount of wheat shipped out in these earlier years reflected American decision to help alleviate famine among millions of Asians. And, finally, the Suez crisis helped swell U.S. shipments of petroleum to oil-starved Europe.

A look at the composition of export over the past few years should be the clincher for skeptics who still believe that our foreign markets are crumbling.

If this belief were true, we should expect to see sharp declines in finished goods relative to other exports. This is because finished goods are highly competitive, and many other countries are ready and willing to take over American markets.

What actually happened? In 1958, finished goods accounted for 61.6 percent of exports. That was substantially higher than in the boom export years of 1956 and 1957 when 58.3 percent and 57.2 percent of our exports were in this high competitive category.

FABRICATED GOODS UP

For many fabricated lines, there has been a steady upward trend in exports over all these years. This includes such important lines as machine tools, railroad equipment, radio and TV sets, and office equipment.

The machine tool export boom is especially important. This year, export orders have accounted for 28 percent of all domestic industry activity in cutting-type tools. Without this foreign fillip, tool makers would really be hurting.

Trends in labor cost—United States versus foreign—also are basically optimistic. Thus, U.S. wages have gone up less than in any other industrial country. Our workers get 28 percent more than they did in 1953, while French labor gets 74 percent more, German and Dutch 58 percent more. Italy comes closest to the United States with a 29-percent wage increase since 1953.

On the other hand, our export prices have risen more than those of any other competing country, except the United Kingdom. American goods are being sold at 7 percent above 1953 prices, while Italian products are averaging 13 percent lower, and Japanese and French goods 6 percent lower than in 1953.

These two facts (relatively low U.S. wage costs boosts and relatively high U.S. price boosts) are not so contradictory as they might seem.

It all can be explained by productivity. The widespread switchover from antiquated to modern equipment by oversea producers in recent years has allowed them to grant bigger wage boosts and still come up with a decline in unit labor costs—a major determinant of price.

PRODUCTIVITY RISES SLOWLY

The relatively slow rate of productivity here, on the other hand, has not been enough to offset even relatively minor wage boosts. Result: Unit labor costs, and hence, prices rose here.

These tremendous overseas productivity gains, however, can't continue indefinitely. They're basically a reflection of transition from antiquated and war-torn facilities to modern ones.

This represented a big step ahead—but any future productivity gains will be much smaller, from here on in, because they will start from an advanced technological base.

Conclusion: It will be more difficult for any future relative price advantage for foreigners to come from productivity.

Also any future gains foreign labor makes relative to the United States will tend to raise overseas prices relative to our own.

All these plus factors, as reassuring as they may seem, still leave little cause for complacency. For, even though we haven't lost out to competition on a wage-productivity basis, we might still succumb to other competitive factors. Some of these are:

Relatively flexible cost structure: Many foreign firms can raise or lower prices as market conditions require, while U.S. firms are often saddled with rigid overhead cost structures and insistence on high return on capital.

Depreciation allowances: Foreign firms are frequently benefited by more liberal depreciation laws than we have.

Taxes: It is generally agreed that American firms carry a heavier tax burden than is imposed by any other important competitor country.

But these disadvantages would be less serious if we improved some of our overseas marketing methods, economists say.

For example, we do very little research into the needs of foreigners. A Cadillac may sell very well on Park Avenue, but it can be, and usually is, a dud in the jungles of Africa and India.

The point is that most overseas buyers will turn to the product that best satisfies their particular demands. Frills and extras are unimportant and often impede sales of domestic merchandise.

Credit is another marketing factor to consider. Too often, American suppliers demand cash in advance, while their foreign counterparts, backed by government funds, are able to offer liberal credit terms.

Fortunately, Washington has recently shown signs of changing its thinking in this respect—and indications are that it, too, will be willing to emulate foreign governments by offering currency devaluation insurance and by extensions of the Export-Import Bank credit guarantees.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance of civil rights as our No. 1 domestic issue is matched in increasing measure by its international implications in our role as leader of the free world. Peace requires populations which are educated to believe in the priceless heritage of freedom, and there can be no genuine freedom where racial segregation or discrimination continues to exist. However it may be tolerated as a social disorder, it is alien to a free society. Thus, we can give content to our struggle for freedom in the world in large measure by carrying on at least with equal vigor the struggle against racial segregation or discrimination at home.

It is to this problem that the Reverend Robert F. Drinan, S.J., addressed himself in a sermon at the mass for the advancement of civil rights in the United States, sponsored by the St. Thomas More Society at St. Francis Xavier Church in New York City, Saturday, November 5. As dean of the Boston College Law School, he places great emphasis on the role of law in the fight against racial or religious prejudice, but he emphasizes with equal force the importance of sound public opinion and a deep religious faith along with effective laws necessary to achieve success in eliminating discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent that the sermon preached by Father Drinan be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SIXTIES

(Sermon delivered by Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of the Boston College Law School, at the mass for the advancement of civil rights in the United States sponsored by the St. Thomas More Society at St. Francis Xavier Church, Saturday, November 5, 1960)

The ancient Athenian jurist Solon was once asked how justice could best be secured. Solon replied that justice is assured "If those who are not injured feel as indignant as those who are."

A deep sense of indignation at rights denied to American citizens has brought this distinguished and devoted group here this morning. The attendance at this religious service of Catholics and non-Catholics is silent testimony that every leader working in the field of human and civil rights knows

that this difficult problem is not basically legal or even moral but rather fundamentally spiritual and religious.

We have gathered to pray together for the fulfillment of human liberty. As the architects of the moral universe of tomorrow you give witness here to your conviction that the law, public opinion and religious faith are the three forces which will shape the society which our children will inherit.

THE SIXTIES: A DECADE OF CRISIS

The entire face of America will change during the decade to come. In 1970 the population of this Nation will be at least 200 million. If present trends continue one-half of this number—100 million people—will have no church affiliation. The three religions—Protestant, Catholic and Jew—will all be minorities in confrontation with more than half a nation dispossessed of formal religious practices and association.

It is important to note this fact since the Nation's religious outlook will inevitably influence its attitude to those among us who happen to be of African descent. This group, which will number about 25 million in 1970, will be profoundly affected by the attitude of the religious and the nonreligious. Is it not, however, one of the most amazing paradoxes that today the leading voices and most powerful forces working for total liberty for all Negroes seem to arise more from secular and humanistic origins than from strictly religious? It is well to recall this since every possible source of support will be needed during the sixties to carry out the spirit and letter of the second emancipation proclamation delivered by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954.

One can feel that those devoted citizens who work for minority rights and employ only the argument of human dignity do indeed feel that this dignity has a divine origin yet the nature and source of this dignity must be continuously reexplored and refurbished.

What then can we hope for in the sixties? Could the massive resistance collapse so that we could behold a new America unscarred by racial hostility or religious prejudice? Will the sixties forever bar the necessity of bayonets in Little Rock or sit-in demonstrations in the South?

We must be persuaded that total integration, the total disappearance of all segregation and discrimination is possible if we carry out a three-way program: (1) A continuous appeal to our State and Federal lawmakers for more and better antidiscrimination legislation, (2) an ever more intense campaign to inform society and influence public opinion about the inherent equality of all men, and (3) a crusade of prayer to the Father of humanity begging Him to enlighten the minds and inspire the hearts of His children with a love for every man as an image of his Creator.

No one of these items taken alone will succeed in eliminating discrimination from our midst. All three are required—effective laws, sound public opinion and a deep religious faith. Let us explore each of these three ways to promote human solidarity—the legal, the moral and the religious program required to insure to every member of every minority group that place in the sun in American democracy to which he is entitled.

LEGAL FRONTIERS TO CONQUER

Ever since the Supreme Court in 1954 gave us the magna carta of human equality in America innumerable persons have been working to extend the beachheads of the liberties guaranteed to every citizen. The Federal courts have continued to destroy the Jim Crow pattern in 17 of our States. Decisional law is being regularly extended to ban any public or semipublic acts which are discriminatory because of race or religion. Exclusion of citizens from employment, housing or education because of their race is now clearly forbidden to public officials and, in some States, to private individuals.

But every honest observer must confess a profound dissatisfaction with the inadequate state of our law in relation to its ban on discrimination. Only a minority of Northern States have laws banning discrimination in education, employment, and housing and, in many instances, the enforcement of these laws is ineffective.

The legislators of America should confront the following facts and enact or implement laws capable of correcting these deplorable situations:

1. In every northern city Negroes are segregated in their housing on a "checkerboard" pattern. This situation can be corrected only be effective legislation vigorously enforced along the lines of the recently enacted laws in New York City and the State of Massachusetts.

2. There is abundant evidence that able Jewish citizens are deprived because of their religion of positions in business and banking to which they are entitled.

3. Evidence exists that qualified Catholic professors are not as readily hired at city and State colleges as non-Catholic professors.

4. The right of a woman to receive equal pay for equal work—a right expressly reaffirmed by Pope Pius XII—is not generally guaranteed in American law.

5. The right of a person accused of crime to be free from prejudicial pre-trial publicity has sometimes been lost because of an unreasonable devotion to freedom of the press.

There are then many frontiers for the law to study and conquer. But the status of the Negro in the sixties will not depend primarily on what new antidiscrimination laws are enacted or how much desegregation is ordered by our Federal and State courts. The status of the Negro—his place in the sun of American freedom—will depend on how deeply all Americans believe in the spiritual principle of human equality.

THE HIDDEN POWER OF MORAL CONSENSUS

No law can force men to change their minds although laws do educate and are necessary for that purpose. But compliance with law in any significant sense cannot be expected until and unless those who are forced to comply by law also comply by love. Massive compliance may be accompanied with such massive reluctance that the Negroes who are granted desegregated facilities may be made to feel even more humiliated than if they were offered separate but equal facilities.

The task of the law therefore is but a small (though important) part of the enormous problem of eliminating racial prejudice from the heart of every American.

It is not generally realized that the 1950 census showed that one-third of the Nation's Negroes dwell in northern cities. An unofficial estimate in 1958 placed 40 percent of all Negroes in the North. It seems likely that by 1970 almost 15 million Negroes will be living outside of the South. How will the people of the North treat their new neighbors? This question in many ways is probably more important than the question of how the South will treat its Negro population.

There is encouraging social and legal pressure to give absolute equality to the millions of Negroes in the North but is there an adequate moral consensus that social equality should also be granted? Exclusion of Negroes from country clubs, private hospitals, housing developments, and superior positions in industry is so clear in all northern metropolitan areas that one wonders whether the humiliations endured by Negroes who have migrated to the North are not in fact more severe and degrading than the ordinary Negro's experience in the South.

Education to provide the moral consensus necessary for the most complete integration of the Negro in the North must stress the following:

1. Color or race is irrelevant in our dealings with our fellow citizens. To hold otherwise is to embrace, at least to some extent, the terrible error of racism so vehemently condemned by Pope Pius XII and all modern Popes.

2. It has been shown by many studies that the greatest obstacle to integrated housing in the North is the fear that the presence of nonwhites in the neighborhood will bring about depreciation of the surrounding property. No myth is more difficult to dispel yet no myth could possibly be more erroneous.

3. The human dignity which the Constitution and our basic law presupposes as the indispensable bond binding us together does not mean that we should grant to each other the minimum of those amenities the denial of which would be rudeness. The concept of human dignity which is a part of every American's credo—be he Christian, Jew or agnostic—impels us to be good neighbors to those who share our common destiny.

It is this concept of human dignity which forms the centerpiece and the driving force of the entire movement for full equality for every American.

RELIGIOUS FAITH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Will effective legislation and a sound public morality be sufficient to inspire and advance a society where equal opportunity is available to every person? We are gathered here today because of our dedication to the proposition that law and morality cannot and will not bring about the good society. For we are not merely citizens of the state for whom laws are necessary, nor are we merely brothers for whom a moral consensus is necessary before we can live together in peace. We are sons of God redeemed and joined forever in a real family.

We are gathered here therefore not merely to urge more and better laws against discrimination or to rekindle our public morality but rather to give witness to the fact that when a Negro or a Puerto Rican or any other child of God is humiliated God our Father is insulted and all of us in Him are outraged.

This mass and this religious service have a triple purpose—to change the hearts of those who do not love enough, to do reparation for the humiliation of Christ in His brethren and to pray for inspiration so that we can be the children of light against the powers of darkness.

We Catholics know this mass and your prayers will echo across three universes—the church suffering, the church triumphant, and the church militant. The church suffering is consoled and assisted toward the beatific vision, the church triumphant is reminded of the enormous needs of mankind and the church militant is strengthened by the merit added to the treasury of the mystical body.

You, our fellow Americans of other faiths, know that God, our common Father, hears your cries and righteous prayers for justice and will give effective answer.

How dedicated we will be in the struggle for human rights during the decade to come may well depend on the degree of dedication which we accept here this morning. I urge you to accept and nourish as a direct grace from God those feelings of indignation which come to you because of the denial of the human dignity and the human rights of your fellow citizens. Deepen this indignation because justice will not come unless those who are not hurt, in the words of Solon, feel just as indignant as those who are.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senate is still in the morning hour.

BUSINESS ETHICS AND THE ELECTRICAL FIRMS CONSPIRACY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in this morning's press there is an account of a conspiracy among 19 of the leading manufacturers of electrical equipment in the United States. Involved in the conspiracy are 44 of the officials of these great enterprises. These officials pleaded guilty or nolo contendere to the indictments brought by the Government, charging them with the gravest, most serious kind of conspiracy to undermine and to destroy the competitive free-enterprise economy in this country.

Mr. President, our country, our allies, and all other free peoples are presently confronted with an unprecedented challenge from the Communist world. I submit that unless and until we correct the demoralization which these cases illustrate, we shall find it impossible to provide effective leadership to the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "How Electrical Firms Shared Business," written by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter; and also an editorial entitled "Business Ethics." I especially commend these to the attention of my colleagues. I have never before heard of as shocking a case of violation of our antitrust laws and of the undermining of the very principle of free competitive enterprise.

These cases have very wide ramifications. Presently there is in my State a case in which the bids for turbines in dams built by our Government are in controversy; a foreign company has bid against domestic companies. In the past and presently we have a policy of protecting to a certain extent, under the so-called buy-American principle, our domestic manufacturers; and one of the principal beneficiaries of these laws has been the largest company involved in this conspiracy.

I submit that while these matters are of great importance here at home, they also have very great implications in our foreign relations; and I hope my colleagues will take the time to read this article and the editorial.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1961]

BUSINESS ETHICS I

There is a story in London arising from the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit of 1956. In a moment of informality, the Russian visitors confessed to their hosts a dread of the wearisome accumulation of domestic industrial problems which faced them on their return home. At this point, Mr. Macmillan is alleged to have said: "Ah, we have an easier system here. We leave those matters to a thing we call business."

In a similar fashion we do the same. We leave to a "thing we call business" a multifarious collection of problems relating to industrial activity. Some enthusiastic sloganer has titled this arrangement "Free Enterprise." And lately it is fashionable to speak of the "private sector."

More accurately, we live in a mixed economy with tariffs, subsidies, tax privileges, credit arrangements, and direct and indirect governmental regulation. In total this is neither socialism nor capitalism, but a composite adjustment of a practical people to the realities of day-to-day affairs.

There are after all more important things than the question of one's daily bread, especially in a fortunate land. And the good sense of the American people has generally led us, perhaps without knowing it, to subordinate purely material matters to the general freedom and welfare of the community.

So we do not live for bread alone. Our lives and being are not only demeaned but also lied about in a description of them as "free enterprise." And our lives sensibly refuse to be divided by statistical professors into private and public sectors. We live in private houses which we can afford because of governmental control of the mortgage market and we send our children to public schools over which we exert greater local control than we do over mortgage rates.

But to say that free enterprise is an oversimplification is not to deny that there is much commonsense in the freedom that private enterprise enjoys in America. This provides a sensible division of managerial labor. Quite beyond that practical consideration, it permits more total freedom in everyday life than would be possible under government ownership or direct regulation.

Which brings us to our point. The freedom of American business enterprise is not something decreed in either the Old or the New Testament. It exists only because it has worked and it will cease to exist when it ceases to work.

Today the conduct of private business can be of as much public concern as the conduct of any public agency. That behemoth of public agencies, the Pentagon, spends more than $41 billion a year. But that huge sum is equaled by the net sales of the nine largest private companies.

It is properly shocking when a public official fails to meet his responsibilities—either through his own misconduct or his failure to control his subordinates. In these times, when the private sector is more than three times larger than all governmental expenditure, it is equally shocking when private corporate officials fail to control their large enterprises.

Tomorrow we plan to make some more specific comments.

PRICE FIXING CASE—HOW ELECTRICAL FIRMS SHARED BUSINESS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The Nation's heavy electrical equipment manufacturers pleaded guilty last month to a classic case of price fixing. As described by the Government, they followed a relatively simple pattern to set prices, rig bids and divide up markets.

In some ways, the most remarkable feature of their conspiracy is its size. In all, 19 concerns and 44 of their officials pleaded guilty to one or more of seven indictments. Their agreements were of varying length but spanned the period from 1951 through 1960. They covered sales estimated at $8 billion—$7 billion to private utilities and other corporations and $1 billion to the Federal, State and local governments.

According to the indictment and the statements of Government lawyers at Philadelphia Federal Court hearings on the pleas, the conspiracies usually took this form:

Company executives would meet frequently in hotel rooms. There they would decide how big a share each firm would get of the market under discussion. They would review the orders that were in sight, determine who would get them and how much they would charge. The bigger business—sales to private corporations—would generally be decided by high executives. The smaller Government orders were often left to lower level officials. They would sometimes come to the hotel rooms with ledger lists—a box score showing how much business each firm had been getting. That way, new orders could be allocated so that each firm got its agreed upon share.

Attorneys for the manufacturers told Federal Judge J. Cullen Ganey that the conspiracies violated company policy.

For example, General Electric Co.'s lawyer, Gerhard A. Gesell, said:

"This corporation has had a considered, deliberate policy designed to prevent the very type of occurrence with which we are suddenly confronted here.

"This policy was issued in 1954. It states:

" 'No employee shall enter into any understanding, agreement, plan or scheme, expressed or implied, formal or informal, with any competitor, in regard to prices, terms, or conditions of sale, production, distribution, territories, or customers, nor exchange or discuss with a competitor prices, terms or conditions of sale, or any other competitive information, nor engage in any other conduct which, in the opinion of the company's counsel, violates any of the antitrust laws.' "

Gesell went on:

"This policy * * * repeatedly was brought home in management conferences * * *. Before this case came along, men were disciplined for violation of the policy. Men were discharged. Since this has come along, other men have been disciplined."

Gesell also said that the company's guilty pleas were made with a desire to terminate what would otherwise be most protracted and expensive litigation.

Similarly, former Attorney General Herbert J. Brownell, lawyer for Westinghouse Electric Corp., said:

"Westinghouse has sought for years in every way possible to avoid involvement in cases of this type. Unlawful acts, if any, by its employees charged with pricing responsibility have not only been unauthorized but contrary to specific instructions that the antitrust laws must be obeyed."

Brownell added: "Westinghouse wishes to make it clear that in its pleas of guilty and nolo contendere that it does not thereby admit the allegations."

Sometimes the conspirators worked out their plans in writing. Here is how Assistant Attorney General Robert A. Bicks, head of the Antitrust Division, described the operation for the sale of circuit breakers:

"In the early years there was a practice known as the inner-company memo. Once each week with quite regular precision the top executives responsible for the carrying out of this conspiracy would communicate with each other via memo which each executive initiated. * * * At its early stages in 1951 and 1952 there were four companies in this conspiracy, GE, Westinghouse, Allis-Chalmers (Manufacturing Co.), and Federal Pacific (Electric Co.). I-T-E (Circuit Breaker Co.) did not come in until later.

"The initiator of the communication would change month to month, company by company; by communication known as the inner-company memo would deal generally with jobs that were coming up during that week, the price each would bid, and any comments that were to be offered on the general price level."

These memos, said Bicks, dealt with the sales to private corporations. The sealed-bid business of governments was handled at working level meetings.

Bicks continued: "At a working level meeting where a particularly big job was up for discussion the percentages would be reviewed in light of what was known as the ledger list which had on it recent sealed-bid jobs given to the other defendants. In light of that ledger list it was decided which of the companies, to keep the percentages constant, would get the job. Now if that company was prepared to say the price at which it was going to bid then the other companies could discuss among themselves what they would bid, add on for accessories,

to make sure or to give the company that had the job, whose turn it was to get the job, the best shot at it. If the company whose job the particularly rigged job was supposed to be did not know the price there would be later communication, either by phone to homes with just the first names used, or by letter to homes with just the first names of the senders, with no return address, and this wonderful code which appears for the first time in this case. The numbers were 1, General Electric; 2, Westinghouse; 3, Allis-Chalmers; and 7, Federal Pacific. What happened to 4 or 5 and 6 until I-T-E came in remains a mystery. When I-T-E came in, in 1958, it got 6."

The company officials met in hotels all across the country. Among the places listed by the Government were New York City, Philadelphia, Atlantic City, Hot Springs (Va.), Hershey (Pa.), Cleveland and Seattle.

As the biggest company, GE generally got the largest share of the carved-up markets. The Justice Department said that the agreement on circuit breakers to Government agencies originally gave GE 45 percent, Westinghouse 35 percent, Allis-Chalmers 10 percent, and Federal Pacific 10 percent; for power transformers, it went GE 30 percent, Westinghouse 30 percent, Allis-Chalmers 15 percent, Moloney Electric Co. 10 percent, McGraw-Edison Co. 8 percent, and Wagner Electric Corp. 5 percent.

Sometimes, a company aid would avoid a face-to-face meeting with a group of competitors but accomplish his end anyway.

Baddia Rashid, chief of the Antitrust Division's trial section, told the court of an August 1956, meeting at Camp Keystone, near North Bay, Ontario. He said: "The defendants held the meeting at a particular cabin in this island resort. Mr. Oswalt (W. F. Oswalt, general manager, general purpose control department, switchgear and control division, GE, who pleaded guilty) who was representing General Electric during this period was not attending meetings with the rest of the companies.

However, Mr. Oswalt got himself a cabin in very close proximity to the cabin being occupied by the other defendant representatives: An individual at the conspiratorial meeting was sent periodically during the course of the meeting to Mr. Oswalt's cabin to consult with Mr. Oswalt as to his position on the various matters that were being discussed. It was a representative of one of the smaller companies that was delegated to be, in effect, the relay man between the two cabins.

"Mr. Oswalt agreed to the price increase and so notified the relay man who communicated this fact back to the remainder of the individuals at the first cabin.

"He remained outside the meeting of August 1956, in Canada in another cabin, but he sent the messages in to the other group urging them to put in effect a price increase of 10 percent. In this situation Mr. Oswalt was the initiator and the leading figure on that 10-percent price increase."

The electrical firms used a variety of methods to determine who would get an order. In one case, the companies took turns in alphabetical order. In another, described in the turbine-generator indictment, the decision was made by lot.

But the most sophisticated technique apparently was the phase-of-the-moon formula for determining automatically what each company would bid on power switchgear assemblies for private corporations.

The indictment described its operation this way:

"At these periodic meetings a scheme or formula for quoting nearly identical prices to electric utility companies, private industrial corporations and contractors was used by defendant corporations designated by their representatives as a 'phase of the moon' or 'light of the moon' formula. Through cyclic rotating positioning inherent in the formula one defendant corporation would quote the low price, others would quote intermediate prices and another would quote the high price; these positions would be periodically rotated among defendant corporations."

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my privilege to be a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I have joined with him before in supporting similar legislation, and I share his joy in finding sympathy and encouragement for this legislation from the President-elect.

The latest report from the Labor Department indicates that more than one-third of the major labor market areas are suffering from serious unemployment, and that, in addition to these 51 major centers of unemployment, there are 123 smaller areas with serious unemployment troubles. In my own State of Minnesota, serious unemployment continues in the northeast area, and in Duluth, in particular.

Mr. President, we have had a very serious time in this area of my State. Iron mining is down considerably; unemployment continues to mount; and up to date we have found no real solution. It is our view, in Minnesota, that the area redevelopment legislation offers us at least a hope for some alleviation of the unemployment and economic distress.

I think the need for this area redevelopment legislation has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt during the past 4 years.

In the 84th Congress, the Senate passed an area redevelopment bill to help economically distressed areas; but the other body failed to act on it.

In the 85th Congress, both Houses approved area redevelopment legislation; but the President's veto killed our hopes.

In the 86th Congress, we again were successful in passing area redevelopment legislation through both Houses of Congress. But again the President's veto killed our efforts to get this legislation onto the statute books.

We are indeed fortunate that the recommendations of the special study group headed by Senator DOUGLAS, for the President-elect, are being translated into legislative action so quickly; and I pledge my full support for early action in this House on this thoroughly discussed and thoroughly studied legislation.

No one need fear that this is a blank check for hasty or reckless action. This is primarily a loan program which will be self-supporting in the long run.

Under this proposal, there will be a ceiling of $400 million on the total Federal commitment; and the commitment for the first fiscal year of the new administration is limited to $100 million.

I may add that I think this is a very modest amount; I only hope it will prove to be enough. I have serious doubts that it will; but at least it is a beginning.

The Federal Government can make loans to communities in depressed areas, to aid construction of public or private facilities which will help to attract new industry; and the bill also provides for vocational training and retraining subsistence payments.

Mr. President, I wish to note that it is my intention to offer again the Youth Conservation Corps bill, which I believe is supplemental to the area redevelopment bill, or at least is a companion measure. There is a rising number of unemployed young men between the ages of 17 and 20. This is going to be a very serious problem in some areas of the country. The Youth Conservation Corps bill will afford an opportunity for many thousands of young men for gainful employment in the great national parks, national forests, State parks, and State forests, in the field of conservation.

I shall again introduce the bill, which previously passed the Senate; and I hope that, again, favorable action will be taken on the bill by both Houses of Congress, and that the bill will then be signed by the President.

It will bring new life and new hope to the depressed communities which have too long been denied their fair share in America's prosperity.

Mr. President, area redevelopment legislation is long overdue and urgently needed. This legislation should receive the same high priority in Congress that it has in the program of the President-elect.

I want to compliment the President-elect for his leadership in this matter in keeping the commitment he made to the people of the United States in his campaign.

MORE DANGEROUS THAN A FILIBUSTER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a very able and instructive article appearing on the editorial page of today's Washington Evening Star, by Mr. Gould Lincoln, entitled "More Dangerous Than a Filibuster."

The article very clearly depicts something I have endeavored in time past to present to the Senate, the danger of adopting a gag rule in the Senate of the United States. It looks very wonderful to have a gag rule when one has a majority of the votes, a majority of one, and has made his speech. Then it is wonderful to have a gag rule or a previous question device that brings an issue to a vote and does not give anyone else a chance to express his views; but you may be sure, Mr. President, these chickens will come home to roost, and if we ever do destroy the Senate's constitutional function, and prescribe a rule that will, in effect, deny a representative of a sovereign State the right to full expression on the floor of the Senate by imposing one of these drastic gag rules, we will not only have denied the right of a sovereign State, but we will have sounded the death knell of true liberalism in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE DANGEROUS THAN A FILIBUSTER

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Senate today is locked in another struggle over the proposition that a majority—even of one—should be entitled to cut off debate and force a bill, a resolution, an important issue to a vote, no matter how ill-considered and no matter if it violates rights of a minority. For generations—indeed, since the beginning of the Government of this country—the Senate has remained a unique body, with debate unlimited. This, it is true, was modified by the adoption of the so-called cloture rule immediately after President Woodrow Wilson began his second term of office. This rule, however, specified that debate could be closed only on a request by 16 Senators for cloture, and only by a two-thirds vote. This two-thirds vote requirement to close debate, despite attacks, has continued and is in the Senate rules today. Indeed, it was strengthened at one time to require a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate membership. Two years ago, this was modified to return to the old two-thirds of those present and voting.

Now the proposal by the so-called liberals, both Democratic and Republican, is to change the cloture rule and make it possible to adopt cloture by a majority vote of the Senate, and barring that, by a three-fifths vote. The immediate issue is whether such a change should be made, and whether, if made, it would not rise to change the whole structure of Senate action, including disregard of minority rights, and action on ill-considered and destructive measures.

An interesting question is: Were it not for the civil rights issue—the race issue—and the Negro vote that issue is supposed to command, would this contest over the Senate rules be so strongly pressed at this time? Northern Democrats and northern Republicans, with some exceptions, are pressing hard for this change in the rules in order to put a stop to filibusters against more drastic civil rights legislation, strongly resisted by Senators from the South. They are trying, not merely to give equal protection under the law, but to force by statute changes in society and social relations.

BOOMERANG EFFECT SEEN

In order to gain their particular end at this particular time, supporters of the proposal to amend the rules are closing their minds to the possibilities of the future. Eight or nine Republican liberals are supporting the move which, if successful, could rise to smite them later on. They may find themselves hamstrung in efforts to prevent costly so-called social programs from being enacted into law and to halt excessive Government expenditures which could help to bring about disastrous inflation and devaluation of the dollar. Further, there are liberals on both sides of the aisle who are overlooking the possibility that in the future a mere majority of a Senate, controlled by the conservatives, could force upon them what they consider reactionary measures. At this very time, Republicans in the Senate should be aware, the Kennedy administration is coming into power pledged to the adoption of programs to which they are fundamentally opposed and programs that will tend to increase the vast governmental bureaucracy centered in Washington.

CONDITIONS CHANGED

The conditions today, so far as congressional procedure is concerned, are very different from those which prevailed when an outraged Senate put through the cloture rule in 1917. President Wilson had strongly urged the arming of merchant ships to protect them against German submarine attack. In those days the old short session of Congress—by which a Congress was terminated on March 4—was still in effect. A small group of Senators was opposed to the armed ship proposal. With only a few days of the session remaining before a new Congress—not scheduled to meet until the following December—should take the place of the dying Congress, these Senators by exercising the right of unlimited debate, were able to prevent action on the Wilson armed ship bill.

That kind of action would not be possible today. There is no short session. A Congress can remain in session right up to the day a newly elected Congress moves into the Capitol. As a matter of fact, the failure of the armed ship bill because of the filibuster in the Senate had little effect. Within a few weeks, Mr. Wilson was calling the new Congress into special session for a declaration of war against Germany. And he had no trouble getting prompt action in both Senate and House.

Nor is it at all likely, despite the arguments advanced by some of the liberals, that the Senate will fail to act promptly when the safety or defense of the United States and its people is in the balance.

The use of the rule of unlimited debate, now modified by a two-thirds vote cloture amendment, has been exercised many times in the Senate to halt speedy and perhaps unwise action on a wide variety of subjects besides civil rights. And on many occasions when a measure really needed has been filibustered, in the end the filibuster has been beaten down and the measure passed or adopted.

With all the serious problems confronting the United States today it is to be hoped that the Senate will not waste time—will not tie itself into serious enmities over this question of procedure—and that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government may turn its attention promptly to those problems.

BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR DIRKSEN OF ILLINOIS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday, January 4, was the anniversary of the birth of a distinguished American, who graces this Chamber by his distinguished presence. We salute the State of Illinois and the people of Illinois for sending to the Senate of the United States our beloved friend, an able statesman, one who has a truly marvelous and unique capacity to express himself with dignity and power and persuasion, and one who has been honored again as the leader of our fellow Republicans on this side of the aisle.

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was born in Pekin, Ill., on January 4, 1896. He served his country in uniform in World War I. He became a distinguished lawyer, and, incidentally, matriculated for part of that time in the University of Minnesota Law School; and then for eight terms EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was a leading Member of the House of Representatives.

EVERETT voluntarily retired from public service because of a potential physical affliction, which we are all glad was subsequently overcome, and then he offered his services to the people of his State as a Member of the U.S. Senate. And since 1950, the dear friend of all of us on the minority side, the friend of your colleagues, Mr. President, on the majority side, and of all of us, has added luster to this Chamber by his presence here.

Time and time again Senators have come into the Senate Chamber to listen to the vigor and the warmth and the color and the charm by which the minority leader has led the Senate in its approval of the recommendations which our President these last 8 years has made to the Congress.

Yesterday the Vice President of the United States and the Vice President-elect of the United States, the leadership of the Democratic Party in the Senate, his colleagues in the leadership of the Republican side, and some others of his friends were pleased and proud to commemorate his birth date and to toast him and to bid him Godspeed for many, many more years of health, happiness, and service to his country.

Mr. President, I am most honored to stand here in the Senate, which EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN loves so dearly and in which he is held in so high esteem by all Members of the Senate, and to salute Mrs. Dirksen with him and his family, and, too, the good people of Illinois who have sent him here to demonstrate the preeminence of one of their favorite sons, one of America's most distinguished statesmen, and one of our dearest friends.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly wish to seize this opportunity to extend my felicitations and my congratulations to the distinquished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He is one of the outstanding statesmen and parliamentarians of this era.

Mr. President, I trust that for many, many years to come the mellifluous voice and eloquent words of EVERETT DIRKSEN will be able to resound throughout this Chamber and throughout the land without being circumscribed and stopped by any effort anywhere to impose a "gag rule" in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, apropos of the same subject, I wish to endorse fully the remarks of my colleague from California and subscribe to the emotional and sentimental observations of my friend from Georgia. I must say that in the past 2 years, in which Senator DIRKSEN has been our leader, I have seen a greater degree of fellowship and a greater degree of unity among the Republicans of the Senate, and a spirit of good will in the Senate, which he has inspired even when we have been debating the most difficult and controversial issues.

These things, I think, are a tribute to the great warmth of his personality, which in no way diminishes his vigor or his enthusiasm and courage—at times remarkable courage—in fighting on this floor for things which he thinks are right.

He has repeatedly been helpful to me in connection with problems of my own, and I know he has treated other Senators on our side of the aisle with the same consideration, giving them help from time to time which no one else could have given and which, perhaps, no one sitting in his chair could have given so well.

EVERETT DIRKSEN'S defense of the President's program in the last 2 years has been astonishing. He has repeatedly

carried the flag, to use his own words, regardless of the issue. I think he would agree, as I do for myself, that we have found ourselves very comfortable in the political philosophy of President Eisenhower, and it has not been too difficult to proclaim his program and to fight for it on the floor of the Senate. I have found that a great satisfaction myself, and I have no doubt that in the case of my dear friend, Senator DIRKSEN, his sympathy with these principles has aided him in his forceful and effective proclamation of the President's point of view.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not know about his birthday yesterday, but I wholeheartedly wish for him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a genuine personal pleasure for me to join with EVERETT DIRKSEN'S host of friends in extending warm good wishes to him on the occasion of his birthday. I understand that with this birthday he reaches an age which will entitle him to take advantage of some of the laws which he has helped to pass, and which give special advantage to those of us who may be called elder citizens. He will have some advantage in that regard, but it hardly seems possible that he has reached another birthday. I shall not labor the point further.

EVERETT wears each birthday like a fresh carnation, which serves as a lesson to all of us that nothing keeps a man so young as hard work, a serene philosophy, and a keen sense of humor. His own party members know and respect EVERETT as a distinguished and able leader. The opposition party respects and esteems him as a vigorous and a constructive dissenter when, by his lights, dissent seems to be the course which he should take and the better part of wisdom.

There are places where silence may be golden, but of course the U.S. Senate is not one of those places. In this Chamber, where the gift of eloquence is counted as one of the supreme gifts, EVERETT DIRKSEN stands as one of the finest speakers of our time. If the human voice may be termed an instrument, no one plays it with more skill, with more imagination, with more inspiration or with more effectiveness than our distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Behind this gift of speech is a no less gifted intellect, an outstanding ability to fulfill the high responsibilities of leadership which his party has entrusted to him, and, above and beyond that, a great capacity for deep and enduring friendships.

Throughout his life EVERETT DIRKSEN has used time well. Perhaps that is why time has, in return, been so good to him and given to him so many birthdays. This one, I hope, will be only the beginning of a long and happy string of future birthdays.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle in their felicitations and good wishes to this fine citizen and good man, EVERETT DIRKSEN, the minority leader. I wish to join with the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the words he expressed, up to a point, which I shall note by proper modification.

We in Minnesota are mighty proud of the fact that the Republican leader was a student at the University of Minnesota College of Law. He suffered the same pains on January 2 that the senior Senator from Minnesota suffered, as we watched the Rose Bowl game. I have been able to commiserate with him on this matter of common sorrow.

I say to my friends, sometimes it takes sorrow and travail to bring together those of us who do not always agree. We find common purpose in common grief.

I assure my good friend that his attendance at the University of Minnesota has been looked upon as a singular honor to our splendid university.

In all seriousness, I felt that this side of the aisle would be remiss if we did not indicate to the country and to the Senate that we see in EVERETT DIRKSEN a man who is able, fair, and decent—a very, very powerful advocate of his point of view. The tributes which have been paid to him today, with respect to his support of the President's program, are worthy tributes and a high honor.

Being the leader of one's party in the Congress of the United States, for an administration one has helped to elect and helped to support, is indeed a matter of responsibility; and I think it is a matter of honor when one attempts to carry the banner of that leadership and of that administration as much as one possibly can.

Those of us on this side of the aisle who have disagreed on occasion with some of the programs or the policies of the administration have stood here and watched with respect and with admiration the splendid work and the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

As one who has occasionally suffered some of the verbal parries of the Senator from Illinois, I assure Senators that he is a really tough adversary—tough in the sense of his ability. He is never mean and is never unkind. His speeches are brilliant. He is an exhilarating speaker. I really enjoy listening to him.

I do not know what more one can say as a compliment to someone who devotes himself to the use of the word than to say that one really enjoys his speech and finds it edifying.

My final thought to the Senator from Illinois is this: I should like to go as far as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in saying that I should like to hear the Senator's voice reverberate in these Chambers for years and years, almost forever, except that I happen to be a proponent of the belief that 15 days at a time would be adequate, plus a share of the 100 hours. However, I join with the Senator from California in saying that if the Senator from Illinois wishes to come back for a repeat performance, after we have arrived at the first decision, I surely would have no objection, and most likely would find it beneficial.

I wish him well and thank him for his friendship, which I think is a precious gift.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I add my words to those of my colleagues in wishing the minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, my friend, a very happy birthday. I knew him first when he came to Massachusetts to speak at nonpolitical functions and at political functions, and in every instance he spoke to the point, in language that we could all understand, and in such a way that we enjoyed listening to him.

Since he has been in the Senate I have become his friend. At least I describe myself as a friend of his, and hope that it is mutual. Over the past few years, since he has been our minority leader, he has shown a spirit of nonpartisanship and a spirit of good government. It is a position that I greatly admire. Sometimes I have not always agreed with him. I could not always go along with him. But when I told him my position, he never expressed disappointment or chagrin in any way. As the Senator from Minnesota has so well said, he argues forcefully and to the point, but he argues outside of personalities. When he is all through, no matter how strong his argument may be, he is still a friend.

I join in congratulating the junior Senator from Illinois upon this birthday, and hope that for a good many years, while he and I are serving in this body together, I may have the opportunity of wishing him still another happy birthday. I believe this is the fifth time I have expressed myself on his single birthday, and I look forward to doing so again a year from now.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is an unusual pleasure for me to join the many friends of Senator DIRKSEN on both sides of the aisle in once again wishing him a happy birthday. I knew EVERETT DIRKSEN by reputation a long time before I had an opportunity to meet him personally. When I was a freshman at Carlton College in Minnesota a representative of a book company in Cleveland, Ohio, the Bacon Book Co., publishers of the Peoples Home Library, came to Carlton to try to induce students who were trying to earn part of their way through college to engage in the business of selling books to rural people in remote areas in the summertime.

One of the great illustrative success stories always pointed to was that of a fellow by the name of EVERETT DIRKSEN, who gave up a career as a baker to become a lawyer and statesman, and who left his home in Illinois to go to the University of Minnesota. It was pointed out how successful he had been and how much money he had made selling the Peoples Home Library. He was said to be a great advocate of the slogan of Bacon Book Co., "Bacon books bring home the bacon." He brought it home. I sold many books, but when it came to collecting for them, I did not get much bacon. I found it was easier to sell books to people in Kendallville and Auburn, Ind., than it was to return 6 days later and be compensated for the volume I was so eager to deliver.

I have naturally followed EVERETT DIRKSEN'S career with a great amount of satisfaction ever since that first success story, which was given to me in absentia before I had ever seen his picture, before I had ever run my fingers through

his tousled head of hair, and before I had ever listened to his mellifluous tones as he engaged in the great art of forensics.

When I finally arrived in the House of Representatives, however, EVERETT DIRKSEN was there to greet me. He had already been there for a considerable time and had a great record for himself as the hardest working Member of the House of Representatives. There he served on the Appropriations Committee with great honor and distinction, and I was among those who delivered a farewell address to him when he thought for a time that he was going to have to give up his political career because of faulty vision. Let it be said in commendation of him that when he felt his vision was to be permanently impaired, rather than to do half a job or two-thirds of a job in the House of Representatives, realizing that he might not be able to do the job with 100-percent effectiveness, he walked down to the well of the House on a melancholy afternoon and told us that he was retiring from the Congress and retiring from public life because the doctor had told him that his vision had become greatly disturbed, and that he might conceivably lose the sight in his eyes. So he retired.

The Lord was good to EVERETT DIRKSEN, as he has been good to the Lord and to the people. During a trip around the world he came in contact with an eye specialist abroad, who brought him in contact with certain medical treatments and other treatments which completely restored his eyes to the point where his vision is probably better and more secure now than that of a great majority of the Members of the Congress today.

In the meantime, however, history had marched on. Someone had replaced him in the district which he had represented so well and for so long, in which was his home in Pekin, Ill. He was not one to try to oust from office the Representative who had taken his place in perfectly good faith. So for a while it appeared that the country would lose the services of one of the great statesmen of our era.

However, a vacancy developed on the Republican ticket for a candidate for the U.S. Senate. I shall always remember the evening when I received a telephone call from EVERETT DIRKSEN asking if I would be willing to fly out to Pekin, Ill., on a Sunday afternoon and deliver a "kickoff" speech whereby EVERETT was to announce his candidacy for the U.S. Senate on the Republican ticket. Nothing gave me greater pleasure. I never accepted an invitation to speak with more enthusiasm or with greater alacrity. I remember the day at the Tri-County Fair with EVERETT DIRKSEN. In front of the great multitude of his friends, happily situated there in a little meadow between Pekin and Peoria, Ill., in my weak way I selected a subject upon which anyone could wax eloquent—the values and virtues of EVERETT DIRKSEN. I thought he would make a great U.S. Senator. With due humility he accepted the challenge to run, and the rest is history. He has been here ever since, and I certainly hope that he will be here for many long years to come. I was happy to be here to greet him when he came, as he greeted me in the House of Representatives when I arrived there. So it is good to follow a young man who, in typical American fashion, worked his way up through school, into the House of Representatives, retired, and came back because the good people of Illinois recognized the sterling qualities of character as well as the unique abilities which are so closely identified with the personality of EVERETT DIRKSEN.

My wife Mary and I have been warm personal friends of EVERETT, Louella, and his charming daughter Joy for many years. I do not know how many birthday parties I have attended for EVERETT DIRKSEN, but I like them, and I am perfectly willing to keep on coming for another 50 years. Happy birthday and pleasant going in the days ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, when I was about to come to the Senate of the United States, a very good Republican friend of mine in Rhode Island said, "Watch Senator DIRKSEN." I have done that through the years we have been associated in the Senate. I have observed his talents, his techniques, his oratory, and urbanity, and I must say that I have been very much impressed. But even more than that impression is the experience that during our service here together a mutual respect and admiration and affection has grown up between us, which I prize very, very much. His surface qualities are deep attributes of the considerate colleague—the patriot—the statesman.

In my humble opinion, EVERETT DIRKSEN is one of the most eloquent and brilliant men in the Senate. I have never come in contact with any man who has a fairer sense of judgment, or who expresses himself with more courtesy or conducts himself with more equity in dealing with his colleagues in the Senate, than EVERETT DIRKSEN. I speak these sentiments to you, my friend, the minority leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, on the occasion of your 65th birthday anniversary, and I join with my many colleagues in saying to you and to your whole family: Happiness and health—ad multos annos.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with other Senators who have extended congratulations to the distinguished minority leader on the occasion of his 65th birthday anniversary. He came to the House of Representatives in the 73d Congress. I had the honor of arriving in the 74th Congress. Therefore I believe that on my side of the aisle I began serving earlier with our distinguished minority leader than any other Member of the Senate who has also served in the House of Representatives.

As has been mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I was not only met by the distinguished minority leader, but I was assisted by him in getting started in my service in the House. One thing that I have observed particularly, as I believe every Member of the Senate will agree, is that EVERETT DIRKSEN is one of the hardest working Members of the Senate. That was also true in the other body. He was working very hard over there, too. As a matter of fact, I believe he worked too hard there. I think, too, that he works too hard in the Senate. I have on several occasions during the last session suggested that he slow down a bit, because I believe he has been endangering his health. He should not do it, even though in his fervor he is willing to sacrifice everything for his service. He has done that. He has achieved great success because of his tireless efforts and his personal interest and dedication to the service of his State and to his country. I extend my congratulations to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in congratulating EVERETT DIRKSEN on his birthday anniversary, as well as extending best wishes to his lovely and gracious wife, and especially to express the hope that he will remain in good health.

I may say, EVERETT, that we hear a great deal from you, and have many times, about carrying the flag. It is not very often, however, that our distinguished majority leader, and my leader, has told us what is on that flag. On his birthday I would tell him that on that flag are friendship and affection and warm, good feeling, not only for his colleagues on the Republican side, but also for his colleagues on the Democratic side, and, indeed, also for all the people of our great country who love decency and liberty and justice and tolerance and understanding, and for all of us who may occasionally disagree with him. He has a really big, generous heart. That is what is on that flag, EVERETT. I hope you take that memory with you. And we wish you a very happy birthday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I rise with some humbleness to join in congratulating our distinguished leader of the minority. I say I do so rather humbly, because in years EVERETT is somewhat my senior. Therefore, as a man younger than he, I approach my congratulations to him with some trepidation and with the hestiation of youth approaching greater age and maturity.

To get down to specifics, EVERETT is indeed my senior in years, I believe, by 4 months. Nevertheless, I claim that junior status, and will do so as long as I can, and will hold on to those junior years.

Seriously, I have enjoyed and benefited in my association with EVERETT DIRKSEN for a good many years.

I will not repeat what has been said, but I join in the statements of other Senators who have called attention to EVERETT DIRKSEN'S tremendous capacity, his breadth of understanding of the problems that confront him, and his courtesy and consideration for his fellow men and associates.

I believe that one of the outstanding things that has endeared EVERETT DIRKSEN to Democrats and Republicans alike is the fact that he acts politically and personally without guile. He is not a conspirator in his methods or actions or in his thinking. He is vigorous and frank and powerful in advancing his ideas and the things which he supports. All this adds up to the tremendous confidence which members of his own party and of the Democratic Party have in EVERETT DIRKSEN as a man and as a political leader.

We have congratulated EVERETT DIRKSEN before on his birthday. We all look forward to congratulating him repeatedly in the years to come. We, on the Republican side, look forward to the continuing inspiration of his leadership and to our continuing trust and confidence in him, which are well merited, so far as his piloting the affairs of the Republican Party in the Senate and in the Nation are concerned. I know we can look forward to continuing cooperation and confidence in him by us, by our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle, and by those in the country who respect and admire and appreciate his leadership.

Without further taking the time of the Senate, I wish to close by saying again to EVERETT: Congratulations, long life, and many happy returns of the day, and all of the best to you and yours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend to my friend from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, in behalf of myself and Mrs. Morse, our best wishes for many happy birthdays. I wish to say to EVERETT DIRKSEN that our association has been of many years standing. Although we have found ourselves on opposite sides on many issues, our personal friendship has always been a close one and one that I highly cherish.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] who yesterday celebrated his 65th birthday anniversary.

Recognizing his incomparable ability to present an issue lucidly and forcefully on the Senate floor and on the public platform; recognizing also his geniality and his ability to engage in vigorous debates without being offensive; recognizing also his natural proneness not to exhibit a martyrdom when he does not succeed in the advocacy of his cause; and recognizing other sterling qualities which he possesses, I direct my remarks to what I believe to be his monumental forte.

I have observed his conduct as minority leader for 2 years. I have watched carefully the course that he chose. I believe I can say with certainty that there is not a Member of the Senate who has so frequently advocated what he believed to be the right cause, although it was the unpopular cause. To support the right cause when it is unpopular requires strong character and great courage. To support the right cause, which is also the popular cause, is a simple undertaking in the performance of one's legislative duties.

In my opinion, not a single Member of the Senate, so frequently as the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has stood fearlessly and courageously in the advocacy of causes which he believed were right, even though he knew that they were politically unacceptable. The strength of our country politically must be rooted in that type of public service.

On this 65th anniversary of the birth of Senator DIRKSEN, I merely say to him that he can, with pride, look back upon his last year's service and that of the year before, knowing that he has not chosen the expedient course, but that he has tried to serve his fellow man in a manner which would insure the perpetuity of our country.

The distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] joins with me in offering these congratulations to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

INAUGURATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by S. Con. Res. 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such S. Con. Res. 92, of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution merely provides for the continuation of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States. I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to be heard upon that motion. I believe that under the rulings which have been made by the Chair action on the concurrent resolution would be the transaction of business and might very well prejudice the controversy which the Senate is having about the rules. At least, that is what the Chair has ruled. So I suggest to the movant that if he wishes to go forward with this matter at this particular time, at least the rights of the proponents of the motion which is the pending business may be protected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that action on the concurrent resolution would be considered business which would impede or interfere at all with the rights of the proponents of the motion to change the rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the concurrent resolution may be considered as a part of morning business under the exception, and will not affect the status of the Anderson resolution or prejudice its consideration under the rulings made by the Vice President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does that include also the Humphrey-Kuchel resolution? The Chair mentioned only the Anderson resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair includes all the pending resolutions which are in the same category.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senate should be apprised of the fact that we had another ruling, exactly opposite in effect, made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] on yesterday, when he was the occupant of the chair. Of course one can pay his money and take his choice, as regards those two rulings; and I have already said to the present distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. Moss] that in the light of the fact that the Vice President of the United States has no hesitation in undertaking to declare one of the rules of the Senate unconstitutional, the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Utah, might approach without trepidation the task of overruling the finding made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] when he was in the chair.

I do not know that the matter is quite that simple, however. It would have been in the old days when the Senate made its own rules, and before the Vice President could suggest rules and prescribe them for the guidance of the Senate. This is a complicated day. It may be that we should get a machine similar to one of those which was used at the political conventions and to establish election trends. I heard about them on the television—machines into which were fed certain samples of votes. Into the machines a certain percentage of votes were fed, and the machines would grind them for a while, and then would arrive at a prediction that the manufacturers of the instrument thought would be exactly correct. I have not pursued the matter far enough to know whether the machines justified these claims, but perhaps in this situation we should get a machine of this nature to make rules for the Senate. To me it would be as logical and proper to feed into such a machine copies of Robert's Rules of Order, Reed's Manual of Parliamentary Law, Vice President NIXON's prescription declaring one of the Senate rules unconstitutional, and five theses, from high school sophomores, on what should be the rules of the Senate, and let the machine work on them and finally roll out a result and adopt it as a rule as it would be to permit the Vice President to devise the rules and direct the procedures of this great body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and morning business is closed.

Does the Senator from Georgia enter objection to the unanimous-consent request in regard to the resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President, I understand the resolution had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that was also the understanding of the Chair. But the Chair did not know whether he had cut off the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I would have unhesitatingly apprised the Chair of that, if he had. I was merely making an observation in the morning hour.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLOTURE RULE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the Humphrey-Kuchel substitute to Senate Resolution 4.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me ask how that got to be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the pending business; but the morning hour, by unanimous consent, intervened. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to take up the Anderson resolution, Senate Resolution 4, as modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I respectfully challenge that ruling. The pending business is the motion to proceed to the consideration of that resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is a motion to take up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The resolution is not yet the pending business.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I promised the Senator from Georgia that I would ask for a live quorum. Therefore, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator from Illinois, but I wish to get in my two bits worth on the subject of the birthday of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am sorry; then I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am not sorry at all; I am delighted to have this opportunity to state publicly what I have said many times in private—that I think the Senator from Illinois is a distinguished leader of his party in this body. I have known him for almost two decades, in both the House and the Senate. I have a high regard for his integrity and his ability; and once he gives you his word, it is as good as gold—or, at least, as good as gold used to be. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, for me it is an honor and a privilege to participate with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to one who served his district well while he was in the House of Representatives, and has served his State of Illinois well, and has served his party well, and has served his country well. On this momentous occasion, I extend to him my felicitations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes paid to our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I endorse all the things which other Senators already have said about him. I did not extend my remarks at that time, because I had planned to speak on another subject. I had yielded to the distinguished minority leader, who said he was going to suggest the absence of a quorum. I wish the record to show that the Senator from Illinois made that suggestion for the benefit of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], not for the benefit of the next speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me, if it is agreed that in yielding to me he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in the Senate, those on both the Democratic and the Republican sides of the aisle, in expressing congratulations and best wishes to the able and distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

It was my pleasure first to meet EVERETT DIRKSEN when I was chief executive of my State. He came to Atlanta, Ga., after he had retired from the House of Representatives but before he was elected to the Senate to make a speech on public safety. That is not a very inspiring subject even for one who possesses the oratorical ability of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois. But that evening I listened to him with amazement and was greatly impressed by the manner in which he was able to maintain the interest of the entire audience for the entire evening.

As a Member of the Senate I have come to know him much better and I know that he always knows what he is talking about. He does not speak idly, on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else. He speaks with great eloquence and erudition. He possesses one of the greatest oratorical talents of our country's history.

I desire to join with those who have congratulated him on his birthday; and I wish for him many, many more to come.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLOTURE RULE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, Mr. President; with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor, I now yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senator from Virginia will not lose the floor because of yielding to me for this purpose, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 3]

Aiken	Beall	Boggs
Allott	Bennett	Bridges
Anderson	Bible	Burdick
Bartlett	Blakley	Bush
Butler	Hayden	Morton
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickey	Mundt
Cannon	Hill	Muskie
Carlson	Holland	Neuberger
Carroll	Hruska	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	Pell
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Prouty
Chavez	Javits	Proxmire
Church	Johnston	Randolph
Clark	Jordan	Robertson
Cooper	Keating	Russell
Cotton	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kuchel	Scott
Dodd	Lausche	Smathers
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fong	McClellan	Thurmond
Fulbright	McGee	Wiley
Goldwater	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Miller	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morse	Young, Ohio

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am glad that the junior Senator from Arkansas had inserted in the RECORD this morning an article by a distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared today. Mr. Lippmann is a student of government, and is highly regarded in the Nation for his observations on governmental affairs. His article, published today, supported the position taken by the junior Senator from Virginia, and others, that rules which require more than a bare majority are very proper in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly, not on the motion to take up the proposal to change the rule, but on the merits of what is involved in the proposal to change the rule to shut off debate. My contention is that no change in rule XXII is necessary.

In 1957 a number of proposals were made to change the rules. They followed the usual course, under the Reorganization Act, which provides that when a bill or resolution is introduced, it shall go to a committee. That is the language of the Reorganization Act. Those resolutions went to the Committee on Rules and Administration. There were 350 or 400 pages of testimony had on those proposed rule changes.

But the Congress did not see fit to go beyond the compromise which we provided 2 years ago—that the previous cloture rule, which had required a two-thirds vote of the entire membership, should be limited to two-thirds of those Senators present and voting.

History will show that no major legislation which our Nation really wanted has ever been prevented from passage by reason of too extended debate. Some who have felt that they were very correct in proposing something, impatient of any delay, have criticized the rules of the Senate, which give to all of us an opportunity to be heard. Seldom do we take advantage of such opportunities,

but I wish to read what Mr. Lippmann said concerning the necessity for that rule:

> In my view it is important, indeed vital to our liberties, to preserve the principle that for great issues, for issues that affect deeply great regions or sections of the Nation, there should be required more than a simple majority. For we must never forget that majorities are not always liberal and that they may be quite tyrannical. It is, I have always thought, a short view of history to equate simple majority rule with the defense of the civil rights of Negroes. The civil rights of all Americans will be safer if within the Senate, which represents the Federal principle, we do not give absolute power to simple majorities.

Mr. President, on January 4, 1957, the distinguished Vice President ruled that the Senate was not a continuing body; therefore, we met without any rules at all. Fortunately, last Tuesday he reversed that position and ruled that the Senate is a continuing body.

On January 8, 2 years ago, I spoke quite at length on the subject, to show that from the days of the presentation of the Constitution in the Federalist Papers throughout our history it has always been held that the Senate is a continuing body, and that there were two decisions of the U.S. circuit court of appeals holding that the Senate was a continuing body. In corollary cases involving boards which held over from year to year—as the Senate does, since only one-third of the Members are up for election every 2 years—the State courts ruled, as the Federal courts ruled, that those boards were continuing bodies.

I am glad it is not necessary now for me to argue, or for anybody who is opposed to changing the rules to argue, the fact that the Senate is a continuing body. If it is a continuing body, Mr. President, of course, the rules continue until they are changed in accordance with the way the rules are in the Senate.

I am sure Senators observed the ruling of the distinguished Vice President last Tuesday, when he said the Anderson motion to change the rules could not be considered that day because, under the rules of the Senate, when a motion is made to change the rules the Senate has to be given notice in writing for 1 day of the proposal to change the rules. The Anderson motion could only be construed as a motion to change the rules, which could not be, under the rules, acted upon until the next day.

I shall not go further into these various efforts to say that we have rules and that we do not have them, to say that the Senate under the Constitution has a right to fix its own rules and then to say that under the Constitution the Senate does not have the power to fix a rule which would prohibit a simple majority from doing whatever it pleased at any time it pleased.

All through our rules we have certain things which have to be observed. I have invited attention to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which says, "bills and resolutions shall be referred."

One cannot get together a simple majority, have a Member introduce a bill and send it to the desk, and have a majority vote to say, "We will vote on the bill today." No. Under the rules of the Senate the bill has to go to a committee. If one obtains unanimous consent, that is something else, but if there is one objection there is a rule which must be followed, and the bill must go to a committee.

We find that all through the rules.

What I wish to discuss today primarily is that the rule providing for a two-thirds majority of those Senators present and voting in order to shut off and close debate is very necessary, in keeping with the fundamental purposes of the Senate, which was created by the Founding Fathers as a brake upon hasty and perhaps ill-advised action by the House of Representatives.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, since it is now agreed that the Senate is a continuing body—we, of course, contend if it is a continuing body all of the rules are in effect, and not all of the rules except rule XXII—we then come down to two questions. First, there is the question of whether, even if the Senate is a continuing body and its rules carry over to the next Congress, the rules applying to amendments to rules nevertheless do not carry over. Second, there is the question whether as a matter of substance the Senate rules should be amended to permit cloture by less than is provided in the present rule, two-thirds of those Senators present and voting.

Mr. President, the constitutional issue is not too easy to grasp. Paragraph 2 of section 5 of article I provides:

> Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceeding, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

As our distinguished leader from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has repeatedly pointed out, that constitutional provision gives us absolute power—absolute power—to determine our own rules. No court can take it away from us. No Presiding Officer can take it away from us. We have the power to do this, and we have exercised it in numerous ways throughout our book of rules, laid down first by that great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, when, as Vice President and Presiding Officer, he felt it necessary to formulate some rules for the guidance of this distinguished body. We have had them ever since. Whenever we wish to amend them, we can amend them. We can provide in those instances other than when the Constitution requires a two-thirds majority—for the ratification of treaties, the impeachment of Members, and so forth—that a majority can do anything it pleases, if that is what we wish to do.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire first to read a provision of the Constitution. The Senator may have quoted it already, but for the purpose of emphasis I shall read it again as a preface to my question. I read from the Constitution, article I, section 5, as found on page 506 of the Rules and Manual, U.S. Senate:

> Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

I ask the Senator from Virginia whether we have not made our rules pursuant to that provision of the Constitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have; and we have said that when it comes to ending debate, it cannot be done by a simple majority, but we must have a majority of two-thirds of those present and voting.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not that constitutional authority give the Senate power to make any rule it sees fit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely, except where the Constitution provides that we cannot ratify a treaty with less than two-thirds or we cannot impeach a Member with less than two-thirds.

Mr. TALMADGE. In other words, if a proposed rule is not in conflict with the Constitution, it is not unconstitutional?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We can make any rule we please.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is there any way in which the Senate could make an unconstitutional rule unless it conflicted with some provision of the Constitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has already pointed out that no court could take away that privilege from us and no Presiding Officer could take away that privilege from us. The Constitution gives the privilege absolutely to the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Under that power the Senate could make any sort of rule it saw fit, no matter how ridiculous it might be, and it would still be constitutional, would it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TALMADGE. If the Senate decided to meet every morning at 3:39 a.m. in bathing suits, would it not be constitutional?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would be a little difficult, but it would be constitutional.

Mr. TALMADGE. It might be unreasonable but it would be constitutional, would it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TALMADGE. In fact, any rule which the Senate made subject to the Constitution would be constitutional, would it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Virginia understand that even a lameduck Presiding Officer cannot prescribe what is and is not a constitutional rule of the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to echo that view.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend the Senator for his brilliant speech. His view is my view of the Constitution of the United States. It is not only my view, but it is the words of the Constitution of the United States, and I will not surrender to any Presiding Officer, Democratic or Republican, whether he may be

the Vice President of the United States or the most recent freshman Member of this body, the power to write rules of the U.S. Senate when the Constitution gives that power to this body.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My colleague is absolutely correct. I agree with him 100 percent. I share the hope of our distinguished majority leader, with all due deference to our eloquent and distinguished whip, and to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who offered the first amendment, that we will not be plunged into a filibuster over a change in the rules for which there is no necessity. In any event, we could change the rules later in the session as we have always had the right to do in the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator that if he wishes to filibuster, all we have to do is to vote on the proposed rule changes. A filibuster is an act of volition. It is not an act of God or even an act of the Senate. We can prevent a filibuster by coming to an agreement on time, as to how much time we ought to consume in discussing these particular measures. The desire of the Senator from Minnesota—and I believe I speak for the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on this subject—is merely that the Senate shall exercise its powers in designing its rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has already pointed out that we can do many things by unanimous consent, but it is unique in the formation of the United States that not only does every State have an equal voice here—Arizona has as big a voice as does New York or Texas—but there are only two Senators from each of these States who can speak for those States. It is their sworn duty to do so, and they cannot sit idly by if they think the rights of those States are being sold down the river, and say, "We do not want to delay procedures. We are going to be friendly and cooperative. We are not going to take advantage of the rules of the Senate that permit us to debate these issues. We are not going to carry out our sworn obligation to stand up for the right of our States. We are going to yield to Members from other States, who have a different political philosophy, who think they see a good which we think is a harm." We should not say, "We are going to be agreeable. We will not debate."

Mr. President, we may call it what we please, but southern Senators feel very deeply that the keystone of the arch of the Federal Government was the union of sovereign States, and that therefore our most precious constitutional right is the one that is spelled out in the 10th amendment, that all powers which are not delegated to the Central Government remain with the States or the people thereof.

Therefore, when we feel that the sovereign rights of our States are being nullified and trampled upon, it is our sworn duty to sit here and fight as long as we possibly can.

Does the Senator from Minnesota challenge that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not challenge it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has heard the Senator from Minnesota make eloquent speeches for the rights of Minnesota, and some of the speeches have not been so short.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator that I am very much in the same frame of mind as is the Senator from Virginia. The rules of the Senate are intended to be used. They are intended to be used for the causes in which one believes. I have never been personally critical in the sense of any derogation of my colleagues as they use the rules of the Senate to protect what they believe are their rights, the rights of their people and the rights of the States they represent. My only point is that if during those discussions a majority of our colleagues—and a majority can change the rules of the Senate, as has been indicated—wish to modify the rules of the Senate, I should like the privilege of making my presentation as to the modifications I think are desirable. That is what the debate is about.

I have long been one of the admirers of the Senator from Virginia on many issues, and I believe that some of the greatest work in the Senate has been performed by Senators who come from what is called the southern part of the United States. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not think in terms of South, North, East or West. Frankly, I think every part of this country is a great part of America and is well represented in the Senate. The Southern States are represented in the Senate by Senators of their choice.

I commend the Senator on the vigor of his argument. I commend him on the willingness he exhibits to press this argument, and I assure him that while some of us may hold different views, those views will never be abusive, and we will attempt to find a reconciliation of those views.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate that attitude. The Senator from Virginia was trying to make clear that we feel a great constitutional question is involved. We feel that a very fundamental right of our sovereign States is involved here which we cannot compromise, and we cannot grant away simply to facilitate consideration of what might be called a program of new frontiers for new legislation facing our Nation in a critical time. If there are those who insist, at the start of the session, on treating this body as no longer a continuing body, or who rely upon some ruling of the Chair which we feel is absolutely without any foundation in law, the Constitution, or any known rules, then they must not criticize us if we insist upon trying to protect the rights of our constituents, even though we are in a great crisis.

We face such a crisis. Make no mistake about it. We face a crisis abroad in at least five places in the world where war could break out at any moment. We face it in the fiscal affairs of the Nation. Without any new spending schemes, we are told the deficit of our National Government in the fiscal year 1962 will be $7 billion. We know that there is nearly a $20 billion demand against $18,200,000 in our supply of gold. We must prevent inflation at home. We have to take steps to meet the threat of communism in the various parts of the world.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator for yielding. I merely wish to ask him this question. Has it not been stated by the newly elected President and by the newly elected Vice President that the legislative program which they have enunciated, and which is embodied in the New Frontier program, has to do with a depressed-area bill, a bill for the medical care of the aged, a bill involving minimum wage, a bill involving housing programs, and a bill for school construction? My point is this: Is it not a fact that every one of those programs which the newly elected President has said he must have has been already fully debated on the floor of the Senate, under existing rules?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no question about it. They were debated under existing rules. Some of them have been fully debated. We have already passed the school construction bill. Of course that was hung up in conference. Medical care was passed in modified form. All those measures were debated under the present rules.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not logical to assume that in order to get the so-called administration program through there is no need for any change of the rules?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not. The Senator is absolutely right about that. There is nothing in the so-called crash program that requires it, unless it be an FEPC bill, and that will not go through anyway.

Mr. SMATHERS. That has not, so far, been made a part of the announced program embodying the New Frontier.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not expect it to be announced as a part of it until we have acted on the other matters, because if and when that is announced, it will start a real fight.

Mr. SMATHERS. In bringing this particular debate up at this time, all that it seems to do is to accentuate the differences within the Democratic Party, and regrettably so, and makes it even more difficult to pass the program which the newly elected President wants to have passed. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. My friend from Florida is speaking for the leadership. I concur in what he has said. The leadership has appealed to the majority: "Let us postpone until the regular order proposals to change the rules. Let them go over, as they did in 1957; let them go to the Rules Committee, where testimony can be taken. Let us get ahead with the urgent legislative program that we need to deal with the problems that face the Nation." That is what the leadership has asked us to do.

Mr. SMATHERS. I must say that I speak only for the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, the Senator from Florida is one of our leaders.

Mr. SMATHERS. But in this particular matter I must in all candor say I

speak only for myself. There are other leaders who have other views about it. My own judgment is that if we are interested in getting the program through for the newly elected President, the program which he has announced, it will not facilitate our doing so or it will not help us by engaging in the move that is being made to change the rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct, of course, and I wholeheartedly agree with him, even though I would not settle the issue on that basis. I would fight this on principle. The Senator is also saying that from the standpoint of what is the real business of the Nation, from the standpoint of the 6 million unemployed in our country, and from the standpoint of the stagnation of our gross national product it is better for our Nation that we not engage in this action, even though some Senators may feel the rules are absolutely wrong. The rules are not needed for this development program. Let the development program get underway. Then if Senators wish to break in on the session, let them break in with a proposal to change the rules, and indicate why they believe the rules should be changed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was interested in the statement a moment ago about the desires of the leadership. Has the leadership issued a statement on any of these resolutions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It has to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has to the Senator?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator get such statement in written form, so that it may be placed in the RECORD at this time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We unanimously named the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] as the majority leader. Is that not leadership?

Mr. ANDERSON. Has he issued a statement with reference to any one of these resolutions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He said he wanted to lay the motion of the Senator from New Mexico and other motions on the table, and get ahead with the business of the Senate, because he did not want to take up weeks of this first session to debate the changing of the rules, when the rules are not necessary to be changed for the enactment of the program he wanted to put through.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was that a private communication to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was private.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Virginia believe that an important statement of that nature ought to be made public by the majority leader himself?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He told me he would make a motion to table. How much more public can that be?

Mr. ANDERSON. He is trying to get it disposed of expeditiously. He is opposed, naturally, to long-winded discussions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia does not speak for the leadership in any way. He is a southern conservative who has been out of touch with many things that have been done. He is in sympathy with what he understands to be the leadership program not to change the rules of the Senate before we have acted on our legislative program. The Senator from Virginia cannot say what the majority leader will say publicly, but the Senator from Virginia understood, from private conversations, that the majority leader would prefer that we postpone action on the proposals of the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators, and that he intends at the appropriate time to move to lay those proposals on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Virginia that I understand the procedure very well, because three times a similar motion of mine has been subject to a motion to table; once by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, and twice by our former majority leader, the Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson. Has the Senator from Virginia ever seen any one of those proposed rules emerge from committee for action in the Senate? In all the years he has been here, has he ever seen one of them emerge from committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Two years ago we changed the rule to provide for two-thirds of those present and voting instead of two-thirds of the elected membership.

Mr. ANDERSON. What did the Senator from Virginia do on that occasion? Did the Senator from Virginia oppose the change, or did he want the proposal to go to the Rules Committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. To the Rules Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Virginia voted for the Johnson motion to change the rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, well——

Mr. ANDERSON. Why did the Senator do that? Why did he not stand on his constitutional rights?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That proposal was better than the one the Senator from New Mexico was trying to put through.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why did not the Senator from Virginia stand on his constitutional rights?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We did not want to be put in the position of making a long fight, when the Senator from Texas offered us a much better proposition than the Senator from New Mexico offered us, or what was offered on the other side.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then it is not a question of principle; it is a question of who offers the best proposal. Is that it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We effected a compromise without a difference, because experience has shown that no cloture vote would have been different whether it was by two-thirds of those elected or two-thirds of those present and voting. If those who advocated the change in the rules thought they were winning a victory, we were willing to claim a victory, because we knew we had not lost anything.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then those who announced the great victory were hypocritical. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not say anything about hypocrisy.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator said it was a victory without a difference.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is from my standpoint. That is as I see it. I said the Senator had not won anything from our standpoint, because I checked the records on various rollcall votes, and I saw that nothing would have been changed under a cloture motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree that it did not accomplish anything. Does not the Constitution provide that each House shall have the right to set up its own procedures?

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has said, the Constitution provides that each House may set up its own procedures.

Mr. ANDERSON. I heard the Senator from Georgia say that any rule the Senate adopted would be constitutional. Suppose the Senate said that the Senators from Virginia may vote three times on the same question, and that Senators from the other States may vote only once.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Georgia did not say that. He said that we can make any rule provided it is not in conflict with the Constitution. He did not go to the extreme which the Senator has suggested.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be interesting to examine the transcript of what has been said.

Mr. TALMADGE. If the Senator from Virginia will yield, I would like to say that the Senator from Virginia has stated the position of the Senator from Georgia correctly. Of course, the Constitution of the United States grants to each House of Congress the right to make its own rules. Any rule the Senate makes which does not conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States is constitutional. The Senate has made its rules. Those rules have been in effect, as amended from time to time, for many years. I believe the last time they were recodified in their entirety was in 1884. In the last Congress, as the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Virginia well know, we amended our rules, and reduced the requirement for cloture from two-thirds of the Senators chosen and sworn to two-thirds of those present and voting. Furthermore, we inserted the provision that all the rules would remain in force and effect until changed by the Senate in accordance with its rules.

If they are not the rules of the Senate, I do not know what are. They are clear. There is no argument about it. There is no ambiguity about it. No Presiding Officer, no court, or no one else can say that these rules were not approved.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not that carry out the constitutional provision for each State to have two Senators?

Mr. TALMADGE. It does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, in answer to the question, if the Senate undertook to say that one State could cast three votes, that would be in violation of the Constitution, which limits each State to two Senators.

Mr. TALMADGE. Of course it would.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Virginia served for a long time in the House of Representatives, and served very adequately. Does the House of Representatives adopt its own rules at each session?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is very interesting to note how we get organized. Here is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, January 3, 1961, states——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me quote what I was about to read:

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the 1st session of the 87th Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

Now I quote from the proceedings of the House:

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

They were Members-elect of the House. They had not been sworn in. They had no rules. They had no status except that they had been certified to be Members of the 87th Congress. All of them stood up together—Democrats and Republicans alike—and took the oath of office.

Does not the Senator from New Mexico remember that when he was a Member of the House he stood up and took the oath?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, I do, very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. To support and uphold the Constitution? Was not that what we said?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Sometimes we forget that that is what we said.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to read from section 3 of article I of the Constitution:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature—

And to that phrase I shall refer later—

thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was the intention that each State should have but two votes in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. The first sentence of the 17th amendment reads:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

So it is perfectly clear that any rule of the Senate which provided that Virginia should have three votes and Maryland but one would be completely unconstitutional.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I remember a statement by my distinguished predecessor. Incidentally, since we have been speaking about the birthday of the distinguished minority leader, I may say that January 4 was also the birthday of my predecessor, Senator Carter Glass. He was a great man. He used to say that if the States were ever allowed to have three Senators, he hoped CARL HAYDEN would be the third one from Virginia.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator believes we ought to live up to that part of the Constitution which provides that each Senator shall have one vote. Why does he not believe in that part of the Constitution which provides that each Chamber has the right to adopt its own rules? That was the statement by the Vice President the other day. What is wrong with that? Why does not the Senator from Virginia accept all parts of the Constitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do accept all parts of the Constitution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; the Senator from Virginia does not want to have the Senate to have the right to adopt its own rules.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, no.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has not the Senate made its rules?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course it has.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it has not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We made them years ago and again 2 years ago. We are a continuing body. When the Senator from New Mexico and I were sworn in, two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were not sworn in. By what authority did the Senate start to operate? Those Senators who were not sworn in had no status, then, if the Senate was not a continuing body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that while I was out of the Chamber, a statement was made that I planned to move to table the resolution at the proper time. I did not know that I was going to move to table these resolutions, but I can say that I am sure that some Member of the Senate will move to table them at the proper time. I simply wanted the record to be clear.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia will accept, of course, that misunderstanding of that part of the statement; but the Senator from Virginia said he could not speak for the leadership. We had unanimously elected the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to be our leader; and I understood that our leader wanted to end this debate and proceed with the business of general legislation, which does not involve any rule change at all. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Virginia is correct in what he has just said. It is the hope of the leadership that we may conclude the debate on these resolutions within a reasonable period of time and then to proceed with the business of the program of the President-elect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But we propose to do it under the rules; and I presume that at an appropriate time some Senator will move to lay the whole business on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my assumption.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then we understand each other.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; definitely we understand each other. I was only trying to point out to the able Senator from Virginia that if he is willing to take one section of the Constitution, then probably all sections are all right, and the Senate might adopt its rules of procedure by a majority vote. The argument is made, for instance, that the ruling of the Vice President was not sound when he said that that could be done by majority vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not agree with the construction the Senator from New Mexico places on the Constitution. I pointed out that we have rules; and if they are to be changed, they ought to be changed in accordance with the rules.

The point I wish to emphasize, a point I thought the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was trying to make clear, was that the leadership had taken no position against him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The leadership does not want the Senator's motion adopted right now.

Mr. ANDERSON. I told the Senator I was case hardened to this procedure, having been through it three times.

The paragraph in the Constitution which relates to this rule reads:

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

If the writers of the Constitution had wanted to have a two-thirds vote on the changing of the rules, why did they not apply it to the whole section? Why did they apply it simply to the expulsion of a Member?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Because one of the virtues of the Constitution is that its drafters never went into details except where it was absolutely necessary. There was no restriction with respect to details. There is nothing in the Constitution which prohibits agreements by the Senate on a rule requiring more than a majority of a quorum.

So far as the House is concerned, where the previous question can be moved, where there is clearly majority rule all the time, they provide for the two-thirds rule on the expulsion of Members. But there is no further prohibition on the Senate with respect to a two-thirds vote on anything except as provided with respect to the ratification of treaties.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senate of the United States ever have the right to move the previous question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not that I can recall.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator had better look up his history. I think he will find that it did have such a right.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that in the First Congress the Senate had a rule on moving the previous question.

Mr. ANDERSON. And later than that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps through the Second Congress, too, they had the rule on the previous question. However, the motion for the previous question itself was debatable, so it did not matter. The Journals show that when the previous question was moved, Senators continued to speak, addressing themselves to the previous question, rather than to the main issue, before the previous question was moved. There was a previous question rule, but it was wholly different from the previous question as applied in the national House of Representatives.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Was not the previous question rule debated on this very floor and stricken out of the rules, and a new rule put in its place?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it was, because it was an anachronism. The previous question rule in the old British Parliament was a convenient way of disposing of a measure without actually passing on it on its merits—very much like a motion to lay on the table, here in the Senate. But in the British Parliament it was not a means for debate. It was a vehicle for laying aside a measure, when they refused to put the main question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I had in mind. Of course, it was specifically taken out, I understand, in 1806, only a few years after our Government was established.

But there never was any real restriction on debate in the Senate, as there was in the House; and the necessity for that is pointed out in numerous articles in the Federalist papers—that the House was restricted, but the Senate was not. The Senate was to be a deliberative body and a continuing body. It should act in a restrained way. Its Members were to be elected by the State legislatures, and the Senate was to be a somewhat more conservative body than a body composed of members who perhaps would be proceeding under the stress of temporary passions. As I have said, the Senate was to be a continuing body and was to function continuously.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. And, most important, each State—regardless of size, wealth, or population—was given equal representation in the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BUTLER. But if this rule is repealed, the States will lose the protection of that arrangement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

As I recall, and as the Senator from Georgia said, the Senate after 1806 did not have any previous question rule and did not have any cloture rule until one was proposed in 1917. That situation arose over the question of arming the merchant ships. That question arose during the short session which ended in March. The proposal to have a cloture rule was referred to the Senate committee headed by Senator Martin of Virginia, and then he got out a cloture rule. It was very much more liberal than the one we now have. But the bill to arm the merchant ships went through, anyway.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that was on a motion by Senator Walsh of Montana. The Senator from Virginia wishes to claim credit for a fellow Virginian; but the motion was made by a Senator from the West. Senator Walsh of Montana made a motion identical to the one I have tried to make twice in this body—that the Senate proceed to make its rules. He may not have been a great constitutional lawyer, but the Senate finally agreed with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senate referred that to a committee, and the committee reported the cloture rule. Senator Walsh of Montana moved—just as the Senator from New Mexico has—that the Senate proceed to consider its rules; and the motion was referred to a committee which was headed by Senator Martin of Virginia. And that committee brought in the cloture rule. I do not have the records before me, but that is what actually transpired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. That situation grew out of the bill to arm the merchant ships.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a result of that procedure, the chairman of that committee, Senator Martin, was given credit for that rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. The motion originated with Senator Walsh of Montana; and Senator Martin was the chairman of the committee which wrote the rule. That is what actually happened. It grew out of the ship-arming bill debate. That illustrates the shortcuts that people so often take. That was perhaps one of the worst abuses of the right of unlimited debate that the Senate has ever seen. But after the rule had been adopted, and after the Congress had adjourned, it was discovered that it never gave the authority that was sought in the first place. In other words, that was a sham battle over nothing. The President went ahead and armed the ships without such a law; he did that under his general powers. So that suggestion was just like the strawman that is being put up here.

What proposed legislation is now before us?

Mr. ROBERTSON. None.

Mr. RUSSELL. What proposed legislation is being defeated at this time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. None.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is just a procedure to hold up the normal procedures of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out, no proposed legislation at all is involved in this rules fight, which is only holding up our normal procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senator from Virginia says this is holding up something. Is it holding up something or is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are being delayed and harassed.

Mr. ANDERSON. But what is being held up?

Mr. RUSSELL. What the Senator from Virginia recognizes—and of course the Senator from New Mexico understands the implication—is that the normal course of legislation is being delayed and endangered by the failure of the Senate to have an opportunity to proceed. This controversy has been generated over the fictitious issue of civil rights. Those of us who oppose this proposal could not stop the enactment of civil rights legislation before, under the existing rules, as is well known. We could not stop it last year or in 1957; we simply did not have the votes.

This situation grows out of an attempt to take advantage of an existing majority, in an effort to enact legislation much more far reaching than any enacted in previous sessions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. First of all, no proposed legislation the Nation ever wanted has ever been held up by the cloture rule. In the second place, no part of the program now pending will be held up by rule XXII, which the Senator from New Mexico is so anxious to change. Therefore, this matter is not the first and most urgent piece of business before the Congress, and it should be postponed, and should take its regular course—in other words, it should be referred to the proper committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. What would the regular course be?

Mr. ROBERTSON. To submit a resolution, as was done in 1957, and then have it referred to a committee which will report it to the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. By what procedure?

Mr. ROBERTSON. By majority vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; there was no majority vote. The policy committee would not report it. That situation continued for months.

Mr. RUSSELL. And now it is proposed to stifle the freedom of debate in the Senate just because one of the agencies of the Senate, the policy committee, is charged with some wrongdoing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, if a patient has a case of colic, inoculate him for smallpox. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I agreed to defer until the senior Senator from New York got some lunch—but not for this long. I said I would not speak for more than 20 minutes. My prepared remarks would not have taken longer than that, although I have been glad to have my colleagues interested enough to ask questions.

Mr. President, I should like now to turn to the substantive merits of the case, the argument that the present provisions of rule XXII should be amended and something less than two-thirds of those present and voting be permitted to end debate in the Senate.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America makes it clear that the members of the Constitutional Convention and the members of the ratifying conventions were aware of the basic problem of government. Government must be strong enough to pre-

serve itself and to carry out its decisions. But the government must be so designed that it will not become a tyranny. The Founding Fathers were just as anxious to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity as they were to form a more perfect union or to provide for the common defense.

The importance given to the blessings of liberty is shown by the demands of the ratifying conventions for amendments as a condition to ratification, a demand which was promptly met by the adoption of the first 10 amendments containing the Bill of Rights.

The members of the Constitutional Convention were well aware of the danger that government may become tyranny. James Madison in No. 51 of the Federalist, speaking particularly of the division of the Central Government into three departments, expressed this problem vividly.

It may be—

He said—

a reflection on human nature that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the Government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

The framers of the Constitution adopted two constitutional principles to provide a proper balance between government and the individual, to insure that the government they were creating would be in fact a government of laws and not of men and would in fact be the servant and not the master of the individual.

The first of these principles is the principle of federalism. The States which sent representatives to the Constitutional Convention and which ratified the Constitution continued as sovereign States of the United States and became integral and essential parts of the new United States of America, as such. The new Federal Government, which acted directly upon the individual citizen in many situations, was a government of limited powers, and the States and the people reserved all powers not enumerated.

The second of these principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States is the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each coordinate with and equal to each of the others but not entirely independent of them.

The Senate was created as an integral part of this framework of government. The Senate is an essential part of the compromise effected between the large and the small States in the Constitutional Convention which had to be reached in order to bring about agreement on and ratification of the Constitution. Only in the Senate are the States themselves directly represented. But this direct representation of the States themselves is a fundamental part of the old federal system of government which has made it possible for our Government to continue so long, preserving at least a reasonable degree of balance between the rights and privileges of the individual and the Government.

It has not been an easy or a simple task to keep the Government powerful enough to survive, but not so powerful that the rights and the liberty of individuals are lost. The United States today includes a tremendous area and a very wide variety of soils, climates, and physical resources. This diversity was greatly increased by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood. The United States contains people of widely different interests and abilities. Some of these variations have been lessened by improvements in transportation, communications, and education, but there are still wide differences in the characteristics of our geography, our economy, and our people, not least by reason of their differing abilities and interests.

In No. 10 of the Federalist, Madison gave particular emphasis to this as the source of differing interests and parties, or factions, as he called them.

As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it—

Said Madison—

different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.

The representative Federal Government which the Constitutional Convention devised gave a reasonable opportunity for each of these many and varied interests to have a hearing for their point of view, an apportunity to make their views known, before legislation might be enacted. It also permitted diversity of local legislation to suit the particular needs of a particular area. It permitted these local areas to experiment with legislation, without necessarily subjecting the entire country to legislation which might prove unworkable.

This complex representative Federal Government is the antithesis of the simple democracy where all issues would be resolved by the majority vote of all citizens, such as, for example, the old Greek city-states and the New England town meetings.

The men who wrote the Constitution were firmly convinced that the will of the people was the only "legitimate foundation of any government," as Jefferson said. This view was reflected in the Declaration of Independence. But they did not think that the only or the best way to ascertain the will of the people was to conduct a referendum on every issue, or to resolve all issues by a simple majority vote.

In the first place, they were well aware that the majority might, as was said in the Federalist, "Yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions" or "be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions."

In addition, they were well aware that under a representative form of government, the elected official is not always able to tell what the wishes of a majority of his constituents may be on any particular issue at any particular time, and they were well aware that an elected official may act in the long-run interests of his constituents by voting contrary to what he may think his constituents' wishes are at the moment.

It is by no means an easy thing to tell what are the wishes of a district or a State on any particular issue at any particular time. On many issues, a large part of the people of a district or State, perhaps even a majority, know little and care less. On many issues, the dispute is between a small minority on one side and a small minority on the other, with perhaps the majority completely uninterested. On some issues a small but vociferous minority on one side may be opposed to a far larger but less vociferous group, which may in fact be the majority.

In speaking of the wishes of a district or State, in a representative government, it is necessary to bear in mind that there are almost always differing points of view in the district or State, and it is necessary to distinguish between vociferous minorities who may have the balance of power in the district or State and the best interests of the district or State and the best interests of the country as a whole.

It is not always wrong, of course, for a Senator or Congressman to give greater weight to the views of a vociferous minority, even though a less vitally interested majority may disagree. Politicians, and statesmen too, must take into consideration intensity of feeling, as well as numbers. For instance, if a particular action means little or nothing to the majority, but it will put out of business or do great violence to a small minority, it can be expected that their voices will be heard more loudly than those of the relatively disinterested majority. In such a case, I think a Senator or Congressman might well support the minority, but I would hope he would recognize that he was speaking for a minority, and trying to protect it against the majority. I would hope he could refrain from appearing to speak for a majority. And I would hope he would have enough charity, enough tolerance, enough of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of a political situation rendered indispensable to recognize the rights, and the views and opinions and feelings, of other minorities when their spokesmen presented their point of view.

I would urge that Senators bear in mind Judge Learned Hand's warning, in his speech on the Sources of Tolerance, that the greatest danger of the political life of a country like ours is "the disposition to take the immediate for the eternal, to press the advantage of present numbers to the full, to ignore dissenters and regard them as heretics."

The privilege of free and unlimited debate in the Senate is an integral part of the protection provided by the Constitution for the minority, like the Bill of Rights or the prohibition against bills of attainder and ex post facto laws.

Rule 22 now permits the limitation of debate with the approval of two-thirds of those present and voting. This in itself is a departure from the protection of unlimited debate. It may be a necessary departure and it may be a wise one. I opposed it in 1959, but nevertheless, it was adopted. At least the principle of requiring a two-thirds vote is consistent with many constitutional provisions, such as those for ratifying treaties and proposing constitutional amendments. There is, however, no basis whatever for urging that debate be terminated by majority rule. This would be inconsistent with many provisions of the Constitution, and more important, with the very spirit of our representative Federal Government.

We must always remember that the Constitution was ordained and established both to form a more perfect union and to secure the blessings of liberty to its generation and their posterity. We must remember that they considered it just as important to create a government which would secure the blessings of liberty and protect the inalienable rights of the individual as it was to create a strong government.

If we keep these things in mind, we will see the importance of preserving the right of debate in the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MORSE. Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), seldom have I been the recipient of such a pleasant honor as that now being paid me. My very distinguished colleague is occupying the chair of the President pro tempore of the Senate for the first time since she took the oath of office on Tuesday. It is a matter of great gratification to me that she has taken the chair during one of my discourses on the floor of the Senate. I feel rather sorry for her, from that standpoint; but I do not feel sorry for myself. I assure my colleague that I shall long remember the fact that it was my pleasure to be speaking on the floor of the Senate when the distinguished Senator from Oregon first occupied the chair as a new Senator.

Madam President, I want to be very fair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I have a few more bills to introduce. I suggest that I yield to him, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, to let him make his statement.

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded to Mr. THURMOND, who spoke on a proposed constitutional amendment to change the electoral college system.)

THE ARMY IN THE 1960'S—ADDRESS BY GEN. L. L. LEMNITZER

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, on September 16, 1960, Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army and now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, delivered a very important address entitled "The Army in the 1960's" before the Seventh Annual Conference of Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army, at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. In this illuminating and interesting address, General Lemnitzer eloquently pointed out in detail the importance of the Army's role as a peacetime deterrent against war and also the vital part which the Army would play in general or limited warfare. Because I feel this address by this great soldier contains such valuable information for those serving in Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMY IN THE 1960'S

Secretary Brucker, General Quinn, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to participate in this 1960 Civilian Aides Conference—interrupted as my attendance has been through no fault of my own.

I regret very much that I was unable to fulfill my part of the schedule yesterday as we had originally planned it. We felt that we had prepared an outstanding and well-coordinated program schedulewise, and I am sorry I missed my part. I am pleased, however, to hear the very complimentary remarks that have been made by many members of the Conference regarding the excellence of the presentations yesterday during the period when Secretary Brucker and I were in Washington attending a National Security Council meeting.

I am mindful that this is the last time I shall participate in the Secretary's Civilian Aides Conference as Chief of Staff. I regret exceedingly that I was unable to serve out my full tour as Chief of Staff—but that was not to be. In this regard I feel very much like the recruit who was drilling in front of my quarters at Fort McNair when General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff. The recruit was fumbling and stumbling around, and was really getting laid out by the drill sergeant. Finally the sergeant said, "Well there is one thing about it, Jones. You and General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, have one thing in common."

The recruit thought he was going to get a complimentary remark and said, "Yes, Sergeant, what is that?"

The sergeant said, "You both have gone as far in this Army as you are ever going to get."

Since it is my last appearance as Chief of Staff, therefore, I would like to express my thanks and deep appreciation to all of the civilian aides for the invaluable help they have rendered to the Army, particularly during my period as Chief of Staff. The importance of the role played by the civilian aides is especially apparent to—and thoroughly understood and deeply appreciated by—the Chief of Staff. Many people, particularly senior people in the Army, Army commanders and others, readily recognize the very important role you play. But from the vantage point of the Chief of Staff, I can get the best look of all, excepting only the Secretary of the Army. You are the eyes, the ears, the advocates, and the enthusiastic supporters of the Army in your respective areas. As I said, I am sorry that I was unable to close out my tour as Army Chief of Staff. However, in General Decker, my successor, you will have an able, dedicated, and outstanding officer to work with. It was my responsibility to recommend to the Secretary who my successor would be, and I chose General Decker without the slightest hesitation. I have known him for a good many years, and my selection was based on the very simple but very important criterion that he was the very best man available.

I am pleased that we are meeting here at the Aberdeen Proving Ground for this conference. It has been obvious that our ability to adapt the findings of our Nation's science and technology to military purposes will be a key factor in safeguarding our national security. This applies to all services, particularly the Army. Aberdeen Proving Ground is one of the Army's oldest and most vital centers of development in the field of military technology. To my mind, therefore, it is particularly appropriate to have this year's Conference here.

Now, the theme of this year's Conference, Army objectives for the future during the period 1960 to 1965, strikes me as a subject of particular timeliness and importance. As we enter the sixties, we hear this decade described frequently as the decade of decision between the free world and the Communists. This decade will undoubtedly witness dynamic shifts in the power balance from time to time—between us and our enemies—and whether it is to our advantage or theirs will depend very much on what we do and the determination which we display in this power struggle. All of us here are very much aware of the influence which the U.S. Army exerts in that power balance. We also know that the decisions we make today and within the next couple of years will have an inevitable influence upon the combat capabilities of the Army and our Armed Forces throughout the entire decade of the sixties. The budget, the equipment that we are talking about today will provide the tools that we will have in the Army during the next decade. This is a long period ahead, but a hard fact of life is the requirement of leadtime to place modern equipment in the hands of the American soldier. The wisdom we display in selecting our objectives for the next 5 years and the vigor and ingenuity with which we seek to attain those objectives are going to determine the effectiveness of the Army and the U.S. Armed Forces for a long period ahead.

In my remarks this morning, I would like to take a look into the future, with particular reference to the 5 years ahead. In so doing, I shall describe what appear to be newly emerging aspects of the Communist military threat. I realize that you have been given some of the specifics of this threat, but I want to talk about them a bit more in general this morning. I shall then outline the broad actions we are taking in the Department of Defense to deal with this threat, the Army's contributions to the actions which are being taken, and how these actions affect establishment of the Army's planning objectives.

A predominant influence in the critical period which lies ahead of us is, of course,

the Communist threat—a continuing threat. I, for one, am sure that, regardless of the tactics the Communists adopt, there will be no change in the Communists' ultimate objective. It hasn't changed in the slightest in 43 years, and I see no reason why it should change. The Communist objective has been stated over and over again by the leaders of the Soviet Union. It has been included in all of the Communist literature that has been published over the 43 years since 1917 when the Communists assumed power in Russia. The objective is simple. It should be understood by everyone, but it is not. It is merely that the Communists want world domination—nothing less. Meanwhile, in the very recent past, the Communists have displayed a brandnew trend in tactics. I refer to Mr. Khrushchev's threat to strike the United States with missiles if we—to use his own term—"intervene" in Cuba. This is a disgraceful pronouncement on his part and it is the worst example of this rocket rattling to date. I also refer to the use of Soviet airlift in the Congo. This lift has an ulterior motive. It has been employed to bring not only aid materials. The Soviets also bring in so-called technicians—technicians who are politically trained and indoctrinated and who will have a great influence on the results that come out of the Congo situation. They will have a tremendous influence on the internal struggle that is taking place there. Further, the Soviets are employing airlift to move troops around the Congo for their particular puppet.

Now, in the past, the Communists have made their aggressive military moves primarily against countries that are right up against the Iron Curtain. In such cases, they used their armies or threatened the use of the Red Army. They have also used the threat of missiles in the case of the Suez crisis, among others. In the case of Cuba, the Soviets have employed the threat of an intercontinental missile attack upon the United States itself, in a blatant attempt to influence political activities in the Western Hemisphere. This came as quite a shock to us Americans. In the case of the Congo, the Communists are not dealing with their neighbors up against the Iron Curtain. They have employed strategic airlift to "leapfrog" portions of the free and uncommitted world, and thereby they have extended their military influence to another continent which is a very long way from the Communist empire.

To my mind, these events have a number of very disturbing implications. One implication is that the Communists appear ready to make increasing use of what has been referred to as a massive retaliation in reverse policy. Our capability to respond to an intercontinental attack on the United States will have an obvious bearing on the effectiveness of Communist use of this threat of massive retaliation for political purposes. Another implication is that the Soviets are developing a capability for rapid exploitation of disorders in areas distant from the Communist empire as in the case of the Congo. This capability applies both to cold and to limited war activities.

Of the two aspects of the Communist military threat—limited aggression and general nuclear war—the general war aspect to date has received most public attention. In many ways this is understandable. Such a war would entail a massive nuclear attack on the United States involving unprecedented loss of life and other destruction. Meanwhile, our Nation and the rest of the free world could also go down to defeat as a result of a series of disasters which could be the result of limited wars. As you know, the Army has taken the lead in stressing the importance of being able and prepared to fight a limited war. I have the distinct impression that, after years of intensive effort on the part of everyone from the Secretary right down through the Army staff and the commanders, our efforts in this regard are paying off. However, I have also noted that in some quarters our efforts have created the erroneous impression that the Army considers itself to be solely a limited war force. This is, of course, decidedly not the case. We have taken the lead in focusing attention on the overlooked aspect of the whole spectrum of war and have constantly attempted to point out the likelihood of limited war, but in so doing we have been told by some that the Army is a limited war force. This is a grievous error and I have attempted to focus attention on the error which is involved and have included it in practically all the talks which I have given over the past year. What I am saying is that the Army has a role in all types of war across the entire spectrum. The Army's role in general war or world war, whichever you prefer to call it, is as important as it ever was in our history and can even be more so. I shall bring out this point by discussing briefly what we are doing to obtain deterrence of general war and to win such a war if deterrence should fail.

Today, the major danger of general nuclear war stems, naturally, from the possibility of a deliberate, engineered nuclear attack upon the United States by the Soviet Union. In making such an attack, the Soviets would, of course, attempt to destroy our strategic retaliatory forces. These forces include not only the bombers and missiles of our Strategic Air Command, but also our Tactical Air Force strike forces which are part of the unified commands deployed all around the world, and our naval aircraft. Soon Polaris submarines with a nuclear strike capability will be available.

Now wars are not decided by a single weapon, a single service, a single concept, or a single factor. Wars are settled and won or lost on the basis of overall readiness, determination, ability, and resources. I want to assure you that even if the Communists today launched an all-out nuclear attack upon the United States, nothing in the world could prevent them from bringing down upon themselves almost complete destruction of their own country by our own retaliatory forces. We should never miss the opportunity to make it clear to the Soviet Union that the launching of a surprise or "Pearl Harbor" type of attack upon our country would result in their own destruction. We must make our deterrent credible, in other words. That is the situation today and we have to be very sure that we do not lose our position in this struggle.

Meanwhile, as we and the Soviets continue to build up the means to wage intercontinental nuclear warfare, we simply cannot afford to ignore the possibility of such an attack. This is particularly true because the present state of technology permits neither the United States nor the Soviets to build a truly invulnerable strategic nuclear force. We are, however, working in that direction. The Army plays a major role in that effort through performance of its assigned missions. By the mid-sixties, we should have—if we keep up the tempo—virtually invulnerable nuclear strike forces, consisting of a diversified combination—and it is important to keep it diversified—of mobile land- and sea-based missiles, missiles with hardened sites, and long-range bombers. (The manned bomber is still here for a considerable time.) These forces could not, by any stretch of an enemy planner's imagination, be eliminated, by surprise attack, regardless of the immensity of that attack. Under these circumstances, any rational enemy would realize that his nuclear attack on the United States would guarantee his own destruction. He is not likely, therefore, to embark upon such an attack.

In such a situation, I feel that the danger of a general nuclear war would stem more from an accident than from a deliberate enemy attack. This danger of general war by accident is real, and it is becoming more real as we move into the missile age. A missile is much more responsive than an aircraft and can be launched by the mere pressing of a button. General war could arise from a limited war which gets out of hand. It could arise from an enemy's misinterpretation of our motives and our moves, especially in any period of high tension. It could arise from an irrational decision by a Soviet dictator. It could arise from the accidental discharge of a single nuclear weapon—either on the part of the enemy or ourselves.

It is this danger which we must also keep in mind as we look forward in the sixties. You do not guard against this danger by merely building offensive weapons. Rather, you build defenses—both active and passive—to minimize the destruction of a war which, tragically, neither side really wants.

In this connection, I would like to state emphatically that, while the possibility of a general war will require our most earnest efforts, there is no cause for defeatism in this particular field. Certainly, the possibility of such a war is appalling. Nonetheless, in my opinion, the idea that there is nothing worse—that our objective is merely survival—is outright defeatism. I say this because, if we lacked the courage to stand firm for our beliefs, we would be defeated already. Our whole history as a nation proves beyond any question that apathy and defeatism are foreign to the American character. In brief, we have the resources, the allies, the industrial resources, the personnel resources, and the military resources to meet any enemy threat and to defeat the enemy threat and to defeat the enemy, if he attacks, and ultimately to prevail.

Now, it is true that we have no actual experience in general nuclear war. We are talking merely from study which is the best we can possibly do. However, we have subjected this matter to intensive study and we believe we know a little about it. The more we have learned of nuclear weapons and their application even in general war, the more grounds we have obtained for considering that such a war would not destroy all of mankind. We know, too, that even the most rudimentary forms of protection, especially against fall-out, can greatly decrease casualties which would result from any nuclear war. In other words, our current evidence indicates beyond any doubt that a nation that is prepared can live through a nuclear war, frightful though such a war may be. So that is the reason I say there is no need for dismay or apathy or wringing our hands and saying that we cannot do anything about a general nuclear war. We can.

Meeting the threat, as we see it continuing to develop across the entire spectrum of possible military actions, places special responsibilities upon the Army.

One of these responsibilities is participation in defense against air attack. Through this activity, the Army is helping in a major way to achieve this invulnerable strategic nuclear capability which I referred to, and is contributing to the protection of the population and the economy of this country. Indeed, this protection is being carried to many important strategic oversea areas such as Europe and the Far East. The Army has Nike surface-to-air missile units deployed around high-priority targets here in the continental United States and in certain key oversea areas. The reliability and performance of these air defense weapons have been repeatedly demonstrated against the highest, fastest, and the most advanced air-breathing targets that modern technology has been able to devise. As Secretary Brucker indicated the other evening, a couple of days ago a Nike Hercules missile shot down another missile.

The value of these defenses for the Strategic Air Command is underscored by the

fact that the Soviet strategic strike forces contain approximately 1,200 bombers at the present time. In my opinion, bombers will continue to comprise a noteworthy portion of the Soviet air attack capability for the decade which we have just entered.

Now, as you know, there is also the growing threat posed by ballistic missiles. As we observe the growing Soviet missile capability, we are made the more keenly aware that no operational active defense against a missile attack is yet in existence. The development of such a defense is important for two major reasons. For one thing, there is the obvious requirement to establish effective defenses against missiles for our population, our war industry, and our retaliatory forces. For another thing, there is the impact which development of an operational antimissile defense would have upon the world balance of military strength. Obviously, our ability to defend ourselves successfully against such an attack is an element of our deterrent effectiveness. Furthermore, if the Soviets were to establish an operational antimissile defense before we do, as Secretary Brucker indicated last night, the deterrent effectiveness of our retaliatory forces would be most adversely affected and downgraded.

A second major responsibility which the Army must meet with regard to general war is to continue to make its vital contribution to the capability to hold strategic land areas in the event of an enemy attack, and thereafter, to win the decisive phase of operations that would follow any nuclear exchange. This is a traditional role of the Army and it will always be necessary.

Performance of this task requires the Army—

First, to maintain forces deployed in key areas overseas. Today, we have 41 percent of our active Army deployed overseas and following a pattern of forward strategy which this country must continue to follow.

Second, to continue its cooperation with our allies in the further development of their own military strength. In this respect, some of our best officers and noncommissioned officers are distributed around the entire free world, training our allies in developing their own army strength. The equivalent strength of allied ground forces is on the order of 200 divisions.

Third, to continue to improve our capability to support our military operations wherever they may need to be carried out throughout the world. This includes the capability to act quickly and effectively, involving both the deployment of strategic reserves into an emergency area, and rapid mobilization of our Reserve components. It also includes assistance in support—and I emphasize the word "support"—of our civil defense effort to minimize the effects of a nuclear attack upon our population, industry, and our military installations.

As long as the possibility exists that the Communists might consider that their objective could be advanced by a deliberate resort to general war, the efforts which I have outlined will be an important factor in our over-all deterrent capability. If the time comes when the deliberate initiation of general war becomes highly unlikely, the military efforts which we are making will continue to be as vital during the sixties, and maybe the seventies, as they are today. They will still be essential, to insure that we can protect our people—surely the prime objective of all national security policy—and defeat the enemy, whether a general war attack is deliberate or if it occurs accidentally.

So far as the threat of limited war attack is concerned, the Army, of course, does have important—yes, vital—responsibilities in this regard. Just as in connection with our efforts to meet the threat of general war, we must continue to cooperate with our allies in our efforts to increase their military strength and to come to their aid if necessary. In addition, the growing capability of the Communists to inject themselves militarily into emergencies throughout the world, such as in the Congo, points up certain specific requirements which our Army must be able to meet. Specifically, we need to develop strategic reserves in sufficient strength to enable us to deal with more than one limited emergency at a time—even if the emergencies occur in widely separated portions of the world. This is the reason we have been clamoring for airlift and increases in military strength. We have got to be able to deal with more than one emergency at a time. The enemy would be stupid to attempt to set up these emergencies side by side to make it convenient for us to get the maximum use out of the forces which we have. We require strategic mobility which will enable us to move our strategic reserves promptly, to any part of the world, and more quickly. Speed is the essence of our ability to come to the aid of our allies and assist them before they are overrun. In addition, we need to improve our capabilities and those of our allies to conduct antiguerrilla warfare. This is becoming an increasingly active area. In southeast Asia and in other parts of the world we can expect to encounter guerrilla activities because the Communists are showing themselves very able in this field. Antiguerrilla capabilities are necessary to permit situations such as exist today in Vietnam and Laos to be brought under control by those governments which are friendly to the United States.

In the light of what I have said about the developments in the threat and of the requirements which these developments impose upon us, a number of key objectives which the Army must pursue in the future can be readily identified.

To begin with, it is obvious that our current major lines of activity must be continued. These include forward strategy by deployment of our forces overseas, the maintenance of our air support, and keeping the Strategic Army Corps in top condition and ready to move. We must also continue to maintain trained, ready, reserve components. No war was ever fought and won with the forces in being on the day the war opened. We must have this reserve backup or we will not be able to prevail over the enemy.

Now, in addition, the early development of an operational antimissile defense system is clearly of importance and in the national interest. Consequently, the Army is pushing ahead with the research and development of Nike-Zeus, which is the only antimissile defense system with components actually in the hardware stage. The progress of Nike-Zeus thus far has been most encouraging, and we in the Army see it as a promising augmentation of the Nation's defense and deterrent capability.

One argument which is frequently raised against Nike-Zeus or the development of an antimissile missile is that the system cannot attain "economical attrition." That is to say that to make it effective requires greater effort on our part than is required by the enemy to get through our defense. Therefore, based on the principle of being noneconomical in the field of attrition, it is argued that we should not attempt to build such a defense. I do not accept this premise in the first place, and I regard such thinking as extremely dangerous to national survival. We must defeat incoming enemy missiles—regardless of whether the attrition is economical or not. If we recognize what we are trying to protect, this will stand out as crystal clear.

The other argument against the Nike-Zeus is that we should put all—and I repeat the word "all"—of our effort on offensive or deterrent means. While I yield to no man in recognizing the importance of the offensive to win a war, to have no defenses at all against enemy missiles could be fatal. As I pointed out earlier in my talk, a general war could delevop by accident; it could develop out of a limited war. If we only have a deterrent against general war and inadequate defenses against nuclear attack and we back into a general war there is no alternative to defeat. We all know that if a boxer—who may have the greatest punch in the world—enters a ring with his hands down, with no defenses at all, he may get clipped on his glass chin early in the fight and he will never get his offensive under way. The same principle applies in this field of antimissile activities.

Another Army objective is an increase from our present authorized strength of 870,000 to a total of 925,000. This is a modest increase. It would permit us to man 15 divisions, and thus to enlarge the Strategic Army Corps, and to reduce critical understrengths in some tactical and supporting forces which we have around the world. It is important also because it adds substantially to our flexibility in dealing with the possibility of coordinated, simultaneous, but widely separated Communist attacks. It is important also because it would enhance our ability to reinforce our deployed forces promptly in case of emergencies, whether they be limited or general in nature, in areas where those forces are located.

Closely related is another objective. That is, the attainment of an improved strategic mobility, particularly in the form of better and more airlift, not only for the Army—we are not the only ones who require airlift—but for all of the U.S. Armed Forces. The Army does not advocate any change in the presently assigned responsibility for providing airlift, but we do ask that there be enough to serve our purposes. As in the case of limited war, the Army has taken the lead in pointing out the deficiencies in airlift, although we don't provide it. The Air Force and Navy do. I think last year we made an important dent in this very important problem.

Another continuing requirement for the Army in the future is for modernization of material, both nuclear and nonnuculear. As I said earlier, the occurrence of a limited war raises world tensions and increases the danger of general war by accident. This danger could become even greater if the limited war should be fought with nuclear weapons. We must certainly have the tactical nuclear capability to fight such a war successfully. At the same time, we must not be so lacking in versatility that we are compelled to initiate the use of nuclear weapons or accept defeat. This would be totally unacceptable. Indeed, our dual capability—and we have it in the Army—which enables us to deal successfully with limited war situations through the use of nonnuclear or conventional weapons, contributes greatly to our ability to reduce the danger of accidental general war.

The fact is that no one can predict with absolute certainty whether or not nuclear weapons would actually be used if war should break out. You and I can visualize situations in which the use of nuclear weapons would not be to our advantage. As I pointed out to the Senate Armed Services Committee in my confirmation hearing, nuclear weapons are not the panacea—the cure all—of all military problems. You can see the situation that has developed in the world today. There are many cases in which nuclear weapons would not be applicable and would not solve the problem.

In addition to modernization of weapons, there is also the need for modernization in the vital field of tactical mobility. I understand that General Trudeau has already talked in detail on this subject. There is no doubt but what the expanded area of the battlefield emphasizes the importance of mobility. It is highly possible that the traditional restrictions upon land warfare im-

posed by terrain features such as rivers, swamps, mountains, and forests can be surmounted through forthcoming developments, particularly with regard to the field of Army aviation and tactical air mobility.

Both improved weapons and improved tactical mobility will make it possible to maximize the effectiveness of our forces and the resources that are made available to us.

The final objective of the Army which I want to mention is to help achieve an improved capability to meet the emergency of a surprise attack upon this country—that is, in the field of civil defense. This is important to our deterrent capability now, and it will be even more important in the future. The Army has special qualities in this regard. It is organized, trained, and equipped to operate on land. It depends more on men than it does on machines. Thus, it would be more especially fitted to operate after a nuclear attack had destroyed much of the machinery which we require, literally, for modern living. Further, the elements of both the Active Army and the Reserve components are distributed in an ideal fashion across the length and breadth of this country. This distribution would be particularly valuable in view of the impact which a surprise nuclear attack could have. The Army recognizes that it would inevitably be called upon to render assistance in such an emergency. It considers that the Nation's ability to withstand such an attack is an important element of our total national security posture. Therefore, we regard this responsibility of assistance to civil defense as second only in importance to our combat responsibility. But I want to repeat, and you should repeat it when the question comes up, civil defense is no substitute for our combat mission, as some people would attempt to have it.

In summary, I would like to highlight my principal point which I have made this morning.

The first point I want to leave with you is that, while the threat facing us requires the most earnest and sustained efforts on our part, it must not give cause for dismay, defeatism, or apathy. We can meet the Soviet threat successfully. We have the resources to meet it and defeat the enemy and win.

The next major point is that we must maintain the capability to deal effectively with the threat across the entire spectrum of military activities, that is, the cold war, limited, and general war. In other words, the Army must maintain and enhance its capabilities to defeat an attack both in the form of general war and in any kind of limited war. Moreover, we must continue our efforts to provide the military strength which is vital to the winning of the cold war.

The third point I want to emphasize is that, although the danger of a deliberate Communist resort to general war may decline, the possibility of a general war breaking out accidentally will remain as a continuing danger and, in my opinion, an increasing danger by virtue of the types of weapons which both sides are equipping themselves with. Thus, extensive military efforts will continue to be required both to defeat the enemy and to protect our population and our military potential.

My next point is that the Communist capability for limited war and other lesser forms of aggression is today expanding. The threatened areas are being extended to include parts of the world which previously have been too far from the boundaries of the Communist empire to be realistically vulnerable to Communist aggression.

It is clear that all of these considerations place continuing and increasing importance upon the Army. The Army's flexibility, resilience, character, traditional integrity, and capabilities make it a key element in our total national security effort.

This will hold true not only in the 5 years ahead, but in the late sixties, the seventies, the two thousands, and as long as wars are fought on this earth.

In conclusion, I would just like to say this about the total problem that faces us. The struggle in which the free world is now engaged is a mortal one and it encompasses almost all of the fields of human activity. Every one of you here today, military or civilian, is personally involved in one way or another in that struggle. None of you is an onlooker to the big decisions which are being made every day worldwide.

This Nation, from its earliest beginnings, has been a nation of competitors. I do not subscribe for a minute to the suggestion that now, when Americans are engaged in the most difficult and widespread challenge they have ever faced, this competitive drive and determination to win are growing any weaker. Anyone who thinks so, in my judgment, misreads the temper of the American people. Whatever your position of leadership may be, bear in mind that your objective is to win, and not put a good face on defeat. Your objective is to win all along the line, the little skirmishes just as well as the big battles. The Nation would and should not tolerate less. All of you know of countless examples of this axiom in industry and commerce, which by its very nature is clearly competitive.

Sometimes too many people overlook this fundamental obligation as it is applied to public leadership. It seems to me that history has made much too much of a play over the lost causes and the gallant last stands. Napoleon today is remembered more by some for Waterloo than he is for Austerlitz. But it was Wellington who prevailed at Waterloo and thus shaped the next hundred years of his country's history. The danger we face today is far greater and it will not be settled like Waterloo in any 10 hours. It pits an entire civilization against another in a hundred manifestations and aspects of this mortal struggle, whether it is conventional, nuclear, or thermonuclear weapons that are employed. A clash of this dimension cannot be a stalemate. There has to be a winner and there has to be a loser. We must face reality squarely in all fields, whether it be in international law, in education, in foreign trade, in public information, in propaganda, or in coldblooded military calculation. We must not delude ourselves with hopes or dreams or well meant intentions that fall short of the mark. I feel that mankind's highest hopes are riding on the outcome of the struggle that has gone on for 43 years and can go on for hundreds of years in the future. We are not going to compromise or adjust our sights downward; we are going to win.

It is important for people throughout the country to understand the nature of the problems which we must solve, and the role of the Army in solving them. Such understanding is essential for the Army to receive the support which it requires to carry on its vital task. The contribution which, as leaders in your communities, you have made to achieving this understanding has been of enormous value in the past. In my opinion, the fact that we can continue to count on your assistance in this vital effort ranks among the Army's most important assets in the Army's effectiveness and therefore in the national security.

It has been a great pleasure to talk to you this morning, and I look forward during the panel discussion to further discussions on the topics and the issues which I have raised.

Thank you very much.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe there are no other Senators who wish to speak on the pending motion. I most respectfully request that it be put to a vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 4. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, it is the understanding of the leadership and of all parties concerned that there will be no more discussion on this subject tonight, and that at the conclusion of the remarks of Senators who are on the floor and are interested in speaking, we will adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF JOINT SESSION OF TWO HOUSES TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, tomorrow the Senate will leave its Chamber at 12:45 p.m. because we will be expected in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12:50 p.m.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from South Carolina is entirely welcome.

WOUNDING OF DONALD W. NEWHOUSE

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, last October, the production manager of the Portland Oregonian, Mr. Donald Newhouse, was seriously wounded by a shotgun blast fired at him through the basement window of his home. As yet, the person who perpetrated this criminal act has not been apprehended.

On October 21, 1960, a few days after the shooting occurred, the Oregon Labor Press expressed what I am sure is the unanimous feeling of other residents of Oregon that this crime could have been perpetrated only by a vicious or demented individual who should be brought to the bar of justice as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial which appeared in the October 21, 1960, issue of the Oregon Labor Press.

At the time of that dastardly shooting, Madam President, I issued a statement from my office in condemnation of it; that statement was very much along the lines of the editorial which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOTGUN ATTACK

Shock and outrage are the only possible reactions to the sneak shotgun attack on Donald Newhouse, production manager of the Oregonian and cousin of the newspapers' New York owner, Samuel Newhouse. Young Newhouse received a serious hip wound when an unknown person fired a shotgun blast through the basement window of his home Sunday night.

Shock and outrage, yes. But this is not to say that these emotions should be directed against any union or any union member.

The Oregonian and its pale afternoon shadow, the Oregon Journal, have leaped to the conclusion that this is a case of union violence. This conclusion is completely unsupported. It reeks of sensationalism, distortion, and self-seeking responsibility.

In other words, the newspapers themselves have committed a journalistic shotgun attack.

Obviously, no sane or responsible person could have committed this act of violence. The crime could have been committed by some disgruntled strikebreaker, by some unbalanced union member, or by some person unconnected with the newspapers or the strike. As Chief of Police William J. Hilbruner said: "It might be connected with the strike, or it might just as easily be some crank or crackpot."

The labor unions of Oregon—and especially the unions involved in the newspaper strike—have every reason to deplore this crime. The unions surely deplore it far more than anyone else except the victim and his family, for an unthinking public is only too ready to believe any charge of union violence.

The attack on Newhouse can do nothing but damage to the unions' cause—a just cause for which 800 families have suffered a year of heavy hardship. The unions know this fact full well. But a large segment of the public has been carefully brainwashed to believe unions guilty of any evil insinuated against them.

We hope the demented attacker of Donald Newhouse is swiftly apprehended. Then justice will be done—and perhaps the daily newspapers will stop their shotgun attack on decent unions and decent union people.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, first of all, allow me to state the distinct pleasure I have in being permitted to submit, for printing in the RECORD, certain matters while the Chair is being occupied by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. Our entire body is greatly honored by her presence, and all of us have a distinct feeling of pleasure that she is now one of us.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION THAT A MAJORITY OF THE SENATE HAS THE POWER TO AMEND ITS RULES AT THE BEGINNING OF A NEW CONGRESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, we learn not only through our ears, but also through our eyes; and frequently we can learn more from reading than from actual attendance at the sessions of the Senate. This is true of Members of the Senate, and of course it is even more true of the members of the general public.

Therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two documents which I think have a very real bearing on the question which we shall shortly be asked to decide, namely, the power of a majority of the Members of the Senate to amend the rules of the Senate at the opening of a new Congress, unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses.

So, Madam President, first I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a brief which six Members of the Senate prepared and submitted to the Vice President on December 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me ask whether it is the same brief as the one heretofore printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it has been revised and brought up to date.

Mr. RUSSELL. I knew that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and some of his cohorts had done a great deal of work, and heretofore the Senator from Illinois had offered considerable matter for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

This one treats with the same subject, and embodies many of the same arguments; but we think it is a somewhat improved argument, and we have brought it up to date.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, even though the Senator from Illinois thinks it is improved, I shall not object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (ACTING AS PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES), IN THE MATTER OF THE VICE PRESIDENT'S RULINGS IN CONNECTION WITH EFFORTS TO CHANGE RULE XXII, DECEMBER 30, 1960

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION THAT A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE 87TH CONGRESS HAS POWER TO AMEND RULES AT THE OPENING OF THE NEW CONGRESS UNFETTERED BY ANY RESTRICTIVE RULES OF EARLIER CONGRESSES

Questions presented

1. Whether the Constitution, and particularly article I, section 5 thereof, authorizes the Senate of each new Congress to amend its own rules at the opening of the new Congress unfettered by any restrictive rules of the Senate of earlier Congresses.

2. Whether action by the Senate of an earlier Congress can prevent the Senate of the 87th Congress from adopting or amending rules as the majority of the Senators of the 87th Congress believes will best facilitate the business of the Senate and the implementation of the mandate of the electorate.

3. Whether, at the opening of the Senate of the 87th Congress, a majority of the Members of the Senate may terminate a filibuster by a motion for the previous question or a motion to cut off debate, where such action is necessary to reach a determination on the rules to govern the Senate of the 87th Congress.

Significance of questions presented

1. The issues at stake on January 3, 1961: The success or failure of the efforts that will be made on the opening day of the 87th Congress to end the filibuster and bring majority rule to the Senate may very well determine the outcome of much of the important legislation that will be presented to the new Congress.

For rule XXII is not only the "gravedigger" of meaningful and effective civil rights legislation; it is also the threat under which other vital legislation has been defeated, delayed, or compromised to meet the views of the minority.

It would not be too much to say that what is at stake in the fight for reasonable majority rule to be made at the opening of the new Congress is nothing more nor less than the dignity of the Senate and its ability to function as a democratic and representative legislative body.

2. The impossible hurdle of two-thirds cloture: The existing rule XXII adopted on January 12, 1959, permits the closing of debate only after two-thirds of those present and voting have voted affirmatively to close debate.

This two-thirds of those present and voting rule was the rule from 1917 to 1949. From 1949 to 1959, debate could only be closed by two-thirds of the total Senate (not two-thirds of those present and voting) voting affirmatively to close debate. Actually, there is no practical difference between the 1949–59 rule (two-thirds of the total Senate) and the 1917–49, existing rule (two-thirds of those present and voting). Attendance is now virtually complete on all crucial civil rights issues and two-thirds of those present and voting will in practical effect be just about the same as two-thirds of the total Senate.

Two-thirds cloture, the existing rule, cannot be obtained in those areas where cloture is needed. In all of the nine cases of attempted cloture on a civil rights bill in the Senate, it has never been possible to secure a two-thirds vote of those present—although in several cases a heavy majority wanted to proceed to a vote (e.g., 52–32 and 55–33 on FEPC in 1950).

Up until 1957 the strategy of the anti-civil-rights forces was to use the filibuster or threat of filibuster to prevent any civil rights legislation whatever from going through. In 1957 this strategy was shifted to emasculating civil rights measures under threat of filibuster and thus avoiding the necessity of an actual filibuster. Thus the 1957 and 1960 civil rights bills were watered down by such threats of filibuster and the impossibility of obtaining two-thirds cloture for a meaningful civil rights bill. It is probably not too much to say that the reason that Congress has not enacted legislation supporting and implementing the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision is because such a measure would be relentlessly filibustered and it is not possible to obtain a two-thirds vote to end a filibuster on such a measure. That a majority of Congress favors such action to support the Court, and that majority cloture would bring such action, cannot be doubted.

3. Both party platforms pledge antifilibuster action: Both party platforms recognize that the existing two-thirds cloture rule is unworkable and pledge action to change that rule.

The Republican platform pledges as follows: "We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees."

The Democratic platform pledges as follows: "In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legisla-

tive proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

"To accomplish these goals will require executive orders, legal actions brought by the Attorney General, legislation, and improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule."

4. Changing rule XXII is the only way to implement civil rights promises of both parties: Both parties have pledged meaningful and effective civil rights legislation in the strongest and most unequivocal terms in history. The enactment of these pledges into law depends upon changing rule XXII, for, as we have seen, the history of the Senate makes it abundantly clear that two-thirds cloture is not possible on meaningful and effective civil rights legislation. Any Senator who supports the pledges of his party platform for civil rights legislation with more than lip service must also support strengthening the antifilibuster rule, for the outcome of the latter struggle will determine whether those civil rights pledges can be kept.

5. Opening day or never for rule XXII change: The only time a new filibuster rule can be adopted is at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress on January 3, 1961. As we demonstrate in this brief, at the opening of a new Congress a majority of the Senators present and voting can cut off debate and adopt any filibuster rule for the Senate of the new Congress that the majority desire. But, once the Senate of the 87th Congress has accepted rule XXII by acquiescing in the full body of existing rules and has commenced to operate under them, there is no way of changing rule XXII later on in the 87th Congress.

In a word, rule XXII is self-perpetuating except at the opening of a new Congress. Once rule XXII has been accepted by the new Congress it can be used as a lethal weapon against changing it; there is no way of obtaining the necessary two-thirds to close debate on a resolution for majority rule once the existing rules are in effect. The suggestion that majority rule can be obtained by bringing a resolution to that effect out of the Rules Committee and passing it on the floor later in the Congress is totally illusory. The same group that makes it impossible to obtain two-thirds cloture on meaningful and effective civil rights legislation makes it impossible to obtain two-thirds cloture on a rules change for the purpose of enacting such meaningful and effective civil rights legislation. Majority rule will either be obtained at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress or it will not be obtained during the new Congress at all.

6. The Vice President's rulings: Thus the Vice President's rulings, as suggested herein, "that a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Congress have power to adopt rules at the opening of the new Congress unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses and thus a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Congress have power to terminate a filibuster by a motion for the previous question or a motion to cut off debate where such action is necessary to reach a determination on the rules that will govern the Senate of the 87th Congress" may well determine the future of civil rights and much other legislation in the 87th Congress.

Statement of facts

The Senate of the 87th Congress will convene at 12 o'clock meridian on January 3, 1961. Immediately after the prayer, formalities of presenting credentials and administering the oath to new Members, and the election of officers, a member of the group seeking to change rule XXII will seek recognition and, upon receiving recognition,[1] will address the Chair substantially as follows:

"Mr. President, on behalf of the following Senators [listing them] and myself, and in accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States and the advisory rulings of the Chair at the opening of the 85th and 86th Congresses, I send to the desk a resolution and I ask that the Clerk read it."

The resolution sent to the desk will be as follows:

"Resolved, That subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

" '3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" ' "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

" 'And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

" 'Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.' "

After the Clerk reads the resolution, the Senator who had sent the resolution to the desk will request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution is required because rule XL entitles the Senate to 1 day's notice in writing of motions to amend or modify a rule.[2] If unanimous consent is forthcoming, the resolution is on the floor of the Senate for debate. If, as seems more likely, one or more Senators refuse unanimous consent, the Senator who had sent the resolution to the desk will address the Chair as follows:

"Mr. President, I therefore send to the desk a notice of a motion to amend certain rules of the Senate and ask that it be read."

The notice of motion would read as follows:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely: Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

" '3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question: "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

" 'And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

" 'Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion,

---

[1] Whatever position the new majority leader may take upon the matter of a change in the rules at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress, it is not believed that he would seek to deny recognition to a member of the group seeking to change rule XXII. In 1953, the majority leader, Senator Taft, although opposing the movement for new rules at the opening of the 83d Cong., facilitated the recognition of Senator ANDERSON for the purpose of moving the adoption of new rules. In 1957, Majority Leader JOHNSON also cooperated to this end. In 1959, Majority Leader JOHNSON himself proposed a rules change at the opening of the new Congress. Actually, as will be seen, the proposed procedure to change the rules at the opening of the 87th Cong. follows closely upon Senator JOHNSON's action in 1959, the only addition being the reliance of the "majority rule" Senators upon the Constitution and the advisory rulings of the Chair at the opening of the 85th and 86th Cong.

Furthermore, the Senator seeking recognition on behalf of the group proposing the change in rule XXII would be constitutionally entitled to recognition. This brief puts the Vice President and the leadership of both parties in the Senate on notice that a substantial group of Senators do not automatically acquiesce in the old rules. As such, they are entitled to a determination whether a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Cong. agree with them. Since, as we demonstrate in this brief, a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Cong. have power to adopt rules at the opening of the new Congress unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses, recognition for the purpose of exercising this power or determining whether a majority exists who seek to exercise such power would thus be constitutionally required. See colloquy between Majority Leader JOHNSON and the Vice President on opening day 1959 (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11).

[2] Since rule XL does not restrict the power of a majority of the Senate to act expeditiously on new rules, the group seeking to change rule XXII acquiesces in this rule and is operating under it.

or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

" 'The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for bringing debate to a close by a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn after full and fair discussion.' "

Presumably the Senate would thereupon adjourn until Wednesday, January 4, when debate on the resolution to change rule XXII would commence.[3] It is not believed that the new majority leader would seek to prejudice the right of the Senators bringing up the resolution to change rule XXII by attempting to take up other business on January 3. Indeed, it is customary for the Senate not to remain in session for any length of time on opening day when the new Senators who have just been sworn in have congratulatory and other festivities to attend. If, by some remote chance, an effort were made to go to other business, it would be incumbent on the Senators supporting the rules change either to object to the transaction of any such business or to make certain, by obtaining the necessary consents or parliamentary rulings, that the transaction of such business would not waive the rights of the majority to adopt rules at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress. In other words, it would be necessary to make sure that the Vice President would be prepared to treat January 4 as still the opening of the new Congress for purposes of the rules, despite the business the majority leader proposed to transact January 3. As already indicated, however, it is not believed that this problem is likely to arise; rather, it is assumed that debate on the resolution will commence on January 4 without hitch.

It is immediately recognizable that the proposed procedure for January 3, 1961, is different from the procedure adopted by the proponents of majority rule at the opening of recent Congresses. In 1953 and 1957, the motion utilized on opening day was as follows:

"In accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution which declares that * * * 'each House may determine the rules of its proceedings' * * * I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 83d [or 85th] Congress."

In 1959 the same motion was offered as a substitute for Majority Leader JOHNSON's motion to amend the rules.

The Senators joining in the effort to change the rules on January 3, 1961, have two alternative courses open to them:

(i) They could have proceeded with the motion to take up rules as they did in 1953 and 1957 and as they sought to do in 1959.

(ii) Or they could proceed, as they are doing, under the Constitution, the Vice President's advisory rulings in 1957 and 1959 and the existing rules (to the extent they do not thwart the will of the majority).

The motion to take up rules utilized at the opening of recent Congresses proceeds on the assumption that the rules of the Senate do not carry over from Congress to Congress except by acquiescence of a majority of the Senate of the new Congress. The briefs submitted in support of the motion to take up the rules at the opening of recent Congresses made out an overwhelming case for this proposition.

We have, however, decided on the second alternative of proceeding under the Constitution, the Vice President's rulings and the existing rules, for three reasons:

1. Some Senators have indicated concern at operating under general parliamentary procedures even during the period of the adoption of rules, and the procedure now being followed avoids this problem, for the rules are assumed to carry over except to the extent that they thwart the ability of the majority to determine the rules at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress.

2. Vice President NIXON repeatedly expressed his opinion at the opening of the 85th and 86th Congresses that the rules do carry over from Senate to Senate except that earlier rules, insofar as they restrict the power of the Senate of a new Congress to change its rules, are not binding on the Senate at the opening of a new Congress.

3. Majority Leader JOHNSON's 1959 action in bringing up a rules change on opening day of the new Congress is a recent precedent for immediate consideration under the rules of such rules changes as are desired by a majority of the Members of the Senate.

We desire to make it extremely clear that, by proceeding as we are doing under both the Constitution and the existing rules, we do not waive and we cannot be considered as waiving the constitutional power of a majority of the Members of the Senate of the new Congress to adopt their own rules unfettered by any restrictive rules of the past. We are proceeding under the Constitution and under the Vice President's repeated advisory rulings that the rules, although they do carry over from Congress to Congress, cannot restrict what a majority of the Senate of the new Congress wants to do at the opening of a new Congress in the way of determining what rules are to govern the body for the next 2 years.

What tactics the opposition to a change in rule XXII will adopt are, of course, not known to us at this time. The opponents have at least the following alternatives:

1. They can move to table the resolution to amend the rules. If a majority votes to table, such action would, as the Vice President made clear in 1957, constitute approval of rule XXII as a part of the rules of the Senate of the 87th Congress.

2. They can seek to defeat a motion to take up the resolution to change rule XXII or seek to defeat the resolution itself. If a majority so votes, this would likewise constitute approval of rule XXII.

3. They can make a point of order against the consideration of the resolution to change rule XXII. The point of order would not, clearly not, be well taken. Whether or not the proposed resolution is considered under the Constitution or under the existing rules, in either event it is clearly in order. If rules do not carry over from Congress to Congress except by acquiescence, the proposed resolution is in order as an expression of such acquiescence in the existing rules other than rule XXII plus a new rule XXII. If the rules do carry over, the resolution is in order (as majority leader JOHNSON's resolution was in 1959) as a resolution to change a particular rule.

4. If the opponents of a change in rule XXII do not have the votes to table (as in 1. above) or to defeat the proposed resolution (as in 2. above), those who are most strenuously opposed to majority rule will undoubtedly seek to filibuster either the motion to take up the rules change or the rules change itself or both. It is then and only then that the real constitutional issue arises: Whether a majority of the Senators of the newly convening body can cut off debate in order to carry out their constitutional function of determining rules or whether they must stand powerless before the minority shielded by the rules of an earlier Senate? This brief is essentially directed to the proposition that a majority of Senators present and voting are not bound by the old rule XXII, but can cut off debate at the opening of a new Congress for the purpose of permitting the majority to determine the rules that are to govern the body for the next 2 years.

Vice President NIXON's Earlier Rulings

In 1957, during the debate on the rules at the opening of the Senate of the 85th Congress, Vice President NIXON gave an advisory ruling as follows (103 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 178):

"It is the opinion of the Chair that while the rules of the Senate have been continued from one Congress to another, the right of a current majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to adopt its own rules, stemming as it does from the Constitution itself, cannot be restricted or limited by rules adopted by a majority of the Senate in a previous Congress.

"Any provision of Senate rules adopted in a previous Congress which has the expressed or practical effect of denying the majority of the Senate in a new Congress the right to adopt the rules under which it desires to proceed is, in the opinion of the Chair, unconstitutional. It is also the opinion of the Chair that section 3 of rule XXII in practice has such an effect.

"The Chair emphasizes that this is only his own opinion, because under Senate precedents, a question of constitutionality can only be decided by the Senate itself, and not by the Chair.

"At the beginning of a session in a newly elected Congress, the Senate can indicate its will in regard to its rules in one of three ways:

"First. It can proceed to conduct its business under the Senate rules which were in effect in the previous Congress and thereby indicate by acquiescence that those rules continue in effect. This has been the practice in the past.

"Second. It can vote negatively when a motion is made to adopt new rules and by such action indicate approval of the previous rules.

"Third. It can vote affirmatively to proceed with the adoption of new rules.

"Turning to the parliamentary situation in which the Senate now finds itself, if the motion to table should prevail, a majority of the Senate by such action would have indicated its approval of the previous rules of the Senate, and those rules would be binding on the Senate for the remainder of this Congress unless subsequently changed under those rules.

"If, on the other hand, the motion to lay on the table shall fail, the Senate can proceed with the adoption of rules under whatever procedures the majority of the Senate approves.

"In summary, until the Senate at the initiation of a new Congress expresses its will otherwise, the rules in effect in the previous Congress in the opinion of the Chair remain in effect, with the exception that the Senate should not be bound by any provision in those previous rules which denies the membership of the Senate to exercise its constitutional right to make its own rules."

In 1959, during the debate on the rules at the opening of the Senate of the 86th Congress, Vice President NIXON gave advisory rulings as follows:

"Under the advisory opinion the Chair rendered at the beginning of the last Congress, it is the opinion of the Chair that until the Senate indicates otherwise by its majority vote the Senate is proceeding under the rules adopted previously by the Senate, but, as the Chair also indicated in that opinion, it is the view of the Chair that a majority of the Senate has a constitu-

[3] As in 1959, the Vice President, upon request of a Senator (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 98), would lay the resolution before the Senate during the morning hour. At the conclusion of the morning hour, the resolution would be placed on the calendar (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 102). At that time, the sponsor of the resolution would move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution, as was done by Majority Leader JOHNSON in 1959 (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 103).

tional right at the beginning of each new Congress to determine what rules it desires to follow" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6).

"The resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas will be considered under the rules of the Senate which have been adopted previously by the Senate. But as the Chair stated earlier today, and as he expressed himself more fully in an advisory opinion at the beginning of the last Congress, in the opinion of the Chair the rules previously adopted by the Senate and currently in effect are not, insofar as they restrict the power of the Senate to change its rules, binding on the Senate at this time.

"The Chair expressed that opinion in the last Congress, but it is only an opinion. The question of constitutionality lies within the power of the Senate itself to decide. The Constitution gives to the Senate the power to make its rules. That means that the Members of the Senate have the right to determine the rules under which the Senate will operate. This right, in the opinion of the Chair, is one which can be exercised by and is lodged in a majority of the Members of the Senate. This right, in the opinion of the Chair, in order to be operative also implies the constitutional right that the majority has the power to cut off debate in order to exercise the right of changing or determining the rules" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8–9).

"If, for example, during the course of the debate on the motion of the Senator from Texas, which deals with changing the rules, a Senator believes that action should be taken and debate closed, such Senator at that time could, in the opinion of the Chair, raise the constitutional question by moving to cut off debate. The Chair would indicate his opinion that such a motion was in order but would submit the question to the Senate for its decision" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9).

"In the opinion of the Chair, as he has expressed it both yesterday and at the beginning of the first session of the last Congress, the rules of the Senate continue from session to session until the Senate, at the beginning of a session indicates its will to the contrary.

"In the opinion of the Chair, also, however, any rule of the Senate adopted in a prior Congress, which has the express or implied effect of restricting the constitutional power of the Senate to make its own rules, is inapplicable when rules are before the Senate for consideration at the beginning of a new Congress.

"It has been the opinion of the Chair, for example, that subsection 3 of rule XXII would fall in that category, because it has the practical effect, or might have the practical effect, of denying to a majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress its constitutional power to work its will with regard to the rules by which it desires to be governed.

"On the other hand, in the opinion of the Chair, the requirement that any proposal to amend or adopt rules lie over for a day, under rule XL, would not have such an inhibiting effect. Consequently, the Chair believes that rule XL is one which can properly apply in connection with consideration of the rules by the Senate at this point" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 96).

"It is the opinion of the Chair that at the beginning of a new Congress a majority of the Senate has the constitutional right to work its will with regard to the rules by which it desires to be governed, and that that right cannot be restricted by the membership of the Senate in one Congress imposing its will on the membership of the Senate in another Congress" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 101).

"The key problem around which this discussion has revolved is with regard to the question of whether the Senate can move to bring a question of change of the rules to a vote, as the Senator from Wyoming is aware. It is the opinion of the Chair that insofar as that problem is concerned, at the beginning of a new Congress the Senate can proceed to adopt new rules or to amend old rules without being inhibited by any previous rule which might restrict or deny the constitutional right or power of a majority of the membership of the Senate to determine its rules" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 102).

"A constitutional question would be presented if the time should come during the course of the debate when action on changing the rules should seem unlikely because of extended debate. At that point any Member of the Senate, in the opinion of the Chair, would have the right to move to cut off debate. Such a motion would be questioned by raising a point of order. At that point the Chair would submit the question to the Senate on the ground that a constitutional question had been raised because of the Chair's opinion that the Senate, at the commencement of a new Congress, has the power to make its rules. That power, in the Chair's opinion, cannot be restricted even by action of the Senate itself, which would be the case where the membership of the Senate in one Congress has attempted to curtail the constitutional right of the membership of the Senate in another Congress to adopt its rules" (105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 103).

These rulings are clearly correct[4] and the remainder of this brief is devoted to so demonstrate.

Argument: The Vice President's advisory rulings in 1957 and 1959 reflect a very real understanding of the basic constitutional principle here involved—that the Members of the Senate of each new Congress have undiluted power to determine the manner in which they will operate during that Congress and have no power whatever to determine the manner in which the Senate of future Congresses will operate. This basic constitutional principle is rooted both in article I, section 5 of the Constitution and in the historic democratic principle that the present shall determine its own destiny unhampered by the dead hand of the past.

The Senate of the First Congress meeting in 1789 promptly adopted rules (see debates and proceedings in the Congress of the United States, vol. I, pp. 15–21). Any Senator who would have sought to prevent the adoption of those rules and thus to prevent the transaction of business by undertaking a filibuster would have found himself quickly cut off by a motion for the previous question. Indeed, the rules adopted for the Senate in 1789 expressly provided for the previous question motion and this provision remained in the Senate rules until 1808.

Just as the Senators of the First Congress meeting in 1789 had undiluted power to determine the rules under which they would operate, so the Senators of the 87th Congress meeting in 1961 have undiluted power to determine the rules under which they will operate. No rules of the Senate of an earlier Congress can obstruct this right to adopt rules to govern the transaction of business. And no Senator or group of Senators can obstruct this right by seeking to prevent action on the rules through undertaking a filibuster. The filibuster is not a constitutional or a God-given right. It is up to the majority of the Senate convening on January 3, 1961, to determine whether they will expressly limit the use of the filibuster for the Senate of the 87th Congress.

I. The Majority of the Senate in Each Congress Has a Constitutional Right To Adopt Rules of Proceedings for the Senate of That Congress Unfettered by Action or Rules of the Senate of Any Preceding Congress

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Both the language and context make clear that "each House" means not only the separate branches of the Congress—that is, the House and the Senate—but also the separate branches of each succeeding Congress. No reason has been or can be adduced to interpret this constitutional provision as a grant of rule-making authority to the Members of the House and the Senate meeting for the first time in 1789 and a withholding of this same authority from the Members of the House and the Senate of later Congresses. Both language and logic lead to the conclusion that the constitutional authority to make rules is granted to each House of each Congress.

Article I, section 5, as we have just seen, is an identical grant of rule-making authority to each House of Congress. It is not disputed that the House of Representatives of each new Congress has the power to, and does, adopt new rules at the opening of each Congress. (See point V). The identical constitutional provision cannot reasonably be given a different interpretation as applied to the Senate, a coordinate branch of the "Congress of the United States." (Article I, section 1). For, not only do the two bodies act as a team in the Congress, but the rule-making authority of the House can be rendered meaningless if the Senate is not also in a position to adopt rules that will make possible the expression of the majority will of the Senate and thus of the Congress.

Every principle of constitutional construction supports the interpretation of article I, section 5, which gives the majority of the Senate present on January 3, 1961, the right to "determine the rules of its proceedings" unfettered by action or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. The Constitution of the United States should be interpreted in the light of the intention of its framers to build a democratic government reflecting the will of the governed not only for the day but for an enduring future. What Chief Justice Marshall said in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 415), of the congressional power to pass "necessary and proper" legislation, is equally applicable to its power to make its own rules without the impediments of the past:

"The subject is the execution of those great powers on which the welfare of a nation essentially depends. It must have been the intention of those who gave these powers, to insure, as far as human prudence could insure, their beneficial execution. This could not be done by confining the choice of means to such narrow limits as not to leave it in the power of Congress to adopt any which might be appropriate, and which were conducive to the end. This provision is made in a constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs. To have prescribed the means by which government should, in all future time, execute its powers, would have been to change, entirely,

---

[4] When we say that these rulings are clearly correct, we mean that they are clearly correct insofar as they indicate that a majority of the Members of the Senate of a new Congress can act on rules unfettered by past actions and can cut off debate by majority vote to reach a determination on the rules. Whether the ruling was correct insofar as it suggests that the rules carry over to the extent that they do not restrict the power of the majority to change the rules at the opening of the Senate of the new Congress is a different matter. But for present purposes this question is academic and unnecessary to determine. For, without waiving any right to argue at a later date that the rules do not carry over, we agree with the Vice President's advisory rulings that, even if the rules do carry over, they cannot restrict a majority from changing them at the opening of the Senate of a new Congress.

the character of the instrument, and give it the properties of a legal code. It would have been an unwise attempt to provide, by immutable rules, for exigencies which, if foreseen at all, must have been seen dimly, and which can be best provided for as they occur. To have declared that the best means shall not be used, but those alone without which the power given would be nugatory, would have been to deprive the legislature of the capacity to avail itself of experience, to exercise its reason, and to accomodate its legislation to circumstances."

Likewise, article I, section 5, must be read in the light of the spirit of democratic government upon which the Constitution is predicated. There is no more basic principle of democracy than that the present shall determine its own destiny unhampered by the dead hand of the past. It cannot be argued, in a democracy, that earlier Congresses can bind new Senators who are elected on pledges to particular programs which old rules make impossible.

We cannot state this proposition as well as Thomas Jefferson did many years ago:

"Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead * * *. A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing then, is unchangeable but the inherent unalienable rights of man." (The Jefferson Cyclopedia, vol. VII, pp. 377, 378.)

As one generation cannot bind another, so one legislature cannot bind its successor. This fundamental principle of the independence and full authority of each new legislature, recognized by all authorities, has been well stated by Judge Cooley (Constitutional Limitations, 6th ed., 1890, pp. 146–147):

"To say that the legislature may pass irrepealable laws, is to say that it may alter the very constitution from which it derives its authority; since, insofar as one legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual."

The inherent right of legislative bodies to be unfettered by previous assemblies has been forcefully recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in cases dating back over a long period. This right, as analyzed by the Supreme Court, does not arise from any particular phraseology in Federal and State constitutions; it arises from the very nature of successive legislatures in a democratic society.

In one of the leading cases dealing with this problem, the Supreme Court stated:

"Every succeeding legislature possesses the same jurisdiction and power with respect to them as its predecessors. The latter have the same power of repeal and modification which the former had of enactment, neither more or less. All occupy, in this respect, a footing of perfect equality. This must necessarily be so in the nature of things. It is vital to the public welfare that each one should be able at all times to do whatever the varying circumstances and present exigencies touching the subject involved may require. A different result would be fraught with evil." *Newton* v. *Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio* (100 U.S. 548, 559).

Again, in response to the argument that Congress could not change the use of certain public lands, Mr. Justice (later Chief Justice) Stone said:

"By dedicating the lands thus acquired to a particular public use, Congress declared a public policy, but did not purport to deprive itself of the power to change that policy by devoting the lands to other uses. The dedication expressed no more than the will of a particular Congress which does not impose itself upon those to follow in succeeding years. See *Newton* v. *Mahoning County Commissioners* (100 U.S. 548, 559); *Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.* v. *Spratley* (172 U.S. 602, 621)." *Reichelderfer* v. *Quinn* (287 U.S. 315, 318).

This principle, that no legislature can act so as to fetter its successors in expressing public policy and public will, has been repeatedly expressed. See *Town of East Hartford* v. *Hartford Bridge Co.* (10 How. 511, 533); *Ohio Life Insurance and Trust Co.* v. *Debolt* (16 How. 416, 431); *Connecticut Mutual Life Ins. Co.*, v. *Spratley* (172 U.S. 602, 621); *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U.S. 385, 393 (n. 19)). Who would maintain that, for example, if the Congress enacts a law providing that it can be repealed only by a two-thirds vote, that a majority could not subsequently repeal both that provision and the law itself by a simple majority? Such a theory would by the first, irreversible step toward the destruction of democratic government. Yet this is the very argument which is being made by thise who would assert the binding effects of the old rules upon the Senate of the new Congress.

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution, empowering each House to "determine the rules of its proceedings" must be interpreted in the light of these fundamental democratic principles upon which the Constitution is based; so interpreted, it can only be read to give each branch of each succeeding Congress the same power of making its own rules that the branches of the first Congress had when they met in 1789. And there can be no slightest question whatever that the majority of the Senators in 1789 had the right to adopt rules for their own governance and that that right could not have been frustrated by any attempts at filibuster.

What we have had in the past dozen years is a clear illustration of the evils inherent in the members of a legislative body seeking to bind their successors. What we have had is not simply a rule of the past whose incidental effect is to bind the present and the future; what we have had are purposeful efforts to restrict the authority of future Congresses by preventing changes in the rules.

First came clause 3 of the Hayden-Wherry resolution of 1949, which amended rule XXII to provide that there shall be no cloture whatever on any proposal to change the rules of the Senate. The Senate of the 81st Congress thus attempted to fasten its will on the Senate of all future Congresses; it attempted to perpetuate the present rule XXII for all time. This was not a simple effort to provide rules for the Senate's own governance, but was rather a deliberate attempt to foist those rules upon the Senate of all future Congresses. As Senator RUSSELL so aptly said of clause 3, "the rules of the Senate hereafter are not subject to cloture on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the standing rules * * * it [clause 3] permits Senators who have the courage to do so to protect the parliamentary integrity of this body from assaults that will come in the days that lie ahead." (95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2722. See also 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2230, 2415, 2582–2584, 2673–2675). Clause 3 was, in a word, a deliberate effort boldly stated to flout the basic principle that the Members of one Congress cannot bind their successors. The Vice President's advisory rulings in both 1957 and 1959 clearly stated his belief that clause 3 was unconstitutional.

Then, in 1959, the resolution of Majority Leader JOHNSON made an even more determined effort to bind the Senate of future Congresses. While removing clause 3 of the Hayden-Wherry resolution of 1949, the Johnson resolution of 1959 added a new similarly intended section 2 to rule XXXII, reading as follows:

"2. The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

But this provision can no more deny to a majority of the Senate of the 87th Congress their right to adopt rules than could clause 3 of the 1949 resolution. True, its intent, when considered in the light of the existing rule XXII, is to fasten that rule upon future Congresses until two-thirds of the Senators vote to cut off a filibuster against a rules change and get to a vote on a change in the rules. But the intended purpose falls before article I, section 5, and the basic democratic principles just discussed. A majority in 1959[5] cannot give a minority in 1961 the right to prevent the majority in 1961 from exercising its democratic will. It cannot be that such a strategem has effectively given a minority of Senators a perpetual veto power over the national legislative process.

It might be helpful and clarifying to consider some other possible courses that the Senate of the 81st Congress or the 87th Congress might have followed to perpetuate rule XXII. Suppose that, instead of adopting section 2 of rule XXXII, the Johnson resolution had provided that rules of the Senate "may be amended hereafter only by unanimous consent." Certainly no one would contend that the Senators meeting on January 3, 1961, would be bound by any such rule and yet this is exactly the purpose and effect of section 2 of rule XXXII. As long as a minority of Senators are on their feet and ready to talk and there are not two-thirds of the Senate ready to vote cloture, there can be no change in the rules of the Senate even though 55 percent or 60 percent or even more favor majority cloture. There is little difference between substance, the only effect of which is to create a certain result, and the actual form. When the practical effect of a provision is unconstitutional, it does not matter that the draftsmen have carefully avoided a clear expression thereof.

Or let us take a second case. Suppose the Senate in 1959 instead of enacting section 2 of rule XXXII had adopted a rule that no equal rights legislation could be considered for 25 years or some other terms of years. Again no one would dream of arguing that this rule would bind a majority of the Senate of the incoming 87th Congress. Yet, again as a practical matter, that is exactly the purpose of the action of the Senate of 1959.

The Senate of 1959, by section 2 of rule XXXII, tried to bind the future just as much as if it had required unanimous consent to any changes in the rules or had provided that the Senate of no future Congress could take up equal rights legislation. Its efforts to prevent the Senate from responding to the will of the people cannot succeed under the authorities cited and principles outlined above.

Rule XXII, in combination with rule XXXII, is substance masquerading as procedure. Rules are generally intended to facilitate the conduct of business, not to prevent it. The purpose of rules is to facilitate and provide, by orderly procedures, what a legislative body desires to do; a rule which defeats the purpose for which rules are established is hostile to democratic processes.

Rule XXII, in combination with rule XXXII, is not a procedural means of getting

---

[5] Whether there actually was a majority for this provision is unclear. It was added as part of a compromise package and no vote was ever taken on this provision separately.

business done; it is a substantive means of preventing business from being done.

It is a means of the Senate of one Congress seeking to bind its successors to its own rules and its own inaction.

It is a means of keeping the majority of the Senate and of the people from determining vital substantive issues.

The answer to this attempt to bind the future lies in article I, section 5, which gives the majority of the Senate of the 87th Congress, meeting for the first time on January 3, 1961, the power and the duty to make its own rules, unfettered by efforts of the Senate of an earlier Congress to deprive this majority of its constitutional power and responsibility. Rules adopted by the Senate of an earlier Congress cannot prejudice the explicit constitutional authority in article I, section 5.

II. The Four Closest Precedents in the History of the Senate All Support the Proposition That a Majority of the Senate of a New Congress Can Act To Adopt Its Own Rules Without the Obstruction of Actions and Rules of the Senate of an Earlier Congress

A. Precedent 1—The dismissal of the Senate printer in 1841: A joint resolution of 1819 authorized each House of Congress to choose the printer for the next succeeding House; it provided the method, rights of pay, and other matters of detail. Pursuant to this joint resolution, the Democratic Senate in 1840 chose as printer for the Senate of the following Congress (the 27th Congress) the firm of Blair & Rives. Mr. Blair was editor of the Washington Globe, an intensely partisan newspaper which supported the Democratic administration. The Whigs had given notice during the last days of the 2d session of the 26th Congress that they did not consider that the Democrats had any constitutional or moral right to choose a printer for the next Congress. Despite these warnings, the Democratic Senate awarded the contract for the printing for the next Senate to Blair & Rives.

Immediately upon the opening of a special session of the Whig-controlled 27th Congress, Senator Mangum, of North Carolina, introduced a resolution that Blair & Rives be dismissed as printer to the Senate (9 Congressional Globe, p. 236). The resolution was heatedly opposed, largely on the authority of the established usage under the joint resolution of 1819. The opponents argued that a printer had been elected 10 times under the authority of the resolution and that now, on the occasion of the 11th election, the unconstitutionality of the authorizing resolution was claimed too late.

Senator Allen, of Ohio, in a statement quoted several times during the recent Senate debates on rules changes, summed up the position of those contending for the binding effect of the action of the previous Senate in these words:

"And as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. * * * There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate."

Senator Buchanan and others supported Senator Allen, arguing for the theory of the Senate as a permanent and continuous body bound by the actions of the Senate of an earlier Congress.

Rejecting the appeals of Senators Allen, Buchanan, and the other Democrats, those in favor of the dismissal of the printer designated the resolution of 1819 as a nullity because it attempted to bind the actions of future Houses of Congress. The argument that the Senate of one Congress could not bind its successors prevailed; the resolution to dismiss the printer was adopted 26 to 18.

In a word, the Senate of 1841 rejected the theory that the action of the Senate of one Congress could bind the Senate of a later Congress. The Senate rejected this theory in the face of the same arguments of permanence and continuity that are now being made by the supporters of rule XXII. Indeed, it is significant that Senator Taft, leading the battle against the motion to take up rules in 1953, relied heavily upon the quotation from Senator Allen in the 1841 debate, despite the fact that Senator Allen's statement and his theory had been repudiated by a majority of the Senate when it voted to dismiss the printer. In other words, those who relied upon the statements of Senators Allen, Buchanan, and their colleagues were relying upon the arguments of the defeated side; it was as though, in arguing to a court, a lawyer had relied upon a decision that had been overruled.

B. Precedent 2.—Abrogation of the joint rules in 1876: The story of the abrogation of the joint rules and their relevance to the present issue was well stated in the Leadership Conference Brief, 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 187, and quoted in the 1957 brief submitted by Senators joining in the motion to take up rules (103 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 24, 26). We again quote that statement in full:

"In the First Congress the Senate and House adopted joint rules to govern the relationship and necessary business between them. Annals of Congress, 57–58, 987. Thereafter, these joint rules of the two Houses were treated as in force and revised and amended, although the Senate and House did not adopt them at the beginning of each Congress.

"In 1865, rule XXII of the joint rules was adopted in an attempt to settle the long-standing controversy on the method of counting electoral votes. In 1869, there was a violent quarrel between the two Houses of Congress over the effect of this particular joint rule. This led to a determination by a portion of the Senate to rescind that rule, in anticipation of any problems over the counting of electoral votes which might arise from the 1876 presidential election (Haynes, op. cit., supra, page 245 et seq.). The desire of the Senate to eliminate joint rule XXII led to the end of acquiesence of each new Senate in the continuation of the joint rules and the Senate in the 1st session of the 41st Congress, after 87 years of unbroken historical usage, demonstrated its right to adopt new joint rules at the beginning of each new Congress.

"On December 15, Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, introduced a resolution to adopt the joint rules in force at the close of the last session of Congress. Senator Bayard, of Delaware, asked whether this was necessary, and Senator Edmunds answered:

" 'That, as a celebrated Englishman said, is past finding out. The object of this resolution is to ascertain from the proper Committee on Rules (which had jurisdiction over the joint rules as well as the Standing Rules of the Senate) whether the joint rules that were in force at the last session of Congress are in force now without any vote; and, if so, upon what principle of law or joint proceeding; and if not, of course to take some steps to have some joint rules between the two Houses,' (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 220).

"The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules, which reported it back favorably with a technical amendment making it a concurrent resolution. Senator Hamlin argued that the joint rules operated only by acquiescence (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 309). Considerable heated discussion ensued, in which widely different theories as to the effect and validity of the joint rules were stated. The one point receiving constant reiteration was that the joint rules had operated by acquiescence, and must be subject to change. Senator Hamlin, as he gave the committee report, stated it as follows:

" 'It is only by acquiescence in long years that they have been treated and regarded as rules, and not by an affirmative vote either of the House or of the Senate' (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 309).

"Recognition that common consent or acquiescence could give validity to that which was otherwise doubtful only so long as the acquiescence continued was voiced by Senator Merrimon, who said in the course of this debate (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 431–432):

" 'It seems, as the venerable Senator from Maine [Mr. Hamlin] stated on a former occasion, that this matter has passed uniformly from the beginning of the Government down to this time without question. The question is now raised, and if today some action of Congress should be required under the joint rules, and a Senator should rise and say "I object," there would be the end of it. It is only by common consent that the practice to which I have referred has prevailed.'

"Despite the appeals to history, longstanding practice, and the venerability of the joint rules, the Senate voted to reject a substitute resolution which would have treated the rules as in force and provided for an amendment of those rules, and accepted the initial resolution which was framed on the theory that no joint rules existed at the opening of the new Congress (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 519).

"Thus, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution adopting the joint rules anew for the 44th Congress. The House never passed this resolution. The Senate, at various times, since then has made an effort to have joint rules passed but they never have succeeded. (Gilfrey, Precedents, 1914, p. P–441; Hinds, secs. 6782–6787.) In most respects the House and Senate now operate in the same manner as they did under the joint rules on some theory of usage.

"The decision, by vote of the Senate, that the joint rules were not in effect demonstrated that the joint rules had existed only by acquiescence and that the acquiescence of even 87 years was in no way binding when a majority manifested its will to the contrary. It also showed conclusively that the method by which the majority in such a situation manifests its will is by the adoption of new rules and not by amendment of the old ones."

C. Precedent 3—Senator Walsh's resolution and arguments in 1917: At the opening of the 65th Congress in March 1917, Senators Owen of Oklahoma and Walsh of Montana raised the question whether the rules of the preceding Senate were binding upon the new body.

Senator Owen, on the first business day of the Senate of the new Congress, March 6, 1917, refused to permit a bill to be referred to committee on the ground that committees were not in existence at the beginning of this new Congress, and Senator Walsh supported Senator Owen's contention.

On March 7, Senator Walsh presented a resolution squarely raising the issue whether the rules carried over from Senate to Senate and presented his now famous argument against the old rules being utilized to frustrate the right of the Senate of the new Congress to adopt rules for its governance. Said the Senator: "A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them."

On the evening of March 7, after Senator Walsh's resolution and speech, caucuses of both parties voted to approve a change in rule XXII to provide for cloture by a two-thirds vote. The resolution was debated by unanimous consent without ever being referred to committee and was adopted on March 8, 1917 (76 yeas, 3 nays). Senator Walsh, who had accomplished his purpose of obtaining the cloture rule he sought, dropped his resolution.

D. Precedent 4—Vice President NIXON's Advisory Rulings in 1957 and 1959.

At the opening of the 85th and 86th Congresses in 1957 and 1959, several Senators made parliamentary inquiries of Vice President NIXON. With clarity and consistency the Vice President gave repeated advisory rulings that a majority of the Senate of a new Congress can act to adopt its own rules without the obstruction of actions and rules of the Senate of an earlier Congress and that a motion to cut off debate would be in order against a filibuster attempt to prevent a determination of the rules to govern the Senate of the new Congress. These rulings are quoted earlier in this brief and will not be repeated here. But even a cursory glance back at these rulings will be sufficient to make clear that they follow the Constitution and precedents with logic and reasoning.

Thus, in the four closest precedents, the Senate, while some of its Members talked "continuous body" and others talked in a contrary vein, each time supported the right of the Senate to adopt new rules unfettered by past actions. The printer was dismissed in 1841 despite the argument that this could not be done in the face of the action of the Senate of the earlier Congress; new joint rules were adopted in 1876 despite the action and acquiescence of the Senate of the earlier Congresses; a new cloture rule was adopted in 1917 by overwhelming agreement once the argument was made that the old rules did not bind the Senate of the new Congress; and the Vice President's advisory rulings in 1957 and 1959 were well received by the Senate.

III. The Senate of Each New Congress Makes a Fresh Start on All Activities; It Has a Right To Make a Fresh Start in Whole or in Part on Its Rules if a Majority So Desire

In every major activity the Senate recognizes a constitutional right of the Senate of each new Congress to determine both legislative and executive business anew. All consideration of bills,[6] resolutions, treaties and nominations starts at the beginning of each Congress without reference to or continuation of what has taken place in the past; new officers and committee members are elected in the Senate of each new Congress; when the Senate finally adjourns, the slate is wiped clean; the proceedings begin again in the next Congress.

For convenience, we present an analysis of the operations of the U.S. Senate in tabular form.

The thing that stands out in the analysis is that everything starts afresh with the possible exception of the rules.[7] And these, too, it is submitted start afresh in whole or in part the moment a majority of the Senators at the opening of the Senate of a new Congress so will it and so vote. All that has happened over the past years is that there has been acquiescence in the carryover of rules of the Senate from Congress to Congress.[8] Carryover of the rules based on acquiescence is certainly no precedent for arguing that the earlier rules bind the Senate of the new Congress in the absence of such acquiescence. Absent acquiescence, the Senate of the new Congress has power to adopt its rules at the opening of the new Congress unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses. The acquiescence in rule XXII will be ruptured when the resolution proposed herein is offered on January 3, 1961.

IV. The Talk About the Senate Being a Continuing Body Is Both Misleading and Irrelevant; Whether or Not the Senate Is Properly Termed a Continuous Body as an Academic Matter Does Not Determine Whether a Majority of the Senate of the 87th Congress May Adopt Its Own Rules Unobstructed by the Actions and Rules of the Senate of Earlier Congresses

As we have seen in points II and III, the Senate has not in the past acted as a continuous body.

Analysis of the operations of the U.S. Senate

Activity	Senate acts anew in each Congress	Senate bound by Senate of preceding Congress	Comment
1. Introduction of bills	X		See Senate rule XXXII.
2. Committee consideration of bills	X		Do.
3. Debate on bills	X		Do.
4. Voting on bills	X		Do.
5. Election of officers	X		While the old officers carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carry over. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.[1]
6. Consideration of validity of senatorial elections	X		Although credentials of a Senator-elect are often presented to the Senate prior to the beginning of his term, the validity of the credentials can only be considered by the Senate to which he was elected and not before.
7. Consideration of treaties	X		See Senate rule XXXVII(2).
8. Submission and consideration of nominations	X		See Senate rule XXXVIII(6).
9. Election of committee members	X		See rule XXV. While old committees carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carry over. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.
10. Adjournment	X		Adjourns sine die. When Congress ends at noon of a particular day, and a special session of the Senate of the new Congress is called, the Senate adjourns at noon, and one minute afterward opens the new session.
11. Rules	(?)	(?)	Past practice of Senate on rules is ambiguous. It can be explained as acquiescence in past rules, which can either be repeated at the opening of the Senate of any new Congress by beginning to operate under them or which can be refused by the adoption of new rules in whole or in part.

[1] Similarly, the fact that the President pro tempore carries over until there is a change of party control of the Senate is no evidence of rules carryover. On the contrary, the fact that an election of a President pro tempore automatically follows a shift in party control (see 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9,) is evidence that the Senate of each new Congress responds to the will of the majority of the Senate of that Congress.

It did not act as a continuous body in 1841 when it dismissed the printer chosen by the Senate of the earlier Congress; it did not act as a continuous body in 1876 when it adopted new joint rules; and it did not act as a continuous body in 1917 when it yielded to the contrary arguments of Senator Walsh and adopted the cloture rule he demanded (point II).

It does not today act as a continuous body; it wipes the slate clean on bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations at the beginning of each new Congress (point III).

It would be circular reasoning, indeed, to argue that, despite these actions, the Senate is a continuous body because it has acquiesced in the carryover of rules in the past and is now bound to continue to acquiesce in the old rules because it is a continuous body.

No one would deny that many Senators have talked in terms of a continuous body and that textbook writers have accepted this talk in their academic works. But the talk has been largely by those who tried—unsuccessfully—to use the phrase to prevent Senate action departing from that of the Senate of an earlier Congress and who have failed in their efforts.[9]

[6] As was well said in the 1957 brief of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in referring to the fact that no action in connection with bills carries over from the Senate of one Congress to the Senate of the next Congress:

"This necessary practice is not grounded upon a rule only but upon art. I, sec. 1, of the Constitution of the United States which vests all legislative power in the Congress. As the legislative business of one Congress cannot carry over to a subsequent Congress, a fortiori, the legislative business of one part of the Congress cannot carry over to that part of a subsequent Congress."

[7] It has been suggested that the very fact that the Senate rules referred to in the above analysis provide that Senate bills, resolutions, treaties, nominations, etc., start afresh is evidence that, in the absence of these rules, Senate activities and business would not start afresh. There are several answers to this suggestion: (i) The rules codified rather than reversed existing practice. (ii) At least with respect to legislative business, starting afresh is a constitutional necessity. See note 6, supra. (iii) Senate rule XXXII provides for the continuation of legislative business from session to session of the same Congress; the existence of this rule hardly proves that the opposite would be true in the absence of rule XXXII. No more does the existence of the various rules providing that Senate business and activities start afresh in a new Congress prove that the opposite would be true in the absence of these rules.

[8] Except, of course, in 1917, when Senators Walsh and Owen refused to acquiesce until the Senate adopted the cloture rule they sought, and in 1953, 1957, and 1959, when Senators joining in the Anderson motion refused to do so and the Senate, in voting to table the Anderson motion, indicated its acquiescence in the old rules.

[9] We have already seen (point II, A) how Senator Taft and others quoted Senator Allen and his colleagues who were on the losing side in the 1841 debate over the dismissal of the printer.

The essence of the matter, of course, is that the term "continuous" is an adjective resulting from the two-thirds carryover of Senators, not a cause of any thing. Also, it can be appropriate when considering one aspect of the Senate and inappropriate when considering another. The adjective may, for example, be well used when it is simply meant to convey the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate carry over to the succeeding Congress; but, equally clearly, the adjective "continuing" is inappropriate when it is intended to convey the idea of a body which wipes the slate clean in regard to bills, treaties, nominations, etc. (see point III). But whether or not the term "continuing" is a good or a bad adjective,[10] it has not been a successful adjective when utilized against concrete proposed action. It cannot prevail over article I, section 5 of the Constitution empowering each House "to determine the rules of its proceedings" nor sanction a device by which the Senate of a previous Congress attempted to fasten its will upon the future. Whether the Senate be continuous or not for other purposes, its by-laws (rules) are void where they conflict with its charter (Constitution). If, by saying that the Senate is a continuous body, it is intended to assert that the rules of yesterday can bind the Senate of the Congress of today, the simple answer is that the first obligation of the Senate is not to its rules but to the people and the Constitution from whence its power derives. There cannot be a constitutional obligation of the Senate to observe rules whose purpose and effect is to deprive it of its constitutional right to make its own rules.

Actually, parliamentary bodies generally have both continuous and discontinuous aspects. The House of Representatives, as we shall show in point V, has continuous aspects and yet no one refers to it as a continuous body and no one disputes its right to adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress. By the same token, the Senate has both continuous and discontinuous aspects; its limited continuous aspects do not support the proposition that the Senate of an earlier Congress can prevent the Senate of a new Congress from acting upon rules as the majority may determine at the opening of the new Congress.

The relevant difference between the House and the Senate, which causes the latter to be described sometimes as a continuous body, is the fact that two-thirds of the Senators carry over from Congress to Congress. But the fact that two-thirds of the Senators carry over to the new Congress is not relevant to the question whether the rules of the Senate of one Congress bind the Senate of the next Congress. What is relevant is the fact that one-third of the Senators do not carry over and that, in the course of a very few years, a majority of the Senators do not carry over; and in the course of a little more than a generation, no Senator carries over.

The argument for the carryover of the rules seems to come down to this: Because two-thirds of the Senators carry over, the Senate is a continuous body; because the Senate is a continuous body, the rules carry over. Striking the words "continuous body" out of this formula, the argument comes down to this: Since two-thirds of the Senators carry over, the rules carry over. But this is a patent nonsequitur. It assumes that the carryover of two-thirds of the Senate always carries over a majority in favor of the rules. The infusion of one-third newly elected Senators—both by their numbers and their power of persuasion—may very well change the majority view on rules and it is this majority view that is determinative under our constitutional democracy, not who carries over. That the new one-third may change the majority on any matter is well illustrated by the shifting of the Senate from party to party over the years. The argument that the two-thirds carryover prevents the new majority from acting on the rules disenfranchises not only the newly elected one-third, but the new majority who are prevented from exercising their powers and duties to make the rules for their own work and laws for the people. To say that the Senate of the 87th Congress in 1961 is the same as the Senate of the 1st Congress in 1789 because two-thirds of its members carried over to the Senate of the 2d Congress is to prefer romantic form to rational substance and dubious academic theory to practical reality.

Some Senators genuinely believe the Senate is a "continuous body." Others genuinely believe that it is not, that it acts as a "discontinuous body." Both have the right to their opinions. But when a descriptive term resulting from nothing more than the carryover of two-thirds of the Senators is used as a reason for preventing the majority of the body from determining the Senate's actions, an adjective is being confused with a reason and an effect with a cause. The parliamentary deadfall dug by the Senate of a dead Congress, harmless enough as an abstraction, should not be permitted to stultify and destroy the power of the Senate and of the entire Congress in the present.

V. The Practice of the House of Representatives in Readopting Its Rules in Each New Congress Is a Relevant Precedent for the Senate

As we have noted many times in this brief, article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Article I, section 1 provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The Constitution contains reference after reference to the Congress of which the Senate is a coordinate part. Where any differences in the conduct or authority of the two Houses are intended, they are set forth in express terms in the Constitution and no difference is expressed in relation to the determination of rules. We believe, therefore, that the Senate can properly consider the history and practice of the House of Representatives in the adoption of its rules.

A. Brief history of House practice on adoption of the rules: The House in the First Congress, as one of its first acts, adopted rules of procedure, based on those used in the Continental Congress (Galloway, "Congress at the Crossroads" (1946), p. 13; Annals of Congress 121). The House of the Second Congress instituted the system, now in use, of adopting the rules of the prior House at the beginning of the session (3 Annals of Congress 143). This practice apparently continued until 1860. However, for the 30-year period from 1860 to 1890, the House operated under a system of acquiescence in past rules, without necessarily formally adopting new rules at the beginning of each Congress. During this period the House operated under a resolution providing that the 1860 rules of the House should be the rules "of the present and subsequent Congresses unless otherwise ordered." This rule remained in existence until 1890 and operated as the source of authority for the rules of the House.

In 1890, there occurred perhaps the most famous example of a change in basic legislative procedure in our country. Speaker Reed ruled that at the beginning of each new Congress the House operates under general parliamentary law until new rules are adopted. By so ruling, he made it possible for the majority of the House to adopt new rules which were designed to promote effective majority exercise of legislative functions and to prevent minority obstructionism (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1347; 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 188, 189). Since 1890, House rules have been adopted anew by each incoming Congress. The 1890 episode demonstrates that acquiescence in the carryover of rules does not prevent the majority from acting when they no longer deem such acquiescence in the public interest.

B. Current House practice on adoption of the rules: Very early in the first session of each new Congress, on the first or second day, the ranking member of the (old) Committee on Rules offers a resolution adopting rules for the new Congress (Galloway, "Legislative Procedure in Congress" (1955), p. 15). The resolution often is phrased in terms of reference to the rules of the preceding Congress, although the rules are sometimes set out in full (see 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15–24). Unless a major change is proposed, debate is non-existent or perfunctory and the rules are adopted within a few minutes (see adoption of rules for 84th and 85th Congresses at 101 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11; 103 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 47). Even when a controversial change has been proposed, the debate does not run on unduly (see adoption of new rules for the 81st and 82d Congresses at 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10; 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9).[11] During the period preliminary to the adoption of the rules, the House operates under general parliamentary procedure (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 740–749; 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 24) and under general parliamentary procedure debate on the rules can always be effectively closed by a call for the previous question (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 24). The experience of the House within the last 50 years in adopting rules has proved conclusively that the necessity for periodic adoption every 2 years at the opening of each new Congress does not delay either the organization of the legislative body or the prompt consideration of legislative business.

C. Carryover of House Clerk: Perhaps the most striking example of a House procedure which, at first glance, is inconsistent with the House's view of itself as a discontinuous body is the carryover of the Clerk of the old House for the purpose of opening the new session of Congress in the new House. This procedure is described at 100 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 188 (see also Cannon's Procedure in

[10] The passing reference to the Senate as a continuing body in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U.S. 135), is much discussed and little analyzed. That case involved an investigation into the malfeasance of Attorney General Daugherty, which was begun in the 68th Cong., and the validity of a subpena to the Attorney General's brother which had been issued during the life of that Congress. Before the Supreme Court handed down its decision, the 68th Cong. had expired. In considering whether the case had become moot as a result of this fact, the Supreme Court pointed out that the Senate could now revive the committee "by a motion to that effect" and therefore there was a potential need for the information sought from Daugherty. All the Court held was that the Senate had power to revive a committee started in one Congress by action taken by the Senate in the next Congress. This decision did not involve the determination that the Senate was a continuing body for all purposes, since it dealt only with the problems of continuing investigations; actually, even the finding of the Senate's continuity in this respect is open to question, since a truly continuing body would not require a new motion to continue the work of the committee. In a word, the Court disproved its own dictum.

[11] In 1951, the proposed rules were amended and then adopted without undue interruption of House business even though efforts to close debate by use of the previous question motion were unsuccessful.

House of Representatives 175). It is now authorized by statute, although, of course, that statute, like the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, is subject to change by the House in the exercise of its constitutional right to make its own rules. That statute, moreover, merely codifies a long-standing custom and House rule, under which the House operated prior to the statute. The carryover procedure is not limited solely to the Clerk, for, in case the Clerk is absent, the duty falls upon the Sergeant at Arms and next on the Doorkeeper (Hinds, "Precedents," 15). This well-known and unquestioned procedure offers a further convincing demonstration that necessary procedural carryovers, acquiesced in over a long period of time, do not change the nature of a legislative body and cannot obliterate nor diminish the constitutional and moral right of a majority of an American legislative body to make its own rules.

The House also carries over certain other functions. These are listed in sections 6748–6754 of Hinds, "Precedents." Hinds, in summarizing these carryover procedures, points out that, although the House becomes functus officio at the end of its terms, in practice certain rules extend into the new Congress. But the carryover of the Clerk and of other items by acquiescence does not deprive the House of its right to make new rules at the opening of a new Congress; no more does past acquiescence of the Senate in rules carryover deprive it of the right to make new rules at the opening of a new Congress when a majority of the Senators then elected and present so decide.

These practices and procedures of the House of Representatives are relevant to the debate concerning the adoption of new rules by the Senate. Because the House and the Senate operate as a team in a 2-year Congress, the Senate in each Congress starts anew with respect to legislative business. So does the House. (The Senate also starts anew in each new Congress the business relating to its special functions in connection with nominations and treatymaking.) Both organize their activities on a 2-year basis.

The sole significant difference between the two legislative bodies in our Congress is the duration of the individual Senators' terms and the rotation of one-third of the number of Senators every 2 years. The historical materials demonstrate that the longer term for Senators was established in order to provide a moderating force in Congress, a body which would have stability and the opportunity via its longer term to acquire specialized knowledge in the field of foreign affairs and some independence from the pressures of politics. (See Prescott, "Drafting the Federal Constitution," pp. 247–260.) It is equally clear from the debates in the Constitutional Convention that there was a firm desire to avoid the establishment of a permanent upper house similar to the House of Lords. Thus the Convention dismissed without even a vote a suggestion made that tenure might be for life. It rejected the proposal of a 9-year term in favor of the shorter, 6-year term. The fact that the Founding Fathers desired to give a measure of stability to one branch of the Congress cannot support any artificial theories abrogating the right of new Senators in each new Congress to have equal voice in establishing "the rules of its proceedings." If the rules cannot as a matter of actual fact be changed at the will of the majority, as in the House, the Senate will have been converted into that permanent, undemocratic and irresponsive body which it was the particular intention of the drafters of the Constitution to prevent.[12]

[12] Actually the precedent set by the House in adopting its rules at the opening of each Congress goes far beyond what is proposed here. The Senators backing majority rule are not now proposing the adoption of all the rules at the opening of Congress. All they are suggesting is the adoption of a new rule XXII and the right of the majority of the Senate of the new Congress to adopt that new rule XXII without obstruction in the form of action by earlier Congresses. Certainly the right to adopt a whole new set of rules unfettered by old rules includes the right to adopt one or more new rules unfettered by old rules.

VI. Majority Rule Is the Basic Principle of Legislative Action Prescribed by the Constitution of the United States: The Rulings of the Vice President Should Be Made in 1961, as in 1957 and 1959, in the Light of the Fact That His Decision May Well Determine Whether Constitutional Majority Rule Is To Be Regained in the Senate of the United States

Majority rule has not existed in the Senate of the United States for many years. The filibuster and the threat of filibuster have prevented the majority from carrying out its will in the Senate and thus in the Congress. This is in direct opposition to the letter and spirit of the Constitution which established majority rule as the basic principle of our Government, and the basis of the enacting power of the Houses of Congress. The Supreme Court has aptly described the principle of majority rule as one "sanctioned by our governmental practices, by business procedure, and by the whole philosophy of democratic institutions." *N.L.R.B.* v. *A. J. Tower Co.* (329 U.S. 324, 331).

The pervasive need for majority rule was recognized at the Constitutional Convention. Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist, No. XXII, strongly emphasized this need as follows:

"To give a minority a negative upon a majority (which is always the case where more than a majority is requisite to a decision) is, in its tendency, to subject the sense of the greater number to that of the lesser * * *. If a pertinacious minority can control the opinion of a majority, respecting the best mode of conducting it, the majority, in order that something may be done, must conform to the views of the minority; and thus the sense of the smaller number will overrule that of the greater, and give a tone to national proceedings."

The authors of the Constitution prescribed majority rule as the rule for congressional action by expressly enumerating all the instances in which more than a majority vote was to be required. These special cases were limited to five. There are two-thirds requirements in connection with (1) the power of Congress to override the veto, (2) senatorial ratification of treaties, (3) the initiation by Congress of proposals to amend the Constitution, (4) the impeachment power, and (5) the expulsion of Members of Congress. In these rare instances, where it was felt necessary to make exceptions to majority rule, the Constitution expressly said so (art. I, sec. 7; art. II, sec. 2; art. V; art. I, sec. 3; art. I, sec. 5).

This detailed specification of the two-thirds requirement in connection with particular powers demonstrates that, when Congress was to operate other than by majority rule, it was so instructed by definite language in the Constitution. When a document, as carefully drafted and considered as was the Constitution, enumerates particular exceptions to a general rule, it must be concluded that no other exceptions were intended to be made. As the Supreme Court said in *Addison* v. *Holly Hill Co.* (322 U.S. 607 at 617): "Exemptions made in such detail preclude their enlargement by implication."

The framers of the Constitution gave further evidence of their intent that the majority rule should govern in all except the five specified instances by the great care with which they limited the two-thirds requirement. At least two separate instances are recorded in which the convention rejected efforts to impose a two-thirds requirement on legislation:

1. On August 29, a motion to limit the national power over interstate and foreign commerce by a two-thirds provision was made and rejected. Mr. Sherman, in arguing against the motion, stated that "to require more than a majority to decide a question was always embarrassing, as had been experienced in cases requiring the votes of nine States in Congress" (referring to the Congress under the Articles of Confederation).

2. On September 15, another attempt to fetter Congress' control over navigation by a two-thirds limitation was unsuccessful (Farrand, "Records of the Federal Convention of 1787").

In addition to the rejected attempts that were made to limit the majority principle in connection with substantive powers, the motion in the Constitutional Convention to raise the quorum provision (art. I, sec. 5) from a majority to two-thirds was overwhelmingly put down. Some members of the Convention even feared that a majority was too large a number. George Morris pointed out that "the secession of a small number" might "in the national councils * * * be fatal," and this fear of his was concurred in by a number of others who spoke on the subject (Prescott, "Drafting the Federal Constitution," p. 425 et seq.). Accordingly, the Congress was given power to compel the attendance of absent members so that a majority could be gathered together and the business of the Congress dispatched.

Majority rule is the constitutional measure for legislative action. As Senator Thomas of Colorado pointed out in debating the cloture rule of 1917, "majority rule is an essential principle in American Government" (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 33). Yet this fundamental constitutional principle can only be reestablished in the U.S. Senate through new rules, in whole or in part, at the opening of the Senate of a new Congress. If this route is blocked by a ruling of the Vice President or otherwise, there will be no way to carry out this basic principle of the Constitution and to implement the Supreme Court's statement that a House of Congress "may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints * * *" *United States* v. *Ballin* (144 U.S. 1, 5).

VII. Conclusion

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution gives the Senate of each succeeding Congress, just as it gives the House of each succeeding Congress, the power to act on rules without regard to anything that the Senate of an earlier Congress may have done (point I). We have seen how the fundamental principles of democratic government require that the majority of the Senators of each new Congress have the right to act unfettered by an earlier majority (point I). We have seen how the Senate has refused to be bound by the action of the Senate of earlier Congresses whenever its own majority desired to take action (point II). We have seen how the Senate wipes the slate clean at the opening of each new Congress (point III). We have seen how the Senate has talked continuity and acted discontinuously (point IV). We have seen that the history and practice of the House of Representatives is a relevant precedent in favor of a ruling that a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Congress have power to adopt rules at the opening of the new Congress unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses and thus a majority of the Members of the Senate of the 87th Congress have power to terminate a filibuster by a motion

for the previous question or a motion to cut off debate where such action is necessary to determine the rules that will govern the Senate of the 87th Congress (point V). We have seen that the proposed action at the opening of Congress is the only method to restore the constitutional principle of majority rule to the Senate of the United States (point VI).

For all these reasons, we urge the Vice President, acting as President of the Senate, to reassert his advisory rulings of 1957 and 1959 and thus to make possible a return to the constitutional principle of majority rule.

Respectfully submitted by Senators joining in motion to amend rule XXII.

HUBERT HUMPHREY.
THOMAS KUCHEL.
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
JACOB JAVITS.
JOSEPH S. CLARK.
CLIFFORD CASE.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IN THE SENATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a discussion of the issue of the previous question in the Senate. I may say that I prepared it for the subsequent debate in 1957. It goes into the history of moving the previous question in the Senate and also in the British House of Commons.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IN THE SENATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from time to time during the debate over whether the Senate should proceed to adopt new rules, it was said by the eminent Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that, contrary to published reports, the previous question motion, which was a part of the Senate rules from 1789 to 1806, did not have the effect of closing or limiting debate; and that in the practice of the Senate in those years, there had been no effective rule to limit debate which could be invoked by a simple majority.

It has also been said by the Senator from Georgia and others that in those early days of the Senate, the previous question rule was not one whose usage was like the present usage of the previous question in almost every parliamentary body, the effect of which is to cut off debate, but that it was used then to postpone a matter, the effect of which was said to be to follow the usage of the British Parliament and the Continental Congress.

Mr. President, this may seem to be a highly academic matter to discuss, but since the Senate places so much emphasis upon precedents, and since the question of a substitute for unlimited debate involves the use of the previous question, and since, if we move to adopt new rules in the coming Congress, debate will take place under general parliamentary law, which includes the previous question, it is very important that we know what the precedents, so far as the use of the previous question is concerned, have been in both the United States Senate and the British Parliament, and also, let me say, in the Continental Congress.

I have had my office notify the office of the Senator from Georgia that I intended to discuss this subject this afternoon. So I have tried to comply with the usages and practices of the Senate.

My main purpose in speaking today is to examine the records and the documents and to show that, first, in the early Senate, the moving of the previous question could be used as a motion to end debate; in fact, it was moved with the intention of stopping debate; on two occasions its effect was to stop debate, and it was carried by a majority vote; and, second, while the previous question could also have the effect of postponement, that point is only half the story, for in both the British Parliament and the Continental Congress the motion was also used to stop debate.

I shall develop these points as I go along.

SAME POINTS MADE IN 1953

When the Anderson motion, that the Senate proceed to adopt its rules, was before the Senate in 1953, the same contention was made, namely, that the "previous question" had first only been a motion to postpone consideration rather than a motion to end debate and bring a measure to a vote. In particular, the brief placed in the RECORD on behalf of those who opposed the Anderson motion to proceed to adopt the rules of the Senate, contained such statements.

That brief was printed as a Senate document, Senate Document No. 4, 83d Congress, 1st session, and the statement is on page 11 of that publication.

That brief was placed in the RECORD again this year. Various sources were quoted in that brief as saying that the motion, the previous question, which was a part of the rules of the Senate from 1789 to 1806, could not be used to end debate and bring a vote—as in fact it was used—but was a motion to postpone consideration of a bill before the Senate and that it was debatable. In particular, the brief quotes from an article written by Henry Cabot Lodge in the North American Review of November 1893, entitled "Obstruction in the Senate." This is what he wrote:

"There never has been in the Senate any rule which enabled the majority to close debate or compel a vote. The previous question, which existed in the earliest years, was abandoned in 1806, was the previous question of England and not that with which everyone is familiar today in our House of Representatives. It was not in practice a cloture and it is therefore correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate" (p. 11).

This passage from what Senator Lodge wrote has been extensively used, and, as I shall later show, it is almost completely wrong.

While quoting from that brief during the 1953 debate, the late Senator Robert Taft also quoted from an article in the Congressional Digest of November 1926. That article said in part:

"The previous question was provided for in the first Senate rules found in the Annals of the First Congress from 1789 to 1791. Rules VIII, IX, and XI, related to the previous question but were rarely used. Like the precedents for the rule in the British Parliament and the Continental Congress when it was used in the early days of the Senate it did not limit debate but avoided a vote on a given subject. The previous question was debatable * * * but not on amendments." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, p. 112.)

I shall show today, Mr. President, that both of those statements, the statement of Senator Lodge and the article in the Congressional Digest, are not accurate, and that they have misled a great many eminent students of parliamentary law and Members of the Senate.

On the opening day of this session of Congress, January 3, 1957, I received permission to place in the body of the RECORD a number of papers bearing on the power of the Senate to change its rules, and of the necessity of doing so. Among these was an article written for the Washington Post and Times Herald by Irving Brant, the biographer of President Madison. It was published under the heading "Absurdities and Conflicts in Senate Rules Are Outlined," and appeared on January 2, 1957.

Ordinarily an article in a newspaper, on the subject of senatorial powers and privileges does not unduly attract the attention of any of my colleagues. This one, however, attracted the attention of one of our most distinguished Members, the senior Senator from Georgia, and on January 4 he addressed himself to it in debate. His particular objection to the article was to the following sentence in a thumbnail chronology of Senate rules on debate:

"From 1789 to 1806, debate on a bill could be ended instantly by a majority of Senators present, through adoption of an undebatable motion for the previous question."

This, my distinguished colleague declared, was completely incorrect.

"If," said he, "Mr. Brant had been as zealous in his research, and in seeking and producing the facts as he was in being an advocate in this matter, he would have found that there was absolutely no relationship, except in name, between the previous-question rule which applied in the Senate in those days."

And, I presume, he meant the previous-question rule as it is employed in other bodies to put an end to debate. Concerning the early Senate rule he asserted:

"That was the previous-question rule from the British Parliament, which applied in that body for many years. A motion for the previous question was in the nature of a motion to postpone consideration of a bill before the Senate. It was open to debate. It could be debated without let or hindrance of any kind. It was merely a method of disposing of a measure before the Senate without taking action on it at that time."

Further, Mr. Walter Lippmann, who repeated Mr. Brant's point in an article of his own on rule XXII, was also said by my eminent colleague to have been in error concerning the early practice of the Senate.

Late last December, before the debate on rule XXII, I asked the Library of Congress to go into this matter and to see what actually had happened in the Senate under the previous-question rule in effect from 1789 to 1806. I asked them to go to the original sources—the Senate Journals and the Annals of Congress—and to send me abstracts of the proceedings as given in those historic journals. At the very time Mr. Brant's statement was being called into question on the floor of the Senate, and while his academic qualifications were being rather roughly treated, I actually held in my hand the abstracts from the original Journal of the Senate, the Executive Journal, and the Annals of Congress, which showed that Mr. Brant was substantially correct. In fact at that point in the debate I asked the distinguished Senator who was speaking to yield to me. I made that request so that I might throw some light on the statements concerning the use of the previous-question motion in the Senate from 1789 to 1806. My attempted interruption will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 1, page 153, which I hold in my hand.

It will be noted that because we were under very strict time limitations—which was something of a paradox, for we were debating the issue of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States—my request to the distinguished Senator to yield was refused.

Further, Mr. President, on that very day I had a member of my staff deliver a copy of the abstracts from those early Senate debates to the Parliamentarian of the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to take up four general matters.

First, I feel obligated to discuss the qualifications of Mr. Brant and to defend what is, indeed, described as an excellent reputation for historical and scholarly work—a

reputation which is in no way diminished by the article he wrote for the Washington Post.

Second, I wish to take up, one by one, the occasions on which the previous question was moved in the Senate of the United States in the years 1789–1806.

Third, I desire to discuss the issue of whether or not the motion for the previous question was, in fact, debatable "without let or hindrance."

Finally, I wish to say a few words about the historical evolution of the use and meaning of the previous question motion in the United States and in the British House of Commons.

I

Before speaking about Mr. Brant's qualifications, I wish to state that he has written to me on the subject of his article in the Washington Post and the previous question motion. He apparently welcomed the suggestion that he should devote himself with zeal to seeking and producing facts. He has done so. At the end of my remarks I shall place in the RECORD a memorandum which he has prepared on the development of cloture and the previous question in American and British practice. It includes a penetrating study of the Senate's use of the previous question, probing the motives and purposes of the Senators who invoked it and of those who opposed it. I think that the way in which he has performed this task will impress even those who might be inclined to be critical.

Along with this memorandum, Mr. Brant has written me a letter which does not take up the highly involved Senate cases, as does his memorandum, but summarizes the results of his research into the debatability of the motion for the previous question in the Senate, and the part that motion has played in the development of cloture both in the United States and England. As this letter goes briefly and directly to the main points at issue, I desire to read it to the Senate:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 24, 1957.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The article I wrote for the Washington Post and Times Herald on the right of the present Senate to change its rules without being thwarted by a past Senate appears to have become a matter of controversy since you placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The senior Senator from Georgia said on the floor that I was completely in error in stating that from 1789 to 1806, "debate on a bill could be ended instantly by a majority of Senators present, through adoption of an undebatable motion calling for the previous question."

There was, said the Senator, "absolutely no relationship, except in name, to the previous-question rule which applied in the Senate in those days." The Senate rule from 1789 to 1806, he contended, "was the previous-question rule from the British Parliament, which applied in that body for many years. Such a motion, he said, "could be debated without let or hindrance. It was merely a method of disposing of a measure without taking action on it at that time."

My reference to the motion for the previous question as undebatable needed a qualification which was not given in that chronological summary of Senate practice. Under rule XVI, then in force, a filibustering debate on the motion for the previous question could be stopped at any moment by the Presiding Officer. The rule provided that "every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate." It was not until February 14, 1828, that rule XVI was amended to allow an appeal from the decision of the Chair. Instead of being debatable "without let or hindrance," the motion for the previous question was protected by so sweeping a control by the Vice President that the mere existence of the power made obstructive tactics futile.

In his reference to British and American parliamentary practice, the Georgia Senator took no account of the fact that adoption of the motion for the previous question closed debate instantly and completely, regardless of the motive for invoking it, and brought the main question to an immediate final vote. He also overlooked the interrelated development of the previous question and cloture in the two countries, and the deliberate use of the previous question in the United States to accomplish what the British achieved through cloture.

In the American Continental Congress, the motion for the previous question was so worded as to indicate the purpose of avoiding a vote, even though the effect might be to force one. The same wording is used in the House of Commons. Until recently, I shared the supposition that this early American form was based on British precedent. The truth is that in the 1880's, scores of years after the motion for the previous question had become a universal instrument of cloture in the United States, the House of Commons reached the same end by placing the label of "closure" on the familiar wording (exactly the same except for the irrelevant word "the") in which the motion for the previous question was phrased. The House of Commons then reworded the motion for the previous question by adopting the form used in our Continental Congress—a wording, wrote Clerk of the House Sir Thomas Erskine May, "which appears to be a superior form to that used in this country." Thus, England split the system in two while we use one motion for two purposes.

Where does this leave our defenders of the right to filibuster? They are compelled to appeal to the English practice of the 17th century in order to deny the propriety of an American practice which England took over from America in the 19th century.

Although the constitutional power of the Senate to make its own rules is not governed by the way that power has been exercised in the past, it is well worth while to examine the use of the previous-question rule during the period it existed in the Senate. In doing so, it is not my purpose to draft a brief but to describe each use of the motion with absolute impartiality, not merely in terms of its technical effect, but by seeking out the source, motives, and legislative consequences of the invocation. The factual material ought to be useful to both sides in the current conflict, even though the conclusions which I reach from the record may be displeasing to one group.

Enclosed is a memorandum on the Development of Cloture and the Motion for the Previous Question in America and British Practices.

Yours sincerely,

IRVING BRANT.

I shall later ask to have the memorandum which Mr. Brant submitted printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, since the qualifications of Mr. Brant were called into question, and since some ridicule was heaped upon him, I think it is only proper to speak about the prominence of Mr. Brant as an historian.

I have in my hand five volumes which Mr. Brant has completed on the life of James Madison, which tell the story of Madison from birth through his first term as President, to the outbreak of the War of 1812. I have read all of these volumes. I have read two or three of them several times. I can say that they rank, in the field of biography, with Dumas Malone's Life of Jefferson and with Carl Sandburg's Life of Lincoln. I have read reviews of these books in the historical journals of this country and have noted with pleasure the high praise which the eminent historians who are specialists in this field have heaped upon the work of Mr. Brant.

It so happens that Mr. Brant has specialized in the very period which is under discussion today, the period from 1789 to 1806, and then the later period in which the President of the Senate had power to close debate on his own action, that is until 1828.

Mr. Brant does not accept secondary sources. He goes back to primary sources in every case. He takes no one's word for what happens. He goes to the original documents and to the records of the Senate and the House, and of the Constitutional Convention, as well as letters of contemporaries and contemporary diaries. His work is a magnificent piece of American scholarship, and students of American history know that he really needs no defense.

I wish to make the prophecy that when his final volumes appear, it is quite probable that he will be awarded the Pulitzer Prize, although, of course, I have no power to bestow that prize on him. In any event, I think there can be no doubt about the qualifications of Mr. Brant. I am sure that when the eminent Senator from Georgia, with his characteristic sense of fairness, reviews the evidence, he will not wish to stand on the criticisms which he made of Mr. Brant's scholarship.

Mr. President, I wish to read an excerpt from a letter from one of the most eminent American historians, Henry Steele Commager, professor of history at Columbia and at Amherst College, who is one of the best known and authoritative of historians. This letter concerns Mr. Brant. I wrote him asking for his judgment as to how Mr. Brant stood in the profession. I should like to read the salient portion of the letter, which was sent to me under date of April 13, 1957:

"Brant's Madison, which has now reached five volumes, is by universal agreement of American historians, one of the most impressive achievements of American historical writing of our generation. Thorough, critical, judicious, comprehensive, well written, it has the quality that so few biographies have, of doing the job so completely and so well that it does not have to be done over. What is perhaps most impressive about Brant's work is that it is based entirely on original research, that it takes nothing for granted but goes to the sources, that it maintains the very highest standards of rigid scholarship. Whatever may be said of Brant's interpretations—and there will always be differences of interpretation—this can be said with confidence, that Brant's historical scholarship is impeccable and unimpeachable."

II. THE PREVIOUS QUESTION MOTION AS USED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, 1789–1806

I now come to the subject of the previous question as it was four times employed in the U.S. Senate from 1789 to 1806.

I wish to say, as a matter of clarity, that the "previous question" in the Senate in those years was put in two different forms, although the rules provided that it could only be put in the affirmative.

Those two forms were the affirmative form and the negative form. The affirmative form, as provided in the rules, was "Shall the main question be now put?" The negative form, which was not provided for in the rules, was worded, "That the main question be not now put."

Depending upon the form and the vote, one of two results could flow from either of these motions. The result could be, first, to end debate and bring a vote on the main issue; or second, to postpone.

When the motion was put affirmatively, namely, "Shall the main question be now put?" a majority of the Senators voting "yea" could close debate and the original motion could be brought to an immediate vote. Later I shall deal with the question of whether it could be debated without let or hindrance.

When the previous question motion was put in the negative, namely, "That the main question be not now put," a majority of the Senators voting "nay" could close debate and a vote could be brought immediately on the main question.

In other words, a negative vote on the negative form meant that all the debate was shut off, and the main question was put. There was no hiatus, no interregnum.

On the other hand, when the majority voted "nay" when the motion was put in the affirmative, this had the effect of postponing consideration. Also when the majority voted "yea" when the motion was put in the negative, this had the effect of postponing consideration.

Therefore, I wish to draw the first main point. That is that every form of the previous question—affirmative or negative—could bring the main question to a vote depending upon the will or sense of the Senate. That is to say that the previous question when put affirmatively ended debate when passed in the affirmative, and when put negatively, it ended debate when passed in the negative and brought the main question to an immediate vote, without further debate.

To put it in a slightly different way, when the vote on the previous question motion corresponds directly with the form of the question, debate is closed and a vote is taken on the main issue. That is to say a "nay" vote to the negative form of the question results in closing debate and bringing the main question to a vote, and an affirmative vote on the affirmative form of the question results in closing debate and brings the main question to a vote.

Now I wish to turn to the four cases when the motion was used in the Senate. I shall not discuss them at length at this time for that should wait until Senators have had an opportunity to read the facts about them which are presented in Mr. Brant's memorandum. However, I shall give a brief summary of those cases as well as the abstracts of them from the Senate's records, and, of course, they are found in the Executive Journal of the U.S. Senate, and the annals of the Eighth Congress, first session, as well as the Journal of the first session of the Senate of the United States, which is still in the rare-book room in the Library of Congress.

In August of 1789, the Senate had before it a bill entitled "An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes." On August 17 and 18, 1789, the previous question was moved on each day and put in the form provided in the rules: Shall the main question be now put? On both occasions, which I am here using as a single case, the motion was defeated. The effect was to postpone the main question and it appears that this was the purpose of moving the motion. It is also clear that had the motion passed in the affirmative, the effect would have been to bring the matter to an immediate vote.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed the abstracts from the debates on August 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1789, which are found in the Journal of the first session of the Senate of the United States.

There being no objection, the abstracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[Journal of the first session of the Senate of the United States]

"ABSTRACT 1

"(Friday, August 7, 1789)

"A message from the President of the United States, by General Knox

"Gentlemen of the Senate, the business which has hitherto been under the consideration of Congress, has been of so much importance, that I was unwilling to draw their attention from it to any other subject. But the disputes which exist between some of the United States and several powerful tribes of Indians within the limits of the Union, and the hostilities which have in several instances been committed on the frontiers seem to require the immediate interposition of the general Government.

"I have, therefore, directed the several statements and papers which have been submitted to me on this subject, by General Knox, to be laid before you for your information.

"While the measures of Government ought to be calculated to protect its citizens from all injury and violence, a due regard should be extended to those Indian tribes, whose happiness, in the course of events so materially depends on the national justice and humanity of the United States.

"If it should be the judgment of Congress that it would be most expedient to terminate all differences in the southern district, and to lay the foundation for future confidence by an amicable treaty with the Indian tribes in that quarter, I think proper to suggest the consideration of the expediency of instituting a temporary commission for that purpose, to consist of three persons, whose authority should expire with the occasion. How far such a measure, unassisted by posts, would be competent to the establishment and preservation of peace and tranquility on the frontiers, is also a matter which merits your serious consideration.

"Along with this object I am induced to suggest another, with the national importance and necessity of which I am deeply impressed; I mean some uniform and effective system for the militia of the United States. It is unnecessary to offer arguments in recommendation of a measure, on which the honor, safety, and well-being of our country so evidently and so essentially depend; but it may not be amiss to observe that I am particularly anxious it should receive as early attention as circumstances will admit; because it is now in our power to avail ourselves of the military knowledge disseminated throughout the several States by means of the many well-instructed officers and soldiers of the late Army; a resource which is daily diminishing by death and other causes. To suffer this peculiar advantage to pass away unimproved, would be to neglect an opportunity which will never again occur, unless, unfortunately, we should again be involved in a long and arduous war.

"GEO. WASHINGTON.

"NEW YORK, *August 7, 1789* (pp. 89–90).

"(Thursday, August 13, 1789)

"A message from the House of Representatives

"Mr. Beckley, their Clerk, brought up a bill, entitled, 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same,' together with the papers referred to in the President's message of the 7th of August—and he withdrew.

"The bill entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations of treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same,' was read a first time, ordered, that tomorrow be assigned for a second reading (pp. 95–96).

"(Friday, August 14, 1789)

"Proceeded to a second reading of the bill entitled, 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same.' ordered, that the bill be committed to Mr. Few, Mr. Ellsworth, Mr. King, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Butler (p. 96).

"(Monday, August 17, 1789)

"The committee appointed to take into consideration the bill, entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of Commissioners for managing the same,' reported that it be

" '*Resolved*, That there be allowed and paid to a Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the southern department, that may be nominated by the President, and appointed by, and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the sum of ——— per day, including his expenses, for the time he may be employed in attending a treaty, proposed to be held by the Commissioners of the United States and the Creek Indians, at the Rock-Landing, in the State of Georgia, on the 15th day of September next;

" 'That in case the proposed treaty should fail in the desired object, of establishing peace between the citizens of the United States and the Creek Indians, Congress will make such grants of money, and pursue such other measures, as will be necessary for the protection and safety of the inhabitants of the southern frontiers, and best secure the peace of the United States':

"And on motion to accept the report.

"It passed in the negative.

"On motion, that it be

" '*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to nominate a fit person for Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the southern department, in order that he may be sent forward as soon as may be, to act with the Commissioners of Indian Affairs in the southern department, appointed pursuant to a resolution of Congress, passed on the —— day of —— and aid them in carrying into effect a treaty that is proposed to be held with the Creek Nation, on the 15th day of September next, in the State of Georgia, at the Rock-Landing;

" 'That the sum of ——— dollars be delivered to the said Superintendent, to be appropriated for the immediate purpose of the said treaty, for which sum he shall be accountable:

" 'That the President of the United States be requested to instruct the said Superintendent and Commissioners, to hear and fully investigate all the complaints and grievances of the said Creek Indians, and to use all the means in their power to quiet their minds and do them ample justice, agreeably to the aforesaid resolution of Congress, and instructions heretofore given for the purpose: That if the said Indians should prove refractory, or refuse to treat and establish peace on just and reasonable terms, then and in that case, the said Superintendent and Commissioners be directed to make immediate report thereof to the President of the United States, and Congress will make such grants of money, and pursue such other measures, as will be necessary for the safety and protection of the inhabitants of the southern frontiers, and best secure the peace of the United States.'

"It passed in the negative.

"On motion, that it be

"'*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be authorized and empowered, and he is hereby authorized and empowered, should the Creek Indians decline to make peace with the State of Georgia, to take effectual measures for covering the State of Georgia from the incursions of the Indians, either by ordering some of the troops now at Fort Harmar to march to the frontiers of Georgia, or by embodying such a number of the militia as he shall think sufficient to insure to the citizens of Georgia protection, and the cultivation of their lands in peace and security, and that he be empowered to draw on the Treasury for defraying the expenses of the same.'

"And on motion for the previous question, to wit: 'Shall the main question be now put?'

"It passed in the negative.

"The Senate adjourned to 11 o'clock tomorrow (pp. 96–98).

"(Tuesday, August 18, 1789)

"And proceeded in a second reading of the bill, entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of Commissioners for managing the same.'

"On motion, to strike out 'Eight Dollars,' from the clause providing for the compensation to the Commissioner, and insert '$5,' in line 8.

"It passed in the negative.

"On motion, to insert after 'Eight dollars per day', 'at the discretion of the President.'

"It passed in the negative.

"On motion, upon the compensation to the commissioners, to strike out 'eight dollars,' and insert 'six dollars.'

"It passed in the negative.

"*Ordered*, That the rules of the House be so far dispensed with, as that the said bill shall have a third reading at this time.

"On motion to strike out in line 3, 'forty,' and insert 'twenty,' in order thereby to limit the sum to be expended in negotiating a treaty with the Indian tribes, to $20,000 instead of $40,000.

"The yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the Senators present:

"Mr. Butler, nay; Mr. Carroll, yea; Mr. Dalton, yea; Mr. Ellsworth, yea; Mr. Elmer, yea; Mr. Few, nay; Mr. Gunn, nay; Mr. Henry, yea; Mr. Johnston, yea; Mr. Izard, nay; Mr. King, yea; Mr. Langdon, yea; Mr. Lee, nay; Mr. Maclay, nay; Mr. Morris, nay; Mr. Read, yea; Mr. Schuyler, yea; Mr. Strong, yea; Mr. Wingate, yea. Yeas, 12; nays, 7.

"So it passed in the affirmative.

"On motion, that it be

"*Resolved*, That Congress will make provision for the discharging of any expenses that may be incurred by such military arrangements, as the President of the United States may think proper to make, for the purpose of protecting the citizens of Georgia from the depredations of the Creek Indians, should peace not take place with them, or should they, having agreed to a peace, violate the same.

"And on motion for the previous question, to wit: 'Shall the main question be now put?'

"It passed in the negative.

"And on the question upon the bill, it was

"*Resolved*, To concur therein with the amendment:

"*Ordered*, That the Secretary carry the said bill to the House of Representatives for their concurrence in the amendment (pp. 93–99).

"(Wednesday, August 19, 1789)

"*A message from the House of Representatives*

"Mr. Beckley, their Clerk, informed the Senate, that the House had concurred in their amendments proposed to the bill, entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same.'

"And he withdrew (p. 100).

"(Thursday, August 20, 1789)

"*A message from the House of Representatives*

"Mr. Beckley, their Clerk, brought up the enrolled bill, entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same,' examined by the committee of enrollment, and signed by the Speaker.

"And he withdrew.

"Whereupon the bill was signed by the Vice President, and by the committee of enrollment laid before the President of the United States for his approbation.

"Mr. Beckley, their Clerk, informed the Senate that the President of the United States had affixed his signature to a bill entitled 'An act providing for the expenses which may attend negotiations or treaties with the Indian tribes, and the appointment of commissioners for managing the same,' and had returned it to the House of Representatives (pp. 100–101)."

Mr. Douglas. The second occasion on which the previous-question motion was used was on January 12 and 16, 1792. The Senate had before it the consideration of various Presidential nominations of United States Ministers at foreign courts, and specifically the nomination of William Short, of Virginia, to be Minister resident at the Hague. The Senate disregarded its rules and put the previous question in the negative: "That the main question be not now put." I may say that the rules provided only for the motion being put in the affirmative form. Nevertheless, it was put in the negative form.

The motion carried and this resulted in postponement. The intention to postpone is evident in the negative form of the question. There appears to be the additional purpose of preventing a debate which would have jeopardized a Presidential nomination. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the abstract from this debate of January 12 and January 16, 1792, which appears on pages 96–98, volume I, of the Executive Journal of the Senate.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"ABSTRACT 2

"The Senate had under consideration various Presidential nominations of United States Ministers at foreign courts.

"(Thursday, January 12, 1792)

"The Senate resumed the consideration of the message of the President of the United States, of the 22d December last, nominating Ministers Plenipotentiary at foreign courts; and

"On the question to advise and consent to the appointment of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, to be Minister Plenipotentiary for the United States at Paris, the yeas and nays were required by one-fifth of the Senators present:

"Mr. Bassett, yea; Mr. Bradley, yea; Mr. Burr, nay; Mr. Butler, yea; Mr. Cabot, nay; Mr. Carroll, yea; Mr. Dickinson, yea; Mr. Ellsworth, yea; Mr. Few, nay; Mr. Foster, yea; Mr. Gunn, nay; Mr. Hawkins, yea; Mr. Henry, yea; Mr. Izard, yea; Mr. Johnston, yea; Mr. King, yea; Mr. Langdon, yea; Mr. Lee, nay; Mr. Monroe, nay; Mr. Morris, yea; Mr. Read, yea; Mr. Robinson, nay; Mr. Rutherford, yea; Mr. Sherman, nay; Mr. Stanton, nay; Mr. Strong, nay; Mr. Wingate, nay. Yeas, 16; nays, 11.

"So it was

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, to be Minister Plenipotentiary for the United States, at Paris, conformably to the nomination in the message last mentioned.

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of Thomas Pinckney, of South Carolina, to be Minister Plenipotentiary for the United States, at London, conformably to the nomination in the message last mentioned.

"On the nomination of William Short, of Virginia, to be Minister resident for the United States, at the Hague; the committee having reported the information obtained from the Secretary of State on this subject.

"A motion was made that it be

"*Resolved*, That there is not, in the opinion of the Senate, any present occasion that a Minister should be sent to the Hague.

"On this motion, the previous question was moved for, to wit: 'That the main question be not now put'; and

"On motion, it was agreed, that the nomination last mentioned, and the subsequent motion thereon, be postponed to Monday next.

"The Senate proceeded to consider the message of the President of the United States, of the 11th of January, nominating William Carmichael and William Short, Commissioners Plenipotentiary, for negotiating and concluding a treaty concerning the navigation of the Mississippi, by the citizens of the United States; and agreed that the consideration thereof be postponed until Monday next.

"A message from the President of the United States, was, by Mr. Lear, his secretary, communicated to the Vice President, and he withdrew.

"UNITED STATES, *January 12, 1792*.

"GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE: I nominate Richard Peters to be district judge of the Pennsylvania district, vice William Lewis, who has resigned his appointment.

"GEO. WASHINGTON.

"The message was read, and ordered to lie for consideration.

"(Journal of the executive proceedings of the Senate of the United States, vol. I, Washington, 1828, pp. 96–97.)

"(Monday, January 16, 1792)

"The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the message of the President of the United States, of the 22d of December last, and the nomination of William Short, of Virginia, now Chargé des Affaires of the United States, at Paris, to be Minister resident for the United States, at The Hague, together with the motion made thereon, to wit:

"'That there is not, in the opinion of the Senate, any present occasion that a Minister should be sent to The Hague, together with the motion for the previous question, to wit:

"'That the main question be not now put.'

"And the yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the Senators present, on the previous question:

"Mr. Bassett, yea; Mr. Bradley, nay; Mr. Burr, nay; Mr. Butler, yea; Mr. Cabot, yea; Mr. Carroll, yea; Mr. Dickinson, yea; Mr. Ellsworth, yea; Mr. Few, nay; Mr. Foster, nay; Mr. Hawkins, yea; Mr. Henry, yea; Mr. Johnston, yea; Mr. Izard, nay; Mr. King, yea; Mr. Langdon, yea; Mr. Lee, nay; Mr. Monroe, nay; Mr. Morris, yea; Mr. Read, yea; Mr. Robinson, nay; Mr. Rutherford, nay; Mr. Stanton, nay; Mr. Sherman, nay; Mr. Strong, nay; Mr. Wingate, nay. Yeas, 13; nays, 13.

"The numbers being equal, the previous question was by the Vice President determinated in the affirmative.

"On the question to advise and consent to the appointment of William Short, of Virginia, now Chargé des Affaires of the United States, at Paris, to be Minister resident for the United States at The Hague, as nominated in the message of December 22;

"The yeas and nays were required by one-fifth of the Senators present.

"Mr. Bassett, yea; Mr. Bradley, nay; Mr. Burr, nay; Mr. Butler, yea; Mr. Cabot, yea; Mr. Carroll, yea; Mr. Dickinson, yea; Mr. Ellsworth, nay; Mr. Few, nay; Mr. Foster, nay; Mr. Hawkins, yea; Mr. Henry, yea; Mr. Johnston, yea; Mr. Izard, yea; Mr. King, yea; Mr. Langdon, yea; Mr. Lee, yea; Mr. Monroe, yea; Mr. Morris, yea; Mr. Read, yea; Mr. Robinson, nay; Mr. Rutherford, nay; Mr. Stanton, nay; Mr. Sherman, nay; Mr. Strong, nay; Mr. Wingate, nay. Yeas, 15; nays, 11.

"So it was

"*Resolved*, That the Senate do advise and consent to the appointment of William Short, of Virginia, now Chargé des Affaires of the United States, at Paris, to be Minister resident for the United States at The Hague.

"*Ordered*, That the Secretary communicate this resolution to the President of the United States.

"The Senate proceeded to consider the message from the President of the United States, of the 11th instant, nominating William Carmichael and William Short, Commissioners Plenipotentiary, for negotiating and concluding a treaty concerning the navigation of the Mississippi River, by the citizens of the United States; and agreed that the further consideration thereof be postponed. (Journal of the executive proceedings of the Senate of the United States, vol. I, Washington, 1828, pp. 97–98.)"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the third occasion when the previous question was moved, it was moved in the form prescribed by the rules. That was on February 26, 1799. The Senate had before it the nomination of the President of William Vans Murray, to be Minister of the United States to France. a message which was superseded by another message nominating several envoys to France. The previous question motion was moved in the words "Shall the main question be now put?" On this vote the "yeas" prevailed. Debate was then stopped and the main question was put to an immediate vote.

This is a clear case of the use of the previous question in the affirmative form to stop debate.

The purpose of this motion was also to secure an immediate vote and not to postpone the subject, although in the absence of further evidence the underlying motive for the move is left open to conjecture.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an abstract from this debate which is from page 318 of volume I of the Executive Journal of the Senate.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ABSTRACT 3

"The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination by the President of William Vans Murray to be Minister of the United States to France.

"(Tuesday, February 26, 1799)

"The Senate resumed the consideration of the message of the President of the United States, of the 18th instant, and the nomination contained therein, of William Vans Murray to be Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the French Republic.

"On motion, That it be

"*Resolved*, That by the message of the President of yesterday, nominating Oliver Ellsworth, Patrick Henry, and William Vans Murray Envoys Extraordinary to the French Republic, his message of the 18th of the present month, nominating William Vans Murray as Minister Plenipotentiary to the same Republic, is superseded.

"A motion was made for the previous question, to wit: Shall the main question be now put? and it was determined in the affirmative.

"And, on motion to agree to the main question, it was determined in the affirmative.

"The Senate proceeded to consider the message of the President of the United States, of the 25th instant, and the nominations contained therein, of Oliver Ellsworth and others to office.

"*Ordered*, That the further consideration thereof be postponed until tomorrow. (Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate of the United States, vol. I, Washington, 1828, p. 318.)"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on March 10, 1804, while sitting as a Court of Impeachment in the trial of Judge Pickering, the previous question was moved for the last time. Here the question was worded as the rules required: "Shall the main question be now put?" And here we find written evidence in the accusing diaries of minority Senators that the majority's purpose was cloture—to cut off a tempestuous debate and force the main question to an immediate vote.

Mr. Brant goes into this matter in his memorandum in some detail and has also prepared some excerpts from the diaries of interested Senators. I shall place all of this in the RECORD at a later point but I now ask unanimous consent that there appear in the RECORD at this point an abstract of that part of the debate over Judge Pickering at the place where the previous question was moved. This abstract is from the original which appears on pages 362–363 of the Annals of Congress, 8th Congress, 1st session.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ABSTRACT 4

"The Senate was sitting as a Court of Impeachment in the trial of Judge Pickering.

"(Saturday, March 10, 1804)

"Mr. Franklin was chosen President pro tempore.

"Upon the opening of the court, Mr. White submitted the following resolution:

"'*Resolved*, That this court is not at present prepared to give their final decision upon the articles of impeachment preferred by the House of Representatives against John Pickering, district judge of the district of New Hampshire, for high crimes and misdemeanors, the said John Pickering not having appeared, or been heard by himself or by counsel; and it having been suggested by the court by Jacob S. Pickering, son of the said John Pickering, that the said John Pickering, at the time of the conduct charged against him in the said articles of impeachment, as high crimes and misdemeanors, was, and yet is, insane, which suggestion has been supported by the testimony of two members of the court, and by the affidavits of sundry persons, whose integrity is unimpeached; and it being further suggested in the said petition, that at such future day as the court may appoint, the body of the said Pickering shall be produced in court, and further testimony in his behalf, which will enable the court to judge for themselves as to the insanity of the said John Pickering, and to act more understandingly in the premises; but that the said John Pickering, owing to bodily infirmity, could not be brought to court at present, at so great a distance, and at this inclement season of the year, without imminent hazard of his life.'

"Mr. Nicholas, Mr. Wright, and other gentlemen, objected to the resolution as not being in order.

"Mr. Anderson asked if it would be in order to move an amendment to it.

"Mr. Adams said, he would object to any amendment to it, as, by the rule of the court, a gentleman had a right to a vote upon any specific proposition he might please to submit, connected with the trial.

"Mr. White, called for the reading of the rule.

"Mr. Anderson then moved that the resolution, submitted by the gentleman from Virginia yesterday, be taken up as being entitled to be acted upon first.

"The President pro tempore declared that the resolution of the gentleman from Delaware was fairly before the court, and must be disposed of in some way before anything else could be taken up.

"A motion for postponing the further consideration of it was then made and withdrawn.

"Mr. Nichols hoped it would not be permitted to go upon the journals of the court.

"Mr. Jackson moved the previous question, viz: "Shall the main question be now put?"

"Mr. White hoped that whatever question should be taken on the subject, should be by yeas and nays; that his resolution, and the manner in which it might be got rid of, should be seen and understood.

"Mr. Anderson then moved to amend the resolution, by striking out the words 'not having been heard by himself or counsel;' and all after the words 'was and yet is insane,' to the end of the resolution.

"On motion of Mr. Dayton, the galleries were cleared and the doors closed.

"At 3 o'clock the doors were opened, and the question was taken upon the resolution as at first submitted—yeas 9, nays 19, as follows:

"Yeas: Messrs. Adams, Dayton, Hillhouse, Olcott, Pickering, Plumer, Tracy, Wells, and White.

"Nays: Messrs. Anderson, Armstrong, Baldwin, Breckenridge, Cocke, Ellery, Franklin, Jackson, Logan, Maclay, Nicholas, Potter, Israel Smith, John Smith of Ohio, Sam'l Smith, Sumter, Venable, Worthington, and Wright.

"So it passed in the negative.

"On motion of Mr. Nicholson, the resolution he had submitted the day before for notifying the House of Representatives that the court would be prepared to pronounce judgment on Monday next, was taken up and passed—yeas 20, nays 9. Those who voted in the affirmative last above, here voted in the negative, and so vice versa, except Mr. John Smith, of New York, who was not then present, and who voted here in the negative.

"The court then adjourned.

"(Annals of Congress, Eighth Cong., first sess., Washington, 1852, pp. 362–363.)"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall come back to this Pickering case in a moment, but let me point out here that these four cases present a virtual microcosm of the development of the previous question in American practice. At the outset, in 1789, the Senate started with the positive form of the motion and on one occasion it achieved postponement. From that it went forward (though this was in violation of Senate rules) to the use of the negative form of the motion to produce negative results—a motion not to vote on the main question. In the third and fourth cases (one-half of the total) the Senate employed the affirmative form of the motion for an affirmative purpose—to cut off debate and bring the main question to an immediate vote.

If one looks at the record of the Pickering trial as published in the Annals of Congress, it has the appearance of being defective. It is recorded there that the previous question was moved by Senator Jackson of Georgia, who was one of the anti-Pickering majority. But nothing is said about the putting of the motion. Mr. Brant's memorandum reveals the reason for the omission—a most remarkable one.

The Senate was operating as a court of impeachment, with supplementary rules. All motions had to be voted on by yeas and nays in open session. But debate on motions was forbidden except in closed session. The Senate was in closed session, debating a resolution offered by Senator White of Delaware, when Jackson moved the previous question. To vote on it, it was necessary to open the doors. But opening the doors stopped the debate, and that was the purpose of moving the previous question. With the doors open, nothing remained except to take the yeas and nays on the controversial resolution, which was thereupon defeated by the same Senators who had cut off the debate.

To eliminate all doubt concerning the intentions of the Senate majority on March 10, 1804, when the previous question was moved for the last time, I need but read a single sentence from that day's entry in the diary of John Quincy Adams, one of the defeated Senators:

The next struggle was to prevent all debate upon the resolution.

To reproduce the emotional pitch of that debate, just before it was cut off by the majority, I need but read the words set down in the diary of Senator William Plumer:

"Mr. Nicholas—"

"That was Senator William Cary Nicholas, leader of the majority and spokesman for President Jefferson—a man so close to Jefferson that he is buried in the Jefferson family burial ground at Monticello—

" 'Mr. Nicholas vociferated, order, order, order—I will not submit to hear our proceedings called by the degrading name of a mock trial.'

"To which, says the Plumer diary, the Senator replied that he would not retract his words. If this offended Mr. Nicholas, said he:

" 'I am willing and ready to give him satisfaction at any time and place he will please to name.'

"In other words, they could fight a duel. The Senate has happily graduated from such juvenile delinquencies. But we have yet to realize that the Senate 150 years ago in its ability to limit debate was a more effective body than it is today. Ample power existed, both in the motion for the previous question and the unappealable authority of the Vice President, to cut off debate and bring the business of the Senate to a decision. That power was used, and used effectively, under circumstances far less provocative than a filibuster, which in that day was unknown in the Senate. It was used to suppress a 1-day debate which was merely obnoxious to the majority.

"I am not arguing the merits of that action by the Senate in 1804. But the fact that it used the power is enough to prove that the power existed.

"Here in parallel columns are the complete entries in the official record of the trial of Judge Pickering, and the principal and all revelant entries in the diaries of Senators Adams and Plumer. The protests against curtailment of debate, the references to closing and opening the doors of the Senate, the references to moving the previous question have been italicized; also the remarks of Nicholas about keeping the resolution out of the journals, because these are closely connected with the motion for the previous question.

"From the sequence it is perfectly plain that the doors were closed much earlier than is indicated in the official account. Plumer apparently tried to correct the sequence. He copied various portions of the official account into his diary, shifting the position of them to fit his recollection, but apparently was stumped by some of the inconsistencies regarding the time of Anderson's attempt to amend the resolution.

"Most of the Plumer entries are employed in this chart to emphasize the enormous omissions from the official record, and they could have been far longer.

"I ask unanimous consent that the entries in the official record of the trial and of the relevant diaries be printed at this point in the RECORD.

"There being no objection the entries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"ANNALS OF CONGRESS, XIII, 362–363	"DIARY OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, MEMOIRS, I. 302–303	"WILLIAM PLUMER, MEMORANDUM OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, 1803–07, PP. 173–177
"Upon the opening of the Court, Mr. White submitted the following resolution: '*Resolved*, That this Court is not prepared to give their final decision * * *.'	"Mr. White, in Senate, moved this morning a resolution declaring the Court not prepared to give judgment. * * *	"Mr. White then submitted the following resolution:
"Mr. Nicholas, Mr. Wright, and other gentlemen, objected to the resolution as not being in order.	"On this resolution it was not without the utmost difficulty that any discussion whatsoever could be obtained.	"(Copies official record.)
"Mr. Adams asked if it would be in order to move an amendment to it.	"(Not mentioned in Adams diary, presumably because it was covered in the official record.)	"(Copies official record, adding a word.)
"Mr. Adams said, he would object to any amendment, as by the rule of the Court, a gentleman had a right to a vote upon any specific proposition he might be pleased to submit, connected with the trial.		"Mr. White called for the reading of the rule.—Read.
"Mr. White called for the reading of the rule.		"A motion was made that the galleries be closed—but the motion was lost.
"Mr. Anderson then moved that the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Virginia yesterday (to pronounce judgment on Monday next) be taken up as being entitled to be acted upon first.	"Mr. Nicholas, to give it the slip, insisted upon having his resolution, offered yesterday, first taken up. On which I rose and said that if Mr. White's motion was not considered I should offer a resolution previous in its nature to that of Mr. Nicholas. I was called to order as entering into debate. I answered that I was not debating, but merely stating the purport of a resolution I should offer if that of Mr. White was not considered, and that in thus stating it I should speak until my mouth was stopped by force.	"(Copies official record.)
"The President pro tempore [Franklin, of North Carolina] declared that the resolution was fairly before the court, and must be disposed of in some way before anything else could be taken up.	"I was again called to order, but the president determined that Mr. White's resolution should be taken up before that of Mr. Nicholas.	"(Copies official record.)
"A motion for postponing the further consideration of it was made and withdrawn.		"A motion for postponing the further consideration of this was then made but withdrawn.
"Mr. Nicholas hoped it would not be permitted to go upon the journals of the court.	"The next struggle was to prevent all debate upon the resolution. By our rules there can be no debate on any motion in open court. A motion to close the doors for the purpose of discussing the resolution was rejected, nine members voting for it. But although we are allowed no debate, yet motions to strike out parts of a resolution proposed were admitted by the majority; and Mr. Anderson moved to strike out a great part of Mr. White's resolution, so as to get	"On motion of Mr. Dayton the galleries were cleared and the doors closed.
"Mr. Jackson moved the previous question, viz: 'Shall the main question be now put?'		"Mr. WHITE. There has been no trial—no appearance, no plea—no defense whatever on the part of the accused. Our proceedings scarcely deserve the name of a mock trial.
"Mr. White hoped that whatever question should be taken on the subject should be by yeas and nays; that his resolution and the manner in which it might be got rid of, should be seen and understood.		"Mr. Nicholas vociferated, order, order, order—I will not submit to hear our proceedings called by the degrading name of a mock trial.
"Mr. Anderson then moved to amend the resolution, by striking out the words, 'not		

"ANNALS OF CONGRESS, XIII, 362–363—con.

having been heard by himself or counsel," and all after the words "was and yet is insane," to the end of the resolution.

"On motion of Mr. Dayton, the galleries were cleared and the doors closed.

"At 3 o'clock the doors were opened, and the question was taken upon the resolution as at first submitted—yeas 9, nays 19."

"DIARY OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, MEMOIRS, I. 302–303—continued

rid of all the reasons alleged in it. I objected against any motion to strike out part of an offered resolution, because such motion was itself debate, and contrary to the rule. At length Mr. John Smith, of Ohio, wanted to put a question as to the meaning of a part of Mr. White's resolution. And in order to make that inquiry, a second motion was made to clear the galleries. Smith, now voting for it, gave the casting turn, the necessary number of one-third. The galleries were cleared, and a short discussion of the resolution was had.

"The extreme injustice of judging an insane man as a guilty one; of sentencing, unheard, a man who could not be present at this time without imminent hazard of his life; of precipitating decision without necessity, was urged; Mr. Anderson, and most of the members in the majority, manifesting the most extreme impatience to open the doors and stop all further debate.

"At length, rather than continue the discussion, he (Anderson) waived his motion to strike out part of Mr. White's resolution, and said he was ready to meet it. But Mr. Nicholas said he should move that it might not be entered on the records.

"Although the rule is that all motions shall be decided by yeas and nays in open court, Mr. Nicholas was for having the yeas and nays, without the motion upon which they were taken.

"The doors were opened. The yeas and nays were taken on Mr. White's resolution—yeas 9, nays 19."

"WILLIAM PLUMER, MEMORANDUM OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, 1803–07, PP. 173–177—continued

"Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am in order, sir—and while I have a seat in this body I will act and speak my opinion with freedom * * * I assure the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Nicholas, I wish not to offend him * * * but * * * I shall not retract * * *. If in this I have offended him, I am willing and ready to give him satisfaction at any time and place he will please to name.

"(Plumer followed with an extensive summary of an exchange of remarks between himself and Senator Smith, of Ohio, on the subject of Judge Pickering's intoxication.)

"Mr. ADAMS. If proceedings like ours were had in a court of law, I have no hesitation in saying, it would be considered as a mere mock trial.

"Mr. NICHOLAS. I hope this resolution will not be permitted to be entered even on our minutes—that it will never see the public light. It is not correct—it does not contain all the facts.

"(Plumer records the remarks of Senators Venable, Wright, and Logan, then enters:)

"Mr. NICHOLAS. If this resolution is not passed, I shall object to its being recorded.

"Mr. Jackson moved the previous question, viz: 'Shall the main question be now put.'

"Mr. WHITE. Whatever question is taken on this subject, I hope it will be yeas and nays; and that the resolution and the manner in which it is disposed of may be seen and understood.

"Mr. Anderson then moved to amend the resolution by striking out, etc. (picking up the whole entry from the official report, but adding:)

" 'But this motion for amendment was not seconded.'

"At 3 o'clock the doors were opened—and Mr. Anderson moved that the resolution should lie on the table. On this question the yeas and nays were required—but the motion of Mr. Anderson was withdrawn.

"The question was then taken by yeas and nays upon the resolution as at first submitted—yeas 9, nays 19—so it was negatived."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it therefore appears from the records of the Senate itself, that in the period 1789 to 1806, the Senate, on 4 occasions, used the previous question motion. On 2 occasions its purpose was to postpone. On 2 other occasions, its purpose was to end debate and bring a vote. Further, it will be clear from the nature of the motion that had the Senate voted differently on the first 2 occasions, the effect of that vote, in view of the British practice, could have been to limit debate and bring a vote on the main question, if that had been the will of the Senate.

COULD THE PREVIOUS QUESTION BE DEBATED WITHOUT LET OR HINDRANCE?

Now, Mr. President, I turn from what actually happened in the Senate on the 4 specific occasions when the previous question was moved to the following general questions:

First. Is it a fact that the motion for the previous question could be debated "without let or hindrance" under the rules of the Senate up to 1806? and

Second. Can it be debated without let or hindrance today, for the purposes of obstruction under general parliamentary practice. These are key questions.

With the present Vice President expressing the opinion that section 3 of the present rule XXII of the Senate is unconstitutional, the matters at issue are liable at some stage to be affected by rulings based on parliamentary procedures in general. In that event, the hope of the defenders of the filibuster is to secure a ruling that parliamentary precedents, especially in the United States Senate and in the English House of Commons, admit of no limitation of debate upon the motion to put the previous question.

It was, I suspect, these important aspects of the subject that caused my distinguished colleague to make some comments which brought into question the academic qualifications of Mr. Brant to discuss the subject—remarks which I am sure he would not have made under less controversial circumstances.

It is the importance of this matter which largely prompts my discussion of the subject today, so as to lay the basis for a future ruling by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Let me first point out that the Vice President, from 1789 until 1828, had the power to decide questions of order without an appeal being taken from his decision by the Senate as a whole. That power was found in rule XVI before the rules were amended by the general revision of February 14, 1828. Rule XVI read as follows:

"When a Member shall be called to order, he shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he is in order or not; but every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate; but if there be a doubt in his mind, he may call for the sense of the Senate."

In other words, there was no obligation upon him to call for the sense of the Senate, and the Vice President was to be the judge of whether he would call for the sense of the Senate.

This was a general rule, covering the disposal of all questions of order. The next rule, No. XVII, made an additional provision for personal calls to order. I quote it:

"If a member be called to order for words spoken, the exceptionable words shall be immediately taken down in writing, that the President may be better enabled to judge of the matter. (The Journal of the first session of the Senate of the United States, pp. 14–15.)"

These two rules were the only ones on the subject of order. Thus, both in matters of personal conduct and parliamentary procedure, the decision of the Vice President or President of the Senate was absolute and final during all the years in which the Senate had a rule for the previous question. The power of the Presiding Officer remained absolute until 1828, when rule XVI was amended to read: "every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate."

It may be asked, what if the Vice President, in that day when he possessed unappealable authority, refused to rule that a filibustering debate was out of order? Well, what we are discussing is whether the power existed at that time, not whether the possessor of it was willing or unwilling to use it. But I will say that if any Vice President of the period we are talking about—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, or Aaron Burr, whose busts are placed over the press gallery—had declined to uphold a point of order against a filibustering debate on the motion for the previous question, he would have done so in disregard of section 17 of Jefferson's Manual of parliamentary practice. I quote the relevant part of section 17:

"No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously."

That was a rule of parliamentary practice which Thomas Jefferson laid down as a result of listening to the debates in the Senate.

I do not suppose anybody will contend that in a day when the Vice President had the power and the parliamentary duty to halt a speech that was merely tedious, he lacked either the power or the obligation to halt one that was tedious, dilatory, and deliberately obstructive. Certainly it cannot be argued that Vice President Thomas Jefferson would have refused to uphold the views which he expressed in his own manual. I expect to hear somebody argue that as soon as the Vice President lost this power, by the allowance of an appeal to the Senate, the power vanished completely.

That would be a remarkable argument, indeed, and one completely untenable. To maintain it would mean that if the Presiding Officer alone could do it, then certainly the Presiding Officer and the Senate together could do it. It would mean that the Vice President and Senate combined are incapable of enforcing a point of order which formerly could be enforced by the Presiding Officer alone.

If the Presiding Officer alone could do it, then certainly the Presiding Officer and the Senate together could do it.

It therefore appears clear that, first, from the nature and use of the previous question in the first 17 years of the history of the Senate; and second, the power of the Vice President to decide points of order without appeal, that the Senate had the power and used the power to end debate and bring matters to a vote in that early period.

I may say that the RECORD in the four cases I have read discloses, so far as I can ascertain, that there was no debate on the putting of the previous question; and once the question was put, there was no further debate on the main question itself.

That power did exist and it would still exist at the beginning of a new session of Congress if there were an attempt to filibuster a motion to proceed to the adoption of new rules of the Senate and the previous question motion.

When decisions of the Vice President were made appealable in 1828, the power to decide did not vanish. It was given a broader base in the will of the majority. If there be an appeal from that to general parliamentary practice, it must be to that parliamentary practice which makes any obstructive debate a contempt of the body.

Now I wish to devote a few minutes to the development of the American and British systems of curbing excessive debate.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN—THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

In 1778, the Continental Congress adopted the previous question in the negative form, that is, "That the main question be not now put." Its ostensible purpose was to postpone. At that time, there was no need for a cloture motion for the filibuster, and obstructive debate was unknown. The reason, of course, was that the votes of 9 of the 13 States were needed for passage of a measure, and the problem was in getting the representatives of that many States together at any one time in order to vote. Therefore, if obstruction or delay was the purpose of any group, this could have been accomplished by absences rather than by prolonged debate. In other words, the affirmative requirements of more than two-thirds majority of the States prevented the filibuster.

It should be remembered, however, that even this negative motion could and did close debate and bring a vote, for when the "nays" prevailed in 1778 the Congress adopted an interpretive ruling that they must proceed to a vote.

The matter, interestingly enough, dealt with the question whether any person holding office under the United States could promote, encourage, or attend plays. The act provided that if they did, they should be deemed unworthy to hold such office and, accordingly, should be dismissed.

On this occasion—the only one recorded in the index—the previous-question motion, worded in the negative carried in the negative. A motion was made to postpone action on the substantive matter until the next day. A question was then raised if the Congress were not required to proceed to a vote when the previous question was negatived. The question was put before the Congress itself and by a 7–3 vote it decided that when the negative form of the previous question was passed in the negative, they were required to proceed to a vote on the substantive issue before them. In other words, two negatives made an affirmative.

THE SENATE FROM 1789 TO 1806

From 1789 to 1806, as we have already seen, the Senate had the affirmative form of the previous question as a part of its rules.

It also used the negative. On the four occasions when the previous question was used, the motion in the affirmative form was used three times, and the purpose of the motion on the last two occasions was to close debate. In other words, it evolved in purpose from a motion to postpone to a motion to stop debate, although its effect could have been to end debate on all four occasions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House of Representatives has always had the previous-question motion. From 1789 to 1880, it was in the same form as that provided by the early rules of the Senate, namely, "Shall the main question be now put?" In 1880, it was decided that the Speaker, on motion, should ask for the "yeas" and "nays" on "ordering the previous question."

In the American House of Representatives, the filibuster was used as an effort to prevent a vote as early as 1811. When an obstructive crisis reached its peak, it was effectively dealt with in February of 1811, when the motion for the previous question was used six times in one night to force a crucial question to a vote.

The event which occasioned its use as a cloture motion was a bitter contest over foreign policy which preceded the War of 1812. The filibuster was being used to defeat the nonintercourse bill.

Therefore, the House followed the Senate precedents at this very early time and used the affirmative form of the previous question to obtain cloture. That is still its use—although the form has been modified—in the House of Representatives and that is its use in other parliamentary bodies—with the exception of the Senate—today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois mind an interruption at this point, or would he prefer that it be postponed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senator from Illinois, who has given so much time and devotion to the question of the Senate rule which permits a filibuster—a rule which has been used primarily in connection with civil rights bills—that in the Committee on Rules and Administration we are having quite a struggle with respect to the resolution of the Senator from Illinois and also the resolution sponsored by both the majority leader and the minority leader.

I should like to congratulate the Senator from Illinois for perceiving the critical importance of this issue and of the entire civil-rights issue, of which it is a very essential corollary, if any action is to be had; and I also wish to congratulate him upon his leadership on this subject.

I urge the Senator from Illinois—and I am confident the Senator from Illinois knows me well enough to be sure that I say this with no gleam in my eye—to use his own great influence in his own party—as I am attempting to do in my own, for I believe the civil-rights issue will get nowhere unless Members of both parties who feel strongly on the subject combine their efforts—to have the Senate take action on the civil-rights issue. So I urge the Senator from Illinois to use his own very great influence in his party, and I shall do my utmost in mine, and other Members of the Senate who have been here much longer than I have will do the same, to try at one and the same time we are seeking to have the Senate act on the civil-rights bill also to seek to have the Senate act on the two resolutions.

The present situation is as follows: Upon my motion, the Committee on Rules and Administration has designated an ad hoc subcommittee for the purpose of considering this question. The subcommittee was designated about April 1.

I have done my utmost to get the subcommittee to report one of the resolutions. I have not been successful. Right now, hearings have been ordered, with an unlimited amount of time available at the hearings, insofar as Members of Congress are concerned; and with a limitation of one-half an hour in the case of each organization. How long that will extend the matter, I have not the remotest notion. But I should like to inform the Senator from Illinois that at the next meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is to occur approximately 2 weeks hence, I will again raise the issue; and I have served notice that I will raise it then.

I repeat that, without any gleam in my eye or without any idea that this situation casts reflection upon either one party or the other—for after all, both parties have their troubles—I desire to point out that the question of the Senate rule which permits a filibuster is a corollary of the civil-rights issue, and should be pressed with the same vigor.

I am delighted that the Senator from Illinois has taken the leadership in this matter. I have the honor to be a cosponsor of his resolution—and I emphasize that it is his resolution. The Senator from Illinois has taken the leadership on this issue in his own party, as I have in mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Chair desires to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank both Senators for their comments.

A number of Senators on this side of the aisle have tried to have action taken on the civil-rights bills and on the proposal to change rule XXII, rather than to permit the Senate to be interminably tied up with debate. I am delighted that the Senator from New York is pushing along those lines, on his side of the aisle, and I appreciate very much that in the Rules Committee he moved the adoption of my resolution to change rule XXII, of which resolution he is a cosponsor.

In times past and, as all of us know, even up to the present, Senate Members opposed to civil rights have worked, on both sides of the aisle; and there has been an alliance between sections of my party and sections of the party of the Senator from New York, both to defeat civil-rights measures and to prevent any change in the Senate rule. Some groups do it openly; others do it subtly.

I remember the poem entitled "A Modern Decalogue," by Arthur Hugh Clough, in which the commandment "Thou shalt not kill' is rendered by him in cynical form, as "Thou shalt not kill, but needst not strive officiously to keep alive."

There are many who, although they themselves will not stab civil rights to death, will furnish the danger or other instrument or the interminable debate with which others can do the job. That has been going on for many years; and it is about time that those of us who believe in a vigorous civil-rights program and in the right of the Senate, after due debate, to proceed to vote, should work from both sides of the aisle.

So I say to the Senator from New York that there is room for all of us, and we can press on together; and the more converts we make, the better.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois has put his finger on a critical point. I should like to emphasize it, if I may—although I repeat that he is the one who made the point. It is this: In my view, there is no difference between being in favor of civil-rights measures and being in favor of a change in the rule which permits civil-rights measures to be killed in this Chamber.

Therefore I believe—and I believe it deeply—that the people of the country should hold to account every Member, on both counts equally. I believe there is some dichotomy in the thinking of some Members of this body who, for one reason or another, believe a Member can feel differently about the cloture issue than he does about the civil-rights issue. To the contrary, Mr. President, I sincerely believe that Members cannot do so. I believe there is a real majority of the Senate in favor of the enactment of civil-rights measures; and I believe that there should be, and there must be—and, if the people demand it, there will be—a real majority of the Members of this body who will be in favor of changing the cloture rule.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. Let me say that his help has been and will continue to be of great assistance; and those of us on our side of the aisle will work vigorously; and I am sure he will also work vigorously, on his side.

THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. President, now let us turn to the development of the previous question in the House of Commons. Let us recall the quotation, from the 1953 brief against the Anderson motion, of the words of Henry Cabot Lodge that:

"The previous question which existed in the earliest years, and was abandoned in 1806, was the previous question of England and not that with which everyone is familiar today in our House of Representatives. It was not in practice a form of cloture and it is therefore correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate. (p. 11.)"

That, as we have seen, is totally in error.

We recall also the quotation from the Congressional Digest of November 1926 which the proponents of the filibuster placed in the RECORD in 1953:

"Like the precedents for the (previous question) rule in the British Parliament and the Continental Congress when it was used in the early days of the Senate and it did not limit debate but avoided a vote on a given subject."

We now have seen that this statement is not correct with respect to usage in both the Continental Congress and the early Senate. The Continental Congress actually ruled that the motion closed debate on one occasion; and in the Senate, the previous question was used on two occasions to limit debate. Furthermore, the motion could always have had that effect if that had been the sense of the Senate on the other occasion when it was used.

It is also clear that the statement is not accurate concerning British precedents. Today, the House of Commons has two motions which can bring debate to a close and can bring on a vote. One is called "cloture," and the other is called the "previous question." Both are in addition to the modern guillotine.

The cloture motion is worded affirmatively, that is, "That the question be now put." If the "yeas" prevail, debate is stopped, and the main question is put to a vote. If the "nays" prevail, debate continues.

The previous question motion is now worded in the negative, that is, "That the question be not now put." If the "yeas" prevail, debate is postponed. If the "nays" prevail, debate is closed.

For something more than two centuries before the House of Commons adopted the cloture motion in 1882, it had other methods of preventing obstruction; and the motion for the previous question also could, and did produce that effect.

I wish to introduce at this point in the RECORD, a second letter from Mr. Brant. It traces the use and history of the previous question motion in the House of Commons. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FEBRUARY 6, 1957.

"Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

"DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Since writing my memorandum on the previous question and cloture I have found time to examine the Journals of the English House of Commons from 1604 to 1789—that is, from the birth-year of the motion for the previous question to the year in which it was incorporated in the rules of the United States Senate. The result is a mountain of evidence that, measured by its effects, the previous question was infinitely more important in the early period as a producer of cloture than as a method of postponing a question.

"Hatsell's Precedents, published in 1781, furnished most of the early history of the previous question drawn upon in May's Law and Usage of Parliament and Jefferson's Manual. Hatsell gives the impression, perhaps without intending to, that the motion for the previous question was a rare device in the 17th century. After remarking that 'On the 25th of May, 1604, is the first instance I have found of putting the previous question,' he refers to only four other instances of it before 1700. May cites 1 or 2 others.

"Hatsell gives the usual explanation of the British practice: a member desiring to postpone the main question moves 'That this question be now put' and votes against his own motion. He also makes it clear that when the previous question is moved and carried, 'the Speaker must put the main question immediately.' But Hatsell gives no citations of affirmative results and the reader is left to infer that such a mischance seldom occurred.

"The truth is that between A.D. 1604 and 1700, the previous question was moved 736 times in the House of Commons. It resulted in cloture 491 times, in postponement 245 times.

"These figures can easily be checked for accuracy. The index to the House Journals divides the record into 'Questions, previous, affirmative' and 'Questions, previous, negative.' Affirmative equates with cloture, negative with postponement.

"This period was one of revolutionary struggle and wide swings in British Government. It embraced 37 years of Stuart supremacy over Parliament, nearly 20 years of the Puritan Revolution, close to 30 years of the Stuart Restoration and a final period of tranquility after the 'glorious revolution' of 1688. For clearer understanding, the record of the previous question needs to be broken down into epochs corresponding to the political changes. Following is a tabulation of 17th century motions for the previous question and the results of the motions:

"From 1604 to 1640, the period of Stuart supremacy: Motions, 3. Results, cloture 3.

"From 1640 to 1658, the Puritan Revolution, embracing the Long Parliament, the Commonwealth and the Cromwellian Protectorate: Motions, 523. Results, cloture 351, postponement 172.

"From 1658 to 1660, period of chaos, Stuart Restoration, and retribution: Motions, 97. Results, cloture 74, postponement 23.

"From 1661 to 1688, reign of Charles II: Motions, 81. Results, cloture 47, postponement 34.

"From 1688 to 1700, reign of William and Mary: Motions, 32. Results, cloture 16, postponement 16.

"Totals: Motions, 736. Results, cloture 491, postponement 245.

"Following the Revolution of 1688, it will be observed, postponement caught up with cloture. The change grew more pronounced. Between 1700 and 1790, the previous question was moved on 163 occasions, resulting in cloture 48 times, in postponement 115 times. From 1790 until November 11, 1882, when the House of Commons adopted the modern cloture rule, the motion for the previous question was put 361 times, resulting in cloture 67 times, in postponement 294. Since 1882 it has been put only four times and not once since 1910.

"So, although it cannot be found in any parliamentary treatise, this contrast comes into view:

"In the 17th century of parliamentary tension, the previous question was moved far oftener than in all later centuries combined, and resulted in cloture in two-thirds of the cases.

"In the 18th century of parliamentary tranquility, the previous question tapered off and resulted in postponement two-thirds of the time.

"Finally, when parliamentary obstruction developed in the 19th century, the previous question was transmuted into the virtually identical cloture motion, while the motion

for the previous question continued a separate existence but withered away completely. In all periods, the practice of the House of Commons was molded by the temper of the times and the necessities of legislative business.

"The parliamentary records of the 17th century do not identify the movers of the previous question. One can only speculate on whether it was moved part of the time for the avowed purpose of securing a final vote, rather than moved for one purpose and seized on for another. Even if every one of the 736 motions had the ostensible purpose of postponement, the overwhelming fact is that 491 of them produced cloture, and both the affirmative wording of the motion and the rule as to its application were admirably suited to produce that effect. It likewise seems significant that the affirmative wording became more positive at the height of this positive use of the motion, shifting from 'whether it be put' to 'that it be put.' By all the rules of logic, such a change denotes intent.

"Even in later times the previous-question rule has had a tendency to produce cloture when a strong parliamentary majority was dealing with controversial issues. To illustrate the use of the motion in British practice, Sir Thomas Erskine May cited (but did not describe) three 19th-century examples from the House of Lords. Two of these motions represented the clear purpose of postponement, although in one of these the motion was offered by an advocate of immediate passage of the main question. Unable to win Prime Minister Disraeli's approval of a warning to Russia not to attack Constantinople, Lord Dorchester made the motion in order to avoid the consequences of a more direct refusal to take this action (Lords' Journal, v. 110, p. 22, Parliamentary Debates, Jan. 28, 1878). In another instance, 10 motions against the income tax were disposed of by offering and defeating 10 motions for the previous question (Lord's Journal, v. 74, p. 87.) The third example was by far the most controversial.

"On August 6, 1839, Lord Brougham moved to resolve that witnesses who refused to testify in Irish sedition trials should be sent to prison. 'After long debate,' the Lord's Journal records, the previous question was moved and resolved in the affirmative. The motion apparently came from the opposition, which was protesting against a vote, but leading up to it in the record of the debate are such entries as these:

" '[Loud cries of "Question, question."] * * *

" '[Cries of "Divide" and "Question".] * * *

" '[Continued cries of "Question" and "divide."].'

"It was under the stress of such cries, and after a warning by Lord Broughan about 'the waning night and the waning patience of the House,' that the previous question was moved and carried by 86 to 52. The main question then carried without a division (Mirror of Parliament, VI, 4775–4777, 4784).

"In this case, cited as typical by England's foremost parliamentary authority, the motion for the previous question was in effect a surrender to the demand for an end of debate and led directly to passage of the resolution. It was a duplication by the House of Lords of the dominant aspect of the previous question in the 17th century.

"The House of Commons three centuries ago had other effective ways of dealing with excessive debate and kindred obstructive devices. On April 17, 1604 (1 month before the first use of the previous question), the following entry was made in the House Journal:

" 'Agreed for a general rule, if any superfluous motion, or tedious speech, be offered in the House, the party is to be directed and ordered by Mr. Speaker.'

"Anybody who questions the force of that rule might observe how it was indexed at the time: "Speaker to stop superfluous motions, and tedious or impertinent speeches.' (Com. J. General Index, I–VII, 861).

"The moment the rule was approved, the Speaker proceeded to read a letter he had just received from 'one John Tey,' a member who was also 'the King's Aulnager [wool inspector] for London.' Tey complained that on his drawing up a motion which represented the King's pleasure and express commandment, it pleased the Speaker 'to distaste my motion, and * * * to clip me off.' He intended to inform the King of this. On the Speaker's initiative, the House adjudged Mr. Tey's conduct 'to be an error in the party, and he was ordered to acknowledge his error publicly; which he presently was content to do; and so was pardoned by the House.' The custom in that day was to send nonapologizing members to the Tower.

"That 1604 prohibition of any tedious speech came down through Hatzell into Jefferson's Manual, written to guide procedure in the U.S. Senate. Jefferson as Vice President had power to enforce it, which meant power to stop a filibuster. Together with the prohibition of any superfluous motion and kindred 1604 rulings, it furnished the legal basis for the declaration of the Speaker of the House of Commons on July 25, 1877, that willful and persistent obstruction of legislation is contempt of the House. Added to that is the direct link between the British previous question, whose main effect in early days was cloture, and the British closure motion of the present day—both of these having the same wording, 'That the motion be now put,' and the same effect when carried.

"I have said that in the House of Commons the previous question was transmuted into cloture. That is definitely revealed in the 1881 records, together with the inherent power of the House to control an obstructive minority. Faced with a prolonged filibuster against the protection of person and property (Ireland) bill, the Gladstone ministry kept the House in continuous session from 4 p.m. on Monday, January 31, until 9 a.m. Wednesday, February 2. At that hour the Speaker said that, in spite of a 5-day debate and 41 hours of continuous sitting, an important measure, declared to be urgent, was 'being arrested by the action of an inconsiderable minority, the Members of which have resorted to those modes of "obstruction," which have been recognized by the House as a Parliamentary offense.' With the legislative powers of the House thus paralyzed:

" 'A new and exceptional course is imperatively demanded; and I am satisfied that I shall best carry out the will of the House, and may rely upon its support, if I decline to call any more Members to speak, and at once proceed to put the question from the chair.'

"He proceeded to put the question and it carried, 164 to 19. Prime Minister Gladstone then arose and offered the 1881 "Urgency Rule," by which, on a 3-to-1 vote of the House that a measure was urgent, "the powers of the House for the regulation of its business" were vested completely in the Speaker. He could do whatever the House had power to do. What followed is revealed in Hansard's Parliamentary Debates for February 25, at a later stage of the person and property filibuster:

" 'Mr. O'Donnell: I wish to say—and I will delay the House only a very few minutes—

" 'Mr. Speaker: It appears to me to be the general sense of the House that the question should be now put.

" 'The Marquess of Hartington [a Secretary of State]: I beg to move, sir, that the question be now put.'

" 'Motion made, and question put, "That the question be now put." '

"The motion carried, 282 to 32, and the House then voted 281 to 36 'That this bill do pass.'

"This took place nearly 2 years before the word 'cloture' or the 'cloture rule' came into the House of Commons rules. What actually happened was that on the Speaker's initiative, and in fulfillment of the mandate given him to stop filibusters, the wording of the previous question was employed, deliberately and knowingly, for the specific purpose of ending debate and forcing a vote on the bill. The same thing happened 4 days later on another bill, and in each case the action was indexed in the Journal of the House of Commons as a motion for the previous question. Here are the two entries in the index to the 1881 Journal:

" 'Question, previous; put and agreed to, it appearing to Mr. Speaker to be the general sense of the House, That the question be now put [page] 96. Mr. Speaker having stated that he collected from the last division, that it was the general sense of the House, that the question be now put, 100.'

"Thus we find that after closing debate 491 times in the 17th century, through the motion for the previous question, the House of Commons deliberately resorted to the same instrument in 1881, for the purpose of ending filibusters. Back of all this is the demonstrated fact that the House of Commons, like any parliamentary body, has power to insure the orderly transaction of business according to the will of the majority, and that this power was effectually exercised by the Speaker, with the unspoken assent of the House, before he was formally clothed with this authority.

"Apply these long lines of precedent to the current controversy over the senatorial filibuster, in which the previous question is likely to be invoked during the process of changing the rules. It is clearly revealed, not only that cloture was the most familiar result of moving the previous question during the first century of its use, leading logically to the American use of it for that purpose, but that British practice took the same direction when the need arose in the 1880's. And it is evident that any attempt to filibuster the putting of the motion for the previous question is contempt of the House under parliamentary practices running back to 1604.

"If British precedents are to be invoked today, to curb the right of the United States Senate to change its rules through the freely expressed will of the majority, it will have to be done in defiance of English history as well as of the United States Constitution.

"Yours sincerely,

"IRVING BRANT."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Mr. Brant's findings are summarized in the following sentence of his letter:

"The result is a mountain of evidence that, measured by its effect, the previous question was infinitely more important in the early period as a producer of cloture than as a method of postponing a question."

The proof of this assertion is found in the figures Mr. Brant cites on the use of the previous question motion in the British House of Commons. First, however, recall that the proponents of the filibuster have claimed that the previous question motion in the early Senate was like the rule in the British Parliament in that—they say—it did not limit debate but avoided a vote on a subject. And my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, referred to the previous question motion in the early Senate:

"That was the previous question rule from the British Parliament, which applied in that body for many years. A motion for the previous question was in the nature of a motion to postpone consideration of a bill before the Senate."

Mr. Brant made an extraordinary study of the many occasions on which this motion was used, and has tabulated the results. It is a tremendous feat of research, and is extremely important in the study of this question.

Well, what was that motion in the British Parliament, and what effect did it have?

In the 17th century—that is, from 1604, when it was first adopted to 1700—12 years after William and Mary ascended the throne of England—the previous question was moved on 736 occasions. Its effect was to close debate 491 times and to postpone only 245 times.

From 1700 to 1790—that is until the time when the first Senate of the United States adopted the previous question rule—the previous question was moved in the House of Commons 163 times. Its effect was to close debate 48 times, and to postpone 115 times.

Thus, in the almost 2 centuries of usage of the previous question rule in the British Parliament before it was adopted in the first Senate, we find that it was moved on 899 occasions. Its effect was to limit or close debate 539 times, and to postpone on 360 occasions.

So if the previous question motion in the early Senate was, as the proponents of the filibuster claim it was, the rule from the British Parliament, it is quite clear that it was a rule whose effect was to limit debate 60 percent of the times it was used prior to its adoption by the first Senate. Thus, its principal use was to close debate, and Mr. Brant is not in error when he states that there "is a mountain of evidence that, measured by its effect, the previous question was infinitely more important in the early period as a producer of cloture than as a method of postponing a question."

From 1790 to 1882—when the House of Commons adopted a specific cloture rule—the previous question motion actually limited debate on no less than 67 occasions. In this latter period the motion resulted in postponement on something like 294 occasions.

The form of the previous question motion in the British House of Commons evolved over the years, and the motion before 1882 was put "that that question be now put." If the "yeas" prevailed, debate was stopped and the main question voted on. When the "nays" prevailed, the main question to which it referred was postponed.

It should be noted that this motion was in the affirmative form, and the negative form of the previous question only came into use in the House of Commons in 1888.

In 1877, when the House was faced with obstructive debate over the South African bill, the Speaker ruled that—as was the tradition of the House—a Member who was willfully persisent in obstructive debate was guilty of contempt of the House. It should be emphasized that he was not announcing a new principle, but said at that time that everyone knew that obstruction was in contempt.

The House of Commons then had no cloture rule as such. The previous question had often had the effect of closing debate. The rules of Parliament, wrote Sir Thomas Erskine May (the Clerk of the House), in describing the situation, were designed to afford every legitimate opportunity of discussion. In the observance of these rules he said, "Freedom of debate has been respected with rare patience and self-denial." He then continued, and the citation is May's Law and Usage of Parliament, ninth edition, 1883, page 380:

"But of late, these salutary rules have been strained and perverted, in the House of Commons, for purposes of obstruction."

It became clear that such a course, if persisted in, would frustrate the power and authority of Parliament and secure the domination of a small minority, condemned by the deliberate judgment of the House and the country. That it was unparliamentary and opposed to the principles of orderly government was manifest, and on the 25th of July, 1877, it was declared by the Speaker:

"That any member willfully and persistently obstructing public business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of the House, and would be liable to such punishment, whether by censure, by suspension from the service of the House, or by commitment, as the House may adjudge." (Sir T. Erskine May's Law and Usage of Parliament, 1883 edition, pp. 380–381.)

So, instead of converting the motion for the previous question into a means of cloture at that time, the Speaker asserted the power of the House, under general parliamentary practice, to stop a filibuster by suspending the participants or committing them. I ask those of my colleagues who appeal to British parlimentary practice as a guide to decision of points of order in the United States Senate, whether they are willing to be governed by this particular parliamentary power? Which would they prefer, to let debate be closed by moving the previous question—as is done in all other American legislative bodies—or would they rather be dealt with by a citation and punishment for contempt, which is an alternative if the general parliamentary practice of the British House of Commons is invoked.

In 1878, a select committee of the House of Commons was appointed to study the problem of obstructive debate and to make a report on that problem.

It will be recalled that the Irish leader, Isaac Butt, died in 1879 and Charles Stewart Parnell took over the leadership of the home-rule movement. As the eminent Oxford historian, Keith Feiling, put it, Parnell "set to work on two fronts: at Westminster, to make Parliament unbearable by obstruction until Ireland's claims were heard, and to bid one British party up against the other"—Keith Feiling, A History of England, London, Macmillan, 1950, page 978.

So it happened that the question of how to deal with obstructive debate came inescapably before the British House of Commons soon after the Speaker made his 1877 ruling.

The next move was the adoption of a standing order in 1880, under which any Member who was cited by the Speaker for willfully obstructing debate was suspended. Several Members were suspended, but the obstruction increased.

In February of 1881 the situation became so intolerable that I wish to quote the following from Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, third series, volume 257, column 2032, during the debate over the protection of person and property—Ireland—bill:

"(9 a.m. Wednesday, February 2 [1881])

"At this time Mr. Speaker returned to the House and resumed the chair; and the honorable Member for Cavan at once resumed his seat.

"Mr. Speaker thereupon addressed the House as follows:

" 'The motion for leave to bring in the protection of person and property (Ireland) bill has now been under discussion for above 5 days. The present sitting, having commenced on Monday last at 4 o'clock, has continued until this Wednesday morning, a period of 41 hours, the House having been frequently occupied with discussions upon repeated dilatory motions for adjournment. However prolonged and tedious these discussions, the motions have been supported by small minorities, in opposition to the general sense of the House.

" 'A crisis has thus arisen which demands the prompt intervention of the Chair, and of the House. The usual rules have proved powerless to insure orderly and effective debate. An important measure, recommended in Her Majesty's speech nearly a month since and declared to be urgent in the interests of the State by a decisive majority, is being arrested by the action of an inconsiderable minority, the Members of which have resorted to those modes of "obstruction" which have been recognized by the House as a parliamentary offense.

" 'The dignity, the credit, and the authority of this House are seriously threatened, and it is necessary that they should be vindicated. Under the operation of the accustomed rules and methods of procedure, the legislative powers of the House are paralyzed. A new and exceptional course is imperatively demanded; and I am satisfied that I shall best carry out the will of the House, and may rely upon its support, if I decline to call any more Members to speak, and at once proceed to put the question from the chair. I feel assured that the House will be prepared to exercise all its powers in giving effect to these proceedings.

" 'Future measures for insuring orderly debate I must leave to the judgment of the House. But I may add that it will be necessary either for the House itself to assume more effectual control over its debates or to entrust greater authority to the Chair.'

"Question put, 'That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question.'

"The House divided—ayes 164, noes 19. Majority, 145.

"The Speaker then proceeded to put the main question, which was agreed to without a division.

"[These proceedings cause great excitement among the Members present; and those who had voted in the minority withdrew from the House, crying 'Privilege! Privilege!']

* * * * *

"Mr. GLADSTONE. I propose to move tomorrow the following resolutions:

"1. If upon notice given a motion be made that the state of public business is urgent, and if on the call of the Speaker 40 Members shall support it by rising in their places, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question [that the public business is urgent], no debate, amendment, or adjournment being allowed * * * and if the question be resolved in the affirmative by a majority of not less than three to one, the powers of the House for the regulation of its business upon the several stages of bills, and motions, and all other matters, shall be and remain with the Speaker, until the Speaker shall declare that the state of public business is no longer urgent."

This was adopted February 3, 1881, and the bill was voted to be urgent. The effect of this proposal was to affirm that the House had full authority to regulate its proceedings and to delegate this power to the Speaker to exercise at his discretion.

A few weeks later, there were two further incidents which show how effective the power of the Speaker to limit debate really was. I quote again from Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, third series, volume 258, column 1832, during the Debate over the Protection of Person and Property—Ireland—bill on February 25, 1881:

"Mr. O'DONNELL. I wish to say—and I will delay the House only a very few minutes——

"Mr. SPEAKER. It appears to me to be the general sense of the House that the question be now put."

In other words, he was shutting off debate.

"The MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON. I beg to move, sir, that the question be now put.

"[Hartington was described as 'one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State.']

"Motion made, and question put, 'That the question be now put.'

"[Ayes 282, noes 32. Question put, 'That this bill do pass.' Ayes 281, noes 36.]"

And this action led to the following entry in the Index:

"Question, previous; put, and agreed to, it appearing to Mr. Speaker to be the general sense of the House, that the question be now put, 96."

The second incident is found in Hansard, same volume, column 2017, March 1, 1881, on the debate over the Peace Preservation—Ireland—bill:

"[Motion before the House that debate be adjourned.]

"The MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON. I hope the House will not assent to this motion, but that it will determine to conclude this debate tonight. If we may judge from the tone and character of most of the speeches recently delivered, it appears to me that there is not material for another discussion.

"(Journal of the House of Commons, p. 100, March 1, 1881)

"[Motion to adjourn debate defeated, after midnight, 202 to 21.]

"And, Mr. Speaker, having stated that he collected from the last division that it was the general sense of the House that the question be now put:

"A motion was made, and the question being put, that the question be now put.

"The House divided.

"The yeas to the right.

"The noes to the left.

"[Tellers named.]

"Yeas 200, noes 22.

"[Main question carried by same vote, authorizing the bringing in of a bill to amend the law relative to possession of firearms in Ireland.]"

And this action also led to the following entry in the Index for March 1, 1881:

"Question, previous, put, and agreed too * * * Mr. Speaker having stated that he collected from the last division, that it was the general sense of the House, that question be now put, 100."

These incidents show how the Speaker exercised the power to regulate proceedings and that the official index to the debates show the incidents as examples of the previous question which, on these occasions, closed debate and was used for that specific purpose.

Following these events it was decided that a formal system of closing debate would be more effective—as certainly it would be less irritating—than punishment for contempt. Thus, in 1882, the House adopted a cloture rule. The form of the motion was "That the question be now put." As a result, the House of Commons had two motions—the previous question and a cloture motion. They were both worded in the affirmative and they differed in form only between a "that" and a "the," that is:

Previous question: "That that question be now put."

Cloture: "That the question be now put."

There was another difference between these two motions apart from the difference between a "that" and a "the." Both ended debate and brought a vote if the "yeas" prevailed, but there was a difference between them when the "nays" prevailed. If the "nays" prevailed when the previous question was put, the effect was to postpone the matter. If the "nays" prevailed when cloture was put, debate continued.

Because these differences were so subtle and because the forms of the motion were so much alike, the Speaker, in 1883, proposed a change. He proposed that the form of the "previous question" be changed to the negative form, namely, "That the question be not now put." He did this for two obvious reasons: First, because when both motions were in the affirmative, it was easy to confuse one with the other. Second, as the "previous question" was ordinarily put for the purpose of postponement, but had the effect of cloture if the "yeas" prevailed and of postponement if the "nays" prevailed, the Member moving the previous question motion for the purpose of postponement had to vote against his own motion—or "nay"—if he wished his purpose to be fulfilled.

So, what happened was that the House of Commons actually followed two American precedents. In effect, it adopted the American system of using the previous question as a means of stopping debate, but changed the name of it from the previous question to cloture. It then preserved the motion for the previous question and held it to its original purpose of postponing a vote, by adopting the wording which we in the United States employed to achieve that end during the period of our confederation. It should be recalled, however, that the effect of its use in the Continental Congress was to end debate. Do not get the impression that this was a mere coincidence. I quote the words in which Sir Thomas Erskine May, the Clerk of the House of Commons, suggested the change. It is to be found on page 304 of the 1883 edition of his Law and Usage of Parliament:

"In 1778, the Congress of the Confederation adopted the 'previous question' in a negative form, i.e., 'that the main question be not now put,' which appears to be a superior form to that used in this country and is still followed, though with different objects, in America."

Sir Thomas explained the difference in a footnote on the same page:

"In America, the effect of the previous question is immediately to suppress all further discussion of the main question."

So there we have it.

In the United States, direct progression from original use of the previous question as a means of postponement, to universal use of the same motion as a means of forcing a vote.

In England a similar direct progression from one purpose to the other, but with the old form of the previous question given the new name of cloture, and the old purpose of the previous question preserved by giving the motion a new form.

Yet even in the House of Commons today, where the negative form of the previous question continues to be employed, the defeat of that motion will produce the full effect of cloture just as surely as will the carrying of the affirmative motion. In other words, two negatives make an affirmative. That is made perfectly clear in the latest edition—published in 1950—of May's treatise on parliamentary practice. I quote from page 389:

"If the previous question be resolved in the negative, the original on which it was moved must be put forthwith, no amendment, debate, or motion for adjournment being allowed, because, as the House has negatived the proposal, 'That that question be not now put,' the question must be put at once to the vote."

It is, therefore, clear that in both the United States and England, all of the legislative bodies that have been confronted with filibusters—all of them that have been so confronted except the U.S. Senate—have done what was necessary to rescue the legislative process from the obstructive tactics of a small minority. Majority rule has prevailed, with the rights of the minority respected.

Now let me discuss this development to curb excessive debate. It is perfectly clear from what I have already said that, in England, the principal effect of the motion for the previous question in early years was to close debate. In later years, its principal effect was to postpone a question on which the maker of the motion did not desire an immediate vote although its effect was still to limit debate on numerous occasions. It is not less true that in England, even today, the effect of putting the motion for the previous question—in case the House does not wish for a postponement—is to bring the main question to an immediate vote, without debate or amendment.

Finally, it is an unchallengeable fact that in parliamentary bodies in the United States, for about a century and a half, the previous question has been moved for the primary and explicit purpose of cutting off debate and forcing the main question to a vote.

How has this American development come about? Some will say it has come about by a perversion of the original rule. They simply complain that parliamentary bodies in the United States have converted the original British rule to postpone to a motion to limit debate.

But the truth is as we have seen that at the time the early Senate used the previous question as cloture, the British had, in fact, ended debate hundreds of times by that same method.

Others will explain this American development by saying that the motion for the previous question was the nearest instrument at hand to do what the Members of the Congress regarded as necessary to be done a hundred and fifty years ago.

I will go further and say—as must be clear from the exposition of the development of the previous question in the House of Commons—that the motion for the previous question was not merely the instrument nearest at hand, but that it was and still is far better adapted to the purpose of cloture than to the postponement of a subject. Of all the clumsy, backsided, crablike methods of securing a temporary postponement, the motion for the previous question is about the worst, when employed and worded as it was in the British House of Commons while that body was creating the alleged precedents—and I emphasize "alleged"—which are supposed to hogtie the American Senate today.

The reason is that prior to 1888, a Member of the House of Commons who did not want a question voted on made a motion that it should be voted on, now. He then voted against his own motion. If a majority did likewise—that is, if the motion was defeated—the subject was postponed to a future day. But if the motion carried, that was a vote to put the main question now, and it was put instantly, without debate and without amendment.

What was needed to convert the motion for the previous question from a method of postponement into a method of cloture? Nothing whatever was needed except that the Member who made the motion should wish it to carry, instead of wishing it to be defeated. All that was needed to make the motion effective for the purpose of cloture was that a majority should vote for it.

That is the sum total, the absolute total, of this supposed American subversion of a sacred English institution. How sacred was it? We have seen that the British in the House of Commons in the 17th century voted on the previous question 736 times. The result was "cloture" 491 times and "postponement" 245 times. Using only the logic of words, the House of Commons perverted its own rule more than two-thirds of the time. But, judging the matter both by the logic of words and the logic of results, it seems more natural to conclude that the British did not pervert their rule at all. Quite to the contrary. The utterly absurd and illogical system by which a man voted against his own motion has all the appearance of a reversal of the original process. Certainly, in the early days of America, our lawmakers merely decided that a motion to vote on a question now was a motion to vote on it now. That seemed more natural to them than to move to vote on it now in order to defeat the motion and prevent a vote on it now. I call that supposed perversion of the rule a natural, logical, and commonsense development, thoroughly typical of our countrymen at the be-

ginning of the 19th century. Right at that time a young diplomat—secretary of a foreign legation in Washington—wrote home as follows:

" '[In Congress] there are about five persons who look like gentlemen. All the rest * * * are well, indeed, if they look like farmers, but most seem apothecaries and lawyers.' (Augustus Foster to his mother, Lady Elizabeth Foster. Foster papers, Library of Congress.)"

I do not know about the lawyers, but it is my opinion that the farmers and apothecaries believed in putting motions that produced their desired effect by being passed, not by compelling a legislator to vote against his own motion.

V. Conclusion

In summary, it is clear that the United States Senate from 1789 to 1806 had a motion for the previous question. This motion was put in both affirmative and negative forms. Depending upon the will of the Senate, a vote on the motion could either postpone or it could end debate and bring the main question to an immediate vote. As it happened, on two occasions the purpose and effect of the motion was to postpone. On two other occasions the motion was moved for the purpose of closing debate and bringing a vote. On one of those two occasions that actually happened and on the other occasion the motion—though not voted on—achieved the same result.

Further, it is clear that the Senate, through the Vice President, had the power to limit or stop obstructive debate. On the one hand, the Vice President had the power to decide points of order without appeal to the Senate. On the other, Jefferson's Manual provided that "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously or tediously." From the history of the Senate in those days, it appears that Senators did not use the filibuster and, therefore, it was probably not necessary to invoke this power. However, the latter point is only conjecture, because we do not know the full details of events in the Senate owing to the lack of complete reporting of debates.

Finally, it has been clearly shown that for almost 200 years in the House of Commons, the motion for the previous question served principally to close debate. Later—in the 19th century—it became an instrument of postponement, and then, in the 1880's, the words of the motion were given a new heading—the title of cloture—while the motion for the previous question was given a negative wording which coincided with the purpose of postponement. In the early days of the United States Senate, the previous question was used for the purpose of cloture. It has been so used in the House of Representatives since 1811, and the same is true of all general parliamentary practice in this country. The evolutionary process in both the United States and England, except for the Senate of the United States, has been the same—toward the orderly use of parliamentary authority to prevent the obstruction of public business.

Broader and deeper than the form, purpose, and effect of the previous question motion in the early Senate and the power of the Vice President to preserve order is the power set forth in the Constitution—the power of the Senate to "determine the rules of its proceedings." The power to determine includes the power to change. That power cannot be taken away by law, by preexistent rules, or by precedent. It most certainly cannot be taken away by invoking the fictional tradition of a past that never was. Whenever a majority of a quorum in this body decides to cut loose from the tentacles of the filibuster, it will have the power to do so without "let or hindrance" from those who believe that democratic self-government is fulfilled in the paralysis of the legislative process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Memorandum on the Development of Cloture and the Previous Question in American and British Practice, by Irving Brant.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MEMORANDUM ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLOTURE AND THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH PRACTICE

"(By Irving Brant)

"The motion for the previous question originated in the British Parliament at the beginning of the 17th century. It was used in the American Continental Congress late in the 18th century and appeared in the first rules of both Houses of the United States Congress in 1789, but was dropped by the Senate in 1806.

" 'The previous question,' it is stated in Sir Thomas Erskine May's Law and Usage of Parliament, 'is an ingenious method of avoiding a vote, upon any question that has been proposed.' But if the majority does not wish to avoid a vote, the effect of putting the previous question is to cut off debate and force the main question to a decision at once. Thus the rule can, with equal ease, be made a method of postponement or an instrument of cloture, regardless of variations in the form of the motion or the original purpose of it.

"Forms of previous questions

"In the British House of Lords, the Lord Speaker puts the question, 'Whether the original question be now put.'

"In the House of Commons the words of the motion are negative, 'That that question be not now put.'

"In our Continental Congress, it was moved 'That the main question be not now put.'

"In the United States Senate, from 1789 to 1806, the prescribed wording was, 'Shall the main question be now put?'

"In our House of Representatives, the wording duplicated the Senate version, from 1789 until 1880, when it was decided that the Speaker, on motion, should ask for the yeas and nays on ordering the previous question.

"One would suppose, from the origin of the previous question and the present wording in the House of Commons, that the negative form originated in the Commons and was transplanted to America. That is not the case. Until 1888 the House of Commons used the affirmative form, and the circumstances of the change throw a striking light upon the present difference between American and British practice.

"England follows Continental Congress

"In the ninth edition (1883) of May's Law and Usage of Parliament, the author (who was clerk of the House of Commons) called attention to the awkward wording of the previous-question motion then in use: 'That that question be now put.' To use that motion in order to postpone or get rid of the subject, May pointed out, the mover had to vote against his own motion. He then suggested a change in wording based on American precedent:

" 'In 1778, the Congress of the Confederation adopted the previous question in a negative form; i.e., "that the main question be not now put," which appears to be a superior form to that used in this country, and is still followed, though with different objects, in America' (p. 304).

"American purpose is cloture

"This transatlantic difference was explained in a footnote:

" 'In America, the effect of the previous question is immediately to suppress all further discussion of the main question. Cushing, Law and Practice of Parliamentary Assemblies, 1855, pages 553, 554.'

"May's statement, made at a time when the U.S. Senate had no previous-question rule, referred to the general American practice. That is described as follows in Hughes' American Parliamentary Guide:

" 'The previous question in American assemblies is used exclusively to close debate and prevent amendments. * * * [It] may not be debated. May not be amended. * * * May not be postponed.' (Pp. 159, 569, 1924 edition.)

"Cloture and previous question in England

"Now, observe what was happening in England when May wrote about the differing purposes of the previous-question rule in the two countries. The year before, in 1882, the House of Commons had adopted a permanent closure rule which required an immediate vote on a motion "That the question be now put." This motion enabled a majority of members present to force an immediate vote on the main question. The closure rule was used at once, and freely, but 6 years passed before a member moved the previous question. The Speaker thereupon said (March 20, 1888):

" 'If I were to propose that question in the customary form, the terms of the motion would be "That that question be now put," words which are almost identical with the words of the motion for the closure of a debate.'

"They were indeed almost identical. The motion for the previous question differed from a motion for closure only by the difference between a 'that' and a 'the.'

"Previous question: 'That that question be now put.'

"Closure: 'That the question be now put.'

" 'That' and 'the' both referred to the same question. If the first was defeated, the subject was set aside but could be resumed on a future day. If the second was defeated, debate was resumed at once. But if either motion received an affirmative majority, the main question had to be put to an immediate vote, without debate or amendment.

"The Speaker then proposed and the House agreed to adopt the negative form 'That the question be not now put,'—the form used in the American Continental Congress.

" 'Previous question' always stops debate

"Thus it came about that in the House of Commons today the closure motion is worded affirmatively, the motion for the previous question is worded negatively. If the affirmative motion is defeated, the debate goes on. If the negative motion receives an affirmative majority, the subject is set aside till another day. But all debate is cut off and the main question is put to an immediate vote if the majority votes affirmatively on the motion with the affirmative wording, and the same is true if the majority votes negatively on the motion with the negative wording. This letter effect is clearly stated in the 10th (1893) edition of May's Law and Usage of Parliament:

" 'If the previous question be resolved in the negative, the original question must be put forthwith, no amendment, nor debate, nor motion for adjournment being allowed, because, as the House have negatived the proposal, "That that question be not now put," the question must accordingly be put at once to the vote.'

"When one considers the microscopic difference between cloture and the previous question in the original form of these British motions, and considers also that every form of the previous question establishes cloture when the majority votes that way, it becomes easy to see why the motion for the previous question has become the prevailing instrument of cloture in the United States.

"Use of motion in House of Representatives

"In the use of this motion it is far easier to trace the course of events in the House of Representatives than in the Senate. The halting of debate in the House, through the

motion for the previous question, became fully established in the bitter contest over foreign policy preceding the War of 1812. On February 27, 1811, with sine die adjournment compulsory on March 3, the climax was reached in a long filibuster which threatened defeat of the nonintercourse bill. The Democratic majority held the House in session all night. Between 2:30 in the morning and 5 o'clock, the previous question was moved and carried 6 times. Here are the entries in the Annals which describe the decisive use of the motion to force a final vote:

" 'Mr. P. B. Porter then said that, for the purpose of coming to a decision on the bill, and putting an end to a scene which was, to say the least of it, disreputable to the House, he moved for the previous question on engrossing the bill.'

"The motion carried and the bill was engrossed, and then, say the Annals, 'The previous question was required on its passage, and carried in the affirmative.'

"Senate was once a fast-acting body

"Philip Morier, British chargé d'affaires, relayed to London the slanderous report he received from Federalist Congressmen, that the bill 'was passed amidst the drunken shouts of the majority' at 5 o'clock in the morning. Instead of recording statistically what happened in the Senate, when that controversial bill arrived 3 days before the demise of Congress, allow me to quote what I wrote about it in James Madison, the President:

" 'The sober Senate, in which filibusters were unknown, passed it in 2 days' time, and the President signed it almost before the ink was dry.' (P. 263.)

"This contrast in speed between House and Senate was fairly typical. The most controversial treaty in American history, prior to the struggle over the League of Nations, was the one negotiated by John Jay with England in 1794. The Senate rejected one article and called for renegotiation of others, yet ratified the treaty in 2 weeks. The House made a 4 months' fight against the implementation of it. New England Senators violently hated the 1803 Louisiana Purchase, and could have nullified it by 2 weeks' delay in the exchange of ratifications. Yet the treaty of cession was ratified in 2 days.

"Early Senate rule on previous question

"In appraising the powers and actions of the Senate before 1806, in regard to limitation of debate, it is necessary to hold three things in mind:

"1. The absence of the filibuster during that early period.

"2. The purpose and effect of the limitations actually placed on debate—whether they represented a primary purpose or an incidental effect.

"3. The power of the Senate to curtail debate as a primary purpose, regardless of whether the actual curtailments were primary or incidental.

"The first and third of these chiefly affect the conclusions to be drawn; the second directly involves the circumstances of the actions. Those circumstances are not easy to ascertain, because the Senate in early years held all its meetings behind closed doors. The Annals of Congress, which are mostly a compilation of unofficial stenographic reports and summaries published in newspapers, contain no record whatever of Senate debates before 1800, and the Senate Journals and Executive Journals are of course empty of them.

"Senate rule VIII, adopted in 1789, made the motion for the previous question a privileged motion, and rule IX prescribed its wording and the manner of its use:

" 'The previous question being moved and seconded, the question from the Chair shall be: "Shall the main question be now put?" And if the nays prevail, the main question shall not then be put.'

"First use of previous question in Senate

"This was first resorted to on August 17, 1789, when the Senate had before it a House bill authorizing an appropriation of $40,000 to pay the expenses of treaty negotiation with the hostile Creek Indians. A Senate committee reported this bill favorably, but advised a pledge in addition that if the treaty should fail to establish peace, 'Congress will make such grants of money' as might be necessary to protect the frontier.

"The report was rejected, whereupon its backers offered a motion empowering the President to 'draw on the Treasury for defraying the expenses' of troop movements that might be made necessary by failure of the treaty. The Senate Journal next records:

" 'And on the motion for the previous question, to wit: "Shall the main question be now put?" It passed in the negative. The Senate adjourned to 11 o'clock tomorrow.'

"On the following day, by a vote of 12 to 7, the Senate struck '$40,000' out of the House bill and inserted '$20,000.' A new resolution was then offered to give the President discretionary spending power. Like its predecessor, this resolution encountered a motion for the previous question and the result was the same. 'It passed in the negative,' records the Senate Journal. 'And on the question upon the bill, it was resolved, to concur therein with the amendment.'

"Since the movers of the previous question are unidentified and the yeas and nays were not taken, there is no tangible record to show whether these two motions were intended to force a vote on the two resolutions or to get them out of the way. The latter seems more probable because such a maneuver would enable the economy bloc, which enjoyed a 12-to-7 majority, to avoid an indefinite grant of spending power to the President and yet escape the odium of a vote against the defense of the frontier.

"Negative form used for postponement

"The previous question was next moved on January 12, 1792, when the Senate was considering the nomination of William Short, then chargé d'affaires at Paris, to be Minister at The Hague. President Washington, on December 22, had submitted Short's name for the Holland post along with those of Thomas Pinckney and Gouverneur Morris for London and Paris. All three legations had been without a minister for some years.

"On December 29—the fourth day of debate—a motion was offered 'that, in the opinion of the Senate, it will not be for the interest of the United States to appoint ministers plenipotentiary to reside permanently at foreign courts.' This was amended next day to read 'that the Senate do not possess sufficient evidence to convince them that it will be for the interest,' etc., and was referred to a committee to report generally thereon.

"The committee reported on January 6 that from the facts communicated to them, they are of opinion that there is now a special occasion for appointing a Minister to the Court of London. Pinckney was thereupon confirmed without a rollcall. A fight was made against the report that there was a special occasion for appointing a minister to France, but it carried 19 to 7 and on the following day Morris was confirmed, 16 to 11.

"Part of an isolationist fight

"On the nomination of William Short, the committee reported the information obtained from the Secretary of State on this subject. The information unquestionably was favorable, for Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson had unbounded admiration and affection for Short, his former Secretary of Legation at Paris. The report, however, was followed by a motion 'that there is not, in the opinion of the Senate, any present occasion that a Minister should be sent to The Hague.' The Executive Journal continues:

" 'On this motion, the previous question was moved for, to wit: "That the main question be not now put." '

"On motion, the nomination and motion of disapproval were put over till Monday, the 16th. On that day, the previous question was put to a vote which came out 13 to 13. The Executive Journal then records:

" 'The numbers being equal, the previous question was by the Vice President determined in the affirmative.'

"Since the motion was worded in the negative, this was a decision that the question be not now put. The Senate thereupon confirmed Short, 15 to 11.

"Dangerous debate is avoided

"In this instance, it will be noted, the Senate disregarded the form of previous-question motion prescribed in rule IX and went back to the negative form used in the Congress of the Confederation. The reason for that is evident in the nature of the conflict. Besides wanting to get rid of all foreign legations, the Senate isolationists were rubbed raw by the fact that in Holland the United States owned an expensive, long-empty hotel which had been bought by Minister John Adams during the Revolution to impress money-lending Hollanders with the soundness of American securities. If that issue were debated in the Senate, Short would be in trouble.

"Of the 13 Senators who voted for the motion not to put the motion, 12 voted immediately afterward to confirm Short. By moving the previous question, they not only got rid of a dangerous resolution, but limited the debate on confirmation to the issue of Short's fitness for the place—an issue on which he was impregnable. If any Senator undertook to speak against the mission itself, he would be subject to a ruling by Vice President John Adams that he was violating the decision on the previous question. The purpose and effect were made unmistakable by the resort to the negative wording of the motion, which conflicted with the rules of the Senate. As it was, the tie vote broken by the Vice President was taken as an omen of ultimate defeat. Secretary of State Jefferson sent orders to Holland that the legation building be sold at once and advised Short to apply for a transfer to some other post. Congress, he wrote, was likely to close the one at The Hague by refusing an appropriation for it.

"Senate forces vote by 'previous question'

"The previous question was moved on a third occasion on February 26, 1799, during a lull in the excitement which resulted from the XYZ disclosures. Following a conciliatory overture by Talleyrand to William Vans Murray, who had succeeded William Short as Minister at The Hague, President John Adams on February 18 nominated Murray to be the American Minister at Paris. Faced with a senatorial revolt, he shifted on the 25th to the nomination of Chief Justice Ellsworth, Patrick Henry, and Murray as envoys extraordinary to France, with treaty-making powers. The next day a motion was offered, declaring that the new message superseded the prior nomination of Murray alone. The previous question was moved in the form prescribed in the rules: 'Shall the main question be now put?' Both it and the main question, the Executive Journal reveals, were 'determined in the affirmative.' One can only speculate as to the circumstances which produced this motion for the previous question. It involved no hostility to Murray, who was the only one of the three special envoys to receive unanimous confirmation. The motion could have been made to prevent or cut off a politically dangerous debate—for the sending of this peace mission wrecked the Adams Cabinet and split the Federalist Party asunder. It could

have been an impatient way of preventing a waste of time discussing a question that required no discussion. If nobody wanted to talk there was no reason to make the motion. The one certainty is that the previous question was moved to bring the main question to an immediate vote, not to postpone it. Thus it disproves the contention, made on the Senate floor on January 4, 1957, that the Senate before 1806 governed its practice solely by 'the previous-question rule from the British Parliament, which * * * was merely a method of disposing of a measure, without taking action on it at that time.'

"'Previous question' in impeachment trial

"The last senatorial motion for the previous question was made on March 10, 1804, when the Senate was sitting as a court in the impeachment of Judge John Pickering. Climaxing a 3-day debate behind closed doors, Senator White, of Delaware, offered a resolution—regarded by the majority as an accusation of ex parte prosecution—'That this court is not at present prepared to give their final decision' upon the articles of impeachment. The reason: no inquiry had been made into the suggestion that the judge had failed to appear because he 'was and yet is insane.' The official record recounts a series of objections and out-of-order motions leading up to the following:

" 'Mr. Nicholas hoped it would not be permitted to go upon the journals of the court.

" 'Mr. Jackson moved the previous question, viz: "Shall the main question be now put?" '

"Senator White wanted the yeas and nays on whatever was done to dispose of his resolution. Then:

" 'On motion of Mr. Dayton, the galleries were cleared and the doors closed.

" 'At 3 o'clock the doors were opened, and the question was taken upon the resolution as at first submitted, yeas 9, nays 19' (Annals of Congress, Eighth Cong., first sess., pp. 362–363).

"This record reveals the alinement, Jackson being a lieutenant of Nicholas, who was President Jefferson's right hand man. In other respects it's far from clear. However, the diaries of Senators John Quincy Adams and William Plumer make it evident that the Official Reporter transplanted the motion to close the doors, to the point at which they were reopened. The galleries were actually cleared (though not at the first attempt) a short time after the resolution was introduced; the previous question was moved just before the reopening. The remark by Nicholas, which preceded the motion, was made in the middle of a debate which would have been out of order in open session. Both this fact and the nature of the struggle are made clear in the diary of Senator Adams, a Pickering supporter.

"Majority wanted to prevent debate

" 'On this resolution (wrote Adams) it was not without the utmost difficulty that any discussion whatsoever could be obtained.'

"He described an opening maneuver by Senator Nicholas, the majority leader, and then wrote:

" 'The next struggle was to prevent all debate upon the resolution. By our rules there can be no debate on any motion in open court. A motion to close the doors for the purpose of discussing the resolution was rejected.'

"Senator Smith, of Ohio, asked the meaning of part of White's resolution. The answer could not be given in public, so he reversed his position and furnished the additional vote needed to go into conclave. Thereupon, wrote Adams:

" 'The galleries were cleared, and a short discussion of the resolution was held * * * Mr. Anderson [of Tennessee] and most of the Members of the majority all the time manifesting the most extreme impatience to open the doors and stop all further debate.'

"The nature of the discussion is indicated by Senator Plumer's record of the remarks of the majority leader:

" 'Mr. Nicholas vociferated, order, order, order—I will not submit to hear our proceedings called by the degrading name of a mock trial.'

"To which White replied that he did not mean to offend the Virginia Senator, but he would not retract his words:

" 'If in this I have offended him, I am willing and ready to give him satisfaction at any time and place he will please to name.'

"It was in this atmosphere, after this offer to fight a duel, that Senator Jackson moved the previous question and White demanded the yeas and nays. That forced the issue, but at this point the special impeachment rules took over.

"Opening Senate doors had effect of cloture

"Under the rules, all motions had to be voted on by yeas and nays in open court. It was necessary to open the doors in order to vote on Jackson's motion. But opening the doors would produce the precise effect desired from the motion for the previous question. It would stop all debate, because debate was forbidden in open session. It would lead at once to a final vote, because the President pro tempore had ruled that the White resolution was fairly before the court and must be disposed of before other business was taken up, while procedural objections by Adams had balked all attempts at amendment. The effect of the majority maneuver was cloture, and Adams bitterly recorded the result:

" 'The doors were opened. The yeas and nays were taken on Mr. White's resolution—yeas 9, nays 19.' (White had walked out.) (Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, I, 302. William Plumer, Memorandum of Proceedings in the U.S. Senate, 1803–7, pp. 173–177.)

"I shall now offer some observations on the factual record.

"Senate did not follow early British usage

"Had the Senate been governed by the British practice of using the motion for the previous question to postpone a subject, that would have been the object in all four of the cases in which the Senate resorted to it. Instead, both in 1799 and 1804, the purpose and effect were to bring the main question to a vote, and in the 1804 instance the first objective was to halt a debate which was obnoxious to the majority.

"There is no possibility that Senator Jackson moved the previous question in order to postpone the White resolution. Had that been the intention, it would have been necessary for the anti-Pickering forces to put the motion for the previous question to a vote and defeat it, thus deciding not to put the main question. Instead, they cut off debate by opening the doors, put the main question, and defeated it. They halted the debate just 2 hours after the question at issue was formally placed before the Senate.

"This action was a little less ruthless than it seems, because the subject of Pickering's alleged insanity had been debated at large, behind closed doors, for the better part of 3 days. A motion to postpone a decision was beaten on March 9, 10 to 20. The repetition of it next day, with accusatory language in the resolution, did not put the majority in a mood to tolerate prolonged and uninhibited debate.

"Senate set precedent for House of Representatives

"Observe the similarity of language employed in the debate leading up to this final moving of the previous question in the Senate, and the first use of it in the House of Representatives to stop a filibuster. 'Order, order, order,' shouted Senator Nicholas. 'I will not submit to the degrading [accusations].' And in the House of Representatives, 7 years later, the same rule was invoked to end a debate described as 'disreputable to the House.' That body, instead of inventing a new form of cloture, was actually following the precedent set in the Senate.

"In the sequence of motions for the previous question in the Senate there is a remarkable resemblance to the evolution of the previous question and closure in the British House of Commons. When the supporters of William Short used the 'previous question' to avoid a debate and a vote that would imperil his confirmation, they emphasized their purpose by ignoring Senate rules and offering the negative form of the motion, 'That the main question be not now put.' But when the majority wanted to silence the Senators who were calling the Pickering procedure a mock trial, they adhered to the Senate rules and employed the words, 'Shall the main question be now put?'

"American and British parallels in cloture

"That shift in the resort to the two forms is analogous to what took place in the House of Commons in the 1880's, when the form of the previous question was 'That that question be now put.' Instead of utilizing this for closure without changing the name, the House of Commons reworded the previous question to the negative form which was used by the U.S. Senate in the case of William Short. The old affirmative British form of the previous question, analogous to the one used by the Senate in the Pickering case, was given the name of 'closure.' Under that title it is employed today in England for the precise ends which every American legislative assembly, except the U.S. Senate since 1806, achieves by means of the previous question. In the Senate before 1806, in the House of Representatives since 1789, and in the House of Commons since 1887 (when the original closure rule was strengthened) those three bodies demonstrated their ability to cope with every problem of obstruction procedure which they faced.

"Vice President's rulings were unappealable

"Ability to halt debate in the Senate before 1806 depended on one point alone—whether Senators could talk indefinitely, without let or hindrance, on the motion to invoke the previous question. The answer to that is 'No,' because in that day there was no appeal from the decision of the Vice President on points of order.

"This very point was raised in the Senate during a debate on filibusters in 1891, and the earlier plenary power of the presiding officer was admitted by one of the leading champions of the filibuster in his day—Senator Carlisle, of Kentucky, whose congressional career included three terms as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Carlisle had asserted that 'the motion for the previous question was debatable in the English House of Commons from the time it was first established in 1604 or 1605 until the present hour.' It was used there, he said, not to suppress debate but to suppress the subject itself without a direct vote on it, 'and for that purpose it prevailed in this Senate until perhaps about the beginning of the present century.'

"Carlisle's assertion about the use of it in the Senate was erroneous though no doubt sincere. What attracted attention, however, was his seeming implication that the motion to invoke the previous question was equally debatable in the House of Commons and in the United States Senate. The following colloquy ensued:

" 'Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

" 'Mr. CARLISLE. Certainly.

" 'Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator aware that in the Senate until 1828 the presiding officer, the Vice President, decided all questions of order without appeal and without debate?

" 'Mr. CARLISLE. Certainly. * * * The proposition I make is that as soon as you gave

the Senate the right to pass upon an appeal, as soon as you provided by your rule that the question should come before the Senate for its decision, then it came there as every other question must come before a legislative assembly, subject to debate unless you provided to the contrary in the rules' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 21, 1891, vol. 116, p. 1606).

"Although he conceded that the Vice President originally possessed power to prevent a filibuster, Senator Carlisle contended that after 1828, when appeals from the decisions of the chair were sanctioned, the Senate became subject to the general parliamentary practice concerning the previous question, which, he said, had been debatable in the English House of Commons 'from the time it was first established in 1604 or 1605 until the present hour.' On this reasoning, a Senate minority could prolong debate forever, on the changing of a rule, by talking forever against the motion to put the previous question. That has become, in truth, the solitary parliamentary point on which today's Senate minority relies to preserve its power to paralyze the business of Congress.

"Debate for obstruction held to be contempt

"But Senator Carlisle overlooked one fact. If any member of the House of Commons undertook to debate any motion for the willful and persistent purpose of obstructing legislation, he was guilty of contempt and could be suspended or sent to jail. The cloture rule was adopted in 1882, not to create a power to control debate, but to cut it off by a simple vote of the House instead of through the use of its police power. This is made crystal clear in the 1883 edition of May's Law and Usage of Parliament (p. 380):

" 'The rules of Parliament are designed to afford every legitimate opportunity of discussion, to insure reasonable delays in the passing of important measures, and to guard the rights of minorities. In the observance of these rules, both houses have displayed a generous regard for the liberty of individual members, and of political parties. Freedom of debate has been respected with rare patience and self-denial. * * * But, of late, these salutary rules have been strained and perverted, in the House of Commons, for purposes of obstruction. It became clear that such a course, if persisted in, would frustrate the power and authority of Parliament, and secure the domination of a small minority, condemned by the deliberate judgment of the house and the country. That it was unparliamentary and opposed to the principles of orderly government was manifest; and on July 25, 1877, it was declared by the Speaker, "that any member willfully and persistently obstructing public business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of the house, and would be liable to such punishment, whether by censure, by suspension from the service of the house, or by commitment, as the house may adjudge." '

"The Speaker was not setting forth a new principle but reasserting an ancient one. The quoted sentence opened with the words, 'Now, the house is perfectly well aware' that any member thus obstructing public business is guilty of contempt. The antiquity of that principle can be sensed in the declaration in Jefferson's Manual that no person 'is to speak impertinently, or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously.' Jefferson based that statement—which clearly outlaws the filibuster—on Hatsell's Precedents, and Hatsell cited a string of prohibitions proclaimed in the spring of 1604. (2 Hatsell, 230–238, 1818 edition.)

"In 1880, 3 years after the Speaker of the House of Commons invoked the rule of contempt, this was implemented by a standing order for the suspension of any member named by the Speaker 'as disregarding the authority of the chair, or abusing the rules of the house by persistently and willfully obstructing the business of the house, or otherwise.' Suspensions followed, says May, but obstruction continued. The house then shifted to a cloture rule which controlled the filibusters without resorting to the punishment of individuals.

"Ample power in Senate today

"From the whole record three things seem clear:

"1. The British Parliament, on whose precedents the defenders of the filibuster chiefly rely, has always possessed power, independently of its modern cloture rule, to prevent the obstruction of public business through misuse of debate.

"2. The United States Senate, from 1789 to 1806, had ample power under its rules to cut off debate and bring any question to an immediate vote, by the action of a majority of Senators present, supported by an unappealable ruling of the Vice President against obstructive tactics. It used its power to this end in 1804.

"3. The use of the motion for the previous question to close debate, now virtually universal in American parliamentary practice, is not a perversion of the original rule, but an evolutionary development growing out of the problems of democratic self-government.

"Against this array of facts the defenders of the filibuster have no defense except the erroneous claim that under general parliamentary practice—meaning British practice—the motion to put the previous question may be debated to death. Nowhere in the world is that true and never has been true. The motion to put the previous question is totally undebatable in the United States House of Representatives and in American State assemblies, which use it expressly for cloture. In the Senate before 1806, any attempt to turn normal discussion of that motion into a filibuster—i.e., to talk endlessly on the question whether the debate had been long enough—could be quelled instantly by the Vice President. In the British House of Commons, ancient usage and modern practice combine to make any debate, on any motion, a contempt of the House when it represents a willful and persistent attempt to obstruct public business. That covers the field.

"To put an end to filibusters in the Senate today it is only necessary for a majority of Members present to uphold the Vice President in two rulings. One of these Vice President NIXON has already offered as an informal but officially recorded opinion: That a Senate rule which hampers the power of the Senate to change its rules is unconstitutional.

"The other is: That if, in the process of changing the rules, the previous question is invoked under general parliamentary practice, the procedure adopted shall follow either the American rule of no debate on that motion, or the British rule of no obstructive debate on any motion. If the filibusterers wish to jump from the frying pan into the fire, they can appeal to the practice of the United States Senate before 1806, when the British rule of no obstructive debate, reinforced by the unappealable power of the Vice President, enabled the Senate to take the lead in making the previous question an effective instrument of cloture."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Georgia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, January 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Local-State Efforts Needed To Spur Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the days ahead, the economic problems confronting the country will be one of the major issues with which we will be concerned.

As necessary, Uncle Sam needs to take action to help spur business and industrial activities, to create more jobs, and generally to improve our economic outlook. I am not one, however, who believes that Uncle Sam must do the whole job.

On the contrary, I believe we are overlooking our greatest potential for economic progress if we ignore, or attempt to usurp, the responsibility of States and local communities to act effectively in promoting economic progress.

Across the country, we find that problems differ widely. Consequently, we need programs tailored to each specific situation. This requires constructive, creative efforts, not simply by the Federal Government but also by States and local communities.

In a special report to my constituents, I recently reviewed a series of steps which, if undertaken, could help tremendously in improving the economic outlook. Following its publication, a great many individual, civic, and governmental interests endorsed this approach. Believing it may offer some useful ideas for dealing with our economic problems, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL ECONOMIC REPORT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

A dynamic economy depends upon citizen-community-free enterprise cooperation to assure a pace of growth necessary to meet the needs of the people and the economy. To accomplish such a goal requires a multipronged program. Particularly, it demands creative thinking and planning "tailored" to the needs of each community.

Over the years, a number of programs have been initiated to provide a framework of action within which communities can move ahead to resolve economic problems and to promote progress. Among the major ones are included: Encouraging greater industrial development in both urban and rural communities; improving the outlook for job-creating businesses—large and small; expanding rural development programs, particularly in areas of chronically low income; and other efforts for maximum utilization of natural and human resources to serve our people.

Overall, these are examples of programs making a contribution in this field. However, a greater cooperative effort by State-local interests—working with, and utilizing services provided by, Federal agencies—is needed to promote economic progress.

ATTRACTING NEW INDUSTRY

To improve the economy, industrial progress, for example, can be spurred in two ways:

1. By attracting new industries. How can this be done? Initially, by forming a community development committee and carrying out investigations undertaken in the following areas: Determine quantity and skills of available workers; study economic trends in area; determine likely industrial prospects; survey of local market needs and opportunities; enlist assistance of State engineering schools, bureaus of business research, etc., to assist in specific technical problems. Discover why—in the past—industry may have failed or moved away; survey of locally available natural resources and industrial potential; clearinghouse of information on sources of venture capital; examine and utilize applicable methods of successful industrial expansion programs of other communities; determine needed civic improvements; i.e., traffic arteries, store fronts, garbage disposal, street paving, etc.; enlist assistance of Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce and the Business and Defense Services Administration; review and, as possible, favorably adjust tax system and other local government services.

Having made these determinations, projects to remedy weaknesses should be commenced and publication and promotion of area's advantages should be undertaken. Additional steps include: Developing and reserving for industry suitable industrial sites; modernizing old industrial facilities and building new ones. Financing for such efforts can be raised by contributions or floating bonds.

2. To expand existing industry, the steps include: Attempt to find sources of business expansion loans (banks, individuals, insurance companies, the Small Business Administration); initiate local business and industry improvement clinics with assistance of local trade associations, Government field offices, university engineering and business schools; render, where possible, or suggest specialists to render, market and produce development assistance.

The Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce provides technical services to States and local communities; issues publications on area development problems and assists States and local groups to: Create new industrial diversification; acquire and prepare land for industrial use; organize industrial districts; develop new products; locate new markets; locate industrial prospects; help manufacturers who are seeking sites for new branch plants to provide sources of data on plant location; provide guidance on security factors in plant location; plan site selection surveys and maintain a library of plant location data.

IMPROVING THE OUTLOOK FOR NEW BUSINESS

Now, how is it possible to brighten the outlook for small business? Nationwide, there are over 4.6 million enterprises, including over 100,000 in Wisconsin, of which about 95 percent are small businesses.

To help meet some of the different problems, the Small Business Administration provides a number of services to small businesses and local development companies seeking to raise employment or economic development in a community. The programs include:

1. Local development company loans: Companies having a broad base of ownership may borrow funds to buy land and either build a new factory or expand and convert an existing plant, provided the project will aid a small business concern.

2. Production assistance: Small businesses are invited to register their facilities at the SBA regional office. The SBA acts as a clearinghouse for services which small firms may offer other small firms or larger firms.

3. Research and development assistance: Technical assistance is provided by SBA on product research, new product potential, processing methods, product and marketing developments, new industrial uses for materials, and industrial uses for agricultural products.

Assistance is also rendered through advice on problems of plant location and plant space and undertaking the locating of tools or materials needed; through the awarding of a certificate of competency, the small business is encouraged to bid in competition with larger firms for Government contracts; management courses, in conjunction with local educational institutions; management counseling with SBA regional office; management seminars and 1-day conferences; publishing information on available materials, patents, and how-to articles.

4. Financial assistance: Business loans—financing on reasonable terms when it is not otherwise available through private lending sources; disaster loans—granted to aid firms stricken by either physical damage or economic injury.

In general, the assistance rendered the small business emphasizes efforts to aid unemployment areas, areas affected by economic dislocation, depressed areas, areas whose economy is adversely affected by Government-sponsored projects (such as the Federal highway program) or whose economy is adversely affected by natural economic shifts.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS POOLS

The development of small business pools, also, is helping to meet some problems that could not otherwise be resolved, such as programs to collect market and research information related to a particular industry for dissemination to participating members; construct, acquire or establish laboratories and other facilities for the conduct of research; prosecute applications for patents and render patent services for participating members; as well as negotiate and grant licenses under patents held under joint programs.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The general objective of the rural development program is to assist in remedying low income on farms and disadvantaged rural families.

The major targets of the program include providing farm families with information and ability to gain tools, land, and skills for successful farming; education and job training; health services and community sanitation; expansion of markets for products of small farms, i.e., new processing plants, additional co-ops; changes in crops and increased crop production; forestry and conservation assistance for small woodlots and timber processing enterprises; water resource development; and industrial development. About 200 counties in 30 States, including Sawyer and Price Counties in Wisconsin, have been designated for the rural development program.

The accomplishments achieved have been: new businesses and services activities have added nearly 18,000 full- or part-time jobs; market improvement projects started; soil mapping completed on farms in rural development areas; projects in health services reported; rural clubs organized in communities, to exchange ideas on promoting better living; and other steps that have improved income and farm life.

How can a local county with chronic low income initiate a rural development program? A county may apply to the State rural development committee (in Wisconsin, headed by Henry L. Ahlgren, associate director of extension, University of Wisconsin). The committee decides which counties and/or areas will be designated, and how extensive the program will be in those areas. Even though the county may not be designated a rural development county under the program, it can ask the State extension service and the university for technical assistance. It can, under its own aegis, follow closely the form of the rural development counties. And, if the State rural development committee assents, it can have the help of rural development agents on specific problems.

A BIGGER SLICE OF THE MULTIBILLION-DOLLAR TOURIST PIE

Looking now to the development of tourist trade, we find that tourism is one of the fastest developing businesses in the United States. Annually, tourists in this country spend $15 and $20 billion.

As of now, tourism is the third largest industry in Wisconsin. However, I believe we can cut, for our Badger State, an even larger slice of this economic pie.

Tourism benefits not a few, but many segments of the community's economy, including services, transportation, accommodations, entertainment, cleaning services, products such as sporting equipment, souvenirs, fashions, etc., utilities (power, water, light). The result: greater economic growth and easing the local tax burden. A secondary benefit from tourism is that it attracts new industry through increase in population, pleasant locale for plant location, etc.

A great many communities can—either by exploiting an existing potential or even by importing one—probably turn themselves into regions which will appeal to tourists. Examples of attractions: A good inn, a historical landmark (battle site, churches, mill, etc.); a body of water, an animal preserve; hills, mountains, valleys, forests or woods; geological formations—such as the Wisconsin Moraines—and other natural or man-made features.

Programs that will develop tourist trade include: Facelifting program for the community; i.e., clean up unsightly areas, refuse, junk; paint and spruce up town; encourage clean, comfortable lodging places; well-cooked, well-served meals; developing, or improving specific tourist attraction; obtain expert advice in restoring historic structure, draining lakes, etc.; determine from what areas to attract tourists, and then advertise; enlist cooperation of area newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations to help sell community.

What are basic tourist habits? According to a report by the Department of Commerce, 80 percent travel by air; 69 percent stay in motels; 26 percent stay in hotels and resorts; 27 percent with friends and relatives; most tourists take two vacation trips a year, totaling 20 or more days; 17 percent go in the winter; 18 percent in spring; 40 percent in summer; 25 percent in the fall; average annual expenditure per family is $400; roughly 1 out of 12 goes abroad each year. The rest stay in the United States, the largest single tourist market in the world.

Tourist development programs can be supported by private or business financing; by group (chamber of commerce, community associations, etc.) contributions; or other ways. Overall, expanding tourism promises

great things for the years ahead. Paid and increasingly longer vacations, good roads, more leisure time and money, early retirement, more education—all these portend a fast-growing opportunity for the American to travel.

SUMMARY

This, then, is a brief look at some of the opportunities for greater citizen-community-State effort to better utilize our human and natural resources. As this can be done more effectively and successfully, we, in Wisconsin, can build an already good life into an ever-brighter future.

National Concern About Civil Liberties of All Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the eloquent junior Senator from Maine, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, recently gave a major address at a meeting of the Florida Civil Liberties Union in Miami. He addressed himself to the question of differences among peoples of this Nation; he showed that differences can be a source of strength and not necessarily a source of weakness.

In his plea for national concern about the civil liberties of all citizens, the Senator expressed a confidence and a determination which should be shared by all who believe that much work must yet be done to guarantee and protect those liberties. Mr. President, I ask that unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

(Address by Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine)

My father's father was a farmer in Russian-occupied Poland prior to the turn of the century. He shared the intense patriotism and love of liberty which has preserved the identity of my ancestors as a people through centuries of oppression. He early determined that his youngest son, my father, should have an opportunity to build a better and freer life than appeared possible under the czarist tyranny.

And so it was that, in his early teens, my father was apprenticed to a tailor. At the age of 17, having learned his trade, he left his home, embarking upon a new life, preferring the bright prospect of the unknown and unfamiliar freedom to his oppression-darkened homeland.

What he found here forever justified his hopes and his father's faith. At his knee, I have heard him reminisce, for hours on end, out of the fullness of his heart, upon his boyhood life—the close family ties which bound him to loved ones he was never to see again, the warmth at his father's house, the joys and pleasures of his childhood. It could not have been easy for him to leave them behind. He talked to me of these things because he wanted to relive them. But he had a deeper purpose.

Increasingly, as the years pased by and my comprehension grew, he drove home his lesson. What he had lost had been more than offset by what he gained—for himself, for his father, and for me. Here, if a man had ability, he could apply it in a manner of his own choosing. Here, if a man had an opinion, he could express it without fear of reprisal. Here, if a man disagreed with governmental policy, he could say so, and, more than that, he could do something about it by casting his ballot at the polls. Here, a man was completely free to reap the fruits of his own integrity, intellectual, and physical capacity, his own work. There were no heights toward which he could not strive. It mattered not what his national background, his religious or political beliefs, his economic status in life might be.

These beliefs were my father's life. He held them confidently through periods when he felt the lash of prejudice directed against those of foreign birth and of his creed. On the evening of my inaugural day as Governor of Maine, he turned to me and said, very simply, "Now I can die happy." A few months later the final chapter of his life was written. I am sure that, in the closing moments, he must have thought of the strange and wonderful destiny which had so astonishingly vindicated the beliefs which had uprooted his life.

In 1789, Benjamin Franklin described the America which was my father's life, when he wrote:

"God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'This is my country.' "

Everyone in America is a member of a minority group. It may be economic, social, political, religious, racial, regional, or based upon national origin. It may not be such today as to set us apart in any unpleasant way. But it could tomorrow.

The character of our minority status may vary in its impact today upon our effective enjoyment of dignity, equality, security, and opportunity. It may not today constitute a disability in any of these respects. But it could tomorrow.

Our particular minority group may be joined today with others in a common cause or common prejudice or a common indifference with majority status. The accompanying power to affect the rights and privileges of minority groups not a part of the coalition is subject to abuse resulting from indifference, callousness, or deliberate intent. Today, as a member of the current majority, the possibility, or even the actuality, of such abuse may be of no concern to us. But it could be, if our particular minority group becomes the object of tomorrow's prejudice or indifference.

To those who say—and there are such—that certain national and ethnic groups are better and more desirable as Americans than others, let us ask: "Who is to make the selection, and at what point in history, and is the selection subject to revision as the majority coalition changes?"

To those who say that there are superior and inferior citizens, depending wholly upon race, national origin, religion, or color, let us ask: "Who is to make the selection and how can you be sure what your status will be when the majority coalition takes shape?"

I am not suggesting that the case for civil liberties should be based upon fear of each other.

I am saying simply this. Our differences have made our country great. They have done so because, increasingly, creative ability, intellectual capacity, and high moral and spiritual principles, wherever found, have been allowed to seek their highest attainable level.

I am also saying this. Our differences can destroy us; and the instruments for such destruction are prejudice, fear, indifference, hatred, and retaliation.

Is it better for us and our country that we seek reasons to like and trust each other? Or is it better that we seek reasons to fear each other?

In the 1860's, the Maine Legislature concerned itself with the problem of inducing settlements in the unpeopled townships of the State. An agent was sent to Sweden, with instructions to make vigorous efforts to establish a Swedish colony in Maine. Within 10 weeks he had brought to Maine 22 men, 11 women, and 18 children—including a pastor, farmers, a civil engineer, a blacksmith, 2 carpenters, a basketmaker, a baker, a tailor, and a shoemaker. They carved a home out of the wilderness of northern Maine. New immigrants followed. Within 5 years the population had increased to 600 who had built a prosperous community of 130 houses, barns, 2 steam sawmills, 1 water-power sawmill, and the incidental business establishments. At the end of 5 years, 133 men applied for citizenship.

A member of the Swedish Parliament wrote to the Governor of Maine as follows: "May the young colony of New Sweden grow and flourish, not only in material strength, but even in developing their moral and intellectual faculties. And may the new population thus add to your State and to your Great Republic a good and healthy element of moral power from the old world, and becoming inbued with the spirit of your free institutions, reflect that spirit on their native land.

"What we have lost in the old fatherland will then not have been lost to humanity: On the contrary, the trees have only been transplanted on a fresher soil, where they will thrive better, and give richer and more abundant fruits. God bless the harvest. God bless your land."

Civil liberty is the sunshine without which the crop will suffer. The enemy of civil liberty is prejudice. The cause of prejudice is fear—fear of the unknown, fear that there is no real basis for mutual trust and confidence, fear that those discriminated against may abuse power and authority if given the chance.

If such fears are well-founded, there is no real basis for democratic institutions. All the evidence from our national history and experience indicates that they are not well-founded. The growth of our free institutions—their effectiveness and strength—has been in direct proportion to the expansion of civil liberties and their enjoyment by greater numbers of our people of more diverse and varied backgrounds, talents, and experiences. This has been our harvest. And it has been fruitful.

The cause of civil liberties, then, is not simply that of do-gooders, or of neighbors interfering without justification in the affairs of neighbors. It is the cause of all those who are concerned that our national climate be a healthy one.

Let those who support this cause, however, avoid self-righteousness. Let us not refuse to give the trust and confidence which we ask. Faith begets faith if buttressed by an accumulation of reassuring experiences.

There are some important assumptions whose validity we ought to consider:

1. Long-sustained habits of discrimination generate forces of stress and strain which, if allowed to explode, can produce as much evil as the discrimination itself.

2. The overwhelming majority of Americans share the basic belief in the worth and dignity of the individual. Those who deny it to others do so, in many instances, because of a belief that their own is threatened.

3. The forces of decency will, in the long run, prevail. If we deny the validity of this assumption, then we ourselves are in doubt as to the integrity of democratic institutions.

Obviously, these assumptions do not solve the problems created by prejudice and dis-

crimination. They serve simply as a brake upon our impetuosity. They should not serve as an excuse for inaction.

Our goal must be to replace fear and distrust with understanding and trust.

How do we achieve it?

Communication—as between equals—is important.

Familiarity—as among equals—is important.

Education is important.

But how do we communicate, how do we get to know each other, how do we educate each other when there is stone wall resistance to even the slightest contact?

There are, of course, all of the arts which man has used to influence man since the beginning of time—and which reach their full potential in a democracy—the arts of persuasion, discussion, and debate—the power of example and experience.

There is also the rule of law—not as a primitive force, not as a harsh master, but as a stimulus, as a prod, as a standard of conduct.

We cannot legislate trust and understanding. We cannot legislate confidence. We cannot strike down fear by legislative decree. We cannot by a stroke of the legislative pen, create love and kindness in a human heart.

But we can, by wise legislation, create a climate in which men, separated by divisive differences, can learn to live together.

It is possible to establish rules to prevent abuses, to restrain the impulsive, to contain and eliminate excesses, to encourage responsible attitudes, to give support to moderation.

When men are equal before the law and are required to treat each other as such, they are more inclined to believe in such equality.

We have made legislative progress in this field in recent years. Some believe we have moved too fast; others that we have not moved fast enough. Without resolving that difference of opinion, I think it fair to say that we have moved ahead, that the movement has achieved constructive results, and that it gives promise of more progress.

In the long run, we must and will achieve basic civil liberties for all our people. Toward this end, we can do no better than to pray in the words of St. Francis:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love.
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, light.
Where there is sadness, joy."

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a violent day swept by angry forces with which unaided we cannot cope, Thou only art our strength and refuge, amid mortal ills prevailing.

As citizens of a world that carries on its sagging shoulders problems of human relationships and burdens of suffering, greater than humanity has ever before borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation.

In this day of crashing systems, save us from being prophets of gloom and of doom. As we peer at the fiery destruction of the old, may there be vouchsafed to us vistas of a richer, fairer earth to be.

Rising above all that is ignoble, teach us to work together in glad harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all peoples of this awakening earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of life more abundant for all mankind.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 5, 1961, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee be permitted to meet at 2 p.m. today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is a slight difference in the information which has been given to me as to the exact time when the joint session will be held, this afternoon, in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Can the Chair inform the Senate on that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint session is scheduled for 1 p.m., this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that it is my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum at 12:40; and at 12:45 the Senate will proceed in a body to the House of Representatives, for the official count of the electoral votes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this morning I read in the press—although of course I learned a long time ago that one cannot believe all he reads in the press—that there was likely to be some controversy with respect to the electoral votes for the State of Hawaii. Does the majority leader have any information on that? Some of us do not always attend these vote countings. The vote countings heretofore have been had by various and sundry means.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that to the best of my knowledge the votes from the State of Hawaii have been dispatched by the Governor of Hawaii to the General Services Administration; that the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Felton Johnston—at least, last evening, and, I am sure, also this morning—was and is in constant contact with the General Services Administration; and it is our hope that by the time we meet in the House of Representatives, the ballots from Hawaii will have been received, transferred to the proper receptacle, and made an official part of that ceremony.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further, I wish to violate a rule I have followed for many years, because I am so intrigued by that statement. Let me say incidentally that I do not like to reveal abysmal ignorance, and as a rule I do not do so. But let me ask whether we have passed a statute which gives the General Services Administration custody of the electoral votes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am revealing my own ignorance on this matter, also. But I recall a conversation I had with the Secretary of the Senate last night, and I believe he said Governor Quinn had dispatched the ballots to the General Services Administration, and Mr. Johnston had been in touch with the Administrator of that agency, so that if they do arrive in time—and it was anticipated that they would—they could be transferred to him and, I assume, put in their proper boxes and placed in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. The ballots to which the distinguished majority leader refers as having been dispatched by Governor Quinn confirm the latest report that the Democratic nominee carried the State of Hawaii by a small majority, do they?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding, but I hope the Senator from Georgia will not hold me too closely to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair ask whether the Senator desires to obtain a response to his inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the distinguished Senator from Montana to say that was his understanding, but that he was not completely assured. Probably the Chair is better advised on this subject than is the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The advice received by the Chair on this particular subject is only as good as that of the Parliamentarian; and the Chair knows that the Senator from Georgia and all other Senators respect the views of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that the Chair and all Senators will consult the Parliamentarian, in the days ahead, and will be guided by his views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In certain cases the Chair does.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but only in certain cases. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to law, the General Services Administration participates in the manner the Senator has described. That is by law, not simply by precedent or custom.

Mr. RUSSELL. So we have delegated to the General Services Administration the function of receiving the electoral votes, as transmitted by the various State authorities, have we?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair may respond, let the Chair state that the law provides that the General Services Administration shall receive two copies of the electoral votes which are submitted by the States; and, under the law, one of those copies is made available to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, who then carries out the constitutional function of announcing the vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Chair, as the constitutional officer of the Senate, received those votes from the General Services Administration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair received the ballots this morning from the General Services Administration; and they are in the appropriate sealed boxes, and will be carried over to the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then apparently there is no truth in the rumor that there will be a controversy about those votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, let me say that I was quite curious about the statute that brings the General Services Administration into the picture. I have not gone back in the RECORD to examine the debate; but I infer that the National Archives are under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, and therefore the General Services Administrator has charge of the National Archives; and these are papers that would be committed to the National Archives; and for that reason he was brought in, under the statute, as the custodian in fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's casting that light on the subject.

But I must say that it would appear to me that it would be more in order, under the constitutional machinery for the counting of the electoral votes and the canvassing of the returns, for the reverse of that to happen—in other words, for the ballots to have been originally forwarded to the constitutional officers of the Congress, and by them transmitted to the General Services Administration, for perpetuation in the National Archives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If there had been a question about the ballots from Hawaii, would the Senate be called upon to vote on such a matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the understanding of the Chair, if such a question were raised, the joint session would be dissolved, and the Senate would return to its Chamber, and would there consider the matter; and at the same time the House would concurrently consider the matter. Once the two bodies had concluded their deliberations and had reached their decisions, the joint session would be reconvened. If the two bodies agreed, that of course would decide the matter. If they disagreed, then, according to 3 U.S.C. 15, the votes of the electors whose appointment shall have been certified by the executive of the State, under the seal thereof, shall be counted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement," for the fiscal year 1961, had been reapportioned indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for increased pay costs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," for fiscal year 1961, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PARTICIPATION IN RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH FOREIGN CONTRACTORS FROM REQUIREMENT FOR EXAMINATION-OF-RECORDS CLAUSE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT OF COSTS FOR CERTAIN U.S. NATIONALS BEFORE FOREIGN TRIBUNALS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS DISPOSAL ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flying pay of that Department, for the period March 1, 1960, through August 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO CREATION OF A BOARD FOR THE CONDEMNATION OF INSANITARY BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS OR UNSAFE BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON FINDINGS RESULTING FROM INITIAL REVIEW OF BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on findings resulting from initial review of the ballistic missile programs of the Department of the Air Force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESERVATION BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY OF CERTAIN LANDS AT FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek Area, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS GOVERNING SELECTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 24, 1948, which establishes special requirements governing the selection of superintendents of national

cemeteries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC DOMAIN OF CERTAIN LANDS IN BIG DELTA AREA, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta Area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN VICINITY OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC DOMAIN OF CERTAIN LANDS IN GRANITE CREEK AREA, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek Area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC DOMAIN OF CERTAIN LANDS IN LADD-EIELSON AREA, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson Area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command Training Site, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION TO SUBMIT FINAL REPORT

A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ENTITLED "MAXIMUM DESIRABLE DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS OF VEHICLES OPERATED ON THE FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM"

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid System," dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMBERSHIP ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Vice President, as in executive session, laid before the Senate two letters from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Neville Miller, to fill the unexpired term of James E. Colliflower, as a member of the Board of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, whose term expires March 3, 1961, and the nomination of Neville Miller to succeed himself as a member of that agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recent election served to center attention on many of the obstacles which still exist to the full exercise of the franchise by all qualified Americans.

I have been giving considerable study to a number of these problems and have in preparation several proposals for improving the present situation. These will relate to such matters as voting on more than one day, the encouragement of uniform local residence laws, and the reform or abolition of the electoral college system.

Judging from the many articles and editorials, and other commentaries which I have been reading, there does appear to be very widespread dissatisfaction with many of our present election laws. This is, of course, a very vital area of our democratic process and we must proceed with great caution in devising improvements. But I have no doubt in my mind that there is a necessity for improvement, and I believe that this period immediately following the election and long prior to the next presidential election offers a particularly propitious opportunity for objective consideration of the situation.

I have been very much encouraged by a number of letters I have received on this subject. One such letter I received recently from the eigth grade citizenship education class at Washington Junior High School in Jamestown, N.Y., relating to the electoral college, contained a petition to the Congress of the United States which I would like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this petition be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned, students of Washington Junior High School in the city of Jamestown, county of Chautauqua, and State of New York, do respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the electors from each of the respective States for the election of the President and of the Vice President shall not be permitted to vote by the so-called unit rule for the candidate receiving the greatest popular vote in each such State in the presidential election but rather shall be obligated to cast their votes for each of the various candidates for such offices proportionate to the popular vote in such election in each such State, with the voting for the offices of the President and of the Vice President to be by the same ballot.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FONG:

S. 180. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $200,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 181. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available under such acts to persons holding leasehold interests in lands in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 182. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make grants in cash and land to the Convalescent Hospital of Washington, D.C., Inc., for the purpose of enabling the corporation to establish a convalescent and chronic disease hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Mihail Zanakis; and

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Georgette D. Caskie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Alberto L. Rodriques; and

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Dr. William Kuo-Wei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 187. A bill to authorize the erection of a U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 188. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; and

S. 189. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Auva Constance Lewis; and

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Sue Lee Kam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. BOGGS):

S. 192. A bill to provide for the establishment of a poultry research laboratory in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd; and

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Wong Bak Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 195. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 196. A bill to make the treatment under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of certain foundations, all of which are closely associated with State colleges and universities and which act as intermediary recipients and administrators of gifts for the exclusive use

or benefit of those colleges and universities with their consent, identical with that of those institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 197. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 198. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in the State of Indiana to Clark County, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 199. A bill to amend the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1057), with respect to conveyances of Federal property to Indian tribes;

S. 200. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," approved August 3, 1956; and

S. 201. A bill to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 202. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 203. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 204. A bill to provide that section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not apply to candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 205. A bill to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 206. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Maj. Gen. Howard McCrum Snyder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Jean Goedicke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 208. A bill for the relief of the Smith Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 209. A bill to conserve and develop certain seashores of the United States for the public use and benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 210. A bill to establish a national mining and minerals policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 211. A bill to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 212. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 213. A bill to provide for the computation of basic pay of Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 215. A bill for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren;

S. 216. A bill for the relief of SFC William H. Riester, Jr.;

S. 217. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn;

S. 218. A bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

S. 219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma; and

S. 220. A bill for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 221. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gojko D. Stula;

S. 222. A bill for the relief of Meher K. Kanga and Kersasp H. Kanga;

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Onofrio D'Amato;

S. 224. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sanchez Morillo; and

S. 225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chien Chen Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell 10 Liberty-type merchant vessels to citizens of the United States for conversion into barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Mr. McGEE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 3

Whereas the United States has benefited greatly from the exchange of students between our own country and other countries through the Fulbright Acts and Smith-Mundt Acts; and

Whereas the other nations of the world have in recent years experienced remarkable growth in the number of persons trained through the operations of these and similar programs; and

Whereas increasing the level of education of the peoples of the world is the most productive investment that the nations of the world can make for the well-being of all mankind; and

Whereas programs of international cooperation in education enhance international understanding and thereby promote the cause of peace; and

Whereas many nations or regions of the world not now possessing sufficient educational facilities, such as necessary schools, universities, colleges, and technical institutes are ready to establish, expand and improve such facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby expresses its interest in encouraging the development of international programs for the expansion and improvement of education at all levels, including provisions for teachers colleges, technical institutes, as well as other necessary schools, colleges, and universities, national or regional in scope; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress hereby recommends that the United States Government encourage the organizations of the United Nations system to develop programs for increased international cooperation in the field of education that would best serve the needs of the several member countries, as well as the cause of world peace and international economic and social development; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress hereby expresses its willingness to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing into operation certain aspects of such programs through the use of foreign currencies available for these uses, or otherwise as may prove suitable and desirable.

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES RELATIVE TO ECONOMIC OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20); which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

S. RES. 20

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of the present organizational structures and operational methods of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government at all levels in the formulation, coordination, and execution of an integrated national policy for the solution of the problems of survival with which the free world is confronted in the contest with world communism;

(2) the capacity of such structures and methods to utilize with maximum effective-

ness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation in the solution of those problems; and

(3) development of whatever legislative and other proposals or means may be required whereby such structures and methods can be reorganized or otherwise improved to be more effective in formulating, coordinating, and executing an integrated national policy, and to make more effective use of the sustained, creative thinking of our ablest citizens for the solution of the full range of problems facing the free world in the contest with world communism.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized:

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one such person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and shall receive compensation at an annual gross rate not less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO INVESTIGATE POSTAL SERVICE, LIFE INSURANCE AND HEALTH BENEFITS, AND CAREER SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. RES. 21

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) The postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the complete reorganization of the entire postal rate structure, (b) the establishment of better service to the public, and (c) the operation of the postal establishment with greater efficiency and economy;

(2) The operation of the Federal employees' group life insurance and health benefits program to establish their effectiveness and determine the extent of their financial stability; and

(3) The establishment of guidelines to fix boundaries for keeping positions in the career service and for identifying those which clearly should be filled without regard to civil service procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $65,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

DEATH OF LATE REPRESENTATIVE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 23) relating to the death of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, which appears under a separate heading.)

A U.S. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN SOUTH TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the erection of a U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas.

The veterans to be served are among the 1,500,000 residents of a 40-county area covering over 40,000 square miles. Most of the territory is in the 14th and 15th Congressional Districts south of San Antonio. This area now has no Veterans' Administration hospital. It includes 3 of the 11 most populous counties in our State. It is in the area of the lower Rio Grande Valley, with extensive irrigation, citrus farms, and inhabited by many people, including elderly people, who enjoy living in that salubrious climate. The population of the area is one of the most rapidly expanding in the State.

This vast area where this hospital is needed is 20 times larger than the entire State of Rhode Island, and is bigger than a half dozen other States in the Union. In all this area there is not a single veterans' hospital, which means that some veterans have to travel more than 400 miles to receive medical attention.

There have been cases where veterans died traveling from this area to Veterans' Administration hospitals. There have been many cases where veterans have been denied hospitalization benefits because they were unable to make the long trip to the nearest facility.

In this area the climate is much warmer than other areas of the State, and there are many complaints from veterans that they do not do as well when they are taken away to colder areas for hospitalization.

The bill I am introducing today is S. 457, which I introduced in the 86th Congress. It empowers the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site for the hospital and authorizes erection and operation of a 300-bed facility.

Construction of the South Texas Veterans Hospital has been repeatedly urged by the South Texas Veterans Alliance, an organization representing all veterans groups in the 14th and 15th Congressional Districts.

While location of the hospital will be decided by normal administrative procedure, it is important to note that a very kind lady has offered to donate property for a veterans hospital site, a beautiful lakeside site of over 140 acres worth over a half million dollars, if the hospital is created and erected on this site.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill providing for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill is ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 187) to authorize the erection of a U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide for the furnishing of general medical and surgical facilities to veterans entitled to hospitalization or domiciliary care, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in south Texas, and to contract for the erection thereon of a hospital with a capacity of three hundred beds, together with the necessary auxiliary structures, mechanical equipment, domiciliary and outpatient dispensary facilities, and accommodations for all personnel; and the Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire the necessary vehicles, furniture, equipment, and accessories to be used in the maintenance and operation of such

hospital. The Administrator is authorized to accept gifts or donations to assist in defraying the costs of constructing and equipping such hospital.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of $26,000 per bed.

POULTRY RESEARCH LABORATORY, DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce today, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and myself, a bill, the purpose of which is to establish a disease and nutritional research center for the Delmarva Peninsula to be located in or adjacent to the substation farm of the University of Delaware, near Georgetown, Del.

The poultry industry is the most important agricultural enterprise in Delaware and the Delmarva Peninsula.

The largest portion of the industry is broiler production, with its associated feed, hatchery, and transportation industries.

In Delaware alone, between 65 and 95 million broilers have been produced annually for the past decade, representing a gross income between $50 and $70 million. The Delmarva area produced 180 million broilers in 1957, with a feed bill of $67 million, a payroll of $45 million, and other costs on a comparable scale.

Despite great strides in efficiency of production, a major problem in the industry is that of reducing costs of production so that birds can be sold profitably. Such efficiency requires further improvement in feed conversion ratio, disease control, feed handling, housing, management, and financing.

A recent publication by the Institute of American Poultry Industries of Chicago, Ill., states that the value of poultry condemned by U.S. inspection service in 1959 was estimated to be $90 million and about 75 percent of this was because of air sac infection, one of the diseases that need further research.

There are many diseases of poultry prevalent on the Eastern Shore which are of great importance to the industry.

In addition, there are other problems which we feel have a direct influence on the disease incidence in the area, and which it would seem of paramount importance to investigate simultaneously or concurrently with the disease aspects, all of which no doubt adversely affect the economics of the poultry industry on the Eastern Shore. These are nutrition, genetics, housing, and other management practices. It has been shown in work recently undertaken that these factors play a highly significant role in disease incidence and losses from condemnations.

Recognizing that the diseases and other factors cited may be of great economic importance to the industry on the Eastern Shore, it is also well to point out that some phases of research will always yield data of importance toward a solution of the problems to the industry throughout the United States. Consequently, any research data in this area would complement that in other areas of the country.

Since nutrition and management are also major factors in the production of broilers, one of the greatest potentials for gains in economy of production is probable from research in this area.

A research laboratory such as the one proposed in the bill Senator BOGGS and I are introducing for the study of disease and nutritional problems of poultry will not only benefit the Delmarva area, but will benefit the entire poultry industry.

In introducing this bill, it should be pointed out that the poultry industry is one of the few segments of agriculture which are not being subsidized by the U.S. Government.

Government cooperation, however, in a disease and nutritional research center is helping these farmers in an area in which they cannot operate alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 192) to provide for the establishment of a poultry research laboratory in the State of Delaware, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. BOGGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CAPITAL BUDGET FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have several times before, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a capital budget for the Federal Government. It calls for the submission of figures as a part of the budget which will show the division between expenditures for capital investments and expenditures for operating expenses. Under its terms, these figures would not replace any part of the present budget, but would be an addition to it.

The measure I am offering is the same as S. 1244, which I sponsored last year with several of my colleagues. Two similar bills were introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleagues from Oregon, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, of the Third District, and the Honorable AL ULLMAN, of Oregon's Second District. Hearings were held on these measures on June 8 last year by the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations.

It was brought out at these hearings that the Eisenhower administration was opposed to the capital budget, as it has been since it took office in 1952. It was also clear that supporters of the capital budget were prepared to revise the bill in some respects in an effort to meet some of the administration's objections.

However, we will soon have a new administration. The platform upon which it was elected says this about the capital budget and its relationship to natural resources:

> Long-range programing of the Nation's resource development is essential. We favor creation of a Council of Advisers on Resources and Conservation, which will evaluate and report annually upon our resource needs and progress.
>
> We shall put budgeting for resources on a businesslike basis, distinguishing between operating expense and capital investment, so that the country can have an accurate picture of the costs and returns.

The heart of my bill provides that in the estimates transmitted to Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, the President shall distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful life of 10 years or more.

It further provides that obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt.

Finally, it directs the Council of Economic Advisers to include in its recommendations to the President, and the President to include in his economic report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a 6-year projection of such proposed investments.

It is my hope that the incoming Kennedy administration will give prompt attention to the subject matter of this bill. Its introduction will serve as a basis for a report and recommendation by the new Budget Bureau, and other affected agencies.

One of the great hopes offered by the election of Senator Kennedy is the hope for a revival of the flagging development of the country's natural resources. But in such other major areas of public investment as housing, the Nation is also awaiting a renewal of interest and effort by the Federal level of our Government.

A capital budget is nothing more than a tool which enables the public to get a clear picture of those expenditures which will be recovered. It is a reform recommended by the first Hoover Commission which remains to be put into effect. It deserves prompt attention by the Congress and by the new administration.

I hope we will soon have either a report on the measure I am now offering, or a new proposal for a capital budget from the Kennedy administration.

I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be printed at this point.

I also ask that it be on the table until Friday of next week to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

I will ask that the bill be allowed to remain at the desk until Friday of next week to enable other Senators who may wish to join as cosponsors to do so, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement in explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and will lie on the desk as requested; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 195) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Sena-

tors), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1961."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(b) To assist in achieving these objectives it is the further policy of the Federal Government (1) to distinguish between its operating expenditures and capital investments, (2) to exclude certain productive capital investments from the public debt, and (3) to retire the public debt."

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SEC. 3. Section 4(c) of such Act (relating to the duties and functions of the Council of Economic Advisers) is amended by changing the designation of paragraph (5) to (6) and inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) to evaluate each year the Federal budgetary situation as related to the prospective gross national product and other economic indicators and needs, and to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments;".

CAPITAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) In transmitting to Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, the President shall also—

"(1) to the extent and in such detail as he shall designate by Executive order (and so far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service) distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful economic life of more than ten years and which are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature;

"(2) advise the Congress as to the progress made in identifying and computing capital investments and more particularly such productive capital investments; and in computing the public debt exclude therefrom an amount equal to such productive capital investments;

"(3) advise the Congress as to a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments; and

"(4) advise the Congress as to the amount of the public debt as computed in accordance with this section and of the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

"(b) The amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt contained in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this Act.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 5. The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, with respect to budgets, reporting, auditing, and accounting, shall apply to the functions exercised by any officer or agency of the Government proposing the investment of Federal bond proceeds in productive capital, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO GIFTS TO INSTITUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would remove an inequity in the application of section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which allows deduction of up to 30 percent of a donor's adjusted gross income if the extra 10 percent comprises gifts to educational institutions.

Thirty or more State universities and land-grant colleges are now blocked, either wholly or in part, from the benefit of this section. These institutions are ones which receive and administer private gifts through separately incorporated foundations, either by necessity or preference.

Schools are defined in the code as having a faculty and students, granting degrees, et cetera. Inasmuch as the endowment association is closely associated with the University of Kansas, and this situation is true in many of our other similar schools, a specific favorable ruling was received from the Bureau of Internal Revenue in 1956, which permitted contributors to the association to take the maximum tax deductibility of 30 percent of adjusted gross income on their gifts.

This year the Bureau of Internal Revenue changed this ruling so that donations to the endowment associations no longer qualify for 30-percent deductibility, but only for 20-percent deductibility.

An inequity results because section 170(b)(1)(A) applies only to gifts made directly to the specified institutions. Gifts made to separate foundations for the exclusive use or benefit of particular educational institutions do not qualify for the extra 10-percent treatment—Revenue Ruling 60–110, March 28, 1960—even where the recipient foundations are the designated gift-receiving agencies of the affected universities.

There are 44 or more such gift-intermediary foundations associated with State universities and land-grant colleges. Each such foundation serves one particular university and is controlled by its parent institution in practice, although not in law.

At least 14 universities in 9 States cannot receive or administer private gifts without the services of such gift-intermediary foundations. In these cases, some element in State law prevents the corporate university from receiving or administering private gifts as specified by donors. In most cases, however, such foundations exist at the preference or for the convenience of their parent universities rather than by absolute necessity.

In order to preserve the original intent of section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), it is proposed that amendment be made to section 503(b)(2)—which defines the educational institutions which may benefit from the extra 10-percent rule—to provide for gift-intermediary foundations of the type here described.

I realize that tax legislation must originate in the House of Representatives, and I sincerely hope that, once legislation of this type is approved by the House, we may get early action in the Senate.

Action on the proposed amendment is so urgent that I expect to offer it as an amendment to the first bill dealing with tax legislation that comes before the Finance Committee from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a general statement of reasons favoring the proposal, be made a part of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 196) to make the treatment under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of certain foundations, all of which are closely associated with State colleges and universities and which act as intermediary recipients and administrators of gifts for the exclusive use or benefit of those colleges and universities with the consent, identical with that of those institutions, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of educational organizations) is amended by inserting "Either—(A)" at the beginning of the paragraph, by inserting "or" at the end of the paragraph, and by inserting after the paragraph the following new subparagraph:

"(B) an organization operated substantially to receive and hold, invest, administer or expend property, less expenses, exclusively for the use or benefit of a particular educational organization of the type described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and in section 511(a)(2)(B) (relating to State colleges and universities), except that no organization may qualify under this subparagraph if it disburses funds in a manner unacceptable to the said educational organization."

The statement presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT OF REASONS FAVORING THE PROPOSAL

The attached amendment to section 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is proposed on behalf of a number of State universities and land-grant colleges which have separate foundations acting as their designated agents for receiving and administering endowment funds and other gifts. The present wording of section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the code has made it impossible for some of these universities to benefit from the extra 10-percent deduction rule which Congress meant they should enjoy. This

amendment is thus proposed to remove an unintended inequity.

In enacting the extra 10-percent provision, Congress intended this special benefit specifically for colleges and universities, churches and associations of churches, and hospitals, and these alone. It did not wish to include quasi-educational organizations which might be charitable, wholly worthy and exempt, but are not actually schools. It meant specifically to exclude charitable foundations not directly associated with particular colleges and universities, even though all the beneficences of such a foundation might be for educational purposes. Section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) was therefore written narrowly, applying only to gifts made directly to colleges and universities—not, as usually provided with respect to gift deductibility elsewhere in the code, gifts made for the use of such institutions. (For further discussion of the congressional intent, see appendix D.)

Congress did not realize that there are some State universities and land-grant colleges which rarely if ever receive gifts directly. Some of these institutions are legally prohibited from receiving gifts—gifts meant for them must go to the State, for instance, which is not thereby obligated to use the funds so received for the university—but most of them prefer to receive private support through intermediary foundations rather than being obligated to do so. The exact reasons for this practice vary from State to State, but typically include such factors as administrative simplicity, removal from any possible political involvement, and investment flexibility.

Where a State university or land-grant college has such an intermediary foundation which handles gift funds on its behalf, that institution is now either denied outright the benefit of section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), or able to enjoy it only by altering its preferred procedures. The Internal Revenue Service has, in Revenue Ruling 60–110 (Mar. 28, 1960), denied the extra 10-percent privilege to university foundations of this type, since legally such foundations are separate corporations. Gifts to them are thus not legally gifts to a university, even though, in fact, they are.

These intermediary foundations are integral, essential parts of their universities in all practical respects. They perform a group of functions which are handled through regular administrative offices at other colleges and universities. They receive gifts, both for current use and for endowment; enter into contracts, and receive funds as trustees; manage properties and investments; acquire campus land and erect university buildings; and administer student loan programs, scholarships, and faculty projects. One such foundation is in the unusual position of being the legal owner of much of its university's campus land and buildings. In general these foundations do a variety of things which are normal, accepted functions of colleges and universities. They merely do them through separate corporations rather than through the university corporation.

There are many historical, legal, and operating links between these foundations and their parent institutions. Most such foundations were set up at the instigation of university presidents or chancellors. University presidents or their representatives are commonly included on the boards and executive committees of the foundations. In practice, although not generally as a legal requirement, the foundations disburse funds only as specifically desired by the university administration. Alumni of the institution predominate on the board of such a foundation. Each of the foundations serves one particular tax-supported college or university.

To illustrate these points specifically, attached as appendixes A, B, and C are detailed descriptions, respectively, of the Kansas University Endowment Association, the University of Nebraska Foundation, and the University of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc. These three examples, chosen from the same part of the country to minimize any question of regional differences, illustrate the functions and diversity of such organizations.

There are known to be at least 44, but probably fewer than 100, such foundations in the United States. Of these, the foundations of at least 14 institutions in 9 States (Iowa, Kansas, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) are especially affected because of some specific legal impediment concerning the receipt, investment, or administration of gift funds by the corporate universities supported by those States.

The actual effect of the present inequity has varied widely from university to university. The problem is most important to those foundations now doing the best jobs of attracting private support for their universities, since the extra 10 percent deductibility factor has practical meaning only to the prospective donor of an exceptionally large gift. Such donors come most often to the alert fund raising officers who find them. Some foundations have never had prospective donors whose gifts were of such size that the extra 10 percent had a practical effect. For those who have had prospective large gifts lost or delayed by the present inequity, however, the situation has been especially painful because it adversely affects the most important gifts—the biggest ones.

It is proposed by the attached amendment to remove this inequity by specifically qualifying gift-intermediary foundations closely associated with publicly supported colleges and universities, where the disbursements made by the foundations have university approval.

Amendment is proposed to section 503(b)(2), the paragraph which defines the educational organizations which may benefit from section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), rather than to the latter section because this seems a more workable way of preserving the original intent of section 170(b)(1)(A). Amending the latter could weaken the intended general distinction between gifts "to" and gifts "for the use of" educational institutions. This distinction should, we believe, be preserved. We propose an exception specifically and only for gift-intermediary foundations closely associated with State universities, land-grant colleges and other tax-supported colleges and universities. Without this exception, the institutions themselves cannot fully benefit from a provision intended for them.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS—CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CLARK COUNTY, IND.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I introduce two bills for appropriate reference and ask that the statements accompanying them be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HARTKE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 197. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

The statement of Mr. HARTKE accompanying the above bill is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to encourage self-employed individuals to establish voluntary pension plans.

This legislation simply permits self-employed individuals to take care of their retirement needs during their working years. It will give to the self-employed the same benefits of our tax laws which are now enjoyed by employees of businesses and corporations. The benefits of the bill are much more modest than those given to corporation employees and officers, since there is a limitation placed on the amount which self-employed individuals may contribute to a retirement plan.

Legislation encouraging thrift and self-reliance has always been looked upon with favor by American citizens. We encourage corporations and businesses to provide retirement plans for their employees, but self-employed individuals have been left out. This legislation will encourage them to provide for their retirement needs themselves. This will encourage individual initiative.

We have delayed action in this field too long. I earnestly hope that it will be possible for the Senate Finance Committee to begin hearings on this legislation early this year so that we may take final action before the end of this session.

To the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 198. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in the State of Indiana to Clark County, Ind.

The statement of Mr. HARTKE accompanying the above bill is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the transfer of certain property currently within the possession of the Department of the Army to Clark County, Ind. Upon accomplishment of the transfer, the land will be designated for the use and disposition of the 4–H Club of the county.

It was my pleasure to introduce legislation of a similar nature in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

The State of Indiana is one which possesses a proud and noble agricultural heritage. Agriculture has been a strong facet in the economy of Indiana, and Indiana has been a substantial contributor to the agricultural betterment of the United States.

But the maintenance of such productivity is allowed only by the development of the skills of our young farmers.

It is my hope, that the transfer of this land might effect a more compatible means of education and development of the young agricultural minds of Indiana, and I strongly urge that Congress take favorable action upon this bill in order that the needed facilities may be at the disposal of the Clark County 4–H Club.

DEFENSE OF CERTAIN SUITS AGAINST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment.

Incredible as it may seem, under existing law, a postal worker who is involved in an accident while driving a Government truck during the course of

his duties can be held personally liable for any damages. This is a manifestly unjust situation that should be corrected at the earliest possible date.

I have long sought a remedy for this inequitable situation which has in the past been remedied only on an individual basis by private legislation.

A study was made of the best way to effect this change during the last session of the Congress, but unfortunately, and inadvertently I fear, the measure last year was amended in such a way as to make it inconsistent with the body of Federal law and practice in the field of tort claims.

This bill, in the form in which I am now introducing it, should be satisfactory on all counts. No longer will the postal employees, or any other Federal workers in a similar position have to be tried in a personal capacity. The Government will bear the defense costs and assume the liability as determined in a Federal court. These cases will be tried in a Federal district court under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This should not work any great hardship upon the plaintiff, but it should for the first time provide adequate and equitable protection for the drivers of postal vehicles. I urge all my colleagues to give their support to this worthwhile and much needed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 202) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof and (2) by adding immediately following such subsection (a) as hereby so designated, four new subsections as follows:

"(b) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346 (b) of this title for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the employee or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim.

"(c) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any employee of the Government or his estate for any such damage or injury. The employee against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the head of his department to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleadings and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought to the Attorney General, and to the head of his employing Federal agency.

"(d) Any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of this title and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (b) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

"(e) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677, and with the same effect."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to be in effect six months after the enactment hereof but any rights or liabilities then existing shall not be affected.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 28, entitled 'Judiciary and Judicial Procedure', of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 315(A) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a bill for introduction and for appropriate reference.

I might say to the Members of the Senate that last year I sponsored a bill to amend section 315(a) of the Communications Act which would allow the networks of the country to proceed to make time available to presidential and vice-presidential candidates in the election which has just become history, and concerning which some more history will shortly be made on the other side of the Capitol.

I have consulted many persons involved in this matter, including both political parties. The bill I introduced last year to amend the section was temporary; it provided only for the campaign just past.

In order to bring the matter before the Senate again, I am reintroducing the amendment to the Communications Act, section 315(a), which would make the amendment permanent and would allow availability of time for presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 204) to provide that section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not apply to candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

USE OF TELEVISION STATIONS FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing on behalf of the senior Senator from the State of Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, the measure designed to help activate many of our idle educational television channels.

This measure which passed the Senate during the 86th Congress would allocate $1 million to each State and the District of Columbia toward the purchase or installation of equipment to get educational television stations on the air. None of the appropriation authorized could be used for personnel or program service.

As this measure is presented again to the Senate, I recall the article written for the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Journal and printed in the May-June 1960 edition:

We have our race for space. We have shown haste to face the missile gap. However, thus far, we have set no pace to erase the gap in educational television which measures almost two-thirds of our Nation in breadth.

Many contend that we have given our educators more advice than funds, more students than desks, more technology to teach than we have modern tools to teach it, including educational television.

On April 14, 1952, the Federal Communications Commission set aside 242 channels for noncommercial educational stations. Now that number has been increased to 257. Less than 55 stations are on the air today.

During that same period, what has happened in other fields?

Both Russia and America have placed satellites in orbit, launched deep space thrusts, made supersonic missiles operational, adapted atomic propulsion to water navigation.

Our travelers have become accustomed to crossing the continent in less than 4 hours and the Atlantic Ocean during daylight hours. But two-thirds of our students have progressed eight grades without having educational television available to them.

For the one-third of the Nation's school population which has used educational television, the experience has been most rewarding and promising. To know exactly how rewarding and promising, you should have sat with me in my Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee room a year ago.

Had you been a parent listening, you would have heard other parents tell how their children had gained in knowledge through educational television.

Had you been a teacher, you would have heard eager fellow educators telling what a tool the medium is when applied as a teaching supplement.

Had you been a lawmaker, the problems of utilizing educational television properly would have been most revealing and heart touching.

You would have learned of innumerable community meetings held, countless conferences convened, reams of minutes taken, and many sound conclusions reached.

Testifying before my committee were those who had channels allocated but not activated. Those who had stations in service. Those who had seen educational television in service elsewhere and now wanted it for their areas, their children.

There was no shortage of desire for an educational television station. Nor was any lessening of need indicated. Only a shortage of dollars was indicated to buy equipment, install it, get the picture into the classroom.

The dollars trouble me, as they do you.

Those offering testimony saw in my measure, S. 12, being reintroduced in the Senate today, a chance to obtain part of the dollars they need. This help, they felt, can spell the difference between having a channel which is allocated but unused or a channel beaming programs to students.

Each witness knew that even $1 million allocated to each State and the District of Columbia, as provided by the Magnuson measure, would not stretch far. They knew the dollars supplied could be used only to buy equipment or install it. After the station was on the air, no Federal funds under the Magnuson Act could be used for either personnel or program service.

But they must have equipment before programs. The equipment must be installed. So they were for my bill. They thought it should be speedy. That no time be wasted getting the program in operation.

That was a year ago.

I have been fighting for this legislation for the past 4 years. This was a logical next step, since we had won the battle to have these channels reserved exclusively for educational purposes.

If this effort meets with success and we can immediately double or triple the number of educational stations now on the air, considering that we now have less than 55, this can be an important step forward.

If every community could proceed as did my home city of Seattle, then the problem could be lessened.

Loren Stone, who directs channel 9, Seattle, tells me that the $1 per student contribution made by the majority of school districts, King County, and Seattle city schools, coupled with the same payment from Seattle University and Seattle Pacific College provides about two-thirds of the station's annual budget. The other one-third comes from the University of Washington. Other areas have tried much the same plan with varying degrees of success.

But in Seattle it works.

Cutting down operational costs there is the arrangement for the University of Washington to provide studio and office facilities on the campus, and, through the school of communications, to make students available to augment the station's small professional staff. Housing for the station transmitter is provided at Edison Technical School and Edison's students maintain and operate the facility.

However, at channel 9's start, capital funds came almost exclusively from outside the local educational group. The Fund for Adult Education, an independent agency created by the Ford Foundation, made a grant to the station of $150,000, upon the condition the station raise double that amount in local matching funds. Commercial television station KING–TV, owned by Mrs. Scott Bullitt made a gift of television equipment, including a transmitter, two camera chains, a tower, and many other useful items valued at $121,963. A community-wide drive for funds produced $33,441. The Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp. made a grant of $10,000 to the station as being one of the first 10 educational television stations to commence broadcasting. The University of Washington provided studio and building facilities, which for purposes of the required matching funds, have been valued at $275,000.

Through this supercommunity effort and the humanitarian gesture by Mrs. Bullitt, we now have "Calculus," a half-hour three-times-a-week series for accelerated mathematics students going to our high school seniors in the Seattle-King County area.

Our third graders get "Panchito y los Animales," a quarter-hour three-times-a-week series in the Spanish language.

Junior high students studying Washington State history can look up from their books to catch "Reliving the Past," a weekly series carried on channel 9.

The "Listen and Say" basic speech and reading program commands wide attention in our primary classes.

To permit the greatest possible elasticity, the classroom teacher can pluck from the air the individual program best suited for her room at the time she wants it because each of the in-school programs are repeated two or three times during the day or week. These repeats are made from kinescopes made of the programs in channel 9's studios. Thus repeats are possible in future years and loans are possible to schools outside the station's coverage area.

Loren Stone informs me that channel 9 has an evening schedule including an hour for children from 7 to 8, an hour of telecourses from 8 to 9, and an hour of general cultural and informational programs for adults and the entire family from 9 to 10.

Each of you has an example to draw upon from the nearest educational station. Perhaps you, as I, have talked with children who view the programs, use the facility to give new meaning to textbook pages, learn by seeing as well as hearing.

Actually, one cannot know the full meaning nor potential of educational television until you have sat down with the student, the teacher, the parent, and talk concrete results.

The results are eloquent.

So was Dean Gordon Sabine, of Michigan State University, when he told my committee last year:

> The educational needs of the United States have so far outstripped the educational capabilities of the Nation that we must have educational television to help us win the fight to educate a whole people. Without it, we surely are defeated.

Then the words uttered by Richard B. Hull, director of radio and television broadcasting for the Ohio State University in Columbus still echo in the hearing room:

> With the kind of Federal aid which S. 12 provides, aid which specifically forbids any kind of Federal direction or control, a "grassroots" educational television development at the State level for the first time becomes possible, and the electronics mass media, already harnessed to the purposes of business and industry can become available to education.

This testimony, and thousands of words in the same vein, give stature to the hearing record on S. 12. They gave impetus to the measure when it passed the Senate.

But the only real satisfaction can come when the electronic picture tube lights up in those classrooms in the other two-thirds of our Nation to let those students have this vibrant, vital new educational supplement that is television.

Until these tubes glow, our job remains unfinished.

I wish to let the bill remain on the desk so that the names of additional sponsors may be added to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask the Senator how long he wishes the bill to lie on the desk?

Mr. MAGNUSON. At least 3 or 4 days; at least until Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, because many Senators will not be here over the weekend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four days, then?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROTECTION OF WATER RIGHTS OF STATES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. CURTIS], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian.

Mr. President, on two previous occasions, like bills on the same subject have been introduced in this body.

It is considered necessary to give legislative assurance of the integrity of western water rights, in view of the adverse implications arising from recent Supreme Court decisions, in particular in the case of *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* (349 U.S. 435 (1955)).

Much discussion and effort have already been devoted to the question. There are on file reports from departments and agencies having programs or interests connected with western water

rights. It comes as no surprise to find that divergent views on such legislation were expressed. But a concern for reasonable protection of Federal programs and interests—which, incidentally, this bill provides for—should not altogether hold up legislative action and thus deprive persons in reclamation States of the needed assurance of their vested property rights in the use of water.

I send the bill to the desk, Mr. President, with the request that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 211) to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The purpose of the bill is to protect the States' water rights. Let me ask whether in any way the bill would modify the so-called O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not my recollection that it does; I do not think it touches that part of it at all.

For the information of the Senator from South Dakota, let me say that the bill I am now introducing is the same, in its provisions, as the one introduced 4 years ago by Senator Barrett, of Wyoming. That will identify the bill with the Senator's recollection, I am sure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that is the bill, I wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska for introducing it; and I would be happy to be associated with him in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. I shall be happy to have the name of the Senator from South Dakota included as a cosponsor.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC FROM UNSANITARY MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators MCCARTHY, PROXMIRE, WILEY, and myself I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce.

This proposal, aside from minor technical changes to clarify the wording of several provisions, is identical to the milk sanitation bill which I introduced in the 86th Congress. Representative LESTER JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, has introduced the same measure in the House of Representatives.

During the last session of Congress, extensive hearings were held on this proposed legislation by the Subcommittee on Health, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and by the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety; and during those hearings the proposal was discussed in detail.

By establishing the United States Public Health Service's proven milk code as the quality yardstick for milk moving in interstate trade, the National Milk Sanitation Act would eliminate the use of arbitrary local health standards as trade barriers against the shipment of high-quality milk from one State to another. Currently, many eastern and southern milk markets are hemmed in by sanitary standards which do more to protect local milk monopolies than to protect the public health.

Milk and milk products are the only agricultural products prevented from moving freely in interstate commerce. This is obviously unfair to producers who live in areas, such as in Minnesota and Wisconsin, that provide the ideal conditions for volume production. It is also unfair to the consuming public to deny them the benefits resulting from the free flow of trade.

The National Milk Sanitation Act is intended to bring commerce in milk and milk products out of the 19th cenutry into the present day, for the betterment of the general welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislative proposal be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 212) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Milk Sanitation Act".

SEC. 2. The Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—MILK SANITATION

"Congressional findings

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds that the sanitary control of fluid milk and certain milk products is necessary to protect the public health and recognizes that the exercise of such sanitary control is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, but that no State or local government has the right to obstruct the free movement in interstate commerce of milk and milk products of high sanitary quality by use of unnecessary sanitary requirements or other health regulations.

"Definitions

"SEC. 802. For purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'milk' means the lacteal secretion, practically free from colostrum, obtained (A) by the complete milking of one or more healthy cows, which contains not less than 8¼ per centum milk solids-not-fat and not less than 3¼ per centum milkfat, or (B) by the complete milking of healthy goats.

"(2) The term 'milk product' means (A) cream, sour cream, light cream, whipping cream, light whipping cream, heavy whipping cream, half and half, reconstituted half and half, whipped cream, concentrated milk, concentrated milk products, skim milk, nonfat milk, flavored milk, flavored drink, flavored reconstituted milk, flavored reconstituted drink, buttermilk, cultured buttermilk, cultured milk, vitamin D milk, reconstituted or recombined milk, reconstituted cream, reconstituted skim milk, cottage cheese, and creamed cottage cheese, as such products are defined in the edition of the Public Health Service's recommended Milk Ordinance and Code (unabridged form) which is current on the date of enactment of this title; (B) any other fluid product made by the addition of any substance to milk or to a product specified in clause (A), if the Surgeon General, by regulation, designates the product so made as a milk product for purposes of this title on the basis of a finding that such product is used for purposes similar to those of milk products specified in clause (A) and is shipped in interstate commerce in sufficient quantities to be of public health importance and to warrant its control under this title; and (C) nonfat dry milk products and other dry milk products, when used or intended for use in the manufacture of a milk product specified in clause (A) or pursuant to clause (B): *Provided,* That upon the becoming effective, under section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of a definition and standard of identity for milk, or for any milk product specified in or pursuant to this paragraph, such definition and standard of identity shall govern to the extent of any inconsistency between it and the definition specified in or under this or the preceding paragraph.

"(3) The term 'interstate milk plant' means, except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, any establishment or facility (including equipment, vehicles, and appurtenances in, or operated in connection with, such establishment or facility) (A) in which milk or milk products are collected, handled, processed, stored, pasteurized, or bottled or otherwise packaged or prepared for distribution, and (B) from which milk or milk products are shipped in interstate commerce. In any case in which, in lieu of utilization of a fixed establishment or facility, an interstate milk shipper utilizes one or more trucks or other mobile facilities for collecting milk or milk products (or performing any other function or functions specified in clause (A) of the preceding sentence) and directly shipping such milk or milk products in interstate commerce, such truck or trucks or other mobile facilities, and equipment and appurtenances operated in connection therewith, shall collectively, in accordance with regulations, be deemed to be an 'interstate milk plant'.

"(4) The term 'milk supply', when used with respect to an interstate milk plant, means the dairies, dairy farms, and plants directly or indirectly supplying the plant with milk or milk products.

"(5) The term 'State milk sanitation rating agency' means the State health authority, except that in any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, engaged in making sanitation ratings of milk supplies, the term shall mean such other State agency.

"(6) The term 'receiving State' means any State into which any milk or milk product emanating from an interstate milk plant is introduced or offered for introduction; and the term 'receiving locality' means any municipality or other political subdivision of a State into which any milk or milk product emanating from an interstate milk plant in another State is introduced or offered for introduction.

"Federal Milk Sanitation Code

"SEC. 803. For the purposes of rating, certification, and listing of interstate milk

plants and their milk supply as provided by this title, the Surgeon General shall by regulation promulgate, and may from time to time amend, a Federal Milk Sanitation Code which shall set forth milk and milk product sanitation standards and sanitary practices (including standards as to inspections, laboratory examinations, and other routine official supervision by local or State milk sanitation authorities, or by both) which, if effectively followed, would in his judgment result in a supply of milk and milk products of a sanitary quality at least equivalent to that of—

"(1) Grade A raw milk for pasteurization and Grade A pasteurized milk, respectively, and

"(2) milk products containing only grade A raw milk as their milk component and intended for pasteurization, and milk products containing only grade A pasteurized milk as their milk component, respectively, produced or processed, or both, in conformity with the provisions of the edition of the Public Health Service's recommended Milk Ordinance and Code (unabridged form) which is current on the date of enactment of this title.

"Compliance ratings

"SEC. 804. (a) The Surgeon General shall by regulation promulgate, and may from time to time amend, standard rating methods and criteria for determining through compliance ratings, with respect to milk and milk products, the degree to which interstate milk plants and their milk supply comply with the Federal Milk Sanitation Code. Such ratings shall be expressed in terms of percentages of full compliance.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall announce, by regulation, the minimum compliance rating (pursuant to such rating standards) which, in his judgment, are necessary to give satisfactory assurance that milk and milk products shipped from interstate milk plants receiving such ratings will have been produced, handled, transported, and processed in substantial conformity with the Federal Milk Sanitation Code, except that the minimum so prescribed shall not be less than 90 per centum.

"Submission of State plans

"SEC. 805. The State milk sanitation rating agency of any State which wishes to obtain for its interstate milk shippers the benefits of this title shall submit to the Surgeon General for approval a State plan for periodically (but not less often than annually) rating interstate milk plants located in such State, and their milk supply, on the basis of the standard rating methods and criteria in effect under section 804(a), and certifying to the Surgeon General those interstate milk plants and their milk supply receiving a compliance rating at least equal to the minimum ratings established under section 804 (b). Such plan shall be accompanied or supplemented by such information concerning milk sanitation control activities of the State agency and of local official milk sanitation control agencies, and such other relevant information, as the Surgeon General may request.

"Approval, suspension, and revocation of State plans

"SEC. 806. (a) The Surgeon General shall approve a State plan submitted under section 805 if it meets such requirements as he determines to be necessary to obtain reliable ratings for the purpose of maintaining the list provided for by section 807, including a requirement that such ratings will be made only by State rating officials who are full-time employees of the State milk sanitation rating agency (or under interstate arrangements, by full-time employees employed by a sister State having an approved plan or by both States jointly) and hold a currently valid certificate of qualification issued or renewed by the Surgeon General. Approval of a State plan shall be for such period (but not exceeding three years) as may be fixed by regulation.

"(b) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State milk sanitation rating agency, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it complies with neither the requirements for State plan approval in effect at the time such plan was last approved, nor with the requirements for State plan approval as last amended, or

"(2) in the administration of the State plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision contained in such plan, the Surgeon General shall revoke his approval of such State plan. The Surgeon General may suspend his approval of a State plan at any time after giving the notice of hearing referred to above and pending such hearing and decision thereon if in his judgment the protection of the public health so requires.

"Listing of certified interstate milk plants

"SEC. 807. (a) The Surgeon General shall establish and maintain a list of certified interstate milk plants, and shall publish such list, or revisions or amendments thereof, not less often than quarterly. Except as provided in subsection (b), an interstate milk plant shall be included on such list if such plant and its milk supply, by a certificate currently in effect at the time of such listing, has been certified to the Surgeon General by a State milk sanitation rating agency under an approved State plan as having compliance ratings at least equal to the minimum ratings established by the Surgeon General under section 804(b). Such list shall identify the interstate milk plant or plants involved in any such certification, the persons having legal ownership or control thereof, and in accordance with the regulations, the milk and milk products covered by the certification.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall not include or permit to remain on the list provided for under subsection (a) any interstate milk plant if—

"(1) the person having legal ownership or control thereof does not consent to the listing of the interstate milk plant, or

"(2) the last rating upon which the certification of the plant and its milk supply was based is more than one year old, or

"(3) the State milk sanitation rating agency gives written notice to the Surgeon General that the plant and its milk supply is no longer entitled to the minimum rating required for listing, or

"(4) the Surgeon General, after investigation made on his own initiative or upon complaint of a receiving State or locality, finds that the plant and its milk supply, though duly certified, is not entitled to the minimum rating required for such certification.

"(c) (1) Any decision of the Surgeon General—

"(A) to exclude or remove an interstate milk plant from the list pursuant to paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section or pursuant to section 810(b), or

"(B) not to take such action upon complaint of a receiving State or locality under paragraphs (4) of subsection (b),

shall, in accordance with regulations, be made by order stating the findings and conclusions upon which it is based. Notice of such order shall be given to the person having legal ownership or control of such plant, the State milk sanitation rating agency whose rating of such plant is involved, and the complainant State or locality, if any, and such order shall, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, become effective on the date specified therein but in no event earlier than the thirtieth day after the date of its issuance.

"(2) At any time before an order pursuant to paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection is issued or becomes effective, the Surgeon General may by order defer or suspend the listing of any plant when, in his judgment, the protection of the public health so requires.

"(3) At any time before the effective date of an order issued pursuant to paragraph (1), any person (including any complainant receiving State or locality) adversely affected by such order and entitled to notice thereof, and the State milk sanitation rating agency (if any) whose rating of an interstate milk plant is involved, may file objections thereto (stating the grounds of such objections) and request a public hearing, and the filing of such objections and request shall operate to stay the effectiveness of such order, but shall not operate to stay any order of deferment or suspension under paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Surgeon General shall, upon the basis of the record of such hearing, by order confirm, modify, or set aside his prior order and the findings and conclusions stated therein, and specify the date, not later than thirty days after its issuance, on which the order entered after such hearing shall take effect.

"(d) (1) Any person (including any complainant receiving State or locality) adversely affected by an order of the Surgeon General issued pursuant to paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of this section and entitled to notice under paragraph (1) of subsection (c), and the State milk sanitation rating agency (if any) whose rating is involved, may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the interstate milk plant involved is located by filing with such court, not later than sixty days after the date of issuance of the order based upon the record of such hearing, a notice of appeal. The jurisdiction of the court shall attach upon the filing of such notice of appeal. A copy of such notice of appeal shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Surgeon General or any officer designated by him for that purpose.

"The Surgeon General shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of an order.

"(2) The court shall have jurisdiction to enter, upon the basis of the record of the proceedings filed with it in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection, a judgment affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, the decision of the Surgeon General. The findings of the Surgeon General as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole, shall be sustained, but the court may, on good cause shown, remand the case to the Surgeon General to take additional evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous order, and shall file with the court any such modified findings of fact and order, together with the record of the further proceedings. Such additional or modified findings of fact and order shall be reviewable only to the extent provided for review of the findings of fact and order originally filed with the court. The judgment of the court shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"Prohibition against discrimination against sanitary out-of-State milk and milk products

"SEC. 808. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b)—

"(1) no milk or milk product which emanates from an interstate milk plant in another State, while such plant is listed by the Surgeon General under section 807 with respect to the milk or milk product, as the case

may be, shall be subject to seizure or condemnation in, or to exclusion from, a receiving State or locality, or from transportation, distribution, storage, processing, sale, or serving in such State or locality, and

"(2) no processor, producer, carrier, distributor, dealer, or other person handling such milk or milk product shall be subject to punishment, or to denial of a required license or permit,

by reason of the failure of such milk or milk product, or of the sealed container or vehicle (complying with the Federal Milk Sanitation Code) in which such milk or milk product was brought into the State, or of an interstate milk plant in another State or its milk supply, or of any transportation or handling facility, in which such milk or milk product was produced, processed, carried, or handled, to comply with any prohibition, requirement, limitation, or condition (including official inspection requirements) relating to health or sanitation and imposed by or pursuant to any State or local law, regulation, or order of the receiving State or locality, or by any officer or employee thereof. In the event any milk or milk product emanating from a listed interstate milk plant in another State and complying with the Federal Milk Sanitation Code is commingled with milk or milk products from within the receiving State the provisions of the preceding sentence shall apply to the resulting mixture, except that nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the application of such State or local laws, regulations, or orders to such mixture by reason of the failure of such milk or milk product of intrastate origin not emanating from an interstate milk plant in another State, to comply therewith immediately prior to such commingling.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not be deemed to prohibit any receiving State or locality from—

"(1) subjecting any milk or milk product, upon its arrival from another State, to laboratory or screening tests in accordance with standard methods for the examination of dairy products provided for in the Federal Milk Sanitation Code, and rejecting the shipment if upon such examination it fails to comply with the bacterial and coliform count standards, temperature standards, composition standards, and other criteria of such code relating to the then physical condition of such milk or milk products, and

"(2) enforcing sanitary laws and regulations, equally applicable to milk or milk products not coming from outside the State—

"(A) to require pasteurization of raw milk or raw milk products brought into the State before delivery to retail sale or consumer-serving establishments or before use in making milk products or other products,

"(B) to otherwise protect milk or milk products from contamination or deterioration after arrival through requirements as to temperature and sanitary handling, transportation, and storage: *Provided*, That the State or locality may not, except as provided in subparagraph (C), reject the sealed container or vehicle, as such, in which the milk or milk product arrived in the State, if it complies with the Federal Milk Sanitation Code, or

"(C) as to the type of container in or from which milk or milk products may be sold at retail or served to consumers.

"Civil action to restrain interference with operation of title

"SEC. 809. The United States district courts shall, regardless of the amount in controversy, have jurisdiction of any civil action to restrain the application of any law, ordinance, regulation, or order of any State or political subdivision of a State, or to restrain any action of an officer or agency of a State or political subdivision of a State, which interferes with, conflicts with, or violates any provision of this title. Such action may be brought by the United States, or by any interested person. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to deprive any court of a State of jurisdiction which it would otherwise have to restrain any such application or action which interferes with, conflicts with, or violates any provision of this title.

"Inspection by Surgeon General

"SEC. 810. (a) The Surgeon General may make such inspections of interstate milk plants and plants proposing to become interstate milk plants, and of their milk supply, and such laboratory examinations, studies, investigations, and ratings, as he may deem necessary in order to carry out his functions under this title and to promote uniformity in the application of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code and the Surgeon General's standard rating methods and criteria.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall remove any interstate milk plant from the list provided for under section 807 if the State or any local milk sanitation authority or laboratory refuses to permit representatives of the Service to inspect and copy relevant records pertaining to State or local health and sanitary supervision of such milk plant or any part thereof or facility connected therewith and its milk supply, or if the person in charge of such plant or of any part of the milk supply of such plant, or any person under his control, refuses to permit representatives of the Service, at all reasonable times, to—

"(1) enter such interstate milk plant or any establishment, premises, facility, or vehicle where milk or milk products intended for such interstate milk plant are produced, processed, packed, held, or transported.

"(2) inspect such plant, establishment, premises, facility, or vehicle, and all pertinent personnel, dairy animals, equipment and utensils, containers and labeling, and milk and milk products, and

"(3) inspect and copy pertinent records.

"Research, studies, and investigations concerning sanitary quality of milk

"SEC. 811. The Surgeon General shall conduct research, studies, and investigations concerned with the sanitary quality of milk and milk products, and he is authorized to (1) support through grants, and otherwise aid in, the conduct of such investigations, studies, and research by State agencies and other public or private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, and (2) make the results of such research, studies, and investigations available to State and local agencies, public or private organizations and institutions, the milk industry, and the general public.

"Training milk sanitation personnel

"SEC. 812. The Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) train State and local personnel in milk sanitation methods and procedures and in the application of the rating methods and criteria established in regulations pursuant to section 804,

"(2) provide technical assistance to State and local milk sanitation authorities on specific problems,

"(3) encourage, through publications and otherwise, the adoption and use, by State and local authorities throughout the United States, of the sanitation standards and sanitation practices specified in the Federal Milk Sanitation Code, and

"(4) otherwise cooperate with State milk sanitation authorities, other public and private organizations and institutions, and industry in the development of improved programs for the control of the sanitary quality of milk and milk products.

"Savings provisions

"SEC. 813. (a) The provisions of this title shall not apply to manufactured dairy products, including but not limited to butter, frozen deserts, condensed milk, evaporated milk, sterilized milk or milk products not requiring refrigeration, all types of cheese except cottage cheese and creamed cottage cheese, and nonfat dry milk, dry whole milk, or part fat dry milk unless used or intended for use in the preparation of fluid milk products. As used in this section the term 'manufactured dairy products' does not apply to the milk products defined in section 802(2).

"(b) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to make lawful or authorize the application of any State or local law or requirement of any receiving State or locality discriminating against milk and milk products which would not be lawful or authorized if this title were not in effect.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to supercede or modify any provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or of any provision of the Public Health Service Act (other than this title).

"Appropriations

"SEC. 814. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Service such sums as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out his functions under this title."

SEC. 3. Section 2(f) of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The term 'State' means a State or the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, except that, as used in section 361(d) and in title VIII, such term means a State or the District of Columbia;".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), is further amended by renumbering title VIII (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title IX, and by renumbering sections 801 through 814 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act, and references thereto, as sections 901 through 914, respectively.

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate February of each year as American History Month.

Selecting February as American History Month is especially appropriate when we consider that among the famous Americans born during February are: George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Edison, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

In bringing to the forefront the strength, courage, and determination of the past through the observance of a national history month, we would be setting an example and guide for the future, worthy of consideration by all Americans.

Many cities and States currently observe American History Month as a result of the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Through their suggestion, I am introducing this resolution today.

It is my hope that this proposal will be given the expeditious and affirmative consideration it so well deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the joint resolution printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) designating February of each year as American History Month, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas all Americans must honor their debt to the past and their obligation to the future; and

Whereas our freedoms are the result of the sacrifice, wisdom, perseverance, and faith of our forefathers; and

Whereas the more fully we understand and appreciate our history and heritage the more we will be able to prove worthy of it; and

Whereas the need was never more acute for encouraging study and recognition of the greatness that is America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as American History Month, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

IMPROVEMENTS IN METHODS OF NOMINATING AND ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 102, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement by him on the need for an Organization of American States Peace Fleet.

INTERNATIONAL PARK IS SYMBOL OF FRIENDSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for a period of some months now the Missoulian-Sentinel, Missoula, Mont.'s daily newspaper, has been running a series of guest editorials. These editorials have been of exceptional quality, and one of the finest to appear in a recent issue was written by my good and long-time friend, D. Gordon Rognlien, of Kalispell, Mont.

Gordon Rognlien's editorial was devoted to the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park as a symbol of friendship between Canada and the United States. I recommend this editorial to all of my colleagues here in the Senate. It underscores the devotion of this man and his associates to a project which has been so successful. If there were more examples of international good will in the world today, there would be a better understanding and less strife among nations today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD the guest editorial entitled "Peace Park Symbol of Friendship," which appeared in the December 24, 1960, issue of the Missoulian-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missoulian-Sentinel, Dec. 24, 1960]

PEACE PARK SYMBOL OF FRIENDSHIP

When Mary first told Joseph of the expected Christ Child, his first words to her were, "Peace be with you." After the birth of Jesus the shepherds told of seeing the heavens open and a host of angels singing "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." So it is very fitting that on the eve of the celebration of the birth of the Prince of Peace we again pause and reflect about peace on earth.

It is, of course, the hope of all, that peace can come to this troubled world and we as individuals would like to lend our assistance, but we feel so insignificant and inadequate to make any positive contribution.

A group of Rotarians from both Alberta and Montana, realizing the futility of individual action, reasoned that collective action of many Rotarians from both sides of the border could dramatize the fact that Canadians and Americans live side by side in peace and harmony and thus bring international attention to this example of international good will. As a result, the idea of creating an international peace park was born.

FIRST OF ITS KIND

No time was lost in making this dream a reality. The national legislative councils of both Canada and the United States passed laws uniting Waterton Lakes National Park and Glacier National Park, creating the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park, the first of its kind in the world.

It was created as a symbol of the traditional friendship existing between these two great nations and to serve as an example to a war-weary world that nations with common boundaries can live together peaceably.

The dedication ceremonies were held at Glacier Park on June 18, 1932, where celebrities from both countries attended. Hope for the success of their venture was well expressed by President Hoover, who wrote: "Dedication of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park is a further gesture of the good will that has so long blessed our relationship with our Canadian neighbors, and I am grateful in the hope and faith that it will ever be an appropriate symbol of permanent peace and friendship."

During the ensuing 28 years, Rotarians of both countries, under the inspired leadership of Canon S. H. Middleton, of the Anglican Church of Canada, have spread the idea of the peace park in many ways—by the erection of cairns with appropriate inscriptions at the international boundary, by railroad and park literature, through the Rotarian magazine, and by pamphlets sent to Rotary officers and clubs throughout the world.

Each year members of this association meet, first on one side of the international boundary and then on the other, where we enjoy the pleasures that result from making new friends and renewing old acquaintances from across the border.

Each annual meeting is closed with a "hands across the border" ceremony, where the Canadians stand on the north side of the imaginary line and the Americans on the south, grasping each others hands and reciting a pledge of eternal peace and friendship. It is a thrilling experience which creates in the hearts and minds of all that each is making some individual contribution toward world peace.

FOREIGN COMMENDATIONS

It is hard to know how effective the peace park idea has become or how far it has spread. We do know that we receive letters commending the idea from Japan, France, England, and other foreign countries.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD wrote: "The weight of world problems would be much less if there were more Waterton-Glacier peace parks in the world."

President Eisenhower voiced the sentiments of us all when he said: "This peace park is a living monument to the tradition of friendship which unites the people of Canada and the United States. To a world beset by strife and struggle, it stands as a symbol of mankind's highest hopes and achievements."

It is the hope and prayer of all who have participated in this movement that the peace park will contribute, in some small way, to a better understanding and friendship among the peoples of the world.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

WILLIAM THE SILENT JOURNALISTIC AWARD TO R. H. SHACKFORD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President: Last month, R. H. Shackford, foreign correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers received the 1960 William the Silent Award for journalism.

Mr. Shackford is a distinguished journalist with many years of outstanding service to the people of the United States. I number myself among his many readers and have drawn heavily from his dispatches from many parts of the world to keep myself informed on the facts of the international situation and for the development of insight into the significance of these facts.

I am delighted to call to the attention of the Senate this distinction which has come to Mr. Shackford, a distinction which he greatly merits. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a news story covering the award to Mr. Shackford be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 8, 1960]

SHACKFORD WINS JOURNALISM HONOR

NEW YORK, December 8.—R. H. Shackford, foreign correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, today was awarded the 1960 William the Silent Award for journalism.

He received $1,000 and a gold medal in recognition of his incisive series of articles on the Netherlands published last December in the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Private Dutch citizens sponsor the prize. It generally is awarded annually to a writer adjudged to have done the most to further Netherlands-United States understanding.

LUNCHEON

Albert Balink, chairman of the William the Silent award committee, made the presenta-

tion at a luncheon in the Overseas Press Club. Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador in Washington, was a guest.

Mr. Shackford, 52, is a native of Westbrook, Maine. He became a United Press reporter 25 years ago. UP promoted him to Washington overnight editor, diplomatic correspondent, and finally general news manager for Europe. He became Scripps-Howard's chief European correspondent in 1952.

In the postwar period he covered most of the important international conferences all the way from Paris to San Francisco; London to Rio; Brussels to Bogotá; Rome to Ottawa; Mexico City to Moscow. Since 1954 he has operated out of Scripps-Howard's Washington bureau, traveling abroad extensively to report on world affairs.

HEADLINES

Previously Mr. Shackford received the Headliners award for coverage of the United Nations and in 1956 the Lawrence S. Mayers peace award.

The William the Silent award was established in 1950 as a living memorial to 14 American news correspondents who lost their lives in the line of duty in a plane crash in Bombay, India, on July 12, 1949. Among the victims was William H. Newton of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Gold medals also were presented today in recognition of intelligent reporting of Dutch affairs to Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and David H. Beetle, formerly of the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate—and I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the minority leader—that after the joint ceremony in the House of Representatives, the Senate will return to the Chamber and resume its deliberations on the measure pending before it.

Again, I should like to ask the Senate minority leader if it would meet with his approval for the Senate to meet tomorrow, in an attempt to expedite action on the pending measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is not that I am allergic to Saturday sessions as such, but I do know that in the first week there are so many accumulations to be disposed of that I hoped every Member of the Senate would have a little time to get his office affairs in order and get his accumulation of correspondence out of the way, and then, with a free and wholly unencumbered mind, approach the heavier responsibilities of the rules discussion on Monday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE OF FREEDOM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD some remarks on the House of Freedom, the demonstration retirement house for the White House Conference for the Aging, being held in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF FREEDOM

I would like to call attention of the Members of the Senate to House of Freedom, the demonstration retirement house for the White House Conference for the Aging being held in Washington, D.C., January 9–12, 1961. This project will be a valuable contribution to the public interest, and in my opinion will be one of the most important tangible results of the conference.

The Members of the Senate have been invited by the sponsors to inspect the project, and I urge that all of you take the opportunity to do so.

The overall objective of the demonstration is to focus national attention on the need for special approaches to housing for the elderly and to point the way to solutions to this problem by private industry, public agencies and appropriate legislative support.

The house is actually a basic building block which is adaptable to multiple-unit arrangements such as garden court apartments, row housing, and other community projects other than high rise apartments. The house will crystallize in one research unit all the best ideas applicable to the needs for housing in outside institutional housing and high rise apartments.

The sponsors are seeking the informed evaluation of the project by the delegates to the conference and by the Members of Congress. The combination of applied research summarized in tangible form in the demonstration house and the response of the conference delegates will lay down guidelines on what is needed in housing our older citizens for private builders, public officials, lenders and welfare groups interested in the problem.

House of Freedom is sponsored by the National Retired Teachers Association, the American Association of Retired Persons, and Douglas Fir Plywood Association.

The first two groups are nonprofit associations with about 500,000 members dedicated to assisting our older citizens to live in usefulness, independence and dignity throughout their later years. Douglas Fir Plywood Association represents more than 85 percent of the western fir plywood industry of Washington, Oregon, and California.

The project undertaken by these organizations represents a healthy quality of initiative and resourcefulness. It should stimulate new construction of housing units that are badly needed.

There has been much agitation for the Government to do something about the problem of housing for the elderly and the depressed housing industry in general.

The plywood industry in the State I represent is in an even more depressed state. Naturally I'm concerned about these conditions as are many others. But I am also heartened by the daring and imagination with which the plywood manufacturers are approaching the problem of broadening their own markets without outside assistance.

The House of Freedom project which they are financing originated at a conference of experts in the field called together by W. E. Difford, executive vice president of Douglas Fir Plywood Association, to explore what the plywood industry could do to stimulate more and better housing for our older citizens.

Here are some of the conclusions of that first conference:

Housing needs for the elderly are as varied as those for the general population, but little has been done about the problem.

About 80 percent of the Nation's citizens over 65 can afford good minimum cost housing. Although about 60 percent of one group of older persons surveyed want to move to better housing, only 10 percent really want to move away from their present communities.

Private builders as a group have not recognized the demand for specialized housing for the elderly, or they have misjudged the opportunity with the result that for many people good housing for their declining years is impossible to obtain.

Private industry and private nonprofit groups can handle the biggest part of the job, but some form of Government assistance is needed, particularly in public housing and institutional housing.

Granted a healthy economic climate, private industry will probably be able to build and sell as many as 250,000 sale and rental units for the elderly annually.

Groups like the plywood industry should take the initiative in showing what can be done in the field to stimulate further action.

In view of the problems involved in housing our older citizens adequately, in view of the steps these organizations have taken to help develop solutions, and in view of the results they have produced already, I again urge upon you that you inspect the House of Freedom project during the period of the White House Conference.

SELECTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS BY PUBLIC LANDS STATES IN EXCHANGE FOR LAND TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES FOR MILITARY AND OTHER USES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill, S. 111, to authorize public lands States to select certain public lands in exchange for land taken by the United States for military and other uses, and for other purposes, and listed a number of sponsors.

The able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] should have been listed as a sponsor. If the bill has not been printed, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be listed as a cosponsor; and if the bill has been printed, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Washington be included as a cosponsor in subsequent printings of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR AND ORDER FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be listed as an additional cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have been informed that S. 109 has not been printed; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 2 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS FROM ELECTORS IN THE SEVERAL STATES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was interested in the discussion about the law requiring the reports from the electors in the several States to be forwarded to the General Services Administration. I wish to make perfectly clear now that if the law does require that, it is wholly unconstitutional. The Constitution of the United States is very specific with respect to this matter.

I wish to read the 12th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I am one of those old-fashioned people, Mr. President, who still believe the Constitution of the United States has some meaning. It has been kicked around in a great many areas, but I was sworn to support the Constitution, and not a lot of these other odd ideas.

> The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the persons voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each—

This is the cogent part, Mr. President—

> which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

That is the provision in the Constitution. It does not say anything about the General Services Administration. If there is any law which undertakes to repeal it, though it probably has been upheld by the Supreme Court [laughter], it is completely in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this ancient and antiquated document, the 12th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The President of the Senate shall, in presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. [And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.] The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President, shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

WE MUST END USELESS CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the time has come to reappraise our entire civil defense program and to stop the senseless waste of this boondoggling bureaucracy.

During the past 10 years, more than $1 billion of taxpayers' money has been thrown down the drain by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and its satellites in communities throughout America. For this huge sum, American taxpayers have received nothing but confused and muddled plans which would be totally ineffective should nuclear war strike.

In view of the failure of high paid officials of civil defense as it has been conducted during recent years, an overhaul is essential to avoid further inexcusable waste and to spare the public the continuing nuisance of meaningless practice alerts and needless alarms.

We must recognize that defense of civilians in the event of war should definitely be the responsibility of the Armed Forces. Defense of civilians is a major factor in the defense of our country. This must not be left to politicians in armbands. It should be recognized as an important duty of those best trained to perform that duty successfully—the Armed Forces of our country.

Mr. President, recent editorials in many great newspapers throughout the country expose the absurdity of our civil defense program and conclude that in the last analysis the best civil defense is a world relationship that seeks to end the armaments race between our Nation and the Soviet Union and Red China, and seeks to eliminate the frictions that might lead to nuclear war.

I embody four representative editorials on this subject as part of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials from the Detroit Free Press, Washington Daily News, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, and New York Post printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Nov. 26, 1960]

AS WE SEE IT—MUCH TO THE POINT ON CIVIL DEFENSE

U.S. Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, expressed the feelings of many Americans when he teed off on the Nation's civil defense program as a huge and wasteful boondoggle.

The Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization, said Senator YOUNG, has become the respository for "hacks and defeated office holders" who have to be given refuge from the political storm.

He went on to criticize OCDM for inept and muddled planning, characterized by its contradictory course "of advocating both evacuation and bombshelters as safeguards against mass slaughter in the event of nuclear war."

He indicted the agency for having squandered more than $1 billion since 1951, exclusive of surplus Government property turned over to civil defense agencies. The program also has placed a heavy burden upon the States and local governments which have been forced to create and maintain supplementary civil defense programs.

"Americans," he declared, "are tired of schemes to provide identification bracelets for teenagers to exchange; or millions of contradictory pamphlets; of highly publicized bombshelter honeymoons; of policemen loafing on civil defense duties, waiting for a bomb to drop, while many of our city streets are unsafe after dark."

Senator YOUNG's language may be strong, but there is a good deal of commonsense behind his faultfinding. There is an equal amount of good sense in his statement that in the event of an emergency, the defense of American civilians should be under the protection of the Armed Forces which, reason tells us, would have to take over from well-meaning but ineffective and untrained civilians.

The best antidote of all, he suggested, would be to concentrate upon creating a world relationship that would eliminate the frictions which might cause a bomb to be dropped.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 26, 1960]

THE BOONDOGGLE SPREADS

Beginning with the bright new year, the taxpayers of the United States will be nicked for an extra couple of million dollars a month to expand the so-called civil-defense organization.

The House twice turned down this scheme, but finally succumbed after repeated Senate approvals and pressure from the CD boys.

Uncle Sam will shell out a million a month, and the States have to put up like sums. All of it comes from the same people, the taxpayers.

The tipoff on the urgency of this plum tree (it will add 1,300 to the public payrolls) can be seen in the proviso Congress attached to the money—no action before January 1, so it wouldn't get mixed up in the presidential campaign. In other words, Congress (Democratic) didn't want the administration (Republican) handing out this patronage before election.

This is supposed to provide us with a truly national civil defense capability. But nobody yet has figured out any workable plan for managing 180 million people in case of an atomic attack. The House should have stood its ground.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Nov. 29, 1960]

A GRAND ILLUSION?

Serious charges have been made by U.S. Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, against the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Describing the Nation's civil defense program as a "billion dollar boondoggle," Senator YOUNG called upon the incoming Kennedy administration to dismantle the OCDM.

In an article published in a Wisconsin magazine, the Progressive, the Ohio Democrat blasted the defense organization for

following "the muddled, contradictory course" of advocating bomb shelters and evacuation as safeguards against mass slaughter in event of nuclear war.

Mr. YOUNG charged that the civil defense program is a grand illusion which has squandered over a billion dollars since 1951 through poor planning, confused thinking and colossal ineptitude.

More than 60 percent of funds appropriated to the agency, Senator YOUNG declared, goes for salaries and expenses, "much of it to the hacks and defeated officeholders for whom the OCDM has become a convenient and comfortable haven in the political storm."

The Senator wrote: "Instead of having money to spend on vital programs such as schools, many communities may receive a screeching siren, a few stretchers, some two-way radio equipment for civil defense officials to play with and an occasional alert to confuse the citizenry whether in event of a nuclear attack they should run or hide—or do both."

The defense of American citizens, he observed, should be under the direction of those who know about the problem, the Armed Forces. No civil defense is adequate and what is needed are: "solid, workable international agreements to disarm," Senator YOUNG maintained.

We would like to see such agreements, too, but until they are reached there must be some organization to handle civil defense, to try and bring order out of the panic which inevitably would result in event of a nuclear attack on this country.

Senator YOUNG's accusations against the OCDM should not be dismissed lightly, however. He has made serious charges which should be investigated by the incoming President and Congress. It wouldn't do any harm, either, for the Pennsylvania Legislature to look into the State civil defense organization and find out what it has accomplished.

[From the New York Post, Nov. 27, 1960]

FOLLIES IN THE SHELTER

The grand illusion of the nuclear age is the fantasy that, in a rain of thermonuclear missiles, a hole in the ground will provide an escape. On the basis of this hallucination, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has been encouraged to play a frenetic game of atomic charades which Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, of Ohio, has now denounced as a "billion-dollar boondoggle."

In recent months there have been increasing sounds in Washington indicating dissatisfaction with the OCDM's exercises in futility. But YOUNG, unlike some of his critical colleagues, is not suggesting that better holes be built faster or that they be federally financed or that warning systems be improved. He faces the basic truth of the problem. "No civil defense program," he says in an article in the current issue of the Progressive, "will adequately protect our citizenry should war strike." What is needed, he says, are "solid, workable international agreements to disarm."

Senator YOUNG's statement of the OCDM's historic irrelevancy will not make him popular with those in high places who limit their criticism to the OCDM's inefficiency and obsolescence. For example, a report by a House military subcommittee in July recognized some of the idiocies of the civil defense program as rudimentary and often irrelevant, but maintained that no effective plan could be achieved without adequate shelter protection. It recommended Federal grants for construction of modern caves.

The ludicrous, contradictory operations of the OCDM—on the one hand the mass evacuation exercises with picnic finales, and on the other a barrage of propaganda on how to stay put in a do-it-yourself shelter—are not only a measure of the confusion with which the OCDM and its woolly-minded bureaucrats look to the future. They also reflect the general failure of world leadership to meet the challenge Senator YOUNG has stated.

A melancholy sign of the times is that so thoughtful a man as Governor Rockefeller has succumbed to the irrational theory that holes are necessary for survival; one immediate effect of his dictum that all new State buildings must have shelters is that it may well delay construction of a much needed hospital in Syracuse and retard the training of medical students. Possibly this is a minor inconvenience, but as a recent report by the Fund for the Republic put it not long ago: "Once the shelter program is under way, it will constitute a significant retreat from the idea of the obsolescence of war."

Senator YOUNG refuses to retreat from this idea. He says so loudly and clearly. We wish more of our lawmakers would come out of their holes and take up the cry.

Admittedly, it is easy to say that OCDM cannot be written off so long as we confront an inscrutable, unpredictable adversary. We do not lightly discount the problem. But neither can we avoid the sense that the quest for holes in the ground too often serve as a substitute for the search for even a limited peace on earth. It is, we insist, a burlesque of the human condition to believe that the OCDM bureaucracy offers us any authentic protection from the great terrors of our time.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM AGREEMENT BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the honor to announce to the Senate today the consummation of a new educational exchange program agreement, which was initialed on December 2, of which we have recently been notified, between our Government and that of Japan, acting through Japanese Foreign Minister Kosaka and American Ambassador Douglas MacArthur, Jr.

Under the new agreement, the U.S. Government will make available 846 million yen, or about $2,350,000, to finance the new U.S. educational exchange program. The U.S. yen funds were derived from the balance of yen deposits for the construction of U.S. military dependents' housing in Japan pursuant to the exchange of votes of February 18, 1960, which makes certain stipulations regarding yen deposits concerning the agricultural commodities agreements between the United States and Japan.

The significance of this agreement, Mr. President, is that it will materially expand the opportunities for Japanese to study in the United States. The new program will make it possible for 750 Japanese university graduates, lecturers, research scholars and teachers to be awarded travel grants in the United States enabling them to undertake study and research in the United States during the next 3 years.

The agreement will also provide opportunities for 150 American graduate students, lecturers, teachers, and research scholars, to visit Japan during the same 3-year period.

The significance, Mr. President, is this: Shortly after the student riots in Japan, Senators may recall, I addressed myself to the Senate, urging that it was a time for calm and clear thinking in our reaction to what was going on in Japan, and urging, as one element of that, to show our good will to the Japanese people we should invite 100 of the non-Communist student leaders involved in the Japanese student riots to come to the United States as soon as possible. Subsequent events have shown the viewpoint of the Japanese people generally to be favorable to freedom.

Subsequently, Mr. President, I have been working upon the matter with the State Department and with a number of distinguished American foundations. I now have every expectation that the fundamental objective which I sought to attain in my proposal at that time may be attained by action of the U.S. Government and through the wise application of its policies, without committing it to the fact that those who study here will necessarily be non-Communist student leaders in these riots, with the understanding that the greater amplitude now to be given to this program is in response to an accepted requirement, in the best interests of our Government and in the best interests of the free world, that we expand the opportunity for study in the United States by Japanese university graduates.

I think the initiative which has now been taken is most fruitful and critically important, and I think it is a matter for real congratulations to the Governments of the United States and Japan that this agreement has now been consummated. I have every confidence that in the implementation of the program a very keen look will be taken toward the objective which I tried to carry through in the middle of last year, and that there will be a real effort to bring into the United States those who can profit the most from seeing our free society and our free institutions in action and those who can do the most to spread understanding of these ideas abroad in Japan when they return.

I close upon this note: It must be emphasized that when Commander Perry sailed into Tokyo Harbor over a century ago, very deep ties were established with the people of Japan. I hope very much that we are in the process of restoring these ties after Japan's tragic aberration in its aggression in World War II, as I think it is becoming generally acknowledged throughout our own country that our current friendship with the Japanese people stands as an important part of the structure in the free world which fortifies us all against the dangers of the loss of our freedom. Also I believe that the majority of the Japanese people now give every evidence of wishing to develop and cultivate their friendship with the United States. Therefore it is necessary for us, in the days ahead, to move in every way possible with understanding and good will, as demonstrated by this agreement.

DR. ROBERT WEAVER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I notice with great interest that some question may be raised by certain of our very distinguished colleagues about the confirmation of the appointment of Dr. Robert Weaver, of New York, as Housing and Home Finance Administrator. This is an extremely important appointment,

and I happen to know Dr. Weaver and to have worked with him in New York. Also as he is a Democratic appointee and both New York Senators are Republicans, I think, therefore, it would be appropriate for a fellow New Yorker to speak about his record.

His record in the field of housing is one of long experience and great accomplishment, and I think we must regard this in all fairness as one of those appointments which, though we on the minority side will look quite properly with the greatest care and the greatest scrupulousness upon each appointment, it must be considered as an appointment which is in real essence a high caliber appointment in this particular field.

Dr. Weaver is vice chairman of the New York City Housing Redevelopment Board. Previously he served as New York State Rent Administrator. Before that he served as deputy commissioner of housing for New York.

As head of the HHFA he would be overseeing and directing the operations of agencies dealing with Federal housing, urban renewal, public housing, community facilities, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. Dr. Weaver is already thoroughly familiar with many of these activities, because there is no State in the Nation with more active Federal housing programs than New York.

It is also pertinent to note that both the Democratic and Republican platforms have pledged us that there will be an elimination of discrimination in housing. So the fact that Dr. Weaver has been active in the NAACP, an organization with which he has been long associated, should not be considered as a disqualification, but rather as an added qualification, for the post to which he has been named.

I speak entirely as a New Yorker, and one who knows Dr. Weaver, and, therefore, as one who has a right to testify as to his character and competence, without regard to the fact that other Senators may raise certain questions, which they have a right to raise, as bearing upon his confirmation. But I think it is only fair that the RECORD should show his experience and his high character as we know it in New York.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be included as a part of my remarks an article on his background appearing in the New York Times headed "A Genial Intellectual—Robert Clifton Weaver."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 31, 1960]

A GENIAL INTELLECTUAL—ROBERT CLIFTON WEAVER

When the New Deal express roared into Washington in 1933, Robert Clifton Weaver, a young Harvard-trained economist, was on it.

He was one of the first of a group of Negroes—later called the Black Cabinet by the Negro press—recruited by the Roosevelt Administration. Most of them, like Dr. Weaver, were described as race relations advisers. Their mission was to seek to resolve the complex racial problems confronting the depression-era Government in such fields as housing, education, and employment.

In those days racial segregation and discrimination were as entrenched in the Nation's Capital as in the rest of the country. And Negroes were largely excluded from or segregated in Federal agencies, services and programs.

THEY WERE TOUGH

But Dr. Weaver and the other race relations specialists operating in various Federal agencies proved to be tough-minded and resourceful foes of the status quo.

Employing patience, persuasion, moral preachment, logic, and the right cussword at the right time, they saw to it that Negroes won a rightful share of the public housing, public assistance, and other benefits being dispensed by the New Deal.

In short, their efforts laid the groundwork for what has become an almost completely integrated Federal Government operating almost completely integrated programs.

Dr. Weaver's own selection for the Nation's top housing post yesterday by President-elect John F. Kennedy illustrates how far Negroes have come since the depression years.

By the time he left Washington in 1944, Dr. Weaver, a genial intellectual, was regarded as the most influential Negro in the Federal Government.

FIRST AIDED ICKES

He began in 1933 as an aid to Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes. He later served as special assistant in such agencies as the Housing Authority, the Housing Division of the Works Progress Administration, the National Defense Advisory Commission, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission.

This broad Federal background in housing, his later service as State rent administrator in the Harriman administration—the first Negro to hold a cabinet-level in the State government—his service as a member of the city's housing and redevelopment board and his writings and research have combined to make him one of the country's outstanding housing experts.

Dr. Weaver, a liberal, has long been associated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights groups. He has been NAACP national chairman for the last year.

Although a civil rights crusader for three decades, he feels that the best way for Negroes to achieve equal opportunity is to "fight hard—and legally—and don't blow your top."

Dr. Weaver is convinced that housing segregation is the basic cause of much segregation in schools and other areas. He has been a strong advocate of a Presidential Executive order banning segregation in all Federal aided housing.

Dr. Weaver, a heavy-set chain smoker who hates exercise, loves reading and tinkering around the house—he once held an electrician's license—will be going home when he returns to Washington. He was born there in 1907, the son of a postal clerk.

His wife, the former Ella Haith, is an assistant professor of speech in Brooklyn College. They live in a spacious apartment at 295 Central Park West. They have an adopted son, Robert, Jr., now 19.

Dr. Weaver, who received his doctorate at Harvard, numbers among his close friends another well-known Washington figure, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, who once taught at Howard University there. Dr. Weaver is the author of two books, "The Negro Ghetto," a study of housing problems published in 1948, and "Negro Labor: A National Problem," a discussion of employment discrimination, published in 1946.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled, "On the Art and Wisdom of Slamming Doors," by the very able journalist, James Reston, concerning the Cuban situation, appearing in this morning's issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE ART AND WISDOM OF SLAMMING DOORS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 5—President Eisenhower at least left Cuba with a bang. He finally told off his tormentors and slammed the door on his way out. It was a grand exit which made the pictures dance on the wall and rattled old Fidel's back teeth, and his country obviously loved it.

In fact, the reaction in the United States to the break in diplomatic relations was almost as dramatic as Ike's last hurrah. Most papers decided that the President had no other alternative. Some called it "inevitable" and the News in New York concluded that "All Americans except the local Reds and their dupes will applaud this decisive action."

Well, maybe so, but Americans have been arguing about Cuba and diplomatic relations ever since the State Department was founded, and if everybody is now suddenly going to agree on these questions, it will be the first time in our history.

For over a hundred years, this country assumed that it should maintain diplomatic relations with foreign governments regardless of how they came to power or how they conducted their affairs or what they said about the United States.

For example, Thomas Jefferson, the first Secretary of State, thought the only test for maintaining diplomatic relations was whether the government concerned was running the store. He put it a little more elegantly: "The will of the nation [Cuba] is the only thing essential to be regarded."

Incidentally, he had a simple solution for the Cuban question. He thought maybe we should annex it, and John Quincy Adams, his successor at the State Department, was afraid Cuba would fall under the influence of a hostile foreign power, and also flirted with annexation.

It was only when Woodrow Wilson arrived on the scene with his moral approach to foreign policy that the United States began granting or withholding or withdrawing recognition in accordance with whether we approved of the way the government concerned came to power or spoke and acted.

Thus, it can be argued that Eisenhower's action was right or wrong, wise or unwise, but it cannot be argued on the basis of American history that it was inevitable.

The argument for the break was that Castro had gone well beyond the bounds of proper diplomatic procedure and that, if we had tolerated his insults and permitted him to reduce our mission in Havana to 11, we would not only have had an ineffective mission but would have debased the whole procedure of decent diplomatic intercourse and weakened ourselves in the eyes of other countries.

Another argument for the break was that it encouraged other American Republics to do the same and thus promotes the isolation of Castro in this hemisphere.

There were, however, arguments on the other side. The break makes it more difficult to get out of Cuba the anti-Castro Cubans who may one day organize his defeat. It removes the embassy as a source of accurate information and a rallying point for Castro's opponents. It limits Kennedy's freedom of action 16 days hence when he has to deal with the Cuban problem. And, of course, it encourages the popular view in this country that an American Embassy is sort of a badge of our approval of the government concerned or a reward for good conduct.

In the modern world, however, this is not what an embassy is. We maintain embassies in other countries not because we approve of

what goes on in those countries but because we live on the same planet with them and either have to remain in contact with them or at least watch what they are up to. This is why we remain in Moscow and many other places run by governments we do not approve.

Among other reasons, we have ambassadors abroad for the same reason that we have soldiers on constant patrol along the Iron Curtain: We want to know what's going on; and the more hostile the enemy is, the more we patrol night and day.

The real test in the Cuban case is not whether slamming the door makes Ike feel better, but whether it promotes the interests of the United States. Maybe it will, but obviously Castro did not think so. He provoked and presumably wanted the break, but it is Kennedy and not Eisenhower who must now deal with the consequences.

Mr. MORSE. In this column Mr. Reston sets forth the arguments which are advanced for the breaking of diplomatic relations with Cuba and those advanced against the breaking of diplomatic relations with Cuba.

After listening to the briefing of representatives of the State Department on this matter in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, I stand on every word of my observations in the speech I made day before yesterday on the subject matter. I particularly buttress it with the final paragraph in the Reston article in which he said:

The real test in the Cuban case is not whether slamming the door makes Ike feel better, but whether it promotes the interests of the United States. Maybe it will, but obviously Castro did not think so. He provoked and presumably wanted the break, but it is Kennedy and not Eisenhower who must now deal with the consequences.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until the conclusion of the activities centering on the joint session in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Members of the Senate will go to the Hall of the House of Representatives and act as the Senate itself, and that the Senate does not normally stand in recess during the counting of the ballots.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to its Chamber at the conclusion of the ceremonies in the Hall of the House of Representatives for the conduct of Senate business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

(See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today for the proceedings in the House of Representatives in connection with the counting of the electoral votes.)

(At 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m., the Senate returned to its Chamber.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was under the impression that certain Senators wished to introduce bills and submit resolutions, even though the morning hour has passed.

RESULTS OF COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and myself, as tellers on the part of the Senate, and Representatives KELLY and BOLTON, as tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, I report the results of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning January 20, 1961, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The undersigned, CARL HAYDEN and CARL T. CURTIS, tellers on the part of the Senate, EDNA F. KELLY and FRANCES P. BOLTON, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 1961.

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President			
		John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia	Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas	Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts	Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina	Barry Goldwater, of Arizona
Alabama	11	5		6	5		6	
Alaska	3		3			3		
Arizona	4		4			4		
Arkansas	8	8			8			
California	32		32			32		
Colorado	6		6			6		
Connecticut	8	8			8			
Delaware	3	3			3			
Florida	10		10			10		
Georgia	12	12			12			
Hawaii	3	3			3			
Idaho	4		4			4		
Illinois	27	27			27			
Indiana	13		13			13		
Iowa	10		10			10		
Kansas	8		8			8		
Kentucky	10		10			10		
Louisiana	10	10			10			
Maine	5		5			5		
Maryland	9	9			9			
Massachusetts	16	16			16			
Michigan	20	20			20			
Minnesota	11	11			11			
Mississippi	8			8			8	
Missouri	13	13			13			
Montana	4		4			4		
Nebraska	6		6			6		
Nevada	3	3			3			
New Hampshire	4		4			4		
New Jersey	16	16			16			
New Mexico	4	4			4			
New York	45	45			45			
North Carolina	14	14			14			
North Dakota	4		4			4		
Ohio	25		25			25		
Oklahoma	8		7	1		7		1
Oregon	6		6			6		
Pennsylvania	32	32			32			
Rhode Island	4	4			4			
South Carolina	8	8			8			
South Dakota	4		4			4		
Tennessee	11		11			11		
Texas	24	24			24			
Utah	4		4			4		
Vermont	3		3			3		
Virginia	12		12			12		
Washington	9		9			9		
West Virginia	8	8			8			
Wisconsin	12		12			12		
Wyoming	3		3			3		
Total	537	303	219	15	303	219	14	1

CARL HAYDEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
EDNA F. KELLY,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United is 537, of which a majority is 269.

John F. Kennedy, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for President of the United States 303 votes;

RICHARD M. NIXON, of the State of California, has received 219 votes;

HARRY F. BYRD, of the State of Virginia, has received 15 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 537, of which a majority is 269.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of the State of Texas, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes;

Henry Cabot Lodge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received 219 votes;

STROM THURMOND, of the State of South Carolina, has received 14 votes.

BARRY GOLDWATER, of the State of Arizona, has received 1 vote.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1961, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the business before the Senate is the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment to Senate Resolution 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Resolution 4 is now before the Senate, and the question is on agreeing to the so-called Humphrey-Kuchel amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am ready to speak briefly on the pending business; but I certainly wish to yield to any Senator who has other matters to submit, such as the introduction of bills or requests that certain matters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or anything of that sort, if any there be.

However, apparently no Senator wishes to bring such matters before the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, the pending measure is an attempt to amend rule XXII of the Senate rules, which has existed, in one form or another, as to its sections that relate to cloture of debate, since the days just prior to the First World War.

I think perhaps it might be interesting to review the rules of the Senate, as they apply to debate, as to the time that may be consumed by Senators and as to the privileges of Senators during debate. I think it may be worth while to review that subject quite briefly at this time, in order to show, among other things, that the rule XXII cloture provision which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and constituting a quorum, before a measure may be brought to immediate consideration, and with further debate, except in a limited way, dispensed with—is not out of accord with the rules and the practice of the Senate, but is, instead, in strict accord with the rules, practice, and traditions of the Senate for a long, long period of time.

Mr. President, the rule of the Senate which has to do with debate is rule XIX. There are several paragraphs, Nos. 1 to 7, in that rule, but I shall read only paragraph 1, which states the general rule of appearance of Senators upon the floor to participate in debate. Paragraph 1 of rule XIX reads as follows:

When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer, and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Mr. President, I think it is reasonably clear, from a consideration of paragraph 1 of rule XIX, that the rules of debate in the Senate are clearly laid down therein, and that it is very clear that a Senator, having received the recognition of the Presiding Officer, may proceed without being interrupted, without his consent, and can speak at least twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate. On the matter of what constitutes a day, I should say that numerous rulings have held, and the Senate practice as prescribed by other rules is to the effect, that a legislative day does not mean the same thing as a calendar day, and that when the Senate recesses from day to day, the legislative day continues until there has been an adjournment.

Under rule XIX of the Senate, therefore, which has existed for a long, long time, a Senator, when recognized, may debate, without his infracting the rules of ordinary decency and procedure and courtesy—and those matters are discussed in later paragraphs of rule XIX—as long as he wishes to do so. Likewise, he may discuss the same subject matter twice in any legislative day so long as the same measure is pending.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader whether or not any action is contemplated this afternoon, or whether the Senate can be informed that there will be nothing except speeches and that after any Senator who wants to occupy the Senate floor has had an opportunity to do so, the Senate will adjourn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, I wish to state that, insofar as I know, after having asked some questions around the Chamber, there will be no business of any real consequence as it relates to voting this afternoon. I would hope, however, that Senators who have speeches to make, and are ready to get them off their chests, will do so.

On that basis, it is believed we shall be able to adjourn at a reasonable hour tonight until 12 o'clock noon Monday. I will even go so far as to give the assurance to Members of the Senate that there will be no voting this afternoon, insofar as the majority and minority leaders can control it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader, and I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was very glad to yield.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have already stated that rule XIX, in its first paragraph, prescribes the general rule for debate, which covers the appearance of Senators upon the floor of the Senate, covers their recognition, allows them to speak without interruption unless they grant leave to be interrupted and to speak for as many as two times on a subject on a legislative day; and a legislative day has repeatedly been held to run beyond a calendar day and up until the time of an adjournment of the Senate.

The other rules that have to do with debate, Mr. President, are in the nature of rules to suspend or to limit or to affect in some special way the general rule of debate stated as rule XIX, which I have already read into the RECORD.

Mr. President, rule XXII in its cloture provision includes the two-thirds vote requirement, and that two-thirds vote is required before the general rule of the Senate which I have already read can be so changed and affected as to cut off debate, after a small period of time following the adoption of the cloture measure, by two-thirds of the Senate or more.

Instead of being an unusual provision, that two-thirds provision is in strict accord with other provisions in the Senate rules and in the Senate practice; and it is on that subject that I wish to dwell briefly here this afternoon.

First, rule X, Mr. President, which is the rule for making a special order of business out of a matter coming before the Senate, is found on page 11 of the Senate Manual, and I quote only partially from it and only a part of paragraph 1, which reads as follows:

Any subject may, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, be made a special order; and when the time so fixed for its

consideration arrives the Presiding Officer shall lay it before the Senate,

And so forth. That is a suspension or change in the normal manner of the procedure of the Senate in taking up matters which are before it or can be brought before it.

The point I make in referring to that rule is to invite attention to the fact that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is provided as the test before any special order can be made, before the rules may be so changed in their application to the calendar of the Senate or to matters which may be brought before the Senate as to address the attention of the Senate to that particular measure so picked up and made a special order. Provision for a two-thirds vote is a part of the Senate rules and has been for a long, long time. It is found in rule X, and is but one of the several provisions to which I shall refer.

I have heard of no one objecting in any way to the fact that a two-thirds vote is required for a matter which may be even as incidental as that; namely, to pick up some item of present interest and ask that it be set down for special consideration and made a special order at a particular time.

Mr. President, rule XVI deals with legislation on appropriation bills and prescribes generally the conditions under which appropriation bills shall be considered and passed during the debates of the Senate. There is, of course, the provision which bans the bringing up of new legislation as a part of an appropriation bill, except subject to very special rules which are engrafted upon the rules of the Senate by the provisions of rule XVI, which I shall not read into the RECORD, because they are mere details. In order to have general legislation, new legislation, engrafted upon an appropriation bill, Mr. President, it is necessary that either those special conditions, which are rather drastic, be met, or that the matter be held to be subject to a point of order, so that it may be knocked out by a ruling of the Chair or upon a point of order made by any Senator.

Mr. President, this provision of rule XVI is, of course, subject to rule XL of the Senate, which is the provision for suspending the rules, because when a rule is proposed to be suspended in order to allow the bringing of general legislative matters into an appropriation bill one must turn to rule XL for the provisions of the body of rules as to suspension. That rule, which is entitled "Suspension and Amendment of the Rules," provides:

> No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII.

Mr. President, it is no news to the Senate, of course, that a rule may be suspended by unanimous consent, but the provision to which I wish to address myself in rule XL is the first sentence, which says:

> No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof.

That provision has been proceeded under many times on the floor of the Senate. The question came up long ago as to what number of votes or what percentage of votes should be required when the rule has been otherwise observed, by the filing of a written notice of 1 day, when the time comes for the calling up of the motion to suspend the rule. The Senate has on so many occasions ruled that a two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rule that I do not wish to detain the Senate unduly by bringing into the RECORD all of the cases in which that decision has been announced or followed. As a matter of fact, there have been 20 such cases since the year 1915. For reference of other Senators, I invite attention to the fact that they will find these cases as note 19 on the bottom of page 568 of the excellent book on Senate Procedure which has been compiled by the distinguished Parliamentarian of the Senate and his distinguished associate.

Mr. President, the general statement made by the two Parliamentarians of the Senate, who collaborated in the drafting of this book, is under the head "Vote Required," meaning the vote required to suspend the rules, and is found at the top of page 568. It says this:

> The Standing Rules of the Senate may be amended by a majority vote, but a two-thirds vote of the Senators present, a quorum being present, is required for their suspension, including suspensions for the purpose of proposing legislative amendments to general appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I think that is so clear a statement of the state of the rules, as well as of the state of the practice of the Senate, that it does not need to be repeated. I wish to have the record show, if I may, first, that under the note stated by the editors of the book to which I have referred it is shown that since the year 1915 there have been 20 incidents of the affirmation of the following of that rule requiring a two-thirds vote for suspension of the rules of the Senate.

I think it might be profitable at this time to read into the record two series of excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; one from the year 1915, when the Senate affirmed a rule that a two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rules, and the other a quotation in part from the RECORD of June 26, 1916, and the days following, which shows the same general course followed.

Mr. President, first, as a predicate for the reading from the RECORD of 1915, I wish to state that the Senate under rule XL has the power to suspend a rule pursuant to a notice without the reference of such notice to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Secondly, where such a notice was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the report of the committee, upon objection, must lie over 1 day under the rule. Lastly, suspension of the rules requires a two-thirds vote.

These are the historic recitals of the consideration of the matter, in which the Senate itself by a rollcall vote affirmed the requirement of a two-thirds vote before a rule could be suspended, affirming that the rule was a part of the Senate procedure.

On January 11, 1915—63d Congress, 3d session, RECORD page 1357, Senate Journal, page 52—during the consideration of H.R. 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1916, Mr. Morris Sheppard, of Texas, submitted a notice in writing, which was read, that he would move to suspend paragraph 3 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate for the purpose of proposing to the bill a certain amendment set out in his notice.

On January 12—RECORD, page 1382; Journal, page 53—Mr. Sheppard made such motion pursuant to his notice, and, in reply to an inquiry by Mr. Reed Smoot, of Utah, if he expected to refer the proposed motion to the Committee on Rules, stated that such reference was not required by the rules.

Mr. Hoke Smith, of Georgia, made the point of order that the rules could not be modified in that way; that the proposed modification ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules for a report from that committee.

Mr. Sheppard cited a precedent of March 2, 1861.

The Vice President, Mr. Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana, overruling the point of order, said:

> The Chair is ready to rule. Under rule XL the Chair is of the opinion that the Senate has the unqualified power in accordance with this notice to suspend the rule if it chooses to do so. If it does not choose to do so, the proper procedure is to move to refer the notice to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Smith then moved that the notice be referred to the Committee on Rules, which was agreed to—yeas, 37; nays, 34.

Later, on the same day—RECORD, page 1395—Mr. Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Rules, reported the motion favorably and recommended that for the purpose named and the consideration of the amendment proposed by Mr. Sheppard and all amendments thereto, paragraph 3 of rule XVI be suspended.

Mr. Sheppard having moved the adoption of the report, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, asked that the report lie over for a day. The Vice President ruled that a motion to proceed to the consideration of the report was in order, whereupon Mr. Smith made such a motion.

Mr. Lodge then made the point of order that the report should lie over 1 day, citing section 2 of rule XXVI, as follows:

> All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless the Senate by unanimous consent shall otherwise direct.

Mr. Smith withdrew his motion. Mr. James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi, contended the motion was in order at that time. He said:

It seems to me the Senator from Texas has a right to insist upon the consideration of the motion at this time. It is offered as an amendment, and he has given notice that he will offer it. He has complied with the rules of the Senate. The Committee on Rules has reported, and reported favorably. I insist that it is the Senator's right to have the matter considered now, and that too, without regard to the report of the committee. Rule XL is very clear, and to my mind there is no room for doubt or question as to the course which the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas should take.

The Vice President, holding the report must go over, said:

There can be no doubt that under the second clause of rule XXVI, which had escaped the memory of the Chair, the report of a committee, upon objection cannot be considered today. It must go over until tomorrow.

On January 13, 1915—RECORD, pages 1503–1513—when the unfinished business, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, was laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock, Mr. Sheppard moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of presenting his proposed amendment to the appropriation bill; whereupon the Vice President made the following ruling:

The Chair on yesterday, not having remembered section 2 of rule XXVI, which provides that—"all reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct * * *."

Inadvertently, in the first instance, held that the report went to the calendar upon objection. The Chair was led into that error by clause 4 of rule XIV, which applies simply to bills and joint resolutions and does not apply to a report of the Committee on Rules. The Chair, therefore, is of the opinion that the report of yesterday came over to be handed down today during the morning hour, but the morning hour was consumed in the consideration of a previous resolution coming over from a preceding day. Meantime the unfinished business was laid before the Senate; but the Chair has now no doubt that, in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the Senator from Texas has a perfect right to move to proceed to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules.

The question before the Senate is therefore, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules?

In reply to a parliamentary inquiry by Mr. Ollie M. James, of Kentucky, as to whether the motion was in order after 2 o'clock the Vice President said:

The Chair holds that at any time the Senate has a perfect right, upon motion, to take up any matter that is upon the calendar. * * * In accordance with rule IX it (the motion) must be decided without debate.

After a quorum call, the Vice President withdrew the statement just made that the motion was not debatable, stating that upon an examination of rule IX he found the rule referred to motions made prior to 2 o'clock, and not after 2 o'clock.

Mr. William J. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that the rules of the Senate could be suspended by unanimous consent, but that it had not been the practice of the Senate to suspend the operation of its rules on motion.

Mr. Sheppard, in supporting his motion, said:

There is nothing revolutionary about this proceeding. I have followed strictly one of the rules of this body, rule XL, which provides that "no motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof."

Mr. President, this is not the first time rule XL has been invoked. On March 2, 1861, when the Democrats were in control of the Senate, the same question was raised. The right of the Senate was sustained to suspend the rules by a majority vote.

One of the Senators in opposing the motion to suspend the rules used almost the exact language that has been employed by the Senator from Missouri here today. Mr. Hale said, after the motion had been read:

"I do not wish to interpose any objection, but I want to maintain the rights of the minority of the Senate. It is the first time, I think, I ever knew a motion made here to suspend the rules."

The Senator from Missouri says he thinks this motion of mine is the first attempt; evidently it is not. Mr. Hale continued:

"I do not know of any provision by which we may suspend the rules. Ordinarily, when we undertake to do anything contrary to the rules of the Senate, it is done by unanimous consent. We have by resolution suspended the joint rules, but the rules of the Senate are imperative; and there is no provision in our rules, as there is in the Rules of the House of Representatives, by which they may be suspended."

After a long debate it was decided by a majority of the Senate that the rules might be suspended in this way. The very rules the Senator from Missouri eulogized so enthusiastically have been followed in this case and strictly followed. The motion was presented in writing, laid over a day, and then by a vote of the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Rules, one of the greatest committees of the Senate, a committee that numbers in its membership some of the most prominent and gifted Members of this body. That committee, by a majority vote, has reported to the Senate that the motion should be adopted, and I have no fear, therefore, Mr. President, of the result.

Mr. Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska, while agreeing to the proposition that the motion to suspend the rules was in order, made the point of order that the suspension of the rules should be in accordance with parliamentary precedent by a two-thirds vote and only by a two-thirds vote, as followed by the House of Representatives.

The Vice President held that the point of order was prematurely made, that after the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report had been determined and the report was before the Senate, he would make some observations on the point of order.

Mr. Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, supported the proposition that Mr. Sheppard had a right to make the motion under the rules of the Senate; that it was the duty of the Senate to consider the motion under the rules; and that if the Senate refused to take up the report, Mr. Sheppard was denied an absolute right which he had under its rules, namely, the right of moving to suspend a particular rule upon giving a specified notice.

Mr. Sheppard's motion was agreed to by a vote of 49 yeas, 23 nays, and he thereupon moved the adoption of the report.

At that stage I interpolate that as the result of the vote, the report was taken up, and the Senate then was to consider the matter covered by the report and the motion upon which that report was based.

The Vice President then submitted Mr. Hitchcock's point of order to the Senate for decision. I believe the point the Senate must recognize in looking at this precedent and the others that follow is that in 1915, when it reached the point which we have reached now in referring to that historic debate, the Senate realized that rule XL, while it permitted a suspension of the rules, did not by its own terms provide by what vote the rule was to be suspended, and that it was necessary to have some determination by the Senate itself as to what vote was required.

Here is the statement made by the learned then Vice President, Mr. Thomas R. Marshall, who said:

The Senator from Texas moves the adoption of the report of the Committee on Rules. The Senator from Nebraska raises the point of order that a two-thirds majority shall be held necessary to suspend the rules.

The Constitution of the United States provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." The Senate has assumed the right to be a self-governing body, and under this clause of the Constitution has made its own rules, and has so sedulously guarded its prerogatives that it has even reserved the right to appeal from the decision of the Presiding Officer; it pays no attention to anything that the presiding officer says or to any opinion he has if it does not happen to coincide with the view of the Senate.

The present Presiding Officer believes that the Senate has reserved to itself the exclusive right to say what the rules are, how they may be adopted, and how they may be abrogated or temporarily laid aside. The present Presiding Officer does not believe that it is within the province of the present occupant of the chair to determine whether rule XL should be strictly construed in accordance with the literal language thereof or whether the Senate of the United States proposes to construe the same in accordance with well-known parliamentary procedure. The Chair therefore submits to the Senate the determination of the question as to whether or not it requires a two-thirds majority to adopt the report of the Committee on Rules providing for a suspension of a certain rule.

Thus, the precise point was clearly transferred to the lap of the Senate by the then Presiding Officer, who had called attention to the fact that Rule XL allowed a suspension of the rules, but did not prescribe the standard under which the suspension should be accomplished.

Mr. Sheppard, in opposing the point of order, made a statement which I shall not quote in full at this point, but I ask

unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that if the Senate should decide that it requires a two-thirds vote to put rule XL in operation, it would write something into the rule that is not there. It would write language into the rule that does not belong there. Wherever our rules require a two-thirds vote, they specify that fact. For instance, rule X provides:

"Any subject may, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, be made a special order."

Treaties to be ratified require a two-thirds vote, and it is so specified in the rule relating to them. There is no requirement mentioned in this rule for a two-thirds vote or a three-fourths vote or a unanimous vote. The logical inference, therefore, is that the rule may be put into operation by a majority vote. The rule reads, in part, as follows:

"No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof."

When a similar question was before the Senate in 1861 a majority of the Senate suspended the rules. It seems clear to me that the intention of this rule is to give a majority of the Senate an opportunity to assert itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the gist of Senator Sheppard's statement was that in 1861 it had been held that a majority could waive the rule. That was really the point he made.

Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, supporting the point of order, said:

The rule which it is proposed to suspend contains no provision as to the majority requisite for its suspension. On the face of it it might be inferred that that meant that it could be done by a vote of a bare majority. * * * So far as my knowledge extends, in all parliamentary bodies of which I know anything, a vote larger than a majority is required to suspend the rules. In my own State, in the legislature, it requires a two-thirds vote. In the House of Representatives two-thirds is established by their rules as necessary to suspend the rules. * * * The ground on which that general practice rests is the sound ground that if the rules are to be suspended by a majority vote there are no rules. The suspension of the rules must have a greater sanction than an ordinary matter.

Mr. Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia, opposing Mr. Hitchcock's point of order, said:

The general parliamentary law is that a majority has a right to change and fix its rules, except so far as that majority might have bound itself by specific rule designed to take care of the minority. I cannot find anywhere that, in the absence of a specific rule or statute, there is anything to control the majority of any legislative body. In the House of Representatives a two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rules * * * by a specific rule of the House itself, which requires a two-thirds majority to suspend its rules and pass a bill. There would be no necessity for a specific rule requiring a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules unless under general parliamentary law the rules could be suspended by a majority vote.

Mr. President, I do not believe it would have been possible to present more specifically the question as to what is the rule of procedure in the Senate whenever it is proposed to suspend the rules. The rules are written, of course, for the government of the Senate and its Members. As the then great Senator Lodge so ably stated, the rules are no rules if a majority can change them at any time by its mere fiat. The Senate was presented with that specific point, and it was thrown into the lap of the Senate by the then Presiding Officer, Vice President Marshall, who specifically ruled that a two-thirds vote was required.

Mr. Thomas W. Hardwick, of Georgia, favoring the point of order, quoted a provision from the Manual of General Parliamentary Law, by Speaker Thomas B. Reed, of the House of Representatives, referring to parliamentary law generally, and not specifically to the House of Representatives, as follows:

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Unless the rules themselves provide for their own suspension, they can be suspended by unanimous consent only. It is usual to provide that under certain circumstances and at certain times two-thirds may suspend the rules.

As further supporting his contention, Mr. Hardwick read a provision from Robert's Rules of Order, which, after citing the necessity at times for a temporary suspension of the rules, stated that if such a motion was carried by a two-thirds vote, then the particular thing for which the rules were suspended could be done.

During the course of his argument, he said:

The contention I present is that while rule XL provides for a suspension of the rules when notice in writing has been given, yet the rule itself is silent as to how much vote is required in order for the motion to suspend to prevail; and in the absence of a specific provision in the rules themselves, following the general and almost universal American practice, two-thirds is required.

Mr. Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, opposing the point of order, after citing several instances where amendments to the rules had been made by majority votes, took the position that, as between an amendment and a suspension of the rules, there was no material difference in principle, and that the effect of a suspension in an individual instance was merely a temporary amendment of a permanent rule, instantly reestablishing the rule thereafter; and that an amendment and a suspension were exactly upon the same basis under rule XL.

The point of order of Mr. Hitchcock was sustained by the Senate by a vote of 41 yeas to 34 nays.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota believes that the able Senator from Florida is making a very interesting and worthwhile statement of the principles involved in the pending question. Does the Senator feel that if the rules could be changed at any time without notice and upon a majority vote it would convert so-called Senate rules into a mere statement of procedure, which could be changed at convenience?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do. They could be changed by a bare majority—with tyranny which has never been exercised in this body—changing the rules to suit their purpose. I am not willing to stand here in the Senate and see any such stultification of the procedures of the Senate and these rules, which so clearly provide, sometimes by wording in the rules themselves—as in the case of rule X—or, as in the case which I have just discussed, in the interpretation of rule XL by vote of the Senate that a two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Florida agree with me that such a method of changing the rules would inevitably lead to the sacrifice of many minority rights?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would indeed; and the minority affected might be such a minority that it would practically be half of the Senate. It might even be 49 Members of the Senate, which is more than half of the number of Senators who are customarily present.

The Senator from Florida does not want to see the Senate take such an abysmal departure from the rules of orderly procedure, which it has established throughout its long and illustrious history, sometimes by wording incorporated in the rules themselves, and sometimes by the submission of a question after strenuous debate to the Senate for determination by a vote of the Senate itself.

The Senator from Florida could not think of anything more destructive of the stability of the Senate, or of respect for the verdicts of the Senate, as reported by its record upon yea-and-nay votes, nothing could disturb that record, the stability of the Senate, or the confidence in which its proceedings are regarded, so greatly as a changing of the rules or a winking at the rules or an abandoning of the rules, such as is suggested by some of our friends during the current discussion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Florida recall the basic reason for the colonies proposing, in the original instance, that the Bill of Rights should be added as amendments to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. One of the reasons was the protection of minorities; another was the protection of the States; another was the protection of individuals. There were various reasons.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it were possible to amend the Constitution by a majority vote of Congress, would not that tend to the erosion and the destruction of the rights of minorities?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly would. Of course, the framers of our Constitution, with excellent judgment, averted any such possibility as that, unless we are going to start to ignore constitutional provisions as well as the long established rules and traditions of the Senate

and House. But the Founding Fathers averted any such careless procedure by words actually written into the Constitution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The purpose of my interrogation is that I desire to stress to the people generally, and have it realized, that rules and constitutions are primarily for the protection of minorities; that majorities, if we had simple-majority rules, could abrogate the rules and make them over from day to day. However, rules and constitutions are safeguards of something more than a majority vote. They are primarily designed to protect the rights of individuals or the rights of minorities.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota is, of course, completely correct. I appreciate his comments. We want to protect, by continually following the rules and traditions of the Senate, the rights of minorities, whether we happen to be, for the moment, within the minority or not. The protection of minorities, of States, and of individuals continues to be the primary objective, I think, of our Government as a whole.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota are making their statements for the RECORD. I do not know of any more fallacious contention that could be made than that which is inherent in the advisory opinon of the Vice President, and supported by some of our friends who would like to attach to themselves the label of liberals, that there is anything inherently wrong or immoral in placing limitations on the unbridled power of a temporary majority. Our Constitution was written to serve as a brake on the unbridled power of a temporary majority.

The U.S. Senate, as a rare and unique institution of government, is largely designed to cause a slowdown in hasty action by a temporary majority which might do harm to our country or to any group of our people, or, indeed, to any individual American citizen.

At least four instances occur to me out of hand—perhaps there are more—in which the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution of the United States specific provisions which denied the right of a majority—indeed, of 60 percent or 62 percent—of the Members of Congress to take any hasty action.

A two-thirds vote of both Houses is required to submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution. Then the Constitution requires the approval of three-fourths of the States before such an amendment can become a part of the Constitution.

The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of this body, by the express terms of the Constitution, to give the advice and consent of the Senate to the making of treaties with foreign states.

The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote, in our fine system of checks and balances, to override the disapproval of a bill by the Chief Executive of the United States—what we commonly refer to as the overriding of a veto by the President.

The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of this body, sitting as judges under the Constitution, to impeach any public official.

The Constitution likewise provides that there shall be a two-thirds vote before a Member of the Senate can be expelled.

The Founding Fathers knew that, down through the years, there would be a great many young men in a hurry who would want to get things done and change the whole scheme of things overnight. The Founding Fathers knew that there would be times when there would be a majority of such men in the House and Senate of the United States. They knew that at times those persons would be absolutely ruthless and contemptuous of the rights of minorities, based on sectional hatreds or religious bias, or other differences between the members of the human family.

So the entire setup, the whole fabric of our Government, which has enabled us to create the American way of life, the greatest civilization the world has ever known, the most bountiful life mankind has ever lived, has grown out of the restraints on the power of a temporary majority. Yet we are told that the Vice President would declare unconstitutional anything which would stay the hand of a temporary majority in the Senate to recast the rules of this body so as to change the historic and traditional place of the Senate in our form of government, and to prevent it from maintaining its position as a unique parliamentary body in world history.

Mr. President, I am always suspicious of persons who try to take shortcuts. I am always suspicious when they want to take the quick and easy way without regard to the rights of others. I am always more suspicious when any group seeks to gag its opponents and prevent them from discussing, debating, objecting, and giving the reasons for their objections to any proposed cause or form of action anywhere along the line.

If the Senator from Florida will indulge me further, it was never intended that we should have a pure democracy, where the majority of one on today could change the whole scheme of things which had existed up until that good hour. Ours is a republican form of government. There are brakes on hasty action by the majority. If it were not for those brakes, this would not be the United States of America it is today, and this country would not be a great leader among the nations of the world. We would not have the greatest civilization and the highest standard of living that mankind has ever seen.

No one knew that better than old Ben Franklin, when he came out of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Some of his friends met him and asked, "Mr. Franklin, what kind of government have you given us in the new document you have been laboring over?"

He said, "A republic—if you can keep it."

That has been the challenge which has resounded through the ages: "A republic—if you can keep it."

I insist that we who are today resisting the efforts to take short cuts, resisting the efforts by one man presiding over the Senate to assume power which is not his under the Constitution of the United States, which he is sworn to uphold and defend, believe firmly that we are trying to keep and trying to save this Republic.

I am so happy that the distinguished Senator from Florida has gone back into the precedents coming down through the Senate from years back, pointing out how there are so many brakes on immediate action by a majority, and how wisdom and justice have dictated that in instance after instance more than the immediate vote of a temporary majority be required if drastic action is to be taken. The Senator from Florida is rendering a great service here in pointing out all these instances in which, in our parliamentary system, we deny and completely refute the contention—whether made by the Vice President or by anyone else—that there is anything inherently wrong in a limitation on the power of a majority, whether it be in the Congress or elsewhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the fine comment made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I approve every word he has uttered.

I have before me a brief memorandum of the instances referred to by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia, in which, because of the fact that the framers of the Constitution knew that there were certain matters which needed to be particularly safeguarded, that document provided for a two-thirds vote of one or both Houses of Congress. I shall read the memorandum into the RECORD, in the order in which those instances appear:

Impeachment requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate, when sitting as a court of impeachment.

Expulsion requires a two-thirds vote of either House, when acting on the expulsion of one of its Members.

The passage of a bill over the disapproval or veto of the President requires the two-thirds vote of each House, separately. That applies to bills that have been passed.

A separate provision applies to all other orders or concurrent resolutions or matters, other than bills, which may be passed by both bodies; and it provides that, except in the case of joint resolutions providing for adjournment, a two-thirds vote, again, of each House, separately, is required, in order to override the disapproval of the President.

In the approval of treaties by this body, the Senate, a two-thirds vote is required in order to concur in the act of the Executive.

And in the matter of proposing amendments to the Constitution, of course, a two-thirds vote of each House, separately, is required before the amendment may be submitted to the States; and the amendment becomes a part of the Con-

stitution only after three-fourths of the States approve the proposed amendment.

The Founding Fathers, in giving to each body of the Congress the right to make its own rules, certainly did not assume for a moment that the Senate and House of Representatives, in their experience and wisdom and desire to have proper rules of procedure, would not determine that certain matters—just as had been determined by the Founding Fathers as to these important national matters—arising under our procedure would not require safeguarding by more than a mere majority vote of the Members present. And, of course, as Senators well know, we have had in our rules provisions—and I am just now in the course of outlining some of them—providing for a two-thirds vote; and some of them have been written right here on the floor of the Senate, after consideration of the inadequacies of rules written into the body of our rules, but not stating specifically that more than a majority vote was required in certain instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On January 12, 1959, I placed in the RECORD a list of eight instances in which two-thirds votes were required. I believe that six of them have been cited by the Senator from Florida. There were two others. In connection with all eight, I prepared a brief statement and references. Will the Senator from Florida be willing to have me ask unanimous consent that that matter be printed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly. I am glad to have the Senator from South Dakota do so; I gladly accede to his suggestion, because I wish the list to be all-inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON MAJORITIES

1. No impeachment without two-thirds of the Members present. Article I, section 3, reads (clause 6):

"The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present."

2. Expulsion of a Member requires two-thirds majority. Article I, section 5, clause 2, reads:

"Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member."

3. Overriding veto: Article I, section 7, clause 2, reads:

"If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be considered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law."

A similar provision is found in the succeeding clause, which reads:

"Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill."

4. Amendments to the Constitution itself rest upon a proposal by "two-thirds of both Houses." Article V reads:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided That no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

That last phrase might be noted in passing—namely, that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Any proposal to limit debate involves depriving some States of their voice, albeit not their suffrage. Respecting the thought guards the suffrage of the States in the Senate, and certainly suggests restraint in depriving a State of the presentation of its views in the Senate. This is an aspect of the matter which those who would limit debate by simple majority vote might well consider.

5. Again, the Constitution, in article II, section 2, requires concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present for the ratification of treaties. Clause 2 of section 2 reads:

"He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

6. Again, where election of Vice President falls to the Senate, through failure of the electoral college to cast a majority, the Constitution, both in the original article II and in amendment 12, relies upon a two-thirds rule. The applicable clause in amendment 12 reads:

"The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice."

7. Again, removal of a disability for membership in the Congress, when caused by having been involved in an insurrection, may be removed by a two-thirds vote of each House.

Thus, it would seem that the Founding Fathers sought to protect the rights of minorities by requiring more than simple majorities to override or silence them in matters of great moment.

And it scarcely need be said that the maintenance of this principle requires the availability of such a rule for every instance in which a minority might think that its rights were imperiled by the suppression of speech.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, let me observe that one of them related to a circumstance which might have developed today, inasmuch as today, while the two Houses were in joint session, the Senate witnessed the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States. If the election had turned out in such fashion that the election of the President and the Vice President had not been determined by the electoral college, and if the election of the President had fallen to the House of Representatives, the election of the Vice President would have devolved upon the Senate. In that case the Constitution provided, in the original Article II, for a two-thirds vote as regards the election of the Vice President. That is another instance in which the two-thirds idea was selected by the constitutional fathers as the appropriate dividing line when something more than a simple majority vote was to be required. That is set forth in the list I have already mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for mentioning that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I may do so, I should like to clarify my position by pointing out that I think something more than a simple, temporary majority vote should be required for changing the rules; but I do agree with the Vice President that the Constitution states that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, and that at some point each House must have that right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a practical matter, I think the Vice President ruled correctly when he said that that time is at the opening of a Congress. The Constitution makes no requirement that in the determination of its rules, a two-thirds vote should be required. But after the rules of the Senate have been adopted, I think the Senate has wisely provided that more than a simple majority vote should be required; and I believe that a two-thirds rule or such a rule with notice is very much in order and is very much to be desired.

But I do not care to take the time of the Senator from Florida to debate that matter at any length now.

However, I agree with him that if we are to protect the rights of minorities and the rights of individuals, it is important that we have rules, and that they may not be arbitrarily changed, as a matter of convenience from day to day, by a simple majority vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I hope he will also agree that in the adoption of rules, even at the beginning of a Congress, at least the rules of normal parliamentary procedure, as recognized from one end of this country to the other, should prevail for the government of the Senate. Of course, I think the Senate itself has determined that, being a continuing body, as it undoubtedly is, the rules which prevail at one time hold over until, under those rules, they may be changed in such a way as a then majority of the Senate may decide it wishes them to be.

Mr. President, let me return to the point I was pursuing a few minutes ago—although first I wish to say that I appreciate very much the observations which have been made by both of my distinguished friends.

In 1916 the question of how large a majority was required to suspend a rule of the Senate again came before the Senate, and again was decided by the vote of the Senate itself, since which time it has never been challenged. I have already stated for the record that 20 instances are referred to in the notes by the Parliamentarians, who have very carefully collected the precedents, and have set them forth in the book to which I have referred. There are 20 such instances, and they include the 2 to which I have been referring. Since 1915 there have been 20 such instances in which the Senate itself has proceeded under the two-thirds rule; and in the first 2 of those instances the Senate determined that that was the rule. That determination was made by votes taken here on the floor of the Senate.

The question then came up again on the calendar day of June 28, 1916, the legislative day of June 26, 1916. Those proceedings will be found on pages 10136 to 10145 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 1st session of the 64th Congress. That came up during consideration of House bill 10484, another appropriation bill; it was the Post Office Department appropriation bill for 1917.

Mr. Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, proposed an amendment prohibiting the transmission through the mails of publications containing advertisements of intoxicating liquors into so-called dry States. The amendment, on a point of order, was held by the Vice President, Mr. Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana, to be general legislation. Mr. Jones, pursuant to notice given by him on June 26—which was 2 days previously, though the same legislative day—then moved to suspend paragraph 3 of rule XVI, prohibiting general legislation on general appropriation bills, so that the amendment might be in order. In reply to a parliamentary inquiry if a two-thirds vote was not required for that purpose, the Vice President said:

> The Chair finds that on January 13, 1915, the present occupant of the chair did submit that identical question to the Senate, and that by a vote of 41 yeas to 34 nays the Senate decided that it required a two-thirds majority to suspend the rules. If it be desirable to revert to that ruling the Chair will now rule that it takes two-thirds to suspend the rule; but, of course, there can be an appeal from the decision of the Chair on that question, when the Senate can reverse the ruling if it so desires.

The point of order was then raised that the word "day" in the rule meant a legislative and not a calendar day, and therefore the notice, having been given in the same legislative day, did not meet the requirement of the rule.

I have already stated the notice was given on 2 calendar days before, though in the same legislative day.

The Senate, however, after discussing the question at some length, adjourned, thereby removing the question from further controversy.

On June 29, 1916—RECORD, pages 10204–10215; Senate Journal, 466—a vote was taken on the motion of Mr. Jones to suspend the rule, which resulted: yeas 36, nays 28.

The Vice President announced that, in accordance with the former ruling of the Senate that it required a two-thirds vote to suspend the rule, the rule was not suspended.

Mr. Jones took an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, which was sustained by a vote of 42 yeas, 25 nays.

I call to the attention of the learned occupant of the chair [Mr. BLAKLEY] and other Senators, that the Senate was more strongly of the opinion than it was earlier that a two-thirds vote should be required to suspend the rules of the Senate, or otherwise the Senate really had no rules, but would simply allow a majority, at any time, on its own notion, to set aside the rules.

I cannot speak too strongly on this. First, the Constitution, on all such matters of this kind, prescribed a two-thirds vote as a reasonable basis for all matters where great concern was involved. We have already had placed in the RECORD seven such matters, and I thank the Senator from South Dakota for referring to two of them which I had inadvertently omitted.

In the case of our own rules, we have, under rule X, which has been on the books so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, prescribed that to make a bill a special order, calling it up notwithstanding its place on the calendar or its absence from the calendar, requires a two-thirds vote. A two-thirds vote is required in that kind of matter to vitiate the ordinary rule of procedure for the taking up of bills.

I have already shown that in rule XVI and rule XL of the Senate there are prescribed occasions when it may be necessary to suspend the rule, rule XVI pertaining to appropriation bills, rule XL applying to all of the rules, including appropriation bills, but not naming in its own wording a precise vote which is required to obtain suspension.

I have shown that in two cases, in 1915 and 1916 the Senate itself, on submission of the question by the then Vice President, presiding over the Senate, affirmatively decided that a two-thirds vote was required before a rule could be suspended.

I have brought these matters into the RECORD not only to show the tradition of the Senate and to show the country the use of the two-thirds rule in special cases, but also to show that the inclusion of that requirement in rule XXII was no idle matter.

As a matter of fact, I think the wording of rule XXII, which was last voted on in 1959, is in precise accord with the two-thirds rule as followed in other matters and in the Constitution, because it gets away from the requirement of including in the count Senators who are selected and sworn, but who may not be present and participating, requiring a two-thirds vote of those present—a tradition for the protection of important points, for preservation of the rights of minorities, for the preservation of rights which are regarded as of such consequence that a third of the Senate is willing to stand and stand until they fall, notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the country may think otherwise.

Mr. President, that is no new provision under our procedure, both constitutional and statutory, and from the point of view of rule making, by fiat of the Senate itself, as I have already shown in specific cases which came up for the consideration of the Senate. That being the case, it seems to me it is appropriate to consider for what purpose this two-thirds requirement appears in rule XXII. It seems to me the recounting of the cases in which cloture has been attempted, as placed in the record of this debate on January 4th by our able colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], will point up this discussion.

That list shows the 35 bills which he says have been filibustered in the history of his compilation, beginning back in 1865 and coming through the FEPC bill of 1946. The reason why he limits himself to those provisions in that exhibit 2 is, of course, Mr. President, that his exhibit is taken from a printed report of a hearing in the Senate conducted by our Rules and Administration Committee in the 81st Congress, 1st session.

The purpose of my referring to exhibit 2 is that it is shown affirmatively that in every case but 10, the measure which was temporarily held up by the resort to lengthy debate was either passed, or, in one case, it was found legislation was unnecessary and the purpose was accomplished by Executive order. Twenty-five out of the thirty-five bills were successful.

The first of the 10 in which there was no final action was the force bill of 1890–91. Mr. President, I wonder whether any sane Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives could comment at this time that he wished any such legislation to be seriously considered as was embraced in the terms of the notorious force bill which was defeated at that time. Nobody has ever suggested such legislation since that time.

The second was the armed ship bill of 1917, at the beginning of World War I. In that case President Wilson found he needed no legislative authority but had ample authority under his Executive powers to take the action which was required, and it was taken.

The other eight bills fall into three categories: First, the antilynch bills; second, the anti-poll-tax bills; and third, the FEPC bill.

It is rather evident, Mr. President, from that listing, that the only field in which the legislation was not passed, or in which an early recourse from the executive was not found, was the troublesome field of so-called civil rights.

It is also evident, Mr. President, from a reading of the list, that a great many of those bills had to be changed materially in form before they could meet the approval of this body. Anyone who wishes to go back into the record can learn the history of each of them.

For instance, there was the bill on statehood for Arizona and New Mexico.

The reason for the filibuster against this bill was that those two Territories did not wish to be brought into the Union together as one State. They desired to be separate States. In 1911 their friends filibustered the bill proposing to create one State out of those two great areas. They filibustered it to death. In 1912, after another effort in that direction, the Congress decided that two areas which had as many friends might well make two good States—and they made two good States, Mr. President. I think the whole Nation has been happy in the service to the Nation rendered by the people of those two good States. I know we are all happy that each is a State, with all the rights and privileges of statehood.

I could go through the list exhaustively, Mr. President, because I have made some study of each of the bills. Suffice it to say that if any Senator is interested enough in the question to go into the subject matter, he will find that the bills in their original state which were prevented from passage by lengthy debate should not have been passed, and when the bills were returned in acceptable form they were passed, except in the 10 instances which I have mentioned. Of the 10, only in those relating to civil rights has no such legislation been included in bills which have passed.

Of course, two civil rights bills have been passed in recent years, in 1957 and 1960, but to say that they could have been passed or should have been passed in the forms in which they were defeated upon the floor of the Senate after lengthy debate is quite another thing. My own feeling is that the bills received their just deserts when they were denied passage by the stern opposition which was given to them.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to raise a basic question with the Senator from Florida as to why there is any need, or on what basis there is any need, for a change in the rules of this body at this time. I refer in my question to what the Senator has said, that two civil rights bills have been passed under the present rules in the last 2 or 3 years, and proposals which were stronger than the provisions which finally became laws were voted on under the present rules time after time and defeated by majority vote. Otherwise, those provisions would have been in the bills. The Senator recalls that, I am sure, and I think it strengthens his position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure it strengthens my position. I am glad indeed that my distinguished friend has brought it to our attention.

The last item in the list which was defeated by lengthy debate is the FEPC bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recalls, as I do, with some poignancy, the fact that FEPC bills, both limited and unlimited, were offered as amendments to the last so-called civil rights bills, which we passed in 1960, and were turned down by a majority vote of the Senate. Those proposals and others, I am sure, were referred to by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator might mention another, which is the so-called title III. That was a major provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Title III was one of the most vicious proposals ever presented on the floor of the Senate. It was omitted by a majority vote.

I will say to my distinguished friend, the point I am making has to do with the list of measures which were defeated, as shown by the compilation included in the RECORD by our learned friend the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I think perhaps title III was the most vicious of all the proposals, because it proposed to place in the conscience of one man, the Attorney General of the United States, whoever he might be, a power to make a decision and to predicate further action upon that decision, as to when a threatened breach of so-called civil rights was to occur. It would have given to him the right, upon his sole decision, to take such matter to the Federal courts by securing an injunction against others; and, if anybody saw fit to disobey the injunction, whether he knew about it or not, the Attorney General would have had the right to proceed through the drastic procedure of criminal contempt, and the case would have been tried without following our good old Anglo-Saxon provision for bringing in juries. That proposal would have set up a program completely foreign to anything that I understand to be in our Anglo-Saxon history, or within the present traditions of the country. I am glad the Senator referred to it, though it does not happen to be the case that that is one of the bills which, by itself, was defeated by lengthy debate.

Mr. STENNIS. The point is that those measures were debated in the Senate on their merits, and the pros and cons were actually passed upon. The proposals failed to become law not because of the present rules of the Senate, but because their proponents could not get a majority of the membership to vote in their favor. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is completely correct. I add the point so well and ably made by my distinguished colleague from Florida yesterday in the course of a colloquy. It is claimed by some, or has been claimed during the debate already, that this rules change must be accomplished in order to permit the passage of the program of the President-elect. My able colleague pointed out the fact that instead of that being true, we have a record of the passage by the Senate in the last Congress of the five measures which are contained within the preferred program of the President-elect. In one or two cases there were vetoes by the President which were sustained. In other cases the measures were held up in the House of Representatives. However, the fact remains that, in respect to the five measures in the "must" program of the President-elect, each has been submitted to the Senate, has not been subjected to unlimited debate, has proceeded to consideration, and has been passed by the membership of the Senate, which was comprised, in the main, of the same Members who are now present.

Mr. STENNIS. Has the Senator from Florida heard any discussion or proposal by a single Senator, much less a group, to the effect that the Senate rules would be used to defeat the measures in the Kennedy program? Is there any talk to that effect at all?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has not heard any such talk, and would not make himself a party to any such procedure, because he thinks the items in the program do not lie within the field which is of such great and terrific concern to the area of the country from which the Senator from Mississippi comes and from which I come. We think we know what would follow if some of the proposed far-reaching civil rights bills were passed. We think we have a right, from our own public service and knowledge, to predict what would occur. The Senator from Mississippi is a long-time former judge of the circuit court of his State, and also a long-time Senator from his State. He knows what might be expected to result in his State if compulsive, coercive measures were used in fields such as those attempted to be covered by the so-called civil rights program. If we did not express our deep concern and apprehension on the floor of the Senate to our colleagues and to the general public of this Nation, we would be guilty, indeed, of gross neglect of duty.

I believe the Senator from Mississippi knows, as well as I know, that Senators from our Southland would not make themselves a party to any effort by unlimited debate to stop a final vote upon the five measures which are included within the program of the President-elect.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator from Florida will yield quite briefly again, I shall not further disturb his presentation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Mississippi will not join in any kind of movement to cut off proper consideration of the proposed legislation in any way. The Senator from Mississippi does not know of any other Senator who has any such plans, and has not even heard the subject mentioned since we have been here this year. I do not think it would happen at all.

All the civil rights measures which the Senator from Mississippi knows anything about have already been brought to the floor of the Senate and have had their day in court here. Some were passed and are now law, and some were voted down because the majority did not favor them. And that is the way it will happen again.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend for his able and constructive comment. Not only has the Senator from Florida heard no suggestion this year of the application of unlimited debate to any of the five fields, but also he did not hear any such suggestion made during the previous Congress or prior thereto. To the contrary, the records will show that while many Senators from the South oppose certain

items of that legislation, there was by no means unanimity among Senators from the South concerning those subjects. There is a clear showing that there was no resort to unlimited debate when those very measures were before the Senate. The Senator from Florida, speaking for himself, never even heard any Senator suggest such a course of action.

I wish to discuss briefly the fact that the two-thirds vote requirement in critical cases of great importance to our country has been engrafted upon the Constitution in seven different instances. It has been engrafted upon our own rules in certain instances. It has been followed by a vote of the Senate when specific legislative proposals were submitted in 1915 and 1916, followed 18 times since that time. I think there can be no justification at all for an effort to impose a majority rule on such a question as this when everything in our traditions—constitutional, statutory, and rulewise—is to the other effect. Particularly do I think that it would be unwise to write for the Senate a new standard by reaching into the grab box and pulling out a three-fifths requirement. Two-thirds has been the customary requirement when there were questions of such grave importance that a whole area of the Nation felt itself impelled persistently to bring its point of view to the attention of the Nation.

In looking at the list of 35 instances referred to by the able Senator from California it is clear that the question does not relate solely to the Southland, because it was concerned with only a small part of those 35 instances that have embraced the so-called civil rights questions or any other questions of peculiar importance to the Southland. Some matters of great importance to the Nation as a whole, such as the force bill, have been defeated by resort to extensive unlimited debate and other matters which appear on the face of that bill.

I feel with all my heart that it would be a distinct disservice to our country, in the first instance, and an almost destructive disservice to the Senate, with all of its traditions, to engraft upon our rule book a provision that a mere temporary majority can, at its will, displace one rule or any rule, no matter how important, which in the wisdom of the Senate, since the founding of this country, has been found necessary to accomplish orderly procedure and the enactment of legislation which is good for the country, and in a way that commands the confidence of the country and the adherence in general by the people of the country to the decisions of the Congress.

I hope the Senate will not think of tearing down the temple which has been erected in all the years since the Senate began to function by substituting a measure which in effect would permit a bare majority, on a day-to-day basis, to set aside rules and to accomplish whatever it might wish in order to inflict its will, whether that will represented a majority of the people or whether, as certainly might happen in some instances, it represented only as much as one-fifth of the people. If there were gathered together in one group Senators from States with smaller population, the will of a bare majority of Senators might be inflicted upon the people of this great country. I hope the Senate will not be so unwise, and will defeat this ill-starred, injudicious attempt to tear down the temple of our fathers.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AND COMPLIMENTS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today marks the 79th birthday of the man who has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other in the history of our country. He is a man under whom I had the pleasure of serving for approximately 10 years while I was a Member of the House from the First District of the State of Montana. He is a man who has, I would hazard, 50 of his "boys" serving in the Senate at the present time. In sagacity, in wisdom, in tolerance, in understanding, the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN of Texas, stands in a class by himself. He has guided many of us in the right ways. He has helped us at the right times. And it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure on this occasion to extend my congratulations and solicitations to the Speaker on this his 79th birthday.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I join in felicitations to our distinguished colleague on the other side of the Capitol. I was not one of those privileged to graduate from SAM RAYBURN'S College of Political Knowledge, but I have been permitted to associate with him in many ways in many parts of the country. My esteem and my admiration for him are unlimited. His wisdom, even outside his "shop," has served to guide me wisely in many ways.

I pay tribute to him on this his 79th birthday. I know that I share the sentiments of all my colleagues in the Senate when I say that it is our hope that we might in some small way approach the stature and the contribution to public life that SAM RAYBURN has attained in this our country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say also for the RECORD that I was tremendously pleased and impressed by the action of the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, as he and the Speaker of the House presided over the counting of the ballots designating the election of the next President and Vice President of the United States. I thought he was gracious in his comments to the Speaker on his birthday, and I thought that he was more than gracious and understanding in his final statement to the membership of both Houses assembled. What he said then has left an indelible imprint on me, because he spoke as a true American, and he gave voice to feelings which I know he truly felt, and he exemplified in very few words the strength and the significance of the democratic system under which we operate. To me, the Vice President made a magnificent exit.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while tributes are being paid to the Speaker of the House, I certainly wish to join in the sentiments expressed by our colleagues. Here is a gentleman who has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any man in the history of our Nation. He has served in that capacity for 19 years. He has served in the House of Representatives itself almost as long as anyone ever has.

I did not have the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with him, but I know from his products and what I have seen from his operations in the Government—with the President and Cabinet members and Members of Congress, and everyone else—that he has certainly been a wise counselor. Few men have left the imprint on this country he has left and continues to leave, in shaping its policy and shaping its legislation over these critical years, in which the Nation and the world have been transformed in many ways, and during which time policies have been changed and conditions have changed. Yet he still goes on at his fast pace with his wise counsel and sound views.

Somebody referred to him as a teacher of the men in the House of Representatives. That reminds me of a tribute that I saw on a monument on a famed university campus in this country, where a teacher is paid this tribute by former students:

> A part of him will be a part of us and our children and their children forever.

A part of Mr. SAM will be a part of this Nation, I hope, forever. I am glad to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this wise man.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have paid their respects to the illustrious and renowned Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

Members of Congress who have been privileged to know the Speaker for a number of years affectionately call him Mr. SAM. He represents the finest tradition in this country in the field of legislative government. He has surely made his great contribution to the strength and the welfare and the prosperity and the happiness of this Nation. The name of Speaker RAYBURN will go down in the history books of our country as a truly significant voice and force in the Government of the United States. I feel it a rare privilege to enjoy his fellowship and to share in his friendship.

As I recall, Speaker RAYBURN was elected to the House at the same time that the late and beloved Alben Barkley came to Congress. I also recollect that the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HAYDEN], came to Congress in the same year.

These are remarkable men—two of them still with us, and one, Mr. Barkley, who will always live in our memory.

I wish Mr. SAM not only a happy birthday this year, but also many more of those happy birthdays in good health and good spirits, and with all the blessings of a good life. I am sure he will be granted those blessings by a wise and kindly Providence.

I also wish to join the majority leader in commending the Vice President on his remarkable message on the occasion of the counting of the electoral votes. As was indicated in the Vice President's message, this was a historic occasion. I believe the Vice President's message will go down as one of the truly historic messages. It was one filled with humility. It was a gracious and a very thoughtful pronouncement.

In these few moments the American people, particularly our young people, received a lesson in democracy and in responsible representative government from one of the practitioners of representative government, in a very forceful and yet a very considerate and timely manner. It goes without saying that on many occasions I have sharply disagreed with some of the utterances of the Vice President. I only say that because it is a matter of record. But I surely admire and respect him for the manner in which he has conducted himself during the recent months, during the campaign, and more directly and more precisely in this ceremony of today when the electoral vote was counted. He proved himself to be a fine American and, indeed, a great public servant.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House regarding the death of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chair laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 18), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 23) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative from Massachusetts, I move that the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Messages received from the Government of the District of Columbia January 6, 1961:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, Neville Miller as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to fill the unexpired term of James E. Colliflower, resigned, whose term expires March 3, 1961.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, Neville Miller as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to succeed himself for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The tribute to Job, the patriarch, by one of his friends (Job 4: 3–4): *Behold, you have instructed many and your words have kept men on their feet.*

O Thou who art the supreme source of all good gifts, we rejoice that in these strange days, when confused cries are echoing throughout the world, we have among us men and women whom Thou hast blessed with a vision of the durable and eternal values and who never fear the loneliness of following and pursuing that which is noblest and best.

On this his birthday we thank Thee for the life and character of our beloved Speaker who holds such a regal place in our affections, not only because of his conspicuous achievements in the realm of politics and the affairs of state but, that, in the high and holy privilege of daily walking and working with him, we have found ourselves strengthened and encouraged by his words of counsel and the companionship of his kind and gracious heart.

We pray that Thou wilt continue to endow him richly with the gifts of leadership, the leadership of aspiration and adventure, of wisdom and understanding, of faith and fortitude, and may his own heart be filled with gladness and receive the benediction of Thy grace as he gives himself wholeheartedly and patriotically to the arduous task of finding ways and means for the building of a better world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 4, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution that effective January 3, 1961, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, 86th Congress, continue and have same powers as conferred by said resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 11 and House Resolution 12, 87th Congress, he did, on Wednesday, January 4, 1961, administer the oath of office to the Honorable JAMES B. UTT and the Honorable GEORGE M. GRANT at Bethesda, Md.

GEORGE M. GRANT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 82

Whereas GEORGE M. GRANT, a Representative from the State of Alabama, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said GEORGE M. GRANT as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

HON. JAMES B. UTT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 83

Whereas JAMES B. UTT, a Representative from the State of California, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES B. UTT as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. Will any Member who has not been sworn come to the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. ADAIR appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

STATE OF HAWAII

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith is a copy of the certificate of ascertainment received today from the State of Hawaii, in conformity with the final clause of section 6, title 3, United States Code.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the certificate.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII.

To the ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, PURSUANT TO THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

I, William F. Quinn, Governor of the State of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the returns of votes cast for electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at an election held therein for that purpose, on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in the year of our Lord 1960, agreeably to the provisions of the laws of the said State, and in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States, for the purpose of giving in their votes for President and Vice President of the United States, for the respective terms prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to begin on the 20th day of January in the year of our Lord 1961, were, ascertained by judgment of the circuit court of the first judicial circuit, State of Hawaii, in proceedings entitled *Herman T. F. Lum et al.*, v. *Gavien A. Bush et al.* (Civil No. 7029), entered on the 30th day of December A.D. 1960, and that the list of persons voted for and the number of votes cast for each, pursuant to said judgment, respectively, is as follows:

Republican Party: Gavien A. Bush, 92,295; J. Howard Worrall, 92,295; O. P. Soares, 92,295.

Democratic Party: William H. Heen, 92,410; Delbert E. Metzger, 92,410; Jeannie Wilson, 92,410.

And I further certify that: William H. Heen, Delbert E. Metzger, and Jennie Wilson were appointed electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at said election.

Given under my hand and the seal of the State, this 4th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1961.

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the people of America, and particularly our colleagues in the House and Senate, know as we sit here today that one of the great figures of American history is our distinguished and beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

We will not be here two or three generations from now, but we do not have to wait for the historians of tomorrow to write about the life of this great man and his outstanding contribution to the preservation and the progress of our country.

As we sit here today we know that SAM RAYBURN when he was born was to be a man of destiny, we know that SAM RAYBURN today is one of the great figures of American history. Strong and determined in his views, tolerant in his associations with his fellow men, possessed of a mind of understanding that is not only a symbol but an inspiration to all persons to follow, SAM RAYBURN has dedicated his life to the public service of the people of the State of Texas and to the people of the United States of America.

To adequately discuss this outstanding American and fine gentleman would take a long period of time. While he may be a citizen of Texas, so far as the State of Texas is concerned, in the minds of all Americans he is a citizen of every State of the Union. That impression exists in the minds of our people as the result of the man himself: His dedicated mind to God, to country, and to mankind. As the result of the election to Congress by the people of my district, one of the great pleasures of my life has been to meet and to know SAM RAYBURN. Throughout the years as a young legislator in this body and as the years have gone by, he has always been a constant inspiration to me as well as to other people. On various occasions I have referred to him as the man with a "heart of gold." You and I have the honor today of sitting in the presence of a man who very shortly will have presided over this body twice as long as any other Speaker in the history of our country and who has served longer in this body than any other man in the entire history of the National House of Representatives. We also have the honor of sitting in the presence of an humble man; yes, and all the greater because of his humility, who is a man of destiny and a man of history. We know today that SAM RAYBURN's place in American history will be outstanding.

So, without any further remarks on my part, I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues, both in the House and in the Senate, and beyond that the people of the 50 States of the Union, in extending to him our very hearty and sincere congratulations on his birthday anniversary and that God, in His infinite wisdom, will continue for countless of years to come to bestow upon SAM RAYBURN the man, SAM RAYBURN the legislator, SAM RAYBURN the Speaker, an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Happy birthday, SAM RAYBURN, on this occasion.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express what I know to be the feelings of the membership on this side of the aisle, shared with the feelings of the entire membership of this House: Our best wishes, our hearty congratulations and good luck to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] well said most everything in the hearts and minds of all of us. I want our Speaker to know how heartily we agree and to congratulate him and to wish him well in all the days ahead.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to pay tribute to the fairest bluebonnet of Texas, or the fairest marigold of the United States, as the case may be.

Much is being said these days, in the newspapers and elsewhere, about the tender age of those who are about to lead the executive branch of the Government and the rather ancient age of those we have just chosen to guide the ship of state in Congress.

Cicero, whom history has proved a wise scholar on matters of state, had this to say:

> Intelligence, and reflection, and judgment reside in old men, and if there had been none of them, no states could exist at all.

But in the same passages Cicero qualified what he meant by old men in whom intelligence, reflection, and judgment reside. He said this:

> For as I like a young man in whom there is something of the old, so I like an old man in whom there is something of the young; and he who follows this maxim, in body will possibly be an old man, but he will never be an old man in mind.

The truth is, then, that there is really no conflict or disparity in ages, such as the commentators suggest, in the judgment, reflection, and intelligence of our leaders. Certainly if there was ever a man who remains young in mind it is our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. He will never be an old man in mind.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES; JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Willam M. Miller, an-

nounced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President.

The Vice President of the United States would like to make an expression on behalf of the Members of the Senate who are here meeting with the House of Representatives, extending our congratulations to the Speaker on his 79th birthday, which he celebrates today.

Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers on the part of the two Houses will take their place at the Clerk's desk.

The tellers, Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. CURTIS, on the part of the Senate, and Mrs. BOLTON and Mrs. KELLY on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Senator HAYDEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic and it appears therefrom that John F. Kennedy received five votes for President, and HARRY F. BYRD of the State of Virginia received six votes for President; that LYNDON B. JOHNSON of the State of Texas received five votes for Vice President, and STROM THURMOND of the State of South Carolina received six votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will omit in further procedure the formal statement just made and will open in alphabetical order and pass to the tellers the certificates showing the votes of the electors of each State. The tellers will read, count, and announce the result in each State as was done in the State of Alabama.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

When the State of Hawaii was reached, the Vice President made the following statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair has received three certificates from persons claiming to be the duly appointed electors from the State of Hawaii. The Chair will hand these certificates one at a time to the tellers who will read the certificates and the attached papers in full. After the first certificate has been read the Chair will then hand the second certificate to the tellers, and then the third.

The Chair hands to the tellers the first of the three certificates for the State of Hawaii.

The first certificate is as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII

We, the undersigned, electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the respective terms beginning on the 20th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1961, being electors duly and legally appointed and qualified by and for the State of Hawaii, as appears by the annexed list of electors, made, certified, and delivered to us by the executive of the State, having met and convened at the capitol, in Honolulu, in said State, in pursuance of the Constitution and laws of the United States, and in the manner provided by the laws of the State of Hawaii, on the first Monday after the second Wednesday, being the 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

Do hereby certify, that being so assembled and duly organized, we proceeded to vote by ballot, and balloted first for such President and then for such Vice President, by distinct ballots.

And we further certify, that the following are two distinct lists; one, of the votes for President, and the other, of the votes for Vice President, so cast as aforesaid:

LIST OF ALL PERSONS VOTED FOR AS PRESIDENT, WITH THE NUMBER OF VOTES FOR EACH

Name of person voted for: RICHARD M. NIXON, of California. Number of votes: Three.

LIST OF ALL PERSONS VOTED FOR AS VICE PRESIDENT, WITH THE NUMBER OF VOTES FOR EACH

Name of person voted for: Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts. Number of votes: Three.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands.

Done at the Capitol, in the city of Honolulu, and State of Hawaii, on the first Monday after the second Wednesday, being the 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

O. P. SOARES,
GAVIEN A. BUSH,
J. HOWARD WORRALL,
Electors.

STATE OF HAWAII

To the ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, PURSUANT TO THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

I, James K. Kealoha, Acting Governor of the State of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the returns of votes cast for electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at an election held therein for that purpose, on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in the year of our Lord 1960 agreeably to the provisions of the laws of the said State, and in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States, for the purpose of giving in their votes for President and Vice President of the United States, for the respective terms prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to begin on the 20th day of January in the year of our Lord 1961, were, ascertained on the 16th day of November A.D. 1960, and that the list of persons voted for and the number of votes cast for each, respectively, is as follows:

Republican Party: Gavien A. Bush, 92,505; J. Howard Worrall, 92,505; O. P. Soares, 92,505.

Democratic Party: William H. Heen, 92,364; Delbert E. Metzger, 92,364; Jennie Wilson, 92,364.

And I further certify that Gavein A. Bush, J. Howard Worrall, and O. P. Soares were appointed electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at said election.

Given under my hand and seal of the State, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1960.

JAMES K. KEALOHA,
Acting Governor.

The Chair then handed the second certificate to the tellers.

The certificate is as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII

We, the undersigned, electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the respective terms beginning on the 20th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1961, being electors duly and legally appointed and qualified by and for the State of Hawaii, as appears by the annexed list of electors, made, certified, and delivered to us by the executive of the State, having met and convened at the capitol, in Honolulu, in said State, in pursuance of the Constitution and laws of the United States, and in the manner provided by the laws of the State of Hawaii, on the first Monday after the second Wednesday, being the 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

Do hereby certify, That being so assembled and duly organized, we proceeded to vote by ballot, and balloted first for such President and then for such Vice President, by distinct ballots.

And we further certify, That the following are two distinct lists; one, of the votes for President, and the other, of the votes for Vice President, so cast as aforesaid:

List of all persons voted for as President, with the number of votes for each:

Name of person voted for: John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts. Number of votes: Three.

List of all persons voted for as Vice President, with the number of votes for each:

Name of person voted for: LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas. Number of votes: Three.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands.

Done at the capitol, in the city of Honolulu, and State of Hawaii, on the first Monday after the second Wednesday, being the 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1960.

JENNIE K. WILSON,
WILLIAM H. HEEN,
DELBERT E. METZGER,
Electors.

The Chair handed the third certificate to the tellers.

The certificate is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE.

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greetings:

I certify that the annexed copy, or each of the specified number of annexed copies, of each document listed below is a true copy of a document in the official custody of the Archivist of the United States.

Certificate of ascertainment of electors of the State of Hawaii, dated January 4, 1961, received by the Administrator of General

Services in accordance with section 6, title 3, United States Code.

In testimony whereof, I, Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, have hereunto caused the seal of the National Archives to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register of the National Archives, in the District of Columbia, this 6th day of January, 1961.

WAYNE C. GROVER,
Archivist of the United States.
By DAVID C. EBERHART.

STATE OF HAWAII
TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES PURSUANT TO THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES:

I, William F. Quinn, Governor of the State of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the returns of votes cast for electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at an election held therein for that purpose, on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in the year of our Lord 1960 agreeably to the provisions of the laws of the said State, and in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States, for the purpose of giving in their votes for President and Vice President of the United States, for the respective terms prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to begin on the 20th day of January in the year of our Lord 1961, were, ascertained by judgment of the Circuit Court of the First Judicial District, State of Hawaii, in proceedings entitled *Herman T. F. Lum et al.* v. *Gavien A. Bush et al.* (Civil No. 7029), entered on the 30th day of December A.D. 1960, and that the list of persons voted for and the number of votes cast for each, pursuant to said judgment, respectively, is as follows:

Republican Party: Gavien A. Bush, 92,295; J. Howard Worrall, 95295; O. P. Soares, 92,295.

Democratic Party: William H. Heen, 92,410; Delbert E. Metzger, 92,410; Jennie Wilson, 92,410.

And I further certify that William H. Heen, Delbert E. Metzger, and Jennie Wilson were appointed electors of President and Vice President of the United States of America, for the State of Hawaii, at said election.

Given under my hand and the seal of the State, this 4th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1961.

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

STATE OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, January 4, 1961.

Mr. FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator of General Services,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have enclosed herewith the certificate of election of the three Democrat electors of the State of Hawaii; namely, Mr. William H. Heen, Mr. Delbert E. Metzger, and Mrs. Jennie Wilson.

These electors were adjudged by the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit, State of Hawaii, to have received a majority of the votes cast in the general election on November 8, 1960, for presidential electors of the State of Hawaii and to be the duly elected presidential electors of the State. A certified copy of the judgment is enclosed.

Under the Hawaii elections contest statutes, an appeal may be taken to the supreme court of the State from the judgment of the circuit court. The appeal must be made within 10 days after the decision of the circuit court is entered, in this case by January 9, 1961.

The attorney general has advised me that he will not appeal the decision of the circuit court, and he has further advised me that the possibility of an appeal in this case by any defendant not represented by him is remote.

As required by the State election contest statutes, State certificates of election have also been issued to the Democrat electors.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, STATE OF HAWAII, CIVIL NO. 7029

Herman T. F. Lum, Ernest I. Murai, Dolores Martin, William R. Norwood, Hung Leong Ching, Edith DeMatta, James H. Kamo, H. Tucker Gratz, Jean Sharpless, T. S. Goo, Tadao Beppu, Robert C. Gilkey, Mitsuyuki Kido, Richard Kageyama, Duke Kawasaki, Revocato Medina, Walter M. Heen, Mildred Curley, Kaipo Kauhane, Denise Chu, Joshua Chu, Shizue Kashima, Joe Motti, Bertram Kanbara, Harry G. Albright, Sam Tanna, Hiroshi Kato, and Thomas P. Gill, complainants, v. *Gavien A. Bush, O. P. Soares and J. Howard Worrall, presidential electors; Mrs. James Beatty, Chris Holt, David Kahookele, Arthur Kau, Tetsuichi Kurata and Henry Yamashita, alternate presidential electors; and James K. Kealoha as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii, defendants.*

JUDGMENT

Pursuant to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law heretofore filed herein,

It is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that William Heen, Delbert Metzger, and Jennie Wilson, the nominees of the Democratic Party for presidential electors of the State of Hawaii, received a majority of the votes in the general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii, for the election of presidential electors and alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii and in said general election were duly elected as the presidential electors of the State of Hawaii to elect a President of the United States of America to hold office for a term of 4 years from January 20, 1961; that John Silva and Sam David, the nominees of the Democratic Party for alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii for William Heen, received a majority of the votes in the general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii for the election of presidential electors and alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii and in said general election were duly elected as the alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii for William Heen to elect a President of the United States of America to hold office for a term of 4 years from January 20, 1961; that Ernest Uu and Charles Thompson, the nominees of the Democratic Party for alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii for Delbert Metzger, received a majority of the votes in the general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii for the election of presidential electors and alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii and in said general election were duly elected as alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii for Delbert Metzger to elect a President of the United States of America to hold office for a term of 4 years from January 20, 1961; that John Fernandes and George Watase, the nominees of the Democratic Party for alternate presidential electors for Jennie Wilson, received a majority of the votes in the general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii for the election of presidential electors and alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii and in said general election were duly elected as alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii for Jennie Wilson to elect a President of the United States of America to hold office for a term of 4 years from January 20, 1961; and that in the general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii for the election of presidential electors and alternate presidential electors of the State of Hawaii, no other person received a majority of the votes for any such office or was elected to any such office.

It is hereby further ordered, adjudged and decreed that in said general election on November 8, 1960, in the State of Hawaii, the total number of valid votes for the nominees of the Democratic Party for presidential electors and alternate presidential electors was 92,410 valid votes and the total number of valid votes for the nominees of the Republican Party for the presidential electors and alternate presidential electors was 92,295; and that in said general election no other person received a valid vote for presidential elector or alternate presidential elector.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, this 30th day of December 1960.

RONALD B. JAMIESON,
Judge of the Above Entitled Court.

The VICE PRESIDENT (after consideration of the aforementioned documents by the tellers). The Chair has knowledge, and is convinced that he is supported by the facts, that the certificate from the Honorable William F. Quinn, Governor of the State of Hawaii, dated January 4, 1961, received by the Administrator of General Services on January 6, 1961, and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives on January 6, 1961, being Executive Communication Number 215 of the House of Representatives, properly and legally portrays the facts with respect to the electors chosen by the people of Hawaii at the election for President and Vice President held on November 8, 1960. As read from the certificates, William H. Heen, Delbert E. Metzger, and Jennie Wilson were appointed as electors of President and Vice President on November 8, 1960, and did on the first Monday after the second Wednesday of December, 1960, cast their votes for John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts for President and LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas for Vice President.

In order not to delay the further count of the electoral vote here, the Chair, without the intent of establishing a precedent, suggests that the electors named in the certificate of the Governor of Hawaii dated January 4, 1961, be considered as the lawful electors from the State of Hawaii.

If there be no objection in this joint convention, the Chair will instruct the tellers—and he now does—to count the votes of those electors named in the certificate of the Governor of Hawaii dated January 4, 1961—those votes having been cast for John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, for President and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, for Vice President.

Without objection the tellers will accordingly count the votes of those electors named in the certificate of the Governor of Hawaii dated January 4, 1961.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count and announce the electoral votes of the remaining States in alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, CARL HAYDEN and CARL T. CURTIS, tellers on the part of the Senate, EDNA F. KELLY and FRANCES P. BOLTON,

tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1961.

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President			
		John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia	Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas	Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts	Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina	Barry Goldwater, of Arizona
Alabama	11	5		6	5		6	
Alaska	3		3			3		
Arizona	4		4			4		
Arkansas	8	8			8			
California	32		32			32		
Colorado	6		6			6		
Connecticut	8	8			8			
Delaware	3	3			3			
Florida	10		10			10		
Georgia	12	12			12			
Hawaii	3	3			3			
Idaho	4		4			4		
Illinois	27	27			27			
Indiana	13		13			13		
Iowa	10		10			10		
Kansas	8		8			8		
Kentucky	10		10			10		
Louisiana	10	10			10			
Maine	5		5			5		
Maryland	9	9			9			
Massachusetts	16	16			16			
Michigan	20	20			20			
Minnesota	11	11			11			
Mississippi	8			8			8	
Missouri	13	13			13			
Montana	4		4			4		
Nebraska	6		6			6		
Nevada	3	3			3			
New Hampshire	4		4			4		
New Jersey	16	16			16			
New Mexico	4	4			4			
New York	45	45			45			
North Carolina	14	14			14			
North Dakota	4		4			4		
Ohio	25		25			25		
Oklahoma	8		7	1		7		1
Oregon	6		6			6		
Pennsylvania	32	32			32			
Rhode Island	4	4			4			
South Carolina	8	8			8			
South Dakota	4		4			4		
Tennessee	11		11			11		
Texas	24	24			24			
Utah	4		4			4		
Vermont	3		3			3		
Virginia	12		12			12		
Washington	9		9			9		
West Virginia	8	8			8			
Wisconsin	12		12			12		
Wyoming	3		3			3		
Total	537	303	219	15	303	219	14	1

CARL HAYDEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.
EDNA F. KELLY,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 537, of which a majority is 269.

John F. Kennedy, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for President of the United States 303 votes; Richard M. Nixon, of the State of California, has received 219 votes; Harry F. Byrd, of the State of Virginia, has received 15 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 537, of which a majority is 269.

Lyndon B. Johnson, of the State of Texas, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes; Henry Cabot Lodge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received 219 votes; Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, has received 14 votes; Barry Goldwater, of the State of Arizona, has received 1 vote.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1961, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, since this is an unprecedented situation, I would like to ask permission to impose upon the time of the Members of this Congress to make a statement which in itself is somewhat unprecedented.

I promise to be brief. I shall be guided by the 1-minute rule of the House rather than the unlimited time rule that prevails in the Senate.

This is the first time in 100 years that a candidate for the Presidency announced the result of an election in which he was defeated and announced the victory of his opponent. I do not think we could have a more striking and eloquent example of the stability of our constitutional system and of the proud tradition of the American people of developing, respecting, and honoring institutions of self-government.

In our campaigns, no matter how hard fought they may be, no matter how close the election may turn out to be, those who lose accept the verdict, and support those who win. And I would like to add that, having served now in Government for 14 years, a period which began in the House just 14 years ago, almost to the day, which continued with 2 years in the Senate and 8 years as Vice President, as I complete that 14-year period it is indeed a very great honor to me to extend to my colleagues in the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle who have been elected; to extend to John F. Kennedy and LYNDON JOHNSON, who have been elected President and Vice President of the United States, my heartfelt best wishes, as all of you work in a cause that is bigger than any man's ambition, greater than any party. It is the cause of freedom, of justice, and peace for all mankind.

It is in that spirit that I now declare that John F. Kennedy has been elected President of the United States, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON Vice President of the United States.

Members of the Congress, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

(Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes post meridian, the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.)

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair directs that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal.

THE SPEAKER'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 5 days in relation to the birthday of our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and that in connection with my request the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the distinguished majority leader in wishing you a happy birthday with many happy returns. Your distinguished service in this House surpasses that of all others and places your name in history beside the greatest of those ever to have served this country.

Your many kindnesses to me have given you a perpetual place in my heart, set apart from all other men whom I have had the honor to know. I am proud that my congressional district borders yours. I am proud that the people in every section of my State look upon you affectionately as Oklahoma's great Congressman at Large. The people of Oklahoma really feel this way about you.

They adore you and appreciate, beyond the power of words to express, the helping hand you have given us on so many occasions.

We wish you many long years of health and happiness and many long years of distinguished and irreplaceable service in this House.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join the majority leader in extending to our beloved Speaker best wishes for a happy birthday and many more to come. The Members of this body have no finer or truer friend than SAM RAYBURN. His qualities of greatness are worn easily. He has never lost the common touch. His love for people is second only to his love for his country. His door is always open for his fellow Members of this great body. Although he is the busiest man here, he is the most accessible. His advice, counsel, and judgment have been an invaluable staff to me since the day I arrived here. America is fortunate to have this man of the people, this great Democrat, as one of its foremost leaders. His impression on history extends beyond the borders of his congressional district in Texas and beyond the borders of his beloved country. All the world is better for having SAM RAYBURN. His footprints extend from this position of great responsibility to every corner of the world. I extend my sincerest congratulations and best wishes to Speaker RAYBURN on this, his 79th birthday.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the majority leader and my colleagues in wishing the distinguished Speaker a happy birthday.

It is a great privilege for all of us to have had the opportunity to be associated with him in the House of Representatives. One of the most satisfying experiences I have ever had is my association with him and the generous friendship he has afforded me.

Throughout this Nation and the world I know there are men and women who rejoice in his splendid service to humanity everywhere.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and others in extending birthday congratulations to Speaker RAYBURN on the occasion of his 79th birthday anniversary.

Speaker RAYBURN, as we all know, is recognized as a great Texan and a great American, but I would like to remind my colleagues that he is also a great Tennessean. Tennessee claims him as a native son and shares with Texas great pride in his noble achievements and distinguished record of service to our beloved country.

During the adjournment of Congress Mr. SAM returned to Tennessee and to his birthplace in Roane County, Tenn., which is adjacent to the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress. During this latest visit to his native State, I had the pleasure and privilege of being among the party that received Mr. SAM and welcomed him back to Tennessee. That was a great day for our State and today is also a great occasion as Tennesseans, Texans and all Americans congratulate Speaker RAYBURN on another milestone in his distinguished career.

The illustrious career and record of Speaker RAYBURN is unsurpassed and unequaled in the history of our Nation. The influence and leadership of Speaker RAYBURN is felt around the world and as we move into the sixties I am most happy to join with others in wishing for our friend, Speaker RAYBURN, many years of good health, good luck, success, and happiness.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this House has never been more unanimous than it is in extending good wishes to the Speaker on his birthday.

No man has occupied the Speaker's chair longer than its present occupant and few have enjoyed the great measure of respect and affection that is his. He has shared his pride in the House of Representatives and his love for the Congress with all of us and has made us proud to serve with him.

He has freely given of his 50 years of experience and all of us have benefited by it. He is a good friend and a just leader who gives dignity and honor to the House.

Despite the heavy duties of the speakership, he remains a ready friend and a valued counselor. In the finest sense, he is a true leader of men.

Speaker RAYBURN has won the respect and earned the admiration of thousands of men and women who have served with him. There is no better testimony to his integrity and his talents. No man has given more generously of his efforts through a half century of dedicated service to his fellow citizens.

Our words do not add to his stature but we hope he will accept them in the spirit of affection in which they are offered—our best wishes for good health and happiness to a great American.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the 79th natal anniversary of the distinguished and beloved presiding officer of this body, it is interesting to note that the transcending American who served as President of the United States longer than any President in the history of the Republic, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the mighty American who served as Speaker of the House, a position second only to the Presidency, longer than any Speaker in our history, both were born in January in the year 1882. The name of SAM RAYBURN, as that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is imperishably interwoven in the story of our country and of the world in great and crucial periods. To us who here serve with him in the House is the rare privilege of association with a statesman history will write one of the outstanding legislators of all times. With admiration and affection we salute Mr. SAM on his birthday.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the murmuring of joyful voices in the distance are measured in tones of happiness. We are glad to have with us in our work, with God's blessings, a great American.

Your fine sense of balanced sagacity in international and national questions serves as our guidance on political policy. Many of us, in times of great stress and confused attitudes of mind, look to you for strong leadership.

Your level-headed thinking on important measures has pointed the way from indecision.

You are a great statesman, who lives by the rule of the common man—"make up your mind, using commonsense, and then do it."

As a patriotic leader, dedicated to the great American principle of devotion to the Nation's common good, you have always reflected such interest in the type of laws passed by the Congress for the protection, welfare, and prosperity of its people.

We, your Democratic colleagues from the great State of Illinois, greet you with heartfelt embrace on this, your 77th birthday. And pray to God in His omnipotent wisdom, to safeguard your health. May we, by our loyalty to your great leadership, add to your happiness and insure to the people of this Nation the protection which they have so richly received through your good offices.

We pray that your birthdays be many—so that the security of the liberty-loving nations be preserved. May God bless you, and may we have you with us again and again.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the talk that our great Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, made about our beloved Speaker. Of course JOHN MCCORMACK is known to be one of the great orators, not only of the Congress, but of this Nation or any other place, and while he did, Mr. Speaker, say some fabulous and wonderful things, there is no way in the English language, or any other language I know, to properly describe the love and respect that the men in this House, on both sides of the aisle, and they represent every human being in America, love and regard our own Speaker SAM RAYBURN. They know SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, Tex., to be a real man, a great man, a good friend, and above all an outstanding, true statesman and an American.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with you day in and day out, weekends, nights, Sundays, and in conventions all over this Nation for over a quarter of a century; and your whole life and your heart and JOHN MCCORMACK said you had a heart of gold; I think you have a heart of gold and silver too, a brilliant brain and an understanding heart too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you know it or not but you do not know how the people down home, in that Mobile Bay country, love and respect you. They just want to take you away from Bonham, Tex., and bring you over there. The time you spent with us there in the last Democratic campaign for President-elect John F. Kennedy and Vice-President-elect LYNDON B. JOHNSON will always be remembered by the men, the women, the boys, and the girls. It was a great experience for these people and one night when you, the Governor of Alabama, the great senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, all of the Democratic leaders and I were speaking for our party and congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on the great speech you made

that night over the radio and television hookup, we estimated several hundred thousands of people heard your speech and we had never heard a better one. The great BOB SIKES, of Crestview, Fla., and his wonderful wife, Inez, phoned when we finished and told us how much they enjoyed your wonderful talks and the talks that were made by all of the great men that were there to help us in our campaign. The same thing from down in the great State of Mississippi, there on the gulf coast, then up at York, Ala., on all over that part of the country; and, Mr. Speaker, I had several telephone calls from Butler, Choctaw County, Ala. I was born there and I understand that it is less than 100 miles from where you were born. You were born up there in that great country, the Horseshoe Bend country, and that was a battle where your people and my people fought with the Indians that really caused us to have that peace treaty with England. Had it not been for those great people there in the battles there, and then in Mobile at Fort Bowyer, which is Fort Morgan now, the battle at Pensacola, and the battle at New Orleans against the British, I believe, and many many people believe, we would still be a colony.

The great Tom Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., has spent thousands and thousands of hours of time; he sent people all the way to England to search for the records and found them; the English decided to make peace after we down in Alabama, in Tennessee, in Mississippi, and Florida, won those battles from the English. The record is clear, and your folks and my folks were there fighting side by side. Then the great Sam Houston was there, too. You and he, Sam Houston of the Alamo fame, come from the same part of the country that we all come from, and our own Sam Houston was badly wounded in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, Ala. There is a book out on this, and I have sent it to you. I have also sent it to many other people. I sent it to you to put in your wonderful library; if you have not read it, I want you to read it. But anyway, today, when you were sitting there in the chair as Speaker of the House of the Congress of the United States, JOHN MCCORMACK told his great audience, not only on the floor of the House, but the galleries were full from every State in the Union and many other lands, that you had been Speaker longer than any man on earth and almost twice as long as the great Henry Clay.

You did so much good on your trip to our beloved Alabama. You took a lot of time out of Texas to help Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Mississippi, and Florida. While we were disappointed in losing Montgomery and Birmingham, Ala., we carried Mobile and all of that part of Alabama by a beautiful majority for Jack Kennedy and LYNDON JOHNSON, who have now been certified as President and Vice President of these United States.

All of the people all over that part of our land will always remember and never forget the days and nights you spent there with us inspecting beautiful Brookley Field that has made the greatest record that we have in this Nation for the Air Force, where you inspected our great State docks at Mobile and all of the many plants up and down the river where they are bringing in iron ore from Venezuela to make steel there in Alabama, where the great aluminum plant is running day and night; the largest paper mill in the world that has over 40 acres of plant and machinery under one roof; then the great Scott Paper Co.; then the Stone Container Co.; and then as we were cruising along showing you the great waterways of Alabama, you will recall, that we inspected the largest rayon plant in the world, the Courtaulds Co. of England; then a little further along, the Stauffer Chemical Co. of France; and then on up to Mount Vernon where the great Indian Chief Geronimo was in captivity for so long before we sent him to Oklahoma, but we still have one of his grandsons who is one of our game wardens at our hunting preserve on the Tombigbee River at McIntosh; then we showed you the spot where Aaron Burr was captured after he killed Alexander Hamilton. Last, but not least, the plant of the great Olin Mathieson Co. which produces trainloads and bargeloads of chlorine, caustic soda, and many other chemicals. This great plant, to give you an idea of the size, uses over $2 million worth of electricity in 1 year. You saw the pipelines that lead to the Tombigbee River from their plant; you saw the loading of barges with chemicals that go all over this Nation everywhere that water runs. Then we went on up to the Geigy Chemical Co. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who invented DDT and these people are now building seven new plants and, by the way, a great Texas company is building these plants for the Geigy Chemical Co. Brown & Root, of Texas, are the contractors.

Then we went on up the river to Jackson, Ala., where you saw the great sawmills, the Vanity Fair silk mills, their new golf course, and then last, but not least, the great Jackson lock and dam at Coffeeville, Ala., which will be completed this spring when we hope you will return and be there with us to rejoice and celebrate the dedication of this great dam which will throw the water 80 miles farther up the Tombigbee River. The Army Engineers, as you know, Mr. Speaker, are spending over $500,000 a month completing this great project.

So your trip and your speeches over the radio and your appearance with our Senators Lister Hill and John Sparkman, our great Governor, John Patterson, Congressman George Grant, and all of us will be a memory that will linger with the people of the First Congressional District of Alabama for many long years to come. They just want you to return again and again.

Well, our prayer is, Mr. Speaker, that Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas and Tennessee, will be with us for many, many years to come, and I wish you could have heard all of the fine things said about you on your 79th birthday yesterday. You looked so fine when Vice President NIXON was sitting by you there on the Speaker's rostrum, and I thought Vice President NIXON gave you a great compliment. The moment your name was mentioned, every man sprang from his seat, not only Democrats but Republicans, to applaud you and the great work you have done and have been doing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1961

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NEW INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR CUTS IN U.S. TARIFFS

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the substance of an advertisement that the Trade Relations Council of the United States recently ran in both the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post and Times Herald dealing with the subject of new international negotiations for more cuts in U.S. tariffs. The Trade Relations Council is a vigorous coalition of American industry and agriculture dedicated to the concepts of equal opportunity and fairplay in world trade. The membership of the Trade Relations Council is composed of hundreds of manufacturers, manufacturing trade associations and agricultural cooperatives. Through the trade associations and agricultural cooperatives, this organization represents tens of thousands of domestic business firms and agricultural producers.

The matter follows:

There's trouble ahead for many American industries. And that means trouble for the people who depend on these industries for jobs. It is trouble in the form of new international negotiations for more cuts in U.S. tariffs.

The U.S. Government has just published a list of American products which may be placed on the official bargaining list when we and 36 other countries, all members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), get together at Geneva, Switzerland, early next year for another round of bargaining over tariffs and other trade matters.

You know conditions and trends and prospects in your own industry better than any outsider does, and you know whether your industry can afford to give tariff concessions in today's struggle for markets. But here are a few points you may want to keep in mind if you agree that this is a good time to make haste slowly in tariff bargaining.

OUR TARIFFS ARE ALREADY AMONG THE LOWEST IN THE WORLD

Only a few countries have lower customs duties than we do. Most of our biggest trading partners, just as highly industrialized as we are (thanks in large measure to the

generosity of the American taxpayer via foreign aid), maintain higher tariffs than we do—and lots of other trade restrictions as well.

In fact, one recent study identified 36 different ways—not counting tariffs—that countries can discourage foreign trade and block unwelcome imports. According to that study, no less than 62 countries require import licenses; 46 require export licenses; 28 restrict incoming capital and 36 restrict outgoing capital; 23 have multiple rates of exchange; and 21 engage in preferential trading systems.

WE GIVE A LOT—AND GET SHORTCHANGED IN RETURN

Often the United States has reduced its tariffs if other countries simply agree not to increase theirs. Sometimes other countries lower their tariffs on a so-called reciprocal basis—but continue using other types of restrictions against our goods. Here is how this inequality works:

In 1959 Great Britain shipped 210,494 passenger cars to this country, but took only 301 from us. West Germany sent us 205,799 cars, and took only 417 of ours. France shipped us 171,285 cars, and accepted 666 in return. We imported 46,629 cars from Italy, and sent 643 over there. Adding up, it turns out these countries sent us 634,207 cars—and took 2,027 U.S. cars.

WE ARE ALREADY SPENDING OVERSEAS $3–$4 BILLION A YEAR MORE THAN WE TAKE IN

In 1959 the United States spent $3.7 billion more abroad than it earned. In 1958 the deficit amounted to $3.4 billion. This has upset what the economists call our balance of payments, drained over $3 billion out of our gold reserves in the last 2 years, and raised doubts around the free world about the soundness of the American dollar. Even our foreign friends agree we cannot continue running up losses like this indefinitely.

WE STILL DON'T KNOW HOW THE NEW TRADING BLOCS IN EUROPE WILL AFFECT US

The free nations of West Europe are split into two rival trading camps—the Common Market and the Free Trade Association. Both give favored treatment to their members. Both are still working out internal kinks, and will be for a long time. Both are composed largely of GATT member nations—but the tariff advantages they extend to each other discriminate against other GATT nations, including the United States.

The question is: How best can the United States deal with these rival blocs?

One thing is clear. We cannot bargain effectively with them until we know exactly how their tariff policies and procedures will affect us.

And obviously we cannot be expected to make a lot of tariff concessions at GATT's bargaining table, simply on promises that we will get concessions in return at some vague point in the future, after the new trade alliances have ironed out all their internal differences.

In short, the only sensible course open to us is to wait until the other parties decide how they are going to play the game. Then—and only then—will the United States be able to bargain realistically on a give-and-take basis.

Look what's happened to imports of some of the products on the tariff barter list. Are American companies and workers who make these products expendable?

Value of imports, 1959 over 1954—from U.S. Government statistics.

		Percent
Automobiles	up	1,537
Carbon tetrachloride	up	2,305
Cash registers and parts	up	318
Cotton yarn	up	42
Ethers and esters	up	505
Eyeglasses and goggles	up	477
Files and raps	up	152
Fishing tackle	up	333
Floor and wall tiles	up	1,513
Fountain pens	up	672
Hi-fi equipment	up	1,085
Linoleum	up	1,964
Machine tools (metal cutting and forming)	up	97
Needles	up	376
Paper box machines	up	250
Plate glass	up	270
Rayon staple	up	75
Rivets	up	120
Selected sporting equipment	up	8,498
Shotguns	up	118
Steel beams and girders	up	91
Surgical instruments	up	69
Synthetic iron oxide and pigments	up	90
Wire rods	up	120

PANAMA CANAL: PRIME TARGET FOR SUBVERSIVES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the Congress much was said on the floor of the House and before committees about the status of the Panama Canal and the strip of U.S. sovereign domain known as the Canal Zone.

The leader in what has been a campaign of enlightenment on Isthmian Canal policy questions is my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. His many years of steady, extensive travels, and keen awareness of the dangers in the evolving situation to the south, have enabled him not only to speak with authority but also to predict events with a remarkable degree of accuracy.

Notable among his predictions was his warning of the Congress on August 31, 1960, that after adjournment the President, on recommendation of the Secretary of State, would authorize the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone. As foretold, this occurred on September 17, 1960—the day known as Constitution Day.

Among recent published statements on the Panama Canal sovereignty question is the October 1960 leaflet of the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main Post Office, Yonkers, N.Y., which I quote as part of these remarks:

PANAMA CANAL

ITS HISTORY

The Isthmus of Panama is a tongue of land between the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea. This narrow strip became important as long ago as 1453 when Constantinople fell to the Turks and Christian Europe found itself cut off from India. Columbus sailed west to find a route to the East. Balboa followed and explored the Isthmus of Panama in search of a mythical waterway. Hernando Cortes, Spanish conqueror of Mexico, proposed construction of the needed water route. He was the first of many to hope for this water link. During six centuries, men planned, fought, and died in the cause of constructing a canal.

In 1883, a French company started excavation under Count de Lesseps. The company eventually found it needed 10 times the estimated funds and the project folded in 1889. Ferdinand Marie de Lesseps was condemned to imprisonment, but the sentence was not carried out. Thus, the genius responsible for the Suez Canal failed in Panama. The dream of Columbus remained but the dream of many at the birth of the 20th century.

The Spooner Act of 1902 authorized President Theodore Roosevelt to start a U.S. canal. Colombia owned Panama, however, and the Colombian Government would not do business. Panama revolted in 1903 and we recognized the provisional government immediately. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between the United States and Panama established the Canal Zone, comprised generally of a strip of land extending 5 miles on either side of the present canal. We paid the Republic of Panama $10 million in 1903 and $250,000 annually beginning in 1913. (We raised payments to $430,000 per year in 1936 and to $1,930,000 per year in 1955.) In 1921, the United States gave Colombia $25 million and special shipping rights across the Isthmus because of damages she suffered in the Panamanian revolt.

Building of the Panama Canal was prosecuted vigorously from 1907 to completion in 1914. Because of malaria and yellow fever, the United States drained and oiled the marshes of Panama and built sewerage and water supply systems for whole cities under the medical direction of Col. William C. Gorgas. Chief Engineers George W. Goethals and J. F. Stevens led military and Government workers. Vast expenditures in human lives and national assets brought about the opening of the Panama Canal on August 15, 1914.

From opening until today, the American flag has flown over the Panama Canal as testimony to the fact that the blood, sweat, and tears of our Nation called to life the dream of centuries. The Panama Canal is not international, is not the property of any other country. It is ours, just as much ours as the Capitol dome and the national anthem.

ITS INFILTRATION

The campaign to oust the United States from control of the Panama Canal was started by Communists and supported by leftwing university students and volatile nationalists in Panama.

Following the fall of Madrid to Franco at the end of the Spanish civil war in 1936, many of Spain's Loyalists (Communists) migrated to the Americas. One group cleared a crooked path to Panama and organized the political party called the Partido del Pueblo. Ever since, the population of Panama has been stirred up with demands for Panamanian sovereignty and American concessions of power. The idea is to lead the people to revolt by appealing to their national pride. Once the disturbance is great enough, the subject of Panama can be brought up in the U.N. Perhaps it can even be brought before the World Court. (No problem at all after repeal of the Connally reservation.) Mexico is on the World Court and her chief political party is pro-Castro; and, presumably, pronationalism anywhere in the Americas. Egypt is on the World Court and Nasser's position on sovereign rights in Suez would determine Egypt's vote in favor of independence for the Panama Canal. Russia and Poland are on the World Court. That adds up to four of the five votes necessary for a World Court quorum-majority against the United States in Panama. Unlikely? Yes, but so were the Red takeovers in parts of Africa, in China, in Cuba. We had better learn to protect ourselves against the improbable. Again, the

Red plan has been to stir up national feeling in Panama against the United States so as to create a crisis of worldwide interest. The Partido del Pueblo in Panama has demanded many things. Among them: a 50–50 division of gross toll receipts from the Canal; liquidation of our Panama Canal Company; prohibition of the use of the English language in the zone; flying of the flag of the Republic of Panama over the canal.

Now, what would you say if we told you that the United States is on the verge of giving in on at least one of these demands? Well, go ahead and say it, because the U.S. State Department has a strong body of advisers drawing up a recommendation that Panama be allowed to fly its flag over the Canal Zone. That sight should lead Panamanian nationalists to riot until we get out altogether. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania Democrat, has promised to press for the impeachment of the Secretary of State if the flag of Panama should ever be displayed over the canal with our consent.

The Reds love to use meaningless words. The Chinese and Cuban Communists were "Agrarian Reformers" when they were coming to power. And the flag of Panama over our canal is being described as a proposed symbol of Panama's "Titular Sovereignty." Why not a hammer and sickle over Alaska since Russia once owned Alaska? Or a French flag over the Louisiana Territory? Or a British flag over the Original Colonies? Those favoring the flying of Panama's flag in the Canal Zone should be required to view the famous flag-raising picture from Iwo Jima. Old Glory is a symbol not to be taken lightly, not to be replaced on any flagstaff without consequence.

The Canal Zone was lawfully purchased and the canal itself was built by the United States. To date, the U.S. taxpayers have spent more than a billion and a half dollars on construction and maintenance and they have collected from canal tolls only $966 million. Yet, we find America's rights at stake.

First, there will be the nationalization of the Panama Canal and the rise to power of an absolute, leftwing power in the Republic. Then, there will be the internationalizing of the canal when the Republic proves incapable of running it. It will be the turning over of the canal by a group of Communist nationals to a group of Communist internationals.

ASSORTED FACTS

A U.S. Communist, John Reed, who went to Russia in 1917 and now lies buried in Red Square, once said that "internationalization of the Panama Canal" was one of the aims of the Bolshevik revolution.

If Castro gets the Dominican Republic, he will lead a drive against the Panama Canal. Trujillo of the Dominican Republic is an anti-Communist. The State Department experts seem much more concerned over getting rid of Trujillo than over squashing Castro. If Trujillo goes, who comes in his place? And, if the answer is: "Another Castro," what becomes of the canal?

This year, our State Department removed some of the security provisions from jobs in the Canal Zone, and Red agitation and espionage were thereby accommodated.

The canal is the sole means of shifting war vessels from one ocean to the other quickly. Also, it is an essential supply line. Without our complete control, it is of little use to us in time of emergency.

Last year, Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant went to Panama to investigate anti-American riots. Panamanian authorities now insist he promised them that their flag would fly in the Canal Zone. Any statement to correct their impression, Mr. Merchant?

The Partido del Pueblo of Panama was one of the first Communist parties in the Caribbean. The Republic of Panama has two other parties, the National Liberal Party and the National Patriotic Coalition, both liberal; the Conservative Party is no longer in existence.

Panama imports over four times as much as she exports. This is because the canal brings a continuous stream of buyers into the country who buy imported goods from Panamanian middlemen. This is one example of the many ways in which the United States has been a benefactor of Panama. In return, we ask only that Panama keep her word, given in 1903, that the United States would always have rights to the Canal Zone "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

There is an enormous streamer on the campus of Panama's National University right now which reads, "The canal is ours."

OUR PROGRAM

1. Make the history of the canal known to others by way of fighting Red propaganda which says that America has been unfair in her dealings. The truth is that we have been more than generous with Panama and we have brought prosperity and sanitation to the people of the Republic without interfering with their freedom, government, and way of life. No other major power in history has ever treated its smaller neighbors so justly.

2. Write to Hon. Christian A. Herter, Department of State, Washington, D.C., and ask him to declare that the United States shall not permit the Panama flag to fly in the Canal Zone.

3. Write to your Senators and Representative requesting a joint congressional resolution reaffirming our historic policy of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone.

4. Sound out candidates for Congress and the Presidency on their position. If you get a reply from either major presidential candidate favoring our sovereign rights, return the letter with an inquiry as to how this can be done without the Connally reservation. (See our August leaflet.)

5. Repeat the entire truth and alert others to the danger we are facing in Panama. With our knowledge and consent, Panama's nationalistic efforts are gradually undermining our rights and obligations. Things may move to a head swiftly. A year before Castro organized the revolt in Cuba, few Americans had ever heard of him. The complete usurpation of our rights in the Canal Zone could come about just as suddenly—and soon. Our best defense is an informed and active America.

INAUGURATION OF THE GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very important event in the history of my beloved State of North Carolina. Yesterday I witnessed this event—the inauguration of Terry Sanford as Governor.

I was impressed with the ceremony and parade for Governor and Mrs. Sanford and with the military honors rendered for the new Governor and his wife. Former Gov. Luther Hodges and Mrs. Hodges were also honored by the military.

Most of all, however, I was impressed with the individual personalities and talents engaged in the ceremonies.

I would like to point out that Governor Hodges has had the longest tenure as Governor since North Carolina became a State in 1776. Governor Hodges has made us proud. We are proud of his success as a businessman, of his greatness as Governor, and of his integrity as a human being. It was no surprise to North Carolina that Governor Hodges was appointed as Secretary of Commerce for the Cabinet of President-elect John F. Kennedy.

Youthful, but mature, Terry Sanford is also capable of great leadership. He has the firm backing of the North Carolina citizenry and by the North Carolina congressional delegation that accompanied me yesterday. Our interest and presence at the inauguration is witness to our support and sincere best wishes for Governor Sanford's tenure in office.

I would also like to extend my best wishes to the new Lieutenant Governor, Harvey C. Philpott, who, as Governor Hodges, has been successful in business. With Governor Sanford's ability as an attorney and Lieutenant Governor Philpott's knowledge of the business world in North Carolina, our new gubernatorial team cannot be matched. The two Senators from North Carolina [SAM J. ERVIN, JR., and B. EVERETT JORDAN] had intended to be present at the inauguration, but at the last minute, were forced to change their plans because of senatorial obligations.

All of the Members of the House delegation in Congress were in attendance. They were: 1st District, HERBERT C. BONNER; 2d District, L. H. FOUNTAIN; 3d District, DAVID N. HENDERSON; 4th District, HAROLD D. COOLEY; 5th District, RALPH J. SCOTT; 6th District, HORACE R. KORNEGAY; 7th District, ALTON LENNON; 8th District, A. PAUL KITCHIN; 9th District, HUGH Q. ALEXANDER; 10th District, CHARLES RAPER JONAS; 11th District, BASIL L. WHITENER; and 12th District, ROY A. TAYLOR.

There follows the schedule of events on inauguration day:

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1961

10:30 a.m.:

Military honors rendered for Governor and Mrs. Hodges at the executive mansion, 200 North Blount Street.

10:35–11:50 a.m.:

Military escort of Governor and Mrs. Hodges, Governor-elect and Mrs. Sanford, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. Barnhardt, Lieutenant Governor-elect and Mrs. Philpott, and the inaugural party from the executive mansion to the Raleigh Memorial Auditorium. (Route: Blount Street to Edenton Street around Capitol Square and down Fayetteville Street.)

12:00 noon:

The inauguration, Raleigh Memorial Auditorium.

The inaugural proceedings called to order.

Processional by University of North Carolina Concert Band, Herbert W. Fred, conductor. The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Governor-elect, the Lieutenant Governor-elect, the supreme court, and members

of the Council of State are escorted to the stage.

The invocation by Dr. Charles Lynnwood Brown, pastor, White Memorial Presbyterian Church, Raleigh.

The national anthem by the entire assemblage led by Mrs. Willis Casey.

Administration of oaths of office to Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and members of the Council of State.

The inaugural address by Governor Sanford.

Festive finale "God of Our Fathers" (Warren-Maddy). The University of North Carolina combined choruses accompanied by the concert band. (Woman's College Choir, Richard Cox, director; Woman's College Chorus, William C. DeVeny, director; North Carolina State College Glee Club, J. Perry Watson, director; University of North Carolina Men's Glee Club, Joel Carter, director.)

The audience is invited to join in singing the final stanza.

The benediction by the Reverend Graham S. Eubank, district superintendent, the Methodist Church.

1:00 p.m.:

Military honors, including 19-gun salute, rendered for Governor and Mrs. Sanford in front of Raleigh Memorial Auditorium.

1:10 p.m.:

The inaugural parade passes in review on Fayetteville Street before Governor and Mrs. Sanford, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. Philpott, the inaugural party, and distinguished guests.

2:30 p.m.:

Buffet luncheon at the executive mansion for Governor and Mrs. Sanford, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. Philpott, the inaugural party, and distinguished guests.

8:00–10:00 p.m.:

Public reception at the executive mansion, 200 North Blount Street.

TAX ADJUSTMENT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. IKARD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this new Congress meets today with many problems facing our Nation in both domestic and international areas. Some of the problems are of recent origin and will require intense study and analysis prior to the enactment of legislation or the formulation of policies for their solution. However, there are certain specific, long-recognized problems of vital importance to our domestic economy for which solutions have been devised after lengthy and critical studies and painstaking analysis—and which now require only action by the Congress to reap their beneficial effects.

Foremost on this list is H.R. 2, which I have introduced today, which provides for a tax adjustment based upon the reinvestment-of-earnings principle. The bill is designed to assist small and growing business to obtain much needed business capital by authorizing a deduction from taxable net income, an amount equal to the aggregate addition to capital represented by reinvestment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable. The maximum deduction would be 20 percent of net income or $30,000, whichever is the lesser.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of H.R. 2 are not new. The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and I introduced identical bills in the 86th Congress containing these provisions and they were also contained in several companion bills which were before the last two Congresses. The proposal has the recommendation of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, as well as the active support and sponsorship of many Members of Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means, after extensive hearings, recognized the desirability of this legislation in meeting one of the greatest problems of small business. In its Report No. 2198, dated July 16, 1958, the committee stated:

> Your committee is convinced that one of the greatest problems confronting small and medium sized business is the acquisition of sufficient capital to modernize and maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors. In this regard your committee is aware of the fact that small and medium sized businesses must rely to a very large extent upon retained earnings for modernization and expansion. Thus, there is a need to allow such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes to provide the funds necessary for growth. To aid in achieving this end your committee has investigated thoroughly various proposals to postpone, or to reduce, taxes based upon reinvestment in inventory and depreciable property, and would have liked to have included a provision along these lines in this bill. However, it has been forced to the conclusion that the budgetary limitations under which all tax relief must now be considered are such that any tax reduction which now could be granted under a reinvestment formula is so small as not to represent any meaningful tax relief to small business.

Mr. Speaker, the endorsements of these committees were the results of lengthy hearings held throughout the country as well as in Washington. The action of these committees represents a considered judgment based upon the analysis of survival and growth problems affecting millions of small- and medium-size businesses. The proposals were backed by 60 national trade associations in 1958. An additional 31 national associations have since endorsed the legislation and the list is growing.

Action now is more vital than ever before. We are all well aware of the current depressing economic news which forebodes unemployment nearing or exceeding 6 million by the end of February. We know of the tremendous unused capacity of the Nation's steel plants, and the excess capacity of untold numbers of manufacturing establishments. We are cognizant of the inventory depletion of the distributive pipelines while consumer savings reach an all-time high. We are conscious of the demanding need of economic stimulants that will counteract the depressing effects of unemployment and unused productive capacity. Seldom is the opportunity presented to blend in one measure economic benefits providing immediate stimulants to our economy, as well as long overdue legislative recognition that the historical method of financing small business through reinvestment of retained earnings is absolutely vital to the growth and expansion of small- and medium-size businesses employing the bulk of American wage earners.

We have long taken pride in our dynamic economy which has placed our country on the productivity pinnacle of the world, thus enabling Americans to enjoy the highest standard of living. Serious unemployment, idle productive capacity, and the discouragement of investment remove the dynamo from dynamism. They shackle the efforts of our enterprising small businessman in his struggle to survive, let alone contribute to an ever-growing, ever-expanding economy. The tax adjustment contained in H.R. 2 offers a sensible, simple, practical, and immediate solution to the pressing problem of millions of small businesses in their efforts to obtain and retain an economic role in our manufacturing, distributive, and service systems. It uses the time-tested, time-honored, and tradition-steeped method of capital acquisition—retained earnings—to finance plant modernization, other depreciable assets, and the purchase of inventories.

Opportunities for securing necessary equity capital by small business are based upon the demand for the available supply of capital and the prospects of after-tax earnings sufficient to pay dividends or repay borrowed money. Small businesses have found it almost impossible to secure the required funds from the capital markets, and the voluminous record of the 1957 hearings held by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in 14 major metropolitan business areas on this very problem is replete with case history after case history of small- and medium-size business firms unable to secure funds on any basis, equity or debt, because their retained earnings prospects after taxes were disproportionately lower than larger firms seeking the same funds. Added to this chronic credit problem is the fact that in 4 of the last 5 years, the monetary authorities have followed active policies of credit restraint designed to make credit more expensive. These policies have had only one effect on small business: Credit which was difficult to obtain normally became increasingly more so, and equity investment, dependent upon prospects or growth through retained earnings, almost disappeared from the scene.

Mr. Speaker, capital and credit availability to enable small- and medium-size businesses to realize their growth potential, can be effectively realized through the early enactment of this tax adjustment measure, and at the same time provide a powerful stimulant to the specific areas of our economy most in need of bolstering. Less than 3 weeks ago, the staff report to the Select Committee on Small Business of the House on the Status of Small Business in Retail Trade, dated December 16, 1960, in cautioning against a complacent attitude toward the problems of small business, had this to say in its conclusions:

> The fact that business failures from 1948 to 1959 involved firms with current assets of over $1.5 billion, suggests the magnitude of the losses and hardships experienced by those involved. This justifies continuation of efforts aimed at providing small businesses

with a competitive atmosphere and a tax, financial, and general economic environment in which individual initiative and efficiency, rather than large financial resources and market power, determine survival and growth.

The cornerstone of the reinvestment of earnings principle contained in the bill is that the tax credit is only available to those businesses who increase their expenditures for depreciable assets and stock in trade. A business must take affirmative action in increasing investments in expansion, modernization, increased inventories and accounts receivable to be eligible for the tax credit. Revenue loss, if any, would be minimal. Moreover, the stimulus to employment and production resulting from the reinvestment incentives would precede by at least 1 year whatever tax impact there might be, if any.

I have long been impressed with the basic simplicity and soundness of the reinvestment of retained earnings approach as the solution to the capital funds required so urgently to finance the growth of these smaller concerns. The current state of the economy reemphasizes the benefits obtainable to the entire business structure, through increased employment and renewed productivity of idle plant capacity, by early enactment of the measure by this Congress. In view of the overwhelming evidence supporting the necessity for the affirmative relief, which the measure would grant, contained in the hearings of several committees of both Houses of the Congress, and reaffirmed in committee reports, it is my earnest hope that favorable consideration of the bill will be one of the first actions taken by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include H.R. 2 in the RECORD at this point:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEDUCTION FOR ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE ASSETS, INVENTORY, AND ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.

(a) ALLOWANCE.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 181. ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE ASSETS, INVENTORY, AND ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount measured by the additional investment in such trade or business for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The deduction under this section for any taxable year shall not exceed whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) $30,000, or

"(2) an amount equal to 20 percent of the taxable income (computed without regard to this section) from such trade or business for the taxable year.

"(c) ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT DEFINED.—For purpose of this section, the additional investment in a trade or business for a taxable year means the amount (if any) by which—

"(1) the aggregate, computed as of the close of the taxable year, of the adjusted bases of—

"(A) all property used in the trade or business of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167,

"(B) all stock in trade and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, and

"(C) all accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, exceeds

"(2) a similar aggregate, computed as of the beginning of such taxable year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES—LIMITATION ON AFFILIATED GROUP.—For the purposes of this section:

"(1) All members of an affiliated group shall be treated as one taxpayer, and

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate shall apportion the limitation contained in subsection (b) of this section among the members of such affiliated group in such manner as he shall by regulations provide.

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUP DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to it by section 1504, except that, for such purposes, the phrase 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 80 percent' each place it occurs in section 1504(a)."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 181. Additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

TWO NECESSARY PIECES OF ECONOMIC LEGISLATION: THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL AND A BILL TO EXTEND TAX CONCESSIONS TO FIRMS EXPANDING OR MOVING INTO UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I introduced for appropriate reference two pieces of legislation which I believe to be urgently needed in meeting the most serious economic problem that faces this Nation today, the problem of unemployment.

My first bill is the familiar depressed area bill which was passed by the 86th Congress, subsequently vetoed by President Eisenhower, and which featured so prominently in the recent election campaign. I have introduced this measure in the precise form in which it passed the Congress last year. While some changes might be desirable, last year's bill would at least seem to offer the formula by which most rapid agreement can be achieved in the 87th Congress, and certainly we must act quickly.

My second bill I also had the honor of introducing in the 86th Congress, and, in my judgment, it is an important and necessary adjunct to any depressed area bill. The depressed area bill proposes to entice new industries into unemployment areas by making low-cost loan funds readily available to them. But the absence of such funds is not in every case the major reason why unemployment areas find it difficult to attract new industry. There are also the incentives, usually offered in the form of lower real property tax, currently being extended to new business by some of our sister States in the South. Concessions of this kind, together with apparent advantages in lower wage costs and lower social protective legislation, have played their part, too, in luring industries into moving from the North to the South, leaving unemployment distress in their wake.

So I believe we must find some means of eliminating this disparity and provide certain counter concessions to those manufacturers who are willing either to move into an unemployment area or who are prepared to resist the lure of moving and who decide instead to remain in a distressed area and expand their manufacturing facilities there.

My bill would enable such businesses to depreciate their construction costs at a faster rate. Rapid amortization is not, of course, any forgiveness in taxes. It is only a temporary deferral of tax returns to the Government. Yet experience has shown that this type of tax treatment can be helpful as a business stimulant. We must make it more attractive for industry to stay where it is, or even to move back into unemployment areas, and I believe this legislation will help to do the job.

On Monday the special task force on economic distressed areas appointed by President-elect Kennedy and presided over by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], submitted its recommendations for dealing with this problem. I was most pleased to see included in these recommendations one proposing precisely the kind of special tax amortization provided for in my legislation. The report's recommendation is as follows:

As additional encouragement to private industry to locate branch plants in chronic and persistent labor surplus areas and to expand existing enterprises in these areas, consideration should be given to the question of whether special tax amortization providing for accelerated writeoff of plant and equipment would help to encourage industries to locate or expand production facilities in such areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy action on my two bills. The hour is late and the needs in my district and of other districts throughout our country press for the swiftest and most effective type of remedial action. Very likely in meeting the needs of these unemployment areas we will also succeed in providing the added push that will succeed in getting our overall economy out of its current doldrums and moving ahead once again.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE CHARTER

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege today to introduce a bill providing for a home

rule charter for the District of Columbia. This bill, which is being simultaneously introduced in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, and by the able chairman of the Senate District Committee, Senator BIBLE, provides for an elective mayor, council, and nonvoting Delegate to this House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following joint statement by myself and my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, be printed in full at this point in my remarks:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AND CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN OF OREGON

We have today introduced in the Senate and House, respectively, a bill providing for a meaningful and democratic home rule charter for the District of Columbia. The bill which we have submitted to the Congress for what we hope will be early and favorable action, provides for an elective mayor, council, and nonvoting Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives. This measure, together with the constitutional amendment which the Congress last year submitted to the States, providing for a presidential vote for the people of the Nation's Capital, will bring the reality of democracy to the people of that city which ought to stand as a symbol of democracy throughout the world.

Contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers, and certainly contrary to the practice of the past, the residents of Washington have for many years been denied any voice in their own government. The affairs of this great American city have been in the hands of appointed officials of the District Commission, and the Members of the Congress, not one of whom could be held responsible in any way by the people of the District. This has been a simple and indefensible denial of the basic principle of democracy. It is not enough to say that the Commissioners have been good men. Most have been. It is not enough to say that the Members of the Congress have dealt generously with the people of the District, which has often been the case. The question of home rule is the question of the right of three-quarters of a million Americans to govern their own destinies, for good or ill.

We look forward with high hopes to the enactment of this legislation, and to the ratification of the proposed constitutional amendment by the State legislatures.

THE SPEAKER'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to congratulate the Speaker both as Speaker and as a friend on his birthday.

The following is a transcript of the tribute paid to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, just reelected Speaker for the ninth time. This tribute was broadcast by Ray Henley on the Three Star Extra program, Thursday evening, January 5, 1961, on the National Broadcasting Co. The following is the text of that nationwide broadcast:

The grand old man of the Democratic Party will be widely feted as another milestone comes round. The daddy leader will be 79 tomorrow. No man in the party receives so much affection from his followers. Mr. SAM is tough and often sharp of tongue, but Democrats, especially the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives know him as a man of his word and they hold him in highest esteem. A Republican Member has joined the parade of well-wishers. Representative JAMES FULTON, of Pennsylvania, has introduced his bill to have one of three House Office Buildings named for Mr. SAM.

Three Star Extra hopes this measure goes through, as of course it will if Speaker RAYBURN permits it to come up for action. The bill would name each of the buildings for a Speaker; one for Old Joe Cannon of long ago, one for Nick Longworth who died as Speaker in Republican days. He was the husband of Princess Alice, daughter of Teddy Roosevelt. The third building would be named the Rayburn Building, fully justified recognition for three outstanding Speakers of the House.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY BY THE PLYWOOD INDUSTRY

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, two of the pressing problems this Congress must face this year involve help for depressed areas and some action in providing for the needs of this country's senior citizens. An organization that has its headquarters in my district in Washington is doing something about both of these problems in a way I think should prove interesting to you and to some of the country's business leaders.

Plywood made from Douglas-fir and other trees that grow in the rain forests of the Northwest is familiar to everybody. I do not think it will come as a surprise to you that nearly two 4-by-8-foot panels are produced every year for every man, woman, and child in this country.

But an industry with this kind of production capacity is obviously in trouble when its markets fail. Housing has dropped seriously in the last year and this is the biggest market for the western plywood industry.

This has meant falling prices, production curtailment, unemployment, and depression-like conditions for a lot of areas in Washington, Oregon, and California. The Plywood Belt has some depressed areas that would compare with any in the country. These areas are dependent on plywood and lumber, both of which are in a depressed state.

Despite these conditions, plywood production is higher than it was in 1959. This is because many mills expanded in hopes market conditions would be good. Housing experts predicted—falsely, it turned out—a good year in 1960. This increased production was sold, and used, because the industry has been working on expanding its markets for more than 20 years. The industry could have produced much more than it did, but at least it was not forced to retreat.

The promotional arm of the industry is the Douglas-Fir Plywood Association. More than 130 western plywood mills are members. This association provides quality control for its members to keep their production up to high, voluntary standards, and also administers a promotional program underwritten last year in the amount of $5.5 million. Part of the association's job is research. It operates three laboratories to do it. Another part is to find new markets and help sell them.

Because of some circumstances I will not go into here, the association began studying the field of retirement housing more than 2 years ago. W. E. Difford, executive vice president of the Douglas-Fir Plywood Association, was convinced there was something wrong with the stereotype we have of the retired person. Mr. Difford doubted if the majority were poor and he was even more doubtful that very many were handicapped and needed institutional care. Yet, so far as the association could discover, these groups, and the small group wealthy enough to afford expensive housing, were the only ones getting any attention from government or private industry.

After looking over the results of its own study, the plywood association organized a conference on retirement housing in Tacoma, where its headquarters are located. Mr. Difford invited the most knowledgeable people he could find: builders who were active in the field, architects, editors of influential building magazines, officials of national groups involved with retired people, and a representative of a Government agency active in the field of housing the elderly.

These experts sat down for 2 days and discussed possible ways to reach a market they are convinced has a potential of a quarter of a million housing units per year.

They reached this figure through a number of surveys that were presented and from the experience builders have had who aimed their developments directly at persons 60 years old and over. The surveys also prove that most of the couples who have reached retirement age can afford to supply their own needs. It also was pretty obvious that a lot of the things they need are not available. One of these things was comfortable housing at reasonable cost.

Here is what the plywood industry, working through its association, is doing to help itself and to help satisfy some of the needs of our senior citizens.

A house has been built, on a corner of 17th and M Streets, here in Washington, that the plywood association has had designed specifically for Americans over 60. It is completely furnished and landscaped. It was built there for display to delegates to the White House Conference on Aging and is well worth your time to see. The house is cosponsored by the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons whose 500,000 members certainly would know something about the value of the project.

It is a small, compact home that has all the features anyone could want. It

is easy to maintain, comfortable, and, perhaps best of all, can be built for about $9,000. It has two bedrooms, a separate dining room, a modern kitchen—even a special room where the homeowner can install woodworking equipment or work on a hobby.

In addition to this, the plywood association is providing everything a builder needs to offer this house in his area. Plans, financing information, data on the market, methods of selling—these things are all available. These houses should sell everywhere in the country, everywhere people live and want to live their retirement years. And the house can be built by itself, as part of a duplex or four-plex, or as a unit in row or tract housing.

As a result of its own efforts, and using its own money, here is what the plywood industry has done:

It has provided a much-needed solution to some pressing housing needs for elderly people who are living in houses too big or too inconvenient for their needs, and for others unnecessarily living in institutions.

The housing industry, in desperate need of something to help it get on its feet, has everything it needs to appeal to a new and immense market.

For itself, the plywood industry has created a market that will allow it to go back to full employment and cure the depressed conditions in the areas so dependent on it.

The plywood industry believes that this is certainly a much healthier way to solve these problems than to call on the Federal Government for aid to depressed areas and subsidized housing for the elderly. Certainly, Government programs can help, particularly in the field of mortgage insurance. But by doing something about these things itself, the plywood industry has saved the taxpayer a lot of money and saved a lot of Americans from hardship and inconvenience.

This house is open now for the inspection of White House Conference delegates. Invitations also have been sent to the Members of Congress. I earnestly urge you to take time from your busy schedule to see for yourself what this dynamic industry has done to help itself and to help this country.

TAX ADJUSTMENT BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a tax adjustment bill primarily designed to aid small- and medium-size businesses utilizing the reinvestment of earnings principle. It is identical with the bill which my colleague, the Honorable FRANK IKARD, of Texas, introduced in the last Congress.

The bill is a simple straightforward measure to encourage the growth of small- and medium-size concerns by enabling them to use some of their net earnings to finance growth through expansion and modernization. It would permit millions of businesses located in every city, town, or hamlet to use the historical method of financing business in the American economy—by plowing back into the productive wealth stream some of their business earnings. Specifically, the bill would permit all business to deduct from taxable net income an amount equal to the aggregate addition to capital represented by reinvestment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, provided that the maximum deductions would be 20 percent of earnings or $30,000, whichever is the lesser.

The bill has been aptly characterized as implementing the seed corn philosophy upon which the productive might of America has been nourished. That philosophy is likewise simple, sound, and straightforward. We plant 1 acre of corn, but we retain enough seed from the harvest to plant 2 acres next year. For new and small businesses, there is no other avenue of growth except through retained earnings, because capital from bank borrowings, new equity, or other sources is not generally available to them.

The bill will provide the favorable climate necessary for growth. Growth and expansion will continue to be the rewards of ingenious, enterprising, and competent management. But such management cannot have superimposed on it growth tax deterrents which effectively prevent the increase in next year's plantings. The bill is not special privilege legislation because it applies to all businesses, large or small, incorporated or unincorporated, but it is recognized that it will have the most beneficial effect on the smaller businesses.

Adequate capital for the attraction of additional entrepreneurs, for the survival as well as the growth of existing small businesses, has long been recognized as a widespread real problem. While the capital problems of small business have been recognized and extensively documented by a multitude of case histories and congressional committee conclusions in recent years, no relief has been granted and the problem has become increasingly acute. The extent of the problem is mirrored in the increase in business failures as well as the dramatic increase in mergers and acquisition of smaller units by larger concerns.

Today, the country is faced with mounting unemployment and increasing idle productive capacity resulting principally from deferral of capital expenditures and contraction of inventories. These economic depressants can receive a vital counterstimulant by the enactment of this measure which will increase expenditures by business in depreciable capital assets as well as the stock in trade end products of our manufacturing and processing industries. In other words the tax adjustment is not available unless the business increases its investment through modernization of or additions to facilities or inventories.

America is in the beginning years of a decade labeled by some as the soaring sixties in which the economic horizons have been painted with glowing promises of uninterrupted new peak achievements in all lines of endeavor. Quite recently, concern has been expressed lest the idle plant capacity, the number of unemployed plus the foreseeable additions to the labor force during this decade—which will be half again as large as the new workers during the fifties—should warrant the reference to be the sobering sixties. While reappraisals must constantly be made none is required to reassure ourselves that America must grow during the sixties to provide job opportunities for the some 14 million who will be seeking employment. We know we must have economic growth as the base for an adequate national security program. We cannot afford to be blind to the methods by which new and enterprising businesses are fostered and nourished. We cannot let the vigor and benefits of new ideas, expanding programs, and energetic approaches to the creation of new wealth be sacrificed on the altar of blind adherence to a tax policy which everyone readily admits is stifling small businesses which must rely on the seed corn of retained earnings to grow and prosper.

I am sure that it is now generally recognized that this adjustment will not result in any revenue loss to the Federal Treasury, but rather the adjustment will result in additional Federal revenues. The time has just about expired when the Federal Treasury can afford not to have this legislation enacted. The smaller concerns in all lines of business must be able to retain a larger part of their earnings to meet their working capital requirements if we are to give more than lipservice to the necessity of maintaining a climate favorable to the economic growth of these millions of businesses.

This bill provides for the relief so sorely needed. It will provide additional employment not only in the smaller concerns but to all producers and suppliers of capital goods and their end products. It will reactivate existing idle plant capacity. It is a perfect example of the seed corn philosophy at work. I earnestly hope that the Ways and Means Committee will schedule the small business tax adjustment bills for early consideration since it has previously approved the reinvestment of earnings principle and recognized the necessity for its adoption to afford effective relief to small business.

REELECTION OF WILLIAM E. MILLER OF NEW YORK AS CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker I rise today to pay tribute to the gentleman from

New York [Mr. MILLER] and to congratulate him on his reelection as chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee.

Everyone who has served in this body during the past 10 years and those new Republican members who Tuesday were seated for the first time know BILL MILLER as a capable and devoted legislator, and indefatigable worker and a campaign director without peer.

During the five terms he already has served in the Congress, he has established himself as a true statesman and a valued colleague. He has never deviated from principle, regardless of the tremendous pressures which often have been brought to bear on him. His judgment and counsel on all legislative matters have been invaluable to his colleagues, his constituency, and his Nation as a whole.

BILL MILLER first was elected chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee on January 21, 1960, to succeed our late and beloved colleague from Pennsylvania, Richard M. Simpson. In less than a year, he has distinguished himself in a most remarkable way.

Because of his leadership and his willingness to help Republican candidates anywhere and at all times, last November our party was able to recapture 21 of the seats we had lost in the preceding election.

The victory was particularly significant because it came during a year when the Nation was electing a member of the opposite party to the Presidency.

In addition, BILL MILLER has breathed new fire into the committee he heads. Under his chairmanship, a vigorous, efficient, and effective organization has been developed. I am confident that because of this, the minority in this body again will become the majority when the people go to the polls in 1962.

CHIEF FORESTER OF UNITED STATES HONORED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service rates high in the esteem of Congress. The efforts and accomplishments of the U.S. Forest Service in the multiple-use management of our great Federal forest properties and in the administration of the cooperative programs with our State and private forestry agencies are outstanding. This bureau is represented by a dedicated group of Federal employees who have an enviable esprit de corps and a reputation for hard work. It is also a bureau that returns large sums of money to the Federal Treasury and to the States from the sale of timber and other forest resources which it harvests on a sustained yield basis.

It is fitting therefore that Chief Forester Richard E. McArdle is one of the five career men of the Federal Government to go to the White House on January 11 to receive the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

The President based his selections on recommendations of an awards board headed by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor.

To be selected from the 2.4 million U.S. civil servants as one of the 5 employees to receive this significant citation is, indeed, an honor of which Chief McArdle is deserving.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the record excerpts from the Washington Post's January 4 account of this award:

"Through these awards," said the President in a special memorandum, "a grateful Nation honors these men who have dedicated their highest abilities to serving the best interests of this great country.

"I take this opportunity to express my faith in the skill and devotion to duty that characterize the Federal work force. These characteristics provide a firm basis for the Nation's continued progress in the future."

McArdle, a Government forester for 36 years, has served in all major forest regions of the United States and, the President said, his "imagination, vision, and inspiring leadership have brought exceptional progress in the development and protection of vital forest resources for the American people now and for generations to follow." McArdle, a native of Kentucky, received a Ph. D. degree from the University of Michigan and devoted his early career to research in forestry.

TEN-YEAR PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1959, I introduced in the first session of the 86th Congress a bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for the construction of medical, dental, and public health education facilities. I did so because we as a nation are sorely lagging in developing our schools of medicine, dentistry, public health, and other centers for education and research in the health field. We are not equipped to meet the needs of today and even less prepared to face the challenges of tomorrow.

My proposal received no support whatever from the Eisenhower administration and no action was taken by that session of the Congress. Hearings were held in June of 1960, and the proposed legislation to provide Federal funds for the construction and expansion of health teaching facilities received wide support from eminent medical, dental, and public health educational authorities throughout the country. Nonetheless, the bill was never reported out of committee.

Today, I ask this Congress to move quickly in authorizing a program for the construction of medical, dental, and public health training facilities. We have lost more ground than we can afford during the past 18 months, and we dare not lose more.

One of the more sobering realities of American life today is that we are rapidly developing a shortage of physicians and other health workers. We are facing a shortage which will reach 15,000 physicians and 15,000 dentists by 1975. The prospect imperils the maintenance of our present health standards and precludes the expansion demanded by our growing and aging population. Unless some positive steps are taken now, this shortage will be reflected in a lower level of quality and in maldistribution of the Nation's health and medical services.

We simply cannot let this situation continue. It is perfectly clear what must be done, and done quickly, for every month's delay simply intensifies the problem. We need facilities for educating greater numbers of medical, dental, and public health students each year, and these facilities will become possible only with the assistance of the Federal Government.

The facts are set down clearly in a broad-scale study of medical education, conducted for the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service by a group of national leaders in medicine, education, and public affairs, and published some 15 months ago. While the data contained in the report have been well known for a long time to those of us who have been concerned with the problems of education in the health professions, the conclusions give added urgency to our conviction that immediate action is required. I am sure that many of you are familiar with this report, entitled "Physicians for a Growing America," which brings together in one place all of the circumstances and conditions which surround medical education today. To those of you who are not, I recommend it as required reading at an early date.

Specifically, among its recommendations, the report states:

To increase the supply of physicians and to safeguard and protect the Nation's investment in research and medical care facilities, Federal support should be given to the construction of medical school facilities.

Bear in mind that this was a unanimous recommendation of 22 non-Federal leaders in medicine, medical education, and related fields.

We Americans speak proudly of our progress in the health field. It is true that we have made tremendous strides in many areas. We can be proud of what has been accomplished in the construction of hospital and other health facilities, in the improvements of medical and public health services, in medical research and the assurance of its future development. We can be pleased with the advances associated with the pharmaceutical and chemical industry, with the contributions of voluntary health agencies and foundations, and with the health consciousness of the American people which finds expression in organization and action. We can be proud of these things, and pleased, but we cannot be content.

As I pointed out in this House 18 months ago, one of the great gaps in our present programs is in the absence of broad support for the health institutions as contrasted with the support of some of their separate functions. Medical teaching institutions now receive grants from the Federal Government to assist in the support of teaching in specific branches of medical science. Through the provisions of the Health Research Facilities Act, Federal funds also are available for the establishment of laboratories and other research facilities. But, to date, the necessary assistance has not been forthcoming to enable these teaching institutions quantitatively to keep up with our population growth and with the demands engendered by the rapid changes in medicine and public health.

This longtime concern of mine has been shared by many people who are influential leaders in medicine and science today. Numerous proposals have come from the Members of the Congress, from the executive branch, and from interests outside the Federal Government devising ways to meet at least part of the all-too-evident need. There has been a great deal of discussion but almost nothing in the way of action.

Today I ask the Congress once more to consider legislation to give greater Federal assistance in the renovation and modernization of our present medical and related schools, and to give encouragement and stimulus to the construction of new schools. The legislation I am introducing would build upon and extend into a parallel field the highly productive present program of matching grants to assist in the construction of health research facilities. As I told the House a year and a half ago, this procedure would set no new precedents. Nor would it pose any philosophical problems, even among those who persist in the archaic belief that the use of Federal funds for the partial support of medical school activities would be a threat of Federal control and socialized medicine.

This legislation gives clear recognition to three things: First, that in a medical school research and education are interrelated parts of a single process; second, that adequate facilities are a basic requirement for medical, dental, and related research and education; and third, that the Federal Government shares in the responsibility to see that such facilities are abreast of the national need.

My proposals are completely in step with other construction programs, where matching funds from Federal sources—such as the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and the health research facilities construction program—have proved highly successful in helping the States, communities, and institutions raise money from non-Federal sources. Such matching grants foster and encourage the putting of State and private money to effective use. Without the stimulus of Federal funds, the other funds might never be raised and the needed facilities probably never would be built.

I urgently recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation to modify and extend the Public Health Service Act in the following major respects:

First. Add a new title to the Public Health Service Act to provide funds for the construction of health educational facilities for our public and nonprofit medical, dental, and public health schools to insure the continued production of an adequate number of properly qualified and trained physicians, dentists, teachers, and research scientists.

Second. Authorize appropriations of $50 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for grants for the expansion and improvement of existing schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health.

Third. Authorize appropriations of $100 million for the period beginning July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1971, for grants for the construction of new schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health.

Fourth. Establish in the Public Health Service a National Advisory Council on Health Educational Facilities to advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and to consider all applicants for health educational facilities grants. This Council would consist of the Surgeon General, as Chairman, and the Commissioner of Education as ex officio members, and of 10 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from the fields of health sciences, education, and public affairs.

I repeat, there is great need for the rapid enactment of such legislation.

I have already referred to the population changes that will occur during the next decade. Our total population will grow from the present 180 million to 220 million by 1970. Nearly three-quarters of this increase will be among persons over 65 and under 20 years of age, when requirements for medical care—which means primarily more physicians—are most frequent.

The report of the Surgeon General's consultant group of medical education—to which I referred earlier—states that to maintain the present ratio of 141 physicians to 100,000 population will require a total of 330,000 physicians in 1975. If the schools must graduate 11,000 medical students a year by that time—or 3,600 more a year than are presently being graduated—this means almost a 50-percent increase in output.

Moreover, the estimate that 330,000 physicians will be required by 1975 includes the more than 1,500 physicians trained in foreign medical schools who are now licensed in this country each year. Obviously, we welcome all qualified physicians trained abroad to practice medicine in the United States if they wish to do so. At the same time, it is disquieting that a great and wealthy Nation such as ours should be dependent on other countries of the world for an adequate flow of medical manpower. This situation exists in no other circumstance in our country and highlights, I believe, the really acute state in our health and medical field.

The consultants' report also makes the very important point that to meet this 1975 figure, present schools must be expanded and a number of new schools established. Since the establishment of a new medical school usually takes about 10 years from the first planning to graduation of the first class, planning must begin right now. The report also applies the same urgency both as to need for increased numbers and to additional teaching facilities to dentists as to physicians.

An additional important consideration I would bring to your attention is the increasing responsibility carried by the medical schools in pioneering in the provision of medical and community health services. These schools carry out the largest component of the Nation's research effort in the health field. In addition, they produce an important segment of the Nation's total manpower for research in the health sciences.

As I told this body in May of 1959, the medical schools need for assistance in the construction of new and the renovation of existing facilities has been amply demonstrated and often reiterated in studies and reports by such eminent groups as the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, the Surgeon General's consultant group, this House itself, along with many others whose interest, insight, and integrity are beyond question. They do not pretend, nor do I, that matching grants for construction purposes will meet all of the future needs of the medical schools. I intend to recommend further steps in the direction of additional assistance at an early date.

Right now, existing health educational institutions are inadequately housed and we need new schools to provide for the years ahead. It is futile to pretend that any other segment of American economy will meet this need without some Federal assistance.

To paraphrase the words of the Surgeon General's consultant group:

> As a nation we have come to value and expect first-class medical service for all our people. But the provision of such service will require more physicians, dentists, and other health personnel. Without them, the amount and quality of care must suffer. We have here a national health problem, the need of the whole people. The provision of the needed support is without question a national responsibility.

BILL TO PERMIT CERTAIN VETERANS TO REINSTATE THEIR NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will permit certain veterans to reinstate their national service life insurance. I feel this is a long needed correction of an injustice that was done in 1951.

World War II veterans, as well as Korean war veterans, were not properly

warned, and reopening the right for them to reinstate their national service life insurance is no more than fair. At the time of discharge, many of these veterans were relatively young and they were not aware of the values of this insurance. Some cases have come to my attention where veterans were even advised to drop their Government life insurance by service personnel who were uninformed.

I strongly urge the speedy enactment of this legislation to rectify this harsh treatment of our veterans.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SUBVERSION IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in numerous statements to the House and in press releases, I have emphasized the treasonable influences in the Department of State as related to the conduct of our Caribbean and Isthmian Canal policies.

The strength of these influences was boldly exhibited on September 17, 1960, officially designated as Constitution Day, when the President shocked the Nation with his order striking the flag of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

Less dramatic but equally serious in its implications has been the failure of our Cuban policy, resulting in the loss of vast properties of U.S. citizens, the setting up of a Soviet satellite in the West Indies, and invasions of other countries by revolutionaries from Cuba.

So far the press of our Nation has not treated these questions as they should be, with the result that the influences responsible for these dangerous developments are still with us.

Fortunately, one distinguished scholar and author, George E. Sokolsky, of New York, has pointed directly to the source of the trouble-subversion in the Department of State.

In a recent series of illuminating articles, which I commend for reading by every Member of the Congress, he urges public investigation of these subversive influences in the Department of State.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 17, 1960]

THE ORGANIZATION OF STATE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The foreign affairs of this country have assumed a primacy in the public eye that is considerably exaggerated for unless this country's currency is sound, unless its workers are employed and its social conditions are stable, it cannot maintain the role of leadership.

* * * * *

The State Department needs reorganization in all departments. A new Secretary of State is handicapped by leftovers who have tenure under Civil Service and Foreign Service regulations. The Cuban situation is evidence that there are still hidden Communists in this critical Department and they should be expelled because it is impossible to serve the United States and the Kremlin simultaneously. There ought to be a congressional investigation of the operations of the desks having to do with Latin America. The investigation should be public with nothing hidden away to save anyone's face. This country would be shocked at what would be discovered. The Alger Hiss case would take second place.

The trouble with the intramural investigations is that the American people, who are most concerned, are never given the information which they should have. No newspaper can make public what it could not prove in a court to be true and to prove "what everybody knows" would require a subpena and the power to cross-examine witnesses under oath.

A new Secretary of State can so reorganize his Department that those who can be harmful are put in places where they can do no harm. He has the opportunity of a new approach and of reorganization, particularly if his President means to clean house.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 22, 1960]

WHO IS HE?

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The anti-Castro Cubans have been telling me for more than 6 months that an official of the State Department, William Arthur Montenegro, is responsible for the success of Fidel Castro.

But the State Department records do not show the employment of a William Arthur Montenegro. Is this a personality with two names? Does a person who has an effective voice in determining American policy in Latin America go by two names? Latin American Communists know of two men by the name of Montenegro, one who is actually a Communist Party member, another who was very sympathetic to the party. Both were journalists.

This is a case for Robert Kennedy, the oncoming Attorney General, a very tough "Mick" who is not likely to look on a cover-up very kindly. His book, "The Enemy Within," establishes that he regards the Department of Justice with a jaundiced eye because it has lost too many cases in the courts which adequate preparation should have won. Searching for Montenegro ought not to be difficult. No matter what name he employs, the record of how things were made easy for Castro by the Government of the United States will lead directly to a case which, if properly prepared, will make previous cases look very mild, indeed.

William Arthur Montenegro, under that name and under another name, wrote for the Havana Post from 1933 to 1937. That is a good place to start if anyone needs a tip. There are articles in that paper which were contributed by such a person.

The State Department has a technique for covering up and for evading scandals. When a State Department official goes wrong or is caught with bloody hands, the trick is to send him to other parts of the world, far from news centers, until those who are interested forget about him, get interested in something else, or die. Then the career official who went awry may return to Washington.

But the Cuban story will not die down. Too many Cubans have been robbed of their homes. Too many Americans have lost their businesses. Too many Latin Americans fear the Communist menace.

They are after William Arthur Montenegro by whatever name he has gone in the State Department. They know who he is, and they will not rest, no matter to what embassy in Europe the State Department sends him.

Were there such a committee as Senator McCarran or Senator Joseph McCarthy headed, there would be an investigation of major magnitude, and it would be out in the open. Senator FULBRIGHT is insistent that the State Department depend upon especially trained men, career men, those who prepare themselves for the Foreign Service and stay in it as a life work. Therefore, it is up to Senator FULBRIGHT to investigate William Arthur Montenegro by whatever name he has gone in the State Department for nearly two decades. Also, they would want to know precisely what incompleted educational preparation this person had for a State Department career.

How is it possible for a person to enter upon a State Department career without training, with a record of only 1 year in college and an incompleted premedical course? What goes on in that very choice department of Government?

On this subject, there ought to be a public hearing and the first three men who ought to testify in public should be Robert Hill, American Ambassador to Mexico; Arthur Gardner, American Ambassador to Cuba; Earl E. T. Smith, American Ambassador to Cuba. These men should be required to tell publicly, under oath, what their personal experience has been in the Castro matter and what their experience has been with the State Department, and what reports they sent to the Department warning of the perils in Latin America and how their warnings were ignored. It would be interesting to know if such reports reached higher officials, particularly President Eisenhower. Also, such an open, public hearing might ask Herbert Matthews of the New York Times to identify William Arthur Montenegro. Anti-Castro Cubans insist that to understand the State Department attitude toward Castro, it is essential to have Matthews identify Montenegro. Also, Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith told me that when he was appointed ambassador, he was instructed by the State Department to be briefed by Herbert Matthews. Smith also testified to this effect before a congressional committee.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1960]

EACH YEAR ITS OWN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The year 1961 brings in a new President, with some new faces in his administration and some very old ones. Some of the new faces give hope of a rationalization of the structure and policy of government. Some of the old faces are not a little frightening because they were among the authors of the errors which have brought upon us many of our present difficulties. But men do grow older and they do mature and those who blundered may have learned that doctrinaire assumptions are neither facts nor policies.

* * * * *

What is necessary is not so much a reformulation of policy as a total reorganization of the personnel of the State Department.

And this brings me to the question of what will be done about William Arthur Montenegro, by whatever name he goes in the State Department.

I have been told that the Eastland committee has been investigating William Arthur Montenegro, by whatever name he goes, for many months, and that this committee possesses more information concerning him and his activities than I possess, although I doubt that, for I have the entire story. However, if the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee possesses such data, what is it waiting for?

The new President will need to face many reorganizations of departments, but none is as important as the restudy of the personnel of the State Department and of other departments which deal with foreign relations. For some reason, these departments have been infiltrated and infested with unsatisfactory personnel. It is not so much a matter of the "ugly American," as it is that the information which comes to a President is too often inadequate or even incorrect and that the day-by-day actions and decisions which cumulatively become policy before a President can act, are not always beneficial to the United States.

Some Presidents have taken the view that because these departments affect international relations, they must be protected from the vugiar eyes of the people through the action of a congressional committee. Thus great mischief can be done by small people. The William Arthur Montenegro case—by whatever name he goes—opens the door wide. No Secretary of State and no President can have any excuse for protecting this case from congressional investigation, and this one case will open many windows to shocking conditions.

The new President will have to clean house anyhow and he might as well start in the State Department which is the showcase of the Nation and a very sloppy showcase it is, indeed.

CUBA AND GUANTANAMO

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the breaking of diplomatic relations by the United States with the Communist-dominated Government of Cuba on January 3, 1960, as the result of a Cuban ultimatum to the United States to reduce its diplomatic mission in that country, again dramatizes the serious situation in the Caribbean about which I have addressed the Congress on many occasions and corresponded with the Department of State.

Promptly after learning of the President's action, I telegraphed commending him and promising my full support. Later, on January 4, I again telegraphed him urging that he reassert our determination to remain in the Guantanamo Naval Base and to defend it, and that he reactivate immediately the Caribbean Naval squadron on a permanent basis with a squadron commander reporting directly to the Chief of Naval Operations.

In this general connection, we should not overlook the fact that the Guantanamo and Cuban situations have a long background.

During the September 1960 sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the question of continued U.S. control over the Guantanamo Naval Base arose and received wide attention.

Because of the open threats of pro-Communist Cuban leaders against our position under the current treaty, I wrote two letters to the Secretary of State, on September 22 and October 3, 1960.

In its reply on October 5, the Department of State took an unequivocal stand, which for emphasis, I shall quote:

The United States maintains the Guantanamo naval establishment under the terms of a valid and binding international agreement which can be abrogated only by agreement of both parties. I can assure you that the Department has no intention of agreeing to the abrogation of the agreement or to the abandonment of the base.

The entire exchange of letters and telegrams follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Acting Prime Minister of Cuba, Raul Castro, in an Associated Press Havana dispatch on September 20, 1960, is quoted as stating: "It is within our possibilities in a determined moment to reclaim that piece of our national territory (Guantanamo)." This statement, made only three days after the President's order that the Panama flag be flown over the Canal Zone, assumes a gravity that cannot be ignored.

I respectfully request to be advised as to what the policy of the United States will be in event of such possession by Cuba.

The location of Guantanamo on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, its function as an element in the strategic triangle of the Caribbean (Guantanamo, Panama, and Trinidad), proximity to north-south ore-oil shipping routes, nearness to the Cape Canaveral missile range, and value as a submarine and air base to any enemy attacking the United States are factors that combine to make continued U.S. possession of Guantanamo a matter of the highest importance to our security.

In answering my query, I respectfully request you not to reply in the evasive manner that featured your correspondence with me concerning the flying of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone, but to give a clear-cut statement of the policy to be recommended by your department.

In addition, please do not advise me that the question presented is hypothetical and will be met when the problem arises. My position is that the problem has arisen.

An early reply is requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 3, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 22, 1960, following a published threat by Acting Prime Minister Raul Castro of Cuba to secure control of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo, I wrote you inquiring what would be the policy of the United States to meet this situation. To date no reply has been received.

News dispatches on September 27 from the United Nations were to the effect that Prime Minister Fidel Castro made a stronger and more specific threat before the General Assembly of that international organization.

Because this latest development emphasizes the necessity for a policy that will safeguard our unimpaired possession of that base, many of our people have become concerned lest subversive influences in the State Department recommend actions that may result in the loss of Guantanamo.

Accordingly, I repeat my request of September 22 for a clear-cut statement from you of the policy to be recommended by the State Department.

In answering my letter, I also respectfully repeat my previous requests that you do not reply in the evasive manner that characterized your correspondence with me about the ill advised order directing the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone and that you do not reply that the situation in Cuba is hypothetical. It is here now and our people have a right to know what our policy is.

In addition, I respectfully request that you do not have some subordinate write me, for this is a matter of crucial importance despite the focusing of publicity on far-away Congo. I ask your personal consideration.

A prompt reply is requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 5, 1960.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have received your letter of September 22, 1960, addressed to Secretary Herter, concerning the position of the Department with respect to the Guantanamo naval base.

As you mentioned in your letter, Raul Castro on September 19, 1960, made reference to the Guantanamo base. Subsequent to this remark, Fidel Castro in his address on September 26 to the General Assembly of the United Nations and again on his return to Cuba stated that the Cuban Government is considering asking for the withdrawal, through the process of international law, of U.S. military forces from Guantanamo. Cuban officials have made a number of statements to the effect that they do not intend to attack the base.

The United States maintains the Guantanamo naval establishment under the terms of a valid and binding international agreement which can be abrogated only by the agreement of both parties. I can assure you that the Department has no intention of agreeing to the abrogation of the agreement or to the abandonment of the base.

Please call on me if I may be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

JANUARY 3, 1961.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

My compliments on your decision to break diplomatic relations with Cuba. Be assured of my complete support of this action in best interests of our country and world peace. Let us hope your decision will be followed by all nations which believe in God and freedom. Let us pray that stricken Cuba will once again be returned and soon to her freedom-loving God-fearing people who are the traditional friends of United States of America.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 4, 1961.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you reassert determination of United States to remain in and defend Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and that you order reactivated immediately Caribbean naval squadron of one carrier, one cruiser, and necessary destroyer escort with commanding officer of squadron reporting directly to Chief of Naval Operations and that this squadron be made permanent. That you call for a diplomatic quarantine of Castro's Cuba by all Western Hemisphere nations and that you urge immediate convening of the Organization of American States to that end.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

MONROE DOCTRINE AND SELF-DEFENSE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the establishment of a Communist beachhead in Cuba in January 1959, the question of the Monroe Doctrine as an expression of the principles of international law in dealing with the protection of the Western Hemisphere has been increasingly discussed in the press of the Nation.

Among the recent contributions to the cumulating literature on that vital policy question is a thoughtful article by Dr. Charles Callan Tansill in the December 1960 issue of American Mercury.

As a life student of American diplomatic history, author of many books on that subject, and former adviser of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,

Dr. Tansill is one of the leading authorities of the country in his field whose views command respect.

The indicated article follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

(By Charles Callan Tansill)

In one of his hysterical tirades against the United States, Nikita Khrushchev boldly announced that the Monroe Doctrine is out of date and no longer has any validity in international relations. In Cuba, Premier Castro accepted this declaration at face value, and has continued to thunder against any application of the doctrine.

To any student of American foreign policy it is evident that in 1823 President Monroe sent his famous message to Congress as a warning to European powers that America would seriously object to any intervention in Latin America. This warning was unilateral and was based upon the principles of international law dealing with the doctrine of self-defense. Every nation has a Monroe Doctrine that is designed to protect its national security and it can never be out of date.

Since 1808 the Caribbean has been an American danger zone and our Presidents have been deeply concerned about any type of European intervention. After the war for southern independence, the Department of State has watched with anxious eyes for an indirect intervention in the Caribbean through the transfer of sovereignty of island possessions. We were particularly fearful that Germany might attempt to secure from Denmark the control of the Danish West Indies, and in August, 1916, President Wilson exerted such pressure upon Denmark that she sold the islands to the United States for $25 million.

The attitude of President Theodore Roosevelt toward European intervention in Venezuela in 1902 is a twicetold tale that does not need repetition here. But it is important to note that on December 6, 1904, he proclaimed his corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. If any nation in Latin America engaged in chronic wrongdoing the Monroe Doctrine would "force the United States * * * to the exercise of an international police power." We would compel Latin American Nations to behave themselves.

In 1911 another corollary was added to the Monroe Doctrine. When rumors were circulated that a Japanese company was negotiating for the purchase of a tract of land on Magdalena Bay, Mexico, the Senate of the United States immediately adopted a resolution that strongly condemned the transfer of strategic spots in the Americas to non-American private companies that might be agents for a foreign power. The infiltration of foreign powers into the Caribbean area through indirect means was said to be a breach of the Monroe Doctrine.

In June 1940, when Nazi armies had overrun both France and Holland, the American Congress, fearful that Hitler had his eyes upon the Dutch and French islands in the Caribbean, adopted a resolution strongly reaffirming the nontransfer principle of the Monroe Doctrine. German refusal to accept this principle led to the convening of the Havana Conference on July 21, 1940. Under the terms of the Act of Havana, July 30, any territory of a European power in danger of falling into the hands of an unfriendly power, might be taken over and jointly administered by the American Republics pending a final disposition of the areas in question. Multilateral action was coming into vogue.

In the meantime, in December 1936, a Special Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, meeting in Buenos Aires, adopted an important protocol relative to nonintervention: "The high contracting parties declare inadmissible the intervention of any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the parties."

But this ambitious peace structure of the Roosevelt administration does not mean that the Monroe Doctrine is out of date or that a system of collective security can take the place of any individual action on the part of the United States if its national security is seriously imperiled. The Monroe Doctrine, and the important series of treaties that implement it, are merely expressions of the principles of international law dealing with the right of self-defense. This right is basic to national sovereignty and can never be abandoned by the United States.

PANAMA INTRIGUE: CONGRESS MUST INVESTIGATE SEQUEL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on September 1960, under the title of "Panama Intrigue: Congress Must Investigate," I included an exchange of correspondence between the Department of State and myself on the question of subversive activities in that Department. Also published with that assembly of letters was one to the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations in which I urged an immediate investigation by this committee to determine the identity of these influences.

In November 1959, it will be recalled, the isthmus was the scene of the worst border violence in Panama Canal Zone history, with radical-led mobs endeavoring to enter the zone to plant the Panama flag over that territory and to that end employing physical violence.

A year later, in October 1960, when news stories indicated the imminence of a repetition of the 1959 Canal Zone border disorders, I wrote the Secretary of State on October 18, protesting the failure of that Department to comment on what was developing.

Replying on November 2, the Department of State commented that the "motivation and arrangement for the flag day parade are compatible with the consideration which led to the decision to display the flag of the Republic of Panama in the Canal Zone."

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an official admission of the willingness of the Department of State to compromise on the fundamental principle of Canal Zone sovereignty to placate radical-led mobs in Panama.

In order that the Congress, especially committees concerned with the investigation of subversive influences in the Department of State, may be fully informed, I quote the two indicated letters:

OCTOBER 18, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would appreciate knowing what action is proposed, concerning the parade into the Canal Zone on November 4, since no permit has been requested and Panama is again forcing the issue now that they have been given a foot in the door by flying the flag.

Do I understand the State Department will not comment on the rapidly developing parade of thousands of Panamanians with their flag from one end of the zone to the other?

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 2, 1960.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your letter of October 18, addressed to the Secretary, regarding preparations for a parade in the Canal Zone on November 4 has been referred to me for reply.

The municipal council in Panama City recently requested the Foreign Minister to make arrangements with Canal Zone authorities, through diplomatic channels, for a parade through a part of the zone on Panama's flag day, November 4. A similar parade is being planned in Colon for November 5, Colon's independence day celebration. Subject to certain limitations as to the parade route, the Acting Governor of the Canal Zone has acquiesced to the request for the parade at Balboa; details are not yet available on the arrangements at Cristobal.

A leading Panamanian newspaper in commenting editorially on the November 4 parade stated that the "ceremony would be the best recourse against the occurrence of any disturbing and disorderly event during the national holidays." The article went on to say that "the misguided or irresponsible groups who plan to provoke violent encounters with the neighbors on the other side of the Fourth of July Avenue will, with this patriotic parade organized by the municipal council, remain completely frustrated in their extremist demonstrations."

Information available to the Department and the Embassy to date indicates that the motivation and arrangements for the flag day parade are compatible with the considerations which led to the decision to display of the flag of the Republic of Panama in the Canal Zone.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 15 minutes, on January 9.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. NELSEN, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:

Mr. FULTON.
Mr. VAN ZANDT in four instances.
Mr. SCHERER.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. BUCKLEY.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. RYAN in two instances.
Mr. EVINS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under

its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

215. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of the certificate of ascertainment of electors of the State of Hawaii, dated January 4, 1961, pursuant to section 6, title 3, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

216. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting the Seventh Special Report of the Council on the operations and policies of the international financial institutions of which the United States is a member, for the 2-year period April 1, 1958 through March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 4(b)(6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

217. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to (50 Stat. 885, 50 U.S.C. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

218. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to an act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

219. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the prices negotiated for J-71-A-11 aircraft engines under Department of the Air Force contract AF 33 (600)-23143 with Allison Division, General Motors Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

220. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of conversion from a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to a fixed-price basis of certain portions of Department of the Navy contract NOy-83333 with Brown-Raymond-Walsh (a joint venture) for the Spanish base construction program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

221. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a general review of current automatic data processing developments in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 3, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Sitka Harbor, Alaska, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted June 21, 1957 and July 31, 1957; to the Committee on Public Works.

223. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Powells Bay, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

224. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on our fiscal year 1959 review of the education and training programs administered by the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of veterans of the Korean conflict and of children of persons who died from injury or disease resulting from service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 1921. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1922. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 200 beds at Clark County, Nev., to the Commtitee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1924. A bill to provide for the designation of parts of U.S. Highways Nos. 61 and 71 as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 1925. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1926. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 1927. A bill to provide for certain survivors' annuities in additional cases under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Code with respect to the payment of compensation and pension to widows of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1929. A bill to amend section 703(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, relating to longevity step increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1930. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase by an additional one-half of 1 percent of the annuity computation formula for determining annuities for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ICHORD of Missouri:

H.R. 1931. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend title 38 so as to provide a uniform effective date for the award of compensation payments not previously authorized by law; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 1934. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 1937. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 1938. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 27 acres of land at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1940. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended, to 32 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 1942. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1943. A bill relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 1944. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 1945. A bill to appropriate $238,000 to the Secretary of the Army to carry out certain works of improvement at Rye Harbor, N.H.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 1947. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1948. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedure for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 1949. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding and false advertising of decorative hardwood or simulated hardwood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1950. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Dspartment of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 1951. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Bong Air Force Base, in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1952. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that in determining eligibility of a veteran to disability pension the income of a spouse shall not be counted in computing the veteran's annual income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1953. A bill to provide a basis for payment of death pension by the Veterans' Administration to a widow or child of a person who served in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and who died while on active duty under circumstances which are held not to be a basis for an award of death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1954. A bill to provide that amounts equal to amounts paid by a veteran for expenses of the last illness and burial of a wife or child shall not be included in the computation of his annual income for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who serve 2 or more years in peacetime shall be entitled to a presumption that chronic diseases becoming manifest within 1 year from the date of separation from service are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend section 12(b) of Public Law 85–857 to provide for payment of the World War I bonus to certain individuals discharged on account of alienage, except pursuant to their own application or solicitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1957. A bill to eliminate the prohibition contained in section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, against affording education or training to an eligible veteran of the Korean conflict beyond 8 years after his discharge; and, to make January 31, 1965, the uniform deadline beyond which such education or training may not be afforded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for the widows and children of veterans disabled 30 percent or more while engaged in armed conflict or in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1959. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall, if otherwise eligible, have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1960. A bill to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the preservation of total disability ratings under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration where such ratings have been in force for 15 years or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1964. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Altoona, Pa., shall have 500 beds for the furnishing of intermediate care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1965. A bill to amend section 491 of title 18, United States Code, prohibiting certain acts involving the use of tokens, slugs, disks, devices, papers, or other things; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 1966. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, and loan guarantee benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for paying dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of certain deceased veterans having serious service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 1969. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1970. A bill for the establishment of a Resources Planning Commission for the Lower Colorado River Basin, to study the multipurpose resources of public lands and other land and water areas in and near the Colorado River between Hoover Dam and the Mexican boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1971. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1973. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit stock of a small business corporation which is owned by a husband and wife to be treated as owned by a single shareholder for purposes of determining the number of shareholders of such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1974. A bill to encourage equity investment in new and small businesses, to relieve unemployment, and provide additional revenue to the Federal Government to be applied to debt reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1975. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club-dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1977. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to permit permanent plan U.S. Government life (converted) insurance policies and national service life insurance policies to be assigned as collateral for certain loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1979. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1980. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1981. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1982. A bill to provide for an increase in the amount of clerk hire available to Members of the House of Representatives whose constituencies contain a population of 800,000 or more; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1983. A bill to cancel reimbursable charges against Mission Indian lands in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1984. A bill to authorize payment of the claims of certain former owners of property vested by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1985. A bill to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 1986. A bill to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 1987. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 19 which is located in the State of West Virginia as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 1990. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1991. A bill to permit the free marketing of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1992. A bill to authorize the classification, segregation, and disposal of public lands chiefly valuable for urban and business purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1993. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 1994. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 1995. A bill to establish a commission to study the adequacy of compensation for real property acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain technical revisions in the income and administrative provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1997. A bill to repeal the interest rate limitations on obligations of the United States issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 1998. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 1999. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2000. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2001. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2002. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 2003. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 2004. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2005. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2006. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended, with respect to the definition of the term "low-rent housing"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2007. A bill to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds to provide for a reduction in the national debt and a reduction in the Federal individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 2008. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2009. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of individuals for benefits from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 2010. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2011. A bill to amend Public Law 85-278; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2012. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the increased use of milled or enriched rice by the Armed Forces, Federal penal and correctional institutions, and in certain federally operated hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2013. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2014. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2015. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to provide a formula for guaranteeing a minimum increase when an employee is promoted from one grade to another; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2016. A bill to provide that States and political subdivisions which operate liquor stores shall not be required to pay more than one tax as a retail dealer in liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2017. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2019. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 2020. A bill to fix midnight as the effective time of discharges from the Armed Forces prior to January 1, 1957, for the purposes of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2021. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2022. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2023. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2024. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2025. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2026. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2027. A bill to provide a program of technical and financial assistance to communities to help effectuate desegregation of schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2028. A bill to create a community relations service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 2029. A bill to reimburse producers of crotalaria seed in certain areas for losses sustained by them on their 1959 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 2032. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H.R. 2033. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 2034. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2035. A bill making appropriations to carry out the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960, for the year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2036. A bill making appropriations for land-grant-college aid to the State of Hawaii as authorized by the Hawaii Omnibus Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 2037. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 2039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 2040. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to prohibit the discharge of debts and

obligations of which moral turpitude is the gist of the action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2041. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2042. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 2044. A bill to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2045. A bill to amend section 498(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to increase from $250 to $1,000 the valuation figure with respect to informal entries of imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 2046. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2047. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 2048. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 2049. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 2050. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (college housing) to authorize loans to educational institutions for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, and improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2052. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1959, to authorize conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2053. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 2054. A bill to establish a Federal regional water pollution control research laboratory in the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide that payments made under title III of that act may not be used to acquire equipment manufactured in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2056. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and north Cascades region of the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2057. A bill to provide for the securing of custody and disposition by the United States of missiles, rockets, earth satellites, and similar devices adaptable to military uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 2058. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2059. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 2060. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 2061. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 2062. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2063. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that deductions on account of earnings shall not be made in the case of beneficiaries who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to emphasize the policy of promoting employment under stable prices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2065. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Toulouse as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the employment of administrative assistants by Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2067. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.50 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2068. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2069. A bill to provide that the unmarried children of certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States or of the Philippine Scouts may be admitted to the United States as nonquota immigrants, during a 2-year period, without regard to their age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2070. A bill to provide retirement benefits for firefighters employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2071. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 so as to require that dollar funds made available to foreign countries by the Development Loan Fund for the purchase of materials or supplies shall be utilized for the purchase of materials or supplies produced in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 2074. A bill to establish a commission to study the adequacy of compensation for real property acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2075. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall purchase certain oil paintings of Nez Percé Indian leaders for display at the site of the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 2078. A bill to provide for the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of railroad equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; to create and establish a public agency with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2080. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2081. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend section 313 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957, to extend the presumptive period with respect to service connection of multiple sclerosis for an additional 4 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the U.S. Military Academy of Medicine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 2084. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2085. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adoption in the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international cooperation in educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to call for a study by the United Nations to determine whether it would assist the deliberations of that body if its headquarters were located in a neutral nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume II, The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev," and to provide for the printing of additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 84. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the powers and functions of agencies over the operation of aircraft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 55; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 87. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the need for rapid and complete atomic disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 88. Resolution providing that the office building presently being constructed for Members of the House of Representatives shall be named the "Rayburn House Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 89. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the people of all Ireland should have an opportunity to express their will for union by an election under the auspices of a United Nations Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting passage of a Federal area redevelopment act to help the Nation's surplus labor areas rebuild their economies, and that the proposed act contain sufficient authorizations for loans; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Spero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Maria Swiatek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Orlando Gonfiantini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Santina Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Gino Forato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2092. A bill for the relief of Wladyslawa Golas Romankiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2093. A bill for the relief of Janina Koscinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pellegrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2095. A bill for the relief of John Wrocenski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2096. A bill for the relief of Eva, Albertina, and Rita Carrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2097. A bill for the relief of Margarita Jericevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2098. A bill for the relief of Jure Ruscic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2099. A bill for the relief of Iona Lembesis (nee Rozanitou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2100. A bill for the relief of Ursula Kruthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2101. A bill for the relief of Evelina Scarpa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Gadecki and her two minor children, Wanda and Stanislaw Gadecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2103. A bill for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2104. A bill for the relief of Elio R. Anelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2105. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Erny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2106. A bill for the relief of Carmine Spedaliere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS:

H.R. 2108. A bill for the relief of Lucia Lena Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2109. A bill for the relief of Marta Manelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2110. A bill for the relief of Angela Calajo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2111. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 2112. A bill for the relief of George Koorie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 2113. A bill for the relief of Katherine May Purves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Helga B. Scharnberg Kemery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2115. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josephine L. Go and Dr. Welles P. Go; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Tokutaro Gomi and Fusae Gomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2118. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Mato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2119. A bill for the relief of Juanito Segismundo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2120. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mine Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2121. A bill for the relief of Juan Pascual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2122. A bill for the relief of Kyozo Tanimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tom Pon Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2124. A bill for the relief of Utanosuke Fujishiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2125. A bill for the relief of Soon Tai Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2126. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshiko Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Maria Rubi Lupisan Anit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2128. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 2129. A bill for the relief of John Calvin Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2130. A bill for the relief of G. Elmer Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Carmen Armbruster Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Katherine Au-Young Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 2133. A bill for the relief of Miss Varsen Emcyian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Consolacion M. Rapa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2135. A bill for the relief of William K. Cassell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2136. A bill for the relief of Hajime Misaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2137. A bill for the relief of Rocco Guiseppe Lavagnino and Caterina Cirelli Lavagnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2138. A bill for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2139. A bill for the relief of Suraj Din; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2140. A bill for the relief of Pola Pesla Scheidenfisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2141. A bill for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2142. A bill for the relief of Joginder Singh Bains; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2143. A bill for the relief of Capt. Arnold M. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2144. A bill for the relief of Graham Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2145. A bill for the relief of Joginder Singh Toor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2146. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara J. Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 2147. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Stultz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 2148. A bill for the relief of Wong Bak Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2149. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie A. Dablias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2150. A bill for the relief of Sha Fong Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2151. A bill for the relief of Sho Kwon Shin (also known as Cheng Ah Mao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2153. A bill for the relief of Andrew Furesz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2154. A bill for the relief of Michel Leon Partayan aka Bartayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2155. A bill for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2156. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2157. A bill for the relief of Tatiana Serafimovna Erohina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Sister Marie Bernard (Miss Nicolina Ossa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2159. A bill for the relief of Sister Eucharia (Miss Philomena Iannucci); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Sister Alphonsus Marie (Miss Mary Grace Padovano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2161. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Dulcis (Miss Mary Teresa Di Iola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Budano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2163. A bill for the relief of Michael Fodale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2164. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Massagli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2165. A bill for the relief of Marie F. Balish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Emilia, Guido, and Carlo Borsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2167. A bill for the relief of Lugino Valore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Ricardo V. DeLos Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Caridad P. Buncab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yi Mou Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Alden Jo Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 2172. A bill for the relief of Tam Jam Yick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2173. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanka Krickovic Mladenovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Ho Ching Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2175. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela Dovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Salvatore Mortelliti and son, Antonio Mortelliti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dezso Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 2178. A bill for the relief of Marii Rak Velickovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Essie V. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Eugene C. Harter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 2181. A bill for the relief of Kim Dom Yong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2182. A bill for the relief of Necasio Agustin, Artemio Agustin, and Gloria Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2183. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the heirs, of Gen. John C. Frémont, the city of San Francisco, and all other persons against the United States arising out of the seizure of certain real property by the U.S. Government in 1863; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2184. A bill to authorize the reconveyance to the former owner thereof of certain property at Chelf Air Force Depot, Los Angeles County, Calif., when such property is declared surplus to the needs of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2185. A bill for the relief of Andrija Artukovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2186. A bill for the relief of Serafin Estrada-Serna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2187. A bill for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2188. A bill for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Wenceslao Alavez Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Antonia Dovolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Pablo Santana Castellon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2192. A bill for the relief of Josafat Magos Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Tranquilino Rodriguez Cervantes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2194. A bill for the relief of Jose Abraham Lizarde-Aguilera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2196. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army, on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2197. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States which was reserved or otherwise retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to Orange Coast Junior College District, Costa Mesa, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2198. A bill for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca, Rosario Perez Sepulveda, Carlos Perez Sepulveda, Jorge Perez Sepulveda, and Antonio Perez Sepulveda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 2199. A bill for the relief of Samuel Lipsih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

28. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of Robert and Ruth Sicular and others, East Bay Community Forum for Civil Liberties, Berkeley, Calif., requesting the abolishment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

29. By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: Petition of Lloyd Williams Post No. 41, Berryville, Va., supporting the function and work of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1960 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $264. E. (9) $430.63.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,210.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,311.74. E. (9) $2,311.75.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,776.53 E. (9) $13,776.53.

A. American Federation of Government Employees, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $7,199.61. E. (9) $22,465.94.

A. American Optometric Association, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,466.50. E. (9) $3,762.09.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,351.42

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $490. E. (9) $11,979.74.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,082.50.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,978.99.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.
E. (9) $34.57.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $440.09.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,850. E. (9) $3,019.20.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,717.12.

A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif., and 1201 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federated Indians of California.

A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $648.80.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jacob I. Bellow, 4338 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge No. 12, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $40.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1220 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $15.95.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,363.36.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,846.60.

A. Roland Boyd, 218 East Louisiana Street, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,040.42. E. (9) $466.66.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $255.18.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $72.18.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $193. E. (9) $193.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $336.53.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
E. (9) $14.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $18.50.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $265.28.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $160.61.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $314.14.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $312.05.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $616.33.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 Johns Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $374.92.

A. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $69.73.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German & Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,715. E. (9) $13,357.12.

A. Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $199.65.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $844.15. E. (9) $844.15.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Instituto do Acucar e do Alcool, Republica dos Estados Unidos do Brasil Federal District, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

A. Oscar Cox, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York 5, N.Y., and Congopalm, 12 Avenue des Aviateurs, Leopoldville, Belgian Congo.
D. (6) $620. E. (9) $15.60.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,057. E. (9) $1,057.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $616.33. E. (9) $616.33.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $138.87. E. (9) $116.04.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $557.49.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,211.50. E. (9) $68.88.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga
B. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $600.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,188. E. (9) $600.02.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carlyle M. Dunaway, 608 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Life Underwriters, 608 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $820. E. (9) $237.25.

A. Harold Edwards, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 709 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $700.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $606.51. E. (9) $25.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24.20.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $37.14.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,757.03.

A. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $379.71. E. (9) $379.71.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $225.

A. Charles H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $450.71.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $3.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $75.

A. Hughes, Hubbard, Blair & Reed, One Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Bendix Corp., Fisher Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $279.99.

A. George F. Hussey, Jr., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Standards Association, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10.99.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,046.03. E. (9) $1,046.03.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,455.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South 4th East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrialles Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Tom Killefer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $53.04.

A. James P. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, Sprinkler Irrigation Association, Washington Counsel for Aluminum Extruders Council, and Northwestern Lumbermen's Association.
E. (9) $2,186.34.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $630.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
(E) (9) $13,011.54.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,407.04. E. (9) $6,072.52.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $606.51. E. (9) $18.50.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Office Employees, c/o Clyde R. Payne, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $125.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $11.70. E. (9) $11.70.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $30.30.

A. Donald Linville, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $210.

A. Lobby for Peace (northern California), 345 Franklin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,508.10. E. (9) $3,643.01.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $619.59.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. John H. McCormick, Jr.
B. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,355.75. E. (9) $235.78.

A. Frederick C. McKee, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $735.72.

A. John H. MacVey and William T. Sherwood, Jr., 824 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nippon Light Metals Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh Street East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959 Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $633.33.

A. Julia L. Maletta.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,066. E. (9) $2,250.18.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,026. E. (9) $592.87.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $606.51. E. (9) $16.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $38.52.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,205. E. (9) $418.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.,
B. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $583.20.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $167.01.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,824.99. E. (9) $348.50.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,285.88.

A. Theodore A. Miller, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Venice Land Co., Box 1576, Venice, Fla.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $759.42.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,884.60. E. (9) $132.15.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,524.35. E. (9) $1,883.82.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees.
D. (6) $1,669.32. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (9) $2,387.53. E. (9) $2,387.53.

A. National Association of Life Underwriters, 608 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,387.53. (E. (9) $2,387.53.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,754.75. E. (9) $2,041.55.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,111.53.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,935.02. E. (9) $1,935.02.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $380.08.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,070. E. (9) $10,311.93.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $171.44.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,478.99. E. (9) $11,478.99.

A. National Postal Clerks Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,776. E. (9) $5,300.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,775.87. E. (9) $715.05.

A. National Retired Teachers Association & American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $73.09.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,615.13. E. (9) $8,997.92.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,116.05. E. (9) $5,768.71.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $58.62.

A. Northwest Committee for Transportation, 2928 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $382. E. (9) $287.63.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $357.07. E. (9) $580.25.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $212.50. E. (9) $26.90.

A. Karla V Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $4,624.98.

A. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,612.48. E. (9) $2,010.84.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22.50.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,329.60. E. (9) $30.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $154.81.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $74. E. (9) $76.88.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $236.

A. Regional Broadcasters, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,980.29.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $135.02.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $666.67. E. (9) $100.50.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $2.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $171.89.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Mobil Oil Co., Los Angeles; et al.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $345.

A. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608–612 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $395.67.

A. Hollis Mackay Seavey, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Regional Broadcasters.
D. (6) $3,666.66. E. (9) $273.55.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $203.51.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $3.30.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City and County of San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,371.15.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.
E. (9) $43.40.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $687.88.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $941. E. (9) $4,159.19.

A. John P. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $616.20.

A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $8.05.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Standard Public Relations, Inc., 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $600.

A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $213.28.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $84.32.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Merchandise Co., 236 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $763.42.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 92 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $232.94.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corporation, 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.49. E. (9) $240.62.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $148.70.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $90.28.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608–612 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $95.67.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39.31.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,423.37. E. (9) $3,350.42.

A. Venice Land Co., Box 1576, Venice, Fla.
A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $10,911.73. E. (9) $3,040.55

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $19,725.58. E. (9) $22.16.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,404.42.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,502.22. E. (9) $2,502.22.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold M. Williams, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $22.77.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $156.25. E. (9) $13.52.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,480.75. E. (9) $67.60.

A. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) $1.08.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $2.80.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◀	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,384. E. (9) $256.25.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,755.27. E. (9) $44.25.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,293.05. E. (9) $6,293.05.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,243.48. E. (9) $2,243.48.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Association of Port Authorities, 601 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $7,685.06.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $8,054.67. E. (9) $8,054.67.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,430. E. (9) $25,430.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $32,921.90.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14,742.09. E. (9) $13,442.09.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,094.75. E. (9) $1,883.16.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1387, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $19,877.78.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $524.18. E. (9) $55.70.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $16,992.34.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,305.33. E. (9) $3,750.

A. American Optometric Association, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $5,018.14.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $520.10. E. (9) $520.10.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,736.42. E. (9) $2,365.14.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,376. E. (9) $9,469.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45,598.88. E. (9) $4,596.64.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,503.77. E. (9) $1,503.77.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,616.76.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $4,529.15.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,100.82.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,782.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $568. E. (9) $274.40.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,188.04.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cerro de Pasco Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and American Metal Climax, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $25.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $758.96.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $59.15.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $14.75.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City.
E. (9) $1,248.30.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th & E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,418.77. E. (9) $6,418.77.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,957.28. E. (9) $9,957.28.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.72. E. (9) $2,296.72.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $165.30.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $846.35. E. (9) $846.35.

A. Howard Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,681.58.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $500.

A. Richard W. Averill, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $141.05.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 325 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $575.12.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. $3,274.88. E. (9) $299.06.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,235. E. (9) $58.59.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. James F. Bell, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jacob I. Bellow, 4338 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge No. 12, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,017. E. (9) $584.30.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Robert J. Bird, Esq., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. David Bishop, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $987.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $550.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $370.92. E. (9) $95.13.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $284.05. E. (9) $11.40.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Cos., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $382.80.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $230.12.

A. R. T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $540.59.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $2.53.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William N. Brinker, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amity Fabrics, Inc., 12 West 32d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $67.80.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $982.36.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,476.27. E. (9) $3,476.27.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $107.98.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $737.50. E. (9) $737.97.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $60.56.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $144. E. (9) $2.74.

A. Bulgarian Claim Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $89.83.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187. E. (9) $187.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $31.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation & Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,937.45. E. (9) $35.30.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $44.60.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $396.08.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $27.27.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,942.31. E. (9) $294.23.

A. Judy Carlile, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $190.07.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $436.92.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) 630.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,025.84.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $7.65.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $162.23.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Greg-Gary Corp., 7 Park Avenue., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $400.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,396.95. E. (9) $4,173.91.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1101 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Central Street, Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.20.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Ball, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sporting Arms & Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, 250 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $10.

A Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin A. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Cos., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $83.45.

A Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $158.55.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $317.67.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,822.28.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $682.26.

A. Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, 18 Laurel Avenue, Old Bridge, N.J.
D. (6) $50.

A. R. T. Compton.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $840.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers' Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R.
D. (6) $832.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 36 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $28.60.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $150.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $160.70.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $15.89.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $257.69.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $160.70.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 831 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Agucar y Fomento de la Cana, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,000. E. (9) $388.88.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $33.30.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Poultry & Egg Producers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41.16.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $438.54.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $211.46.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,744.70. E. (9) $119.70.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $3,304.25. E. (9) $304.25.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,986.86.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,189.81. E. (9) $18,529.38.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41.90.

A. Division of Legislation & Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,197.04.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $66.87.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $3.50.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $45.28.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,624.99.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $46.25.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,862.02. E. (9) $90.

A. Fred H. Dressler, Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th & E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $82.63. E. (9) $39.14.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $48.50.

A. Myron G. Ehrlich, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Marjory Hendricks, 2700 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31.25.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $5.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,968.75. E. (9) $11.03.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $958.38. E. (9) $9.20.

A. Miles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $9,900. E. (9) $3,590.23.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,342.68. E. (9) $22,161.07.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,349.98.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wood, King, Dawson & Logan, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,328.13. E. (9) $16.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,806.25.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 40 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $61.42.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $110.45.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert W. Frase, 120 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $1,075.65.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Committee for Educational & Cultural Materials, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,986.86.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,699.17. E. (9) $5,985.23.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $457.50.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $727.97.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.58.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association.
D. (6) $1,620. E. (9) $31.56.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $175.44.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,000.39. E. (9) $6,792.25.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $15,782. E. (9) $16,865.88.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $32.40.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Gayle Gupton, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank E. Haas, 230 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $256.44. E. (9) $359.79.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $199.88.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,901.20.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wisconsin Avenue Committee on Transportation Problems, 3900 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $758.33. E. (9) $7.83.

A. E. C. Halibeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,708.32. E. (9) $280.73.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $89.22.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,624.96. E. (9) $166.78.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $38.05.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,258.66. E. (9) $1,770.30.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., and subsidiaries.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $253. E. (9) $9.10.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Mrs. Glenn C. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $571.56. E. (9) $583.03.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $120.90.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,133.

A. Patrick B. Nealy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $92.55.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru, S.A.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $295.54.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $262.28.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reciprocal Inter Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,113.47 E. (9) $227.61.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,626.71.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,187.92. E. (9) $1,062.92.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $77.76. E. (9) $77.76.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., Empire State Building, Fifth Avenue at 34th, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $33.11.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $53.56.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $89.34.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $107.30.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $25.27.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $15.75.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $75.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tenn.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $160.70.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue., Annapolis, Md.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. Hughes, Hubbard, Blair & Reed, 1 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Bendix Corp., Fisher Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, Sacramento, Calif., and Edward S. Cohen, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $472.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $213.87.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,170.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,005.08. E. (9) $7,005.08.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39,955.69.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481, First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $3,157.14.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $142.52.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $225.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,391.23. E. (9) $53.10.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Tennessee Absorbent Co., Southern Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,328.69.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, Inc., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $444.18. E. (9) $55.70.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,029.44. E. (9) $100.75.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.07.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Robert F. Jones, 515 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., and subsidiaries.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $461.59.

A. Henry B. Jordan, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cyrus W. and Lucille M. Manfull, 13152 Wentworth Street, Pacoima, Calif.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $554.97.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,150.76.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $172.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $255.40.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $83.50.

A. Frank T. Kenner, 38 Niuiki Circle, Honolulu, Hawaii.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $179. E. (9) $11.55.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,718.52. E. (9) $1,420.12.

A. Charles E. Kief, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.75.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.92.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $380.03.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $132.25.

A. James F. King, 411 Universal Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $595. E. (9) $595.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $120.69.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $29.77.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,764.57.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $791.27. E. (9) $1,197.97.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,430. E. (9) $4,819.25.

A. Dan Lacy, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for the Universal Copyright Convention, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Langan, 100 Indiana Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,126.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $900.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $206.75.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $224.58. E. (9) $6.80.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $600.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $75.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,212.50. E. (9) $37.35.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24.38. E. (9) $31.38.

A. Lee & Ross.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $4,208.02.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $545.71.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $112.90.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $9.30.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,891.12. E. (9) $3,891.12.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $20.30.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $956.25. E. (9) $18.16.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $441.69. E. (9) $1,219.94.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Group Hospitalization, Inc., 14th and L Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $10.50.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolpho von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corporation, 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association.
D. (6) $153.12. E. (9) $10.46.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,162.50. E. (9) $26.18.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) $2,244.70. E. (9) $13.55.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $5.73.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,208.64. E. (9) $106.05.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement.
D. (6) $999.99.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $28.08. E. (9) $15.23.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,477.50. E. (9) $46.83.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $97.75. E. (9) $1.09.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $210.93.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York City.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Express Agency, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,564.39.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $405.80.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,270. E. (9) $934.31.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $177.05.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,797.84. E. (9) $45.30.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $687.46.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $271.31.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $952.26. E. (9) $11.65.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $225.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $740.05.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $945.43. E. (9) $820.42

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.50. E. (9) $14.20.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $680.84. E. (9) $353.35.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mrs. Vera Mayer.
B. National Consumers League, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,179.96.

A. Howard W. Mays, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Lester H. Means, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., Appliance Park, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $5.75.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,055.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., Glostex Chemicals, Inc., O. Hommel Co., and Pemco Corp.
D. (6) $1,215.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $330.95.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $49.20.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $150.76.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,513.01.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. John R. Miles.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $1,237.57.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Josephine S. Bogert, 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $21.10.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,553. E. (9) $264.10.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Kifer, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 800 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.25.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $104.17.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., American Road, Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $300.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.
E. (9) $42.81.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $169.93.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $271.38.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,704. E. (9) $29.90.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $611.04.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $4.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $723.27. E. (9) $11,304.09.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,461.67.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $586,167. E. (9) $22,692.66.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15.23. E. (9) $15.23.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,450. E. (9) $6,472.29.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,260.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $524.50. E. (9) $524.50.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27,918.24. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $455,817.06. E. (9) $4,474.05.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $845. E. (9) $206.75.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size & Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Committee for the Universal Copyright Convention, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $8,322.37. E. (9) $8,322.37.

A. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $720.69.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $1,578.08.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $100.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of First Class Mailers, 500 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $667.50. E. (9) $746.43.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $1,342.69.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $523.72. E. (9) $680.94.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,586.59. E. (9) $2,586.59.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125,680.15. E. (9) $9,051.16.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $162,832.66. E. (9) $22,869.94.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,995.16. E. (9) $18,933.02.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $909.43. E. (9) $2,548.14.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $847.70. E. (9) $2,758.38.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $973.25. E. (9) $973.25.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,258.66. E. (9) $1,770.30.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,822.19. E. (9) $1,642.74.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,039.63. E. (9) $7,039.63.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York City.
E. (9) $832.19.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,492.38. E. (9) $9,492.38.

A. National Postal Committee for Educational and Cultural Materials, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,440.92. E. (9) $3,440.92.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,785.04. E. (9) $12,346.76.

A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,070. E. (9) $8,089.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $499.58.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,026.63. E. (9) $7,383.02.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,578.44. E. (9) $4,975.39.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
B. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N.C.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33. E. (9) $33.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,689.80. E. (9) $3,010.04.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $26,945. E. (9) $3,021.31.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,775. E. (9) $16,978.51.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $2,808.32.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md.; Walker & Dunlop, Inc., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Frederick W. Berens, Inc., 1722 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.; The Carey Winston Co., 1723 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; B. F. Saul Co., 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.90.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $2,236.63. E. (9) $2,011.25.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,012.50. E. (9) $34.58.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $39.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington 6, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $9.95.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,529.75.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $600.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $782.68.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,595. E. (9) $69.52.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.10. E. (9) $98.99.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,624.99.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $159.49.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,238.10.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer & Luxford, 1210 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. El Salvador Fishermen's Association, San Salvador, El Salvador.
E. (9) $14.03.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $175.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $497.22.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $251.47.

A. Sanford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $555.80. E. (9) $17.05.

A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.44. E. (9) $2,167.24.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $49.75.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., J. W. Keen, Luke and Eleanore Flood, Frostproof, Fla., and J. Allen Brown, Coral Gables, Fla.
E. (9) $17.18.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $72.50.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $3,727.95.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $7,943.72. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $827.94.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $105.58.

A. Charles E. Potter, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $1,388.97.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.70.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $50.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,124.80. E. (9) $30.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $68.48.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $9.44.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) $54.67.

A. C. J. Putt, 910 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Sante Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Association, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York City, N.Y.; National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $13,249.97. E. (9) $8,858.17.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63.44.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $52.12.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $59.97.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,288.56.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.
D. (6) $88.50. E. (9) $274.50.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $188.65.

A. J. B. Reeves, Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $74.36.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $24.51.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $118.35.

A. C. Frank Reifsnyder and Charles W. Halleck, 800 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. China Merchants Steamship Navigation Co., Ltd., 48 Chung King Road, South, Taipei, Taiwan.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $555.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U.S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $48,628.08.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,083.16. E. (9) $9,849.80.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. $778.31.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) $55.78. E. (9) $131.36.

A. Leon D. Richeson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The First National City Bank of New York, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $1,140. E. (9) $27.80.

A. Siert F. Riepna, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John J. Riggle, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $521.80.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $115.51.

A. William N. Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $264.78.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Adrian Roberts, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington D.C.
E. (9) $400.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $59.40.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 605, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,550.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (7) $1,800.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 210 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,892.51 E. (9) $484.10.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $438.92.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $97.53.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass., and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $434. E. (9) $195.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $82.04.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
3. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $345.

A. Henry F. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N.J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $176.97.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.14.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Washington (D.C.) Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,239.95.

A. Arthur E. Scribner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,875. E. (9) $18,270.28.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $25.25.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation & Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $213.75. E. (9) $13.08.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $69.75. E. (9) $118.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $55.20.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $63.65.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $471.50.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $749.98. E. (9) $453.93.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.
E. (9) $43.40.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Asociation, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $774.35.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $4,942.28.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $325.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $51.06.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $213.87.

A. Carleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $240.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,922.50. E. (9) $687.46.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $472.50. E. (9) $224.27.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,280.76.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $173. E. (9) $1,724.12.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $585.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $18,767.06. E. (9) $8,506.26.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $626.05.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National R. R. Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $2,499.40.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234 Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,406.25.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,153.85.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Sugar Beet Growers Association, Hereford, Tex.
D. (6) $1,045. E. (9) $42.43.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $280.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $509.57.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $893.75. E. (9) $1,223.55.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Importers and Producers Institute, care of Warren J. Sinsheimer, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., 99 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $83.20.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $8.50.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $273.55. E. (9) $301.91.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $933.33. E. (9) $9.73.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $10,985. E. (9) $5,499.18.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $133.91.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $332.83. E. (9) $135.25.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $3.52.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $164.18.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $129.50.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $59.88.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. Mobil Oil Co., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg., et al.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
E. (9) $97.06.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $71.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $50.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $830.37.

A. United American Veterans Commentator, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $1,386.90.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,957.21.

A. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $59.15.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $697.22.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $80.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $35.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $180.

A. Leland M. Walker, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.65. E. (9) $111.82.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $67.50. E. (9) $2.59.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $597.50. E. (9) $40.42.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $126.44. E. (9) $1,072.48.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C. R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $500.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.22.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $44.42.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $221.47.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,301.92.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $401.08.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $401.08.

A. Don White, Box 279, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 279, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,830.53.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $55.25.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $109.64.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $700.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,417. E. (9) $2.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $369.10.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,694.89.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,369.23.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Company, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $230.37.

A. W. F. Wimberly, Post Office Box 4147, Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wood, King, Dawson & Logan, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $154.24.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brookhart, Becker & Dorsey, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Freight Brokers, Forwarders & Custom Brokers Association, Inc., Post Office Box 807, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Avon Products, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for Effective Use of the International Court by Repealing the Self-Judging Reservation, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee to Support U.S. Congress, 18 Laurel Avenue, Old Bridge, N.J.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Casimiro Giurici, 90 East 141st Street, Bronx, N.Y.

A. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Myron G. Ehrlich, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Marjory Hendricks, 2700 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George R. Frankovich, Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollabaugh & Jacobs, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Patent Policy Study Committee, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., Glostex Chemicals, Inc., O. Hommel Co., and Pemco Corp.

A. Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer & Luxford, 1210 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. El Salvador Fishermen's Association, San Salvador, El Salvador.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Warren S. Richardson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barbara Roads, 470 Palos Verdes Boulevard, Redondo Beach, Calif.
B. Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Association, 316 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. Carleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Spring-Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. Stump, Post Office Box 1101, Alexandria, Va.
B. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Role of Local Government in Relation to the Needs of State and Federal Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1960, the State College (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce through its legislative affairs committee sponsored a symposium at which time the role of local government in relation to the needs of State and Federal Governments was discussed.

It was my privilege to deliver the following address in connection with the program:

THE ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN RELATION TO THE NEEDS OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress of the 20th District of Pennsylvania)

The general principle of local government is basic to our freedom.

The varying forms of local government stem from the beginning of American history—and from the traditions of Anglo-Saxon-Viking and other northern European peoples.

Such devices as the town meeting bear a strong resemblance to the public meetings by which much public business was conducted in the government of the ancient Greek city-states.

Though the government of such states was usually truly national government—because it was independent of any higher governmental authority—yet it was truly local government in its form, and also in the narrow extent of territory and restricted number of people to which it applied.

Boards of aldermen, selectmen, county supervisors, and the like constitute a form of government whose origin is lost in the mists of antiquity.

Such governments differ from the government of separated powers—as we know it in our State and National Governments—in that they often combine in one board or council the legislative and executive powers.

Here, in the more intimate departments of government, where each legislator-official is, or should be, well known to the neighbors whose affairs he is empowered to regulate, the traditional reliance has been not on formal and structural safeguards but on direct contact consultation and the frequently recurring opportunity to vote out the incumbents and vote in new men.

Actually, no theoretical structural safeguard built out of philosophical concepts of government could equal the simple down-to-earth safeguards, which we can easily have in local matters, of knowing the territory, knowing the officials, and keeping a watchful eye upon their operations.

Local government deals with the tangible and visible surroundings of our homes and businesses.

As Thomas Jefferson said commenting in his autobiography on this tendency toward impracticality in big government:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread."

Abraham Lincoln wrote in his famous "Fragment on Government" on July 1, 1854:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

This, as well as Jefferson's remarks, represents sound American traditions in political thinking.

I believe it is consistent with Lincoln's thought that we keep governmental action to the necessary minimum and that this includes submitting every public problem to the smallest simplest, most local sort of government that seems able to handle it with efficiency and economy.

This basic thought common to both Lincoln and Jefferson is further amplified in Jefferson's autobiography:

"It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers but by their distribution that good government is effected.

"Were not this great country already divided into States that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns

itself directly and what it can so much better do than a distant authority."

Continuing, Jefferson said:

"Every State again is divided into counties each to take care of what lies within its local bounds, each county again into township or wards to manage minute details and every ward into farms to be governed each by its individual proprietor.

"It is by this participation of cares, descending gradually from general to particular, that the mass of human affairs may be best managed for the good and prosperity of all."

A great defect in the American civic consciousness is the tendency to confuse the various levels of government and their appropriate concerns.

The citizen will vote for or against a candidate for constable or similar local office on the basis of the candidate's opinion on some such question as the Arab-Israel disagreement or the problem of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands.

The same citizen will write to his Representative or Senator in Washington with regard to local parking regulations or sewer charges or a proposed change in zoning.

Studying and taking part in local government is at once the easiest and the best way for the citizen to get to understand the workings of politics, to share in the making of decisions and the planning of action and to have the immediate satisfaction of sharing the tangible benefits of his work for the community.

It is also the most frequented path toward a political career and probably the best possible apprenticeship.

It is only too frequently the case, however, that the public ignores the local government and turns its eyes exclusively to the Federal Government.

Particularly, citizens tend to think the Federal Government is the proper place to go for any sort of help that may be needed. However, close to home may be both the problem and the means for its solution.

Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, drew a great deal of adverse comment as well as some hearty agreement when he stated last December:

"We carry on massive Federal programs which State and local governments could do better."

This is a facet of the present-day danger of America—the tendency for anything big to overwhelm, overcome, and annihilate anything small.

Big business tends to swamp small business; big government tends to swamp local government.

In the field of government, the prerequisite for any attempt to combat this tendency is that the people should familiarize themselves with the local scene.

They should study local needs and possible programs; get to know the local government officials, civic organizations, and interested individuals who are working on the same matters, and then they will be in a position to join in the effort.

Nothing practical and effective can be accomplished in local matters unless this effort is made to relate the local problem to the local governmental structure.

Though there is, certainly, a strong tendency among the unthinking to throw any local problems on Uncle Sam's broad shoulders, there is at the same time a strong swing in the contrary direction.

Even while the clamor arises for more and more State and Federal services to communities such as towns and cities and metropolitan regions, there is a strong tendency among these communities and their responsible governments to attack and solve their own problems.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, recently delivered an impressive address on this topic at a workshop sponsored by the State office for local government.

Governor Rockefeller said:

"Modern administrative methods, broader financial bases, and technology allow local government to produce much more rewarding results at a faster pace."

He maintained that demands on local governments were increasing in spite of expanding State and Federal services.

The New York Governor stated:

"The importance of maintaining local government that can answer the call with efficiency, economy, and foresight grows more imperative."

It is evident that we must foster among our people—and particularly the youth—a general understanding of the proper limits of each type of government, village, town, township, city, and county.

We must work for an amicable and cooperative agreement in the planning program and in the division of labor among these governmental bodies and for their working in helpful coordination with State and Federal agencies for the attainment of local benefits.

Overall planning is proper to the higher governmental agency, but what we have a tendency to forget is that the decision as to local details is likely to be both juster and more practicable if it is made by the local authorities.

A good example of coordinated work of the sort I have in mind is the custom they have in some localities with regard to the county road system, where the town builds its roads in consultation with the county highway engineers and planners, but then gives over the problem of maintenance entirely to the county which is already provided with ample equipment and crews for the task.

The expense of this maintenance of town roads is, of course, chargeable to the town but the system procures for the town better maintenance at less cost than it could manage by its own unaided efforts.

And this cooperation in planning, this division of labor, should be encouraged not only between one level of government and another, but between governments or government agencies and private organizations of citizens within the local community.

Aid in general education in the field of local government and in its application in many special fields can be obtained from such groups as community councils, churches and church organizations, farmers' organizations and cooperatives, businessmen's groups, PTA's, and other school organizations—women's clubs, Red Cross and other health organizations, lodges and social clubs, and veterans' organizations.

The All-America City Awards sponsored jointly by the National Municipal League and Look magazine afford an annual show window exhibit of spectacular accomplishments of municipalities in self-help and self-improvement.

These concrete examples of what a local government can do in modernization, in slum clearance, in establishing efficiency of operation, in annexation, in securing regional cooperation and outside guidance and aid are displayed in a vivid article in Look magazine for March 1, 1960, on this year's awards.

I have here a clipping of this article which I am glad to show you.

I cannot conclude my remarks, frankly and sincerely, without mentioning that I believe that the chamber of commerce is one of the best agencies for the work our communities need.

Local units of the chamber of commerce are ideally composed and situated to arouse public interest in local government, to form a liaison between local government agencies and various groups of citizens.

I look to just such a group within the chamber of commerce as this legislative affairs committee as a vitally important organization to aid in arresting what I regard as a most unfortunate trend in government—the tendency to ignore local officials and their functions and to pass over their suitability for the solving of community problems.

The education of citizens in the nature and function of their local government—and in the proper delimitations of its scope—is a great service to the community.

Similarly beneficial is the function of the chamber of commerce in bringing together business people from all parts of the local community, and making them well acquainted with the individuals charged with the responsibilities of local government.

In these ways a live-wire chamber of commerce is helping the citizens of our local communities to combat the chief dangers of our civilization today, ignorance and indifference.

The chamber of commerce is working for economy and efficiency in helping to build communities in which the local needs will be met by cooperative coordinated efforts of the local people.

I am grateful to President Charles E. Duke of the Legislative Affairs Committee of the State College Chamber of Commerce for permitting me to share in this forward-looking enterprise by participating in this luncheon meeting.

Dr. George Washington Carver: A Brief Sketch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, to honor the late Dr. George Washington Carver, January 5 has been proclaimed George Washington Carver Day in New York State. The date marks the 18th anniversary of Dr. Carver's death at Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala. A great Negro scientist, he rose from slavery to worldwide esteem.

Born in slavery in the 1860's, Dr. Carver as a youth earned enough money doing odd jobs to complete his college and graduate study. His achievements won for him, in 1896, the position of director of agriculture at Tuskegee Institute. This he held until his death, despite numerous offers of higher positions and greater income.

Through his own intelligence and initiative he became world famous. He brought new wealth to the South by discovering hundreds of new uses for the peanut and sweetpotato. He found commercial use for cornstalks, grass, and weeds. His chemical discoveries increased the income of the South by many millions of dollars.

Despite his innate shyness, Dr. Carver could not keep his light hidden and honors came to him. As early as 1917, he was made a member of the Royal Society of Arts, London. In 1923 he received the Spingarn Medal for research in potash and in 1929 the Theodore Roosevelt Medal was awarded him for distinguished services to science. Simpson College gave him the degree of doctor of science in 1928. He left his laboratory in 1934 to take part in the organization of the Farm Chemurgic Council and

thereafter appeared on its annual programs. The U.S. Department of Agriculture appointed him collaborator to the Bureau of Plant Industry in 1935. Henry Ford built a memorial replica of his birthplace at Greenfield Village where Dr. Carver spent some weeks during 1942.

Dr. Carver has been called a master teacher. His unselfishness and devotion to his work and to humanity grew more firmly as the years passed. He has earned a large niche among America's truly great.

It is appropriate that we remember Dr. Carver's words of wisdom:

There is goodness in everything * * * I am only a trailblazer for those who come after me.

Needed: An OAS Peace Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world, and particularly the people of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, is now awaiting to see what will result from the breakoff of United States-Cuban relations.

Naturally, all of us hope for some sign that Castro and his advisers will demonstrate responsibility, not only in dealing more democratically with the people of Cuba, but also in carrying on normal relations with other countries—rather than continually attempting to export revolutionary communism.

Recently, I was privileged to make a statement not only reflecting on the Cuban situation, but also containing some suggestions which I feel would help to promote peace and stability in the Western Hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Our breaking of relations with Cuba—justified by a long series of provocative acts by Castro—will, in all likelihood, not result in any real reform of policy under the present Cuban regime.

Overall, these irresponsible policies have reflected (1) betrayal of the original purposes of the revolution by the Cuban people; (2) a close tie-in with the Communist world conspiracy; (3) an erratic and sometimes almost psychotic effort by Castro to climb to power and recognition on the bloody shoulders of his compatriots in the revolution.

Now, the breakoff of U.S. relations may trigger more erratic, dangerous moves by Castro. We can expect that (a) his dictatorial policies within Cuba will get harsher; (b) his playing "footsies" with the Communists may become even cozier; (c) his troublemaking in the Western Hemisphere will, as possible, be expanded.

The situation, however, warrants stringent action, not just by the United States, but also by the Organization of American States.

Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, Castro and company, for example, may attempt to continue to use Cuba as a sort of "gun running" center for revolutionary activities elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere.

To cope with such threats to peace, the members of the OAS, individually and cooperatively, will need to take steps to prevent such dangerous activities.

During the recent crises in Nicaragua and Guatemala, the United States, by request of the respective governments, dispatched a protective fleet to prevent Castro-supported efforts to provide guns and manpower for troublemaking in those countries. While the move was effective, we cannot expect Communist efforts to export revolutions to be discouraged.

The U.S. action, however, established a precedent which, if more broadly utilized by OAS, could guard against efforts by one nation to start trouble in another.

The cause of peace in the Western Hemisphere, I believe, could be effectively served if efforts were made—both by the United States and OAS—to provide the OAS with a peace fleet. The assignment of the necessary ships and manpower for such a purpose would be a sound investment in security.

Under the auspices of OAS—rather than as a unilateral action of the United States to a nation's call for help—such a flotilla of peace would (1) curb "gun running" and other violations of order and peace; (2) be less likely to stir up anti-U.S. animosity; (3) give greater strength, prestige and effectiveness to the OAS itself; and (4) generally stand as a guardian against threats to security in the Western Hemisphere.

Benjamin Franklin and the Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1960, the residents of Claysburg, Pa., dedicated their new post office building at which time I delivered the following address:

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AND THE POST OFFICE

(Address by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the dedication of the Claysburg Post Office, Claysburg, Pa., November 5, 1960)

We are here today to dedicate a new post office building and to forge a new link in this vital chain of communications.

All of you can be proud of this new edifice which is much more than an attractive building of brick and mortar.

It is concrete evidence of the growth and progressive outlook of this community.

The post office has become such an integral part of our lives that most of us seldom give it a second thought.

Like so many other things in our lives today we tend to take its faithful service for granted, but can you imagine what life would be like without these postal facilities?

We would be cut off from most of our written sources of news and contemporary thought if magazines and out-of-town newspapers could not be circulated. Many of our personal messages and gifts to friends and loved ones could not be delivered except in person.

Without the post office our major source of contact with family and acquaintances who are often widely scattered over this vast country of ours as well as overseas would be lost.

Business enterprises would be unable to maintain branch offices or operate in nationwide or international markets without the facilities of a postal service.

The alternate means of communicating with business associates are far too expensive for the general run of business operations.

The post office has become indispensable for most personal and business purposes. Moreover, the post office offers us a variety of other related public services such as money orders, postal savings, c.o.d. delivery, registry, and a number of other services for other Government agencies.

The dedication of this new post office building here in Claysburg, Pa., seems to me an opportune time to recollect some of the early development of the American postal system and the contributions to this great institution of a great American and native son of Pennsylvania—Benjamin Franklin.

The memory of Benjamin Franklin as a postmaster has been almost completely overshadowed by Franklin as a statesman in this formative period in American history.

During his tenure as Deputy Postmaster General for the northern Colonies from 1753 to 1774, Franklin's outstanding achievements as an international spokesman for the colonists and an inventor have caused most of us to forget his early connection with the colonial postal service. As a result, we are apt to overlook the great service he rendered our country by molding the colonial post office into the vital public institution it has become.

When Franklin first assumed responsibility as postmaster of the post office in Philadelphia in 1737, the colonial postal system was far from efficient or complete. It failed in many respects to meet the needs of the growing colonial settlements in North America. Mail service was slow and undependable. Little had been done to improve the postal facilities in their first 50 years of existence.

Mail service between the colonial centers south of Philadelphia had never been coordinated with service north of the city. Post riders took as much as 4 weeks to carry mail from Boston to Williamsburg, Va. Nor was there any assurance that letters would ever reach their destination. In addition, the service, though poor, was very expensive.

Under Franklin's able administration, mail service was improved markedly. Old schedules were maintained more faithfully and real steps were taken to provide more speedy as well as more frequent carriage of the mails.

By October 1754, weekly service between Philadelphia and New York was replaced by trips three times a week and the delivery time was shortened to 33 hours. Delivery of mail between these two important centers of colonial life was further expedited by the inauguration of day and night post riding on this route.

Franklin was able to reduce the time required to transport mail from Philadelphia to Boston from 6 weeks to 3 by making the route more direct.

In addition to expediting delivery on existing routes, he expanded the area served until it reached from what is now Maine to Georgia with cross routes wherever there was sufficient demand for the service.

Benjamin Franklin pioneered a number of new postal services. He introduced the first city delivery system in America while he was postmaster of Philadelphia.

This system, known as the penny post, furnished delivery of all unclaimed letters within the city limits for the additional charge of 1 penny.

By 1753, other large cities were adopting the penny post as the most effective means of distributing mail in urban centers.

In the smaller towns, unclaimed letters were advertised in local newspapers with the

notice that any letter not called for within 3 months would be forwarded to the Central Post Office at Philadelphia.

Thus, the American dead-letter office was born.

Franklin also inaugurated the use of postmarks to record the time a letter was received by the post office and set up a uniform and efficient accounting system to simplify the work of all the post offices.

After 4 years under his administration, the colonial American post office showed a profit for the first time since its founding a hundred years earlier.

Today no one considers the delivery of magazines and newspapers by the post office controversial, but in Franklin's day no publication was automatically distributed.

From the very beginning the relationship between the post and the first news publication was a vital one.

Most of the early postmasters were printers who used their post offices to circulate their publications.

They zealously prohibited the post rider in their area from carrying any rival publications.

Although Benjamin Franklin also was a newspaper publisher, he insisted from the first that rival newspapers be allowed to circulate.

When he rose to the position of Deputy Postmaster General he revolutionized the entire concept of the postal service as a carrier of news by abolishing the former monopolistic practices of most colonial postmaster-editors and required postage on all publications carried by the post riders.

By these acts he became a Founding Father of our free press which is such an integral part of the democratic way of life.

Benjamin Franklin is considered the patron saint of the modern post office because of these and other valuable services he rendered while in charge of the colonial post.

He was the first postmaster to regard the postal system as a necessary public facility rather than simply a business enterprise.

He laid the foundations for the high standards still maintained by postal employees today.

The official slogan of the post office "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds," is still the creed of the modern mail service and is proof that Franklin's ideals have been emulated by succeeding postal administrators.

Historically, the post office has carried the major share of the burden of transmitting ideas and information.

As Benjamin Franklin foresaw, the post office has been a significant factor in our national development.

During the Revolutionary War period the rival postal system formed by the colonists after the British dismissed Franklin from the colonial post, greatly aided the cause of freedom by uniting the colonists.

The post office has been equally important in other periods in our national development such as the Civil War and the settlement of the West.

New means of mass communication have since been developed but the post office continues to be as vital today as it was back in the colonial days for the bulk of correspondence.

In the last 10 years alone the volume of mail in the United States increased by some 18 billion pieces, and is still growing.

The Post Office Department is currently engaged in a program of modernizing its mail handling facilities as well.

New electronic and mechanical devices are being installed in some of the larger city post offices to expedite sorting and distribution operations.

The ever-increasing volume of mail coming through our post offices these days makes improvement of mail handling facilities essential.

Although the speed of transporting mail has increased tremendously since the days of the post riders, many of our smaller post offices still use manual sorting and distribution methods which are virtually identical to those used in Benjamin Franklin's time.

The new post office we are dedicating here today is part of this same modernization program begun in 1953 by Postmaster Arthur E. Summerfield.

The many new post offices and improved handling facilities which have been added to our postal system since the inception of the program exemplify the way the Post Office is maintaining the fine traditions founded by Benjamin Franklin.

In conclusion I wish to congratulate Postmaster Welter and the employees of the Claysburg Post Office on being able to perform their duties with modern postal equipment.

Likewise the patrons of the Claysburg Post Office are to be congratulated on having such a fine new building in the community since it will provide modern postal facilities for this entire area.

At the same time taking its place alongside the fine and modern First National Bank Building, the appearance of the community has been greatly improved.

Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate the residents of Claysburg as they join with other American communities in keeping pace with American progress.

With the raising of this flag in the name of the U.S. Post Office Department, I hereby dedicate this new building to be known as the Claysburg Post Office—in the fine traditions of the postal system—and to the service of the citizens of Claysburg.

Postmaster Walter—I charge you with these responsibilities.

In this connection, the fine cooperation rendered by the General Refractories Co. in disposing of the site and the old post office building for a nominal price, was instrumental in expediting the construction of this new post office building.

For that reason, officials of the General Refractories Co. are to be congratulated for the part they played in securing a new post office building for Claysburg.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of the Congress we were all saddened by the news of the passing of our late colleague and esteemed friend, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. Mrs. ROGERS was a lady of great ability and certainly an expert on legislation concerning the needs of the veterans of this Nation.

She commanded an important place in the House of Representatives and as we meet this year she is certainly missed.

When I first came to the Congress—in the 80th Congress—Mrs. ROGERS was elected as chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs and it was under her chairmanship that I served on my first committee in the Congress. She was always a gallant lady, an effective legislator, untiring in her efforts with the interests of the veterans, their widows and dependents always at heart. She was often called the "Sweetheart of American Veterans" and indeed she was beloved by all veterans. At a critical time in our Nation's history, she was a leader for beneficial veterans' legislation and veterans' rights that will long be remembered because of her public service. The veterans of this Nation have lost a fine friend. The people of her district have lost a devoted Representative and we of the House have lost one of our most beloved lady Members.

A Matter of Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued from my office on the first day of this session:

Congressman WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, Democrat, of New York, said Tuesday that he intends to notify his fellow Members of his support for a drive to shut off as much as possible of the flow of funds to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"It's a major leak that needs immediate repair," said RYAN. "Hundreds of thousands of dollars annually are not only being wasted, but are actually being used to humiliate scores of loyal American citizens and to embarrass thousands of others."

Congressman RYAN applauded a statement issued earlier by California's Democratic Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT on abolition of the un-American activities unit.

RYAN, newly elected from Manhattan's 20th District and New York's first reform Democratic Congressman, said he agrees strongly that the committee serves no useful legislative purpose and cannot justify its existence. However, he also feels that ROOSEVELT is correct in his stand that an all-out fight to kill the committee at this time would fail for lack of support.

"After conferring with JIMMY ROOSEVELT and other members of the Democratic study group," said RYAN, "I believe we can best attack this problem by putting the squeeze on the committee's appropriation during the coming session. I think the suggestion for a full hearing on this appropriation before the House Committee on Administration is excellent."

The Democratic study group is an organization of some 100 liberal Members of Congress. RYAN said those Members he had talked to were opposed in principle to the methods used in the past by the Un-American Activities Committee. The study group is chiefly concerned at this time with a change in the rules to help break up a deadlock holding up liberal legislation. RYAN met with the group for the first time this week.

"I can certainly understand," said RYAN, "that many Members of Congress feel it would be politically dangerous for them to vote, at this time, for outright abolition of the committee. However, these same Members would have no objection to, and would

undoubtedly support, a thorough scrutiny of the requested appropriation for the committee and would agree that every dollar should be fully justified before it is approved by the House of Representatives."

ROOSEVELT had suggested in a letter to all House Members, that a "happy byproduct of our economy drive" in cutting back the budget for the HUAC would be the limitation of "the power of this committee to embarrass our Nation, to humiliate its citizens and to tarnish the good name" of the House of Representatives.

"Perhaps if we turn down the appropriations faucet tight enough," said RYAN, "we won't have to perform a major operation on the Un-American Activities Committee at this time."

Caribbean Crisis Demands Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the breaking of diplomatic relations by the United States on January 3, 1961, with the Communist-dominated Government of Cuba, after a long series of incidents affecting the peace and safety of the Western Hemisphere, emphasizes the gravity of the situation in the Caribbean.

This severing of relations, even were it followed by a formally declared quarantine and complete diplomatic isolation, will not of itself solve the problem of Castro and Bolshevist subversion, for developments in Cuba are but one sector in a vast struggle of the so-called international Communist conspiracy for world domination, with the United States marked for ultimate conquest.

The long delay on the part of our Department of State in reacting to the dangers of the beachhead of Red subversion in Cuba makes time of the utmost importance to the security of the entire Western Hemisphere and calls for immediate action.

The United States must ask the Organization of American States to work with the United States to stop the use of Cuba as a base for Communist infiltration and subversion of the Americas; also to prevent its serving as an arms depot and staging ground for revolutionary invasions of friendly countries.

In event of failure or delay by the Organization of American States to bring about cooperative action, the United States, in line with the principles of international law dealing with the right of self-defense, should act unilaterally for the security of the country.

In preparation for either of these contingencies, I urge the immediate creation by our Government of a permanent and independent special Caribbean squadron of the necessary capabilities to be based in the Canal Zone for diplomatic and other missions incident to the protection of the Western Hemisphere.

Also, I urge a full congressional inquiry into the existence of subversive influences in our own Department of State that contributed toward bringing about the deplorable condition now facing our country in the Caribbean.

I appeal to the people of the Nation to write their views to the President, their Senators and Representatives, especially the necessity for action.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick A. O'Leary

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing us today throughout the United States is the question of how to fully use the experience and training of the thousands of elder citizens who form a vital part of our Nation's population. Due to the advancement of science the lifespan of the individual is increasing steadily. But at the same time we have, up to the present time, failed to fully provide for those many who still can be of benefit to the communities in their later years.

I am happy to rise on the floor of this House today and to tell you the story of one individual who has attempted in his own way to do something for these people. He himself can be classified as an elder citizen; that is in years but not in spirit and in vigor. He is not only a constituent of mine but a distinguished churchman. I am referring to the Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick A. O'Leary, pastor of Our Lady of Mercy Roman Catholic Church in the Bronx. This parish is located in the 24th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. This distinguished churchman has just recently completed 50 years of service in the priesthood, and over that entire period of time he has covered himself with honor not only as a man of God but also as a fine human being. He has taken a deep and abiding interest in the affairs of the community in the Bronx which his parish embraces. Throughout his long tenure in Our Lady of Mercy parish he has done all he can in his own way to help all those who have come to him with their problems. He has contributed greatly to the progress of the Bronx community. He is indeed a fine example of a well-rounded individual.

Monsignor O'Leary being an elder citizen himself is well aware of the difficulties sometimes faced by those people who through no fault of their own found themselves with little to do in the so-called golden years of their lives. To help these people and to give the community the full benefit of their experience and knowledge 2 years ago Monsignor O'Leary formed a Golden Age Club in his parish. In a short period of time this club has expanded and has given to many a new lease on life while at the same time giving to the community many new useful participants in community affairs.

On November 11 last Monsignor O'Leary was honored himself by receiving the 1960 Golden Age annual award. The citation he received on that occasion expresses only too well the record of Monsignor O'Leary's life. It reads as follows:

For outstanding service to the community and devotion to the Church of Our Lady of Mercy throughout the years.

I congratulate Monsignor O'Leary on this award and on his many services to the church and community throughout the years. I wish him 50 more golden years to match those he has already given to the Bronx and the church.

Retirement of Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, prior to the meeting of the 87th Congress, I received word of the retirement from the U.S. Marine Corps of Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle. It was with considerable regret that I contemplated this distinguished officer leaving active service. Don Hittle has been a trusted friend to many in the Congress and a dedicated officer whose prime goal in life has been service to his country. In his over 20 years' service he has left a record of which he can be justly proud. I am especially happy to give this recognition of his work since General Hittle grew up in Lansing, Mich. His father, the late Senator Harry F. Hittle, for 22 years served with distinction in the Michigan State Senate where I had the honor of working under him early in my legal career as counsel for the senate judiciary committee of which he was chairman. His mother is one of my constituents.

Don Hittle is a military officer of high standing but he was even more. His expert knowledge of world history and geopolitics, military organization and grand strategy, coupled with his unique writing ability has enabled many to gain a better, clearer, insight into the world problems through reading his numerous published articles and books. It is to our advantage that he has been able to communicate so effectively his thoughts on these subjects which are of such great importance to our Nation today.

General Hittle was born in Bear Lake, Mich., and was graduated in 1937 from Michigan State University with a bachelor of arts degree. He later earned a masters degree in oriental history and geography at the University of Utah.

He began his Marine Corps career as a second lieutenant in July 1937 and served in almost every conceivable capacity during his 23 years service. He was commander of the Marine detachment of the U.S.S. *Washington* during the Arctic operations under the British home fleet in 1942. He instructed in the Officers School at Quantico and then

was assistant chief of staff, G–4, of the 3d Marine Division. For his outstanding service in this capacity on Iwo Jima he was awarded the Legion of Merit with Combat "V".

In China in 1945 and 1946 he commanded the 2d Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division. After a tour as secretary of the academic board at Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, General Hittle went to the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, as executive officer of the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps unit, following which he was ordered to Headquarters Marine Corps where he served as legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

General Hittle retired, as of November 30, 1960, from active service in the U.S. Marine Corps. At the time of his retirement, as most of my colleagues know, he occupied the important and trusted position of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. In this position, and earlier when he was legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Hittle was more than someone we knew. He was a warm and close friend of many Members of Congress. I know the Department of Defense and the Marine Corps are losing a valuable officer. However, I am happy that Don will still be in a position where our country will benefit from his services. He has accepted a newly created position with the Veterans of Foreign Wars—he will be director of military and foreign affairs at the national headquarters of the VFW here in Washington. The VFW is to be congratulated on the decision to create this position, but more specifically upon the selection of General Hittle—eminently qualified to serve in such a capacity.

Our National Transportation System and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1960, it was my privilege to deliver the following address at the Institute of Railway Labor Organizations on the campus of Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.:

OUR NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Institute of Railway Labor Organizations, campus of Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., September 21, 1960, at 7 p.m.)

Transportation is one of the tools required by civilized man to bring order out of chaos.

It reaches into every phase and facet of our existence.

Viewed from every standpoint—economic, political, and military—it is unquestionably the most important industry in the world.

You can no more operate a grocery store or a brewery than you can win a war without transportation.

The more complex life becomes, the more indispensable are the things that make up our transportation systems.

It is an accepted fact that the transportation system of a nation is one of its greatest strengths.

The strength of our country is told in the fabulous history of the railroads.

Their story and the parallel story of our national growth is a new and equally fascinating chapter in the history of mankind.

While the mournful whistle may have given way to the horn of the diesel—and—although the "Phoebe snow" no longer keeps "bright and snowy white upon the road of anthracite"—yet these stirring reminders of past glory—memorialized in song and poem—will always keep alive in the hearts of all Americans the stirring saga of the railroads.

Believe it or not, in the central Pennsylvania area ads recently appeared in our local papers announcing the fact an old Huntingdon-Broadtop steam engine and several passenger coaches are back in service hauling sightseers on a limited stretch of this abandoned railroad.

Most interesting is the fact that students from grade and high schools are traveling to Orbisonia, Pa., to get a look at their first steam locomotive and ride on an old steam-powered train.

Frankly, what I am trying to say is "time marches on" and to the extent as a former railroad employee—I never thought I would live to see the day when steam motive power on the railroads would become a relic of the past.

It is recognized the world over that one of the most closely knit fraternities in the country is that of railroadmen.

And rightfully so.

For who else—among all professions—can look at this great land of ours and say—with more justification—"This I helped to build.

"Those who went before me used pick and shovel to build the roads and lay the ties and stretch the rails that made this country what it is.

"In this I have pride.

"In this pride I am justified."

In addition to its contribution to our national growth is the story of the railroads in national emergencies.

Here the railroads have more than proved themselves.

Their extremely fine performance will never be forgotten.

Their employees—men and women—have met the challenge, not only in this country but in many areas overseas.

When I speak of railroads in general, I do not mean management or labor or track and equipment separately.

I mean the combination of all three.

Management, labor, and track and equipment are as interrelated and dependent—one on the other—as the head, the heart, and the body.

Working in concert this glorious history has been compiled.

Before the dawn of the nuclear age—when the men of the railroads were fashioning the romance of the rail—we in America felt secure behind our ocean barriers.

The very thought that we would ever be involved in a war in our own country was absurd.

But all this is changed.

The bright flash of atomic light at Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, revealed in its glow the lurking specter of nuclear war, a war that knows no boundaries or barriers, that has no concern for distance and little for time.

The dawn of a new-born day may herald the beginning of the end, unless we have prepared ourselves and have the capability to survive.

Now, where do the railroads fit into this picture of capability to survive?

In its ninth annual report to the Congress, dated January 13, 1960, the Joint Committee on Defense Production outlined the dependence of the various governmental departments and agencies upon transportation to meet objectives in the event of emergency.

Planning under this program is being carried on throughout the Government under the supervision and direction of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization.

The Department of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and others have all indicated to OCDM the extent of their reliance on transportation in the event of emergency.

Railroads are in the forefront.

The extent of this reliance will, of course, depend upon the magnitude or location of the theater of operations.

Whatever the nature of the requirements, it is anticipated that almost total reliance will be placed upon commercial transportation within the United States to support the national defense.

In connection with the specific role of the railroads in national defense, I would like to touch on an item of considerable impact and interest to the Air Force. It deals with the old concept of mobility, but with a new application.

Within the intercontinental ballistic missile weapons system has arisen the operational concept of mobility.

This is an answer to the problems encountered when missile sites are permanent.

The ability to move at random over a relatively unlimited area increases the potential aggressor's targeting problem tremendously.

This concept is being applied to the Minuteman missile system and involves mounting the missile on a specially designed railroad car as part of mobile trains that will move at random over selected trackage within the United States.

This is the first time a civilian train and crew will be an integral operating part of a military weapons system on a continuing basis.

A military transportation officer will direct train movements from the Strategic Air Command—command post—with a civilian representative of the railroads sitting at his side to assist in this effort.

The Association of American Railroads has played an important part in the planning that has come into the development of this concept.

Tests of this concept began in June of this year and were completed during the summer months.

Results were highly satisfactory and the Air Force and the railroads are proceeding with plans to make this weapons system operational.

It is this type of application of transportation resources to the support of advanced weapons systems which is—and will continue to be—essential to our national defense.

If war should come to this country—and God forbid—the problems faced in past emergencies will be minute by comparison.

To the hurdles of overburdened equipment and overworked men—which the railroads met and vanquished so magnificently in World War II and Korea—will be added the problems of vast destruction of both peoples and things.

These are not unknown to the railroads.

In fact, the ability of the railroads to overcome these obstacles with apparent ease is legendary.

The destruction of tunnels, bridges, and roadbeds by the floods on the Ohio River in

1937; the California earthquakes of 1952 and hurricane Diane in 1955—disasters so well known in railroad circles—present a modern-day picture of major damage from natural forces.

It is to the eternal credit of the railroads that not only did they dig out and restore service in an absolute minimum of time, but they did it out of their own resources of men and materials and on their own initiative.

The railroads do not have to wait upon directives and decisions of some public body.

They are indoctrinated in the tradition of self-reliance. They know what has to be done, how to do it, and they go out and do the job. The railroads are unique in this field among modes of transportation. This means a great deal toward restoring service after an emergency.

It also means that the Nation has at its call in time of national crisis a trained reserve of men schooled in this vigorous tradition. A trained reserve that may someday cease to exist if the decline in railroad employment continues at its present pace.

The Congress of the United States is acutely aware of the need for an adequate transportation system—of all modes—in existence in time of emergency. I repeat, in existence in time of emergency.

In all previous experience and planning for mobilization—from the standpoint of transportation—the United States has enjoyed the luxury of time to build our capacity to transport.

Due to the changing concepts of war, this luxury in all probability will no longer be available to us.

We will be obliged to do with what we have.

Should war come suddenly to this continent, it would be today's trained people and the existing plant and facilities which would have to meet it.

For this reason, primary congressional concern is on the importance of the current health and continuing ability of transportation to respond instantaneously to any emergency which might arise.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, a special subcommittee—of which I was proud to be a member—of the House Committee on Armed Services conducted hearings into the adequacy of transportation systems in support of the national defense effort in the event of mobilization.

Representatives of eastern, southern, and northern railroads testified before the members of this committee, as did representatives of the Railway Labor Executives Association, the Association of American Railroads, and railway equipment suppliers.

The story that they unfolded left me gravely concerned over whether the railroads will be strong enough and healthy enough to flex their historic muscles and measure up to past performance.

The inroads upon the freight and passenger business of railroads by other modes—and especially the private automobile—has been reflected in a steady decline year by year.

The railroads—which in 1945 handled 67 percent of all public and private intercity ton-miles of freight—accounted for only 45 percent in 1958.

In the passenger field the railroads—which at one time enjoyed a virtual monopoly in intercity commercial passenger transportation—hauled only 31 percent of the total for-hire transportation in this field in 1958.

The obvious resulting decline in railroad equipment and employees was the most disturbing feature of this testimony.

There is no doubt that today's railroad equipment includes little reserve capacity.

But even if this were not true, the real loss to the railroads and to the Nation is apparent in the sharp decline in manpower.

From 1,358,838 employees in 1946 to 840,575 in 1958.

It matters little that mechanization and other technological changes have been to a great extent responsible for this decline.

The plain fact is that these employees are no longer there.

Thousands of trained and skilled workers have been furloughed.

Many have obtained work in other industries.

The once vaunted trained reserve of railroad employees—the shock troops, skilled in coping with disaster—no longer exists.

This is the real tragedy of the decline of the railroads.

As appropriately stated by Chairman Tuggle, of the Interstate Commerce Commission:

"The railroads' ability to transport might be governed more by shortages of manpower * * * during a survival period than by shortages of equipment and facilities."

Is it any wonder that Congress is concerned about the health of the railroads?

A sound and healthy railroad industry is essential to the United States.

The special subcommittee—of which I spoke earlier—made several recommendations, which, if followed, should provide needed financial relief for the railroads.

The most important of these was tax relief—Federal, State, and local.

It was obvious from the testimony that the policies of all levels of government in providing roads, air terminals, waterway developments, and other means of assistance to other modes of transportation operated to the detriment of the railroads.

While the users of these facilities merely pay a fee for the use thereof, the railroads have been and are required to provide and maintain their own terminals, rights-of-way, and other fixed facilities.

On top of this, each layer of government imposes a tax based on the value of the property.

In hearings by the Interstate Commerce Commission beginning in March 1956—relative to the railroad passenger deficit—the matter of such taxation, as it affected the whole of the railroad industry, was fully explored.

On May 25, 1959, a report was released by the ICC which contained—in addition to others—the following recommendations:

1. That the Federal tax laws be amended to encourage local and State tax relief—at least to the extent of disregarding State and local provided pretax net income for Federal tax purposes;

2. That State and local governments take such steps as may be required to effect a greater degree of equity in respect to tax burden on railroad property in relation to taxpayers generally, and consistent with the desire of their communities for retention of commuter and other passenger train service.

The committee was in agreement with these suggestions, and recommended prompt action in this field.

With such relief the railroads should be able to sharply change the present picture of bad-order equipment, deferred maintenance, and overage equipment and facilities.

Such changes will of necessity drastically reverse the present decline of employment in the whole of the railroad industry.

The 86th Congress—just recently adjourned—aptly expressed its concern over the health of our transportation systems by the many fine pieces of legislation and resolutions introduced.

All were directed toward putting our transportation systems on a sound financial basis because of their essentiality to the national security.

Some have become law and others, not yet acted upon, will be reintroduced in the 87th Congress.

Perhaps the most important of these—from the standpoint of the railroads—were H.J. Res. 606 and S.J. Res. 158.

The acknowledged purpose of these resolutions is to establish a National Advisory Committee on Rail Transportation.

The primary basis for the establishment of such a committee is expressed as follows:

"Whereas an adequate system of rail transportation is essential to the national economy and to the national defense."

You will find this theme running through every piece of legislation on this topic.

This is the most graphic illustration of the concern with which the Congress views the status of our transportation systems.

In addition, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with statements of the Members of Congress expressing their feeling regarding various facets of this problem.

As you are aware, I personally have sponsored legislation for assistance to the railroads because of my grave concern over this situation.

Let me recall to you a statement I recently made with reference to the need for immediate congressional action.

This statement was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1960:

"Unless we have adequate transportation in all modes to sustain both our military activities and our civilian economy—in event of an emergency—we will be like unto a living body with a ruptured aorta: Our life blood slowly but surely running out.

"Indeed, the bell will be tolling for us."

From my own wartime experience I know that measures to insure this can be neglected or deferred only at grave peril to our national security and survival.

John Foster Dulles Memorial Stamp Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include a copy of the speech delivered by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield on the occasion of the first day ceremony of the John Foster Dulles memorial postage stamp. Because of the high esteem in which Secretary Dulles is held, not only by my colleagues in the Congress, but by the American people as well, I feel Mr. Summerfield's remarks deserve wide recognition and commendation:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES MEMORIAL STAMP CEREMONY—TALK BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 6, 1960

It is a pleasure to welcome this distinguished audience.

We appreciate your being with us today as we honor the late John Foster Dulles and his more than 50 years of dedicated and devoted service in the cause of justice and freedom for all men.

In issuing a memorial stamp dedicated to John Foster Dulles, the U.S. Government pays homage not only to the chief architect of this Nation's foreign policy during a time of challenge and crises, but to a man of outstanding character and stature who worked untiringly for peace, ignoring every personal cost and sacrifice, however great.

Early in his life, John Foster Dulles resolved, the way many young men do, to work

for the betterment of mankind. Through his long and brilliant career he succeeded as very few do in achieving the goal he set for himself. His dedication was to peace, based on the belief that change, though inevitable, must be attained without war through the acceptance of law and the fostering of justice throughout the world.

Born here in Washington, D.C., on February 25, 1888, the son of a Presbyterian pastor of Watertown, N.Y., and the grandson and nephew of men who served as Secretaries of State—under President Benjamin Harrison and President Woodrow Wilson—Mr. Dulles' early life centered around rigorous and intensive religious training intertwined with family discussions on morality and diplomacy.

On assuming the office of Secretary of State in January 1953, Mr. Dulles' dedication to peace faced the ultimate test. Crises throughout the world in Korea, Iran, Indochina, Europe, challenged him. But he was prepared, for activity in the field of foreign affairs had been his vocation or avocation throughout his life. Behind him lay nearly 50 years of experience in writing and thinking about world events, including intense participation in foreign matters in the 8 preceding years. John Foster Dulles understood the peoples and the nations of the world—their aspirations and their problems. He was ideally equipped to play a leading role in assisting the free countries of the world in building and maintaining the unity and strength indispensable for guarding peace and preserving freedom.

Mr. Dulles deeply believed that moral principles should be brought boldly and unashamedly into the arena of world affairs. Each human being, he felt, was endowed with spiritual dignity and worth which all others should respect; whenever these elementary truths were rejected, he maintained, spiritual and social disorder was inevitable.

His faith in the average man was unshakeable. He believed that the struggle for peace would never be won without the cumulative efforts of millions of individuals working, each in their own environment, in ways which develop moral power and organize it as a mobile powerful force.

John Foster Dulles felt that our Nation had a noble mission to perform: to set an example before the world by requiring the highest standards of conduct for ourselves. He wanted the world to know that our country remained steadfast to its historic ideals and followed its traditional course of sharing the spiritual, intellectual and material fruits of our free society. He knew that we need not fear competition from the despotic nations, if we continued to move forward under freedom as a dynamic, liberalizing force.

His deep personal faith coupled with rare moral and physical courage characterized his life's work. John Foster Dulles probably best described his own qualities in stating "To achieve world order is a long hard task * * * and calls for men who are clear of vision, strong of faith and competent in deed."

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Secretary Dulles' service in the field of foreign affairs, President Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote, in part:

"I am quite certain that as this administration joins those which are viewed from long historical perspective, your accomplishments will establish you as one of the greatest of our Secretaries of State."

And in his "The Legacy of John Foster Dulles," Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON noted:

"The Communists have no hesitancy in proclaiming their faith in the eventual domination of the world by dictators. Can we be less determined in our dedication to the cause of freedom from tyranny for all people? In this thought Mr. Dulles leaves to the free world perhaps his most lasting and valuable legacy."

For the public services he rendered, for the inspiration he provided his fellow citizens, and for the personal sacrifice he made, we honor his memory by issuing this postage stamp.

I am highly privileged to take part in this program today and to pay tribute, along with his many friends and the members of his family, to this great and good man I knew so intimately as a friend and fellow Cabinet member.

I shall always remember him as a wholly dedicated public servant whose tireless energy, and great intellectual abilities were devoted to the most noblest of man's aspirations—peace with justice.

In this spirit, then, the Post Office Department gratefully and proudly dedicates this John Foster Dulles memorial stamp.

After its first-day sale here today in Washington, 120 million of these Dulles memorial stamps will be placed on sale in the Nation's 35,000 post offices.

We believe the widespread use of these Dulles stamps will reawaken the gratitude of our people for the many services rendered in their behalf by John Foster Dulles. We hope, too, that they will stimulate the interest and strengthen the belief in the philosophy of peace with justice—the ideal mankind has never yet reached but never quite forgotten—both here and throughout the world, which he so ably and consistently championed throughout his truly distinguished career.

Barry Goldwater Needles the Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, you and other top brass of the Congress graced the speaker's table at the Women's National Press Club dinner for Members of Congress at the Statler Hotel on last Tuesday evening. I know you do not agree with most of what Senator GOLDWATER, in his speech to the liberals, said on that occasion. You must admit, however, that it was a great and effective speech. While you joined in the laughter at some of the devastating satire by BARRY GOLDWATER, it seemed to me that you winced on a number of occasions when the Senator's cold logic far overshadowed Senator HUMPHREY'S loquacious defense of the liberal school. Since all Members of Congress were not present at the press dinner, it is my feeling that they should have the opportunity to read and enjoy this exceptionally well-done dissertation by the senior Senator from Arizona:

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, WOMEN'S NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1961

In the invitation I received to address the Women's National Press Club, Miss Lewing asked me to offer some advice to liberals who will hold forth in the next session of Congress. I am very happy to do this, because although I addressed about 500 gatherings during the last campaign, there wasn't a liberal in the lot. They wouldn't even give me token integration.

In fact, rather than associate with me and my kind, they are prepared to give up public gatherings. I can assure you from the bottom of my heart, we don't want that any more than they do. All we ask is our rights.

When a conservative is invited to give advice to the liberals, he finds himself in approximately the same situation as a vegetarian missionary assigned to a tribe of cannibals. Without a quick conversion, the results will be personally painful. I think it is absolutely necessary that we conservatives counsel with our liberal friends to prevent the Daniel Boones of the New Frontier from leading us all down the wilderness trail to a completely collectivist state.

While I have been asked to be here tonight only in the capacity of an adviser, I cannot resist the temptation to comment on the recent election. The other day I came across a message that describes how I feel about the election so much better than I can hope to phrase it, I have taken the liberty of bringing it with me tonight. This was a telegram that was sent by the defeated presidential candidate to his victorious opponent in a musical comedy some years ago. It reads and I quote, "Heartily congratulate you on your splendid victory and charge fraud in Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Montana, Washington, Ohio, and Massachusetts." Now, if you will drop out the States mentioned in that telegram which went Republican and add Texas to the list, you'll understand how we Republicans feel about 1960.

But this is a season of good will and nonpartisanship, a nonpartisanship that I have every reason to believe will last until January 20. It may even last longer and go all the way through January 21. During this happy period, you will see the lions and the lambs frisking together in a joyous coexistence, reminiscent of the peaceful days when Mr. Khrushchev was being entertained at Camp David, and those days in West Virginia when my friend HUBERT was saying so many nice things about the President-elect.

During this period you will find Senator BYRD playing leapfrog with Senator CLARK, and Drew Pearson might even write an item insinuating that DICK NIXON is not crooked all the way through. It is even remotely possible that during this period Senator MORSE will moderate his language.

In the spirit of one for all and all for one, I want to compliment our President-elect on his choice of Mennen Williams to be in charge of African affairs. Although we kept it a close secret during the campaign, I think I can now safely reveal to you that DICK NIXON had intended to offer him the same post if the Republicans had won. I know that Governor Williams probably sat up as late as the rest of us election night sweating out the returns, but he was the only politician in the country who really didn't have to worry how it came out. He was earmarked for Africa no matter who won. He will be safe there—Reuther can't lay a hand on him, and it will be virtually impossible for him to disturb the tax solvency of those countries.

Before going further into the subject of my discussion this evening, I must sincerely and from the bottom of my heart comment on the warmth and beauty and charm the new First Lady will bring to the White House. However, I think we can all agree that if the election had depended on who that first woman would be, there would have been no contest for either Jackie or Pat would fit the description I had given.

In mentioning the President-elect's wife, I must also compliment him and his family for the close association they enjoy with each other. I know the joy that comes from this closeness for I have lived my life in a family

closely knit also. The Kennedys are an example of family life that can serve the country well. In fact, it is from this that I offer my first advice to a liberal.

Mr. President-elect, it is with some trepidation that we conservatives learn of the willing ear that you give to Mr. Galbraith, Mr. Schlessinger, and the Americans for Democratic Action, so please find an empty room in the White House and comfortably settle your father Joe in it, then have breakfast with him every morning, and listen to his advice.

In mentioning Joe Kennedy, I am sure it was a sentimental gesture on the part of our President- and Vice President-elect that caused them to purchase their clothes in London. Sentimental or not, at a time when we have our own depressed areas, I think it would be fitting if the leaders of our country would buy their clothes in America and support our economy.

Follow the examples of the vice chairman in charge of the Democratic deficit, Frank Sinatra, who is having his clothes made by one of America's leading dress designers.

You will forgive my using the word "economy," Mr. Kennedy. I know it wasn't in your platform. Seriously, no one realizes better than we Republicans do that the next administration will be faced by some of the most menacing situations the world and our country have ever known.

In meeting the problems of the Congo, Algeria, Laos, Cuba, the rest of the world and our own Republic, I think I can freely pledge for our party our loyal support to the new President in what I am certain will be his patriotic efforts to bring about the just and honorable peace that President Eisenhower fought so valiantly for and which all the peoples of the world so fervently desire.

There will be honest differences and we shall endeavor sincerely to iron them out so that a united America can show a genuine unity of purpose.

There is only one area of conflict where we may disagree violently. In a savage civil war now raging in New York State between the forces of Carmine DeSapio and the agrarian reformers of Eleanor Roosevelt, our party believes that it is in America's best interests to remain neutral. All we ask are tickets on the 50-yard line.

We would entreat you, therefore, Mr. Kennedy, not to lend lease nor supply either side with enough arms and patronage for a decisive victory either way.

If this fight can be kept going through 1962, we can reelect Nelson Rockefeller as Governor without much difficulty. Nelson has done a good job, and I'm convinced he will do even better in his second term, especially, if we keep him away from David Susskind.

Back to Joe Kennedy for just one more time. I must recognize that he was the only member of the Kennedy family who did not take an active part in the campaign, and was, therefore, ineligible for a Cabinet job. Jack made this perfectly clear at the outset when he said he wouldn't appoint anyone—anyone, mind you—just because they had made a substantial financial contribution to the Democratic Party. The President-elect has been working with great diligence on his new Cabinet, but as we have all recognized, he has experienced difficulties in finding an adequate supply of men who are acquainted with P-T boats, who have graduated from Harvard, who have been ushers in one of the Kennedy weddings, or who can play touch football. Harvard is being robbed to supply this administration with men. In fact, it will probably come to be known as a broad A administration.

Again, what I am about to say is not in the form of advice, but I must comment on our new Vice President. He has had an outstanding political career during which he has made remarkable contributions to our Republic. Those of us who know him count on him to continue his dedicated efforts. Probably, his greatest contribution, however, came in this past election year. We call it the Johnson ballot. It is the Townsend plan for uncertain candidates. The plan is to run for not just one office, under the Johnson ballot run for everything on the ballot. You can't lose them all—and if you don't win the one you really want, you can always trade.

Rumors in times such as these are ever with us, and I'd like to put an end to some of them right now. Despite what you might have read in editorials and columns written by male writers—I make this important distinction as to the sex of authorship because I find the women of the working press much more intriguing and more imaginative than those of the opposite sex, but despite what you may have read, HUBERT, the Republicans do not intend to suggest legislation which would make the use of the straightedge razor compulsory, outlaw automobiles, and revoke the right of women to vote.

Some of my friends around the country are a little amazed when I tell them that in Washington confusion is our most important product. I am afraid it would tax their understanding if they could be here tonight. The liberals go to Joe Kennedy for money, Walter Reuther for votes, Arthur Schlessinger and Kenneth Galbraith for their economic and history lessons, London for their suits, and Goldwater for advice. I would recommend my psychiatrist, but his appointment book is so full, I can't get on the couch until December of 1962. My function this evening is to give advice to my liberal friends so I must get on with that and in a serious way.

First, I would urge my liberal friends not to take the results of the 1960 elections or themselves or their philosophy too seriously. The future of the Republic is at stake. The questions involved in national survival will not be solved by slogans or name calling. The urgencies of this hour require that mature Americans put aside the petty adolescense of partisanship and engage in a serious reflection and discussion of man's relationship to government and government's relationship to man in this Republic.

For three decades you liberals have failed to produce a new idea in government. Your only answer to our problems has been and is now, to, first, pigeonhole our people into groups, to regulate by edict, and to spend the peoples' money. Even the new frontier is old. It was first suggested by Henry Wallace. In his book by that title written in 1934, he suggested changes in the rules just as JOE CLARK is doing today. The rules were not changed then, and they won't be now and we hope the new President will not try as one of his predecessors did, to change the referees.

In this charge, I am reminded that 60 years ago night before last, Mr. Arthur Twining Hadley, a Yale man and please, Jack, forgive me for mentioning the name, had this to say at a symposium being held by the New York Herald Tribune. "I apprehend the day in this country when group cleavages and group interests are set over against the whole national interests, it could well become our undoing, and give us real trouble." It doesn't take Scotland Yard or the FBI to detect how our people have been pigeonholed into self-interest groups by the philosophy of the liberals which has created in these organizations the attitude of "Hooray for me and the devil with our country." Already, Washington is overbooked with meetings being held by numerous organizations and groups to determine what demands they can make for themselves of the new administration. It would be a joyous hour if they would meet to ask themselves what they can do to make our Republic more enduring.

The apostles of the liberal cause have claimed for themselves the sole proprietorship of an interest in the miseries and misfortunes and the triumphs and successes of mankind. And when we who are conservatives question their proposed sources of action, they inevitably accuse us of a lack of concern for the welfare of our fellow man.

You liberals have had your say—your policies have prevailed to drive the destiny of this Nation rather generally over the past 28 years. You have directed the creation of supergovernment, you have established boards and commissions to redress all wrong, you have taught men to lean on governmental structure for support. I do not question your motive but I read an unquiet discontent which prevails across this land—a thoughtful questioning of the direction in which you have led us. We are strong people—weakness and dependence is not a suitable state for the descendents of the men and women who bought and paid for our constitutional liberties with their treasures and their blood.

By your legislative acts, through your boards and commissions and your controlled rulings and regulations, you have earnestly sought to do more than make justice prevail. You have hopefully tried to reform the nature of man. You have, in my opinion, been deceived by the false notion that governments can make men good, or productive, or considerate, or kind, or charitable, or thrifty. And your leaders who have seen a vision of a better world are bitterly disappointed over the failure so plainly evident.

I would suggest that what you have attempted to do is beyond the ability of man to accomplish. For you have attempted to create by legislative fiat and governmental decree a state where man might expect not only justice but mercy as well. The fallacy of the liberal presumption is that society can be made perfect when man surrenders his liberty to government and then relies on government for his every need and want. The lesson of America's history and evolution shows very plainly just the opposite—that moral government accompanies material improvement just as long as the climate is liberty. When liberals talk loosely about this country's lost purpose, I suggest that they might remember that one of our Republic's purposes is freedom and that we have remained free for nearly two centuries must be listed as one of the great achievements of history.

Your well-meaning, well-intentioned proposals have operated to deny and to limit human personality. If, we, I think most of you will agree, this wartorn, weary world is in need of love and charity and mercy, then I would suggest we must once more recognize that only the individual, human personality can respond to God's mercy and reflect to his fellow men meaningful love, effective justice, and provide the kind of political government under which the individual citizen can create for himself a more satisfying existence.

In closing, let me give one more piece of advice to my liberal friends. You have, for nearly 30 years, talked about the forgotten man. I want to talk about the forgotten American. This is a man who prays, and pays, and works. He stays out of mischief, he behaves himself, he believes in the Constitution and the free enterprise system, and he pays his taxes. That is the forgotten American. To aid him, I would suggest that you liberals join us conservatives in a sincere effort to stop pitting group against group for political gain and to remember that goodness and kindness and brotherly love stem from the hearts of men, not from the halls of government.

How Can the Church Meet the Challenge of Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 23, 1960, it was my privilege to take part in the morning services of the First Evangelical United Brethren Church, Altoona, Pa., and to deliver the following address on the subject "How Can the Church Meet the Challenge of Communism":

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT SUNDAY MORNING SERVICES OF THE FIRST EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH, OCTOBER 23, 1960

It is a treasured privilege to join you in divine worship this morning as we acknowledge our great gift of faith in Almighty God and our love for the great Republic—that guarantees our right to pay homage to our Creator—under the priceless heritage of American freedom.

Because the Communist world seeks to eradicate religion from the minds of men I thought it appropriate to select as the topic of my morning message—my answer to the timely question—How can the church meet the challenge of communism?

The first necessity for the church—in meeting the challenge of communism—is to take a clear-eyed view both of itself and of its enemy.

We must face the fact that our own slackness and defects, our meek acceptance of social injustices, and our selfish violations of our own professed principles, give to Russian and international communism the strongest of propaganda weapons.

We must face, too, the fact that communism is basically and unalterably opposed to all religion.

The saying, "Religion is the opium of the people," originated by Karl Marx, was frequently quoted with entire approval by Lenin, and is a fundamental tenet of the Communist dogma, endorsed by Khrushchev as well as by Stalin.

We of the non-Communist world are repeatedly deceived by the Marxist procedure, plainly prescribed in the Communist Manifesto of shifting superficial policies as expedient while preserving basic purposes.

The unchanging reality underlies the bewildering surface of change and contradiction.

The pea of atheism lies under one or another of the shells in this old carnival game of deception.

First, there is the shell called "separation of church and state" which is a name the Communists use for persecution.

Then there is the shell of toleration presented as in the wording of the Soviet constitution, "freedom of function of religious cults and freedom of antireligious propaganda."

Finally, there is the shell of favor and support of any religious group the Communists believe they can use to their own advantage.

If we keep our senses about us we shall make no bet on which shell covers the pea at this particular moment.

The consistent Communist interpretation of "separation of church and state," is the requirement of atheism for all government officials since the government officials must be Communist party members and the Communist party members must be atheists.

The Soviet regime under Stalin in 1942, under Nazi attack, called in the Russian Orthodox Church to bolster the Russian nationalistic spirit, for defense of the land.

Ever since that time the Soviet Government has found it expedient to sponsor and support the national church on occasion, and to a limited extent, keeping its chief officials firmly under state control.

Contracts between these Communist state functionaries and representatives of churches in the non-Communist world both within the Soviet Union and elsewhere are coldbloodedly directed to the furtherance of Soviet domestic and foreign policy.

Soviet treatment of the Moslem faith and its adherents is similarly dictated by a scornful policy.

Accordingly, on February 8, 1958, there was a radio broadcast from Moscow proclaiming the long-cherished desire of Soviet Moslems to visit the holy places of Mecca and Medina.

The broadcast continued in these words: "However, in all the approaches to these places that are considered holy to all Moslems U.S. imperialists want to build bases for dreadful atomic weapons. * * * The Moslem world, our Moslem brothers, must not allow the U.S. imperialists to build atomic bases."

Of course, the fact is that any obstacle between the Moslems in the Soviet Union and the holy places of Mecca and Medina is set up purely by the Government of the Soviet Union, which, from 1945 to 1953, for instance, permitted no such pilgrimages at all.

Treatment of Moslems within the Soviet Union has ranged from mass slaughter and the deportation of whole republics into exile and captivity to a showy but small-scale support and patronage.

Jews in the Soviet Union have been subjected also to violent treatment intended to keep them intimidated and subjected to the ruling powers.

At times when the Jews are in disfavor the Communist press quotes the comment of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: "What is the world basis of Jewry?

"Practical need—avarice.

"What is the world religion of the Jew? Haggling.

"What is his earthly god? Money—the emancipation of the Jews in its final meaning is the emancipation of mankind from the Jews."

When it suits Communist purposes, however, to give the impression that Jews in the Soviet Union are free to observe their religious practices without interference, a tableau can be arranged for the purpose as on the occasion when the American visitor, Murray Schulman, expressed interest in visiting the synagogue in Moscow during his stay from May 9 to 12, 1955.

Here is what happened according to a published report:

"The visit was arranged. At 11 a.m., Tuesday, May 10, Schulman and two non-Jewish (U.S.) veterans arrived at the synagogue.

"They found there about 30 old men and the chief rabbi of Moscow, Solomon Schleifer, allegedly assembled for services.

"Schulman expressed his surprise for no services are held in the synagogue on weekday mornings at this hour."

Protestant groups are also subjected to the swing of the pendulum of Soviet favor and disfavor from a showy display of some religious ceremony in Moscow to restrictive laws and slanderous public accusations usually directed toward one particular church, such as the Baptist (the largest Protestant group in the Soviet Union), or Jehovah's Witnesses.

Treatment of the Catholic Church seems to vary geographically rather than with the times.

Where it suits Russian purposes, as in the Polish and Ukrainian regions that have been annexed to the Soviet Union, the Catholic Church is officially annexed to the Russian Orthodox Church, its priests and members having the choice of submission or punishment such as forced labor in Siberia.

In Lithuania, by contrast, some confiscated Catholic churches are reported to have been returned to religious use, and the Soviet news agency, Tass, reported on April 19, 1957, the graduation of 14 Catholic priests from a local seminary.

The Soviet Union contains representatives of many faiths and its Government seems to be willing and able whenever the occasion arises to produce some venerable church dignitary for public display and propaganda.

When the Burmese premier, U Nu, visited the Soviet Union, the alleged head of the Buddhist faith in the U.S.S.R., Pandita Lama, made it a point to go to Moscow for medical treatment and to be there to greet U Nu on his arrival in the capital.

Pandita Lama seemed to know little about any other Buddhists in the Soviet Union and refused U Nu's invitation to visit Burma on grounds of old age and ill health.

These are the grounds upon which leaders of minority religious groups in the Soviet Union generally refuse invitations to visit any place outside the borders.

In 1955, the Soviet Union succeeded in having installed as head of the Armenian Orthodox Church a Soviet puppet priest in Rumania.

This Russian priest is serving Soviet foreign policy well in establishing relations with Armenians outside the Soviet zone of control.

In all these Soviet relationships with religion the steady gaze can discern one constant principle, the cold and scornful use of religion as a propaganda factor, in both internal politics and foreign relations.

When nationalism is, at some particular time or place, to the interest of the Soviet policy it is fomented by all the means at hand including the encouragement of the national church or repressive measures against whatever church the national group may dislike and fear.

When and where nationalism, or any other quality associated with religion, interferes with Communist policy, it is ruthlessly repressed by all means including persecution, mass evacuation, and wholesale killing.

I have taken these accounts of Communist behavoir from the record of the Soviet Union, because there, where the Communist Party is in undisputed control, its deeds are its own plain and unshared responsibility.

But the Soviet Union's actions and the behavior of Communist parties all over the world are consistent in this matter of attitude toward religion.

Everywhere the Communist is a convinced atheist, a hater of any and all religion, but, for this very reason willing to use religious belief as a tool and weapon and to dupe believers even of the clergy into gullibly following him down the path to destruction.

He will use truth, half-truth, big lie or multiple lie, with cynical disregard until anyone who tries to combat him is swamped and confused in a multitude of explanations and distinctions.

The Communist does not always lie, he takes a devilish delight in finding a truth that suits his purpose, and proclaiming it loudly.

We must perceive and act upon the truth that communism is not what it says it is, a creative, forward-moving, revolutionary force, but a counter-revolutionary deadweight of dictorial conspiracy and tyranny.

Its materialism is a lowering of man's sights and hopes to rewards that would not make men happy, even if he could get them, which he cannot by the Communist conspiratorial methods.

Religion—Christianity, the revolution of the spirit of man is the real forward movement in the world.

This is the courage that knows no defeat even in prison or in the grave.

This is the spirit that holds through death and disaster, through hardship and warfare and victory, to the Christian virtues of faith, hope, and charity.

These are no armor against communism, they are no weapon against communism.

Let those who scorn religion, like the Communists, presume to make use of religion as a tool and a weapon, to hide behind it and to smash down their enemies with it.

It is for us to serve our religion, to fight for it and under its banner, to order our lives by its direction.

It is for us to strive impartially and unselfishly for the rule of law and justice in our own lives—in the affairs of our country, and in the affairs of nations.

It is appropriate as we gather to worship in this house of God this morning and by doing so give public homage to our Creator that we should prayerfully invoke His divine aid in repelling the forces of world communism who denounce religion as being the opium of the people and hope to banish it from the face of the earth.

As we dedicate this church flag depicting our faith in God and this new Star-Spangled Banner which symbolizes the liberty and freedom of 50 States in one Union, inseparable and indivisible, under God, let us rededicate ourselves to the spiritual values represented by these banners, love of God, love of church, and love of our country.

Let us regard these flags with love and reverence for they are emblems of our religious faith and of the loyalty and respect we owe to our beloved country.

As we gaze upon Old Glory let us resolve in our hearts to renew our allegiance to God and country saying in all sincerity to our glorious national emblem—"Dear old flag, we fling thee afresh to the breeze and say, 'three cheers for the red, white, and blue,' and we shall place above thee but one symbol 'neath God's shining sun the cross of His only begotten Son and under the inspiration of the cross and the flag we shall march to the moral, the mental, and the spiritual mastery of mankind."

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, amid the seething strife that mars the earth which could be so fair, we turn from ourselves and all the vexatious problems which press upon us to the supreme spiritual verities which cannot be shaken, which abide forever, and on which in the end our very salvation depends.

As members of Thy family on this shrinking globe, may we be gripped and guided by the realization that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

Deliver us from complacent satisfaction, as in an impoverished world we gaze upon its misery from the ivory towers of our own privilege.

By the saving grace of true penitence, may we speedily cleanse our land of betrayals which cut across and deny our high profession.

Open our ears to the imperative voice which sounds across the ages, saying, "I was hungry, You fed me; I was imprisoned, You came unto me," as an ancient parable becomes today's soundest politics and policies.

In the Master's name we lift our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, January 6, 1961, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana, attended today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Forces, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPENSATION OF ACADEMIC DEAN OF NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), Department of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, U.S. Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean of the Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the special helium-production fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Air Force on progress of the flight training program, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contracts awards to small and other business firms, during the month of October 1960 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the government of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISCHARGE BY BOARD OF PAROLE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF CERTAIN PAROLEES

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO SMALL CLAIMS AND CONCILIATION BRANCH OF MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, for the 2-year period April 1, 1958–March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH ALLISON DIVISION, GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on the examination of the prices negotiated for J-71-A-11 aircraft engines under Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33 (600)-23143 with Allison Division, General Motors Corp., Indianapolis, Ind., dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing developments in the Federal Government, dated December 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY CONTRACT WITH BROWN-RAYMOND-WALSH FOR SPANISH BASE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of conversion from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to fixed-price basis of certain portions of Department of the Navy Contract NOy-83333 with Brown-Raymond-Walsh (a joint venture) for the Spanish base construction program, dated December 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR KOREAN CONFLICT VETERANS AND WAR ORPHANS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of education and training programs for Korean conflict veterans and war orphans, Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH PROGRESS AND PLANS OF U.S. WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research progress and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COURT OF CLAIMS OPINION IN CASE OF CLAUDE S. REEDER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of *Claude S. Reeder* v. *The United States*, dated January 6, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED BILLS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation to amend section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide for temporary injunctions and restraining orders in merger cases, and to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to provide for prior notification of certain mergers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific or professional personnel of that Administration, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ANNUAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (S. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I submit the 10th annual report of that joint committee, with material on mobilization from departments and agencies. I ask that the report may be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 226. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district court judges for the District of Maryland; and for the appointment of additional circuit judges for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 227. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of political parties for their radio and television expenditures in presidential election campaigns; and

S. 228. A bill to establish a Federal Presidential Election Board to conduct preference primaries in connection with the nomination of candidates for President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 229. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 230. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BURDICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 231. A bill for the relief of Helga G. F. Koehler;

S. 232. A bill for the relief of Dragomir Popovich;

S. 233. A bill for the relief of Sonja Dolata;

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Ratajczak;

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ya-Pin Lee;

S. 237. A bill for the relief of Chieh-Hsia Mao and his wife, Rose Tung-Pei Mao; and

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Aharan Rotholz and Dan Rotholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 239. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Donald Herbert French;

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis; and

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 243. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 244. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of Wadley Research Institute of Dallas, Tex.; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Kam Yung (Lee) Chong;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Lillie; and

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herman Piet Kramer and Marie Kramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 248. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Margrit Binder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 250. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; and

S. 251. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Tassou; and

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamata Vergyri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 254. A bill to amend the Hatch Act so as to permit certain political activity by Federal employees residing in Maryland or Virginia and employed in the District of Columbia or surrounding counties of such States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S. 255. A bill for the relief of John T. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 256. A bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 257. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 258. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Mississippi to the heirs of H. A. McNemar;

S. 259. A bill for the relief of Willie Lee Young and Minnie May Kees;

S. 260. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to certain land situated in the State of Mississippi to Cyrus Hugh Covington and Mrs. Mildred Covington; and

S. 261. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Mississippi to J. P. Carter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 262. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Georgiou Stavropoulos;

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Guisseppe Glorioso;

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong;

S. 265. A bill for the relief of Ante Gulon;

S. 266. A bill for the relief of Georgios Tzotzolas;

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chou Kwoon Tai; and

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Alexander Wyon;

S. 270. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Telisa Prendic de Milenovic;

S. 271. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Hartman;

S. 272. A bill for the relief of Alino Torri;

S. 273. A bill for the relief of Hratch Samiel Arukian;

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Hajime Asato;

S. 275. A bill for the relief of Maria Lombardo;

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Douglas Der-Young Tang; and

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Erica Barth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 278. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 279. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Chiang Chen Chi; and

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Mervin L. Cotterell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 282. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the State of Utah; and

S. 283. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property owned by the United States to Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 284. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Alpo Fransila Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 286. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refund certain tuition payments of former nonresident students in the public schools; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 287. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. CARLSON):

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY

Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Senators BYRD of West Virginia, DOUGLAS, DIRKSEN, HUMPHREY, COOPER, MORTON, HARTKE, MOSS, BARTLETT, YOUNG of North Dakota, PASTORE, LONG of Hawaii, METCALF, CHAVEZ, KEFAUVER, LAUSCHE, YOUNG of Ohio, MCNAMARA, HICKEY, SALTONSTALL, CLARK, MORSE, BEALL, WILEY, GRUENING, and GORE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) relating to a Joint Committee on National Fuels Study, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH, which appears under a separate heading.)

MODERNIZE THE MONROE DOCTRINE TO MEET THE THREAT OF COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. BUSH submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to modernize the Monroe Doctrine to meet the threat of Communist imperialism in Latin America, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUSH, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 24) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGES FOR DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the 85th and 86th Congresses I introduced proposed legislation which called for the appointment of one additional judge in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland—S. 1142 in the 86th and S. 697 in the 85th Congress.

Despite the need for this judge, the Democratic-controlled Congress nevertheless chose not to act. Since that time, however, several years have passed and the Judicial Conference has published the results of at least two comprehensive studies of the overcrowded docket conditions existing in the Federal system and its recommendations for additional district and circuit judges needed to adequately cope with the crowded docket. I have therefore, in the bill I am now in-

troducing, changed the language of my previous bills so as to conform to those Judicial Conference recommendations as they pertain to the State of Maryland. Those recommendations provided for the appointment of at least two additional judges to the district court bench and two additional judges to the bench of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

I have many times in the past publicly stated my views on the need for these additional judges and the need grows greater with each passing day.

The present caseload of the two courts, according to the Judicial Conference's reports, is much higher than the national average. Those statistics reveal a phenomenal increase in civil cases filed since the end of World War II in Maryland's U.S. district court. For the 7-year period from 1946 through 1952, the average annual civil filings were 571.

In the succeeding 7-year period, from 1953 through 1959, they rose to 892, an overall increase of 56 percent with no increase in judge power. The average number of civil cases commenced per judgeship in 1959, 418, was almost twice the national average of 215.

The situation is also critical with respect to the criminal caseload which in 1959 was more than 60 percent above the national average of 108 per judgeship. Nevertheless, the median time for disposing of cases in the district of Maryland—10.4 months in 1959—is consistently below the national median—15.3 months in 1959.

An analysis of the court records of the fourth circuit will reveal that the need for the additional two judges recommended for that court is equally great.

The nationwide need for additional Federal judges has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the Democratic controlled 85th and 86th Congresses by the Attorney General who has long been concerned with overcrowded docket conditions.

The drastic need has also been recognized by President Eisenhower, who in an effort to get the Congress to act, promised to split the appointments to newly created judgeships equally among the two major political parties. That was indeed a generous bona fide gesture made in an effort to get action. The President was, nevertheless, ignored.

Mr. President, I doubt that the present administration will make the same generous offer, but whether it does or not, I strongly urge that this Congress take action not only on my request for additional Federal judgeships in my jurisdiction but on all recommendations of the Judicial Conference as well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 226) to provide for the appointment of additional district court judges for the district of Maryland; and for the appointment of additional circuit judges for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, weeks have passed since the presidential election. In its immediate aftermath there was a vast outpouring of public indignation from every State of the Union over the patent inadequacy, the creaky antiquity and the glaring inequity of the entire presidential electoral system from beginning to end.

Today, the inadequacy remains; the antiquity remains; the inequity remains. But I wonder, Mr. President, how much of the public indignation remains. It is a long time from November to January and, somehow, we have once again muddled through a presidential election which has managed, more by accident than design, reasonably to reflect the views of the voters in the selection of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

The flaws in the electoral system are still there; but is the will to do something about them still there? As the Senate well knows, after every major election which, in one manner or another, highlights the outrageous weaknesses in the system, there is a clamor for change. The attempt to improve the system has been made before, many times. Rarely have the attempts met with success and many times they have failed. These failures notwithstanding, it seems to me that the attempt must be made again and again so long as the flaws remain. The attempt must be made and, someday, it must succeed if we are to insure the continued vitality of the basic political machinery of the Nation.

It has sometimes taken great catastrophies in other areas of our social life to end inertia and to produce significant changes in practices, as, for example, in fire prevention, in banking, and in many other matters. I hope that it will not require anything so drastic to produce significant changes in the basic but outmoded instrumentalities of our political freedom—that for selecting the President of the United States so as to encourage the best possible choice as well as the continued responsiveness of the Office to the people of the Nation.

During the last political campaign I announced that I would present for the consideration of the Senate, certain measures for dealing with what appeared to me to be significant flaws in the presidential electoral system. That is what I shall do, today, after these explanatory remarks have been completed.

The significant flaws, as I see them, the flaws requiring priority consideration, are the following:

First. The out-of-date unrepresentative, and on occasion completely irresponsible, electoral college system.

Second. The long interregnum or transition when the administration remains in the hands of the incumbents from early November to late January—in hands which have, in reality, already been cut off from their source of power.

Third. The brutal length of presidential campaigns and its brutalizing effect on the level of debate and discussion.

Fourth. The costs of campaigns and the methods of financing them.

Fifth. The nomination of presidential candidates by the major parties under the present convention system.

Today I wish to introduce three legislative measures which are designed at least to begin to cope with these five categories of flaws. They are not the first legislative word, and I am sure, not the last word on any of these problems. They represent one Senator's thinking—aided in its legal expression by the experts of the Library of Congress and the office of the Senate legislative counsel. They are an attempt to find a legal road out of the morass of confusion, inequity, and irresponsibility which characterizes the present system of presidential selection.

The first of the three measures, Mr. President, is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States. This measure represents a complete departure from the present electoral college system. It does not seek to patch up that system; it seeks to end it.

The proposed amendment calls, simply, for the election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote. It would give to every vote—wherever it may be cast in the Nation—an equal value with all others cast. In short, it would write into the Constitution the principle that one American voter equals one vote—no more, no less, in the selection of the President and Vice President of the Nation.

This approach is not new, Mr. President. It has been tried time and again since the very beginning of the Republic. In recent years, the distinguished majority whip, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Members have fought well but without success to bring about this change.

It remains to be seen whether a renewal of the effort at this time will meet with any results. I must confess that I am not sanguine in my expectations. The issue is not simple and even if it were, constitutional changes are not easily or quickly made, nor should they be. Nevertheless, it seems to me most desirable that we test periodically in the Congress these propositions: First, we have reached that point in our continuing constitutional evolution in which Americans should express their unity as a people, beyond State divisions, by selecting by equal vote throughout the land the President of the United States; and second, we have reached, as a people, that point of political enlightenment and maturity at which Americans are competent to fill the Presidential office by direct vote, without the faceless intermediaries of the electoral college.

My experience with my fellow Americans, not only in Montana but throughout the Nation, leads me to subscribe to both propositions. It is for that reason that I will introduce this proposed amendment. It is for that reason that I have considered but rejected alternative proposals for changes which would, in essence, seek to amend or to patch up rather than abolish the electoral college system. No matter how it may be

changed, so long as the institution remains, we will not conform to the basic principle of one American voter—one vote in the selection of the President. All significant measures short of this, so far as I can see, can act only as a rejockeying of inequities, as efforts to shift advantages as between large States and small States, between rural areas and urban areas. I, for one, can see no real national purpose in exchanging the inequities which exist in the present system for the unknown inequities which various halfway measures may substitute for them.

To the only significant argument which still serves to underwrite the electoral college system, that is, that it is a part of the Federal system and as such must be preserved, I can only reply that, in my opinion, the Federal system is not strengthened through an antiquated device which has not worked as it was intended to work when it was included in the Constitution and which, if anything, has become a divisive force in the Federal system by pitting groups of States against groups of States. As I see the Federal system in contemporary practice, the House of Representatives is the key to the protection of district interests as district interests, just as the Senate is the key to the protection of State interests as State interests. These instrumentalities, and particularly the Senate, are the principal constitutional safeguards of the Federal system, but the Presidency has evolved, out of necessity, into the principal political office, as the courts have become the principal legal bulwark beyond districts, beyond States, for safeguarding the interests of all the people in all the States. And since such is the case, in my opinion, the Presidency should be subject to the direct and equal control of all the people. That is what this proposed constitutional amendment, if it is approved, will help to do. And may I add that under its terms the proposition would be put, not to the State legislatures for ratification, but as also provided for in the Constitution and as was done in the case of the repeal of the 18th amendment, to the direct and specific consideration of amending conventions chosen by the people in the States solely for that purpose.

This amendment, as now proposed, will do one thing more. It will speed the day for the assumption of office by a President-elect from January 20 to the December 1 prior. In short, this provision will reduce the lame-duck Presidency by several weeks and thereby cut the dangerous drift in national leadership during periods of administrative changeover. At the same time it will give the new President a greater opportunity to shape his program more effectively to action by permitting him more time to gain control over the continuing processes of the executive branch before the meeting of the new Congress.

Let me turn next, Mr. President, to the first of two bills which I shall also introduce today along with the proposed amendment. This bill, Mr. President, is aimed, simultaneously, at two flaws in the present electoral system—the cost of campaigns and their brutal and brutalizing length. I need hardly explain to Members of this body that the costs of political campaigns—particularly presidential campaigns—has reached enormous levels. If all the expenditures from all sources are totaled, the cost runs into tens of millions of dollars—no one really knows exactly how much. Money is clearly a factor in all campaigns and, in close campaigns, it may be the decisive factor.

I do not think that it serves the interests of the entire Nation when elections can be influenced significantly or even decided by the question of which candidate can raise the most money. I do not think it serves the national interests when the expenses for those who campaign to serve all the people must be financed by a relative handful of people and organizations which make large contributions directly or indirectly. I do not think it adds to the dignity and vitality of the nation's political life when another major source of political finance is the patently unsatisfactory practice of selling $2 steaks at $100-a-plate dinners. I do not think it serves the national interest when political campaigns which begin as instruments of public enlightenment end in a crescendo of weary repetition and name calling as the length of the campaign exhausts the candidates and forces of hate and malicious gossip are emboldened to join in a final chorus of distortion and defamation at the close of the campaign.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I do not criticize the loyal adherents of any party in these comments. They work hard for their candidates.

They raise money as best they can because money is essential in political campaigns. They do the best that they are able to do. But I do believe all of us, in the Congress, and in the Nation, share reponsibility for the neglect and inertia which makes a most vital instrument of freedom dependent for its financing on a system less equitable and less rational than the fundraising devices of obscure charities. I do believe both parties share responsibility for persisting in campaigns whose length is more attuned to the age of drum signals in the jungle than to the age of instant and full national electronic communications.

This bill which I am about to introduce, Mr. President, acts to supplement in a limited way, out of public funds the resources of the major parties so that they will become more dependent in a financial sense on all the people rather than on a relative handful of contributors. I would hope that the bill will be seen as complementary to the kind of legislation proposed by our late colleague, Senator Hennings, during the last session. His interest in this subject was intense, and he sought to bring about a rational approach to the limitation on expenditures by all parties.

The bill that I am about to introduce, Mr. President, seeks to isolate a principal cost of modern presidential campaigns—TV and radio broadcasting which have become the most important single devices of public discussion of the issues. It would have the Nation underwrite out of the Treasury $1 million of the cost of such broadcasting for each party. This would pay for roughly a total of less than 10 hours of a full national network coverage on radio and TV. It would do this, however, only if the parties held their nominating conventions for President and Vice President after September 1. In other words, Mr. President, the people would cover with public funds a part of the cost of a presidential campaign but only if the parties in turn agree to shorten their campaigns which, in effect, they would do if they held off their nominating until September 1.

Finally, as I noted, the bill would also act to simplify and to make more equitable the conditions of nomination of candidates in the party conventions. For to be eligible for the financial aid provided under the measure, a party's convention would not only have to be held after September 1 but votes at the convention would have to be allotted on the same basis as congressional representation and no fractional voting would be permitted. Convention delegates, thus, would have to be chosen in rough proportion to population. Conventions would consist uniformly of about 600 delegates rather than the many more who now participate, and we would see an end to that curious convention phenomenon whereby some delegates are worth half a body while others are whole and full of value.

I turn now to the second of the two bills which I shall introduce today. This bill is concerned with the question of the use of the direct primary as a device for the nomination of presidential candidates. Let me say at the outset, that in preparing this bill, I have drawn heavily on the original work of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas; the able Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Proxmire; and our late and dedicated colleague from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger.

I considered for a long time the possibility of a direct national primary. For constitutional reasons as well as those of practicality, I have now come to the conclusion that something along the lines of the approach of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], which would not require a constitutional amendment, would be most practical at this point. What is proposed, then, is a modification and elaboration of a bill presented by him in the 82d Congress. It would give Federal assistance at a set rate to States to help them finance the conduct of preferential primaries for nominees for the Presidency. In short, it is an effort to encourage States to use this device so that when the conventions do meet they will have before them a far more extensive grasp of popular sentiment as expressed through preferential primaries than is now the case, a sentiment which they would ignore at their own peril. In short, the bill is designed to help bring the nominating processes out from behind the closed doors and to encourage wider popular participation in them. The bill attempts to meet objections which were raised against the original Douglas legislation, and it goes further

in providing some financial assistance to serious candidates for the nomination for the Presidency in each party.

That, Mr. President, completes my presentation of the three measures affecting the electoral system which I am about to introduce. I present them to the Senate only after the most careful study of the problem and with a full awareness that changes in the basic political machinery of the Nation ought never to be lightly undertaken. I introduce them with the expectation that they will be carefully considered by the appropriate committees along with other motions on this subject.

By the same token, I introduce them in the belief that action to modernize the electoral machinery for the Presidency and to introduce a measure of greater dignity and public responsibility into political campaigns is long overdue, I introduce them in the belief that more equitable conditions for the selection and consideration of candidates and more direct popular control will better serve the present needs of our people and help to revitalize and encourage greater popular participation in the most important single expression of political freedom in this Nation—the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate referral the following:

A proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

A bill to authorize the appointment of a Federal Presidential Election Board to conduct preferential primaries for the nomination for President.

A bill to reimburse political parties for radio and television expenditures in presidential election campaigns.

Mr. President, these thoughts are presented for the consideration of the Senate and, particularly, for the study of the appropriate committees. Any or all of them—on the basis of further study—may prove to have some merit. Any or all of them may not. They have been introduced for the purpose of bringing about consideration of a set of electoral problems of serious proportions. The proposals are presented in the hope that the responsible committees will weigh them along with other proposals and come up with some effective answers to these electoral problems.

Let me say finally that not a little of what has been proposed and much of what has been said can be found in legislation previously introduced by Members of the Senate and the House, both Democrats and Republicans. I have borrowed heavily from other colleagues and, if there is any credit in these suggestions, they, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and the Senate legislative counsel, deserve most of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and bills I have introduced may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution and bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution and bills, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendement to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, shall be elected by votes cast by the people of the several States. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year in which the regular term of the President and Vice President, as herein provided, is to begin.

"The persons voting in each State in such election shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature of that State. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The candidates for the offices of President and Vice President shall be selected in such manner as the Congress shall by law provide. The names of the candidates so selected shall be placed on the ballot in each State, and shall so appear thereon that a single vote will be cast by each voter for the candidate of a political party for the office of President and the candidate of the same party for the office of the Vice President.

"SEC. 2. Within two weeks after such election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists showing the number of votes cast in such State for the candidates of each political party for the offices of President and Vice President, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate.

"On the twenty-first day following such election the President of the Senate shall open all certificates in the presence of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the United States, and the votes shall then be counted. The candidates of a political party for the offices of President and Vice President having the greatest number of votes shall be President and Vice President, respectively. If the candidates of two or more political parties shall have an equal number of votes for President and Vice President, and the candidates shall be deemed elected who shall have received the greatest number of the votes in each of the greatest number of States. The Congress may by law provide for the case wherein one or more of the persons referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph are unable to be present on the day fixed for the opening of the certificates, declaring who shall act in their places.

"SEC. 3. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the first day of December in the fourth year of their term; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

"SEC. 4. The first, second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of the amendment to the Constitution, that part of section 1 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution which refers to the terms of the President and Vice President, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. This article shall take effect on the first day of June following its ratification.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 227. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of political parties for their radio and television expenditures in presidential election campaign.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of reimbursing political parties for their expenditures for radio and television broadcast time in aid or support of the election campaign of their candidates for President and Vice President, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, with respect to each presidential election, from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 4:

(a) A sum not to exceed $1,000,000 to each political party whose candidates for President and Vice President receive 10 per centum or more of the total popular vote in such election; and

(b) A sum not to exceed $100,000 to each political party whose candidates for President and Vice President receive more than 1 per centum but less than 10 per centum of the total popular vote in such election.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, a political party shall not be eligible for reimbursement under such provisions unless—

(a) Such political party submits to the Secretary of the Treasury, within — days after the date of the election, an application for reimbursement accompanied by a correct and itemized statement of the expenditures with respect to which it seeks reimbursement; and

(b) The candidates of such political party for President and Vice President in such election shall have been nominated at a convention—

(1) which was convened on or after the first day of September of the year in which such election is held, and

(2) in which (i) the number of votes allotted to each State was equal to the number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from such State, (ii) the number of votes distributed among the other areas under the jurisdiction of the United States did not exceed six, and (iii) fractional voting was not permitted.

SEC. 3. In any case in which the candidates of any political party for President and Vice President are also the candidates of one or more other political parties, reimbursement under this Act shall be made only to whichever one of such political parties received the greatest number of popular votes.

SEC. 4. This Act shall apply to the presidential election to be held in 1964 and to each such election thereafter.

SEC. 5. There is herby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 228. A bill to establish a Federal Presidential Election Board to conduct preference primaries in connection with the nomination of candidates for President.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to encourage the use of preferential primaries for the purpose of suggesting nominees for President to the major political parties, there is hereby established the Federal Presidential Election Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall consist of the following members:

(1) Two members to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Two members to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States;

(3) Two members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(4) Two members to be appointed by the President of the United States from each political party which polled more than 10 per centum of the total popular vote in the next preceding presidential election, such appointment to be made from among names submitted by the national committees of such parties; and

(5) One member to be appointed by the President from each political party which polled more than five but not more than ten per centum of the total popular vote in the next preceding presidential election, such appointment to be made from among names submitted by the national committees of such parties.

(b) Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of four years beginning on March 1 of the year following a presidential election except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first appointed after the enactment of this Act shall commence on the dates of their respective appointments and shall end on February 28, 1965. Vacancies shall be filled promptly by appointment as provided in subsection (a) of this section. After the appointment of the first members of the Board, and at the beginning of each four-year term thereafter, the Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of the members of the Board to call a meeting of the Board at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and vice chairman.

SEC. 2. (a) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with the several States, through their appropriate officials, to conduct preferential primaries for suggesting nominees for President to each political party which polled 10 per centum or more of the Nation's total popular vote in the next preceding presidential election.

(b) The Board is hereby authorized to compensate each State with which an agreement is made for use of its facilities and services, but such compensation shall not exceed in any State an amount equal to twenty cents multiplied by the total number of votes cast in the preferential primary held in that State.

SEC. 3. (a) No person shall be a candidate for nomination in a preference primary under this Act unless there shall have been filed with the Board—

(1) a petition on behalf of his candidacy signed by at least 1,000 citizens of each of three-fourths of the States who are registered or otherwise qualified to vote in their respective States; and

(2) a bond in the sum of $25,000 which shall be forfeited if such person fails to poll at least 3 per centum of the total vote in all States in which preferential primaries are held under the provisions of this Act.

(b) Whenever the Board shall receive a petition which appears to qualify the name of a candidate for President, it shall forthwith in writing notify the prospective candidate of such petition and shall advise him that, unless he informs the Board of the withdrawal of his name from the ballot within ten days after receipt of such notice, or unless there is a failure to comply within such time as may be fixed by the Board therefor with the provisions of subsection (a)(2), his name shall appear on the ballot of his party in such presidential preference primary in all States which entered into agreements therefor with the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each candidate whose name appears on the ballot in a preference primary held under the provisions of this act shall be eligible for reimbursement by the Board in an amount not to exceed $250,000 for expenditures made by him or by any person for him with his knowledge and consent in aid or support of his primary campaign.

(b) The reimbursement authorized by this section shall not be paid to any candidate unless—

(1) the candidate shall file with the Board, within 20 days after the last preference primary has been held, a correct and itemized account of each such expenditure together with the name of the person to whom such expenditure was made, except that only the total sum of expenditures for items specified in section 309(c) of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (2 U.S.C. 248 (c)), need be stated; and

(2) the candidate polls at least 3 percent of the total vote in all States in which primaries are held under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. The Board shall by regulation specify the time within which the petitions referred to in section 3 shall be filed, the dates of such preference primaries, and other details necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes and provisions of this act, but no such preference primary may be held later than August 1 of any presidential election year.

SEC. 6. As used in this Act, the term "State" means one of the several States. The Board may, however, in its discretion, conduct preferential primaries in other areas under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States, either independently or in conjunction with local officials.

SEC. 7. Each member of the Board shall receive the sum of $50 for each day or part thereof spent in the performance of his official duties. The Board shall appoint and fix the rate of compensation of such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be paid out of appropriations therefor, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board in each presidential election year not to exceed the sum of $10 million to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the able majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote, introduced by him earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITING THE TRAVEL OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, sponsored by myself and by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], which would give to the Secretary of State the power to withhold passports from persons who seek to travel abroad to further the international Communist conspiracy.

I have noticed with considerable concern recent statements by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others, that the Communist Party is revitalizing its internal structure; that the party apparatus is being strengthened; that recruiting campaigns are underway.

We have known for some time that a major objective of the Communist Party is the complete and utter destruction of our security system. Recently, the party has been particularly active in its assault on the State Department's passport program.

On June 16, 1958, the Supreme Court held by a 5-to-4 opinion in the Kent-Briehl and Dayton cases that the Secretary of State did not have authority to deny passports even when he had evidence that the persons concerned were going abroad knowingly and willfully to advance the Communist movement. I propose to give the Secretary of State the legislative authority the Supreme Court found lacking.

I believe it is absolutely essential that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to active proponents of the Communist conspiracy. I do not feel that "freedom to travel" is compromised in any real sense by legislation necessary for our national safety, any more than freedom to drive a car down Main Street is violated by a regulation keeping from behind the wheel the blind or the insane. The bill I am introducing seeks to strike a balance between the rights of the individual and the requirements of national safety necessary for the protection of the public interest.

The bill I am introducing today is identical with S. 2315 which I introduced in the first session of the 86th Congress. Unfortunately, no action was taken on that bill. I feel it is very important that we take action on this matter very soon.

This bill should not be misunderstood as one seeking to reverse any holding of the U.S. Supreme Court. It merely seeks to supply the statutory authority the Court found lacking.

Representatives of the Department of State have testified before committees of this body, and have stated in public pronouncements that the Communists have been quick to take advantage of this breach in our defenses. Communists are flocking to the State Department to get their passports while the getting is good. There is no longer any deterrent whatsoever to the free movement of Communist agents and couriers to whatever country

their subversion might be most effective in dismembering the free world.

Couriers are essential to carrying out the international Communist conspiracy. We do not allow Communist couriers to enter this country. Why, then, should we allow homegrown Communist couriers to leave it and travel freely abroad? We must give the Government the power so it does not remain helpless to prevent American Communists, including national leaders and officials of the Communist Party of America, from going abroad to conspire against the very Government which must facilitate their travel.

I request unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for a week to enable other Senators who wish to do so to join in sponsoring this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point of my remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 229) to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the international Communist movement of which the Communist Party of the United States of America is an integral part, seeks everywhere to thwart United States policy, to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States, and by every means, including force and violence, to weaken the United States and ultimately to bring it under Communist domination; that the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States, and seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States; the travel by couriers and agents is a major and essential means by which the international Communist movement is promoted and directed; that a United States passport requests other countries not only to permit the holder to pass freely and safely but also to give all lawful aid and protection to the holder and thereby facilitates the travel of such holder to and in foreign countries; and that in view of the history of the use of United States passports by supporters of the international Communist movement to further the purposes of that movement, the issuance of a passport to, or the possession of a passport by, persons described in section 2 is inimical to the security and to the conduct of foreign relations of the United States and therefore passports should not be issued to or held by such persons.

SEC. 2. (a) In accordance with the findings in section 1, the Secretary of State is authorized to refuse to issue a passport, or to revoke a passport already issued, to any person as to whom it is determined on substantial grounds that he knowingly engages in activities for the purpose of furthering the international Communist movement, unless such person demonstrates to the Secretary, by clear and convincing evidence, that his activities abroad would not further the purposes of such movement.

(b) The Secretary shall consider as evidence of activities in furtherance of the international Communist movement, within the meaning of subsection (a)—

(i) present membership in the Communist Party or former membership terminated under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person continues to act knowingly in furtherance of the interests and under the discipline of the Communist Party;

(ii) activities under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that a person, regardless of the formal state of his affiliation with the Communist Party, is knowingly acting under the discipline of the Communist Party, or as a result of the direction, domination, or control exercised over him by the international Communist movement;

(iii) other facts which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person is going or staying abroad to conduct activities for the purpose of furthering the interest of the international Communist movement.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State may require, as a prerequisite to the issuance, renewal or extension of a passport that the applicant subscribe to and submit a written statement duly verified by his oath or affirmation as to whether he is or has been within ten years prior to filing his application a member of the Communist Party.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this title shall continue in effect until the termination of the national emergency established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 2914, December 16, 1950 (64 Stat. A 454).

TITLE II—PROCEDURE FOR PASSPORT DENIAL AND REVIEW

SEC. 5. Upon application therefor, duly completed, and upon compliance with any requirement under the provisions of section 3 of title I of this Act, a passport shall be issued to any person qualified under section 212 of title 22 of the United States Code (32 Stat. 386), or the applicant shall be informed in writing of a denial thereof, within ninety days after the receipt of such application. If a passport is denied, revoked, or restricted for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographic restrictions of general applicability, the passport applicant or holder shall be informed in writing of the reason, as specifically as is consistent with considerations of national security and foreign relations, and of the right to a hearing before the Passport Hearing Board in accordance with the provisions of this title. Notice of the denial or revocation of a passport under the terms of title I of this Act shall specify the paragraph or paragraphs of section 2(b) of title I on the basis of which the passport is denied or revoked.

SEC. 6. There shall be established within the Department of State a Passport Hearing Board consisting of three officers of the Department to be designated by the Secretary of State. This Board shall have jurisdiction in all cases wherein a hearing is requested in writing within thirty days after notification of the denial, revocation, or restriction of a passport, for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographical restrictions of general applicability. The Board shall hold a hearing within ninety days after the receipt of the request unless such time limit is extended at the request of the party. The officers who present the case of the Department of State to the Board shall not otherwise participate in the deliberations or recommendations of the Board.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall establish and make public rules which shall accord to the individual in proceedings before the Board the following rights:

(1) To appear in person and to be represented by counsel;

(2) To testify in his own behalf, present witnesses, and offer other evidence;

(3) To cross-examine witnesses appearing against him at any hearing at which he or his counsel is present and to examine all other evidence which is made a part of the open record;

(4) To examine a copy of the transcript of the open proceedings or to be furnished a copy upon request.

(b) In order to protect information, sources of information, and investigative methods, disclosure of which would have a substantially adverse effect upon the national security or the conduct of foreign relations, the Board may at any time consider oral or documentary evidence without making such evidence part of the open record. Prior to completion of its proceedings, the Board shall furnish to the individual a résumé of any such evidence, and shall certify that it is a fair résumé. The Board shall take into consideration the individual's inability to challenge information of which he has not been advised in full or in detail or to attack the credibility of sources which have not been disclosed to him.

SEC. 8. Within sixty days after completion of its proceedings, the Board shall make written findings, conclusions, and recommendations, which shall be transmitted with the entire record to the Secretary of State who shall make the final administrative determination. If the recommendation of the Board is adverse to the individual, a copy of the recommendation and of the findings and conclusions which are based upon the open record or upon the résumé of any evidence not made part of the open record, shall be furnished the individual, who may within twenty days following the receipt thereof submit to the Secretary written objections thereto. The Secretary shall base his determination upon the entire record submitted to him by the Board, including all findings and conclusions, and upon any objections submitted by the individual. In appropriate cases, the Secretary may remand a case to the Board for further proceedings. In the event he takes action adverse to the individual, the Secretary shall make appropriate written findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review any final determination of the Secretary of State under section 8 of this Act to determine whether there has been compliance with the provisions of this Act and of any regulations issued thereunder. In any such proceedings the court shall have power to determine whether any findings which are stated to be based upon the open record are supported by substantial evidence contained in that record, or, in the case of a résumé of evidence which was not made part of the open record in conformity with section 7(b) of this Act, are supported by the résumé of such evidence, duly certified by the Board under said section 7(b).

SEC. 10. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (5 U.S.C., ch. 19), shall not apply to proceedings under this title.

TITLE III—REGULATIONS

SEC. 11. The Secretary of State is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE IV—SEPARABILITY

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment.

CONSTRUCTION OF GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reauthorize the construction of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota. This project was authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act, as a part of the Missouri River Basin development. Although over half a million acres of North Dakota land have been taken for reservoir purposes in carrying out the many objectives of the 1944 act, no appropriation was ever made by the Congress for the Garrison diversion unit. Because of the lapse of time and changes in engineering in the project, this reauthorization is sought.

This project would divert water from the Garrison reservoir for various purposes, including irrigation and municipal water supply. It would be in keeping with the overall development of the Missouri River.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislative proposal be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 230) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of works recommended therein by the Secretary shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with such modified general plan.

SEC. 2. In connection with the carrying out of the plan for the Garrison diversion unit, the Secretary is authorized to make provision for the conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources of the area in accordance with the authorities and procedures of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661, and the following).

The Secretary is authorized to construct recreational facilities essentially as described in aforesaid House Document Numbered 325, and to withdraw or acquire by such means as he considers in the public interest additional lands required therefor if the State of North Dakota, or a political subdivision thereof, or a public entity agrees to operate and maintain such recreational facilities for a period of at least twenty years. After twenty years of State or local operation and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to convey to the State, or to a political subdivision thereof, or to a public entity, without monetary consideration, the recreation facilities, including land therefor, to be used, operated and maintained by the State, or political subdivision, or public entity exclusively for public use purposes. Except for works and areas which will be administered by an agency of the Department of the Interior, provision of specific facilities for these purposes shall not be undertaken by the Secretary until suitable agreements have been made with State or local agencies respecting, among other things, administration and the bearing or sharing of appropriate operation and maintenance costs. Appropriate shares of the Federal costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Garrison diversion unit shall be allocated to the purposes specified in this section and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable as are certain other purposes of the project under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391, 43 U.S.C. 945), the Secretary is authorized to pay just compensation to the owners of private lands west of the one-hundredth meridian, for all lands or interest in lands required for right-of-way purposes for the Garrison diversion unit.

SEC. 4. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

THE RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to offer a bill to be known as the Resources and Conservation Act of 1961. I have the honor to include as cosponsors of this legislation 30 of my distinguished colleagues from both sides of the aisle. They are Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, COOPER, GRUENING, HART, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, KEFAUVER, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, METCALF, MOSS, MORSE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio.

It long has been my conviction that we need to work out a declaration of national policy on this matter in the Congress. And I feel strongly that our natural resources programs need better coordination at a high executive level. That is why I was especially interested in the last Congress in Senator Murray's bill, S. 2549, of which I was a cosponsor. The bill that I offer today with the support of so many colleagues has the same basic objectives as the Murray bill.

This legislation offers a declaration of national policy on resources conservation and utilization, and proposes to establish effective coordinating mechanism in the Executive Office of the President in the form of a permanent Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers.

This proposal is in line with the natural resources plank of the 1961 Democratic platform. It also is in line with repeated declarations of policy by Senator Kennedy during the campaign.

I think the words of President-elect Kennedy best describe the objectives of my bill. At the Western Water and Power Consumers Conference at Billings, Mont., in September, Senator Kennedy said:

> As our needs mount and as population grows, it will become increasingly essential that we consider all our resources in the light of their relationship to each other—as well as to the economy as a whole, and the needs of our people. That is why I support efforts to establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President—a council which will engage in overall resource planning and policy—which will assess our national needs—and recommend national programs to meet them. With such a council, working in cooperation with a joint congressional committee, we can have a continuous appraisal of our resource needs, and up-to-date inventory of our resource potential, and a resource development program which can be shaped to fit all the needs of a growing economy and an expanding population.

It is with a feeling of honor and a deep sense of responsibility that I propose the Resources and Conservation Act of 1961. I ask, Mr. President, that it be held at the desk for a week for the addition of the names of other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 239) to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Resources and Conservation Act of 1961."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, conservationists, State and local governments, and private property owners, to use all practicable means including coordination and utilization of all its plans, functions, and facilities, for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, conditions under which there will be conservation, development, and utilization of the natural resources of the Nation to meet human, economic, and national defense requirements, including recreational, wildlife, scenic, and scientific values and the enhancement of the national heritage for future generations.

RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year (commencing with the year following enactment of this Act) a conservation report (hereinafter called the "Resources and Conservation Report") setting forth (1) the condition of the soil, water, air, forest, grazing, mineral, wildlife, recreational, and other natural resources with particular reference to attainment of multiple purpose use; (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of the aforesaid natural resources; (3) the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human and economic requirements of the Nation; (4) a review of the conservation programs and activities of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, and nongovernmental entities and individuals with particular reference to their effect on full conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources; (5) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the Resources and Conservation Report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 2.

(c) The Resources and Conservation Report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b), shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 5.

COUNCIL OF RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Resources and Conservation Council (hereinafter called the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret natural resource policy, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national resource policy to promote conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources. Each member of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $ per annum. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

(b) The Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of an executive officer and such staff assistants and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the president in the preparation of the Resources and Conservation Report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning natural resource conservation and development trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the policy declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining whether such development and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policy, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and trends;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote conservation, development, and utilization of the natural resources of the Nation to meet human and economic requirements, including recreational, wildlife, and scenic values.

(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal resource policy and legislation as the President may request.

(d) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in December of each year.

(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, conservationists, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

(f) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $ in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Resources and Conservation, to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Resources and Conservation Report;

(2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this Act; and

(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Resources and Conservation Report, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year following the enactment of this Act) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Resources and Conservation Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed twenty-five cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, the sum of $, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

AGE DISCRIMINATION BARRED

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors.

I introduce this measure, Mr. President, because unless we have leadership from the Congress with relation to the hiring practice of Government contractors, this cruel and wasteful practice will continue unabated.

This practice is cruel because all arbitrary discrimination is cruel. And it is arbitrary to judge any group of people by a single attribute, be it age, race, sex, religion, or country of origin.

The wastefulness of discrimination because of age has been well documented by the report prepared by the senior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging. In his report, Senator MCNAMARA indicates the fallacy of the productivity argument frequently used against older workers. He also points out that the safety and absenteeism record of older workers is the same as for younger employees, while the turnover and discharge rates are even lower.

A further waste is the failure to use the skills and experience of older workers. No real price can ever be placed on skill and experience. Those qualities of maturity and judgment that older workers have are irreplacable, and as our technology and means of production become ever more complex, these qualities become increasingly valuable.

The Department of Labor has developed data to show that discrimination against older workers is persistent, widespread, and irrelevant. The economy loses billions of dollars annually in productivity. There is no measure for the suffering and humiliation of those thousands classed under the hearing "Personnel, Obsolete."

Congress has already taken action in this field. The Yates amendment prohibits the imposition of age restrictions as a qualification for direct employment with the Federal Government. My bill would extend, in essence, this valuable policy to Government contractors. With the Federal Government as the Nation's largest customer, we will be taking an important step forward to end this unjust practice.

I am introducing this bill for myself and my colleagues, Senators MORSE, KEFAUVER, HUMPHREY, YARBOROUGH, and PROXMIRE.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 243) to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U.S.C. 35–45), is amended (1) by striking out "and" following the semicolon in subsection (d), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) That the contractor will not expressly or in practice impose any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons, except such requirements or limitations, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, relating to specific jobs or types of employment as are reasonably designed to protect older workers from tasks which they could not ordinarily because of their age be expected to perform safely or efficiently."

FREE IMPORTATION OF ELECTRONIC MICROSCOPE FOR USE OF WADLEY RESEARCH INSTITUTE, TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the free importation of an electronic miscroscope for the use of the Wadley Research Institute of Dallas, Tex. This institute is a nonprofit research organization carrying out significant work on the causes and cures of leukemia and other diseases. The institute presently owns an electronic microscope, but new research needs are requiring it to attempt to secure a much more powerful machine, available only abroad.

Mr. J. C. Robbins, Jr., of Longview, Tex., a public spirited citizen, is engaged in raising the money for the purchase of the machine in view of the possible significance of the humanitarian results which can flow from the use of the new machine by the Wadley Research Institute. The cost is about $40,000, and about $20,000 has already been raised.

I introduce the bill to aid in the acquisition by allowing the duty free importation of the microscope, which can be obtained only in Holland. Unless the cost can be held at a minimum, it is possible the research institute may have to forego purchase of the machine. The research institute has been on the waiting list for about 3 years.

The Wadley Institute is located adjacent to the famous Baylor Hospital in Dallas, Tex., and was established through the generosity of J. K. and Suzie L. Wadley, of Texarkana, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 244) to provide for the free entry of an electronic microscope for the use of Wadley Research Institute of Dallas, Tex., introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF SIZE AND WEIGHT ON FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER TO OR FROM ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to restore the size and weight limitations on parcel post packages mailed to or from Hawaii and Alaska, as those limits existed prior to statehood.

As territories, residents of what are now the 49th and 50th States could send packages through first-class post offices up to 100 inches in length and girth, and weighing up to 70 pounds. However, statehood brought both Hawaii and Alaska under the tighter limitations which apply to the States of the mainland. These are 72 inches and 20 pounds for first-class post offices, as in Honolulu.

Obviously, the needs of Alaska and Hawaii for more adequate parcel post shipments are related to their geographical positions, and not to their status as territories or States. Until bridges with a span of more than 2,000 miles can be constructed, we in Hawaii cannot enjoy railroad or truck service from the mainland. Such service to Alaska across the wide open spaces of western Canada is severely limited. Both States need the broader parcel post limits. Enacting them would do no economic harm to the public carriers.

A measure identical to this now offered was passed by the Senate at the last session. I hope that we will again pass it at this session, in time for favorable consideration by the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 248) to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the minimum wage. I do so with some misgivings, because I am rather fearful of the impact of such an increase upon the economy at a time when there are, admittedly, soft spots in the economy. I am one of the first, very candidly, to concede that fact.

I think, from the studies of the Secretary of Labor heretofore, when the minimum wage question was raised, it was expressed in terms of a further diminution in the number of available jobs. I think the last time it accounted for, probably, a loss of some 40,000 jobs. That accounts for my misgivings.

The House passed a minimum wage bill which included extended coverage, and so did the Senate. The matter was before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a long time. I sat in the conference on the question, and we could come to no resolution of the question. In the bills which were then pending—the Senate bill particularly—were a number of what I regarded as highly offensive proposals. They would have modified—in fact, completely nullified—the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, and would have stretched the long hand of the Federal Government over almost every business, large and small, whether retail or wholesale, and whether engaged in interstate commerce or intrastate commerce.

We provided, however, one of those interesting gimmicks that we frequently encounter; that is, having taken jurisdiction of the whole business, we then provided some cutoffs. We said the law does not apply to retail business if the volume is less than $1 million a year; it does not apply to laundries and cleaning plants if the business gross is less than $250,000 a year. However, the fact is that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government was established over businesses which have no interstate character, and any subsequent Congress can then lower the ante from $1 million to $500,000, to $250,000, and finally sponge it altogether. Then there will be complete jurisdiction over every field of business activity in the country, whether interstate or intrastate, which will make the Federal Government the sole master in that field. That is a little too much for my rather rural soul to accept. I was brought up as one who had a great devotion to the Constitution of the United States. And in the absence of highly persuasive data to the contrary, I intend to continue that devotion.

So, Mr. President, the bill I have introduced today, together with a statement and a report in the nature of an economic analysis, which I asked the Board of Economic Advisers to the President to make, is a simple measure. It provides for some additional coverage and it provides for a $1.10 wage, so the impact will not be too great at an unseemly time; and, generally speaking, it copies the format of the bill we passed in 1938, when I was a Member of the House

of Representatives and participated in the proceedings on that occasion.

So, Mr. President, I introduce the bill and submit the statement and the report, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 256) amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961".

SEC. 2. Section 3(m) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) 'Wages' paid to any employee includes tips and the cost to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such facilities and tips based on average tips and average cost to employers similarly situated of furnishing such facilities or other appropriate measures of fair value and such determinations shall be used in determining the wage paid to any employee where adequate records of the actual amount of tips received or actual cost of furnishing such facilities are not available.

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'American vessel' includes any vessel which is defined as a 'vessel of the United States' in title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States or any State.

"(q) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

"(r) The terms in sections 6, 7(a), and 12(c) describing the employees to whom these sections apply shall, without limiting their present application, include any employee engaged or employed in the activities of any enterprise having one hundred or more employees and doing business in commerce to a substantial extent except employees referred to in clauses (1), (6), (7), (10), or (14) of section 13(a). For the purpose of this Act—

"(1) 'Enterprise doing business in commerce to a substantial extent' means any enterprise which purchases merchandise, materials, or supplies that move directly across State lines to its place or places of business and have an aggregate annual dollar value of $1,000,000 or more, as determined by their aggregate dollar value for the preceding calendar or fiscal year, or in the case of an enterprise in existence for less than one year, by their aggregate dollar value for the period of its existence.

"(2) 'Enterprise' shall mean the related activities performed by any person or persons for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or the products thereof, or a combination of them, to others, and shall include all such activities whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units.

"(3) An 'enterprise having one hundred or more employees' shall mean an enterprise having an average weekly employment of one hundred or more employees as determined by the number of employees during the last preceding calendar or fiscal year or, in the case of an enterprise in existence for less than one year, by the number of employees during the period of its existence.

"(s) 'Restrictive work practices' include failing or refusing to perform any work in an efficient and economical manner, and requirements that unnecessary work be performed or unnecessary positions of employment created or continued."

SEC. 4. Section 6(a) of such Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) by striking the amount "$1" and inserting in lieu thereof the amount of "$1.10"; and

(b) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) therein; inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and adding the following new paragraph (4):

"(4) if such employee is employed as a seaman on an American vessel not less than an amount which will provide wages equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection for all hours the employee was actually on duty. Such hours shall not include off-duty periods which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement or periods aboard ship when the employee was not on watch and was not, at the direction of a superior officer, either performing other work or standing by."

SEC. 5. Section 13 of such Act is amended as follows:

(a) The portion of subsection (a) which precedes the paragraph numbered (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply (except to the extent provided by section 3(r)) with respect to".

(b) Clause 14 of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(14) any employee employed as a seaman on a vessel other than an American vessel."

(c) Following subsection (f), the following new subsection (g) is added:

"(g) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 of this Act shall not apply to an employer if any of his employees through collective action (including inaction) or any labor organization representing such employees or officer or agent thereof directly or indirectly engage in, urge, seek, or promote any restrictive work practices."

The statement and report submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

MINIMUM WAGE STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

At this time I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the minimum wage.

I do this with some misgivings, because I am fearful of the impact which such an increase in the minimum wage will have on our economy at this time. This point has been forcefully made by many authorities in the financial field.

Be that as it may, I am persuaded to introduce a bill to raise the minimum wage at this time, because I believe that assistance should be given to those who receive the minimum wage. I therefore propose an increase in the minimum wage to $1.10. This is a moderate increase, not as much as some would like and more than others think is wise, but in this world we must seek to follow the middle path and to compromise our differences. While we must provide today for the needs of those who live and work today, we must not drain off the lifeblood of our economy by imposing a wage so high that there are no funds left in our economy for growth to provide jobs for those who are born today to live and work tomorrow. Perhaps we must even sacrifice a little today to make possible a better tomorrow. My good colleagues across the aisle claim that the last election was a mandate for sacrifice, and if this be so, I offer them a bill especially suited to their taste.

The dangers of raising the minimum wage are many. The cost of goods can get too high. There is a limit to what people will pay. When it is reached, the wheels and machines of industry stop turning and pink slips take the place of weekly paychecks.

We cannot let this happen, but certain it will be, if we let ourselves be carried away on the gossamer wings of that rarefied idea that the higher prices are, the more money people must be paid. This idea is as thin as the air it floats on. Its facts and figures spiral ever upward to the heavens, and we all know that an economy based on cloud 9 way out yonder just will not work.

The bill I now introduce tries to keep the economy based right here on earth. It does not offer pie in the sky, but more dollars in the pocket. It was these dollars in the pocket which Congress said were necessary to maintain a minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency, and well-being of workers when it passed the first minimum wage bill in 1938, and the same was true of the amendments which increased the minimum wage to 75 cents in 1949 and to $1 in 1955. I now propose to increase it 10 percent, to $1.10. That increase is greater than the 7½-percent increase given Government workers in the last session after much consideration.

Because of the dangers of such an increase it must be limited to those who receive the minimum wage. They need it most. It must not be an excuse for a spiraling round of inflation in which everyone gets a 10-percent increase and everything goes up 10 percent. The responsible people in our labor movement must exert their energies to insure that this increase in the minimum wage is not used for the purpose of increasing wages to create or maintain a wage differential for the benefit of those earning more than the minimum wage. The purpose of this bill is to increase the minimum wage, and the increase should stop there.

Increasing wages is not the only way wage costs can spiral, however. Today wages are being inflated by the failure or refusal of some groups to do a day's work for a day's pay. This includes cutting down on the work done in a day and also requiring the creation or continuation of unnecessary jobs. I call this restrictive work practices, and the bill provides that workers who collectively engage in such practices shall not enjoy the benefits of the law. Those who are not willing to work to the best of their energy and ability should not benefit from a wage-hour law at the expense of the consumer who has to pay the cost of their wages. In the time in which we are now living, with all its complexities, stresses and strains, and all of its costly armament, we cannot forget the consumer—the taxpayer who pays the bill for it all. He, too, has an interest which must be protected.

What of the workers to be covered by this increased minimum wage? Federal control over wages and hours is based on the power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce. According to a bill introduced last session by my Democrat colleagues, they would like to expand the concept of interstate commerce to include almost every business in every nook and cranny of these United States except the mom and pop store. They would like to include activities affecting commerce. Not just in commerce, but affecting commerce. I want to emphasize that.

Some things should be beyond the reach of the labyrinthian powers of the Federal Government. Local business is one of them. Over two decades of experience with the original law have made it crystal clear that the onerous burden of such a law falls on

the little fellow—the small employer who may earn less than his employees and must burn the midnight oil to keep a vast multitude of records for the Federal Government. We must keep this in mind when we are told that the coverage of the act must be increased. We have done so in this bill by extending the coverage of the act only to businesses having more than 100 employees and doing business in commerce to a substantial extent. Thus, we have tried to impose the burdens of the act where they can be best borne.

This bill, therefore, takes the middle road. There are grave dangers in any increase in the minimum wage. There are also areas in which there may be a valid need for an increase. The problem must be studied with great care, so that what is done does good rather than harm. In that study I trust that this proposal will receive careful consideration and that it will point the way to a solution of the problem.

STATEMENT ON THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE MINIMUM WAGE

One of the principal questions with which this session of Congress will have to deal is what changes, if any, are to be made in the Fair Labor Standards Act under which a $1 minimum wage requirement is currently applicable to close to 25 million wage and salary workers in private industry.

The action taken by Congress on the minimum wage will affect the welfare of several million individuals with respect to the opportunities for employment that are open to them as well as to the wages that they receive. It will also affect the welfare of many thousands of businesses, especially small businesses, and, it is safe to say, will affect the economic health of our Nation as a whole. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that action be taken only after a thorough and deliberate evaluation of the probable impact on jobs and on wages of the various proposals for increases in the minimum permissible wage and extensions of coverage that will be made.

A good deal can be learned about the probable effect of an increase in the minimum wage at this time from the economic impact of the increase from 75 cents to $1 on March 1, 1956. At that time, about 2.1 million of the 24 million workers then covered by the act were being paid less than $1 an hour. Most of these 2.1 million workers received an increase in their wages as a result of the act, as did many workers whose pay was already above the minimum requirement. But a large number of workers did not benefit from the higher minimum wage; on the contrary, they lost their jobs. Evidence presented in the report submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Labor in February 1960, in accordance with the requirements of section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, shows that the 1956 increase in the minimum wage had a seriously adverse effect on employment in many industries.

In 12 of the industries in which special studies were made by the Department of Labor, it was found that employment fell by nearly 10 percent from 1955 to 1957. These 12 industries employed a sizable percentage—more than 10 percent—of the workers paid less than $1 in 1956; their total employment was 400,000 and the decline in jobs reached 37,000. The largest employment declines occurred in the South, notably among sawmills, tobacco stemming and redrying plants, and in mills for the production of seamless hosiery and wooden containers.

Clearly, the adverse effects of an increase in the minimum wage tend to be felt most heavily by small businesses and by industries in which there is extensive employment of relatively low-wage workers. Characteristically, many such businesses are located in the southern areas of the country; they are high-cost industries which, for one reason or another, have difficulty meeting the competition of newer, more advanced, and lower-cost plants. While there is no direct evidence on this point in the February 1960 report of the Secretary of Labor, it would appear that many businesses were forced to discontinue operations altogether as a result of the 1956 minimum wage increase.

Also in this connection, it is useful to recall testimony given by the Secretary of Labor before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, May 19, 1959, as follows:

"I think it fair to conclude from the available evidence that the increased wage costs connected with the minimum wage had an adverse effect on employment in the low-wage industries, which cannot be explained in terms of general weakness in the overall economic situation or adequately explained in terms of long-run or special circumstances in the low-wage industries involved."

The question to which we should address ourselves at this time concerns the impact that might follow in 1961 from an increase in the minimum wage. Whatever benefit there might be to those who get a higher wage without loss or reduction of employment, there are two reasons for believing that a minimum wage increase at this time would have an adverse effect on jobs that would be greater, proportionately, than the adverse effect created by the 1956 increase.

First, because a larger percentage of workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act are receiving wages at this time that are at or close to the minimum than was the case in 1956, an increase in the minimum wage would affect a larger proportion of covered workers and a larger number of jobs than in 1956. The reason for this is that when the minimum wage is raised, one of its effects is to compress the range of wage payments and to place a larger percentage of covered workers at or near the minimum. After a time, wages above the minimum are increased, earlier wage differentials are reestablished, and the range and distribution of wage rates tends to return to its former pattern. However, this process takes time, and the evidence suggests that wage differentials have not as yet adjusted themselves fully to the 1956 increase. As a result, an increase in the minimum wage at this time, whether by 15 or 25 cents, would have an impact on wages and employment that is greater, proportionately, than what was produced by the 1956 increase.

Second, the adverse effect on employment of an increase in the minimum wage at this time would be greater than in 1956 because at that time the economy was expanding at a rapid rate whereas employment is currently tending to decline, especially in manufacturing, which is most affected by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

No one can say precisely what difference these two circumstances would make in the adverse impact on employment of a minimum wage increase, but it is safe to say that if the 25-cent increase in 1956 had the effect of reducing employment by 10 percent in low-wage industries, a 25-cent increase at this time would reduce employment in these industries by far more than 10 percent. In other words, the times are far from propitious for governmental action that would raise the costs of maintaining jobs and creating new ones. Certainly, if the minimum wage is to be increased at all, it ought to be increased by only a moderate amount and the increase ought to be effective no sooner than July 1, 1961. It would be a grave mistake, in any case, to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour at this time, and even an increase to $1.15 would be a very difficult one for many businesses to absorb.

Extension of the coverage of the minimum wage law also presents serious difficulties. Bills were introduced and debated last year in both Houses of the Congress that would have extended coverage by anywhere from 700,000 to as much as 4 million additional workers. All major proposals would have extended coverage to retail trade but it should be noted that employment in trade lines has been declining recently—from 8,611,000 in August to 8,492,000 in November (seasonally adjusted). In this connection, it is well to recall the caution expressed in the January 1954 Economic Report of the President: "* * * We should undertake adjustments of the minimum wage at a time when economic activity can take them in stride, thereby minimizing the risk of unemployment of the less productive workers whose welfare the minimum wage seeks to aid."

The merits of different proposals on changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act will be studied carefully during the present session, but this much can be said at this time. The minimum wage made applicable to workers brought under coverage of the act in 1960 should be the $1 minimum presently in effect for covered workers. If the minimum for presently covered workers should be raised to $1.15, effective in 1961, the minimum wage applicable to newly covered workers should be phased up to the $1.15 level over a period of time, say, over 2 years. This would permit time for the affected businesses to make the adjustments that would reduce the adverse effect on employment to a minimum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask that the bill be permitted to lie at the desk for a period of 2 days, in case there are other Senators who share my conviction in this field and who would care to be cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], will permit me to do so, I should make an apology for sending forward a bill and suggesting cosponsors, when at the same time I have pending a resolution outlawing the entire business of cosponsorship. I think it is wicked; I think it is evil; I think it is unjustified; I think it is unwarranted; and if someone will hand me a copy of Roget's Thesaurus, I shall pick about 100 other words to use in emphasizing my belief that cosponsorship of measures in the Senate is wrong; and I believe I could make a good and lucid argument against the practice. However, so far as it now obtains, I may just as well become a part of that inequity and ask for cosponshorship. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. In this connection the Senator from Illinois does not endorse sin, as I understand, but only the practice of cosponsorship.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us say just that specific sin. [Laughter.]

AUTHORITY TO REFUND DISTRICT SCHOOL TUITION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill designed to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refund tuition payments under certain circumstances when in their judgment, and upon showing of good cause, such refund is deemed equitable.

My attention was called to the fact that under existing law, once tuition

payments have been made—although the child, or children, may not subsequently attend District of Columbia schools for the full period for which the payment was made—a refund for the portion of a semester unused, cannot be made.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that by introducing this bill I am in no way seeking to prejudge the issue in any particular case. My bill seeks only to provide the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their delegates, with a power they now lack and a procedure which they do not have, which, in equity, they ought to possess.

The effective date of the bill is made retroactive for the purpose of permitting such relief as it will afford to be available to those who have felt aggrieved by a situation which should have been remedied at an earlier time. However, I can appreciate that administrative difficulties might be encountered were there not a definite cutoff date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 286) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refund certain tuition payments of former nonresident students in the public schools, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DESIGNATION OF FOURTH SUNDAY IN SEPTEMBER OF EACH YEAR AS INTERFAITH DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day.

The development and growth of our great Nation are directly attributable to the mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation which have to an extent permeated most of our society. I am sure all will agree that when these precepts are cast aside, it is, in the last analysis, to cast aside the very principles of our national origin.

The creation of Interfaith Day would seek to unite individuals of all faiths behind a common purpose—the extension and preservation of individual dignity. By attempting to achieve this goal, which Godless nations bent upon world domination have purposely omitted from their philosophy, we are further enunciating the human instincts and religious beliefs forming so large a base in our national life.

Furthermore, at this crucial juncture in world history, it is important that Americans do everything within their power to display the lamp of freedom to people throughout the world who are yearning for the rights and guarantees enjoyed by our citizens. Interfaith Day could be one outward manifestation of these principles embodied in the framework of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

It is my hope that this joint resolution will be acted upon expeditiously and affirmatively. As many of my colleagues may recall, the Senate during the 86th Congress acted favorably upon this joint resolution; however, failure of the House Judiciary Committee to act on this proposal prevented its passage during the last session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 24) designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America was founded on the firm basis of freedom of thought and conscience; and

Whereas the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on a basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guarantees of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it ought to be, and is hereby declared to be, the policy of Congress to encourage the mutual understanding of all people of good will; and

Whereas the program of the interfaith movement offers a practicable means for encouraging such mutual understanding: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as "Interfaith Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate.

COMMISSION TO STUDY INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN TRADE ON BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 13 of last year I, for myself and numerous Senators, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 208 to provide a Commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States. I am reintroducing that joint resolution on behalf of myself and Senators HICKENLOOPER, WILEY, HRUSKA, COTTON, DWORSHAK, BUSH, KEATING, AIKEN, PROUTY, BENNETT, SCOTT, BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, CASE of New Jersey, and CARLSON, for we feel that increasing competition of foreign-made goods in the American market has become one of the growing challenges of our time. A close examination of the reasons for the growing invasion of the American market can be found in the advanced wage rate, the use of industrial technology, which we have so freely exported, Government aid to producers abroad in the form of larger depreciation allowances, export aids, and so forth. The lure of a very lush American market coupled with the above created a dilemma, which must be resolved. We, however, cannot very well urge the lifting of quotas on trade restrictions abroad on other countries and then in the same breath urge similar restrictions on our own market. There are several other key questions that must be resolved. To best ascertain the answers would be to have an objective study and survey of the whole problem by trained and competent persons, mainly outside of Government, who have a vital concern in the problem.

To that end, I now introduce for appropriate reference this joint resolution, and I ask that during the remainder of today and for tomorrow that it lie on the desk for the purpose to permit those Senators who wish to cosponsor to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States

Whereas the broad objective of the foreign economic policy of the United States is to advance the national interest and to improve the security and well-being of the United States and its people, and to promote the economic strength of the United States and of the rest of the free world; and

Whereas in achieving the objectives of its foreign economic policy the United States Government has stressed the importance of expansion of foreign trade in both goods and services and of private investment in and mutual assistance to the lesser developed nations of the free world; and

Whereas the President, by special message to the Congress on March 17, 1960, has directed that a comprehensive program for the expansion of United States exports be undertaken through the coordinated efforts of various governmental agencies; and

Whereas it is deemed to be in the public interest that a commission be appointed by the President to study and report concerning the influence upon business and industrial expansion in the United States of foreign trade, and related matters concerning the foreign economic policy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a commission to study the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States. Such Commission shall be known as the Commission on International Trade, and is hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall consist of twelve members, appointed by the President, broadly representative of the public

generally, including industry, labor, agriculture, trade, and Government.

(b) The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Vacancies on the Commission shall be filled by the President.

(d) The members of the Commission who are in the service of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in that capacity, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(e) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. In its study, the Commission shall, to the extent that it finds appropriate, survey and make a factual report on the following:

(a) The impact of foreign trade in goods and services upon the American economy;

(b) Differentials in labor and other costs, for selected commodities, between domestic and foreign producers;

(c) Prices, in the United States and abroad, of certain major goods and services which move in international trade;

(d) Aid rendered by the United States and foreign governments to the export trade;

(e) Protection provided by the United States and foreign governments against the importation of goods and services;

(f) The effect of regional market arrangements upon the foreign trade of the United States;

(g) Present procedures under the Trade Agreements Act and the various extensions thereof;

(h) American investment abroad, and the relation of such investment to the foreign economic policy of the United States;

(i) Policies and practices with respect to United States and foreign government purchase of goods and services; and

(j) Subjects related to the foregoing, which may, in the opinion of the Commission, be relevant to the foreign economic policies of the United States.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia and may establish working offices abroad. Members of the Commission and staff are authorized to travel both at home and abroad.

(b) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 5. Not later than July 31, 1962, the Commission shall file a final report with the President for transmittal to Congress. With the filing of its final report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $1,000,000 for the work of the Commission.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for myself, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Illinois and minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Minnesota and assistant majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which proposes creation of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study.

I recognize that conflicting interests will inevitably bring about difference of opinion on any subject as complex as that relating to our great store of natural fuels. This is to be expected.

What disturbs me, however, is the idea I have heard expressed that we should not study the energy fuels and that we should not make an effort to inform ourselves as fully as possible on a matter so vital to our national security and our future economic development.

It is my opinion that a joint congressional committee to study our country's energy fuels is clearly indicated; it is essential.

The resolution I have introduced does not seek to legislate for or against any fuel or any segment of the economy. It does seek to enable the Congress to procure full information, through study, concerning the fuels of the Nation and to present to the appropriate standing committees of the Congress findings and recommendations. It would be my hope that out of this data a national fuels policy might appropriately be formulated and considered for congressional enactment.

The proposed Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study would make its report not later than January 1, 1963, and cease to exist thereafter.

To suggest what the findings of this joint committee will be is not possible, but a search for truth is a most desirable endeavor and should envisage giving assurance to our country that the energy fuels will be available to the greatest number of our citizens for the longest possible time.

We have a chaotic fuels-marketing condition in this country, and, in my judgment, it has led to great waste and has depressed substantial elements of our economy. But all of us would be in a much better position to judge conditions with more accuracy if the entire problem were to be subjected to a detailed study and report.

The confused fuels situation has caused many coal mines to be closed and has curtailed exploration for new oil and gas fields. My esteemed colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, feels as do I in this statement.

Perhaps an inadequately informed person might say: "That is no problem. Open the closed mines and drill more oil and gas wells."

But such a statement is unrealistic when the fact is recognized that a mine which has been closed is quite often doomed, unless a very substantial amount of money is available and spent to maintain it. Who can afford the maintenance costs of a nonproducing mine?

In most cases it is more economical and safer to open a new coal mine than to reopen an old one, notwithstanding the capital investment requirements and the time factors involved in opening a modern coal mine.

In either instance, much time and money would be needed before production could begin, and there must be available trained manpower, large quantities of material and equipment, and substantial capital resources to make this development possible.

Concerning oil and gas wells, it is an established fact that exploration and drilling are slow, costly, and often fruitless procedures. Here, too, trained manpower, expensive materials and equipment, and much capital are essential to successful production.

Furthermore, if we continue to depend extensively on foreign imports, as we do at this time, our domestic fuels industries are certain to continue to decline.

If a national emergency should develop, very conceivably we might face in this country a period when our domestic industries would be paralyzed by a lack of fuel. Truly, this would be a paradoxical situation in view of the fact that there are in the United States immense supplies of untapped natural fuels.

It is my opinion—and this is substantially the reason why I am introducing this legislation—that we should study our energy fuels field and, subsequently, seek to bring about a coordination of the policies affecting all fuels within the framework of an adequate and effective national fuels policy.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas adequate supplies of fuel and energy resources in all forms are essential to the continued welfare of the Nation, to its industrial development, to the consuming public, and to the national security; and

Whereas authoritative estimates forecast that by 1980 the population of the United States will increase to two hundred and fifty million and that the consumption of fuel

and energy resources will have increased by nearly 100 per centum; and

Whereas a study of our national fuel and energy resources, and their reserves will determine the amounts and availability of all of our fuel and energy resources; and will determine the limitation of reserve of certain fuels; and

Whereas maintenance of the basic fuel industries, together with adequate facilities for the transportation of fuel and energy resources and the necessary manpower and machinery to make these resources available, is essential to national defense, to national security, to the general economy of our Nation, and to the stability and prosperity of the basic fuel industries; and

Whereas in view of these and other considerations it appears that a joint congressional committee study is desirable and necessary to determine if the establishment of an overall national fuels policy is advisable and needed; and

Whereas, the Congress, in connection with the development of such a national fuels policy, should have the necessary data and recommendations presented for its consideration by the joint congressional committee making this study: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (The House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee which shall be known as the Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") and shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The party representation on the joint committee shall reflect, as nearly as may be feasible, the relative membership of the majority and minority political parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the Joint Committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee shall—

(1) Make a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the available fuel and reserves of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; and make a report of findings, together with recommendation, to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives for their consideration and action in formulating a national fuels policy; and

(2) Consider the importance and reasons for the possible formulation of an overall national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account the investment necessary for the maintenance of efficient and adequate fuels and necessary related industries, and the necessity for the maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the joint committee shall, in addition to such other matters as it may deem necessary, give consideration to—

(1) the proved and predicted availabilities of our national fuel and energy resources in all forms;

(2) projected national requirements for the utilization of these resources, both to meet immediate demands and to provide for future expansion of the economy;

(3) technological developments, in progress and in prospect, including desirable areas for further exploration and technological research designed to supplement decreasing natural reserves of certain fuels;

(4) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon the individual industries so regulated, but also their impact upon related and competing fuels and their interaction with other regulatory programs; and

(5) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant considerations, including proposed amendments to such existing laws as the Federal Power Act, the Natural Gas Act, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 necessary to integrate existing laws into the national fuels program.

(c) The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 1, 1963. Upon the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times as it deems necessary, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony on any matters not specifically listed, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The joint committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $200,000 per year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the desk until the close of business on next Friday, January 13, in order that other Senators who may desire to do so may join as sponsors. Several of our colleagues have indicated their support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, today I joined with the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], and other Senators in introducing a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee of the Congress to study the fuel and energy resources of the Nation. Last year I was cosponsor of this resolution, and I am glad that it is being introduced at the opening of this session of the Congress so that it may receive early consideration.

Both the Democrat and Republican platforms adopted last year expressed in substance their approval of the fuel study proposed by this resolution, and I believe that members of both parties will approve its early passage. The resolution expresses the need of a study of our fuel and energy resources in the interest of national security, the economy of our country, and the stability of our basic fuel industries. It is in the national interest to establish a joint committee to determine whether a national fuel policy is advisable, and for this reason, above all, I urge the early consideration and approval of this concurrent resolution.

MODERNIZE THE MONROE DOCTRINE TO MEET THE THREAT OF COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and lie at the desk until the close of business Thursday of this week so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas intervention by the world Communist movement directly or indirectly in the affairs of any of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere would threaten the sovereignty and political independence of that nation and other such nations; and

Whereas the free and independent nations of the Western Hemisphere have long since ceased to be objects for domination, control or colonization by other powers; and

Whereas the direct or indirect intervention by the world Communist movement, by whatever means such intervention might be disguised, in any American nation, would constitute in effect such domination, control or colonization by a non-American power, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American nation; and

Whereas any such intervention by the world Communist movement in the affairs of any nation situated in the Western Hemisphere would constitute a threat to the peace and safety of the United States and the other nations of that hemisphere;

Whereas the American republics have condemned emphatically intervention or the threat of intervention even when conditional from an extra-continental power in the affairs of the American republics; and

Whereas the intervention of the Sino-Soviet powers in the American Republic of Cuba is threatening hemisphere unity and jeopardizing the peace and security of this hemisphere; and

Whereas in the rapidly evolving atomic age the threat presented by any such intervention might develop with such rapidity that there would not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) if one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance should be threatened in any manner with domination, control or colonization through the intervention of the world Communist movement, any other such party would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking appropriate steps to forestall such intervention and any domination, control or colonization of any nation of the Western Hemisphere by the world Communist movement.

(b) If any such defensive measures are taken by any defending nation of the Western Hemisphere, such nation should report promptly the action so taken to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, established in the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, may be organized to provide for the provisional administration of the nation so defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the purpose of my concurrent resolution is to reaffirm and reinforce the Monroe Doctrine and bring it up to date to meet the new conditions created by modern Communist imperialism. It would serve emphatic notice upon the Soviet Union and Red China that the United States and her Latin American allies will not tolerate domination, control, or colonization of any Western Hemisphere nation by the world-Communist movement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following materials may be printed in the RECORD after these remarks:

First. An announcement I have made concerning the resolution.

Second. An article entitled "A Way To Stop the Reds in Latin America" by my constituent, the distinguished authority on Latin America, Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, of Yale University, to whom I am indebted for much of the language in the resolution. This article appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for December 28, 1959.

Third. A press release by the Department of State entitled "Arms Buildup in Cuba," dated November 18, 1960.

Fourth. The introduction to a State Department document entitled "Responsibility of Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere," dated August 1, 1960.

Fifth. The text of the act of Bogatá, outlining measures for social improvement and economic development in Latin America.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

WASHINGTON, January 9.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH called upon Congress today to serve notice upon the Soviet Union and Red China that the United States and her Latin American allies will not tolerate domination, control or colonization of any Western Hemisphere nation by the world Communist movement.

The Connecticut Senator said he would introduce this week a resolution which he described as intended to "reaffirm and reinforce the Monroe Doctrine and bring it up to date to meet the new conditions created by modern Communist imperialism."

Senator BUSH, a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services who recently returned from a tour of Central American countries, said the need for congressional action to strengthen the Monroe Doctrine has been increased by intensified Communist activity in Latin America during the past year.

"I regret that a similar resolution I introduced in January 1960, was not acted upon by the Committee on Foreign Relations," he said. "Since then, the world Communist movement has sent to Cuba increasing numbers of so-called technicians and heavy shipments of tanks, machineguns, planes, and other weapons. Cuban soil is being used for the export of Soviet communism to other American Republics. Propaganda and subversive activities have been accelerated in all Latin America."

Senator BUSH said he hoped that his resolution would be to justify any American Republic in regarding a threat of Communist domination of another nation in the Western Hemisphere as a threat to itself, and to collective security. It could then take defensive measures, reporting promptly to the Organization of American States.

Senator BUSH said he hoped this his resolution would be used as the vehicle for a "full-scale review" by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of the events leading to Fidel Castro's takeover in Cuba, and the intensification of Communist activities in all Latin America.

"I hope hearings and a thorough study by the committee will lead to comprehensive recommendations for strengthening our position in Latin America," he said. "Defensive measures against the spread of Sino-Soviet influence are not enough. We must have constructive action to improve the lot of the people of the Latin American countries, many of whom live in conditions of appalling squalor.

"We have made a good start with the ICA's self-help housing program in Guatemala and Nicaragua. This has created much good-will for us in these countries, and should be extended to others among our neighbors to the south.

"By this and other means, as suggested in the Act of Bogota, we can join with our Latin American allies in a far-reaching attack on the poverty, illiteracy, and lack of social justice which afflict so many people in these nations."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 28, 1959]

A WAY TO STOP THE REDS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Samuel Flagg Bemis)

Prof. Arnold Toynbee—in a recent, 1958, brilliant study of "The Eve of War, 1939"—has called attention to the fact that in 1940 no power was threatened on more than two fronts, east and west, whilst now, 1959, each of the two surviving power groups—U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—is threatened on three fronts, east, west, and north, "a first-class revolution in international affairs * * * that is not easily grasped or taken into account."

Now suppose the United States should be threatened on all four fronts, including south as well as north, from the Caribbean, as well as the Arctic? Instead of an expansive and friendly ally like Canada stretching for thousands of miles between us and Soviet jet, submarine, and missile bases, with a double line of distant early warning trips, we suddenly become exposed to such bases almost within sight of our southern coastal cities, and right athwart our naval communications from Atlantic to Pacific by the Panama Canal? Would this not tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war?

Since 1934, the first line of our defense has shifted from Panama to Europe and Asia. In this geopolitical framework the strategical paths over the Arctic regions have indeed become of more immediate significance than the Caribbean. It has even been argued by some strategists that, in the atomic age, the Panama Canal is no longer a lifeline for the defense of this country; that we could well afford to have it neutralized under an international authority, so great is the danger that one atomic bomb could neutralize—i.e., paralyze—it by knocking it out.

Scarcely anything, short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt. It would split our present global strategy into a two-ocean strategy and prevent the Panama Canal's being used by the West as a substitute for a blocked Suez Canal, or to relieve the burden on our flagging railway system in case of war.

The Communist conspiracy is on its toes today in Panama trying to dislodge the United States from control of this still-vital American lifeline.

The United States should make it clear to the world that in the Panama Canal Zone it will continue to act as if it were sovereign, as, indeed, it has an explicit treaty right so to do, and to stick beyond any cavil to the military defenses of that waterway.

MORE THAN THE CANAL CAN BE LOST

Much more than the canal, and all that means to American defense, can be lost. If international communism is allowed to jump the Atlantic and set up a rule in a state of the New World, the way it recently tried to leapfrog over Turkey into Syria and Lebanon, it would mean not only effective neutralization of the hemispheric lifeline in a strategic sense; it would create an active fourth front for the defense of the United States. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

Latin American Communists schooled in Moscow have studied just how to set up their system in the Americas. They tried it once already in Guatemala, while the United States stood by with arms folded around the doctrine of nonintervention, awaiting the uncertain action of a conference of foreign ministers which, thanks only to the counter-revolution of Carlos Armas, never had to meet.

When, finally, the diplomatic doctors did an autopsy on the fallen Arbenz regime in Guatemala, they found the disease of international communism to be far more deep-seated than they had suspected. In fact, it still lingers as a cancer in the body politic of honest liberalism, not only in Guatemala but in all the States of Central America and the Caribbean. It is festering now in Cuba, in Panama, in Venezuela where they spat on Vice President NIXON. The cancer is spreading.

What is there, within the inter-American peace system—pledged as it is to the doctrine of nonintervention—to prevent such a disaster in the New World?

Nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American peace structure, put into place by the good neighbor policy. In numerous treaties since 1933—subject to honorable denunciation by any of the parties on 1 year's and, in some cases, 2 years' notice—the American Republics have declared inadmissible the intervention of any one of them (1933, 1936) or group of them (1948) directly or indirectly or for whatever reason, within the internal affairs of another American State.

There is, however, one outstanding exception to this sweeping pledge: It does not affect existing treaty obligations. For example, it would not affect the existing treaties of the United States with Panama or Nicaragua by which the United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan canal site; it would not affect our treaty with Cuba giving us the naval base at Guantanamo; it would not affect the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, of Rio de Janeiro, of 1947.

The Rio pact—the first regional alliance of the diplomatic revolution which now binds the United States to defensive alliances today with some 46 countries of the globe—

provides for joint intervention, if two-thirds of the American States shall agree to assist in meeting an armed attack against an American State—the group acting within the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty also provides, article 6:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation (of the Organization of American States) shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The Rio Pact of 1947 is the same bond which brought inter-American diplomatic intervention to stop local wars between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It is the same bond and principle which animated the meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs last August, in Santiago de Chile, invoked by four republics, including the United States—that gentle pan-American huddle which weakly empowered the Inter-American Peace Commission to watch and study military movements in the Caribbean and report to the next (11th) Conference of American States at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960.

This is the same casus foederis (a case within the provisions of a treaty) to which appeal had been made, upon the insistence of Panama, in the case of Guatemala in 1954, for a meeting of foreign ministers of American States to consider the crisis of Guatemala, but did not meet because of Carlos Armas' successful counterrevolution.

Today it is very doubtful whether the Organization of American States, through its Organ of Consultation, could muster the necessary two-thirds majority of the high contracting parties quickly enough to give a mandate, under the terms of the Rio Pact of 1947, for joint intervention to suppress a Latin-American government gone Communist by infiltration of a popular-front government or capture of a liberal revolution, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Continent.

It might be tried, but, if it failed, what then?

UNITED STATES CAN EXERCISE THE INHERENT RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

There remains the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that interposition by any European powers to extend their system to any region of this hemisphere is dangerous to our own peace and safety. There remains the inherent right of self-defense, both individual and collective, even if it is not agreed on by a two-thirds majority of American States.

"We owe it [therefore] to candor," pronounced President Monroe in his famous message of December 2, 1823, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those [European] powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety—we could not consider any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—which would induce measures on the part of the United States "indispensable to their security."

An important corollary to the Monroe Doctrine since its origin—indeed, a vital dictum of the doctrine since 1869—prohibits the transfer of any colony in the New World from one European sovereign to another—lest such an occurrence upset the balance of power against the security of the United States in this hemisphere.

This no transfer principle has been bound up in the Monroe Doctrine throughout its history. President Grant officially proclaimed it a part of the doctrine in 1869.

A 1940 PRECEDENT FOR ACTION

As Hitler's armies were overrunning Western Europe and threatening to take over French, Dutch, and British colonies in the Western Hemisphere—i.e., Guadalupe, Martinique, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, the Guianas, Aruba, etc.—a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress of June 18, 1940, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implementing the sense of an earlier declaration by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Panama in September 1939, at the beginning of the war, stated:

"(1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"(2) That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Shortly thereafter, a special conference of Foreign Ministers of the same Republics, facing the danger of Nazi conquest of Europe and England, gave a mandate to any one or more American Republics, in case of the imminent danger of transfer of colonial territory in the American Continents from one European sovereign to another, to step in and act quickly to forestall such a transfer. A special convention provided for an inter-American committee to administer the government of the rescued region, pending its restoration to its inhabitants upon the return of peace.

But the Havana mandate of 1940 looks only to the actual transfer of an existing colony in America from one European sovereign to another European sovereign. It does not explicitly envisage the case of a European sovereign in fact, if not in name, extending its Communist system to a Republic of the American system a la Guatemala—and will it be a la Cuba, a la Panama, a la Venezuela?

The Pact of Rio of 1947 does anticipate such a "fact or situation" endangering the peace and security of any Republic of the New World, but it requires a two-thirds vote of the 21 Republics to give a mandate to one or more Republics to act in time to stop the danger.

It would be nice if there could issue from the 11th meeting of American states, to meet at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960, a declaration on the lines of the Act of Havana of 1940, giving a mandate for individual or joint action to prevent the international Communist system of the Old World extending itself to an American state, directly or indirectly, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American republics.

It is not known whether our Department of State is endeavoring to put such a business on the agenda for the Quito of Conference. It ought to be a major goal of our Government to secure this kind of declaration. Such a proposal, incidentally, would be a touchstone to reveal the degree of Communist power within the various delegations.

However, it is not likely, in the present condition of inter-American relations, that such a declaration would be accepted by even a bare majority of the states—and the emergency may be upon us even before the meeting at Quito next February. Already the Cuban dictatorship has announced its intention to buy jet planes from inside the Iron Curtain.

The dilemma of our Latin American policy today is whether, on the one hand, to interpret the inter-American doctrine of nonintervention so as to permit a non-American power to extend its revolutionary system to the New World by capturing a republic in the Caribbean or Central America, now within easy bombing range of the United States and of the Panama Canal; or, on the other hand, to prepare some anti-interventionist action within the framework of the inter-American peace structure that would really prevent the intervention of international communism. That is: Inter-American intervention to prevent non-American intervention, one horn of the dilemma; or the other horn of absolute nonintervention to permit the intervention of international communism to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere.

LET SOMETHING BE DONE NOW TO DETER COMMUNIST INROADS

In 1940, the Congress acted promptly in the face of the danger arising from the war in Europe. Let it now pass an analogous resolution, to make it clear to our friends and enemies, all over the globe, that this Government is determined within its inherent right of self-defense, and within the purview of the pristine Monroe Doctrine, and indeed of the Pact of Rio and the inter-American peace structure, not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the peace and security of the United States, and of all the Republics of this hemisphere—indeed, the balance of power for freedom against slavery in the entire globe.

Such a resolution against the intervention of international communism—couched in the language of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, and the nonintervention declarations of Washington (1951) and Caracas (1954), and the recent Declaration No. XI of Santiago (1959)—should provide for the administration of the state thus defended or rescued, by the same inter-American authority and machinery set up in the Havana Convention of 1940 for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America threatened by a transfer of sovereignty.

Thus stipulated, there need be no apprehension on the part of our good neighbors that the United States would be reverting to the old system that characterized the interventions against European imperialist intervention in this hemisphere during the first quarter of our century.

Such a policy would protect the doctrine of nonintervention against the new technique of intervention by international communism, and would do so within the spirit of the inter-American peace and defense treaties. It would not wait for the accomplished fact of a leap of the Communist revolution across the Atlantic to uproot the Monroe Doctrine in the New World, as it has already destroyed the open-door policy in China. By thus assuming the initiative in the New World, we can also defend the global balance of power on which the peace and security of the United States and of our sister Republics of America in the world must depend during the coming decade.

WHY WAIT FOR THE BLOWS TO FALL?

It is too much the practice of the United States, in the continuing world crisis of our time, to let the initiative rest with the enemy, to wait for the blows to fall and only then endeavor to improvise some action to fend them off.

Let something be done now, before it is too late, to deter the action. Congress ought, at the beginning of the next session in January, immediately, on the eve of the Quito Conference, to pass a joint resolution analogous to that of June 18, 1940, explicitly pointed at the present fact or situation.

If the Quito Conference doesn't back it up, then the United States, acting under the pristine Monroe Doctrine, must do so. The act of faith known as the good-neighbor policy, and the freedom of the New World—but, most essentially, the security of the United States and the blessings of liberty invoked in our Constitution—are now at stake.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PRESS RELEASE, NOVEMBER 18, 1960

ARMS BUILDUP IN CUBA

In a note addressed to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States on October 28 (Department of State Press Release No. 622), the U.S. representative to the Council of the Organization of American States stated that the Cuban Government has been receiving substantial quantities of arms from various sources. In response to numerous queries as to the nature of this arms buildup, the Department is making public information on this subject which has been compiled from a number of sources which are considered to be reliable.

Since Fidel Castro came into power, Cuba has created and armed a military force 10 times the size of that of ex-President Fulgencio Batista and far larger than any army in Latin America.

Added to the arms already held by the 26th of July movement (approximately 8,000 men) upon Castro's assumption of power, the regime took over materiel sufficient for an army of 25,000 men. These supplies provided a formidable arsenal for the Castro government at its outset. In addition, the Castro regime accepted delivery of considerable ammunition contracted for by the Batista government and also sent special missions to Europe for the purpose of purchasing even more war materiel.

Cuban arms purchases include not only sufficient small arms, according to Fidel Castro's own announcement, to equip Cuba's militia, whose numbers now total more than 200,000 persons, with late model weapons but also large quantities of heavy equipment of a variety of types.

The tempo of arms deliveries to Cuba has stepped up noticeably since the seventh meeting of foreign ministers in August of this year and Castro's subsequent rejection of the San Jose resolution, which condemned extracontinental intervention in the affairs of the hemisphere and the acceptance by an American Republic of an extracontinental offer of intervention. Significantly, recent arms shipments to Cuba have originated exclusively in Iron Curtain countries. Spokesmen of the Cuban Government have clearly indicated its intention to continue to depend upon the Sino-Soviet bloc nations, principally the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, to build their war materiel stocks. The bloc nations apparently desire to contribute to Caribbean tensions by burdening the Cuban economy with excessive arms purchases and by supporting the aggressive policies of the Cuban Prime Minister.

At least 12 Soviet ships have delivered arms and ammunition to Cuba since July of this year, the most recent being the *Psow* which unloaded approximately 6,000 tons of arms at the port of Preston, Cuba on November 7, 1960. Total Soviet bloc arms provided to the Castro government amount to at least 28,000 tons.

Attached is a tabulation of arms and ammunition estimated to have been imported into Cuba since Castro assumed power on January 1, 1959.

Estimate of items included in military imports by Castro government

	Soviet bloc sources	Other sources	Total
Automatic rifles:			
Czech	45,000		
Other types		48,000	
Total			93,000
Submachine guns	10,000	1,000	11,000
Machineguns (including .50 caliber)		200	200
Flamethrowers		7	7
Mortars	150	104	254
Tanks	40	15	55
Assault guns	10		10
Armored personnel carriers	60		60
Field guns	25		25
Howitzers	55	16	71
Rocket launchers	30	70	100
Antitank guns	60		60
Antiaircraft guns	80		80
Helicopters, Soviet	10		10
Mobile radar, Soviet model	15		15
Mig aircraft	8		8
Ammunition (rounds):			
Assorted ammunition (pounds)	12,000,000		12,000,000
Rifle		44,734,000	44,734,000
Machineguns		1,000,000	1,000,000
Hand grenades		20,000	20,000
Artillery shells		[1] 43,735	[1] 43,735
Rockets, 3.5-inch		8,000	8,000

[1] Plus 835 boxes.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CUBAN GOVERNMENT FOR INCREASED INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS IN THE HEMISPHERE

INTRODUCTION

The present document is submitted to the Inter-American Peace Committee in response to the committee's requests addressed to the American Governments for information and points of view which would aid the committee's study of Caribbean tensions. In this document, the United States presents certain information and viewpoints which are additional to those presented to the committee on June 27, 1960, in a memorandum entitled "Provocative Actions of the Government of Cuba Against the United States Which Have Served To Increase Tensions in the Caribbean Area." The present document deals principally with two additional subjects of major concern: the relations between the Revolutionary Government of Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc; and the emergence of a dictatorial pattern of political control in Cuba. The document also categorically rejects Cuban imputations and charges that the United States has violated, or contemplates any action which would violate, principles which are consecrated in the United Nations Charter and the various inter-American agreements to which it is signatory.

1. Relations between Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc

International tensions in the Americas have been heightened by the nature of the relations that have developed during the past year between the revolutionary government of Cuba and the Governments of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and other countries belonging to the Sino-Soviet bloc. The maintenance of commercial and other normal relations by the Cuban Government with the countries belonging to the Communist bloc might not of itself cause concern to other countries. However, the increasingly intimate relationships established between the revolutionary Government of Cuba and the Governments of the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China and other countries associated with them, are such as to create a deep concern on the part of other American Governments because of the growing evidence of the intention of the Communist powers to exploit these relationships for the purpose of actively intervening in the affairs of the American Continent.

Statements of Soviet Russian and Communist Chinese leaders indicate that the Sino-Soviet powers are attempting to use the Cuban revolution as an instrument of foreign policy with the objectives of increasing world tensions, undermining hemispheric solidarity and carrying forward their aggressive attacks against the free world, and especially the United States. The Communist powers, moreover, not only support the revolution in Cuba itself, but openly espouse it as a dictatorial pattern that should be applied to all of Latin America.

In May 1960, Premier Nikita Khrushchev expressed approval of the Cuban revolution:

"I can but welcome the events in Cuba, where the people proudly and courageously rose up under the banner for the struggle for their independence. I am convinced that other Latin American countries will also rise up in the struggle and applaud their successes in this fight."

On June 22, 1960, Peng Chen, a member of the Politburo of Communist China, spoke in similar terms:

"Enjoying the sympathy and support of the Socialist camp, the correct fight of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against imperialism and its lackeys is rapidly developing and has become an historical uncontrollable torrent. The valiant people of Cuba have given a brilliant example for the peoples of Latin America * * * Only through * * * waging a resolute fight against the American imperialists and their lackeys and isolating the American imperialists to the maximum, can the war be prevented and world peace defended."

On July 9, 1960, Premier Khrushchev added to a statement of support a military threat:

"We shall do everything to support Cuba in her struggle. We will help our Cuban brothers fight an economic blockade and the blockade will be a failure. Now the United States is not so unreachable as it once was. Speaking figuratively, in case of necessity, Soviet artillerymen can support with rocket fire the Cuban people if aggressive forces in the Pentagon dare to start intervention against Cuba."

Cuban leaders have acknowledged the statements of the Sino-Soviet leaders with expressions of friendship and gratitude.

Captain Antonio Núñez Jiménez, Director of the National Agrarian Reform Institute, on June 8, 1960, said that Cuba was "the Soviet Union's greatest and most loyal friend." On July 10, 1960, President Osvaldo Dorticós, saying that the economic war had begun and that "tomorrow there may be armed war," stated:

"Tonight we hail the message of solidarity spoken by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union and coming to us in our most difficult hour. But of course this solidarity, which is a guarantee of world peace, must not diminish our efforts of preparation. We must prepare ourselves better than ever every day, more peasants in the militia, more students in the militia, more workers and women and men in the militia." (Dr. Castro gave substance to the statement of President Dorticós by stating on July 26, 1960, that "this is the last time that the militia will have to march without rifles. The arms for the militia are already here, in the national territory." Dr. Castro has stated that Cuba will arm a militia of 100,000 men.)

The same day, Dr. Ernesto Guevara, pointing out that "We are practically the arbiters of world peace," stated:

"The people of the world are with us and against North American imperialists. The Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R. has said that if the United States invades Cuba, it will mean not only death and destruction in

Cuba, but also the launching of tremendous destructive force from the U.S.S.R. against Cuba's aggressor. They must be careful, those sons of the Pentagon . . . who up to now have been flaunting their arrogance throughout America. Let them take thought. We are defended by one of the most powerful military forces in history."

On July 21, 1960, Major Raúl Castro stated that the Soviet Union would "use all means at its disposal to prevent an armed intervention of the United States against the Republic of Cuba," and that Cuba was profoundly grateful for "the political and moral support the Soviet Union is giving the Cuban people."

High officials of the Cuban Government, in concert with the statements of Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders, have frankly stated their desire that the Cuban revolution be taken as a model for similar revolutions throughout Latin America. Dr. Castro said on July 26, 1960: "We promise to continue making the nation the example that can convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the American Continent." In Alexandria, Egypt, on July 27, 1960, Raúl Castro said that Cuba would "defend * * * the revolution of 200 million Latin Americans that consider the Cuban revolution as their own revolution."

In a speech before the Latin American Youth Congress in Havana on July 29, Dr. Guevara called upon the Latin American nations to choose sides as "friend or foe." The friendship of the Sino-Soviet bloc, he said, "can be the basis for the carrying out of the American revolution."

The threatened intervention of the Soviet Union—to the extent of suggesting missile warfare—has been based upon the alleged intention of the United States to intervene in Cuba with military force. The complete lack of foundation for such allegations was discussed in the memorandum presented to the Inter-American Peace Committee by the United States on June 27. Cuban officials have, while hailing the offers of military support from the Soviet Union, conveniently disregarded the repeated assurances expressed by the President, the Secretary of State, and other high officials, that the United States, far from having any aggressive designs, intends fully to live up to its inter-American and other international commitments which obligate it to refrain from any form of intervention or aggression and to seek the solution of international controversies by peaceful means.

2. Emergence of a dictatorial pattern of political control in Cuba

The close association between the revolutionary government of Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc, and the encouragement by the communist powers of revolutionary movements patterned on the Cuban model in other Latin American countries, give particular grounds for concern over developments in Cuba that have a bearing upon principles and objectives of the American Republics set forth in the charter of the Organization of American States.

The revolutionary government of Cuba came to power with the sincere applause and good wishes of the peoples of the United States and other friendly countries, who were impressed by the valor of the revolutionaries and by the lofty aims professed by the 26th of July movement. The almost immediate recognition granted to the new government made evident the sincere desire of other governments in the hemisphere to give it all possible friendly support.

Many of the pronouncements and initial acts by leaders of the 26th of July Movement gave hope that Cuba would assume the position of a leader in the common struggle of the peoples of America for freedom and representative democracy, and for the economic and social reforms necessary to build a better human life. Dr. Castro was acclaimed as a new figure on the American scene who was genuinely interested in the welfare of his people, who was dedicated to a program of democracy and economic betterment, and who would seek ways of strengthening the bonds of hemispheric solidarity by giving renewed vigor to principles and objectives which underlie the Inter-American system.

Unfortunately the opposite has taken place with reference to the political structure being erected in Cuba by the revolutionary government. Instead of building upon the basic elements of a democratic system as set forth in the declaration of Santiago, the Cuban Government has increasingly followed practices and adopted formulas, typical of dictatorial political systems.

In the declaration of Santiago certain of the main principles of the democratic system in this hemisphere were set forth, with no attempt to be complete, "so as to permit national and international public opinion to gage the degree of identification of political regimes and governments with that system, thus contributing to the eradication of forms of dictatorship, despotism, or tyranny, without weakening respect for the right of peoples freely to choose their own form of government." A recital of the facts of political developments in Cuba in relation to the principles of the declaration of Santiago is included in the body of this document. These developments have all been publicly proclaimed. The record clearly demonstrates, among other factors, the absence of any move to hold elections, the virtual prohibition of political opposition, the practical elimination of freedom of the press and other violations of fundamental human rights.

Repeated statements by Prime Minister Castro and his associates have impugned the value of democratic elections and have indicated a clear intent not to hold elections in the foreseeable future. Thus, the revolutionary government of Cuba perpetuates itself in power without an electoral mandate or any fixed term of office.

Political opposition has been virtually eliminated. All opposition parties have been driven underground or eliminated and many of their leaders have sought asylum in other countries. Only the Partido Socialista Popular (Communist Party) is permitted to act openly.

Freedom of the press, radio, and television has been virtually extinguished. There exist in Cuba today almost no independent organs of public opinion. Newspapers and radio and television stations have been taken over; and editors and publishers who did not conform to the official views of the revolutionary government have been forced to seek asylum and flee to other countries. Outstanding among these was the recent case of Miguel Angel Quevedo, editor of the internationally known magazine Bohemia, who had been one of the most enthusiastic and powerful supporters of the revolution. The text of the impressive statement made by Dr. Quevedo when he sought asylum in the Venezuelan Embassy in Habana is included in the body of this document.

Individual liberties have been suppressed by military trials and summary executions, imprisonment for political activities, forced exile and the arbitrary imposition of penalties for crimes vaguely described as counter-revolutionary which has generally meant any opposition to the revolutionary government. Anticommunism has been defined as counterrevolutionary. The labor movement has also been deprived of its democratic character and converted into an instrument of control by the revolutionary government in disregard of the expressed will of the membership of labor organizations.

The course of political developments in Cuba outlined above, and described in detail in the body of this document, has had an inevitable effect upon the standing of Cuba in the inter-American community. Increasing numbers of exiles have sought refuge in foreign lands. In the beginning, most of these were persons associated with the previous regime. The last several months have, however, seen an increasing flight of exiles who had been actively associated with the revolution in its early days but whose independence or difference of opinion had resulted in danger to their personal safety. Former Provisional President Manuel Urrutia and Maj. Huber Matos, one of the chief military lieutenants of Dr. Castro in the revolutionary movement, are now political prisoners. Dr. José Miró Cardona, first Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government, has sought asylum in the Embassy of Argentina in Havana. The presence of opposition leaders in other countries has been accompanied by intensified complaints by the Government of Cuba against other governments, particularly the United States, for harboring what it terms "war criminals."

The developments in Cuba outlined above are a particular cause of concern on the part of the Government and people of the United States because of the relationship between these developments and the growing Communist influence on Cuban policy. This influence has been reflected in the emergence of the Communist Party (Partido Socialista Popular) as the main political organization in Cuba. Like other Communist parties, it is of course responsible to the dictates of the Soviet Union.

Communist influence existed in the early days of the Cuban revolution, but its growth since that time has been rapid and continuous. With the active cooperation of Raúl Castro and Ernesto Guevara, whose sympathy for Communist purposes and methods is well known, Communists have been placed in key positions throughout the revolutionary government where they are now deeply involved in remodeling Cuba along dictatorial lines. By July 17, 1959, Communist control was sufficiently strong to force the resignation of Provisional President Manuel Urrutia because he had criticized Communist influence in the government. By October of that year, the Communists had seized control of the Cuban Confederation of Labor and the Federation of University Students at the University of Habana. (In July 1960, the federation took control of the university.) Also in October 1959, Communist control of the armed forces was accelerated by the appointment of Raul Castro as Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces.

In June 1960, it was possible for Captain Antonio Núñez Jiménez to state in Moscow that "The Communist Party of Cuba is the party whose members are receiving the benefits of the revolution." A few days later Dr. Castro confirmed that "anticommunism is counterrevolutionary." On July 9, 1960, Fauré Chomón, who has been named Cuban Ambassador to Moscow, stated:

"I wonder if you have ever thought about what political party is now ruling Cuba. We all know that the revolution is led by a group of revolutionary comrades. But what party do they represent These comrades belong to the revolutionary party. Little by little we have been forming a revolutionary party. The several revolutionary groups have united in order to make the revolution a success. Our revolutionary party is composed of the active members of the 26th of July movement, the Socialist (Communist) Party, the Revolutionary Directorate and the other groups."

When it is considered that most of the non-Communist leaders of the 26th of July movement are "inactive" and others have defected and been forced into exile, and that

the revolutionary directorate has only nominal existence, the Communist Party emerges as the sole remaining member of the ruling groups mentioned.

From the above, it is therefore clear that not only is Cuba under its revolutionary government being transformed rapidly into a dictatorial political state, but a state in which the reins of political control are increasingly being concentrated in the hands of the Communist Party, thereby contributing to the general subversive of the revolutionary government of Cuba to the purposes of the Sino-Soviet bloc. These developments cannot fail to increase international tensions not only in the Caribbean area but throughout the American Continent and place in jeopardy the cooperation of the American States as well as the purposes and principles of their Organization.

ACT OF BOGOTÁ

MEASURES FOR SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF OPERATION PAN AMERICA

The Special Committee To Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation,

Recognizing that the preservation and strengthening of free and democratic institutions in the American Republics requires the acceleration of social and economic progress in Latin America adequate to meet the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the Americas for a better life and to provide them the fullest opportunity to improve their status;

Recognizing that the interests of the American Republics are so interrelated that sound social and economic progress in each is of importance to all and that lack of it in any American republic may have serious repercussions in others;

Cognizant of the steps already taken by many American Republics to cope with the serious economic and social problems confronting them, but convinced that the magnitude of these problems calls for redoubled efforts by governments and for a new and vigorous program of inter-American cooperation;

Recognizing that economic development programs, which should be urgently strengthened and expanded, may have a delayed effect on social welfare, and that accordingly early measures are needed to cope with social needs;

Recognizing that the success of a cooperative program of economic and social progress will require maximum self-help efforts on the part of the American Republics and, in many cases, the improvement of existing institutions and practices, particularly in the fields of taxation, the ownership and use of land, education and training, health and housing;

Believing it opportune to give further practical expression to the spirit of Operation Pan America by immediately enlarging the opportunities of the people of Latin America for social progress, thus strengthening their hopes for the future;

Considering it advisable to launch a program for social development, in which emphasis should be given to those measures that meet social needs and also promote increases in productivity and strengthen economic development,

Recommends to the Council of the Organization of American States:

I. MEASURES FOR SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT

An inter-American program for social development should be established which should be directed to the carrying out of the following measures of social improvement in Latin America, as considered appropriate in each country:

A. Measures for the improvement of conditions of rural living and land use:

1. The examination of existing legal and institutional systems with respect to—

(a) Land tenure legislation and facilities with a view to insuring a wider and more equitable distribution of the ownership of land, in a manner consistent with the objectives of employment, productivity, and economic growth;

(b) Agricultural credit institutions with a view to providing adequate financing to individual farmers or groups of farmers;

(c) Tax systems and procedures and fiscal policies with a view to assuring equity of taxation and encouraging improved use of land, especially of privately-owned land which is idle.

2. The initiation or acceleration of appropriate programs to modernize and improve the existing legal and institutional framework to insure better conditions of land tenure, extend more adequate credit facilities, and provide increased incentives in the land tax structure.

3. The acceleration of the preparation of projects and programs for:

(a) Land reclamation and land settlement, with a view to promoting more widespread ownership and efficient use of land, particularly of unutilized or underutilized land;

(b) The increase of the productivity of land already in use; and

(c) The construction of farm-to-market and access roads.

4. The adoption or acceleration of other Government service programs designed particularly to assist the small farmer, such as new or improved marketing organization; extension services; research and basic surveys; and demonstration, education, and training facilities.

B. Measures for the improvement of housing and community facilities:

1. The examination of existing policies in the field of housing and community facilities, including urban and regional planning, with a view to improving such policies, strengthening public institutions and promoting private initiative and participation in programs in these fields. Special consideration should be given to encouraging financial institutions to invest in low-cost housing on a long-term basis and in building and construction industries.

2. The strengthening of the existing legal and institutional framework for mobilizing financial resources to provide better housing and related facilities for the people and to create new institutions for this purpose when necessary. Special consideration should be given to legislation and measures which would encourage the establishment and growth of:

(a) Private financing institutions, such as building and loan associations;

(b) Institutions to insure sound housing loans against loss;

(c) Institutions to serve as a secondary market for home mortgages;

(d) Institutions to provide financial assistance to local communities for the development of facilities such as water supply, sanitation, and other public works.

Existing national institutions should be utilized, wherever practical and appropriate, in the application of external resources to further the development of housing and community facilities.

3. The expansion of home building industries through such measures as the training of craftsmen and other personnel, research, the introduction of new techniques, and the development of construction standards for low- and medium-cost housing.

4. The lending of encouragement and assistance to programs, on a pilot basis, for aided self-help housing, for the acquisition and subdivision of land for low-cost housing developments, and for industrial housing projects.

C. Measures for the improvement of educational systems and training facilities:

1. The reexamination of educational systems, giving particular attention to:

(a) The development of modern methods of mass education for the eradication of illiteracy;

(b) The adequacy of training in the industrial arts and sciences with due emphasis on laboratory and work experience and on the practical application of knowledge for the solution of social and economic problems;

(c) The need to provide instruction in rural schools not only in basic subjects but also in agriculture, health, sanitation, nutrition, and in methods of home and community improvement;

(d) The broadening of courses of study in secondary schools to provide the training necessary for clerical and executive personnel in industry, commerce, public administration, and community service;

(e) Specialized trade and industrial education related to the commercial and industrial needs of the community;

(f) Vocational agricultural instruction;

(g) Advanced education of administrators, engineers, economists, and other professional personnel of key importance to economic development.

D. Measures for the improvement of public health:

1. The reexamination of programs and policies of public health, giving particular attention to:

(a) Strengthening the expansion of national and local health services, especially those directed to the reduction of infant mortality;

(b) The progressive development of health insurance systems, including those providing for maternity, accident and disability insurance, in urban and rural areas;

(c) The provision of hospital and health service in areas located away from main centers of population;

(d) The extension of public medical services to areas of exceptional need;

(e) The strengthening of campaigns for the control or elimination of communicable diseases with special attention to the eradication of malaria;

(f) The provision of water supply facilities for purposes of health and economic development;

(g) The training of public health officials and technicians;

(h) The strengthening of programs of nutrition for low-income groups.

E. Measures for the mobilization of domestic resources:

1. This program shall be carried out within the framework of the maximum creation of domestic savings and of the improvement of fiscal and financial practices;

2. The equity and effectiveness of existing tax schedules, assessment practices and collection procedures shall be examined with a view to providing additional revenue for the purpose of this program;

3. The allocation of tax revenues shall be reviewed, having in mind an adequate provision of such revenues to the areas of social development mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs.

II. CREATION OF A SPECIAL FUND FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

1. The delegations of the governments of the Latin American Republics welcome the decision of the Government of the United States to establish a special inter-American fund for social development, with the Inter-American Development Bank to become the primary mechanism for the administration of the fund.

2. It is understood that the purpose of the special fund would be to contribute capital resources and technical assistance on flexible terms and conditions, including repayment in

local currency and the relending of repaid funds, in accordance with appropriate and selective criteria in the light of the resources available, to support the efforts of the Latin American countries that are prepared to initiate or expand effective institutional improvements and to adopt measures to employ efficiently their own resources with a view to achieving greater social progress and more balanced economic growth.

III. MEASURES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The special committee, having in view resolution VII adopted at the seventh meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs expressing the need for the maximum contribution of member countries in hemisphere cooperation in the struggle against underdevelopment, in pursuance of the objectives of Operation Pan America, expresses its conviction—

1. That within the framework of Operation Pan America the economic development of Latin America requires prompt action of exceptional breadth in the field of international cooperation and domestic effort comprising:

(a) Additional public and private financial assistance on the part of capital exporting countries of America, Western Europe, and international lending agencies within the framework of their charters, with special attention to:

(i) the need for loans on flexible terms and conditions, including, whenever advisable in the light of the balance of payments situation of individual countries, the possibility of repayment in local currency,

(ii) The desirability of the adequate preparation and implementation of development projects and plans, within the framework of the monetary, fiscal, and exchange policies necessary for their effectiveness, utilizing as appropriate the technical assistance of inter-American and international agencies,

(iii) The advisability, in special cases, of extending foreign financing for the coverage of local expenditures;

(b) Mobilization of additional domestic capital, both public and private;

(c) Technical assistance by the appropriate international agencies in the preparation and implementation of national and regional Latin American development projects and plans;

(d) The necessity for developing and strengthening credit facilities for small and medium private business, agriculture, and industry.

Recommends: (1) That special attention be given to an expansion of long-term lending, particularly in view of the instability of exchange earnings of countries exporting primary products and of the unfavourable effect of the excessive accumulation of short- and medium-term debt on continuing and orderly economic development.

(2) That urgent attention be given to the search for effective and practical ways, appropriate to each commodity, to deal with the problem of the instability of exchange earnings of countries heavily dependent upon the exportation of primary products.

IV. MULTILATERAL COOPERATION FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The special committee, considering the need for providing instruments and mechanisms for the implementation of the program of inter-American economic and social cooperation which would periodically review the progress made and propose measures for further mobilization of resources, recommends:

1. That the Inter-American Economic and Social Council undertake to organize annual consultative meetings to review the social and economic progress of member countries, to analyze and discuss the progress achieved and the problems encountered in each country, to exchange opinions on possible measures that might be adopted to intensify further social and economic progress, within the framework of Operation Pan America, and to prepare reports on the outlook for the future. Such annual meetings should begin with an examination by experts and terminate with a session at the ministerial level.

2. That the Council of the Organization of American States convene within 60 days of the date of this act a special meeting of senior government representatives to find ways of strengthening and improving the ability of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to render effective assistance to governments with a view to accepting the objectives enumerated below, taking into account the proposals submitted by the delegation of the Republic of Argentina in Document CECE/III–13:

(a) To further the economic and social development of Latin American countries;

(b) To promote trade between the countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as between them and extracontinental countries;

(c) To facilitate the flow of capital and the extension of credits to the countries of Latin America both from the Western Hemisphere and from extracontinental sources.

3. The special meeting shall:

(a) Examine the existing structure of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and of the units of the Secretariat of the Organization of American States working in the economic and social fields, with a view to strengthening and improving the Inter-American Economic and Social Council;

(b) Determine the means of strengthening inter-American economic and social cooperation by an administrative reform of the Secretariat, which should be given sufficient technical, administrative, and financial flexibility for the adequate fulfillment of its tasks.

(c) Formulate recommendations designed to assure effective coordination between the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and other agencies offering technical advice and services in the Western Hemisphere.

(d) Propose procedures designed to establish effective liaison of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and other regional American organizations with other international organizations for the purpose of study, discussion and consultation in the fields of international trade and financial and technical assistance.

(e) And formulate appropriate recommendations to the Council of the Organization of American States.

In approving the Act of Bogotá the Delegations to the Special Committee, convinced that the people of the Americas can achieve a better life only within the democratic system, renew their faith in the essential values which lie at the base of western civilization, and reaffirm their determination to assure the fullest measure of well-being to the people of the Americas under conditions of freedom and respect for the supreme dignity of the individual.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing—and it may be that this matter will be reached during the debate today over rule XXII, but, at least, if it is not reached until tomorrow, it will be helpful—an amendment which I shall offer to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators, to Senate Resolution 4, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, will be received, printed and lie on the desk.

AID TO DISTRESSED AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators SCHOEPPEL and YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 9) to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies and create new employment opportunities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

EXPANSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators BIBLE, MUNDT, KUCHEL, and LONG of Missouri were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 22) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1961, the names of Senators YARBOROUGH, CLARK, MOSS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, CHURCH, BIBLE, CARROLL, SMATHERS, KERR, MCGEE, CANNON, JACKSON, SYMINGTON, and HUMPHREY were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 109) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. GRUENING) on January 5, 1961.

PROGRAM OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators BENNETT, RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, LONG of Missouri, and HART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 120) to amend the Federal

Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

EVALUATION OF RECREATIONAL BENEFITS FROM CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, LONG of Missouri, FULBRIGHT, and HART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 121) to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any Federal water resources project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators RANDOLPH, NEUBERGER, PELL, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 146) to extend and increase the special milk program for children, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators JACKSON, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, HUMPHREY, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, DOUGLAS, WILEY, and CLARK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 174) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON on January 5, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON EXPECTED NOMINATION OF DEAN RUSK TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, it is the intention of President-elect Kennedy to nominate Mr. Dean Rusk, of New York, as his Secretary of State. The Committee on Foreign Relations proposes to hear Mr. Rusk in open meeting at 10 o'clock Thursday morning, January 12, in room No. 4221, New Senate Office Building. Interested Senators who wish to attend will, of course, be welcome.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter from him to Bureau of Budget concerning study of Great Lakes water level.

BIRTHDAY OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to preclude the introduction of bills, but I do wish to take occasion to observe the fact that today is the 48th anniversary of the natal day of the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON.

Apropos of that anniversary, let me say, first, that the U.S. Presidency is probably the choicest gift within the bestowal powers of the people of any country on the face of the earth; and any person who is nominated and who begets the esteem, the confidence, the trust, and the admiration of his fellow citizens and his fellow associates in the common political cause becomes outstanding by that fact in itself. And then to have an opportunity to go before the people of the country and present his cause, and to have those efforts rewarded by a great outpouring of his fellow citizens, and to fall behind by only one-tenth of 1 percent, is a magnificent tribute to a young man who today is 48 years old.

He has had a rich, fruitful, and constructive public career, particularly at the Federal level. First, it was his privilege to serve in the House of Representatives; second, in the Senate of the United States; third, for 8 years as Vice President of the United States; and then he became the candidate of his party for the Presidency and received so great a tribute from the American people.

Mr. President, never was he more magnificent, never was he more superb, than on last Friday, after we marched to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of complying with the Constitution and statutes of the United States, to count officially the electoral vote and to determine formally and officially who was the President-elect of the United States. As Vice President NIXON then pointed out, not within 100 years has it happened that the loser should stand in his place, presiding over a joint session of the House of Representatives and the Senate—and, insofar as I know, it is the only time when the Vice President does preside at a joint session, there to become the initiating officer in having the vote counted—and then comply with the statute, and announce the winner, and then extend his felicitations. It was done in such rare grace and under such—shall I say—emotional circumstances, that it was a double tribute to his poise, to his understanding, and to the fact that he would have been magnificent in victory, as he was even greater in defeat.

So today we mark the 48th birth anniversary of a great American, the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one of the Republican Members of the Senate who has had the opportunity to sit beside the Vice President of the United States in the weekly meetings at the White House during the past 8 years, I desire to join our minority leader in wishing Vice President NIXON a very happy birthday on this, his 48th birth anniversary.

I have always appreciated the wisdom of his remarks, his ability to understand quickly the problems which face us, and the very helpful suggestions he has made from time to time—not only suggestions for the good of the country, but also suggestions of a more personal character, when we have met with him.

I join our minority leader in all the remarks he has made about Vice President NIXON.

What commends RICHARD NIXON so highly to all of us in this time is his great spirit of sportsmanship, as so ably demonstrated by the manner in which he has taken a very close defeat and the manner in which he has conducted himself for the good of the Nation. RICHARD NIXON has always set an outstanding example of high character and excellent personal conduct throughout his career, and in a way that has been particularly notable since November 8.

So, Mr. President, I join in wishing Vice President NIXON a happy birthday and great opportunities, in the days to come, for future use to the country. Today we salute both Vice President NIXON and his lovely wife, who has been so fine a helpmate to him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to join all Americans in wishing a happy birthday to a great American, a great patriot, public servant, model husband and father—the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON.

As an outstanding young man in American political life, serving in the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and as Vice President, DICK has written a splendid record.

As a pillar of the great Eisenhower administration, DICK has drawn new respect and esteem, not only to himself, but to the Vice Presidency.

He is a man of broad experience, capability, and knowledge in domestic and international problems, and a veteran of the Second World War.

He is a man of high principle and integrity—a statesman within the definition of Edmund Burke: "One who has the disposition to preserve and the ability to improve."

He is a family man, reflecting the highest standards to which Americans aspire in homelife, family relationships, and public service.

He is a warm human being, attuned to the needs of our people at all economic levels and of all ages.

His career reflects the "poor boy to success" story, according to the best traditions of America.

True, he is a fighter. In these times of trial and challenge, however, the country needs fighters who are guided by real principles and high morality.

Last Friday, as I sat in the front row in the House of Representatives, and observed DICK NIXON as he presided at the meeting as the electoral votes were counted, there came to my mind a statement that I heard about him years ago when I was in California, right after his

election to the Senate. Someone said, "The Senator is a man who is equal to any emergency."

At that time, in victory, he was humble and calm. Friday, while he was counting himself out, he also was calm, pleasant, manifesting a sense of humor and a wonderful smile. I thought, as I observed him, of the day after Caracas, when the House passed a resolution praising his courage and dignified conduct.

It was Cicero who said, "A man of courage is full of faith." DICK manifested this same spirit when he was in Russia talking to Khrushchev. No one who observed him as he presided last Friday—unless he knew it—would have said: "He is the defeated candidate."

A man who can keep his calm and his poise like he has, after the experience he went through, is not a defeated candidate. He has again demonstrated victory out of defeat, or, as the House resolution put it, "Courage and dignified conduct."

In optimistically facing the future, DICK continues to reflect the Christian attitude and greatness of soul which have marked his career in public life.

Upon his 48th birthday, we—all America—extend heartfelt wishes not only for a happy anniversary, but also warm affection to his wife, Pat, and his wonderful family.

Our best wishes come to him in the knowledge that his career, as an outstanding American will, I am confident, continue to make a unique contribution to the Nation he has served so well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following my statement, an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of January 8, 1961, entitled "Mr. NIXON's Farewell."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. NIXON'S FAREWELL

Very few men like to lose, and RICHARD NIXON, one may be sure, is not to be counted among their number. Still, there is such a thing as a genuine good loser, and the Vice President's name ranks high on this list.

Mr. NIXON demonstrated that he could smile and accept the bitter disappointment of defeat in his little talk to party workers in Los Angeles on the morning after the election—in the weary hours when it became apparent that Mr. Kennedy had won the election. And he demonstrated it again in his farewell remarks to Friday's joint session of Congress.

There are those, of course, who can see nothing good in anything done by Mr. NIXON. With these people, sniping and cynicism have become a way of life. But they are in the minority. Most Americans, we are sure, will credit the Vice President with sincerity when he stood before the Congress to extend his best wishes to the winners. And why best wishes? Because these winners now must work "in a cause that is bigger than any man's ambition, greater than any party—the cause of freedom, of justice, and peace for all mankind." This is not just a form of words, not merely a pious expression from a man play-acting in the role of good loser. It happens to be true. And Mr. NIXON, whatever his implacable detractors may think, has done well to rise above personal disappointment and set the example of good will and best wishes to those upon whom the heavy burdens of victory soon will descend.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I realize there is little that I can add to what has been said and what will be said concerning the character of RICHARD NIXON. I consider DICK NIXON as the personification of the spirit of good sportsmanship, for which our country is well known.

I was in New York, at the United Nations, a few days after our Vice President met with the President-elect in Florida. It appeared to some of the representatives from countries in distant parts of the world that this was a rather unusual circumstance, and some of them did not seem to think it real that a defeated candidate for the Presidency could be with the winner in such amicable circumstances. So I felt called upon to tell them that in the United States, after a free election—and we still do have free elections—the defeated candidate did not go into exile, but, instead, helped carry on the affairs of the country, to the best of his abilities.

Mr. President, we are sorry to have DICK NIXON leave this body—at least, I am sorry, and I know a great many of us here are sorry to have him leave the post of Presiding Officer. But as he goes back to California and to private life, we realize that his interest in the welfare of his country will not be lost to us.

So I want to join with all others in wishing him the best for the future on this his 48th birthday.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in wishing the Vice President many happy returns on his birthday, and at the same time I wish to express my deep appreciation of the leadership he has shown to the Republican Party and to the United States, particularly during the past 8 years. I can hardly think of a Republican political leader who has been under more severe attacks than has DICK NIXON. At all times he has shown great courage, iron nerve, and a determination that has been at times magnificent.

I have a profound admiration for this man, and I look upon his retirement in the immediate future with extreme regret. I wish him health and happiness for the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I take the deepest personal pleasure in extending to Vice President NIXON the best of good wishes on this memorable occasion. It has been my high privilege to serve with the Vice President both in the House, to which I was elected at the same time and in the Senate. In the course of this long and valued friendship I have unfailingly been impressed by the great qualities of mind and heart that he has brought to every task, to every problem, to every challenge with which he has been confronted. The preeminent gifts of intellect and of leadership that he possesses were given their full and due recognition in 1960 when he was chosen by his party as Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States. By a hairline margin DICK NIXON was defeated in the November election. It must, however, be the supreme pride of his life that so many millions of his fellow citizens demonstrated the depth of their belief in this outstanding American by making him their choice to assume the leadership of our great Nation. Almost unique in our history is the tribute of more than 34 million American voices speaking out their faith in one man.

It has been said that the mark of a great man is the humility with which he wears the laurel wreath of success. No less a mark of greatness lies in the dignity and grace with which a man accepts the bitter taste of defeat.

Last Friday afternoon DICK NIXON gave to the Congress of the United States one of its finest hours—yes, gave to this Nation one of its finest hours—when it fell to his lot to announce the election to the Presidency of his distinguished rival and our deeply esteemed former colleague in the Senate, President-elect John F. Kennedy. What could have been a difficult moment he turned into an historic moment. In words which deserve to be remembered he revealed to us not only the grandeur of our cherished democratic process, but also an example of the kind of man whose heart and mind and spirit form a part—a timeless, precious, indispensable part—of that national grandeur.

The Vice President will soon depart from this Chamber, but he will never depart from the hearts and memories of those who proudly lay claim to his friendship.

It is my fervent hope—a hope I know is shared by all who know him—that in the years to come DICK NIXON will always know the deep inner happiness and contentment by which life best rewards the man who gives the best of himself to life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I should like to join with those expressing congratulations and best wishes to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on the occasion of his 48th birthday.

Since January 1947, when we both first entered the U.S. House of Representatives, I have watched as a friend his outstanding and distinguished public service. It has been intelligent, courageous, and in the very best American concept. His vigorous leadership and great ability have been a source of strength for our Nation and free people everywhere.

His public service is greatly appreciated and valued.

He is still a young man, yet seasoned to meet great challenges and to serve his fellow man. As he moves into the future, I wish for him and his lovely wife and children the most satisfying and rewarding experiences.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying highly deserved tribute to our esteemed Vice President on his 48th birthday. He has been with us, and by that I mean with the legislative branch of the Government since the 80th Congress, following his election to the House of Representatives on November 5, 1946. His service has included some time in the Senate and as Vice President since 1953.

Mr. President, while the record of this young man is a matter of pride to all of us it is something more than that to Members of Congress from Indiana since

the maternal side of his family stems from good old Hoosier stock. His mother, Mrs. Hanna Nixon, was born in Jennings County, Ind.

Perhaps no other man in American political history, at age 48, has had such an interesting, intensive and responsible career as has our friend, DICK NIXON.

His service in the House of Representatives is outstanding. He made a name for himself there.

When he moved to the Senate his great energy drove him to further heights and certainly we all know his record as Vice President is one that has been unequaled in that position in American history.

Then he barely missed, and I mean barely, the highest office in the land. The tribute paid to him by the American people in the last election speaks louder than anything else.

I know that all of us wish for him and his fine family continued success, health, and happiness.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues who are today marking the birthday of the President of the U.S. Senate, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, by offering words of praise and appreciation.

Here, in RICHARD NIXON, we have the kind of greatness which has become a symbol of American opportunity and achievement. Here we have one born to humble surroundings. He worked in his father's general store. Early in life he learned the lessons of hard work, thrift, and the kind of life which build moral character. Like most American boys, he attended public schools. From early in life, RICHARD NIXON had high ideals and, like the typical American boy, high ambition. His story is a Horatio Alger story.

One cannot talk about RICHARD NIXON without mentioning his wonderful wife, affectionately called Pat. Pat Nixon worked in hospitals and department stores to gain a college education, and, after her marriage to DICK, taught school to help him through his law course.

By their own efforts, the Nixons rose in esteem and prominence. While still quite young, RICHARD NIXON was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, then to the Senate, and then to the Vice Presidency.

He is still a young man. I am sure the best part of his life is ahead. He has much to offer a troubled world. The world is going to hear a lot about RICHARD M. NIXON for years to come. Of that, I feel sure.

To RICHARD NIXON, whom I am proud to call a friend, I say "Happy birthday and many more."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I pay my sincere respects and offer hearty congratulations to the Vice President of the United States on the occasion of his birthday. The people of California, I have no doubt, would wish to join their representation on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and in the House in warmly felicitating the Vice President on this day of his natal celebration.

California has honored the Vice President of the United States on many occasions. So have the people of the United States. So, too, has the political party—the Republican Party—to which he and I and millions of others, belong.

On this occasion, as we celebrate his birthday, and when the Senate is involved in a debate of far-reaching and transcendent importance on rules of procedure, I am particularly pleased to observe that it is Vice President NIXON, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, who with courage and with clarity has laid before the Senate an opinion concerning the power and responsibility of its Members. It is an excellent guide for good government in America and for good and orderly procedure in this House of Congress.

Shortly, the Vice President of the United States will return to his native State. Behind him is a record of honorable service in the legislative and executive branches of the Government of our country. He takes with him the best wishes of all of us in Government, Democrat and Republican alike, for the devotion to duty which he has displayed in all the multitudinous and important official labors by which he has served his Nation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with other Members of the Senate in congratulating the Vice President of the United States on his 48th birthday. I congratulate him for all he has accomplished during his life.

To have served in the House of Representatives, in the U.S. Senate, and as Vice President of the United States for 8 years, to have been chosen by his party as its candidate for President, and to have received the vote of almost one-half of the voters in the recent campaign—all of these facts are eloquent testimony of the success he has achieved as a leader of this country. But I think, in a deeper sense, we must recognize that it is a record which has been based upon the confidence of the people of his State and of his Nation.

In his life, we know he has been criticized, as are all men who work and take strong positions.

I think it was Arthur Guiterman who wrote:

> For some are born to set things right,
> While some are built for sneering,
> And he that likes to work and fight
> Must never mind the jeering.

I think the great majority of the American people would agree that today the Vice President holds the respect and affection of the people as few men have held that respect and affection.

I do not know what the Vice President is going to do, but I am sure, whatever he does, he will take to his task the same ability, patriotism, and devotion to his country that he has evidenced throughout his life.

In many ways, I think the career of RICHARD NIXON has been typical of the best traditions of his country. He has been an American epic, as has the life of his wife. So today, in this very humble and inadequate way, I express my own congratulations to the Vice President for what he has meant to our country, and for what I am sure he will mean in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in the remarks he has just made about the birthday of the Vice President of the United States. The Vice President, with whom I had the honor and privilege of serving in both the House and the Senate, has indeed grown in stature and in understanding. I want to state again that I think he has shown an awareness of what our Government means, and what democracy really is. He proved that by the magnificent speech he made at the conclusion of the counting of the electoral votes on last Friday.

The Vice President will leave the Senate shortly for other duties. I wish him and his family well, because I believe that they have made real contributions to the welfare of this country, and that by what they have done they will long be remembered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to add my comments to those which have been expressed about the distinguished Vice President of the United States. The people of Iowa have deep love and affection for our Vice President. I take this opportunity to extend him a happy birthday greeting on behalf of the people of my State, and to wish him Godspeed in his future activities of service to his country.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today marks the birthday of the Vice President of the United States, and, with his many friends on both sides of the aisle and throughout the United States, as well as in the still unliberated areas of the world, areas which greeted him with such wild and enthusiastic acclaim as the symbol of freedom and of the unserving devotion of our country to that cause, on this day I congratulate him on the observance of another birthday.

I should like to pay tribute to him for his patriotism, his courage, his devotion to the public interest; the fact that, whether in these Halls or on the campaign trail, or in any other situation which he has confronted during his vigorous life, he has, first of all, put the welfare of the United States and of its people first. He has conducted himself in this Chamber with fairness. He has at all times gained the respect and the admiration of the Members of the Senate. He has on the campaign trail demonstrated the kind of sincerity, fairness, decency, and uprightness which won the respect of the entire country and the support of very nearly half of it in the recent election.

Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States goes now to other fields of activity. Wherever they may lead him, I know that all of us join in wishing for him enjoyment, serenity—by comparison with the turbulent days of the recent past—further opportunities to be of use to his country, and above everything else, the thanks of the American people for having demonstrated that, as he did once again so recently, the country is more important and the welfare of its people is more important than the ambition of any man; that we must at all times demonstrate at home and abroad that we are a united people and that, having established our differences, it becomes ever so much more important to establish our union

as a free people, devoted to a common cause, the security of the United States, its welfare, its advancement, and its standing in the good opinion of men of good will through the world.

So I congratulate DICK NIXON, as well as his lovely and most popular helpmate, Pat, upon his birthday, and I wish for them long life, happiness, and continued opportunities for devotion to the good of their fellow man and, if he shall so desire it, for continuance in public service.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I, too, rise in observance of the birthday of DICK NIXON. I think all the things that could be said have already been said, and I do not want to burden him or my colleagues with undue repetition. But over the years, since we first met in the House, the Vice President and I have been very close, and I believe our association has been one of mutual respect and affection, as well. It goes very deep.

On this occasion of his birth date anniversary, I should like to point out only one thing which I think is deeply typical not only of DICK NIXON at his best, but of DICK NIXON when he is truest to himself. Only last week, in the joint session of the Senate and the House, which met for the purpose of receiving the ballots of the electors in the recent presidential election, our former colleague, and now Vice President, presided. The gracious manner in which, in the unusual circumstances then prevailing, he conducted himself, his words, not only gracious, but very deeply moving, were typical of the kind of maturity, insight, and deep understanding of America and the things that hold us together.

I think it was most appropriate that, just before the anniversary of his birth, he had occasion to conduct himself in that significant and moving manner. For that, and all else, and particularly on a personal basis, I, along with my other colleagues, wish him the warmest and best greetings on this anniversary of his birth date.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the birthday of one of our most distinguished Americans, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

His is truly a remarkable record commencing early in life. He came from a family of very modest means, and had to work his way through college. Both in undergraduate school and in law school he was an outstanding student. He acquitted himself with much credit during World War II as an officer in the U.S. Navy. Soon after the conclusion of World War II he was elected to the House of Representatives where he obtained national renown and acclaim as an investigator. It was largely through his efforts that Alger Hiss, one of America's most notorious traitors, was brought to justice.

Because of his fine record in the House the people of California sent him to the Senate where it was my privilege to be closely associated with him. During the past 8 years he has served with great honor and distinction as Vice President of the United States. I doubt if any Vice President in the history of the United States has been assigned more important tasks or has fulfilled these assignments with greater distinction than has DICK NIXON.

As the Republican Party's candidate for President of the United States, he conducted himself in an able, honorable, and commendable manner. He has endeared himself to millions of Americans in a durable way, and he will long be remembered. DICK NIXON has gone a long way in this world, and I hope and pray that his future will be even brighter. There is great need in this country for men in public office of the personality, character, and integrity of DICK NIXON. The Republican Party is most fortunate in having him as a leader in the years to come.

I wish to join his innumerable friends in extending my greetings and best wishes on this his 48th birthday.

BELATED BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, January 5, I had been called off the floor of the Senate just prior to the tribute paid by several of my colleagues to the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, on the occasion of his birthday. Belatedly, I wish to add my congratulations to the distinguished Senator.

I have had the pleasure of knowing the minority leader for many years, dating back to the time when we were both Members of the House of Representatives. I have the highest regard for him as a man, as well as our party's leader in the Senate. He is a strong leader, and, at the same time, he has made many stanch friends, on both sides of the aisle.

One of the bright spots in my experience in the Senate is the constant friendship and consideration of the Senator from Illinois.

I desire to join with those who wished him well on his birthday. I congratulate him, and wish for him many more birthdays to come.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while the majority leader is in the Chamber, I should like to inquire as to what may be expected today so far as any action in respect to rule XXII is concerned. I gained the impression somehow, somewhere, that probably no action would be forthcoming until Tuesday, but in any event I am sure Senators would like to have an expression from the majority leader as to how the program will unfold for the next several days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not the intention to have a vote today. It is possible there will be a vote tomorrow, and certainly by Wednesday at the latest. It is the hope of the leadership that those Senators who have something to say on this most important subject will use the time today to make their views known and will be prepared to vote on the resolutions beginning tomorrow, or, at the very latest, the next day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

AMERICAN MARIGOLDS NAMED "ALASKA"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am not one for flowery speech but last week I received as a gift a beautiful bouquet of flowers from the W. Atlee Burpee Co. With the flowers came a card informing me that these flowers were a new species of American marigolds named "Alaska" in honor of our great State. As I gazed upon these beautiful flowers I was captured by their brillant yellow hue and long graceful stems. The sight was a feast for one's eyes.

While I viewed this gorgeous spectacle my mind began to reflect on the significance of this flower. Its size is meaningful because it is at least three times the size of an ordinary American marigold. The blossom's brillant yellow reminded me of Alaskan sunsets that last far into the cool summer nights and of the glitter thrown off by well-washed nuggets that stud our many streams. This enduring gift is most significant of all because like Alaska this flower also has a bright future and will go on and on to grace these United States. I want to express my gratitude to the W. Atlee Burpee Co. for honoring Alaska in this way. I might add that Alaska's State flower is the forget-me-not, and surely we have not been forgotten in the naming of a new species of marigolds.

TELEVISION'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the past I have frequently been a critic of television. There is still too much trivia on the air, in my opinion, especially in the prime evening hours, when the largest potential audiences are able to listen.

But there is another side to this story. In the past few months many of us have become aware of the tremendous job television can do when it aims high. There has been an impressive succession of genuinely outstanding programs. During the national political campaign we had the now historic great debates in which the two presidential candidates met face to face in verbal combat while as many as 80 million viewers looked on. What a magnificent contribution this was to genuine democratic participation in our huge Nation. This was an indication of what television can do.

The coverage of the campaign, and the election brought more Americans into closer contact with the meaning and excitement of politics than ever before, as the personalities and policies of the candidates and the parties were revealed in painstaking detail. Thanks to television this was the best informed electorate in my judgment in our history.

On the night of the election, the networks brought the details of the nationwide vote count to an enormous audience that stayed up to watch what surely must have been the most prolonged cliff hanger since the end of "The Perils of Pauline."

Other broadcasts have continued this high level of television programing. A

moving study of the problem of migratory labor in this country drew wide attention. This program moved many to express their concern to me in many ways. I was traveling in Wisconsin then. From the response in my State, I am sure that America's heart was deeply moved by this great development. There have been programs on the U–2 affair, on the sit-ins, on the world refugee problem, and on other subjects of equal importance. These programs have had an immense impact on tens of millions of Americans, providing a vast increase in understanding.

I think that one must recognize that the television networks' elbowroom is limited by certain factors. The need to find financial sponsorship for programs among a fairly small number of advertisers inevitably places an overall restriction on the scope and nature of programing. The established tastes and viewing preferences of most Americans are likely to remain fairly stable. The much-maligned ratings continue to provide a persuasive link between the desire of a potential sponsor to reach a maximum audience, and the nature of the program which will accomplish this with the greatest degree of reliability.

These hard facts of life in the television industry being what they are, it is all the more worth taking time out to praise the networks for putting on a very substantial number of outstanding programs in recent months. The merits of these shows deserve recognition. Those responsible for the broadcasts should be praised and encouraged to continue their working efforts.

During the next few days I intend to place in the RECORD the actual transcripts of some of these outstanding broadcasts. The bare script of a television broadcast hardly does justice to the total impression achieved by a program, but it may serve as an indication, in permanent form, of how good television can be at its best.

I think it is time that the Congress recognize how this magic medium transforms our democracy. And just in the nick of time. Many of us have feared that the problems of our democracy have been becoming too vast, too remote, and too complicated with the impact of technology shrinking the contact size of a world becoming always more complex with burgeoning population and multiplying independent nations.

Now television has come along and it is at last possible for the great majority of us Americans to develop a far better understanding of our responsibilities, and how massive and challenging a job we face. In many ways American television is beginning to do part of that job.

Today I wish to list a number of these network programs by title.

The list is by no means exhaustive and does not attempt to be. Rather, it may serve as a sketch of the broad panorama of fine programs that have been offered in recent months, particularly in the field of news features. The list of programs follows:

NBC: "U–2 Affair," "Sit-In," "The Working Mother," "The Cold Woman," "Nigeria," "Minuteman Missile," "Birth Control," "Algeria," "Cuba," "Federal Aid to Education."

CBS: "Harvest of Shame," "The Influential Americans," "Money and the Next President," "Turmoil in Tokyo," "Berlin—End of the Line."

ABC: "The Man and the Mandate," "The Money Raisers," "Yanki No," "Featherbedding?" "Down the Road," "The Rag Tent."

THE DEMOCRATS AS POOR WINNERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, of all the able journalists who have reported the deliberations of this body over the years, none has evidenced greater perception of the constitutional role of the Senate than has the distinguished columnist William S. White. Time and again in his articles and books he has pointed out and emphasized that the Senate was created to function as one of the checks and balances of our republican form of government, and that interference with that function does a grave disservice to the rights of all Americans. In his column of January 6, as published in the Washington Evening Star, Mr. White pulls no punches in exposing the disservice being done our Nation and its citizens by the current efforts of certain willful Members of the body to force it into an arbitrary mold of their own self-serving design. Mr. White's forceful conclusions commend themselves to the serious consideration of every Member of this Senate, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of his column be printed herewith in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICTORS: POOR WINNERS?—DEMOCRATS ARE VIEWED AS SHOWING LESS THAN FULL TRUST IN JOHNSON

(By William S. White)

The Democrats are proving again, that, because of the ultraliberals and the ultrasuspicious and righteous among them, their party as a whole has a hard time withstanding prosperity. They are not so much poor losers—as the Republicans sometimes are—as they are very poor winners.

A visitor to the Democratically controlled Senate might suppose he was seeing a party which has just lost, not won, a national election and so was now embittered, one against the other.

Some of the time the ultraliberal and ultrasuspicious group howls itself hoarse in accusing other Democrats of not having done enough for the Kennedy ticket. The rest of the time this faction occupies itself in two curious enterprises both of which would demonstrably harm the new Kennedy administration.

One of these projects has been an absurdly extreme—and thus foredoomed—scheme which in spirit would alter the whole constitutional structure. This was a demand that a bare majority of the Senate be allowed to halt all debate, after a stated period, on any matter. Because some filibusters are bad, all filibusters—or rather any delaying action which a simple, momentary majority might call a filibuster—were to be put under the gag.

This proposal was solemnly pressed in an institution whose very existence is a denial of the principle of absolute majority rule. If the Constitution had put that kind of rule in force for Senate membership, some States of little population would have not two Senators but the irreducible one. And others would have now not 2 Senators but 20 or more. The Senate, of course, was explicitly made to restrict mere majority rule.

Thus some of those loudly demanding absolute rule by a majority-of-one would thereby sink into oblivion in a vastly enlarged Senate sea—and the interests of their home States along with them.

More importantly, the effect of this extraordinary project would be indefinitely to delay if not permanently to endanger the whole legislative program of the new administration to which these same men so endlessly declare their attachment.

The second historic activity of the ultras was to make certain that the two leaders most vital to the success of the Kennedy administration were put in a poor light from the start.

First, more than a dozen of this faction opposed a motion—which all the same carried by 3 to 1—to have Vice-President-elect LYNDON JOHNSON sit as chairman of Democratic conferences when invited by the new leadership to do so.

Now, of course, this small courtesy will neither increase nor decrease Senator Johnson's influence at the Capitol. He will, after all, be there anyhow, as the Senate's presiding officer. And it is not improbable that even if he had been denied security clearance to attend the caucuses he still might have been able to talk to Democratic Senators, anyhow.

The ultras moved from this historic demonstration to a series of equally humorless "demands" upon the man just unanimously chosen as their new Democratic leader, MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana. First, they called upon him to give up the standing right of a leader to make certain committee appointments. Next they agreed reluctantly to let him go on making these choices—if he would promise to put them before all Democratic Senators for approval. (He was, of course, going to do this, anyhow.)

The unavoidable implication of all this earnest charging about was this: Certain Democrats were publicly expressing something considerably less than full trust in a new Democratic Vice President—who cannot be cut down without injuring Mr. Kennedy, too—and a new Democratic Senate leader.

Old Senator Tom Connally once made a memorable description of this kind of mentality. "When I invite a man to dinner," he said, "I do not search him before he leaves the table to make sure he hasn't stolen the spoons."

FAILURE OF VOICE OF AMERICA IN LATIN AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in this morning's Washington Post an article entitled "America Fails To Raise Single Voice in Latin Areas." This is a feature article of the Associated Press, and was written by Endre Marton. The article begins:

Despite Cuba's drift into the Communist camp and the break in United States-Cuban relations, the Voice of America has no plans now to keep America's image before the Cuban people through special broadcasts, it was learned yesterday from Government sources.

At the same time, an analysis available at the State Department showed the Voice beams only 31½ hours a week to Latin America, less than half in Spanish. There are no such U.S. broadcasts in Portuguese, Brazil's tongue.

By comparison, the Communist bloc nations are bombarding Latin America with more than 174 hours of special broadcasts

weekly in Spanish, Portuguese and their own languages, apparently intended for eastern Europeans living there.

The assigned mission of the U.S. Information Agency, which controls the Voice's policy, is to keep this country's image before the world, to interpret U.S. life and culture for foreign peoples.

The USIA issued a report on 12 years of Communist broadcasting worldwide, 1948–1959, saying "radio propaganda is not popular in Latin America."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Red broadcasts to Latin America, the report said, lag behind those to any other major area.

The USIA said Communist propaganda broadcasting increased 500 percent in that 12-year span, reaching a total of almost 3,000 hours a week in 55 languages. At the same time, U.S. broadcasts rose about 250 percent, to 565 hours in 36 languages.

The separate analysis, reflecting the situation now, shows that the Voice programs 14 hours a week of news, features, and commentary in Spanish, plus some music. In addition, the United States beams 2½ hours daily in Spanish—a program the Voice claims is very popular.

While the Voice has no program in Portuguese, the state-controlled radios of Moscow, Peiping, Prague, and Bucharest blare Communist propaganda in that tongue to Brazil, largest, and most populous country of South America.

Moscow tells its version of the truth through 24½ hours weekly to South America and 14 hours weekly to Central America, Mexico, and the Caribbean area in Spanish, and 17½ hours weekly to Brazil in Portuguese—a total of 56 hours every week.

Red China beams 31½ hours a week (21 hours in Spanish, 10½ hours in Portuguese); Prague 37½ hours (20 hours Spanish, 17½ Portuguese). Other Communist stations join in to make up the overall total of 174¾ hours in broadcasts to South America.

Voice officials said 125 South American radio stations in 13 countries pick up Voice material and rebroadcast it for their listeners.

Further, the Voice is confident it scores with its recorded programs carried by South American stations. These programs, taped in Washington and flown to the different countries, were used by South American radio stations during 160,000 program hours last year, a figure officials call impressive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my point in bringing this article to the attention of the Senate today is that on June 29 of last year I addressed the Senate on the subject "The New Communist Propaganda Assault." At that time I pointed out, for example, that Red China had tripled her Spanish-language broadcasting to Latin America in the last year. She also had tripled the number of delegations invited from Latin America, with all expenses paid, to Peking. I pointed out also that Communist countries had established strong radio transmitters which beamed broadcasts all over Central and South America and throughout the Caribbean.

I am not at all certain what the budget message will include for the Voice of America. However, I hope that when the new administration comes into power, one of its first objectives in the field of our foreign policy will be to strengthen, to improve, and to modernize our programs of information and education to the Latin American areas. Certainly we have had plenty of indication that the image of the United States in Latin America has been terribly distorted. Our message is not getting through. While some may say, as the Voice of America report indicated, that radio broadcasting is not popular in Latin America, this is no longer the case. The Communists have even gone to the point of distributing receivers. They have placed large receiving sets in public squares, and small radios have been made available to the populace at a very reasonable price, some of them as grants or gifts, so that the propaganda of the Communist bloc countries can be heard throughout the Latin American area.

It is my hope—and I shall surely be vigilant about the realization of that hope—that the Voice of America will be a voice that can be heard and understood; a voice that really speaks the spirit and the philosophy of the United States, and the purpose of the United States, into Latin American areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newsletter I have prepared entitled "The Communist Challenge," citing such areas as the Soviet economic offensive, the rising tensions between Red China and the Soviet Union, Communist propaganda, the Soviet education challenge, and other items, be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the text of my news release of June 29, 1960, which sets forth what I consider to be an analysis of the Soviet propaganda offensive, not only in Latin American areas, but elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent also that a special newsletter on Latin America be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objections, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

(Newsletter from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, September 15, 1960)

We shall make a terrible mistake—perhaps a fatal mistake—if we think of the Communist challenge primarily as a military challenge. It is a military chellenge—but the challenge is also political, economic, ideological, and in the deepest sense, religious. The Communist ideology is a direct challenge to the fundamental beliefs of our Judeo-Christian heritage and to our tradition of individual freedom and human dignity.

Some philosophers of history seriously ask whether Western civilization and the moral values we cherish can survive the complex, profound crisis which we are now going through. I am not a pessimist on this question. I believe the United States of America can inspire and lead the way toward a bright future—helping to banish poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance and helping to create new opportunities for personal freedom, dignity and individual achievement.

But there is nothing automatic or predestined about the survival of the free world. We will have a future only if we pay the price of survival and leadership—only if we understand the crisis we confront and meet the challenge with courage and imagination—and with full awareness of the dangers and opportunities before us.

We must keep in mind that the challenge of world communism is not our only problem. We are also faced with the challenge of modern technology and the new revolution of rising expectations. Fantastic achievements of modern science and technology now put mankind within reach of eliminating stark poverty and starvation. Yet, ironically, modern technology also enables mankind to exterminate the human race in a nuclear holocaust.

And the revolution of rising expectations underway among the peoples of the economically less developed areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is testing our good will and capacity to help downtrodden peoples break out of the vicious circle of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance. If these people are to resist the false promises of Communist agitators, we must make it very clear to them that we will give them long-term economic aid and technical assistance—not just because we are opposed to the evil threat of communism but because we are sensitive to their needs—because we are genuinely concerned about people, peace, and progress.

During my 12 years in the Senate of the United States, I have repeatedly called attention to the menace of international communism. In recent Senate speeches I have urged action by the United States to counteract the Soviet economic offensive, to overcome the propaganda gap, to meet the Soviet education challenge, to examine rising tensions between Communist China and Soviet Russia, and to initiate and carry out a genuine works of peace program.

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

The Soviet economy is growing rapidly—and we should be seriously concerned about the growth of our own economy. Soviet production is roughly 40 percent as great as American production but the growth rate of the Soviet economy is two to three times bigger than ours. For the past 8 years the American economy has been limping along with a growth rate of 2½ to 3 percent while the Soviet economy has been growing at a rate of 6 to 9 percent a year.

Just as we relate our military power to the security needs of the free world, so we must relate our great wealth and economic productivity to the needs of the less developed, uncommitted countries. The Soviet Union and Communist China are stepping up trade and aid penetration into strategic areas where the Communists hope to establish a firm political foothold. Premier Khrushchev boasts that Soviet Russia will overtake the United States and eventually win the world to communism by victory in the field of peaceful production. America's lagging growth rate is wasteful and dangerous. We must step up our economic growth or we will eventually fall behind in the race for economic supremacy and world leadership.

RISING TENSIONS BETWEEN RED CHINA AND SOVIET UNION

It would be wrong to underestimate the strength of the Sino-Soviet alliance, but deep-seated frictions have developed in the last few years, and it is reasonable to expect that these tensions will increase rather than lessen. I am convinced that the bonds now holding Red China and the Soviet Union together are stronger than the differences which divide them but it would be foolish to ignore existing tensions in formulating our foreign policy toward these two Communist giants.

Population

By 1975 Red China will have approximately 1 billion human beings. Although parts of western China are still sparsely populated, by 1975 there are going to be tremendous population pressures. It is no secret that Soviet officials are very apprehensive when they think about the 3,500-mile border between Red China and Soviet Asia. The population of China is increasing between 15 and 25 million a year while the Soviet Union,

which now has a population of about 200 million, has an annual increase of only 3 or 4 million.

Prestige rivalry

The Communist empire formerly had only one center in Moscow. Now it clearly has two centers—Moscow and Peking. Moscow cannot be happy that its previous unquestioned leadership of the Communist movement has been challenged.

Red China is now operating its own foreign propaganda and economic aid program in competition with both the United States and the Soviet Union. Red China is now operating in sales territory that the Russians used to think was their own. And the Chinese in their propaganda feel free to take positions which differ from the line of the Soviet Union.

Another worry for the Russians is Red China's increasing attempts to influence East European Communist satellites. The Stalinist leaders of some of the satellites such as Walter Ulbricht of East Germany are ideologically closer to Communist China than to Soviet Russia.

Policy disagreements

In spite of efforts to gloss over policy disagreements, policy tensions are growing. The most serious disagreement is about the inevitability of war. The Soviet theorists seem to think that the Communists can win the world through propaganda and political subversion and economic means, short of all-out war.

In Red China, however, the relatively low level of economic development and the large population appear to make the consequences of miscalculation and general war less disruptive and less horrifying than in the Soviet Union. Soviet Russia has more to lose now that its people have tasted the fruits of bourgeois luxury and the pleasures of rising production of consumer goods. The leaders of Red China face serious domestic difficulties in their efforts to build new industries and to speed modernization of Chinese agriculture.

Because of these internal pressures and what they consider a national insult in the so-called American occupation of Taiwan across the Formosa Straits, the Red Chinese leaders in Peking find the policy of peaceful coexistence less attractive than do the Russian Communists.

The commune system is one of the proudest accomplishments of the Chinese Communist revolution but the Russian Communists consider this experiment too radical. Naturally the Chinese Communist leaders resent this attitude. They resent also the Russian reluctance to share nuclear weapons and the Russians' unwillingness to provide more economic aid for China's industrial development.

Another tension stems from the Chinese regard for Mao Tse-tung as the top-ranking Communist theoretician, whereas Khrushchev considers himself to be the foremost interpreter of Marxism-Leninism. Russia has considered itself to be the prophet of communism for such a long time that the Kremlin leaders resent being challenged in the ideological realm by the Chinese Reds who claim to have a "purer" communism. And finally, the Chinese—whether Communist or not—are anti-foreign, anti-Western, and anti-imperialist. To the Chinese, Soviet Russia—even though Communist—is still foreign, Western, and imperialist.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Winning the minds and the hearts of men is the most important business of the 20th century and yet America, with the best ideas to offer, seems to be losing the propaganda war to the Communists who are busy exploiting every possible channel of radio, television, books, magazines, cultural and educational exchanges and a wide variety of people-to-people contacts. We Americans are too much inclined to neglect the vital importance of information and education in winning uncommitted peoples and giving hope to those who seek freedom.

The Sino-Soviet bloc stepped up its international broadcasting 400 hours a week last year to about 3,000 hours a week—more than five times as much as the United States' 590 hours a week. And Communist transmitters are four times more powerful, on an average than ours, so their signals come through much more clearly. India is getting 162 Communist periodicals and 120 of these come from Russia and China. We are distributing only four publications in India. The Russians spent more on one propaganda gimmick, the Moscow Youth Festival, than the yearly appropriation for the U.S. Information Agency.

We are the greatest advertising country in the world but in the most important advertising campaign of all—advertising ourselves and the democratic way of life—we are a poor second to the Russians. The Communist bloc spends as much on propaganda in Latin America as we spend on our entire worldwide information program.

It is time to wake up to the propaganda challenge and put our information and cultural programs and our student exchange efforts into high gear.

THE SOVIET EDUCATION CHALLENGE

Thoughtful Americans are concerned about the missile gap, the space gap, the lag in our capacity for limited war, the lag in our economic growth rate. I am very concerned about these problems but I am even more concerned about the education gap. The Soviet Union is building up a tremendous stockpile of highly trained brainpower that presents a far greater challenge to the United States than any Soviet stockpile of fissionable materials for atomic power.

The real threat to America's world leadership comes not from Soviet rockets—but from Soviet schools. The success of Soviet conquest is pegged to the progress achieved by Soviet education. This is the new Soviet power. If we ignore this challenge, Soviet education can make the United States a second-class power in less than 10 years.

Soviet Russia is spending 7 or 8 percent of its gross national product on education—double the rate of education spending in the United States—although the actual amount of money is about the same in both countries. So a country only half as rich as we are is spending just as much on education as we do.

Before the Communist revolution in 1917, Russia was 75 percent illiterate. Now illiteracy is almost completely wiped out. Here we are struggling to achieve and maintain a student-teacher ratio of 30 to 1. Yet the Soviet Union reports they have achieved a student-teacher ratio of 17 to 1.

If you wonder why there is no teacher shortage in Russia, I can give two simple reasons—money and prestige. Compared to American teachers, the Russian teacher is poorly paid. But the beginning teacher in the Soviet Union earns as much as beginning doctors and engineers. Top Soviet professors get salaries equivalent to $35,000 or $50,000 a year. Furthermore, the Russian people respect the teaching profession. There is so much competition to attend teachers' institutes that only one out of five applicants can be accepted.

Is it so surprising that the Soviet Union threatens to outperform us in scientific and technological progress? There are twice as many science teachers in the Soviet Union as there are in the United States. And 12,000 of America's 23,000 high schools do not even offer a course in physics, a basic science in the atomic age.

I am aware of the progress underway in secondary school teaching of physics and mathematics in the United States and I support these efforts. We have made much progress, but much remains undone. There is still a bad education gap—and it will get steadily worse unless we take very decisive steps to change our aimless, careless attitude toward education in America.

And just think what this education gap will mean 10 or 20 years from now. To whom will the emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America look for scientific and technological leadership and assistance?

Soviet Russia now has a manpower reserve of 974,000 professional engineer graduates—or one-third more than we have in the United States. Furthermore, they expect an annual increase of 125,000 in the next 5 years—three times as many engineers as we expect to add to our supply of engineers. And every high school graduate in Russia has studied a second language for 6 years. Only 15 percent of America's high school students study a foreign language, and many of these study the foreign language for only 2 years. There are 10 million Russians studying English—and only 10,000 Americans studying Russian.

Less than 1 percent of our high school students study ancient history which many educators consider essential for understanding modern history, including American history. Russian students get a thorough indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism. How do we expect our young people to understand the great traditions and principles of freedom and democracy if they do not even have a nodding acquaintance with Athenian democracy or our wonderful Judeo-Christian heritage?

Our educational system must reflect our own national character, our own hopes and aspirations. We must not imitate the Communists—but where we can, we should learn from them. Now I do not want to let anyone think that education in America is no good. It is good. Our teachers are competent, self-sacrificing, and dedicated. And there is a tremendous difference between an educated man in a free society and an educated man in a slave society.

In America, we educate for freedom. In Russia they are training people for service to an all-powerful, totalitarian Communist state. They want engineers and scientists. We, too, want engineers and scientists—but we also want philosophers and poets, historians and theologians, and all the other people whose creative freedom and originality give meaning to the democratic way of life.

We are going to need all the brainpower we can muster in the years ahead if we are to meet the challenge of Soviet competition. Yet half of the top 5 percent of our high school graduates never go on to college. Right now we are wasting priceless brainpower that we will need desperately in the coming decades. Yes, brainpower is our most valuable resource and we should be developing it up to the very limit of our capacities. We should be investing more money in schools, more money for teachers' salaries, more money for college scholarships, more money for college housing, libraries and laboratories.

It is false economy to shortchange America's young people in education. It is first-rate foolishness to give our boys and girls a second-rate education in a world of competitive coexistence. It is a national scandal that we spend more on alcohol and tobacco than we spend on all elementary and secondary education put together. And we spend three times as much for advertising as we do on higher education. We spend millions of dollars on military projects which have less than a 50–50 chance of success. And millions of dollars go down the drain every time we have a fizzle or a flop at Cape Canaveral. But education is an investment where we know every dollar spent will help our youngsters and will help America.

WORKS OF PEACE

We are engaged in a long, hard competition with an aggressive Communist empire which is fully aware of the value of education and propaganda—and is investing heavily in both. Our free society can meet the Communist challenge—but we will not meet the challenge with piecemeal, finger-in-the-dike, off-again-on-again hasty improvisations. We must have intelligent long-range planning and we must have the determination and the endurance to translate our long-range planning into effective action for peace and progress.

Behind a shield of military strength, we must move forward with the works of peace to strengthen the free world and to break the demoralizing pattern of poverty and disease, hunger and ignorance in the uncommitted and emerging countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We must help the people of these less developed nations not just because we want them strong enough to resist communism but also because they are God's children and because poverty and ignorance are seedbeds for war and revolution. And we can help by using our God-given farm abundance wisely in a true food for peace program for the benefit of mankind.

Only in a unity of peoples who want to prosper and to be free can we find an enduring peace. We can build that unity by sharing with others our own heritage of freedom and progress.

HUMPHREY TELLS STORY OF NEW COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA ASSAULT

(Newsletter from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, June 29, 1960)

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today documented before the Senate what he described as "the dramatic new acceleration of the Communist propaganda assault" and then suggested a program to respond effectively to the challenge.

"Why is it," HUMPHREY asked, "that the country with the best case seems to be losing the propaganda war, and the countries with the worst case seem to be winning it?"

HUMPHREY stressed the recent step-up in propaganda from Red China as "a new force in the world situation."

"Communist China," he said, "is moving to the forefront—speaking a strident and aggressive message, reaching out with a propaganda effort which sends words and people to all parts of the world."

He also outlined the new efforts of Castro's Cuba "which must be included in any discussion of anti-American propaganda."

"Castro's government is spending more than $100 million on propaganda in Latin America, and the Communist bloc is spending a like sum in that area.

"The Cuban campaign is directed by Che Guevara, generally acknowledged as a solid Communist. Cuba's shortwave and mediumwave broadcasts are beamed to about 40 stations in Central and South America. Further, the Cuban press service reaches every Latin American country.

"The Soviet Union will open its Embassy in Havana in August, and once Russia is established in Cuba, she intends to use that country as a major base from which to bombard Latin America with propaganda."

HUMPHREY listed these elements of the Communists' bold new emphasis on propaganda:

"Red China has tripled her Spanish-language broadcasts to Latin America in the last year. She has also tripled the number of delegations invited, with all expenses paid, from Latin America to Peking.

"The Sino-Soviet bloc's international broadcasting increased 400 hours per week last year—for a total of approximately 3,000 hours. This is more than five times as much as the United States' 590 hours a week.

"Equally important, the Communist transmitters are, on the average, four times as powerful as our own, so that signals come through much clearer.

"India receives 162 Communist periodicals, 120 of which come from Russia and China. We distribute four publications in India, which is exactly one-thirtieth of what the Chinese and Russians are doing.

"The Communist bloc participated in approximately 200 international trade fairs last year. Our budget allowed us to be in 12.

"Last year, Red China received about 440 delegations, which was about 200 more than in the previous year. The Soviet Union has doubled the delegations it has received every year since 1954. Last year, 1,207 delegations visited Russia, 90 percent of which came from Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

"Russia is making a strong bid to take the lead from us in training the future leaders of the emerging nations. Next fall, the Soviet Union will open the University of Friendship, which will offer full tuition, transportation, as well as room, board, and spending money for 4 years to 4,000 students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"The Communists are making Africa and Latin America major target areas. Russia now broadcasts 76 hours a week to Africa, as compared to 3½ hours a few years ago. The Communist bloc spends as much on propaganda in Latin America as the United States spends on its worldwide information program."

In suggesting the American response to the Communist cultural and propaganda offensive, the Minnesota Democrat said:

"Propaganda cannot stand on its own two legs. In order for it to be effective propaganda, it must have a constructive policy to espouse. Words must be linked to deeds."

Senator Humphrey suggested that some of the "deeds" would include: America's cleaning up its own house in the area of civil rights so that "we can demonstrate that when our information service talks about freedom, we want it not only for export, but also for domestic consumption"; formulating a foreign policy in which "we initiate instead of react—in which we see opportunities and not only problems"; and in putting the search for a meaningful and fully controlled disarmament plan "at the very heart of American foreign policy."

Senator Humphrey stressed that America must invest more in its information effort. Noting that the Communists spend between 15 and 30 times as much on propaganda as the United States does and that the Russians spent more on a single propaganda gimmick—the Moscow Youth Festival—than the yearly United States Information Agency appropriation, he said:

"We are the greatest advertising country in the world. We spend more on advertising and public relations for goods and services than the rest of the world combined. And yet in the most important advertising campaign of all—that of advertising ourselves and the democratic way of life—we are a poor second to the Russians. We spend $10 billion a year advertising our products, which is 100 times as much as we spend advertising our system.

"We invest one-quarter of 1 percent of the amount that we spend on defense on our information budget. I support a solid defense posture, but we often treat the ideological war as sort of a preliminary bout to a military struggle. What I am suggesting is that the final bout—the championship match—may well be in the ideological arena. Indeed, let us pray that it is.

"This decade of the sixties may well be the most critical in our entire history. It is time to wake up to the propaganda challenge. It is time to put our information and cultural programs into high gear. It is time for the country with the best case to start winning the propaganda war."

LATIN AMERICA

(Newsletter from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, August 26, 1960)

Behind the headlines telling of turmoil in Cuba or dissension in the Organization of American States, the nations of Latin America are rushing into a tremendous social revolution. The revolution of rising expectations is under way—with brighter hopes for an end to the misery, poverty, hunger, and ignorance which degrade human nature and blight the future for more than 180 million men, women, and children south of the border.

These people want an end to semifeudal conditions with 5 percent of the people owning 90 percent of the land—with a handful of fabulously wealthy families living in luxury while the vast majority live in squalor on the thin edge of starvation. Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture, and death to achieve responsible government, responsive to the needs and the hopes of a better life for their people.

In the midst of this social upheaval, the United States too often has appeared callous and indifferent to Latin America. In our eagerness to stop the spread of Communist subversion and tyranny, we have too often in past years appeared unconcerned about such home-grown despotism as the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic. Cuba was ripe for revolution when the Castro coup toppled Batista—and now the Communists are twisting the revolution to their own purposes. But all over Latin America the same sources of discontent and revolution threaten to interfere with democratic political, economic, and social development.

After World War II our concern with problems in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia resulted in neglect of our 20 fellow American republics. We gave billions of dollars—generously and wisely—to restore the economy of Western Europe. But the cumulative 14-year total of economic aid to Latin America under mutual security comes to only $564 million. We told the Latin American nations, desperately seeking aid to modernize their primitive economies, that they should seek private investments and private enterprise to develop their economic potential.

Now we in the United States like our system of free enterprise. It has worked well for us, although not in the pure way that some people like to pretend. But Latin Americans still have bitter memories of "robber baron" exploitation which we long ago refused to permit in the United States. Furthermore, private enterprise usually is reluctant to make the long-term, low-return investments in a foreign country's economic "infrastructure," the roads, powerplants, schools, hospitals, and sanitation facilities which are essential for sound economic development. Latin Americans tell us they cannot stop their revolution of rising expectations while waiting for trickle-down prosperity.

After almost 8 years of indifference and inaction on the needs of Latin America, the President recently requested Congress to authorize $600 million in economic aid for Latin America. For 8 years responsible citizens and Members of Congress have been calling for a genuine, realistic, adequate, long-range program of assistance for economic development in Latin America—but the light seems to dawn in the White House only when Cuba is well down the Communist path.

I believe the President's request shows a basic misunderstanding of the way to approach Latin America's economic development problems. Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, calls it frankly a stopgap measure, designed to bolster our diplomats at the September economic conference in Bogotá, Colombia. The Washington Post called it

vague to the point of despair. I voted for this authorization—not because I want to give this administration a blank check for reckless spending, but rather with the thought that the next resident at the White House will know what is needed.

And what is really needed at this stage in Latin America is not money—but planning. The success of the Marshall plan in Europe was due largely to cooperative planning by the nations which were to receive economic aid. We need the same kind of cooperative regional planning for economic development in Latin America. We must encourage the countries of Latin America to cooperate—and we must join them not as the boss, not as "Mr. Moneybags," but as a partner and good neighbor. The mechanism for this kind of cooperative effort exists already in the Organization of American States.

A coordinated program along the lines of the Marshall plan would give Latin Americans new hope of achieving bread and freedom, a better life with new dignity as human beings. We should not be ashamed of humanitarian motivations. We should not be ashamed of our interest in helping downtrodden peoples break out of the vicious circle of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance. Nor should we be embarrassed when our humanitarian interests coincide with our national interest in strengthening the underdeveloped countries of Latin America to resist the tempting promises of the Communists.

As population expands, as industrial development spreads, as hope and impatience mingle, Latin America will be a cauldron of competing ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it. We should prepare for it wisely, not expect blank check gifts or loans to buy friendship.

Last year in Puerto Rico I outlined a 9-point program to improve relations between the United States and Latin America. Here are the points I made:

1. We must step up economic aid to Latin America. These countries must speed their economic development—or misery and discontent will make them Communist camping grounds. We must encourage cooperative, coordinated planning through the Organization of American States.

2. We should speed and strengthen technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training and public administration. When President Truman first announced this "bold new program" of point 4 aid, he got a tremendously enthusiastic response from our Latin American friends. This program pays big dividends in good will and progress for a relatively small investment of money and manpower.

3. We should support moves to establish regional markets in Latin America, thus broadening markets for new low cost mass production and encouraging healthy diversification in the Latin American economies.

4. We should review our trade and tariff policies to see how they affect Latin America. It is a waste of time to give economic aid and then nullify the good effects by shortsighted trade restrictions. Of course, if American industries are injured, we must help the people and the communities affected. I have sponsored a Trade Adjustment Act for just this purpose.

5. Investment in health is the cheapest, most effective way we can help build for the future in Latin America. Disease is an economic loss as well as a human tragedy. We must give more support to the work of the Pan American Sanitary Organization which carries out activities along the lines of my health for peace proposals.

6. We must step up student and cultural exchange with bold and imaginative programs. Too often we exclude just those young Latin Americans who would benefit the most—the so-called leftists or those who doubt our good intentions.

7. American press, radio, and TV should give broader and better-balanced news coverage to Latin American affairs. These countries have tremendous, complex problems in pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. They need understanding as well as economic aid and technical assistance.

And we must step up our own information program to Latin America. Red China and the Soviet Union are pouring five times as much radio broadcasting into Latin America—and their transmitters are four times stronger than ours. We are falling behind in the war of words to win the hearts and the minds of the Latin American peoples.

8. We must reappraise our military assistance program in Latin America. We should not promote an arms race among these countries—and we should not give arms to a dictator to intimidate or tyrannize his own people. Castro still reminds the Cubans that the United States supplied arms to Batista.

9. We should press for regional disarmament in Latin America. The Organization of American States already provides fine machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes. I believe Latin America can be an international showcase of disarmament—with clear evidence that transfer of resources from weapons of war to economic development contributes to world peace.

With our food abundance, with our technical know-how, with our rich, productive economy, with our sympathy and understanding, we can help our Latin American friends put an end to the ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance—and we can build an atmosphere in which peace and freedom flourish.

YOUTH PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Youth Corps Panel Asks Rigid Tests." The article was written by Carroll Kilpatrick and appears in the Washington Post of today.

I now read part of the article:

Rigid standards should be established for selecting young men and women for the Peace Corps, which President-elect Kennedy proposed in the campaign, and they should be paid salaries in local currencies at going rates in the countries where they serve, a task force report today said.

Prof. Max F. Millikan, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, delivered the report to Mr. Kennedy in Washington Saturday, and it was released here today.

Mr. President, one point about the article to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate is that in making public the report, there was an indication of some change in earlier thinking in regard to the draft status or selective service status of the young men who may be included in this corps. Some of the original proposals had included a suggestion that these young men be exempt from selective service, but eligible for the Reserve requirements, and, of course, eligible for universal military training and recruitment in case of national emergency or war.

The Millikan report does not suggest exemption from selective service; but, rather, it suggests deferment. I am very much pleased, Mr. President, first of all, that the President-elect, Mr. Kennedy, appointed the task force to study this worthy proposal; and second, that the task force report has been made available.

As the Senate will recall, part of the Mutual Security Act of last year called on the Government to make a study of the possibilities and feasibility of a so-called Youth Peace Corps. That study is supposed to be available not later than March 31 or April 1. I hope the study will be received early enough so it can be carefully studied by the Congress itself.

I mention this point because it is my hope that once the administration has decided upon the policy it wishes to pursue in connection with this matter, at least I shall be given the privilege of being one of the sponsors or at least a cosponsor of this particular measure, because I am strongly in support of it, and back on June 16, 1960, I introduced a bill which provided for a very modest program for the so-called Youth Peace Corps, limited to 500 young Americans who would become the first enrollees in the first year of the Youth Peace Corps, which would be designed to expand our technical assistance program.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article published on January 9 in the Washington Post and a release I submitted in the Senate, dated June 16, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CORPS PANEL ASKS RIGID TESTS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK, January 8.—Rigid standards should be established for selecting young men and women for the Peace Corps, which President-elect Kennedy proposed in the campaign, and they should be paid salaries in local currencies at going rates in the countries where they serve, a task force report today said. Prof. Max F. Millikan of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology delivered the report to Mr. Kennedy in Washington Saturday and it was released here today.

In making it public, the President-elect had no comment about the recommendation that his proposal for draft exemption for persons serving in the Peace Corps be abandoned.

The lengthy document said extreme care should be exercised in starting the program, that it should be begun on a modest scale and that universities should be responsible in part for carrying it out.

* * * * *

The Millikan report recommended the establishment of an international youth service agency to administer the Peace Corps. The agency should operate mainly through contracts with private nonprofit organizations such as universities, the report said.

The agency itself should not administer programs in the field. "The program should be launched on a limited pilot basis with no more than a few hundred members employed on tasks now known to be clearly vital to the recipient countries," the report said.

"Tough criteria of both academic and personality qualifications should be required by international youth service administration; participants should be required to commit themselves for at least 2 years, and should all have at least a bachelor's degree."

Youth Corps members should work for the country to which they are assigned but be under the general supervision of a senior American official. In no country should more than a limited number of members be

assigned, for they should be spread in small numbers in the host country, the report said.

In discussing the draft problem, the report recommended draft deferment rather than exemption.

"There is abundant evidence that draft exemption is not required as a bait to induce an adequate number of applications to permit the selection of a first-class group," the report said. Moreover, the numbers to be selected will be small in the early years of the program.

The report warned that unless the whole program were carried out with the greatest care it could be brought into disrepute in the early stage.

"It should be recognized from the beginning that there will inevitably be some failures and some mistakes," it said. "These will not be fatal if they are limited to parts of the program and counterbalanced by some notable successes.

"It is essentially for this reason that we recommend a variety of differing contracts with private organizations each of which will bear principal responsibility for its own program rather than a massive centrally organized Government effort."

HUMPHREY CITES PEACE CORPS AS MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Under legislation introduced Wednesday by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, 500 young Americans would become the first enrollees next year in a Peace Corps designed to greatly expand our technical assistance program overseas.

The Humphrey bill calls for an eventual corps of 10,000 volunteers, enlisted for 3-year terms, to teach basic agricultural and industrial techniques, literacy, vocational education, the English language, and sanitation and health procedures in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. One year of the first enlistment would consist of an intensive language- and area-study program.

Citing the experience of the International Voluntary Service, a private nonprofit organization which has pioneered in the use of young American men in technical assistance programs under contract with the International Cooperation Administration, Senator Humphrey pointed out "these idealistic, talented young men, oriented toward the people-to-people approach, have enjoyed extraordinary success."

The Minnesotan gave as an example of IVS successes the work of a team of eight IVS specialists who set up an experimental station in Laos. The IVS men developed a fiber that would bring in $1,500 per acre, in a country where per capita annual income is less than $100 per year. The Laotian Government, Humphrey said, was so impressed that it has requested 11 more teams—1 for each Laotian province.

In Egypt, Senator Humphrey pointed out, one of the first requests made to the U.S. Government by the Egyptians after the Suez crisis had subsided was to send back 2 IVS men who had been operating a 33-acre experimental farm—"and another 10 just like them."

Humphrey said that the IVS experience demonstrates the "particular value" of utilizing young men without families, able to spend most of their spare time with the local populace and to participate in community cultural affairs.

"They can be real 'grass-roots ambassadors' in the villages and towns," he said, "and can give a tremendous impetus to our people-to-people effort."

"We need many more such young men—far more than any private organization can manage," Senator Humphrey declared. "There is a great body of idealistic and talented young men in this country who are longing to work for their country in constructive ways. The Peace Corps would tap those vital resources."

Senator HUMPHREY pointed out an added dividend in the Peace Corps investment: "the development of a large pool of experienced men, trained in some of the more remote languages and with detailed knowledge of the emerging areas of the world—a pool from which our Foreign Service, ICA and USIA can profitably draw."

The Minnesotan said that service in the Peace Corps at a modest rate of pay, under his bill would be considered the equivalent of 3 years of active duty with the armed services, although upon discharge from the corps the young men would still be liable under UMT to be called to military service in times of war or national emergency.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most important gatherings of recent years takes place in Washington this week. Twenty-eight hundred delegates, from every State of the Union, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, will participate in the White House Conference on Aging. Three hundred national voluntary organizations will be represented.

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome all the distinguished persons who are to take part in this significant conference, and to express to them my wishes for a productive and successful meeting. I wish to extend a special welcome to the Minnesota delegation and its Chairman, Dr. Arnold M. Rose.

The White House Conference is a device that has been used successfully in the past to bring into the national spotlight subjects deserving widespread discussion and debate. Unfortunately, the work done at these meetings has not always been followed up, and the usefulness of some of the conferences has therefore been dissipated.

The able Representative from the State of Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, who introduced in the other body the legislation initiating the Conference, has stressed that:

> The Conference was not intended to be a goal in itself, but a "launching platform" for new, strengthened and expanded programs.

The purpose of the White House Conference is to bring together lay individuals interested in the field of aging, as well as professionals and experts, to allow them to meet and talk. The Conference should facilitate an exchange of views and a cross-pollination of ideas. Out of it should come new plans, new goals, and new directions. It should be looked at as only a starting point in building up on every level of government solid programs on aging.

DEMOCRATS TOOK INITIATIVE

Mr. President, the fact that this Conference is taking place in the waning days of the present administration has led some persons to believe that it is a "lameduck" conference. The idea for this meeting, however, came from Democrats who were concerned that the Eisenhower administration was taking insufficient action in this area. The legislation setting up the Conference was passed by a Democratic Congress. It is unusual, moreover, for Congress to initiate a White House conference; normally the executive branch takes the lead in proposing such a meeting.

On the other hand, a Republican President signed the law and a Republican Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was responsible for the machinery which brought the Conference into being. A distinguished former Member of Congress, Robert W. Kean, also a Republican, is Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the Conference.

The White House Conference on Aging comes at a particularly appropriate time. Not for a generation has there been such intense interest in the problems of the older members of our society. The reasons for this widespread concern are not hard to find. The age structure of our country has shifted markedly in this century, and there are far more aging persons now living than there have ever been before. In 1900 there were only 3 million Americans over 65; today we have 16 million. They now constitute more than double the percentage of the population they did then. We now have fully 6 million persons over 75, and more than 2 million over 80.

Mr. President, one would expect that this development—the lengthened span of life, made possible by the remarkable achievements of medical science—would be greeted with universal joy and deep thanksgiving. However, as all of us know, this is not the case. The host of problems brought by the larger number of older people among us has not been met. For far too many older persons, prolonged life means simply prolonged misery.

LOW INCOME OF ELDERLY

We hear a great deal these days about underdeveloped countries and underprivileged peoples; but we do not need to look outside our country to find a shockingly underprivileged group. The average annual income of persons over 65 is less than $1,000 a year. Only about one in five has a paying job. The large majority live on meager pensions, savings, social security benefits, or welfare. Social security benefits were never meant to be sufficient to live on. Yet hundreds of thousands of oldsters do just that; their sole income is their OASI check, which averages $72 a month for individuals and $125 for couples.

Mr. President, even persons in the prime of life who are active and working, often have a difficult time meeting the staggering costs of modern medical care. The health problems encountered by the aged are far more serious than those of younger persons. Illness comes more often and lasts longer. Such serious diseases and problems as heart disease, arthritis, cancer, and high blood pressure occur in a much higher proportion in older persons, as do numerous other crippling, long-term afflictions. Individuals over 65 spend, on the average, over twice as much time in hospitals as do persons under 65. A study made by the Health Information Foundation of New York found that the average yearly medical expenditures for persons over 65 were more than double those of the rest

of the population, even when nursing-home expenses, paid primarily by the elderly, were excluded.

Heavy medical expenses, which can be ruinous even to a young man or woman, are often disastrous to old folks who are more likely to have them, and who are far less likely to be financially able to meet them.

RISING MEDICAL COSTS

We are all aware how fast medical costs have climbed in recent years—faster, in fact, than any other item in the family budget. Since the war, the cost of medical care has risen twice as much as the average increase in the Consumer Price Index. In the last 10 years alone the cost of medical care has gone up 44.5 percent, and hospital rates have risen 87 percent.

The costs of long-term illness are especially destructive. Last year, Secretary Flemming told the Finance Committee that $6,000 is a conservative estimate of medical expenses incurred by a person ill for an entire year. There are thousands of aged persons who are in this situation—needing medical or health care for months or years.

The way in which most Americans protect themselves against the vast damage that illness can do to the pocketbook is to purchase insurance against the cost of medical care. Today, 67 percent of Americans have some degree of protection against the costs of hospital care. Sixty-two percent have a measure of protection against the costs of surgery.

ELDERLY DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE INSURANCE

However, when it comes to older persons, it is another story entirely. The latest and most reliable figures that are available—they were released in December by the Public Health Service—indicate that among persons 65 and over, only 46 percent have any form of hospitalization insurance, and only 37 percent have any kind of surgical insurance.

The costs of insurance against hospital and surgical expenses have naturally risen along with the expenses themselves. The price of hospitalization insurance has gone up by 110 percent in the last decade. It is especially difficult for old people, because the insurance companies consider them bad "risks." Often they cannot get any insurance at all. When they can, the costs are very high and the policies are filled with restrictions and limitations. Often they are cancellable after a major illness, and benefits are inadequate. A large number of commercial insurance companies refuse to sell medical insurance to anyone over 65, under any conditions.

The commercial plans available to the elderly clearly do not "fill the bill." A mere glance at most of them shows that they are completely beyond the means of the vast majority of aged persons. The benefits of one typical policy, which costs $72 a year, are limited to $10 a day for 31 days, up to $200 for the cost of surgery, and half of miscellaneous hospital costs up to $125. Payments for the same or related illness can be made again only after 6 months. Mr. President, for $72 the elderly man or woman who buys this particular policy is getting very little. The average cost of a hospital room is double the $10 allowed. Miscellaneous expenses add up quickly in a modern hospital, and often exceed the cost of room and board. One-third of all patients over 65 who enter a hospital stay over 31 days.

SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH IS BEST

Mr. President, those of us who have maintained an interest in this field over the years are aware that many and varied solutions have been proposed to the health needs of the aged. I have studied this problem many times. I am convinced that one type of proposal is far better suited to meet the needs than any other. I refer to the so-called social security approach.

This is the approach backed by the President-elect.

It is the approach called for in the platform of the Democratic Party, which promises—

> An effective system for paid-up medical insurance upon retirement, financed during working years through the social security mechanism, and available to all retired persons without a means test.

It is the approach that was approved by the State Governors at the Governors' conference in Montana, on June 29, 1960, by the lopsided vote of 30 to 13.

It is the approach that has been endorsed by dozens of experts in the field, including three former Commissioners for Social Security—Mr. Arthur Altmeyer, Mr. John Tramburg, and Mr. Charles Schottland. Both Mr. Tramburg and Mr. Schottland, incidentally, served under the Eisenhower administration.

SOUND FINANCING

Many other nationally known experts in the field of government finance and social security—Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, of the University of Michigan; Prof. Seymour Harris, of Harvard; Prof. Herman Somers, of Haverford College; and Dean J. Douglas Brown, of Princeton University, to name only four—have spoken in favor of the social security approach.

Mr. President, the use of the social security system to provide health benefits to the aged is by all odds the most equitable, practicable, and efficient method that I am aware of. By using an experienced and proven administrative mechanism that already is in existence, incalculable savings can be made. Records, statistics, administrative know-how, and trained personnel preclude the need to establish an entirely new governmental agency. The savings and convenience of a large overall system of insurance, administered by Social Security, would be lost under a system run individually by States or under a cumbersome system of subsidizing private insurance carriers.

The social security system—unlike all private plans, which must depend on the current payments by the aged themselves—spreads the burden among the young and active members of the community. There is no cost after retirement, the time when payments are most difficult to meet.

NO MEANS TEST

There are other advantages to the social security approach: Since payments are deducted from payrolls, payments are not required to be made when an individual is unemployed. Deductions from the payrolls are taken as a percentage of income—up to the maximum of $4,800. Commercial insurance costs the same, no matter what the worker's income is. If insurance is paid for through payroll deductions, it cannot be lost through nonpayment, through changes in residence or place of employment, or through unilateral action on the part of the insurer, as often happens in the case of commercial insurance. Above all, the social security approach avoids use of a means test. The elderly person who receives medical benefits gets them as a matter of right, for he paid for them while he was working. The tinge of charity which hangs over the public assistance program and makes it humiliating to many aged persons who are forced to resort to it would not touch the benefits received under social security.

I want to mention one other great good that would come about if medical insurance were made a part of the social security system: An enormous burden would be lifted from private commercial and nonprofit insurance plans and it would be possible to provide health insurance for younger people at rates lower than those presently required.

Local welfare agencies, hospitals, and private charities which now pay for free or reduced care for elderly persons with insufficient personal means would also be relieved of a heavy burden. Similarly, the Federal Government, which now spends over one-third of a billion dollars on medical care for the aged, through public assistance and veterans programs, would save substantial sums from its general revenues.

Today, I do not want to get into a discussion of specific benefits that should be included in a social security medical bill. I only wish to point out that on this subject there is room for differences of opinion. We already have much knowledge on this issue, and much evidence has been taken. It is time now to sit down and work out an acceptable answer. The people of this country have waited long enough. They expect us to come up with a good bill this year.

EARLY ACTION NEEDED

Mr. President, aging is a problem that is of immediate concern to every American. Everyone has relatives and friends who now are faced with the grave problems of the retirement years. Maintaining good health is only one of these. There are many others—social isolation and loneliness, the maintenance of income, keeping busy through gainful employment or satisfying leisure-time activities, proper housing, and so on.

All these problems are important, and present us with a great challenge. Without doubt, the financing of good health care in the retirement years is the most immediate question to be settled. It must be given very high priority in our legislative schedule. It is one of the great unfinished tasks of this affluent society. Here is a human need. We have an obligation to meet this need with compassion and wisdom.

THE COATESVILLE DECLARATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 85 prominent businessmen recently signed the Coatesville Declaration of Economic Freedoms, a statement of principles drafted on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Lukens Steel Co. in Coatesville, Pa.

An engraved stainless steel plaque embodying the declaration and the names of the endorsers was presented to President Eisenhower at a White House ceremony on December 13, 1960. The President was deeply interested in the 10 economic freedoms in the declaration and indicated that greater means of communication should be used to spread the principles contained in this important statement.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the Coatesville declaration, the list of those who endorsed it, and an article about the presentation ceremony which appeared in Newsweek magazine of December 26, 1960.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COATESVILLE DECLARATION

We, who are charged with responsibility for producing much of this Nation's strength, hold this to be the decade of decision.

We believe the choice before the world is between slavery and freedom.

We believe the foes of freedom are formidable, but only as freedom is not fully understood.

We therefore dedicate this declaration to such an understanding.

We hold the core of liberty to be free choice, no less in economics than in politics; and that economic liberty has made of this Nation a true arsenal of democracy—not merely with bombs and missiles, but with food for the hungry, aid for the needy, and spiritual inspiration for free men the world over. It is an economic system—however imperfect—in which no man is a slave.

We see at the core of this system these economic freedoms:

1. Freedom of competitive private enterprise, the keystone, which assures maximum production of goods and services under private ownership of the tools and facilities of production, and holds as its highest goal the opportunities for self-fulfillment for every man and woman.

2. Freedom of choice of occupation, which offers every person a choice of opportunity according to his interest and capacity, and makes every citizen independent in a society that is dependent on him.

3. Freedom of voluntary organization for private enterprise, which guarantees to all individuals the right to engage in and conduct the businesses of their own choosing.

4. Freedom of contract, whereby two or more parties—buyer and seller, employer, employee—labor union—may enter into voluntary agreement—a fundamental guarantee at the core of this Nation's personal and economic activities.

5. Freedom to own property and to pass it on to one's heirs, a major incentive toward the functioning and the generation of ownership responsibilities in a society of free enterprise.

6. Freedom to produce, buy or sell in free markets at free prices without government interference—except to prevent abuses.

7. Freedom of competition, which permits, within reasonable limits, the growth and prosperity of the individual under the American enterprise system, and makes for higher wages, lower prices and better products.

8. Freedom to trade, which with few limitations, sets neither boundaries nor barriers on the flow of commerce across State and Nation, nor in the way of each man's pursuit of success.

9. Freedom to make profits, which are the rewards for economic risks undertaking, and which support the undertaking of further risks and the further enrichment of all enterprise.

10. Freedom of money, whereby a sound currency is dominated by economic rather than political forces, ensuring the proper functioning of a free enterprise society.

We believe these freedoms to be the essence of economic liberty, and a bulwark of political freedom.

We, therefore, post this declaration for all men, who would be free, to see and know.

COATESVILLE DECLARATION ENDORSERS

C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines; Thomas L. Perkins, chairman, American Cyanamid Co.; B. F. Fairless, president, American Iron & Steel Institute; Paul M. Hahn, president, the American Tobacco Co.; Logan T. Johnston, president, Armco Steel Corp.; Clifford J. Backstrand, president, Armstrong Cork Co.

Charles H. Percy, president, Bell & Howell Co.; Arthur B. Homer, president, Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Robert S. Ingersoll, president, Borg-Warner Corp.; Lee H. Bristol, chairman, Bristol-Myers Co.; W. S. Cutchins, president, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

Arthur H. Motley, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Barry T. Leithead, president, Cluett Peabody & Co., Inc.; Wm. E. Robinson, chairman, the Coca-Cola Co.; Joseph V. Santry, chairman, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Alfred C. Neal, president, Committee for Economic Development; R. O. Hunt, president, Crown-Zellerbach Corp.

Raymond F. Evans, chairman, Diamond Alkali Co.; Earl W. Bennett, chairman, Dow Chemical Co.; C. H. Greenewalt, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Thomas J. Hargrave, chairman, Eastman Kodak Co.; James F. Oates, Jr., chairman, Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

John F. Gordon, president, General Motors Corp.; M. G. O'Neil, president, General Tire & Rubber Co.; Dan Gerber, president, Gerber Products Co.; John L. Collyer, chairman, the B. F. Goodrich Co.; E. J. Thomas, chairman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Arthur B. Sinkler, president, Hamilton Watch Co.; Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart Schaffner & Marx.

Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co.; Louis Ware, chairman, International Minerals & Chemical Corp.; Henry S. Wingate, chairman, International Nickel Co.; Henry H. Rand, president, International Shoe Co.; Harold S. Geneen, president, International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

H. F. Johnson, chairman, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

C. R. Cox, president, Kennecott Copper Corp.; Fred C. Foy, chairman, Koppers Co., Inc.

C. D. Jackson, publisher, Life magazine; Charles L. Huston, Jr., president, Lukens Steel Co.

R. A. O'Connor, chairman, the Magnavox Co.; H. B. Maynard, president, Maynard Research Council, Inc.; John A. Barr, chairman, Montgomery Ward & Co.; Charles Allen Thomas, chairman, Monsanto Chemical Co.; Robert W. Galvin, president, Motorola, Inc.

Rudolph F. Bannow, president, National Association of Manufacturers; Lee S. Bickmore, president, National Biscuit Co.; Stanley C. Allyn, chairman, National Cash Register Co.; Melvin H. Baker, chairman, National Gypsum Co.; William E. Blewett, Jr., president, Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.

Thomas S. Nichols, chairman, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.; William C. Scott, president, Outboard Marine Corp.; J. P. Levis, chairman, Owens-Illinois Glass Co.

Herbert L. Barnet, president, Pepsi Cola Co.; Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman, Pillsbury Co.; E. T. Asplundh, chairman, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

John L. Burns, president, Radio Corp. of America.; Charles M. White, chairman, Republic Steel Corp.; Bowman Gray, chairman, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co.; Charles H. Kellstadt, president, Sears Roebuck & Co.; Ernest Henderson, president, Sheraton Corp. of America; Grant G. Simmons, Jr., president, Simmons Co.; H. E. Churchill, president, Studebaker-Packard Corp.

J. Doyle DeWitt, president, Travelers Insurance Co.

John I. Snyder, Jr., chairman, U.S. Industries, Inc.; Alexander Calder, chairman, Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp.; Howard S. Bunn, president, Union Carbide Corp.; Henry E. Humphreys, Jr., chairman, U.S. Rubber Corp.; S. W. Antoville, chairman, U.S. Plywood Corp.; Roger M. Blough, chairman, U.S. Steel Corp.

Walter L. Morgan, president, Wellington Management Co.; W. P. Marshall, president, Western Union Telegraph Co.; Elisha Gray II, chairman, Whirlpool Corp.; Hobart C. Ramsey, chairman, Worthington Corp.

John L. Mauthe, chairman, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

THE PRESIDENCY: IKE LOOKS BACK

By long tradition, delegations of many sorts descend on the White House to be received by the President. One such last week was a group of industrialists who came bearing the Coatesville Declaration of Economic Freedoms, a statement of principles signed by 85 top businessmen to mark the 150th anniversary of Lukens Steel Co. in Coatesville, Pa.

To the outside world, these visits seem to be rather formal affairs; but this time, Mr. Eisenhower was intimate and relaxed. Here, from one who was present, is a description of a visit with the President.

Pushing way back from his desk in the Oval Room of the White House, Dwight David Eisenhower slumped low in his chair, his legs stretched straight out in front of him. He had just been presented a plaque embodying the Coatesville declaration, and the President was in a pensive mood.

"I have read this declaration, and I think it's fine," he said to the group seated around his desk. "But it brings to mind this question—how do we explain to people just what we're trying to do? I have a feeling that too much of our talking in this country is done on a horizontal basis—we talk to people who agree with us, when we should be communicating vertically to all the people.

"You think that you're getting your message across, that people are listening and agreeing with what you're saying. But then, along comes the time when they go to the polls, and you find out that they haven't really heard you at all."

The President seemed to have two groups particularly in mind—the Negro voter and organized labor. For the Negro voter, he said, his administration had paved the way for great progress—total integration in the Armed Forces and in the District of Columbia, and a right-to-vote law enacted. The President also pointed out that Vice President NIXON headed a commission for fair employment on Government contracts. Yet when the election came around, it seemed to the President that what the Negroes voted on was not the gains in such broad

social areas but the number of people unemployed, the amount and duration of unemployment benefits, the paycheck, and the like.

As for organized labor, the President said that the GOP got 47 percent of its vote in 1952 and far less than that this time. Somewhere, somehow, he said, there was a failure to communicate.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Turning to the Coatesville declaration, which outlines some basic American freedoms, the President said he agreed with it—as far as it went. But wasn't there a basic freedom involved in a man being able to work whether he joins a union or not? This was not to argue against unions, he added, or to argue which side is right. But wasn't this, he asked, an area of controversy that should be discussed?

Mr. Eisenhower told his audience that his own political doctrine—or philosophy—went back to Jeffersonian principles. He recalled that Jefferson's party was called Republican in those days, and his principles remain good ones. The United States, Mr. Eisenhower went on, has got to get away from the idea of a welfare state—and if some people think of that word as a good word, he himself thinks of it as a bad word. What this country needs, he reiterated, is to get back to the idea of frugality and self-dependence.

As the visit ended, the President thought for a moment and said he would always remember a saying he picked up in Washington, some 40 years ago: "Nobody is qualified to work in Washington unless he has his bag packed at all times and is ready to leave." If a man's job has become so important to him that he can't leave it, the President said, then he has no place here; he has lost some of his self-respect.

DELAWARE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I have the unpleasant task of calling the attention of the Senate to a deplorable situation which exists in the Delaware State Highway Department.

This is an agency which not only has the responsibility of handling millions of dollars for the Delaware taxpayers, but also is directly responsible for the disbursement of many millions of Government funds under the Federal highway program.

While this is primarily a State problem, nevertheless, in view of the fact that this agency does handle such a large amount of Federal funds, and since there is a strong possibility that Federal laws as well as State laws may have been violated, I feel that these situations should be called to the attention of the U.S. Senate as well as be referred to the appropriate department for action.

In this report I shall call attention to the manner in which the chairman of the Delaware State Highway Commission has been using the power of his office to negotiate and direct contracts to many companies in which he has the controlling interest.

Through his personally controlled companies, he has been leasing office space and making sales of equipment and supplies to the State agency with which he is working as well as selling equipment and supplies to construction firms who are bidding on these State and Federal contracts.

Under his chairmanship, the highway department has been turned into a source of revenue to finance the political party with which he is affiliated, and he has allowed the power of this agency to award contracts, approve overruns, and make purchases to be used as an inducement in the solicitation of heavy political contributions.

I shall point out that the chief engineer of the Delaware State Highway Department not only has cooperated in and supported these activities of the chairman, but also has been the recipient of lavish entertainment and substantial gifts of cash and merchandise from these same contractors with whom he has been negotiating.

I shall outline specific charges against one other member of the highway commission who is presently under indictment in the Delaware State courts for having accepted kickbacks from a contractor with whom he as a member of the commission negotiated a lease. This man is still serving as a qualified member of the commission because the Delaware Legislature has refused to confirm his successor.

There has been plenty of evidence developed to show that, in addition to these three men named, there has been a widespread practice among the lesser employees—inspectors, and so forth—to accept gifts of merchandise and cash at periodic intervals from the many contractors and suppliers doing business under the road construction program.

All these charges should and will be carefully examined and taken care of, but an agency cannot be cleared of corruption without starting at the top; therefore, I shall confine my remarks today to specific charges against the three men aforementioned, and I am suggesting that the time is long past due when all three should be removed from office.

Before making this report, I wish to compliment the attorney general of our State, Mr. Januar D. Bove, Jr., for the excellent job which he has done thus far in exposing the scandalous conditions in this State agency. For the past several months he has been conducting an investigation of alleged irregularities in the State highway department. This investigation is still underway, but it has already developed some alarming facts.

As I direct criticism against two members of the highway commission and the chief engineer, the question may well be asked as to why the Governor of Delaware has not acted more forcibly.

The fact is that the Delaware Legislature several years ago, through "ripper legislation," overrode the Governor and enlarged the membership of this State commission, even going so far as to name the members of the commission in order that their political party might control the patronage and decisions of this important agency.

This "ripper legislation" was enacted by a Democratic-controlled legislature and passed over the veto of the Governor.

Since that time the terms of many of the members of this commission have expired, but the same politically controlled legislature has arrogantly refused to confirm the Governor's appointees.

Under Delaware law, the old members of the commission continue to serve until such time as their successors are confirmed.

This "ripper legislation" was opposed by the then Governor of our State, Mr. Boggs; it was opposed by the present Governor of our State, Governor Buckson; and it was also opposed by our Governor-elect, Mr. Carvel.

In fact at the time this arrogant procedure was adopted by the legislature, Governor-elect Carvel was serving as chairman of the Democratic State committee, and in that capacity strongly opposed the action by the legislative members of his own party.

This "ripper legislation" is subject to severe criticism, and the manner in which the legislature in its bills named the members of the highway commission, thereby usurping the appointive powers of the Governor, is indefensible. It does not mean, however, that all the members of the commission were political stooges. There were some good men on this commission, but the fact remains that the commission was deliberately politically loaded.

As further evidence of his concern, a special committee of outstanding citizens of Delaware has been appointed by the Governor-elect with the request that it survey the charges which have been leveled against this agency and submit to him its recommendations for correction.

I point this out lest my remarks be interpreted as criticism of the good intentions of the past Governor, the Governor-elect, or his committee; however, this is a problem involving not only our State, but also the integrity of men who are handling millions of Federal funds.

To emphasize the seriousness of this situation I quote from Attorney General Bove's interim report to the State highway commissioners under date of November 1960:

MORAL LAXITY

Perhaps most important is the fact that our investigation has already laid bare the existence in the highway department of a moral laxity which is incompatible with the honest management of large sums of money. The low standards of conduct are perhaps best exemplified by the common practice that State highway department employees from the highest office on down receive gifts in cash or in kind from those persons doing business with the highway department. Perhaps even more shocking is the apparent ignoring, in at least one instance, of crime by the members of the commission, or at least some of them, even after the facts had been fully disclosed. Further, there exists a recognized acceptance of self-dealing. In this atmosphere, petty graft appears to flourish luxuriantly and clearly there is no will on the part of highway department employees to withstand political or other pressures. Control over the disbursement of funds is inevitably lost.

More specifically, the charges against these men are as follows:

The chief engineer of the Delaware State Highway Department, Mr. Richard A. Haber, frankly admits accepting lavish gifts from 125 contractors and operators doing business with the State highway department.

These gifts range from a bottle or cases of whisky and cash items of $20 to $100 up to gifts with a valuation in excess of $500.

This is a top employee of the department and one who has the responsibility of recommending the awarding of contracts and the payment of overruns involving millions of State and Federal funds to these same contractors.

When Mr. Haber was asked by Attorney General Bove, how widespread is this practice at this time, he answered, "I would say that of our 1,100-odd employees, at least 1,050 of them will have received a gift of some sort every year."

When asked, "And are those gifts in cash and also in the form of presents?" Mr. Haber replied, "Yes, sir."

Mr. Haber admitted having personally accepted two gifts upon which he placed a valuation of around $500 each.

One gift to Mr. Haber came from the contracting firm, Greggo & Ferrara. This company gave to Mr. Haber's wife a silver tea set, upon which he placed a valuation in excess of $500. This contractor does substantial business with the State of Delaware, and Mr. Haber as the chief engineer is in the position to recommend approval or disapproval of his contracts or overruns.

Another sizable gift was a portable bar installed in 1956 in his new home by Henry C. Eastburn & Son, a contractor who not only does substantial road building construction for the State, but also has had unusually large overruns approved by Mr. Haber—at least one of which had been previously rejected by the highway commission.

Mr. Haber also admits receiving numerous other items of cash and merchandise from 125 contractors and suppliers doing business with the State of Delaware, and there is plenty of evidence that he was a party to using the power of this agency in urging or practically demanding that these contractors and suppliers make substantial contributions to his political party.

In fact, one of these contractors, Henry C. Eastburn & Son, who had installed the bar in Mr. Haber's home, also wrote two checks totaling $15,000 payable to the Democratic State committee—all during the same period in which they were being given approval for large overruns on State contracts.

These two political contributions are identified as follows:

One check was for $9,000 (check No. 2658) made payable to the Democratic State committee and signed by Henry C. Eastburn & Son, Inc., Newark, Del.

The second check was for $6,000 (check No. 655) also made payable to the Democratic State committee but drawn on the account of the Newark Construction Co., Inc., of Newark, Del. This company is controlled by Henry C. Eastburn & Son, Inc.

Both checks were drawn on the respective corporation's accounts in the Equitable Security Trust Co., of Wilmington, Del., and the checks were delivered to Mr. Garrett Lyons (now deceased), then the Democratic State chairman.

Mr. Haber admits that perhaps Mr. Lyons had discussed this previously rejected claim of the Henry C. Eastburn construction company with him.

When the chief engineer, Mr. Haber, was asked what significance he would attach to the payment of the Eastburn previously rejected claim and the two political contributions, he replied that "you would put two and two together."

I shall not take the time of the Senate at this time to document more than this one specific case wherein political contributions are involved; however, I will state that there are many such instances which we do have fully documented and which clearly establish that there has been a widespread practice condoned by the chairman of the commission and the chief engineer to help finance the Democratic State Party through solicited or forced contributions from these respective contractors and suppliers.

Not only are the contractors being solicited, but also this investigation has established that many of the employees of the Delaware State Highway Department are being forced to contribute a part of their paycheck to the Democratic State committee.

To make this charge even more serious, both the kickbacks from the employees and the solicitations from the contractors have been collected by employees of the State highway department while on official duty and on occasions even when using a State car.

Both the solicitation and payment of these political contributions by the numerous corporations and companies who have been doing business with the State and Federal Governments is unquestionably a violation of the Federal law.

In addition to condoning the solicitation of political contributions from these contractors, the chairman of the Delaware State Highway Commission, Mr. J. Gordon Smith, has flagrantly abused his authority as chairman of the commission to divert a substantial volume of purchases being made by the Delaware State Highway Department to companies directly controlled by himself or members of his immediate family.

Through his ownership or control of the Kent County Motors, numerous office buildings, and equipment agencies, Mr. Smith as chairman of the Delaware Highway Commission has been negotiating with himself rather lucrative deals.

He as chairman of the Delaware State Highway Commission has negotiated for office space in buildings which he and members of his immediate family own.

As an automobile dealer he has enjoyed profitable sales of cars and trucks to the Delaware State Highway Department, and many of these purchases were without bids.

As an agent for various types of equipment used by the State of Delaware and equipment used by these same road-building contractors and suppliers he has used the power of his office in the furtherance of his sales.

The most flagrant example of Mr. J. Gordon Smith's abuse of the power of his position as chairman of the State highway commission is exemplified by the manner in which the Delaware State Highway Department purchased the present site of the new State police headquarters, north of Dover.

In 1956 the commissioners of the Delaware State Highway Department were interested in procuring a site for the new location of headquarters for the Delaware State police.

As chairman of the State highway commission, Mr. Smith was aware of this interest and knew the location desired.

There was a property of approximately 200 acres lying on U.S. Highway 13, north of Dover, owned by Mrs. Mary Attix and her husband and other heirs.

Mr. Smith obtained an option on this property to purchase the entire tract for $80,000, with the option containing a proviso that the deed or deeds would be made to him or his nominees.

Immediately after obtaining this option a meeting of the Delaware State Highway Commission was called by him as chairman.

Upon his recommendation the commission without any knowledge of Mr. Smith's option was told that a small corner of this property—about 3 to 5 acres—could be obtained for $40,000 from Mrs. Attix and others, and upon his recommendation the purchase was authorized.

He then instructed his attorney to request two deeds—one wherein the small tract would be deeded direct to the State of Delaware, and the other showing the remainder of the tract to be deeded to him.

In payment for the transaction he presented the $40,000 check of the State of Delaware and his own check for the balance. This made the transaction appear on the highway department books as a direct purchase from the original owners.

This is but one example of the arrogant manner in which Mr. Gordon Smith has used the power of his office as chairman of the Delaware State Highway Commission, and when this abuse of power for personal gain is considered in conjunction with the manner in which he has condoned the open solicitation or demands upon these road building contractors that they finance his political party, most certainly it demonstrates that the time is long past when Mr. Gordon Smith should be removed from public office.

Mr. Robert D. Thompson, of Rehoboth, is another member of the Delaware State Highway Commission who has used the power of his office to enrich his own personal fortune.

Mr. Thompson is presently under indictment in our State courts for accepting kickbacks on a contract, but notwithstanding this fact, as a result of the failure of the Delaware Legislature to confirm his successor, he is still serving as a member of the Delaware State Highway Commission and charged with the responsibility of spending millions of State and Federal funds.

Mr. Thompson is specifically charged with having accepted a $6,500 annual kickback from Mr. Alvin Simpler, who

was holding a contract for a State concession near the Indian River inlet.

The significant point in this instance is that this particular contract was negotiated on behalf of the Delaware State Highway Department by Mr. Thompson in his official capacity as a member of the commission.

In negotiating this contract upon which Mr. Thompson was to get a kickback he agreed on behalf of the State highway department that the space for trailers would be enlarged and that the rentals could be raised from $30 to $50.

Also, under the agreement the State highway department was to furnish the materials for the enlargement of the bait stand.

The highway department also promptly furnished a deep well which was needed and which had been requested by an earlier tenant but not provided.

These are the major concessions which had not been extended to the previous tenants although they had paid exactly the same rent as provided for in Mr. Simpler's contract.

This particular kickback was being paid to Mr. Thompson on a contract which involved only State property and, therefore, the Federal Government is not involved except that it does show the caliber of one of the commissioners of the Delaware State Highway Department, which department is presently spending not only State but also Federal funds.

However, even here there is a question as to whether the Federal income tax has been paid on this kickback by Mr. Thompson, and also the Treasury Department will be interested in knowing whether or not the kickbacks paid by the contractor were charged off as business expenses.

Payments to public officials of bribes or illegal kickbacks are not deductible items for income tax purposes.

As stated earlier there are many other instances of unwarranted acceptance of gifts and entertainment on the part of numerous employees, inspectors, and so forth, of the Delaware State Highway Department, each of which requires appropriate action; however, before beginning to clean up the improprieties of certain lesser employees it is essential that we start right at the top and get rid of those officials who not only have condoned these improper practices but also who by their own actions have set a very low standard of morals as to the responsibility of public officials.

Only recently the financial world was shocked when the directors of one of our large corporations fired the president of that company because he was found to have been directing some of the procurement for the corporation to companies with which he was affiliated.

This drastic action was supported by the entire business world. Certainly we are not going to establish a lower code of ethics for the conduct of public officials than that which is being enforced in private industry.

Just as the directors of this corporation removed their officer, so, too, must Mr. J. Gordon Smith, Mr. Richard Haber, and Mr. Robert Thompson be removed.

These charges cannot be ignored by the U.S. Government on the basis that they are solely a State problem. Many of the contracts awarded by this agency carry Federal participation of from 50 percent to 90 percent. Therefore, the Federal Government does have a direct responsibility in any question raised regarding the character or integrity of the men who are administering these funds. It is a very serious situation when we find that the men who have the responsibility of awarding contracts and inspecting the work of the road construction companies have been receiving substantial gifts from the same contractors.

Many questions of impropriety remain to be followed through, with appropriate action to be taken in regard to both State and Federal laws which may have been violated.

I am hoping that with the cooperation of the Delaware State Legislature these men, should they refuse to resign, will be fired; however, should the legislature refuse to cooperate with the Governor-elect and Attorney General Bove in cleaning up this agency, there is one further step which can be taken—a step which I hope will not be necessary. But if necessary I shall not hesitate to introduce in the Senate a resolution requesting that the Bureau of Public Roads be instructed to withhold all further Federal funds under the Federal highway participation programs until such time as the appropriate action has been taken to clean up this department.

I close my remarks today by emphasizing that while I have had the unpleasant task of making charges against citizens of my State and an agency of my State, I do not want my remarks to be construed as a blanket indictment against all of the officials or employees of the Delaware State Highway Department.

I know that the overwhelming majority of the officials and employees of this agency deplore this situation just as much as I; however, with this corruption existing at the very top and being condoned by high political officials they have been handicapped as long as these men remain in power.

At the same time, I want to point out also that while the information that has been called to the attorney general's and to my attention thus far has involved political contributions made to the Democratic State committee, we have been cautioned that if we persist in this investigation we may find similar contributions to the Republican Party.

My answer to this suggestion is that it makes no difference—it is still wrong, and we are requesting that if anyone knows of any improper political contributions to either party we would appreciate having such information, and it will be dealt with accordingly.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Humphrey, Kuchel, and others, amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and may I call to the attention of the attachés of the Senate that it will be a live quorum, so all Senators may be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 4]

Aiken	Ellender	Metcalf
Allott	Engle	Miller
Anderson	Ervin	Morse
Bartlett	Fong	Morton
Beall	Fulbright	Moss
Bennett	Goldwater	Mundt
Bible	Gore	Muskie
Blakley	Gruening	Neuberger
Boggs	Hart	Pastore
Burdick	Hayden	Pell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hickey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Robertson
Cannon	Hruska	Russell
Capehart	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jackson	Schoeppel
Carroll	Johnston	Scott
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Church	Lausche	Sparkman
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Cooper	Long, La.	Talmadge
Cotton	Magnuson	Wiley
Curtis	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Dodd	McClellan	Yarborough
Dworshak	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McNamara	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, it is with reluctance and humility that I rise to address the Senate so short a time after taking the oath of office as a Member of this body.

I recognize my position as a freshman Member and fully respect and appreciate my senior colleagues.

It is to be doubted that any issue that may arise during this session of Con-

gress will be of more far-reaching importance than the subject now under discussion to change the rules of the Senate, specifically rule 22, respecting the limitation of the right of debate.

The question involved has to do with the fundamental liberties guaranteed us under our U.S. Constitution.

Senators far, far better equipped than I have discussed this question during the last few years.

I cannot hope to rise to their standards.

Yet, feeling so strongly about this issue, I could not remain silent and be true to my convictions. I could not remain silent and keep faith with the people of the great State I represent.

I must speak even though I cannot do so with the eloquence or the wisdom of those who have preceded me.

Mr. President, we have been told by able and distinguished Senators that this is a majority-rule amendment to the Senate rules that we are considering.

That has a fine sound to it.

But let us analyze exactly what it means.

We are told that the will of the majority should prevail. We are told that it is in the American tradition that a majority should prevail.

Yes.

And yet, the minority also has rights that should be respected.

While a majority may govern, in our Nation a majority does not rule. There is no more divine right to majority rule than there is divine right to monarchy.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend my friend from Texas for the fine speech he is making. Is it not true that if a majority had ruled, Andrew Johnson would have been impeached as President of the United States for upholding law and the Constitution?

Mr. BLAKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. If a rule XXII had been in force in the German Reichstag, is it not true that Adolph Hitler probably would never have seized all power in Germany?

Mr. BLAKLEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is not also the same comment true with reference to Mussolini in Italy?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that as long as we have freedom of debate and strong and determined and courageous Senators, we can protect the rights of minorities from being trampled upon by a majority at any given moment?

Mr. BLAKLEY. That is the purpose of the uniqueness of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Our governmental design is not that the minority should be ruled by the majority. Governed yes, but ruled never.

Our Constitution and the representative government with which we are blessed provide a great multitude of safeguards for the protection of minority rights.

The focal point, the very center, of this carefully planned system of safeguarding minority rights is the U.S. Senate, with its tradition of full and free debate on all issues.

I would not willingly see this changed.

I believe any change that would lessen the protection now given minority rights would be a tragic backward step in the unceasing struggle to maintain individual freedom of this Nation.

We have before us a proposal that, according to those who favor it, would place only a reasonable limit on free speech.

I am forced to reject the term.

I cannot believe there is such a thing as reasonable limitation of free speech.

Either speech is free or it is not free. Either a man has the right to have his say or he does not have that right.

The proponents of this proposal—and I do not for a moment impugn their motives or question their good intentions—state they are simply seeking a means of preventing filibusters in the Senate.

I am frank to say that the word "filibuster" does not frighten me in the least.

Those who speak of filibusters are those who want to make it easier to impose cloture, which means limitation of debate, which means gag rule.

If we are going to use scare words, the opposite number of filibuster is gag rule. I would much rather take a chance on the former than on the latter.

It is not talk that threatens freedom. The threat comes from enforced silence.

The right of full freedom of speech somewhere in our lawmaking process is essential to the maintenance of all the other freedoms with which Americans are blessed. The forum of all forums for exercise of that right traditionally has been the U.S. Senate—and by express design of the authors of the Constitution.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to vote away that right.

The right of unlimited debate in the Senate is a potent protection of the right of all the American people to complete information regarding all decisions finally made by the Congress.

It is a protection against the destruction, whether accidental or purposeful, of the important constitutional separation of powers between the legislative branch and other branches of the Government.

It is a protection to Senators themselves—and, of course, to the people they represent—against hasty action or ill-advised action based on incomplete information.

I have not been in this body for long. But Senators who have been here for many years will testify that few, indeed, are the good laws that were written in haste—few the poor laws written deliberately and with full consideration given to all factors involved.

Mr. President, we act here for 180 million people as Americans. We also act for them as citizens—in some, many; in some, comparatively few—of 50 sovereign States.

Each of these States is equally represented in the Senate. The most populous State has no more votes in the Senate than the least populous. Each of the 50 speaks here with as loud a voice as any other.

Why, then, should Senators view with approval a majority-rule amendment as applied to the procedures of the Senate?

Why should it be made possible for a majority of the Senate, conceivably representing a minority of the American people, to cut off discussion of legislation affecting all the people?

Is not the present two-thirds rule a sufficient restraint available for use against a single Senator who is backing a last desperate fight for the preservation of freedom?

The majority-rule amendment argument falls of its own weight.

Mr. President, the United States lives and has its being in a system based on freedom—individual freedom, freedom of enterprise, freedom in government.

Each of these freedoms depends on the other. None could stand alone. If one falters, the others inevitably are weakened.

These are the freedoms we must maintain—the essentials guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They are the freedoms that sustain and strengthen us in times of trouble. They are the freedoms that give us sound reason, in times of adversity, to put aside gloom and to look with confidence to the future.

Two components of these basic freedoms would be directly weakened by the proposals we are now considering. The remaining one would be subject to consequent erosion.

The right of individual freedom of expression would be weakened.

Freedom in government, depending basically on unhampered consideration of all proposed legislation, would be weakened.

And, of course, this whittling away of individual freedom and freedom in government would adversely affect freedom of enterprise.

This is what happens when you start tampering with our freedom system.

If we grant power that makes it easier to impose gag rule in the Senate, we have to assume that, at some time or another, the power is going to be used.

We need not be concerned with how this power might be used to do no harm to the liberties of the people. If no harm is involved, we do not have any need for this proposal to reduce the right of free speech in the Senate.

But we do need to concern ourselves with considering—carefully and prudently—how such a grant of power might be used to do harm, deep and lasting harm, to the liberties of the people.

It is of the majority-rule amendment that they speak to us.

But, Mr. President, simple majority rule is not at all the basic principle of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

The authors of the Constitution assumed that the rights of the majority would hardly be abridged. These rights

would be taken care of by simple force of numbers.

The authors of the Constitution were more concerned—and properly so—with the rights of the minority.

Thus they provided that the Constitution itself must be ratified by three-fourths of the original States.

Thus they provided that the Constitution could be changed not by a simple majority but only through ratification of proposed changes by three-fourths of the individual States.

This was done deliberately by the Founding Fathers—and their purpose was to insure deliberation when constitutional changes were proposed.

The President's veto of a measure passed by Congress cannot be overriden by a simple majority—no, not by a three-fifths majority, either.

Treaties must be approved by a two-thirds vote of Members of the Senate present and voting.

Mr. President, the first settlers came to America to escape oppression. When they founded a new nation, the wisest among them drew up a Constitution that established a Government under which freedom flourished.

Under this system of freedom, a strong and vigorous society sprang into existence. America became the promised land to Europe's teeming millions, and they came here because this was a good place to live and a good place to make a living. Eventually, we had to enact laws to control the flow.

Strangely, there were those among this new population who began to call for changes in the very system that made the United States so attractive to them. Some among us are too prone to feel that the Constitution should be changed to meet some immediate desire. Some are impatient with the restrictions the Constitution places on government.

But those restrictions are important and necessary. If government is not restricted, it becomes the master, rather than the servant of the people.

That is something which might well be kept in mind by those who may be deluded by past experience with lawmaking bodies where simple majorities decide every issue.

The U.S. Senate is different. It was meant to be different—a forum where every State is equal to every other State.

Just as the Constitution itself provides a method for changing the Constitution, so do the rules of the Senate provide a method of changing the rules.

And, of course, the rules have been changed—a number of times. There is no roadblock to changing the rules of the Senate. That is not the issue here, although efforts are put forth to make it seem the issue.

Mr. President, I said a little while ago that I am not frightened by the word "filibuster." I repeat that statement.

Filibuster is a word used by opponents of full and free debate in an attempt to cow and shame those who believe wholeheartedly that, in the U.S. Senate at least, there should be no hesitancy about exploring completely any issue that arises.

There are those of us who will not be cowed, who will not be shamed, when this word filibuster is hurled at us as an epithet.

It is a word that, when its essential meaning is clear, may be regarded as a badge of honor.

If to filibuster means to stand up—and to stand up for a long time, if that is necessary—for the right of a minority viewpoint to be presented fully and adequately, then I for one shall not hesitate to speak out, to filibuster, if you please—when the occasion demands.

If to filibuster means that the Nation's lawmakers must avoid the temptation to legislate only from day to day, ignoring the lessons that the past hold for the future, then we must have lawmakers who are willing to say, "On this issue I take my stand and I will strive to inform my colleagues and the American people."

Mr. President, I believe, deeply and wholeheartedly, that the freedom to debate on matters affecting the welfare of our people is basic. I believe this freedom is indispensable if we are to maintain our other freedoms.

If I did not believe this, I would not be in the Senate at all.

It is easy to say that if we accept the proposals now being presented to us, we would be giving up only a little.

That is what the Arab said when the camel first thrust his nose inside the tent.

Soon the camel had the tent. The owner of the tent was outside in the cold of the night.

Mr. President, it is impossible to subtract a little freedom here and say the loss will be made up there.

Lost freedom is gone. It does not reappear. It is not compensated for elsewhere.

Even after listening to the discussion here since the Senate convened, I cannot keep from feeling a sense of surprise that the issue involved should be presented as one of—and I will have to place the words in quotation marks—"liberals" versus "conservatives."

It is not, I submit, a correct presentation. For the terminology indicates that "liberals"—quotation marks again—favor gag rule of the Senate and "conservatives" oppose gag rule of the Senate.

No. This could not be true.

Mr. President, it is not liberal to facilitate cutting off debate in the U.S. Senate on matters affecting the people of all the 50 States represented here.

Is it, then, that only the conservatives are to speak out freely on behalf of free speech?

At bottom, this issue does not have anything to do with liberalism or conservatism. But if defending the rights of minorities is to be regarded as conservatism, then I accept—I grasp—the designation, conservative.

Conservatively, if that is the word to be used, I believe the rights of minorities must be preserved.

Conservatively, I go along completely with the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which provides that rights not delegated to the Federal Government remain with the States or with the people.

Conservatively, I hold to the concept that, in the Senate of the United States, each one of the 50 sovereign States is the equal of any other.

Conservatively, I stand for freedom of the individual; for freedom of enterprise; for freedom in government.

I hope, as I believe, that this kind of conservatism is Americanism as sound and valid in the second half of the 20th century as it was when some wise men met in Philadelphia and wrote a document that formed the basis for a new and free nation.

Mr. President, I succeeded to the Senate seat left vacant by the resignation of a great American, Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice-President-elect of the United States. Almost 12 years ago, when Lyndon Johnson was beginning his Senate career, he delivered an address here entitled, "Unlimited Debate: The Last Defense of Reason."

It was a truly outstanding speech, one that foretold the brilliant career that lay ahead of this man. I should like to quote the final paragraph of that address by a then freshman Senator. Here it is:

> This freedom we debate, Mr. President, is fundamental and indispensable. It stands as the fountainhead of all our freedoms. If we now, in haste and irritation, shut off this freedom, we shall be cutting off the most vital safeguard which minorities possess against the tyranny of momentary majorities. I do not want my name listed as one of those who took this freedom away from the world when the world most needed it.

Mr. President, whatever may be my privilege of service in this, the greatest deliberative body in the world, it is with the deepest of gratitude that I have been permitted this presence here today, to raise a voice in defense of freedom.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I desire to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. He has made one of the ablest and finest speeches on this subject that has been delivered in the Senate since I have been here, and I have been a Member more than 18 years, and have heard this subject discussed over the years. The junior Senator from Texas has made a very outstanding address.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I appreciate very much the comment of the senior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Texas for a very fine address. It represents sound thinking and, I know, very sincere thinking. It also represents a very fine understanding of the most practical side of the problem we have here to be decided on the floor of the Senate.

I commend the Senator from Texas very highly; and I believe that his words of caution and sound wisdom will have influence both here and elsewhere in the Nation. So I am one of the Members of the Senate who appreciate very much the real contribution he has made.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his comment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield to the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to commend very heartily the distinguished junior Senator from Texas for the eloquent speech he has made in defense of the fundamentals of Americanism that have enabled this country to achieve its present greatness.

Many years ago a distinguished British scientist and able author came to this country and studied our institutions of government. After concluding his study, he said, "I see nothing so remarkable about the Constitution of the United States, because it is all sail and no anchor." He went on to say that in the years to come, mobs would arise and would take over this country on the impulse of the moment, and that we would, therefore, have our institutions of government destroyed. He also said that the American Republic would be as fearfully plundered as the Roman Empire was in the sixth and eighth centuries, but that the Huns and Vandals would be generated within our own institutions. But, Mr. President, he overlooked the great anchor that has provided stability to these United States through all the years since the Constitution was adopted in 1789; that anchor has been the Senate of the United States, and the rules of the Senate which permit the representatives of the several States to stand upon this floor and speak. That anchor has been the refusal of the Senate to gag its Members as every other parliamentary body has done. In my opinion, the one great stabilizing factor that has preserved our form of government through all the years has been the right of discussion in the Senate.

So, I am reassured, Mr. President when from the great State of Texas there comes to this body a Senator who rises and makes so eloquent a statement in defense of the fundamentals upon which we must rely if this country is to continue to grow and expand, as has been done by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas; and I congratulate him.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for an observation?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Texas for his very able statement. He has made a great contribution to the present debate. He has also emphasized a fact stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in one of its great decisions—that "the Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible union composed of indestructible States." A point which sometimes I fear the American people are losing sight of is that there will no longer be a government under the Constitution if the Federal Government becomes so strong that it swallows up the States.

The able and distinguished Senator from Texas pointed out exceedingly well the fact that there is danger in the tyranny of a majority. He has emphasized the fact that the value of the Senate to our system of government lies in the fact that the Senate has always recognized as a most valuable attribute the power of unlimited debate.

I have always liked the expression which has been attributed to Voltaire:

> I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

Mr. President, it is a fact of American history that time and time again the Senate, through the exercise of its right of unlimited debate, has been able to educate not only the country but also the Members of the Senate itself as to the implications of proposed legislation of a dangerous nature; and time and time again a minority of the Senate, by reason of the right of unlimited debate secured to Members of the Senate by Senate rules, has been able to convince a majority of the Senate and a majority of the country of the unsoundness of the views which a majority of the Members of the Senate was seeking to impose upon the American people in the guise of law.

I think the junior Senator from Texas has made a great contribution, not only to this debate, but also to the preservation of one of the fundamentals of American government, in emphasizing the necessity of having the Senate continue to be a body in which a minority will have a reasonable opportunity to convince a majority of the errors of the ways of the majority, and thus protect the country against unwise legislation.

I find it rather strange, Mr. President—and I am glad the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas shares this view—that any group of men would wish to silence other men, for fear that the ones they wish to silence might be able to persuade them that they are in error.

So I wish to commend the Senator from Texas for striking a powerful blow in favor of preservation of the thing that makes the Senate so valuable to the Nation, namely, the right of a minority not to be gagged by a majority. I agree with the Senator from Texas and with the elder Senator Robert M. La Follette that whenever there comes a time in the Senate when a majority of one can silence the minority, that moment will sound the death knell of constitutional liberty in America.

So I commend the Senator from Texas on the great contribution he has made by emphasizing these points.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, today I wish to address the Senate with reference to the pending matters concerning rule XXII, including points with reference to the ruling of the Vice President as to the alleged invalidity of rule XXXII, particularly the amendment to that rule enacted in 1957.

The effect of that ruling, as I understand it, Mr. President, is that the Vice President, through that ruling alone, as to amendment of the rules of the Senate at this particular time in the session, would set up a new system of rules that would include the previous question being operative on the floor of the Senate, more than a century after its being outlawed, and providing that the previous question could be decided by a mere majority vote, and could be decided even without debate.

Mr. President, I dislike to raise the question, at the beginning, of civil rights, but I believe if the ruling were not tied in, in a general way, with the atmosphere of the so-called civil rights question, already there would have been great indignation expressed on the floor of the Senate. I believe many, many, many—far more than a majority—of the Members of the Senate already would have risen up against the ruling to protect this institution.

I say that with all deference to the Vice President or to anyone else who has a position on this matter.

Mr. President, only 2 short years ago, almost to a day, in very plain, simple, concise, understandable language, the Senate, when it had the question before it, adopted an amendment to rule XXXII, which is only two and a third lines long. I quote now section 2 of rule XXXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate:

> The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

Mr. President, the hard fact we must face is the simple, straightforward language, based upon the plain provisions of the Constitution. Article I, section 5, says in part, "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings."

The decision was given in the face of this language and the unbroken precedents through all the decades of history. There is significant language in the solemn declaration of the Constitution and of the Senate rules. We have an unbroken practice of more than a century.

One man, who is not a Member of this body but is a constitutional officer, the Vice President, has made a ruling. Can he by one ruling as to one of the rules in particular, or as to any of them which have to do with amending the rules, sweep aside things which are considered sacred and essential in our law, in our Constitution, and in our customs? Will he be permitted to do this, and thus to an extent destroy this body as a great institution of American Government?

I am reminded of a story I heard about a soldier in western Europe, some time after World War II had ended. The soldier was on a sightseeing trip. He was taken to observe a burning taper or light of some kind in a sacred religious shrine, and he was told that the light, in one form or another, had been burning 400 continuous years. He said, "Did you say 400?" The reply was "Yes." He said, "Well, that is too long. I am going to blow the darned thing out." And he did.

I cannot find any better reason or a better fact on which to base the ruling than simply to say, "Well, it has been in effect too long; I am going to blow it out."

That soldier destroyed the light with his breath, but I do not believe any one ruling by any one man, whatever is his position, is going to be permitted to modify the Senate as an institution of government.

Mr. President, I have before me a brief historical review, with some comments

thereon, covering the history of the operation of the Senate rules. They are rules which distinguish this body from all other bodies in the American Government. I do not say they make it any better, but it is different. They distinguish this body from all other bodies in the self-governing nations of the world. I do not say it is better, but it is different. I say it has functioned well to meet our numerous problems, nationwide, decade after decade and century after century.

I believe every Member of the Senate, from the President pro tempore, who has been here the longest, to the most recently sworn Member, has a positive duty to fully weigh and fully consider the import of the question we have before us, without being carried away by any subject matter, regardless of what it may be, tied in directly or indirectly with this grave question.

I am one of those who happen to believe the Senate and this Nation will not go so far. I do not believe we will do so, yet.

Mr. President, I believe a grave disservice is being done to the Senate as an institution and to the country when questions are raised and seriously considered on the floor of the Senate concerning the nature of this deliberative body, without having the utmost deliberation by a committee, after study by experts, those who have had experience over the years.

The Senate has been referred to as the greatest deliberative body in the world. Those of us who love the Senate and its customs and institutions cherish the esteem in which it has been historically held.

Since I came to the Senate some 13 years ago I have seen emerge a very divisive question as to the continuity of the rules of the Senate, which strikes at the heart of the concept of the continuity of the Senate itself. This is now consuming important time, when the Senate organization should be our pending business, and it is now delaying consideration of other pressing business, also. I shall enumerate some of the items later.

If such a question is to be seriously considered on constitutional grounds, it is my view that the question was decided as a constitutional issue by a decisive vote of the Senate, 72 to 22, on January 12, 1959. By action taken at that time the Senate wrote into its own rules the rule XXXII, the long-accepted understanding that the Senate rules continue from year to year and from Congress to Congress unless amended or changed in accordance with the procedures prescribed therein.

Mr. President, through what door could anyone come to say that the decision of the Senate, made as recently as 2 years ago, by a vote of 72 to 22, does not apply? One might say the Senate did not know what it was doing. One might argue the Senate made a mistake. How can it be argued, with logic and as a practical matter, that the rule simply does not apply? I say anyone making such an argument comes in through a very narrow door, when it is said that, after all, the rule does not apply to questions which concern a proposal to adopt different rules.

For continuity, Mr. President, I quote again section 2 of rule XXXII from the Standing Rules of the Senate, as follows:

> The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

Mr. President, it is therefore both disappointing and alarming to me to see that the Senate is now attempting to dissect itself, to separate itself from the established rules and precedents which have been a part of the Senate since the first Congress. I believe a great disservice is being done to the Senate and to the States we represent. I certainly hope that when this issue is resolved the decision will again be that the Senate is a continuing body in all respects and that the rules continue in all respects as provided therein.

In effect, the Vice President's ruling provides that history is incorrect, that the Senate is not a continuing body; and, further, that the Senators, by a vote of 72 to 22, cannot declare the Senate to be a continuing body; and even that the rules cannot be made to apply until amended as set forth therein. The practical effect of it all is that damage is being done also to the States.

Mr. President, the President of the United States represents the Nation as a whole. His primary responsibility runs to the people themselves. The executive branch and the vast army of Federal employees are not responsible to the States.

Most of the officials in the executive branch have never been elected to any office, nor are they selected by the electoral process. The people cannot bring about their removal, and the complicated administrative procedures for removal and impeachment are admittedly difficult. These are the only ways by which an official may be punished for misconduct by separation from public service, and in neither of these ways do the people or the States have a chance to act directly. Members of the House of Representatives are elected directly by the people. Since the adoption of our Constitution they have been selected from geographical subdivisions of the State and are responsible to the voters of their districts. While all of them, of course, have a certain loyalty to their States, it is not in the House of Representatives that the States are represented directly.

The Federal courts certainly do not represent the States and, in fact, recent decisions of the Federal judiciary have shown an increasing disregard of the reserved rights of the States and of all the people which are protected by the 9th and the 10th amendments.

There is only one place in the Federal Government where the States are represented directly, and that is here on the floor of this Chamber. Therefore the Senate is the only direct defender of their rights and powers, and within this body each State stands, regardless of size, section, economic interest, or population, on an equal voting basis with its sister States. This is their only forum in the Federal Government. It is the principal place where the powers of the States and the rights of the people, reserved by the 9th and 10th amendments, find their protectors.

Now, if these premises are true—and they are true—then it must follow that the Senate as an institution, and the Senators elected from their States, are the trustees of the States powers and rights under our Constitution.

The Constitution itself expressly provides that that body, including the Senate, shall have the power—and that means the sole power—to make its own rules; and no one can set those rules aside, either by interpretation or by ingenious ways of finding an open door in the idea, after more than a century and a half, that all the rules continue and the body continues, all except the one proposition of the continuity of the rules themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Mississippi believed that the Presiding Officer did not rule correctly, could he not submit the question to the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. I am arguing now that he did not decide the question correctly. He was thoroughly incorrect under the Constitution and the rules of the Senate. One of the effects of that ruling, if it is allowed to stand, would be to submit every question to majority rule, and in that way I say it is an attack upon the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he believes an attack upon majority rule is an attack upon the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator does not believe there has been an attack on the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not say anything like that.

Our argument is based upon the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. If anyone can point out any provision in the Constitution to the effect that the Senate must decide its rules by majority vote or can set aside its existing rules by majority vote, I will stand with the Senator from New Mexico on the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its procedures.

Mr. STENNIS. Correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Each House may punish its Members for disorderly behavior.

Mr. STENNIS. I have already cited that provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. With the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members it may expel a Member.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. If each House can determine the rules for its procedure, it certainly can do so by majority vote, can it not? If it does not, it is not determining its rules.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the argument of the Senator from New Mexico is highly academic. All the precedents and customs of history are against his posi-

tion. If the Senate wished to adopt a rule of that kind, it would be satisfactory. Our argument is against permitting a Presiding Officer to place the Senate in a position where it would not have any choice.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senate has a remedy. If the question is a constitutional one, it may be submitted to the Senate, and a majority of the Senate can either uphold the ruling of the Chair or not uphold the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. The question was submitted to the Senate 4 years ago and decided by a vote of 72 to 22.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator would not wish to say that the discussion occurred 2 years ago, would he?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. It was 2 years ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Both 2 years ago and 6 years ago.

Mr. STENNIS. I knew it had been more than 2 years ago that that question was before the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Periodically we have discussed the question. There is an old saying to the effect that no question is settled until it is settled correctly. The Senator has said several times that the question can be studied by committees. It has been studied by committees at least since 1915. Is not 45 years long enough?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with arguments of the kind which the Senator from New Mexico is making. We have in the Senate new Members who have only recently been sworn in.

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely; and we seek to give those Senators an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not question the Senator's motives, but my point is that the proposed method of setting aside an established rule that was written and adopted a few years ago by an overwhelming vote is ingenious, and it is academic to make the argument now that every question should be decided by a majority vote. That is one of the points against which I am arguing. The Senator was not present when I made my opening remarks, in which I pointed out the distinctions between this body and others.

I respect the Senator from New Mexico and the arguments he has made; but with all deference to him I submit again that it is highly misleading to say that the principal point, much less the only point involved here, is merely a question of whether or not the Senate shall decide questions by majority vote. It is very true that we already decide by a majority vote certain questions. The question here is whether rules that have already been decided by an overwhelming vote shall be set aside by a ruling of the Chair that might be temporarily agreed to by a majority of the Senate, some Members of which have been here only a few days.

If these premises are true—and they are true—it must follow that the Senate as an institution and the Senators elected from their States are the trustees of the States' powers and rights under our Constitution.

None of us here had anything to do with creating these rights. Those rights were created when the Bill of Rights was adopted. I cannot enlarge upon those rights except by following the constitutional provision for amendment of that organic charter.

I think we do have a definite responsibility, whenever a Federal legislature anticipates the creation of a new Federal power and a corresponding diminution of States powers, to see that the State is protected. We have a duty to support corrective legislation when executive prerogatives, particularly in the field of Executive orders and regulations, are carried too far and infringe upon State jurisdiction. By the same token, we have the same responsibility to protect the executive branch of the Government, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch; and one of the ways we do it is by adopting our own rules. I believe we have a high duty to support corrective legislation and restore to the States the rights and powers they lost, many of them by judicial decree, whenever the Congress feels that the decision is unwarranted.

We have done that many times, Mr. President. Most of us, I think, feel a deep responsibility to the States which sent us here as trustees of their power to retain that bundle of powers intact during our tenure here and to make it no more difficult for those who will succeed us to defend the sovereignty of our State against the encroaching power of the Federal Government. I think that this attack on the Senate rules has damaged the prestige of the Senate in the eyes of the people of our country and that, therefore, the States prestige and power to defend themselves have been damaged to some immeasurable degree.

To my mind, the question of further limiting free debate in the Senate is a great step forward in limiting the powers of the States to be heard in the Federal Government, and I hope that Members of this body will carefully consider the question in this context. I do not think any of us would willfully participate in the loss of an incident of sovereignty of our State; but, in my opinion, a vote to gag the Senate or further hinder free debate here is a violation of the trust of the State and its people in sending us here to represent them.

EFFECTS OF SUCCESSIVE EFFORTS TO LIMIT DEBATE IN THE SENATE

In recent years, and particularly since 1949, there has been a concerted effort to limit debate in the Senate. Concessions were made in 1949 and the effect of that change was to make any motion subject to cloture.

In 1959 the number of Senators required to invoke cloture was reduced from two-thirds of those elected and sworn to two-thirds of those present and voting. At the present time 34 Senators of the 51 constituting a quorum could invoke cloture. Prior to 1959, 67 Senators would have been required to accomplish this. Proponents of free debate in the Senate saw the number required to invoke cloture cut by one-half and realized that under certain circumstances a minority of the Senate could limit debate.

Current proposals now being considered would further reduce this. In the case of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the minimum number required to cut off debate would be reduced to 31 Members.

While these actual changes have been achieved as a result of concessions and compromises, it is clear to me that we are greatly accelerating the pace toward an effective gag rule, enforced at the whim of a transitory majority.

TRANSITORY MAJORITIES

If the Senate is considered to be just another legislative body—an annex of the House of Representatives—then rule XXII cannot be sustained on logical grounds. But if there is any merit in my contention that the Senate has a duty to represent the States, then there should be special rules to protect the power and rights of the States.

Centralization of government is now the trend in national affairs.

I say, from my observation and from my experience here in the Senate, that some of the most effective work that has been done to protect minority groups, not just once but many times, over and over again, from year to year, has been done by very small minorities, some of which are generally and loosely classified as some of the most liberal Members of the Senate.

I have the honor to serve as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations, where one department of the Federal Government is involved every year with more than $48 billion. That amount has been going up year after year for more than a decade. With the missile programs coming along, no one sees much hope of making any material reductions in those appropriations. All this illustrates and emphasizes how far beyond the control of the people—of the States or any other medium of government—except a few people in the Federal Government who are specially designated and can find the time to pass on these matters, this matter has gone.

It is proceeding with breakneck speed. I think that the Senate on some sound occasions has attempted to brake this trend of changing seriously our form of government. I feel that its action as a restraining influence is a major part of its duty and purpose I still believe that government should be kept close to and responsible to the people and that the effectiveness of local and State government should not be drastically reduced by ill-considered and unwise legislation.

Many politically expedient, but basically unwise, proposals have been defeated by free and open debate. They have gone unlamented into oblivion because of the deliberative power of the U.S. Senate. I believe it is dangerous to tamper with this fundamental characteristic of this institution as we know it.

I believe it would be basically unwise for the States, as well as the people, if this deliberative function of the Senate were cut off by adoption of a gag rule.

Yet, with each successive change in rule XXII, we are taking giant steps in

adoption of such a parliamentary device. Freedom of debate in the Senate is absolutely essential for the protection of minority rights. None of us can tell today when we may be in the minority on some future issue to be considered here. We are certain that vital issues affecting our States and people and the country will be considered soon. If debate is to be for all practical purposes eliminated and issues decided without full and free debate—but by sheer numbers, the rights and powers of the people we were elected to protect will be greatly jeopardized.

At this point, in discussing the issues that must be decided, I shall digress from the historic aspect and go for just a moment to the present day. In a few days we will inaugurate a new President and Vice President of the United States. I do not believe there is any President since Abraham Lincoln, exactly a hundred years ago, who has come into the Presidency with so many grave problems as will be true with our former colleagues, Senator Kennedy and Senator JOHNSON.

By way of comparison, the events of a hundred years ago, so far as number and complexity of these problems and world affairs are concerned, do not weigh in the scales in anywhere near the same way. We are in a new world and in a different world. We are facing and confronting problems that are involved in the so-called cold war.

The new President will be faced with what I think is one of the most serious matters that have ever come up, which could quickly develop into another Korea. These are questions for which there are no quick answers. There will have to be some effective answer to the problem in southeast Asia, such as in Laos.

Almost in sight of our shoreline there is the very perplexing matter of Cuba, right here in our own hemisphere, and that involves all of Latin America.

The Monroe Doctrine, which has always been a part of our policy, has been abrogated and is almost defunct, if not forgotten. We are in a critical time. I am not bringing up these matters or dragging in a great many problems just for the fun of it.

Then we are confronted with serious matters in the United Nations, if our commenators and our news reporters are accurate, in which it is absolutely and indispensably necessary that a new start of some kind must be taken and a new formula found.

We are confronted with a serious matter, as the Senator knows, with reference to the future of NATO, and what is going to be done there.

Then we have what is perhaps the most grave problem of all that I have mentioned—and it is one about which I certainly know less than most Senators—and that is the drain of gold. It is a worldwide economic question and problem which is involved with reference to the drain of gold away from us.

In view of all those conditions confronting the President-elect, I have not heard that a call of any kind for the Senate to change its rules has come from those who will be charged with the primary responsibility in the executive branch. I have not heard of any such call from the man upon whose shoulders these burdens will fall. I have not heard that any such call to change the Senate rules has come from the men who were selected, in the constitutional processes, just as we were. There has not been any cry of need or of distress urging us to come back here in a hurry, and before many Senators had time to get settled, proceed forthwith to make a drastic change in the rules—not just a rule, but the rules, because such a proposed change would affect the entire Senate as an institution of Government.

I come now to a consideration of the so-called Kennedy program. I believe he gives that title to special bills, such as an additional statute with respect to medical care; a so-called housing bill; the question of education and the appropriation of money for the educational program; and a depressed areas bill. Undoubtedly he will call for a higher minimum wage.

Still, I have not heard from the new executives who will soon take office any call for the Senate rules to be changed or affected in any way by reason of the world problems, the national problems, or the immediate so-called Kennedy administration questions. Not a single word to that effect has come to me, certainly, and I have not heard that any other Senator has received such a call.

As a matter of fact, the very bills I have mentioned as being an immediate part of the so-called Kennedy program have already passed this body and the House of Representatives in one form or another. They were debated here and were freely discussed and voted upon. They may not have been in the form in which some Senators wanted them; but if they were not, that was because not enough votes could be mustered for them. That is the only reason. They have all been before the Senate time and again within the last 12 months. They will come before us again. I have not heard anyone say that he will try to keep them from coming up. They will come before us. Resort to any kind of strategy to keep such bills from coming before this body has already been had.

The latest report I have read from the economic advisers of the President-elect is that the economy of our Nation is now in a recession. Instead of trying to apply remedies to that kind of condition, the Senate is running off, without anyone urging us, trying to change its rules by the ingenious, indirect way of having the Vice President, even though he is a constitutional officer, give a special ruling, and then trying to have it sustained.

If we desire to continue in the favor of the American people, I think it is high time that we put first things first and try to get constructive answers to help the President-elect and all his group to solve the problems which will confront them. We should seek to provide constructive answers to the major, far-reaching, earth-shaking problems I have all too briefly enumerated. But I have not heard from any persons in responsible positions a call for a change in the Senate rules.

It may be said that the proposed change in the rules is to facilitate the passage of the so-called civil rights measures. Such measures have previously been considered by the Senate, and all of their major provisions have been debated. Two such bills have been passed within the last few years. As they wound their way through this very legislative chamber, all of them, each time, received many amendments carrying all the major points of the so-called civil rights issue to the debate platform. Those which received a majority vote here are the law today. Those which did not receive a majority vote were not, of course, included in the law. That was not because of the rules of the Senate; it was because the amendments did not receive enough votes. The RECORD shows that happened time and time again.

It happened in 1957 and again in 1960. In 1960 the Senate debated extensively many of those major provisions, with recorded votes.

To return to the main context of my historical presentation, some minority rights should never be overridden. Individual rights are recognized in the Constitution, particularly those relating to alleged violations of criminal law. An accused person is a minority of one in a criminal proceeding, opposing a majority of 170 million or 180 million. Yet few of us would seriously consider taking steps to deprive an accused person of his right to a trial by jury, to habeas corpus, to due process of law, or to any other constitutional rights, which often require the unanimous vote of a jury. We would not take away those rights in any way simply because the accused person was in the minority. Nothing less should be done, then, in regard to the States themselves.

After all, we were elected by the people voting as a State unit. We represent the States in the Federal Government. We are the ones who are the representatives of the people and their voices. We must remember, too, that a simple majority does not necessarily represent the thinking of a majority of the people of the States. It takes time for many vital measures to be understood by the people at home or in our State capitols.

Prolonged debate on truly critical measures provides an opportunity for constructive thinking at the grassroots level, by the local leaders of the people, who will be most affected. All of us who have had long experience in the Senate have seen the volume of serious mail building up day by day during the course of debates of long duration. The time we take to consider such mail enables us to determine more accurately the thinking of the people whom we represent. Of course, full and free debate on controversial matters provides a degree of protection against hasty action and enables us to resist the clamor of well-organized groups supporting their selfish interests.

Mr. President, there comes to my mind a matter which I believe never reached the form of a bill. I was a Member of the Senate during the Korean war, when

President Truman recalled General MacArthur. I believe that was the most confusing time for the Senate and the American people that I ever witnessed since becoming a Member of this great body. If it had been possible then for some quick action to be taken, I do not believe there is any doubt that the mood or the reaction of the people in Congress at that time would have been very discrediting to the Chief Executive or to the executive branch of the Government.

But as one day follows another, and as week followed week, and the Senate, through its legislative processes and channels, held a long and enlightening hearing under the guidance of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whom I am happy to see in the Chamber, when he rose to one of his great heights, gradually the matter was better understood. The significance of what had been said by one and what had been done by another came through. There was an evaluation. There was a calmer consideration of the matter. Things moved along then under the constitutional processes. Enlightenment came to us. We moved along again as a united people. There was no personal discrediting of either the President or General MacArthur. There was no finer example of calmness, in my humble opinion, although it may not often be cited.

I am certain in my own mind that during those first days following the recall of General MacArthur had something been rushed and crowded through this body which would have been highly detrimental to the executive branch of the Government and the prosecution of that war, a terrible precedent would have been set.

VIEWS ON CONTINUITY

Mr. President, the Senate has long been regarded as a continuing body. That is not a newly made point, for some of the most direct statements about the Senate's being a continuing body were made in 1841, during the controversy over the Senate printers. The Senate in the 26th Congress had elected printers on February 20, 1841, as its printers for the succeeding Congress. On March 4 of that year the political complexion of the Senate changed. The Senate organized by reelecting its President pro tempore, and sat in special session until March 14. The House of Representatives adjourned sine die, and was not in session after March 4. On March 4, a resolution to dismiss the printers was introduced. Irrespective of the Senate's right to dismiss printers for cause, contractual or otherwise, the debate involved, as a collateral item, the continuous nature of the Senate. Some even stated that the next Senate would be a new Senate, to which Senator Allen, of Ohio, replied, according to the Congressional Globe, as follows:

> And as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. The argument so much relied on in this discussion and on which so much logic and reasoning had been wasted in opposition to these printers was untrue. There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic.

Mr. President, I am quoting now from the matter as reported by the Congressional Globe, which in that day reported the proceedings partly by summary.

I read further from the quotation:

> They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate. There was a new House of Representatives—but not so the Senate. The Constitution replenishes that body every 2 years by the election of a class of Senators, and thereby gives eternity to the duration of the body. There was no new, nor was there any old Senate.

Mr. President, I like the words "gives eternity to the duration of the body."

On March 8, 1841, Senator Buchanan, of Pennsylvania made a most pertinent statement, which was summarized as follows in the Globe:

> There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting in 1789. It has existed without any intermission from that day until the present moment, and would continue to exist as long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body. Its rules were permanent and were not adopted from Congress to Congress like those of the House of Representatives. For many years after the commencement of the Government its Secretary was a permanent officer, though our rules now require that he should be elected at stated intervals. The Senate always had a President, and there were always two-thirds of its actual Members in existence, and generally a much greater number. It would be useless to labor this question. Every writer, without exception, who had treated on the subject had declared the Senate to be a permanent body. It never dies; and it was the sheet anchor of the Constitution on account of its permanency. Senators were thus deprived of the poor apology that one Senate had no right to bind its successors. (Cong. Globe, 26th Cong., 2d sess., v. 9, p. 240.)

It may be noted that in the controversy after which the printers were ultimately dismissed, Senator Henry Clay, of Kentucky, although personally in favor of limiting debate at times, as opposed to John C. Calhoun, who was a forceful and outspoken proponent of unlimited debate, voted to dismiss the printers, but advocated that the Senate was a continuing body. On this point the Legislative Reference Division of the Library of Congress, in commenting on the Congressional Globe of March 11, 1841, stated:

> But a vote to dismiss its printers was not necessarily a vote that the Senate was discontinuous. One of the Senators who advocated and voted for the dismissal, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, agreed with the opposition that the Senate was everlasting. And if the proponents of the discontinuity view were, in fact, more numerous than its opponents the reports in the Congressional Globe—wholly fail to indicate it ("Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body," Document 4, 83d Cong., 1st sess., p. 37, Appendix.)

OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS OF CONTINUITY

There are four fields that warrant special attention as illustrating the continuing nature of the Senate. These are first, officers of the Senate; second, Senate committees; third, the Senate as an executive body; and fourth, the treaty ratifying power.

Officers of the Senate serve for no stated term of office. They serve until their successors are selected. Benjamin Harrison, former President of the United States and U.S. Senator, pointed this out in his book entitled "This Country of Ours," page 51. George H. Haynes, in "The Senate of the United States," volume 1, page 261, points out the same thing as an illustration of the continuing nature of the Senate. Senator Anthony on March 24, 1879, while the Senate was in the process of replacing some of its officers with others along purely political lines, observed:

> The Senate never dies. The same which it was when it met in 1789, it is now, and has held continuous and unbroken existence ever since. Its elective officers are chosen, not for a definite period, but during the pleasure of the Senate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 9, pt. 1, p. 147).

With respect to the President pro tempore of the Senate, there have been several significant expressions applying to that office regarding the continuing nature of the Senate. In Senate Report 3, 44th Congress, 1st session, page 2, dated January 10, 1876, the Committee on Privileges and Elections made a survey of the customary procedure regarding the office of President pro tempore. It cited 49 instances where the office held over after the first recess, and only 4 where it did not. The report also stated:

> The custom of the Vice President to vacate the Chair before the close of a session to enable the Senate to choose a President pro tempore did not begin until after the passage of the act of March 1, 1792, and was obviously instituted to meet the contingency contemplated in the act by providing a President pro tempore of the Senate during the vacations of that body. The Senate in contemplation of law is a perpetual body, and the officers of the Senate are as much its officers during its vacations as during its sessions.

A resolution providing that the tenure of office of President pro tempore of the Senate does not expire at the meeting of Congress after the first recess, the Vice President not having appeared to take the Chair, was unanimously adopted January 10, 1876—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, page 316. Senator Merriman made the following statement:

> I want to emphasize the matter. This resolution is adopted unanimously. It is a resolution that affects the organization of the body for all time to come and establishes a precedent.

Two days later, the Senate adopted a resolution stating:

> The office of President pro tempore is held at the pleasure of the Senate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Jan. 12, 1876, pp. 360–373).

On March 2, 1891, Senator Charles F. Manderson was elected President pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of March 12, 1890—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 22, page 3637—with the intention, apparently, that his office would continue over into the following Congress. Subsequent Presidents pro tempore were regularly elected with reference to the same resolution. Numerous instances in history are cited in Gilfry's compilation "President of the

Senate Pro Tempore" of officers who hold over from one Congress to the next.

It is a well accepted custom that the Senate can and does order investigations, interim reports, final reports, and recommendations by its committees, without reference to the ending of one Congress or the beginning of another. Even when there is some change in the composition of the committee membership, this procedure is not affected.

While the House has no such rule, the Senate has provided by rule XXV that all standing committees continue until their successors are appointed. Haynes, in his treaties on "The U.S. Senate," not only recognizes this point but attributes the growth of Senate committee activity to it. He states, at page 551:

> But increasingly, beginning with the last quarter of the 19th century, the House has seemed to be relinquishing such activities, while the Senate has been greatly expanding its exercise of the investigative function in the number, variety and importance of its inquiries. The explanation of this remarkable shift is to be found in the contrast between the rules and procedure of the House and of the Senate.

That custom does not continue so much in the present day, of course, but I cite it here as an illustration of the unbroken continuity of the concept, the practices, and the methods that have been used all these years, almost for two centuries now, by the Senate.

The functions of the Senate for various executive, rather than purely legislative, purposes offer further arguments on behalf of continuity. The Constitution gives the Senate prerogatives in giving or withholding "advice and consent" to certain Presidential appointments and with respect to treatymaking. Prior to enactment in 1933 of the 20th amendment to the Constitution, which, among other things, abolished the so-called lameduck sessions of the Congress, and which advanced the commencement of the Presidential term from March 4 to January 20, many special sessions of the Senate, as distinguished from special sessions of the Congress, were convened for executive purposes. Woodrow Wilson, in "Constitutional Government in the United States," at page 127, wrote:

> The continuity of the Government lies in the keeping of the Senate more than in the keeping of the Executive, even in respect of matters which are the especial prerogative of the Presidential office.

It is appropriate to note that while Executive nominations not disposed of in the Senate die with the Congress in which they are submitted, treaties transmitted to the Senate for ratification do not so die. Rule XXXVII of the Senate provides that all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, but that they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon. Thus, unless withdrawn by the President or failing from lapse of time, a treaty continues to be live matter and, as such, continues as pending in the Senate.

CONTINUITY AS A MATTER OF LAW

Now, Mr. President, I am mindful that determinations as to whether the Senate is a continuing body are made by this body itself. Thus, I address myself to the point as a lawyer or advocate, and I realize that considerably more than one-half of the Members of the Senate are lawyers, many of them widely recognized and acclaimed in the legal profession.

In the legal approach we may list arguments to present the case as follows:

First. The Constitution provides that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate shall be continuous at all times in their tenure of office. This is in excess of the majority requirements of the Constitution for a quorum to do business.

Second. The Senate is more than an upper house as the terms "upper" and "lower" houses are often used historically or parenthetically. The Senate at law is assigned definite and distinct duties and prerogatives.

(a) It has the sole power to try all impeachments.

(b) It has the power to give or withhold advice and consent in the making of treaties and the nomination and appointment of Ambassadors, Judges of the Supreme Court, and certain officers of the executive branch of the Government.

(c) With the exception of bills for raising revenue, in which it may propose or concur with amendments, it may originate legislation.

Third. The Senate may constitute and empower committees with duties and powers to operate continuously or for times certain irrespective of the beginnings or endings of the terms of Congress. This point has been litigated in the courts, and the continuing nature of committees of the Senate has been clearly recognized. The courts thus have held that the Senate is a continuing body. If it were not such a body itself, its committees could not be continuous.

Fourth. There are definitions at law of what is continuous which definitions by comparison apply to the factual position of the Senate. In cases where courts have had jurisdiction over governmental bodies composed of members elected or appointed at different times on a successive basis such bodies at law have been held to be continuing bodies.

Fifth. The Senate by its legal composition, its traditions, customs, and procedures has operated and has established itself as a continuing body and a separate and distinct institution of Government.

I continue to emphasize these different approaches, the different phases of this question, to show that the unanimous view is that the Senate is a continuing body that goes on from one year to the next, with its power to regulate itself and its control of its own affairs continuing. On at least two occasions it has recognized the legal fact that the Senate is a continuing body. Both cases involved the point as to whether committees of the Senate were within the scope of their authority because Congress was not in session. In *McGrain* v. *Dougherty* (273 U.S. 180–182) the Court stated:

> The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives, whose Members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it cannot well be the same with the Senate which is a continuing body whose Members are elected for a term of 6 years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation.

Mr. Hinds, in his collection of precedents, says: "The Senate as a continuing body may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of Congress" and after quoting the above statement of Jefferson's Manual, he says: "The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of Congress." This being so, the Senate being a continuing body, the case cannot be said to have become moot in the ordinary sense. (See also Hinds' Precedents, vol. 4, secs. 4396, 4400, 4404, 4405.)

The Supreme Court reiterated the doctrine of McGrain against Dougherty in the case of *Sinclair* v. *U.S.* (279 U.S. 263, 295–296 (1928)). A witness at a Senate committee hearing refused to answer a question on the grounds that the investigation and the question were unauthorized. He was prosecuted for contumacy and convicted. The appeal involved the point that Congress was not in session. The Court quoted the resolution of the Senate authorizing the committee to sit after the expiration of the then current Congress and until otherwise ordered by the Senate, and stated:

> The sole purpose was to authorize the committee to carry on the inquiry. It would be quite unreasonable, if not indeed absurd, for the Senate to direct investigation by the committee and to allow its power to summon and swear witnesses to lapse.

The conviction was affirmed. Since the continuing nature of the Senate was a necessary point in the appeal, this case is a holding by the Court that the Senate is a continuing body. The reference thus is not merely dictum.

Both of these Supreme Court cases have been cited in numerous Federal decisions. They have been Shephardized and many citations are shown. For example, the McGrain case was cited in *Morford* v. *U.S.* (176 F. 2d 54 (D.C. 1949)) to show that the basic intent of Congress in establishing committees must be followed and in *Barsh* v. *U.S.* (167 F. 2d 241 (D.C. 1948)) on the point of a question being authorized as within the powers of a committee. The Sinclair case appears frequently in Federal citations, for example, in *U.S.* v. *Josephson* (165 F. 2d 82 (2d Circuit, 1948)) on the point of the courts turning to congressional practice to show congressional intent. The Sinclair case, citing the McGrain case, probably settled the continuity of the Senate point insofar as the Supreme Court is concerned, unless other points of appeal or certiorari might involve it collaterally.

In other fields of the law we find definitions of the word "continuous" or the phase "continuing body" that are enlightening. In criminal law "continuous" has been defined as something which endures after the period of consummation (*U.S.* v. *Owen* (32 F. 534, 537)).

In contract law a continuing guaranty is one which contemplates a future course of dealing (*Ricketson* v. *Lizatti* (90 Vt. 386, 98 A. 801)).

A continuing trespass is one which remains constantly such as permanent structures on the lands of other person (*Sample* v. *Roper Lumber Co.* (150 N.C. 161 63 S.E. 731)).

In tort law continuing negligence is negligence that was anterior to the time of harm done and continued in force up to the crucial time (*McNeill* v. *Atlantic Coast Line* (167 N.C. 390, 83 S.E. 704, 707)).

An appropriate definition or illustration of what is a continuing body may be found in the New York case of *People ex rel Lazarus* v. *Coleman* (91 N.Y.S. 432, 433, 99 App. Div. 88). The question was on a writ of mandamus running against a governmental board for a wrong done by a previous board. The term of office of board members expired at different times somewhat analogous to the U.S. Senate. The court held that it was a continuing body and allowed the writ. The court stated:

> The terms of office expire at different times. It is therefore a continuing body and a writ of mandamus running against the board to reinstate the relator would accomplish that result whether the board was composed of the same persons who passed the resolution resulting in his dismissal or not.

The same principle involved in this case has been upheld in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Thompson* v. *U.S.* (105 U.S. 480 26 L. Ed. 521).

I submit that by all legal, factual and traditional standards the Senate of the United States is a continuing body.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was called from the floor and I have not been able to enjoy all of the very fine address being made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I wonder if the Senator has pointed out the two instances in the Standing Rules of the Senate in which the Senate itself has declared itself to be a continuing body.

Mr. STENNIS. I had not covered that. I should be glad to have the Senator read the points he has in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 37 of the Senate Rules and Manual, in subparagraph (2) of rule XXV, which defines the composition and jurisdiction of the several committees of the Senate, after all of the committees have been defined and named, appears this language:

> Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

In other words, the committees have been carried over and they are in existence today, though this is a new Congress. Under this rule the committees have been carried over into this Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I yielded to the Senator from Georgia, so that he could give two pertinent quotes. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania also.

Mr. CLARK. I desired to make a comment on the first quote.

Mr. STENNIS. May I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it does not matter. In rule XXXII, adopted by the Senate, the Senate provided, in section 2:

> The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

The Senator has discussed very ably the legal definition of the word "continue" as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I am glad the Senator gave the holdings by the judiciary that the Senate is a continuing body. I regard it as equally significant that the Senate has itself always insisted it was a continuing body, and has used the word "continue" on at least two occasions in the rules.

Mr. STENNIS. Even more so is it binding and is it authoritative because we are the ones who have the constitutional responsibility for making those rules.

There was cited by the Senator from Mississippi before the Senator could get to the Chamber the actual vote on the proposal. The last division was 72 to 22.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I was called off the floor and did not hear that comment.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I simply wished to bring to the attention of my two distinguished friends the first statement in rule XXV, which is:

> The following standing committee shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress.

From that language I assume the committees do not carry over automatically but that there is a duty in each Congress to reconstitute them.

It has always been my view that it does not make any difference, for the purpose of this rule controversy, whether the Senate is a continuing body or not. In my judgment, the Senate is a continuing body for some matters and not for others. I am sure my friend from Georgia would agree with that to at least some extent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed. The Senate by its own rules has provided that certain types of business before the Senate expire with each Congress.

The Senator from Pennsylvania should be congratulated, because he apparently is the one who convinced the Vice President of the United States of the fact that the Senate was a continuing body for all purposes except that of changing the rules, which procedure he disliked and declared unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is very kind, but I have no more influence with the Vice President of the United States than he has.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I wish that were true. I wish that were true.

Mr. CLARK. Unhappily, it is.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Vice President, of course, started out in his holdings or findings in the matter with an advisory opinion, I believe it was called, some years ago.

Mr. CLARK. 1957.

Mr. RUSSELL. 1957. In that advisory opinion he did not deal with the question of whether specifically the Senate was a continuing body. He did state, that, in his opinion, the Senate could, at the beginning of each session, make rules.

Mr. CLARK. New rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. New rules. I could understand that position.

I can understand the position which was taken by the distinguished late Senator Walsh, of Montana.

I can understand the position of the Senator from New Mexico, that the Senate could meet and make new rules. That was the position of the Senator from New Mexico when he first offered the proposition several years ago; when he moved that the Senate proceed to enact a body of rules.

I have not been able to understand the position of the Vice President, that all rules apply except those he has decided on he will declare unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is something I have not been able to exactly comprehend. In my judgment, either all of the rules go over or none of the rules go over. Either, under the exercise of the rule-making power as provided in the Constitution, the Senate makes its rules and, as a continuing body, the rules apply until changed in the manner described therein, or else in the beginning of each Congress the Senate should adopt all new rules, as is done in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not said that the House has one rule approved and one not approved. It is not said, "We approve this rule and disapprove the other. This rule comes over from a previous Congress, and this rule does not come over from a previous Congress."

The House of Representatives adopts all of its rules. I can understand that viewpoint. I think a fairly respectable argument could be made for it, although I think the weight of authority is against it.

However, I cannot understand any argument which says those rules of a certain vintage which relate to certain matters can be changed at the beginning of the session. I will never concede, as a Senator of the United States, as one who is in the legislative branch of the Government and is proud of that fact, that the executive branch, even though acting as our constitutional Presiding Officer, has a right to declare a rule of the Senate unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Which is what the Vice President undertook to do. The Senate might declare a rule unconstitutional, but the Presiding Officer of the Senate has no right whatever to declare a rule unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so that I can answer the argument?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK. I would not make an effort to explain to my good friend from Georgia that which the Vice President of the United States has been unable to explain to him. I suppose this is one of those little things we had better agree to disagree on. But with respect to his second comment, as to the change in rule XXXII, which we made on January 12, 1959, I make the comment that frequently I find myself in the minority in this body, and I know of no one who has a greater respect for the rights of the minority than my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that statement, because I have made a profession of being in the minority. If I did not respect the rights of the minority, I would not have any self-respect. I have often been in the minority.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his comment. When the Senate, by the apparently overwhelming vote of 72 to 18, or whatever it was, inserted the change in rule XXXII 2 years ago, I was one of the 18 of the minority, and I cling to my view that when we took that action, we acted outside the purview of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that the Senator from Pennsylvania at that time thought it was an ultra vires act of a legislature. But it is one thing for a Senator to attack the rule as being unconstitutional and another for him a Presiding Officer to undertake to declare that a rule of the Senate is unconstitutional. If we were to establish as a precedent that the Vice President could declare a rule of the Senate unconstitutional, we would never know whether we were standing on firm ground. Some Senator could make an unconstitutional argument, and the Vice President could declare the rule unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further for one comment; and I shall not transgress on his patience further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Georgia that it must be the Senate and not the Vice President which makes the final determination as to whether or not the rule is unconstitutional. I believe that all of us who think it is feel that way also.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania thinks the Senate should have the right to appeal a decision of the Chair on these questions. It is quite a concession on his part, and I am grateful to him for it.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the course of the discussion we have been assailed time and again with the argument that there is some great sanctity attached to the sheer weight of numbers, and particularly a majority of one. If there is one body in our system of government which is unique and distinctive it is the Senate of the United States. The feature that makes us such a distinctive body is the fact that our composition is a constitutional refutation of the right of a majority of one to proceed to act in the Government.

The question of representation in the Senate was a rock that almost brought the Constitutional Convention to grief. The Convention was almost wrecked on that rock—the composition of the Senate. The representatives in the Constitutional Convention finally decided that each State, whether large or small, should be represented by two Senators in the Senate, and they did not leave any question to chance. They did not know but that a Vice President might rule that while the Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators, a rule can be written to provide that the voting strength of Senators shall be based upon population. In that case the two Senators from New York, of course, would outvote the two Senators from Alaska about 100 to 1. The delegates to the Convention took no chances on that question.

The delegates to the Convention said that each State shall have two Senators and each Senator shall have one vote. The provision was spelled out in the Constitution. I suppose one could say, "Of course, if there are going to be two Senators, each will have one vote."

But they were taking no chances on a rule permitting a majority of one in the Senate to institute some sort of proportional voting strength in the Senate.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention went further and provided that no State could be denied any of its rights in the Senate, and that the votes of the two Senators could not be taken away except with the consent of the State involved. That provision is the only absolute veto in the U.S. Constitution. Their positions in the Senate cannot be affected except by unanimous consent of all the States involved.

We have been talking about a majority of one, which would have the right to move and work its will in the Senate on the remaining 49.99 percent. Each State, no matter how small, has a position of equality in the U.S. Senate.

Under the Constitution, when a Senator from Alaska votes in this body, he casts a vote that gives each Alaskan approximately 100 times the influence that each citizen of the State of New York has when a Senator from the State of New York votes in this body. Yet we are told that the procedure must be wheeled around in order to make it possible for merely a majority of one to declare any measure unconstitutional.

The most distinctive feature of the Senate is that it is a forum of the States, and no State should be denied its rights. Neither the vote of a Senator nor the right of a Senator to defend his position on the floor of the Senate for as long as he desires, should be taken away from him without his consent.

Such right should not be removed by any parliamentary manipulation or Vice-Presidential ruling. It should not be done by any shortcuts. If it is, it ought at least to be done in the way that is prescribed in the rules that govern this body, which no one, until a few years ago, had ever challenged as having come over from year to year.

It has been stated that Senator Walsh apparently challenged that point. I deny that statement. The resolution Senator Walsh submitted to change the rules provided for a committee to be appointed to consider his resolution. The committee was appointed. His resolution was considered, and the committee reported to the Senate in the manner prescribed in the rules of the Senate, and the change in the rules that we now find in section 22 was adopted.

When we determine that 90,999,999 Americans can work their will through the rules of the Senate or by any other means on 89,999,999 Americans who might be opposed to it, we shall certainly destroy the Senate. It is rather remarkable that so many people who have enjoyed the aura that attaches to this body should be willing to destroy it and to destroy our republican form of government. It was never intended that we should have a pure democracy through which a mob from day to day could change the whole scheme of things and the laws of the country.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the eloquent address of my distinguished and able friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi. Many persons seem to regard an extended debate as bad per se. I remind the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi that the Dixon-Yates contract, in connection with which the Supreme Court today upheld the action of the Government, was killed by an extended debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The junior Senator from Tennessee made the first speech on that contract. There were two or three Senators present on the floor on that day. I made the first half dozen speeches on this contract, and I had great difficulty getting an audience. Eventually it became involved in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I wish now to make this point. In the course of consideration of that proposed legislation, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, former Senator William Knowland of California, began to use what I regarded as a very oppressive legislative instrument. He moved to lay on the table every amendment that I and other Senators on our side of the question offered. As the able Senator knows, the motion to lay an amendment on the table means there can be no further talk on it.

This helped stimulate an extended debate, of which I was one of the leaders. That debate lasted for 13 days and nights. There was never an attempt or intention of preventing a vote on an amendment or on the measure ultimately, but in the course of that debate we resisted and we talked, until on the floor of the Senate there was an abandonment of the use of the oppressive parliamentary device of laying on the table without debate an amendment offered by a Member of the Senate. When that parliamentary device was abandoned, we quickly came to a vote.

I point out these two things with respect to extended debate to illustrate that good frequently comes from a so-called educational campaign in the Senate. In most cases even those who are engaged in this kind of endeavor are those who are generally described as liberals in the Senate.

I do not subscribe to the kind of filibuster when cake recipes are read. I believe in germane debate, but I believe in the right of Senators to resist oppressive legislative tactics by freedom of debate.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his very fine contribution. He has certainly refreshed my recollection very pleasantly when he refers to the debates on that occasion, when he made the first of several speeches and aroused the Senate and the country on the bad parts of that measure and the Dixon-Yates matter.

I remember that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made a very fine contribution in that same debate. I may say to the Senators who have recently taken their seats, this month, that that event is an outstanding illustration of the wisdom of the Senate rules, which are now sought to be largely destroyed.

To illustrate the difference in the rules of the two Houses, I may say that at that time I visited in the House of Representatives, and noticed that one of the Representatives from the State of Mississippi, with every county in his district directly affected by the proposed legislation, was permitted to debate that far-reaching measure for 3 minutes in his own right as a Member of that body. Another Member graciously yielded him 2 additional minutes. Therefore, he had 5 minutes available to him to debate the measure. That is all the time he had available to him to debate the points he had in mind. As a matter of fact, the presiding officer in the House took about 4 minutes trying to get sufficient order so that the Member might be heard.

The bill was sent to the Senate. As the Senator from Tennessee has said, "We debated it here for 13 days and nights." The senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators, who are generally referred to as liberals, did a very outstanding job in that debate. I remember that the Senator from Tennessee rendered fine service in that connection.

I also recall that the Senator from California, who was then the majority leader in the Senate, actually undertook to portion out the time for debate. He yielded 10 minutes, for example, to a Senator. In other words, he withheld his motion to table a Senator's amendment and allowed him 10 minutes to discuss his amendment. I remember that in the course of the debate the Senator from Mississippi replied that he was not willing to pay that price, meaning that he was not willing to treat the Senate rules in any such way, and, therefore, he did not speak on my amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder whether the Senator recalls that the moment at which the extended debate took a turn toward an imminent end came when the junior Senator from Tennessee offered another amendment and the majority leader rose to inquire of the junior Senator from Tennessee how long he wished to speak, which indicated another motion to table would be made, and the junior Senator from Tennessee said he did not wish to be recognized upon any limitation except in his own right as a Member of the U.S. Senate. There was a bit of staring at each other. Then the distinguished majority leader took his seat without making a motion to lay on the table. The junior Senator from Tennessee then spoke for less than 5 minutes, and we proceeded to vote.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for refreshing my recollection as to that happening in the Senate. I remember it well now. No matter how any Member of the Senate might have voted on that bill, in the final analysis I believe that was one of the great moments of the Senate, when individual Members of the Senate refused to be mistreated under a possible use of the rule.

I state further that the program became law and has served its purpose well, and seems to have balanced out the various conflicts of interest that were represented in that far-reaching measure. With reference to the matter of the contract in Memphis, Tenn., as the Senator from Tennessee has stated, the courts today, as I understand, have given final approval to it.

Mr. GORE. The Supreme Court.

Mr. STENNIS. The Supreme Court of the United States today has given final approval to the contentions and points that were fully debated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator well recalls, because most of these matters happened while he was here, that on a number of occasions the rules have proved to be the real bulwark of protection for our democracy. A number of occasions come to mind. One proposal was to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. That measure went through the House in a few days. It ran into serious opposition in the Senate. As a result, through debate it was defeated in the Senate. Except for the rules, the Supreme Court packing measure would perhaps have been enacted.

Then there was the proposal to draft railroad labor into the Army and use that labor as slave labor, one might say, to run the railroads under draft. That measure passed the House of Representatives on the same day it was introduced. It was probably one of the greatest achievements of Bob Taft when he led the debate against that proposal. The measure, after 2 weeks of debate, was put aside.

I believe another illustration of this situation was the patent provisions of the Atomic Energy Act when they came before the Senate. The junior Senator from Tennessee made a magnificent contribution to that debate, showing how completely unsound those proposals were. Those are three examples of proposals that were unsound.

This Nation would have been plagued with those proposals for many years to come if it had not been for the right of a Senator to stand here, hold the floor, and explain why he thought an unsound measure was being proposed. I would not like to see applied in the Senate the rule which exists in the State Legislature of Louisiana, whereby the floor leader, any time he thinks he is getting the worst of a debate, can move the previous question, even while another man is speaking, and get a vote on it.

Measures of the sort I have described certainly would have passed the Senate if we had had such a rule as that.

When one starts to destroy the rules and to strike at what appears to be surplusage at the moment, then someone else wants to modify it further, and over a period of time, all the safeguards we have for sound consideration disappear.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his very sound remarks. It seems to me that the Senate might be likened unto a man who is sound in body and sound in mind. But if he takes a sharp knife and continues to keep whittling at his right hand, he finally cuts it off. The Senate might be cutting off its great power in government; and certainly we have whittled considerably on ourselves over the last few years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi warmly upon the very fine address he has just made. If it once be conceded that the Vice President—the present Vice President or any other Vice President, not, of course, referring to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair)—may, in his or her judgment, decide that any rule is unconstitutional, and then submit the matter to a majority of the Senate for a decision, does that not open the door wide to a knocking out by the mere majority of the moment of any rule of procedure, whether or not the written rules are, or rules which have been, decided by many precedents in the past?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Florida is exactly correct. The present Vice President has made his ruling, stating that it pertains to the right of the Senate to make its own rules. Some other Vice President may select another basis. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has made a fine point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. It occurs to me that if the present Vice President can make this particular point at the beginning of the session, or at the beginning of this Congress, as to rule XXII, there is no reason whatsoever why he or any other Vice President cannot make the same

point concerning the same rule or any other rule at any stage in the course of the session, which, of course, upon submission to the Senate, leaves the question, it seems to me, completely to the whims, the caprices, and the momentary judgment of a majority of the Senate to alter the Senate rules at will. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. I think that is one of the great dangers confronting us. I fear a majority of the Senators have not maturely considered that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that this was a matter which should be dissociated from all pending or prospective legislation in the civil rights field or any other field. This question goes to the very heart and, I may say, soul of the Senate itself.

I make the point that every Senator should vote his convictions and his final judgment, but I hope that if they vote to sustain the position of the Vice President, they will say they are not voting simply to sustain a ruling from the Chair on this point, because I believe under our system of government no mortal man has a semblance of authority, be he a constitutional officer or anyone else, to declare invalid, void, and unconstitutional a rule deliberately adopted by this body. Whenever we admit such a contention, I think we are not only on the way out, but we have already completed our labors as an important and distinctive branch of the Government.

So, however, one may feel as to what the rules should be, let us not be a party to establishing and sustaining a precedent of this kind. I do not speak of the Vice President personally. I do not believe anyone, anywhere, in our system of government can set himself up as a one-man court to make a ruling on a so-called constitutional question and thereby upset the rules or upset a body of the type of the U.S. Senate, a constitutional branch of our Government. I believe the Senate simply ought not let that happen. We should dissociate ourselves from such a course of action.

I appeal to the great liberal Senators, like the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I appeal to him and his fine sense of justice and his strong, vigorous thinking. I urge him to rethink this matter, should he be inclined to let the Presiding Officer set such a precedent as the knocking out of the rules of the Senate, starting them on their way to being declared invalid, simply by a ruling which, as I understand, is more or less gratuitous anyway.

I want to emphasize what I believe the Senator from Tennessee has already emphasized far beyond anything I could present. I emphasize that this is not a southern fight. It is not a rule XXII fight. I sometimes think there is some effort made to scare new Members of the Senate away from voting with those of us who seek to maintain these rules so rigidly. I think this question goes to the very vitals and the very heart of our form of government, and more particularly of this body.

Rule XXII has been used in the past by almost all minority groups, as well as by almost all of the liberal forces in the Senate. I think that since I have been a Member of the Senate there have been more delays and so-called long debates by far carried on by those who live outside the South than by the southerners themselves. It may be true that the debates in which the southerners have been the leaders have run longer; but only the other day I saw the Senator from Wisconsin and his colleague carry on a two-man discussion. That could be repeated many times.

Protection has been sought not only by the southern Democrats but also by progressive Republicans such as the late Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, and many others.

There are two examples of legislative measures which were highly popular in the excitement of the times and which were defeated in the Senate because the Members of the Senate and the people of the country had an opportunity to take a second look at the matters. They have been referred to briefly, but to complete the record at this point I shall refer to them again.

In 1937, when President Roosevelt was seeking to increase the membership of the Supreme Court, his popularity would have assured this objective had the matter been brought to an early vote. The strategy of delay was decided upon, and after a few months a majority of the Senate came to the conclusion which most of them hold today, namely, that the Supreme Court should be an independent body of respected jurists, not loaded with political appointees.

Later, during the railroad strike of 1946, it was recommended that striking employees be drafted into the military service. A bill looking to that end passed the House of Representatives within minutes after the recommendation had been made. In the Senate, however, the more thorough and detached consideration of the measure led to its being killed as unwise. There have been cases when prolonged debate has been the major factor in the passage of bills. Recent examples of this were the Lend-Lease Act of 1941 and the loan to Great Britain in 1946, both of which had doubtful support when the debate was begun, but which later gained a substantial majority.

I have already referred to the disclosures and the understanding which came to the people and to Congress concerning the recall of General MacArthur by President Truman. Thus, almost every minority group in the country has benefited because of this principle in conducting the business of the Senate. I am satisfied that not only has the country as a whole benefited, but that the country as a whole and minority groups will suffer should the Senate not protect its own rules.

From this brief résumé of the principle and the rule as it now stands, we can see that free debate has best served those who would now destroy it, even though none can tell who may be the next to invoke its protection.

Those who are contending for a change would destroy this rule and the principle it sustains because this manner of procedure has become beclouded by the civil rights issue—a legislative matter. That I believe is 99 percent of the cause of the pressure and the agitation to destroy this mud sill, this bedrock of the Senate.

Rule XXII, as a procedural rule, is more important than the passage of any bill. It is more important than the passage of the civil rights bills by those who favor them. It would be hard for me to think of a more effective method of cutting down the States' rights and powers than by putting this proposed straitjacket of gag rule on the Senate or any part of it.

Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), I now raise the question, who comes here, after all, urging that these rules be swept away in the way now proposed, and that such a precedent be established, and that majority rule control? Is it the majority leader of the Senate? Not as I understand. Is it the minority leader of the Senate? Not as I understand. Is it the President-elect of the United States, to whom we look to carry the burdens which will face him as the months unfold—greater burdens, unfortunately as I have said, than I believe any President within the last 100 years has faced. No, it is not they. Madam President, from what source does the call for this proposed change come? What is the need for it? Madam President, I submit there is no need for it, or else we would have heard the call come from those who must carry these burdens and responsibilities.

I hope the day never comes, and I do not believe it has come, when a majority of the Senate will let its Presiding Officer set aside its major rules, without debate, without any training as a judicial officer, without any preparation which ordinarily would be had in connection with so grave a step—but simply because he might declare so important a rule unconstitutional.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that I think the Senator from Mississippi has well made the point that since rule XXII was adopted in 1917, very much more good than evil has been done under it.

I make the additional point that prior to 1917 there was no limitation whatsoever upon debate; and the 1917 rule, which with some amendments is now the rule, was a restrictive one and was so regarded. Furthermore, under the rule of unlimited debate which prevailed prior to 1917, much more good than evil was done as a result of unlimited debate.

I call attention to the following list of proposed laws which were defeated for the moment by unlimited debate in the years prior to 1917:

The reconstruction of Louisiana measure, which was defeated in 1865, and was replaced with a better law in 1868.

The election laws of 1879, which had to be repealed in their entirety in 1909.

The force bill of 1890–91, which was defeated; and there is no one to mourn its defeat; no one would stand for it for a moment now.

The three river and harbor bills which were defeated in 1901, 1903, and 1914, all of them being replaced later by better measures.

The Tri-State bill, which was defeated in 1903, and was replaced by a better one in 1907, which was amended in 1912.

The Columbian Treaty, which was defeated in the regular session in 1903, but was ratified in a somewhat different form in a special or subsequent session that year.

The two ship subsidy bills which were defeated in 1907 and 1922–23, but were replaced in different form in 1936.

The Canadian reciprocity bill, which was defeated in 1911, but was passed later in better form.

The Arizona-New Mexico statehood bill, which was defeated by a determined filibuster by those who felt that each of those territories was entitled to be a State; and later, as the RECORD shows and as history shows, each of them has made a fine State, when admitted under subsequent legislation.

The ship purchase bill of 1915, which was passed in different form in 1916.

The point I should like to make is that even under the rule of unlimited debate, without the restrictions embraced in rule XXII, as now somewhat modified, the history of the Senate and the history of the country show that vastly more good than harm was done by debate without any limitation.

So I warmly commend the Senator for insisting upon preserving the limited restriction upon debate which is embraced in rule XXII, as modified.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and other Senators, relative to certain pieces of proposed legislation which passed the House of Representatives, but were held up, stopped, or debated at length in the Senate.

One of those pieces of proposed legislation was the proposal—for which, unfortunately, and to my sorrow, I voted in the House of Representatives—called for drafting the railway strikers. Reference has been made to the part the Senate played in killing that nefarious and uncalled for piece of legislation, and some reference has been made to the outstanding efforts of the late Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, a great Senator. I think we should also remember that there was another Senator who raised his voice and had as much influence in stopping that attempt to "railroad through" that proposed legislation—and I am not using a pun—and that is the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who at that time joined Senator Taft, and they, too, were joined by other Senators. Many times since I have thanked God that there was an institution such as the U.S. Senate where a mistake which we made in the House of Representatives, and to which I contributed, could be corrected and was corrected.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana for his very fine contribution.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I appreciate the comment made by the Senator from Montana, although he touched on a very delicate matter, insofar as I am concerned. The Senator from Montana will recall that in the heat of that debate I made an unkind reference to the President of the United States, for which I subsequently apologized, although the fact is that the surrender of the railroad brotherhoods in that controversy was prepared by me, in my office, and was dictated by me, and was written on the typewriter by my stenographer, and was placed on the desk of the President by 10:30 that morning—which preceded the speech he made before the joint meeting of the two Houses. It was in the heat of that debate, knowing that background of fact, that I made the statement for which I subsequently apologized, and which apology the President, because of his bigness, most generously accepted.

But the Senator from Montana is correct on the point that on that occasion it was the Senate debate of substantial length which prevented, I believe, the making of what would have been a great mistake.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senators for their very pertinent comments on these points.

Madam President, again, with all deference to the present Vice President, and let me say that my remarks apply to the Office, I trust that a majority of the membership of this great body, with its distinctive characteristics in our form of government, will not permit to stand a ruling by its Presiding Officer that its rules are unconstitutional and therefore are void and invalid. We have seen such a ruling made; and then the Chamber became almost vacant, while the matter was really discussed on its merits by only a few Senators, who pointed out the lessons of history as evidenced by the experience of the legislative branch and by the experience of others. While all that was being done, the seats of Senators in this Chamber were almost entirely vacant. But, following that, the Senators who advocate the change will return to the Chamber and will attempt to permit a majority of the Senate, even though honest, to materially change and greatly lessen the power and the importance and the responsibility of this great branch of our Government.

Madam President, I trust that that will not happen, and I do not believe it will happen.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on the afternoon of January 4, I said, as will be found on pages 79–80 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date:

The Morse antifilibuster resolution, which I have introduced year after year and will offer again this afternoon before adjournment or recess, provides for the basic principles contained in the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators have offered on this occasion. I am a cosponsor of that resolution, too.

I introduced a series of bills on that day, and by oversight my resolution was not included in the series. I now ask unanimous consent that my resolution be accepted for introduction, appropriately referred, and printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the body of the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the resolution, as well as the Humphrey-Kuchel resolution, in my judgment covers every objection that was raised this afternoon by the speeches of two of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKELY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In the course of their remarks they stressed the importance of the Senate rule as a check upon precipitate action in the Senate. They pointed out that time and time again the Senate had been able to function as a check upon hasty action in the Senate; and no one would fight harder to protect that checking power of the Senate than the senior Senator from Oregon.

But the exercise of the checking function under our form of government does not include in its meaning the power to prevent action from ever occurring on an issue when a majority of the representatives of the people think action should be taken. The Humphrey-Kuchel proposal, the Morse antifilibuster proposal, the antifilibuster proposals introduced in the past by Senators such as the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], former Senator Lehman and others have not only sought to protect minority rights, but also to make it possible for democratic procedures, through the exercise of the majority rule principle, to function. Every debate that was used as an example this afternoon, whether it was the railway case of 1946 or the atomic energy bill or the Dixon-Yates contract, about which I shall have something to say momentarily, could have been held under our proposals, just as it was held. In fact, more debate could have been held on each of those issues than in fact was held if any one of these antifilibuster resolutions had been the rule of the Senate, because these antifilibuster resolutions guarantee adequate time for the minority to present its case, guarantee the checking of a steamroller tactic in the Senate, and assure that there shall be at least 100 hours of debate after cloture.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon is making this point. It seems to me it should be made over and over again until we are able to persuade not only our colleagues, but the American people, that what the Senator from Oregon has said is irrefutable logic and cannot be denied. There is no effort by any Senator—certainly not the Senator from Pennsylvania and certainly not the Senator from Oregon—to restrict full debate of any issue, but we would give the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the opportunity to hold up a vote on an issue of importance until the question had been completely ventilated—for 2 or 3 weeks, if necessary. I hope that no Member of this body will vote against any of the present efforts to modify rule XXII on the totally fallacious ground that this is the only way that those in the minority can take their case to their colleagues in extenso as well as to the country. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for his very capable presentation of that point of view.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his comments. I wish the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that I stand shoulder to shoulder with him in support of the Kuchel-Humphrey or the Humphrey-Kuchel proposal and other proposals that guarantee this protection to the minority. This afternoon the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], one of the great parliamentarians of the Senate, together with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] and other Senators cited some of the historic debates of recent years in the Senate in which the debate was conducted at some length, but in every case they cited no cloture petition had been filed.

These debates were all held prior to cloture. The antifilibuster resolution known as the Humphrey-Kuchel proposal, or the Morse antifilibuster resolution, which I have just offered, provides for lengthy debate after cloture—after a petition is signed by 16 Senators proposing that debate be brought to an end.

Has any Senator stopped to think what 100 hours of debate means in the Senate? As the Senator from Pennsylvania has clearly stated, it means many days of debate. Suppose the Senate met for 8 hours a day in debate. There would be many days of debate after cloture. No one can convince me that if we are entitled to 100 hours of debate after cloture, which, in most instances means that there have already been many days of debate before cloture, we cannot present to the people of this country every possible argument that can be presented on an issue—I care not what the issue.

MEANING OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

To my distinguished friends who have been arguing the checking power of the Senate, I should like to say that in my judgment it is a misapplication of this precious procedural principle in our constitutional form of government which we call the check-and-balance system. The check-and-balance system does not mean that any division of our Government shall exercise the authority of preventing another branch of the Government from exercising its prerogatives on an issue. But this filibuster technique that is argued for by some would continue a power in the Senate so that neither the courts nor the executive branch of the Government shall have an opportunity to pass their judgment upon the particular issue that may be involved in a given piece of legislation. In other words, they seek to maintain a continuation of a procedure in the Senate that gives a minority in the Senate the power of finality on an issue. Such an exercise of power by a minority of Senators, in my judgment, does a great wrong and injustice to the entire theory of the check-and-balance system under our form of government.

What we seek is a guarantee that there will be full protection in the Senate of minority rights for full and adequate debate on a subject by the minority seeking to change themselves into a majority and seeking to inform the American people as to what is involved. But after there has been full and adequate debate, under our democratic form of government the majority should have the right to work its will on the legislative process and pass the legislation if a majority of Senators favor it. Then it should go to the White House for veto if the President believes that, on the merits, it ought to be vetoed. That is the exercise of the checking power by the President. If the measure is signed by the President, it may go to the courts of the land for the exercise of the judicial checking functions of the judiciary. That procedure will keep faith with our democratic processes. It gives full effect to what we call our system of checks and balances. Therefore, I think the time is long overdue when the attempt to maintain a power of finality in the Senate by a minority should be defeated.

It is said, and particularly pointedly to me and other liberals in the Senate, that in the decades gone by since 1917 there have been liberals in the Senate who have fought attempts to place a limitation upon debate. I believe in doing my research, and so I have been doing a little research on this subject. It is true that liberals such as La Follette, Hiram Johnson, Norris, and others have been opposed to limitations upon debate.

It is also true, Madam President, that the record fails to disclose that they ever had an opportunity to discuss the specific proposal which is now before the Senate. I am perfectly willing to say that it may be, if they had had the present proposal before them, they would have held to their position. However, I cannot be sure.

If they lived now and saw the changed conditions that have occurred in our democracy since the time that they walked the carpet of this historic Chamber, they might recognize that the time had come when there ought to be a reasonable limitation which would provide for 100 hours of debate after cloture, as a rule in the Senate. If they held to their position that the resolution we seek to adopt should not be adopted, I would say that great as they were, they would be in error, and I would vote against them on the floor of the Senate.

At a later time in the debate I propose to present persuasive data which will show that a majority vote rule will succeed in protecting minority rights and still make it possible for the majority to exercise its will on legislative processes in the Senate in keeping with the constitutional meaning of the check-and-balance system.

It will show that the so-called 60-percent rule will not do it, that the 60-percent rule at best is an expedient, that the 60-percent rule has within itself no inherent merits; that the 60-percent rule is at best a compromise, and, I think, a very bad compromise, and that the 60-percent rule will not, in fact, based upon past filibusters, have succeeded in breaking those filibusters. In fact, in my judgment it is possible to make a case for the adoption of the majority vote proposal, but it is not possible

to make a case on the merits for the 60-percent rule.

Therefore, as I have previously announced, I shall vote against the 60-percent proposal and shall continue my fight, so long as I sit in the Senate, for giving to the American people the rule they are entitled to, namely, majority vote rule, and giving to the Democratic Party, may I say, a keeping of its pledge. The Democratic Party, in convention assembled, did not pledge any 60-percent rule. The Democratic Party pledged a majority vote rule.

I do not intend to walk out on that pledge by supporting any expedient compromise. I serve notice on my liberal colleagues that they can count me out on that compromise. When they are ready to stand firm again for a majority vote rule in the Senate, I will join them. I shall not only vote against them on the 60-percent rule, but I shall be glad to join in making them understand the merits of the majority vote principle by engaging in a long discourse on public education on the question, if it is going to be a 60-percent rule that will be the final compromise proposal.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and myself, I intend to introduce a bill to provide for the city of Washington an elected mayor, an elected city council, and an elected nonvoting Delegate to the Congress of the United States.

It is with great pleasure that I do this, for the subject is one which has occupied my attention for several sessions of the Congress and it is a special source of gratification to me to be associated in this endeavor with the great chairman of my committee who has consistently demonstrated the sincerity of his interest in the District by the effective manner in which he has successfully sought and obtained legislation of value and importance to the District.

I am further heartened as I view prospects of legislation this session by the information that my gracious colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, of Oregon's Third Congressional District, is offering a companion measure in that body. She will be a most valuable and articulate ally in this important fight for principle of government at the local level. This principle is that government of a city should be based upon the free election by the citizens of representatives responsible to them for the conduct of local affairs.

Madam President, the great French philosopher, Montaigne, warns us in one of his essays that:

> Our ordinary practice is to follow the inclinations of our appetite, to the left, to the right, upward, downward, just as we are wafted by the winds of occasion. We know what we want only at the moment we want it.

In the past decade, the winds of occasion have blown fiercely about the subject of the bill we propose to introduce this morning.

However, what is proposed is no new and glittering venture; rather, it is but an extension of the practice to be found in each of our States. Local self-government is a mode of political behavior which has deep roots in our national past and against which, in abstract, no man or woman in this Chamber would argue.

The home rule bill we offer today differs from that which passed the Senate last session, only in the fact that effective dates have been modified to make it current. Yet, we would not be realistic were we to hazard that this simple needed legislation will become law without controversy or amendment. Rather, it is my hope that early consideration can be given to the bill by committee and that in the hearing room all points of view may be voiced to the end that the reported measure will be strengthened in detail while preserving the essential elective structures.

I feel that the bill, in principle, is sound; that the procedures set forth in it are workable; and, that enactment is in the public interest. It is not necessary to rehearse in tedious detail at this time the arguments supporting the measure. It will suffice to state that by its introduction, once again, the Senate is presented with an opportunity to pass upon the merits of a specific proposal to convey to the people of Washington, D.C., a right—a birthright, if you will—of which they have long been deprived.

Madam President, it is so easy for our memories to be short. However, as I introduce the bill again, I wish to pay tribute once more to a former Member of this body who has gone to his reward, to the great Matt Neely, of West Virginia. Although the bill for a time was known as the Neely-Morse bill, and then became known as the Morse bill, I have always referred to it as the Neely-Morse bill, because when it was first introduced in the Senate many years ago, Matt Neely and I stood together, as we fought for true home rule for the District of Columbia. We defined true home rule as encompassing the election of a mayor in the District of Columbia. We fought for that principle because in my judgment there cannot be true home rule in the District of Columbia if the chief executive of the municipal government is imposed upon the citizens of this community by the President of the United States or by any other officer. It seems to me that if we wish to present to the world a good example of democracy in action, we will not delay any longer the adoption of a home rule bill that gives true home rule to the District of Columbia by giving its citizens the right to elect their own mayor.

Recently—in fact, from September until December—I served as one of the delegates in the U.S. delegation at the United Nations. I do not know how many delegates, during those 3 months, came to talk to me about the situation in regard to the denial of democratic rights in the District of Columbia. I was quite surprised to discover how well informed delegates from Africa, Asia, and Latin America were in regard to the denial within the District of Columbia of this basic democratic right of local self-government.

Therefore I wish to say, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that when I introduced the bill this afternoon I also introduced a subject matter that is of more importance to the foreign policy of this country than, I am sure, many of my colleagues fully comprehend. Our failure to grant local self-government to the citizens of the District of Columbia has resulted in great damage to our prestige in the world, for the obvious and well-established fact that we do not always square our fine-sounding preachments about our democracy and our practice of it here at home.

In the consideration of this bill, I hope that matters truly extraneous will not be given weight, but instead, that we will adhere in our deliberations consistently to a pattern of legislative action based upon the extension to the people of the District of those principles of democracy and local responsibility for civic functions which are common to all the other cities and towns of our country.

Let us not be wafted hither and thither by winds of expediency, nor by the counsels of the trimmers. Instead, let us at this session set a straight course and, by adhering to it, bring this long deferred but urgent business to a successful conclusion.

Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide home rule for the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 287) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Contains definitions of principal terms used in the bill.

TITLE II—STATUS OF THE DISTRICT

Incorporates the District of Columbia as a body politic and corporate in perpetuity for governmental purposes. Provides that all the territory constituting the permanent seat of the Government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia, and that the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia remains unchanged.

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Creates a District Council consisting of nine members elected as provided in title VIII. The qualifications for members of the Council are set forth as follows: (1) a qualified elector; (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated; has, during the 3 years next preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the District and has for 1 year

preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated; (3) holds no other elective public office; and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds.

The compensation for such members is fixed at $8,500 per annum for the Chairman and $6,500 for members.

The powers of the present Board of Commissioners are transferred to the Council, except those conferred on the Mayor, and the Board of Commissioners is abolished.

The Board of Education is abolished, and its functions are transferred to the Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

The Zoning Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, the Redevelopment Land Agency, the Armory Board, and the National Capital Housing Authority are abolished and their functions transferred to the Council. Powers of the Council and the qualified electors, and the limitations on those powers, are spelled out. The Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the Washington Aqueduct, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or any Federal agency are specifically excluded from the authority of the District government.

The qualified electors and the Council are prohibited from passing any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility of the National Capital Planning Commission, except as to membership on the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council as regards to the Engineer Commissioner or the Board of Commissioners.

The bill makes explicit the constitutional power of Congress to legislate at any time with respect to the District of Columbia.

Jurisdiction over the municipal courts shall vest with the Council. Any person to be appointed or elected after the date of enactment of this act shall hold office for a term of not less than 10 years and receive a salary not less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the municipal court.

The bill provides for the election from its members of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Council, the appointment of a secretary as its chief administrative officer with duties as specified in the bill, and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary, the calling of the first and regular meetings, the establishment of committees, the scope and form of acts and resolutions, and the procedure for the adoption and passage of zoning acts. The Council is empowered to conduct investigations, and to issue and enforce subpenas.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Creates the office of Mayor to be elected as provided in title VIII. The qualifications for holding the office of Mayor are as follows: (1) A qualified elector; (2) is domiciled and resides in the District and has during the 3 years next preceding his nomination been resident in and domiciled in the District; (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. His salary is to be $15,000 annually, with an allowance for official expenses of not more than $2,500 annually. The bill confers on him usual administrative powers and duties, including the power to appoint personnel in the executive branch of the government and to remove such personnel in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The Mayor would have full authority to execute the powers and duties imposed upon him by law, including the authority to redelegate functions to subordinate officials as he deems necessary. The Mayor shall keep the Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District, and make such recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable. The Mayor is empowered to veto acts of the Council; they may be passed over his veto by vote of two-thirds of the members of the Council.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

The fiscal year of the District of Columbia is fixed by the bill, and the preparation and adoption of the budget is provided for. The Council is empowered to rescind previously appropriated funds then available for expenditure, or to appropriate additional funds.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

The District is authorized to incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget, with a restriction that the aggregate debt, including debt owed to the Treasury of the United States, is not to exceed 12 percent of the average assessed value of the taxable real and tangible personal property of the District as of the 1st day of July of the 10 most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available. The bill provides that new debt would have to be approved by the voters except that, within the 12 percent limitation, debt up to 2 percent (in the aggregate) of the assessed valuation of taxable real and personal property could be authorized by the Council without approval of the voters. The Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, and the bill sets forth the provisions which must be contained in an act authorizing the issuing of bonds.

The Council is authorized to issue supplemental notes in a total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year if there are no unappropriated funds available to meet supplemental appropriations. Such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such act becomes effective. Short term notes may be issued in anticipation of revenues in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of the total anticipated revenue for the current fiscal year.

Bond acts of the District shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation of rate or amount upon all taxable real and personal tangible property in the District in amounts, which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for such purposes, will be sufficient to pay principal and interest as these fall due. In addition, the full faith and credit of the District for the payment of the principal and interest on all bonds and notes is pledged.

Bonds and notes issued by the Council and the interest thereon would be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

The bill would permit national banks, Federal building and loan associations and Federal savings and loans associations and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations domiciled in the District of Columbia, to underwrite and trade in public bonds or notes of the District issued pursuant to this title.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

This title provides for the bonding of employees of the District, and the Mayor is charged with the administration of the financial affairs of the District. He must prepare and submit the annual budget estimates and budget message; supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions; maintain systems of accounting and internal control; submit to the Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department; prepare at the end of each fiscal year a complete financial statement; supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the District; supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues; have custody over all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District; and have custody of all investments and invested funds of the District.

The Council may provide for the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure. The bill provides that no officer or agency of the District shall expend or contract to expend any money for any purpose in excess of amounts available under appropriations therefor, except expenditures for capital improvements to be financed in whole or in part by the issuance of bonds.

The bill provides for an independent audit by the General Accounting Office in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General. Such audit reports as the Comptroller General deems necessary shall be submitted to the Congress, the Mayor, and the Council. The Mayor, with the advice and consent of the Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are given power to enter into agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owed by the District to the United States, or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill continues the Board of Elections as established by the District Primary Act. Successors to the present Board, after their terms have expired, would be appointed without regard to political affiliations by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council, for a term of 3 years. The Board is charged with maintaining a permanent registry; conducting registrations and elections; determining appeals; printing, distributing, and counting ballots; dividing the District into three wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular as possible; establishing voting precincts; operating polling places, certifying election results and other duties. The Board is given authority to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the purposes of the act, and the salary of each member is fixed at the rate of $1,500 per annum. Present law provides compensation for Board members at $25 per day while performing duties.

The Board of Elections shall conduct a general election in each even-numbered year and in any odd-numbered calendar year, if an act authorizing the issuance of bonds as required by section 602 to be submitted for a referendum at an election is enacted at least 40 days prior to the date for conducting the election in such year.

General elections are to be held on the fourth Tuesday before the Tuesday in November prescribed for runoff elections. The latter are to be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

The offices to be filled by election are members of the Council, the Mayor, and the District Delegate. Members of the Council shall be elected for 2-year terms beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year following such election. The Mayor shall be elected for a 4-year term. The District Delegate shall be elected for 2 years beginning at noon on January 3 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

The bill provides a procedure for the recall of any elective officer of the District of

Columbia by the qualified electors of the District. The petition to be filed demanding the recall by such qualified electors of any elective officer must be signed by not less than 25 percent of the number of qualified electors voting at the last preceding general election. The petition must set forth the reasons for such demand, and be filed with the secretary of the Council.

On the ballot at such election shall be printed in not more than 200 words the reason for demanding the recall of any elective officer, and in not more than 200 words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands. No petition demanding the recall of any officer shall be circulated until he has held office for a period of 6 months.

The Board of Elections is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of petition for recall, and with respect to the conduct of any special election held for this purpose.

Vacancies in the office of Mayor or in the Council are to be filled at the next general election. It is provided that until a vacancy in the office of Mayor or in the Council can be filled in a general election, a vacancy in the office of Mayor shall be filled by appointment by the Council, and a vacancy in the Council shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor.

In the event the office of Delegate becomes vacant at a time when the unexpired term is 6 months or more, a special election is authorized.

A qualified elector shall be a person who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the 1-year period ending on the date of the election; who is a citizen of the United States; who is on the day of election at least 21 years of age; who has never been convicted of a felony or, if so convicted, has been pardoned; who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction and who certifies that he has not, within 1 year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot. The term "municipal office" as used in the bill means an office of any governmental unit subordinate to a State or territorial government.

The bill provides that no persons shall be registered unless he shall be able to qualify otherwise as an elector on the day of the next election; he executes a registration affidavit on a form prescribed by the Board of Elections showing that he will meet on election day all the requirements of a qualified elector. An appeal procedure is provided for a person who is not permitted to register.

The bill provides for two methods of nominations: (1) a declaration of candidacy without petition but with a filing fee equal to 5 percent of the annual compensation of the office for which nomination is sought or (2) a nominating petition signed in the case of District Delegate or Mayor by 600 qualified electors registered in the District, and in the case of a candidate for the Council 300 qualified electors registered in the ward from which nomination is sought. Elections are to be nonpartisan. The ballot is to show the wards from which each candidate, other than the District Delegate and Mayor, has been nominated. Each voter is entitled to vote for nine candidates for the Council, not more than three from each ward, and one candidate for District Delegate, and one candidate for Mayor. Absentee voting will be permitted under regulations adopted by the Board of Elections.

The bill contains an amendment to the Hatch Act by adding the District of Columbia to section 16 thereof, which provides that—

"Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities, the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons."

Provision for challenging voters and for appeals to the Board of Elections are made. Poll watchers are authorized, and a procedure is set up pertaining to recounts parallel to that of the District Primary Act with a modification to take care of referendums. The petitioner must deposit a sum of $20 for each precinct to be recounted. The fee is refunded if the election result is changed by the recount. The petition is to the Board of Elections, and is filed by qualified candidates in the elections. In the case of referendums, since there are no candidates in a referendum, any person who voted in any election is eligible to petition the Board for a recount of votes cast on a referendum question.

Violations of any provision of this title or regulations published under its authority are declared misdemeanors and penalties are provided.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Except where the terms of intergovernmental contracts are prescribed by other provisions of law, the District and Federal Governments are authorized to contract with each other for the rendition of services in order to prevent duplication of effort and to otherwise promote efficiency and economy. Such contracts are to be negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned and be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council. Such contracts will provide for payment for the actual cost of furnishing such services.

The costs to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such contract is to be paid out of appropriations made by the Council to the District officers and agencies to which they are furnished.

The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such contract shall be paid from appropriations made by the Congress to such Federal officers and agencies.

No member of the Council and no other officer or employee of the District shall have any financial interest direct or indirect in any contract or sale to which the District is a party.

Except for the qualifications already enumerated, no person is ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Council or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or receives compensation from another source. The right of a person to another office under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service as a member of the Council or the Board of Elections if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in the other office.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission is authorized to render advice and assistance to the new government in the development of a merit system.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Whenever the functions of any existing agency or officer are transferred under the bill the personnel (except the members of Boards or Commissions abolished by the bill), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations which relate to the functions are also transferred. Provision is made for the settling of disputes which may arise out of such transfers.

Any statute, regulation, or other action relating to any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by the bill shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made. No pending judicial or administrative action shall abate by reason of the provisions of the bill becoming effective, but such actions shall continue with appropriate substitutions of parties.

The purpose underlying this title is to provide continuity in the transfer of existing personnel, property, and funds; to continue in effect present statutes and regulations; and to provide for orderly disposition of pending actions and proceedings.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

This title provides that, should a part of the act be held invalid, the remainder of its provisions shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

The President of the United States is authorized and requested to take such action during the transition period between the enactment of the bill and the first meeting of the Council as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform its functions. The sum of $500,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the District to pay the expenses of the Board of Elections and in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of the bill. The full amount of expenditures made under this authorization shall be reimbursable by the District to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

The charter (titles I to XI, inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, and XVII) shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted in the charter referendum provided by title XIV, except as specified in section 1406, except that part 2 of title III, title V, and title VII, and section 402 shall take effect on the day upon which the Mayor and Council first elected takes office. Titles XII, XIII, and XIV shall take effect on the day following the date on which this act is enacted.

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

The bill provides that on a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections, not more than 9 months after the enactment of the act, a referendum shall be conducted to determine whether the registered qualified electors of the District accept the charter. The Board of Elections established under the District Primary Act is charged with duties of registration and the holding of the charter referendum. Provision is made for the form of ballot to be used in the referendum and for the method of voting. If a majority of the registered qualified electors voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter, the charter shall be accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result to the President, which must be done not later than 30 days after the date of the referendum. The bill contains a prohibition against the interference with the registration or voting of any qualified elector in the referendum.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

The bill provides for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. He shall have the right of debate, may make any motion, except to reconsider, shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, but may not vote, which is the same status as the Territorial Delegate. His term of office shall be for 2 years. No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he is a qualified elector, at least 25 years old, holds no other public office, is domiciled and resides in the District, and during the 3 years next preceding his nomination (a) has been resident in and domiciled in the District and (b) has not voted in any election (other than in the District) for any candidate for public office. The bill amends several statutes relating to a Territorial Delegate and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to make them applicable to the District Delegate. The Delegate is to be elected as provided in title VIII.

TITLE XVI—REFERENDUM

The bill provides that the qualified electors shall have power to approve or reject in a referendum any act of the Council, or part or parts thereof, which has become law, whether or not such act is yet operative. This power shall not extend, however, to acts authorizing the issuance of bonds, which are subject to the provisions contained in section 602 or to acts continuing existing taxes, or making appropriations which in the aggregate are not in excess of those for the preceding fiscal year. Within 45 days after an act subject to this title has been enacted, a petition signed by qualified electors equal in number to at least 10 percent of the number who voted at the last preceding general election may be filed with the secretary of the Council requesting that any such act, or any part or parts thereof, be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors. The Board of Elections is charged with conducting any referendum under this title.

When a referendum petition has been certified as sufficient, the act or parts thereof specified in the petition shall not become operative, or further action shall be suspended if it shall have become operative, until and unless approved by the electors as provided in this title. If the secretary of the Council has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective within 30 days after filing, the petition shall de deemed sufficient for the purposes of this title. An act which is submitted to a referendum which is not approved by a majority of the qualified electors shall be deemed repealed.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

Subject to the provisions of section 324 of the bill, the qualified electors are given the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District.

In exercising the power of initiative, not more than 10 percent of the number of qualified electors voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by initiative petition. The method for holding elections under the initiative procedure is set forth in this title.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

Provides that this act, divided into titles and sections according to the table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy, which is a part of such act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act."

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to the retention by Congress of the ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital which is granted by the Constitution, it is the intent of Congress to restore to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia the powers of local self-government which are a basic privilege of all American citizens; to reaffirm through such action the confidence of the American people in the strengthened validity of principles of local self-government by the elective process; to promote among the inhabitants of the District the sense of responsibility for the development and well-being of their community which will result from the enjoyment of such powers of self-government; to provide for the more effective participation in the development of the District and in the solution of its local problems by those persons who are most closely concerned; and to relieve the National Legislature of the burden of legislating upon purely local District matters. It is the further intention of Congress to exercise its retained ultimate legislative authority over the District only insofar as such action shall be necessary or desirable in the interest of the Nation. Finally, it is recognized that the restoration of the powers of local self-government to the inhabitants of the District by this Act will in no way change the need, which arises from the unique character of the District as the Nation's Capital, for the payment by the Federal Government of a share of the expenses of the District government; and it is intended that an equitable share thereof shall be paid annually.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Definitions

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Title II—Status of the District

Sec. 201. Status of the District.

Title III—The District Council

Part 1—Creation of the District Council

Sec. 301. Creation and membership.
Sec. 302. Qualifications for holding office.
Sec. 303. Compensation.
Sec. 304. Procedure for changes.

Part 2—Principal Functions of the District Council

Sec. 321. Functions heretofore exercised by the Board of Commissioners.
Sec. 322. Functions relating to zoning and other agencies.
Sec. 323. Certain delegated functions.
Sec. 324. Powers of and limitations upon District Council.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

Sec. 331. The Chairman.
Sec. 332. Secretary of the District Council; records and documents.
Sec. 333. Meetings.
Sec. 334. Committees.
Sec. 335. Acts and resolutions.
Sec. 336. Passage of Acts.
Sec. 337. Procedure for Zoning Acts.
Sec. 338. Investigations by District Council.

Title IV—Mayor

Sec. 401. Election, qualifications, and salary.
Sec. 402. Powers and duties.

Title V—The District Budget

Sec. 501. Fiscal year.
Sec. 502. Budgetary details fixed by District Council.
Sec. 503. Adoption of budget.
Sec. 504. Budget establishes appropriations.
Sec. 505. Supplemental appropriations.

Title VI—Borrowing

Part 1—Borrowing for Capital Improvements

Sec. 601. Borrowing power; debt limitations.
Sec. 602. Contents of borrowing legislation; referendum on bond issue.
Sec. 603. Publication of borrowing legislation.
Sec. 604. Short period of limitation.
Sec. 605. Acts for issuance of bonds.
Sec. 606. Public sale.

Part 2—Short Term Borrowing

Sec. 621. Borrowing to meet supplemental appropriations.
Sec. 622. Borrowing in anticipation of revenues.
Sec. 623. Notes redeemable prior to maturity.
Sec. 624. Sale of notes.

Part 3—Payment of Bonds and Notes

Sec. 631. Payment of bonds and notes.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Sec. 641. Tax exemption.
Sec. 642. Legal investment.

Title VII—Financial Affairs of the District

Part 1—Financial Administration

Sec. 701. Surety bonds.
Sec. 702. Financial duties of the Mayor.
Sec. 703. Control of appropriations.
Sec. 704. Accounting supervision and control.
Sec. 705. When contracts and expenditures prohibited.
Sec. 706. General fund.
Sec. 707. Contracts extending beyond one year.

Part 2—Annual Post Audit by General Accounting Office

Sec. 721. Independent annual post audit.
Sec. 722. Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act.

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

Sec. 731. Adjustment of Federal and District expenses.

Title VIII—Elections in the District

Sec. 801. Board of elections.
Sec. 802. What elections shall be held.
Sec. 803. Elective offices; terms of office.
Sec. 804. Vacancies.
Sec. 805. What candidates are elected.
Sec. 805a. Recall.
Sec. 806. Qualified electors.
Sec. 807. Registration.
Sec. 808. Qualified candidates.
Sec. 809. Nominations.
Sec. 810. Nonpartisan elections.
Sec. 811. Method of voting.
Sec. 812. Recounts and contests.
Sec. 813. Interference with registration or voting.
Sec. 814. Violations.

Title IX—Miscellaneous

Sec. 901. Agreements with United States.
Sec. 902. Personal interest in contracts or transactions.
Sec. 903. Compensation from more than one source.
Sec. 904. Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in development of District merit system.

Title X—Succession in Government

Sec. 1001. Transfer of personnel, property, and funds.
Sec. 1002. Existing statutes, regulations, and so forth.
Sec. 1003. Pending actions and proceedings.
Sec. 1004. Vacancies resulting from abolition of Board of Commissioners.

Title XI—Separability of Provisions

Sec. 1101. Separability of provisions.

Title XII—Temporary Provisions

Sec. 1201. Powers of the President during transition period.
Sec. 1202. Reimbursable appropriation for the District.

Title XIII—Effective Dates

Sec. 1301. Effective dates.

Title XIV—Submission of Charter for Referendum

Sec. 1401. Charter referendum.
Sec. 1402. Board of Elections.
Sec. 1403. Registration.
Sec. 1404. Charter referendum ballot; notice of voting.
Sec. 1405. Method of voting.
Sec. 1406. Acceptance or nonacceptance of charter.

Title XV—Delegate

Sec. 1501. District Delegate.

Title XVI—Referendum

Sec. 1601. Power of referendum.
Sec. 1602. Effect of certification of referen-
Sec. 1603. Submission to electors.
Sec. 1604. Availability of list of qualified electors.
Sec. 1605. Results of referendum.

Title XVII—Initiative

Sec. 1701. Initiative.

Title XVIII—Title of Act

Sec. 1801. Title of Act.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Definitions

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The terms "District Council" or "Council" means the Council of the District of Columbia provided for by title III.

(3) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the District Council provided for by title III.

(4) The term "Mayor" means the Mayor provided for by title IV.

(5) The term "qualified elector" means a qualified elector of the District as specified in section 806, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(6) The term "act" includes any legislation adopted by the District Council, except where the term "Act" is used to refer to this Act or other Acts of Congress herein specified.

(7) The term "District Primary Act" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (Public Law 376, Eighty-fourth Congress; 69 Stat. 699).

(8) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation.

(9) The term "capital project", or "project", means (a) any physical public betterment or improvement and any preliminary studies and surveys relative thereto; (b) the acquisition of property of a permanent nature; or (c) the purchase of equipment for any public betterment or improvement when first erected or acquired.

(10) The term "pending", when applied to any capital project, means authorized but not yet completed.

(11) The term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections created by section 3 of the District Primary Act.

(12) The term "election", unless the context otherwise indicates, means an election held pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(13) The term "domicile" means that place where a person has his true, fixed, and permanent home and to which, when he is absent, he has the intention of returning.

(14) The term "municipal office" means an office of any governmental unit subordinate to a State or Territorial government.

(15) The terms "publish" and "publication", unless otherwise specifically provided herein, means publication in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District.

(16) The term "Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia" means the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Tax Court, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and such other municipal courts as the District Council may hereafter establish by act.

TITLE II—STATUS OF THE DISTRICT

Status of the District

SEC. 201. (a) All the territory constituting the permanent seat of the Government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is hereby declared to be a body politic and corporate in perpetuity for governmental purposes and as such may sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with, and have a corporate seal. Such body politic and corporate is the successor of the District of Columbia created by section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia and continued by the first section of the Act of June 11, 1878 (D.C. Code, 1951 edition, sec. 1–102). So far as is consistent with the provisions of this Act, all powers, rights, privileges, immunities, duties, obligations, assets, and liabilities of the District of Columbia created by such section 2 are hereby transferred to, vested in, and imposed upon the body politic and corporate created by this section.

(b) Section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1871 (16 Stat. 419), and section 1 of the Act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 102), are hereby repealed.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia as the same was established or may be subsequently established under the provisions of title I of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 552).

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Part 1—Creation of the District Council

Creation and Membership

SEC. 301. There is hereby created a Council of the District of Columbia consisting of nine members elected as provided in title VIII.

Qualifications for Holding Office

SEC. 302. No person shall hold the office of member of the District Council unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated, has, during the three years next preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the District and has for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. A member of the Council shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Compensation

SEC. 303. Each member of the District Council except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $6,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. The Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate of $8,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. All members shall receive such additional allowances for expenses as may be approved by the District Council to be paid out of funds duly appropriated therefor.

Changes in Membership and Compensation of District Council Members

SEC. 304. The number of members constituting the District Council, the qualifications for holding office, and the compensation of such members may be changed by act passed by the District Council: *Provided*, That no such Act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election on the proposition set forth in any such act.

Part 2—Principal functions of the District Council

Functions Heretofore Exercised by the Board of Commissioners

SEC. 321. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all functions granted to or imposed upon the Board of Commissioners of the District are hereby transferred to the District Council except those powers hereinafter specifically conferred on the Mayor.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District is hereby abolished, and all provisions of law providing for the Board of Commissioners of the District, and the offices of Commissioner, Engineer Commissioner, and Assistants to the Engineer Commissioner of the District, are hereby repealed.

(c) The Board of Education provided for in section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), is hereby abolished and its functions are hereby transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Functions Relating to Zoning and Other Agencies

SEC. 322. (a) The Zoning Commission created by the first section of the Act of March 1, 1920, creating a Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia, as amended (D.C. Code, 1951 edition, sec. 5–412), is hereby abolished, and its functions are transferred to the District Council.

(b) The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; the Armory Board; and the National Capital Housing Authority are hereby abolished and their functions transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Certain Delegated Functions

SEC. 323. No function of the Board of Commissioners of the District which such Board has delegated to an officer or agency of the District shall be considered as a function transferred to the Council by section 321. Each such function is hereby transferred to the officer or agency to whom or to which it was delegated, until the Mayor or Council, or both, pursuant to the powers herein granted, shall revoke, modify, or transfer such delegation.

Powers of and Limitations Upon District Council

SEC. 324. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and subject to the reserved powers of the Congress as provided in section 324(d), there shall be vested (1) in the District Council, and (2) in the qualified electors of the District of Columbia as provided in section 1701 of this Act, complete legislative power over the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District: *Provided*, That such subjects are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. Except as otherwise provided in sections 321 and 322, nothing in this section shall be construed as vesting in the District government any greater authority over the Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the Washington Aqueduct, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or any Federal agency, than the authority which was vested in the Board of Commissioners prior to the date of the enactment of this Act. The District Council shall, by majority vote of those present, confirm or reject nominees proposed by the Mayor, and shall have

power, by vote of two-thirds of its members, to override any veto by the Mayor.

(b) The qualified electors of the District of Columbia or the District Council may not pass any act contrary to the provisions of this Act or—

(1) impose any tax on property of the United States;

(2) grant any exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise;

(3) authorize any lottery or the sale of lottery tickets or authorize any form of gambling;

(4) authorize the use of public money in support of any sectarian, denominational, or private school except as now or hereafter authorized by Congress;

(5) lend the public credit for support of any private undertaking;

(6) authorize the issuance of bonds except in compliance with the provisions of title VI; or

(7) pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463), as amended by the Act of April 30, 1926 (44 Stat. 374), the Act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 781); and the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and the people or the Council shall not pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any Act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility, of the National Capital Planning Commission; except insofar as the above-cited or other referred to Acts refer to the Engineer Commissioner or the Board of Commissioners, the former of which terms, after the enactment of this Act, shall mean the Mayor or some District Government official deemed by the Mayor to be best qualified, and designated by him to sit in lieu of the Mayor as a member of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and the latter term shall mean the District Council.

(c) An act, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall become effective thirty days after its passage or at such later time as the Council may designate: *Provided,* That an act may become effective at any time after its passage if the Council by vote of two-thirds of its members shall state in such act that an emergency exists requiring such earlier effective date. Every act or resolution shall include a preamble, or be accompanied by a report, setting forth concisely the purposes of its adoption. Every act or resolution shall be published, within seven days after its passage, as the District Council may direct.

(d) The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the qualified electors of the District of Columbia and the District Council by this Act, including without limitation legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this Act and any act or resolution passed by the Council or any act passed by the qualified electors of the District of Columbia.

(e) Upon the effective date of this title, jurisdiction over the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall vest with the District Council in all matters pertaining to the organization and composition of such Courts, and to the appointment or selection, qualification, tenure, and compensation of the judges thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the tenure of any judge occupying the position of a judge of a Municipal Court of the District of Columbia on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that his compensation may be increased.

(f) On or after the effective date of this title, any person appointed or elected to serve as judge of one of the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall not (1) be appointed or elected to serve for a term of less than ten years, or (2) receive as compensation for such service an amount less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) Nothing in subsection (e) of this section shall be construed to curtail the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or any other United States court other than the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia.

Part 3—Organization and procedure of the District Council

The Chairman

SEC. 331. The District Council shall elect from among its members a Chairman who shall be the presiding officer of the District Council and a Vice Chairman, who shall preside in the absence of the Chairman. When the Mayor is absent or unable to act, or when the office is vacant, the Chairman shall act in his stead. The term of the Chairman shall be for two years.

Secretary of the District Council; Records and Documents

SEC. 332. (a) The District Council shall appoint a secretary as its chief administrative officer and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the compensation and other terms of employment of such secretary, assistants, and clerical personnel shall be prescribed by the District Council.

(b) The secretary shall (1) keep a record of the proceedings of the District Council, (2) keep a record showing the text of all acts and resolutions introduced, and the ayes and noes of each vote, (3) authenticate by his signature and record in full in a continuing record kept for that purpose all acts passed by the District Council, and (4) perform such other duties as the District Council may from time to time prescribe.

Meetings

SEC. 333. (a) The first meeting of the District Council after this part takes effect shall be called by the member who receives the highest vote in the election provided in title VIII. He shall preside until a Chairman is elected. The first meeting of the District Council in each odd-numbered year commencing with the first odd-numbered year next following such election shall be called by the Secretary of the District Council for a date not later than January 7 of such year.

(b) The District Council shall provide for the time and place of its regular meetings. The District Council shall hold at least one regular meeting in each calendar week except that during July and August it shall hold at least two regular meetings in each month. Special meetings may be called, upon the giving of adequate notice, by the Mayor, the Chairman, or any three members of the Council.

(c) Meetings of the District Council shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators. The records of the Council provided for in section 332(b) shall be open to public inspection and available for copying during all regular office hours of the Council Secretary. Any citizen shall have the right to petition and be heard by the Council at any of its meetings, within reasonable limits as set by the Council Chairman, the Council concurring.

Committees

SEC. 334. The Council Chairman, with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint such standing and special committees as may be expedient for the conduct of the Council's business. All committee meetings shall be open to the public except when ordered closed by the committee chairman, with the approval of a majority of the members of the committee.

Acts and Resolutions

SEC. 335. (a) The Council, to discharge the powers and duties imposed herein, shall enact acts and adopt resolutions, upon a vote of a majority of the members of the Council, unless otherwise provided herein. Acts shall be used for all legislative purposes. Resolutions shall be used to express simple determinations, decisions, or directions of the District Council of a special or temporary character.

(b) (1) The enacting clause of all acts passed by the District Council shall be, "Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia:".

(2) The resolving clause of all resolutions passed by the District Council shall be "The Council of the District of Columbia hereby resolves,".

(c) A special election may be called by resolution of the District Council to present for referendum vote of the people any proposition upon which the District Council desires to take such action.

Passage of Acts

SEC. 336. The District Council shall not pass any act before the thirteenth day following the day on which it is introduced. Subject to the other limitations of this Act, this requirement may be waived by the unanimous vote of the members present.

Procedure for Zoning Acts

SEC. 337. (a) Before any zoning act for the District is passed by the District Council—

(1) the District Council shall deposit the act in its introduced form, with the National Capital Planning Commission. Such Commission shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit, report to the District Council whether the proposed act is in conformity with the comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia. The District Council may not pass the act unless it has received such report or the Commission has failed to report within the thirty-day period above specified; and

(2) the District Council (or an appropriate committee thereof) shall hold a public hearing on the act. At least thirty days' notice of the hearing shall be published as the Council may direct. Such notice shall include the time and place of the hearing and a summary of all changes in existing law which would be made by adoption of the act. The District Council (or committee thereof holding the hearing) shall give such additional notice as it finds expedient and practicable. At the hearing interested persons shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard. The hearing may be adjourned from time to time. The time and place of the adjourned meeting shall be publicly announced before adjournment is had.

(b) The District Council shall deposit with the National Capital Planning Commission each zoning act passed by it. If in the opinion of the Commission such act as passed, would adversely affect the interests of the Federal Government, the Commission, shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit certify to the District Council its disapproval of such act. If such certification of disapproval is not made within such thirty-day period, the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the expiration of such period. If the Commission makes such certification of disapproval within the thirty-day period above specified, the zoning act shall take effect as law only if, within thirty days after the day on which such certification is received, the act be readopted by the affirmative vote of at least

two-thirds of the members of the District Council; in which case the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the day on which it is readopted, or at such later date as the Council may designate.

Investigations by District Council

SEC. 338. (a) The District Council, or any committee or person authorized by it, shall have power to investigate any matter relating to the affairs of the District; and for that purpose may require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and other evidence. For such purpose any member of the District Council (if the District Council is conducting the inquiry) or any member of the committee, or the person conducting the inquiry, may issue subpenas and may administer oaths.

(b) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the District Council, committee, or person conducting the investigation shall have power to refer the matter to any judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, who may by order require such person to appear and to give or produce testimony or books, papers, or other evidence, bearing upon the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof as in the case of failure to obey a subpena issued, or to testify, in a case pending before such court.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Election, Qualifications, and Salary

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby created the office of Mayor of the District of Columbia. The Mayor shall be elected as provided in title VIII.

(b) No person shall hold the office of Mayor unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled and resides in the District and has during the three years next preceding his nomination been resident in and domiciled in the District, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. The Mayor shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

(c) The Mayor shall receive an annual salary of $15,000, and an allowance for official expenses, which he shall certify in reasonable detail to the District Council, of not more than $2,500 annually. Such salary shall be payable in periodic installments.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the method of election, the qualifications for office, the compensation and the allowance for official expenses pertaining to the office of Mayor may be changed by act passed by the District Council: *Provided*, That no such act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election of the proposition set forth in any such act.

Powers and Duties

SEC. 402. The Mayor shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control, and to that end shall have the following powers and functions:

(1) He shall designate the officer or officers of the executive department of the District who shall, during periods of disability or absence from the District of the Mayor, the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the District Council, execute and perform all the powers and duties of the Mayor.

(2) He shall act as the official spokesman for the District and as the head of the District for ceremonial purposes.

(3) He shall administer all laws relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment of personnel in the office of the Mayor, personnel in executive departments of the District, and members of boards, commissions, and other agencies, who, under laws in effect on the effective date of this section, are subject to appointment and removal by the Commissioners. All actions affecting such personnel and such members shall, until such time as legislation is enacted by the District Council superseding such laws and establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4) continue to be subject to the provisions of Acts of Congress relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment applicable to officers and employees of the District government; to section 1001(d) of this Act, and, where applicable, to the provisions of the joint agreement between the Commissioners and the Civil Service Commission authorized by Executive Order Numbered 5491 of November 18, 1930, relating to the appointment of District personnel. He shall appoint or assign personnel to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners and shall have power to remove such personnel from such positions. The officers and employees of each agency with respect to which legislative power is delegated by this Act and which, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, was not subject to the administrative control of the Board of Commissioners of the District, shall continue to be appointed and removed in accordance with applicable laws until such time as such laws may be superseded by legislation passed by the Council establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4): *Provided*, That all appointments of department heads and members of boards and commissions; all appointments and assignments to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners of the District, and appointments made pursuant to section 804 of this Act, shall be by and with the consent of the Council.

(4) He shall administer the personnel functions of the District covering employees of all District departments, boards, commissions, offices, and agencies, except as otherwise provided by this Act. Personnel legislation enacted by Congress, prior to or after the effective date of this section, including, without limitation, legislation relating to appointments, promotions, discipline, separations, pay, unemployment compensation, disability and death benefits, leave, retirement, insurance, and veteran's preference, applicable to employees of the District government, as set forth in section 1002(c), shall continue in effect until such time as the Council shall, pursuant to this section, provide similar or comparable coverage under a District civil service system or systems, based on merit. The District civil service system or systems shall be established by legislation of the Council and shall provide coverage similar or comparable to, or shall provide for continued participation in, all or part of the Federal civil service system. The District civil service system or systems shall take effect not earlier than one year or later than five years after the effective date of this section.

(5) He shall, through the heads of administrative boards, offices, and agencies, supervise and direct the activities of such boards, offices, and agencies.

(6) He shall, at the end of each fiscal year, prepare reports for such year of (a) the finances of the District, and (b) the administrative activities of the executive office of the Mayor and the executive departments of the District. He shall submit such reports to the Council within ninety days after the close of the fiscal year.

(7) He shall keep the District Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District and make such recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable.

(8) He may submit drafts of acts to the District Council.

(9) He shall perform such other duties as the District Council, consistent with the provisions of this Act, may direct.

(10) He may delegate any of his functions (other than the function of approving contracts between the District and the Federal Government under section 901) to any officer, employee, or agency of the executive office of the Mayor, or to any director of an executive department who may, with the approval of the Mayor, and if the Council has given assent, make a further delegation of all or a part of such functions to subordinates under his jurisdiction.

(11) The Mayor or the District Council may propose to the executive or legislative branches of the U.S. Government, legislation or other action dealing with any subject not falling within the authority of the District government, as defined in this Act.

(12) As custodian he shall use and authenticate the corporate seal of the District in accordance with the rules of the Council.

(13) He shall have the right, under the rules to be adopted by the District Council, to be heard by the Council or any of its committees.

(14) If empowered by the District Council, he is authorized and directed to promulgate, adopt and enforce such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with any Act of the Congress or any act of the Council, as are necessary to carry out his functions and duties.

(15) He shall within ten days after the adoption of any act by the District Council approve or disapprove such act, in the event of disapproval stating his reasons therefor. If the Mayor shall not act thereon within ten days, such act shall become law as provided in this Act. Upon such disapproval, such act shall not become law unless pursuant to section 324(a) it shall subsequently within thirty days after such veto be readopted by vote of two-thirds of the members of the District Council, whereupon it shall become law in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

Fiscal Year

SEC. 501. The fiscal year of the District of Columbia shall begin on the 1st day of July and shall end on the 30th day of June of the succeeding calendar year. Such fiscal year shall also constitute the budget and accounting year.

Budgetary Details Fixed by District Council

SEC. 502. (a) The Mayor shall prepare and submit, not later than April 1, to the District Council, in such form as the Council shall approve, the annual budget estimates of the District and the budget message.

(b) The Mayor shall, in consultation with the District Council, take whatever action may be necessary to achieve, insofar as is possible, (1) consistency in accounting and budget classifications, (2) synchronization between accounting and budget classifications and organizational structure, and (3) support of the budget justifications by information on performance and program costs as shown by the accounts.

Adoption of Budget

SEC. 503. The District Council shall by act adopt a budget for each fiscal year not later than May 15, except that the District Council may, by resolution, extend the period for its adoption. The effective date of the budget shall be July 1 of the same calendar year.

Budget Establishes Appropriations

SEC. 504. The adoption of the budget by the District Council shall, from the effective date thereof, operate to appropriate and

to make available for expenditure, for the purposes therein named, the several amounts stated therein as proposed expenditures, subject to the provisions of section 702.

Supplemental Appropriations

SEC. 505. The district Council may at any time adopt an act by vote of a majority of its members rescinding previously appropriated funds which are then available for expenditure, or appropriating funds in addition to those theretofore appropriated to the extent unappropriated funds are available; and for such purpose unappropriated funds may include those borrowed in accordance with the provisions of section 621.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

Part I—Borrowing for capital improvements

Borrowing Power; Debt Limitations

SEC. 601. The District may incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget: *Provided*, That no bonds or other evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued in an amount which, together with indebtedness of the District to the Treasury of the United States pursuant to existing law, shall cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the District to exceed 12 per centum of the average assessed value of the taxable real and tangible personal property of the District subject to taxation by the District as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available, nor shall such bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued for purposes other than the construction or acquisition of capital projects connected with highway, water and sanitary sewage works purposes or other revenue-producing capital projects which are determined by the District Council to be self-liquidating exceed 6 per centum of such average assessed value. Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness may be issued by the District pursuant to an act of the District Council from time to time in amounts in the aggregate at any time outstanding not exceeding 2 per centum of said assessed value, exclusive of indebtedness owing to the United States on the effective date of this title. All other bonds or evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued only with the assent of a majority of the qualified electors of said District voting at an election on the proposition of issuing such bonds. In determining the amount of indebtedness within all of the aforesaid limitations at any time outstanding there shall be deducted from the aggregate of such indebtedness the amount of the then current tax levy for the payment of the principal of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the District and any other moneys set aside into any sinking fund and irrevocably dedicated to the payment of such bonded indebtedness. The District Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, in the manner provided in section 631 hereof.

Contents of Borrowing Legislation; Referendum on Bond Issue

SEC. 602. (a) An act authorizing the issuance of bonds may be enacted by a majority of the District Council members at any meeting of the Council subsequent to the meeting at which such act was introduced, and shall contain at least the following provisions:

(1) A brief description of each purpose for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred;

(2) The maximum amount of the principal of the indebtedness which may be incurred for each such purpose;

(3) The maximum rate of interest to be paid on such indebtedness; and

(4) In the event the District Council is required by this part, or it is determined by the Council in its discretion, to submit the question of issuing such bonds to a vote of the qualified electors of the District, the date on which such election will be held, the manner of holding such election, the manner of voting for or against the incurring of such indebtedness, and the form of ballot to be used at such election. The ballot shall be in such form as to permit the electors to vote separately for or against the incurring of indebtedness for each of the purposes for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred.

(b) The District Council shall cause the proposition of issuing such bonds to be submitted by the Board of Elections to the qualified electors at the first general election to be held in the District not less than forty days after the date of enactment of the act authorizing such bonds, or upon a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the District Council, the Council may call a special election for the purpose of voting upon the issuance of said bonds, such election to be held by the Board of Elections at any date set by the Council not less than forty days after the enactment of such act.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized and directed to prescribe the manner of registration and the polling places and to name the judges and clerks of election and to make such other rules and regulations for the conduct of such elections as are not specifically provided by the District Council as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for the publication of a notice of such election stating briefly the proposition or propositions to be voted on and the designated polling places in the various precincts and wards in the District, which said notice shall be published at least once a week for four consecutive calendar weeks on any day of the week, the first publication thereof to be not less than thirty nor more than forty days prior to the date fixed by the District Council for the election. The Board of Elections shall canvass the votes cast at such election and certify the results thereof to the District Council in the manner prescribed for the canvass and certification of the results of general elections. The certification of the result of the election shall be published once by the Board of Elections within three days following the date of the election.

Publication of Borrowing Legislation

SEC. 603. The Mayor shall publish any act authorizing the issuance of bonds at least once within five days after the enactment thereof, together with a notice of the enactment thereof in substantially the following form:

"NOTICE

"The following act authorizing the issuance of bonds published herewith has become effective, and the time within which a suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of such bonds can be commenced as provided in the District of Columbia Charter Act will expire twenty days from the date of the first publication of this notice (or in the event the proposition of issuing the proposed bonds is to be submitted to the qualified electors, twenty days after the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of the election ordered by said act to be held).

Mayor."

Short Period of Limitation

SEC. 604. Upon the expiration of twenty days from and after the date of publication of the notice of the enactment of an act authorizing the issuance of bonds without the submission of the proposition for the issuance thereof to the qualified electors, or upon the expiration of twenty days from the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of an election upon the proposition of issuing bonds, as the case may be, all as provided in section 603—

(1) Any recitals or statements of fact contained in such act or in the preambles or the titles thereof or in the results of the election of any proceedings in connection with the calling, holding, or conducting of election upon the issuance of such bonds shall be deemed to be true for the purpose of determining the validity of the bonds thereby authorized, and the District and all others interested shall thereafter be estopped from denying same;

(2) Such act and all proceedings in connection with the authorization of the issuance of such bonds shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly and regularly taken, passed, and done by the District and the Board of Elections in full compliance with the provisions of this Act and of all laws applicable thereto;

(3) The validity of such act and said proceedings shall not thereafter be questioned by either a party plaintiff or a party defendant, and no court shall have jurisdiction in any suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of same, except in a suit, action, or proceeding commenced prior to the expiration of such twenty days.

Acts for Issuance of Bonds

SEC. 605. After the expiration of the twenty-day limitation period provided for in section 604 of this part, the District Council may by act establish an issue of bonds as authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 601 to 604, inclusive, hereof. An issue of bonds is hereby defined to be all or any part of an aggregate principal amount of bonds authorized pursuant to said sections, but no indebtedness shall be deemed to have been incurred within the meaning of this Act until the bonds shall have been sold, delivered, and paid for, and then only to the extent of the principal amount of bonds so sold and delivered. The bonds of any authorized issue may be issued all at one time, or from time to time in series and in such amounts as the District Council shall deem advisable. The act authorizing the issuance of any series of bonds shall fix the date of the bonds of such series, and the bonds of each such series shall be payable in annual installments beginning not more than three years after the date of the bonds and ending not more than thirty years from such date. The amount of said series to be payable in each year to be so fixed that when the annual interest is added to the principal amount payable in each year the total amount payable in each year in which part of the principal is payable shall be substantially equal. It shall be an immaterial variance if the difference between the largest and smallest amounts of principal and interest payable annually during the term of the bonds does not exceed 3 per centum of the total authorized amount of such series. Such act shall also prescribe the form of the bonds to be issued thereunder, and of the interest coupons appertaining thereto, and the manner in which said bonds and coupons shall be executed. The bonds and coupons may be executed by the facsimile signatures of the officer or officers designated by the act authorizing the bonds, to sign the bonds, with the exception that at least one signature shall be manual. Such bonds may be issued in coupon form in the denomination of $1,000, registerable as to principal only or as to both principal and interest, and if registered as to both principal and interest may be issuable in denominations of multiples of $1,000. Such bonds and the interest

thereon may be payable at such place or places within or without the District as the District Council may determine.

Public Sale

SEC. 606. (a) All bonds issued under this part shall be sold at public sale upon sealed proposals at such price or prices as shall be approved by the District Council after publication of a notice of such sale at least once not less than ten days prior to the date fixed for sale in a daily newspaper carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news or to the subject of State and municipal bonds published in the city of New York, New York, and in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District. Such notice shall state among other things that no proposal shall be considered unless there is deposited with the District as a downpayment a certified check or cashier's check for an amount equal to at least 2 per centum of the par amount of bonds bid for, and the District Council shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids.

(b) The Treasurer of the United States, and any administrative officer or agency of the United States Government, may purchase bonds issued under this part with funds under the control of such officer or agency to the same extent as the Treasurer, officer, or agency is permitted by law to invest such moneys in obligations of the United States Government, and such sale may be negotiated without the necessity of complying with the provisions of this section, relative to a public sale of bonds.

Part 2—Short-term borrowing

Borrowing To Meet Supplemental Appropriations

SEC. 621. In the absence of unappropriated available revenues to meet supplemental appropriations made pursuant to section 505, the District Council may by act authorize the issuance of negotiable notes, in a total amount not to exceed 5 per centum of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year, each of which shall be designated "supplemental" and may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such act becomes effective.

Borrowing in Anticipation of Revenues

SEC. 622. For any fiscal year, in anticipation of the collection or receipt of revenues of that fiscal year, the District Council may by act authorize the borrowing of money by the execution of negotiable notes of the District, not to exceed in the aggregate at any time outstanding 20 per centum of the total anticipated revenue, each of which shall be designated "Revenue Note for the Fiscal Year 19 ". Such notes may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes, together with the renewals, shall mature and be paid not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the original notes have been issued.

Notes Redeemable Prior to Maturity

SEC. 623. No notes issued pursuant to this part shall be made on demand, but any note may be made subject to redemption prior to maturity on such notice and at such time as may be stated in the note.

Sale of Notes

SEC. 624. All notes issued pursuant to this part may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at private sale without previous advertising.

Part 3—Payment of bonds and notes

SEC. 631. (a) The act of the District Council authorizing the issuance of bonds pursuant to this title, shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation as to rate or amount upon all the taxable real and personal tangible property within the District in amounts which, together with other revenues of the District in amounts which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for said purposes, will be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on said bonds and the premium, if any, upon the redemption thereof, as the same respectively become due and payable, which tax shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner as other District taxes are levied and collected, and when collected shall be set aside for the purpose of paying such principal, interest, and premium.

(b) The full faith and credit of the District shall be and is hereby pledged for the payment of the principal of and the interest on all bonds and notes of the District hereafter issued pursuant to this title whether or not such pledge be stated in the bonds or notes or in the act authorizing the issuance thereof.

Part 4—Tax exemption—Legal investment

Tax Exemption

SEC. 641. Bonds and notes issued by the District Council pursuant to this title and the interest thereon shall be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

Legal Investment

SEC. 642. Notwithstanding any restriction on the investment of funds by fiduciaries contained in any other law, all domestic insurance companies, domestic insurance associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and other fiduciaries within the District of Columbia may legally invest any sinking funds, moneys, trust funds, or other funds belonging to them or under or within their control in any bonds issued pursuant to this title, it being the purpose of this section to authorize the investment in such bonds or notes of all sinking, insurance, retirement, compensation, pension and trust funds. National banking associations are authorized to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell, for their own accounts or for the accounts of customers, bonds and notes issued by the District Council to the same extent as national banking associations are authorized by paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (title 12, U.S.C., sec. 24), to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell obligations of the United States, States, or political subdivisions thereof. All Federal building and loan associations and Federal savings and loan associations; and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations, domiciled in the District of Columbia, may purchase, sell, underwrite, and deal in, for their own account or for the account of others, all bonds or notes issued pursuant to this title: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as relieving any person, firm, association or corporation from any duty of exercising due and reasonable care in selecting securities for purchase or investment.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

Part 1—Financial administration

Surety Bonds

SEC. 701. Each officer and employee of the District required to do so by the District Council shall provide a bond with such surety and in such amount as the District Council may require. The premiums for all such bonds shall be paid out of appropriations for the District.

Financial Duties of the Mayor

SEC. 702. The Mayor, through his duly designated subordinates, shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the District and to that end he shall—

(1) prepare and submit in the form and manner prescribed by the District Council under section 502 the annual budget estimates and budget message;

(2) supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions to insure adequate control of revenues and resources and to insure that appropriations are not exceeded;

(3) maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide—

(A) full disclosure of the financial results of the District government's activities,

(B) adequate financial information needed by the District government for management purposes,

(C) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets: *Provided,* That as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Mayor shall cause the accounts of the District to be maintained on a basis that will facilitate the preparation of cost-based budgets;

(4) submit to the District Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department, and in any further detail the District Council may specify;

(5) prepare, as of the end of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement and report;

(6) supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the corporate limits of the District for taxation, make all special assessments for the District government, prepare tax maps, and give such notice of taxes and special assessments as may be required by law;

(7) supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues of the District for the collection of which the District is responsible and receive all money receivable by the District from the Federal Government, or from any court, or from any agency of the District;

(8) have custody of all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District, or any agency of the District government, and deposit all funds coming into his hands, in such depositories as may be designated and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by act of the District Council;

(9) have custody of all investments and invested funds of the District government, or in possession of such government in a fiduciary capacity, and have the safekeeping of all bonds and notes of the District and the receipt and delivery of District bonds and notes for transfer, registration, or exchange.

Control of Appropriations

SEC. 703. The District Council may provide (1) the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and (2) the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure.

Accounting Supervision and Control

SEC. 704. The Mayor, through his duly authorized subordinates, shall—

(1) prescribe the forms of receipts, vouchers, bills, and claims to be used by all the agencies of the District government;

(2) examine and approve all contracts, orders, and other documents by which the District government incurs financial obligations, having previously ascertained that moneys have been appropriated and allotted and will be available when the obligations shall become due and payable;

(3) audit and approve before payment all bills, invoices, payrolls, and other evidences of claims, demands, or charges against the District government and with the advice of the legal officials of the District determine the regularity, legality, and correctness of such claims, demands, or charges; and

(4) perform internal audits of central accounting and department and agency records of the District government, including the examination of any accounts or records of

financial transactions, giving due consideration to the effectiveness of accounting systems, internal control, and related administrative practices of the respective agencies.

When Contracts and Expenditures Prohibited

SEC. 705. No officer or agency of the District shall, during any budget year, expend or contract to expend any money or incur any liability, or enter into any contract which by its terms involves the expenditure of money, for any purpose, in excess of the amounts appropriated for any item of expenditure. Any contract, verbal or written, made in violation of this Act shall be null and void. Any officer or employee of the District who shall violate this section, upon conviction thereof, may be summarily removed from office. Nothing in this section, however, shall prevent the making of contracts or of expenditures for capital improvements to be financed in whole or in part by the issuance of bonds, nor the making of contracts of lease or for services for a period exceeding the budget year in which such contract is made, when such contract is permitted by law.

General Fund

SEC. 706. The general fund of the District shall be composed of the revenues of the District other than the revenues applied by law to special funds. All moneys received by any agency, officer, or employee of the District in its or his official capacity shall belong to the District government and shall be paid promptly to the Mayor, or his duly authorized subordinates, for deposit in the appropriate funds.

Contracts Extending Beyond One Year

SEC. 707. No contract involving expenditure out of the appropriations for more than one year shall be made for a period of more than five years; nor shall any such contract be valid unless made or approved by act of the District Council.

Part 2—Audit by General Accounting Office

Independent Audit

SEC. 721. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. In the determination of the auditing procedures to be followed and the extent of the examination of vouchers and other documents, the Comptroller General shall give due regard to generally accepted principles of auditing, including consideration of the effectiveness of the accounting organizations and system, internal audit and control, and related administrative practices. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the District and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) (1) The Comptroller General shall submit such audit reports as he may deem necessary to the Congress, the Mayor, and the Council. The reports shall set forth the scope of the audits and shall include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Mayor and the Council informed of the operations to which the reports relate, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The reports shall show specifically every program, expenditure, and other financial transactions or undertaking which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

(2) After the Mayor and his duly authorized subordinates have had an opportunity to be heard, the Council shall make such report, together with such other material as it deems pertinent thereto, available for public inspection.

(3) The Mayor, within ninety days after the report has been made to him and the Council, shall state in writing to the Council what has been done to comply with the recommendations made by the Comptroller General in the report.

Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act

SEC. 722. Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (U.S.C., title 31, sec. 2), is hereby amended by striking out "and the municipal government of the District of Columbia".

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District expenses

Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

SEC. 731. Subject to section 901 and other provisions of law, the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the District Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, are authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement or agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owned by the District to the United States or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Board of Elections

SEC. 801. (a) The members of the Board of Elections in office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in office for the remainder of the terms for which they were appointed. Their successors shall be appointed without regard to political affiliations, by the Mayor by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. The term of each such successor (except in the case of an appointment to fill an unexpired term) shall be three years from the expiration of the term of his predecessor. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. When a member's term of office expires, he may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified. Section 3 of the District Primary Act is hereby modified to the extent that it is inconsistent herewith.

(b) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections shall also, for the purposes of this Act—

(1) maintain a permanent registry;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) in addition to determining appeals with respect to matters referred to in sections 807 and 811, determine appeals with respect to any other matters which (under regulations prescribed by it under subsection (c)) may be appealed to it;

(4) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(5) divide the District into three wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular as possible, and establish voting precincts therein;

(6) operate polling places;

(7) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(8) perform such other functions as are imposed upon it by this Act.

(c) The Board of Elections may prescribe such regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be necessary or appropriate for the purposes of this title, including regulations providing for appeals to it on questions arising in connection with nominations, registrations, and elections (in addition to matters referred to it in sections 807 and 811) and for determination by it of appeals.

(d) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board of Elections, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable such Board properly to perform its functions.

(e) In the performance of its duties, the Board of Elections shall not be subject to the authority of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(f) The Board of Elections, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 801 and 807. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(g) The Board of Elections is authorized to employ such permanent and temporary personnel as may be necessary. The appointment, compensation, and other terms of employment may be set by the Board of Elections without regard to the provisions of section 402 of this Act.

(h) Each member of the Board of Elections shall be paid at the rate of $1,500 per annum in periodic installments.

What Elections Shall Be Held

SEC. 802. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct a general election—

(1) in any even-numbered calendar year commencing with 1962; and

(2) in any odd-numbered calendar year commencing with 1963, if an act authorizing the issuance of bonds required by section 602 to be submitted for a referendum at an election is enacted at least forty days prior to the date for conducting the election in such year.

(b) Such general elections shall be held on the fourth Tuesday before the Tuesday in November prescribed hereafter for runoff elections.

(c) Any runoff elections required to be held pursuant to section 805 shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

Elective Offices; Terms of Office

SEC. 803. (a) The offices of the District to be filled by election shall be the elective offices on the District Council, the Mayor and the District Delegate.

(b) The term of an elective office on the District Council shall be two years beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

(c) The term of office of the Mayor shall be four years, beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year next following his election.

(d) The term of office of the District Delegate shall be two years beginning at noon on January 3 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

Vacancies

SEC. 804. (a) Vacancies in the office of Mayor or in the District Council shall be filled at the next general election held pursuant to section 802 for which it is possible for candidates to be nominated following the occurrence of the vacancy. A person elected to fill a vacancy shall take office as soon as practicable following the certification of his election by the Board of Elections and shall hold office for the duration of the unexpired term to which he was elected but not beyond the end of such term.

(b) If the office of Delegate becomes vacant at a time when the unexpired term of such office is six months or more, a special election and, if necessary, a runoff election shall be held, at such time and in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for general elections) as the Board of Elections shall prescribe.

(c) Until a vacancy in the office of Mayor or in the District Council can be filled in the

manner prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a vacancy in the office of Mayor shall be filled by appointment by the District Council; and a vacancy in the District Council shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor. No person shall be qualified for appointment to any office under this subsection unless, if nominated, he would have been a qualified candidate for such office at the last election conducted prior to or on the date the vacancy occurred. A person appointed to fill a vacancy under this subsection shall hold office until the time provided for an elected successor to take office, but not beyond the end of the term during which the vacancy occurred.

What Candidates Are Elected

SEC. 805. At any general election, a candidate for Delegate or a candidate for Mayor who receives a majority of the votes validly cast for such office shall be elected. At any general election, each of the three candidates in each ward for positions on the District Council receiving the highest number of valid votes, shall be elected if he receives more than one-sixth of the total number of votes validly cast in the District for all candidates in his ward for the position for which he is a candidate. In case any office is unfilled because of failure of any candidate to receive in any general election the necessary proportion of votes validly cast, there shall be a runoff election to fill such office. In such runoff election the candidates shall be the persons who were the unsuccessful candidates for the unfilled offices in the general election, and who received the highest number of valid votes in that election, to the number of twice the offices to be filled. The candidate or candidates receiving the highest number of votes validly cast in the runoff election shall be elected. In any election in which there are two or more similar positions to be filled in any ward, a vote for any candidate for such a position in that ward will be valid only if the ballot records votes for as many candidates for such positions in that ward as there are positions to be filled.

Recall

SEC. 805a. (a) Any elective officer of the District of Columbia shall be subject to recall by the qualified electors of the District. Any petition filed demanding the recall by the qualified electors of the District of any such elective officer shall be signed by not less than 25 per centum of the number of qualified electors of the District voting at the last preceding general election. Such petition shall set forth the reasons for the demand and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council. If any such officer with respect to whom such a petition is filed shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted and take effect on the day it is offered, and the vacancy shall be filled as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause. If he shall not resign within five days after the petition is filed, a special election shall be called by the Council to be held within twenty days thereafter to determine whether the qualified electors of the District will recall such officer.

(b) There shall be printed on the ballot at such election, in not more than two hundred words, the reason or reasons for demanding the recall of any such officer, and, in not more than two hundred words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands. Any officer with respect to whom a petition demanding his recall has been filed shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of such special election is officially declared by the Board of Elections. No petition demanding the recall of any officer filed pursuant to this section shall be circulated against any officer of the District until he has held his office six months.

(c) If a majority of the qualified electors voting on any petition filed pursuant to this section vote to recall any officer, his recall shall be effective on the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the special election, and the vacancy created thereby shall be filled immediately in a manner provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause.

(d) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of a petition for recall filed pursuant to this section, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any special election held pursuant to this section.

Qualified Electors

SEC. 806. No person shall vote in an election unless he meets the qualifications of an elector specified in this section and has registered pursuant to section 807 of this Act or section 7 of the District Primary Act. A qualified elector of the District shall be any person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the one-year period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least twenty-one years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or, if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent, as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certifies that he has not, within one year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot.

Registration

SEC. 807. (a) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he shall be able to qualify otherwise as an elector on the day of the next election; and

(2) he executes, in the presence of an employee of the Board of Elections authorized to take oaths for such purposes a registration affidavit on a form prescribed by the Board of Elections showing that he will meet on the day of the election all the requirements of section 806 of this Act.

(b) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections, but not later than three days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied the appellant may, within three days after such denial, appeal to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. The court shall decide the issue not later than eighteen days before the day of the election. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending an election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged", as provided in section 811.

(c) For the purposes of this Act, the Board of Elections shall keep open, during normal hours of business, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays excepted, a central registry office and shall conduct registration at such other times and places as the Board of Elections shall deem appropriate. The Board of Elections may suspend the registration of voters, or the acceptance of changes in registrations for such period, not exceeding thirty days, next preceding any election as it may deem necessary and appropriate.

Qualified Candidates

SEC. 808. The candidates at an election in the District shall be the persons, registered under section 807 of this Act or under section 7 of the District Primary Act, who have been nominated as provided in section 809 of this Act: *Provided*, That no member of the Board of Elections may be such a candidate.

Nominations

SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a candidate shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition in accordance with rules, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribed by the Board either—

(1) a declaration of candidacy accompanied by a filing fee equal to 5 per centum of the annual compensation for which nomination is sought; and said fee to be refunded—

(A) if the candidate withdraws his candidacy in writing received by the Board not more than three days after the last day on which nominations may be made; or

(B) if the candidate polls 10 per centum or more of the total vote cast for that office; or

(2) a nominating petition signed by the number of registered voters specified below, without payment of a filing fee: *Provided*—

(A) that any petition for a candidate for the office of District Delegate or Mayor be signed by six hundred qualified electors registered in the District, and

(B) that any petition for a candidate for the District Council be signed by three hundred qualified electors registered in the ward from which he is nominated for such office.

(b) No person may be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall, within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made (as prescribed by the Board of Elections), notify the Board of Elections for which such office he elects to run.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto: *Provided*, That the originals or facsimile copies thereof shall have been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days: *And provided further*, That no challenge as to the qualifications of the signatories shall have been received in writing by the Board of Elections within ten days of first posting of such petition.

(d) The Board of Elections may, at its discretion, declare elected, without an actual count of the votes cast, any unopposed candidate.

Nonpartisan Elections

SEC. 810. (a) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliations, emblem, or slogan.

(b) Section 16 of the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), is amended by inserting immediately after "exists in" the following: "the District of Columbia or".

Method of Voting

SEC. 811. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot shall show the wards from which each candidate (other than for District Delegate and Mayor) has been nominated. Each voter shall be entitled to vote for nine candidates for the District Council, not more than three from each ward; for one candidate for Mayor and for one candidate for District Delegate. No person shall be a candidate from more than one ward.

(c) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(d) Absentee balloting shall be permitted under regulations adopted by the Board of Elections.

(e) At least ten days prior to the date of any referendum or other election, any group of citizens or individual candidates interested in the outcome of the election may petition the Board of Elections for credentials authorizing watchers at any and all

polling places during the voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board of Elections shall formulate rules and regulations, not inconsistent with provisions of this title, to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern their conduct, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed.

(f) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any challenge or acting on his own with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged". Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (g).

(g) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections within three days after election day. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(h) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or to operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one what votes were cast. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(i) A voter shall vote only once with respect to each office to be filled.

(j) Copies of the regulations of the Board of Elections with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

(k) Before being allowed to vote the voter shall sign a certificate, on a form to be prescribed by the Board of Elections, that he has duly registered under the election laws of the District and that, to his best knowledge and belief, he has not since such registration done any act which might disqualify him as an elector.

Recounts and Contests

SEC. 812. (a) The provisions of section 11 of the District Primary Act with respect to recounts and contests shall be applicable to any election or referendum held under this Act, except that in the case of any initiative, referendum, or recall election any qualified voter who has voted in any such election may petition the Board of Elections for a recount of the votes cast in one or more precincts under the same conditions required of a candidate for office under section 11(a) of the District Primary Act.

(b) If the court voids all or part of an election under this section, and if it determines that the number and importance of the matters involved outweigh the cost and practical disadvantages of holding another election, it may order a special election for the purpose of voting on the matters with respect to which the election was declared void.

(c) Special elections shall be conducted in a manner comparable to that prescribed for regular elections and at times and in the manner prescribed by the Board of Elections by regulation. A person elected at such an election shall take office on the day following the date on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the election.

(d) Vacancies resulting from voiding all or part of an election shall be filled as prescribed in section 804.

Interference With Registration or Voting

SEC. 813. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration of voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

Violations

SEC. 814. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this title, or of any regulation prescribed and published by the Board of Elections under authority of this title, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Agreements With United States

SEC. 901. (a) For the purpose of preventing duplication of effort or of otherwise promoting efficiency and economy, any Federal officer or agency may furnish services to the District government and any District officer or agency may furnish services to the Federal Government. Except where the terms and conditions governing the furnishing of such services are prescribed by other provisions of law, such services shall be furnished pursuant to a contract (1) negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned, and (2) approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. Each such contract shall provide that the cost of furnishing such services shall be borne in the manner provided in subsection (c) by the Government to which such services are furnished at rates or charges based on the actual cost of furnishing such services.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out any contract negotiated and approved pursuant to subsection (a), any District officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its function to any Federal officer or agency, and any Federal officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its functions to any District officer or agency. Any function so delegated may be exercised in accordance with the terms of the delegation.

(c) The costs to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the District Council to the District officers and agencies to which such services are furnished. The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the Congress to the Federal officers and agencies to which such services are furnished.

Personal Interest in Contracts or Transactions

SEC. 902. No member of the District Council and no other officer or employee of the District with power of discretion in the making of any contract to which the District is a party or in the sale to the District or to a contractor supplying the District of any land or rights or interests in any land, material, supplies, or services shall have a financial interest, direct or indirect, in such contract or sale. Any willful violation of this section shall constitute malfeasance in office, and any officer or employee of the District found guilty thereof shall thereby forfeit his office or position. Any violation of this section with the knowledge express or implied of the person contracting with the District shall render the contract voidable by the Mayor or the District Council.

Compensation From More Than One Source

SEC. 903. (a) Except as provided in this Act, no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the District Council or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source.

(b) The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the District Council or such Board, if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

(c) For the purpose of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), no person shall, by reason of membership on the District Council, or the Board of Elections or by reason of his serving in any position in or under the government of the District of Columbia, be considered to be an officer or employee of the United States.

Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in Development of District Merit System

SEC. 904. The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to advise and assist the Mayor and the District Council in the further development of the merit system required by section 402(3) and the said Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with the District of Columbia government to make available its registers of eligibles as a recruiting source to fill District positions as needed. The costs of any specific services furnished by the Civil Service Commission may be compensated for under the provisions of section 901 of this Act.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Transfer of Personnel, Property, and Funds

SEC. 1001. (a) In each case of the transfer, by any provision of this Act, of functions to the Council or to any agency or officer, there are hereby transferred (as of the time of such transfer of functions) to the Council or to such agency or to the agency of which such officer is the head, for use in the administration of the functions of the Council or such agency or officer, the personnel (except the members of boards or commissions abolished by this Act), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds, which relate primarily to the functions so transferred.

(b) If any question arises in connection with the carrying out of subsection (a), such question shall be decided—

(1) in the case of functions transferred from a Federal officer or agency, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and

(2) in the case of other functions (A) by the District Council, or in such manner as the District Council shall provide, if such functions are transferred to the District Council, and (B) by the Mayor if such functions are transferred to any other officer or agency.

(c) Any of the personnel transferred to the Council or any agency by this section which the Council or the head of such agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of its or his functions shall, in accordance with law, be retransferred to other positions in the District or Federal Government or be separated from the service.

(d) No officer or employee shall, by reason of his transfer by this Act, be deprived of a civil-service status held by him prior to such transfer.

Existing Statutes, Regulations, and so Forth

SEC. 1002. (a) Any statute, regulation, or other action in respect of (and any regulation or other action issued, made, taken, or granted by) any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by this Act shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made; but after such transfer references in such statute, regulation, or other action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made by this Act shall be held and considered to refer to the officer or agency to which the transfer is made.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "other action" includes any rule, order, contract, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as affecting the applicability to the District of Columbia government of personnel legislation relating to the District government until such time as the District Council may otherwise elect to provide similar and comparable coverage as provided in section 402(4).

Pending Actions and Proceedings

SEC. 1003. (a) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any officer or agency in his or its official capacity or in relation to the exercise of his or its official functions, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but the court, unless it determines that the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding is not necessary for purposes of settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained, with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(b) No administrative action or proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but such action or proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as are appropriate.

Vacancies Resulting From Abolition of Board of Commissioners

SEC. 1004. Until July 1, 1963, no vacancy occurring in any District agency by reason of section 321, abolishing the Board of Commissioners, shall affect the power of the remaining members of such agency to exercise its functions, but such agency may take action only if a majority of the members holding office vote in favor of it.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Separability of Provisions

SEC. 1101. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

Powers of the President During Transition Period

SEC. 1201. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to take such action during the period following the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the first meeting of this District Council, by Executive Order or otherwise, with respect to the administration of the functions of the District of Columbia government, as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform their functions under this Act.

Reimbursable Appropriations for the District

SEC. 1202. (a) The sum of $500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the District of Columbia, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for use (1) in paying the expenses of the Board of Elections (including compensation of the members thereof), and (2) in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of this Act.

(b) The full amount of expenditures out of the appropriations made under this authorization shall be reimbursed to the United States, without interest, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, from the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

Effective Dates

SEC. 1301. (a) As used in this title and title XIV the term "charter" means titles I to XI, both inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, and XVII.

(b) The charter shall take effect only if accepted pursuant to title XIV. If the charter is so accepted, it shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted (as determined pursuant to section 1406) except that—

(1) part 2 of title III, title V, and title VII shall take effect on the day upon which the council members first elected take office, and

(2) section 402 shall take effect on the day upon which the Mayor first elected takes office.

(c) Titles XII, XIII, and XIV shall take effect on the day following the date on which this Act is enacted.

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

Charter Referendum

SEC. 1401. (a) On a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections, not more than nine months after the enactment of this Act, a referendum (in this title referred to as the "charter referendum") shall be conducted to determine whether the registered qualified electors of the District of Columbia accept the charter.

(b) As used in this title, a "qualified elector" means a person who meets the requirements of section 806 on the day of the charter referendum.

Board of Elections

SEC. 1402. (a) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections established under the District Primary Act shall conduct the charter referendum and certify the results thereof as provided in this title.

(b) Notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of section 801 of this Act shall govern the Board of Elections in the performance of its duties.

Registration

SEC. 1403. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct within the District of Columbia a registration of the qualified electors commencing as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty days nor less than fifteen days prior to the date set for the charter referendum as provided in section 1401 of this title.

(b) Prior to the commencement of such registration, the Board of Elections shall publish, in daily newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(c) The applicable provisions of section 807, notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted, shall govern the registration of voters for this charter referendum.

Charter Referendum Ballot; Notice of Voting

SEC. 1404. (a) The charter referendum ballot shall contain the following, with the blank space appropriately filled:

"The District of Columbia Charter Act, enacted ————, proposes to establish a new charter for the District of Columbia, but provides that the charter shall take effect only if it is accepted by the registered qualified electors of the District in this referendum.

"By marking a cross (×) in one of the squares provided below, show whether you are for or against the charter.

☐ For the charter

☐ Against the charter"

(b) Voting may be by paper ballot or by voting machine. The Board of Elections may make such changes in the second paragraph of the charter referendum ballot as it determines to be necessary to permit the use of voting machines if such machines are used.

(c) Not less than three days before the date of charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall mail to each person registered (1) a sample of the charter referendum ballot, and (2) information showing the polling place of such person and the date and hours of voting.

(d) Not less than one day before the charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall publish, in newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the polling places and the date and hours of voting.

Method of Voting

SEC. 1405. Notwithstanding the fact such sections do not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of sections 811, 812, 813, and 814 of this Act shall govern the method of voting, recounts and contests, interference with registration or voting, and violations connected with this charter referendum.

Acceptance or Nonacceptance of Charter

SEC. 1406. (a) If a majority of the registered qualified electors voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter, the charter shall be considered accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result of the charter referendum to the President of of the United States, as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The Board of Elections shall, within a reasonable time, but in no event more than thirty days after the date of the charter referendum, certify the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

District Delegate

SEC. 1501. (a) Until a contitutional amendment and subsequent congressional action otherwise provide, the people of the District shall be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a Delegate, to be known as the "Delegate from the District of Columbia", who shall be elected as provided in this Act. The Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, but not of voting. The Delegate shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and shall possess in such committee the same powers and privileges as in the House of Representatives, and may make any motion except to reconsider. His term of office shall be for two years.

(b) No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is at least twenty-five years old, (3) holds no other public office, and (4) is domiciled and resides in the District and during the three years next preceding his nomination (a) has been resident in and domiciled in the District and (b) has not voted in any election (other than in the

District) for any candidate for public office. He shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this subsection.

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 601 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "from the Territories".

(2) Clause (b) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (70 Statt. 743), is hereby amended by striking out "from a Territory".

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" in the Act of July 16, 1914 (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 37), is hereby amended by striking out "from Territories".

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 241), is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "and the District of Columbia".

(5) Section 591 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting "and the District of Columbia" before the period at the end thereof. Section 594 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "Territories and possessions" the following: "or the District of Columbia". The first paragraph of section 595 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "from any Territory or possession" the following: "or the District of Columbia".

TITLE XVI—REFERENDUM

Power of Referendum

SEC. 1601. (a) The qualified electors (as defined in section 806) shall have power, pursuant to the procedure provided by this title, to approve or reject in a referendum any act of the District Council, or part or parts thereof, which has become law, whether or not such act is yet operative. This power shall not extend, however, to acts authorizing the issuance of bonds, which shall be subject to the referendum provisions contained in section 602, or to acts continuing existing taxes or making appropriations which in the aggregate are not in excess of those for the preceding fiscal year. Within forty-five days after an act subject to this title has been enacted, a petition signed by qualified electors equal in number to at least ten per centum of the number who voted at the last preceding general election may be filed with the Secretary of the District Council requesting that any such act or any part or parts thereof, be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors.

(b) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of petitions for referenda and with respect to the conduct of any referendum held under this title.

Effect of Certification of Referendum Petition

SEC. 1602. (a) When a referendum petition has been certified as sufficient, the act, or the one or more items, sections or parts thereof, specified in the petition shall not become operative, or further action shall be suspended if it shall have become operative, until and unless approved by the electors, as provided in this title. The filing of a referendum petition against one or more parts of an act shall not alter the operative effect of the remainder of such act.

(b) If within thirty days after the filing of a referendum petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed sufficient for the purposes of this title.

Submission to Electors

SEC. 1603. An act with respect to which a petition for a referendum has been filed and certified as sufficient shall be submitted to the qualified electors at a referendum to be held in connection with the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of the sufficiency of the petition. The District Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of conducting the referendum.

Availability of List of Qualified Electors

SEC. 1604. If any organization or group requests it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the act to be voted on at a referendum, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

Results of Referendum

SEC. 1605. An act which is submitted to a referendum which is not approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall thereupon be deemed repealed. If a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon approved the act, it shall become operative on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the referendum. If conflicting acts are approved by the electors at the same referendum, the one receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict. As used in this section, the word "act" shall mean the complete act, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the petition for referendum.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

SEC. 1701. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 324 of this Act, the qualified electors of the District shall have the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District.

(b) In exercising the power of initiative conferred upon the qualified electors by subsection (a) of this section, not more than 10 per centum of the number of qualified electors voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by an initiative petition. Every such petition shall include the full text of the measure so proposed and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council to be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors. Any such petition which has been filed with the Secretary, and certified by him as sufficient, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the District at the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of sufficiency. The Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of considering the petition. Any measure so proposed by the petition shall, if approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon in such election, take effect and become law on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of such election or on the date provided for by such measure. If conflicting measures proposed are approved by the electors at the same election, the measure receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

(c) If, within thirty days after the filing of a petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed certified as sufficient for purposes of this section.

(d) The style of all measures proposed by initiative petition shall be as follows: "Be it enacted by the People of the District of Columbia."

(e) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of initiative petitions, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any election during which any such petition is considered.

(f) If any organization or group requests it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the measures proposed to be voted on, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 1801. This Act, divided into titles and sections according to table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy which is a part of such Act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that a joint statement issued today by the Honorable EDITH GREEN and myself on this subject matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE AND CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN, OF OREGON

We have today introduced in the Senate and House, respectively, a bill providing for a meaningful and democratic home rule charter for the District of Columbia. The bill which we have submitted to the Congress for what we hope will be early and favorable action, provides for an elective mayor, council, and nonvoting Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives. This measure, together with the constitutional amendment which the Congress last year submitted to the States, providing for a presidential vote for the people of the Nation's Capital, will bring the reality of democracy to the people of that city which ought to stand as a symbol of democracy throughout the world.

Contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers, and certainly contrary to the practice of the past, the residents of Washington have for many years been denied any voice in their own government. The affairs of this great American city have been in the hands of appointed officials of the District Commission, and the Members of the Congress, not one of whom could be held responsible in any way by the people of the District. This has been a simple and indefensible denial of the basic principle of democracy. It is not enough to say that the Commissioners have been good men. Most have been. It is not enough to say that the Members of the Congress have dealt generously with the people of the District, which has often been the case. The question of home rule is the question of the right of three-quarters of a million Americans to govern their own destinies, for good or ill.

We look forward with high hopes to the enactment of this legislation, and to the ratification of the proposed constitutional amendment by the State legislatures.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]

some minutes ago engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in regard to the debate which occurred on the floor of the Senate in connection with the nefarious Dixon-Yates contract. I do not know whether when the Senator from Tennessee spoke earlier this afternoon he was aware of the latest chapter that has been written in the Dixon-Yates contract matter. However, because I joined with the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators in deploring the course of action taken by the Eisenhower administration in regard to that shocking fraud practiced upon the people in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, I wish to comment on the latest chapter that has been written on that subject matter.

It will be recalled—and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stands as my proof—that on several occasions in the past several years since the Dixon-Yates contract was consummated, I pointed out to the American people that when the history of the transaction was written, history would spell it out for what it was—a shocking instance of political corruption; an additional example of the political corruption that has characterized so much of the Eisenhower administration; political corruption which I am sure very often went on without the knowledge of the President. But that did not change his responsibility for it.

History will record the record of this administration in the giving away of the precious rights of the taxpayers over and over again in the whole field of natural resources. There was, for example, the shocking example in regard to tidelands; the shocking record of the Eisenhower administration in its attempt to give away the people's interest in connection with the rivers of the Nation to the private utilities and monopolistic combines by the plausible-sounding partnership scheme, which was naught but a scheme to cheat the American people out of the precious economic rights that they own in the river basins of the country.

When that history is written, this administration will then, for our descendants, appear in the light that some of us have tried to warn the American people, during the very existence of the administration, was a proper description of it. Time and time again, when I have warned the American people that this administration was honeycombed with what I call economic corruption, I have been abused and castigated by a large segment of the American press. However, I am completely confident that history will sustain me. History has already sustained me in regard to the Dixon-Yates contract, because today the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 6-to-3 decision, wrote the final chapter on the shocking Dixon-Yates contract. I read from the Associated Press news tickertape which has just come in:

The Supreme Court today decided the United States need not pay $1,867,545 damages for cancellation of the controversial Dixon-Yates powerplant contract.

Chief Justice Warren delivered the 6-3 decision.

Justice Harlan wrote a dissenting opinion in which Justices Whittaker and Stewart joined.

The tribunal ruled on a Government appeal from a decision by the U.S. Court of Claims, awarding the amount to the Dixon-Yates combine for its expenditures on the project before President Eisenhower canceled the contracts in 1955.

We all know how difficult it was finally to secure the cancellation of the contract. I am satisfied that had there not been speech after speech on the floor of the Senate, engaged in by the two Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. GORE], and other Senators among us, the administration never would have taken the step even to cancel the contract. There was no question that in those speeches we proved the conflict of interest.

That was a shocking example of conflict of interest. It should have taken the President only about 2 minutes to fire Wenzell after he knew Wenzell had been maneuvered into a position of power within his administration. Some of us said so on the floor of the Senate at the time of the incident. But weeks went by, and no Presidential action was taken, although the facts were well known throughout those weeks.

I return to the news account:

Signed in 1954, the Dixon-Yates contract touched off a fight between private and public power interests in the Tennessee Valley Authority area. The argument became a political issue, and there was a congressional investigation.

J. Lee Rankin, U.S. Solicitor General, argued before the Supreme Court that the contract was unenforcible and the Government was not liable because of a conflict of interest on the part of one of those taking part for the Government in negotiations for the contract.

The whole arrangement was defended by the President of the United States, but the stench was too great, even, for the nostrils of the Solicitor General of the United States. To his everlasting credit, let me point out, the Solicitor General of the United States went before the courts and argued against the contract on the basis of a conflict of interest.

This is not the first time I have spoken with great pride about my profession; but it is my observation that when a competent member of my profession is placed in a position of public trust and responsibility, he will usually get the kind of response which the Solicitor General got in the Dixon-Yates case. But even though there had been pronouncements on the part of the White House itself, seeking to defend that shocking contract, the Solicitor General knew what the law was, and the Solicitor General knew that the contract could not be justified as a matter of law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is not the Solicitor General actually a member of the administration?

Mr. MORSE. He certainly is. The President could not even keep his own Solicitor General with him in regard to his attempt to sustain this political corruption.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could not the act of the Solicitor General be regarded as an act of the administration, which, at least theoretically, must be authorized by the Executive?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, theoretically that is so; but the President's position was so well known to the public that that inference could not be drawn in this case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not appear that this amounts to an admission by the Executive that the contract was not an honorable contract?

Mr. MORSE. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and I, and other Senators, said practically that very thing when we engaged in the debate at the time of its cancellation. I remember very well the participation in that debate by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

We pointed out then, in that debate, that the President could not even take along his own Department of Justice in that deal. That was a political payoff that has come home to roost.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course the Senator from Oregon has been proved correct about that contract; and the decision today is only the final chapter, I believe, in the proof. He and others knew more about it then than I knew at that time. However, it seemed to me that the administration's atomic energy amendments actually contained provisions that, dollarwise, would have been far more injurious to the interests of the country and its taxpayers than would even the Dixon-Yates matter. I have in mind the proposed giveaway of the patent rights to the Government's discoveries in the field of atomic energy.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana knows that I agree with him on that point. All of us joined in the fight against that attempt by the administration, which was supported by the then majority leader of the Senate, to steamroller through that attempt at that time, on the very afternoon when it was brought to the Senate. That was a 110-page bill; and the RECORD will show that at that time I said that I did not believe half a dozen Senators had even read the bill. Nevertheless, the majority leader wanted the bill voted on that very afternoon. They got it through the House the very day it was taken there.

But they did not get it through the Senate that day, because a few of us believed there should be adequate debate in the Senate to stop such a steamroller attempt. There is no doubt that atomic energy bill, which involved between $12 billion and $14 billion of investment by the American taxpayers, did not involve a dollar of investment at that time by the private utilities in atomic energy development. The private utilities of the country did a magnificent job of administering the atomic-energy program during the war; but they were well paid for their administration, and of course they had that patriotic duty, anyway; and I am sure they would do it out of patriotism.

But when the administration sought to turn over to the private utilities, for nothing, the atomic energy program, the

administration was seeking to give away $12 billion or $14 billion of investments by the American taxpayers; and that attempt was made right here in the Senate.

I said then, and I now repeat, that it was another shocking example of the political corruption of the Eisenhower administration. It cannot be justified on any ethical ground or on any economic ground or in the interests of decent government. When the historians get through writing about that one, this administration will be shown in the history books as one that sadly failed in its trust to the American people in that entire field of economic development.

Madam President, I return to the Associated Press dispatch in regard to the Dixon-Yates matter:

Adolphe Wenzell, a New York investment banker, served as consultant to the Budget Bureau during part of the negotiations. At the time, he also was a vice president of the First Boston Corp., which eventually became interested in the financing of the powerplant.

Counsel for Dixon-Yates told the High Court that Dixon-Yates early in the negotiations had called attention to a possible conflict of interest and suggested that Wenzell withdraw but the Government permitted Wenzell to continue. There was no agreement or understanding, the counsel said, that Dixon-Yates would go to First Boston for its financing.

In making a claim against the Government, the combine said it sought only to recover out-of-pocket costs.

How well I remember the afternoon when the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] stood here on the floor of the Senate and disclosed that a Senate subcommittee had asked the Bureau of the Budget for a list of the personnel who had been working on the Dixon-Yates matter, and that when the list came up, Wenzell's name was not on it. Apparently they did not know what we already knew; or, Madam President, apparently they thought they could "get by" with that concealment.

When the Senator from Tennessee pointed out that the man who was the brains behind the contract was on the payroll, but that his name was not on the list sent to the Senate, they were caught barehanded, or perhaps I should say redhanded. Then their alibi was that it was an oversight or a mistake—what a remarkable mistake. I said then, in effect, that in my judgment these administration officials sought to deceive that Senate committee; they were hoping they could cover up. In my judgment the investigation made by the Senate committee was largely responsible for the disclosures which led to the decision handed down today by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Madam President, the Associated Press dispatch goes on to say:

Warren, for the Court majority, said the Government may disaffirm a contract which is "infected by an illegal conflict of interests."

Warren added that the public interest "requires nonenforcement" of the contract.

He added that this is true "even though the conflict of interest was caused or condoned by high Government officials."

Let me repeat that, because none of us needs be told to whom the Chief Justice refers in that sentence. The dispatch says:

He [Warren] added that this is true "even though the conflict of interest was caused or condoned by high Government officials."

Madam President, I thank God that under our constitutional form of Government even the President of the United States and his assistants are subject to the operation of our constitutional processes; and I am glad that once again the Supreme Court has stood as a protector of the basic principle that the Constitution applies to all, no matter how low or how high may be his station.

The Associated Press dispatch goes on to say:

The Chief Justice asserted that, "the same strong policy which prevents an administrative official from exempting his subordinates from the coverage of the statute, also dictates that the actions of such an official not be construed as requiring enforcement of an illegal contract." He added:

"Although nonenforcement may seem harsh in a given case, we think that it is required in order to extend to the public the full protection which Congress decreed * * *."

The Chief Justice said that, on the Government's conflict-of-interest defense, there appeared to be but two legal principles involved. These were, Warren said, whether the activities of Wenzell constituted a violation of the Federal conflict of interest statute and, if so, whether that fact alone barred the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. from enforcing the contract. The Chief Justice then declared the Court of Claims was in error in its decision, "and that both of these questions must be answered in the affirmative."

Madam President, how well I remember the day when the Court of Claims handed down its decision; and how well I remember the statements which were made, in the Senate and elsewhere, by apologists for the administration. They said, "We told you so. We told you there was nothing wrong with the contract."

But our reply was, "Wait until the Supreme Court of the United States gets through with that case."

It was perfectly clear to me, as I read the Court of Claims decision, that it would not pass the Supreme Court because I think the line of decisions in the U.S. Supreme Court is so clearly in support of the great decision handed down this afternoon that the decision was inevitable. I am not surprised. I am thankful that once again we have every reason to place our trust in that great temple of justice within a stone's throw of the desk from which I speak—the great guarantor and protector of the constitutional rights of the American people.

Madam President, the dispatch goes on to set forth the observations of the dissenting opinion; and, in fairness to the dissent, I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Supreme Court today decided the United States need not pay $1,867,545 damages for cancellation of the controversial Dixon-Yates powerplant contract.

Chief Justice Warren delivered the 6–3 decision.

Justice Harlan wrote a dissenting opinion in which Justices Whittaker and Stewart joined.

The Tribunal ruled on a Government appeal from a decision by the U.S. Court of Claims, awarding the amount to the Dixon-Yates combine for its expenditures on the project before President Eisenhower canceled the contract in 1955.

Signed in 1954, the Dixon-Yates contract touched off a fight between private and public power interests in the Tennessee Valley Authority area. The argument became a political issue, and there was a congressional investigation.

J. Lee Rankin, U.S. Solicitor General, argued before the Supreme Court that the contract was unenforcible and the Government was not liable because of a conflict of interest on the part of one of those taking part for the Government in negotiations for the contract.

Adolphe Wenzell, a New York investment banker, served as consultant to the Budget Bureau during part of the negotiations. At the time, he also was a vice president of the First Boston Corp., which eventually became interested in the financing of the powerplant.

Counsel for Dixon-Yates told the High Court that Dixon-Yates early in the negotiations had called attention to a possible conflict of interest and suggested that Wenzell withdraw but the Government permitted Wenzell to continue. There was no agreement or understanding, the counsel said, that Dixon-Yates would go to First Boston for its financing.

In making a claim against the Government, the combine said it sought only to recover out-of-pocket costs.

Warren, for the Court majority, said the Government may disaffirm a contract which is "infected by an illegal conflict of interests."

Warren added that the public interest "requires nonenforcement" of the contract.

Warren added that this is true "even though the conflict of interest was caused or condoned by high Government officials."

The Chief Justice asserted that "the same strong policy which prevents an administrative official from exempting his subordinates from the coverage of the statute also dictates that the actions of such an official not be construed as requiring enforcement of an illegal contract." He added:

"Although nonenforcement may seem harsh in a given case, we think that it is required in order to extend to the public the full protection which Congress decreed."

The Chief Justice said that, "On the Government's conflict-of-interest defense, there appeared to be but two legal principles involved. These were," Warren said, "whether the activities of Wenzell constituted a violation of the Federal conflict-of-interest statute and, if so, whether that fact alone barred the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. from enforcing the contract." The Chief Justice then declared the Court of Claims was in error in its decision, "And that both of these questions must be answered in the affirmative."

Harlan, joined by Whittaker and Stewart, favored upholding the Court of Claims' award of damages to the Dixon-Yates combine.

Harlan described the Government's defense against the claim as "far from ingratiating."

He said, "Wenzell's superiors in the Government were fully aware of his connection with First Boston and the possibility that First Boston might later figure in the financing of the power project."

"With this knowledge," Harlan said, "Government officials affirmatively acquiesced, and indeed encouraged, his continuing in his consultative role."

Harlan said that in his view, "the Government must win if Wenzell was personally indirectly interested in the contract through First Boston.

"But in the light of the finding of the Court of Claims I cannot agree that Wenzell was so interested," Harlan wrote.

At the time of the controversy over the Dixon-Yates project, the one thing the disputants were agreed on was that there was need for someone to build a powerplant.

The Atomic Energy Commission was taking increasing amounts of power from the TVA system. There was the prospect of a power shortage in the Memphis, Tenn., area

TVA supporters wanted TVA to build a steamplant, but the administration was against expansion of TVA in this manner and Congress declined to appropriate money for a TVA plant.

Eventually a contract for a steamplant at West Memphis, Ark., was signed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Dixon-Yates group, formally known as the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. Later the city of Memphis decided to build its own plant. In canceling the Dixon-Yates contract, President Eisenhower said the city's decision ended the need for a private plant.

Mississippi Valley Generating Co. was set up jointly by Middle South Utilities, Inc., headed by Edgar H. Dixon, and by Southern Co., headed by Eugene A. Yates, who has since died.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgement, there is no doubt that the great majority opinion written by Chief Justice Warren demolishes the observation of the dissent.

I turn now to another matter.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS—A REPORT OF PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, in areas of controversial public policy there is frequently a welter of charge and countercharge which serves to obscure the basic principles which ought to govern action. Certainly this factor has entered into the polemics of the continuing debate over the effect of integration upon our public schools. It is refreshing, therefore, to come upon a factual report by a responsible public official and a distinguished educator which presents, not only the statistics of the effect upon the school system of a major city of desegregation, but which also redirects our thinking from the superficial to the fundamental objectives of any American educational institution.

Dr. Carl F. Hansen is Superintendent of Schools for the Capital of our Nation. He has had the unique opportunity of observing, at first hand, the change in that system since 1954. He has related that experience concisely in an article entitled "Six Years of Integration in the District of Columbia," which was published in the October 1960 issue of the Teachers College Record.

Not one of us would take issue with his statement in that article:

That American children, regardless of race or social or economic status, must have the best possible opportunity to learn. Extraneous characteristics of race, for example, make them no less (or more) precious as citizens, no less worthy of opportunity, and certainly no less important to the welfare of the nation.

This is the affirmation of the democratic ideal which should govern our decisions in the realm of educational policy, and, in my judgment, Superintendent Hansen is to be congratulated and commended for having voiced it so admirably.

Madam President, because I know that many of my colleagues are receiving considerable correspondence concerning the school system of Washington, and because I believe Dr. Hansen's article to be authoritative in providing factual evidence which may be helpful in answering inquiries, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX YEARS OF INTEGRATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Carl F. Hansen)

The spotlight in educational matters properly belongs on the education of children. In the District of Columbia, where integration took place in 1954, we have attempted to emphasize educational practices in relation to children's needs above the sheer processes of desegregation. By this deliberate kind of accent, we have tried to work for children generally, not white children or Negro children.

This emphasis seems correct despite certain facts—even because of them. For example, the Negro enrollment in the Washington, D.C., schools in 1959–60 was 76.7 percent, and the percentage of Negro teachers was slightly over 62. But both because of these facts and in spite of them, it seems much more realistic to conceive of educational practices in Washington as geared to the needs of a cosmopolitan clientele coming from an inner city of just under 750,000 in a metropolitan area where the population approximates 2 million. Thus, the problems of our pupils are common to those generated in crowded urban centers—poverty, cultural as well as economic deprivation, a high incidence of juvenile and adult crime, and the low motivation for academic work that is associated with horizons limited by city streets and lower class concepts. Yet, in the frequent and inexcusable squalor of unrefreshing homes, children can find hope in the schools, which are their main avenues to freedom and which must meet their needs however deep they may lie.

It is with the education of children in this context that we are properly concerned. If it can be shown that desegregation increases the strength of the program, eases the processes of curriculum change, consolidates however slowly the efforts to improve resources, inspires a unified community of warmhearted people to help children become better citizens, then integration can be looked upon as contributing to overall educational objectives that are precious to everyone. The important thing is for a school system to give evidence that something is happening which leads to the improvement of human behavior.

This article will be concerned primarily with the education of children in the desegregated school system in the Nation's Capital. As facts are presented, there will be no effort to cover up, to distort findings, or to gloss over problems because public education in American cities is not primarily a demonstration of the true and noble in our country. The inadequacy of school support in relation to the extent of human needs to be met is not the peculiarity of a desegregated school system. It is the tragedy of the American city.

DESEGREGATION HISTORY

In even the most concise form, the history of desegregation in the District of Columbia helps to make clear the extent of social change which can occur within a relatively short time.

Prior to May 17, 1954, when the Supreme Court declared school separation by race to be unconstitutional, Washington entertained two school systems, organized under one Board of Education and managed by one Superintendent. While much was done to establish lines of communication between the two entities, an unbelievable degree of separation prevailed. Those who feared desegregation clung tenaciously to the fiction that lines must be held firm. The leadership of each division of the school system, intent on preserving its identification and prerogatives, sought little counsel with that of the other division. In general, where integrated groups like curriculum committees existed, Negro teachers and officers were given slight opportunity for leadership responsibility.

When the change occurred in 1954, Negro teachers and officers were educating 64,080 Negro children in explicitly separate schools, and white teachers and officers similarly taught 41,393 non-Negro pupils in separate schools. Eight days after the Supreme Court decision, the Board of Education set policies that clearly eliminated racial segregation. Its action led to a unification process that produced, by September of 1954, racially mixed classes in 116 schools (73 percent) and biracial faculties in 37 schools (23 percent).

Clearly two inferences may be drawn: The principle of educating children according to their residences or special needs rather than by race can be promptly put into practice; and the process bears a significant relationship to readiness and a willingness to learn by doing. In many ways, problems of relationships remain to be solved, but the center of effort is now on the simple yet very complex business of educating children as they enter the classroom of this great city.

ENROLLMENT BY RACE

The table that follows shows the trend in enrollment by race in the Washington schools from 1950 to 1959. This change is due directly to the exodus of whites to the suburbs and the occupation of the vacated housing by Negroes. It is generally recognized that this phenomenon is typical of our large cities and defines a very general problem.

Having noted that our schools had a large Negro membership, a superintendent of schools in another city, somewhat patronizingly, I thought, said to me, "You will soon be an all-Negro school system."

"We will continue to be an all-American school system," I replied. What I meant, of course, was that American children, regardless of race or social or economic status, must have the best possible opportunity to learn. Extraneous characteristics of race, for example, make them no less (or more) precious as citizens, no less worthy of opportunity, and certainly no less important to the welfare of the Nation.

With the reservation, therefore, that a school system or any part of it should not be labeled by race, the enrollment trend by race is significant as a fact but not an explanation of effect at this stage in the history of desegregation in this school system.

TABLE I.—*Washington enrollment by race, 1950–59*

[In percent]

Year	White	Negro
1950	49.3	50.7
1951	47.6	52.4
1952	45.8	54.2
1953	43.2	56.8
1954	39.2	60.8
1955	36.0	64.0
1956	32.0	68.0
1957	28.8	71.2
1958	25.9	74.1
1959	23.3	76.7

The most impressive conclusion to be drawn from school enrollment figures by race is that residential segregation continues unabated. The most notable concern is, therefore, how to ameliorate the effects of residential groupings that perpetuate some of the aspects of legal segregation and create instability in communities when Negroes move into them. The schools are responsible for the education of children residing near them. Theirs is not the task of setting the housing patterns for the community, except as education in urban redevelopment may contribute to intelligent planning.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS

After the schools were desegregated in September 1954, test results were reported on a citywide basis. The discovery that the total academic norms in the local schools were below the national standards threatened to destroy confidence in the school system. The problem was made all the more complex by the difficulty of communicating to the lay community the meaning of the test results. When medians or averages were used, many found it difficult to interpret them as midpoints in a wide distribution of scores. Moreover, to describe the results as a reflection of an atypical distribution of pupils was regarded as an alibi rather than an objective analysis of conditions.

Finally, for those who needed a propaganda tool against desegregation, the apparent but obviously unreal loss in academic standards was a handy weapon. Used lustily and widely, it created an inaccurate image of the school system which is only now coming by degrees into true focus.

It follows logically, therefore, that much attention was given to the upgrading of academic performance. This required simply an enlarged opportunity to learn for all children. At the same time, the total community was reminded over and over again that the measure of a school program is the change for good made in children who are involved in it. Thus, the measure is relative to the stage of the child's development when he begins to receive instruction. The accomplishment is evaluated by the amount of growth he achieves while under instruction.

Information which will justify at least tentative conclusions about the effect of desegregation upon academic standards is to be found in the reports of an extensive citywide testing program. While these data are naturally subject to qualification, they are the most objective available. They are submitted as evidence of an observable improvement in the quality of Washington's educational product over the past 5 years.

In 1959–60, over 60,000 children were tested with the Metropolitan Readiness, California Mental Maturity, and Stanford Achievement Tests as appropriate to their grades. The outcomes of this program are instructive.

Kindergarten and first grade: In terms of national norms, readiness tests showed a local median percentile rank of 43 for the kindergarten and 20 for new entrants in the first grade. Obviously, then, the new entrants, numbering 3,012, are generally in the low normal group, suggesting special educational problems. Special procedures must, consequently, be devised for them. These aids may even have to be extended to their homes because it is known that many of the difficulties of these children result from adverse home conditions.

Further evidence of cultural and psychological lag among these pupils is apparent in the fact that the scores of 12.7 percent of them classified them as "poor risks" for kindergarten. This figure must be read against a national norm of 8 percent. Similarly, 23.3 percent (703) youngsters in the first grade also scored as poor risks as against 6 percent on the national scoreboard. In the average or above-average categories, there were 55.5 percent of the local kindergarteners, compared with 63 percent in the Nation as a whole. In the new entrants to the Washington first grade, only 36 percent could be classified average or above.

It is clear, then, that the educational problem is shaped by the lack of preparation for learning with which many children begin schooling. No one can discredit an educational establishment for this condition, but unless strenuous efforts to obtain needed resources are made by the community under the leadership of the schools, criticism is very much in order. Many of these children will be the problem learners, the dissatisfied, unhappy, frustrated youngsters of later school periods, the early school leavers, and to some extent the delinquents. It is clear that the problem requires maximum resources and attack at this early stage for the benefit of the community as well as the individual children.

Third grade: In the third grade, local medians were only slightly below the national norms. A primary exception was arithmetic reasoning, where the Washington median grade equivalent was 2.8, compared to the national norm of 3.5. Except in arithmetic reasoning, however, the 11,110 third graders achieved beyond the level that their intelligence grade placement 3.1 would indicate as expected for them.

Compared with comparable test scores by all third-grade pupils in 1955–59, the 1955–59 crop did considerably better on everything except arithmetic reasoning, where the two groups were essentially the same. In the latter year, the percent of Negroes in the third grade was 81.5 as against 66.3 in 1955–56. It may be concluded, therefore, that academic achievement has improved since 1955–56 and that this improvement is taking place as the ratio of Negro children is increasing. It would seem that the education of all the children, white and Negro together, is clearly improving in a desegregated school system.

One of the worries some people had about desegregation was that it would reduce the learning opportunities for white children. "Standards will be dragged down and all will suffer," was the claim. But third grade reports in 1959–60 show that such is hardly the case. From 1 to 9 percent of the pupils tested made the highest possible scores in one or another of the five sections of the Stanford Achievement Test. Moreover, 42 percent made scores at or above the national norms in paragraph meaning. This was, incidentally, higher than was to be expected from the median intelligence grade placement for the class. In general, there was a small but substantial increment in achievement over even the preceding year. Washington third graders are performing very close to the national pattern. The brighter pupils are, of course, above the norms in their reading achievement.

Fifth grade: For a reason not yet determined, norms fell in the fifth grade slightly below the intelligence grade placement for the group and even more below the national norms. This tendency was consistent over all subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test. Nevertheless, the more able pupils at or above the 75th percentile in intelligence achieved at or above ability expectations for their group in three subjects. On the other hand, pupils in the lowest quarter were achieving below measured ability in all subjects.

Although the 1959–60 group (79.1 percent Negro) did much better than the 1955–56 group (63.9 percent Negro), there is much to be dissatisfied with and as yet unexplained in what appears to be a dip in the rate of local achievement between the third and the sixth grades.

The record of test scores shows that a larger percentage of 1959–60 fifth-grade pupils achieved at and above the grade norm than the 1958–59 group in all six areas tested. This gives evidence of progress and positive achievement for the average and above-average pupils. It leaves, however, the enormous educational problem of upgrading large numbers of educationally handicapped children.

Sixth grade: The 1959–60 group of sixth graders hit the national norm in one area tested (spelling) and fell only very slightly below it in the other five. Thus, the gap between local and national norms seems to narrow quite perceptibly as pupils experience 6 full years of education in a unified school system.

Again, the 1959–60 group (77.2 percent Negro) showed considerable improvement in all areas tested over the 1955–56 group (63.2 percent Negro). Taken against the 1958–59 sixth graders, the present class did not perform quite as well, scoring consistently just under the 50th centile on national norms as compared with scores just over 50 made by pupils from the preceding year. But 39 to 50 percent of the students achieved at or above the national norms on one or more subtests, a fact that constitutes further evidence of improving achievement under integrated conditions. This inference is strongly supported by the further fact that growth in achievement, shown by comparing the medians of the total groups tested in 1956 and in 1960, increased from the third to the sixth grade by rather more than the expected 3.4 years of gain in every one of the six areas tested. Thus, the group, growing in its proportional Negro membership, developed academically at a better than normal rate during their years of instruction in the Washington program.

Junior high school: In the junior high schools, comprising grades seven through nine, student achievement was assessed by means of the educational ability, differential aptitude, and Stanford achievement tests. In addition, ninth graders were given the short form of the California test of mental maturity.

In the eighth grade, the median grade equivalents, while still from 0.4 to 0.8 below the national norms, were markedly superior to 1955–56 scores. The best gains were in arithmetic reasoning and computation, where improvement in median performance was one full grade equivalent and 0.8 grades, respectively. Even more noteworthy is the fact that this group improved from their achievement in the fifth grade to their achievement in the eighth at somewhat more than an expected rate. Assuming a normal increment over the 3-year interval of three grade equivalents, one is struck by growth in this class in excess of that figure over all subtests (3.3 in paragraph meaning, word meaning, and arithmetic reasoning, and 3.5 in arithmetic computation). Since the rate of growth in these particular children was below normal expectancy prior to their experience in the fifth grade, this development burst is indicative of notable improvement in the period since integration was achieved.

Ninth grade test scores showed a median IQ (California test of mental maturity) of 95 with a range from 55 to 154. Put another way, the range in mental age was from 8 years, 4 months, to 21 years, 6 months. Educational planning must obviously take into account this wide spread of intellectual ability if the diverse but always poignant needs of the children are to be met. In the District of Columbia, this responsibility is dealt with through grouping by ability and the popularly known track system.

Senior high school: In the test data available for the senior high school students, the significance of the track system stands out. In the 10th grade, for example, the brightest pupils, those following honors and regular college preparatory courses (tracks 1 and 2), scored at consistently high levels. The median percentile ranks achieved by honors students were 83 (basic social concepts), 87 (natural science), 95 (correctness of expression), and 88 (quantitative thinking). For those in the regular college preparatory program, the scores for the same four areas in median percentiles were 51, 63, 76, and 59. It seems highly improbable that the desegregation process, contrary to the expressed fears of many, has had an adverse effect on the achievement of the able student, whether white or Negro.

In the case of track 3 pupils (those in the general curriculum for students not qualified for or interested in college preparatory work), however, the local median percentile fell in every case below the national norms. The actual scores for the four areas were 23, 28, 39, and 19. Again, much remains to be done to upgrade the educational achievement of this large group of high school boys and girls. Nevertheless, the scores of 2,234 12th graders in tracks, 1, 2, and 3 show improvements of from 3 to 16 percentile points over their scores made as 10th graders, adjusted for norm differences to take into account that percentiles are relative to the grade of testing. This observation constitutes substantial evidence for the proposition that this group made, on the whole, more than expected improvement over the period of instruction in integrated high schools.

Thus, this summary of achievement records shows generally a rate of learning that is higher than one would ordinarily expect. The persistent educational problem is twofold. The first is how to improve the factors which condition children for school experiences. As has been shown, many children enter the Washington school system with severe cultural handicaps. The alleviation of this problem may not be expected solely from the schools. A total community attack is urgent if the crippling educational disabilities suffered by many of our children are to be removed.

The second aspect of the problem, however, the schools can do much about. They can improve the quality of education by better teaching, better curriculum organization, concentration upon essentials, and the provision of improved services at all levels.

IMPROVED SERVICES

No one can satisfactorily measure the constructive effect of school unification upon the improvement of services to children. The imponderable but strongly felt divisiveness of a dual school system restricts advancement. When a community looks clearly and impartially at the needs of a single school system, it can direct an integrated attack upon its problems and speak as a single voice for the improvement of education for every child. Such a drive in the District of Columbia has produced some observable evidence of progress in school services and instructional emphasis. Part-time classes—the extent of them, at least—is an index of vitamin deficiency in a school system. From a peak of 5,446 children on half-day sessions because of overcrowding in 1957, this figure dropped to 1,339 in March of 1960. Although much additional school construction is needed here, the reduction in part-time schooling indicates that improvement is taking place.

Class size, whether high or low, has much to do with the quality of education a community is providing for its children and youth. For more than 5 years the Board of Education, widely supported by parent and civic groups, has worked to attain an average class size in the elementary schools of 30 pupils. In 1954, the pupil-teacher ratio (for average class size as used here) was 38.2 in the Negro elementary schools and 34.5 in the white elementary schools. With additional appropriations by Congress upon the strong pleas of the schools and most community groups, the ratio is expected to be 30.78 in 1960–61. It is hoped that Congress will authorize the taking of the last step to the goal of 30 in the next budget year.

Teacher supply is, of course, a basic key to good education. The report on this feature is negative. The number of temporary teachers has increased from 579 in 1954–55 to 1,250 in 1959–60. The problem stems in the main from the fact that only about one applicant in four over the past year has been able to pass District qualifying examinations. Teacher standards have been maintained at a high level. Recruitment procedures have been stepped up. Salaries have been increased to some extent but not enough to overcome the attractiveness of suburban assignments. The overriding fact is that it is difficult to find white teachers psychologically prepared to take jobs in predominantly Negro schools, with the result that the source of applicants tends to become more and more restricted. So that we may have wider choice among applicants of all races, a better job must be done to convince teachers that any assignment in the city school system is professionally rewarding and to make the rewards evident.

Special education classes for slow learners, where trained teachers work with groups averaging no more than 18 per class, has been stepped up from 74 in 1954 to 225 in 1959–60. This notable expansion in special services is continuing in each budget year. Similarly, the reading clinic staff has been increased from 12 to 32 during the same period of time. The Department of Pupil Appraisal has grown from 14 in 1954 to 31 in 1960 with the addition of school psychologists, clinical psychologists, and psychiatric social workers. The elementary department of supervision, now serving on a total city system basis, has grown from 7 in 1954 to 14 in 1959–60. Each of these services, which improve the educational program for children, has been expanded and strengthened since the advent of desegregation. No one can avoid the belief that these gains, cautious and timid as they are, occurred more easily because the school system is now unified.

Free lunches for needy elementary school children will be supported by an appropriation of $425,900 for the school year 1960–61. This is the second year of such service, now expanded to supply free lunches to 4,800 needful children. Conducted now as a part of the school program, this function contributes significantly to educational readiness. It represents a further advance in services to children.

CHANGES IN PRACTICE

While it is hoped that innovations and modifications in educational practices since 1954 will increase efficiency, this may not be conclusively so in every instance. For this reason, some features of the Washington enterprise are listed as changes rather than as scientifically established improvements.

Ability grouping for academic instruction now extends in different degrees from the 1st through the 12th grade. Beginning in the elementary school, the basic curriculum provides an especially designed pathway for the student whose ability to achieve academic success is limited. The aim is to provide a maximum challenge at his level with immediate possibility for transfer to more difficult levels when he is ready. The general program from grades 1 through 12, the honors from grades 4 through 12, and the regular college preparatory programs from the ninth grade are all designed to reduce ranges of differences within classes in order to establish maximum challenge for every pupil and to facilitate individualized instruction, insofar as possible, for each.

The junior primary was established in 1958–59 for children who, after a year in the kindergarten, were not ready for the first-grade program. This is proving to be a salutary aid in meeting the problem of severe physical and psychological retardation without requiring the child to undergo an unearned failure at the very beginning of his school experience.

Professional study has been stepped up in an effort to improve the quality of teaching at all levels. The increased emphasis on the gifted and the slow learner has resulted in expansion of inservice education. In such departments as mathematics and science, workshops and experimental teaching have been planned to modernize the content and methods of instruction. Under stimulus of the drive to upgrade instruction here, about 1 out of 4 teachers regularly attends summer school, workshops, or institutes.

Remedial reading has been made the core of the elementary summer school program. The reading materials used have included arithmetic problems to develop comprehension in this subject field. During a period of 5 weeks of intensive instruction in reading, 2,000 elementary school children were able in 1960 to make average gains of from 0.5 to 0.9 years according to tests given to measure growth over the period of instruction.

A lay reader program, supported by the Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation, was recently established to help senior high school teachers with the reading of pupil compositions. The success of the program to date has warranted its continuation into the second year.

Foreign language instruction, offered in 1959–60 to about 2,000 third graders, will be extended into the fourth grade in 1960–61 when a staff of 18 specialists will be employed to instruct pupils at these levels. When completed, the plan will supply 4 years of language instruction to more able students, beginning in the third grade.

Curriculum revision is taking the direction of defining specific behavioral goals by levels in the basic subjects, with at least the beginning of a definition of differences in quality rather than merely quantity of content by levels.

The boys' junior-senior high school was established for youth from 14 to 18 years of age who have emotional disorders of such magnitude as to require special therapeutic assistance. With an enrollment that has not yet exceeded 40 at any one time, this special school is discovering techniques and skills which seem to be fruitful. The emphasis on the therapeutic nature of the service appears promising.

The Amidon Elementary School is a special demonstration school organized for the year 1960–61. It will be used to demonstrate a combination of direct, highly organized instruction in basic content with what is known about the nature of the learner, his needs, interests, and characteristics. Emphasis will be placed on phonics, grammar, composition, spelling, handwriting, mathematics, science, history, and geography in sequential order.

SUMMARY

An overview to show some of the changes in instruction occurring is significant only because Washington's is a recently desegregated school system. The proof of the efficacy of the changeover is in the dynamic quality of the subsequent educational program. Far from producing dismay and stagnation, or even any shadow of disappointment, the desegregation process has brought a renewal of vigor, energy, enthusiasm, and imagination to the staff, the board of education, and to the elements of the community who believe nothing is so vital to human welfare and to the Nation as a system of free education equipped to do what it is supposed to do.

There should be no mistaking this truism: children's educational problems do not result from desegregation. Satisfactory resolutions are more likely to be brought about if the schools are unified and integrated. This improvement in educational functioning is the heart of the Washington story.

RESOLUTION 69, CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the text of the RECORD Resolution 69, approved by the third convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, Sacramento, Calif., August 15 to 19, 1960.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 69, SUPPORT PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF STRIKEBREAKING

Whereas Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, has introduced Senate Resolution 271 in the U.S. Senate to initiate an investigation of strikebreaking, including importing strikebreakers across State lines, so-called strike insurance, and other union-busting activities; and

Whereas these strikebreaking activities have cost unions affiliated with the Allied Printing Trades Councils millions of dollars and the loss of many union printing offices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the third convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO give unqualified approval and support to the proposed Senate investigation of strikebreaking and urge all of the members of the respective affiliated crafts to contact Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, in support of Senate Resolution 271; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the presidents of the five international unions comprising the International Allied Printing Trades Association; and be it further

Resolved, That these international unions request each member of each union to contact Senator HILL urging this investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE.

GROWTH WITHOUT INFLATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the September 26, 1960, issue of the New Republic carries an article which is of great interest and great help to the Congress in dealing with economic conditions.

It is entitled "Growth Without Inflation" and is authored by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and his assistant, Mr. Howard Shuman.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this excellent article be inserted at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH WITHOUT INFLATION

(By Paul H. Douglas and Howard Shuman [1])

The Democratic platform promises that a new Democratic administration will do many things. The question that is most often asked, and asked sardonically by some, is how these pledges can be made good; how we can have a more productive economy with full employment and without inflation.

A Democratic President is pledged to provide a stronger defense, more and better schools and teachers, more in fact of a great many things our communities need and want. The present administration replies that the Democrats are talking pie-in-the-sky, that they mean to indulge in wild spending and budget-busting, that these things cannot be done, or should not be done now, or should be left to the States to do, or should be studied for another year or two.

There is, therefore, a real cleavage between the parties and the candidates with respect to what and how much should be done by the Federal Government, and how to do it. And there is the further problem that any Democratic President, if he is true to the platform commitments, must overcome obstacles set in his way not only by most of the Republicans but by the ruling conservative coalition in Congress. These are the matters we want to discuss, and we begin by examining what has happened to our economy and what a new President could do to help make it function so that public needs can be more effectively met.

It has been reported often enough that from 1953 to the end of 1959 our economy, as measured by the real gross national product, grew at the relatively slow rate of 2.4 percent a year, below the longtime historical growth rate (1890–1959) of 3.2 percent. It was also, according to the OEEC, markedly below the average annual growth rate of 4.6 percent for our Western European allies for the years 1950–57, and it was, of course, very much below the recent Russian growth rate which Mr. Allen Dulles has estimated at 7 percent a year. Furthermore, while the comparison infuriates orthodox conservatives, it is nevertheless true that the yearly growth rate from 1947 to 1953 was 4.6 percent, or nearly double that for the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration.

Moreover—and this point is often missed by statistical jugglers—if growth is computed in per capita terms, the real annual increase from 1953 to 1959 amounted to only 0.7 percent or only about one quarter of the 2.5-percent rate which characterized per capita growth in the previous 6 years.

While there has been some pickup this year over last, progress has been far less than was confidently predicted at the beginning of 1960; there is an excessive amount of unemployment and a huge gap between our productive capacity and its use.

The Republicans insist that the high rate of growth in the 1947–53 period was caused by the Korean war, yet they almost never grant that the 12 percent rise in living costs during this period was in any way associated with the war. But we need not argue about the cause of growth. Instead, let us compare the progress of the economy under the Truman administration and under the Eisenhower administration as measured by the gross national product after taking out the Federal Government's purchases of goods and services. This will give us one measure of the growth in total consumption and investment in the private sector of the economy, plus the purchases by State and local governments.

In the postwar years up to the outbreak of the Korean war, the gross national product less Federal purchases increased at an average annual rate of 9.2 percent. This amazing increase in output occurred despite the drastic $97.7 billion reduction in Federal purchases from 1945 to 1947. Despite the extraordinary shock of this cut in purchases by the Federal Government, the economy was able to provide jobs for virtually all of the 5½ million additional people who came into the labor force during the first 2 postwar years as service men and women were discharged from the Armed Forces.

The more recent record is in sharp contrast. In the years 1953 through the second quarter of 1960, the gross national product less Federal purchases has increased at an average annual rate of 4 percent, less than half the rate of increase in the postwar, pre-Korean years. Following the end of the Korean war, Federal Government purchases were reduced, but by insignificant amounts compared to the post-World War II cutbacks. Also, from 1953 to 1959, although the growth in the labor force was much slower than in the pre-Korean postwar period, unemployment has been, on the average, at a substantially higher rate. In the main, these facts seem incontestable.

No statistical measurements are perfect but the real gross national product, corrected as it is for changes in the prices of its component parts, measures the total output of goods and services more closely than does any other series. It is the accepted standard of measurement among statisticians of all nations and therefore can be used with approximate reliability.

Now, the competent special staff of our Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, headed by the brilliant Otto Eckstein, has concluded that with proper governmental policies we can raise this annual rate of growth to 4.5 percent a year. If attained, this rate would give $10 billion more in GNP in the initial year than we would get with a 2.5 percent growth rate. At the end of 15 years, or in 1975, it would yield a gross national product of $975 billion, as compared with the $715 billion which would be reached by plodding ahead under a 2.5 percent rate. This difference of $260 billion in the terminal year, to say nothing of the enormous added sums which would have accrued during the intervening 15 years, indicates the magnitude of the stakes involved. As we have pointed out, the relative difference in per capita product would be far greater. It takes little imagination to see that the difference between the two possibilities in terms of personal well-being and national strength—and possibly even survival—are so great as to make Vice President Nixon's scornful dismissal of the issue as mere "growthmanship" absurd.

HOW CAN IT BE DONE?

We of the Joint Economic Committee rejected as a long-time goal the Russian forced-growth rate of 7 percent, both because it probably could not be permanently maintained and because in a free society it cannot be reached without rigid controls and inflation. Our staff nevertheless concluded that the 4.5 percent rate could be attained without any appreciable increase in price or wage levels and without any change in our basic institutions. Governor Rockefeller and Senator Kennedy have recently set a somewhat higher annual goal of 5 percent. This may well be attainable without significant loss, but we think it safer to shoot initially for the slightly lower figure. If and when this is reached, we

[1] Paul H. Douglas is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and a distinguished economist whose many professional studies include The Theory of Wages, Controlling Depressions, and Economy in the National Government. Howard Shuman is his administrative assistant.

can then see whether a still further increase is possible at the price we wish to pay.

It is important to set a goal, but it is equally important to point out the paths that take us there. Generally speaking, the most important ways are (1) adequate increase in the physical quantities of both labor and capital; (2) fuller utilization of the existing quantities of labor and capital through the reduction of unemployment and involuntary part-time employment, on the one hand, and of unused plant capacity [i.e., steel] on the other; (3) an improvement in the quality of both capital and labor through better technology and the development of greater practical abilities among the workers, and (4) finally, general improvement in the spirit of industry through greater competition and more industrial harmony as between the various economic classes. Associated with all these is having the returns for labor and capital, namely, wage and interest rates, adequate to call forth the full participation of both but not so excessive as to discourage or prevent such use. Another factor is, of course, the wise use and prudent development of our natural resources of timber, minerals, the soil, and water.

No one, we believe, realizes more vividly than do we the part played by increases in the physical quantities of both labor and capital in raising total production and of the importance of having capital grow more rapidly than labor in order that more may be at the disposal of each worker and hence cause output per worker to go up. In fact, the senior author of this article carried on scientific studies for more than 15 years on the relative roles which were played in production by the two factors of labor and capital.

Aside from liberalization of our immigration policies, there is little that can be done through governmental action to increase the size of the labor force over the next 15 years. In recent years it has grown at the rate of about 1.6 or 1.7 percent annually. But governmental policies which succeed in maintaining a prosperous economy will encourage a more rapid growth in family formation, in the nation's population, and therefore in the labor force, than we have been able to achieve in the past.

The increase in the physical quantity of capital has been and should be at a considerably higher rate than this. According to Goldsmith's impressive study, aggregate national capital in deflated terms increased from 1897 to 1921 at a yearly rate of approximately 3½ percent. During this period the rate of capital saving per capita rose by about 1¾ percent. The great depression and the great war of course greatly slowed down the rate of capital growth: in many of these years the depreciation of capital was not fully met. It would seem highly desirable that at the very least the 1897–1929 growth rates for capital should be maintained, and if possible somewhat increased. We would welcome a still higher rate of increase, but it should not be purchased at too high a price.

The history of our economy indicates that increased investment can best be achieved by assuring vigorous expansion of total demand. This means that interest rates should be as low as are consistent with reasonable stability in the price level, and although the statistical evidence is meager, it furnishes no proof that higher rates of interest, which the financial community wants, increase the rate of personal or corporate savings. We are not arguing here for pegged low interest rates but against pegged, artificially high interest rates. The savings needed to offset any demand inflation which might result from a high rate of private investment should be provided primarily by budget surpluses rather than by unduly increasing interest rates.

UNEMPLOYMENT—LABOR AND CAPITAL

But a mere increase in the physical supply of labor and capital is not enough. It is also necessary to have both more fully employed. Here great improvements can and should be made.

The chief enemies of adequate growth are economic recessions and depressions. These not only cause output to decline while they are operative, but they also require much of the subsequent upswing to be merely a recovery of lost ground rather than a continual advance.

Despite all the brave talk of recent years, we need further steps to lessen the severity of industrial recessions and to shorten their duration.

Moreover, one of the more ominous features of recent years has been the rise in unemployment. The rates were higher during the recession of 1957–58 than during the previous recession of 1953–54. Even more important is that each succeeding revival and recovery has found unemployment at a higher level than previously. Thus, while unemployment in this country was 3 percent in the revival from the winter of 1951 to the summer of 1953, it ran to 4 percent during the 2 years from the summer of 1955 to that of 1957. In the recovery from the recession of 1957–58, the index of unemployment has been below 5 percent in only 3 months. Indeed, for June of this year it was no less than 5.5 percent. If we add to this the full-time equivalent of the involuntary part-time workers, we get an added 1⅓ percent, bringing the total involuntary lost time close to 7 percent. This is far too high a figure for society willingly to endure. We are personally far more optimistic than formerly about our ability to reduce unemployment to not far from 3 percent plus another 1 percent lost because of part time.

But to cut back the unemployment, a variety of steps will be needed. To start with, low-interest Government loans will reduce hard-core unemployment in the depressed areas, such as the coal mining, textile, and cutover regions. Such loans would also utilize more fully the existing social capital in these areas such as is already invested in houses, schools, churches, stores, streets, and utilities and hence release, for other productive purposes, capital which would have to be provided were these communities to be almost completely abandoned. Joined with this program should be a program of vocational retraining. Similarly, the rehabilitation and retraining of the disabled will raise productivity as will the development of more flexible retirement systems, permitting competent workmen to prolong their working lives beyond the present artificial dividing line of 65.

We must think also of the high unemployment of capital. There was, of course, a considerable amount of idle plant and equipment in 1953. But even if we take May of that year as the base of 100, by December of 1956, an index of comparative utilization had fallen to 87, and 2 years later, to 75. Since then there has been some recovery, but with the steel mills as late as the end of July still operating at around 50 percent of capacity, it is doubtful whether more than 80 percent of the available capital plant and equipment is now utilized even on the basis of the prevailing shifts. Having so much existing capital idle in turn discourages the investment of additional new capital and hence holds down production and employment in the capital goods industries, as well as future productivity everywhere.

One of the basic cures for the excessively high ratio of unemployed capital is lower prices in the monopoly and quasi-monopoly industries. With lower prices in these industries, more goods would be demanded as the lower income groups would come into the market, and the middle and upper groups would buy more. This increase in the quantity demanded would at once expand employment and production. It would also lure back into manufacturing and other industries workers who have been squeezed out into the service trades where their average value productivity is lower and hence would increase the total output still more rapidly. There is little doubt that the prices of many products have been kept unduly high by the innately restrictive effects of monopoly and quasi-monopoly and by explicit or tacit price agreements between ostensibly competing firms.

It was formerly the fashion to sneer at the antitrust laws and at "trustbusting" as both ineffectual and undesirable. But our economic progress would have been much slower had it not been for the Sherman and Federal Trade Commission Acts, and a still stronger effort at enforced competition would be all to the good. Why, for example, should not the giant industries be split up into almost as many companies as there are production units? Could not the giants in autos, chemicals and steel be further subdivided? Those who say they believe in a free competitive system cannot properly object to such a policy, for it would introduce more competition and at once lower prices and stimulate effort and output.

This is one of the advantages of foreign competition which has already had a stimulative effect upon our automobile, steel, and electrical equipment industries.

What role do wage rates and union work rules have in all this? Undoubtedly, some unions have succumbed to the prevailing social and business ethic of getting as much for themselves as possible—irrespective of social consequences. They have seen their employers follow this policy, and admonitions that they should do differently have naturally seemed insincere. If a new spirit can be breathed into industry, if the distinction which Thorstein Veblen used to draw between the making of goods and the making of money could be greatly narrowed, there would also be an improvement in the practices of unions. This could be aided by periodic conferences on productivity and by providing adequate protection, as well as by the retraining of displaced workers, so as to lessen the working man's fears of new practices and machines.

IMPROVEMENTS IN QUALITY

But progress is not merely a mechanical manipulation of adding more physical units of labor and capital and then utilizing these units more fully and effectively. Earlier studies by one of the present authors laid overwhelming stress upon such purely quantitative factors for the period from 1890 to 1922, and this emphasis may have been most pertinent to that time. But this explanation does not suffice for the last four decades. There is every indication instead that improvements in the technology of capital and in the skills and education of the labor force, as Prof. Theodore Schultz has computed, account for from one-half to two-thirds of the total increase in our productivity.

The methods by which inventions and the spread of technology can be fostered are not mysterious. Private enterprise and true competition are certainly powerful forces. Monopolies and bigness may furnish the resources but do not provide the incentive to innovate. Smaller and more competitive units would probably do better. But this is not all the story. For public action can help as well. We sometimes forget that the present huge IBM calculators have been developed from the Hollerith machine which was first used in the census of 1900. Similarly the whole field of atomic energy which may either destroy or reframe the world has been financed from public funds and largely conducted by nonprofit groups. Other breakthroughs which may be impending are the

economical desalinization of sea water and the artificial manufacture of chlorophyll. These would literally change the face of the earth and are enterprises which are too huge for private resources to cope with.

A large part of the research work done in defense plants is now financed and stimulated by the National Government. It is only proper that advances in technology obtained through public funds should be used for the benefit of the general public instead of being locked up under the private patent system for the primary benefit of the firms where the subsidized research and development were carried on.

If we are to attain the 4.5 percent rate of growth we believe is realistic, we should also institute a thoroughgoing reexamination of our patent system, to see if the right to exclusive use or disuse of inventions does adequately stimulate research and its practical utilization, or whether it helps to build up monopolies and retard the successful general spread of innovations. Competent students of this subject, such as Floyd L. Vaughn, have long advocated a compulsory leasing system as being preferable to our present provision of exclusive use. Certainly this question should be speedily and thoroughly explored.

In our estimates of an attainable 4½-percent rate of growing we did not include gains resulting from improvements in the quality of human effort. Yet this should have a longrun effect and can, in fact, be further stimulated. For even in material terms investment in people is productive. Mankind is both an end and a means. Education is not only worthwhile in itself, but it also makes men and women more productive. Experiences with the many millions trained under the GI bill of rights proves this. We should make such educational opportunities more available to all, but especially to the presently handicapped classes, such as the lower income groups, Negroes, Latin Americans—and women. This would release a great deal of latent ability which otherwise lies fallow. This is one of the reasons why Federal aid to education would ultimately more than pay for itself. Similarly, competitive scholarships for the needy and especially gifted would be highly desirable.

Is not better health also a productive investment? To reduce the days lost from sickness; to raise the level of vitality while at work and to prolong the years of working life would all raise the material productivity of life as well as adding value to life itself. Tuberculosis and formerly dread fevers have largely been conquered, but cancer, heart diseases and the crippling diseases have not. We need more research in these fields and also more adequate provision for making the curative processes of modern medicine more available to the lower income groups in the population. And here too the Federal Government must play an increasingly important role.

Similarly, the conservation of our natural resources, the protection of an adequate stand of timber, the provision of facilities for recreation and the preservation of the places of natural beauty and historic interest, the purification and proper use of our water supplies, the economical desalinization of sea water, all are great and productive tasks. Likewise, slum clearance and urban renewal together with better housing for low income families are productive investments, for they diminish illness, reduce fire, police and hospital costs, decrease juvenile delinquency and crime and help to provide an atmosphere that encourages lives to be usefully spent. Such public investment is not, as many charge, a waste. On the contrary, properly conducted they at once make for a better life for all, as well as a greater national product.

As a former Pennsylvania Congressman always used to shout, "Where is the money coming from" for the necessary public investment? The answer is fourfold:

1. From the reduction of wastes and improper business subsidies. The wastes in the procurement, handling, and disposal of military supplies run into the billions of dollars a year. The subsidies to airlines abroad; to shipbuilders and ship operators; to huge sugar, wheat, corn, and cotton farmers; to the slick mass circulation magazines and newspapers, come to additional billions. A truly thrifty and humane government would either eliminate or greatly reduce these wastes and save at a minimum from $4 billion to $6 billion a year. This, the present administration, for all its talk about budget balancing and fiscal responsibility, has stubbornly refused to do.

2. From plugging such tax loopholes as excessive depletion allowances for gas, oil and sulfur, abuses in business expense account deductions, the failure to provide for the withholding at the source of the basic income tax on dividends and corporate interest payments, the 4-percent dividend credit, stock option, and capital gains abuses, etc. The correcton of these injustices could save from $4 billion to $6 billion a year, some of which should be used to reduce tax rates.

3. From the increased rate of growth itself. As we have seen, a 4½-percent growth rate would give in the very first year $10 billion more of gross national product than a 2½-percent rate. With the same tax rates this would yield $1.7 billion more revenue to the Federal Government and additional sums to State and local governments. At the end of 15 years, the difference in Federal revenues in that year alone would be around $45 billion, while huge added sums would have accrued in the meantime. In other words, once a higher growth rate is stimulated by wise policies, it can largely finance its own continuance and enhancement.

4. Finally as we shall see in the paragraphs devoted to Federal Reserve policy, the Government can properly claim a share of the profits resulting from the creation of an increased money supply.

With thrift, foresight and courage, we can therefore obtain the funds needed for productive investment.

Let us not be afraid to invest in the future; to invest publicly as well as privately in human beings as well as in machines; in education as well as in technology; in natural resources as well as in manmade objects, in things spiritual and esthetic as well as material.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIGH INTEREST

Finally let us come to the question of interest rates and their effect upon growth, employment, and price levels. We are as much opposed to the Federal Reserve pegging the price of Government bonds through unlimited purchases in order to maintain artificially low interest rates as we were in 1951 when the senior author was largely responsible for inducing the Truman administration to give up this practice.

But what is commonly ignored by the financial community and by those who take their cues from it is that under this administration the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have worked closely together to raise interest rates to an artificially high level. Under Mr. William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve, the money supply has been allowed to increase at the rate of only 1.7 percent a year, or appreciably less than even the low growth rate of 2.4 percent. This in itself has operated to increase interest rates by forcing a more spirited bidding for loans in relation to the supply of credit. The Reserve rediscount policies have further contributed to the same end both by increasing the cost of rediscounting and by exerting a psychological influence upon the market and upon the other interest rates. The policies of the Treasury have operated in the same direction. At the very beginning of the Eisenhower administration they raised the interest rate which the Government paid on long-term bonds from 2¼ to 3¼ percent. Some increase may have been in order but not such a jump as was put into effect. This was proved by the fact that after issue, the bonds speedily rose to an appreciable premium. It is significant that from 1953 to the end of 1959, the Treasury has accepted the advice of the American Bankers Association with respect to the interest rate and maturity on new Government security issues in 84 percent of the cases, and in only 16 percent has it rejected their recommendations. (In 5 percent more of the cases, some major changes were made in the recommendations of the ABA.) In the last year of the Truman administration, this advice was rejected in 37 percent of the cases.

The basic rates on issues of Government securities have therefore been largely set according to the wishes of the banking profession. Imagine the outcry if the Department of Labor were given the power to set the basic wage rates in the country, and if in five-sixths of the instances in which it so acted, it did so according to the advice of the AFL–CIO.

The result, in our judgment, has been to give us an interest structure which is higher than it would have been under purely competitive conditions, were the Government and the Federal Reserve neutral. Perhaps they cannot be completely neutral, but certainly they have erred on the side of an excessively high interest rate.

As we have said, there is no indication that these higher rates have encouraged saving. They have certainly discouraged investment in housing and by small business. They have, therefore, held down production, retarded employment, and maintained an unduly high rate of unemployment.

A 5-POINT PROGRAM

The sound remedies for these practices were pointed out by our Joint Economic Committee in our report on "Employment, Growth, and Price Levels." They are:

1. To use fiscal policy to a much greater degree to remedy excessive business fluctuations instead of depending almost exclusively upon monetary policy. This would mean bigger surpluses in periods of prosperity and rising prices, to be obtained by plugging tax loopholes, etc. It would also mean quick and temporary reductions of tax rates as a recession started and unemployment rose sharply.

2. The Federal Reserve should expand the money supply at approximately the same rate as the growth in the real gross national product. This would be noninflationary and should indeed lead to a stable general price level. The Federal Reserve attributes its slowing down of the rate of increase in the money supply to the need to compensate for the increased velocity of bank credit. But this very increase was in turn primarily caused by the higher interest rates which in turn were influenced by the relative shortage of credit. For with bank loans costing more, business cut idle bank balances to the bone and did the same with their physical inventories. This raised the rate of turnover or the velocity of bank deposits. Thus the Reserve's chain of logic was very faulty. A lower rate of interest resulting from a more ample supply of bank credit would have lowered the velocity of bank deposits and hence would have largely swept away the argument for dampening down the rate of growth of the money supply to a figure markedly below the increase in the real national product.

3. The Reserve should expand the money supply at a proper rate primarily by means of open market operations rather than as in the more recent past by lowering reserve ratios. The Government would thus get its

present commission of one-sixth of the expansion in monetary purchasing power. In this connection it should never be forgotten that this power is vested completely in Congress, i.e., article I, section 8: "Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Proper expansion through open market operations rather than by lowering bank reserve requirements would bring added revenues of many hundreds of millions of dollars a year to the Government which over a decade would amount to huge sums.

4. In doing this there is no reason on earth why the Reserve should confine itself to purchasing short-time bills only. This is a delusion of Mr. Martin's with which few monetary experts agree. The purchase of long-time bonds by the Reserve to provide the needed secular growth rate in the money supply would exert a stabilizing and somewhat lowering influence on interest rates without the slightest taint of pegging the market.

5. The Treasury should put its long-term issues up for competitive bidding instead of issuing them as par in general accord with advice given by distinctly interested parties.

Along with these reforms, the Treasury should seek to broaden the market, cultivate new sources of investment, and sell its long-term bonds to a greater degree when interest rates are comparatively low. To prevent undue speculative swings in the bond market, as in 1958, margins should probably be required of the customers who buy from the 17 traders exclusively handling the Government bond market.

All of these measures should tend to reduce the general level of interest rates. They would increase output and employment and, consequently, growth without inflation.

Such are the economic issues facing the Nation. They may seem abstract. But they are not. They are at the heart of politics in 1960. Upon their correct solution may hinge not merely the maximum prosperity of our economic system, but possibly its ultimate survival. The stakes are sufficiently important for us to try to understand the issues and to make an informed choice.

CHALLENGE TO A NEW LEADERSHIP

A final question must be asked: What would a new President and a new administration have to do to put these economic policies into effect? How could it be done when Congress is run by the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, when the seniority rules give such authority to some who fundamentally disagree with the platform of the party and refuse to support its nominees, and when the House Rules Committee and the Senate filibuster rule give to small minorities a veto over progressive legislation.

There are several answers. Foremost among them is the power of the President to lead. When, as now, the President and his administration gloss over unemployment at excessive levels, when inflation is named Public Enemy No. 1 though the economy has serious problems with deflation, when a balanced budget at low levels of receipts is put ahead of adequate growth and adequate budget surpluses, and when policies to use fully or further develop both our human and our natural resources are opposed as "wild spending," little can be achieved even with mammoth efforts by liberal legislators. Therefore, the first obligation of a new President is to give the public some better economic education. Then the legislative branch can move because public opinion will be behind it.

Second, the new President must prepare a budget which does meet our needs. It would include adequate funds for defense and for the domestic programs needed to improve the skills and health of our people and properly develop our resources. And it should further provide for an adequate surplus to offset any inflationary pressure.

The President must not only send to Congress a budget to carry out these new programs but put into effect fiscal and monetary reforms so that they can properly be paid for. This means, especially, tax reform, changes to improve the automatic economic stabilizers to promote economic growth and stability, and administrative efforts to root out wasteful practices and inefficiencies.

The biggest reason for the slow growth in recent years has been the fact of two recessions and the failure to recover adequately from the second one. A President who quickly and decisively introduced proper budgetary and fiscal policies when a recession threatened, who shored up and improved the automatic stabilizers before they were needed, and who saw to it that cuts or increases in defense orders were matched by countercyclical actions elsewhere in the economy, could both help to prevent a recession or mitigate its effects when it hits.

He could cut back on waste and excessive subsidies through budget procedures. He could sign depressed area bills when passed by the Congress. He could press for school aid and health programs instead of using his power and influence to see that they were blocked. He could place men in key positions who were in sympathy with progress rather than fearful of it.

If elected he should immediately gather together a group of tax experts to prepare the detailed provisions for tax reforms so that he could move quickly in the early days of his tenure. The power to authorize public works projects, to appoint judges, and to grant legislative requests could be and should be used to lead wayward Congressmen to support his general program. In a word he should use the full power of his office to attain his ends. A President who understands the power of his office and who is willing to exercise it can achieve these goals even against all the barriers and burdens placed in his way by the legislative process, by the groups with special and parochial interests, and by those whose sights are set too low.

U.N.'S CRITICAL QUARTER YEAR

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on December 20, 1960, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "U.N.'s Critical Quarter Year."

The editorial concludes:

The U.N. could yet go the forlorn way of the lost League of Nations. Our own Government and all free governments must stand firm and united to prevent this calamity.

My experience at this session of the General Assembly described in the editorial bears out the conclusion stated in the editorial. The fight being waged to preserve the effectiveness of the United Nations is, in fact, part and parcel of the fight for world peace and must be continued in every way in which our country is capable.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N.'s CRITICAL QUARTER YEAR

The U.N. General Assembly is winding up one of the most dangerous 3 months in its history. The atmosphere has not been good or promising since Premier Khrushchev sailed into the East River on September 19 for almost a month's stay.

Mr. Khrushchev's decision to come here resulted in an abortive summit conference to which came such personages as Castro, Tito, Gomulka, and Nasser. All of us, and especially the harassed New York City police, will long remember the days of the sirens, the mob scenes in the streets and the rowdy barroom spectacles sometimes produced in the Assembly itself. We will, of course, remember that Prime Minister Macmillan, Prime Minister Nehru and King Frederik of Denmark also came, saying what they had to say in a modest and quiet manner. But it is Khrushchev's shouting and desk pounding and Castro's dismal hours of inflated oratory that will linger in our memories.

The Assembly does not really debate—it declaims. It does not pass laws—it votes on resolutions. Yet it has authority: When the Security Council is paralyzed, as it usually is on serious questions, the Assembly can act. The Assembly can sustain the Secretary General in his Congo program, as it can admit 17 new nations, mostly small ones, thereby adhering to a nobly democratic principle but, at the same time, changing its own structure and its own nature. The veto power in the Assembly now lies with the little African and Asian nations.

The Assembly makes history, after its own fashion, with patience and sometimes with fury. It can vote unanimously for constructive steps to reduce world tensions and then sit in long-suffering silence while one member, the U.S.S.R., viciously denounces another member, the United States of America. It can sit all day, and until 4 o'clock or later in the morning—a heroic act for many of its aging delegates. It behaves as though it were making history, and perhaps it is doing so. Now it nears the end of the first part of this 15th session. The curtain may be rung down today before midnight, or perhaps not until the milkman begins his rounds tomorrow morning, or even later. The Russians have been defeated in their drive to resume talking in mid-January. They will have to wait nearly 3 months, when possibly the new American delegate, Adlai Stevenson, will be moved to make a new and appealing speech.

The issue is not yet certain. The United Nations is already feeling throughout its whole structure what the Secretary General has called the corrosive effects of unfriendly and unfair attacks. The U.N. could yet go the forlorn way of the lost League of Nations. Our own Government and all free governments must stand firm and united to prevent this calamity.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I had intended to introduce another bill this afternoon, but, because I intend to introduce it in behalf of myself and my very able colleague who now presides over the Senate [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I will postpone introduction of that bill until either later today or tomorrow, because I should like to engage, as I am sure my colleague would, in a brief colloquy on the floor. Therefore, I yield the floor at this time.

PREFERENTIAL TAX TREATMENT OF INCOME EARNED ABROAD AND THE NEED FOR DISCONTINUATION

Mr. GORE. Madam President, the times in which we live are marked by political, economic and social revolution. A new President will undertake an unprecedented burden of leadership next week. His voice will be the voice of freedom heard around the world. It will be the voice of freedom and it must be strong.

We are rich in both human and material resources. We have the tools and we have the know-how; we have the basic urge of freedom to spur us on. I believe and I pray that President Kennedy will provide the leadership essential to a destiny of greatness.

Yet we face problems of most serious proportions. At home our economy is lagging and our ability to meet our responsibilities abroad has, by some, been questioned. The image of America as a vital society surging forward to new heights has been blurred.

Our difficulties with the balance of payments and the recession at home are in large measure symptoms of a single malady—our failure to follow correct policies and to pursue vigorously programs of action designed to make maximum use of our resources for the development of a strong and expanding economy.

Any effort to examine analytically in one speech all the many facets of the problem would, of necessity, be limited to a statement of generalities. Fiscal policy, tax policy, monetary policy, international trade, education, health, full employment, and other broad subject areas are integral elements of overall national policy. I hope from time to time to contribute to a discussion of several of them.

Today, however, I shall confine my remarks to one aspect of tax policy which, in my opinion, has contributed materially to our balance of payments difficulties and which, at the same time, has adversely affected economic health and progress at home. I refer to provisions of our tax structure which give preferential treatment to income earned abroad by U.S. taxpayers. I discuss this today in the hope, perhaps farfetched, that it will catch the attention of either the outgoing and incoming Presidents or their fiscal advisers. Cooperation on this issue between the outgoing and the incoming Secretaries of the Treasury could prove quite helpful. I will, of course, solicit the views of Mr. Douglas Dillon on this subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that it might also be well that we seek to determine the views of the outgoing Secretary of the Treasury on the balance of payments problem, because he has been very much concerned with it, as the Senator knows, and has had much contact with that problem. Perhaps we should seek to obtain his views on the subject before he turns over the responsibilities of his office to his successor. Last year I believe he gave us some very enlightening information on that subject, and I would hope we might obtain his views before he relinquished his office.

Mr. GORE. I should be delighted to receive them. I doubt that this should be allowed to interfere with the hearing on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury, but after the committee has arrived at its decision on that problem it would, in my opinion, be fruitful to hear Secretary Anderson.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not at all mean to suggest that this should interfere with the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dillon. I had in mind, in view of the fact that Mr. Anderson has been very much concerned about this matter, and justly so, for the past year, at least, that it might be well for us to obtain his views on it before he leaves office.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator, as usual, has made a very provocative suggestion.

During the period 1958 to 1960, inclusive, we ran a cumulative deficit of about $12 billion in our balance of payments. In other words, our payments to foreigners have exceeded our receipts from foreigners during this 3-year period by about $12 billion. Foreign dollar holdings have increased to a level which has caused concern.

U.S. gold supply has been reduced by about $5 billion worth of gold during the past 3 years, and our gold stock is now down to about $18 billion. Since we do not have an international banking organization or the debt management machinery adequate to handle international transactions of this type and magnitude, this continued large payments deficit poses a number of serious problems. The soundness of the dollar is brought into question. This, in turn, creates dangers for international economic security because the United States is the free world's banker. This adverse balance and lack of more sophisticated and adequate international monetary facilities threatens to inhibit the United States for the time being from putting into effect fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies called for by domestic economic conditions and world security requirements. Remedies and reforms should be earnestly and quickly sought both at home and in new international concerts, else other and more unwelcome measures may be necessary.

Many reasons for our deficit in international payments have been advanced. It has been said that American goods have been priced out of foreign markets and that prices, particularly wages, must be lowered if our goods are to be competitive.

Some contend that we must restrict imports in order to have a favorable balance.

Some have contended that, since foreign aid and military spending abroad contribute to this imbalance, we must reduce foreign aid spending and reduce the number of U.S. troops overseas.

There is some measure of validity in all these approaches to the problem. We have lost our oversea markets in certain commodities and certain areas. For the most part, such losses have occurred in the products of industries such as steel where administered prices are the rule, and where the price structure has, therefore, been distorted. An examination of export statistics will show, however, that while we have lost some of our export markets in certain lines, we have gained others. Overall, our exports of merchandise continue to run well ahead of imports. For the third quarter of 1960, the latest period for which I have statistics, exports of merchandise showed a surplus over imports of $5 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis. Despite this large surplus in merchandise, however, our total transactions showed a deficit of $4.1 billion on an annual rate basis.

Our problem, then, does not arise because imports of goods and commodities exceed exports, although the balance of payments situation could, of course, be eased by a further increase in exports of merchandise or a decrease in imports.

Our balance-of-payments problem certainly would be eased if we reduced our spending for foreign aid and reduced the numbers of our military forces overseas. But the requirements of international security, if they are at all valid—and I think they are—necessitate solutions other than abandonment of our free world commitments and obligations. If it is necessary for the security of the United States and of our allies to deploy armed forces overseas, this need cannot be sacrificed to balance of payments considerations which are narrowly tied to gold. Neither can our urgent social and economic needs at home. Indeed, an adequate program of international security requires vigorous domestic progress—cannot be sustained without domestic progress.

Of course, we need to review on a continuing basis all our policies, both foreign and domestic, to insure that our policies are right for today, and are not simply a continuation of past policies.

The balance-of-payments problem has been acute for 3 years, yet only recently has it been officially acknowledged as a problem. And, even then, inadequate measures have been taken.

One of the factors which seems to have been largely overlooked by many who have analyzed our balance of payments is the increased flow of private capital abroad and the uses to which that capital is being put. This capital outflow shows signs of continuing to accelerate. Effective curtailment of this outflow would bring our balance-of-payments problem into manageable proportions. The direction of capital outflow into proper areas and proper activities, on the other hand, would bring further benefits.

It is indeed surprising that nothing has been done and so little has been proposed when the regulation of the outflow of capital is such an obvious solution, at least in part, to such a pressing problem. This is even more surprising when one reflects that most of this outflow is brought about by provisions of our own tax laws that are unfair in the first place. We continue, through tax favoritism, to lend positive encouragement to an increased flow of capital abroad. One could rationalize such preferential treatment as long as an argument can be made that national purposes are served. But the Congress and the administration have persisted in providing this subsidy to foreign investment long after its detrimental effects were obvious. Indeed, last year the Congress, over my strenuous but un-

availing opposition, enacted legislation to worsen this already bad situation.

I wish to examine rather briefly, because an exhaustive discussion might take several hours, the flow of capital abroad and to relate this flow to our balance of payments deficit and to our faulty method of taxing income earned abroad, a method which is heavily weighted in favor of foreign investment and against domestic investment.

Following the end of World War II, American investors were encouraged to increase their holdings abroad in order to rebuild the economies of those areas devastated by war. It was necessary, in order to guarantee political and social stability in Western Europe and Japan, to restore economic stability. This objective was quickly accomplished, and by 1950 the economies of the countries of Western Europe and Japan were sufficiently strong to allow them to begin a buildup of their gold and dollar reserves. There was no longer a need, so far as they were concerned, for increased U.S. investment within their borders. They may have benefited thereby, but the balance-of-payments situation did not indicate such a need.

But with a booming economy in Europe and plans for the inauguration of the Common Market, the already large flow of capital into Europe was stepped up.

Now, there are three general types of private foreign investment, direct, portfolio, and short-term. They generally respond to somewhat different stimuli. Short-term funds are likely to flow back and forth in response to shifts in short-term interest rates. This is one reason, I might say parenthetically, for the Federal Reserve Board to abandon its discredited bills-only policy so that long-term rates may be reduced while short-term rates are held to less violent fluctuations.

Direct private investment abroad is, perhaps, most responsive to tax policy and has, furthermore, more important long-range effects which I shall discuss later.

There is a general lack of understanding of the magnitude of our foreign investment and particularly of the rate at which it is increasing.

Our investment abroad has nearly tripled during the past 10 years, and direct private investment now totals about $32 billion. Our investment abroad is growing currently at an estimated rate of about $3.5 billion per year. We are sending abroad about $2.5 billion per year in new money. This far exceeds our annual average loss of gold.

No suggestion has been made by the administration that this large outflow of private investment capital be reasonably regulated, even though the United States and West Germany stand alone in failure to require foreign capital investment to comply with established national purposes. So long as the national interest is not adversely affected, freedom of capital movement by U.S. citizens and corporations is, of course, desirable.

Even more strange, neither an administration suggestion has been made nor a congressional act has been taken to repeal the positive tax incentives that stimulate the very capital outflow that has in very large part created the imbalance of international payments.

Such inaction is intolerable, as I see it, both because preferential tax treatment of profits earned abroad is, in the first instance, discriminatory and highly inequitable and, in the second place, is now adversely affecting the national interest.

Not only do we continue tax incentives for foreign investment through granting foreign tax credits, but our faulty tax structure encourages foreign investors to keep their profits abroad. This prevents our receiving large payments from abroad which would, of course, be on the positive side of the balance of payments.

Although I do not want to get too technical, I might say a word here about our statistics. Generally speaking, they are regarded as being quite good, and yet I find some disturbing points. For one thing, I believe we have grossly underestimated the outflow of capital in recent years. In 1957, for example, our statistics show direct private investment of $2.058 billion. A very thorough study and survey by the Department of Commerce just recently released shows that this figure should be about $2.5 billion. In other words, there were a great many transactions in which American corporations sent capital abroad which were not recorded. There has always been a large, too large in my opinion, item labeled "errors and omissions." During 1960 this item showed an extremely large negative swing which indicates, among other things, that there is an increased flow of funds out of the country on unrecorded and unreported transactions. I do not want to belabor this point, but it should be considered. Last year the Congress did enact legislation which I proposed to require additional reporting of certain activities and I hope this will result in the Treasury at least knowing more about what is going on, even if not too much can be done about it pending further legislative action by the Congress.

Up to this point, I have been emphasizing the outflow of capital in relation to our balance-of-payments problem. This is perhaps a short-range problem, although a serious one. There are other, and perhaps more disturbing, aspects of the present large outflow of capital.

In the first place, entirely too much of the present outflow of funds is going into manufacturing facilities. This has the effect of setting up competition for our exports, particularly to Europe and the United Kingdom.

It has been claimed in the past that our foreign investment was designed to advance international trade, and thus our own exports. It is interesting, and somewhat alarming, to note that today only 10 percent of our foreign direct investment is going into marketing activities, activities which might encourage our exports. On the other hand, 85 percent of our direct investment in the United Kingdom and 75 percent in Western Europe currently goes into manufacturing activities.

Total sales by American plants in Europe in 1959 amounted to about $8 billion. Certainly a part of this $8 billion worth of merchandise could have been replaced by exports of American manufactured items. I think it is unnecessary to point out that these extra exports could have balanced our payments and provided additional jobs here at home.

The new administration should realize that a continuation of this development will give rise to high protectionist sentiment that may pose a threat to international trade programs and legislation. Indeed, this has already occurred to a disturbing extent.

Second. Looking to the future, a continued buildup of American investments abroad could mean that eventually, barring wholesale expropriation, we will begin to receive large payments from these oversea profits. This may sound good, but in what form will we receive these payments? Certainly these foreign governments cannot pay in gold or in their own currency which, generally speaking, is worthless to us without conversion. They will have to pay by our increasing imports into this country. This was the case in Britain prior to World War I. This may work well for a national economy which needs disproportionately large importations of raw materials and agricultural products. The United States hardly fits this category.

Third. Large oversea investments, particularly in manufacturing and the extractive industries, inevitably revive the cry of economic colonialism and result in expropriation or other forms of discrimination against our activities. This usually leads to poor diplomatic relations.

We can see this so clearly even now. We have but to reflect on current events in Canada where a resurgent spirit of nationalism is venting itself on American enterprise. The people of Great Britain have recently expressed their sentiments in no uncertain terms regarding the Ford Motor Co. transaction. Events in Cuba and others in Mexico further illustrate a cause for concern.

Let me say at this point that a judicious amount of private foreign investment is helpful. It is most helpful to the host country, particularly when the economy of that country is in an underdeveloped state. But current laws do not accomplish this. Instead, they continue to push more and more investment into countries where it is not needed and into activities which do our domestic economy positive harm.

Having demonstrated, at least to my satisfaction, that our current large capital outflow is not helpful and is, in fact, harmful both in the short- and long-run, let us turn to an examination of the preferential provisions of our tax law which cause this large capital outflow and, perhaps, arrive at some solution to the problem.

There are two aspects of these laws which are directly responsible. First, foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations pay no U.S. income tax whatsoever on their profits until such time as those profits are returned to the parent U.S. corporation. Second, when U.S. income taxes are paid, foreign income taxes are allowed as a credit against U.S. taxes rather than being merely deducted from gross income, as is the case with any

other item of business expense, including payment of taxes to our respective States.

Let us consider first the foreign subsidiary. Just what is the value of the tax deferral in this instance?

A recent study by the American Management Association shows that the reinvestment of foreign earnings over a 3-year period can provide "roughly double the rate of profit accumulation for reinvestment that is possible under domestic tax schedules." This, of course, encourages the retention and reinvestment abroad of the earnings of foreign subsidiaries and discourages the repatriation of earnings.

Because of this deferral in taxation until repatriation, the foreign subsidiary gets the advantage of an interest-free loan in the amount of the tax which it should be paying to the United States. This will operate as long as profits are not brought home.

This is roughly equivalent to delaying the payment of the Federal income tax on the profits of a domestic corporation until such time as the corporation pays a dividend, and then taxing only so much of the profit as that dividend represents.

The domestic subsidiary corporation, then, is under a tremendous competitive disadvantage as compared with the foreign subsidiary of the same parent corporation. It would be only natural for the parent corporation to push the expansion of its foreign subsidiary at the expense of its domestic subsidiary. Advantages are available to a corporation with a foreign subsidiary over a competing corporation without a foreign subsidiary.

Figures from various American companies bear this out. In 1958 U.S. businesses spent 17 percent of their total capital outlays overseas; 1959 showed a continuation of this trend. As for specific companies, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. expected to spend nearly half its total expenditures in 1960 for expansion and modernization overseas. General Motors expected to spend $200 million to expand foreign subsidiaries. Firestone has been spending 25–30 percent of its capital outlays abroad. Kaiser Aluminum expected to spend about 80 percent of its total capital outlay abroad during 1960. Many other similar figures could be given. We are familiar with the recent Ford Motor Co. proposal.

One particularly undesirable practice has grown up recently because of this and other aspects of our foreign tax laws. I refer to the reinsurance gimmick for tax avoidance. Perhaps that is a strong term, but I believe it is deserved. In recent years, insurance companies have been organized in tax haven countries abroad for the purpose of reinsuring policies of domestic companies. There are, of course, legitimate reinsurance operations. What I refer to, however, is the setting up of a dummy company for the sole purpose of transferring profits from a domestic company to a foreign company so that such profits will escape taxation currently, and eventually be taxed at a greatly reduced rate, if at all.

Third country tax havens for management or holding offices is another favorite tax avoidance device.

Now, let us consider the method of computing the U.S. tax on income earned abroad when such income is taxed at all.

Basically, the difficulty and the main point of favoritism here is that our tax law provides that foreign income, war profits and excess profits taxes may be credited so as to offset most of the U.S. tax, rather than merely being allowed as a deduction along with other business expenses. This amounts to a sizable sum of money. Claims for foreign tax credits run well over $1 billion per year, and would be much higher, of course, if subsidiaries repatriated their profits rather than retaining them overseas for expansion or profit accumulation.

Allowing any item of expense or expenditure as a credit against taxes violates sound principles of taxation. All such items, where it is proper to consider them at all, should be treated as business expenses and deducted from gross income in arriving at the net income subject to applicable tax rates. I have long advocated the repeal of the foreign tax credit, it being basically unsound in principle and discriminatory in practice.

The Congress of the United States, since our present income tax laws first became effective in 1913, has always maintained the right to tax the income of U.S. citizens or corporations on a worldwide basis. The Congress has never surrendered the right to tax, or to legislate concerning the taxation of income of U.S. citizens and corporations earned anywhere in the world.

The proper handling of multijurisdictional taxation, foreign or domestic, has long presented a program. Prior to 1918 all foreign taxes, including income taxes, were treated as deductible expenses just as were taxes levied by States or local governments within the United States. As a matter of expediency or accommodation, and on the grounds that American corporations operating abroad were allegedly at a competitive disadvantage with foreign corporations, foreign income taxes in 1918 were placed in a separate category from taxes imposed by domestic jurisdictions, and it was provided by law that foreign income taxes could be either credited against American income taxes or allowed as deductions from taxable income at the option of the taxpayer. Taxes levied by domestic jurisdictions, States, and local governments, continued to be treated as deductions from income. This, of course, actually operates as a discrimination against business within the United States in competition with business in foreign countries.

There has been at least one determined effort to abolish the foreign tax credit. In 1933 the House Ways and Means Committee designated a subcommittee to investigate methods of preventing the evasion and avoidance of the internal revenue laws, to consider means of improving and simplifying such laws, and to study possible new sources of revenue. This subcommittee, sometimes known as the Hill subcommittee, rendered a report to the Ways and Means Committee which states, in part:

> Your subcommittee recommends complete elimination of the provision of the present law (sec. 131, Revenue Act of 1932) allowing foreign income taxes to be credited against Federal income tax. The present provision discriminates in favor of American citizens and domestic corporations doing business abroad as compared with those doing business in this country. For instance, an American citizen who pays a State income tax is only entitled under the present law to deduct such tax from his gross income in arriving at his net income subject to the Federal tax. He is not permitted to offset his State income tax against his Federal income tax. However, if an American citizen pays an income tax to a foreign country, the present law allows him, under certain limitations, to reduce his Federal income tax by the amount of such foreign tax. Furthermore, a domestic corporation doing business in this country is also only allowed a deduction from gross income for the income taxes paid to the States. However, an American corporation doing business abroad, either directly or through a subsidiary company, is entitled, subject to certain limitations, to offset its Federal tax by the amount of income taxes paid to a foreign country. This discrimination is particularly noticeable in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court holding that the term "foreign country" as used in the credit sections means not only a foreign state recognized in international law but any political subdivision thereof, no matter how small.
>
> Under the Revenue Acts of 1913, 1916, and 1917, a taxpayer was not entitled to any credit for taxes paid to a foreign country. These early acts permitted taxes paid to a foreign country to be deducted only from gross income, which was also the rule applied in the case of State, county, and municipal taxes.
>
> Your subcommittee is of the opinion that taxes paid to foreign countries should be treated in the same manner as taxes paid to the States and should only be allowed as a deduction from gross income. It is estimated that the elimination of the foreign-tax credit will increase the Government revenues by about $10 million annually.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Department opposed this recommendation on the grounds that a change would injure American exports and it was killed. I do not believe such grounds could be supported today.

Many arguments have been advanced for continuing and broadening the foreign tax credit loophole. Generally speaking, they can be grouped under three general headings:

First. The foreign tax credit is necessary to prevent double taxation. This argument assumes that double taxation, that is, the taxation of the same income by more than one government, is wrong per se. Our tax laws recognize no such principle. There is essentially no difference, so far as a taxpayer is concerned, between a State income tax and an income tax levied by a foreign government. So-called double taxation is not avoided in the case of State taxes by allowing such taxes to be deducted as an item of business expense. What is accomplished is an accommodation which works satisfactorily. The foreign tax credit represents an accommodation, just as does the allowance of the State income tax as a deduction. Either is a compromise. The tax credit, however, is wrong in principle and discriminatory in practice.

Second. It is said that a dollar earned anywhere should be subject to the same tax. This objective, if it is a proper objective, is not achieved by the foreign tax credit. A dollar earned through a

subsidiary operating abroad does not bear the same tax burden as does a dollar earned in New York or New Orleans.

Third. It is said that the foreign tax credit encourages private investment abroad. This is the argument which is most often advanced today to justify tax preferences to companies operating abroad. It is true that a desirable ingredient of our foreign economic policy is an increased private investment abroad, provided we can direct the investment into desired channels and into the most proper areas of the world.

Even so, I seriously doubt the wisdom of using U.S. domestic tax policy, particularly with the general application thereof, as a means of furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. Domestic tax policy must be measured primarily with the yardstock of fairness and equity. I particularly question the wisdom of granting domestic tax preference for income earned in foreign countries. At best, it is nonspecific and generally tends to confuse, and sometimes defeat, as is the present case rather than exclusively to attain specified objectives. There is a great deal of difference, insofar as the furtherance of our national objectives is concerned, between encouraging a manufacturer to begin assembling automobiles in Germany and encouraging a food processor to open a plant in India. As we now see, the foreign tax credit may promote undesirable development. There are better, more direct, and more manageable means of promoting desirable foreign investment and development.

Several arguments can be made against the foreign tax credit. I call attention to three which I consider pertinent:

First. The foreign tax credit allows the foreign government to determine the effective U.S. tax rate, operating frequently as a preemption.

I have seen the tax returns of one of America's largest corporations, having widescale holdings in foreign countries. For 5 consecutive years that company paid not one dollar in income taxes to the U.S. Government.

It has been alleged that many foreign governments have tended to adjust their tax rates to the U.S. rate. Be this as it may, we have given the foreign government, through the mechanism of the foreign tax credit, the power to decide whether the United States can collect taxes on income of U.S. corporations earned abroad at the rate of 52 percent, 20 percent, 10 percent, or 0 percent.

Second. The benefits of foreign tax credits accrue to a relatively few companies. According to a study of this problem made in 1955, it was then estimated that 40 percent of all foreign investment is accounted for by 10 U.S. corporations and 71 percent by 62 corporations. Any concessions made in the form of tax reductions woud necessarily accrue very largely to these few corporations. It was estimated that 25 to 50 corporations would receive half the benefits from any tax reductions, and nearly all the benefits from such reductions would be received by 150 corporations.

Third. Benefits accruing to corporations as a result of the foreign tax credit do not necessarily further national objectives. It was formerly felt that most of the benefits derived from the foreign tax credit accrued to export operations and thus benefited the entire American economy. As I have shown, this does not now appear to be the case. On the contrary, the foreign tax credit now encourages the establishment of manufacturing concerns in foreign countries where goods are produced which are in direct competition with American exports or even become competitive as imports into the United States.

Recently I had a seatmate on a plane ride from Nashville, Tenn., to Washington. We fell into a discussion of this subject. I related that, in my opinion, this development had taken two major steps: First, the establishment of subsidiaries in foreign countries by U.S. corporations to supply the markets which those corporations had built up in those countries; second, the importation of the products of the foreign subsidiaries into the United States, to supply the markets which the parent corporation had built up in the United States.

He reached under the seat and pulled out a small transistor radio bearing the trademark of a well-known U.S. corporation which manufacturers radios, but also bearing in very fine print, the words "Made in Japan."

There are many specific points which I could go into, but which I shall reserve for detailed discussion at a later date. These include the utterly unjustifiable granting of the percentage depletion tax reduction formula, plus the foreign tax credit, for foreign oil and mineral operations; the Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. provisions which no longer serve a useful purpose, if they ever did; faulty gross-up provisions which result in the foreign subsidiary receiving both a credit and a deduction when taxes are finally assessed against it. But these are really peripheral, although important matters.

What is needed immediately is the repeal of our provisions of law allowing foreign income taxes to be credited against U.S. income taxes, and the enactment of legislation to charge to domestic corporations for annual tax purposes the profits made by their foreign subsidiaries, whether or not such profits are repatriated. This, in my opinion, should be done without regard to the balance-of-payments deficits. The imbalance-of-payments situation, however, makes such action imperative. Unless the removal of the tax incentive reduces capital outflow to tolerable proportions, then it may be necessary to consider some reasonable form of direct regulation of large foreign capital investment.

This is but one of the myriad of problems with which the new President will be faced. Like many another, it has an important interdependency with the overall necessity of providing security, peace, and well-being for our people, and, so far as we can achieve it, to make it possible for the people of the free world to enjoy these benefits.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee on making a very real contribution to our efforts to secure adequate revenue to put the Kennedy program into effect.

Second, I congratulate him upon his astute ferreting out of another tax loophole, which perhaps some of us who have been working in this vineyard for the last 4 or more years might have found sooner.

Does not the Senator feel that there is a definite obligation on both the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance to begin promptly to hold hearings to uncover all these inequitable tax loopholes, through which billions of dollars of needed revenue are seeping out every year?

Mr. GORE. Before responding to the Senator's question, I wish to thank him for his very generous comment.

The tax reduction brought about by the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 placed the Eisenhower administration virtually in an economic straitjacket, leaving it without the flexibility to utilize fiscal policy and other economic means to bring about stability, on the one hand, and an adequate rate of growth, on the other.

With the third recession within this administration now upon the country, the new President will take office next week with, I fear, almost 6 million persons unemployed. Not only does that mean human tragedy; it also will severely reduce the Government's revenue.

Therefore, it seems to me imperative that additional sources of revenue be sought. How are those additional sources to be found? They are to be found either, first, through the levying of additional taxes or, second, through the removal of the tax favoritism, commonly called closing tax loopholes. There are many of them. I think this would be a fruitful endeavor. The House Ways and Means Committee has already held extensive hearings on the subject; and I hope the Senate Finance Committee will soon do so. I believe it should.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit an interruption, let me say that I see on the floor another member of that committee—the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I have no doubt that he will be happy to join the Senator from Tennessee in this effort.

In the past, our trouble has been that we have had to bring up these tax-loophole-closing efforts in the closing days of the Congress, when we are always met with the argument that the Finance Committee has not made any investigation of the subject. We are always met with the strong argument that the Bureau did not make the recommendation, that the Eisenhower administration did not recommend it, and that our Finance Committee had not investigated it. So it is said that we are trying to act without sufficient factual background. The Senator from Tennessee will recall, I am sure, as will the distinguished Senator

from Louisiana, that last year we were met with that argument.

Mr. GORE. I do recall it, and I thank the able Senator from Pennsylvania for his contribution.

As I said earlier, this is one type of tax favoritism on which I will solicit the views of Mr. Douglas Dillon, who has been designated as Senator Kennedy's choice for Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator will agree that every effort should be made by those of us Democratic Members of the Senate and the House who believe that billions of additional dollars could be saved through closing these tax loopholes, to persuade the Treasury itself to make the studies and investigations and recommendations which could be so helpful to us in closing these tax loopholes.

Mr. GORE. I must say that after some considerable experience in this endeavor, I believe we can never do this job adequately without the vigorous leadership of a President of the United States and a Secretary of the Treasury. It is very complicated and very difficult. It is very difficult both technically and politically. Unified leadership will be required, in my opinion, in order to achieve the necessary goals; and I regard tax inequities as the crying injustice of our time and our society.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the planks in our Democratic platform which call for the closing of tax loopholes, and, of course, he is also aware of the fact that our successful candidates for both the Presidency and the Vice Presidency espoused that platform in its entirety; and I recall that on more than one occasion during the campaign, President-elect Kennedy spoke in favor of closing these tax loopholes.

So I hope the Senator from Tennessee will join me in feeling that we can look forward to having some Executive leadership; and I hope very much indeed that the new Secretary of the Treasury—Republican though he be—will be only too anxious and willing to help those of us who have this platform commitment, to carry it into effect.

Mr. GORE. I think we can form some valid opinion with regard to Mr. Dillon after he appears before the Senate Finance Committee. He will there be afforded an opportunity to clarify his views and to state his positions.

Mr. CLARK. One final point, and I shall be through: My distinguished colleague serves not only on the Finance Committee, but also on the Foreign Relations Committee. In the text of his speech he has referred to the fact that the business of foreign tax policy is an integral part of our foreign policy, as well as an integral part of our economic policy. I wonder whether he would be receptive to the thought that it would be wise to deal with this matter on a selective basis. I believe my friend has made some reference to that thought, in his address.

What I have in mind is that from where I sit there can be very little justification for the present tax policy toward foreign subsidiaries of American corporations that are doing business in the NATO area or in Japan, particularly those that are doing business in Western Europe. But I believe it is an essential part—and I suspect that the Senator from Tennessee shares my view—of our foreign economic policy to render assistance to underdeveloped nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. So I hope we can work out a foreign tax policy which will encourage private capital to take up some of the load in those underdeveloped areas, which is in the interest of our overall foreign policy, while at the same time preventing a repetition of the kind of tax avoidance in the NATO countries and in Japan which my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, has so eloquently discussed this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. As I have said, I have serious doubts about the advisability of using domestic tax policy in the furtherance of U.S. foreign policy objectives, particularly if we rely upon general application. For instance, if foreign tax credit is to be given to all income earned abroad, then we see what has already happened: An overwhelming proportion of it goes, not to underdeveloped areas, where we particularly desire to see development, but, instead, to highly industrialized areas from which we already are receiving some severe competition. Moreover, an overwhelming proportion of it goes to foreign manufacturing subsidiaries of U.S. corporations.

It seems to me that if we are to use domestic tax policy for the furtherance of U.S. foreign-policy objectives, then we must be "selective"—to use the word the Senator from Pennsylvania has used. We must have some means which will be specific; otherwise we may prevent the achievement of our foreign-policy objectives.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his comments.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the majority cloture resolution which is the pending business before the Senate. In my opinion, the rules and procedures of the Senate are stacked against the people of the United States and the people of the free world. They protect the status quo at a time when change is not only well nigh universal, but also well nigh inevitable. They impede action at a time when action is imperative. They result in half measures doomed to be too little and too late. In many ways they are one of the most important causes for our failure in the Senate during the last 8 years, to take legislative action desperately needed for our domestic well-being and for our security abroad.

Earlier this afternoon the very able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], in defending the present cloture rule, asked the rhetorical question: What is the need to change the rule? I should like to address myself briefly to answering that question.

The rules of the Senate, and rule XXII in particular, give to the opponents of measures strongly advocated by President-elect Kennedy the opportunity to defeat those measures in the Senate of the United States. Presently it is essential, in order to terminate debate and thus bring measures advocated by the President and reported out of committee to a vote on the floor, to have 67 votes on a cloture petition.

It is well known by every Member of the Senate that there is a minimum of 35, and possibly even more, Senators in number who, quite conscientiously and honestly and sincerely, are utterly and totally opposed to the program of the President-elect. If the present cloture rule remains in effect, those Senators can defeat, by delay and by filibuster, every single important measure of the Kennedy administration.

They can prevent enactment of medical care for the aged, tied to social security. They can prevent a minimum wage law. They can prevent Federal aid to education. They can prevent legislation to help our distressed areas, of which my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has more than its fair share. They can prevent a proper housing bill, including urban renewal. They can prevent the repeal of the iniquitous Connally amendment to the World Court statute. They can prevent all of the measures which my party is committed to in its platform and which the candidates of my party advocated during the course of the last campaign.

The rules make it impossible for the legislative branch of our Government in general, and the Senate in particular, to pass meaningful legislation to protect voting rights, speed school desegregation, and promote job opportunities.

In nine efforts in the past, cloture has never been invoked in the consideration of civil rights legislation. While I believe civil rights to be an important reason for changing the rules, I place my case on a far broader base; and that is that, if we do not change the rules, the Kennedy program can be stopped in the Senate.

Senators who have been here far longer than I have seen a determined group of 12 Senators or less hold up needed legislation day after day and month after month. Senators with far greater legislative experience than I have seen measures watered down, to the point where they are hardly recognizable in their original form, because a small

group of determined Senators put a price tag on their consent to terminating further debate. By a price tag I mean they required that a majority of the Senate should so water down a measure that their opposition to it could be set aside.

My good friend the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has already announced his determined opposition to the program of the President-elect of the United States. He is one of our ablest as well as one of our most popular Senators. I have seen him operate in the 4 years I have been in the Senate, and I know full well that the Senator from Arizona, if he sets his mind to it, can prevent the entire Kennedy program from coming to a vote, unless we change the cloture rules.

So I say to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]: That is the need for changing the cloture rules. That is the real need—to see that measures for which Americans have been waiting for years are able to be passed in the Senate of the United States, and not be defeated by a determined and reactionary minority of the Members of this body.

Mr. President, it is somewhat amusing to look at the definition of filibuster in the Encyclopedia Britannica:

> A name originally given to the buccaneers. * * * The modern use of the word denotes one who engages in private warfare against any state. In the United States it is colloquially applied to legislators who practice obstruction. Its practice has successfully defeated many pieces of legislation.

So much for what we seek to curb. We oppose private warfare against the best interests of the United States of America.

Let me say to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since all except one of them have long since left, and one of them, I regret to state, is required by our procedures and his lack of seniority, to remain here, while the other is quite free to go whenever he wants to—and I can assure him I intend no "end run" which would require his presence to protect his rights; I can only assume he remains because he is fascinated by my eloquence—to those of us on the Democratic side I call attention to our Democratic Party platform under the heading of "Congressional Procedures":

> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

I campaigned pretty extensively last fall in support of the plank which was approved by the Vice President-elect and by the President-elect of the United States, and they accepted the call of the convention to run as my party's candidates for the high offices to which they were elected.

I am confident that, with perhaps 15 exceptions, every other Democratic Senator in this body supports our party platform. It would indeed be a cynical thing if the first vote the Democrats cast in the 87th Congress were to repudiate the specific plank in their own platform, on which their candidates ran successfully and of which their candidates publicly approved.

I am the guardian of no man's conscience, but I could not conscientiously cast my first vote to knock down a specific plank in the platform of my party.

I wish to refer briefly to the public record of the President-elect. I hold no mandate to represent his views on this subject. He has wisely determined that, under the separation-of-powers doctrine, he will make no effort to impose his views on this arm of the legislature, but the public record speaks for itself.

Senator Kennedy's first vote in the Senate in 1953 was in favor of the Anderson motion to adopt new rules, to permit a change in the cloture rule, rule XXII. He voted for the Anderson motions to adopt new rules in 1957 and in 1959. The purpose sought to be attained by the adoption of new rules was to change the cloture rule to decrease the percentage by which Senators must agree in order to limit debate. Senator Kennedy voted for a majority cloture amendment in 1959 which was identical with the Humphrey-Kuchel resolution, which is now pending. In that year, when the resolution was defeated, he voted later to support cloture by three-fifths of the Senators, which is the proposal embodied in the Anderson amendment, upon which we may be called upon to vote tomorrow or the next day. As recently as December 20 of last year, 1960, he was reported by the wire services at Palm Beach as having reaffirmed his view that it should be possible for a majority of Senators to limit debate.

Mr. President, in my judgment it is very difficult indeed for Senators to do anything other than to support the view so expressed in the past—but in the recent past—by the President-elect, which is itself a part of our party platform, and which has behind it all of the logic and all of the equity which has been brought before this Senate by my numerous colleagues who have supported the pending motion.

I had occasion last year and the year before to point out the analogy between the present situation in which the Senate finds itself and the situation of the State of Poland in the 17th and 18th centuries, which resulted in the abolition of Poland as a free nation. Historians are agreed that one of the major factors resulting in the death of that nation was the institution of the Liberum veto, under which any member of the Polish Legislature could refuse assent to any measure proposed by any other member of the Polish Diet, and thus prevent all legislation from being passed.

This veto was first used sometime after 1606. It was used in 1625 to break up the parliament. In 1658 a majority was in favor of eliminating the Liberum veto, but since unanimity was required the majority was unsuccessful in its efforts.

The real decline of Poland was caused by the Liberum veto, and the first two partitions of Poland took place. Finally, in 1788, only 7 years before the third and final partition of Poland, the Liberum veto was abolished. It was used by Poland's enemies. It was used to destroy the Polish state.

My statements are based on careful documentation, which appears in the Cambridge History of Poland, and in a one-volume history of Poland edited by Mr. B. E. Schmidt.

We are not so far, today, from that Liberum veto situation, because although one Senator cannot prevent the Senate from legislating for more than a few days, because his physical energy will be exhausted, a small group of determined Senators can prevent the Senate from ever legislating.

I suggest again that, in a time when our domestic well-being and our national security abroad are in jeopardy, we would be wise indeed to change our procedure so that the charge can never be made that the Senate did not fulfill its proper constitutional duty in legislating in support of measures desired by an overwhelming majority of the American people and by a substantial majority of the Members of this body.

It has been said that when 12 willful men prevented the Senate of the United States in 1917 from arming the merchantmen, thereby running the serious risk that the merchantmen would be destroyed by German submarines, such action was not particularly important because shortly thereafter President Wilson was able to achieve the same result by Executive action.

Mr. President, I point out that at the time, in 1917, President Wilson himself was almost in a desperate state of mind because this small minority of willful men were opposing his policies and putting the United States of America in a position where its merchant fleet and its foreign trade were in serious danger of being swept from the seas. President Wilson was so concerned that he said, in 1917, what is equally true in 1961:

> The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action.

In 1917, 75 Senators—and there were then only 96—signed a statement saying that they would, if they could, vote to arm the merchant ships against German aggression, but they were unable to do so because a filibuster prevented them from bringing the matter to a vote.

I say again to my good friend from Mississippi, this is the need for a change in the cloture rule.

Mr. President, I have pointed out the specifics of the Kennedy program which can and, in my judgment, in all likelihood will, be defeated if the cloture rule is not changed.

Let us also think of some of the other matters still in prospect, with respect to which the same result would apply. These include: The ratification of a treaty banning nuclear explosions; a general disarmament agreement; an Atlantic Community proposal; strong

economic measures to counter severe unemployment or a depression, if we go into one. Any one or more matters of this sort may become critical to the well-being of this country within the next 2 years, while the present Congress is in session.

If action is not taken now action can never be taken while the 87th Congress sits. Many members of the public and even some Senators do not yet seem to be aware of the fact that we must change the rules now or we can never change them while the 87th Congress is in session.

Let us suppose we were to refer to the Committee on Rules and Administration the proposed changes in the cloture rule and the other changes in rules which I have submitted and which lie at the desk. Let us suppose the Committee on Rules and Administration is persuaded that these rules changes are desirable. Let us suppose the committee reports them to the Senate, and let us suppose they go to the calendar. Let us further suppose the majority leader motions them up for consideration. They can never be passed. They can never be passed unless we have 67 votes instead of 51 votes to change the rules and to put the new rules into effect. We can do it now, under the ruling of the Vice President and the general principles of constitutional law, with 51 votes. If we wait until next week and transact business in the interim, we can never do it unless we can get 67 votes to impose cloture.

There is one additional point, Mr. President. Let no man think that the rules fight can in any way possibly delay the presentation and enactment of the Kennedy program.

This rules fight will be over by the 20th of January, one way or another. Either those who support a meaningful change in the cloture rule will persuade a majority of our colleagues to support us; we will move the previous question; we will cut off debate and by majority vote we will change the rules and that will be the end of it, and we can put that matter to the test this week—at the latest finally next week—or we will fail in that effort and a motion to table will prevail. In either event the whole problem will be behind us by the time John Fitzgerald Kennedy takes the oath of office as President of the United States.

So I repeat. Let no one deceive himself into believing that he must vote against a change in the cloture rule because he might be delaying enactment of the Kennedy program. That argument does not have a single leg to stand on. It is totally and completely fallacious.

I say to my friends on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, "Vote against the change in the cloture rule if you wish because you do not think it should be changed but, for goodness sake, do not try to persuade Senators or even yourself that you are voting against a change in the rules because you want the Kennedy program to go through. The two matters have absolutely nothing in common."

There are a number of other changes in the rules which in my judgment are necessary to insure majority rule in the Senate after reasonable debate. I should say, as was said earlier by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in the colloquy which I had with him, no Member of this body wishes to cut off debate before a reasonable time has elapsed. How long is a reasonable time? Two weeks, three weeks, a month? During that period any popular measure which a minority believes to be not in the best interest of the country can be argued almost interminably, and if the country and the Senate can be rallied in support of the minority, they will have ample opportunity through debate to do so. So no one should think that the passage of this pending measure to impose majority cloture is the imposition of gag rule which would cut off meaningful debate. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I have before me a memorandum which sets forth briefly other important changes in Senate procedure, which I shall urge on my colleagues before we put the matter behind us. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this memorandum may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENACTMENT OF KENNEDY PROGRAM REQUIRES A NUMBER OF RULES CHANGES TO INSURE MAJORITY RULE

1. COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

The Senate should consider the adoption, preferably by amendment to the Senate rules of a committee bill of rights that would give the majority of the members of any committee the rights (a) to convene meetings; (b) to determine the business to be considered; and (c) to terminate discussion of the pending business within the committee after appropriate debate.

2. SENATE PROCEDURE

We cannot afford the luxury of unlimited debate in the Senate if we are to attend to the legislative business of the country in the sixties. The present cloture rule requiring the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senate to terminate debate is clearly inadequate. A determined minority can almost always muster the 30-odd votes needed to defeat cloture on a controversial bill. Cloture moves have been unsuccessful on the last 13 efforts, stretching all the way back to 1927.

We must and can adopt an amendment to rule XXII when the Senate of the 87th Congress convenes next week to authorize a majority of Senators to close debate after full discussion and to permit the Senate to vote on the substance of the pending business.

The Senate should also adopt a rule of germaneness in debate, similar to that in effect in most other free world legislative bodies, so one or more Senators cannot prevent Senate consideration of legislative matters which may be urgently needed in the public interest.

In addition we should remove the undemocratic powers now vested in a single Member of the Senate to prevent all 130 committees and subcommittees from meeting during Senate sessions, to stop all Senate action by requiring journal readings and to prevent the conduct of miscellaneous business during the morning hour. These powers should be vested only in a majority of the Senate.

3. CONFERENCE PROCEDURE

The practice of appointing a majority of Senators who have fought against important amendments to represent the Senate in conference with the House to resolve differences in the versions of a bill passed by the two Houses does violence to fundamental democratic principles. The rule I will propose would require that a majority of Senate conferees should have voted for the bill in question.

Mr. CLARK. In conclusion, all of these proposals are designed to restore true majority rule in Senate committee and in floor deliberations. They will be opposed by those who oppose congressional action on some or all of our most pressing domestic and foreign problems. Their arguments will stress the safeguards necessary to prevent tyranny by a majority.

I submit that those who oppose majority rule are fearful of democracy itself, which is based to a large degree on the principle of majority rule, as Thomas Jefferson so well stated in a quotation which has already been widely used in this debate. Of course, at times majorities can and do act unwisely, but this is one of the inherent dangers of democracy. Our constitutional system is replete with checks and balances which will remain as limitations of democratic majority rule regardless of the nature of congressional rules of procedure. Small State overrepresentation in the Senate, Executive veto power and the two-thirds requirement for overriding, the prohibitions written into the Bill of Rights, and judicial review all act as curbs on precipitate legislative action. So does our committee system through which are screened all the measures which eventually come to the floor.

To overlay on these constitutional safeguards undemocratic limitations in archaic rules of procedure is utterly without justification.

I am less concerned with the rights of parliamentary minorities than I am with the rights of popular minorities. I am less concerned with unwise action by Congress in the cold war period in which we live than I am with congressional inaction on a whole gamut of unsolved domestic and foreign problems which demand solutions without further delays.

I am interested in all democratic procedural reforms which will reestablish the Senate as an effective arm of the American Government able to act when a majority is ready to act and thus to perform its intended constitutional duties. But my particular concern is that the Senate does not become the graveyard of the legislative program of the incoming administration. Establishment of genuine majority ruling in congressional procedures can and must prevent this from happening.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 10, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 4:3, *The Lord will hear when I call unto Him.*

Eternal God, whom we worship with humility and gratitude, we beseech Thee to give us a clearer apprehension of Thy will and a keener appreciation of the sanctity and dignity of our mission in life.

Inspire the Members of Congress with great perspectives as they daily take counsel with Thee and with one another concerning the needs of our Nation and the welfare of all mankind.

May we open widely unto Thee the windows of our souls and be blessed with altitude and strength of character.

Show us how we may help to extinguish those hot embers of hatred and ill will, of jealousy and selfishness, which at times burn so fiercely within the heart of humanity.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we offer our prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 6, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 23

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 13, 87th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect LOUIS C. RABAUT, of the 14th District of Michigan, I have the honor to report that on Saturday, January 7, 1961, at Detroit, Mich., I administered the oath of office to Mr. RABAUT, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. RABAUT subscribed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 90

Whereas LOUIS C. RABAUT, a Representative from the State of Michigan, from the 14th District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said LOUIS C. RABAUT as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER COMMEMORATIVE MEMORIAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. J. Res. 110) establishing the George Washington Carver Commemorative Memorial, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the "George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission" (referred to in this resolution as the "Commission") which shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(A) five members who are outstanding Americans to be appointed by the President;

(B) two members who are Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(C) three members who are Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) one member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative.

(2) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed by him to serve as temporary Chairman of the Commission until a permanent Chairman is selected as provided in this paragraph. It shall be the duty of the temporary Chairman to convene the Commission, as soon as practicable after the appointment of the members thereof, at which time the Commission shall elect a permanent Chairman from among the members of the Commission and provide for the selection of such other officers as the Commission may deem necessary. The members shall serve without compensation, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the commemoration of the work of George Washington Carver and his contributions to humanity. In carrying out these functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation to plan an appropriate celebration in connection with the commemoration of the work of George Washington Carver, and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein.

(c) The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

(d)(1) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this section. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this section.

(2) A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress not later than June 30, 1963. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Commission, for necessary expenses in carrying out its functions under this section, $249,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this resolution been printed?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is similar to a resolution that was passed by the House last year, H.J. Res. 799, with the exception that the 16-member commission provided for in that resolution has been reduced to 11, and instead of its being called the George Washington Carver Centennial Commission the pending resolution calls it the Memorial Commission because of uncertainty as to the exact date of George Washington Carver's birth.

As you know, he attended college in Iowa. He was born in Missouri.

Thirty-six thousand dollars has already been appropriated for the current fiscal year in anticipation of becoming effective only when the necessary legislation in the form of a resolution is adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Is the $36,000 a part of the $249,000 or is it in addition thereto?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, it is a part of it.

Let me say that to offer this resolution brings me great happiness not only as a Member of the House but personally in commemoration of this great man, in my opinion one of the greatest men who ever lived, starting out under the adversities he did, his wonderful character, and the great things he did for mankind. While I have offered the resolution I want the record to show that I consider it a joint resolution offered by myself and the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who has worked untiringly with me on it. As a matter of

fact, he originated it, and I want the record to show it. It has been a pleasure to work with him on it. It should not be referred to as the McCormack resolution, but as the McCormack-Jensen resolution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased, of course, by the words of the great majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK]. He has explained the situation as it exists. I might say that Dr. Sidney Phillips is greatly interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. By the way, Dr. Phillips is president of the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation,

Mr. JENSEN. He came to me last year because George Washington Carver had attended college at Simpson, Iowa, and afterwards had been an instructor in the State agricultural college at Ames. He suggested that we establish this commission for the George Washington Carver centennial celebration.

I was very happy to cooperate. I then went to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and explained the situation to the gentleman, and he was very cooperative. Then I asked the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate $36,000 to initiate the work of the Commission, which it did, contingent on the passage of this resolution.

When the gentleman from Iowa asked if this is part of the $249,000 that the resolution calls for, I can only say that it is, of course, the duty of Congress to determine how much more money will be appropriated.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say for the record that when we authorize $246,000 or thereabouts and $36,000 has been appropriated in anticipation of the passage of the resolution, and will operate only after passage. I consider that $36,000 a part of the complete authorization. I think the gentleman from Iowa should make the same admission for the record.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Since the House approved a similar resolution last year, although it did not receive approval in the other body, I am not going to object, but I want to say that from here on out this business of establishing additional commissions will have my opposition. With the economic situation being what it is in this country, we need to conserve the dollars of the taxpayers of this country, and I intend to object to the establishment of commissions for capricious reasons.

Mr. McCORMACK. Generally speaking, then, the gentleman intends to object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution carries out a custom of the Congress and the American people in honoring such great men as George Washington Carver; it follows through on exactly the same basis as we have honored George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Booker T. Washington, and many other honored Americans. So I am happy that there has been no objection raised to this resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. As my colleague from Iowa says, he is not going to object, neither am I at this time; but if this is the beginning of a practice, without saying anything at all about the merits—undoubtedly it has merit—of spending the taxpayers' dollars to honor some great American—we just cannot all who richly deserve high honor. During the last campaign I learned or rather heard it said that 17 million Americans went to bed every night hungry. If that be true instead of creating these commissions we ought to see that we in some way first satisfy that hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everyone is in agreement now. Let us go along.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LIBERATION OF RUSSIA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, to defeat communism in the world it must be destroyed in Moscow. The liberation of Russia is the key to the salvation of the world from the peril in which it stands today.

And yet, the timid foreign policy of the United States, by one diplomatic concession after another, is failing to enlist the support of its greatest potential friends; the people of Russia, and China, and all the other captive nations.

This lack of understanding and initiative during the past 8 years has disheartened the captive peoples who have looked to us for political and moral leadership, and has eroded our prestige and position as the champion of freedom.

Our Nation must get moving again and reach through to the captive peoples in the spirit of our own Declaration of Independence which proclaims that—

> All men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

With our encouragement, communism will be weakened and overthrown by its first victims, the people of Russia and China themselves.

But we must have a foreign policy that will give them hope, and the message of our courageous and progressive faith in freedom must be communicated to them by Russians and Chinese who are members of the free world community.

For some thoughts as to how this can be accomplished under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD, the following article dated New York, November 1960. It is titled: "Some Basic Facts Concerning Communism" and is signed by Alexandra Tolstoy, Igor Sikorsky, and Boris Sergievsky.

SOME BASIC FACTS CONCERNING COMMUNISM

ITS OBJECT—WORLD DOMINATION

Once again we are approaching the anniversary of that fateful day when communism seized control of the Government of Russia. The Communists were able to seize power in Russia because the country had been weakened by the Revolution of 1917 which had destroyed the traditional form of government and social structure and had proved itself incapable of creating a new government based on the trust and support of the Russian people.

Forty-three years have passed since Russia fell into the hands of the international Communist conspirators. During this time the Communists have expanded their power to cover one-third of the world. Their advance was especially impressive immediately after World War II, when the shortsighted and thoughtless policy of the West gave them the opportunity of capturing China and many nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Recently their offensive against the free world has been intensified, as can be seen from the events in the Congo, Laos, and Cuba.

There is nothing surprising or unexpected in this fact. Khrushchev's behavior in the United Nations astonished only those who either did not understand communism or those who were trying to mislead public opinion in the free world. Attempts to explain Khrushchev's belligerence by his desire to appease Chinese aggressiveness and the old guard Stalinists in Moscow find no support in the facts or in the history of the Communist movement. Communists are openly striving for a worldwide revolution and are doing everything to gain this aim. Secretary of State Christian Herter was right when, in his address to the American Bar Association, he said: "The Soviet goal is the collapse of order, then Communist control." Here the Secretary of State correctly defined the situation in the Congo, but his definition also has a much broader and more general significance. Communists will never be satisfied with seizing power in any one given state—power over the whole of humanity always was and will ever remain their proclaimed objective.

WAYS AND MEANS—CONSPIRACY, TERROR, AND WAR

Lenin, whom Communists consider their leader and teacher together with Marx, said that any crime is justified if it helps attain the object.

We see Communists in every country, in every nation, prior to their seizing power, employing conspiracy, espionage, lies, and introducing their agents into the government and armed forces.

Communists do not hesitate, where it is possible, to use violence to seize a government. Where such methods cannot be employed they openly conquer weak states with Communist troops. In Russia and China, they came to power by seizing the government and destroying their opponents. In Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, and many other countries power was handed to local Communists by Soviet or Chinese troops.

Having once seized power, the Communists proceed to strangle all freedom of conscience and resort to physical violence to destroy or remove their opponents. The citizens of every state seized by Communists are deprived of freedom of speech, press, and as-

sembly. They do not have the right to belong to political parties, except the Communist Party, sometimes, as in Poland and East Germany, the Communists create fictitious political parties, actually in their complete control, with the object of misleading public opinion in the free world.

In countries under their control Communists destroy all freedom of worship, persecute the clergy and the faithful. It is a mistake to believe that there is no persecution of religion in the Soviet Union and other Communist states. This persecution not only exists, but is growing in scope. In 1959, the Communist Party began taking away children from parents who were giving them a religious education. The parents themselves received prison sentences for this "crime."

By abolishing the right of private property the Communist Party gains complete and arbitrary control over the standard of life and economic existence of individuals and whole classes of the population.

In the course of the 43 years since the coming to power of communism in Russia these qualities of communism have often been considered results of the character of the Russian people. Some Western historians and writers have expressed the opinion that the Russian people, who have supposedly always existed in a state of slavery, had neither the wish nor the strength to resist communism.

However, after World War II and after communism had spread to many other nations, it became very obvious that this theory was not true. Communists turned out to be the same everywhere—in China, in Cuba, in East Germany, and in Vietnam—and there are no reasons to believe that they would be any different if they should succeed in coming to power in, let us say, France or in one of the republics of South America. Furthermore, the history of the last decade has shown that it is actually the Russian people who have resisted and continue to resist communism with greater tenacity than any other nation. During World War II many millions of Russian soldiers refused to participate in the defense of the Soviet Union; several generals of the Soviet Army with General Vlasov at their head endeavored to organize a Russian army of liberation to fight communism. As is well known, these generals were handed over to the Communists by the Western Allies after the defeat of Germany, and subsequently were hanged in Moscow. This act was not only a cruel and criminal violation of all moral law, but also a grievous political mistake. It destroyed all confidence in the West amongst the broad masses of the Russian people, and demonstrated that the free world did not wish to help the Russian people in their struggle against communism.

When, in 1956, the Hungarian people rose against Communist dictatorship, the Russian soldiers of the Red army were the only foreign soldiers to help the Hungarians in their fight. The eventual defeat of the uprising cannot be blamed on these soldiers, but it certainly is the fault of the free world which abandoned to their fate both the Hungarians and their Russian allies.

WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES?

The Communist Party is not a national party of any one nation. It is not a political party in the same sense as, for instance, are the Republican and Democratic Parties in the United States.

The Communist Party in every nation is a branch of an international organization striving to impose its power over the whole of the world. Mistaken therefore are those who think of the present plight of the world as international tension or believe that the cold war is between the United States and Russia.

Actually, the tension in the world today results from the incessant war the international Communist organization is waging with all opponents of communism wherever they be or whatever nationality they belong to. The free world has but one enemy—Communists, any kind of Communists—regardless of whether they be Russians or Americans, Hungarians or Poles, Chinese or Japanese. On the other hand, the free world has many allies. These allies are all the nations enslaved by the Communists and all the nations which are threatened by Communist enslavement.

The free world will be able to hold its ground and resist Communist aggression when it realizes that what is going on today in the world is not a struggle between nations or groups of nations, but a struggle between godless and inhuman communism on one side and the rest of humanity on the other.

TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM

It should be clearly understood that all efforts to halt communism's aggressive pressure on the free world are foredoomed unless the free world itself takes the offensive against communism.

The former President of the United Nations General Assembly, Dr. Charles Malik, was absolutely right when he said:

"The West should stand firm at all costs against any further expansion of communism, including above all the test case of Berlin. Some Western commentators have darkly hinted that the West would not fight over Berlin. It is fair then to ask, over what would the West fight? * * * An active policy of liberation is of the essence in any sound Western program for the coming years. Only a believing, active, sustained and bold looking-forward to free Eastern Europe, a free Russia and a free China is worthy of the gigantic world struggle."

The free world should retaliate to Communist aggression by carrying the struggle to the rear of communism. It is inadmissible and disastrous to permit a situation to continue in which Khrushchev openly tells the free world that he will bury it, and to pretend that the free world does not believe the threat. It is inadmissible and disastrous to continue a situation where communism is incessantly digging a grave for the free world while the latter does nothing or almost nothing to bring the end of communism.

Such transmitters as the Voice of America, Radio Liberty, the Voice of Canada, the B.B.C., and the Spanish National Radio daily penetrate the Iron Curtain and are of great value since they serve to inform the enslaved nations of the truth concerning the free world. Such broadcasts should be continued and expanded. But merely telling the objective truth about the free world is not sufficient to gain victory. The enslaved nations and first among them the Russian and Chinese people must know that the free world stands ready to help them in their struggle for liberation.

In the past, the free world has more than once proclaimed its readiness to combat slavery and infringements of human rights. Today communism is openly establishing a system of physical and spiritual slavery and has brought under its domination one-third of the world and is boasting that soon it will conquer the remaining two-thirds—why, then, is the free world silent and does not come out with a statement that it is ready to help the victims?

Why, then, instead of making such a statement—which would be the only wise and fitting one from a political and moral point of view—does the free world proclaim that its object is peaceful coexistence with the tyrants?

If the free world wishes to avoid the grave that communism is preparing for it, it should openly and directly call the enslaved nations to resistance and to struggle for their freedom. It must give them that political and moral assistance which develops strength tenfold.

First of all, the free world must discard the pernicious faith in the possibility of "peaceful coexistence" of communism with freedom. Participation of Communists in the United Nations serves to discredit the organization in the eyes of the enslaved nations and debars it from effectively assisting in the struggle for freedom in the rest of the world. The exchange of "cultural delegations" does not, as those who do not know communism believe, assist in the mutual understanding of nations. This exchange demonstrates to the enslaved nations that their fight for freedom is doomed since the free world is accepting their masters as brothers. The exchange serves to ease the penetration of Communist agents into the free world, as every Communist, always and everywhere, is first and foremost an agent of that criminal organization of which he is the servant.

After discarding the idea of peaceful coexistence, the free world should frankly and openly state that it considers Communists as enemies and the enslaved nations its best allies. At the same time assurance should be given to the Russian and Chinese peoples that no material gains are being sought and that the wish to help does not stem from any quest for territorial gains or wish to introduce any form of government and has the sole object of removing and destroying communism and restoring the rights of human individuality.

To defeat communism in the world it must be destroyed in Moscow. The liberation of Russia is the key to the salvation of the world from the peril in which it stands today.

It is not enough and it is well-nigh impossible to destroy communism in Warsaw or Budapest, China, or Cuba without getting rid of communism in Russia. The fate of humanity depends on the fate of Russia.

THE FIRST VICTIM OF COMMUNISM

In the United States the conceptions "Russian" and "Communist" are often considered synonymous. This is a mistake produced by ignorance and fostered by those who call Communist expansion "Russian imperialism" and the Soviet Union—the Russian Empire.

In 1959 the Congress of the United States adopted a resolution establishing the observance of Captive Nations Week every year. Under the influence of negligent advisers the resolution included a list of captive nations, among them not only those nations which had actually been and were captured by communism, but some nonexistent nations as well.

This list has done the United States much harm. It gave the Communists a chance to accuse America of the desire to dismember Russia. It allowed Communists propaganda the possibility of proclaiming as traitors all Russians opposing communism and living abroad.

The fateful mistake made by Congress was enhanced by the fact that the list of captive nations did not include the Russian people, thereby giving the impression that the Russian nation had not been captured by communism.

The captive nations themselves treat the Russian people otherwise. They know, better than the free world, the nature and history of communism and that Russia was its first victim. The Assembly of Captive European Nations which exists in New York stated in its 1960 September bulletin:

We have always made the distinction between the criminal apparatus which from the Kremlin oppresses a third of humanity and the Russian people who were their first victims.

The free world should follow the example of the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

What they have said about the Russian people should be broadcast for the entire world to hear. We sincerely hope this will be done by the next President of the United States.

If he were to say as much, his words would be heard by all of Russia—from the Baltic to the Pacific Ocean, from the Arctic Circle to the Caucasus. They would give fresh strength of resistance to communism to the Russian people. They would demonstrate to the Russians that they have friends in the free world on whose sympathy and assistance they can count. At the same time the words of the President addressed to the Russian people and to all other nations enslaved by communism would immeasurably help the cause of peace in the world and would diminish the threat of atomic war now hanging over humanity.

To realize this it should be kept in mind that Communist aggression continues in its intensity only because the Communists are confident that they will not be stopped. They know that the free world will never begin a war while they themselves, atomic threats notwithstanding, have at present no intentions of embarking on one. It is their intention to strengthen their own armament and at the same time to weaken the fibre of the free world by propaganda, subversive interference in the economic and political life of free nations and turning to their benefit all existing difficulties and errors.

The principal obstruction the Communists encounter are the discontent and resistance of the population in Russia and other enslaved nations. The thirst of this population for economic well-being based on individual initiative and for the restoration of traditional forms of national life weakens and terrifies Communists much more than the armed might of the free world. They think their own armaments will sooner or later counterbalance this might and believe that they will succeed in further weakening the power of the West by gaining control over more Asian, African, and other presently free states. They foresee that the number of American strategic bases in the world will diminish in the course of the next few years by reason of further penetration of Communist propaganda into the countries where they are located.

At the same time the Communists are well aware that they will never be able to change the attitude of the captive nations toward the doctrines of Marx and Lenin. They realize that the hatred of these peoples toward the Communist regime will never die and that they are only waiting for the opportunity to act, as happened in Russia during the Second World War or in Hungary in 1956.

It is therefore clear that the aggressiveness of communism in the free world will diminish in inverse ratio to the growth of resistance to communism among the captive nations; the chances of war will also become more remote. The free world should realize and ever keep in mind that the support of the captive nations in their struggle with communism is the best assurance against war. The free world should never lose sight of the fact that the key to the effectiveness of such assurance lies first of all in assistance to the Russian people, on whom today hangs the fate of humanity.

Bitterly mistaken are those who think that war can be avoided by concessions to communism, by appeals to their desire for peace, calling upon them for mutual understanding with the free world.

The nature of communism is determined by its doctrine and as such is incapable of either compromise or cessation of aggression. The worldwide Communist revolution was and remains the objective. In losing sight of this, in accepting Communists to full membership in the United Nations, as rightful representatives of the nations they have enslaved, and in denying these nations help, the free world has even up to the present time followed a treacherous path.

At the present moment, however, the free world and more specifically the United States are faced with the dilemma: either to succumb under the pressure of communism or to stand up and resist by force of arms.

The only conceivable way to avoid these alternatives is by taking to the other side of the Iron Curtain the struggle which the Communists have been waging for the last 43 years on the territory of free nations, enslaving them and turning them into slave camps. The surge of the wave of communism in the world has continued too long. The time for the wave of freedom has arrived. If it does not rise, if it does not spread to the nations now groaning under the Communist yoke, the destruction of the free world, with or without war, is inevitable.

To conclude, we wish to repeat the call that was made by anti-Commmunist Russians in September and October 1960 during Khrushchev's appearance at the General Assembly of the United Nations:

"Communism in Moscow means war.
A free Russia means peace.
Russians want freedom.
Help them in their struggle."

THE FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Colorado are, individually, introducing legislation to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct dams, reservoirs, canals, and facilities for the generation of electrical energy. The proposed legislation would supply a supplemental water supply to the residents of the State of Colorado and would be governed by the Federal reclamation laws and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

This is a proposal to divert the waters of the Colorado River system to the Arkansas River Basin and it provides that this authorization shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Colorado River Storage Project Act, and the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994), and shall be included within and shall in no way increase the total quantity of water to the use of which the State of Colorado is entitled and limited under said compacts, statutes, and treaty, and every contract entered into under this act for the storage, use, and delivery of such water shall so recite.

The project, when constructed, will be subject to the Constitution and laws of the State of Colorado which provide for the development of its resources by giving the better right to the use of water to the appropriator who first makes beneficial use of water. This principle is not diluted by any provision of the proposed legislation. It does not make reservations for later use of any appropriator within the State. As between Colorado and other States, some provisions have become law which provide for the reservation of the waters of Colorado for future use as against other States.

The project has been outlined in House Document 187, 83d Congress, modified as proposed in the September 1959 report of the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Ruedi Dam and Reservoir, Colo." Naturally, there will be a possibility of various changes, modifications, and additions to this plan and Congress can properly act when the proposals are presented.

It is my hope that all Members will become well acquainted with these proposals and recognize that this is a new start that can help develop the West. We, in Colorado, know that the proper development and retention of its water is the salvation of our future. The approval of this legislation at this session of Congress should meet with the approval of those who are interested in the future development of our country.

ORDINANCE OF SECESSION OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago on this date a convention called and authorized by the Mississippi State Legislature adopted an Ordinance of Secession, declaring itself henceforth "to be a free, sovereign, and independent State." This ordinance, in effect, declared that the State of Mississippi was reclaiming the rights yielded by the State to the Central Government when it joined the Federal Union on December 10, 1817.

Mr. Speaker, on the same date, January 9, 1861, the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter, S.C., signaling the beginning of the War Between the States.

Because the Ordinance of Secession of Mississippi is a historical document, I am including a copy as part of my remarks along with a list of the signers:

ORDNANCE OF SECESSION, JANUARY 9, 1861

ORDINANCE OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI—CHAPTER I

An ordinance to dissolve the union between the State of Mississippi and other States united with her under the compact entitled "The Constitution of the United States of America."

The people of the State of Mississippi in convention assembled, do ordain and declare, and it is hereby ordained and declared as follows, to wit:

SECTION 1. That all the laws and ordinances by which the said State of Mississippi became a member of the Federal Union of the United States of America be, and the same are hereby repealed, and that all obli-

gations on the part of the said State or the people thereof to observe the same, be withdrawn, and that the said State doth hereby resume all the rights, functions and powers which, by any of said laws or ordinances, were conveyed to the Government of the said United States, and is absolved from all the obligations, restraints and duties incurred to the said Federal Union, and shall from henceforth be a free, sovereign, and independent State.

SEC. 2. That so much of the first section of the seventh article of the constitution of this State as requires members of the legislature, and all officers, executive and judicial, to take an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution of the United States, be, and the same is hereby abrogated and annulled.

SEC. 3. That all rights acquired and vested under the Constitution of the United States, or under any act of Congress passed, or treaty made, in pursuance thereof, or under any law of this State, and not incompatible with this ordinance, shall remain in force and have the same effect as if this ordinance had not been passed.

SEC. 4. That the people of the State of Mississippi hereby consent to form a Federal Union with such of the States as may have seceded or may secede from the Union of the United States of America, upon the basis of the present Constitution of the said United States, except such parts thereof as embrace other portions than such seceding States.

Thus ordained and declared in convention the 9th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1861.

In testimony of the passage of which, and the determination of the members of this convention to uphold and maintain the State in the position she has assumed by said ordinance, it is signed by the president and members of this convention this the 15th day of January A.D. 1861.

W. S. Barry, President; Adams County, A. K. Farrar, J. Winchester; Attala County, E. H. Sanders; Amite County, D. W. Hurst; Bolivar County, M. H. McGehee; Carroll County, J. Z. George, W. Booth; Claiborne County, H. T. Ellett; Coahoma County, J. L. Alcorn; Copiah County, P. S. Catching, B. King; Clarke County, S. H. Terral; Choctaw County, W. F. Brantley, W. H. Witty, J. H. Edwards; Chickasaw County, J. A. Orr, C. B. Baldwin; Covington County, A. C. Powell; Calhoun County, W. A. Sumner, M. D. L. Stephens; De Soto County, J. R. Chalmers, S. D. Johnston, T. Lewers; Franklin County, D. H. Parker; Greene County, T. J. Roberts; Hinds County, W. P. Harris, W. P. Anderson, W. B. Smart; Holmes County, J. M. Dyer, W. L. Keirn; Harrison County, D. C. Glenn; Hancock County, J. B. Deason; Issaquena County, A. C. Gibson; Itawamba County, R. O. Beene, A. B. Bullard, W. H. H. Tison, M. C. Cummings; Jasper County, O. C. Dease; Jackson County, A. E. Lewis; Jefferson County, J. S. Johnston; Jones County, J. H. Powell; Kemper County, O. Y. Neely, T. H. Woods; Lawrence County, W. Gwin; Lowndes County, George R. Clayton; Leake County, W. B. Colbert; Lauderdale County, J. B. Ramsey, F. C. Semmes; Lafayette County, L. Q. C. Lamar, T. D. Isom; Marshall County, A. M. Clayton, J. W. Clapp, S. Benton, H. W. Walter, W. M. Lea; Madison County, A. P. Hill; Monroe County, S. J. Gholson, F. M. Rogers; Marion County, H. Mayson; Noxubee County, Israel Welsh; Neshoba County, D. M. Backstrom; Newton County, M. M. Keith; Oktibbeha County, T. C. Bookter; Perry County, P. J. Myers; Pike County, J. M. Nelson; Panola County, J. B. Fizer, E. F. McGehee; Pontotoc County, C. D. Fontaine, J. B. Herring, H. R. Miller, R. W. Flournoy; Rankin County, Wm. Denson; Sunflower County, E. P. Jones; Simpson County, W. J. Douglas; Smith County, W. Thompson; Scott County, C. W. Taylor; Tallahatchie County, A. Pattison; Tishomingo County, A. E. Reynolds, W. W. Bonds, T. P. Young, J. A. Blair; Tunica County, A. Miller; Tippah County, O. Davis, J. H. Berry, J. S. Davis, D. B. Wright; Washington County, J. S. Yerger; Wilkinson County, A. C. Holt; Wayne County, W. J. Eckford; Warren County, W. Brooke, T. A. Marshall; Winston County, J. Kennedy, W. S. Bolling; Yalobusha County, F. M. Aldridge, W. R. Barksdale; Yazoo County, H. Vaughan, G. B. Wilkinson.

Mr. Speaker, ironically enough, the events that brought about Mississippi's Ordinance of Secession in 1861 bear a marked similarity to those which are transpiring today.

In 1961 the people of Mississippi, instead of fighting to dissolve their ties with the Constitution of the United States, are zealously and relentlessly fighting to preserve our constitutional Republic.

A NEW EMPHASIS ON BUY AMERICAN LEGISLATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced again in this Congress two bills which I introduced in the last Congress dealing with the subject of the Buy American policies of our Federal agencies.

The first bill, H.R. 2073, provides for an amendment to the existing Buy American Act to make two important changes. First, my bill would spell out in the statute itself the cost differential which Government agencies must be guided by in conforming with the requirement that they make their purchases from American manufacturers so long as the price differential is not "unreasonable." At the present time the definition of reasonable and unreasonable price differentials is set by executive action. Until recently that figure has been set at 6 percent generally and 12 percent in the case of American-made goods manufactured in areas of substantial unemployment. Quite obviously, the basic purpose of the Buy American Act, which is to channel American purchases by Federal Government agencies to American manufacturers rather than to foreign manufacturers, could easily be nullified by the executive branch if the differential in cost were to be set at an unrealistically low figure.

The second feature of my bill is that it would then proceed to establish that percentage at 25 percent. As a matter of fact, the executive department has recently adopted this same figure for goods purchased in unemployment areas, presumably borrowing it from any legislation as it appeared in the 86th Congress. However, I feel it is important that we should nail the figure down into the basic legislation rather than allow it to be subject to abrupt change, on the part of the executive.

The other bill I have introduced, H.R. 2072, would direct the Development Loan Fund, in making purchases from American manufacturers, to give priority consideration to manufacturers located in areas of substantial unemployment. In recent months the Development Loan Fund, in providing its foreign aid assistance to countries overseas, has been directed by the President to require that those foreign countries utilize their loan funds for the purchase of goods manufactured in the United States. However, the Executive order makes no provision for any priority in making these purchases from areas which are suffering most heavily from unemployment, in spite of the fact that in many cases the unemployment from which these areas are suffering is directly the result of increased American purchases abroad.

Surely the Development and Loan Fund must be directed to give special priority consideration to these unemployment areas, and that is what my bill would do. For one thing this would be the cheapest and certainly the most effective way of providing Federal help for distressed areas, and I believe we must do everything we possibly can in the application of every existing Government procurement program to give priority to our unemployment areas. As the Executive order to the Development and Loan Fund now stands foreign governments purchasing locomotives in this country, for example, are quite free to purchase these locomotives from the General Motors Corp., let us say, even though the American Locomotive Co. in my district in Schenectady, now known as Alco Products, Inc., to take another example, has been almost squeezed out of the locomotive business because of declining orders, and thousands of former loyal locomotive employees are today walking the streets in my district in search of work. Even a comparatively few locomotives channeled into this one unemployment area could have a profound stimulating effect on our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, some of us in this House have fought hard in the past 2 years to emphasize the threat which foreign competition is presenting to our economy and to emphasize the need for concentrating on American purchases. In many ways the fight we have been fighting has been an uphill battle. But things have begun to change in the past few months, because suddenly the problem of the gold outflow is staring us squarely in the face. Suddenly for this reason it has become not only necessary but even fashionable to buy American. To meet this problem of increased foreign imports and the economic disbalance which they have brought about, the administration has recently taken the very drastic step of putting the major share of the burden of halting the gold outflow onto the wives and children of American servicemen stationed abroad. Such action can be at best inadequate and

may well be seriously harmful to our overall defense. I believe the solution to our long-range problem in balance of payments lies rather in the adoption of the type of legislation which I have introduced. I commend these bills to the favorable consideration of my colleagues in this House.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my friends and colleagues in this body know my concern for an adequate resource development program. Those of us from the Pacific Northwest are particularly aware of the importance of this program because of our area's great land and water resources, but it is a vital issue for all the people everywhere. Our Democratic Party is justly proud of its heritage of principle in this field of policy and of its record of accomplishment through the years.

It has long seemed to me that a more realistic budgetary concept toward reimbursable resource expenditures is essential if we are to adequately utilize our great natural resources.

The capital budget concept which I am again presenting to Congress has at least two advantages over the present system. First, it would regularize and provide for an overall planning of resource development investment. Second, and perhaps more important, it would facilitate the understanding, by Congress and the administration as well as by our people, of a fundamental distinction in our budgetmaking; the distinction between expenditures for current operating expenditures and investments in capital development. I might point out also that this second advantage would touch on fields of Government operations aside from just our resource development program.

Because of my belief that adoption of the capital budget concept would represent an important improvement in our fundamental budgetmaking process, I sponsored a bill in the last Congress which called for its adoption. I was extremely pleased that last year, a subcommittee of our Government Operations Committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], held preliminary hearings on my bill. It was, of course, no surprise to me that the outgoing administration registered strong opposition to my proposal. I feel, however, that the opportunity I had to reply to the distorted criticisms made of the bill was a very healthy thing. I am grateful that the Government Operations Committee printed those hearings and made them available for use by my colleagues.

The following brief summary of my bill's major points will, I think, indicate the purposes of the measure as well as its specific provisions. Our proposal, and I am joined in sponsorship of this bill by the gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and by a number of distinguished Members of the other body, including both Senators from my own State [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER], is that the Employment Act be broadened to include as a statement of purpose the policy of differentiating between operating expenditures and capital investments. It would add to the duties of the Council of Economic Advisers that of recommending minimum and maximum programs of capital investment covering a period of 6 years ahead. The President would be required, in the presentation of his budget to the Congress, to distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments and to distinguish within capital investments those of a self-liquidating nature having an economic life in excess of 10 years; to report as to the amount of the Federal debt, again distinguishing that part which is represented by these self-liquidating capital investments; to recommend the minimum and maximum programs of capital investment as prepared by his Council of Economic Advisors; and to report on the effect of the proposed budgetary program on the reduction of the Federal debt. Finally, the bill calls for a distinction in law between the two types of Federal debt, gross debt and net debt, the latter excluding the amount representing self-liquidating capital investment.

Mr. Speaker, we who sponsor this legislation are firmly convinced that it is based on a sound and fundamental principle and that it offers a framework on which the legislative process can build the best possible bill to meet our needs. I am proud to say that the Democratic Party has recognized and affirmed this principle. In our platform we state that:

> We shall put budgeting for resources on a businesslike basis, distinguishing between operating expense and capital investment, so that the country can have an accurate picture of the costs and returns.

This is the aim of the bill which I have introduced and I urge the new administration to utilize our specific proposal in pursuing our mutual goal. I hope that the various executive agencies concerned under the new administration will furnish us with constructive comments on our proposal or, if they desire, recommend specific legislation of their own in this field. It is, as I have indicated, the fundamental improvement of our all-important budget making process that I seek. I believe that such an adoption of the capital budget concept, in whatever form we determine is best suited to our specific needs, will make possible not only the return to the multiple-purpose resource development principles that are a part of the Democratic Party's heritage, but a moving ahead in this vital field of policy on a more sound and coordinated basis in the challenging years of the sixties.

BUILD A STRONG AND HONEST TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we who believe that the building of a strong and honest two-party system in the South is imperative to good government are proud of the record established by Dallas County Republicans. In the past three presidential elections Dallas has given the Republican nominee its support and has been listed among the leading major cities with the highest percentage of Republican votes.

In the recent campaign, Dallas was first among the cities of more than 300,000 population in terms of the percentage of the vote given to the Republican presidential ticket.

We think this is good for Texas and good for America. Our whole system of government has come to depend upon two strong and healthy parties presenting the voters with a choice of philosophies and programs. The Republican victory in Dallas gives strength to the two-party movement in the South and we are proud of the accomplishment.

This morning I received the following letter from Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, the chairman of our party, who shares our pride:

> REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
> *Washington, D.C., January 4, 1961.*
>
> Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR BRUCE: I note that in 1960, as in 1956, the city of Dallas ranks first among the cities of more than 300,000 population in terms of the percentage of the vote given to the Republican presidential ticket.
>
> The development of tremendous Republican strength in Dallas is a phenomenon without parallel in our recent political history. It is a tribute to the vigor and determination of the dedicated people who have worked for the Republican cause under your leadership. I hope that the spirit which has produced these magnificent results in Dallas will prove contagious in the elections which lie ahead.
>
> Best wishes for the New Year.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> THRUSTON B. MORTON.

URGENTLY NEEDED TAX REFORM BILL

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a tax reform bill which I believe to be urgently needed legislation. This is the same bill I had the privilege of sponsoring in the last Congress along with my very good friends Congressman SYD HERLONG, Congressman HOWARD BAKER, and others. I hope it will be given serious consideration in this present session.

We are paving the way for socialism in America through the progressive confiscatory tax. Instead of taking property, as they do openly in Communist and Socialist countries, we have been taking income which, if carried to the ultimate end, will mean that we will have the property and our people will have lost their freedom just as surely as if we had confiscated the means of production in the beginning.

Our increasingly high taxes are drying up risk capital and killing incentive. When incentive goes, free enterprise will die. When risk capital becomes scarce, Government loans enter the scene. In both cases, socialism blooms while the heavy laden taxpayer gives up property and loses freedom. This might be called socialism, American style.

To whatever extent we are encouraging socialism by tax burdens at the expense of personal freedom and free enterprise, we must alter the income tax law. Yet such alteration in the closely knit Government-business relationship must necessarily be accomplished gradually, with maximum foresight and planning. The changes effected must not disrupt business nor inflate or weaken our currency through deficit spending, as a result of precipitously reduced income to Government.

The bill I introduced today provides: First, a gradually reduced individual and corporate income tax rate over a 5-year period. It would provide reductions for individuals—lowest bracket down from 20 to 15 percent; highest, 91 to 47 percent; corporate, 1 percent per year; second, a more realistic depreciation rate; third, decreased estate and gift taxes; fourth, deferral of capital gains tax until taxpayer disinvests. At the end of the 5-year period further tax changes could be made to remove the tax burden and stimulate economic growth.

The loss of Government income, which always must be considered in tax cuts, would be more than offset by business growth which in turn provides more tax revenues. This seemingly contradictory anomaly has been established by earlier tax cuts providing the wisdom and incentive of such action.

During the recent campaign we discussed thoroughly Russian economic growth as compared to our own. By passing such legislation as is proposed here and preserving incentive, building risk capital, we can surpass any Russian effort that is based on government tyranny. If we try to emulate Russia by government regulation, control, and confiscatory progressive taxation, which is Russia's blueprint for destroying free enterprise societies, we just commit suicide.

Too many of our citizens and, unfortunately, some Members of Congress, do not recognize the danger of ever-increasing taxation and, consequently have given no thought to a solution. This tax bill, I am convinced, provides a solution and will strengthen our free-enterprise system and make more secure the liberty of our people.

PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO REDUCE TARIFFS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced the House Concurrent Resolution that in the 86th Congress was introduced by more than 40 Members from some 25 States. The sponsors were about equally divided between the two parties. The resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the President should not exercise the authority granted him in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 to reduce existing tariffs by as much as 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, even since the adjournment of the last Congress additional force has been lent to the proposal that since the United States is in no present position to make further tariff reductions the Congress should now advise the President that he should lay the 1958 authorization aside. There is, after all, nothing mandatory about an authorization.

Conditions have come to the surface since 1958, that, while some of them were long on the way and were foreseen by some of us, have now awakened many people to the unenviable trade position of the United States in competition with the other leading industrial nations of the world.

The new concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 4) cites many of these conditions as a preamble to its conclusion. These need not be repeated here. Members may read them in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under permission already granted, I insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 4.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Whereas the Eighty-fifth Congress passed the trade agreements extension bill in August 1958, authorizing the President within a four-year period to reduce existing customs duties up to 20 per centum;

Whereas an international conference held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is being convened in January 1961, in Geneva, Switzerland;

Whereas profound changes in the international competitive standing of United States producers have occurred since the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958;

Whereas mounting deficits incurred by the United States in the total foreign account, which attained the magnitude of $3,400,000,000 in 1958, $3,700,000,000 in 1959, and an estimated $3,000,000,000 in 1960;

Whereas the gold outflow in partial satisfaction of these deficits since January 1958 has reached a level of approximately $5,000,000,000, while the stock of gold at Fort Knox has fallen to a level below $18,000,000,000 against which foreign claims of more than $18,000,000,000 are outstanding, nearly all of which could be withdrawn on demand;

Whereas prevention of a disastrous outflow of gold to foreign countries adds to the pressure on the Treasury Department to offer higher interest rates on its current and future borrowings, thus dampening domestic industrial activity and promoting stagnation while adding to the outlay for interest on the national debt, the interest service on which has already reached the level of $9,600,000,000 annually and bids fair to rise appreciably, thus adding to the national budget additional billions of dollars of fixed charges;

Whereas imports of finished and semifinished manufactures have risen sharply in recent years and now represent two-thirds of our total imports, thus reflecting the sharpened competitive advantage that has been gained by other industrial countries over the United States;

Whereas the United States has moved from the position of a leading export nation in a number of items that are products of mass production and therefore the output of our most advanced industries technologically, among them being automobiles, petroleum, cameras, sewing machines, and typewriters, thus reflecting the startling loss of technological leadership by the United States to other countries that enjoy a wage differential in comparison with this country;

Whereas numerous domestic manufacturers have in the past two years made arrangements to manufacture abroad as a means of gaining lower production costs and enabling them to supply foreign markets from abroad rather than from the United States and in some instances to ship into the United States from branches established abroad, thus reducing opportunities for employment of American workers, retarding American suppliers of materials and parts to domestic industry, and preventing small American companies that lack the capital resources to invest in foreign facilities from participating in the economic growth represented by such use of United States capital, thereby producing the total effect of handicapping American industrial power and diminishing tax revenues at a time when the cold war costs of the Federal Government are mounting;

Whereas the productivity of labor in other industrial countries has taken a notable leap, stimulated in great degree by some $25,000,000,000 in modern machinery and equipment shipped abroad by the United States during the past seven years, thus increasing the competitive advantage of foreign producers, particularly in the absence of any significant increase in foreign wage rates compared with those prevailing in this country;

Whereas American industry may expect increasingly sharp and distressing competition from abroad because of the generally weaker bargaining powers of foreign labor unions compared with those of this country, thus offering no hope of any closing of the cost differential between foreign and domestic producers in the foreseeable future;

Whereas this competition, already severe and capturing progressively larger shares of our home market for numerous products, will create grave problems of survival for some of our industries and of maintaining in such industries an American scale of wages and the enjoyment of an American standard of living for their workers, even without further tariff reductions by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:

That the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the tariff negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1961, notwithstanding the authorization contained in Public Law 85–686, known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to call particular attention to some compelling facts that will point to the utter folly of this country's further tariff reductions. Not only would such action be foolish; it would in fact be dangerous to our economy and therefore indefensible and reprehensible.

One of the hard facts that we must face is the meaning of our loss of gold. In 1960 we lost another $1.7 billion, over a billion of it in the last 6 months. This loss brought the gold stock remaining in Fort Knox to $17.6 billion or the lowest point since January 1940; and, already in 1961, the new year that is hardly underway has witnessed the loss of another $100 million. As matters stand today, foreign claims against the dollar are higher than the stock of gold remaining in Fort Knox. If a run should develop we could be denuded completely of our gold.

I cite this situation, not merely as a danger in itself, but as a symptom of what is wrong basically. The question is what has brought us to this unenviable position.

Has it been our expenditures overseas? Unquestionably that has been a strong contribution—not simply because of the amount of money sent abroad, but because of what was done with it. As an example, some of the Marshall plan money went for the construction of pottery plants abroad, some went for the building of textile industries, and so forth. I happen to come from a State in which pottery manufacturing is an important source of income and employment. Moreover, imports of pottery have been a source of distress to our producers over the years. A number of plants have been driven out of business as a result of this low-wage import competition. Why then was it considered wise to stimulate the pottery industry abroad? What God-given right has the foreign country in pottery production that should give it the privilege of driving us out of the business, and, mind you, with our own financial assistance?

When was the right of eminent domain conferred upon foreign producers entitling them to bulldoze our producers out of their way at will? Now we have distress area bills designed to repair the damage. We will be called upon once more to dip into the Treasury to cover up the effects produced by the previous dippings into the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, meantime we made it easier for other countries to ship other goods into this country. We stripped our tariffs to mere stumps of what they were. We cut them down an average of about 80 percent from the previous height. We actually invited other countries to come into our home market and to dispossess such of our industries as could not compete with the low wages paid in the other countries. We raised hardly a hand to defend them. Our State Department subscribed to the miserable and intolerable theory that any industry in this country that could not compete with coolie labor was not worth keeping alive. On top of that, to repeat, they cut away existing tariff defenses, helped build up competing industries abroad, thereby adding to the tax burdens of domestic industries and saw to it that our industrial know-how was ladled out freely to foreign producers.

If the chickens are now coming home to roost in ever greater flocks it should be no surprise.

Mr. Speaker, our whole modern economy since the days of Henry Ford has been built upon mass production and high wages. This combination has enjoyed a phenomenal success, equalled nowhere else in the world. This mass production made possible higher wages and lower costs. In turn it provided the purchasing power that absorbed the high volume of goods that came from the production lines.

The entire system was built under the protection of the tariff. This prevented the undermining and breakdown that otherwise might have occurred. What we did in fact was to insulate ourselves against low foreign wages that could have sapped our system of its vitality and made of it the anemic productive pattern that prevailed elsewhere.

Then we forgot. We became very prideful. We were the world's industrial leaders. We were strong and invulnerable—at least so thought our economists and so they preached in their classrooms and into the ears of the State Department. It was outmoded, horse-and-buggy thinking to cast doubt on this unwholesome fallacy.

Well, it is said that pride goeth before a fall; and today we stand at the verge of a downfall.

We were the world's leading mass producers. We were in the technological forefront. Thanks to the State Department philosophers and the internationalist zealots, we are fast losing this lead. No longer are we the vanguard. ECA, FOA, ICA and the other aliases used to designate our foreign aid program saw to that. They overran our factories with foreign engineers and experts eager to learn our methods and techniques and they did not go away empty-handed. Today they are using our modern methods.

Meantime we supplied over $30 billion worth of modern machinery to those countries, a great part of it paid for by our Treasury. Any wonder that their productivity per man-hour shot ahead and greatly outstripped our rate of increase? Now we gasp for more growth and expansion. We forget what we have done to put us in our present spot.

Where is this expansion to take place?

With all the increased productivity in other industrial countries, wages there have lagged in relation to the rising productivity. Therefore the competitive advantage previously enjoyed abroad over our handicraft and less mechanized industries has now been extended to our mass-production industries.

As a result our own industries, that is, those of them that are faced by growth-dampening import competition are dividing their investments into foreign and domestic. Why? The answer is self-evident. They feel as Ford must have felt that the return on their dollar will be better abroad than here. The investment climate abroad looks better than in the United States of America. This is not to say that foreign investments are evil in themselves. It does mean that we would do well to look at the home front when our dollars seek foreign outlets rather than at home. How will we absorb the unemployed in this country if we do not expand?

Yet it must be very clear that we will not get the needed expansion until our producers can be sure that they can sell their increased output for the home market in the home market instead of being pushed aside by imports.

Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as unspeakably stupid under these circumstances to heap still greater incentives upon our producers to go abroad as against investing more freely and with greater assurance at home.

I for one cannot feel that the distressed areas in this country can possibly be helped by further tariff reductions. Nor can I bring myself to believe that we will achieve the increasing growth in this country that is needed to absorb the expanding work force if we are to expose an already excessively exposed production plant to more job-killing import competition.

Mr. Speaker, I beseech my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 4 and thus to prevent piling further distress on areas that are already in distress in this country and to avoid creating additional distress areas.

I should like to ad lib at this point to remind my colleagues of the House of Representatives that in a very close fight during the last session of the 86th Congress a watered-down version of H.R. 5 was approved. I shall feel kindly toward the other body because that bill, H.R. 5, found a quiet resting place in a pigeonhole of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding because he has been the leader in this Chamber in the fight against the large flow of foreign imports into this country, a condition which has resulted in many areas throughout the country and, certainly, in my own district in much unemployment because of this competition. I want to ask the gentleman, Is is not true that the bill which the gentleman is offering in this Congress, as he did in the last Congress, would tend to reduce this flow of imports? And, I would like to ask the gentleman too, if it is not also true that thereby we would be preserving American jobs instead of exporting those jobs to foreign countries?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from New York is correct. That is the situation and that is the objective of House Concurrent Resolution 4.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman would yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel encouraged in the long fight he has been waging, sometimes against heavy odds, by the attention that has recently been paid in this country to this problem? We are told today that gold is flowing out of this country at a rapid rate and

attempts have been made to stop this flow by imposing what seem to me to be unnecessarily severe restrictions on the wives and families of American servicemen. Does not the gentleman feel that the case which he has been trying to take to the Congress and to the people, and which some of the rest of us have been trying to help him on has now become one of the major issues in the Nation, and does he not feel, perhaps, that the real solution of the gold outflow problem lies rather in the adoption of long-range legislation such as he is proposing and also of other companion pieces of legislation that some of us have introduced.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman well knows that for the last 12 years I have been telling my colleagues what would happen to our gold reserves if we do not make some changes in our present trade policies. The reciprocal trade agreements may have been in order and may have been all right in 1934, but I would like to remind the gentleman that there have been quite a few changes in the situation in this country since 1934 and in all the countries in the world. But, there stands the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act just as it was in 1934. We are the only party of the 42 nations in that international agreement that lives up to its commitments, and the rest of the parties to the agreement set up every kind of device possible until the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has become a one-way street. It is a joke and it is no longer reciprocal and it is time that the Congress did something about it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When does the present reciprocal trade law expire?

Mr. BAILEY. The present Reciprocal Trade Act expires on June 30, 1962. The purpose of the resolution I have introduced is to freeze the authority granted to the President to reduce import duties by 20 percent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned in his statement that $30 billion of American money is now invested abroad. Converting those dollars in terms of jobs; what would that amount to?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not have the information at the moment to be able to give that information to the gentleman, but I will be glad to supply it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Based upon my reading, recently, I find that $30 billion of American capital invested abroad represents about 5 million American jobs. In other words, we have transferred those jobs from our American workingmen to the workingmen of other countries.

Mr. BAILEY. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have tried to buy friendship by draining the Treasury of the United States, and we have less friends today than we have ever had. Now they are trying to buy that friendship by selling American jobs down the river.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If I may ask the gentleman just one other question; is it not true that many of these great organizations, both business and labor, that supported the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act a few years ago are now taking a negative position?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from the State of West Virginia on this fight which he is renewing in this session. The gentleman from West Virginia well knows of my association with him on this particularly vital subject matter over the last 5 years. The particular commodities and particular products which are adversely affected in the gentleman's home State of West Virginia differ in kind entirely from the products which are adversely affected in Georgia, but the principle is the same. However, we have studied this situation carefully, and we have realized that jobs of men and women in West Virginia, as well as jobs of men and women in Georgia, are being jeopardized and threatened every day as long as the present policy is being carried out, which sacrifices American industry and American employment and the jobs of American men and women to competitive counterparts, all over the world. We realize that we must take a second look at this very important subject. It is possible that the Department of State and the Department of Commerce, as well as the incoming President of the United States, must make a very positive reappraisal of this subject matter which is permitting foreign surpluses to be compounded on top of domestic surpluses. This could destroy the economy of any nation on earth.

The gentleman remembers that in 1934, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first enacted that its purpose was a very meritorious one. The purpose and the principle underlying subsequent extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have likewise been meritorious. However, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that in 1934 there was a very clear necessity for stimulating commerce and trade among the nations of the world. The purpose of the Act at this time, as was well defined and sponsored by the then Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was to promote the free flow of goods and commerce among the nations of the world without artificial trade barriers whereby there might be an exchange of goods and commodities in which we were in surplus for an exchange of goods and commodities which other nations were in surplus. It was not intended then, and should not be permitted now, to pile up or encourage foreign surpluses on top of existing domestic surpluses of like commodities and products.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman, and I shall enjoy working shoulder to shoulder with him in modification of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to adequately safeguard and protect America's basic industry.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman. I will certainly do everything within my power to the end that the true purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act may be kept in force and effect in this country.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

YELLOW JOURNALISM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters and articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post over the years has constantly and viciously attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities with false and distorted editorials, cartoons, and slanted news stories. Recently it has stepped up its hysterical smear attack to the point that thoughtful and informed persons are beginning to wonder about the real motives of those in the Washington Post organization who are responsible for this kind of yellow journalism. It has consistently used the very tactics with which it charges the staff and members of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In connection with its handling of the San Francisco riots the Washington Post is guilty of almost unbelievable distortion of the facts. It has charged that the film of the riots, taken by television and newsreel cameras on the scene at the time, has been forged by the committee.

So that the public and Members of Congress who are daily exposed to the warped propaganda of this leftwing newspaper may have some idea of the facts surrounding the recent controversy about the committee and the film of the San Francisco riots, Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent herewith to insert in the RECORD a series of letters by the chairman of the committee to the Washington Post in reply to its scandalous attacks; a letter to the editor of the Washington Post by the distinguished Congressman from Washington, the Honorable THOMAS PELLY; an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of December 5, 1960; a transcript of the broadcast by Ray Henle on the NBC network; a column by David Lawrence; an editorial from the Arizona Republic of October 30; an article by Jack Lotto in the Cincinnati Enquirer of November 6; the radio broadcasts over Mutual Broadcasting System by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on December 6, 7, and 8; Counterattack of January 6, 1961; and two joint statements by seven ministers who attended all of the San Francisco hearings.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 28, 1960]

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER DEFENDS UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES GROUP IN "ABOLITION" FILM

(Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER of the House Un-American Activities Committee has taken severe issue with three of our editorials

(November 26, November 30, and December 20) which criticized "Operation Abolition," the film prepared by the committee about the student riots in San Francisco last May.

(In order that readers may judge the editorial criticisms and Mr. WALTER's answers in context, we publish below the complete exchange of correspondence on the subject.)

DECEMBER 9, 1960.

Mr. J. RUSSELL WIGGINS,
Executive Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Upon my return from Geneva, Switzerland, where I attended the session of the council of the Intergovernment Committee for European Migration, I found the enclosed cartoon and editorial, both having appeared in the Washington Post on November 30.

Having been accused of a "curious little fraud," I wish to obtain from you an explanation regarding the alleged "doctoring" of the film, including an indication of specific parts of the newsreel which you believe were deleted or altered.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Member of Congress, Chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee.

DECEMBER 16, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: This is in reply to your letter of December 9. An example of the kind of distortion to which our editorial referred and to which the cartoon alluded revolved about the identification of Harry Bridges with the city hall disturbances.

Those on our staff who viewed the film gained the distinct impression that the narration and the pictures identified Bridges as a very active and present participant in the so-called riots. I do not have the exact quote of the narration at hand, but the version quoted by Herb Caen in the San Francisco Sunday Chronicle pretty well fits the recollection of the members of our staff. That quote is: "Among the Communist leaders who had an active part in the San Francisco abolitionist campaign and the protest demonstration was Harry Bridges, whom you see here being escorted out of the city hall by police officials moments before the rioting broke out."

The testimony of three different persons with whom we were in touch was that Bridges was not at the city hall at the time the rioting broke out but was eating lunch at a restaurant not far away, and that by the time he got to the city hall, the thing was all over.

It seems to us also that the fact that 67 of the 68 arrested persons were released, after being charged with disturbing the peace and resisting arrest, indicates that the facts were not exactly in accord with those as presented in the film. Our attention has been called to a statement from several sources that Mr. Wheeler, of the committee staff, has admitted that the film has inaccuracies and distortions.

These are some of the considerations that led us to the comment to which you refer.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. WIGGINS.

DECEMBER 23, 1960.

Mr. J. RUSSELL WIGGINS,
Executive Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Your statement in your letter of December 16 that you have been in touch with three different persons who say that Harry Bridges was not in the San Francisco City Hall but eating lunch at a nearby restaurant when the rioting broke out, and it had ended by the time he arrived at city hall, in no way negates the statement in the film, "Operation Abolition," that:

"Among the Communist leaders who had an active part in the San Francisco 'abolition' campaign and the protest demonstrations was Harry Bridges, whom you see here being escorted out of city hall by police officials moments before the rioting broke out."

The film, as the above quotation from its narration clearly indicates, does not associate Bridges with the rioting but only with the protest demonstrations. Your statement that your staff members who viewed the film "gained the distinct impression" that it identified Bridges as "a very active and present participant in the so-called riots," does not speak well for their memory nor for their attentiveness to what they hear—qualities which are quite important to accurate reporting.

A variety of sources attest to the accuracy of the film's statement that Bridges "had an active part in * * * the protest demonstrations":

The San Francisco Examiner had newsmen on the scene. It reported (May 14, 1960, sec. 1, p. 5, col. 1):

"[Bridges] had been haranguing a group of people still in the rotunda, and crying, 'I'm going to get a gang up and see the mayor.'"

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin also had reporters on the scene. It reported (May 13, 1960, p. 1, col. 8):

"[Bridges] was hustled out of the city hall by police today after he started to address a group of demonstrators at the bottom of the main stairway inside the rotunda."

J. Edgar Hoover in his report on the riots, "Communist Target—Youth," stated:

"Order had been restored when Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, suddenly appeared on the scene. Demanding to know what part firemen had played in the use of the fire hoses, Bridges commented that he would see if the firemen's pay could be cut. The day's activities closed with Archie Brown joining Bridges and shouting, 'You tell them, Harry; they'll listen to you.'"

If you had checked with the committee on the Bridges matter, you would have been informed frankly—as other news media representatives have been—that the film commentary is in error in stating that Bridges was escorted from the city hall before the rioting broke out. This unfortunate, but honest and decidedly minor, error has the effect, in a sense, of clearing Bridges to a certain extent—because it removes him from the scene before the violence broke out. This fact hardly fits in with your implications about the manner in which the film has been distorted and the sinister motives for the alleged distortions.

Your second point. You state:

"It seems to us also that the fact that 67 of the 68 arrested persons were released, after being charged with disturbing the peace and resisting arrest, indicates that the facts were not exactly in accord with those as presented in the film."

Your writing here is rather vague and fuzzy, particularly for a newspaper editor, but I presume you mean by the above that the fact that 67 of the 68 arrested were released, indicates that they were not guilty as charged.

Inasmuch as you have editorially claimed "diligent inquiry into the San Francisco matter," however, I find it difficult to believe that this is really what you could mean. Surely you must know that Judge Albert J. Axelrod of the San Francisco Municipal Court stated in his decision on the case that, as far as the arrestees were concerned, there were "enough facts to justify a conviction on at least two grounds," but then went on to state three reasons why he was dismissing the charges against the arrestees:

(a) A conviction on any one of the counts could carry with it "a stigma which could well haunt them every time they applied for a responsible position either in private industry or in the Government service." The judge said that in the past he had received numerous appeals from young men and women to erase convictions on their records because they were hampering their chances for employment, but that he had been helpless to aid them.

(b) A mass trial of the defendants would not only be costly in a monetary sense, "but would play directly into the hands of those who create the unrest and do everything in their power to upset our democratic processes and way of life." [1]

(c) He believed the defendants had already been punished sufficiently and said, "I am hopeful that they have learned the errors of their ways and that there will be no repetition of their type of conduct."

This statement, coupled with hundreds of feet of film footage shot on the scene by local TV cameramen—portraying many of the arrestees engaged in rioting, disturbing the peace and resisting arrest (the three charges against them) and with the accounts of numerous newsmen on the scene, leaves no doubt that, on the matter of the arrestees, the film presentation is "exactly in accord" with the facts.

Your final effort to justify your vicious editorials about the film is based on a statement "from several sources" that a committee staff member has admitted the film contains "inaccuracies and distortions." If you had truly made "diligent inquiry" into the film, you would have found, as other people have (see for example the Palo Alto Times of Nov. 30), that the film contains absolutely no distortions, that the staff member in question had not himself used the word "distortions," and that he had stated only that there were three insignificant time sequence errors in splicing together the thousands of feet of film that make up the picture.

I do not ask you to publish this letter but, inasmuch as you fail in your letter of December 16 to produce a shred of evidence that would justify your charges that I am a party to forgery, fraud, falsification and warping of the truth, I ask that you publish the attached letter as my official reply to the three editorials the Washington Post has published on the committee film, "Operation Abolition."

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: In three editorials and one cartoon the Washington Post has made vicious attempts to discredit the motion picture "Operation Abolition," a documentary film of the Communist-led riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco on May 13, 1960.

The Washington Post editorials have labeled this film a "falsification of facts," "forgery by film," "mendaciously distorted"; "highly colored and questionable," "a piece of propaganda," and a "curious little film fraud" with a "highly loaded running commentary." They have charged that the film "warps the truth" and "makes a dirty joke of the congressional investigating power."

The Washington Post claims that it has made "diligent inquiry" to ascertain the truth concerning the San Francisco riots and

---

[1] Apparently Judge Axelrod supports the committee claim that the riots were Communist-instigated.

that this truth contradicts the committee's film on two basic points.

The first point is that the main thesis of the film is "wholly unjustified." You correctly describe its main thesis as being "that the demonstrations were Communist inspired and Communist led." The truth, you claim, is "that Communists had nothing whatever to do with the instigation, organization, or leadership" of the student rioters.

What are the facts on this matter?

The San Francisco Chronicle of May 18, 1960, made the following statement concerning Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco:

"Mayor Christopher agreed that a 'great majority' of the student demonstrators were 'dupes of the Communists.'"

The San Francisco Examiner of May 18, also referring to Mayor Christopher, reported:

"The mayor said that in his opinion last Friday's riot was Communist directed and that for the most part 'unknowing and misguided students' were innocent pawns of trained Communist agitators skilled in crowd control tactics."

Thomas Cahill, chief of police for the county and city of San Francisco, testified before the committee on May 14 that his security unit has advised him that "a number of those who seemed to whip those people in the group (outside the hearing room) into a mob frenzy, were individuals who had been hostile and who had testified at the hearing."

Michael J. Maguire, San Francisco police inspector who was in charge of a police unit assigned to maintain order at the hearings, testified before the committee the same day. The following exchange took place while he was on the witness stand:

"COMMITTEE COUNSEL. Did you * * * observe the activities among the young people who had been assembled here in the hall, by certain people who were known by you from confidential sources to be members of the Communist Party?

"Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, sir.

"COMMITTEE COUNSEL. Did you see agitational activities among the young people by Merle Brodsky, who was ejected twice from this committee hearing?

"Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, sir.

"COMMITTEE COUNSEL. Did you see agitational activities among the young people by Archie Brown, who likewise has been identified as a member of the Communist Party and who likewise has been twice ejected from this hearing room because of his disturbance of the proceedings?

"Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, sir."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who is certainly in a better position to know the truth about the San Francisco riots than anyone else in the country, prepared an official report on the riots, "Communist Target—Youth," which was published as a document of this committee last summer. In explaining why he had prepared this report, Mr. Hoover wrote: "It is vitally important to set the record straight on the extent to which Communists were responsible for the disgraceful and riotous conditions which prevailed during the HCUA hearings. It is vitally important that not only the students involved in that incident, but also students throughout the Nation whom Communists hope to exploit in similar situations, recognize the Communist tactics which resulted in what experienced west coast observers familiar with Communist strategy and tactics have termed the most successful Communist coup to occur in the San Francisco area in 25 years."

In his report, Mr. Hoover devoted five pages to factual material on just how the Communist Party went about planning the demonstrations and then carrying them to a successful conclusion. The evidence he presented is too extensive and detailed for me to quote or even summarize here. The following brief, generalized statements from his report, however, flatly contradict the "truth" advanced by the Washington Post and completely support the committee film:

"An officer warned that fire hoses would have to be used if the crowd did not disperse, but the crowd, instigated by Communists who had maneuvered themselves into strategic positions, became more unruly" (p. 8).

"Immediately after the affair ended, the party's national leader, Gus Hall, congratulated the west coast comrades for the initiative and leadership they displayed at all stages of the demonstrations" (p. 9).

"The Communists demonstrated in San Francisco just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is. They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots" (p. 10).

"Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say 'It can't happen here.' The Communist success in San Francisco in May 1960 proves that it can happen here" (pp. 10–11).

Mr. Hoover also mentioned the riots in the course of a major address he delivered on October 18, 1960. He said in this address:

"The diabolical influence of communism on youth was manifested in the anti-American student demonstrations in Tokyo. It further was in evidence this year in Communist-inspired riots in San Francisco, where students were duped into disgraceful demonstrations against a congressional committee.

"These students were stooges of a sinister technique stimulated by clever Communist propagandists who remained quietly concealed in the background. These master technicians of conspiracy had planned for some time to use California college students as a front for their nefarious operations. This outburst was typical of these cunning conspirators who constantly play active, behind-the-scenes roles in fomenting civic unrest in every conceivable area of our society."

The second major charge the Washington Post has made against the committee film is that it distorts the facts by attempting to represent the rioting as resulting from student violence which "required the San Francisco police to turn fire hoses on them and eject them by force from the city hall."

You claim that the truth is that the San Francisco police "reacted with altogether needless ferocity" when some students "began to chant when they were denied admittance to the hearing room."

That is your claim. But what were the conclusions of every newspaper in San Francisco which had reporters on the scene during the riots? Here are a few excerpts of the truth as they found it:

San Francisco Examiner: "The riot apparently was triggered shortly before 1:30 p.m. when the mob rushed the door of the supervisors chambers.

"When all the seats in the chamber were filled, Patrolman Ralph Schaumleffel, on duty at the door, closed it, informing the crowd there were no more seats.

"The mob then climbed over the barricades and stormed the door, knocking Schaumleffel down.

"Then, the officer said, while he was on his back a student * * * grabbed the policeman's nightstick and hit him over the head with it.

"Inspector Mike Maguire of the intelligence detail then grabbed a fire hose and ordered it turned on." Saturday, May 14, 1960.

San Francisco News-Call Bulletin: "The hearing room was packed, and the mob in the corridors and rotunda was becoming more and more unruly.

"Judges in upstairs courtrooms were complaining the racket was interfering with due processes of law.

"Patrolman Ralph Schaumleffel, 33, standing guard, was trampled underfoot as a stampede to the hearing room began.

"One of the mob * * * wrested the policeman's billy club from his hand and walloped him on the head.

"Another kicked him in the groin.

"The mob smelled blood, and the riot was on." Saturday, May 14, 1960.

San Francisco Chronicle: "Friday afternoon's mob of 200—mostly students, but not all of them innocents in the art of mass demonstration—threatened to force its way into the Un-American Activities Committee meeting room against the orders and warning of the police. What, we wonder, does the concept of 'law and order' mean to these students? What do the sight of a policeman's uniform and the sound of his command mean? Apparently, to this mob, nothing but a challenge to get more stubborn and defiant.

"The performance by college and university students in so ill-mannered, boorish, and obviously dangerous a way gets no sympathy from us as an exercise of youth groping to understand and improve the democratic process." Editorial, May 16, 1960.

Perhaps the most interesting of all the news accounts of the riot is one by the students themselves, describing events which occurred during the first day of the hearings. The official University of California student newspaper, the Daily Californian, stated on page 1, Friday, May 13:

"Fights and violence erupted at the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings yesterday in San Francisco * * * much of it sparked by university students."

Attempting to support your claim that the students were not guilty of violence, you quoted the following statement from an article by one Paul Jacobs, which was published in the Reporter magazine of November 24, 1960:

"After the riots were over, the sheriff of San Francisco County said: 'There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students.'"

On December 6, 1960, Sheriff Matthew C. Carberry, sheriff of the county and city of San Francisco, issued the following statement concerning the above quote attributed to him by Mr. Jacobs:

"I did not make that statement. I do not know the author of the article, Paul Jacobs, and have never spoken to him and have never been interviewed by him.

"I was on the scene on Thursday and Friday (May 12 and 13) up to luncheon time when I went for a luncheon conference with the chairman of the committee, Mr. WILLIS. The disorders took place during luncheon and I was in no position to know anything about them.

"I did not make that statement."

In summary, the findings which resulted from the "diligent inquiry" of the Washington Post are contradicted by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the mayor, sheriff, and a police inspector of San Francisco, the San Francisco Chronicle, Examiner, News-Call Bulletin, and the Daily Californian, by Judge Albert Axelrod, and also, of course, by the moving picture record of exactly what happened in San Francisco, filmed not by the Committee on Un-American Activities but by TV stations KRON and KPIX of that city.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1960.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read your editorial of December 20, 1960, and your prior editorial

of December 5, 1960, in which you deal with the subject of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the film "Operation Abolition." As a Congressman of the United States, familiar with propaganda techniques, including that of certain editors, I want to tell you that I have been disturbed and nauseated by your obviously calculated program of falsehood and misrepresentation employed in an effort to discredit the committee and the film. I am also shocked to note your bold and shameless efforts to suppress free speech and education in the schools of Arlington County and elsewhere by your campaign of editorial distortions.

You glibly assert that "Communists had nothing whatever to do with the instigation, organization or authorization of the student demonstration" at the committee hearings in San Francisco. This assertion you know to be completely false and dishonest. At no point in your editorial do you explain that, as a result of the investigation of these riots by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the report of J. Edgar Hoover declared that these riots were, in fact, Communist instigated. The film commentary, which you suggest was "slanted," actually follows the Hoover report. Likewise, you do not point out that, as reported by the San Francisco Chronicle of May 18, 1960, Mayor Christopher of San Francisco said:

"In his opinion, last Friday's rioting was Communist directed and that for the most part 'unknowing and misguided' students were innocent pawns of Communist trained agitators educated in crowd control tactics."

Your further assertion that there was no violence on the part of the students requiring San Francisco police to turn fire hoses on the demonstrators is likewise utterly false. Again, the Hoover report, the reports of the San Francisco police, and the film contradict you.

Of course, all people will not agree at all times on all matters. However, your editorials indicate a deliberate effort to prejudice that area of the public which has not had the facts available to it or had seen the film or read the Hoover report. You are guilty of abusing the privileges of a free press, by using the monopoly position of your newspaper as an instrument for the perversion of truth. Although it is generally recognized that a responsible and free press is basic to the democratic process, responsibility entails the presentation of facts, balanced editorial comments, and the defense of truth. That responsibility you have evidently abandoned in your editorial policy.

Moreover, you are, I believe designedly, giving aid and comfort to the Communist program to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a movement which has been spearheaded by Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist, who together with certain other identified Communists, fellow-travelers and their dupes, have been recently on tour of college campuses and other places for the purpose of instigating action against that committee. The formation of a group known as the National Committee To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities was announced in the Communist press on August 15, 1960, with a mailing address given as 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., which is also the address of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedom, an organization previously cited as a Communist front and also a major adjunct of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, likewise cited as a Communist front.

Your astounding effort to suppress the right of free speech to which Congress and its committees are entitled, your calculated interference with school administration by attempting to forestall the presentation of facts and current history to social science classes, merits total condemnation and will meet with the just resistance of an outraged public.

The artifices you are employing to beguile the public from information it should have on the subject of Communist subversion of youth will not succeed. It is clear that you have knowingly joined in a propaganda campaign to create, by slander, a climate of hostility to a committee and to a newsreel film that portrays facts from which the people will draw reasonable conclusions if left to themselves.

I have long been familiar with the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which fulfills an important lawmaking function of Congress. I have always been impressed by its outstanding efforts and achievements, under the fair and able leadership of its brilliant and dedicated chairman, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania. But you have gone beyond the bounds of propriety. After reading your distorted editorials, I am now, more than ever, determined to support this House committee.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

[From the Evening Star, Dec. 5, 1960]

THE COMMUNISTS' ROLE

It is hardly surprising that a hue and cry has been raised against a movie film called "Operation Abolition," prepared by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to depict the student demonstrations which erupted at the committee's San Francisco hearings last May.

The criticism centers on two complaints: (1) That the committee distorted the true facts to imply falsely that Communists inspired and led the riots, and (2) that a motive in doing so was to promote and aggrandize its own activities through propaganda.

We have seen the film. We also have read the report of FBI Director Hoover on the San Francisco incident. The facts are that the film closely follows both the substance and the conclusion of the FBI report, and the burden of the report is to show unequivocally how Communists did in fact not only inspire but coolly manage each essential phase of the demonstrations. Much of the film's narration and continuity came directly from the report. If the result is a distortion, then the official FBI account would have to be no less so, and we do not think that this is true. How emphatic was the FBI report? Here is a single excerpt:

"The Communists demonstrated in San Francisco just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is. They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots. Their success there must serve as a warning that their infiltration efforts aimed not only at the youth and student groups but also at our labor unions, churches, professional groups, artists, newspapers, government, and the like, can create havoc and shatter our internal security."

In producing the film, the House committee may have promoted its own role in attacking subversion. But is this a surprise? The right of Communists to engage in legal propaganda is most vigorously defended by those who are dedicated to discrediting the committee. Why should not the committee equally promote its own viewpoint, as long as it does not, in the process, distort the basic facts of its subject? In the early days of the New Deal, there were those who bitterly attacked the FBI as a dangerous, totalitarian force which should be curtailed. And that agency survived largely because of the effectiveness with which J. Edgar Hoover was able to publicly dramatize and promote its value.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has been guilty of excesses. But the time to criticize is when excesses occur. In our judgment, this is not one of those times. If the film is as accurate a warning of the dangers of Communist infiltration as the Hoover report indicates, it serves a useful purpose, and it should be exhibited.

BROADCAST BY RAY HENLE FOR "THREE-STAR EXTRA," NOVEMBER 29, 1960

A little over 2 months ago an organization in the San Francisco area began a protest against a film produced and circulated by the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. This film was a documented and narrated account of the student riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco last May. It undertook to show the Communist instigation and organization of the riots. It named some of the Communist ringleaders, and it showed them in the midst of the riots in film clips which had been subpenaed from a number of west coast television stations which had sent photographers to cover the demonstrations. In short, it attempted to give a picture story of the first serious Communist-inspired student riots on American soil.

The film was put together by a commercial producer in Washington, and sold, with the committee's approval, to anyone who desired it at $100 a copy. It has enjoyed considerable popularity, and, as of this date, more than 500 copies have been sold, and orders are still coming in.

Most of the films have been purchased by church and civic organizations, industrial concerns, and even by individuals. They have been shown in churches, schools and community meetings in a great many areas, and have been well received.

The organization which started the protest against the film is known as the Bay Area Student Committee To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. On September 11, it issued a nine-page press release in which it attacked the filmed story of the riots.

Last week the left-of-center magazine, the Reporter, carried a story attacking the congressional committee film and branding it as a distortion of the truth. Since then some newspapers have picked up the attack and denounced the committee for circulation of the film.

Yesterday the Harvard Crimson, the student newspaper of Harvard University, published an editorial denouncing the university's department of naval science for scheduling a showing of the film to men enrolled in the naval science course. It quoted the Reporter magazine as charging distortion in the film, and then proceeded to condemn the university's naval science department for disseminating "dangerous and irrelevant Government propaganda in the guise of education." Perhaps, partly as a result of the editorial which was written in advance of the showing, there was a demonstration against the film by some of the university's students when it was put on the screen that day.

Actually, the film and the narration parallel very closely all of the disclosures on the student riots in San Francisco as contained in a report by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover not only charges that the San Francisco riots were inspired and organized by Communist leaders, but supplies the names and the details. He tells how the Communist agitators planned to be thrown out of the Un-American Activities Committee hear-

ings in order to win the support of students whom they were using as their dupes. He tells in detail how the riots were arranged in advance by Communist organizers and with Communist funds, and how the country's top Red, Gus Hall, congratulated the west coast leaders afterward on a job well done. Such is the story told by Director Hoover, and it substantiates the story told by the Un-American Activities Committee film.

We were able to contact by telephone today the newly elected editor of the Harvard Crimson, Mr. Mike Lottman. Mr. Lottman said that he did not write the editorial; it was written by one of the other editors, but he said it represented the views of the Crimson staff. Mr. Lottman said he was not familiar with the FBI report on the San Francisco student riots, and that he had not seen the film. He said he did not know if the writer of the editorial knew of the FBI report, but he presumed he probably drew most of his information from the critical story in the Reporter magazine.

We asked Mr. Lottman if he now intends to go further into the information on the San Francisco riots, including that contained in the Hoover report, and give a more complete and accurate picture to the student readers of the Harvard Crimson. He said he considered the matter a dead issue now, but that if it is revived, that may be done.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 30, 1960]

RED INFILTRATION CONTINUES IN UNITED STATES—BRINGING ACTIVITIES OUT INTO OPEN CALLED ONLY WAY TO FIGHT MENACE

(By David Lawrence)

When are the American people going to be given the full story of Communist infiltration inside the United States?

Just because the late Senator McCarthy went to extremes—due to his excess of zeal and his passionate devotion to the anti-Communist cause—the tendency now is to belittle the Communist menace altogether or to brush off references to it as just a hysterical manifestation of McCarthyism in a misguided era. This same trend has been noticeable in Britain and France, where many writers continuously refer to McCarthyism as a means of pooh-poohing Communist infiltration today.

The Communists, on the other hand, benefiting by indifference and complacency in Western countries, have been making hay, particularly in the United States. The newspapers generally, for instance, printed brief stories of the student demonstrations at San Francisco when the House Committee on Un-American Activities was meeting there a few months ago, but this correspondent recently saw a half-hour movie, compiled from the reels of news photo staff men covering the tragic event, which reveals that it was far more sensational than the news dispatches indicated. It shows the brazen behavior of persons, known to have been active in Communist Party affairs, who boldly sought by mob action to interfere with the committee's public sessions. The movie contains comments by Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The reels have become available for showing to public and private groups, and information concerning them is obtainable at the offices of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This is the movie which a so-called liberal group of Harvard students booed when it was shown to other students a few days ago.

It seems incredible that such a demonstration as occurred in San Francisco could be organized inside the United States, but it is not surprising to those who have been pointing out that the Communists have not for a moment relaxed their cold war efforts.

The only way to fight this kind of insidious warfare is to bring it out in the open. In such a movement, the people naturally must depend on the committees of Congress. Here, for instance, are some of the conclusions recently presented by the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in an exhaustive study entitled "Mob Violence as an Instrument of Red Diplomacy":

"In some Latin American countries, and in Japan, Communist parties controlling an insignificant minority of the total votes cast have resorted to the policy of manipulating and inciting mobs to accomplish political and diplomatic objectives in the interest of Soviet foreign policy.

"These operations are directed primarily against the American Government, to defeat its objectives and humiliate its spokesmen and representatives.

"Latin American Communists succeeded in seriously interfering with the 1948 Bogotá inter-American conference. In 1958, they subjected Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and his wife to a most humiliating experience.

"Attacks are concentrated upon American property and personnel.

"The (United States) resort to international financial aid, no matter how generous, has not of itself furnished an adequate preventive against anti-American, Communist-inspired mob violence.

"Despite the numerous examples of worldwide Communist imperialism and brutality, there have been few cases of mob violence against Communist embassies or agencies.

"For the most part the Communists operate behind the scenes, making use of uninformed and excitable teenagers, students, and illiterates.

"As a rule, the Communists wait for a suitable issue to arise on the basis of which they can successfully provoke mob excitement and violence. If the issue does not exist, they create one.

"In large measure, the Communists exploit economic difficulties and nationalist emotions.

"The Communists' standard practice is to employ nonmilitary weapons, easily accessible to the mob, such as stones, poster sticks, clubs, gasoline, kerosene, homemade bombs, etc. These have been supplemented by the looting of guns and ammunition from hardware stores.

"The techniques followed by the Communists parallel those taught in special schools for international Communist agents in the Soviet Union.

"Communists make adequate preparations far in advance for their inspired riots, through provocative mass meetings, leaflets, broadcasts, cartoons, newspaper articles, and even assassinations.

"The Communists have utilized their control of labor unions, to augment the mobs operating under their direction.

"Leaders of the Communist Parties of Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Japan have been in Moscow where they have received instruction and directives, including training in handling mobs and military techniques.

"The Communist Party of China has rendered valuable assistance to Communist Parties in Latin America and in Japan which have organized mob violence. This assistance has taken the form of training of leaders, financial aid, broadcasts and propaganda. This is, no doubt, the result of an agreed-upon division of labor with the U.S.S.R."

[From the Arizona Republic, Oct. 30, 1960]

SAME OLD ATTACK

The perennial attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee is once again in full swing, this time headed by a group which calls itself the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It's not difficult to figure out why that group is opposed to the House committee. Of 34 delegates who attended its first national session in New York recently, 6 have been accused by the House committee of having been members of the Communist Party. They are Harvey O'Connor, Florence Luscomb, the Reverend William Howard Melish, Russ Nixon, Frank Wilkinson, and Richard Criley. Many of the other members—including Prof. Corliss Lamont, folk singer Pete Seeger, economist Otto Nathan—suffer the same chronic case of pinkeye which has infected many opponents of the House committee.

Not all the opponents of congressional committees investigating communism are themselves Communists, of course. But many of the sincere opponents, particularly those who base their opposition to the committees on the grounds they are unconstitutional, are uninformed about the history of the investigatory power. That mention of that power was omitted from the Constitution was doubtless not an oversight, but rather because the Founding Fathers took it for granted as implicit in the legislative function.

Indeed, the colonial assemblies in America instituted investigatory power as a normal part of their business (and were upheld by the courts), and under the Federal Constitution, the first formal congressional investigation was undertaken by a select committee of the House in 1792. Even as far back as the 16th century, formal parliamentary investigations in England were being conducted as the normal course of events.

Opponents of the investigating bodies claim that investigations often violate civil rights and are used primarily as propaganda forums. Unfortunately, this is sometimes true, as was seen in Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S recent drugs inquiry. (Strangely enough, opponents of investigating committees usually object only when the inquiry concerns suspected subversives; when a Kefauver conducts a kangaroo court investigation into drug profits, they are strangely silent.) The remedy for these violations, however, is to correct and redress inequities which do exist in congressional investigating procedures, not to abolish the investigatory power.

The current popularity of a film depicting the Communist-inspired San Francisco student riots proves that opposition to the House group is not nearly so widespread as the title of the anti-HUAC committee indicates. Prepared by the House committee, the film provides an exceptional insight into Communist mob psychology in action, and it has astonished audiences wherever it has been shown. A few citizens in the Phoenix area recently bought the film and are currently showing it to schools, churches, and civic and professional organizations. As a valuable public service, KPHO–TV has twice presented the film, and plans to run it again in the future.

Arizonians are involved in the controversy over the House Un-American Activities Committee in one other way, this time in an election campaign. In the First Congressional District race (Maricopa County), voters will be asked to choose between Representative JOHN RHODES, who has been a stanch supporter of the HUAC during his tenure in Washington, and challenger Dick Harless, who, when he was in Congress, voted against appropriations for that watchdog group on two separate occasions.

There are other differences, of course, between the conservative JOHN RHODES and the liberal Dick Harless, but this is clearly one of the most important. At this crucial

period in history, when the Communists and their helpers are doing all in their power to cripple the effectiveness of the HUAC, it's extremely important that proved supporters of that investigatory body be elected regardless of which political party they represent.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Nov. 6, 1960]

KILLING OF COMMITTEE AIM IN COMMY DRIVE AGAINST HOUSE BODY STUDYING ANTI-AMERICANISM

(By Jack Lotto)

An identified Communist, who helped organize the student demonstrations in San Francisco last May, is masterminding the current campaign to destroy the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The manipulator in the abolition drive is Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles. He was convicted last year of contempt of Congress and faces a 1-year jail term. Wilkinson was fired from his post as information director of the Los Angeles Housing Authority in 1952 when he refused to answer court questions concerning Communist Party membership.

His chief "kill the committee" aid is Harvey O'Connor, of Little Compton, R.I., another identified Red who is waiting trial on congressional contempt charges.

To create the illusion of widespread distaste for the House group, Wilkinson and O'Connor have been busily establishing one abolition committee after another.

Investigation, however, shows that all the groups opposing the House Un-American Activities Committee are interchangeably officered by the same known Communists and pro-Red apologists.

The latest Wilkinson-O'Connor offshoot is called the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. Wilkinson is its field representative. Seven of the 11 officers have been named, in sworn testimony, as party members.

Six of them are also on the national council of the big Communist front, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, organized by Wilkinson and O'Connor.

The national headquarters for this new outfit is the same Los Angeles address as another pro-Communist abolition group with the high-sounding name of Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms. Executive secretary and coordinators: the same Frank Wilkinson.

Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a recent report to Congress, described the Citizens Committee as under control of the Communist Party and Wilkinson as its brains and the energy.

Another new organization agitating against the House investigating unit is called the Committee of First Amendment Defendants.

One guess as to the names of the directors. You're right. Two of the four-man steering committee: Wilkinson and O'Connor.

Wilkinson as the so-called coordinator of all the abolition organizations, has been concentrating lately on enlisting students in the anticommittee work.

At a closed meeting in New York, he told of his 16-State tour to drum up opposition, and boasted of success in college campus activities in Boston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Milwaukee, and Los Angeles.

The key to their activity is winning congressional and grassroots support for a resolution to be introduced by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, to wipe out the House committee.

As an alternative the abolition boys, in personal visits to Congressmen, are urging severe budget cuts. Success here would also effectively stifle the committee's investigative ability.

A drive is now underway to collect kill-the-committee signatures, to be turned over to friendly Congressmen at a demonstration in Washington when Congress reconvenes January 4.

FULTON LEWIS, JR., BROADCAST, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1960, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

"Operation Abolition": Some weeks ago I called your attention to a one-half-hour film that had been compiled by the House Un-American Activities Committee, entitled "Operation Abolition," documenting the student riots in San Francisco last May, when the House Un-American Activities Committee attempted to hold hearings there on Communist infiltration into the schools and colleges of that area and subsequently reported to you on the tremendous demand the committee had had for those films, and the extensive showing of them that was taking place over the United States.

Since that time more than 500 of these individual films have gone into circulation and new demands are pouring in for prints faster than the prints can be made. It is an impressive and very frightening film, made up from TV and Movietone newsreel clips of the actual rioting, made at the time and as I have said before, if you think it can't happen here, you should make it your business to see a showing of it. It is a documentation of the extent to which the American Communists can and will go to incite students to rioting for their own ends, and the film shows the actions of identified Communist leaders in the crowd, outside the San Francisco City Hall, inside city hall and inside the committee room, agitating the students and leading the disorders.

In case you have any doubts that this is a calculated ingredient in the Communist plan of revolution, I might begin by reading a section of the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party U.S.A., currently in circulation among party members and operatives, which reads as follows:

"The rebelliousness of school children, directed against a part of the State machinery itself, is something that Communists cannot afford to ignore. This, together with their desire for knowledge and social life must form the starting point for our work among students in the schools."

So the objective is quite clear and direct, and this House Un-American Activities Committee film brings the San Francisco riots into clear focus as an effective effort to carry out these objectives. An official FBI report, signed by J. Edgar Hoover, concerning these incidents, says:

"Immediately after the affair ended, the party's national leader Gus Hall, congratulated the west coast Communists for the initiative and leadership they displayed at all stages of the demonstrations.

"Particularly pleasing to party officials was the number of students involved in the demonstrations. They commented that there had not been so much 'political activity' among student groups for years. Archie Brown, especially, was commended for the tremendous job he had done among the students, working with them in the corridors of city hall and winning their sympathy."

The report then continues with some specifics about how the party leaders were jubilant over the effects of the riots and that it had been a big "shot in the arm" for the party, by bringing out much better attendance at meetings and that the party's west coast publication, the People's World, was very happy because it had helped in a fundraising drive it was putting on, to finance its own continued publication. The FBI report then says:

"In short, the consensus in the Communist Party was that the riot was the best thing for the party that had occurred in years. Party leaders expressed the opinion that it was especially significant that the party had been able to enlist the support of so many people in all walks of life, when the party, itself, was publicly under attack by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The feeling was that not only had the party taken a major step toward its goal of abolishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but also it had taken a major step toward playing a greater role on the American scene."

Now that, you understand, is not my statement, nor the statement of the House Un-American Activities Committee which is on the defensive, but the official statement in an official report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

And this same report goes on to say that at a party meeting on the night of May 20, 1960, this same Archie Brown told the group how he planned to follow up the victory by further using college students as a target and that the campaign would emphasize police brutality, so-called in the San Francisco riots, as grounds for further student activities and incitation.

Examination: The reason that I am reviving this question at this time is that this committee film has thrown a panic into Communist ranks because of its effectiveness and a nationwide organized campaign to discredit the film has been undertaken, using fellow travelers and dupes in the liberal world to help in the movement because this film has been hurting the Communist cause very very badly indeed. The very extent of the efforts to which the Communist propagandists have gone, and places in which they have managed to place their propaganda that the film is a misrepresentation and a distortion of the facts is the best evidence of how bad they are hurting.

The Washington Post has used two editorials and a cartoon by Herblock and the Harvard Crimson has used an editorial, objecting to the showing of the film to men enrolled in a naval science course.

My distinguished colleague Ray Henle, a week ago tonight, took notice of this editorial, and reported that after the editorial, there was a campus demonstration by students against the showing of the film.

What was most interesting was that Mr. Henle contacted the editor of the Harvard Crimson by telephone, a young man named Mike Lottman, and reported that he said he did not write the editorial; that it was written by other members of the editorial staff but he said it did represent the views of the whole editorial staff.

Mr. Henle quotes Mr. Lottman as saying he was not aware of and had not read the official FBI report on the student riots, which back up the film in detail and that he had not even seen the committee film. He said he presumed that the writer drew most of his material for the editorial from a critical story about the film, published in the Reporter magazine, which is a leftwing periodical.

In the next few nights, I want to go further into this story with you to demonstrate the implications of this whole thing. * * * Harvard, after all, is an important college campus and there is evidence that other publications in leftwing ranks have used the Reporter magazine story as the foundation for their attacks on the film. The story, by the way, was written by a man named Paul Jacobs of whom I never heard before and we'll take this story apart to show its own misrepresentations and falsifications in the future.

Sources: Suffice it to say for tonight that one of the key lines in the article quotes the sheriff of San Francisco County as saying:

"There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students."

That, of course, is playing the line of police brutality which Archie Brown said on May 20 would be his theme in the follow-up activity. If there was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students, it certainly is implied that there was police brutality in turning the hoses on the students.

I undertook to call the sheriff of San Francisco County by long distance telephone today, Sheriff Matthew C. Carberry, to ask him about that quotation and do you know what he said?

"I did not make that statement. I do not know the author of the article, Paul Jacobs, and have never spoken to him and have never been interviewed by him.

"I was on the scene on Thursday and Friday up to luncheon time when I went for a luncheon conference with the chairman of the committee, Mr. WILLIS. The disorders took place during luncheon and I was in no position to know anything about them.

"I did not make that statement."

It seems to me that's interesting because it serves as a commentary on the reporting of Reporter magazine and Reporter magazine's reporter, Paul Jacobs. And remember, the Harvard Crimson editorial, written by some schoolboys for campus consumption, was based largely on the Reporter magazine story, according to its editor.

This one line, however, is only a sample and we'll go deeper into the Paul Jacobs article in subsequent broadcasts. It is particularly ironic that the Paul Jacobs article ends with this quotation:

"Although 'Operation Abolition' seems to be doing well at the box office, this unusual venture of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is not apt to win any prize for accuracy."

The Saturday Evening Post, the editors of which have seen the film, recommends the film and says:

"For once, the facts are pictorially recorded for all to see."

FULTON LEWIS, JR., BROADCAST, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1960, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

"Operation Abolition": Last night, ladies and gentleman, I presented to you some disclosures about the efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to discredit the documentary film which has been put together by the House Un-American Activities Committee, showing the Communist-inspired student riots in San Francisco last May and how various leftwing and fellow traveler publications are spearheading the attack on the film.

The keystone of this attack, as I told you, seems to be an article which appeared in the November issue of the Reporter magazine, an extreme leftwing publication, the author of the article being one Paul Jacobs, who charges that the film is a distortion and misrepresentation. This article seems to have been the basis for a critical editorial in the Harvard Daily Crimson and the Washington Post and other publications of anti-anti-Communist leanings.

The editor in chief of the Harvard Crimson told my colleague, Ray Henle, that he had never seen the film but that the information was drawn from the article by Paul Jacobs. The Washington Post editorial specifically refers to the Paul Jacobs article and uses the information in it as the basis for its charge that the committee is guilty of "forgery by film." It quotes the article as saying that "both the narration and the way the film clips were edited deliberately distort a number of facts."

The editorial then goes on to quote from a paragraph in the article which reads, in full, as follows:

"For example, separate sequences have been run together in 'Operation Abolition' to give the impression of mob action and the film shows students displaying defiance after police warnings, although actually the demonstrations occurred at a completely different time and the police use of fire hoses on the students is justified on the basis of the claim that the students attempted to rush police barricades inside the city hall, where the committee was holding its hearings. But no film accompanies the commentary about this alleged attempt; in fact, photographs taken at the time show the students seated on the floor and in the corridors when the hoses were turned on them. After the riots were over, the sheriff of San Francisco County said: 'There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students'."

I reported to you last night that the sheriff of San Francisco County informed me by telephone that he did not make any such statement, did not know Paul Jacobs who quoted him, and had never spoken to or been interviewed by Paul Jacobs. So much for the last sentence.

Now let's take a look at the statement about distortion in regard to the students attempting to rush police barricades inside the city hall. The avowed pattern of the Communist Party leaders and agitators—the very ones who led these student riots last May—at a party meeting in San Francisco on May 20 after the riots were over, was to use the charge of police brutality against innocent students to capitalize on the riots and consolidate any gains they might have made among student ranks. This was a perfectly open and frank declaration with no strings tied to it, made by Communist Leader Archie Brown, who was commended for his part in leading the riots by none less than Gus Hall, national head of the Communist Party.

By way of serving this line, consciously or unconsciously, the Washington Post editorial says:

"Washington Post: 'In point of fact, the San Francisco police acted with altogether needless brutality, turning fire hoses on students whose protests were not flagrantly unruly.' "

Now, would you like to hear what an official report by the FBI, signed personally by J. Edgar Hoover, has to say about the continuity of events in question? This is his verbatim report on the events of Friday, the second day of the demonstrations and the occasion on which the fire hoses were used, which is the basis for the police brutality charge and the charges of misrepresentation by the film. I now quote directly from the J. Edgar Hoover-FBI report:

"Archie Brown quickly resumed his tactics of the day before, once the session started. The crowd outside the hearing room chanted and sang songs. The songs and chants were obviously part of a well-organized plan as illustrated by the song sheets being used. Pleas for order and quiet brought only jeers.

"With the tension growing, the inevitable happened. Violence flared that afternoon. One of the judges in a municipal courtroom in city hall ordered the mob dispersed because the noise made it impossible for him to hold court. When an attempt was made to carry out the order, the crowd responded by throwing shoes and jostling the officers. An officer warned that fire hoses would have to be used if the crowd did not disperse, but the crowd, instigated by Communists, who had maneuvered themselves into strategic positions, became more unruly.

"One of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence. Leaping a barricade that had been erected, he grabbed an officer's night stick and began beating the officer over the head. The mob surged forward as if to storm the doors and the police inspector ordered the fire hose turned on. The water forced the crowd to the head of the ballustrade and the cold water had a sobering effect on the emotions of the demonstrators.

"For a few minutes, relative quiet ensued. Taking advantage of the lull, police officers began to lead some of the demonstrators away, advising them that they must obey the order to disperse. Suddenly, realizing what was happening, militant individuals in the group set the pattern for renewed violence, by kicking and striking the officers. In all, 68 individuals, most of whom were students, were arrested for inciting a riot and resisting arrest.

"Order had been restored when Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union suddenly appeared on the scene, demanding to know what part firemen had played in the use of the fire hoses. Bridges commented that he would see if the firemen's pay could be cut. The day's activities closed with Archie Brown joining Bridges and shouting, 'You tell them, Harry; they'll listen to you.' "

Now that is the official report of the FBI, signed by J. Edgar Hoover, and you can take your choice as to whether you want to believe that or whether you prefer the innuendoes of the Paul Jacobs article and the statement by the Washington Post editorial that "the San Francisco police acted with needless brutality, turning fire hoses on students whose protests were not flagrantly unruly."

And I think it's a fair question to ask whether that is responsible journalism on the part of the Reporter magazine, the Washington Post, the Harvard Crimson, or any of the other newspapers which have accepted the Reporter magazine article as factual presentation. After all, the editor of the Harvard Crimson admitted that he had never seen the film and had never read the FBI report on the riots. The Washington Post actually attributes its information to the Paul Jacobs article in the Reporter magazine.

Who is Jacobs: And would you like to have a little background on this Paul Jacobs, whom they all quote and who is so conveniently serving the Communist cause which west coast leader Archie Brown publicly vowed to pursue?

Well, he was identified under oath before a congressional investigating committee as one of the people who worked on the notorious blacklisting report by the Fund for the Republic several years back, which was known as the Cogley report and was so questionable that a special investigation of it was conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Do you see how the ball bounces? And the twists and turns it makes in doing so?

The good old Fund for the Republic, back in our midst again.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1960, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"Operation Abolition": For the last 2 nights, ladies and gentlemen, I've been reporting to you on the obvious campaign of certain leftwing, anti-anti-Communist publications over the Nation to discredit the half-hour film that has been put together by the House Un-American Activities Committee, giving the documented story of the student riots in San Francisco last May when the House Committee on Un-American Activities attempted to hold hearings on Communist activities in the northern San Francisco Bay area.

In the forefront of this smear effort has been the leftwing Reporter magazine which published an article by one Paul Jacobs, formerly with the Fund for the Republic, which article was snatched up by the Washington Post and the Harvard campus newspaper, the Crimson, as a basis of attacks of their own, apparently without either seeing the film or reading a report by the FBI, signed by J. Edgar Hoover himself, which corroborates the pictorial story told by the film in the most minute detail.

To give you a bit of perspective on why this is a matter of major importance, there are several considerations behind this attack, not the least of them being that this film is doing mortal damage to the intentions of the Communists in infiltrating college campuses of the country by the sheer stark, horrifying scenes that it presents. You think that it can't happen here; this film shows that it can and does happen here, and has. * * * and it is just as anarchistic as the youth demonstrations in Tokyo, or in Caracas against Vice President NIXON, or in Uruguay against President Eisenhower. This is all part of a planned Communist pattern, to use impressionable and emotionable college students for mass violence to accomplish their own purposes of violence and disorder, but in this particular case to help in their avowed goal of destroying a committee of the Congress of the United States, which is a thorn in their side and which poses a threat to their continued operation in the future.

It is particularly important to them, at this time, because they have hope that when the new Congress convenes in January, and the House of Representatives is organized for the coming session, there may be a chance of abolishing that House Committee on Un-American Activities, thus leaving themselves freer to conduct their subversive activities along a score of nefarious fronts.

I make no accusation that the Reporter magazine, the Washington Post and the Harvard Crimson—and the other newspapers who have given aid and comfort to the cause of this picture—are consciously in league with the Communist conspiracy in what they have written and are writing. It is enough to let the facts stand for themselves and the facts are that this special report by the FBI and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, confirm in detail the story as told by the film.

But there are certain things in the FBI report that are not told in the film, and they give the lie to certain claims and pretenses in these articles and editorials of attack in the newspapers and magazines which is a very pointed lie.

Attacks: The articles and editorials attempt to present these riots as legitimate, spontaneous demonstrations by northern California students, outraged over the mere existence of the House Un-American Activities Committee as a matter of inherent love of freedom and American tradition and that the demonstrators were in no sense inspired by Communist agitators.

For example, the article in Reporter magazine says the following:

"Congressman WALTER launches immediately into the main theme of the picture, which is to suggest that the demonstrations were Communist inspired and Communist led. In the attempt to prove this assertion both the narration and the way film clips were edited deliberately distort a number of facts.

"For example—" and then goes on to list the charges which I have given to you, and thoroughly exploded over the last two broadcasts. The Washington Post, in its editorial entitled "Forgery by Film," is much more direct and positive in its charge. This is what it says:

"This is a flagrant case of forgery by film. The film warps the truth in two important respects. First it suggests as its main thesis that the demonstrations were Communist inspired and Communist led. Diligent inquiry has led us to a conviction that this charge is wholly unjustified. It cannot be asserted, of course, that no Communist took part in the demonstration. But the main body of students who picketed the committee hearings in protest, were inspired only by their own valid and thoroughly creditable indignation at the committee's conduct; and they were led by fellow students, loyal to American ideals and acting in accordance with that loyalty."

I emphasized the words "diligent inquiry" because they are important. I don't know what the Washington Post considers to be diligent inquiry, but I do know two things: that Allan Barth, the editorial writer for the Washington Post, only today, called for a copy of the film to view it, clearly indicating that he had never seen the film when he wrote the editorial but instead, as he indicated in his editorial, was taking the word of Reporter magazine for what it contained.

And I know also that the FBI report on the student riots, which corroborates the film story in detail, was available to Editor Barth when he wrote his editorial but he ignored completely the report of the FBI, if he ever saw it.

So the theme of these articles and editorials is that the film distorts the facts, by presenting the picture that these were Communist-inspired riots, when in fact, according to the writers, it was just a sincere, legitimate emotional demonstration by legitimate students in protest against the wicked, wicked House Un-American Activities Committee.

FBI report: Now let's see what the official FBI report—which has been available to these writers all along and was available to them when they wrote their editorials—has to say about the inception of these demonstrations and the events within the Communist Party that led up to the riots. And remember, this is the FBI, entirely on its own, entirely independently, reporting under the signature of J. Edgar Hoover.

The report explains, first of all, that a year prior to these hearings, the Un-American Activities Committee scheduled hearings in San Francisco to investigate Communist infiltration among teachers and educators, at which time a number of protest groups were organized and the committee decided to call off the hearings. Now from here on I am quoting from the FBI report:

"The cancellation of the proposed 1959 hearings left many of these groups and organizations inactive, but intact. As a result when the May 1960 hearings were announced, it required little effort to reactivate these opposition groups, despite the fact that the current hearings were not to be directed at Communist activity in the educational field.

"After the proposed 1959 hearings had been canceled, the House Committee on Un-American Activities turned over its files on these individuals to the California attorney general's office and to the school boards of the teachers involved for any necessary action.

"But the Communist Party members in the area skillfully planted the idea that the 1960 hearings were still aimed basically at teachers and that the stated objective to inquire into Communist Party activities in the area was merely to cover a planned attack on teachers.

"With this setting, it is possible to reveal how the Communist Party plan of attack unfolded. It will be seen that the plan had two important objectives and unfolded in two phases to accomplish them. The first objective of the party was to fill the scene of the hearings with demonstrators. The second was to incite them to action through the use of mob psychology.

"The first stage of the party's plan of action began to unfold after the word was received on April 26, 1960, by party officials that subpenas had been issued for local Communists to appear for the hearings, scheduled to take place May 12–14, 1960. One of the recipients of a subpena was Douglas Wachter, an 18-year-old sophomore at the University of California. Wachter, incidentally, had attended the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party in December 1959 as an official delegate from northern California.

"Party officials decided to build a major part of their plan of attack around Wachter. Immediately, after receiving a subpena, Wachter proceeded to the University of California campus to organize student demonstrators. Mickey Lima, chairman of the Northern California District of the Communist Party instructed Roscoe Proctor, a member of the district committee, to also contact certain students at the University of California and enlist their support.

"Lima was assured that student support would be forthcoming from Santa Rosa Junior College. His contact at San Francisco State College, the son of a current member of the Sonoma County Communist Party, was equally enthusiastic in promising support.

"The party line on the hearings and the general plan of attack were outlined and distributed early in May to all members in the area and in a memorandum captioned 'memo on the Un-Americans.' It was a call to action and rank and file party members in the area quickly responded.

"Members of the San Jose club of the Santa Clara County Communist Party circulated petitions and arranged for the publishing of a protest advertisement in the local newspapers. Oakland Communist Party members arranged for radio broadcasts and publication of protest advertisements in their newspapers. Fund drives were initiated in the various clubs to provide financial support for the attack.

"On the evening of May 6, party leaders held a meeting to assess their progress and plan further activity. Mickey Lima stated that the activity on the campus of the University of California had begun to pay dividends—students were beginning to call for demonstrations and picket lines to greet the House committee.

"Lima then issued orders that each club representative in the area assume the responsibility of contacting every club member to insure that massive demonstrations would take place at the hearings. He also discussed the plans that had been formulated by the Communist Party Youth Group in the East Bay area and stated that he wanted them coordinated with the plans of the San Francisco groups.

"A telephone campaign was conducted by party members to solidify opposition to the committee and was designed specifically to reach 1,000 people. Merle Brodsky, an active leader in Communist Party affairs in California for more than 20 years, boasted that he was calling everyone he had ever known, enlisting support for the demonstration."

The purpose? You've heard the official FBI report now, ladies and gentlemen. Does this sound to you like a spontaneous demonstration by legitimate students, inspired by well-meaning student leaders as these attacking articles and editorials present the picture? If not, why did the Reporter magazine and the Washington Post, "after diligent inquiry" represent them to be such? And by so representing do you think that these and the other attacking publications are perhaps playing the game of the Communists?

[From Counterattack, Jan. 6, 1961]

SUPPORT THE HUAC

The 3-year campaign of the Communist Party (CP) to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) is coming to a head with the convening of the new 87th Congress. An all-out effort has been initiated by the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (NCAUAC) with the appearance of pickets before the White House in Washington, D.C., on January 2, 1961, and attempts on the part of some of the pickets to buttonhole individual Members of Congress to persuade the legislators toward their point of view.

Needless to say, the anti-House groups are receiving much assistance from non-Communists and anti-anti-Communists, many of

whom should know better. Leaders of this synthetic phase of the struggle are Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, and the Washington Post, which has long indicated its preference for the anti-anti-Communist position.

A two-page advertisement appeared in the Washington morning newspaper in which Representative ROOSEVELT endorsed the attack on the HUAC, but, from available reports, the ad did little to add to the number of pickets or the noise of the demonstrators.

The NCAUAC chairman for this desperate bid to destroy the effectiveness of the HUAC is none other than Aubrey Williams, former head of the National Youth Administration under President Roosevelt. Williams is well known for his activities on behalf of Communist causes and was president of the Southern Conference Education Fund, although he has denied under oath that he was a Communist.

Actually, the so-called march was sponsored by the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee of New York, of which Sandra Rosenblum is chairman. Representation was claimed from most colleges in the New York area in the picket line, the pickets having arrived in Washington in four buses.

It is significant to recall that on December 23, 1960, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, issued a report about the CP's plans to formulate a new national youth organization. Obviously, this tactic is designed to capture the Nation's young people for the purpose of instigating student demonstrations and riots wherever it will serve the CP purposes most. The lessons learned in South America, Japan, and San Francisco, so pleased the CP commissars that their plans call for more of the same on a bigger and broader plane.

Hoover's report said: "In addition the Communists hope to repeat the success which they achieved on the west coast last May in spearheading mob demonstrations by college students and other young people against a committee of Congress."

Gus Hall, Communist Party leader, is to head this clandestine youth group and its publication will be called "New Horizons for Youth," under the editorial direction of Daniel Rubin of New York.

To overcome this attempt at Communist penetration among our youth, we must be alert and to be alert, we must have the facts. Here is where some of our news media have fallen down on the job. This is a good example of the prevailing climate of softness that seems to stem from the idea that we must get along with everybody. Don't cause trouble or strife; don't even report it; it might cause a fight. This is the area where we are losing the cold war.

EXAMPLE

On January 3, 1961, the New York Times carried an AP dispatch about the demonstration before the White House under the headline: "Uphaus Leads Drive in Capital on Un-American Activities Unit." The article proceeded to report what appears to be what a reporter was told. In other words, it was a press release put out by the NCAUAC. The story mentioned the sponsor of the show which "* * * estimated that 350 persons from many parts of the Nation joined in the protest."

The article then quoted some of the remarks alleged to have been made at a rally by Dr. Willard Uphaus who was recently released from a New Hampshire jail after serving a year for contempt for refusing to cooperate with a State legislative committee. Aubrey Williams of Montgomery, Ala., chaired the meeting and after quoting some remarks at random, the article ended on this note:

"The sponsor of the rally reported that many students had participated in the day's activities. They said representatives were present from City, Queens, and Hunter Colleges and Columbia University in New York; Reed College, Portland, Oreg.; University of California at Los Angeles; the University of Puerto Rico; Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio; and the University of Chicago."

The impression left by the article is that 350 students from these colleges spontaneously and without direction, appeared in Washington to protest against the continuance of this committee which had more to do with uncovering Alger Hiss and many other spies and subversives than most other media.

The difference between the Times story and the one that appeared in the New York Daily News on the same date is so great, that one could easily get the impression that the papers were reporting about totally unrelated and different events.

The News story under the headline "Antis, Pros of Probe Picket White House," reads as follows:

"A leftist march on Washington, billed as a student demonstration against the House Committee on Un-American Activities collided today in front of the White House with a larger group of committee supporters.

"Under the watchful eyes of police, the opposing groups were separated and permitted to carry placards on the sidewalks lining Lafayette Park, across from the White House. Anti-Communists outnumbered those demanding abolition of the House committee more than 2 to 1."

WHAT THE TIMES LEFT OUT

To get a more accurate picture of what happened, since we were not on the scene ourselves, we referred to the January 2, 1961 issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C. Under the headline "Other Groups Picket Anti-Committee Pickets" the Star reported as follows:

"More than 500 pickets, some opposing the House Un-American Activities Committee and others supporting it, paraded along H Street NW. near the White House yesterday.

"There was no disorder as the sign-carrying marchers from eight groups—which included New York students, Hungarians, Cubans, Catholics and members of the American Nazi Party—picketed each other for 2 hours.

"Deputy Police Chief George R. Wallrodt, who headed a force of 35 policemen on the scene, said some shouting and jeering broke out later after a rally of the anticommittee group in All Souls Unitarian Church, 16th and Harvard Streets, NW.

"The largest single group, Deputy Chief Wallrodt said, was the 212 members of the Youth Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, who arrived from New York on four buses.

"Supporting the House committee were 105 members of the Anti-Communist International and 100 Young Americans for Freedom, both from New York. Smaller pro-committee groups included the Fighting American Nationalists, the Catholic Freedom Foundation, and the Federation of Former Hungarian Political Prisoners.

"A group of anti-Red Cubans bolstered the Anti-Communist International the deputy chief said, and George Lincoln Rockwell of Arlington was on hand with a few of his American Nazi Party members."

Later that night the story related, the anticommittee group heard Dr. Uphaus talk at the Unitarian Church. This meeting was picketed by about 175 of the procommittee demonstrators and while there was some disorder, there were no arrests.

ANALYSIS

This is typical of the anti-anti-Communist technique. The Times story is only 50 percent correct—there were anti-House committee pickets outside the White House on January 3, 1961, the day the 87th Congress convened. This type of news coverage tells only one side of the story and leaves the reader with the impression that everyone in the demonstration was against the House Un-American Activities Committee. The thought is also left with those who don't know, that the House Un-American Activities Committee must be a bad committee if so many are against its continuance, and no one is for it.

We do not want to leave the impression that we are accusing the Times or the AP with having Communist spies on their staffs who planted the half-true story. On the contrary, if there were such spies around, they would be relatively easy to uncover because of their activities. The problem is much worse than that and therefore much more difficult to correct since the cause may be any one of many.

For example, reporters are people and like all of us, are inclined to take the easy way out. It is much easier to rewrite a press release prepared by someone else than it is to do your own leg work, go to the scene of the story, wait around the 2 hours necessary to get sufficient facts and then back to the office to type out the story. And why worry about it anyway since most people aren't interested, and most certainly won't be by the time the paper is thrown away?

An old reporter recently told us that he was broken in on the job with a newspaper with the admonition, "Remember men, you write today's headlines for tomorrow's basket." The smart publicist knows this is the way some newspapers operate and can take advantage of it for his own purposes. Unfortunately, not all smart publicity men are on our side. Too many others don't know much about communism and many more don't care.

This practice, however, has created a situation which prevents the vast majority of our citizenry from getting the true facts. It leaves the field to the minority who know what they are doing and why they are doing it.

The foregoing is only one example of possibly hundreds which could explain the reason for such a distorted picture. The reason might also be that it is the policy of the particular newspaper or the particular reporter. In any event, the effect is bad as it does not portray the facts sufficiently to give the reader an opportunity to make up his own mind about the pros and cons of the so-called controversy. A void is created by the half-truth which permits Communist propaganda to appear and sound more palatable than it otherwise would.

CONCLUSIONS

We have been aware of the Communist Party's distaste for any Government agency which has the power to and does investigate its subversive activities, since investigative agencies and congressional committees were authorized by Congress to operate in this fashion.

We are aware of the activities of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) which began a specific drive over 3 years ago to get the Congress to abolish the HUAC, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the FBI, and the Government's security program.

Taking into consideration the last issue of Counterattack where it was pointed out that the Communist manifesto issued in Moscow on December 6, 1960, stressed the need for destroying all anti-Communist organizations (see p. 201), it is easy to see that the above-mentioned committees and agencies are in for a fight for existence. The manifesto is an order to every Communist Party group in the world. Anything we do that does not defend our system will aid this directive and the Communist Party causes.

It is clear that the NCAUAC is aiding this cause and so is the Youth to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is also clear and of small comfort, that

this youth committee has affiliates on the campuses of each university and college mentioned in the Times article.

As if to prove a point, it has been pointed out in the past (see Counterattack, July 22, 1960, p. 113) that the Communist Party was stepping up its activity among youth groups in the United States as well as all over the world. It is up to us to get the truth and pass it along to those who are the special targets of Communist Party intrigue. It would be a tragedy if the Communist Party were able to succeed in this endeavor.

What to do: Write your Senators and Congressman today. Tell them that you support the intent, purpose, and activity of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the FBI and the Government's security program. Do not let this fight go by default. If these committees and agencies were hampered in their work, it would be a terrible blow to the Nation.

Alert your children to the activities of these groups among the young people. Activate your social and neighborhood groups by explaining to them what is going on. If you can, influence your local papers about the true facts and see that they don't distort the news by only printing one half of a story. This is important.

THE CLERGY SPEAK OUT

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that since I am a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities I will be charged with slanting my remarks. There were a number of ministers present at the hearings in San Francisco. They issued a voluntary, joint statement following the hearings. Those who issued the statement were Dr. G. Archer Weniger, of Oakland; Rev. Don Watson, of Oakland; Dr. H. Austin, of San Francisco; Rev. Robert F. Hakes, of Alameda; Dean William G. Bellshaw, of the San Francisco Baptist Seminary; Dr. H. O. Van Gilder, of the Western Baptist Bible College; and Dr. Arno Weniger, of San Francisco.

Here follows their own eyewitness account of what transpired inside the hearing room:

More than a dozen ministers were in attendance at the congressional hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco on May 12 and 13 in the supervisors chambers in the city hall. What we witnessed was utterly fantastic. The shameful demonstration against law and order and against this duly constituted committee of the Congress defies description. We sat in the rear of the room on a raised platform where we could easily observe the proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators. We studied the crowd carefully for hours and could easily discern which were the masterminds of the mob riots. It is our certain conviction that this indefensible demonstration against law and order was conceived, planned, and directed by a few hard-core Communist agitators who were carrying out their textbook orders on insurrection with classic success. Leaders of the mob included faculty members and well-known leftist lawyers for the fifth-amendment Communists.

We were sitting where we were able to observe the giving of instructions by the riot leaders who had gained access to the room. The Daily Californian, which was distributed widely at the scene, gave explicit instructions on the front page of the Thursday issue on exactly how to harass the committee. They were told to laugh out loud at every incident that appeared to be amusing in order to make the Congressmen look ridiculous. These well-disciplined mobsters laughed on the dotted line and obeyed their masters to the last jeer. We watched a national committeeman for the party line up a dozen Communists near the railing and throw every sneer, invective, abusive language, vile profanity, and fiendish charge at the Congressmen they could conceive. For nearly 15 minutes at one point, this lawless crowd of students from the university, together with party cadres, had the chambers almost in their control. The students, comprising the rear third of the audience stood up on their seats and yelled, jeered, hissed, and scoffed at the Congressmen. It was almost complete breakdown of law and order. We witnessed more violations of the law in 15 minutes than we have seen in 15 years.

The only criticisms we have of the police authorities were of allowing this element to make such a mockery out of law and order, without jailing every one of the leaders.

The height of their devilish hypocrisy was reached when they had the consummate nerve to profane the national anthem by singing it at the peak of their demonstration, and giving expression to their treasonable delight by singing "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord." The depth of their deceit was reached when this mob element put their hand over their heart and pledged allegiance to the flag. We shall never forget the hiss and boos that greeted Mr. Arens when he first mentioned the name of God in connection with one who broke from the party.

We are at a loss to understand how clergymen, such as Bishop James Pike, could give any aid and comfort to this lawless kind of activity by statements deriding the committee, and by allowing his assistant pastor to address one of their despicable rallies.

We came away from this hearing absolutely convinced of the overwhelming necessity of continuing the House Committee on Un-American Activities. No free agent could view the hearings without being impressed with the fairness, justice, and dedication to a thankless, but positively necessary task.

Chairman Edwin Willis was unusually temperate and patient. We have nothing but unbounded admiration for Richard Arens, committee counsel, whose skill and understanding of this perilous conspiracy was a blessing to behold. We apologize to these devoted public servants from Congress for the devilish and deceitful conduct of an infinitesimally small but alarmingly arrogant segment of this area, who are willing to be tools of the Communist conspiracy which would make a shambles out of the liberty which marks this great Nation as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

EYEWITNESS MINISTERS CERTIFY ACCURACY OF SAN FRANCISCO FILM—"OPERATION ABOLITION"

The frightening drama of the Communist-inspired student riots of May 12–14, 1960, has been captured in a startling film authorized by the House Un-American Activities Committee entitled "Operation Abolition." The film is a 40-minute documentary taken by news cameramen both inside and outside the city hall. Local Communists are identified as they incite the crowds to wild disorder and violence, in which several policemen were hospitalized. Communist charges of police brutality are ridiculous. One could not be an eyewitness to this tragedy without a fear of those few who are dedicated to this party of treason and yet who so successfully staged this dress rehearsal for revolution in our own area. This film is one of the most effective counterblows for liberty imaginable. These Communists, together with their fellow travelers, dupes, suckers, unwitting tools, and a few regrettable allies in the ministry, little realized that they would be making a permanent record which would expose their treasonable activity.

Inasmuch as the Communist conspiracy has launched a massive attempt to discredit this film, we ministers who were eyewitnesses to this horrifying development locally, wish to certify that this film is a true and accurate representation of the activities of the hearings. The commentary is truthful. The film is not "doctored." The sound track is not distorted. The leftwing charge that this film is a forgery is a manifest lie. While the original films were probably 5 hours in length, most was repetition of the obstructionist tactics of the subpenaed witnesses. Nothing was eliminated which would show the rioters in any better light. In fact, we were amazed that the committee would allow witnesses Wm. Mandell and Douglas Wachter to freely express their vicious propaganda attack upon the Congressmen.

We feel that it is our duty to warn citizens to beware of a Communist-doctored version of the film, which has been so grossly emasculated that it bears little resemblance to reality and constitutes a clever piece of propaganda for the Reds.

We urge that every citizen see the true version of the film, and then make every effort to have it shown as a patriotic gesture before every church, civic, governmental, commercial, educational and private group possible. No film has stirred more interest over the Nation. Your local police department can probably tell you where copies can be secured.

Moreover, we feel that this is the hour when citizens should close ranks behind our courageous Congressmen who are bearing the heat and burden of the day in this struggle. The Communist conspiracy is mobilizing the full strength of every sympathizer to destroy these absolutely essential committees. Write today to Chairman FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Inform your own Congressmen.

MORTGAGE GUARANTEE PROGRAM FOR DEPRESSED ECONOMIC AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to promote the redevelopment of economically depressed areas by establishing a Government corporation which will provide a secondary market for industrial mortgages covering property in those areas.

In my district, comprising Luzerne County, one of the obstacles to redevelopment is the fact that the local lending and banking institutions have reached the limit of their lending power under the regulations established by the Pennsylvania banking laws.

Therefore, it is most important that some means be found to release the mortgage financing that is currently committed so that the required funds for further industrial expansion can be made available. My bill will, upon enactment, do that very thing.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the Kennedy Task Force Committee dealing with problems of areas of chronic unemployment to which I served as an adviser and it was unanimously approved by this committee and incorporated in its report of January 2, 1961.

On page 8, section E, of that report it states as follows:

Many communities which have suffered heavy unemployment over a long period have invested large sums, including funds raised by popular subscription through community development organizations, in long-term industrial mortgages. But these communities, some of which pioneered in self-help operations, now find their available risk capital tied up in these mortgages, and are running out of financial resources. In order to free their funds for new investment in enterprises which will create the required new jobs, the Area Redevelopment Administrator should study the feasibility of allowing financial institutions in distressed areas, especially community development groups, to rediscount their industrial mortgages with some agency of the Federal Government. This could follow the general pattern established for the purchase of real estate mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I would like to submit my formal statement on the bill itself and its provisions:

Forced with the long and turbulent history of the area redevelopment bill, also known as the distressed or depressed areas bill, and also as the Flood-Douglas bill, I recognize the need for another approach to at least one part, but an important part, of this many-sided problem.

The chamber of commerce, the Committee of One Hundred, and the Industrial Development Committee of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and the Chamber of Commerce and the Can-Do Committee of Hazleton, Pa., are outstanding examples of what a community can do to help itself to meet the issues of unemployment, underemployment, and general economic and industrial development. With a long history of success in rasing local funds in various ways and enjoying the enthusiastic participation of local banks in financing its extensive programs, these areas soon realized that its local risk capital was exhausted for this purpose and what was needed now is a bill to allow banks and lending institutions to rediscount their industrial mortgages with the Federal Government following generally the same pattern as Fannie Mae mortgages. These mortgages should be purchased at a little less interest rate than the banks have charged in order to give trustee banks an opportunity to charge a small sum for servicing the loans for the Federal Government. This proposal has been endorsed by bankers, lawyers, by various union people, and by the businessmen, and by the industrial development corporations of the affected area.

This type of program is an absolute must for communities who have attempted an economic renaissance. When the communities run out of financial steam, additional moneys could thus be funneled into the community for industrial development usage at no cost to the Government. It would be a loan which would be repaid with interest. Another point in its favor is an existing Government agency could handle the entire transaction.

Secondly, the Federal Government should rediscount the third mortgages of industrial development agencies in the same manner. It would supply these communities with partial or additional funds to continue their industrial development program through their existing industrial development corporations.

Here is a concrete proposal which would continue to spark our industrial renaissance, so I have a suggested program of Federal loan guarantee and discount facility—the proposal outlined below is patterned generally after the V-loan program authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950:

1. An independent agency, the Area Redevelopment Administration, would be established (similar to that provided for in S. 722). This agency would determine the eligibility of areas under criteria established by the law.

2. The ARA would be authorized to insure industrial loans in eligible areas if it determined that the loan would contribute to the basic economic health of the area and that it met certain standards of soundness. This guarantee would cover up to 90 percent of the outstanding balance of the loan and a premium would be charged by ARA. To initiate the program, the Treasury would be authorized to contribute $10 million as an insurance reserve. This Treasury contribution would be ultimately repayable from income received from application fees and insurance premiums.

3. The ARA would discount the insured portion of any loan upon demand by the borrower. The amount of the discount would be based on the current cost of money to ARA. To finance these purchases, ARA would be authorized to issue its own debentures, not guaranteed by the Government, to private investors. To provide a basis for issuing these debentures, the Treasury would be authorized to purchase $10 million preferred stock in the ARA discount facility (to be repaid to the Treasury eventually out of income). In addition, the investor who sold a loan to ARA would be required to purchase a certain percent of capital stock.

The proposals made in the ARA plan are aimed primarily at those areas of substantial unemployment which are making progress is helping themselves. In particular, the purpose is to free funds of banks which are loaned up both in terms of their total ratio of industrial loans to deposits and in the amounts which can be loaned to a single borrower. It is also intended to help development corporations which have reached the limit of their financial capacity.

It has been proposed that the Federal Government provide guarantees of privately made loans and also a discount facility empowered to purchase loans from banks and development corporations. In addition to establishing precedents for this type of aid, the assistance proposed by this plan might be patterned after one of these programs. The plan generally follows the V-loan program.

It should be noted that the insurance and discount proposals could be considered independently.

The principle benefit of the insurance feature would be to encourage private lending institutions outside the redevelopment areas to purchase loans from local lenders, thus freeing local resources. A Federal discount facility would not need the insurance although the insuring agency might well handle the review and approval of loans more expeditiously than the discounting agency.

It has been suggested that the Federal Housing Administration be the agency to write this insurance. However, this would probably antagonize the real estate interests which would object to seeing FHA take on a program outside their field. Also the insuring of industrial loans would be completely new to the FHA staff. Already there are many complaints that FHA processing takes far too long (often as much as 45 days) to approve applications in their own field of housing. Also, it seems certain that other Government agencies, particularly the Department of Commerce, would raise strong objections on jurisdictional grounds.

LOAN INSURANCE

Obviously it is very important to keep red-tape and bureaucratic details to a minimum. A coinsurance approach such as is used in the FHA property improvement program would help to hold processing time to a minimum. For example, the Government might guarantee 90 percent of the outstanding balance of a loan.

A FEDERAL DISCOUNT FACILITY

In view of objections to using Federal money for area redevelopment any discount facility would probably have to be patterned after the Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary market operations.

Briefly, FNMA is authorized to sell its own debentures (which do not carry any Federal guarantee) to private investors in an amount up to 10 times its capital, surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings. The initial capital was provided by the Treasury which purchased $50 million of FNMA preferred stock. Additional capital comes from the requirement that anyone selling a mortgage to FNMA must purchase common stock equal to 2 percent of the amount of mortgages sold. The objections to a similar discount facility for area redevelopment would be the initial Treasury capital required plus the fact that the debentures which the agency sold would compete with the Treasury for private funds.

THE V-LOAN PROGRAM

An interesting variation of the insurance-discount idea was provided in the Defense Production Act of 1950. Under this program Government procurement agencies, primarily the Department of Defense, were authorized to guarantee loans when necessary to stimulate defense production. This guarantee included a provision that upon request by the lender the procuring agency was required to buy the loan. Adapting this to area redevelopment, the law might authorize an Area Redevelopment Administration to offer its guarantee for any loan which it determined would aid employment in an eligible community. This guarantee would also contain a contractual agreement that the agency would purchase the loan upon request by the lender. The funds for these purchases could be obtained from the sale in the private market of the Agency's own debentures.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

In regard to points 3 and 4 of the outlined hereinabove, which call for long-term low interest loans to private utilities for highways and schools and other services to industrial tracts, it is suggested that the funds be made available by earmarking authorizations in existing programs such as the public facilities loan program administered by Community Facilities Administration (HHFA). These earmarked funds could be used only after certification of need by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

As a result of the developments which witnessed in my own area, what such need most is refinancing assistance. The problem existing in our industrial development agencies here is that we have reached the limits of the lending capacity of most of the banks. We have already been forced to secure out-of-area financing in one instance. We are rapidly being forced out of this area for financing in many other instances.

Under these circumstances, it seems that one important thing that we should try to do is to establish a system whereby the banks in an area could rediscount the "paper" with the Federal Government. As I have said, this would be much along the lines of the so-called Fannie Mae mortgages whereby the Government buys up or rediscounts these mortgages.

If this could be arranged for the labor-surplus areas utilizing industrial development programs, it would mean loaned-to-capacity banks could rediscount this paper with the Federal Government, possibly at a percentage slightly less than what they are

receiving. This difference could be used to pay the banks for the servicing of the Federal Government's mortgage and handling the collection.

This, of course, must be done in such a way that the Federal Government would be the lender rather than the banks. This is necessary so that the local development corporation would no longer be liable to the banks and would no longer be carried by the banks as an up-to-capacity borrower. Thus, the banks would have a practically inexhaustible lending capacity to an industrial development organization such as Can-Do in Hazleton or any similar local group.

The second feature of this bill should be that Can-Do, the local group, would be able to either mortgage its interest to the Federal Government at a nominal rate of interest, which should be less, of course, than what Can-Do is paying to its bondholders and a sufficient percentage of interest left so that Can-Do can service the collections and pay for them out of the interest. Can-Do could either mortgage any interest that it had left in any particular building or, as in the case of some buildings where it had taken mortgages, could rediscount these mortgages with the Federal Government. If this system were set up it would mean an end to any further Can-Do drives for money since it would have a continual revolving fund of money until such time as all Can-Do bonds were due for redemption. Every time it had reached the limit of its capacity and were completely out of money, it could then either mortgage any interest it still had with the Federal Government, or it could rediscount with the Federal Government any mortgage that it would then hold.

As I see it, this is one great need of such local groups. In addition, it will put us into competition with a great deal of the country that we are not in competition with at the present time.

Another thing, it will urge any area that wants any government assistance to first go out and raise funds of their own—this should be a qualification of the bill—and will urge States that want assistance to set up funds of their own before they would have any ability to rediscount in the method that I have set forth. The financing plans suggested here will provide the large majority of the necessary industrial development money once a community has raised funds. While the Federal Government would be participating with its ability to raise and loan money, it would not require the Federal Government to participate unless the community and State had first shown initiative. This would have a great advantage in that it would proceed to construct buildings in exactly the same manner it is doing now. Thus, it would only be when it would reach a limit of its funds that we would apply for this assistance. Federal redtape would not prevent a delay in the construction of the building or the signing of a prospect.

I respectfully submit that regardless of what is done about any other type of bill, we should go on record as urging this kind of assistance.

I do not look upon this bill as a sacred cow and therefore, untouchable. This bill is the synthesis of the thinking and the experience of many responsible citizens who have devoted their time and talents for many years to this problem. This bill is a proposal for a vital need. I would urge that when considered by the great Banking and Currency Committee of the House, which committee undoubtedly will receive the bill, the vast experience of that committee and its brilliant staff with the many problems of the distressed economic areas of our Nation as well as its knowledge of the Government mortgage program, will expedite the passage of this legislation bringing to the bill ideas, suggestions and proposals to insure its success.

I am indebted to numerous civic leaders in my congressional district for their advice and assistance in the preparation of this bill and these remarks; particularly Mr. Frank Burnside, Mr. John Hourigan and Mr. William O. Sword, of Wilkes-Barre; Attorney Lou Feldman, past national commander of the VFW and attorney for the Hazleton Can-Do group; Dr. Edgar L. Dessen the driving force behind the Hazleton operation, and Mr. Clifford Jones, secretary of the Hazleton Chamber of Commerce.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of numerous Members, I present herewith a progress report on the Point 4 Youth Corps proposal.

The 86th Congress in June 1960, authorized a study of the point 4 Youth Corps in section 307(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960. The Appropriations Committees of the Congress approved the sum of $10,000 from Government funds to help finance such study. The authorizing legislation specified that the President should arrange for a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation to make the study and that the study should evaluate the advisability and practicability of entering into such a program.

The Director of the International Cooperation Administration acquired responsibility in the executive branch for arranging for such study and he, in turn, delegated the responsibility for necessary staff work to the Deputy Director for Management of ICA. After preparing a guidance outline to control the development of the study, ICA then contacted three foundations in an attempt to secure an additional amount deemed necessary to fully implement the study.

Following failure to obtain additional funds, ICA proceeded to select a study group to make the study. A contract committing the $10,000 available for ICA use was executed with the Research Foundation of Colorado State University in November 1960.

By the terms of the contract, the Research Foundation of Colorado State University is required to provide ICA with a preliminary report making recommendations on the Youth Corps proposal not later than March 1, 1961, and a final report not later than May 1, 1961. The study group has sufficient funds to make field visitation to some eight countries in three separate sections of the world in order to check out the practicability and feasibility of the Youth Corps idea.

Since a considerable public interest has been displayed in proposals for a Youth Corps or Peace Corps, utilizing young U.S. adults in overseas service, some of the leading ideas developed in three meetings are set forth below. Two of these meetings were held by Dr. Maurice L. Albertson, director of the Research Foundation, in New York and Washington, and one was held by the House author of section 307(b), Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin. Representatives of universities, foundations, labor unions, voluntary agencies, and religious denominational groups attended the meetings by invitation. The ideas presented below represent some of the thinking and discussion which occurred in the three meetings:

1. Objectives of the point 4 Youth Corps program: Firm conclusions were not reached concerning objectives. The concensus of opinion was that the objectives should be somewhat broader than those usually attributed to technical cooperation. The Youth Corps should provide opportunity for young Americans to have significant experience in working overseas where they can contribute to aiding with particular objectives and aspirations of foreign people. The objectives are not to be confined to those of the foreign government but might well reflect expressed needs and aspirations of private institutional groups. It is assumed, however, that objectives of private foreign groups will be ones which the foreign government would not oppose. It was concluded that if appropriate jobs could be found, the Youth Corps might well add a new dimension to international economic and social development effort. It is important that U.S. people demonstrate to foreign people that they really care about them as people and are vitally interested in their social and economic development.

From the standpoint of American youth, the objective would be to provide opportunities for young Americans to develop themselves, to gain experience in technical cooperation work abroad, to engage in meaningful and useful work, to obtain better understandings of the culture and society of foreign peoples, and to assist in creating at home a wider understanding of the needs and aspirations of particular countries and peoples. A body of opinion favored stressing the mutuality of purpose of the United States and of the foreign country in a program of this kind.

2. Program elements: It was thought that three separate but coordinated aspects of a Youth Corps program would be desirable and should receive investigation. One aspect of the program would be a United Nations Corps in which the United States would participate. A second aspect would concern itself with intensification and expansion of going voluntary agency and university programs. Several voluntary agencies and the universities and foundations are already engaged in programs which send young people abroad to teach in all types of schools, to demonstrate improved practices in agriculture and to do a variety of tasks of either a technical cooperation or a cultural or educational nature. This aspect of the program could be largely expanded without disturbing the essential management controls which private agencies now exercise over their programs. These private bodies could greatly expand existing programs if governmental resources were made available for oversea travel and other types of support.

The third aspect of the program would consist of a corps sponsored and financed almost entirely from U.S. Government funds. This aspect would provide the largest numbers and the major nucleus of the corps.

Various possibilities respecting a single directing and coordinating administering agency encompassing all three aspects were advanced. The Youth Corps could be an independent governmental agency reporting to the President, a semiautonomous organization in the Department of State, a part of ICA, a quasi-private public agency such as the National Science Foundation or body, such as the Fulbright committee which handles educational exchange.

It was the opinion of most of those present that the organization chosen probably should be governmentally administered but be guided by a public advisory committee. It should be permitted to have maximum autonomy and freedom in all aspects of its operations, and should receive maximum logistics support from existing U.S. Government agencies. It should have as independent a character as possible consonant with its position of being a utilizer of public funds. Complete dependence would not be placed upon the use of public funds, how-

ever, the maximum use of private funds and private resources would be added as well as would maximum use of all resources available to the countries to be benefited.

3. The size of the corps: Proposals on the size of the corps varied greatly. Representatives of organized labor felt that the corps should not be restricted to an elite college class. It should include journeymen, apprentices, artisans, and a variety of other labor technical or supervisory groups for which an effective demand is presumed to exist in foreign underdeveloped countries.

Representatives of the universities and private agencies felt that the corps should be restricted in size at least initially, that there should be careful selection of members on the basis of character, motivation, ability to represent the United States effectively, and ability to perform in tasks recognized as being important in the economic and cultural development of selected foreign countries. It was pointed out repeatedly that the nature of effective needs and demands for U.S. assistance would vary greatly as between countries aided and that no uniform pattern of program was possible. The majority of persons attending the various meetings cautioned that the corps should start small, possibly having no more than from 500 to 2,000 members the first year, and develop only as real demand for expansion is demonstrated. In other words, a beginning would be made with presumably a small group of well planned pilot projects. As these projects succeeded, others would be added to round out the corps.

There was an equally strong sentiment that to start with too small a number might be detrimental. A small effort would not be worthy of U.S. governmental support. Likewise, the very fact that the U.S. Government advertised its intention abroad to devote rather substantial resources to this effort would serve to help create an effective demand for assistance. It is quite all right to assume that no projects be undertaken except by specific request of a foreign group; however, unless an atmosphere of rising expectation is generated and unless foreign people know that a resource of some magnitude exists, a body of specific requests for assistance would not be forthcoming.

4. Types of jobs to be performed: The discussions revealed many possibilities in respect to types of jobs which youth corps members could perform.

In many of the very underdeveloped countries there is need for teachers of various kinds. Teachers are needed in elementary and secondary schools and in technical and trade schools. In countries where there are going universities, young people could teach at the university level. It was felt that a basic requirement for teaching would be knowledge of the particular technical or professional field as a first prerequisite. In connection with the orientation process, young graduates would require at least minimum instruction in educational and teaching methods.

An expansion of the various types of work now being performed by the International Voluntary Services, Inc., was also deemed desirable. International Voluntary Services, Inc., works in the field of community development and agricultural improvement.

The field of public health was mentioned as an area where extensive work of an apprentice and operating type might be performed by youth-corps members.

One member of the group mentioned the success already realized in using young business school graduates in development banks overseas.

Additional proposals covered a wide range of other activities, including work in conservation and natural resources development, recreation, local government, public administration, and internships or apprenticeships in many fields, especially those in which programs of technical assistance are underway. Some of the participants pointed to successful university exchange programs which might be enlarged with U.S. Government assistance. Others commented on the need to explore the possibility of use of a corps similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps in the United States but on a more limited scale.

Other participants mentioned requests which had already been made by particular countries. Among these was the request by the chief justice of one country for graduates of Harvard Law School to serve as clerks for court justices. Another was a request by a minister of education for 50 college graduates in the schools of his country.

In all cases there was rather uniform agreement that persons selected for the Youth Corps should have high standards of proficiency in the particular field in which they were selected to work.

The experience of universities and voluntary agencies reveals that rather extended research and negotiation is the rule before good projects are found. Another time period elapses after a project is operating before the benefits of the projects are proven to the satisfaction of both participants and people in the host country.

5. Relation of corps membership to draft exemption: Following rather extended discussion, it was pretty firmly agreed that membership in the corps should not be held out as an alternative to a requirement for military service. Even if this were done legislatively, a succeeding Congress could remove the exemption. As a practical matter, persons who serve 2 or 3 years in the corps would undoubtedly obtain deferment while they were so serving; afterward the deferment might well continue for other reasons—for example, having passed age limits, having gotten married, or having entered into a line of work of recognized importance. International Voluntary Services, Inc., cited its experience in not having a single member of its oversea group called up by a draft board.

6. Necessity for close coordination with going programs: Some experienced participants pointed to the necessity for closely relating Youth Corps projects and programs to other aid programs in the host country. For example, Youth Corps programs carried out at local levels should be related to ICA and other programs operating at district and national levels. Projects undertaken should not be merely gimmicks but should be related to worthwhile long-range social and economic development aims. Emphasis should be placed on careful planning of projects before they are implemented.

There were differences of opinion as to how closely the program should be identified with U.S. National Government policies and aims. Some participants felt that as much disassociation as possible would be preferable; others pointed to the danger of attempting to disavow a relationship with U.S. Government aims and purposes.

Some experience points to the desirability of bringing foreign leaders to the United States for training and observation prior to inaugurating projects abroad staffed by U.S. citizens. Before any project is inaugurated, it should be requested by people in the host country through reliable channels.

7. Leadership of the Youth Corps overseas: It was generally agreed that well selected, mature, and imaginative leadership would be necessary for each project or group of projects in each foreign country. The highest possible standards should apply in the selection of Youth Corps leaders. Emphasis should be placed on demonstrated capacity to live and work effectively with others, especially in foreign environments.

8. Relationships with host country people: It was proposed that host country people be closely brought in as participants and partners in Youth Corps projects to the maximum extent possible. The word "associates" might be used to denote this relationship.

The primary objective of the Youth Corps leader must be to convince foreign people of the reason for the project. One participant pointed out that new wells drilled to obtain pure drinking water in a country were later filled in with rocks by the uninformed local people.

9. Orientation and training of corps members: All participants were agreed that well-developed orientation courses lasting from 3 to 6 months were a necessary part of preparation for oversea work. The content of such courses should include, among other things, studies of the anthropology, sociology, system of government, and general culture of each country or area. Where possible, minimum knowledge of the language should be acquired. For some areas, where there is a variety of dialects and no single national language, the language teaching problem becomes complex if not impossible. Courses are available, however, which develop basic language acquiring aptitude. Corps members also need refresher training and the development of common understandings of the significance and meaning of American culture and government.

The period of orientation training was viewed likewise as a device for final selection of corps members. Part of the orientation would be given in the United States and part abroad in the country of assignment, with participation, where possible, of local leaders. A transitional training and selection period was discussed in a boot-camp context. The boot camp could be either in some underdeveloped area of the United States or in some country like Puerto Rico.

10. The role of exploration, planning, research, and evaluation: It was generally agreed that a program of the type contemplated can grow and improve only if continuous research and planning is devoted to isolating, analyzing, and taking action on the problems and questions met. Program additions, modifications, and extensions depend upon such careful study and analysis. Some of this study becomes meaningful only as a body of experience is developed in which failures, shortcomings, and successes in various aspects of the program can be seen.

It was agreed also that continuous independent evaluation of pilot projects and programs would be necessary to point the direction of future growth and to make necessary readjustments.

11. Timing of the program: There was a general understanding that while Congress intended to legislate on this subject, bills would not be introduced until the study by Colorado State University was completed at least in its first draft. Many participants felt that public interest in the corps was high enough that detailed collateral studies on such matters as selection, training, orientation, and other aspects which require considerable study, should be done simultaneously and on a voluntary basis by universities and other groups who have proper capability. The actual papers produced by these research groups would be made available as soon as possible to the Colorado State study group.

It was considered that public and congressional interest would demand a program to be ready for initiation sometime in September of 1961. It was also assumed that continuing study by foundations and universities would be useful over a period of time even during early stages of development and operation of the Youth Corps. A topic which could well be further explored would be the relationship of university education to preparing students for membership in the corps. It was thought that increased attention should be given to supplying a pool of youth

with successful experience overseas in technical cooperation and cultural activities which could be drawn upon to supply personnel for U.S. Government and other groups operating in the foreign field. Other corps graduates, by returning to their home communities and taking up their chosen vocations, would help to promote world understanding.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 1 hour, on January 16.

Mr. MORSE, for 60 minutes, on January 16.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 30 minutes, on January 12.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia), for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. FOGARTY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 12, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

225. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

226. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Forces for fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 279 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

228. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Secretary of the Air Force on the progress of the flight training program, pursuant to Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

229. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms during the month of October 1960, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

230. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 26th Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

231. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 40th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

232. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to provide for prior notification of certain mergers," and "A bill to amend section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide for temporary injunctions and restraining orders in merger cases"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

234. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report covering positions established and compensated under authority of section 1581, title 10, United States Code, pursuant to section 1583 of that title; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 2201. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and to provide loans for the construction of private, nonprofit elementary, and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2202. A bill to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and others with respect to the formulation and evaluation of projects for the development of the Nation's water resources, to establish a Water Resources Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2203. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2204. A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1930; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2206. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2207. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2208. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 2209. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2210. A bill to create a U.S. Department of Mineral Resources and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2211. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2212. A bill to permit the free marketing of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2214. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2215. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of property expropriated, intervened in, or otherwise confiscated by Cuba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 2218. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2219. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Nation's pioneer lumberjacks with a likeness of the Lumbermen's Memorial Monument in the Huron National Forest on said stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2220. A bill to provide a different basis for determining the amount of money to be made available to the State of Michigan because of the location of national forest lands within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2221. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Nation's pioneer lumbermen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2222. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Michigan of certain land in Grayling Township, Crawford County, Mich., to be used for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permited without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2225. A bill to require contractors having certain contracts with the United States to name their subcontractors, material men, and supply men, to quote subcontract and material and supply prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2226. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 2227. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a husband or widower have been dependent upon his wife in order to qualify for a spouse's or widower's annuity on the basis of her wage record; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that a husband or widower has been dependent upon his wife in order to qualify for husband's or widower's insurance benefits on the basis of her wage record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain water soluble compounds as cutting oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 2235. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 2236. A bill to promote the redevelopment of economically depressed areas by establishing a Government corporation which will provide a secondary market for industrial mortgages covering property in those areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2237. A bill to provide further bases for determinations with respect to disability for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 2238. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2240. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2242. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the parish of Plaquemines, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges or dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2244. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deferment of income from service contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2247. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2248. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to increase the earnings includible in computing benefits, to eliminate age requirements for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to increase the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2249. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in the State of California to the county of Trinity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2250. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2251. A bill to provide that certain caps shall be dutiable under paragraph 1504 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 2252. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2253. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2254. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain surplus property of the United States to Cumberland County, N.C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on cigarettes shall apply to cigarettes made with substitutes for tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2257. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 2258. A bill to adjust the amount of funds available for farm operating loans made pursuant to section 21(b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2259. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2260. A bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 2261. A bill to exercise the full constitutional power of the Federal Government with respect to trademarks, to fulfill certain international obligations, and to make further provision for the suppression of unfair competition in commerce subject to lawful regulation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 2262. A bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2263. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 2264. A bill to provide for the acquisition or construction of a building to be used as a residence for pages of the Senate

and of the House of Representatives, for a Capitol Pages' Residence Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2265. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2266. A bill to eliminate the requirement that veterans must have served for 90 days or more to qualify for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2267. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a national peace agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 2268. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books to certain public and private institutions of higher education for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 2270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide water and sewage disposal facilities to the Medora area adjoining the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2271. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 2272. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 2273. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to increase the amount of wages entitled to priority to $1,800 and to provide that pension and welfare benefits earned by an employee shall have the same priority as direct wages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2275. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2276. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 so as to authorize a study for the purpose of determining the feasibility of locating the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States near the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 2277. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska (by request):

H.R. 2279. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2280. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2281. A bill to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2282. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2283. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 2284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2285. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2286. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2287. A bill to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and others with respect to the formulation and evaluation of projects for the development of the Nation's water resources, to establish water resources commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 2288. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 2289. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2290. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2291. A bill to amend sections 502(d) and 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to approval of certain bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2292. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of honorable discharge in lieu of certificates of disenrollment to certain persons who served as temporary members of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve during World War II; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2293. A bill to provide that the unmarried children of certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States or of the Philippine Scouts may be admitted to the United States as nonquota immigrants, during a 2-year period, without regard to their age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2294. A bill to accord certain naturalization privileges to veterans of the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 2295. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide water and sewage disposal facilities to the Medora area adjoining the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2296. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 2297. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2298. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2300. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 2302. A bill to provide penalties for membership in the Communist Party, and to permit the compelling of testimony relating to such membership and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 2303. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 2304. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not sever service connection of any veteran's disability when he has been in receipt of compensation for 10 or more years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2305. A bill to permit the exchange between farms in the same county of cotton acreage allotment for rice acreage allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2306. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide retirement credit for periods of sick leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2307. A bill to require that all pieces of third-class matter mailed in bulk shall bear the sender's pledge to pay return postage at the current per-piece charge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2308. A bill to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, with respect to its applicability to certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2309. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the donation of surplus property to public libraries which are tax supported in whole or in part; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2310. A bill to provide certain retirement benefits for certain widows of former Government civilian employees who died on or after February 29, 1948, and prior to October 1, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2311. A bill to provide that a manufacturer or producer of nonbeverage products containing distilled spirits shall not be required to pay the tax imposed on such spirits by section 5001 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if he is appropriately licensed and bonded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2312. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain restrictions on the crediting of self-employment income for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes, so as to permit such income to be retroactively credited (upon payment of tax) to the same extent as wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2313. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2314. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt in amounts which reflect annual increases in the gross national product; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2315. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the validity of a lien for taxes as against a mechanic's lien; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the communications and transportation taxes for amounts paid by nonprofit hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to certain educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2319. A bill to amend section 202 of the Social Security Act to permit certain beneficiaries of an insured individual to meet the applicable proof-of-support requirements even though such individual was unable by reason of illness or injury to provide such support during a period ending with his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2320. A bill to amend title I of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve the acquisition of certain lands of national historical significance, or interests therein, for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2321. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202), to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2322. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be granted leave upon the critical illness or death of a close relative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 2323. A bill to prohibit advertising in commerce of articles produced in the Soviet Zone of Germany unless the advertisement clearly states that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2324. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 2325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 2326. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2327. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2328. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge, or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2329. A bill to acquire lands to construct an approach road into the Ozette Lake region in the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2330. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.J. Res. 110. Joint resolution establishing a George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution establishing a George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to authorize the reimbursement of not more than two employees in the office of each Member of the House of Representatives for travel to the Member's congressional district, and to authorize payment of additional mileage allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution calling upon the motion picture industry to take appropriate action to make certain that no damage will be done to the foreign relations of the United States by the showing in foreign countries of movies which misrepresent our Nation or its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in the month of October as National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariff be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SLACK:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 91. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document certain material relating to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 92. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Res. 93. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the administration by the Secretary of Commerce of the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 94. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 95. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the social and economic problems engendered by parenthood outside of wedlock, and of ways in which the growing burdens it imposes on all levels of government may be mitigated; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Res. 96. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Orlando Gonfiantini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Yick T. Jew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Washington George Brodber Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Ruben N. and Dorothy A. Bergendoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Clara Betello Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Maria Stella Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Kaino Knuuttila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Miss Kamila Wierzbicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 2340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Gerber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luigia Lenardon De Carli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Esther Boghos Ofiazian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2343. A bill to waive any claims of the United States for the repayment of loans made by the Department of State to Harry H. Thomas and Jeanne A. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Theresa Del Vecchio Cipollone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Ferruccio Scifo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Maria Cascarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Marlene E. Belfast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Caterina Buttazzi Petruzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Zaharoula Vasilakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Marija Toic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Hans Hangartner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Gregory J. Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Jonathan Barnes and his sister, Caroline Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Mr. Louis Fischer, Feger Seafoods, and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R. Stuart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Podias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ryo H. Yokoyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Eishin Tamanaha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Gus Nihoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2359. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Waimea Ranch Hotel, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 2361. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 2362. A bill for the relief of Mira Kovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kamel Said Michel Baladi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmine Jandrisits (Serra); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2365. A bill for the relief of Marija Matijevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Chu Shu Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 2367. A bill for the relief of Kevork (Azoyan) Sarkissian (also known as Keriar Ananian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 2368. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki Caperoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 2370. A bill for the relief of Clyde E. Harwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2371. A bill for the relief of Ali Khosrowkhah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2372. A bill for the relief of George Edward Barnhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Doroteja Kosich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2374. A bill for the relief of Francesco Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

30. Mr. SEELY-BROWN presented a petition of resident of Norwich, Conn. in opposition to pay television, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 7, 1961)

The Lord's Prayer in unison and call of the roll of House Members by State started the 87th Congress. Then SAM RAYBURN, Texas Fourth District, was reelected Speaker for the 10th time (over CHARLIE HALLECK of Indiana, the Republican's choice). The Speaker's election, by a straight party line vote, is the most important vote cast in the 2-year session, since it establishes the organization of Congress. Besides choosing a speaker, this vote places either the Republican or Democratic Party in control of the legislative activity, the committee chairmen and the majority of members on each committee being of that party.

The 87th Congress totals 437 Members, 262 Democrats (86th Congress, 283), 174 Republicans (86th, 153), 1 Member not seated. Democrats objected to seating one Republican; Republicans objected to seating two Democrats. The Democrats were seated. It is important for citizens to understand the organization of Congress, to realize who the committee chairmen and committee members are, to know the legislative procedures of our country. Then it will be realized that elections are not popularity, personality or charm contests really, but a selection of people whose views will be embodied in the legislation that then affects the lives of everyone. It should be no surprise that a liberal chairman will program and push only the liberal legislation. A Congressman's only commitment is the oath he takes to defend and support the Constitution.

The Rules Committee "purge" controversy serves to remind all Americans of the importance of rules of procedure in government. Only through equitable rules, fairly administered, can a republic in a democracy flourish. Rules protect the minority groups most of all, rightly protecting them from being unfairly trampled by the majority. Indeed, our Government is nothing but rules of procedure. The present Rules Committee controversy has been labeled a phony or smokescreen issue because under House procedures the Rules Committee now can be bypassed by the House through the procedure known as Calendar Wednesday. (Example: Rules Committee bypassed last year in the depressed areas bill.) The real issue, and very dangerous, is the aim of liberals to gain further control of the Rules Committee so that the legislation programed before Congress can be presented when they choose under a closed rule. This rule limits House debate on the merits of a bill and prevents any amendments being offered. So the legislation presented cannot be changed (or possibly even understood owing to limited debate).

DICK NIXON's unique task was presiding over a joint session of Congress for the reading of the electoral vote. His farewell remarks were Lincolnesque in character and

deeply moved the assembled Congressmen, bringing them to a long, standing ovation.

Legislation now in the forefront is the five point Kennedy package: (1) Aid to education, Federal grants for school construction and teachers' salaries; (2) aid to depressed areas, Federal grants to communities suffering unemployment; (3) medical care for the aged as a part of the social security program; (4) more Federal public housing; (5) increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour. The 86th Congress held firm against these bills. This legislation and many other welfare schemes stand an excellent chance of passage, limited only by whatever dampening effects shortage of money may cause. We are faced with an extremely liberal administration and only slightly less liberal (if at all) congressional Democratic leadership. The misunderstanding of basic economics by the Kennedy forces is best shown now by their consideration of greatly increased Federal expenditures on public works, the old "made work" philosophy of Federal job provision, and simultaneously a tax cut to stimulate business.

The gap between income and outgo is the danger—spelled "inflation" or cheapening of our money. As less money comes in through taxes because of recession, we increase Federal spending—then further cut Government income by cutting taxes, in short, a formula for bankruptcy. An interesting sidenote here is the recognition of the fact that a tax cut will stimulate business. Since this is so, then why wait for recessions or hard times (which high taxes can help bring on) to cut taxes? Why not cut them even in good times and the increasing prosperity will increase tax revenues to Uncle Sam? The key to Federal governmental success—and the one liberals or radicals shun, is reduced Federal expenditures in welfare boondoggle or wasteful programs. Reduced spending will permit reduced debt, reduced taxes, a stable currency, a sounder Government, reinforcing individual, local, and State rights. To this program I dedicate my efforts.

This year, as always, I shall endeavor to inform my constituents—by questionnaire, weekly newsletter (sent to anyone on request), weekly radio broadcast, Sunday, KLIF, and weekly television, Sunday, WFAA–TV. Our best Government will result only from an informed electorate and responsive, responsible Congressmen.

Tribute to George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, today, January 9, 1961, a resolution (H.J. Res. 110) looking toward the establishment of a memorial to a great American, George Washington Carver, was passed by the House of Representatives. I cannot let the occasion pass without expressing my personal gratification that the House has united to do honor, spontaneously and without objection, to the memory of a man whose name stands proudly for all we most value in America.

George Washington Carver rose from poverty and obscurity, conquering the handicaps imposed by our society upon one of his race, and achieved fame, conferred tremendous material benefits upon our country by his discoveries and inventions, and earned the grateful affection of millions. His was an unselfish, a generous, a noble success. He was a man of outstanding humility and simplicity, dedicated to the ideals of pure science, to the practical values of applied science, to the demands of human needs, and to a dedicated Christian service. Our country owes to this man and to his memory a debt we can never hope to repay, and it is most fitting that we hold him up to be honored and emulated by every American citizen.

Needed: A Study of the Great Lakes Water Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Great Lakes waterway system constitutes the greatest inland chain of navigable waters in the world.

The St. Lawrence Seaway development project, now completed, represents a major effort to expand and more fully utilize the potential of the lakes system.

I am hopeful, also, that the project of deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels can also be completed by the target date of 1962, to enable the rest of the lakes area to benefit from the seaway.

Now, a next step in further development of the Great Lakes may well be efforts to control the water level, which seriously affects shipping, as well as lakeshore interests.

In 1952, the Corps of Engineers initiated a study of the Great Lakes water levels. Because of great and costly damaging effects of widely fluctuating water levels upon shipping, industrial, residential, resort, and other interests in Wisconsin and around the lakes, I believe the study should now be completed.

I would certainly hope that, when this matter comes up for consideration in the days ahead, our colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee would give sympathetic consideration to this proposal.

Recently, I contacted the Bureau of the Budget to urge approval of funds in the 1962 budget for carrying this study forward.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the Bureau of the Budget printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I am writing to respectfully urge inclusion in your 1962 fiscal budget of funds for a study of Great Lakes water levels.

As you well recall, the Corps of Engineers undertook a comprehensive study of the lakes in 1952 to determine:

1. The feasibility of a plan of regulation of the levels of the Great Lakes which would best serve the interests of all water uses, including the reduction of damages to shore properties, the use of the Great Lakes for navigation, and the use of the storage and outflow from the Great Lakes for power development; and

2. The advisability of adopting local protection flood control projects for areas along the shores of the Great Lakes and tributary streams that are subject to inundation as a result of fluctuations in the levels of the lakes where such projects are found to be feasible and economically justified.

Unfortunately, the study was interrupted and postponed.

From time to time, the water levels of the Great Lakes may fluctuate in irregular cycles in a range of approximately 5 feet. Consequently, extreme high levels result in inundation of shorelands, beach erosion, difficulties in the docking and loading of vessels and damage to dock facilities, interference with land drainage, and aggravation of floods on tributary streams to the Great Lakes. Conversely, extreme low levels reduce the cargo-carrying capacity of vessels on the lakes, require extensive harbor and dock improvements, expose unsightly flats, decrease the area of waterfowl nesting grounds, and cause excessive shoaling.

During 1951–52, extensive damage from high water levels to the Great Lakes shoreline properties was officially estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $61 million. You will recall that a study to determine the feasibility of attempting to control levels of the lakes was originally scheduled for completion in the year 1957. Unfortunately, however, this has been too long delayed because of the lack of funds. With the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Great Lakes—formerly an inland system—has now become an international waterway, carrying large volumes of shipping to and from the ports of the world. The lakes traffic is tremendously important to the economy of the Midwest and the country.

A comprehensive study of the factors involved in the fluctuation of water levels, accompanied by recommendations on what might possibly be done either to avert the fluctuations or at least to minimize the damage resulting, would, I believe, be of great value to the country.

I respectfully urge, therefore, that funds, estimated at $145,000, be included in the budget for fiscal year 1962.

With appreciation for the consideration I know you'll give this matter, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Annual Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks on the occasion of the annual Pulaski Day celebration sponsored by the Polish United Societies of Chelsea, Mass., on October 9, 1960:

ANNUAL PULASKI DAY

Greetings, Pulaski Day, 1960, gives Americans of Polish origin the opportunity to speak up for freedom and human dignity.

In so doing, they become the voice for their oppressed relatives and friends in the

homeland who are restless but silent under the Communist tyranny.

It is good that the Polish community celebrates Pulaski Day during the visit of Khrushchev to the United Nations.

For he cannot ignore the passionate faith in freedom that distinguishes Polish history and is an indivisible part of the Polish character.

Seeing the tribute that all Americans, following the proud leadership of the Polish community, pay to the memory of General Pulaski who was a key figure in winning the war for American independence, he cannot fail to realize that the same spirit animates the people of Poland today.

He knows that he cannot hold them captive forever.

And so he is trying to blackmail the West into acknowledging Communist sovereignty over all the captive nations.

I predict that he will never succeed in this.

One of the purposes of Pulaski Day is to tell the captive peoples that as they helped us we shall help them.

Not by force of arms, but by the example, and by economic aid, and by reassurances that we shall never forsake those who are related to us by the strongest of all loyalties: The universal hunger of all peoples for freedom under God.

General Pulaski taught us that freedom is a human right, and that we are morally obligated to work for its development in every country on this earth.

That is why he is remembered, honored and emulated 181 years after his death on October 11, 1779, after leading a cavalry charge in Savannah.

That is why his spirit is immortal, and will continue to lead humanity long after communism is dead and forgotten and Poland is forever free.

Dr. T. Keith Glennan's Outstanding Record in Space Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the difficult task of organizing and directing the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration by T. Keith Glennan, the first Administrator of the new U.S. Government department which is devoted to the exploration of outer space, and the magnitude and the complexities of creating scientific research and development necessary to make practical use of this vast and hitherto unknown area is little short of phenominal.

The challenge that faced Dr. Glennan when he took over the task of Administrator-Director of NASA was a staggering one, not only because of the demands that were placed upon the United States to match the scientific progress made by the Soviet Union, but to find the men with the unusual talents to build a coordinating and cooperating team of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, chemists, biologists—in fact all phases of science and physics and engineering—and to assemble the plants and facilities in the proper locations in order to get into production as soon as possible.

Dr. Glennan has done this with an abundance of patience, courage, administrative ability and scientific know-how. He has surmounted the heart-breaking obstacles of failures with success upon success. The latest summary of international satellite and space probe places the United States far and away above the U.S.S.R. The summary referred to is as follows:

The following space vehicles are in orbit:

Name and country	Launch date	Transmitting
Explorer I (U.S.)	Jan. 31, 1958	No.
Vanguard I (U.S.)	Mar. 17, 1958	Yes.
Vanguard II (U.S.)	Feb. 17, 1959	No.
Pioneer IV (U.S.)	Mar. 3, 1959	No.
Explorer VI (U.S.)	Aug. 7, 1959	No.
Vanguard III (U.S.)	Sept. 18, 1959	No.
Explorer VII (U.S.)	Oct. 13, 1959	Yes.
Pioneer V (U.S.)	Mar. 11, 1960	No.
Tiros I (U.S.)	Apr. 1, 1960	Yes.
Transit I–B (U.S.)	Apr. 13, 1960	No.
Midas II (U.S.)	May 24, 1960	Yes.
Transit II–A (U.S.)	June 22, 1960	Yes.
NRL Satellite (U.S.)	do	Yes.
Echo I (U.S.)	Aug. 12, 1960	Yes.
Courier I–B (U.S.)	Oct. 4, 1960	Yes.
Explorer VIII (U.S.)	Nov. 3, 1960	Yes.
Tiros II (U.S.)	Nov. 23, 1960	Yes.
Lunik I (U.S.S.R.)	Jan. 2, 1959	No.
Spacecraft I (U.S.S.R.)	May 15, 1960	No.

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS OF NASA

This summary shows that the United States is 15 to 1 ahead of the U.S.S.R. in earth orbit—2 to 1 ahead of the U.S.S.R. in solar orbit—and 10 to 0 ahead of the U.S.S.R. in transmitting.

During the October 1, 1959–March 31, 1960 period, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration completed and set in motion a long-range plan of space exploration spanning the 1960–70 decade.

At the same time, NASA's research, space flight, and aeronautical programs moved ahead and major organizational changes were effected to accommodate increased responsibilities in the field of launch vehicle development.

On January 14, 1960, the President notified the Congress of his intention to transfer to NASA the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., along with Saturn, the 1.5-million-pound-thrust clustered rocket engine under development by the Division. The transfer became effective 60 days after notification and the budgetary transfer was to be completed by July 1, 1960. On July 1, NASA assumed responsibility for the Division's facilities and 1,200 acres at the arsenal—which the President has renamed the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center.

To speed development of launch vehicles, and to make the most effective use of the Huntsville group, NASA created an Office of Launch Vehicle Development late in 1959 and other major divisions were realined as follows: the Office of Space Flight Programs; the Office of Advanced Research Programs; the Office of Business Administration; and the Office of Life Sciences Programs.

The Saturn rocket shares top NASA priority with Project Mercury, first phase of the manned space flight program. Project Mercury progress during the report period included delivery by the contractor of the first operational Mercury space capsule on April 1.

MAJOR PROGRAMS

SPACE FLIGHT

Sustained by vigorous research and development in space sciences and space technology, NASA's space flight program was marked by three particularly significant experiments—the Explorer VII satellite; the sun-orbiting Pioneer V deep space probe; and the Tiros I experimental meteorological satellite which has transmitted 22,952 photographs of the earth's cloud cover.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

In the realm of aeronautics, research continued across the speed range from hovering flight to the near-satellite velocities of the rocket-boosted Dyna-Soar I, under development by the Air Force. Between these speed extremes, NASA, in cooperation with the Air Force and Navy, continued to place strong emphasis upon the X–15 rocket-powered research airplane project. Final contractor tests for the first X–15 were completed and the airplane was transferred to NASA on February 9. NASA and USAF pilots have been flight-testing the airplane since that time. In addition, NASA is studying a number of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) and short takeoff and landing (STOL) aircraft. Supersonic transport concepts are also being investigated.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

In the field of international cooperation, NASA concluded agreements for establishing Project Mercury tracking stations in Australia and in Spain's Canary Islands. NASA also offered the services of its tracking stations, subject to the consent of the host countries, to the Soviet Union for any manned space flight program it may develop, and established the Office for the United Nations Conference to represent the United States in a conference on the peaceful uses of outer space.

NASA'S LONG-RANGE PLAN

NASA's overall mission, as outlined in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, is to exploit the earth's atmosphere and outer space for peaceful purposes and to provide aeronautics and space research support to the armed services at the same time. In producing a long-range plan, NASA is translating into operational terms the objectives set forth in the act calling for the preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology and in the application thereof to the conduct of peaceful activities within and outside the atmosphere.

LAUNCH VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT

Foundation stone of the long-range plan is development of a small family of versatile, highly reliable launch vehicles to power spacecraft on a wide variety of orbital and space-probing missions. Scout and Delta, which were flight tested for the first time shortly after this report period ended, are the smallest vehicles in the family.

In the medium- to high-thrust class is the Atlas-Agena B which the Depart-

ment of Defense will make available to NASA to replace the Vega which NASA canceled on December 11, 1959. A still more advanced, higher thrust vehicle is the Atlas-based Centaur with its liquid hydrogen second stage. The first Centaur launching is planned for 1961. When fully developed, it will be capable of sending some 8,500 pounds into an earth orbit.

In the high-thrust vehicle range, NASA has begun static testing—that is, running the engines with the vehicle clamped, in a vertical position, to its launch pad—the 1.5-million-pound-thrust Saturn first-stage multichambered engine.

With Saturn, NASA will lay the groundwork for manned exploration of the moon. Saturn will be capable of circumnavigating the moon and returning to earth, and of launching a 25,000-pound space laboratory into an earth orbit. During the next few years, NASA will be flight testing various Saturn stages and in 1964 the first three-stage vehicle will be launched.

Toward the end of the 1960's, NASA expects to have a launch vehicle in the Nova class which may consist of a cluster of F–1 single-chamber engines, each producing 1.5 million pounds of thrust. By clustering these engines, which are now under development, it would be possible to achieve a total thrust of 6 to 12 million pounds. Alternatively, the very large capacity of the system might be achieved through the use of nuclear energy.

Nova will probably be the first vehicle with which the United States will attempt to land men on the moon. Now in the concept stage, it should be capable of carrying 100,000 pounds to the moon and of placing a 290,000-pound space laboratory, occupied by several individuals, in an earth orbit.

Nuclear propulsion systems, which are now a subject of active research and development in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission, will be developed over this decade for important roles in the space program.

LONG-RANGE PLAN MISSIONS

The successful operation of Tiros I was the first event on NASA's list of specific missions in the long-range plan. Tiros I will be followed by other experimental weather satellites of similar type. These will be followed by the more advanced Nimbus series.

Also scheduled for 1960 was the first launching in Project Echo of a 100-foot-diameter, inflatable passive reflector communications satellite. The ultimate purpose of these orbiting spheres, made of micro-thin aluminized Mylar plastic, is to serve as global teleradio-transmission links. A series of such satellites may one day revolutionize worldwide communications and make transoceanic TV a reality.

In April, NASA achieved the first completely successful suborbital test flight of an Echo sphere and transmitted voice and radio signals via the sphere. Radio transmitters on the ground beam electromagnetic waves at the satellites which, in turn, reflect or bounce them back to another ground station.

FIRST MERCURY SUBORBITAL FLIGHT

The United States plans to send up an astronaut on the first suborbital flight in Project Mercury. A Redstone rocket will launch him in a Mercury capsule from Cape Canaveral on a 15-minute flight down the Atlantic Missile Range at speeds up to 4,000 miles per hour. He will experience about 5 minutes of weightlessness, reach an altitude of 100 miles and a distance of 180 miles, and will land in the sea off the coast of Florida.

During the next 2 to 3 years, NASA has scheduled 20-odd testing, training, and orbital flights in Project Mercury. The first manned orbital flight should take place in 1961.

MOON LANDINGS PLANNED

During the 10-year period, the United States will press forward with its lunar exploration program, which will consist of step-by-step progress through a series of experiments, each designed to extend our knowledge and capabilities. First attempts will be lunar orbiters, followed by so-called hard landings of scientific data-gathering instruments. Next will come soft landings on the moon with more fragile instruments. NASA may land mobile instrument stations on the lunar surface, powered by solar batteries.

The most rewarding phase of lunar exploration will come when men reach the moon, probably after 1970. In a broad sense, the main drive of the long-range plan consists of preparation for manned expeditions to the moon and nearby planets in the decades to follow. The United States is placing emphasis upon lunar experiments for several reasons:

First, in the words of a scientist in NASA's lunar program:

> The moon may have the answers to some of the most important questions in science. How was the solar system created? How did it develop and change? Where did life come from?
>
> The particular importance of the moon is that it is the only accessible object that can give us these answers. The reason for this is that the moon has no wind and water to erode its surface, to wear away the record of history, to destroy the cosmic dust that has fallen there for billions of years.

Second, success in the lunar program will provide this country with the experience for attempting flights to the nearer planets. In short, NASA will be able to perfect its communications, guidance, and propulsion systems over the lunar distance—about a quarter of a million miles—and thus get practice for the longer voyages to Venus and Mars.

PLANETARY MISSIONS

The planetary missions have as their scientific objectives the study of the origin and evolution of the solar system; the study of the nature of planetary surfaces and atmospheres; and the search for life.

PLAN IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Any plan projecting research and development activities as far as 10 years ahead is, of course, subject to continuing review and change.

COMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE STUDIES

On a broader, more general scale, the agency has established a committee on long-range studies to consider the international, economic, social, political, and legal implications of space research and exploration. Toward this end, NASA has negotiated several contracts with private research organizations to study these implications. The committee has also called upon a legal foundation for an analysis of all available space law literature and proposals for the control and administration of outer space activities.

The outstanding record made by Dr. T. Keith Glennan and his staff will be difficult to improve. It is regrettable that Dr. Glennan has decided to resign. His successor will have a difficult task and heavy responsibility to carry out the space program laid out by Dr. Glennan.

The American Delegation to the Geneva Conference of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) Should Refrain From Offering Further Reductions in Our Import Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I was not among those who introduced the concurrent resolution last year cosponsored by 42 Members of the House from over 20 States, and supported by many additional Members. I am, however, happy to introduce it in this Congress. I am in complete agreement that the American delegation that has gone to Geneva, Switzerland, attending the current tariff-cutting conference of GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—should offer no further reductions in our import duties at the present time.

Events since the original introduction of the concurrent resolution last year and the reintroduction this year bear witness to the wisdom of pressing for immediate passage of the resolution at this time.

For example:

First. The declining confidence abroad in our management of international fiscal policies as evidenced by the steady bleeding of our gold reserves, and mirrored by the fluctuations on the London market of the price of gold in dollars from $35 to $40 a fine ounce;

Second. The Presidential concern as reflected in his recent buy-American directives and the decision on troop maintenance abroad;

Third. The rejection by our allies of our request that they share the crushing burden of America's defense expenditures abroad on behalf of our allies.

The issue facing us today, is the renewed GATT session in Geneva. Each Member of this House should note that

while you and I have been constitutionally assigned the responsibility for regulation of America's foreign trade, we have never been given the opportunity of passing upon our membership in this multinational trade group. Now, 13 years and six tariff-cutting conferences later, we find that two score countries determine what U.S. trade policies shall or shall not be. Yes, you and I, the representatives of the people who work and produce the goods of commerce, are no longer within speaking distance of the decisions affecting that commerce. Our accountability in this vital issue has been cleverly transferred to the constellation of executive diplomats sitting in Geneva.

But now let us let the record speak its eloquent piece. What has happened since GATT assumed the duties of the Members of the House:

First. The tariff defenses of our constituents' jobs and products have been reduced beyond recognition. Even the Randall report of 1954 said, "By any test that can be devised, the United States is no longer among the high tariff countries of the world." As you know our tariffs have been slashed 80 percent. Yet GATT has not succeeded in promoting reciprocal measures among the other member trading nations which now enjoy what my colleague has called the right of eminent domain here in our domestic market.

Second. As the GATT-conceived tariff reductions began to take effect our imports increased as surely as day follows night. And as imports grew to the highest level in history job opportunities shrank and work decreased. There is no need for me to document this fact. The record is open for all to see who can spare several weeks and examine the hundreds of briefs and statements in the files of the Tariff Commission supplied last summer by trade associations, corporations, and labor unions, when hearings were held on the long list of items for further tariff reductions. Let me cite but one example: We are losing the production of about 700,000 automobiles annually to foreign competition in our domestic and foreign markets. This figure is comprised of total imports plus our loss in exports. According to the president of one of our largest machine tool companies, the production of 700,000 autos would represent a total work force—from mine to mill to factory—of approximately 350,000 workers.

And the same dampening conditions are experienced throughout all layers of production in many other industries. An unfortunate side effect to be noted is the stifling of research and development. This we can least afford. We cannot afford to fall behind in a field so important to our security. A few of the industries are: Steel, ships, sewing machines, glass, pottery, meters, lockwashers, typewriters, cameras, shoes, machinery, textiles, and hundreds of other products.

Third. Now consider the effect of these developments upon the respective industries themselves. GATT's policies, promoted and fostered by our own officials, are driving American plant and equipment out of the country with each fresh assault by the job-killing, sales-liquidating imports upon our market.

At the very moment when this Nation's economy desperately needs the transfusion of new capital investment for growth here, we find that our enterprises are shifting more and more to oversea locations, a trend which is assuming the role of a substitute for rather than a supplement to domestic investment.

Keep in mind that about 3,000 American production companies have polka-dotted the globe beyond our shores with almost 10,000 plants, worth $30 billion—book value only—employing over 3 million foreign workers—in turn generating an additional 5 to 6 million jobs—with an annual payroll of $7 billion. Our capital abroad pays an annual corporate tax tab approaching $5 billion.

This is the real price of membership in GATT. After many years as a close observer of our foolish foreign gambits there is not a shred of doubt in my mind that a significant portion of the 4 million men and women who shuffle along the lonely streets of our cities and towns hungrily searching for sustaining employment are out there right now because of the posse of Ph. D.'s who have dictated our foreign trade policies.

If there is to be any substance to the current talk of growth and development in this country let it begin at this point. Eliminate the growth-killing effects of surplus imports spilling out of thousands of mills and factories in scores of countries in the Orient and in Europe. They are displacing our goods on the shelves and in the warehouses from Bangor to San Diego. This situation requires immediate, I repeat, immediate attention and careful evaluation. The moratorium on additional tariff cuts proposed by the concurrent resolution that I, together with other Members, have reintroduced, is the least present and immediate step that should be taken by passing the resolution.

Commonsense put back into our foreign trade will put dollars and cents back into our domestic economy, into the pay envelopes of our workers, and into the expansion programs of our industries.

George Washington Carver Memorial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to establish a commission known as the George Washington Carver Commission.

It is rather befitting that I introduce this joint resolution for the establishment of the George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission on this date for today is George Washington Carver Day—a day authorized by the 79th Congress to pay tribute to this great scientist and humanitarian. This legislation, when enacted, will provide for an observance of the contributions made by this great man.

Born of slave parents and self-taught at an early age, George Washington Carver received his formal education at Iowa State College of Agriculture where he later became a member of its faculty. He received his doctorate degree from Simpson College, Iowa. He gained national attention through his work while heading the department of research at Tuskegee Institute.

Notable among his achievements in this capacity was his discovery of over a hundred products from the sweet potato, 60 articles of value from the pecan, in addition to hundreds of byproducts from the peanut.

For these achievements, Dr. Carver received many awards. To name a few:

First. He was made a fellow of the Royal Society of Great Britain.

Second. He was presented the Spingarn Medal for the most distinguished service by an American Negro in the year 1922.

Third. Congress authorized the minting of the Carver-Washington half dollar.

Fourth. The George Washington Carver postage stamp was issued in his honor.

Fifth. The George Washington Carver National Monument was established at Diamond, Mo., his birthplace, in 1953, by the National Park Service under the Department of the Interior.

In a spirit of reverence to God and deep devotion to this country, refusing personal gain, he made his achievements a gift to the people and the world.

Should We Recognize Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, wherein he urges Peiping's economic and diplomatic isolation. The Senator's remarks were reprinted from the New Leader as a public service by the Committee of One Million (Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations), 17 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.:

SHOULD WE RECOGNIZE RED CHINA?

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senator, Illinois)

The past few months have seen the rise of new efforts to convince the American people of the desirability of closer diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with Communist China. The opposition to such a policy is neither conservative nor liberal, but rests on the highest degree of bipartisanship. The Committee of One Million (Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations), with which I have been associated since its inception in 1953, represents all political philosophies. Its

members include Senators Ralph E. Flanders, Irving M. Ives, Jacob K. Javits, Mike Mansfield, Richard L. Neuberger and Margaret Chase Smith.

Those who advocate closer ties between the United States and Communist China base their arguments on two assumptions:

1. The Communists are in firm and permanent control of the mainland of China. Even though we do not like the Peiping regime, it is in power and will be there for a long time to come. There is little that we, or the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, can do to change this situation. Therefore, unless we wish to ignore 600 million people, we must deal with the Peiping regime.

2. Chinese communism is different in certain aspects from Soviet communism. Expanded trade and cultural relations between the free world and Communist China will drive a wedge between Moscow and Peiping and perhaps even make a Tito out of Mao Tse-tung. Through such trade and cultural relations ties between Red China and the free world will be strengthened with the corresponding weakening of the ties between Peiping and the Kremlin.

The Committee of One Million believes that both these assumptions are false, as were the similar premises used in the 1930's to justify Western relations with Japan, Italy, and Germany; until Pearl Harbor, all too many individuals in the United States believed that (1) the Governments of Japan, Italy, and Germany were in firm control of their peoples, and (2) trade and cultural relationships with the Axis Powers would somehow convince them that we wanted only friendship and coexistence—if sufficient concessions were made, the Axis Powers could be split.

Such trade and appeasement came to an end in the tremendous holocaust of World War II. The scrap metal which the United States shipped to Japan was turned into bombs which devastated half of Asia. Oil sold to Italy in 1936, on the theory that to restrict trade means to restrict freedom, powered the planes which strafed Ethiopia and encouraged Mussolini's quest of empire. High-level diplomatic relations and negotiations with Germany ended in the disaster at Munich. The Luftwaffe and the Wehrmacht were built as a result of trade which, at the start, was limited to nonstrategic goods. The end result of this policy was the death of millions of men, women, and children, and the destruction of entire cities and peoples.

One might think that this bitter historical lesson would be deeply ingrained in the intellects of all freemen who survived. Unfortunately, many prominent individuals and organizations still call for expanded trade and cultural relations and, ultimately, diplomatic relations with Mao Tse-tung's China. Their arguments are based on wishful thinking rather than fact.

Information reported by Peiping itself refutes the idea that the Communists are firmly entrenched on the mainland. Mao's "let a hundred flowers bloom" campaign uncovered broad opposition to Communist rule in China that had to be crushed through the current rectification and antirightist drives. We have reliable reports of anti-Communist student demonstrations; official reports of the relocation of tens of thousands of intellectuals from urban areas to farm; the visible evidence of a constant stream of refugees to Hong Kong and Macao; the report of Shih Liang, Peiping's Minister of Justice, that the people's courts had dealt with 364,604 counterrevolutionary cases in a 17-month period. These are strong indications, indeed, that all is not well in Communist China.

The second assumption—that Mao might become a Tito—seems to have been shattered by Peking's joining with the Soviet Union in the most vigorous denunciation of Tito's recent deviations. Its attitude or "revisionism" today is as clear as was its support of the brutal Soviet intervention in Hungary.

There appear to be only two alternative lines of action open to U.S. policy: either expand trade and cultural relations with Red China, which is the first step toward its admission to the U.N. and recognition by our Government; or continue and strengthen our present policy of resolute opposition to any political, diplomatic, economic or moral assistance to Red China.

Let us examine the possible results of the first of these two alternatives: We have already agreed to actions by our allies to ease their restrictions on trade with Red China. The moment our own trade restrictions are eased substantially, the prestige of the Peking regime will begin to mount in Asia. The economy of Red China, which by its own admission is facing serious difficulties, will be bolstered. In a recent speech, the Deputy Minister of Economic Planning of the Peking regime called for wide-scale economic retrenchments and admitted critical shortages of pig iron, steel and lumber; shortages in meats, totaling 20 million hogs; shortages in edible oils; shortages in cotton, totaling 20 million tons; shortages in coal which led to the destruction of railroad cars for fuel in Inner Mongolia. Expansion of trade would act as a rescue operation. The power of Communist China would be considerably enhanced.

Then, American newspapermen and businessmen will go into Red China and begin dealing with Communist Government officials. Pressures will increase for U.S. Government officials to be stationed in Red China to assist our citizens. The next step would be establishment of U.S. consular offices—which would inevitably lead to recognition of the Mao regime. Somewhere along the line will come admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The moment that our Government recognizes Peiping, the key will be turned on the prison that is mainland China. We will have told our present allies in Asia that they would have been better off as neutrals, and indirectly told the neutrals that they might as well give in to the Reds now as later.

If Communist China is admitted to the U.N., the Charter of that organization would, I am afraid, be another "scrap of paper" to be tossed into the pile of discarded international documents. Many forget that the Charter did not provide for universality of membership, but restricted it to peace-loving states. Communist China can certainly not be designated as a peace-loving state after its aggressive war in Korea, its violation of the 1953 armistice terms and its aid to subversive movements in Vietnam and Laos. True, we already have some aggressor states in the United Nations. But why should we add to their number and, in addition, give the aggressor a seat on the Security Council?

Furthermore, if we recognize Peiping, we will have helped solidify one of the most potent fifth columns in history. The 12 million oversea Chinese living in Southeast Asia will have little choice but to give their allegiance to Red China, and to try to deliver into its control the countries where they have great power: the Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, Singapore and Malaya, Thailand, and Burma. And our own citizens of Chinese descent will be subjected to blackmail and coercion, through their relatives in China, by the diplomatic representatives of the Peiping regime.

Admission of Red China—which would entitle it to China's permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council—would tie up the Security Council completely, and thereby encourage aggression by both the Soviet and Chinese Communists. For the sake of expediency, and a few dollars' profit, we will have made valueless the sacrifice of 35,000 American boys who died in Korea resisting Chinese Communist aggression.

What of the other road—that of nonrecognition and no trade?

Following this road, we will strengthen our national security by adhering to the intelligent principle of steadfast support of our allies and refusal to build up our enemies. By helping to strengthen freedom among our allies and helping to build sound economies and political systems in Asia, we will demonstrate the value of a free society as opposed to slavery under communism. Continued economic pressures from without could cause greater economic pressures from within to force Peiping to make basic concessions to the Chinese people. If there is any chance at all of dividing China from the Kremlin, it must come by forcing Peiping to turn from Moscow because the Soviet Union cannot supply China's needs, rather than by making it easy for both countries to survive.

The argument is sometimes heard that we must be "realistic" and "practical"—the implication being that to be realistic and practical we must deal with Communist China. In contrast, our Committee of One Million insists that, to be realistic and practical, we must not recognize Red China or admit it into the U.N. To do so would be to invite disaster.

The Earnings Limitation of the Social Security Act Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the first bills I introduced in this Congress was H.R. 315, to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder. This bill, if enacted, will go a long way, I believe, in correcting what is perhaps one of the most serious inequities in the Social Security Act. The present law, as amended in the last session of Congress, permits persons who are retired on social security benefits to earn only approximately $1,350 a year without losing benefits. However, if they do not work they can receive an unlimited income from dividends, interest, rents, or other means without losing any social security benefit checks.

In our country today we have more people over 65 than at any time in our history, and many thousands of the more than 12 million who are eligible for social security benefits cannot afford to retire on their small pensions. They find it necessary to continue at least part-time work. My bill will permit them to earn a little without being penalized for doing it.

The present limitations, Mr. Speaker, are a serious reflection on our free enterprise system. Very few people, except those, of course, who are disabled, care to become completely inactive when they reach the retirement age. Many of the individuals who are eligible for social security benefits have a real desire to continue working, and they can make

a real contribution to our Nation's overall economy by doing so. Why should they be penalized because they earn a little extra money which many need just to provide the necessities of life?

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will favorably consider this legislation, and that early action in the House and Senate will follow.

A National Science Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, the opening day of the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill to establish a National Science Center, including a National Science Academy, dedicated to training future scientists and engineers and strengthening scientific research. My bill was the very first one to be put into the legislative hopper and it bears the number H.R. 1.

I have had bills in the previous two Congresses advocating the establishment of a Science Academy along somewhat different lines. The new bill H.R. 1, has been completely rewritten after consultations with leading scientists, educators, and Government officials, and after hearings held in recent months by a House Science and Astronautics subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The proposal to establish a National Science Center is intended to meet future national needs for trained manpower and new scientific knowledge, and also to help win the scientific and technical phase of the cold war. As proposed in the bill, the Science Center would be comprised of:

First. An educational institution of the highest caliber to be known as the National Science Academy, intended for both undergraduate and postgraduate studies in science and engineering.

Second. Research institutes in various scientific fields for the promotion of scientific knowledge and research to advance the Nation's economy, health, welfare, and progress.

Third. A Scientific Career Service for obtaining and retaining the personnel necessary to carry out the scientific, technological, and research functions of the U.S. Government. Graduates of the Science Academy and other qualified persons able to meet its standards would be eligible for placement in the Scientific Career Service.

The educational institution would be open to young men and young women desiring to make a career in science, while the research institutes would invite outstanding scientists to work in their laboratories on scientific, medical, and other projects designed to benefit humanity. The realization of my proposal would unquestionably have a beneficial impact on scientific progress and education in this country, and it would also go far in building up the image of America as a nation devoted to the utilization of science for the benefit of all mankind and for the attainment of a peaceful world. A science center of this type, dedicated to peaceful purposes, would help raise our prestige in the eyes of all nations to new and greater heights.

Other major provisions of the bill are:

Young men and young women, between the ages of 17 and 25, will be eligible for admission to the Science Academy's undergraduate department, provided they pass qualifying examinations prescribed and supervised by the National Science Foundation. Those accepted will be known as science-trainees and will receive a 4-year training course in science, engineering, and related fields. Upon graduation, they will be required to serve at least 4 years with the Government in their specific field of training or, with the approval of the National Science Foundation, may be permitted to serve in private industry.

Graduate training will be provided for those who have completed undergraduate studies at accredited schools and possess special qualifications for graduate work in the sciences. A 6-year straight-line program leading to a doctor's degree is authorized for undergraduates. Also authorized are a program of college scholarships in science and engineering at other schools and a program of graduate fellowships both at the research institutes of the Academy and at other colleges and universities.

Research institutes in specialized fields of science are to be established, among them an Institute of Meteorology, an Institute of Oceanography, an Institute of Astronautics, an Institute of Medicine, and others deemed necessary.

A limited number of foreign nationals from friendly countries may be admitted, provided they pass a security check, but their number shall not exceed 10 percent of the total number of science trainees attending the Academy.

The proposed Science Center would be nonmilitary in nature and would emphasize the peaceful pursuits of the United States in the sciences, which can and must be separated from military scientific research. It would compete with the so-called Freedom University in Moscow by inviting foreign students to come to the United States to study and to develop into mature scientists able to help their underdeveloped countries. Here they could pursue their studies and research in freedom, observe our way of life, and become convinced of our peaceful intentions.

The Science Center would fill a gap presently existing in trained scientific personnel by providing education and training for young men and young women who, under present circumstances, could not obtain such an education. Outstanding graduate students and noted scientists from all over the country would be attracted to the Academy and its research institutes. Creation of a Science Career Service would elevate the scientist's stature in the public eye as a man interested in the promotion of human welfare and peace. At the same time, the U.S. Government would be guaranteed of a sufficient supply of scientists in this fast-moving era of world competition.

The research institutes, which we would strive to make the largest in the world, would provide the most modern facilities available for research. The best scientific brains from our own country, as well as selected scientists from abroad, would be invited to work there.

There is no need to stress the importance of the basic and engineering sciences in the world of today. My bill would go a long way toward meeting our most urgent national problems in science and engineering: the shortages of trained manpower (and womanpower) for private and public employment, of qualified science teachers, and of facilities and funds for scientific research. The bill would also help overcome our lag compared with the U.S.S.R. in the annual number of graduates both in engineering and in many forms of natural science.

In 1959, for example, the U.S.S.R. produced about three times as many graduate engineers as the United States. The figures given by our National Science Foundation show 38,000 graduating in the United States, compared with 106,000 in the U.S.S.R. More surprising still, the United States is lagging even in the total number of professional engineers: 850,000 compared with the Soviet figure of 894,000. In graduates specializing in purely scientific studies, apart from engineering, the only field in which we lead the U.S.S.R. at the present time is the physical and mathematical sciences.

The Science Academy and its research institutes would serve to stimulate the people of the underdeveloped countries in furthering their economic growth, in improving their national health, in developing their human and material resources, and in attaining a higher standard of living. In this way, we could be instrumental in creating through science a world of abundance where no people need be in want. In the years to come, this important institution would pay for itself in many ways through better education, advanced research, scientific progress, and good will.

It is our plan to hold more hearings before our subcommittee in early 1961. The hearings will be designed, first, to determine the present status of scientific and engineering education and research in the United States. Not only universities and engineering schools, but Government and industrial research facilities and training programs as well, will be included in the survey. The second purpose of the hearings will be to find out what kinds and amounts of trained scientific and engineering manpower the United States will need over the next 10 or 20 years. Earlier hearings have indicated that far more qualified manpower will be needed than existing educational institutions are likely to produce. According to the testimony, statistical studies have led to a consensus that some 10,000 more scientists and engineers per year are needed than our schools are graduating. Yet we were told that in 1955 between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates of college ability failed to enroll in college for

financial reasons, and perhaps an additional 100,000 did not enter college because of lack of interest. We must stop this wanton waste of human resources. In today's world, we can no longer afford it.

The proposed hearings will also consider whether larger grants and loans to existing educational institutions could by themselves solve our national problems in science and engineering. It would seem to me that earlier hearings have already foreshadowed the answer to this question. Obviously, we need a coordinated program that can set national standards and do the job efficiently and economically. The National Science Center could serve as a nucleus as well as a clearinghouse for the training offered by our engineering schools and universities.

I want to make it clear that I do not regard the National Science Center as excluding or even restricting the provision of additional scholarships, fellowships, and loan funds, or as competing with further direct aid to existing educational institutions. In my opinion, the urgency of the times requires us to act in all these ways and in many others. This problem has been with us for a long time, growing worse every year, until it plainly threatens our future prosperity and safety. It is high time to take effective action.

The Post Office: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at Snow Shoe, Pa., on September 24, 1960, it was my pleasure to participate in the dedication ceremonies of the community's new post office building and to deliver the following address:

THE POST OFFICE: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the dedication of the Snow Shoe, Pa., Post Office, Saturday, Sept. 24, 1960)

It is a pleasure to be here today and share with you this memorable and happy occasion. I am honored to be able to participate in this ceremony and help dedicate this building which will stand as a symbol of the progress and growth of this community.

This modern post office providing 1,200 square feet of interior space with new modern lighting and equipment as well as an outside loading platform and parking facilities is part of the program of the Post Office Department to modernize 12,000 of its some 36,000 post offices.

It is pleasing to me to realize that my support in Congress of legislation to authorize improved postal services has resulted in the construction in my congressional district of this fine post office at Snow Shoe and similar ones at Duncansville, Pleasant Gap, Claysburg, and several others in the blueprint stage.

In congratulating the residents of Snow Shoe on their good fortune in obtaining modern postal facilities I wish to commend Postmaster Sullivan and the loyal employees of the local post office as well as the members of the Snow Shoe Lions Club for the public spirit they have manifested in the desire to give this community the benefits of a modern post office.

During the fiscal year 1960 Congress appropriated sufficient funds to permit the modernization of 1,400 post offices.

This occasion gives us an opportunity to reflect on what the postal service means to us.

There are few institutions which touch each of our lives as universally as the post office.

Churches and schools come to mind when you think about important institutions in our modern society but we do not all go to the same church and our direct contact with school is lost when we graduate.

The post office serves all of us daily—delivering our messages and packages. Social and business organizations are equally dependent on the post office. In fact it can be said that the economy of our country would come close to collapse without the unique and dependable services of the postal service.

The post office is a vital link in our country's communication system. The progress of our modern society and that of former civilizations can be traced by developments in the field of communications.

The postal service was one of the first steps in the development of mass communication technique that now includes the telephone—the telegraph and radio—and television. These advancements have made it possible for men to convey their thoughts to others without being limited to face-to-face communications.

The post office historically has carried the major share of the burden of transmitting ideas and information. It continues to perform this role today.

The volume of mail in the United States increased by some 17.7 billion pieces in the last ten years alone.

Since this year marks the 100th anniversary of the pony express we are vividly reminded of the long and at times dramatic past of the modern post office.

A brief glance backward reveals that the postal service has had a vital role in our national development.

The first post office on American soil was established in the home of Richard Fairbanks in Boston in 1639 by a decree of the great and general court of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay.

Putting the delivery of mail under Government protection represented a great improvement in the available means of communication in the American Colonies.

Colonists who had been dependent on travellers, ship's captains, and innkeepers to carry and deliver their letters were enthusiastic about the creation of a postal service.

Mail delivery between the colonies was initiated by the 1672 decree of the Governor of New York establishing a mail route between Boston and New York. The road built to traverse the miles of wilderness between these two centers of colonial life has become known as the Boston Post Road. This road was the first of a number of post roads that were blazed through the wilderness from Maine to Georgia to allow the post riders to carry the mail from one settlement to another.

These post roads soon became the accustomed routes of travel for everyone and formed the nucleus of the first colonial highway system.

Postal service was operated as a business enterprise for profit under the British colonial administration.

The need for a postal service that was operated as a public service rather than a moneymaking scheme was recognized by the First Continental Congress which created the first American public postal system in 1775.

This postal service was an invaluable aid to the revolutionary cause since it furnished the best means of communicating news, information, and official Government intelligence.

The public service character of the post office was further insured by the Constitution which gave Congress the power to create a Federal postal service.

The Post Office Department was administered by the Treasury Department until 1829 when it became a separate Federal department.

The services rendered by the post office have been continually improved down through the years as America has grown and prospered.

In 1790, this young Nation encompassed an area of 867,980 square miles and had a population of almost 4 million.

There were only 75 post offices in those Thirteen Original States of the Union and less than 2,000 miles of post roads. There are now more than 36,000 post offices to serve over 180 million people in an area covering more than 3½ million square miles.

Postal service has come a long way since the days of post riders and stagecoaches.

The advent of the railroads brought the first major advancement in the transportation of the mail. By 1838 all railroads were made post roads.

The mail was being carried on some 10,000 miles of track by the end of the 1840's—the first railway post office cars came into existence in the early 1860's.

The introduction of railroad travel reduced the time required to transit mail by over 60 percent. The trip from Washington, D.C., to Philadelphia, which took 20 hours by stagecoach, was reduced to 6 hours by train.

The westward trek of the settlers and gold prospectors in this period gave rise to one of the most famous episodes in the history of the post office—the pony express.

The pony express mail service filled in the missing link between the most westward extension of the railroads and the west coast.

Pony express riders carried the mail between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif., a distance of some 2,000 miles through wilderness and hostile Indian territory. The trip was frequently made in only 8 to 10 days by using some 80 relay riders, 400 to 500 horses, and 119 relay stations along the route.

The pony express mail service has captured the imagination of succeeding generations of Americans up to the present and will always be remembered as part of our pioneer history. It personifies for us the spirit of postal progress which has continued to characterize the Post Office.

The Post Office has been quick to adopt new technological advancement in order to improve its service.

The development of motor transport brought a number of significant improvements in postal service. The automobile was responsible for promoting the growth of rural free delivery which represented a major extension of postal service.

Rural free delivery proved itself an invaluable service to our Nation's farm families. This service has enabled farmers all over the United States to get newspapers and magazines as well as letters without having to go into town to pick them up.

Rural free delivery provides a vital communication link between countless farm families and the rest of the world by bringing the mail daily in all types of weather. The American farmer is indebted to that loyal group of rural mail carriers whose slogan is "Service with a smile."

The development of the automobile also brought a number of improvements to communities with city delivery services. The use of trucks has made it possible to deliver parcel post packages as well as letters in the city.

The early post rider was able to carry only letters when he was dependent on the horse for transportation.

Domestic parcel post service was not introduced until 1913. Since then, the parcel post truck on city streets has become such a familiar sight that we are apt to take this service for granted.

The development of airmail in the 20th century has further reduced the time element in mail service.

The first airmail flight was made in 1918 between New York and Washington. The Post Office operated its own planes in the beginning, but began contracting this service with private air carriers in 1926. The Post Office is credited with furthering night flying by insisting the mail be sent with the least possible delay. The use of airmail has increased tremendously until now some 97 million ton-miles of airmail are being transported annually by domestic airlines.

Some 17 million ton-miles of first-class mail also is being transported by air in order to expedite delivery in urban areas where surface transportation facilities are inadequate.

The diminishing number of passenger trains combined with the growing volume of mail, increasing population, and the growth of new communities make it likely that air transportation in some form will be used more and more in the future.

We are just entering a new phase in the field of transportation and communications—the missile and space age. The first official mail delivery by guided missile was made by a Regulus missile on June 8, 1959. This missile carried its historic load of 3,000 letters 100 miles from a submarine to the coast of Florida. This event inaugurated an entirely new concept in postal service.

The Post Office has been altered in terms of the types and number of services it provides as well as by its mode and speed of transporting the mail since the colonial days.

Under the capable administration of Arthur E. Summerfield, the Post Office Department is continuing to improve its services.

In recent years the postal service has been engaged in a program of modernizing its mail handling facilities. Another phase of this same program of improving our postal facilities is the commercial leasing program inaugurated in 1953.

President Eisenhower began a $2 billion post office program in 1953 to provide the country with 12,000 new post offices and modernize some federally owned ones. This program represents an attempt on the part of the administration to encourage the construction of new post offices. These buildings are built according to postal service specifications but financed by local interests and then leased by the Government.

With its share of the program—a half billion dollars—the Federal Government equips these new post offices and modernizes the federally owned buildings which can be made suitable to modern needs. Part of the half billion is being used to install the new mail handling facilities. This modernization program of President Eisenhower and Postmaster General Summerfield has been quite successful.

More than 2,000 new post office buildings were erected in the first 4½ years of the program. The postal facilities of others have been significantly improved.

The communities acquiring these new post offices have gained not only a more attractive and efficient place in which to transact their postal business, but also have been given a valuable economic asset which furnishes them with a stable productive income. We can be proud that this new post office here in Snow Shoe is part of that great program. It will remind us of the ways our postal service is keeping pace with the Nation's growth and progress.

I would like to close with one last reminder of the high ideals and the unmatched spirit of the American postal service which has served us so faithfully since the colonial days by quoting the words of Charles W. Eliot and Woodrow Wilson which have been inscribed on the facade of the Central Office in Washington, D.C.

"Messenger of sympathy and love, servant of parted friends, consoler of the lonely, bond of the scattered family, enlarger of the common life, carrier of news and knowledge, instrument of trade and industry, promoter of mutual acquaintance of peace and good will among men and nations."

Federal Commission on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today more than 3,800 delegates and specialists in the field of aging from every part of the United States and abroad, are meeting here in Washington in the first White House Conference on Aging.

During the State meetings preceding this Conference, over 6,000 recommendations were made for improving, expanding, and initiating action to meet the urgent needs of our Nation's deserving and neglected senior citizens.

You will recall that after years of insistent prodding, criticizing, and persuading the responsible departments and agencies to develop more realistic and dynamic programs for the elderly, the Congress became impatient and enacted my bill calling for this White House Conference on the subject.

Since the passage of the bill in August of 1958, I have followed the planning, appropriations, and progress reports with deep personal interest and concern.

The actual cost of the Conference to date has not been compiled. However, I would estimate that at least $2 million has been spent. Every American citizen has a right to expect a reasonable return on this investment and I believe it is the duty of this Congress to protect the taxpayers' interest and at the same time promote the Nation's welfare, by taking action now to insure positive results of the Conference.

During budget hearings before my committee, from the testimony presented before the House subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor considering bills on a Bureau of Aging, and from a review of State reports of their conferences on aging, I have become convinced that once again, Congress must initiate the action that will safeguard the rights of elderly citizens and advance a program that will be in the Nation's best interest.

I have studied the various proposals for a Bureau of Aging, a Division of Aging, a U.S. Office of the Aging, and other variations of organizations to give leadership and responsibility for Federal programs in aging. All of these have at least one great weakness—they would be located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Granted that this Department may have a major program responsibility for activities affecting the aging—it does not include them all. Employment, housing, veterans hospitals and facilities, railroad retirement, civil service, small business, and other areas important to the elderly are handled by other departments or agencies. It is my firm conviction from a critical analysis of the work of the special staff on aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the interdepartmental committee on aging, and the Federal Council on Aging that independence and balanced programing is not possible, whenever or wherever an activity is located within the framework of an existing operation. It automatically takes on the slant or direction of its program or policy and alienates the feeling of responsibility of the other members.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to establish a Federal Commission on Aging. It will be bipartisan and directly responsible to the Congress and to the President. It will have the cooperation of all departments and agencies without the influence or pressure of any one of them.

Sufficient funds will be appropriated to provide for adequate staff, grants to the States for special projects, planning and research, and to establish and maintain a national program focused on problems that concern not only the elderly but are vital to the economic stability and manpower resources of the entire country.

We must not lose the gains or the momentum that has been created by the White House Conference on Aging. A Federal Commission on Aging as proposed in my bill will insure a balanced national program that will not only implement the recommendations of the Conference but give continued, independent leadership and justify the confidence the American people of all ages have placed in their representatives to enact legislation in their and the Nation's best interests.

I earnestly hope the Federal Commission on Aging bill will be recognized for immediate consideration and that you will give it your full cooperation and support.

The Recognition of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a powerful and convincing address delivered on October 13, 1960, by His Excellency, Richard Cardinal Cushing,

archbishop of Boston, at a dinner at Roberts Center, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., by the Boston chapter, Sino-American Amity, to raise funds to be used toward the establishment of the Catholic University of China in Formosa.

In his address Cardinal Cushing discussed the argument for and against the recognition of Red China clearly showing that under world conditions and the aggressive policies of Red China, it would not be in the national interest of our country to extend such recognition.

In view of what is happening in Laos at the present time, as well as other events which have happened recently, any reasonable-minded person, who heretofore, felt that Red China should be recognized by our country or admitted into the United Nations, has plenty of evidence to show their thinking was in error.

In my extension I also include remarks I made on the occasion of the dinner held on October 13, 1960.

The articles follow:

THE RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

(Address by Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, Roberts Center, Boston College, Oct. 13, 1960)

The controversy over the recognition of Red China has lasted for 10 years and attained greatest publicity and, indeed, success at recent meetings of the United Nations. The question is, Should other nations and especially the United States diplomatically recognize the present regime on the mainland of China? If we do, Red China would be in a good position to occupy the Chinese seat in the United Nations and to adjust her international relations with the free nations. If that ever happens, we might be forced to withdraw entirely from the U.N. But despite the fact that the margin of victory for the American position was smaller this year in the U.N. than it had ever been before, I do not believe that we are fighting for a lost cause.

The arguments relating to recognition have changed somewhat with the passing of time. But, the main principles, like all fundamental principles never change.

The advocates of closer diplomatic ties between the United States and Communist China and the replacement of free China in the United Nations by Red China base their arguments on various assumptions:

If we are realistic we must recognize Communist China. The Communists are in power on the mainland of China. There is little that we, or the free Chinese on Formosa can do, to change the situation. We must be realistic. We cannot ignore 600 million people on the mainland of China. We must accept the Communist regime that governs them. To this assumption we reply:

To recognize Communist China would betray American principle and practice. Communist China in no way represents the will or aspirations of the Chinese people. It came to power by force and deceit and continues to hold power by force. Today, after 10 years, less than 2 percent of the people belong to the Chinese Communist Party. It has maintained control by constant purges and the liquidation of at least 18 million Chinese. It has subjugated 600 million people, but it has not won their hearts.

Even though the policy of our Government in recognizing others necessarily permits some elasticity, yet its fundamental principle has been that of Jefferson, who in 1792 said, "It is in accord with our principles to acknowledge any government to be rightful which is formed by the will of the nation, substantially declared." Insistence on the substantial nature of the declaration of popular approval has remained the guiding principle of the policy and practice of the United States to the present time. Effective control of a country depends on popular consent of the governed rather than on an external form of government.

The second argument in favor of recognition is rooted in trade and its possibilities. It is stated that, if we recognize Communist China, we shall expand our trade. Red China is a great potential market for western production. Since other free nations, notably Britain, are trading with Red China, the American embargo, with its ban on United States-Red China trade, has become academic and impractical. Recognition of the regime would provide the means for furthering the interests of American firms in the Far East.

The very opposite is the truth. Recognition of Red China would result in trade beneficial to the Red government, not to the free world generally or the United States in particular. Great Britain, one of the first non-Communist countries to recognize the Red regime, found the answer the hard way. After the Communist occupation of the mainland, British investments amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars were promptly confiscated by the Red government.

For our country, which once did a $1 billion business in China, the prospects of trade are virtually nil. If we have any doubt about this, we should recall the story told by a representative of an American business firm in China. He was permitted to leave the Chinese mainland in the summer of 1956, after his company had suffered losses totaling nearly $5 million. "Our companies," he said, "were wrung dry like dishrags until we had lost everything. To all intents and purposes, this was the swan song of American business in China."

Red China is definitely committed to trading with other members of the Communist bloc and they only trade with the Western nations when it suits their political purpose and when it is made on their terms. It is a matter of record that of Red China's exportable surplus, estimated at $4 billion, 80 percent or $3,200 million, is earmarked for Russia and its satellites. In return, Red China is required to spend what it gets from its exports to buy goods from Russia and other Communist States.

We also know from experience that China will never purchase from the free world anything other than strategic materials for purpose of war and that to ease our restrictions on trade with Red China would give prestige to the regime and bolster its economy. It would undoubtedly improve Communist China's business relations with the smaller nations in Asia. Her cut-price dumping policy in exporting rice and tin has already disturbed the predominant rice economy of Thailand and Burma, and the predominant tin industry of Malaya.

Furthermore, it has been revealed again and again that Red China is engaged in narcotics smuggling on a gigantic scale. Drugs are a state monopoly, a foreign exchange earner, and a political and economic weapon for furtherance of Communist expansion. In 1955, it was estimated that the narcotics sold in America were valued at $350 million. Trade with Red China would expose ourselves to more extensive traffic in drugs.

The third argument for the recognition of Red China pertains to the peace of the future. It is said if we recognize Communist China we shall relieve international tensions, the roots of war. Crises and tensions exist everywhere in Asia. They are the results of our failure to recognize Communist China. By breaking diplomatic relations and forbidding ourselves to communicate with the Reds, we deprive ourselves of the means whereby we might pursue peace without risk of war.

This argument is not very strong.

The systematic exploitation of world tensions is the very essence of Communist technique. Red China is deliberately seeking to increase tensions of every kind; intellectual, political, economic, social, diplomatic, and military, to a point beyond endurance by the free world. When relief is sought by concessions, new tensions are created. Communism, both in Russia and in China, operates under this strategy. Conflict must never cease. Neither Soviet Russia nor Red China can accept a true peace. They will stop creating tensions only when their policy of world conquest has been completely carried out or when they are themselves placed under counter pressures, political, economic and psychological, so great that they must make long overdue concessions to justice and a humanly acceptable world order.

Mao Tse-tung declared that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". Recently this axiom was reaffirmed by the Peiping Defense Minister when he said: "Our policy is a policy of fight fight, stop stop—half fight, half stop. This is no trick but a normal thing." This expresses the very basis of the entire philosophy of communism.

At times we must negotiate but we can do so without recognizing such a government. We negotiated the Korean armistice with Chinese Communists. We took part with them in the Geneva Conference of 1954 which ended the hostilities in Indo-China. Since August 1955, we have conducted negotiations at the ambassadorial level with them, first at Geneva and later at Warsaw. We sought thereby to bring about the liberation of Americans unlawfully detained in Communist China, and to establish a condition of tranquility in the Formosa area.

If Red China is sincere in carrying on negotiations with us, she could freely do so through existing channels. Experience indicates that the regime seeks recognition in order to gain more strength and prestige to advance international tensions rather than to relieve them. Even though China has been plagued by widespread flood and drought, the Red government refused assistance offered by the International Red Cross which sought to relieve the miseries of the Chinese people. This is a proof that the Communists do not even wish to remove the internal tension of their own society. How then can we expect them to lessen tensions toward other peoples?

Red China, by Peiping's own admission (for whatever it's worth) is having the worst drought in the 11 years the Communists have ruled.

As a result, the overworked peasants of the communes face the prospect of going on rations only a scant margin above subsistence level.

But note this: Less than a month ago Communist China signed an agreement for a 25 million loan to the leftward-leaning African State of Guinea, "free of interest and with no conditions attached." The stated idea of this outlay is to "strengthen the friendship and solidarity of the peoples of China and Guinea."

Meanwhile, Peiping boasts of quadrupled food exports over the past 7 years. This, together with such propaganda loans as to Guinea, means a ruthlessly enforced famine to enhance the glories of communism and plant the Red flag in still another country.

The fourth argument for the recognition of the totalitarian rulers of China is a sort of corollary from the third. It states that: To recognize Communist China does not signify our approval. Recognition implies neither approval nor disapproval. It is only a practical arrangement suitable for maintaining contact with the regime. We recognized Soviet Russia in 1933. Why should we not do the same with Communist China, as a tyranny no different from that of Communist Russia.

The truth is that to receive recognition from the strongest and most influential country in the world after recognition was first denied would be a triumph for Red China almost as a great military victory. Recognition in this case would imply something more than approval. It would imply capitulation, surrender. It is the most dangerous thing that we could possibly do. Who among those clamoring for recognition of Red China would ever support recognition of Hitler's Germany now that its barbarous conduct has been revealed? How much good did recognition of that regime ever accomplish?

It is true that we recognized Soviet Russia in 1933. Among the conditions were that Russia would not interfere in U.S. affairs. The Soviet Union has not kept that condition or any other important international commitment. We have a long and well-documented history of Communist duplicity. Such cynical betrayal of truth has never been equalled in the history of mankind. Had there been clear warning about Soviet Russia's insincerity, it is doubtful if recognition would have been accorded in the first place. In the case of Communist China, we have been unmistakably forewarned.

As the late John Foster Dulles has said, "Internationally the Chinese Communist regime does not conform to the practices of civilized nations; does not live up to its international obligations; has not been peaceful in the past, and gives no evidence of being peaceful in the future. Its foreign policies are hostile to us and our Asian allies. Under these circumstances, it would be folly for us to establish relations with the Chinese Communists which would enhance their ability to hurt us and our friends."

Finally, it is contended that if we recognize Communist China we shall drive a wedge between China and Russia. Let us admit for the sake of argument that there is some discord between Peiping and Moscow. Yet the area of discord is accepted by both Governments and subordinated to one common mission of the Soviet-Peiping coalition, the domination of the entire world. Their unity is further consolidated by the fact that both face a common obstacle, the United States. Economically, politically, and militarily, Peiping depends upon Moscow. From the foundation of the Chinese Communist Party, no one demonstrated any lack of fidelity to communism either in the teaching or in the practice of the present rulers on the mainland of China.

Because of their fidelity to the realization of a universal empire it should be presumed that Russia and Red China will act as a team for the indefinite future. They would be immensely strengthened in prestige and effectiveness if recognition were accorded by the United States. Otherwise, why all the support from the leader of the Kremlin and his entourage at the United Nations?

Let us also remember that recognition of Red China could mean the liquidation of free China and the acceptance of Red China into the United Nations.

The anti-Communist Government of the Republic of China on Formosa is a symbol of Chinese opposition to communism. It is the only rallying point in the world for non-Communist Chinese, the only focus of loyalty for millions of Chinese on the mainland and throughout southeast Asia. If the Republic of China on Formosa was ever liquidated, it would extinguish a beacon of hope for millions on the mainland. The 10 million people on that island would be delivered to the slavery of the Communists and the 12 million oversea Chinese would become subject to further pressure as instruments of infiltration and subversion in the countries where they reside. As for admission of Communist China to the United Nations, Red China is certainly not qualified for membership under the terms of the charter of that organization.

We know that our position is just. We also know that our anti-Communist effort must stand fast and firm. Our policy of nonrecognition of communistic China is absolutely sound. This policy along with our continued political, economic, cultural and military support of the free democratic forces throughout Asia represents one of the glories of our country in this 20th century. Whatever our failure in the details of application, our policies are fixed on principles that we cannot change without terrible damage to free China, to the free world and to our own country.

Your presence here tonight is proof that you agree with all this—for you are giving your support to the foundation of a university on Formosa that one day will send forth future Chinese leaders trained under the age-old principles founded on the laws of God and the dignity and the freedom of man.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Gathered here tonight are men and women of all religious beliefs to show by our presence our deep respect, friendship, and affection for two great churchmen of the Catholic Church. His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, and the Most Reverend Paul YuPin, archbishop of Nanking, China. They are not only two great churchmen, but they are two of the outstanding citizens and figures of the world—the world of God and His law, the world of liberty, the world comprised of free nations under governments of law and not of men, the world of love and not of hate, love of God and neighbor, not hatred of God and neighbor.

For both of these great churchmen and world figures are deeply respected by persons of all creeds, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

Archbishop YuPin has received from His Holiness, Pope John, a most important assignment—one far reaching in nature, and which will benefit mankind everywhere and particularly in the part of the world of major importance in combating and defeating the sinister aims of atheistic or international communism. This duty and responsibility is to establish and build in Formosa a Catholic university, to which will go young men and women of all creeds to receive a higher education, which they will carry with them in their journey through life.

This assignment is a hard and difficult one calling for a large sum of money to construct the buildings, establish the faculty, the staff and professors, so necessary in order to instill in the students moral values and human values, to educate them to be leaders in their countries, particularly in the Far East, leaders in all walks of life and dedicated to freedom and a government of law and not a government of men.

And our beloved Cardinal Cushing is sponsoring this banquet, the proceeds of which will be used toward the establishment of this university. And further, Cardinal Cushing has committed himself to the raising of a large sum of money toward the establishment of this university, which in years to come will become one of worldwide importance. One thing we may be certain of is that no student attending this university will ever be a Communist.

His Holiness, Pope John, exercised excellent judgment in selecting Archbishop YuPin for this important task and in designating him to be the first rector of the university.

For in the troubled world of today there are no two men who understand better the sinister destructive intent and purposes of atheistic communism than do Cardinal Cushing and Archbishop YuPin.

Among the first 10 on the list of the Red Chinese to be persecuted or killed if captured, is Archbishop YuPin. The Red Chinese would go to any extent to capture or kidnap the archbishop, for they know Archbishop YuPin, to countless millions of Chinese everywhere, both within and outside Red China, is a symbol of their hopes and aspirations, the early return of their liberty and their culture.

And I think I know something about the world killer minds of those in the Kremlin.

For 26 years ago I was chairman of a congressional committee that investigated communism, nazism, fascism, and bigotry. And 26 years ago, I and the members of my committee, found and reported to the Congress that communism was an international conspiracy with the intent to conquer and dominate the world.

The Smith Act was introduced by me. The Foreign Agent Registration Act is the McCormack Act.

Most persons laughed and scoffed at me 25 years ago, but Cardinal Cushing and Archbishop YuPin, as young priests, saw that communism was international in intent and purpose, and like myself they saw its potential danger to the world.

And Archbishop YuPin will be in the frontlines of this battle between the forces of good and the forces of evil.

And anything we can do to help him quickly establish the university at Formosa will be a maximum contribution on our part in affirmatively combating and ultimately defeating communism on a world level.

In a world of today, it is vitally necessary that America be powerfully strong in all respects, morally and militarily.

From a material angle the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves. And if we are going to err in judgment, it is far better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

In the world of today America cannot afford to be second best in any important field.

We hear Khrushchev boast that communism will "bury us." We hear of his other boasts and constant threats. We see him strutting around at the United Nations. We witness him using the United Nations for propaganda purposes and to intimidate other nations.

Only last Tuesday in another threat he said his country "can produce rockets like sausages."

The world is caught between two countries, our own country and the Soviet Union. All peoples in all countries want to be free, and countless of millions behind the Iron Curtain and in Red China look to America with hope and prayers. For they recognize that America is the leader of all nations and in the minds of all persons who want the God-given right of freedom under law.

America has a rendezvous with destiny. Will we rise to meet the test of leadership that lies upon our shoulders?

This means the willingness to make sacrifices on our part. As the days of martyrdom are here again, and this applies to all religions, it means that we must have the spirit of the Crusaders and in helping Archbishop YuPin carry out his mission of a Catholic university in Formosa you are making a contribution in an affirmative, not a negative way in holding back and ultimately rolling back the world killer hordes of international or atheistic communism.

If any of you can give additional contributions to this cause, you are not only helping build and put into operation this new university, but you are aiding in an effective way in winning the cold war.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1961

(Legislative day of Monday, January 9, 1961)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, trusting only in Thy mercy, bringing nothing in our hands—our selfish hands which we confess too often yield to the temptation to grasp at fleeting baubles—we wait in contrition for Thy benediction, at this shrine of Thy forgiving grace.

We would face whatever the day may bring in the confidence of Thy guidance, in the gladness of Thy service, and in the solemn realization that there are no frontiers in the realm of neighborliness.

May the great causes that will mold the future of human destiny on this planet into the pattern of Thy desire and design, that will heal the hurts of this sorely wounded world, that will create good will and usher in a just and abiding peace, challenge the best that is in us and gain the supreme allegiance of our love and labor as we serve our brief day in these fields of time.

We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, January 9, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the eighth semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF MINERAL RESERVES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Fourth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

EIGHTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS OF POPULATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 22(a) of the act of June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 2a), I transmit herewith a statement prepared by the Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, showing (1) the whole number of persons in each State, as ascertained by the Eighteenth Decennial Census of the population, and (2) the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the existing number of Representatives by the method of equal proportions.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 2022), the third annual report covering U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the year 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

REPORT ON AID IN DISASTERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, pursuant to section 8 of that law.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

(NOTE.—The report was transmitted to the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTIONS WITH ISRAEL AND THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate two messages from the President of the United

States transmitting a convention with the United Arab Republic and a convention with Israel, relating to the avoidance of double taxation of income.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) establishing a George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) establishing a George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the majority leader. The other day, when we were discussing limitations on the length of statements to be made during the morning hour, it was agreed that the 3-minute rule should apply to individual Senators, and that no matter how much subject matter a Senator might have to submit in the morning hour, the 3-minute rule should be imposed. Second, I believe my distinguished friend, the majority leader, indicated that if there were at the desk a list for the purpose of the recognition of Senators, the list would be ignored, and would have no official status, and that it was up to the Chair to recognize whatever Senator first sought recognition.

I noted yesterday that there was a list at the desk. I wonder whether we can have a firm understanding that there be no list at the desk, that we operate under the Senate rule, and that a Senator should rise in his place and should address the Chair and should obtain recognition if he can, and that Senators shall be recognized by the Chair in the order in which they seek recognition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in accord with what the distinguished majority leader has just now stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that under the Senate rule, precedence has always been given to whatever Senator is first recognized, over the list.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the fact of the matter is that there was always a little something persuasive about a list at the desk; and the incumbent of the chair naturally feels under some obligation, I am sure, to recognize the Senators whose names are on the list. If we can now have some definite understanding that there will be no list, we can follow the proper procedure under the rule.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the majority leader and the minority leader on their New Year's resolution, which I assume will be added to a long list of previous New Year's resolutions. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, we try; and I think we are under obligation to try to operate under the Senate rules, and for the convenience of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the written rule of the Senate, which has obtained in this body and is supposed to have guided our deliberations for many years—and I do not think this particular rule has fallen under attack by the Vice President—is very clear in regard to the recognition of Senators. I do not have the rule before me, but I shall state its essence; it states that Senators who seek recognition shall rise in their places and shall address the Chair, and that the Chair shall recognize the Senator who first addresses the Chair. That is the written rule. If a Senator who happens to be presiding at a particular time wishes to keep a list of Senators who hope to be recognized by the Chair, and perhaps also for purposes of convenience in connection with quorum calls and matters of that sort, I do not know of any limitation to be placed on the Chair in that connection. But the rule clearly prescribes that Senators who seek recognition shall address the Chair, and that the Chair shall recognize the Senator who first addresses the Chair.

As to the other matter, I am entirely in favor of the 3-minute limitation. But I am not too sure that we should completely exclude a Senator from rising twice during the morning hour if the hour of 2 p.m. has not yet been reached. It seems to me that a Senator should be limited to 3 minutes when he is recognized during the morning hour, and then should have to take his seat. But after other Senators have had their opportunities during the morning hour, a Senator who previously has been recognized should be permitted to rise again and again obtain recognition, if the hour of 2 o'clock has not been reached, in order to introduce a bill or submit any other matter he may wish to submit in the morning hour. I would not like to have the rule construed as meaning that a Senator could not rise twice during the morning hour, although I state frankly that the 3-minute limitation on time is highly desirable. However, I do not think a Senator should be completely prevented from rising twice during the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield to me, let me say that I am completely in accord with his remarks, and I hope what he advocates will be followed from now on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the stretchout that is objectionable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, with the result that at times a Senator proceeds continuously for almost 30 minutes, during the morning hour, while he handles a vast amount of material, to the exclusion of any opportunity for other Senators who wish to speak during the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, that is the objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I do not think a Senator should be precluded from rising twice during the morning hour, under the circumstances I have stated.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE DOCK ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co., Baltimore, Md., for calendar year ended December 31, 1960, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTION BY THE TOMPKINS COUNTY (N.Y.) MEDICAL SOCIETY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in the RECORD a copy of a resolution which I have received from the Tompkins County, N.Y., Medical Society, which was unanimously passed on December 19, 1960. It relates to legislation affecting the sale and distribution of drugs and related products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION BY THE TOMPKINS COUNTY (N.Y.) MEDICAL SOCIETY

1. Whereas a Special National Academy of Sciences Committee advisory to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, composed of Dr. C. Phillip Miller, chairman, professor of medicine, University of Chicago; Dr. John H. Dingle, professor of preventive medicine, Western Reserve University; Dr. Maxwell Finland, associate professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School; Dr. Colin M. MacLeod, professor of medicine, New York University; Dr. Karl F. Meyer, director emeritus, George Williams Hooper Foundation, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco; Dr. John R. Paul, professor of preventive medicine, Yale University; Dr. Carl F. Schmidt, professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Wesley W. Spink, professor of Medicine, University of Minnesota, has reviewed the policies and procedures of the Food and Drug Administration concerning the acceptance and certification of new drugs; and

2. Whereas this committee has recommended (A) that the Food and Drug Administration should be given statutory authority to require proof of the efficacy, as well as the safety, of all new drugs; (B) that the Food

and Drug Administration be authorized to carry on continuous inspection of drug factories to guarantee compliance with quality standards before marketing, and (C) that several other procedures be instituted with the purpose of safeguarding the public health with regard to drug therapy; and

3. Whereas the Tompkins County Medical Society believes that these recommendations are sound and urgent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tompkins County Medical Society endorse these recommendations and urge the New York State Medical Society to recommend that the Congress of the United States adopt legislation to enact them into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING and Congressman JOHN TABER.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 288. A bill for the relief of the estate of Walter Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 289. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 290. A bill to authorize construction of the Ansonia-Derby local protection project, Naugatuck River, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 291. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divesting of certain interests in estates and trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 293. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Aiko Shinzato; and

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Maria Constantelis (Ampeliciotou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Hanna Ghosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Braha Sundaram; and

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Pendell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 299. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., in honor of George Washington; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 300. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 301. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary L. McNamara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 302. A bill to amend the Act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Ta-tuan Ch'en (T. T. Ch'en); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Anna Lekos; and

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Alexander Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 306. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 307. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Regidor Nava Aguirre (also known as Felipe Capulong);

S. 310. A bill for the relief of Annie Tymochek Porayko;

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Chao-Ling Wang;

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Pietro Corio Costa;

S. 313. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife, Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic;

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Rachel Ann Proctor;

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ting-Wa Wong;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Min-sun Chen;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Marija Gruskovnjak; and

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Kie-Young Shim (also known as Pete Shim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 319. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4(1) thereof, relating to long- and short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies; and

S. 320. A bill to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Paul Burkhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 322. A bill to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 323. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 324. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to the people of other nations in case of disaster; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 325. A bill to establish a Federal Regional Water Pollution Control Research Laboratory in the Pacific Northwest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 326. A bill relating to the compensation of employees in the offices of Senators; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 327. A bill for the relief of T. R. Mackie;

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Toezser;

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Peter Zanelotti;

S. 330. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis; and

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Roszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 333. A bill for the relief of Godofredo M. Herzog; and

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Carmine Vincenzo Mocciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cassim Mohammed Jadwat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 336. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 337. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 338. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 339. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 340. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to enter into a contract with the standing Rock Indian Tribe to provide for the clearing of certain portions of the Oahe Reservoir area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 341. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which apepar under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as "Senior Citizens Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO PRIVATE AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $107,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the follow resolution (S. Res. 26); which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

JOHN T. KNIGHT—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 255) entitled "A bill for the relief of John T. Knight", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII, SECTION 2

Mr. ALLOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business is, presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter each Senator shall be entitled to speak in all three hours and no more in his own behalf on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, but each Senator shall be entitled to yield any or all of the time to which he is so entitled to any other Senator. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY MEMBERS ON STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

Resolved, That members of the majority on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Mr. Kerr (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Holland.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Mr. Ellender (chairman), Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Hart, Mr. McCarthy, and Mrs. Neuberger.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Hayden (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Humphrey.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Russell (chairman), Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Mr. Robertson (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr.

Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Mr. Bible (chairman), Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Smith of Massachusetts.

Committee on Finance: Mr. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Fulbright.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Mr. Fulbright (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Dodd.

Committee on Government Operations: Mr. McClellan (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Muskie.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Mr. Anderson (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Hickey.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Mr. Magnuson (chairman), Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McGee.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Eastland (chairman), Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Mr. Hill (chairman), Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pell.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Mr. Johnston (chairman), Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Randolph.

Committee on Public Works: Mr. Chavez (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Metcalf.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Mr. Mansfield (chairman), Mr. Hayden, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Hickey, and Mr. Pell.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill is similar to a bill which I introduced in the Senate last year. It is my firm conviction that the time has come for the Federal Government to give recognition to the critical importance of our urban areas and the problems which they face. Above all, we must coordinate and centralize the activities of the Federal Government to aid and assist our Nation's cities.

President-elect Kennedy has said that he favors the creation of a Cabinet level Department in this area. The establishment of such a Department was widely discussed in the presidential campaign, and, in fact, became something of a "political football."

Mr. President, the political football season is over. The championship has been decided. I think it would be a tragic mistake if the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs was held up because of partisan political considerations on the part of Members or groups of Members of the Congress.

It is my hope that the leaders of both parties in the Congress will work toward the immediate creation of a Cabinet level Department to assist the residents of our Nation's urban areas. I would be delighted if in determining the scope and activities of this Department, President-elect Kennedy or his designee would consider the central features of the bill which I introduce today.

As a Senator from a State in which problems such as slum clearance, urban redevelopment, improvement of public facilities, mass transportation, water conservation and use are of the utmost importance, I enthusiastically urge the creation of a Federal Department to give direction to the role of the Federal Government in these and many other vital areas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 289) to provide for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that most of the population growth of this country has occurred in the last two decades in urban areas;

(2) that many important Federal programs such as housing, urban renewal and slum clearance, pollution control, airport and highway construction, and defense activities have a primary impact on urban areas; and

(3) that many pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge, understanding and coordination of proper techniques in the utilization of urban land.

(b) Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in correlating Federal activities relating to the Nation's farms, and in promoting efficient use of farmlands and rural areas, the Congress enacts this Act with the purpose of providing a corresponding executive department (1) to coordinate the various Federal activities having a primary impact on urban areas, (2) to insure equitable and reasonable distribution of Federal assistance to urban centers, (3) to foster high level consideration of the pressing social and economic problems growing out of the heavy concentration of the Nation's population in urban areas, and (4) to further knowledge of the principles of unified planning and of using efficiently urban lands.

CREATION OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 2. (a) In order to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1, there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Urban Affairs (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Under the Secretary shall be an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries who shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe and who shall be appointed in the same manner as the Secretary.

(b) There is hereby created in the Department an Urban Advisory Council. The members of this Council shall be appointed by the President upon nomination by the Secretary and shall include persons outside the Federal service with broad experience and interest in urban and related problems. The following Federal officials are hereby designated as members ex officio of the Urban Advisory Council: Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President may designate other Federal officials as ex officio members of the Council. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be reimbursed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949 as amended. The Council shall meet at the call of the Secretary, but not less than twice a year.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall (1) conduct a continuing study of problems peculiar to urban and metropolitan areas, including problems of coordinating Federal and Federal-State programs in such areas, and (2) provide technical assistance to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems. Such assistance shall include whenever appropriate the dissemination to interested bodies of the results of the studies undertaken pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary shall from time to time make such recommendations to the Congress, as a result of the studies to be undertaken under this section and after consultation with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, as he shall determine to be appropriate.

(c) As used in this section the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

FUNCTIONS AND TRANSFERS

SEC. 4. The President shall submit to the Congress reorganization plans providing for the transfer of such functions from officers or agencies of the executive branch of the Government to the Secretary as the President deems appropriate to assist in accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

COMPENSATION OF PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

SEC. 5. The Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries shall receive compensation at the rates prescribed for these positions in the other executive departments.

SEAL

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 7. The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer, or by any agency employee, of the Department.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 8. Section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh: The Department of Urban Affairs."

REPORTS

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall cause to be prepared, published, and transmitted to the Congress an annual report of the activities and accomplishments of the Department.

ENCOURAGING EDUCATION AND STRENTHENING STATES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it was H. G. Wells who said, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." The truth of his statement has become crystal clear as we advance into the age of atoms, astronauts, and automation.

Education poses one of the severest challenges of our age, and I believe the Federal Government can properly aid in meeting the problem. Surely we can do as much for our pupils as we already do for our pines, pigs, and peanuts, all of which receive Federal assistance.

However, Federal aid must recognize the primary responsibility of our States, and their political subdivisions, in the field of education, and the most effective step which the National Government can take would be to aid the States in meeting their obligations. A successful program for Federal aid to education must strengthen the State's responsibility for education and enhance its ability to discharge the responsibility.

To accomplish this, I am introducing proposed legislation which, if enacted, will appropriate annually to each State 2 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes sold within the State. The money will be immediately available to the State for educational purposes only.

My bill would not alter the present 8 cents a package Federal tax on cigarettes. It would only return 2 cents of the tax to the State in which the cigarettes were sold to the consumer. This would provide a total of more than $400 million a year for education, of which New Hampshire's share would be an estimated $2,120,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the estimated distribution of the funds among the States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to States, as proposed by Senator COTTON's bill.

[Receipts in millions of dollars]

Alabama	4.00
Alaska	.36
Arizona	2.32
Arkansas	2.76
California	39.60
Colorado	3.80
Connecticut	6.68
Delaware	1.20
Florida	10.40
Georgia	6.86
Hawaii	.96
Idaho	1.00
Illinois	24.96
Indiana	11.06
Iowa	5.46
Kansas	4.36
Kentucky	6.52
Louisiana	6.50
Maine	2.42
Maryland	6.70
Massachusetts	12.20
Michigan	19.48
Minnesota	6.76
Mississippi	3.36
Missouri	10.40
Montana	1.62
Nebraska	2.90
Nevada	8.76
New Hampshire	2.12
New Jersey	14.66
New Mexico	1.58
New York	46.40
North Carolina	8.78
North Dakota	1.10
Ohio	23.88
Oklahoma	4.60
Oregon	4.18
Pennsylvania	23.30
Rhode Island	2.56
South Carolina	3.68
South Dakota	1.28
Tennessee	6.26
Texas	19.78
Utah	1.10
Vermont	1.02
Virginia	7.32
Washington	5.72
West Virginia	4.18
Wisconsin	9.50
Wyoming	.82
District of Columbia	2.32
Total	409.00

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this proposal is simple, direct, and straightforward.

It avoids many of the obstacles which have blocked action on Federal aid in this field for more than a decade.

No element of Federal control is involved. The funds are to be appropriated directly to the States, for educational use in accordance with State law. No strings are to be attached. No Federal restrictions are to be involved. The State could use the funds for teachers' salaries, for construction, for equipment, or for whatever educational purpose the State deemed most necessary.

This would not require the creation of a bureaucracy in Washington to administer. Furthermore, all the problems of devising a formula for division of the funds between the States are to be eliminated. All that would be involved would be a simple collection of readily available statistics on the cigarette consumption by States. Since almost every State now has its own tax on cigarettes, the figures can be calculated easily on the basis of State tax receipts.

It may be worth noting that the recent report of the President's Commission on National Goals commented favorably on this kind of an approach to Federal aid to education. "This would put the Federal taxing power at the service of the States with little danger of control," the report states.

Proponents of Federal aid to education have fruitlessly banged their heads against the walls of opposition for more than 10 years. This proposal offers a way to avoid those difficulties, and provides affirmative and positive assistance for American education, now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). The bill be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 293) to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement. The bill has been approved by the departments downtown. It has been strongly recommended that Congress take some action to plug the loopholes wherein these individuals who are affiliated with the Communist movement are provided free movement through access to the Passports Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 300) to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I introduce a bill to amend title 4 of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need, because of unemployment of their parents, to be eligible for assistance under State plans for aid to dependent children, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I introduced a similar bill last year, and I hope this year it will receive favorable consideration.

As many Senators know, there are many States where unemployment is not a ground for receiving public assistance. As long as there is one member of a family who is employable, nobody in the family can get public assistance or relief. This situation has resulted in tragic domestic situations. Actually, there is an instance on record in which a man who had been out of a job for months, and whose family was on the verge of starvation, committed suicide so that his family could go on relief and get minimum subsistence.

There are hundreds and hundreds of cases on record in which men have deserted beloved wives and families in order to make it possible for their families—their wives and children—to receive relief. This antisocial situation has shocked me for some time. I hope it will sufficiently shock a majority of my colleagues so the bill may become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 306) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

On behalf of the junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the benefits of the aid to dependent children program to children who are in need because their parents are unemployed.

It is estimated that about 800,000 children would be covered under this bill.

This measure carries out one of the recommendations of the task force on area redevelopment, appointed by President-elect Kennedy and headed by our eminent colleague, the Senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS.

This task force reached the same conclusion as had been reached earlier by the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, which was headed by the able junior Senator from Minnesota and on which I had the honor to serve.

Both these groups found that local communities which are hardest hit by unemployment often have the least adequate resources to provide assistance to the unemployed. In 33 States, including my own Commonwealth, the States provide such assistance, but in 17 States the localities are left to their own resources. Many instances of actual hunger were reported.

While this bill would not provide help for all of the needy unemployed, it would at least provide funds for families which have children.

At the present time, Federal grants for aid to dependent children cover only those children who are in need because of the death, desertion, or disability of one or both parents. But the child who is in need, from whatever cause, is still in need.

Not only does it make no sense for the Federal Government to aid one group of children but not the other, but the inequity has some extraordinary effects in actually breaking up homes, because if an unemployed man dies or deserts his family, his wife and children get a monthly allotment of Federal and State funds. But if he lives, and stays at home, they receive no help.

The Special Committee on Unemployment Problems received some shocking testimony that this quirk in the Federal law can actually lead to suicide. I insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt of testimony from Thomas E. Gish, editor of the Mountain Eagle of Whiteburg, Ky., before our committee.

The excerpt is as follows:

"I have a little statement, as everyone else. And I want to start by telling you of a true happening which I think sums up the entire situation better than any words that might be used.

"At about this time last year—2 weeks before Christmas—an unemployed coal miner in Letcher County whom I have known all my life shot and killed himself.

"The man was the father of eight children, stair-stepped from age 14 down to age 2.

"This man had been out of work for some 3 years. He had been laid off at one of those times when a mine gets new equipment—lessening its need for men. I know that this man made every possible effort to find employment for himself. He made several trips into Ohio and Michigan, looking for work. But he was 55 years old, and he simply couldn't find a job. Well, he drew unemployment insurance as long as he could—but soon that was exhausted. And for some 2 years, he was forced to sit in idleness at home, watching the health of his children deteriorate from lack of enough food—watching their clothes wear out—with no money to replace them. The family lived during this period on money earned by the wife—who cooked in a restaurant for 25 cents an hour. She was and is a good woman and often she worked 18 hours a day to get enough money to keep her family alive. They couldn't really live on what she earned—they could just stay alive.

"The man watched this for some 2 years. He got to thinking about the situation and realized that if he were dead, then his wife and children could draw social security benefits. They would be assured of enough money to maintain a decent standard of living. They could eat, and they could buy clothes.

"And so, as a Christmas present to his wife and his eight children, the man took out his shotgun and calmly shot and killed himself. It was the best Christmas present he knew how to give. Living he was no help to his family. By dying he could feed them."

While only one instance of suicide was described to us, welfare administrators told us that in hundreds of cases men had been forced to desert their families in order that their children could eat. Instances have been reported where welfare workers actually advised this course as the only way out.

I place in the RECORD at this point three paragraphs from a speech given on November 15 by Alvin L. Schorr, family life specialist of the Social Security Administration, at the New York State Welfare Conference in New York City, describing how the present aid to dependent children law tends to break up families. Mr. Schorr was expressing his own views and not necessarily those of the Administration:

"The provision that ADC is available only if a parent is absent or incapacitated operates precisely counter to any cohesive forces in the family. When rent money is a week-to-week issue, the tentative inclination of parents to reconciliation, or to live together again, or to marry tends to be deterred by the fact that even if need continues ADC will end. Caseworkers know this, if administrators sometimes seem doubtful. I think we must feel that it demeans our clients to suggest that their marriages would be affected by money; yet it is the caseworkers among us who appreciate more than anyone else how powerfully want may drive one. The studies of ADC that have addressed themselves, more or less indirectly, to this question usually find some number of parents who are 'apart for our benefit'—a phrase I borrow from a New Orleans study. As future studies approach this question more directly they will find, I have no doubt, a sprinkling of clients in any caseload who are deterred from reconciliation by the absent-parent provision.

"The focus of eligibility determination is on the fact that the father is absent. This can easily become, and in some States policy requires it to become, establishing that the father is permanently—not just casually—absent. The periodic review of eligibility focuses on the fact that the father remains absent. From the point of view of the caseworker, this is the legal requirement and—particularly in the face of too much work and, perhaps, substantial criticism—it may set the tenor of discussion. Even if the caseworker avoids this trap, the client who risks mentioning, say, that her husband has written to her, must consider that doubt about her eligibility is as likely to result as a thoughtful discussion of what is best for her to do.

"I do not speak here merely out of speculation. There is evidence that the Nation's caseworkers do not see children's fathers, even when they might be available. ADC checks are not usually written to fathers, even if they are disabled and in the home. Caseworkers who are caught up in the children's need or what they regard as the mothers' best interests, dictate into records their advice to women to get rid of their men."

It is tragic that the Federal law should contain quirks which lead men to desert their families. My bill would make the public assistance program one which serves to hold families together instead of breaking them up.

In many of those States which provide no State aid for the families of the able-bodied unemployed, this bill would alleviate actual hunger. In other States, such as my own, it would assist the States to maintain adequate public assistance standards or to meet added caseloads.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the protection of natural resources of our Nation is a constant responsibility of many groups and of various branches of government. In recent years, Congress has become increasingly aware of the importance of Federal participation in this field, because we have an undeniable duty of seeing that future generations are assured the maximum opportunity to enjoy the treasures with which the United States was endowed.

In keeping with this concept of responsibility, I am introducing a bill to authorize a beach erosion project, to be carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers, which is of the greatest urgency and involves an unusual Federal obligation.

The bill which I hope will receive the earliest practicable consideration is cosponsored by my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and is similar to a measure we proposed near the end of the 1960 session. It would provide for the restoration and future protection of a substantial portion of the Pacific Ocean shoreline in the community of Oceanside, adjoining the big Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton.

This proposed legislation is occasioned by the fact that competent engineers, including those of the Army, now acknowledge wartime construction caused serious and continuing damage to the oceanside beaches. The Beach Erosion Board and the Chief of the Corps, Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, whom so many of us know well and regard highly, concur in the views that building of jetties to protect the entrance of a small-boat harbor at Camp Pendleton is the reason for eating away of the shore which previously had been stable.

The extent of the damage is indicated by a survey showing that by late 1959 the oceanside beach lost some 3 million cubic yards, and that all of 700,000 cubic yards of temporary replenishment deposited as an interim measure in 1958 began to wash away almost immediately. Erosion dating back more than 15 years has continued at a rapid rate.

I am sure that all of our colleagues who love the seashore will agree that

such a situation takes on the proportions of a castrophe for a beach community whose economy is largely dependent upon its attractiveness to vacationists and tourists.

I believe, as does my colleague, that this is a critical situation, and the bill I am introducing is a highly meritorious measure deserving of early attention.

I ask unanimous consent that at this portion of my comments there appear in the RECORD a letter dated September 2, 1960, addressed to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, senior Senator from New Mexico, and chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, sent and signed by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, in which he recognizes the need for the type of legislation which I now introduce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 307) to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif., introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to S. 3838, 86th Congress, a bill "To authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, California."

This bill would authorize beach erosion control of the shore at Oceanside, San Diego County, Calif., substantially in accordance with plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the Beach Erosion Control Report on Cooperative Study of San Diego County.

The Department of the Army favors the above-mentioned bill.

The Chief of Engineers, in his report dated August 25, 1960, recognized that jetties constructed at Camp Pendleton, Calif., as a wartime measure are primarily responsible for the erosion problem at Oceanside, where the shore had previously been stable. If time had permitted, the detrimental shore effects of the jetty construction at Camp Pendleton Harbor would probably have been determined in advance and appropriate measures included in the plans to avert shore damage. The harbor is used entirely for military purposes and produces no local benefits. Under these particular circumstances, it is the opinion of the Chief of Engineers that, in equity, restoration and stabilization of the Oceanside shore should be a Federal responsibility.

The Chief of Engineers recommends adoption of a project by the United States, in lieu of the existing Federal beach erosion control project, to provide for restoration and stabilization of the shore at Oceanside, Calif., subject to certain conditions of local cooperation, including the condition that local interests agree that the cost allocated to this beach protection project shall be adjusted to reflect the savings from multiple-purpose construction of the addition of the Oceanside Harbor improvement to the overall project, if authorized, and the cost so transferred from the beach erosion project to the harbor project be shared by local interests and the Federal Government as appropriate for small-boat harbor projects.

In the event the committee desires to take action on S. 3838, the following language is suggested as a substitute for section 1 of the bill as presently worded, in order to make it clear that this project is in lieu of the existing Federal project:

"That the project for beach erosion control at Oceanside, San Diego County, California, is hereby authorized, in lieu of the existing Federal beach erosion control project, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated August 25, 1960, at an estimated cost of $1,498,000."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

CONSTRUCTION OF UPPER DIVISION OF BAKER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Baker Federal reclamation project has been under review for many years in the Bureau of Reclamation. On the basis of my present knowledge of the project and its various component parts, I am satisfied that it is extremely meritorious. It is the type of project which will provide tremendous benefits for present and future generations of Americans.

One of the key developments in this outstanding Oregon reclamation project is the Mason Dam, to be located on the Powder River approximately 18 miles from Baker, Oreg.

Baker is the hometown of our distinguished colleague from Oregon on the House side, Representative AL ULLMAN. I am pleased to announce that Representative ULLMAN joins Senator NEUBERGER and me in our enthusiastic support of the bill. According to present plans, the dam will be constructed of rock and earthfill. It will be 185 feet in height and will provide 100,000 acre-feet of total storage, 95,000 acre-feet of active storage, of which 17,000 acre-feet will be exclusively for flood control.

Mason Dam will provide full irrigation for 5,390 new acres and supplementary water for 12,610 acres within the Baker project. Completion of the dam will bring flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits to the people of the area.

The total project cost, based upon October 1958 prices, will be $6,168,000 of which $1,114,000 will be repayable under contracts to be entered into with project water users; $3,743,500 of the project cost will be reimbursed to the Federal Government through Baker revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration over and above the amounts required to amortize the present obligations assigned for repayment from net revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The project has strong and enthusiastic support of local interests. For example, on November 3, 1960, Mr. F. A. Phillips, chairman of the irrigation committee of the Baker County Chamber of Commerce advised me as follows:

On the 27th of October the board of directors of the Baker Valley Irrigation District and myself met with Mr. Nelson, regional director, Mr. Burpee, regional attorney with the Boise office, and with Mr. Mangun from the Spokane office. They read your letter and I am pleased to report they all approved of your plan and the Bureau suggested you present your bill at an early date and try to get appropriation for immediate construction.

The Mason Dam will be a lifesaver for many of the landowners over the years. We are losing many farmers in the West from lack of enough water and facilities to carry on. The Mason Dam will also be a great boost to the economy of the area.

Projects such as the Mason Dam will provide irrigation that will make possible the production of food and fiber for Americans for generations to come. We know that the time is near at hand at which we will be seeking thousands of additional acres which can be put into production to feed an ever-increasing population in our country.

In fact, as I have been heard to say before, population experts already are testifying that they are greatly concerned as to where the Nation is going to get the adequate food supply needed to feed its people by the year 2000. Most of us in the Senate now will be gone by then, but there will still be Senators in the year 2000, and our children and grandchildren will be very much concerned with the problem of food supply. I wish to stress this fact as I urge the passage of the bill, because in building the Mason Dam we are building for the future, and we are seeking to guarantee to future generations of American boys and girls an adequate food supply. Americans of future generations will thank us for having had the vision and foresight to bring about irrigation and reclamation benefits inherent in this project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in my remarks, a copy of a letter dated November 16, 1960, addressed to Mr. F. A. Phillips by Mr. M. B. Austin, acting regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, REGIONAL OFFICE, REG. 1,
Boise, Idaho, November 16, 1960.

In reply refer to: 150

Mr. F. A. PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Irrigation Committee, Baker County Chamber of Commerce, Baker, Oreg.

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: I have your letter of November 7 forwarding Senator MORSE's letter of October 31 to you, together with its enclosure, a draft of suggested legislation to accomplish the authorization of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclama-

tion project, Oregon. You asked for information as to whether the suggested draft of legislation would accomplish the purposes contemplated by the proposed Baker project report.

As you know, our Baker project report is in process of review and consideration in the Department, and until the report has been approved and adopted by the Secretary, any views concerning suggested authorizing legislation are premature. Any comments or information that would be provided, therefore, cannot in any way indicate that the project report or the proposed legislation is satisfactory to the Department.

You asked particularly about the final sentence of section 2 which provides as follows:

"The term 'construction costs' used herein shall include any irrigation operation and maintenance costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the water users to pay during that period."

This language appears to have been adopted from the second sentence of the act of September 13, 1960, 74 Stat. 882, which authorized the construction of the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon. The purpose of the language in connection with that project is to cover the possibility should operation and maintenance costs chargeable to the water users during the first few years of project operation need to be capitalized and charged as a part of the construction cost of the project. This may be a possibility by reason of the initial period of time it takes to get orchard land into revenue producing status. It has not been proposed in the plan of development of the Baker project that it would be necessary to capitalize any of the operating costs of the project and therefore this sentence would not be needed in the authorization of the Baker project. On the other hand, this language remaining in the bill and providing the authority to do so would not appear to be objectionable as long as it is clearly understood, of course, that authority would not be utilized.

You also indicated interest in the paragraph (c) that has been added to section 3, which provides as follows:

"(c) The works authorized in this act shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887)."

This language did not appear in the previous bills that were introduced in the second session of the 86th Congress, being S. 3063 and H.R. 10552. Although there would appear to be no objection to this language there is a question as to the necessity for it. The initial section of the proposed bill provides that the Baker project is to be operated under the Federal reclamation laws and section 9(b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (Act of August 4, 1939, 53 Stat. 1187) requires that any reclamation project where an allocation has been made for flood control be operated for flood control to the extent justified by the allocation. Also, the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, provides quite clearly under section 7 that where any reservoir is constructed with Federal funds and a part of the cost is allocated to flood control, the project is to be operated in connection with the flood control regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. Accordingly, under existing law it follows that the Baker project reservoir would have to be operated under flood control regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army whether or not the language above quoted was included in the authorization act.

One additional matter should be pointed out in connection with any plans to provide authorizing legislation for the Baker project. Our planning report now being reviewed shows that a 160-acre ownership comprised of class 3 and 4P lands would not be sufficient in size to be an economical unit. Accordingly, consideration should be given to having any authorization bill include language that would take care of this matter. A section in the bill following the pattern established by section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958, 72 Stat. 963, authorizing the Seedskadee project, Wyoming, would take care of this matter. Such language would be as follows:

"No water shall be furnished from, through, or by means of project works to lands which are held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of the equivalent of 160 acres of class 1 lands unless the owner thereof shall have executed a valid recordable contract with respect to the excess in like manner as is provided in the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) (43 U.S.C. 423e). In computing 'the equivalent of 160 acres of class 1 lands' under this section, each acre of class 2 land shall be counted as seventy-five one-hundredths of an acre, each acre of class 3 land shall be counted as fifty-five one-hundredths of an acre, each acre of class 4P land shall be counted as thirty-eight one-hundredths of an acre, and each acre of class 4H land shall be counted as 1 acre."

I am returning the letter and document enclosed with your letter of November 7. Again let me emphasize that our project planning report is still under review in the Department and only the Department provides comments on legislative matters.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. AUSTIN,
Acting Regional Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that the bill will be printed at the close of my remarks, I now send the bill to the desk and I yield to my gracious colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 308) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of providing irrigation water, controlling floods, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and providing recreational benefits, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon. The principal works of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir, pumping plants, and related facilities.

SEC. 2. The period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U.S.C. 485h), for repayment of the construction cost properly chargeable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by irrigators, may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of any development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block or to as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable repayment plan as is provided therein. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within the repayment period determined under the provisions of this section shall be returned to the reclamation fund from net revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration, which are over and above those required to meet any present obligations assigned for repayment from such net revenues.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the upper division of the Baker project, to construct minimum basic public recreation facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate State or local agency or organization. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works authorized by this Act as he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661–666c, inclusive), and the portion of the construction costs allocated to these purposes and to flood control, together with an appropriate share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs therefor, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Before the works are transferred to an irrigation water user's organization for care, operation, and maintenance, the organization shall have agreed to operate them in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to achieving the fish and wildlife benefits, and to return the works to the United States for care, operation, and maintenance in the event of failure to comply with the requirements to achieve such benefits.

(c) The works authorized in this Act shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my able colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, in introduction of legislation for Mason Dam, a project which will turn a long-sought dream of Baker County residents into a reality.

Surrounded by lofty and forested mountains, this area of eastern Oregon is one of the most scenic agricultural portions of the West. But nature has not been overgenerous in endowing the vicinity. Limited rainfall in this arid plateau section requires use of water storage reservoirs and irrigation to tide the farmers and ranchers through long periods of summer drought. The water to be stored is now wasted in the floods of spring runoff from the mountains.

I understand that at the present time some 18,000 acres of farmland involved in the upper division of the Baker reclamation project are without water during a major portion of the growing season. Construction of Mason Dam, pumping plant and related facilities will add 100,000 acre-feet of water to the available supply. As a result, land now arid will have sufficient supply for the entire growing season.

I want to emphasize that the agricultural products of this area will not add to any crops now in surplus. Virtually all farm income in this area comes from livestock, hay and pasture. Approval of this project will not increase burdensome surpluses.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Mason Dam project is expected to be received by Congress in the near future. It is my hope that early congressional consideration will follow so that this part of Oregon will be given new stimulus for growth and expansion.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS TO NEZ PERCE TRIBE OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho.

In 1894, the Congress approved an agreement with the Nez Perce Indians which provided for $1,626,222 to be paid to the Indians as compensation for land and other rights transferred to the United States. At this time, there remains in the Treasury of the United States, in two special funds, a little over $6,500 remaining due the Indians arising out of this transaction. Of this, $2,193.33 is in the principal account and, as of January 9, 1961, $4,425.87, interest and accruals on interest. This money is nominally held for individuals who did not receive their shares in the original distributions, made in the years 1895 through 1900.

There is now no way to determine to whom the unexpended balances in the account belong.

The bill I am introducing, at the request of the tribe, would make this small amount of money which belongs to the Nez Perces available for such tribal purposes as the tribe may request, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. It would terminate the account, and finally bring to a close a transaction that ought to have been completed many years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 322) to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSERVATION OF ANADROMOUS FISH SPAWNING AREAS IN THE SALMON RIVER, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, the Salmon River preservation bill. This measure would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from authorizing power developments on that river.

With the late great Senator from Oregon, Richard L. Neuberger, I introduced a similar measure in the 86th Congress. That bill, after referral to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was the subject of extensive hearings in Lewiston, Idaho, in November 1959. Over 50 witnesses testified and although overwhelming support was expressed for the basic objective of the bill, many expressed concern that it did not go far enough. Therefore, in the opening days of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, Senator Neuberger and I introduced a strengthening amendment. Under the new language, the licensing of any dam on the Salmon River would be prohibited. In its amended form, the measure would keep this famed wilderness area open and unobstructed until such time as the fish passage problem has been satisfactorily solved. It was again referred to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the bill, at the end of the 86th Congress had been authorized to be reported favorably.

The bill introduced today makes minor revisions in the language.

The nursery areas for Chinook salmon in Idaho are found in the high mountain valleys of the central part of the State. The Middle Fork of the Salmon, widely known as the River of No Return, runs almost entirely through primitive areas from its headwaters in Bear Valley, including its tributaries, Sulphur Creek, Marsh Creek, Loon Creek, and Big Creek. The main Salmon, which rises in the uplands of the Sawtooth Mountains, and its tributaries like Yankee Fork Creek, the Pahsimerol, and the Lemhi, also have retained their natural character.

This vast nursery area is of immense significance to the great anadromous fish resource of the Northwest. No other river system contributes so greatly to the Chinook runs. No other river system has so long escaped the works of man.

No amount of protection in the spawning areas avails us if the fish cannot get to them.

Evidence indicates that projected development of the upper Columbia will reduce the spawning there as the reservoir areas and slack water encroach upon spawning grounds. The Salmon River's importance as the principal spawning stream will proportionately increase.

Solutions to the fish problem are being sought vigorously, for it is now widely appreciated that the anadromous fishery resource in the Columbia River Basin is a major natural resource. If this bill is enacted, the Congress will express its will that the solution to the fish problem be in hand before any structures are built on the Salmon River, whether for power, flood control, or otherwise.

Fortunately, such a prohibition against dam construction on the Salmon River will have no detrimental effect on the economy or the growth of Idaho or the Northwest. For many years to come, we have sufficient damsites available on our other major rivers to provide all of the water storage, the power, the flood control, and the navigational benefits that the growing needs of the Northwest may require.

I renew the pledge I made when I first introduced this bill 2 years ago, that I will exert every possible effort to secure passage of this measure. I hope there is yet time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 323) to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the fact that the Salmon River and its tributaries constitute one of the principal spawning areas of anadromous fish from the Pacific Ocean, it is the purpose of this Act to prohibit, until developments justify a change in this policy, the authorization of structures on the Salmon River that would restrict the passage of such fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize under the provisions of the Federal Power Act a structure for the storage or collection of water or the development of power on the Salmon River in Idaho or its tributaries which would restrict the passage of anadromous fish, or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams and reservoirs that in his opinion justify amending the provisions of this Act.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am so happy to hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I am filled with nostalgia as he describes that beautiful river of no return, where I have hiked many times. I am sure that all Senators, if they had the opportunity to visit our area and see that wonderful country, would be pleased to know that such an area is preserved so that fishing can be enjoyed and that this great fish run may be preserved for posterity.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I express my gratitude to her for joining so graciously with me in cosponsoring the measure.

GREAT WHITE FLEET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to people of other nations in case of disaster.

The bill is sponsored by Senators AIKEN, ANDERSON, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, ENGLE, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KEATING, KEFAUVER, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, SYMINGTON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, as the deliberations of the 87th Congress begin, I am introducing for what I hope will be early and favorable consideration, a bill to authorize the establishment of a White Fleet of mercy ships to provide prompt emergency aid in cases of natural disaster.

This concept of meaningful assistance, people to people, from those who have to those who need and want the aid of a friendly Samaritan hand, has already stirred the interest and evidenced the support of countless citizens both in America and abroad. People do care what happens to others. And in the hearts of millions is a quiet but real yearning to find some meaningful opportunity through which to help those less fortunate to help themselves. The Great White Fleet, which is proposed in the bill, can be such an instrumentality.

The decade of the sixties promises to be a unique testing ground for freedom's future. America and the free world must and shall insure the sufficiency of their military power. But only madness, aberration, or mistake could unloose the delicately balanced nuclear terror.

And yet, Mr. President, military power alone can offer little more than illusary assurance of freedom's future in the endless pursuit of order and stability within the world society. Ignorance, poverty, disease, and hopelessness are the real forces of disorder and the powerful manipulative tools being utilized by the enemies of freedom. Thus, we must create within the arsenal of freedom an appropriate variety of instruments suitable to the accomplishment of the task ahead, just as we must within the less generic arena of military posture be concerned not only with its sufficiency but the balanced interrelationship of its components as well. The Great White Fleet can and will be such an instrument for order and stability—and thus for freedom itself—providing a method of meaningful participation for those who do care about the needs of their fellow man and freedom's future in our time.

The experience of recent years—yes, even of recent days, Mr. President—are seized upon by critics as evidence of tragic error in American policy and demands are heard for cancellation of rather than correction of international assistance programs. Rather than categorical condemnation of entire programs, responsible voices should point out that these failures reflect a stubborn, yes, almost blind, persistence in American policy and overemphasis upon a single program in lieu of a balanced use of all available tools. The skill of a great craftsman and the beauty of his creation reflects talent with many tools and the wise choice of that one best suited to the task to be performed.

The institutions of freedom are, historically, of varied design, the result of massive and persistent human effort. By definition, the institutions of freedom must be built by the people themselves to insure longevity. The cause of freedom's future in the decades of the sixties cries out for individual participation, individual effort, individual sacrifice, together with and in support of governmental programs. Standing alone, either one is bound to fail. Varied programs of joint effort are urgently required. The Great White Fleet is such a tool. But it is only one. Its success will depend in large measure upon the individual participation of vast numbers of people here and overseas. But to initiate this program of citizen effort the leadership of government and other established institutions in our society must first be evidenced. The bill which I have introduced is but the first, though important, step.

Mr. President, I am honored to offer this measure on behalf of myself and the Senators I named; and I wish to have included in that list the name of one of the original sponsors of the bill last year—the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose name I inadvertently omitted. I also wish to have the bill lie at the desk for 2 days, in order that other Senators who may care to do so may have an opportunity to become cosponsors of it. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

In order to afford an opportunity to other Members of the Senate who may also wish to cosponsor this bill, I ask that it may remain at the desk through Friday of this week.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 324) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to the people of other nations in case of disaster, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 422. (a) Whenever the President determines it to be advisable in the national interest and in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, he is authorized to take such action as may be required to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed and equipped to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to peoples of the coastal regions of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemic disease, earthquake, flood, hurricane, or other disaster; and to further serve as a vehicle for the carrying out of technical assistance and training on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world.

"(b) Such fleet should be established through the restoration to active service and the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States now mothballed in storage but could be operated by appropriate nonprofit private philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to the rendition of emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering.

"(c) The vessels of such fleet should be suitably identified to proclaim to the world their peaceful and beneficent purpose, and should be divided into task groups, each of which should include a hospital ship for the rendition of medical aid, a vessel suitably equipped to generate electrical energy required to meet emergency needs, and one or more cargo vessels suitable for use in the transportation of clothing, medical supplies, and other necessary supplies and equipment.

"(d) Fuel and operational supplies, and port, repair, and navigational facilities of the United States throughout the world should be made available to such fleet in support of its operational activities.

"(e) Provision should be made for the utilization of surplus food commodities of the United States for the relief of hunger, and for the furnishing by the United States of medical and other supplies required for the rendition of other necessary aid and assistance, through the use of that fleet.

"(f) The cooperation of private charitable organizations of the United States should be utilized for the furnishing of clothing and other relief supplies for donation to meet the emergency needs of inhabitants of regions to which task groups of the fleet would be directed to provide assistance."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WATER POLLUTION RESEARCH LABORATORY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a water pollution research laboratory in the Pacific Northwest.

Under the terms of the bill, the Surgeon General of the United States is directed to establish a laboratory for research into the pollution control problems of the Northwestern United States. These problems shall include, but not be limited to, municipal and industrial water supply, municipal and industrial pollution, fish, aquatic life and wildlife, forestry and wood products, reservoirs and effects of storage on water quality and recreational facilities.

Insofar as practicable, the laboratory is to be established at a place where graduate training can be carried out.

I wish to make it clear that our bill is in no way intended to compete with general water pollution control legislation. It is my understanding that omnibus proposed legislation on this subject will soon be introduced. I personally hope we can adopt again a measure along the lines of the one passed by Congress last year and vetoed by the President. Such a bill will receive much more sympathetic treatment at the White House this year than it did last year.

It is quite possible that provision for this laboratory in the Pacific Northwest can be made in omnibus legislation. But the need for this laboratory is so clear that it should not be jeopardized by any controversy that may develop over other aspects of the pollution control problem.

The bill we are introducing has the endorsement of the Oregon Department of Planning and Development, of Governor Hatfield, and of many others in our State who are concerned about the danger of pollution of one of our State's greatest natural resources—water.

I ask that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Friday in the

event that other Senators wish to join as cosponsors, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 325) to establish a Federal Regional Water Pollution Control Research Laboratory in the Pacific Northwest and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Surgeon General shall establish, equip, and maintain a regional research laboratory located in the Pacific Northwest, and, at such laboratory conduct research for the development of practicable means of meeting the specific pollution control problems of the Pacific Northwest including, but not limited to, municipal and industrial water supply, municipal and industrial pollution, fish, aquatic life and wildlife, forestry and wood products, reservoirs and effects of storage on water quality and recreational facilities. Insofar as practicable, such laboratory shall be established at a point where graduate and other training in such research might be carried out.

For the purposes of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized—

"(1) to acquire land and interests therein, to accept in the name of the United States donations of any property, real or personal, to any laboratory established pursuant to this subsection (and any such donation to one of such laboratories shall not be available for use by any other of such laboratories), and to utilize voluntary or uncompensated services at such laboratories; and

"(2) to cooperate with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, with States, and other State agencies, institutions, and with counties, municipalities, business or other organizations, corporations, associations, universities, scientific societies, and individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $4,000,000 for the construction and equipment of the Regional Research Laboratory authorized by this Act.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $1,500,000 for each fiscal year for the Surgeon General to carry out the other functions authorized by this Act.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES IN OFFICES OF SENATORS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill with respect to compensation to employees in the offices of Senators, and I send it to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 326) relating to the compensation of employees in the offices of Senators, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to give greater flexibility to Members of this body in paying salaries to our staffs. At the moment, in my own case, restrictions on the payment of individual salaries is making it very difficult for me to organize my office as I should like to do.

There is no thought that any Senator would be entitled to exceed his present restriction on total amount of salaries; but the bill, if enacted into law, would enable us to pay a slightly higher salary to the No. 4 man on our staff.

I hope the bill will be favorably considered by committee and by my colleagues on the floor.

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CLASSROOM FACILITIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN CHILDREN

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district.

At the present time no general authority exists under which the Secretary of the Interior can spend Federal funds for the construction of school facilities on property not owned by the Federal Government. There is authority of this nature, however, for the Navaho-Hopi tribes of the great Southwest.

Mr. President, this bill would fill a definite need in the education of Indian children. At the present time our public school districts do get assistance for the education of these children in the form of tuition payments under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, as well as Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, as amended. These programs, however, only provide funds for the operation and maintenance of school facilities. Many public schools in my State and, I am sure, throughout the Nation want to bring these Indian children into their school system and provide them with a good education which includes the opportunity of associating with non-Indian children. Unfortunately, however, they can only do this to a limited extent because, like schools all over the country, these schools are crowded and, therefore, lack the necessary additional classroom space required for these children. In many instances these public school districts adjacent to or near Indian reservations have a sizable influx of Indians. These Indians have practically no ability to pay taxes and, as a result, the school districts find themselves unable to build the necessary extra classrooms themselves even by levying the limit provided by law. These districts must have Federal assistance in the construction of schools.

This bill would enable the Secretary of the Interior to aid in the construction of classrooms for these Indian children who are presently receiving their education at schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or, in some instances, who are receiving no education at all.

Mr. President, I have long felt that the best long-term solution to our Indian problem is to educate the young people. Through education they will be provided the tools to go out in the world—off the reservation—and earn their livelihood. In my opinion, one of the best ways of encouraging this is to provide for their education in such a manner that they will be equipped emotionally as well as vocationally to do this. Through their inclusion in our regular public schools they will receive the inspiration through competition to become more independent.

A program of this type, Mr. President, would save the Government a considerable amount of money. It would enable the Federal Government to close a number of small schools which, because of their size, are inefficient and costly to operate, and make it unnecessary to build new ones. In many cases, the schools presently being operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are badly in need of not only repair, but major renovation. Under this program these schools could, and I emphasize could, be closed and the education of these children could be provided for through our regular school system.

I hasten to point out, Mr. President, that a program of the type outlined here is not designed to abandon all the schools now being operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It merely gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to participate financially with public school districts in the construction of classrooms for the education of Indian children where this objective is agreeable both to the Department of the Interior and to the local people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 341) to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEN SENATORS SUPPORT SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and other Senators, a joint resolution which would designate the month of May each year as Senior Citizens Month.

Mr. President, the cosponsors of this joint resolution are the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator

from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Under the joint resolution, during the month of May ceremonial programs and activities would be held to focus national attention on the nearly 25 million Americans who are 60 years of age and older.

Mr. President, the introduction of this joint resolution coincides with the meeting in Washington, D.C., of the White House Conference on the Aging, which dramatizes our growing national concern with the complex and varied problems confronting our older citizens such as inadequate medical care, discrimination in employment, substandard housing, limited or nonexistent vocational training and adult educational opportunities. Our younger generations must not be guilty of old-fashioned or out-dated attitudes toward senior citizens and the worth of their experience, skills and services, for no society can afford to squander such precious human resources.

The proclamation by the President of Senior Citizens Month in May each year will provide us with an opportunity to honor the contributions older citizens make to our economic, social and moral development throughout the year, and to highlight specific issues which should be the subject of local or Federal legislation as well as community or national campaigns. States like New York and California have pioneered in holding such observances, and in 1960 according to the Senior Citizens of America, State, civic, religious, and other groups, and individuals in 44 States, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia participated in making Senior Citizens Month an outstanding success last May. The nationwide proclamation of such a month is a logical and necessary next step.

The very limited financial resources of our older citizens—a majority of the 16 million 65 and over are believed to have incomes of less than $1,000 annually—is undoubtedly a major factor in the mounting demand on Congress and on State legislatures to enact legislation to help assure the aged of adequate medical care, decent housing, and to combat employment practices which discriminate against workers because of their age. Longevity in a democracy such as ours should be a gift and not a burden for the one American in almost every seven who has passed his 60th birthday.

Over 50 million people in our Nation are 45 years of age or older. Those now entering that age group are looking forward to playing a productive role in our expanding economy for another 20 years, and those more advanced seek and should find the opportunity to prepare themselves for a fruitful retirement by developing new interests and skills, and discovering hidden talents. In this fast-paced society, our cultural horizons are often explored and broadened by the older members who have the time, the interest, and the patience to guide, encourage and inspire our eager youth, and to preserve and distill the valuable lessons of the past. It is in our national interest to undertake the programs, engage in the medical research, and provide the opportunities which will permit our senior citizens to lead purposeful, active lives. To this end, Senior Citizens Month, is dedicated.

Mr. President, in a day or two I shall introduce a bill to combat employment practices which discriminate against workers because of their age. This is a protection which I believe to be very important.

The joint resolution introduced today will provide us with a period conforming to what is now provided in many States, during which we can concentrate the attention of the country upon the condition of this very large and most valued group of our citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 162) to create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, introduced by me on January 5, 1961, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] may be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION GOVERNING QUESTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Senators FULBRIGHT, BUTLER, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, LONG of Louisiana, and JOHNSTON, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

USE OF TELEVISION STATIONS FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1961, the names of Mr. METCALF and Mr. COOPER, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) on January 6, 1961.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the name of Mr. AIKEN was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

COMMISSION TO STUDY INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN TRADE ON BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION IN UNITED STATES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1961, the names of Mr. BUTLER and Mr. KUCHEL were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 9, 1961.

PROPOSED 23D AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO REPEAL THE 16TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION WHICH PROVIDES THAT CONGRESS SHALL HAVE POWER TO COLLECT TAXES ON INCOME (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a proposed 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 16th amendment to the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have power to collect taxes on income; and a study made by the Joint Economic Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to determine the effect of its adoption, together with a statement by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

Address entitled "Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one, a Year of Action for America's Senior Citizens," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH before the Conference of Senior Citizens, at the Jewish Community Center, in Washington, D.C., on January 5, 1961.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "The Future of the Republican Party," delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey, on December 16, 1960, at National Press Club luncheon, Washington, D.C.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Résumé of his remarks before Surgeon General's National Conference on Water Pollution, Washington, D.C., December 12, 1960, and excerpt from article entitled "Watering Rocket Bases," published in Time magazine for December 19, 1960.

SERVICE OF MONTANANS IN THE NAVY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 700 miles and soaring mountain barriers separate Montana from the nearest ocean. Yet these obstacles have not foreclosed the restless search for new frontiers which, at an earlier date, carried settlers westward, and in our times propels many Montanans into the service of their county on the high seas. Numerous Montanans are in the Navy. And out of a population of 670,000 in the State, a dozen native sons are now serving, or are retired, with the rank of admiral in the Regular Navy. That is a most remarkable record for a landlocked State. The enthusiasm of Montanans for the sea service is exemplified by the recruitment of an all-Montanan company of 80 for the Navy last October.

And during November 1960 Montana's record was enhanced by the promotion of Mr. Edgar H. Reeder, a businessman and Naval Reserve officer of Butte, Mont., to the rank of rear admiral.

I am delighted to call these matters to the attention of the Senate, to compliment the Montana naval recruits, as well as Mr. Reeder on his selection as admiral. This is a well-earned distinction for an outstanding citizen who served with great credit to his Nation and State throughout World War II and has since retained a most active interest in naval affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point various press clippings pertaining to Mr. Reeder's appointment and to the admirals of Montana origin, as well as to the formation and swearing in of the all-Montana Regular naval recruit training company.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Standard, Butte-Anaconda, Mont., Nov. 20, 1960]

E. H. REEDER, BUTTE, SELECTED FOR PROMOTION TO RANK OF REAR ADMIRAL IN RESERVES

Edgar H. Reeder, Butte Naval Reserve officer, has been selected for promotion from captain to the rank of rear admiral. He has received notification of the selection from the Navy Department.

So far as is known, he is the only Montanan ever selected for flag rank in the Naval Reserve and is the first resident of the Pacific Northwest to be selected for a comparable grade in a number of years.

At the present time there are a dozen native Montanans who are admirals in the Regular Navy.

The selection by the Navy Department will be placed before the U.S. Senate for confirmation.

A native of Canton, Ill., Reeder was reared on the Crow Indian Reservation at Hardin, where he attended grade school and high school. He was graduated from Montana State University with a degree in journalism and business. He won letters in baseball and was active in campus programs.

HIS WAR RECORD

Following a period as a newspaperman in Butte, he moved to Great Falls to engage in business. Later he returned to Butte and was in business here prior to being called to active duty with the Navy 5 months before the outbreak of World War II. He was supply officer on the U.S.S. *Sangamon*, an aircraft carrier, which suffered heavy casualties when struck by a Japanese suicide plane.

Returning to Butte, he operated the Electric and Music Mart for 6 years, and then managed a record business which he sold a year ago. Since December 1, 1959, he has been executive secretary of the Silver Bow Employers' Association.

Reeder is a former president of the Montana Reserve Officers' Association, and also served as national vice president of the Naval Reserve Association. He was administrator of two national resources conferences here, one in 1956; the other in 1959.

OTHER SERVICE CONNECTION

He is chairman of the military affairs committee of the Butte Chamber of Commerce and a past director of the chamber, a member of the American Legion and the U.S. Naval Institute. He is a past president of the Montana Chapter of the Reserve Officers of the Naval Service, commanding officer of the Naval Reserve Supply Company, and executive officer of the Butte Council of the Navy League.

He has been invited by the Navy Department to be a member of the selection board choosing Navy Supply Corps officers. The board will meet in Washington February 21 and will be in session 2 weeks.

Captain and Mrs. Reeder reside at 3636 Whiteway.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, Nov. 21, 1960]

BUTTE MAN NAMED RESERVE REAR ADMIRAL

Edgar H. Reeder, Butte Naval Reserve officer, has been selected for promotion from captain to rear admiral.

Reeder, onetime Butte newspaperman and ex-Great Falls businessman, managed a record business until a year ago. Now he is executive secretary of the Silver Bow Employers' Association.

Reeder is believed to be the only Montanan ever selected for flag rank in the Naval Reserve.

There are, however, about a dozen native Montanans who are admirals in the Regular Navy.

Reeder is known widely in the Billings area. He graduated from Hardin High School.

[From the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., Nov. 21, 1960]

REEDER PROMOTED TO REAR ADMIRAL

BUTTE.—Edgar H. Reeder, Butte Naval Reserve officer, has been selected for promotion from captain to rear admiral.

Reeder, onetime Butte newspaperman and ex-Great Falls businessman, managed a record business until a year ago. Now he is executive secretary of the Silver Bow Employers' Association.

Reeder is believed to be the only Montanan ever selected for flag rank in the Naval Reserve.

There are, however, about a dozen native Montanans who are admirals in the Regular Navy.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Nov. 20, 1960]

NAVAL RESERVE PROMOTES REEDER TO REAR ADMIRAL

BUTTE.—Edgar H. Reeder, Butte businessman and Naval Reserve officer, has been selected for promotion to the rank of rear admiral. He is a former Great Falls man.

As far as is known he is the only Montanan ever to be chosen for flag rank in the Naval Reserve and is the first resident of the Pacific Northwest to be selected for a comparable grade in a number of years. There are a dozen native Montanans who are admirals in the Regular Navy.

A native of Canton, Ill., Reeder was reared on the Crow Indian Reservation at Hardin, where he attended grade school and high school. He was graduated from Montana State University with degrees in journalism and business after winning letters in baseball and being active in campus activities.

After being a newspaperman in Butte, he engaged in a business career in Great Falls and Butte prior to being called to active duty in the Navy 5 months before the outbreak of World War II. He was supply officer of the U.S.S. *Sangamon*, an aircraft carrier that suffered heavy casualties when struck by a Japanese suicide plane. The ship was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

Upon his return to Butte, he again engaged in business, operating the Electric and Music Mart 6 years, then managing a record business which he sold a year ago. Since December 1, 1959, he has been executive secretary of the Silver Bow Employers' Association in Butte.

Admiral Reeder is a former president of the Montana Reserve Officers Association, and also was national vice president of the Naval Reserve Association. He was administrator of two national resources conferences in Butte, in 1956 and 1959.

Admiral Reeder has been invited by the Navy Department to be a member of the selection board choosing Navy Supply Corps captains. It will meet in Washington February 21 and will be in session 2 weeks.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte-Anaconda, Mont., Oct. 30, 1960]

MONTANA HAS PROVIDED 12 ADMIRALS FOR U.S. NAVY

(By Frank Quinn)

Butte and Montana in general are a long way from salt water. The nearest ocean is some 600 miles distant, but the Mining City and the Treasure State has produced more than its share of native-born admirals for the U.S. Navy.

Three are native Butte men: Rear Adm. Dennis J. Sullivan, retired, Rear Adm. J. W. Callahan, retired, and Rear Adm. Alfred R. Matter, Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

In all, 12 boys born in the high mountains and rolling prairies of the Treasure State have gone off to the Naval Academy at Annapolis and then to ships, submarines, and planes to win high honors in three wars as well as contributing to peacetime achievements of the naval service.

Eleven of the twelve are native Montanans, the 12th lived most of his pre-Navy life in the Treasure State.

For many years Butte had one admiral, a title bestowed in honorary manner upon the late Eugene Carroll, early-day Annapolis graduate, whose interest in the Navy continued throughout his life. Carroll was one of the earliest members of the Navy League of Butte. He never did get away from the water. For many years, prior to his retirement, he was manager of the Butte Water Co. Navy personnel throughout the Nation knew the colorful Butte resident who was always in the forefront when the Mining City had occasion to pay tribute to the Navy.

This year the Navy League of Butte, of which E. P. Frizelle is president, obtained from the Navy Department in Washington, D.C., pictures and brief biographical sketches of Montanans who became admirals in Navy services. These sketches are presented here on the occasion of Navy Day, observed annually on or about October 27, the anniversary of the birth date of President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1858, the President who is regarded as the father of the modern U.S. Navy.

In addition to Callahan, Matter, and Sullivan, other Montanans who attained admiral rating are:

Vice Adm. Donald B. Beary, retired, Helena; Rear Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, Jr., Chinook; Vice Adm. George C. Towner, Fort Benton; Rear Adm. Wreford G. Chapple, retired, Billings; Rear Adm. Edwin S. Miller, Missoula; Rear Adm. Arthur A. Agelon, retired, Fromberg; Rear Adm. Neil D. Brantly, retired, Deer Lodge; Rear Adm. James M. Shoemaker, retired, Helena; and Rear Adm. J. C. Hoover, Great Falls.

To list the achievements of all of these men, the decorations they have won for distinguished and meritorious service, oftentimes service of conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity as commanding officers in the Navy, would require much more space. Suffice to say the men from the mountains and the prairies of the wide, expansive State that is Montana have acquitted themselves in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service.

BUTTE JOINS UNITED STATES TO HONOR NAVY

Navy Day has a special significance for all Americans in 1960 as new weapons take their place in the defense forces of the Nation.

Nuclear-powered submarines armed with the Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile now man their assigned bulwarks guarding against Communist aggression.

The official slogan for Navy Day is "U.S. Navy—Flexible Force for Freedom." It is not just a slogan according to Navy men but an outstanding analysis of the Navy of 1960.

Roaming over, under, and on 70 percent of the surface of the globe are ships and planes of the unique force. It is unique because it is capable of unleashing an attack from one submarine, more deadly and devastating than all the bombs dropped during World War II; but it can also provide just the right amount of force to meet any threat wherever it may occur; and it spends its off-duty hours making friends wherever it goes.

Navy Day was founded by the Navy League in 1922. The date of October 27 was selected, but the observance is flexible as is the Navy, with communities noting the day in conference with some special event which might occur within the week of Navy Day.

Butte's observance this year was highlighted by the swearing in Saturday night in Naranche Memorial Stadium of the all-Montana company of Navy recruits.

The ceremony was marked by the attendance of Rear Adm. Bernard M. Stearn, U.S. Navy, who gave the oath to the 78 young Montanans who have cast their lot with the Navy.

Saturday night during the stadium ceremonies Butte residents joined with Americans everywhere in paying tribute to the men and women of the Navy, to the traditions they have left us and to the victories which they won.

SKETCHES OF MONTANA'S ADMIRALS ON PARADE

All but 1 of the 12 Montanans who have achieved admiral rank in the U.S. Navy are presented as a Navy Day feature. Information concerning the Treasure Staters follows:

Vice Adm. Donald B. Beary, retired: A native of Helena, he won the Navy Cross in World War I, commanded the Navy base at Iceland in World War II, supplied the invasion fleets off Okinawa, served as commander of the Western Sea Frontier and president of the Naval War College. Home: Fort Benton.

Rear Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, Jr.: Born in Chinook, he was a destroyer commander in the Pacific in World War II, and as 7th Fleet planning officer, set up the invasion of Inchon in the Korean war. Later he was commander of cruisers and destroyers in the Pacific. Home: Fort Benton.

Vice Adm. George C. Towner: A Fort Benton native, he was navigator and executive officer of the cruiser U.S.S. *Louisville*, commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Helena*, commanded a task group in Arctic exploration and is now commander of Atlantic amphibious forces. Home: Norfolk, Va.

Rear Adm. Wreford G. Chapple, retired: This Billings native is known wherever men get together to discuss submarine operations in World War II. He won the Navy Cross twice and three Silver Stars as a sub skipper. In the Korean war he commanded surface ships. Home: Billings.

Rear Adm. Edwin S. Miller: A Missoula officer, he won a Navy Cross as a destroyer commander in the Pacific in World War II and is now chief of staff to the U.S. representative to the Standing Group, NATO, headquarters, Washington, D.C. Home: Missoula.

Rear Adm. Neill D. Branty, retired: This Deer Lodge officer won the Silver Star as an executive officer of the Cruiser U.S.S. *Denver* in the Solomon Islands in World War II when his ship sank two Japanese destroyers. Home: Houston, Tex.

Rear Adm. James M. Shoemaker, retired: Born in Helena, Admiral Shoemaker was an outstanding Navy flyer and ship commander particularly aboard the carrier U.S.S. *Franklin* for a year before it was kamikazied off Japan. He was not commanding officer at the time of the attack that almost sank the *Franklin* in one of the war's thrilling episodes. Home: Virginia Beach, Va.

Rear Adm. J. W. Callahan, retired: A native of Basin, Admiral Callahan received his early education in Immaculate Conception grade school and Butte High School. He is the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Callahan of Butte. A brother, John D. Callahan is in the insurance business here. Another brother, Captain C. P. Callahan is still in Navy service. Admiral Callahan wears the Navy Cross, Silver Star, Croix de Guerre (France), and two commendation ribbons with combat V. Home: Cordova, Calif.

Rear Adm. Dennis J. Sullivan, retired: He was born September 26, 1903, in Butte, the son of the late Dennis and Nellie Quinn Sullivan. He attended Montana State University at Missoula for a year before entering the U.S. Naval University at Missoula for a year before entering the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis. In addition to the Navy Cross, Legion of Merit with combat V, Bronze Star medal and the Presidential Unit Citation ribbon, he has the American Defense Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one silver and one bronze star, Philippine Liberation ribbon with one star; World War II Victory Medal, the Korean Service Medal, and the United Nations Service Medal. Home: Coronado, Calif.

Rear Adm. Alfred R. Matter: He was born in Butte, February 10, 1910, the son of Alfred Louis and Ida L. (Marchion) Matter. He attended Butte High School and Montana School of Mines before his appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. In addition to the Air Medal and a special commendation of the Secretary of Defense in 1955 he wears the Department of Defense lapel button, and the Presidential Unit Citation ribbon with three stars. He also has the American Defense Service Medal; American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with four operation stars, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with one star, World War II Victory Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal. Official home: Butte.

Rear Adm. A. A. Ageton, retired: This is the only Montana admiral whose picture was not available in time for this page. He is a native of Fromberg. Since retiring he has been working as a journeyman writer, author, and lecturer. In addition to the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal, he has the China Service Medal, the American Defense Medal with star, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with six stars, the American Campaign Medal, the Philippine Liberation Ribbon, and the World War II Victory Medal.

Adm. John H. Hoover, retired: Although born in Seville, Ohio, Admiral Hoover spent his childhood in Montana. He was appointed to the Naval Academy from Montana in 1903. He served in World Wars I and II and distinguished himself in both conflicts. He served almost 42 years in the Navy. In addition to the Navy Cross and Distinguished Service Medal with two Gold Stars Admiral Hoover has the Victory Medal, Destroyer Clasp; the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal and the World War II Victory Medals. Official home: Great Falls.

Rear Adm. B. M. Strean: Butte's guest admiral for Navy Day observance here was Rear Adm. B. M. Strean who swore in the first all-Montana regular recruit training company in Naranche Memorial Stadium Saturday night. He is commander of the Fleet Air Wing at Whidbey Island near Seattle.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte-Anaconda, Mont., Sept. 25, 1960]

NAVY TO ENLIST ALL-MONTANA COMPANY FOR 9-WEEK COURSE

Gov. J. Hugo Aronson has designated October as Navy Month in Montana in connection with a campaign to enlist what is believed to be the first all-Montana peacetime training company for the 9-week recruit course at San Diego.

The Navy needs more crews to man the ships such as the carriers that are being added to the fleet, the Governor said.

The Montana company will take the oath of allegiance during half time of the Butte-Kalispell high school football game here October 29 as a highlight of the Montana Navy Day observance. Montana dignitaries and Navy officers and men will participate.

At least 65 men between the ages of 17 and 30 will compose the Montana contingent, which will be given a special Christmas leave before completing training, according to Ens. William E. Evans, USN, officer in charge of the Navy recruiting station for Montana in Butte. The group will be called the Treasure Staters.

"Montana is proud to provide an all-State recruit training company for the Navy. The Navy hopes to assign a Montana man in charge of the company in San Diego. The record of this State in providing men for the Armed Forces, all out of proportion to its population, was remarkable in two World Wars. In peacetime, too, the State recognizes its obligation to provide manpower for the Nation's defense. Young men facing their military obligation would do well to sign up in this all-Montana group and complete their training together. We all will be watching this group as it takes its place aboard the planes and ships of the world's greatest Navy," the Governor said.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post, Oct. 31, 1960]

ALL-MONTANA NAVY COMPANY OF 80 MEN SWORN IN AT COLORFUL BUTTE EXERCISES

A ceremony, unique in naval history for Montana, a State which has provided 12

admirals, was held in Naranche Memorial Stadium, Saturday night.

Eighty young men, from every part of the wide expanse that is Montana, were sworn in as an all-Montana Regular Navy recruit training company, to be known as Treasure Staters. The ceremonies took place between halves of the Butte-Kalispell Class AA football classic.

"Montanans have given unselfishly of their sons and daughters in defense of our Nation," Rear Adm. B. M. Stearn, USN, who administered the oath of enlistment, told the large gridiron audience which included parents, friends, and relatives of the young recruits.

"Young men and women of the Treasure State have filled the ranks of the Armed Forces far out of all proportion to your population," the admiral said. "Your country, and especially your Navy, is proud of this fine heritage."

MANPOWER MOST IMPORTANT

Admiral Stearn said that in the last 15 years the United States has assumed the role of leader of the free world, and that it leads a comparatively shaky peaceful existence.

"We have been able to do this only by maintaining a strong military posture," the admiral said. "The Navy is an important part of this strong military posture. But, even with fast carrier task forces, deep running submarines, modern and advanced electronic, avionic, and nucleonic devices our military posture is nil without the most basic and valuable ingredient—man. Man, intellectually alert, ambitious and aggressive and aware of the role he must play in our country's affairs. This is the type of man that the State of Montana is sending us to man our aircraft, ships, and submarines. This is why I am pleased and proud to administer the oath of enlistment to your fine Treasure Staters."

NAVY BAND HERE

A 24-piece 13th Naval District Band from Seattle added to the color of the ceremonies. The band played a concert prior to the game and was on the field with a Marine Corps color guard during the ceremony.

The always colorful and pleasing Butte High School Band with its sparkling majorettes and twirlers staged its usually high-class entertainment before the game got underway.

Mayor Vern Griffith gave the address of welcome to the Navy visitors and extended his congratulations to the young recruits. Mayor H. V. Hammer of Kalispell, a World War II Seabee who served in the Pacific with the Navy responded to the Butte mayor's welcoming address and expressed pleasure at being present for the unique ceremony.

Capt. E. H. Reeder, Butte, USNR, was master of ceremonies. The admiral and his party was piped onto the field in traditional Navy fashion with Lt. Comdr. Carroll E. Davis, USNR, Butte, doing the honors with the boatswain's pipe. Members of Butte's Naval Reserve Surface Division, as sideboys.

[From the Montana Standard-Post, Oct. 29, 1960]

MONTANA NAVY COMPANY TO BE SWORN IN AT GAME TONIGHT

The first all-Montana Regular Navy recruit training company enlisted by the U.S. Navy recruiting service of Montana will be sworn in between halves of the Butte-Kalispell football game here tonight.

Eighty youths from all parts of Montana will take the oath that makes them Navy men. The oath will be administered by Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, USN, commander of the fleet air wing at Whidbey Island near Seattle.

The 24-piece 13th Naval District Band from Seattle and the admiral will arrive in Butte at 2 o'clock Saturday afternoon aboard a Navy plane. The band will play a concert prior to the game and will be on the field with a Marine Corps color guard during the halftime activities.

The Butte High School Band, majorettes, and twirlers will perform prior to game time. The school band performance will start at 7:45.

The address of welcome will be made by Mayor Vern Griffith. Capt. E. H. Reeder, USNR, will be master of ceremonies. The admiral and his party will be piped onto the field in true Navy fashion with Lt. Comdr. Carroll E. Davis, USNR, doing the honors with the boatswain's pipe. Six sideboys, members of Butte's Naval Reserve Surface Division, will stand at attention as the admiral moves onto the field.

Lieutenant Commander Meyring, Whidbey Island, public information officer of Fleet Air; Lt. Comdr. Owen Grinde, Butte, U.S. Naval Reserve, commanding officer of the Surface Division here; Lieutenant Dancer, USN, aid to Admiral Strean and Ens. W. E. Evans, officer in charge of the Navy recruiting substation in Butte, will be others taking part in the ceremonies.

The new recruits and the members of the Navy band will stay at the Naval Reserve training center Saturday night. The band will return to Seattle and the recruits will enplane in a 95-passenger Western Air Lines charter plane—the largest passenger plane believed ever to come into Butte—at 5:30 o'clock Sunday morning for their Navy boot training, which will be performed as a unit.

Some of these men may be assigned to the Navy's new nuclear carriers, atomic submarines, guided missile ships, and a variety of other craft sailing the globe.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post, Oct. 25, 1960]

NAVY FLYING BAND HERE FOR SATURDAY

A 24-piece Navy band will fly into Butte at 5 o'clock Saturday afternoon from Seattle to add a musical note to the Navy Day festivities at halftime of the Butte-Kalispell football game and participate in the swearing in of the all-Montana recruit company of Navy men.

The announcement was made Tuesday by E. P. Frizelle, president of the Butte Council of the Navy League.

He said the 13th Naval District Band will be on hand to play for early arrivals at the game and will play the Star Spangled Banner just before the kickoff at 8 o'clock.

At halftime, the sailor-musicians will parade on the field to add nautical airs to the ceremonies at which 78 Montana men will take the oath as members of the U.S. Navy. Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, USN, commander of the fleet air wing at Whidbey Island, near Seattle, will swear in the group. He will arrive here Saturday afternoon.

Frizelle said the Navy band will be overnight guests in the city and will be accommodated at the Naval Reserve Training Center, Clark Park.

The Navy League is supporting the Butte observance of Navy Day, Frizelle explained. The league is composed of friends of the Navy. Navy Day is marked on or about October 27, the anniversary of the birth in 1858 of Theodore Roosevelt, the father of the modern U.S. Navy.

WORLD CENTER FOR STUDY OF CLASSICAL GREEK TRADITION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently there appeared an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Erwin Knoll, noting that the late Mrs. Truxta Beale contributed $5 million to a world center devoted to the study of the classical Greek tradition to be established by Harvard University on a 6½-acre tract at 3100 Whitehaven Street nw., near Dumbarton Oaks, District of Columbia.

The Center for Hellenic Studies will be created and operated under a $5 million grant from the Old Dominion Foundation announced by Paul Mellon of Upperville, Va., chairman of the trustees of the foundation, and by President Nathan M. Pusey, of Harvard.

Mr. President, this announcement is timely because the last week of January each year is designated, "Greek Letters and Greek Press Week," by His Eminence Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America. More and more in recent years we have heard eminent scholars and teachers stressing the importance of the foreign language study in the United States. The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on May 8 and 10, 1957, called a 3-day work conference to consider how foreign language programs in schools may be redesigned to better serve the national needs. This conference was composed of representative leaders in the fields of foreign language teaching, school administration, curriculum development, guidance, and other related aspects of secondary education. As a result of this conference the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, has prepared several significant documents dealing with foreign languages in elementary schools, high schools, and colleges in the United States as well as source material for secondary teachers in foreign languages and emphasis on foreign languages in elementary schools.

In connection with the Greek Letters and Greek Press Week, it is interesting to note that the Greek archdiocese has been making studies to aid in solving some of the problems pertaining to the teaching of Greek in the public schools of America. The archdiocese now operates parochial schools teaching Greek in most of its parishes throughout the United States. Some of the National Greek organizations, such as the Order of Ahepa, Greek-American Progressive Association, Greek Orthodox Youth of America, and numerous Pan organizations, such as the Arcadians, Laconians, Messinians, Macedonians, Cretans, Cypriots, Athenians, Corinthians, Icarins, Eleians, Naxios, Levcadians, Epirotians, Pan-Rhodians, Fanarions, Micrasiatic, Chian, and Stereoelladiton, are working singularly, and jointly through the American Hellenic Congress, in providing the necessary data to encourage the teaching of Greek in the public schools in the United States, consistent with the information developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

For example, the Order of Ahepa has undertaken a nationwide drive to present a volume of Greek classics to the various high schools throughout the United States to encourage students to read the Greek classics. The GAPA inaugurated a plan for the past 2 years in conferring with local boards of education presenting data that would be helpful in adding Greek as a course of study in the public schools, on the basis that Greek and Latin are the basic languages

of the English language. It necessarily follows that each student should be well versed in those two languages to meet the standards of the best possible curriculum for our public schools in this atomic and space age. GAPA also has written to each governor and the mayors of the larger cities urging the teaching of Greek in public schools.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an article from the Orthodox Observer, an official publication of the Greek archdiocese, written by Morton Smith, professor of history, Columbia University, entitled "Hebrew—Why Not Greek?" and an article from the November–December 1960 issue of Tribune of GAPA, written by Dr. Benjamin Fine, entitled "Teaching of Foreign Languages Is Booming in Elementary Schools."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orthodox Observer]

HEBREW—WHY NOT GREEK?

(By Morton Smith)

A hundred years ago in the United States every college or high school which had any academic pretensions offered at least one course in Greek. Since the beginning of this century, vast numbers of Greeks came to this country, especially to Chicago and New York. At present, though Greek is still taught in the great universities and in a number of colleges, almost no high schools teach it. In New York City, for instance, there is only one public high school in which a course in Greek (and Latin) is offered; only five students are taking the course, and of these only one is a Greek.

Hebrew, by contrast, was never a part of the usual pattern of American high school teaching. A hundred years ago it was customarily offered only by colleges and theological seminaries. In the past hundred years vast numbers of Jews came to this country, especially to New York. At present, Hebrew is taught in 84 public schools in 16 American cities, and in over 200 colleges and universities. In New York City, in particular, it is taught in 34 junior high schools and 33 senior high schools of the public school system, to say nothing of private schools and colleges; the enrollment in the public school courses is in the neighborhood of 6,000, and many of the students are not Jews.

Behind this glaring contrast lies the work of a circle of devoted lovers of the Hebrew language, who set to work to save it as a part of America's national heritage. With this purpose they organized the Hebrew Culture Council to study the problem systematically and direct the different sides of the campaign. Success began as recently as 1930, when Hebrew was first offered by two public high schools in Brooklyn. But the preparation behind that first step, and the continued, well-directed effort, which followed it, made possible the immense growth of the past 18 years, during which in the New York public schools alone, almost 75,000 students have studied Hebrew.

The problem was not a simple one. If a language is to be taught in a public school there must be (1) teachers, (2) materials for teaching, (3) approval by the school authorities, (4) support by the community, and (5) pupils. Each one of these points presented special problems: Qualified teachers who knew Hebrew had to be found and persuaded to teach it (rather than some other more popular subject which they might have taught), and the educational authorities had to be persuaded to provide courses for the training of teachers of Hebrew and examinations for licensing them. The required materials for teaching included not only textbooks (of which two have now sold more than 100,000 copies each) but also a suitable curriculum (which could not include religious material, banned by law from the public schools), standards for estimating progress, and the many secondary aids (Hebrew folk songs, dances, plays, maps, pictures, and so on) which are much used in modern secondary education. Approval by the school authorities was contingent not only on the support by the community and the supply of pupils, but also on the ability of the committee to show that Hebrew would be of value to their students; would be accepted by colleges for the satisfaction of entrance requirements, could be carried on further in college study, and would open careers or intellectual fields not otherwise accessible. Support by the communities had to be organized through synagogues, women's organizations, and so on, and to go beyond mere demands to the school authorities for courses in Hebrew—it was most important that parents' committees be organized, parties be given for students, competitions arranged and prizes offered, and students and teachers alike encouraged not only by friendly interest, but also by substantial assistance, for instance in the form of summer scholarships for study in Israel, or in Hebrew-speaking summer camps in this country. Securing pupils, too, was not merely a matter of parental pressure. Many Jewish children, especially the children of immigrants, were highly critical of their parents and resentful of apparent ties with "the old country." Before they could be persuaded to study Hebrew they had to be convinced that it would not make them seem less American; they had to be shown that the intellectual achievements of European civilization were the natural heritage of America and central elements of the American tradition. Incidentally, the establishment of Hebrew in the curriculum of the public schools has had a wonderful effect on the morale of the Jewish youth. They now feel that the cultural tradition of their homes is officially recognized by their country, and the tension between their loyalty to their homes and their attempt to identify with the surrounding world has been diminished.

Now if all this could be done for Hebrew—as it was—why can not something similar be done for Greek? Admittedly, there are many more Jews in the country—and especially in New York—than there are Greeks. Nevertheless, a beginning could be made at once by finding more students for the course in Greek offered at the Erasmus Hall High School in Flatbush, where the devotion of the principal, Dr. McNeill, and of the instructor, Dr. Weddick, has kept alive—but just alive—the tradition that Greek is taught in our public schools. This immediately should be strengthened, by increasing the enrollment in the course. Next, if sufficient students can be found, the proper steps should be taken, through the office of the superintendent of schools, to have Greek restored in several other high schools, located near the several centers of Greek population. Finally, certain junior high schools which serve the largest Greek communities, should be persuaded to offer Greek as a third language. (This last step is most important, for most students continue in high school the language they began in junior high, but very few begin a second.)

The first of these steps, at least, could certainly be achieved by immediate pressure from the Greek archdiocese. But if the program is to have any long success it must be supported by the sincere efforts of the Greek laity, especially by the upper classes of the laity. Young Americans of Greek ancestry must see (and not only be told, for only seeing is believing) that the native language of their ancestors is a possession of which they, as Americans, should be proud. They must see that those Greeks who have been most successful in American life are also most concerned to maintain the knowledge of Greek in America. They must see that eminent Americans, who are not of Greek origin, share this concern. They must see that Greek is not necessarily a sign of split nationality, nor religious devotion, but is, in its own right, one of the greatest intellectual achievements of mankind, and is therefore taught in American schools, as the native language of the political and cultural tradition which has made America.

To demonstrate these facts, and to support them with all the secondary consideration and practical arrangements which were necessary to produce the revival of Hebrew, would require energetic leadership by a committee of distinguished and dedicated men and women, and the full-time work of an executive officer. But surely the goal deserves the effort. Greek is the basic language of the Western intellectual tradition. For any really serious study of occidental philosophy or religion it is absolutely essential. For any study of occidental literature or history it cannot be foregone, unless the student is willing to forego the original and formative documents of his subject, and confine himself to works which merely carry on and develop the tradition. The lack of a real command of Greek has reduced innumerable American scholars in these fields to second-rate repeaters of second-hand information, and this state of affairs will not change substantially until Greek is restored to secondary education, for it is a language so complex and subtle that it can hardly be mastered by those who do not begin it early. Beside its essential position in the study of the humanities, Greek is almost essential for serious study of sculpture, classical architecture, and the graphic arts (some Athenian vases show, perhaps, the finest draftsmanship the West has ever seen, and there are no more brilliant examples of stylization than certain Byzantine icons). The fantastic palace of Byzantine civilization can be unlocked only by Greek, and Byzantium and the Greek Levant are of the greatest importance for the medieval history of the West and for the history of Russia, Turkey, and the Balkans, down to modern times. The Balkan-Turkish area is of particular strategic importance just at present, and Greece is central in it. Even were it not, the extraordinary charm of modern Greek culture, and especially the great achievements of modern Greek poetry, deserve study in their own right. Finally, Greek scholarly publications, especially in the fields of history and archaeology, are of major importance for an area of studies much wider than that directly concerned with Greece. And all this has said nothing of the importance of modern Greek as a language of business and an international language throughout the Balkans and the Near East. A language which occupies such a position in the intellectual and historical worlds is one we cannot afford to do without. The revival of the study of Greek in our schools should be a major concern of every literate American, and if the Americans of Greek ancestry will take the lead in working for it they will perform a most valuable public service.

[From the Tribune of GAPA, November–December 1960]

TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IS BOOMING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

Don't be surprised if your 7-year-old child throws some foreign-sounding words at you when he comes home for lunch. Chances are, he is getting a smattering of French,

Spanish, German, or Italian as part of his school diet. Oddly enough, he likes it, too. The teaching of foreign languages in the Nation's elementary schools has mushroomed in the last 2 or 3 years.

A nationwide survey shows that a record 750,000 pupils are studying foreign languages in the elementary grades. Some 500 school systems, in every part of the United States, have introduced classes in various languages. The most popular are Spanish, French, and German, in that order. Twenty-five hundred different schools, within the 500 cities, have formal or informal language classes. They start from the first grade, sometimes even in kindergarten.

Radio and television are also used to make language teaching more exciting and more dramatic. The Encyclopedia Britannica Films has prepared a complete Spanish language called the Gloria and David series. It contains 519 authentically spoken Spanish sentences on records, as well as 14 color filmstrips. It has been tested in Texas at all grade levels from kindergarten through eighth grade, and found to be valuable. Many superintendents believe children who take foreign languages in the elementary grades will do much better when they reach high school. Ten years ago you could count on the fingers of one hand the number of school systems that permitted the teaching of foreign languages. It was a fad. Critics shook their heads and said it couldn't be done. "How can you expect a first grade child to learn French," they asked, "when high school students have so much trouble with it?"

The skeptics who then insisted that foreign language wouldn't go in the elementary grades now are crying: "It won't stop. Too many elementary children are taking languages. Where will we get the teachers? What will we do when the children reach high school? Can we afford the expense of this program?"

Nevertheless, those responsible for the expansion of the program are delighted. They see problems ahead, but they also recognize the importance of foreign languages to a country that has become a world power. Too many of our high school and college students graduate with little or no knowledge of any language but English—and sometimes they are not too good at that, either. For the past dozen years, worried educators issued pleas for reforming the teaching of foreign languages. Little was done. Then came sputnik. Educators redoubled their efforts to strengthen the curriculum, particularly in math, sciences, and foreign languages. The National Defense Act of 1958 allocated a substantial sum to improve the teaching of modern languages. The importance of languages was stressed by Dr. James B. Conant, in his valuable study of our high schools. Can a first, second, or third grader learn a difficult foreign language? Yes, says Dr. Donald Walsh, research director of the Modern Language Association. He has just completed a study of the teaching of languages in the country. And he is more than pleased at the fantastic growth that has taken place in the elementary grades.

"Children pick up a beautiful accent when they are young," Dr. Walsh observed. "They do not have the inhibitions of their older brothers and sisters. Their enthusiasm is remarkable." The program receives the wholehearted support of Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner on Education. He believes more emphasis should be placed upon foreign languages, and that this emphasis should come at an early age in the child's schooling. "As a Nation we are deplorably unprepared linguistically," Dr. Derthick warns. "Competence in the native language of our friends and foes has become essential for national security."

The United States is at the bottom of the list in the amount of foreign language study required of its school and college students. Such countries as France, Spain, the Soviet Union, Britain, Italy, and Germany require from 6 to 10 years of a second language. We require nothing. In most schools students take a language for 2 or 3 years. More than half of our high schools offer no modern foreign language at all. That is why the sudden interest in this field, particularly on the elementary level, looms so important today. This may well be a breakthrough in a vital academic field. But Dr. Derthick and his associates stress that many dangers lie ahead. If a school introduces French, for example, on the second grade level, there has been a lot of wasted motion. Long-range planning is essential.

"Sound instruction in a modern foreign language in the elementary grades, as elsewhere, must presuppose that objectives are clearly defined in terms of the overall aims and purposes for educating children ages 6 to 12," the commissioner comments. The big bottleneck in the elementary language program is the shortage of teachers. Can we get enough elementary teachers who have the skills, the techniques, and the abilities to make German, French or Spanish exciting and challenging to 6-year-olds? Not at this time. But they can be trained and developed. When Mrs. Evelyn Solomon, second-grade teacher at the Wilson Elementary School of Rockville Center, New York, taught her 24 youngsters German last year, many parents raised their eyebrows. German? At that age? Impossible. But they changed their tune when they heard their children say "guten morgen," "guten nacht," or "sie singst sehr schon." By the end of the second grade the 7-year-olds had picked up 200 basic German words. The parents wanted this program to continue. The superintendent, Herbert Johnson, agreed.

Mrs. Solomon continued with her same class; when school opened several weeks ago, she was promoted to the third grade with her pupils. They will now have another year of German. "I expect them to have 500 words by the end of the year," Mrs. Solomon, an inspiring master teacher, said. And the youngsters? "We love German," they chorused. "It's so much fun. It's just like a game," one bright-eyed girl, 8-year-old Janet, said. "The words sound like music."

Everywhere children enjoy the thrill of learning a new language—quite unlike the moans and groans with which high school students often approach this subject. A first-grade boy in a Miami, Fla., school gave this reason for his enthusiasm: "I want to learn Spanish so that when I bump into Spanish people I can talk to them." And another young gentleman, in the second grade of another Miami school, had his own good reason. Said he: "I have a girl friend who lives next door. She is Spanish. I want to learn Spanish so I can talk to her." A sensible young man.

Whatever the reasons, the teaching of foreign languages in elementary school should be encouraged. Our country will be strengthened if more of our citizens understand the culture and the languages of other nations. We cannot remain a world power and provincial at the same time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, also, I should like to make a brief comment that the Greek newspapers and radio and television programs are being honored on this last week in January as a part of Greek Letters and Press Week. I know that in my State of Illinois we have excellent Greek newspapers, such as the Greek Star, Greek Press, the Chicago Pnyx, and Hellenic Free Press, and the Athenian magazine. Also, the Greek-American residents of the State of Illinois read the national Greek daily newspapers, such as the Atlantis and the National Herald, both of which are published in New York City. Several fine weekly newspapers, such as the National Tribune, the Detroit Athens, Hellenic Chronicle, and Sunday Greek News, also published outside of the State of Illinois, have a faithful group of readers in my State. All of these newspapers serve a useful purpose to the Americans of Hellenic descent in Illinois who are versed in both the English and the Greek languages. In this connection, I am quoting from an editorial which appeared in the National Herald, January 1, 1961, which refers to an editorial from the Boston Globe, pertaining to the importance of foreign language newspapers in the United States and it states as follows:

A Recourse Not Quite Lost

Exceedingly unfortunate in the eyes of most Americans has been the failure of many second generation citizens to retain knowledge of their parents' native language. The people of this country are not good linguists; highly regrettable has been what has seemed the loss of a resource exceedingly important at a time when calls on American diplomacy are heavy.

Fortunately that resource has not quite been lost. A survey has revealed that there are 800 foreign language newspapers in the United States, with a total circulation of 6 million.

The U.S. Office of Education has now made a grant of $125,615 for a 2-year study of ethnic groups, with the idea of renewing their knowledge of their ancestral languages.

The project is important and timely. For a half century or more, second generation citizens have wanted above all things to be Americans. They have concentrated on English, and have sought to perfect themselves in its correct use. They have often been oversensitive about being considered "foreigners," and about their parents' native tongues, which have frequently been local dialects.

But the non-English newspapers print their languages correctly. Nearly a half century has passed since mass immigration ended; Americans of all ancestral backgrounds have contributed their courage and sacrifice in two World Wars. An effort to teach children of ethnic groups the tongues of their first ancestors in this country, and to teach it correctly, should not run into the natural sensitiveness such attempts have met in the past. That should be especially the case, now that it can be pointed out that such knowledge can be of immense value to the country in a critical era.

Mr. President, I believe that everyone who is interested in the highest possible type of curriculum for our students at all levels would agree with the thoughts expressed by the experts that the study of foreign languages has a significant place in the curriculum of our public schools. I hope these comments may help to throw further light and public attention to this project.

BIRTHDAY OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday I was necessarily absent from the Senate and was unable to join my other colleagues in wishing a happy birthday to our distinguished Vice President, Mr. Richard Nixon. I do so today.

I have read, with great interest and hearty approval, the fine things which were said about our Vice President yesterday; and, indeed, I believe that his conduct and deportment, his devotion to the fundamental traditions of our country, evidenced in defeat, in terms of the presidential race, will prove to be as historic as anything which he has done in the course of a long and very important career, which still has many years to run and in which he has many great achievements to make.

I served with Vice President NIXON from the very beginning of his service in the Congress. He was elected to the 80th Congress, just as I was. He has been a personal friend of mine for all of these years, since 1946.

In wishing a happy birthday to him, to Pat, and their children, and a long and happy life and fruitful living, and remembering the warm friendship which he has enjoyed with me and so many others, I should like to emphasize that we are right now debating what I consider to be the most historic single ruling made by Vice President NIXON as Vice President, which I believe will have a profound effect upon constitutional law in this country, upon the development of our legislative processes, and upon the development of an enlightened national policy. I refer to his ruling that, under the Constitution, the Senate of the United States has control of its own rules, notwithstanding the shackles which it may have endeavored to put on itself by the terms of those rules.

As I have said, when we think about a man's birthday, and wish him well, we think of his services. I think this service will prove to be as historic a service as any rendered by the Vice President in the course of a brilliant career as Vice President.

One must also note the impact of his visits to foreign countries and the eloquence and idealism evidenced by his character and in the representation of the best in our Nation to so many friends and allies, and some who are not our friends and allies, abroad.

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM R. WOOD AT UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last fall the University of Alaska, situated just west of Fairbanks, and the world's northernmost institution of higher learning, inaugurated a new president, the fourth in the history of this land-grant college which was created by act of Congress in 1915. He is William Ransom Wood, a distinguished educator, with a personality of rare warmth and charm, who came to the University of Alaska from the University of Nevada where he had served for 4 years as academic vice president. Dr. Wood was chosen by the regents of the University of Alaska from a long list of outstanding highly qualified applicants. It did not take long thereafter for the members of the faculty, the alumni, and the student body, as well as for numerous other Alaskans, to become convinced of the wisdom of the regents' choice.

His inaugural address, delivered on October 23, last, I believe, adequately reveals the character, enlightenment, and high purpose of President Wood. It likewise spells out a program for the University of Alaska which should evoke the interest and support of all who understand how crucial is the need for high standards of higher education and the important relevance of the pursuit of knowledge to the survival of civilization and freedom.

In coincidental harmony with the clarion call to the American people of the new President-elect of the United States to seek new frontiers, so the address of the new president of the University of Alaska summons the people of our 49th State to extend its higher education to new frontiers which will beckon not merely to the present dwellers in the last frontier, but invite other Americans who wish to respond to the great challenges of our age.

I ask unanimous consent that President Wood's stirring inaugural address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

People of Alaska, Governor Egan, Mr. Rasmuson, I accept your charge and your challenge. Come to think of it, at this point there isn't much else I could do.

In accepting such honor and responsibility I am mindful of my own inadequacies. The tasks I assume, of course, must be shared in many ways by members of my family. I should like publicly to thank them for their patience with me and their confidence, which at times I feel is misplaced and a bit on the brash side.

To my mother, Elizabeth Ransom Wood, who at 88 has made the long jet flight alone from Illinois to Fairbanks to be with us on this occasion, I must pay a son's tribute. She is herself a prairie pioneer with the pioneer's abiding faith in education. All her life she has believed firmly that a good, hard-working farm boy could do anything. She saw to it that at least one farm boy had the opportunity to work hard by using a broomstick with judgment and skill upon just the right portion of the boy's anatomy at the proper time.

To my children I am most appreciative for their amused tolerance: to Bill, who is now an editorial assistant for a publishing company in Chicago, and with deadlines that kept him there today, to Mark and to Karen who are here and for once reasonably in line.

To my wife, Dorothy Jane Irving, who keeps the show going onstage and sees that the rehearsal schedule is met, I am completely in debt at all times. From her I learned recently that the chief qualification for being a university president is the ability to spread a little ignorance over a lot of ground.

A man's family is all important to leading a full and satisfying life; it keeps him from taking himself too seriously.

With the good help of my family, in particular of my wife, I can accept the burden of the presidency of the University of Alaska and pledge my full attention to the job.

THE NORTHMOST STAR

The University of Alaska is an incredible institution. For nearly 4 months I have been exploring some of its many facets. To my delight, and at times dismay, I have discovered an astonishing commonwealth of higher educational enterprises. Each day seems to bring into focus a new activity. Each day provides some shred of insight into the complex interrelationships among its several units, interests, and activities. It would be as difficult to know the University of Alaska by studying only one of its parts, as it would be to know Cleopatra, the one of infinite charm, by observing a lock of her hair in a glass box.

Where but in Alaska could one find a single university with a fur farm, a musk-ox herd, a square mile of glacier, several tons of bones of prehistoric animals, an ice station on the Polar ice cap four hundred-odd miles North of land's end, a world-famous scientist with a special alarm system to awaken him whenever the aurora borealis flashes across our northern skies, two satellite tracking stations, no social fraternities, no sororities, and no losing football team for the alumni to use as an excuse for firing the president?

For any parent who has a son or daughter who really wants to learn, I can heartily recommend the University of Alaska. The distraction factor on campus is very low; yet there is a lot of fun.

I am old fashioned enough to believe that students who want to learn comprise the single most important reason for a university. Here on the campus of the University of Alaska there is time to read, time to talk, time to question, time to seek answers in the reference books, time to dream, time to study, time to learn. Here there is time to enjoy the experience of being young. Here there is time to grow in self-knowledge, in philosophical purpose, and in stature among one's peers. Frankly, as I watch the campus come alive when the students arrive, I appreciate fully the remark, "It's hell to be growing old." I'd like to begin the glorious heartaches of youth all over again—here on the campus of the University of Alaska.

I have not yet recovered from the delightful shock of finding instruction underway in classrooms and laboratories from 7:30 in the morning until 10 in the evening, of finding a schedule of Saturday morning classes, a library filled with students on Saturday afternoons and nearly so on Sunday afternoons and evenings, and faculty and administrative office lights burning far into the night. Here the learning lamp is lit, it seems, around the clock, around the calendar.

I am mindful of beginnings. Such an enterprise as the University of Alaska and such esprit de corps don't just happen. The present state of the university, of course, is in part the direct result of a unique environment, an environment that has in recent years increasingly attracted the strong interest of the Federal Government and major foundations. The present rather exceptional quality of the faculty, in part, is traceable to such outside special interests.

The vision and fantastic persistence of the founder and first president, Dr. Bunnell; the imaginative conceptions of Dr. Moore and the dynamic practical leadership of President-emeritus Patty have established a statewide belief in the value of the university.

It is said that a university is a community of scholars. Among the pioneering University of Alaska faculty members of the past have been many great scholars and great teachers: Otto Geist, George Gasser, Mrs. Ladessa Nordale, Dr. Fletcher, Dr. Bramhall. The list is long and distinguished. A university is also a community of typists, account clerks, stenographers, custodians, watchmen, carpenters, painters, electricians, plumbers, mechanics, heating plant operators, cooks, bakers, groundskeepers, firemen, and heavy-duty equipment operators. The university has been held together literally by the skill and loyal service of such long-time staff members as George Keyes, Eunice Collins, and Jack Sullivan. Try operating a university campus for even a single day or night without such as these.

The wise counsel and devoted unselfish public service of boards of regents, past and present, under the strong and expert guidance of such persons as Mrs. Luther Hess,

Mr. Andrew Nerland, and Mr. Elmer Rasmuson have gained far-reaching support for the instructional, research, and public service activities of the university and for its rapidly developing physical plant and growing campus.

Backstopping the regents with exceptional skill and service far beyond the call of duty have been members of the congressional delegation from Judge Wickersham to incumbents Bartlett, Gruening, and Rivers, the Governor, members of the State legislature, and numerous other prominent State officials.

Locally, the university has enjoyed the confidence of the college-Fairbanks community, as have the community college units at Anchorage, Juneau-Douglas, Ketchikan, and Palmer in their communities enjoyed similar friendly assistance. Statewide, the University of Alaska has gained the prideful support of the people of Alaska of all occupations, professions, and pursuits.

The military services, the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, in particular their commanding officers, have contributed much to the university's present stature.

The university is the product of the combined enthusiasms and interests of many. To each who has contributed a measure of allegiance, it is indebted—and deeply indebted to its alumni and former students who have so actively campaigned to create modern facilities for the students and faculty, and have so effectively encouraged graduates of the high schools of Alaska to enroll at their own State university. Alumni, you have counseled promising students of ability wisely in directing them to your alma mater. As a proper environment for advanced learning there are few among America's 2,000 campuses to equal that provided at the University of Alaska. From this splendid setting will continue to emerge, year after year, the men to match our mountains. That is, if the university remains free.

The founders of Alaska's statehood, continuing a Territorial precedent, in their wisdom established the University of Alaska in the original constitution as a corporate entity. While the university is in all matters ultimately responsible to the people of Alaska, and immediately responsible to the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches of State government, it is not directly a unit of any one of the latter. The university is not the State prison, the State hospital, the State division of public roads, nor the State employment service. The university has its own distinctive purposes and needs and operational procedures. Its unique value to the State is a direct reflection of its independent status. The university is nonpolitical, nonsectarian, and nonsectional. The university may be questioned and challenged, yet if it is performing its job well, it is above controversy. The university must be free to seek to know the truth wherever the truth may be found. It must be free to gather data, to analyze and to interpret data without bias or prejudice. To do this creditably for the benefit of its students, the advancement of knowledge, and the well-being of the State, it must be free and responsible. A baby idea, even a strong and lusty one of noble parentage, does not thrive in an ocean of bureaucratic redtape, nor does it reach mature stature until it has achieved a full measure of self-knowledge, self-discipline, and self-denial. In higher learning only the free can be strong and only the strong can carry the responsibility of positive accomplishment.

In recent months we have read much in the magazines about the urgent need for the United States to reshape and to redefine our national purpose. Perhaps there is a measure of concern in this matter for each of us. We know what that purpose has been—or we ought to know. It is set forth clearly in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, and in the Bill of Rights. It stresses the dignity and the worth of the free individual in a free society of free institutions.

Governments exist for the benefit of men; men do not exist for the benefit of governments. Among the 2½ billion humans in the world today, nearly one-third are subject to the contrary ideology—and one-third are on the fence precariously perched as the prize in a global tug-of-war. For these, as indeed for almost the whole of mankind in modern history, America has been the symbol of hope for the less fortunate. The land may have been discovered, explored and at times exploited by the adventurer, but it has been developed by the man who just wanted a chance for himself and his children, by the man who more often than not took his job and his responsibilities more seriously than he took himself. From every people of the earth came those who wanted to be one of us. With their good help "our strength became the strength of 10 because our heart was pure." We grew and prospered and became mighty among nations.

There came, then, a turn in attitude; our stature invited envy and suspicion and distrust. Today those who want a chance to test themselves in the game played by freemen are outnumbered by those who want control of the score and a free hand with the prize. The uncommitted one-third aren't certain which way to lean in the tug-of-war.

Yes, it is urgent that we rethink and reaffirm our purpose as a free people. Somewhere along the line we seem to have lost our appeal. Somehow we have managed to weight the balance a bit too much in favor of the rights of the individual, especially the negative, the nonproductive privileges. The acceptance of responsibility as an individual for more than self-interest has become unpopular among us. Our laws and our procedures have increasingly been designed to defend the self-centered and the nonresponsible.

Perhaps the most important task facing us as a free people is the shaping of a clear distinction between the rights and privileges of the individual and his obligations to the group of which he is a part. At some point which we must define, the good of the one individual merges with or becomes subordinated to the good of the many people. This is always easier to accept for the other person than it is for oneself. The rights of the individual in the group, however wrong, are always more popular than the rights of the group in the individual.

Why in commenting upon the University of Alaska do I highlight freedom and responsibility of the individual as a member of a group? The answer is a simple one: The indivisibility of freedom and responsibility is a fundamental philosophical concept. A university must deal in fundamentals. It must also deal with the forces of continuous change among concepts, their mutations, their interpretations, and applications.

Time was when a university could go along its quiet way quite apart from immediate public concerns of the day and place. That hour of history is past. For the first time in the records of mankind higher education has now become a vitally significant part, indeed, a prominently indispensable part, both of domestic and foreign policy of our own and of all other major national governments.

The impact of this 20th century fact of life, a real shocker in its ramifications, is not yet fully realized even by the mature and intellectually sophisticated faculties of our greatest universities. Yet the students we are educating today will be among the first to live in the 21st century. Are we thinking that far ahead? Are the meaningful courses of instruction for tomorrow that same old assortment of leftover theories and outmoded principles and procedures we knew as students before the great depression and World War II and Russia and Red China and Africa in turmoil? Are we today educating the youth of Alaska for yesterday rather than for tomorrow? Are we heading toward the final roundup on the last frontier or toward a rendezvous with destiny on the new frontier of the space age? It is so easy to put our hindsight where our foresight ought to be—but it certainly distorts our aim.

It is easy to educate for yesterday. Mediocrity loves it. Besides, it is cheaper. The worthless usually is. Higher education for the 21st century will require the most strenuous efforts of our toughest minds. It will be very, very expensive. As expensive by comparison as a Polaris missile is to a World War I torpedo—and as necessary for survival as the Polaris. Yet there is little choice open to us as a people. We go forward militantly into the 21st century intellectually and ethically armed or we shall stand still and be dragged into it to degenerate into ignorance and mediocrity and oblivion.

As long as I am president of your university, good people of Alaska, I shall endeavor with the aid of the best faculty talent available to me, to keep you informed as to what it will cost to educate your sons and daughters for tomorrow. I shall ask your support for every dollar it will take to do the job. I promise you, however, that I shall not ask for lemon meringue pie in a buttermilk sky.

Time was when a handful of almost any kind of seedcorn scattered on almost any kind of soil with any kind of weather would produce enough to live on. We know now that near maximum production is required for our survival as a people. This requires the very best seed, the very best fertilizers, and just the right amount of irrigation at the right time. The university, the whole business of higher education, is subject to this same inexorable law: For these times if there is to be a tomorrow for us and our cherished beliefs, only the best, the very best, will suffice.

Why should you as a taxpayer support your University of Alaska?

First, it is with its several community college branches, its off-campus classes, its research projects, its statewide extension services, and its numerous field stations and shore laboratories your total system of public higher education for the great State of Alaska, the biggest of them all. It is a land-grant university, one of a half hundred or so truly major centers of learning today. As such it is a valued member of the greatest system of public higher education that the world has ever known for cultivating the extraordinary possibilities latent in ordinary people. Historically, these land-grant universities, at least one in every State, have provided a chance and a challenge for all who might be able to profit from the experience. At the same time they have demanded the highest quality achievement and performance of their candidates for graduation.

You should take pride in the fact that one multipurpose, comprehensive institution for the many is the simplest, the most effective, and the most economical organization from the standpoint of the taxpayer that has ever been devised. For this, Alaska is envied by the other States that have several public institutions competing with one another for a share of the tax dollar, with the inevitable overlapping and duplication of functions adding to the total cost. As an Alaskan you get a bigger return than is possible in any other State on every dollar you invest in higher education.

Second, you have long demonstrated your belief in higher education, even in hard times when you had little to offer toward its support other than good will and best wishes. You have demonstrated the faith of the pio-

neer in education, a faith that has led America into greatness. You want the best for your own sons and daughters and for your neighbor's sons and daughters. You recognize Alaska's educated youth as Alaska's greatest resource for the future. You know well that without the enthusiasm and strength of these young people at their very best Alaska cannot be developed significantly in our time either economically, or socially, or culturally. (The three are one and inseparable.) You want top-quality higher education for young Alaskans and you want it here and now.

Third, you are aware of Alaska's geographic location and its strategic implications for modern global relationships. Not only is the University of Alaska the farthest north institution of higher learning on earth, it is also the American university closest to Asia—to Russia, to China, to Korea, to Japan, and the Far East. Over the jet-age polar route, it is a near neighbor to the other great universities of the Far North—at Stockholm, at Oslo, at Copenhagen, at Helsinki, and at Leningrad. Slightly to the south it is linked to the growing universities at Edmonton, at Vancouver, and at Seattle.

If there were no other reason than geography, it is inevitable that the University of Alaska must become a distinguished regional center for research and advanced studies. It is in precisely the right place at the right time in history. Not only the State, but the Nation is concerned that great strides toward the fulfillment of this destiny be undertaken promptly.

Let us move forward on all possible appropriate fronts. In the earth sciences and the extractive mineral industries rest many of our hopes for immediate economic advancement. To strengthen Alaska economically is to strengthen America and the free world. The mining of nonmetallic ores so profitable elsewhere is yet in its infancy in Alaska. The discovery of vast Alaskan reserves in petroleum and gas put renewed emphasis upon the study of geology, geochemistry, seismology, glaciology, and geological exploration. The space age demands for new combinations of metals and rare earths, to function under exceedingly difficult pressures and temperatures, stresses the continuing imperative importance of the sciences of metallurgy and volcanology. Adequate support for a strong program in earth sciences and extractive mineral industries, including further exploration and advanced study of Alaska's paleontological treasure house, is a direct way of putting money in our pockets. The future here is very bright, indeed.

We must add to the fine record of accomplishment in geophysics, strengthen our good beginnings in the mathematics as well as in the other physical and engineering sciences, rapidly advance work in appropriate aspects of oceanography, meteorology, data processing, space technology, and electronics. Some of the studies needed by tomorrow's citizens will surely be out of this world.

We must get on with the task of building the Institute of Marine Sciences, of strengthening our instruction and research in the biological and health sciences, especially as these pertain to living in cold weather environments found in the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions. From such basic studies come progress in natural resources administration in agriculture, in forestry, in wildlife management, in food processing, and in replenishable fiber production. This is a very practical matter. It is the application of new knowledge and new processes to meet immediate needs of people.

Studies in the biological sciences and the physical sciences, however, cannot stand alone. There must be a comparable development in the social sciences. Specifically I mean in economics, in political science, in history and their direct applications in business administration, in management, in marketing, in accounting, and in office administration. As an integral part of its basic and advanced instruction and research program the university faculty and students in the social sciences of the public administration fields can serve the communities and the State government as informed but unbiased, and unprejudiced factfinders. Only upon the basis of analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of pertinent factual information can sound decisions for the building of Alaska be made. To this end I am hopeful that strong support can be gained for the early development of a bureau of business, economic, and government research.

One of the major areas of service of the university is the preparation of teachers for Alaska's elementary and secondary schools. The university has an obligation, also, to provide leadership based upon experimentation and experience toward improving at all levels for all types of youngsters the quality of instruction available to them. This is a universitywide obligation which every department of instruction and every university faculty member must share. A particularly important contribution, of course, is expected of the behavioral sciences: anthropology, psychology, and sociology.

I have mentioned in brief certain areas of opportunity and responsibility of a modern State university whose main campus is located at approximately 65° north latitude on the continent of North America. I have attempted to sketch the urgent necessity of adequate support in Alaska for a vigorous, dynamic program of research and instruction in the earth and extractive mineral sciences, the physical and engineering sciences, the biological and health sciences, and the social sciences, including education, business administration, and public administration.

Mastery of these and related professional disciplines, however, alone or in combination, will not suffice to make a community livable, a State and people prosperous, or to bring satisfaction and fulfillment to an individual. Something more is needed, the essence of which traditionally is found in the humanities and the fine arts which supply indispensable ingredients for the good life. Philosophy, literature, language, art, music, drama—the whole enchanting range of the creative and performing arts—are essentials in higher education for tomorrow as for today and yesterday.

The humanities and fine arts may be considered the natural matrix from which come the fundamental ideas that activate the thinking man in all time. (There are much better ways of saying this. I am sure several occur to you even now.)

The humanistic studies and their creative manifestations provide the insights into purpose, provide the binding stuff which holds together the entire human enterprise in higher education. A student who leaves the university without having had a balanced program of basic instruction in the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities has not received the genuine advantages of a university education. He may be skilled, he may be schooled, but he is not an educated man.

I am delighted to observe that the master campus development plan for the University of Alaska unveiled only yesterday for the first time by the Ford Foundation-financed Stanford research planning group under the able direction of Dr. MacConnell, Mr. Ciampi, Dr. Kendall, Mr. Lackey, Mr. Knorr, and associates, clearly underscores in a physical way the central importance of the humanities and the fine arts. A major structure for tomorrow's campus is the proposed center for the cultural arts. This is conceived to include classrooms, studies, laboratories, offices, and exhibition halls for art, music, speech, and drama, a little theater for student performances, and, ultimately, a major auditorium for community concerts and large university-community convocations. The center would contain, also, a modern museum adequate to house Alaska's world-renowned collection of anthropological, archeological, paleontological, botanical, and zoological specimens of the Far North. The master plan shows a magnificent library as the very heart of the campus. (Only the library could be the heart of a great university.) Such a center for the cultural arts, complete with appropriate extensive library and museum collections, would be in the eyes of the world a mark of maturity for all Alaska, a symbol of the true achievement of statehood in its finest sense.

Such projections are not so wild a dream. If we are to educate properly Alaskan youth for the 21st century, even for the last four decades of the 20th, we must get on with our constructive tasks. Some State projects, some private plans, can be delayed, but not the education of youth. Short of abhorred catastrophe, the urgent needs of youth cannot be stopped or denied. A very large investment of enthusiasm, energy, creative imagination, persistence, and dollars is required. It is, nonetheless, an investment none of us can afford not to make.

Somehow I know in my heart that each of you, students, faculty, all Alaskans, will join me in this high endeavor. Together let us create for all time a truly distinguished center of higher learning in the 49th State. Let us build the University of Alaska to be the northmost star in the intellectual firmament—a polar guidemark for free men everywhere. Let it not be under a Red star from beyond the Bering Straits, but under a white star, 1 of 50 on a field of blue.

AID FOR THE ARTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the national factors that contributes to our position overseas is the level of our creative activities in the arts. In the last decade our American heritage has found extraordinary expression in painting, sculpture, architecture, literature, and the performing arts. The President's Commission on National Goals has cited the importance of supporting the arts, and there is increasing need for Congress to concern itself with the problem of broadening the base of our cultural renaissance. One step in this direction would be the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation, a bill for which I introduced in the last Congress with the support of a wide area of nonprofessional, professional, and business sources in the field of the performing arts.

I have also been a strong supporter of cultural exchange as a means of exhibiting in overseas countries the best in American culture. American artists have rendered magnificent service in sharing our country's culture and promoting good relations with other countries.

As illustrations of the importance of encouraging the arts, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed with my remarks a report headed "Vienna Theaters Stage U.S. Plays," in the New York Times of January 2, and in the same newspaper, a report on the operations of the Arts Council of Great Britain, headed "British Aid Spurs Rise in Repertory," and a third report, also dealing with American drama abroad, is an account of experiences directing African, Middle East, and South American actors by Dr.

Frank C. Davidson, professor of speech and drama at the College of the City of New York, published in Equity, January 1961.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIENNA THEATERS STAGE U.S. PLAYS—WORKS BY AMERICAN AUTHORS DOMINATE PRODUCTIONS—"HARVEY" IS LATEST HIT

(By M. S. Handler)

VIENNA, December 31.—The current success of Mary Chase's "Harvey" at the Akademie Theater has focused attention on the increasingly important role of American authors in theater life here.

The December 29 premiere of "Harvey," with the German comedian Heinz Ruehmann in the lead, drew the most enthusiastic reviews from Vienna's drama critics. The principal newspapers dealt with "Harvey" as a notable event of the season.

Last night saw the premier of Gore Vidal's "Visit to a Small Planet" in Mme. Stella Kadmon's Theater der Courage.

Next month, the Akademie Theater will produce Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman"; the Theater in der Josefstadt will offer Elmer Rice's "Cue for Passion" and the Theater im Zentrum will present Noel Norton's "In Search of a Dictator."

This season has already seen a long procession of American plays that seem destined to become part of permanent repertoires. They include Eugene O'Neill's "Ah, Wilderness," and "Beyond the Horizon," Tennessee Williams' "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," Perry Conner's "Patsy," Ernest Hemingway's "The Old Man and the Sea," and Robert Anderson's "Silent Night, Lonely Night."

The gravitation of Vienna's theatrical producers toward American plays has come about in a natural way and without any official sponsorship by Austrian or American agencies. The producers apparently find American plays easily adaptable from a technical point of view. The themes and moods of the plays also seem to correspond to the tastes of Vienna's theatergoing public.

Although American writers are finding increasing favor, British and French authors are highly appreciated. The foreign play that has won the greatest acclaim this season was Jean Anouilh's "Becket" at the Burgtheater. All the drama critics found "Becket" a masterpiece.

Another play by a French author that attracted considerable attention was Henry de Montherlant's "Cardinal of Spain," which had its world premiere at the Burgtheater December 15.

Eugene Ionesco's "Rhinoceros" is again being shown at the Nammerspiele. Jean Genêt's "Balcony" will be presented at the Volkstheater at the end of January.

British plays that have been or will be produced this season include Nöel Coward's "Blythe Spirit," Terrence Rattigan's "Browning Version," and George Bernard Shaw's "Village Wooing."

Although the Vienna theater has always been cosmopolitan in its taste, there probably never has been a period in which its own contemporary playwrights have played so small a role.

BRITISH AID SPURS RISE IN REPERTORY—ARTS COUNCIL GAINS IN EFFORT TO PROVIDE AN OUTLET FOR NEW THEATRICAL TALENT

(By Seth S. King)

LONDON, January 1.—Efforts to revive the repertory theater in Britain and provide, through it, an outlet for young playwrights, directors and designers, are showing signs of succeeding.

It has not been easy. In the years immediately after World War II, the old repertory companies had to be reassembled. Theaters had to be modernized.

In the last decade, the competition with television grew steadily. So did the indirect competition from a booming real-estate market, in which theaters often could make far more money as commercial or residential units. In 1958–59, repertory companies in six provincial cities lost their theaters and were disbanded.

But at the end of 1960, in England, Scotland, and Wales, there are 30 repertory theaters, with an average of 25 members each. Ten years ago, there were 12 groups.

GOVERNMENT AGENCY PLAN

Behind the movement is the Arts Council of Great Britain, a Government-financed organization created in 1946 to encourage—and subsidize—professional art, music, and drama. Its drama efforts were not fully underway until 10 years ago.

The council is concentrating on permanently housed, nonprofit companies. During the fiscal year that ended last April, the council provided £84,660 ($237,048) in drama grants.

Most of the council's funds have gone to new writers. If a repertory theater wants to produce the work of a new playwright, it may submit his play to the council. If the council's readers agree that it deserves to be produced, the council will pay a major share of the production cost. If the play is poorly received, the grant is larger, and vice versa.

The council also gives direct grants to young playwrights it believes should be encouraged.

YIELDS ARE PROMISING

Its backing of plays by new authors has already shown promising yields.

The council subsidized Robert Bolt's "The Critic and the Heart" 3 years ago. Since then, he has emerged as one of Britain's most successful playwrights. His "A Man for All Seasons," and "The Tiger and the Horse" are enjoying successful runs in the West End.

Shelagh Delaney, author of the current Broadway success, "A Taste of Honey," had an Arts Council grant. Her play was first produced at the Theater Workshop here with council backing.

Arnold Wesker, who wrote "Roots," "Chicken Soup With Barley" and "I'm Talking About Jerusalem," had a grant. The first two plays were backed by the council at the Belgrade Theater in Coventry.

The Arts Council has been attempting to break through the resistance to staging contemporary serious drama. Its directors believe that what is new and different must, if it bears any promise at all, be given a trial.

NEW WRITERS COULD POINT WAY

"Young, inventive writers will change the face of the English theater, and so will the designers, if they ever have the opportunity to show their wares," J. L. Hodgkinson, the council's drama director, said recently.

The council also expects to give funds to repertory companies for promising stage designers. It is planning to encourage art-school students interested in stage design.

"The most important thing now for British repertory companies, and for the whole British theater, is to establish decent standards," Mr. Hodgkinson said. "If the live theater is to survive television and the cinema, it must have quality. This cannot exist without some sort of financial help."

The council believes that the limit has been reached in the number of repertory theaters that can thrive within these aims.

Among the smaller ones, forced to offer a new play each week, the council hopes to provide enough money so that a large enough company can be assembled to allow at least 2 weeks of rehearsal for each presentation.

AROUND THE WORLD FOR SEVERAL YEARS

(By Dr. Frank C. Davidson)

Almost every ingenue in the American theater has played Emily Webb in "Our Town," and it would be hard to envision any one of them not kissing George Gibbs in the wedding scene of Mr. Wilder's classic. But I was to find out that Persian actors' reluctance to execute this minor piece of stage business was part of four centry old moral code.

"Lovers are never close together on the Persian stage," explained the cast. And I quite understood their concern, when upon opening night the audience audibly gasped as George gave Emily a tender peck on the cheek after the wedding ceremony. Thus another Western tradition was initiated in Middle East theater.

Getting the actor who played George at the age of 17 to shave his enormous mustache was something of a problem, too. "It symbolizes my manhood, and I would lose face if I ever shaved it off," said he. Though the handle bar was finally removed at the last dress rehearsal, I noted a few days after the last performance that a thin dark line of stubble had reappeared on his upper lip, and I hoped that his manhood was thereby on its way to restoration.

Acted by a professional company, it took 9 weeks of almost daily rehearsals to direct "Our Town" in Farsi, the Persian language. Since I was not familiar with Farsi, I required an interpreter, and wore out three in the long involved rehearsal schedule. Though the writing technique, and use of the bare stage and the pantomime confused the company at first, they grew to love Mr. Wilder's play. The stage manager in the play, Persia's leading actor, who received the equivalent sum of $1.50 per day for his efforts, was so moved in the third act that he cried nightly throughout his final speech.

It is not impossible to direct a play in a language you do not understand, and after a week of discussing the play via Interpreter No. 1, and a few days of blocking via No. 2, one could discern by a combination of melody pattern, general tune and character relationship, exactly where each actor was in the script. And after a similar period of ear adjustment, it was not too difficult to determine whether the proper emotional relationships were being exploited correctly on the part of the cast.

We had been able to find exactly one English hymn book in Teheran and "Blessed Be the Tie That Binds" and "Abide With Me," two selections to be sung by the choir, were translated and incorporated in the rehearsal schedule. Persians sing very well as a group, and we had been the very model of a model New England choir at the turn of the century for several days before I inadvertently discovered that the lyrics of "Blessed Be the Tie That Binds" were being sung to the tune of "Abide With Me."

My trip had been sponsored by the International Educational Exchange Service, and I was in Persia at the request of the Ministry of Fine Arts of the Persian Government. More specifically, my visit was supervised by the U.S. Information Service of the American Embassy in Teheran, and my duties embodied not only directing plays, but other aspects of drama, including organizing a department of drama at the University of Teheran and teaching the courses in acting, directing, and the history of the theater.

I was startled on my first day of teaching to be confronted with over two hundred students in each of these classes, but delighted to find more than an average amount of talent in the acting class. Among the students were two "mullahs," or priests, and on one occasion the older of the two volunteered to perform a sense memory experience on the stage. As he enthusiastically

mounted the platform to present his exercise, there was an immediate outburst from a large segment of the class. In the ensuing confusion, it was explained to me that it would be quite sacrilegious for a priest to appear on the stage, though he vehemently insisted that "he wanted to be part of the modern world." A split second before a riot occurred, he was persuaded to retire to his seat, and a quarter of an hour later order was restored.

Another group which I organized was a theater workshop at the Iran-American Center, the binational organization with which the U.S. Information Service is closely associated. Here "The Glass Menagerie" was produced, arena style, certainly no novelty to Iranians, since their passion plays had been staged in this manner for a matter of centuries. But it was presented in a typical Persian garden, under a full moon (not in the script), with the audience seated on Persian rugs. Certain English words and phrases in Mr. Williams' script would have had entirely different connotations if translated literally. Amanda, for instance, says she'll have to "work like a Turk" to get things ready for the gentleman caller. Had the literal translation remained, she would have done next to no work at all as far as the audience was concerned.

Working with teachers to form drama programs for secondary schools, and teaching techniques to recreation leaders in the Ministry of Education was interesting. Stimulating interest in drama was no problem, however, as Persian theater dates back to the 15th century in the form of religious recitals and passion plays. Even earlier, the marionette theater was active, as well as the Lutes, who corresponded to court jesters, and who amused the public by mimicry, coarse jokes, and grotesque actions. These can still be found in both small hamlets and large cities in Persia today, and often perform their acts arena style in public squares.

Though the theater of the Western World of England and France made its imprint as early as the 18th century, especially in translations and adaptations of French plays, Naserul Molk, who became Regent of Iran in 1908, was the first dramatist to accurately translate the work of Shakespeare. In the adaptations, Persian names were substituted for the original ones. In Moliere's "Le Misanthrope," not only were the names changed into Persian, but the characters themselves were Persianized, complete with Persian idioms and proverbs. Well known local stories were also incorporated in the text. Since that time, many nationalistic plays have been written by Persian playwrights, mostly depicting the ancient glories of Iran. All of those that I witnessed were filled with excitement, and contained many long-winded speeches made directly to the audience.

"Our Town" and "The Glass Menagerie" were, oddly enough, the first American plays done in the country, and though audiences were bewildered by the graveyard scene in the Wilder play (and came back in Isfahan, Abadan, and Teheran to witness the third act a second time) they nevertheless were fascinated by Mr. Wilder's technique of writing.

The 6 months of living with the people of our Mideast went all too quickly, and I was reluctant to leave. Among some 3 dozen presents given me at a farewell party in Teheran, there were three handsomely painted miniatures of a very unhandsome subject—myself. I paid the 30 pounds excess baggage charges at the airport and bade my friends a final goodby.

Later the State Department invited me to work in east Africa for 3 months, and in Egypt and Iraq for 4 weeks. Dar es Salaam, in tropical Tanganyika, was my first stop. It was here that the deceased Aga Khan came to be weighed in diamonds, and where the new ruler Aga Khan was crowned. There was much work to be done in secondary schools and in community organizations and I found myself teaching such assorted groups as the Aga Khan Girl's School, the Aga Khan Rovers and Guides (as if you didn't know), the Government Indian Secondary School, St. Francis College, the Police Players, and, not to be slighted, their rivals theatrically, the Railway Players.

At the Arnateglu African Community Center I worked, through an interpreter, with an active theater group, whose actors spoke Swahili, an African dialect, and improvised in commedia del arte fashion. The play would last an hour, 2 hours, or even 3, depending upon the mood of the cast, and the audience reception. If a particular scene amused the crowd, the actors would simply repeat it. These players, as in all east Africa, possessed innate acting talents, and were surprisingly graceful in their movements.

In rapid succession there followed a reading version of "Our Town" in Arusha, near the foot of Kilamanjaro, the highest mountain in Africa; an exciting week's work in Nairobi, directing the same play with the Orinet Arts Circle, whose members were originally from India and whose delicate shadings of reading gave the classic new depth.

Names of "up country" towns in Kenya rolled by Kiambu, where giraffes and leopards were often seen roaming wild on the edge of town; 3 days of talks and demonstrations in Nakuru, with its growing Portuguese Goan Institute, where everyone attends events, including dozens of restless children, who use the aisles of the theater as indoor playgrounds and their bellowing windpikes as weapons; they come along to the entertainment, too. Near the end of my tour in Kenya came fascinating Kitale, where the African Women's Progressive Club had just been formed with the purpose in mind of emancipating African womanhood. They presented an original "problem" play based on the organization's promise, but I observed that as soon as the menfolk entered the thatched hut that served as the A.W.P. Club headquarters, the women of the club immediately gave them their seats.

In the final burst of ebbing energy I directed a production of "The Matchmaker" in Nairobi, with an all-British, semiprofessional cast. The American rights were generously waived, and the proceeds, for a change, benefited the theater itself, an edifice built and used regularly by dramatic groups of all races in the province of Kenya.

It was a sad day when I left the Rift Valley of Africa, but the American Embassy in Cairo had invited me for a 2-week visit.

In the cloak and dagger city of Cairo there were three film studios in operation, one of them employing the latest Hollywood techniques of directing and camera work. I was able to lecture at Cairo University as the first American permitted to talk there in over 18 months. There were talks at Port Said, a veritable prison encampment; and at Alexandria, handsome seaport, where citizens were forbidden by the Egyptian Government to borrow books from the U.S. Information Service library. They seemed to get around the situation nicely by sending their small children for the works of Thomas Wolfe and Ernest Hemingway. And the kids could pronounce the names of our authors too.

I liked staging "The Glass Menagerie" in the shadow of the Sphinx for a local Young Women's Christian Association group made up of women of many nationalities and organized very much as the parent organization functions in the United States. I was doubly glad to direct a 3-day training course at the American University, which, throughout the Mideast conflict, has never been the target of vandalism. Its graduates number many prominent professional and business men in Egypt, who respect and cherish their alma mater.

Baghdad, Iraq, found me a guest on government-controlled television. The studio, however, seemed to have no set plan of operation. Scheduled to appear on camera at 8 p.m., I arrived at 7:30 to find an excellent program of native dances in progress. As I watched the Egyptian group execute their stories in dance form, it was suddenly apparent that cameras were blocking my vision. The announcer had asked me a first question even before I knew that I was "on."

The Institute of Fine Arts, the principal group with which I worked, sponsors a 3-year course in drama, and at least two of the instructors had studied in the United States. Theater in Iraq, however, is confined mostly to plays presented by this organization and by the Liberal Theater Group of Oboudi, both amateur producing units.

Back in New York, a semester of teaching at City College found me ready in June for an 8-country, 14-stop tour of South America under the sponsorship of the International Educational Exchange Service and Princeton University. (I am a Yale man.) It was surprising to find so much cognizance and respect for our theater on the part of our neighbors to the south. Three very different professional productions of "The Diary of Anne Frank" were being presented in Rio, Montevideo and Santiago; a splendid interpretation of "The Views From the Bridge" was a rousing hit in Montevideo; Lima was enjoying an early O'Neill play called "Welded"; Luisa Vehil, prominent actress, was performing Lope de Vega's "El Anzuelo de Feniza" in Buenos Aires, and "Long Day's Journey Into Night," with Casilla de Becker, Rio's leading actress, was an artistic, if not financial success there.

Rio's first musical, "Peguei Um Ita No Norte," which decidedly emulated American techniques of production, proved imaginative, if not altogether professional, as did Chile's first attempt at the song and dance show, "Senorita Trini," which was full of topical Chilean references to people and politics. "Please Omit Black Tie," a proletariat play in Sao Paulo, was enjoying a long run. "Gigi" was a hit in Rio.

Interestingly enough, the star of "Gigi," in Rio's production, where Portuguese is the native language, was imported from Argentina, a Spanish-speaking country, to play the role. She therefore spoke Portuguese with a Spanish accent. The aunt in the play hailed originally from France, and therefore spouted her spirited Portuguese with a decided French accent. The performance was well done and provided a kind of curious fascination for local playgoers.

The most expensive production in Rio costs $6,000 in U.S. dollars, which includes all expenses from the beginning of rehearsals to opening night. Top admission price is $1 in the two cities of Rio and Sao Paulo. This includes taxes, which in Rio consist of 20 percent city taxes, 10 percent federal taxes, 50 cents (Brazilian money) for what is called popular cooperation taxes, with 10 percent of what is left going to the playwright, an average of 25 to 35 percent to the theater owner. The producer must yet pay publicity and other expenses out of what remains. No wonder producers of theatrical companies are urging the government to increase the annual subsidy of $540, which is now paid to each producing firm.

In Buenos Aires the producers and managers wrote 24 questions in Spanish concerning the Broadway theater which they wished answered. I, in turn, prepared an hour-long talk embodying the answers. The one thing these impressarios could not understand was why an actor in a professional

company in the United States may be released from his contract after a 5-day trial period. It seems that in Argentina, once an actor is hired for the role, the producer must keep him, no matter how mediocre or inadequate he may turn out to be.

An amateur experimental group in Panama under the guidance of Father Conemines, beloved Catholic priest, was made up of people of all ages, including children of 8 and 10. With practically no funds, he has been able to mount splendid productions of the classics. At San Marcus University in Lima the students were eager and anxious to learn about American theater.

It was not until the second experience of using the improvisation technique in Chile that I realized why the audience laughed when, as independent activities, the students were told to clean a room, cook, or empty garbage pails while in the process of executing their scenes. There was much hilarity at seeing a classmate wield a broom or bake a cake, and I wondered why they seemed awkward and a little embarrassed. Of course, servants in South America are plentiful and cheap, all families have them, and these young people were totally unfamiliar with the process of doing manual labor in the home, because they had never been faced with what is a routine problem to us.

There are new playwrights by the score in South America, and they are writing good plays about their own people and their own folkways. There are plays dramatizing the problems and privileges of nationalism, others depicting the plight of the common man and flaws in the social structure. Psychological and philosophical themes are popular. Though 10 years ago there was a disturbing paucity of translations from American scripts, thanks to a more unified hemisphere intercultural theater, more and more plays of South American origin are finding their way into our theater.

Spanish drama, with its swift moving plots and florid speeches, naturally abounds in South America, and the tragic feeling and lyrical exuberance of the writing and acting are impressive. As a result, serenity and sustained emotion were often lacking, however, and it was accordingly difficult to teach and demonstrate the American subjective acting style. And I am not altogether sure that audiences would ever appreciate our naturalistic techniques of writing and production.

The star system and stock companies, not to mention small experimental groups, are to be found in all of the principal cities. The imagination and technical acumen in scene design and the effective use of limited lighting equipment are everywhere apparent. "Create your own theater with the talent at hand" is a motto that not only has seen fruition in South America, but is equally applicable in the faraway countries of Iraq, Iran, Egypt, and Africa. In earlier treks to Australia, the Philippines, and some eight countries in Europe, I found this also to be true.

We all know that drama has always been a notable medium for intellectual discussion, expression and experiment. But it becomes increasingly clear, on the basis of firsthand experience, that in this time of confusion and strife, theater, more than ever before, is important as a bond of respect, a means of individuals understanding each other and, through individuals, nations themselves.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

"Two roads diverged in a wood, and I * * *
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference."

These are the words of Vermont's beloved poet, Robert Frost. They might well be those of my illustrious senior colleague from Vermont who today is completing 20 years of service in the Senate, for the course of his life has been the road less traveled by.

If there were an unlighted home in rural Vermont, he found his way there and nurtured hope—real hope—that electricity would find its way there, too. The widow, the unemployed, the sick, the troubled—unvisited, unheeded by the multitude—have been major objects of his concern. My senior colleague throughout his lifetime of public service has believed that government should not just administer or legislate—it should also care. In other words, he has recognized that the stronger elements in a free society must be cognizant of the needs of weaker elements in that society if its free institutions are to be maintained and expanded.

What GEORGE AIKEN has done for Vermont and our Nation beggars description. When the St. Lawrence Seaway was merely a vague dream, GEORGE AIKEN was working to translate that dream into reality.

While others talked of "how nice it would be if rural areas had electricity and telephones" GEORGE AIKEN rolled up his sleeves, dug in and fought for programs for rural electrification and communication. He encouraged cooperatives to dare to try—and try they did—successfully, of course.

To find a man as passionately interested, as GEORGE AIKEN is, in God's bounty, our natural resources, we would have to go back to Theodore Roosevelt and Justin Morrill from whose lives he has drawn great inspiration.

He has never sought the spotlight for himself, but his superior intelligence, capacity for hard work, and crusading spirit have brought him national prominence and respect beyond the dreams of most men.

I am proud to call him friend and to honor him today on the 20th anniversary of his entrance into the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, today marks the 20th anniversary of Senate service by one of the greatest men to ever be a U.S. Senator—the senior Senator from Vermont [GEORGE D. AIKEN.]

For 20 years he has served his State and his Nation with great distinction and devotion in the U.S. Senate. There are so many things that could be said about him that if I were to say them at this particular time I would surely be susceptible to be charged with conducting a filibuster for there is more than enough to say about his magnificent record to break the existing nonstop talking record of more than 24 continuous hours.

So I will limit myself to saying this: If when history is written and judgment is passed upon my own service in the Senate, I would feel that historians had treated me most generously if they concluded that my own record was even a fraction as good as that of GEORGE D. AIKEN.

That is why I am so proud that he is a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1 with me.

I think that it is also appropriate to note that this is also the 20th anniversary of the dedicated staff service of Miss Lola Pierotti. She deserves great credit because none of those of us fortunate enough to be Senators could ever accomplish what we do were it not for the wonderful, selfless work that our staff members perform.

EAST-WEST BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the battle for men's minds is one of the most crucial struggles between the East and West in the cold war. Political, economic, and military alinements may well be shaped by the outcome.

If the ideals of freedom—symbolized in this country—are to prevail, the blurred and often distorted image of America created by Communist propaganda must be replaced with a true picture of our free way of life; these must be presented in a way understandable to other peoples; and our principles and ideals translatable to fulfilling their unique goals.

Today, the Communists, for example, are channeling far greater resources and manpower toward attaining the objectives of communism than the United States is dedicating to telling the story of its ideals and practical programs of freedom. Operating on a long-range plan, the Communists carry on broader-scope programs of broadcasting, distributing of books, magazines, newspapers; developing cultural ties; and other techniques for planting the seeds of communism.

If we are to win the battle for men's minds, therefore, a greater effort is needed to refute the lies of Communist propaganda and present the true picture of how freedom best serves mankind.

As we attempt to enlarge our programs to meet the challenge, the targets must include not only the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains but also citizens of Latin America, Africa, and Asia—areas that will have more and more influence upon the global balance of power in the future.

Recently, I made some recommendations on ways and means for sharpening up efforts to win the ideological war. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement enumerating those recommendations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A creative, educational, idea-selling program could well include:

More broadcasts and telecasts to nations in which U.S. policies and programs are not getting adequate presentation, or are being distorted by Communist propaganda.

Increase the flow of books, magazines, newspapers abroad, to include people not now receiving such materials.

Better utilize U.S. creativity and know-how in the production of films—perhaps by producing and distributing an extravaganza-type "Image America" film—more comprehensive than has previously been done—to present, in a dramatic way, a realistic picture of our way of life.

Step up the flow of people between East and West and the vital areas of South Amer-

ica, Africa, and Asia, to present living examples of a free people attaining their goals; we must not hide our light under a bushel.

Improve training programs to orient U.S. personnel both in diplomatic and nondiplomatic posts abroad—to serve as good will ambassadors of our country.

Clarify U.S. citizens' thinking on the crucialness of the ideological battle between East and West; and create a greater knowledge, not only of the differences between the systems, but also of what must be done to combat the many-pronged offensive of the Communists—if we are to survive.

AGAINST UNDUE HASTE AND OVER-OPTIMISM IN PLANNING NEW SUMMIT MEETING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Soviet Government and its representatives, in this country and in several Western capitals, have recently been pressing for a new summit conference. It is reported that Soviet diplomats have called on several prominent figures in the incoming administration in an effort to emphasize the urgent need for a summit meeting in the near future.

I am certain that we all desire to see some constructive action that may ease East-West tensions. Yet, I must caution today against undue haste and overoptimism in planning a new summit meeting soon. It is my opinion that a new summit meeting would be valueless in light of the present atmosphere of East-West distrust.

It is impossible for us to meet with the Soviets and negotiate with them for a permanent peace as long as the present atmosphere of total distrust exists between the Communists and the West. We must first produce a better atmosphere between the two camps by undertaking a number of cooperative international programs which are urgently needed. These include: Working out a program for the peaceful uses of outer space; working out a program of partial disarmament; finding preventive measures to safeguard the world against the terrible dangers of atomic warfare; finding a solution to the present unrest in Laos and the Congo. These are some of the immediately needed cooperative programs which, if accomplished, will aid in the development of a better relationship between East and West.

The making of regular periodic calls for a summit meeting has apparently become a mere habit and a propaganda device for the Communists. When the Soviets call for such a meeting, this does not necessarily mean that they are really ready to negotiate for a permanent and lasting peace. A summit meeting merely serves them as a means for creating the impression that they stand for peace, while they continue stirring up trouble in Africa, in the Far East, and in Central and South America.

How can the Russians expect us to seriously accept their repeated requests for a summit conference while they continue in the pursuit of their old programs for Communist world domination? The Russians now claim to have disowned their old program of world revolution by force. Still, they continue with their subversive programs in many countries, especially those newly created. They continue assuring us that they will "bury" us economically. Is there any sense in going to a summit meeting as long as Mr. Khrushchev is not willing to abandon any part of his worldwide Communist objectives?

The most basic ingredient for successful international negotiations is the element of trust. Without such trust any international summit meeting, or any agreement reached at such meeting, will be completely meaningless. Prime Minister Chamberlain's negotiations with Hitler at Munich demonstrated the uselessness of international agreements when the element of trust is lacking.

In the months ahead, it is important, therefore, that both sides should try to build on the ground that we have in common, instead of concentrating on the differences between us. Recent information shows that in the fairly near future many more nations may join the world's atom bomb club. The possession of this terrible weapon by several small nations may greatly increase the hazards of an unwanted atomic outbreak. Both East and West are endangered by the spread of nuclear weapons, and some program for international nuclear inspection and control is badly needed.

Outer space is another area where cooperation would be mutually beneficial, and disagreement mutually destructive. Both the East and the West would benefit by excluding outer space from military competition. Reaching such agreement is again a concrete project, which, if accomplished, will increase the atmosphere of world trust.

Above all, both the East and West would gain by setting up a limited measure of controlled disarmament. Up to now, Moscow has pressed for agreements on both nuclear test bans and disarmament on her own terms. Such terms might seriously weaken Western defenses against potential Communist aggression.

If the Soviets would show their good faith, if the Russian negotiators would be more willing to agree to a reasonable compromise on nuclear testing, if they would seriously attempt to resolve the disarmament conflict, if they would be willing to seriously search for a reasonable answer to the problems of West Berlin and the division of Germany, if they would be willing to discontinue the fanning of hatred and unrest, then we could make some real progress toward increased international trust and toward peace.

Look, for example, at the continuing difficulties we have had in reaching agreement with the Russians on lifting travel limitations. Several years ago, during the dark and suspicious days of Stalin, the Kremlin divided the Soviet realms into areas which are open and areas which are closed to American visitors. We have long complained about these limitations. We imposed similar limitations on the Russian visitors in the hope that reciprocity in conduct will induce the Kremlin to lift its restrictions. Thus far, we have not been successful. Again, let me stress: New agreements opening both countries to visitors from the other would certainly improve the international atmosphere.

Producing Soviet-Western accord in such areas as space, atomic control, and partial disarmament—is a most essential first step toward greater international understanding and trust. Indeed, I believe that it is imperative that the Soviet Union and the United States soon reach a common understanding so that both nations could better prepare for meeting many of the more grave challenges of tomorrow.

Africa and Asia are awakening. The sixties will be dominated by the problems of the developing countries. It appears that while the Old World is still devoting all its attentions to East-West problems, much greater and more dangerous controversies are looming on the horizon. It has been said that in 10 or 20 years it would appear incomprehensible how in 1960 the Soviet Union, the United States, and their allies, were spending nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars a day to arm against each other while forces were forming in China and Africa that could sweep over them one day like the Mongols of the distant past. New and greater threats are looming on the horizon in Asia and in Africa—the West and the Soviet Union must therefore learn to cooperate in order to prevent this globe from becoming a terrible battleground. The survival of our whole civilization may therefore very much depend on an early agreement between the West and the Soviet Union—to set up a cooperative and constructive program designed to meet the aspirations of Africa's and Asia's awakening masses.

SUPPORT BY VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF U.S. POSITION IN LAOS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ted C. Connell, recently made a public statement that is an important and significant contribution to the type of clear and firm thinking that is so greatly needed today. What he said is so typical of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and its traditional alertness to the national security.

These are times for individuals and organizations—particularly powerful organizations like the VFW—to speak up and give responsible leadership for the expression of public opinion with respect to the recognition of threats to the security of our Nation.

I invite the attention of the membership of this body—and the American public at large—to this statement, which deserves great commendation for its clarity and alert realism. And I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Ted C. Connell, Killeen, Tex., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, today urged "full and complete support" of the firm U.S. position in Laos and at the same time called for the creation of a U.S. Indian Ocean fleet.

In his statement released through the VFW Washington headquarters, Commander

in Chief Connell said: "The current trouble in Laos is far from a routine flareup and it raises questions of profound seriousness as far as the integrity of the free world and security of the United States are concerned. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is in complete support of the firm attitude being taken by our Government and I hope that all other organizations within our country feel the same way.

"It is imperative that we let the Communists know quickly and clearly, without any room for doubt, that this latest aggression would not go unchallenged. Our organization is well aware that in every instance where the United States has taken the bold course in facing up to Red aggression—Greece, Korea, Lebanon, Formosa Straits—that course clearly proved to be the correct one.

"It is obvious that the Communist plotters selected this time of transition in our Government to create trouble because they believed it was a period of indecision. They fail to understand the inherent strength of the democratic process and will discover that there is no difference among Americans on resisting Red aggression."

Continuing, Commander in Chief Connell said: "It is important that we recognize that this new Communist move is more than a local advance by the Reds. It is, rather, an attempt to seize a corridor southward through the southeast Asian peninsula, splitting the independent, anti-Communist nations of that vital region. Each advance that communism makes in that area has the effect of drawing the noose tighter around the entire subcontinent of India.

"This push into Laos and the southwest Asian peninsula, coupled with Red pressure from Tibet in the north, places all of Pakistan and India in increasing jeopardy.

"We must recognize that a vast power vacuum exists from southeast Asia across to the Mediterranean. I believe this calls for the immediate creation of a U.S. Indian Ocean fleet which has been a long-standing objective of the VFW. If the United States and the free world do not take immediate steps to fill this vacuum, we can be sure that the forces of communism will do so. We must remember that the Soviet has not created the largest submarine fleet in the world, together with a modern navy, without purpose.

"I believe," the commander in chief concluded, "That it is only a matter of time before the Soviet Navy begins making appearances in southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Humphrey, Kuchel, and others, amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wonder if I may have the attention of our distinguished majority leader in order that I may clarify the legislative situation.

Many weeks ago the Pontiac Board of Realtors, in Pontiac, Mich., very kindly indicated their desire to have me as a guest at their annual banquet tonight in Pontiac. I have made my plans; but I, of course, along with many other Senators, have a deep interest in the matter which pends, namely, the effort to introduce majority rule as the means of terminating debate in the Senate. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could indicate to me—and I understand the limitations which must attach to any such answer—whether in his judgment I would be able to be absent from the Senate in order to meet this engagement tonight without the danger of missing a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I can only say that if he leaves the Chamber this afternoon to fulfill a longstanding engagement in Pontiac, he will be taking a chance which, if I were in his shoes, I would not take.

That does not mean that there will be a vote today. But there is a good possibility that there may be a vote today; and the better part of discretion would be for the Senator to remain in the Chamber and make sure that the pending proposal, in which he has such a vital and longstanding interest, will be given the consideration which is its due. I wish I could be more encouraging, but I would have to say to the Senator from Michigan and to all other Senators that if they are asking my advice, it would be to remain on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. There may be a vote.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader what time he thinks we might end our labors this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I knew.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would 6 o'clock be a good guess?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think we should adjourn or recess, barring something unforeseen happening, between 6 and 7 o'clock tonight.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But that is not a binding commitment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Anything the Senator from Montana says is as binding as I wish to take it. In this case I shall be lenient.

Mr. HART. I thank the distinguished majority leader very much. I regret the circumstances he indicates but, of course, my obligation is to remain here. I am very grateful to him for being frank; and I am sure I speak for other Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from Michigan raised the question, because it gave me the opportunity to say to all Senators what I have just said to him. I think it is the only procedure we could follow at this particular time.

APPOINTMENT OF JOHN B. CONNALLY, OF FORT WORTH, TEX., BY PRESIDENT-ELECT KENNEDY TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, one of the truly outstanding appointments made by the President-elect is that of John B. Connally, of Fort Worth, Tex., to be Secretary of the Navy.

This is from all standpoints a case of getting the right man for the right job.

Mr. Connally will bring to his new duties the characteristics which have made him, at the age of 43, successful in all that he has attempted.

He has a deep-seated knowledge of the problems of business and of the operations of government.

He is strong and vigorous, both mentally and physically.

He is a patriotic American, deeply dedicated to all that is good for his country.

The new Navy Secretary is a man who has a heroic record of service in the Navy during wartime. As fighter director for the *Essex*, he was responsible for successful fighting operations that earned for him the Bronze Star and the Legion of Merit.

I am pleased to report that on tomorrow evening Mr. Connally will be honored at a banquet given by his fellow townsmen in Fort Worth.

Mr. President, this shows how highly Mr. Connally is regarded by those who know him best. I predict that he will achieve a similar high standing among those who work with him in Washington during the coming months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a fact sheet giving details of Mr. Connally's record in the U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE RECORD OF JOHN B. CONNALLY, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY-DESIGNATE, IN THE U.S. NAVY

December 1941 to January 1946, served on active duty in the U.S. Navy.

December 1941 to February 1943, Under Secretary of the Navy's office.

February 1943, August 1943, overseas, attached to allied forces headquarters in north Africa.

March 1944 ordered to sea duty and subsequently assigned as fighter director officer abroad the U.S.S. *Essex* operating in the Pacific with fast carrier task forces. Later assigned as task group fighter director officer on the staff of Adm. T. L. Sprague aboard the U.S.S. *Dennington*. Served with the fast carrier task forces approximately 17 months operating in the nine major campaigns in the Pacific, including the Marianas, Philippines, Okinawa, Iwo Jima campaign against the Japanese mainland.

For service aboard the U.S.S. *Essex* was awarded the Bronze Star.

While serving as task group fighter director officer aboard the U.S.S. *Dennington* was awarded the Legion of Merit with a combat prize for "an officer of mature judgment and clarity of mind * * * his marked skill in organizing and training a combat information center and his effective control of the coordinated movements of his combat air patrol evidenced his professional ability and his high standards of performance, particularly, under pressure of combat."

January 1946 returned to inactive duty as a lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve.

KENNEDY SHOULD REJECT SAMUELSON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DELIBERATE DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin believes that President-elect Kennedy has demonstrated great wisdom in his reported desire to work for a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility. Many of his appointments have reflected this determination to follow a responsible fiscal policy that will prevent excessive Government spending and big Federal deficits from becoming a source of inflationary pressure, driving up prices throughout the country and increasing the already very heavy burden of our national debt.

At the same time, the President-elect has appointed some so-called task forces which have made public recommendations to the President-elect. Now, on the assumption that at least one of the reasons these reports have been made public was to use their publication as trial ballons, and get congressional reaction, this Senator desires to comment on one of the reports made to the President-elect last week, recognizing of course that this report in no way commits President-elect Kennedy or necessarily represents his viewpoint. Indeed, the purpose of this speech is to serve notice of the junior Senator from Wisconsin's reaction to what appears to be the most significant series of economic recommendations made to the President-elect.

Mr. President, late last week a task force appointed by President-elect Kennedy, known as the Samuelson task force, recommended to the President-elect the consideration of increased Government spending of some $3 to $5 billion to stimulate the economy. As a second line of defense if this spending does not do the trick, the Samuelson group calls for a temporary tax cut at a later time.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS WOULD START OFF WITH DELIBERATE DEFICIT

Mr. President, even if only the first of these suggestions is followed it means that the 87th Congress will be starting off with a deliberately planned deficit, and a big one. I object to these recommendations vigorously. I earnestly hope the President-elect will not propose them to the Congress.

Of course I recognize that Dr. Samuelson is a brilliant economist with a splendid record at MIT. I have read the thoughtful and comprehensive analysis on which these recommendations are based. I acknowledge that the Samuelson recommendations have been enthusiastically endorsed by as responsible and careful a publication as the New York Times. I recognize that in recommending increased spending the Samuelson committee carefully stated that such programs "should be expanded to the extent feasible without disrupting their orderly execution." Now, of course we should get on with essential public projects as rapidly and efficiently as possible at all times. In my judgment speeding up or slowing down vast public projects because of the forecasting of economists will result in immense waste and inefficiency.

What is more, the difficulty of carrying on public projects efficiently in the absence of the discipline of the profit motive is great at best. If the Government is to follow a policy of contracting and expanding public programs to meet the expectation Presidential economists may have about future booms or busts, the task of operating our Government efficiently will be greatly magnified. The coming administration is going to have its trouble winning support for spending for vital and necessary projects. It should not also take on the problem of persuading Congress to spend for spending's sake; that is, to deliberately unbalance the budget. I earnestly hope the administration will not make any essential service of what the Samuelson report itself calls "the football of economic stabilization."

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am convinced that these recommendations overlook the fact that if we go through a full-fledged recession as we did in 1958, this Government will simultaneously and inevitably suffer a mammoth deficit without any increased spending or any tax cut.

HUGE DEFICIT OF FISCAL 1959

The experience of fiscal 1959 is a case in point. The Government had planned and expected a budgetary surplus for that year. But the recession developed, the automatic stabilizers built into our Federal system went to work, revenues dropped very sharply and the budgetary surplus turned out to be a fat $12 billion deficit.

There are many competent economists who contend that this deficit contributed to our recovery from the 1958 recession by pumping $12 billion more into the economy than it took out. I think they are right. I must confess that that 1958 recession taught this Senator a valuable lesson about our economy.

The Samuelson report, in speaking of "the football of economic stabilization," refers only to defense and to foreign aid, and by implication I think it is pretty clear that the views of the Samuelson committee are that other projects can be made the football of economic stabilization, and to that viewpoint I would very vigorously object.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. First, I am very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is saying, and I compliment him highly on his remarks today. I am delighted to hear him assume the position he has taken, because I think the subject he is discussing is highly important.

I refer to the top of page 3 of the Senator's statement, where he speaks about pumping $12 billion into the economy. Am I correct in recalling that the $12 billion deficit was half due to the failure to collect revenue as budgeted, and half due to the special spending that was created in the early part of the year, at a time when the recession was really beginning to give way to recovery; so that half of it was due to failure of the Government to collect taxes as budgeted and the other half to spending that was piled up, presumably to meet the needs of the recession? Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I am grateful for the Senator's question and for his compliment. My best understanding of the question he raises, without having the actual record before me, or comparing the payment of revenues and the amount of the expenditures, is that the point made by the Senator from Connecticut is absolutely valid and correct, although I think the loss in revenue was somewhat greater than one-half. In other words, the loss in tax revenues, it seems to me, was closer to eight or possibly nine billion dollars, although I would have to check the actual figures in order to get the exact and precise record of what it was.

At any rate, the general point made by the Senator from Connecticut is correct. I thank him very much. His question enables me to make this point emphatically, namely, that without any effort on the part of the Federal Government to cut taxes, and with tax rates being maintained at their levels, and without any effort to engage in additional spending, automatically, we had a deficit which, as I am going to point out, did contribute decisively to enabling us to end the recession.

What I am trying to emphasize is that this contribution was automatic. It was the result of economic forces. It was not preplanned.

Mr. President, does anyone argue that the $12 billion deficit was not enough, and that it should have been bigger? I cannot imagine anyone who would have been taken seriously if he had stood on the floor of the Senate and had so contended in 1958 or 1959.

I had always been troubled by how completely a spending program calculated to stop a coming recession depends on the terribly undependable art of economic forecasting. Economic forecasting is about as advanced a science as phrenology—that happy refuge of rogues who will read your character by feeling the bumps on your head.

Of course, the most notorious mistake in economic forecasting was made some 30 years ago when on the brink of the 1929 collapse and the worst economic depression this country has ever known the

economic profession almost unanimously forecast a long and rosy period of steady economic growth for America. I remember it very well. I remember that this was not only the viewpoint of university economists, but also the viewpoint of professional economists.

Anyone who feels that the art of economic forecasting has significantly advanced in the past 30 years has only to consider the almost incredibly perverse record of the Federal Reserve Board in recent years. And, Mr. President, I mean no derogation of the ability of the fine economists who serve on the Federal Reserve Board. They are competent and well qualified professionally. I believe they are among the best qualified in the Nation. The trouble, Mr. President, is that it is not yet given to man to foresee the economic future clearly.

I remember very well that at Harvard Business School we had a professor of banking, Professor Ebersole, who would start off each year by asking how many students expected business during the year to improve and the stock market to go up. Then he would follow the policy of selling if a majority expected the market to go up, and of buying if a majority of the students expected the stock market to go down. In 20 years he had been wrong only once.

What is true of graduate students in business economics, I believe, unfortunately, is also true of people who graduate and carry on with the profession of economics. The fact is that we cannot foresee the future.

DEPENDENCE ON ECONOMIC FORECASTING

But of course any deliberate, planned compensatory fiscal policy that would time increased Government spending and lower Federal taxes to pump purchasing power into the economy and reverse an expected recession must, I repeat must, depend on economic forecasting. Obviously if the economy is going to right itself fairly quickly, perhaps by the time the Government spending can have its effect—then the additional spending serves no stabilizing purpose and may have the effect of contributing to the inflationary impact of pumping up demand at a time when the economy is on the upgrade.

Very simply, economic forecasting is essential to the Samuelson spend-your-way-out approach and if Samuelson or anyone else could accurately and reliably predict the course of our economic future—he could clean up, and big, and constantly, in the stock market.

Now, this does not mean that our Federal Government must confine itself to hand wringing and can do nothing about a recession; far from it. With the economic crystal ball cloudy, Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the new administration will concentrate on suggestions to the Congress for further stabilizing our economy—by making the automatic Federal Government reaction even sharper and more comprehensive—but not by relying on such a thoroughly erratic, unsure, and feeble reed as the ability of economists to foresee the future, when the record is so overwhelming that they cannot do so.

The kind of improvements and reforms in unemployment compensation for which the President-elect fought so valiantly though unsuccessfully as a Senator last year, could help immediately to add a real stabilizer for the economy. So could an effective depressed-areas bill.

PLATFORM PROMISED A BALANCED BUDGET

Our much maligned and sadly misunderstood Democratic platform did pledge a balanced budget or a budget surplus, except in times of recession or national emergency. That was as firm a promise in my mind as any other we made. If this Congress will simply do its best to balance the budget and develop the stabilizers we already have, the budget will slip into an economy-lifting unbalance in recession periods—as it did in fiscal 1959 but we will not aggravate our serious fiscal problem by a super deficit that could lead to unnecessary, unwise wasteful spending and inflation.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin intends to do his best to keep the promise I have made to the people of Wisconsin to fight for fiscal responsibility and to eliminate unnecessary or wasteful spending as long as I am in the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. This is a very refreshing moment for me and a very encouraging one. I mean that in all sincerity. I particularly wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin because his speech comes at a very timely point in the history of the country. Apprehensions have been felt about what might be done by the incoming administration and by the heavily Democratic-controlled Congress. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin is one of the distinguished and able members of the Democratic Party.

I am sure that the problem which the Senator is discussing has a great effect on an even greater problem with which we are concerned, namely, the so-called balance-of-payments problem, which in itself is based really on one thing, namely, confidence.

The reason I am so pleased with the Senator's remarks is that they will give confidence to those who are watching from overseas to find out what kind of action Congress will take. I hope the Senator's colleagues on his side of the aisle, as I hope also my colleagues on this side of the aisle, will read his words and the philosophy which he so very ably proclaimed this morning. I again congratulate him on his splendid speech.

Of course I do not fully agree with one or two points he has made. That is understandable, and I am sure the Senator will forgive me for that. However, I do believe it is a very fine statement. It is a very encouraging one and a very important one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank my colleague from Connecticut. There is no Member of the Senate from whom I would rather hear words of praise on this subject, because the Senator from Connecticut is one of the rare experts in this field. He has had practical experience in the financial field, he has been a professional in it, and he understands the subject very thoroughly. I have served with him for some time on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have the greatest admiration for his ability and understanding.

Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on one other aspect of the Samuelson report. The report is an attempt on the part of distinguished economists, headed by Dr. Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to make overall economic recommendations to the President of the United States. The report sets forth the notion that there are two tools which can be used: One, fiscal—the taxing and spending policy; the other, monetary—the credit policy as it affects interest rates. Almost the entire report deals only with fiscal policy. As I have pointed out, I disagree with much of the prescription on fiscal policy.

The report, I think, very summarily dismisses monetary policy. It admits it is enormously important, that it has been used in the past, that it is the traditional way in which the Government affects the economy; but says that we cannot use it now because we could expect it to lower interest rates; and if we lower interest rates, we shall aggravate the exodus of gold.

In following up this policy I recognize the very great problems which Dr. Samuelson and the other experts in his task force had in making the recommendation. They do not like to disagree with the Federal Reserve Board, but the fact is that it is perfectly possible for us to follow a monetary policy of reducing interest rates to a moderate level by providing about the same ratio between the supply of money and the gross national product that we have had over the past 15 or 20 years, on the average—I repeat on the average—and in doing so to provide an interest rate under which this country could continue to move ahead and develop.

The point I wish to make is that the Samuelson report admits and concedes that the difficulty is that the Federal Reserve Board affects the interest rate by open market operations only by buying and selling Treasury bills—Treasury bills which have a maturity, by definition, of less than a year. The task force says that what would have to be done to drive down interest rates would be to drive down the rate on Treasury bills to 1 or 2 percent.

They say this is exactly the kind of action which is most sensitive to shifts in capital. If the interest rate is driven down to 1 or 2 percent, the expectation is that there will be a gigantic move of investment from this country overseas, where the short-term interest rate is 4 or 5 percent. This expectation makes sense. But the policy of the Federal Reserve of building our whole open market monetary policy on this bills-only technique makes no sense. It has been attacked with the greatest logic by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Of course, it has vast effect on short-

term interest rates but only slight effect on the far more significant long-term rates. The Federal Reserve has never come to Congress or to the Committee on Banking and Currency with any justification for this bills-only policy. They have not even tried to provide a serious and formal justification. It seems to me, Mr. President, that if the Federal Reserve would abandon its bills-only policy, then, long-term interest rates could be moderately reduced with great benefit to our domestic economy, but without seriously affecting the international gold flow.

I think the report, which in many respects is a useful report, does perform, unfortunately, a soft-shoe dance around the whole subject by simply saying that there are difficult imponderables, and that it is hard to discuss them. An entire page of the Wall Street Journal is used to discuss all kinds of other aspects of the economic problem, but they do devote barely three or four paragraphs which simply dismiss monetary policy as inexpedient in view of our international gold difficulties and the policy of the Federal Reserve Board. It seems to me the report could at least give us some indication of why the Federal Reserve Board cannot follow a comprehensive policy in dealing with the reduction in interest rates, and perhaps even discriminate to maintain short-term rates while reducing long-term interest. After all, why should this committee alibi for the Federal Reserve? Is it not true that monetary policy has traditionally in all administrations been the principle tool in our free economy to be used for economic stability?

We have a job to do. Samuelson's group concedes we need lower interest rates to help our economy. It says we cannot reduce short-term rates without aggravating our loss of gold. But the Federal Reserve Board follows an open market policy of only buying and selling 1-year obligations, that is bills. Therefore the Samuelson report says we can do nothing.

Mr. President, I think there is something that can be done. The Federal Reserve can change its policy. The task force report should say so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I assume the Senator has referred to the argument that we should have high interest rates because there might be more of a tendency to leave gold on deposit in the United States rather than to draw it down and invest it in foreign countries where there are higher interest rates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am also disappointed in the Samuelson report because at no point do they give a statistical analysis in which they say that on the basis of any experience in the past there is a substantial exodus of capital, I repeat "substantially," when we lower our interest rates. It ought to be remembered that for 30 or 40 years our interest rates have been substantially below the rates in foreign countries. And what has happened to the gold flow? During most of this period it has flowed to this country, not away from it.

It seems to me there was plenty of opportunity for this Samuelson task force to document the very controversial position it takes, a position with which I am certain many Senators will disagree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If this country does not own the gold, and the gold belongs to foreign countries anyway, and they have the dollar credits which give them the privilege of calling for the gold, can the Senator from Wisconsin tell me why it is any particular favor to this country to have them leave their gold on deposit here, if it belongs to the other countries anyway?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana makes a logical point. There are certainly many things to be considered in terms of handling our gold supply and credit policy sensibly, and to ease the situation very greatly, including the recommendation made by the chairman of the board of the great Morgan Guaranty Bank in Wall Street. He recommends, and he is supported by a number of other bankers, that we simply knock out the compulsory backing of 25 percent which is freezing $12 billion of our gold. That can help to solve the problem.

We can put restrictions on American citizens sending gold to hoard abroad. But these actions deal with the superficialities, the short-term problem. There is a long-term problem, which I think we should not discuss in detail now, but which will be discussed in detail in coming days on the floor and in committees, such as, the foreign aid program, and the stationing of American troops abroad. These seem to me to be the crux of this very unfavorable balance of payments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose we had high interest rates. In theory, that would encourage people to leave the gold in this country. I am sure the Senator has noticed that even at a time when interest rates are higher than they have been in 20 years, the gold still is being taken from this country. I really do not see much difference in whether the gold is taken out of this country or not. If it is not our gold, and if it belongs to foreign countries, as a result of expenditures for foreign aid and the stationing of too many troops overseas, then it does not seem to me that it means much to keep the gold on deposit here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report of the task force be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REPORT ON U.S. ECONOMY PREPARED FOR KENNEDY BY TASK FORCE

I. THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Recession: Economic experts are generally agreed that the Nation's economy is now in a "recession." The slide since mid-1960 cannot be termed a "depression" like that after 1929, but so widespread a decline in production deserves more than the euphemism of a "rolling readjustment."

Prudent economic policy must face the fact that we go into 1961 with business still moving downward. This means that unemployment, now above 6 percent of the labor force, may this winter rise more than seasonally. It means still lower profits ahead.

The fact of recession also has significant implications for the prospective budget. It means a falling off of tax receipts from earlier estimated levels. This recession is wiping out the previously estimated budget surplus for the fiscal year ending June 30. Many experts now believe that as of today it is reasonable to forecast a deficit for this fiscal year, assuming only expenditures already authorized and in the absence of desirable new expenditures from an accelerated effort. Recalling the experience of the 1957–58 recession may be useful: Due largely to the impact of a recession that everyone but the authorities admitted was then taking place, the announcement in early 1958 of a small fiscal 1959 budget surplus was actually followed by a final fiscal 1959 budget deficit of more than $12 billion. Not even the ostrich can avert the economic facts of life. He misreads the role of confidence in economic life who thinks that denying the obvious will cure the ailments of a modern economy.

No one can know exactly when this fourth postwar recession will come to an end. A careful canvass of expert opinion and analysis of the economic forces making for further contraction sugggest this probability.

With proper actions by the Government, the contraction in business can be brought to a halt within 1961 itself and converted into an upturn. Recognizing that many analysts hope the upturn may come by the middle of the year but recalling how subject to error were their rosy forecasts for 1960, policymakers realize the necessity for preparing to take actions that might be needed if this fourth recession turns out to be a more serious one than its predecessors.

Chronic slackness

In economics, the striking event drives out attention from the less dramatic but truly more fundamental processes. More fraught with significance for public policy than the recession itself is the vital fact that it has been superimposed upon an economy which, in the last few years has been sluggish and tired. Thus, anyone who thought in 1958 that all was well with the American economy just because the recession of that year bottomed out early was proved to be wrong by the sad fact that our last recovery was an anemic one: 1959 and 1960 have been grievously disappointing years, as the period of expansion proved both to be shorter than earlier postwar recoveries and to have been abortive in the sense of never carrying us back anywhere near to high employment and high capacity levels of operation. This is illustrated by the striking fact that unemployment has remained above 5 percent of the labor force, a most disappointing performance in comparison with earlier postwar recoveries and desirable social goals.

If what we now faced were only the case of a short recession that was imposed on an economy showing healthy growth and desirable high employment patterns, then governmental policies would have to be vastly different from those called for by the present outlook. But this is not 1949, nor 1954.

Prudent policy now requires that we also combat the basic sluggishness which underlies the more dramatic recession. In some ways a recession imposed on top of a disappointingly slack economy simplifies prudent decisionmaking. Thus, certain expenditure programs that are worthwhile for their own sake, but that inevitably involve a lag of some months before they can get going, can be pushed more vigorously in the current situation because of the knowledge that the extra stimulus they later bring is unlikely

to impinge upon a recovery that has already led us back to full employment.

The following recommendations try to take careful account of the fact that the recession slide is only the most dramatic manifestation of the grave economic challenge confronting our economic system.

II. FEASIBLE ECONOMIC GOALS

Our economic potential

Had our economy progressed since 1956—not at the dramatic sprint of the Western European and Japanese economies or at the rush of the controlled totalitarian systems but simply at the modest pace made possible by our labor force and productivity trends—we could have expected 1961 to bring a gross national product some 10 percent above the $500 billion level we are now experiencing. With unemployment below 4 percent, with overcapacity put to work, and with productivity unleashed by economic opportunity, such a level of activity would mean higher private consumption, higher corporate profits, higher capital formation for the future, and higher resources for much-needed public programs. Instead of our having now to debate about the size of the budget deficit to be associated with a recession, such an outcome would have produced tax revenues under our present tax structure sufficient to lead to a surplus of around $10 billion; and the authorities might be facing the not unpleasant task of deciding how to deal with such a surplus.

The targets ahead

Looking forward, one cannot realistically expect to undo in 1961 the inadequacies of several years. It is not realistic to aim for the restoration of high employment within a single calendar year. The goal for 1961 must be (1) to bring the recession to an end, (2) to reinstate a condition of expansion and recovery, and (3) to adopt measures likely to make that expansion one that will not after a year or two peter out at levels of activity far below our true potential.

Indeed, policy for 1961 should be directed against the background of the whole decade ahead. Specifically, if the American economy is to show healthy growth during this period and to average out at satisfactory levels of employment, we must learn not to be misled by statements that this or that is now at an alltime peak; in an economy like ours, with more than a million people coming into the labor force each year and with continuing technological change, the most shocking frittering away of our economic opportunities is fully compatible with statistical reports that employment and national product are setting new records every year.

Prudent budget goals

A healthy decade of the 1960's will not call for a budget that is exactly balanced in every fiscal year. For the period as a whole, if the forces making for expansion are strong and vigorous, there should be many years of budgetary surpluses and these may well have to exceed the deficits of other years. Economic forecasting of the far future is too difficult to make possible any positive statements concerning the desirable decade average of such surpluses and deficits. But careful students of sound economic fiscal policy will perhaps agree on the following:

(i) The first years of such a decade, characterized as they are by stubborn unemployment and excess capacity and following on a period of disappointing slackness, are the more appropriate periods for programs of economic stimulation by well-thought-out fiscal policy.

(ii) The unplanned deficits that result from recession-induced declines in tax receipts levied on corporate profits and individual incomes and also those that come from a carefully designed anti-recession program must be sharply distinguished from deficits that take place in times of zooming demand inflation. This last kind of deficit would represent Government spending out of control and be indeed deserving of grave concern. The deficits that come automatically from recession or which are a necessary part of a determined effort to restore the economic system to health are quite different phenomena; they are signs that our automatic built-in stabilizers are working, and that we no longer will run the risk of going into one of the great depressions that characterized our economic history before the war.

III. THE CONSTRAINTS WITHIN WHICH POLICY MUST WORK

Gold and the international payments

Granted that the new administration is preparing a whole series of measures to correct our balance of payments position, the days are gone when America could shape her domestic stabilization policies taking no thought for their international repercussions. The fact that we have been losing gold for many years will, without question, have to affect our choice among activist policies to restore production and employment. The art of statecraft for the new administration will be to innovate, within this recognized constraint, new programs that promote healthy recovery.

It would be unthinkable for a present-day American Government to deliberately countenance high unemployment as a mechanism for adjusting to the balance-of-payments deficit. Such a policy would be largely ineffective anyway; but even were it highly effective, only a cynic would counsel its acceptance. It is equally unthinkable that a responsible administration can give up its militant efforts toward domestic recovery because of the limitations imposed on it by the international situation. What is needed is realistic taking into account of the international aspects of vigorous domestic policy.

The problem of inflation

Various experts, here and abroad, believe that the immediate postwar inflationary climate has now been converted into an epoch of price stability. One hopes this cheerful diagnosis is correct. However, a careful survey of the behavior of prices and costs shows that our recent stability in the wholesale price index has come in a period of admittedly high unemployment and slackness in our economy. For this reason it is premature to believe that the restoration of high employment will no longer involve problems concerning the stability of prices.

Postwar experience, here and abroad, suggests that a mixed economy like ours may tend to generate an upward creep of prices before it arrives at high employment. Such a price creep, which has to be distinguished from the ancient inflations brought about by the upward pull on prices and wages that comes from excessive dollars of demand spending has been given many names: "cost push" inflation, "sellers" (rather than demanders) inflation, "market power" inflation—these are all variants of the same stubborn phenomenon.

Economists are not yet agreed how serious this new malady of inflation really is. Many feel that new institutional programs, other than conventional fiscal and monetary policies, must be devised to meet this new challenge. But whatever be the merits of the varying views on this subject, it should be manifest that the goal of high employment and effective real growth cannot be abandoned because of the problematical fear that reattaining of prosperity in America may bring with it some difficulties; if recovery means a reopening of the cost-push problem, then we have no choice but to move closer to the day when that problem has to be successfully grappled with. Economic statesmanship does involve difficult compromises, but not capitulation to any one of the pluralistic goals of modern society.

Running a deliberately slack economy in order to put off the day when such doubts about inflation can be tested is not a policy open to a responsible democratic government in this decade of perilous world crisis. A policy of inaction can be as truly a policy of living dangerously as one of overaction. Far from averting deterioration of our international position, a program that tolerates stagnation in the American economy can prevent us from making those improvements in our industrial productivity that are so desperately needed if we are to remain competitive in the international markets of the world.

History reminds us that even in the worst days of the great depression there was never a shortage of experts to warn against all curative public actions, on the ground that they were likely to create a problem of inflation. Had this counsel prevailed here, as it did in pre-Hitler Germany, the very existence of our form of government could be at stake. No modern government will make that mistake again.

IV. GENERAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The two principal governmental weapons to combat recession and slackness are fiscal (i.e., tax and expenditure) policy and monetary or credit policy. In ordinary times both should be pushed hard, so that they are reinforcing rather than conflicting. These are not ordinary times. Until our new programs have taken effect, America does not have the freedom from balance-of-payments constraints that she enjoyed for the 25 years after 1933.

The usual balance between fiscal and monetary policies will have to be shifted in the period just ahead toward a more vigorous use of fiscal policy because of the international constraint. Some of the conventional mechanisms of credit policy may have to be altered to meet the new situation we face. While credit was made very easy in the 1954 and 1958 recessions in order to induce housing and other investment spending, a similar reduction of the short-term interest rate on Government bills down to the 1-percent level might lead in 1961 to a further movement of international funds to foreign money markets, thereby intensifying our gold drains. Because our monetary institutions are slowly evolving ones, the following recommendations deal less fully with monetary policy than the subject deserves in a full-scale study of stabilization.

The need for flexibility

Since experience shows that no one can forecast the economic future with pinpoint accuracy, the policymaker cannot plan for a single course of action; he must be prepared with a list of programs, reserving some on the list for the contingency that events in the early months of 1961 may turn out somewhat worse than what today seems to be the most likely outcome. The following recommendations of this report, therefore, fall into two parts.

First come those minimal measures that need to be pushed hard even if the current recession turns out to be one that can be reversed by next summer at the latest. Expansions and accelerations in expenditure programs that are desirable for their own sake, improvements in unemployment compensation, new devices that permit use of flexible credit policy within the international constraints and stimulus to residential housing are examples of measures that belong in our first line of defense and which are already seen to be justified by what we know about the recent behavior of the American economy. Now in January the wisdom of such policies can already be vertified.

Second comes a list of other measures of expansion which represent sound programs to combat a sagging economy, but which are more controversial at this time. If we could

read the future better, they might be just what is now needed. But given our limitations, it may be safer to hold such measures in reserve. As the months pass, and the February and March facts become available, we shall be in a position to know whether more vigorous actions are called for. Flexibility in decisionmaking deserves emphasis: There is nothing inconsistent about asking for measures in March that one does not ask for in January, if events have provided us with new information in the meantime. The annual budget should itself be a "living document." Just as Congress should begin to explore measures that will enhance the flexibility of tax rates by giving certain discretionary powers to the Executive, so should Congress itself be quite prepared to flexibly reverse its field in tax legislation when new economic conditions are recognized to call for new measures.

Important warnings

It is just as important to know what not to do as to know what to do. What definitely is not called for in the present situation is a massive program of hastily devised public works whose primary purpose is merely that of making jobs and getting money pumped into the economy. The Roosevelt New Deal inherited a bankrupt economy that was in desperate straits. Whatever the wisdom of antidepression "make-work" projects in such an environment, they are definitely not called for at the present time. There is so much that America needs in the way of worthwhile governmental programs and modern stabilization has so many alternative weapons to fight depression as to make it quite unnecessary to push the panic button and resort to inefficient spending devices.

Similarly, as was mentioned earlier, massive spending programs designed to undo in a year the inadequacies of several years do not represent desirable fiscal policy. Planned deficits, like penicillin and other antibiotics, have their appropriate place in our cabinet of economic health measures; but just as the doctor carries things too far when he prescribes antibiotics freely and without thought of proper dosage, so too does the modern Government err in the direction of activism when it goes all out and calls for every conceivable kind of antirecession policy. The golden mean between inaction and overaction is hard to define, and yet it must be resolutely sought.

Finally, it is worth repeating the warning against concentrating exclusively on ending a downward slide of activity and ignoring the suboptimal level at which the economy may then be operating. Even if this recession ended early in 1961, and even if its initial stages seemed to show a tolerable rate of improvement, that would not alone be enough to render unnecessary policies aimed to get us back to, and keep us at, high employment levels. Satisfactory growth is not something one procures by a once-and-for-all act; eternal vigilance, as with so many other good things, is the price that must be paid for good economic performance.

V. "FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE" POLICIES

Expenditure programs

Pledged expenditure programs that are desired for their own sake should be pushed hard. If 1961–62 had threatened to be years of overfull employment and excessive inflationary demand, caution might require going a little easy on some of them. The opposite is in prospect. The following measures are not being advocated in the faith that they will help business from declining in the first months of the new year. Some of them will, at best, pay out money only after a considerable delay. They are advocated for their own sakes as builders of a better, fairer, and faster-growing economy. And even should their expenditures come into play after we have reversed the recession tide, they should be helpful in making the next recovery a truly satisfactory and lasting one.

(i) Defense expenditures ought to be determined on their own merits. They are not to be the football of economic stabilization. Nor, as was too often done in the past, ought they to be kept below the optimal level needed for security because of the mistaken notion that the economy is unable to bear any extra burdens. Certainly a recession drop in tax receipts should not inhibit vital expenditures any more than should the operation of artificial limits on the public debt. And they should certainly not be maintained at high levels merely for the purpose of substitution for other measures designed to keep employment high. On the other hand, any stepping up of these programs that is deemed desirable for its own sake can only help rather than hinder the health of our economy in the period immediately ahead.

(ii) Foreign aid is likewise to be determined by the need for development abroad. An increase in this program, skillfully tailored to take account of the international payment position, deserves high national priority in a period like this one.

(iii) Education programs including funds for school construction, teachers' salaries, increased loans for college dormitories should be vigorously pushed. Some of these could have an impact even within calendar year 1961 itself.

(iv) Urban renewal programs, including slum clearance and improvement of transportation facilities, represent desirable projects that should come high on the policy agenda.

(v) Health and welfare programs, including medical care of the aged, increased grants for hospital construction, and continued large grants for medical research, are desirable even though some of them—such as health for the aged financed by social security—will not add at all to dollar demand in the near future.

(vi) Improved unemployment compensation is one of the most important of all the measures on this list from the standpoint of antirecession action. The fairest and most effective step the Federal Government can take to help fight the recession would be to expand unemployment compensation benefits. Such expenditures go to those who need them and who will spend the money promptly; they also go up at the right time and in the right place and will come down at the right time and in the right place. It is a sad fact, however, that the Nation's unemployment compensation system cannot possibly do the job it is expected to do. Under present arrangements, it was shown to be inadequate in the 1957–58 recession and it will be inadequate in the present recession as well.

For the immediate future, emergency legislation is needed to permit all States to continue paying unemployment benefits (perhaps at a stepped-up rate) for at least 39 weeks, regardless of the condition of their insurance reserves and even if they have not yet repaid the loans received to tide them over in 1958.

For the long pull, we need a system with basic Federal standards that will (a) cover employees in all firms regardless of size; (b) provide unemployment benefits of at least one-half of the employee's earnings; and (c) extend the term of benefits to a minimum of 26 weeks in all States, supplemented by an additional 13 weeks during periods of high national unemployment. Federal standards are also needed to provide for adequate financing and solvency of the system. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of equalizing the burden of financing unemployment benefits among the States, and to varying the benefits in such a way that they will go up when unemployment in the Nation as a whole is high and go down when unemployment is low. These measures would reinforce the stabilizing effectiveness of the system in all stages of the business cycle and would eliminate the need for hasty action during periods of emergency.

(vii) Useful public works programs should be accelerated to the extent feasible without disrupting their orderly execution. This applies to Federal and federally supported programs, such as (a) water resources, (b) highways, (c) post-office construction, (d) public building construction by the General Services Administration, and (e) military construction. Prompt additional appropriations and authorizations by the Congress are needed in most cases. Opportunities for speeding up authorized public works exist also at the State and local levels. Cooperation of all levels of government strengthens an antirecession program.

(viii) Highway construction programs can be accelerated. Cement capacity and labor availability are such as to make this a potent near-term stimulant. An aggressive Federal highway program might involve any of the following measures: (a) relaxing contract controls over State obligations, and assuring States their obligations will be met; (b) authorizing repayable advance to the States to meet their 10-percent matching requirements under the interstate program; (c) waiving the pay-as-you-go amendment if required to permit full apportionment of future interstate authorizations and, if deemed necessary, increase these authorizations.

(ix) Depressed area programs are desirable both in the short run and the long. The Douglas report spells out needs in this matter and makes comment unnecessary here.

(x) Natural resource development projects, including conservation and recreation facilities, provide further examples of useful programs.

The above list does not pretend to be exhaustive. Certain other expenditure measures could be added to a first line of defense program, but enough has been said to indicate the nature of the needed actions. The order of magnitude contemplated here might be in the neighborhood of $3 billion to $5 billion above already planned programs in fiscal 1962 and does not involve the inflationary risks of an all-out antirecession blitzkrieg. This does not purport to make up for the accumulative deficiencies in those vital areas.

Residential housing stimulus

The last two recessions were helped immensely by a successful program to make credit more available to residential housing. No experts could have predicted the anticyclical potency that housing has shown in the postwar period. Already we have seen some easing of credit in this area, but such steps do not seem this time to have been so successful in coaxing out a new demand for home construction. There is perhaps some reason to fear that less can be expected from the housing area in the year ahead. Downpayments are already quite low, as are monthly payments. Vacancy rates, particularly in certain areas and for certain types of housing have been rising. The age brackets that provide the greatest demand for new housing are hollow ones because of the dearth of births during the depression of the 1930's.

Nonetheless, so great is the need for housing a few years from now when the wartime babies move into the house-buying brackets and so useful is the stimulation that a resurgence of housing could bring that it would seem folly not to make a determined effort in this area. In particular, loans for modernization of homes, which now bear so high an interest rate, might provide a promising source for expansion.

Many specific actions will be required. Mortgage rates might be brought down to, say, 4½ percent interest, with discounts on

mortgages correspondingly reduced; consideration might be given to further extended maximum amortization periods. The insurance fee for single dwellings under FHA programs might well be reduced from one-half percent to one-quarter percent. The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA or "Fannie Mae") could step up its mortgage purchasing program, especially for high-risk mortgages lacking private markets. Housing for the elderly is another program desirable for its own sake. Measures that tie in with urban renewal and college dormitories, as covered above, also hold out promise.

Particularly because our international balance of payments inhibits certain types of activistic monetary policy will it be necessary to push hard on specific credit programs in the housing field. Innovation ingenuity, and experimentation with new instrumentalities will be needed in this matter; it is not reasonable to believe that the patterns earlier arrived at are the last word in feasible programing.

The role of monetary policy

Were it not for the international constraint, an economy that faced recession in the short run and which had been falling below its potential for several years would naturally call for a considerable easing of credit. Indeed a growth-oriented program would entail a combination of low interest rates and widely available credit with an austere fiscal program designed to create budget surpluses large enough to offset any resulting overstimulation of demand. But such a program must await a solution of our international economic difficulties that will free our hands in domestic monetary policy.

The first order of business is to get nearer to high employment. Expansion by the Federal Reserve of bank reserves, in order to increase the supply of money and to stimulate investment spending, will naturally tend to lower short-term interest rates. But in view of the volatility of funds as between our money markets and those abroad which pay higher interest, we can plan only limited use of this conventional mechanism. New exploration is needed.

(i) In the days after the 1951 accord when the lesson had to be learned that Government bonds were not in peacetime to be arbitrarily pegged at artificial price levels, it was perhaps defensible for the monetary authorities to concentrate almost wholly on open market operations in the shortest term Government securities. Without entering into the merits of this position—and the problem is indeed anything but a simple one to be decided by emotional slogans—responsible economists realize that the new international situation requires some change in emphasis. Indeed it is encouraging to note that the Federal Reserve authorities have themselves already been experimenting with actions designed to adjust to the new situation. Still further actions may be desirable in order to help bring long-term interest rates down relative to short-term. It is long-term rates which are most decisive for investment spending; and it is short-term interest rates that are most decisive for foreign balances. This is not an area for hasty improvisation or doctrinaire reversal of policies; but it is one for pragmatic evolution of procedures and policies.

Nor is this merely a task for the Federal Reserve. The Treasury too must consider the wisdom of relying primarily on short-term issues in the period just ahead. Those in Congress who have thought that recession times are the best period in which to issue long-term debt at low interest rates will have to go through the same agonizing reappraisal of their view as a result of the new international situation.

The whole problem of debt management by the Treasury, as coordinated with the Federal Reserve in the interest of overall stability, will require rethinking in these new times. No conflict of desires between the Executive and the Federal Reserve is to be involved, since both have the same interest in economic recovery and defense of the dollar.

(ii) Decisive actions to improve our international balance of payments position are desired for their own sake as well as to liberate domestic stabilization policies. This is not the place to describe the numerous programs that are needed in the international area. Fortunately there are some reasons to think that our net export position is an improving one and that the task is not an impossibly difficult one. The primary need is to make sure that our productivity is improved so that our costs will remain competitive in international markets. But there are also certain measures that can alleviate the psychological drain on gold.

VI. "SECOND LINE OF DEFENSE" POLICIES

Two alternatives

All the above has been premised upon a specific, and perhaps optimistic, forecast of how the economy is likely to behave in 1961. This first alternative could be called the "optimistic model" were it not for the fact that it turns out to involve unemployment that does not shrink much or any in 1961 below present levels of some 6 percent. It seems nevertheless to agree most closely with the likeliest expectations revealed by a careful canvass of economic forecasters in business firms, universities, and public agencies.

Concretely, the optimistic model assumes that the gross national product will decline for at most one or two quarters. It assumes that the calendar year GNP will average out to between $510 billion and $515 billion, which represents an improvement in real GNP of about 2 percent in money terms and 1 percent in real term (after correction for price changes has been made). It assumes that by the end of the year the economy will be running some 3 percent above the present rate. It assumes that even in the absence of any needed programs by the new administration the current budget will have lost its surplus and more likely will show some deficit. It assumes that our new jobs will be barely enough to provide work for the 1.2 million workers who are added to the labor force in 1961 and that unemployment remains a grave social problem.

Evidently such an outlook cannot be regarded as an optimistic one; and it is to improve upon this situation that the above programs were prescribed.

It is only wise, though, to be prepared for an even worse outlook. Suppose inventory decumulation continues longer than expected above; that consumers continue to save as large a percentage of their disposable incomes as they have recently been doing; that plant and equipment expenditures by business accelerate their downward slide; and that construction generally proves to be disappointing. What then?

In that case unemployment will rise toward and perhaps beyond the critical 7½ percent level that marks the peak of the postwar era. In that case corporate profits will sink far below their present depressed levels, and a sagging stock market may add to the public's feeling of pessimism. In that case we shall certainly automatically incur a large deficit. While many hope and expect this more pessimistic model will not happen, it cannot be ruled out by careful students of economic history and present indications.

A temporary tax cut

If economic reports on business during the early months of the year begin to suggest that the second, more pessimistic outlook, is the more relevant one, then it will be the duty of public policy to take a more active, expansionary role. This is not the place to spell out the details of such a program. But certainly the following tax-cut measure will then deserve consideration.

A temporary reduction in tax rates on individual incomes can be a powerful weapon against recession. Congress could legislate, for example, a cut of 3 or 4 percentage points in the tax rate applicable to every income class, to take effect immediately under our withholding system in March or April and to continue until the end of the year.

In view of the great desirability of introducing greater flexibility into tax rates, it would be highly desirable for Congress to grant to the Executive the right to continue such a reduction for one or two 6-month (or 3-month) periods beyond that time (subject to the actions being set aside by joint resolution of Congress) with the clear understanding that the reduction will definitely expire by the end of 1962.

At this time it would be urgently important to make sure that any tax cut was clearly a temporary one. With the continued international uncertainty and with new public programs coming up in the years ahead, sound finance may require a maintenance of our present tax structure and any weakening of it in order to fight a recession might be tragic. Even if it should prove to be the case that growth makes reduction of tax rates possible in the long run, that should be a decision taken on its own merits and adopted along with a comprehensive reforming of our present tax structure. (Various tax devices to stimulate investment might also be part of a comprehensive program designed to eliminate loopholes, promote equity, and enhance incentives.)

VII. A FINAL CAUTION

Direct attack on the wage-price spiral

The above programs have been primarily concerned with fiscal and monetary policy. This is as it should be.

It is important, though, to realize that there are some problems that fiscal and monetary policy cannot themselves come to grips with. Thus, if there is indeed a tendency for prices and wages to rise long before we reach high employment, neither monetary nor fiscal policy can be used to the degree necessary to promote desired growth.

What may then be needed are new approaches to the problem of productivity, wages and price formation. Will it not be possible to bring Government influence to bear on this vital matter without invoking direct controls on wages and prices? Neither labor, nor management, nor the consumer can gain from an increase in price tags. Just as we pioneered in the 1920's in creating potent monetary mechanisms and in the 1930's in forging the tools of effective fiscal policy, so may it be necessary in the 1960's to meet head on the problem of a price creep. This is a challenge to mixed economies all over the free world, and is not to be met by government alone.

SANDED PLYWOOD AND THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on page 1 of the Wall Street Journal for December 29, 1960, there appeared an article, by Ray J. Schrick, entitled "Output Cuts, Price Rise Follow Classes on Supply and Demand."

The article relates an extremely revealing truth about our American economy. It deals with a case that should be carefully considered by agricultural economists. It points the way for our farm economy, for it tells how the producers of sanded plywood in this country have been able to raise their prices and their profits in the last year in the

face of both seasonal and cyclical declines in the demand for their products. They have done this following a series of seminars at which they discussed, under the tutelage of Dr. H. H. Engle, a University of Washington professor of economics and marketing, ways and means of meeting new threats to their economic welfare.

Under the title "The Seven Pillars of Wisdom," Dr. Engle emphasized the proper uses of market statistics, advertising and promotion, production control, storage, selecting proper marketing channels, price policy, and discount policy. While attempting to carefully avoid any suggestion of price fixing or marketing agreements which would violate the antitrust laws, the effort is clearly one aimed at cooperatively limiting supply.

This is, Mr. President, a perfect case to illustrate how even a small competitive industy is able successfully to limit production and increase both its prices and its income. With our vast farm surplus and our immense overproduction in agriculture, the approach expressed so clearly by Dr. Engle rings a bell, as he says:

> It is not a sensible or an orderly method of doing business to produce and to force onto the market more products than the market can absorb. The inevitable result of such a policy is always reaction on prices, driving them lower and lower as production continues to exceed consumption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLYWOOD PROFS: OUTPUT CUTS, PRICE RISE FOLLOW CLASSES ON SUPPLY AND DEMAND—SANDED PLYWOOD PRICE TREND IS CONTRA-SEASONAL; SOME PRODUCERS SHUN SEMINARS—"SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM"

(By Ray J. Schrick)

PORTLAND, OREG.—In spite of the year-long slump in homebuilding and in the face of the usual winter season decline in demand for construction materials, producers of sanded plywood are enjoying a paradoxical market development: Their prices are up 13 percent over the August level.

The gradual firming of prices came after an industry trade association launched an experiment, partly out of desperation. It persuaded many leading makers of sanded plywood to send some of their key executives to a series of special marketing seminars where a group of college professors lectured them, sparing no one's feelings, on the industry's past failures in equating supply with demand for its products.

Acting on their own, producers have sharply cut back production to keep it more in line with actual orders. It's impossible to say whether this and the accompanying price rise are consequences of the seminars; some producers say they are, others see no connection between recent market development and the classroom tutelage. The seminars' participants have taken care to prevent the discussions from running afoul of the antitrust laws' prohibitions against collusion in setting production and price policies, though some members of the industry have been advised by their attorneys to stay out of the program.

There now is considerable talk in the Pacific Northwest about making these seminars, which were started on a temporary basis, a permanent part of the plywood industry's marketing efforts. Such a move might in turn lead to the use of similar classroom techniques in other industries suffering from intense competition and skidding prices.

TOO MUCH CAPACITY

Fir plywood, like steel, aluminum and numerous other industries, at the moment has an overcapacity problem. Despite phenomenal growth in demand, which has pushed output to 8 billion square feet this year from 2.5 billion a decade ago, industry capacity has more than kept pace and now is estimated at more than 9 billion feet. Result: Plywood is one of the few building materials that costs less today than it did in 1950.

Adding to the manufacturers' problems is a pronounced variation in seasonal demand. During the peak construction period in the warmer months demand soars; in winter there is a sharp drop in customer orders, with prices often plummeting 20 percent or more. This year the pressure on plywood prices has been even more severe than usual because of the homebuilding decline; housing starts in the first 11 months of 1960 ran 17 percent below a year earlier.

In August, the price of the principal grade of quarter-inch sanded plywood fell to $60 a thousand square feet, the lowest point in more than 10 years. It was shortly after this that the industry's marketing program got under way. Representatives of 125 mills, accounting for about 80 percent of the Nation's softwood plywood production, were called together in Portland by the Plywood Manufacturers' Institute (PMI), the smaller of the industry's two leading trade associations. This was followed by a series of "workshops" or seminars for smaller groups in five West Coast cities, from Tacoma, Wash., south to San Francisco.

The cost of the program was about $70,000. Larger producers, such as Georgia-Pacific Corp. and U.S. Plywood Corp., contributed $5,000 each while lesser amounts came from about 35 smaller producers, based on their production volume.

"SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM"

Under the ornate heading of the "Seven Pillars of Wisdom for an Orderly Marketing System for Douglas Fir Plywood," the seminars were taught by Dr. N. H. Engle, a University of Washington economics and marketing professor, with a broad experience of Government work and private consulting. Assisting him were two professors from other colleges.

Over and over in the seminars Dr. Engle has emphasized the point: "It is not a sensible or an orderly method of doing business to produce and to force onto the market more product than the market can absorb. The inevitable result of such a policy is always reaction on prices, driving them lower and lower as production continues to exceed consumption."

Dr. Engle's "seven pillars of wisdom" included: Market statistics, advertising and promotion, production control, storage, selecting proper marketing channels, price policy and discount policy.

FIRMER PRICES

Whether the program is responsible or not, quarter-inch sanded plywood prices now hover around $68 a thousand feet, up about $8 from August levels, although this is the season when prices often weaken because of the sag in construction.

"I give a lot of credit for higher prices to our marketing seminars getting people in the proper frame of mind so mills subsequently curtailed their output individually to match their order files," declares the vice president of one large company.

December plywood production has slowed down to about 60 percent of capacity, with several of the industry's largest firms setting the cutback pace. U.S. Plywood Corp., for example, has shut down 23 of its plants in Oregon, Washington, and California from December 23 to January 3. All told, 32 companies have shut down 50 mills this week instead of merely observing a long holiday weekend as is the usual custom.

Do the cutbacks represent an intercompany agreement of some sort? Not a bit, say the backers of the program. "If you give 30 fishermen a map to get to a hot fishing spot on the coast and tell each one that the fish bite best from 2 to 3 o'clock each afternoon and later all 30 men show up to fish at that time, do you think that's collusion or the exercise of individual judgment in going fishing?" says one industry member. The seminars carefully avoided anything that hinted at a company-by-company production allocation system or mandatory cutbacks.

Not all companies are so confident that the program is free of possible antitrust enforcement dangers. Only 40 of the approximately 100 companies in the industry took part. "I'm having nothing to do with it upon advice of legal counsel," declares William Swindells, president of Willamette Valley Lumber Co., who heads an Oregon group of wood manufacturing companies.

ANTITRUST DO'S AND DON'TS

However, the Plywood Manufacturers' Institute attorney, James C. Dezendorf, argues, "This program is simply education. You're teaching the facts of life. But you can't suggest or coerce one or more mills to follow any particular recommendation. Each mill must exercise individual judgment. You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink. That best sums up what you can and can't do under the antitrust law."

While the first round of seminars has ended, the idea still stays very much alive in manufacturers' minds. For example, about 10 major sheathing-plywood makers have been invited to a special 1-day seminar next Thursday. The meeting, under Dr. Engle's direction, will consider the particular marketing problems of sheathing, or unsanded plywood. The price of sheathing, a key homebuilding panel that recently has accounted for over half of all industry production, customarily has been more volatile than the price of normal sanded panels. Sheathing prices dropped nearly 10 percent this fall.

In addition, a textbook elaborating on the material covered in the first marketing seminars is being assembled by two professors who worked with Dr. Engle.

The big danger, some companies which have stayed on the outside fear, is not that the marketing seminars themselves are illegal but that in a group discussion someone might accidentally suggest something illegal. Even though this might be an irresponsible remark by an uninformed person, it's feared this could get other companies in trouble.

Some big lumber companies, who also produce plywood, are ultra conservative as a result of a consent decree obtained by the Justice Department in 1941. At that time 63 lumber companies asserted their innocence of allegations made by trust-buster Thurman Arnold that they "combined and conspired together to restrain, directly and unreasonably, the interstate trade and commerce in lumber." In signing the consent decree, they agreed, without admitting a past violation, not to do many things in the line of limiting production, fixing prices or collecting statistical data to help achieve these results. Among the signers of the decree were Weyerhaeuser, Willamette Valley Lumber Co., and Simpson Logging Co., all now with plywood operations.

A COURT VICTORY

In addition, a group of plywood companies in 1952 won a case on appeal to the U.S. circuit court of appeals against a Federal Trade

Commission cease and desist order alleging "certain acts hindering interstate commerce in lumber products." The companies won because the court held that "where illegal practice had terminated many years prior to filing of complaint, in the absence of circumstances suggesting the likelihood of the resumption of such practice, a cease and desist order was not warranted." The Douglas Fir Plywood Association, the main industry promotion, research and quality control group, has steered religiously clear of price or marketing questions ever since.

Though not all of Dr. Engle's ideas have been greeted with open arms by mill men, at least one proposal already has been accepted by about 80 percent of the industry in principle. This is the revival of weekly production statistics recently by Douglas Fir Plywood Association (DFPA) members. Although DFPA operates completely separately from the Plywood Manufacturers' Institute, which is sponsoring the seminars, a marked change of opinion in favor of issuing statistics occurred among its member mills after the seminars started.

Over 2 years ago, mills tossed overboard their statistical barometer of weekly orders and production because some mills believed plywood buyers, using the barometer's information, often withheld orders and broke the market price.

Dr. Engle, however, severely criticized mills for an "admission of ignorance" in not using weekly statistics as a management tool helpful to them. "One of the major uses of marketing facts is to guide and control the rate of production, to adjust output to the consumer pattern," argues Dr. Engle.

STABILITY AND SALES

The basic thesis in Dr. Engle's doctrine is that it should be possible to have greater price stability in the industry and higher sales, at the same time. His reasoning is that independent distributors who buy plywood from mills could sell far more of the product than they now do. Under typical present-day conditions, it's argued, the wild price gyrations discourage distributors from getting money tied up in inventory that may fall sharply in value tomorrow, so there is no concerted sales effort in pushing plywood all year round.

"Channel-crossing" also has aggravated plywood's problem. Short-circuiting of the historic distribution system of mill-to-wholesaler-to-retailer, between 5 percent and 10 percent of fir plywood now goes direct from mill to a retail lumber dealer or other end user. This would raise no major problems, except that the mills have given the end users the 5 percent "functional" price discount historically given to wholesale distributors who perform a warehousing and distribution function. This has resulted in distributors, in turn, asking and getting an extra 3 percent discount besides the normal 5 percent, in effect undercutting the basic price structure. In addition, competition has brought about unofficial extra discounts off the official price list. The legality of some of this discount pricing has been seriously questioned by Dr. Engle.

"It is more than possible," he says, "that the chaotic and illogical granting of discounts, current in the industry today, might well run counter to the Robinson-Patman Act if it were ever investigated." The Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 aimed basically to prevent one buyer from getting unfair price advantages through discriminatory price preferences given some buyers but not to others.

"A discount is a price reduction no matter in what terms it is quoted," Dr. Engle says.

EVERYBODY GUILTY

Plywood men deny illegal discrimination. The situation is so muddied as to the functions the various buyers perform, with few orders actually identical, that no law violations are involved, says one prominent industry executive. "If there is a violation, nearly everybody and his brother are guilty because practically everybody has not had a firm price policy," he adds.

Antitrust legislation confronts the industry with another built-in dilemma. The companies dare not enter into agreements with competitors to control output or prices. Yet at the same time the larger firms cannot be too aggressively competitive. This might be viewed by the antitrusters as an illegal attempt to monopolize trade.

Along this line, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department recently has been looking into competitive pricing practices in the industry at the wholesale level. A preliminary inquiry has been going on to ascertain whether mill price cutting at the wholesale end has put some independent distributors out of business, according to a Justice Department spokesman in San Francisco. No companies have been named yet. And, in fact, a spokesman for the National Plywood Distributors Association denies that any problem exists, other than a few isolated complaints about big company competition.

MERGER TREND

Nevertheless, a big trend for plywood manufacturers to expand into the wholesale warehouse field, in order to market their overcapacity, has accelerated in recent years. Merger talks are now going on between Evans Products Co. and Aberdeen Plywood & Veneers, Inc., which would make the resulting 35-warehouse chain the fourth largest in the fir plywood industry. Recently Weyerhaeuser Co. acquired 22 additional wholesale warehouses in its merger with Roddis Plywood Corp. And Georgia-Pacific Corp., the biggest fir plywood manufacturer, has 70 warehouses now compared to 60 a year ago and only 30 five years ago.

"Warehouses are about the only strength a mill can have," says one harried sales official. Controlling warehouses assures a mill outlets to push its product. A "captive" warehouse can concentrate on plywood while an independent jobber must be a one-stop shopping center for all kinds of building materials. Fir plywood accounted for only about 27 percent of the average jobber's sales last year.

The plywood industry's economic seminars are only one aspect of a concerted drive to solve its price and production problems. Perhaps great long-range achievements may come from expanding markets or lowering costs through automation, programs which the Douglas Fir Plymouth Association is pushing actively. The trade association spent a record $5.5 million on promotion, research, and quality control this year, up from $4.8 million last year.

Already great progress is coming from increasingly mechanized production. "Mills once had to sell plywood at $76 a thousand square feet to make a profit, later $72 and now $68," estimates one industry authority. "It looks like in the future we can cut the costs of making plywood another $5 a thousand feet and frankly, I think, better than that," declares Harold Evans, director of Plywood Research Foundation, the research arm of DFPA.

CBS PROGRAM, "MONEY AND THE NEXT PRESIDENT"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I observed that in the past few months the television networks have presented an impressive number of outstanding programs. I noted that television is helping us develop a more profound understanding of our responsibilities as citizens. One of the programs which did an especially good job of this was the CBS documentary, "Money and the Next President," which was broadcast on October 27, 1960. It was a careful and intellectually challenging discussion of our Nation's economic future. The main reporter was the noted CBS newscaster Howard K. Smith, the producer was George A. Vicas, and the executive producer was Fred W. Friendly. The program was part of a special series entitled "CBS Reports," dealing with leading national and international issues, which is sponsored by Philip Morris, Inc.

Those who watched this program were able to see and hear leading economists, such as Per Jacobsson, director of the International Monetary Fund, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Treasury Secretary Robert Anderson, Dr. Gabriel Hauge, Dr. Leon Keyserling, and other distinguished economic spokesmen, give their views on questions of monetary and fiscal policy, economic growth, and balance of payments. The printed script of such a program hardly does justice to its total impact, but it may give the reader some idea of what he missed. For this reason, I wish to have the script of the program printed at this point in the RECORD; and I so request.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY AND THE NEXT PRESIDENT

(As broadcast over the CBS television network, Thursday, October 27, 1960)

ANNOUNCER. CBS Reports acknowledges with thanks the cooperation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System, who opened their doors to our cameras to take our television audience inside the Government printing plant where money is printed and stored, and into the vaults of Federal gold depositories. This cooperation was extended by these officials with the knowledge that many of the opinions expressed in the next 60 minutes would be contrary to their own.

Now here is Howard K. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. This is the desk of the next President of the United States in the loneliest room in the world at the White House in what Thomas Jefferson called "The splendid misery."

Mr. EISENHOWER. Now, I don't believe that anyone can predict what the next President's problems are really going to be.

Mr. SMITH. On January 20 next, the 35th President of the United States, armed with whatever memorabilia he brings with him and the consent of the governed, will enter through that door and occupy that seat. The 34th President, speaking of the duties of his successor, said recently:

Mr. EISENHOWER. The biggest problem there is in the United States today is to make sure that her own people—her own people understand the basic issues that face us, and form their own judgment; and if we can inform these people properly, then we can be sure that the health and vigor of the democracy will solve them properly. Our great danger is that we are sometimes led down blind alleys by demagogs, or we're too lazy to inform ourselves, or we just say that some popular figure will solve them for us.

Mr. SMITH. If laziness and popularity contest elections are a problem now, as some say, they will be an increasing burden to the next President who will have to lead at a time when the American people must become increasingly aware of a myriad of complex questions, not the least of which is a crucial one called wealth. Some who come to this room will call it our money problems; others, gold, balance of payments, growth.

The Secretary of Defense will lobby for more funds for missiles and bases. The Secretary of the Treasury will talk of the dangers of inflation. Health and Welfare will want funds for schools and aid to the aged. State will plead for foreign aid funds. The Director of the Budget will want to balance the budget, and all will want to hold taxes down until it comes to their province. But should the 1960 election campaign end up as more of a popularity contest than one of compelling issues, the man who sits at this desk may find himself responsible to an electorate unable to recognize one of the chief remaining differences between our two political parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is a great country, but it can be greater. This is a prosperous country, but it can be the most prosperous country in the world, where all Americans share that prosperity and none live on the marginal edge of existence. But we have to grow, and under Republican leadership this country is standing still—here in this country and around the world.

Mr. NIXON. And so I say tonight, first, the charge that the United States has been standing still just doesn't hold up. What they are looking at when they make that charge is solely at what Government does, and they overlook the very great fact about America's progress. That America's progress comes primarily not from what the Government does but from what 180 million free individual Americans do in individual enterprise.

Mr. SMITH. It is an argument as fundamental as Jefferson and Hamilton; as bitter as Truman and Eisenhower. It has to do with how we manage that which our Founding Fathers called "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In the first of the Kennedy-Nixon debates it became obvious that the question of economic growth and its attendant controversies was going to be a major campaign issue. There were those at that time who criticized the two candidates for going too deeply into such a complicated and difficult and hard-to-follow subject. There may be those who think that the same subject is too difficult and without sufficient excitement and drama for a 1-hour television report. However, we are convinced that this subject is going to be the central debate in the 1960's and so we ought to face up to it. So now, with the help of the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, a Nixon supporter, and Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, a Kennedy adviser, and some others who might be Secretary of the Treasury if their man wins, we present "Money and the Next President of the United States."

The man who sat in this Oval Room longer than anyone in history, Franklin Roosevelt, observed just a short time before moving into the White House, that America's growing was probably over. He said: "Our industrial plant is already built. Our problem, now, is whether it is overbuilt." That was 28 years ago and that overgrown economy, then with a $58 billion gross national product, has now reached the $500 billion level, almost 10 times as much. A nation's real wealth is measured by this term which has been heard over and over in this election campaign. First, let us define gross national product. The gross national product is all the earnings and goods and services manufactured and produced by 69 million employed Americans in the course of a year. It is $11½ billion for milk and dairy products, and just about the same amount—$11 billion—for alcoholic beverages, which does not include the liquor we import. It is $13 billion that we produce in steel—the very sinew of our industry—and almost half that amount on cigarettes. It is $38 billion on automobiles and trucks and almost half that amount—$17 billion—on new home construction. It is $2½ billion on new schools and classrooms, and $3 billion for cosmetics, beauty aids, and other related services—another part of our growth. Our gross national product is made up of more than $2 billion we spend annually on candy; the $267 million that we spend on aspirin and aspirin compounds; and the $280 million we now spend on tranquilizers—perhaps a symptom of living in a state of perpetual crisis. It is almost $2 billion for coal, and more than twice as much for the production of oil. It is $325 million that we spend on textbooks, and $50 million that we spend on comic books. It is $500 million that we spend on civilian space exploration and $6½ billion on military missiles—all forming part of our gross national product to reach $500 billion in 1960. These figures represent the changes, the constant movement, the growth of our economy. They reflect the myriads of choices involved in deciding what we do with our wealth. But faced as we are with global competition from the Soviet Union which is able to afford losses in foreign trade, which it uses as an instrument of Communist policy, and faced with the equally real competition of nations friendly to us, the choices we make may well prove of critical importance for our future, and are reflected in one of the debates of substance in this election year.

Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress last November, said that the Soviet gross national product has been growing twice as rapidly as that of the United States over the past 8 years—and he added, "If the Soviet industrial growth persists at 8 or 9 percent per annum over the next decade, as is forecast, the gap between our two economies by 1970 will be dangerously narrowed unless our own industrial growth rate is substantially increased from the present pace." Or look at the competition in another way. Today, our gross national product is considerably greater than the Soviet gross national product, and yet Walter Lippmann and other experts have estimated that we spend about 20 percent of this amount on public needs, while the Soviets, on the other hand, spend about 50 percent. Other Americans agree with Mr. Dulles, and feel that we're not performing now as we should.

Leon Keyserling, former economic adviser to President Truman.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that the American economy is one of the wonders of the world. We've done enormous things; we're still capable of doing enormous things, and we're now doing some very fine things. But although we are one of the wonders of the world, we're not doing as well now as we should, and we should always remember that history has produced many wonders of the world. Greece was a wonder of the world; Rome was a wonder of the world; the British Empire was a wonder of the world, and there have been others. When they failed to meet the challenge—the crisis of the particular times that confronted them—they first ceased to be a wonder, and then ceased to be a leader.

Mr. SMITH. But others claim that the extent of Soviet growth is a myth.

Economist Colin Clark.

Mr. CLARK. It has been stated by the Central Intelligence Agency in Washington, and by a number of other officials and professors who ought to know better, that the production of the Soviet Union is increasing at a rate of 9 percent per annum or more, and they say we ought to be concerned about it. I quite agree. What we ought to be concerned about is the gullibility and the ignorance of the professors and officials who make these statements. Any careful examination of the Russian figures gives an entirely different result. You'll find that the real rate of growth of Russian productivity in product per man-hour is only 1.6 percent per year, well below the American figure of 2.3 percent per year. So far from overtaking the American economy, productivity is falling further behind.

Mr. SMITH. Gabriel Hauge, former economic adviser to President Eisenhower, takes the middle between those viewpoints.

Mr. HAUGE. Personally, I'm not joining the jumping-jack set about it, but I do want to try to get it in proper perspective. Clearly, an economy as newly out into broad industrialization as that of the Soviet economy, is going to make rapid progress. I think also in our own time, the development of the Canadian economy in a time period roughly identical with that of the Russians, would show that there's nothing uniquely wonderful about the Communist way of getting growth rates in an early stage of industrial development if you have the resources that the Canadians have had. But all that aside, we certainly ought to shuck any remaining ideas that any of us might have that the Communists can't make their system work for the purposes they set for it. Obviously, they can.

Mr. SMITH. John Galbraith of Harvard told Dan Schorr of CBS news that we're growing fast enough, but in the wrong direction.

Mr. GALBRAITH. Well, I would think that our main problem is not how fast we're growing but the kinds of things that we're getting. I said a moment ago that growth consists of getting all of the increasing production of all the goods we use and all the services that we have. Well, there are some things which I support we don't need a great deal more of. We have all the food we need. The food supply is pressing on the population rather than the reverse, and I think we may well be reaching the point where an additional supply of automobiles will become an embarrassment, and we are well supplied with things like clothing, most private goods. Not everybody, but most people are.

Mr. SCHORR. Well, what do you——

Mr. GALBRAITH. On the other hand, there are some things of which we're desperately short. Our schools aren't very good. Our public services aren't very good. Our cities are still decaying. We still have a very bad slum problem. Our urban transportation is in terrible shape, so I would myself place more stress on the kind of growth we get than I would just growth as such. These are all things where decision by government at some level is involved, and where, this being the sad part of it, taxes must be paid, collected and public revenues must be found so that the real problem of growth, as I would put it, is that of an imbalance between our private goods and our public services.

Mr. SCHORR. Dr. Galbraith, can government correct that imbalance?

Mr. GALBRAITH. Why, certainly, this is the function of government.

Mr. SMITH. In this respect it is often said that by an economy of very free choice, we get lots of tail fins and few schools. That our community furniture becomes rather shabby, while our personal possessions become rather affluent. We asked Dr. Hauge about this.

Mr. HAUGE. Now we can have both tail fins, I should think, and schools, or we can have schools and transportation in compact cars if that's what our individual choice is. Individual citizens make a first choice in the marketplace, and then in the polling place. They make a first division of their income between what they retain and what they give to the various levels of government in taxes—Federal, State and local. Now this is varied in different times, but this is a decision—this is individual choice. Now, within the category of individual choice of what we give to ourselves and what we turn over to government units to spend, which is running over a hundred and thirty billion dollars a year now and not really a pikerly

sum at all if we spent it well, you've got the question of how do you spend what you turn over to government. Now, I think it's perfectly proper for people to bring up the subject of how we are using our wealth and our abundance just so that they don't depart from the essentials of our whole society and philosophy, which is individual choice and limited government. I don't think we can run our country on any other basis.

Mr. SMITH. Leon Keyserling.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think, unfortunately, at a time when we are in a struggle with a monolithic and totalitarian power, we have begun to degrade free government. We've begun to talk about the things that ought to be done outside of government and not put enough emphasis upon the kind of things that the American people have to do as a whole. You can't combat totalitarianism by telling 50 States, including Alaska, and 180 million people—"You go and make a program—you go and close the missile gap—you go and get high economic growth." These are matters of national policy, of national direction. And I think that on all these fronts, we've gotten a low rate of economic growth because we haven't done the things we need to do. We've been caught in a sort of paralysis of "we can't afford"; a sort of paralysis of "let's fight inflation."

Mr. SMITH. Some say that if the Russians spend more money than we do on space, while we spend more money than they on cosmetics, they will be farther ahead in space, while we will end up by being better looking. For how can we compete if a monolithic state such as the Soviet Union can virtually channel its economy to produce what it needs, while our decisions are left to a consumer economy where the swimming pools are often easier to sell than schools?

We asked Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson about such choices.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I think the essence of economic freedom is the freedom of choice. Growth, it seems to me, ought to be in terms of real goods and services that people want and that they're able to buy. In Russia, one has very limited choices. One can decide whether he wants to buy one color of a shirt or another color of a shirt, but this freedom extends only to the goods that the Government is willing to produce. In a free-choice society, the consumer reigns almost supreme. He decides what he wants and what he buys at the marketplace. But inherently, I think, our people are fundamentally sound and that they're going to be sure that they will spend, at some level of government, the kind of money that is required in order to have a good educational system; but they will do it because they come to the realization of the importance of it; because of the desirability of affording to their children and to the Nation the kind of trained minds and abilities that the Nation requires. If, on the other hand, we would simply say that the economy has to be directed—that somebody has to decide for us how much we spend and how much we utilize of our resources for each of the segments of our economy, we would have given up a large part of what we now have our defense for, and that is the right of people to make choices.

Mr. SMITH. Treasury Secretary Anderson says free choice. Professor Galbraith says it's "the function of Government." Here are Senator Kennedy and Vice President NIXON on the subject of growth.

Mr. KENNEDY. With a really healthy rate of growth this country can have full employment for all who want a job. With a really healthy rate of growth we can pay for all the defenses that this administration says we can't afford. With a really healthy rate of growth we can afford the best schools for our children and the best paid and the best trained teachers. And, finally, with a really healthy rate of growth, we can talk about an economic crusade for justice. But it's time we stopped talking about it and elected an administration that will do something about it.

Mr. NIXON. We will not be satisfied with what we were doing but in determining what new steps we will take; we will emphasize individual enterprise—and what Government can do, it can stimulate that—rather than putting the primary responsibility on Government, as a source of economic progress in this country.

Mr. SMITH. Every American from Barry Goldwater to Secretary Anderson, to Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Reuther, is for growth and against inflation. The difference is that the Democrats think that preoccupation with inflation will stunt our growth, and the Republicans feel that growthmanship produced by Government action will create inflation. So right now, we shall take our life in our hands and attempt a kind of anatomy of inflation which will take us through the foggy sea of gold, balance of payments and foreign competition. In times past, a nation's fortune was its gold. Today, gold is somewhere in between what Khrushchev calls plating for bathtubs, and others, a ridiculous, yellow fetish, and still others, the protector of the currency. But certainly the United States of America with its stockpile of enriched uranium, automobiles, food, and steel, has far more useful and valuable wealth than bricks of gold in a subterranean crypt. We asked Robert Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, about the relationship of currency to gold.

Mr. Secretary, I have here a $10 bill. It's a gold certificate which promises me that $10 in gold will be payable to the bearer on demand. Could you give me gold for that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Smith, the Supreme Court decided in the 1930's that gold certificates were not redeemable in gold, and of course now, under our laws, individual citizens are not entitled to demand gold of the Treasury. As a matter of fact, all of these gold certificates are supposed to have been turned in to the Government, and I'm sure you'll be glad to leave this one with the Treasury if we give you another $10 bill.

Mr. SMITH. Well sir, I have a more orthodox $10 bill here—one which was printed recently and which bears your name "Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury." Now, what is this worth in terms of hard money? Is this any relation to gold?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, of course, the whole $10 is hard money, freely convertible all over the world. It is backed up by 25 percent of its value in gold, so that for each $10 bill, there is $2.50 of gold to support it.

Mr. SMITH. This gold backing is for Federal Reserve notes which today make up much of the currency in circulation. Most of the rest is backed by silver. In 1952, the Daughters of the American Revolution questioned whether 20 years of Democratic control had kept our gold supply secure, and wanted a delegation to be sent to Fort Knox to count the gold bars.

Gabriel Hauge, now chairman of the finance committee of the Manufacturers Trust Co.

Mr. HAUGE. We have had a tremendous gold stock out at Fort Knox—so great that it got to be the object of humor—and when George Humphrey became Secretary of the Treasury in 1953 he actually went out there and had a count made.

Mr. SMITH. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. JACOBSSON. We need gold, not for the daily payment or from man to man—we need it now more for balancing accounts internationally. And in my opinion, the fact that this country is able to meet drafts on the dollar by using its gold, adds to the certainty of the dollar.

Mr. SMITH. Economist John Galbraith.

Mr. GALBRAITH. Well, the real wealth of a nation, of course, isn't its gold. This is a very unnutritious commodity. The real wealth of the Nation is its capacity to produce things, and I suppose, behind that, the intelligence and skills, culture of the people who produce things. If it just evaporated off the face of the earth, I suppose we'd find something else.

Mr. SMITH. Actually, the $19 billion or so we have at Fort Knox and other gold depositories is little more than chips in a global poker game and has little to do with inflation or the value of the dollar. It all started in ancient times when barter became too cumbersome and gold was substituted. Today, in a commercial world which has passed through the industrial revolution and is now on the threshold of automation, gold has become obsolete as a coin in anyone's realm. What was never more than a glittering chip is now represented by chips of its own, which we in the United States call the dollar.

At the Bureau of Engraving in Washington, we print $28 million every day, 5 days a week. This machine, printing $100 bills, printed $2¼ million an hour this day.

This incinerator, also at the Treasury, burns practically the same amount we print—$28 million every day. You're watching $19 million dollars worth of tired bills that have been in circulation an average of 15 months, being reduced to ashes. There is now $28 billion in currency in circulation with another $219 billion on deposit in banks across the country. It is the increase of these funds, which have no relation to gold and often too little with the goods we produce, that causes inflation. We asked Secretary of the Treasury Anderson how money is created.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us assume the Treasury needs $100 million with which to buy airplanes for the Department of Defense. We need to pay for them tomorrow. We call a bank and say: "Will you lend us $100 million for a given time, at a given rate of interest," and the bank agrees. We send to the bank a security. It may be a Treasury bill or a Treasury note, or certificate or bond. The banker then, upon receipt of the security, credits us with $100 million.

Mr. SMITH. Where do you get the security note? Can you make it out at will?

Mr. ANDERSON. We draw it up and commit the U.S. Government to a payment.

Mr. SMITH. It's a kind of I O U.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, the—where did the banker get the $100 million? Did he select some of his customers' accounts and decrease their accounts? Certainly not. Every customer would object. He simply created a $100 million in the form of deposits, and this is the money that we will use with which to buy the airplanes.

Mr. SMITH. Sir, is that a contributory factor to inflation—to the falling or purchasing power of the dollar?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the reason, Mr. Smith, why we don't want to borrow from the Federal Reserve System. It's the reason why we don't want to borrow any more than we have to from the commercial banking system. Because if the Treasury borrows from you as an individual, your bank account is decreased by the amount of purchasing power which you transfer to the Treasury. There has been no money creation.

Mr. SMITH. This is a savings bond. And when Secretary Anderson refers to no new money being created, he means that in this fashion we lend part of our personal savings to the Treasury, which promises to pay it back, plus interest—no new money has been created. When the Treasury, on the other hand, borrows from a commercial bank, such as Mr. Anderson described, it means that new money has to be created or printed. The healthy way for new money to be born is in direct relationship to the growth of our national product such as iron ore, steel, power, food, and services. It is in this area that the Democratic-Republican argument over tight-

money policies arouses such passions, but this is an entire controversy of its own.

One description of inflation is too much money chasing too few goods, or more simply, a decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, which to some is at the core of the problems of our time. What actually is inflation? How does it affect our lives? Take a man—you—me—anyone. His work provides him with a return in food or clothes or whatever he may want to exchange his dollar for. In 1940 his dollar, for instance, would buy a certain amount of chicken and eggs, but as the years went by, that same dollar bought less and less until in 1960, it will buy only about half; or to put it another way, today it takes $2 to match the stature of the 1940 dollar. However, today, with wages up, the same amount of work in an 8-hour day will bring about the same as 1940. But if the man is out of work or retired, his dollar will bring him only about half.

Mr. EISENHOWER. We must fight—fight inflation as we would fight a fire that imperils our home. Only by so doing can we prevent it from destroying our savings, pensions, and insurance, and from gnawing away the very roots of a free, healthy, economy and the Nation's security.

Mr. SMITH. But money is such an inexact science, if it is a science, that there is disagreement among experts as to whether we do, in fact, have inflation.

Leon Keyserling.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think we don't have inflation now. As a matter of fact, I think what we're really confronted with now is the problem, and I don't want to be an alarmist, of not having next year or the year after another economic recession which is just the opposite of what people commonly think of as inflation.

Mr. SMITH. Economist John Galbraith.

Mr. GALBRAITH. If prices just at this time are stable, we should keep in mind that it's for very temporary reasons. We should have as our objective stable prices. Inflation is a very regressive thing—it helps the strong and it's hard on the weak.

Mr. SMITH. Gabriel Hauge.

Mr. HAUGE. The forces that were very strong in the inflationary direction, that produced almost a kind of an inflationary psychology, were checked last year; and I would say that today there is perhaps somewhat of a lull on this particular front. But if you adopt the definition of inflation that I do, which is inflation comes from bad economic habits, I don't think, perhaps, that we're ever through with it.

Mr. SMITH. Per Jacobsson.

Mr. JACOBSSON. I don't think there is an inflation at the moment in the United States. But then comes the—perhaps the most important question for this country, and that is, how to learn to live without inflation.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of the Treasury Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. My belief is that most economists would say that the 1960's still present problems of inflationary pressures. One must be concerned about the future and not allow things to develop now which will place unreasonable inflationary pressures on the future.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary Anderson and the Republicans believe that inflation caused by too much Government spending is the major domestic problem of the 1960's. The Democrats want to channel more funds into public health and educational services.

Mr. GALBRAITH. This requires a public decision, and one is asking the market to do the impossible if one asks it to provide things like schools, highways, national defense. These things have always been outside of what you call the system of choice. They have always been subject to public legislative action and always will be.

Mr. SMITH. And it is in this area that the money battle is joined as witnessed in this brief exchange from the Nixon-Kennedy debates.

Mr. NIXON. And so I would say that in all of these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: Either he has to raise taxes or he has to unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation, and that will be, of course, a very cruel blow to the very people—the older people—who we've been talking about.

Mr. KENNEDY. There have been statements made that the Democratic platform would cost a good deal of money and that I'm in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error, and it is a fact that in the last 8 years the Democratic Congress has reduced the requests for the appropriation by over $10 billion. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly on the record. My view is that you can do these programs—and they should be carefully drawn—within a balanced budget if our economy is moving ahead.

Mr. SMITH. If the gold supply has little or no direct effect upon inflation, inflation and the state of the dollar have a very profound bearing on the state of the gold market, and 7 days ago gold moved off the financial pages of the papers and on to the front pages and the editorial pages. Some of the most conservative periodicals in the world called it the great gold rush of 1960. As Secretary Anderson said earlier in this program—the individual citizen cannot redeem his dollars for gold. However, in Europe, there was such an intense scurry to buy gold that the price gyrated erratically from $35 an ounce up to $40 an ounce—then back down to $36 an ounce, and then back up to $40 again. Doctors of this inexact science had mixed theories as to the cause, but they all revolved about what is called our balance-of-payments problem. It relates to the fact that our gold supply is shrinking and gold is leaving the country. Actually, it seldom leaves the United States physically, but when our balance of payments sags, at is has recently, gold is moved from the U.S. Treasury vaults into cages of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, where it is earmarked to accounts held by Canada, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, and others. The outflow of our gold reserves has declined steadily since 1958, when it was highest—but it continues—and the last two years saw transfers of close to three billion dollars from our gold reserves to foreign accounts. Even though there would appear to be little connection between gold, currency and imports, one can go to the very place where money is printed to discover a startling clue.

This is a modern, high-speed printing press. It is a special press that prints United States currency. This press and a number of others like it, replacing old, much slower equipment located at the Treasury in Washington, was manufactured in England, which may suggest the range and extent of the changes which have taken place recently in international trade.

Suddenly, the United States, the world supplier, was faced with the unaccustomed reality of foreign competition. Many of the goods coming off efficient, modern assembly lines abroad, built with America in mind, were finding a receptive market here. Since 1947, we imported nearly five and a half million foreign cars. In 1959, bought nearly four hundred and seventy thousand Italian, German and Swiss typewriters. More than 4 million radios from Japan and Germany. Imported turboprops and jetplanes from England and France. Heavy electrical machinery from England and Switzerland. Perfumes, gloves, fashions from France and Italy. Textiles from India, Japan, Hong Kong and England. Steel from Germany and England. Electronic equipment and cameras from Japan and Germany, while our tourists spent more dollars abroad each year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, we have come to a position in which the world is not confronted with a dollar gap, not even primarily confronted with the problem of liquidity, but confronted, rather, with a problem of competitiveness.

Mr. SMITH. An example of this kind of competition is France's Sud Aviation, manufacturers of the Caravelle jet, now one of the world's fastest selling commercial airlines. Its president is Georges Hereil.

Mr. HEREIL. In the United States, our first contract with United Airlines was of an amount of $65 million, but as I said after the signing of the contract, it is just the beginning and we hope, in the next coming years, to reach a total amount of more than $1 billion.

Mr. SMITH. American consumers, who had always seemed to prefer American products, discovered that foreign-made goods often were cheaper—more to their taste in design and had become fashionable status symbols. In 1959 we imported more than $15 billion of foreign products—Jaguar, Porsche, Alfa-Romeo, Lancia sports cars; and Leica, Rolleiflex, Nikon cameras; Gorgonzola, Camembert, Cheddar cheese; Tobler and Lindt chocolate; Brazilian and Colombian coffee; Italian shoes; shirts and dresses; sewing machines; toys.

Economist, John Galbraith.

Mr. GALBRAITH. The United States, of course, has become an easy market in which to sell, and for the same reason, it's become difficult for us to sell our goods at the lower prices in other countries, both in Europe and in the third countries—and countries—the so-called third countries—Africa, South America, have found it easier to—and cheaper—to buy in Europe than with us.

Mr. SMITH. The United States was faced with a balance-of-payments problem, which has to do with our economic relations with other lands. As Dr. Galbraith explains.

Mr. GALBRAITH. The balance of payments, after all, is what we spend for goods for the things we import, plus the money that we spend traveling abroad, plus the money that is invested abroad, plus what we spend for foreign aid, plus military aid—that on the one hand; plus what we earn with our exports on the other hand; plus, also, what people spend traveling in the United States, plus what they choose to invest in the United States. That is the balance, and in recent years, we have been buying more, spending more abroad than we have been receiving, and the result is that we have had a so-called balance-of-payments deficit, which means that the claims of foreigners have been increasing in the United States—what property they own within the United States—bank deposits and so forth, or they have been withdrawing gold from the United States.

Mr. SMITH. But there is a further complication to this problem. At the end of World War II, Europe and Japan were in ruins—their economies shattered. With the disintegration of our wartime alliance with the Soviet Union and the beginning of the cold war, immediate measures were needed to fill the political, economic, and military void left by the war. And so the Marshall plan was born—a program to help rebuild the economies of friend and former enemy alike. We sent funds, technical know-how, equipment, and military aid to France, Italy, Iran, Turkey, Germany, and set up bases.

Paradoxically, the very success of our aid has created a problem for us, best illustrated by the heavy outflow of our gold.

Oscar Strackbein, who believes in high tariffs and represents an industry-labor group dedicated to protectionism.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. We have created a monstrous problem for our economy. This

was not intentional. Our—you might even say that our assistance succeeded too well. Let us say that we had to do these things, but yet, the results that have now come upon us, makes it necessary, in my opinion, that we take measures to prevent the competition from destroying our own industries in this country. We must, in my estimation, fight a rearguard action, if nothing else, to make sure that one industry after another is not undersold and underbid, and driven out of the—our own market by imports that come in at very low prices compared with our own. I recommend specifically that we use import quotas and tariffs as a means of putting on the brakes on imports.

Mr. SMITH. Jean Monnet, father of the Common Market and often called Mr. Europe, is for more competition and against any kind of restrictive tariffs.

Mr. MONNET. I think that the whole philosophy and basis of American prosperity is based on competition—on constant effort—on constant changes—on adjusting yourself constantly to better production. The creation of Europe—the Common Market—certainly has created a competitor which otherwise would not have existed. But isn't that the very basis on which American prosperity has been built? And it seems to me strange to think that you who have built all your prosperity on competition, should today be afraid.

Mr. SMITH. Warren Lee Pierson, chairman of the board, Trans-World Airlines, and former president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. PIERSON. If we raise our tariffs, other countries are going to raise theirs. It's just as simple as that. A few years ago, we tried to help our watch industry by raising the duty on Swiss watches. What was the result? The Swiss almost immediately raised their duties on American farm products. Now, the job we thought we were giving the American watchmaker was not the job of a Swiss watchmaker. Actually, it was a job of an American farmer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Our problem is to bring the balance of payments into greater equilibrium. It seems to me that we must do this not by forms of protectionism, not by trying to lessen the amount of international trade and commerce, but rather by emphasizing American exports, by being as helpful as we can to our exporters so that they can compete in foreign markets by insisting that other countries do not discriminate against goods produced in the dollar area; and by being sure above all else, that we do not allow inflation to so develop in our country that we make ourselves noncompetitive with the rest of the world.

Mr. SMITH. To face growing foreign competition, American firms have opened branch plants abroad. In the past 5 years alone, hundreds of companies have moved to Western Europe and Japan to bring their products closer to the local consumer—avoiding foreign tariffs, saving on transportation costs, and taking advantage of cheaper labor, and Detroit has met the foreign car threat head-on by producing its own compact car versions. This more efficient production in other industries, and heavy foreign sales of our jet transports, have tended to improve our balance-of-payments deficit—a step in the right direction but still not enough. And this month the Pentagon reversed a longstanding policy of giving preference to oversea purchases. From now on, at equal prices, products manufactured in this country will be given preference over foreign products. Although the dollar amount involved in this is small, the step is a symptom of the Government's will to do something about our gold outflow. Both Vice President NIXON and Senator Kennedy have been concerned about this gold outflow and have discussed it in a recent television debate.

Mr. NIXON. As far as the gold supply is concerned, and as far as the movement of gold is concerned, we have to bear in mind that we must get more help from our allies abroad in this great venture in which all freemen are involved in winning the battle for freedom. Now America has been carrying a tremendous load in this respect. I think we have been right in carrying it. I have favored our programs abroad for economic assistance and for military assistance. But now we find that the countries of Europe, for example, that we have aided, and Japan that we've aided in the Far East, these countries, some our former enemies, some our friends, have now recovered completely. They have got to bear a greater share of this load of economic assistance abroad.

Mr. KENNEDY. The difficulty, of course, is that we do have heavy obligations abroad; that we, therefore, had to maintain not only a favorable balance of trade, but also send a good deal of our dollars overseas to pay our troops and maintain our bases and sustain other economies. In other words, if we're going to continue to maintain our position in the sixties, we have to maintain a sound monetary and fiscal policy. We have to have control over inflation, and we also have to have a favorable balance of trade. We have to be able to compete in the world market. We have to be able to sell abroad more than we consume from abroad if we're going to be able to meet our obligations.

Mr. SMITH. As to the reasons for the current anxiety about gold, no man can yet say with certainty, but the United States had lost substantial gold in the last 2 months due to the flight of international capital in search of high interest rates while, in Europe, the London gold market has responded to nervous buying whipped up by an uncertain world situation.

Mr. NIXON. Now, there are a number of reasons for this happening, the experts believe. But you know what they all agree on? That a major contributing factor for the lack of confidence in the American dollar abroad is the widespread fear, growing out of the ill-considered proposals and suggestions made by my opponent concerning the fiscal and monetary policies of this country. What are those proposals? Well, a major London newspaper made the suggestion just a few days ago that my opponent had an idea of devaluating the dollar.

Mr. KENNEDY. I must say the Vice President does show signs of some tension. Tonight he blamed me for the increase in the cost of gold in the London market. Mr. NIXON—if you are listening in—I didn't do it. I promise you.

Mr. SMITH. The task of defending the dollar will be a priority goal of the next President of the United States, and the job will have to be done without sacrificing American prestige and commitments in the vital areas of foreign aid, military assistance, and NATO, in which another kind of survival is at stake. All of this relates directly to the health and the growth of our own economy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Now, what is—the issue is what we are going to do in the future. Now, that's an issue between Mr. NIXON and myself. He feels that we're moving ahead, we're not going into a recession in this country economically; he feels that our power and prestige is stronger than it ever was relative to that of the Communists; that we're moving ahead. I disagree. I believe the American people have to make the choice on November 8, between the view of whether we have to move ahead faster, whether what we're doing now is not satisfactory; whether we have to build greater strength at home and abroad, and Mr. NIXON's view. That's the great issue.

Mr. NIXON. We've got to grow enough to maintain the forces that we have abroad and to wage the nonmilitary battle for the war—for the world—in Asia, in Africa, and Latin America. It's going to cost more money, and growth will help us to win that battle. Now, what do we do about it? And here I believe basically that what we have to do is to stimulate that sector of America, the private enterprise sector of the economy, in which there is the greatest possibility for expansion. So that is why I advocate a program of tax reform which will stimulate more investment in our economy.

Mr. SMITH. This is a voting machine on which the only true verdict on the Nixon-Kennedy debate will be rendered, and the most important act that you and I are likely to perform for several years to come will be to pull the lever or mark the ballot on November 8. We will find on the ballot no indication of economic growth or inflation or national goals—just a man's name. It may be, as Edwin Dale, the New York Times economics expert, has said, that the only basic difference between our two political parties is on economics. If our report has not made your decision for November 8 easier, we hope at least that we have illuminated a little what is at stake when a new President faces the most bountiful but the most disagreed-about mechanism on earth—the American economy. Goodnight.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. MILNE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there is a figure, familiar to me, that is missing from the Senate Press Gallery this session. On Saturday morning, November 19, 1960, death came with quiet but tragic suddenness to Edward J. Milne, of the Providence Journal-Bulletin Washington bureau.

For 10 years he had covered the Washington scene for the newspapers he had served for 32 years, dating from his high-school days. He had risen to the post of city editor of the Providence Bulletin, before coming to Washington, where he quickly became a vital figure in newsgathering on the Hill.

Ed Milne gained national prominence for some of his work—some of it so exclusive that a Senate subcommittee once sought the source of his news. Mr. Milne declined to reveal that source and gave his reasons:

> I gave my promise to my sources that under no circumstances would I make them known. To break that promise would be a dishonorable act. To disclose my sources would, in effect, be to bring my newspaper career to a close. No reporter can last in the newspaper business who violates a confidence. I would be an object of well-deserved contempt among my colleagues if I violated the confidence placed in me by my sources.

I cite this as symbolic of the character of the true newsman—the gentlemen of the fourth estate who so often reach our people before our RECORD, with their coverage of the people's government.

There was nothing belligerent about this man's persistent quest of the news. I have been pleased by the compliments expressed for his courteous bearing when occasion called him to the Senate Reporter's Room. That conduct was the character of Ed Milne.

Perhaps my own estimate of this conscientious newsman is best expressed by my words on receipt of the sorrowful news of his death—and I quote from the press of that day:

> I am deeply shocked by the sudden passing of Edward J. Milne. No less than the newspapers that he represented so faithfully

and so well, the people of Rhode Island have lost one whom I feel privileged to call a public servant, though this brilliant newspaperman was in private employ.

Ed Milne was keenly alive to every measure, every movement, every suggestion that would have impact on our State. He was tireless in his attention to the Congress, to committees and to every channel of the Government that might have Rhode Island matters under consideration.

He was not petty—he was not parochial—he was not partisan. Possessed as he was of a deep sense of values, gifted as a critic, commentator and reporter of the State and National scene, I regarded Ed Milne as a most important part of the Washington complex. I valued him as a friend with a friendship that could not color or detract from his duty to report factually and fully as becomes a dedicated man of the press. My sincere sympathy goes to his family in their bereavement.

Ed Milne's own newspaper, the Providence Journal, in its editorial column of November 22, 1960, delivered a fitting eulogy under the heading "A Dedicated, Talented Newsman Dies":

The death of Edward J. Milne, a Washington correspondent for these newspapers for the last decade, was as untimely as it was dismaying. Cut off in the prime of his career, Mr. Milne had attained great distinction as a dedicated newspaperman, and the richness of his experience had augured continued fruitful service. Mr. Milne brought to his profession a rare combination of qualities: high competence as a craftsman in language, a dogged determination to seek out the truth at whatever cost in time or effort, a wry, sharp wit, an enormous curiosity, and an incisive mind which he harnessed without stint to the practice of reporting.

But he had that one further, priceless quality which marked him as a great reporter. He never was content with the surface facts of what had happened and when. For him, no story was complete unless it had been related logically to the past, fitted to the pattern of existing facts, and tied, if possible, to potential future developments.

Threading his whole career with these newspapers was an abiding respect for the institution of a free press and for his own responsibilities as part of that press. When he told a Senate committee that to disclose news sources would be a dishonorable act, he spoke in a tradition of integrity which he profoundly respected.

Yet Mr. Milne never was pretentious, and he never was stuffy. His best shoptalk stories were about himself and his experiences. In years of service in Providence, he won the respect of men and women in all walks of life; in Washington, he made his mark early—and held it to the end—among the Nation's top reporters.

It will not be easy to fill his place in Washington, and it never will be possible to find again in one man that unique combination of qualities and competencies which brought Mr. Milne honor in his time and the affection of those who knew him in the profession and those outside in the world he had made his beat.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this tribute to a good man and a good newsman belongs in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was such an important part of his life that it deserves to be part of his memory.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the majority leader for an announcement, and that the remarks may appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Steering Committee of the Democratic Conference has met and made its selections for chairmen and members of the various committees.

I send to the desk and ask that a resolution covering these appointments be laid before the Senate for its immediate consideration.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Stephen M. Young, of Ohio; Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut; Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida.

Agriculture and Forestry: Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; B. Everett Jordan, of North Carolina; Stephen M. Young, of Ohio; Philip A. Hart, of Michigan; Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota; Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon.

Appropriations: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Stennis, of Mississippi; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia; Gale W. McGee, of Wyoming; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota.

Armed Services: Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, chairman; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Clair Engle, of California; E. L. Bartlett, of Alaska; Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada; Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia.

Banking and Currency: A Willis Robertson, of Virginia, chairman; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey; Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine; Edward V. Long, of Missouri; Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon; Wm. A. Blakley, of Texas.

District of Columbia: Alan Bible, of Nevada, chairman; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Vance Hartke, of Indiana; Benjamin A. Smith II, of Massachusetts.

Finance: Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, chairman; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia; Eugene J. McCarthy, of Minnesota; Vance Hartke, of Indiana; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas.

Foreign Relations: J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, chairman; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio; Frank Church, of Idaho; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut.

Government Operations: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine.

Interior and Insular Affairs: Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Alan Bible, of Nevada; John A. Carroll, of Colorado; Frank Church, of Idaho; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Frank Moss, of Utah; Oren E. Long, of Hawaii; Quentin Burdick, of North Dakota; Lee Metcalf, of Montana; J. J. Hickey, of Wyoming.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio; Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas; Clair Engle, of California; E. L. Bartlett, of Alaska; Vance Hartke, of Indiana; Gale W. McGee, of Wyoming.

Judiciary: James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, chairman; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; John A. Carroll, of Colorado; Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut; Philip A. Hart, of Michigan; Edward V. Long, of Missouri; Wm. A. Blakley, of Texas.

Labor and Public Welfare: Lister Hill of Alabama, chairman; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas; Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey; Quentin Burdick, of North Dakota; Benjamin A. Smith II, of Massachusetts; Claiborne Pell, of Rhode Island.

Post Office and Civil Serivce: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas; Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania; B. Everett Jordan, of North Carolina; Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia.

Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia; Stephen M. Young, of Ohio; Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Frank E. Moss, of Utah; Oren E. Long, of Hawaii; Benjamin A. Smith II, of Massachusetts; Lee Metcalf, of Montana.

Rules and Administration: Mike Mansfield, of Montana, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; B. Everett Jordan, of North Carolina; Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada; J. J. Hickey, of Wyoming; Claiborne Pell, of Rhode Island.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader a question.

I wish to be heard on the motion the majority leader has made. I have no objection to its present consideration. I may wish to talk for as long as a half hour. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has the floor. I do not wish to inconvenience him. I should like to ask my friend from Louisiana whether he has any objection to this procedure,

which will take him off the floor for as long as perhaps a half hour?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I can conclude my remarks in 10 or 15 minutes, or perhaps less than that.

Mr. CLARK. I am in the hands of the majority leader, for whatever he wishes to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would suggest, Mr. President, that the Senator from Pennsylvania show the courtesy he always has shown, and allow the Senator from Louisiana to complete his speech, which I think will take less than 10 minutes and, if possible, we can get approval of the resolution before the Senate at the present time, and one more as well.

Mr. CLARK. Would it then be the thought of the majority leader that we have the resolution brought before the Senate as the pending business, and then have it laid aside so that the Senator from Louisiana can complete his speech, so that I may address myself to the resolution, which would then be the pending business?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield, if I am able to.

Mr. RUSSELL. If there is no objection, the Presiding Officer can lay the resolution before the Senate as the unfinished business. Then any statement made, whether by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Louisiana, or any other Senator, would be on the pending resolution. There is no rule of relevancy yet in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. That is agreeable to me, so long as we do not dispose of the matter before I have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that some of us who are here will endeavor to see that he has a chance to discuss it as fully as he desires, because we believe in the right of Senators to speak.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his usual courtesy in preventing "gag rule" from dominating this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. It has been said that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds," but I am very consistent with respect to the right of Senators to speak in the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the able majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I correctly understand it would be the desire of the able majority leader, by unanimous consent, to have the pending business laid aside now, or some moments hereafter, in order that the resolution at the desk, read to the Senate, may be taken up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not asked for anything under unanimous consent. I presented the resolution under rule XXV, which calls for the selection of committees on the part of both parties at the beginning of a session. It would be my hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania would allow us to follow through on this proposal, and then allow the Senator from Louisiana to finish his remarks.

It was my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana would yield to me for this purpose, and I had understood—perhaps incorrectly—that the Senator from Pennsylvania at the appropriate time would stand and make his statement relative to this proposal.

I had intended to notify the Senate that was the intention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, so that Senators would be aware of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania was to make a statement relative to the composition of two committees in particular.

I hope that we can pass the resolution now and that the Senator, within the next 10 or 15 minutes, will be able to make his views known.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to retain the right to vote in the negative on the substance of the question of the composition of the committees.

I ask my friend from California if he would agree with me that in order to preserve our rights with respect to the matter of the changes in the rules of the Senate we must conduct business by unanimous consent, or else it is possible it will be held we have acquiesced in the conduct of other business, which will remove a major argument in our effort to change the rules by majority vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not look upon it in that manner, because to me this is in the same category as the conduct of morning business. If I am incorrect, I should like to have the Presiding Officer correct me, and if I am correct, I should like to have the Presiding Officer make a statement to that effect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Resolutions on committee assignments are privileged business.

Mr. CLARK. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Would the consideration of committee assignments, as proposed by the majority leader, have the effect of prejudicing in any way the rights, announced by the Vice President, of those who intend to attempt to change the rules at the opening of the Congress?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No more so than any other business which has transpired thus far.

Mr. CLARK. So that we may be very certain, I ask the following question: Consideration of these proposed committee assignments will not, in the view of the Presiding Officer, be construed as an acquiescing in the present rules of the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this, if we are going to get into that phase of the matter. I did not propose to raise any issue at this time. I had thought that the matter of appointing committees in the Senate was a matter of high privilege. However, I do not know that the Presiding Officer has any right to bind the Senate with that kind of a ruling, as to whether a proceeding to appoint committees is a matter which prejudices any rights. It seems to me that is a question which addresses itself to every Senator in this body, rather than to any parliamentary determination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless it is clear that those of us who propose to change the rules of the Senate, if we can persuade a majority to support us, are not prejudicing the existing parliamentary situation, I will be regretfully compelled to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make an observation, if I had thought that in any way it would have prejudiced the present situation, I would have not presented the resolution seeking to bring about Senate confirmation of the Democratic appointments to committees. It was on that basis that I presented the resolution. It is on that basis that I so understand it at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. Unless the Senator from Georgia dissents from that statement, I shall make an objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do dissent. If we are proceeding to split hairs, I object to the consideration of the resolution, I gather that the procedure followed is to be on the theory that the Senate may stay in session 2 weeks, transact a great deal of business, and apply all the other rules of the Senate. I am not trying to delay the appointment of committees. I am not one of those who undertakes to delay approaching the New Frontier. I may wish to examine some of the vistas of the New Frontier, but I am not trying to delay approaching it. If other Senators are to be so meticulous in trying to build a wall around me, I shall object to the wall being constructed at all. I therefore object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection? Would it be feasible, if the objection is withheld, as it will be, if it is offered, for me to move that the resolution as a privileged matter be given immediate consideration?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator has that right. I did not want it to be considered by unanimous consent with any cloud on any rights I might have, real or imaginary. I do not think I shall have a great many when it comes to the Vice President's ruling. But I wish to reserve such rights as I have, and I wish to retain those so that I may appeal to whatever fairness, justice, and parliamentary regularity there may be left in the Senate. I object. The majority leader has a perfect right to make a motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] will indulge me further, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his graciousness.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had in mind for some days making some remarks on the pending business, as we are now getting close to the time when the Senate is to vote. So this is an appropriate time for me to make my remarks on this matter, with which I have very close connection.

Before proceeding to state what I consider to be the case for the so-called Douglas plan, which now is before us, and which is sponsored—very happily, I think, for all of us—by the distinguished whips on both sides of the aisle, I believe it desirable to explain again, if the matter needs further explanation, why the liberals on both sides of the aisle have forced this matter to the forefront now.

Mr. President, this is perhaps the most important aspect of our debate, but it has been all too little emphasized: The reason is that this is the historic moment in which a result is capable of attainment; and if we pass by this moment—and only a limited number of days now remain; 10, to be exact, but really 9, for all practical purposes—it may be a long time before we have one again, for the very essence of this debate is premised upon what I believe history will recognize as a major historic development in the procedures of the Senate. It is based entirely upon the advisory opinion—that is all it is up to now, and it is very important to explain that to all the world—of the Vice President, that at the moment of the beginning of a new Congress, the Senate has power over its rules, uninhibited by the provisions of the rules themselves as to debate.

Mr. President, we shall have various ways of testing that issue; but that issue has not yet been tested, and it will be up to the Senate to decide whether it will or will not sustain what we now confidently expect will be the ruling of the Vice President. For whether his ruling comes on a motion to suspend debate or on a motion of the previous question, we confidently believe that the incumbent Vice President will, during the next 9 days, have an opportunity to hold that at the beginning of a new Congress the Senate may proceed to adopt or to pass on its rules, uninhibited by the present provisions of rule XXII, which provides that a limitation may not be put on debate except by two-thirds of the Members present and voting, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate itself has adopted a resolution in connection with a minor rules change in 1959, in which it provided that the Senate rules shall be continuing, because nothing in the Senate rules can change the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, this ruling has been made by the encumbent Vice President, and he holds office for 9 more days. Whether the new Vice President will make the same ruling, no one knows. But, indeed, there is reason to believe that the new Vice President may not make the same ruling, because, after all, he was the principal architect of the provision of the last change the Senate adopted in rule XXXII, which provides for a continuance of the rules; and, so far as we know, his views on this subject have not been identical with those of the encumbent Vice President.

This is a chance we cannot take. The constitutional question is too deep, and the issues before the Senate are all too important for the country, and, I respectfully submit, for the world. Therefore, this is the hour; and this opportunity may not present itself again in the next 4 years.

The Senate can, of course, overrule the Presiding Officer; but, as everybody knows, when the Presiding Officer is the newly elected Vice President of a party enjoying a majority in this Chamber of almost 2 to 1, that is going to be a lot harder thing to do than to sustain the ruling that the present Vice President has already announced is the one he is going to make. He announced it as far back as 1957, so the country has had full opportunity to discuss it since that time. That is the historic situation we face.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted the Senator has made note of the fact that the original ruling to which he has referred does not go back to 1950, with the advent of the new administration, but was made in 1957. So the Vice President's opinion expressed here the other day was based upon the advisory opinion in response to a parliamentary inquiry that was made in 1957.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly; and may I say to my colleague, who has been such a stalwart in this fight—that I have been very frank to state the historic character of this struggle. I pay the Senator tribute, and also pay tribute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators on his side of the aisle, who, I am sure, desire to be more than cooperative with the new administration of their own party which is now to come into office.

Mr. President, the question of timing bears very importantly on the point which has been made here time and time again by distinguished colleagues of ours, that this is not a sensational and revolutionary advisory opinion by the Presiding Officer, because there have now been 4 years in which to discuss its effect if this was such an affront to the Constitution and if it did shake the pillars of the Constitution. We hear nothing about it except when we proceed to adopt rules and try to change them and law school professors, judges, and others who are interested in the question have not considered it so revolutionary. That argument is used mostly as an apparition to scare us when we come to consider whether we can or cannot have control over our own procedures and strike the manacles from our own hands—and I say this advisedly—manacles, which prevent us from legislating as the Constitution and the Founding Fathers intended we should.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Many of our colleagues have made reference to the constitutional aspects of this debate and to the requirements in the Constitution placing a limitation on the so-called majority rule.

I would have those same colleagues note that from the year 1789 to the year 1806—at least, starting in 1789—the concept of majority rule in the rules of the Senate for the closing of debate prevailed in the Senate of the United States, at a time, may I say, when the Senate was not an elected body in terms of popular election, but an elected body on the part of legislatures, so that Senators representing their States were selected by the legislative bodies of the respective States.

Therefore, when I hear the complaint that, somehow or other, we are doing an injustice to the Constitution, and thus to the Founding Fathers of this Republic, I cannot help but recall for the record as a historical fact that the very Founding Fathers of the Republic were quite explicit in terms of majority rule. As stated in the adoption of their rules, a majority would be sufficient to curtail debate. The Constitution itself provides that a majority shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of doing business.

If the Senator from New York will bear with me for a minute, one of our distinguished colleagues last week pointed out the number of times in the Constitution that the majority rule principle was set aside. I cannot help but remind my colleague, even though it may be somewhat late, that had the Founding Fathers wanted to set aside the basic premise of majority rule when it comes to the rulemaking power of the Senate, they would have said so, because the only time the majority rule principle is in any way adjusted or altered in the Constitution is by specific assignment, and not by indirection. And the courts of the United States, may I add, have ruled several times that the presumption of majority rule prevails except in those instances where the majority rule is set aside for the two-thirds rule, as it is set aside in overriding vetoes, or in agreeing to treaties, or in impeachments, or in proposed constitutional amendments, or to expel Members of either House. Otherwise, the principle of majority prevails throughout the Constitution, and, I might add for the benefit of my colleagues, even to the point of declaration of war a majority is

adequate under the Constitution of the United States.

I cannot believe, therefore, we would be greatly violating the spirit of the Constitution; I think, to the contrary, we would be upholding the spirit of the Constitution, if we adopted the principle of majority rule in reference to bringing debate to a close, so that we might proceed to a vote.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his usual eloquent contribution. I should like to identify myself with the views he has just expressed.

Mr. President, first, therefore, is the point that this is the historic opportunity, because of the previous notice of the ruling which would be made by the incumbent Vice President, which we have no reason to suppose will be the accepted ruling of the new Vice President. Therefore, this is the hour in which to act.

Second, an effort is made in this Chamber to say that we are trying to impose gags upon our colleagues and to deprive them of the great tradition in this body of free debate. I shall discuss that question in some detail. There is one important point to put in focus here, however, that this process started in 1917, after a long history of 111 years after the previous question method which was in effect up to 1806.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not the contention of the Senator from New York, is it, that the previous question, as it was allowed for by the original rules of the Senate up until 1806, was identical with the previous question as it is now recognized?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows that there has been a great deal of controversy about the use of the previous question in those days and the use of the previous question, for example, in the House of Representatives now. It is my belief the substantial purpose, however, of the previous question, as used in those days and as used now, is the same.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. JAVITS. If I may just finish my answer first. I do not hold with the proposition which has been alluded to here on the floor that the previous question is utilized only for the purpose of laying aside business, and not for the purpose of ending debate in order to act on business. Nor do I hold to the proposition, in the light of the rules as they were at that time, that the fact that some of the discussion continued after the previous question was put indicates that debate does not end when the previous question is put and carried, because—and I am glad to have the opportunity to point this out—it is the fact that the application of the rule for the previous question must be read in the light of other rules which existed at that time, under which the Chair had the power to cut off, without any appeal, any debate which the Chair regarded as not germane, or as frivolous, or as delaying the proceedings.

The only discussion which was appropriate in respect to the other discussion which went on in those days was on the question of whether the previous question should be applied and what would be the consequences if it either were or were not applied.

Therefore, I feel this is not a precedent—as to which there has been considerable argument—which relates to the fact that the previous question will not cut off debate if successfully moved and carried under our present practice, though I will agree that it was not so clearly and specifically articulated as a technique for cutting off debate in those days, or even in the British Parliament, as it has been since in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recognizes, does he not, that the previous question, as it appeared in the Senate rules and practice prior to and ending in 1806, did permit of debate?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from New York has explained his position, which is that it did not permit the kind of debate which is contended for; to wit, debate upon the main question. Rather, at that time, in view of the tremendous power of the Presiding Officer to cut off any further discussion without any appeal, the Presiding Officer could, if he wished and chose to do so, at that time hear some argument upon the technical questions, but not upon the main question. That is totally different from the present situation, and is therefore not an applicable precedent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recognizes, however he may describe it, that the previous question, as provided for in those rules ending in 1806, did allow for debate.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator recognizes no such thing as being a precedent binding upon a successful motion for the previous question now. The Senator, on the contrary, has been taking great pains to point out now why he does not recognize it as any such precedent.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Does the Senator not agree—in fact, does he not in effect state—that what the Vice President ruled was not with respect to any particular form of words or any particular kind of procedure, under whatever name, whether it be called the previous question or anything else?

Is not the important thing instead, substantially, the right of the majority of the Senate to close debate and to come to a vote at the beginning of each new Congress on the question of the adoption of new rules or the amendment of old rules?

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, my colleague from New Jersey, who is very learned in this field and who has made tremendous contributions, is absolutely correct.

Before my colleague came to the Chamber I stated that the form of the motion would be or could be a motion for the previous question, in which case the precedents followed in the House of Representatives on the adoption of rules would be followed, when a motion for the previous question, if sustained, ends all further debate; or there could be a motion made that the Senate now end debate; depending upon the wishes and the desires and the views as to what procedure the Senator making the motion and the Presiding Officer would like to follow.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield further for one observation, the question has been raised again and again that if the Senate follows the advisory opinion of the Vice President, with which the Senator from New York and I so fully agree, it will be getting itself into procedural tangles as to, for example, whether a two-thirds vote or a majority vote on the matter of proceeding to end debate should be allowed.

Would not the Senator agree that the Vice President has been very explicit, that no matter whether it is by analogy to or under the rule taken from one rulebook to another, the Vice President's ruling is clear that a majority controls?

Mr. JAVITS. Without any question. I will say to my colleague from New Jersey that the Vice President, in referring to Robert's Rules of Order and to the rule on the previous question in Jefferson's Manual—and I have little doubt he would say the same in response to any question concerning the precedents of the House of Representatives—has made it clear that he is free to apply any accepted rules of debate except as they may inhibit the right of the majority at the beginning of a Congress to adopt its rules. If the precedents run afoul of that, then the Vice President will not adopt that method of procedure but will stick clearly and with fidelity to the basic constitutional proposition that the Senate has a right to change its rules and to prevent itself from being inhibited in their change. He has defined, precisely, extended debate as being a method of inhibition. That is a very important point. A majority may determine that question.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, we now have those two points. First, we have an historic opportunity which may not recur for some time, and, second, we have a climate in which a majority may act with respect to striking the shackles from its hands in terms of control over its own rules.

A third point, Mr. President, is a very basic point for us to consider. What would a rules change mean?

Mr. President, the rules change would mean a great deal, especially at the beginning of a new administration. I am not one of those Members, Mr. President, who believe in taboos. I shall not observe them in the course of these remarks.

In the first place, a rules change would mean that a new breath of fresh air would be blown into this Chamber—that

we would be legislating in a climate of 20th century reality instead of a climate of 19th century courtliness or inaction. Mr. President, that is precisely what it would mean.

Let us understand each other exactly. With the pistol of extended debate held at the head of the Congress, no matter by whom—whether it be the liberals, or the conservatives, or people of a sectional point of view, or anybody, including myself—it is bound to condition legislation. If, on the other hand, the Senators knew there would be a terminal point, at which a reasonable majority of the Senate could act, the climate would be different. We are not contending for a simple majority provision. We are contending for a constitutional majority provision. I shall come to that point in a minute. We contend for the rights of 51 Senators.

If Senators knew there would be a terminal point reached, Mr. President, in the course of any debate, I think we would see a totally new climate and a totally new understanding of the ability to wrestle with a problem and then to finally resolve it, which has not been seen in this Chamber in many decades.

Mr. President, whether we like it or not, as is true with respect to many things in our lives, the urgency of the world will simply not wait upon the type of deliberative process which may have been satisfactory in the past but which is not satisfactory today, except at the jeopardy of the very foundations of our country, and perhaps, more importantly, the foundations of freedom for all of us and for all people in the world who believe in freedom.

The issue is nothing less than that, Mr. President. We are considering the question of the whole climate of this Chamber and what the Senate may do as the august body it is. The Senate is known far and wide as the primary legislative body in the world. The climate of this Chamber will be very materially changed if we at last do what needs to be done to bring us abreast of the times.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to compliment the Senator for his remarks and for his analysis of the rules of the Senate and their relationship to the legislative process.

I feel that during this discussion we can also lay at rest possibly another myth—if not a myth, at least an image which has been conjured up—which I think beclouds the issue. It has been said that we intend or propose to "gag" the Senate. This has been described in less graphic terms, by those who say that we would attempt to deny an opportunity for the will of the people to be expressed.

Let us take a look at the facts. The first thing we observe is that before debate could be cut off under any procedure in the Senate there would have to be a petition. There would have to be a cloture petition signed by 16 Senators.

Every Senator in this body is jealous of his or of her rights.

I wish to give every Senator an opportunity to be heard and to be heard extensively, if for no other reason than that we want the same privilege for ourselves.

The best discipline in the Senate is not the body of rules that we have, but the rule of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." We have had an exemplification of that rule here. There would be complete disorder and chaos upon appeal.

Therefore, when we talk about a proposal for majority rule, such as that which has been proposed by both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], who are with us here, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and myself and many other Senators, we are not talking about the curtailing of reasonable debate. We are talking about arriving at a point of decision. The decision may be delayed for days, but we say that somewhere along the pathway of the legislative road or process there ought to be a point of decision.

We hear talk about a gag. I point out that the present rule of the Senate provides that when 16 Senators file a cloture petition, it shall lie on the desk for 2 days, I believe, and the Presiding Officer shall then put the question: "The question before the Senate is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be curtailed or that the debate shall come to a close?" If 66⅔ percent of the Senators, which would be 67 Senators, should vote to curtail debate, that would be it. The petition must lie on the desk for 2 days. What does the resolution proposed by the Senator from New York provide?

Mr. JAVITS. It provides 15 days.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Fifteen days. Then what does the resolution provide? One hundred hours of debate. This is not, I repeat, an alternative for the existing rule. This is a second-stage rule. Senators will be given a choice. If it is desired to try to cut off debate earlier with a cloture petition signed by 16 Senators, which petition must lie at the desk for 2 days, we need wait only 2 days and then the question is put: Will the debate be stopped? Will the issue be voted upon? That is what I call limiting the debate. If 66 Senators vote in the affirmative, the debate ceases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Minnesota is now back to a discussion of the old rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I trust that my colleagues will be courteous in that regard. I shall be glad to yield, but I should like to be asked to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say in response to what I gathered was the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota—and he will have the privilege, of course, to make the point in greater detail—that we are not proposing in this particular measure a substitute for the existing rule XXII, section 2. We are proposing an alternative to section 2.

The number of Senators required on the cloture petition under the old rule or under the Javits proposal is the same number—16. The only difference is that under the Javits proposal and the one with which the Senator from Minnesota is associated we propose that after 16 Senators have signed the cloture petition and it is given to the Presiding Officer, before there can be any vote in the Senate, 15 calendar days must elapse for the purpose of debate. Then 100 additional hours of debate are available.

What does the existing rule provide?

The existing rule provides that when a cloture petition is filed, there is no further choice. Two days later the question must be put. While we hear talk about gagging and slow suffocation, we should remember that under the present rule 2 days only must elapse and the question then must be put to this body, and if 66 Senators vote in the affirmative to end debate, the debate is over.

I have heard a great deal about minority rights in the Senate. A minority can be any number from 50 percent less 1 on down. It may be a minority of 1 or a minority of 49. And the rights of the 1 are as important as the rights of the 49. Therefore, what we are really talking about is not the arithmetic of whether it is 66 or 51 Senators. What we are really talking about or what we really ought to be concerned with is the question of whether we provide a process in this legislative chamber for adequate and full discussion of any issue that may be brought before us without gagging the Senate.

I submit that the present rule is a gag rule, because we have no choice when 16 Senators sign a cloture petition. Within 2 days—48 hours—the question must be put to this body, and two-thirds of those present and voting can shut the debate off.

Under the proposal of Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CLARK, and other Senators who have joined with us in the proposal, when the cloture petition is put on the desk of the Presiding Officer, the Senate must wait 15 days before the question is put. Fifteen days are given to this body for further debate. There is no arbitrary or tyrannical rule from the Presiding Officer. There would be no gagging.

After 15 days have elapsed, the Senate can wait an additional 100 hours, which is equivalent to 4 more full 24-hour days plus 4 hours, for the Senate to debate an issue.

I, therefore, charge the existing rule with being undemocratic, and a rule which can gag the Senate. I say that the rule we propose is a very democratic rule. It provides for a majority of the entire body, which means 51 Senators. Then if 51 Senators wish to cut off debate, the privilege does not come to them until 15 full calendar days have elapsed

and then 100 hours of debate have been consumed. I shall leave it to any fair-minded jury in the United States as to who is being gagged and who bears the name of gagging the Senate. I charge that the gag on the Senate is a rule that requires that in 2 days, after 16 Senators sign a petition to chop us off, is such a rule. I submit that we would be much more generous in the rule proposed by the Senator from New York.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I acknowledge that I did not ask the Senator from New York to yield previously, but I was trying to prevent the Senator from Minnesota from repeating the error that he was so persistent in trying to get across, and that was that the present rule provides for a two-thirds majority of all Senators elected and sworn. Actually the rule does not so provide. It provides—

> And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

What I was seeking to do was to prevent the impression that the present rule requires 66 Senators to vote to sustain the motion to bring the debate to a close.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Before he concluded, the Senator got to the point I was trying to get across. He sought to amend his remarks, and I hope they will be appropriately corrected. But, having made that statement, I would take issue with the Senator from Minnesota upon the effectiveness of the remedy that he proposes to meet the purpose described by the Senator from New York. If we are in a modern age in which it is necessary to have more expeditious action, a delay of 15 days plus four 24-hour periods, totaling 19 days, would be quite a little delay. It seems to me preservation of the provisions of the present rule for bringing the question to a vote upon the filing of a petition by 16 Senators, which would then make it the order of business within 48 hours thereafter, would permit expeditious action to meet the requirements of the modern day more advantageously than to have a requirement of 15 days plus four 24-hour days.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the greatest affection for my colleague from South Dakota, as he knows. I was not a bit annoyed. It is simply better to keep the procedure regular for all of us, because when we have the floor we like to feel that we have control of our side of the proceeding, in any case.

In answer to the question of the Senator from South Dakota—then I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia—the Senator from Minnesota made it clear that our proposal is an alternative proposal. The provisions of the present rules will remain. We will continue to have cloture by two-thirds present and voting. But the history of this question indicates that the rule does not give enough authority to the majority to act because the majority has upon other occasions been inhibited in acting, as I shall demonstrate in the course of my remarks, and that we now need some additional relief in that regard. The plan which we have submitted represents a diminution of the voting requirements and an extension of the time.

It is not to the exclusion of the existing plan, but only in addition to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not correct to say that under the present rule, if a petition is signed by 16 Senators, bringing the matter to a vote, and if the Senate begins to vote 48 hours thereafter, if there were 90 Senators present and voting, a majority of two-thirds, or a majority of 60 to 30, would bring the debate to a close?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Senator given any thought to the effect of the method of procedure that is proposed, of having the question decided by simple majority vote, further reducing it below the two-thirds rule, and reflected that there is an analogy with the principle that was included in the proposal of a certain President to pack the Supreme Court in order to get a decision that he wanted?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe so at all. I say that because the minute the Senator from South Dakota uses the phrase "decision that he wanted," the Senator answers his own question. The whole Constitution is designed to enable a majority of one to decide. Therefore, it is not a question of seeking to pack the Senate or change the rules of the Senate in order to get a decision that I or anyone else might seek to get. Rather, it is liberating the Senate, to which the Constitution gives the power to do so, to actually exercise its power, without being inhibited by a rule of debate which in my opinion puts a restraint upon the Senate equivalent to the restraint incorporated in the Constitution.

Therefore, I do not believe that it meets the objection which has been specified by my colleague. I believe that we are merely liberating a majority in the Senate to act in those areas in which a majority, under the Constitution, has a duty to act.

I make the point to the Senator from South Dakota that the argument is frequently made about certain acts under the Constitution which require more than a simple majority. Had the Founding Fathers, or the States subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution, decided to put further restraint upon the action of a majority, that would have been done in the Constitution or by amendment.

Certainly we cannot violate the very basic constitutional principle that no one Congress can bind another, by enabling it to be circumvented through rules which one Congress or one Senate can put upon another Congress or Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure the Senator from New York knows—and I shall state it for the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, if it is not clear to anyone, and for the benefit of anyone who may read the RECORD—that personally I thoroughly agree with the Vice President in his ruling that the Constitution gives each House the right to determine the rules of its procedure. Simply stated, that means that at some time each House must be given an opportunity to make that determination. The Vice President, I believe, has properly applied that to the first business at the opening of a new Congress. I thoroughly agree with that ruling, and the fact that a majority of the Senate or a majority of the House—each House, in other words—may determine the rules of its proceedings that should apply to the Congress.

On the other hand, I have the feeling, which is growing as I listen to the debate, that once those rules are determined upon we should approach with caution any change in the rule which would make a rule a device for getting a favorable vote upon a particular question.

As I said the other day in the colloquy with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the purpose of rules is to protect the rights of minorities. The reason we have rules and constitutions, it seems to me, is to get away from a haphazard changing of the rules from day to day. If we adopt the principle of changing the rules by a simple majority vote or cutting off debate by a simple majority vote, for the purpose of achieving favorable action upon a particular piece of proposed legislation, we are in effect proposing a device for shrinking the guard on free speech in the Senate.

When Mr. Roosevelt made his proposal to increase the size of the Supreme Court, it happened that it was the first term in which the Senator from South Dakota served in Congress. That was a historic debate in both the House and the Senate, in 1937. I came to the conclusion then that it was shortsighted and destructive of basic liberties for a President to propose that the size of the Supreme Court might be increased in order to achieve a favorable decision; that if one President increased it today, another President might increase it further tomorrow or in the next term; or, in case of a vacancy, if the President wanted to shrink it back to the size it was, then by reason of the vacancy or by reason of a resignation, he could seek to do that, thereby effecting a majority. In other words, the Supreme Court packing proposal was a device to get a desired decision. I have doubts growing increasingly in my mind whether these proposals to change or shrink the number by a mechanical device, which would curtail debate in the Senate, might not be just as shortsighted from the standpoint of preserving basic liberties as was Mr. Roosevelt's proposal to increase the size of the Supreme Court.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota that I believe the whole point of difference is that the rule of the Senate which we are discussing is not an instrument of the Constitution, and yet it purports to act as one, and that this is a vice which is inherent in the system which we have remaining with us in this body.

No one is contending for anything other than for what a majority, which

has the power to do it under the Constitution, shall be permitted to do, after observing what I deeply feel—and I know many other Members of the Senate deeply feel—is all the fairness of full and free and ample debate.

I cannot see for a moment how we would operate in any way such as the Senator mentions. I might point out to the Senator that in the Supreme Court packing proposal the Senator confronted a question which a majority of the Senate could decide, notwithstanding its tremendous ramifications. Had I been there, when the Senator was there, I too would have fought the proposal tooth and nail.

Therefore, I believe the Senator has come to the main point of this debate, in my view. If the Senator holds with us that we have the power to deal with our rules, the Senator, of course, can come to his own judgment and endeavor to influence as many Senators as he can as to how these rules might be changed.

I think the critical point which we are trying to establish is that the rules can be changed. Then we will all exercise our collective judgment on that issue.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New York recognizes that I agree that the Senate has the right, by a majority, as its first action, to determine its rules. But I point out to the Senator from New York—I really do not need to point out to him, because with his quick and alert mind he recognizes it—that had it not been for the free debate of the Senate, there was a time, in connection with the Court-packing bill, when that proposal could have been brought to the floor of the Senate and probably would have been whipped through. What defeated the Supreme Court packing proposal in 1937 was the fact that Senators stood here and debated the issue, until the country became alarmed. Finally, one Senator, I think as a result of the extended debate, died, and the Senate came to the conclusion that the proposal ought to be rejected, and the bill was returned to committee.

This question was also debated in the House, but the matter did not come to an issue there. Had it been brought into the House, with the previous question permitted there, it could have been brought to an immediate vote. I think it was the rule of the Senate which permitted unlimited debate that defeated the Supreme Court packing proposal.

If the Senator from New York would have fought that measure, had he been a Member of the Senate at that time, I have no doubt that he would have participated in the debate at some length.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question that our proposal would in no way inhibit the full debate to which the Senator refers, but it would prevent what is occurring now. Even though we should act, we cannot act because of the actions of a relatively small minority.

About 18 Senators showed us how that system worked last year. They kept the Senate completely tied up, and everyone was satisfied that they could have kept the Senate tied up indefinitely. They came to the Chamber every day fresh as daisies, while the rest of us were dragging ourselves into the Chamber at all hours of the day and night.

I think we have made it perfectly clear that this is a question of degree. As long ago as 1917 the Senate adopted a rule for limitation of debate. We subsequently changed that rule of limitation of debate and made it different.

We changed the rule again in 1959 and made it even somewhat more different. We no longer have an obsolute, untrammeled right to debate forever.

So in our proposal, or in whatever proposal any Senator may bring up, we are no longer arguing about a question of principle. The question of principle has been decided. We are now arguing about a question of degree.

Mr. CASE in South Dakota. I want to keep the record straight in one respect. I do not agree that the Senate could have been kept debating forever in the manner to which the Senator alludes. I was convinced that there was a procedure to adopt, and I took steps to invoke that procedure. It was to call for the yeas and nays on an amendment in the first degree which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] had submitted. Then the Senator from South Dakota offered an amendment in the second degree, even stating that he did not propose to vote for his own amendment. After the Senator from North Carolina had offered his amendment in the first degree, the Senator from South Dakota asked for the yeas and nays on that amendment, and they were ordered. The amendment then could not be withdrawn, so the Senator from South Dakota then offered an amendment in the second degree, an amendment which he did not propose to support. However, it brought the issue to a head. Then a motion to table was made. That forced a vote upon a key issue and the filibuster broke.

Mr. JAVITS. Another thing of critical importance is that we argue about the question of degree and how it has worked. Since 1917, the Senate has had 21 votes on the question of cloture. In only 4 cases were we successful in closing debate, whereas in 10 cases out of the 21 a majority of Senators present and voting voted to close debate, and, of course, the debate was not closed. In 9 of those 10 cases there was a constitutional majority.

It seems to me that if a rule such as we propose would operate in only 9 of 21 cases, it cannot be said to be a reckless or revolutionary rule. On the contrary, it comes far nearer being a moderate and reasonable application of the opportunity to close debate than does the present rule, under which debate has not been closed on any issue since 1927. For a matter of 33 years it has been impossible to close debate on any issue under existing rules.

To restate what I said when I began, I certainly should not be deterred from making my views known because of any taboos. It is well known that the principal objective or the principal target against which this rule is directed is an inhibition to enact the civil rights legislation, except such as will be generally acceptable to a very large part of this Chamber, rather than to a majority. It seems to me that that is putting an extra-constitutional inhibition upon one particular type of proposal which is not put upon others. It seems to me that that, if anything, is depriving each State of equal suffrage, which is one of the very fundamental things always talked about by the advocates of States rights, by imposing upon ourselves the limitation which is imposed upon us by the rules of debate.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator from Georgia like to have me yield to him?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I tried to interrupt the Senator from New York a few minutes ago, but I understood he was engaged in a discussion with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, and the only thing he could do was to conclude that phase of the debate.

I rose, seeking to interrupt the Senator, to express my great amazement at a statement I heard made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] when I came in the door. If my ears did not deceive me, the Senator from Minnesota was attacking the present rule XXII; I understood him to say it was a gag rule. I think I am correct in saying that he used the expression "gag rule" in connection with rule XXII.

It is a rather interesting sidelight that he is not seeking to repeal the existing rule XXII; he simply wants to put another halter on the other side in the way of the part 3 which has been offered as an amendment to the pending rule XXII. In other words, we are to be gagged either way. Either we are to be gagged quickly with a two-thirds majority or we are to be strangled or suffocated slowly with the majority gag rule. To me, either one is a gag, and I know that the two together are gags, because even the Senator from Minnesota said that the existing rule XXII was a gag rule.

I do not think that either of them has any place in the Senate. For that reason, I hope that at some opportune time the Senate will dispose of this question in order that we may begin to consider some business which might be more productive for the welfare of the people of the United States.

I am sorry the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is not present. As he left the Chamber, I told him I intended to comment briefly on his remarks, but that I would do so in a spirit of charity. I hope I have done so. Whether it is in the spirit of charity or otherwise, to me it is very evident—and I think it is evident even to a wayfaring man not in the possession of all his faculties—that any idea of trying a different kind of gag under rule XXII in no sense strips that provision of any of its qualities which the Senator from Minnesota at this hour has condemned.

I wish we might have persuaded the Senator to call it a gag rule on two or three other occasions when amendments were pending before the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Although I do not wish to speak in the name of the Senator from Minnesota, it was my understanding that he was of the opinion that we ought to come to a vote on shutting off debate as being far more condign under the existing rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did he not use the word "gag"?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall rely on the Senator from Florida to answer that question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New York. That is what the Senator from Minnesota said.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I heard what the Senator from Minnesota said. My interpretation is that he referred to it as a gag rule—not that it gagged individual Senators, but that it gagged the entire Senate to the extent that the Senate could not come to a vote. Is it not true that history has shown time after time that the Senate cannot come to a vote under the existing rule, if a determined group of Senators opposes having a particular matter come to a vote?

Mr. JAVITS. I think that is the practical effect; and we have seen that attitude taken by a certain group of Senators up to now.

Mr. BUSH. Under the proposed rule, with respect to the pending question, is it not true that there would be 15 days of debate before cloture could be invoked?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. That is to say, 15 working days?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Under the normal procedures, that would mean 3 weeks of debate; and the Senate could work for 8 or 10 hours a day during that period; could it not?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. If cloture were then invoked, there would still be 100 hours of debate available—in other words, 1 hour to each Senator; and on the basis of 10-hour days, that would mean 10 additional days, would it not?

Mr. JAVITS. That is true.

Mr. BUSH. So in total there would be approximately 5 weeks of debate, would there not? Is not that a reasonable estimate?

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is.

When this subject was under consideration on another occasion, I believe—although perhaps it was on this one—the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I could not possibly see how debate could be cut off, no matter how firmly fixed in that desire might be 51 Members of the Senate, in less than 1 month, and probably much longer than that, because it would be very unlikely that any such procedure would be invoked until there had actually been debate for a week or two.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from New York is optimistic in his estimate of a month. I should say it would be unlikely, on a very controversial question, that it would be possible to close debate in less than 5 weeks, if the arithmetic I have recited is anywhere near correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is true. But the Senator from Illinois and I have estimated that at the very least, if there were no waiting for debate on the floor, there would be—at a minimum—1 month. And, without any question, under the normal processes of the Senate, with debate being had, and being followed by an attempt to invoke cloture, there would be a period of at least 5 weeks or 2 months.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from New York has been here 5 years and I have been here 8 years, although together we have not been here for as long as has the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Nevertheless, we have been here long enough to be able to form some very definite impressions. My impression is that any issue that has been before the Senate during this period could have been thoroughly covered by debate for a period of 5 weeks. Does the Senator from New York agree as to that?

Mr. JAVITS. I do; I think that is a very fair appraisal of the situation, certainly on the basis of the experience during my service here, as I have studied the history of the Senate and have watched the Senate's proceedings, either from the other body or before I was a Member of either body.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York have endeavored to put the most charitable and rosy glow on the pending amendment. But the truth is that under the express terms of the amendment, a bare majority of the Senate could absolutely stifle and eliminate all debate in this body except for the 1 hour to be allowed each Senator after cloture was imposed. A majority could meet when a Presiding Officer is in the chair who might be as much in favor of cutting off debate as is the present Vice President of the United States; and that Presiding Officer could recognize, from that majority group, some Senator who would move, every 3 days, for a 3-day recess, and that 3-day-recess procedure could be continued until the 15 days were exhausted. Under such a procedure not one Senator on the other side could even open his mouth to attack the most infamous proposition that could be brought here, until after the Senate had already been put under a gag rule. That is the other side of the coin of this great, so-called charitable proposition that has been brought in here and described as allowing 15 days of debate.

But the proposed amendment itself provides that when the cloture petition is filed—

> The Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by yea-and-nay vote the question:
>
> "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

Where is the provision that Senators will be able to speak for 8 or 10 hours a day, as some Senators keep telling us? Where is there even a provision that they can speak for even 5 minutes, as is guaranteed in the other body, the House of Representatives?

This proposal does not guarantee even 1 minute of debate, if a ruthless majority wished to take that position and had the Senate recess from day to day for 3-day periods until 15 calendar days had elapsed, even though a minority of the Senate might be looking for an opportunity to reveal to the American people some insidious program that might strike at the very root and heart of our liberties. But under this proposal, they could not obtain recognition to do that at all.

Mr. President, when we get Presiding Officers of the Senate who talk about bringing a previous question rule into the Senate and proceeding by vi et armis, by sheer force and might, I say we are not too far from a time when we shall have here a ruthless majority that is likely to recess the Senate for 3-day periods, and thus deny the minority of this body any rights whatsoever. That is not at all unlikely; it could very easily happen.

I do not propose that it happen to me; and I hope it does not happen to the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from New York, although they could easily be hoist by their own petard and become the victims of the scheme they have brought in here.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I have heard the very eloquent explanation by my colleague, the Senator from Georgia. But I believe it assumes that we live in a vacuum and that we shall be immured in some mausoleum. If any majority should be foolish enough to proceed on any course such as the one the Senator from Georgia has described——

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the difference between that and the previous question rule?

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator will permit me to continue with my remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. JAVITS. I say we do not live in that kind of world; and if any majority ever tried that course, it would be the most potent way to stop the very accomplishment of what they sought. Certainly that would be the actual effect of any such practice. The rule we have proposed in good faith proposes 15 days of debate in the normal course of the Senate proceedings. That is our intention; and if that intention were not observed, I think a majority on the floor would suffer very seriously at the hands of the country, and would find that it could not do anything like what was thus contemplated, because of the sheer mass of opposition which an effort to engage in such repression would invite.

In addition, every member of the minority would have more than an opportunity to state his full views before the country, as all of us know.

I believe these are not arguments which are based upon living in the realistic world in which we live and operating in the realistic way in which we operate.

I say to the Senator from Georgia that if that is all that is worrying him, and if otherwise he is quite ready to agree to this amendment as being fair and reasonable, I and, I am sure, my colleagues, will be more than happy to obtain from him any suggestion which he believes would contribute to making it perfectly clear that we have in mind that there should be 15 days of full debate for as long as any Member of the Senate wishes to remain on this floor and either engage in the debate or listen to it. So I must say, in all respects, I do not think that is a sound argument against the proposal before the Senate.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said a minute ago: We are dealing with a question of degree. We are long past the time when there are going to be no rules by which debate can be closed. The question is, What are effective rules in the interest of enabling the country to operate?

I wish to make it crystal clear at once that we are not talking about a simple majority, as they do in the House of Representatives, being ready to close debate. We may be accused, the minute I say that, of not being purists and of not being true to the principle for which we ourselves stand, namely, that the majority which can legislate should be the same majority which can cut off debate. Of course we are not purists. We understand this controversy has had a long history. We understand debate in the Senate, and respect for debate has a long history and that one must proceed in a way which history will understand and accommodate.

Those of us supporting the pending proposition think the time has now come, based on experience—and I shall demonstrate that experience—where it is reasonable that a constitutional majority, and not a simple majority, may, after opportunity for adequate debate, be given an opportunity to perform our constitutional function of voting.

As I said a minute ago, we have had 21 votes on cloture since 1917, only 4 of which were successful, and yet in 9 of those 21, a constitutional majority could have closed off debate.

I pointed out, too, and I should like to repeat it, because I think it is very important, that it is very well known that the principal target, in the inability to shut off debate by what is most often an impossible rule imposed by the Senate against itself, is civil rights legislation. I say there is nothing in the Constitution which distinguishes civil rights legislation from any other kind of legislation. On the contrary, the 14th and 15th amendments, which deal expressly with that kind of legislation, cry for implementation, and were put in the Constitution in answer to a crying need, a need to be implemented, without this impossible constitutional inhibition which we are seeking to change in the rules by which the Senate proceeds.

Finally, I should like to refer to some of the arguments made against the rules change, including the one so eloquently just made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and made by others.

Let us remember that the rule change which is proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], myself, and other Senators, is not new. On the contrary, on April 30, 1958, it was exactly the same amendment which was ordered reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, with the concurrence of five of its members. I should like to read their names, because many of them are of some highly respected Members of this body: Senator Hennings was chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee at that time, whose memory we all honor as a great lawyer, a great American, and a great constitutionalist; Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; my humble self; and Senator Case of New Jersey.

This report came after a series of hearings of the most exhaustive character, in which a two-man subcommittee, composed of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and myself, heard all comers over a very reasonable period of weeks, indeed, months. We then brought in our separate reports to the Rules and Administration Committee, had an opportunity to have our colleagues read them, had an opportunity to debate the question before our colleagues, and then, by the vote which I have just described, a majority of the Rules and Administration Committee reported to the Senate the amendment as a perfectly proper way in which to amend the rule.

If that is not enough, Mr. President, let us turn to some of the very great authorities in our country; not just authorities in one party or on one side, but authorities on both sides.

I am much moved by a statement which I should like to recall to my colleagues, made by President Wilson in 1917. President Wilson said:

> The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action.

It is often thought that one of the Founding Fathers, Alexander Hamilton, was a man of very conservative ideas. Yet I should like to read a statement in the Federalist papers, of which Hamilton was the author. This is from page 16 of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration to which I referred a moment ago, dated April 30, 1958:

> The public business—
>
> Says Hamilton—
>
> must, in some way or other, go forward. If a pertinacious minority can control the opinion of a majority respecting the best mode of conducting it, the majority, in order that something may be done, must conform to the views of the minority; and thus the sense of the smaller number will overrule that of the greater, and give a tone to the national proceedings.

It is most interesting that the concept which Alexander Hamilton expresses in this particular passage from the Federalist Papers is so analogous to our argument today. As I said when I began, I am deeply convinced that we are dealing, not with some abstract rule of procedure, but with the whole climate of change, as to whether it shall be opened to the fresh air of what the successful Presidential candidate called the new frontier, or whether it shall be subject to the rules relating to debate which are now archaic and which prohibit action which we and many others deeply believe is essential in the national interest.

There are two main arguments which are made with respect to the proposal now under consideration. I should like to refer to them very briefly. One is the argument that it gives the power which Senators need in order to convince the country. But this is a power that is unsanctioned by the Constitution, and, indeed, directly in conflict with the proposition that a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business.

In addition, and this is the second part of the question, it is not a gag rule by which Senators will be prevented from making their views known to the country, for the time, when it comes in that operation, is the very time when debate ceases to be debate and becomes sheer obstruction. It is the historic effort to inhibit the Senate in respect of acting by a constitutional majority, according to what the Constitution prescribes.

Many of the Senators who have engaged in those actions have been very frank about it. For example, in my views in the 1958 Rules and Administration Committee report, I quoted from Senator Underwood, of Alabama, who said, in respect of a filibuster against the Dyer antilynching bill in 1922:

> I do not say that captiously. I think all men here know that under the rules of the Senate when 15 or 20 or 25 men say that you cannot pass a certain bill, it cannot be passed.

He then went on to say that:

> There is but one way now for the Senate to get down to work and transact the business of the Government before the 4th of March, and that is to get a final disposition of this force bill before anything else is done. Pass it if you can; abandon it if you are forced to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. First I should like to finish my thought.

Perhaps, Mr. President, we are not quite as direct in our observations as was former Senator Underwood, of Alabama, but when one reads the history of what was and was not possible in respect to the civil rights bills of 1957 and of 1960, I think one gets a very clear picture of the extent to which the actions of the Senate—not its debates, but its actions—are dictated by the inherent power in a minority which is vested by rule XXII.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator tell me the date of the quotation he read?

Mr. JAVITS. Nineteen hundred and twenty-two.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Nineteen hundred and twenty-two is a period of time prior to a number of changes in the rules, is it not? In other words, subsequent to that time there have been at least two modifications of rule XXII. The rule has been modified twice since I have been in the Senate, I know.

I doubt that the statement would be regarded as a reflection of the same Senator's view, if he lived today.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot agree with my colleague, for the reason that in 1922 the rule was exactly as it is today with respect to cloture by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. The only difference between the rule as it was then and the rule as it is now is that at that time there was no rule of cloture with respect to a motion to take up a measure, as I recall. That was imposed in 1949 in return for the concession making the requirement two-thirds of the constitutional membership of the Senate.

It seems to me, therefore, in view of the fact that in essence rule XXII then read nearly the same as it does now, with respect to a measure under debate, the remark is very applicable.

I should like to point out to the Senator that cloture, notwithstanding the fact that a majority was in favor of it—indeed, there have been two occasions on which three-fifths of the Members of the Senate present and voting were in favor of it—has never been successful with respect to releasing a civil rights bill for action.

When I say never, I mean since 1917.

Therefore I believe, Mr. President, that this remark to which I have referred is quite germane to the present situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, lest it should be construed that I am agreeing with the Senator's statement by my silence, I wish to say I shall discuss the issue on my own time.

Mr. JAVITS. I will say to the Senator—and he knows I mean every word of the statement—I would never expect him to be included by his silence in agreement on a particular thing I have said on this subject.

Mr. President, I should like to complete my views now. The next point is very important to us, with a new administration taking office. Both political parties are pledged, I respectfully submit, to a meaningful change in this rule. This is the result of the deliberations of their conventions.

The Republican platform pledges:

> We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

That is a portion of the Republican platform, adopted in Chicago in 1960.

The Democratic platform, adopted in Los Angeles in 1960, reads in part as follows:

> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.
>
> * * * * *
>
> To accomplish these goals will require Executive orders, legal actions brought by the Attorney General, legislation, and improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule.

Mr. President, the overwhelming body of practice in the senates of the American States bears out the proposition for which we are contending. Upon that subject I have a study which has been printed in the RECORD before, made by the Library of Congress, which shows that in 45 out of the 48 States, either by moving the previous question or by other parliamentary proceedings, filibustering is prohibited in the upper chambers. Indeed, the motion for the previous question is specifically authorized in 22 States, and in an additional 15—making a total of 37—the previous question is specifically authorized with a rule not stating the size of the majority required.

I read from the memorandum:

> It is apparent, however, from the other rules in these State manuals, that a simple majority is all that is required.

In addition, 1 more State—making it 38—provides for the previous question by a majority of those elected.

In four States there is no rule fixing a limitation of debate, but there are provisions that the standard manuals of parliamentary procedure shall govern when not inconsistent with the standing rules.

It is to be noted in that respect that even Robert's Rules of Order and other comparable manuals forbid filibustering and obstructive tactics, and give the presiding officer considerable power to prevent such tactics.

In two States, Utah and Vermont, the previous question is forbidden, but Robert's Rules of Order are made specifically applicable.

In South Carolina, another one of the States which is not referred to in the general summary, there is a provision for limitation of debate by two-thirds of those voting, but there is a limitation of debate to 2 hours on any one bill, which in iself is an effective protection against obstruction.

Of the remaining three States, Alabama has a rule which is almost identical with that which existed in the U.S. Senate from 1949 to 1959; namely, providing a limitation of debate by a vote of two-thirds of all of the elected membership. Connecticut forbids the previous question, and has no other rule to limit debate. New Jersey likewise has no effective rule. Perhaps the provision that no State senator may speak more than three times on any subject is the fundamental inhibition.

Mr. President, I point out that in the overwhelming majority of the upper chambers of the American States there is a rule which effectively enables the body to close debate and enables a majority to act.

Mr. President, I point out also, in that connection, we have found by our experience in this Chamber, as I have already explained, that it is absolutely essential we do something about the particular issue, because we are actually—and historically we have been actually—inhibited in terms of acting upon specific measures. The rules of debate as they are now specified for the Senate have had a material and important effect upon changing legislation or preventing certain types of legislation which a majority desired from being passed, merely by virtue of the power in this respect which inheres in a minority.

Mr. President, I also point out that when the Senate wishes to do business it knows how to relieve itself of this very inhibition. Thus tacitly, at least, the Senate recognizes the inhibition.

We have identified, Mr. President, five acts into which the legislative veto of the act of a President was written, but with a cloture provision inserted in the law in order to protect the Senate. The Senate has protected itself from being inhibited from acting by the operation of rule XXII. These are: The Reorganization Acts of 1945 and 1949, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958, and the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

In short, Mr. President, the Senate itself, in its actions, has recognized the danger which is inherent in the inhibition and restraint which is put upon the Senate in rule XXII, and when it chose to do so has relieved itself of this by legislating cloture provisions directly.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this bears very materially upon the proposition which we have been discussing, that these rules, to the extent they inhibit action on the part of the majority—and we have demonstrated they do—represent an extra-constitutional restraint upon the Congress of the United States which we should not carry along any more under existing conditions which we face in the world today.

Mr. President, an effort is being made in the country to take the position that we need no more civil rights legislation now. It seems to me what is going on now in New Orleans demonstrates very clearly it is urgently required that the Congress act in the school desegregation controversy. Only if the Congress will act, thus asserting the national will in respect to this much-vexed question, may we notify all and sundry that we will not accept in any State, by action of any State, a doctrine of interposition, which was made completely obsolescent by the oceans of blood which were shed to make it obsolescent in the Civil War in which this country so tragically engaged.

Mr. President, finally, as I said when I began, we cannot legislate in this field, and we are attempting to legislate upon something which is extremely important.

When we look down the list of issues on which it was impossible to effect cloture, quite apart from civil rights questions—and I offer such a list for the RECORD—we begin to see the consequence of the measures in which we are inhibiting ourselves.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Senate votes on invoking cloture rule

Congress, session, and date	Subject	Senator offering motion	Yeas	Nays	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume, page	Cloture
66th, 1st, Nov. 15, 1919	Treaty of Versailles	Lodge	78	16	58-8555-56	Yes.
66th, 3d, Feb. 2, 1921	Emergency tariff	Penrose	36	35	60-2432	No.
67th, 2d, July 7, 1922	Fordney-McCumber tariff	McCumber	45	35	62-10040	No.
69th, 1st:						
Jan. 25, 1926	World Court	Lenroot	68	26	67-2678-79	Yes.
June 1, 1926	Migratory-bird refuges	Norbeck	46	33	67-10392	No.
69th, 2d:						
Feb. 15, 1927	Branch banking	Pepper	65	18	68-3824	Yes.
Feb. 26, 1927	Retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War	Tyson	51	36	68-4901	No.
Do	Colorado River development	Johnson	32	59	68-4900	No.
Feb. 28, 1927	Public buildings in the District of Columbia	Lenroot	52	31	68-4985	No.
Do	Creation of Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition	Jones (Washington)	55	27	68-4986	Yes.
72d, 2d, Jan 19, 1933	Banking Act	Robinson	58	30	76-2077	No.
75th, 3d:						
Jan. 27, 1938	Antilynching	Neely	37	51	83-1166	No.
Feb. 16, 1938	do	Wagner	42	46	83-2007	No.
77th, 2d, Nov. 23, 1942	Antipoll tax	Barkley	37	41	88-9065	No.
78th, 2d, May 15, 1944	do	do	36	44	90-2550-51	No.
79th, 2d:						
Feb. 9, 1946	Fair Employment Practictices Commission	do	48	36	92-1219	No.
May 7, 1946	British loan	Ball	41	41	92-4539	No.
May 25, 1946	Labor disputes	Knowland	3	77	92-5714	No.
July 31, 1946	Antipoll tax	Barkley	39	33	92-10512	No.
81st, 2d:						
May 19, 1950	Fair Employment Practices Commission	Lucas	52	32	96-7300	No.
July 12, 1950	do	do	55	33	96-9982	No.
83d, 2d, July 26, 1954	Atomic Energy Act	Knowland	44	42	100-11942	No.
86th, 2d, Mar. 10, 1960	Civil Rights Act	Douglas	42	53	106-5118	No.

Mr. JAVITS. If we mean what we say, that the American people want to be realistic in facing the deadly and grim peril which faces them in the world today, then instruments of government must be modernized and made able to function in an effective way, just as instruments of defense or instruments of production. This is precisely what we are debating now. Shall we sharpen, shall we refine, shall we modernize the magnificent instrument of government which is the United States Senate, or shall we leave it under an archaic rule which inhibits it from action in modern terms?

In closing, I utter what I believe has been a concept uttered through the ages in legislatures and deliberative bodies and by executives long before this one. If we remain too strongly bound by these chains which we have put around our own action in a way which is out of date, obsolescent, not in accord with history or the modern world, then we are inviting drastic alternatives, whether it is by men on horseback, whether it is by extra constitutional proceedings, or whether it is by improvident amendments to our own Constitution. The genius of our Government has been its capability to conform to and keep up with the demands of history and with the demands which are made upon our Nation by the times, and I deeply feel that if Senators fail to recognize that this proposed rule change is one of the most critical aspects of that very debate, that it is probably one of the most important issues that can be done in this session of the Congress, then I think they are giving the Congress and the country far less than its due.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on a previous occasion a letter was put in the RECORD dealing with the subject under discussion. The letter was written by the distinguished historian Irving Brant, and was dated December 21, 1957. It dealt with certain precedents in respect of the rule for the previous question, as those precedents had developed in the British House of Commons.

Mr. Brant recently came to me and said that through his research he had obtained further information upon this same subject, and gave me a revised letter, also dated December 21, 1957, dealing with exactly the same subject as was dealt with in his previous letter, which was made a part of the record of the debate in the Senate.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent, so that we may be apprised of all of the researches of Mr. Brant, that the revised letter be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I should like to supplement my testimony of June 28, 1957, on the "previous question" as a method of cloture in the British House of Commons, by reporting on the origin of the long-prevalent belief that it was used primarily in early years to postpone the main question. Apparently this misconception resulted from a total misunderstanding, by later American and British parliamentarians, of a footnote in Hatsell's "Precedents," published in 1781. Stating that he had found an instance of putting the previous question in 1604, Hatsell said in his note:

"Sir Thomas Littleton therefore was mistaken, when he says, in Grey's Debates, volume II, page 113, 'Sir Henry Vane was the first, that ever proposed putting a question, "Whether the question should be now put;" and since, it has always been the forerunner of putting the thing in question quite out.' Sir Robert Howard, in the same debate says, 'This previous question is like the image of the inventor, a perpetual disturbance.'"

That footnote was cited though not quoted in Jefferson's "Manual," as an indication of the customary use of the previous question to postpone the main question. It was quoted by Sir Thomas Erskine in his "Law and Usage of Parliament" to indicate that contrary to the American practice, postponement of the main question was the sole purpose of the previous-question motion in early English usage.

Apparently neither Jefferson nor May ever looked up Sir Thomas Littleton's remarks, which were made in the House of Commons on March 15, 1672. If Littleton had meant what his words have been interpreted to mean, his statement would have been preposterous. Both he and his hearers knew that in the preceding 32 years, the motion for the previous question had produced cloture nearly 500 times, and had resulted in postponement less than 200 times. What Littleton was talking about was the nature of the postponement when the motion for the previous question was defeated. Was it certain that the main question could be called up again? Or would it be quite out?

The House of Commons at that time was considering Charles II's naval supply bill. The King had declared war on Holland, the Dutch Navy was in motion and unpaid British sailors were deserting. Speed was the more essential because Parliament was to adjourn sine die at Easter, exactly 2 weeks off.

But the House had just passed two bills related to religious toleration. Their backers feared that if the King's supply bill was approved before the religious bills came back from the House of Lords, they never would come back. The Stuart party, in contrast, looked on delay as a maneuver to kill the supply bill on account of the suspicion that the Dutch War was a maneuver toward Catholic reestablishment.

When spokesmen of the Crown demanded that the bill be engrossed and taken up on Friday next, the sponsors of the religious bills proposed to have it lie on the table till Friday without engrossment. "Bills are much more slippery in parchment than in paper," said Colonel Birch. Opponents of the supply bill then suggested a brief postponement through a motion for the previous question. The debate continued:

"Mr. WALLER. * * * When a question has been of not putting the question now, has known that question never put at all. * * *

"Sir THOMAS LITTLETON. Sir Henry Vane was the first that ever proposed putting a question, 'Whether the question should be now put,' and since, it has always been the forerunner of putting the thing in question

quite out; therefore would not have that question put now. * * *

"Sir ROBERT HOWARD. This question is like the image of the inventor, a perpetual disturbance. * * *

"Sir THOMAS OSBORNE * * * [is not for putting] a question that has a dangerous construction in it.

"*Ordered*, That the money bill be engrossed, and brought in on Friday."

Thus it is perfectly clear that the House was merely discussing the effect of a negative majority—temporary or permanent postponement. But for a century and a half, American and British commentators have been using a fallacious interpretation of a 1672 remark to misconstrue the early history of a powerful instrument of cloture. For a hint of the power that lay in this motion in the 17th century, consider the other remark quoted by Hatsell, that the previous question "is like the image of the inventor, a perpetual disturbance." The inventor, it had just been (erroneously) said, was Sir Henry Vane. The "image of the inventor," therefore, was his son, Sir Henry Vane II. The younger Vane had recently been hanged because, as King Charles remarked to the Earl of Clarendon, "he is too dangerous a man to let live, if we can honestly put him out of the way." Sir Henry Vane II had been the most powerful man in the Cromwellian Parliament. Richard Baxter wrote of him: "He was that within the House which Cromwell was without."

Here, then, in the record of the 1672 debate, is evidence that the motion for the previous question was an instrument of power, during the Puritan Revolution, that merited comparison with the sword of Cromwell. It was used hundreds of times to stop debate and force the main question to a vote. It is so used today in the U.S. House of Representative and American State legislatures. It is so used in the House of Commons today, under the altered name of "closure." It can be so used in the U.S. Senate, whenever that body is operating under general parliamentary rules, with the full support of contemporary practice and historic precedent.

Yours sincerely,

IRVING BRANT.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JAVITS. I withhold it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I look upon this as opportunity to serve in the greatest deliberative body in the world. I have oftentimes heard the Senate of the United States described in that fashion, as the greatest deliberative body in the world. In spite of all the cartoonists and detractors, I have continued to regard it in that light. I do not believe there is any other deliberative body in the world that has the freedom of expression or gives the opportunity for a man to be as effective. That has been my opinion for a great number of years.

Much of the greatness of the Senate is in its orderly procedure and the extreme rights which each Senator possesses. These rights carry a tremendous amount of responsibility. The free debate which we have had here in the Senate down through the years has without doubt been more responsible for defeating unworthy and undesirable pieces of legislation, which could have done great harm to the structure of our Government, had they not been exposed to that freedom of debate, than any rule that we have here.

Senators, during the course of the debate, have reviewed some of the measures that had been proposed. There is no need to state all of them or to develop them now. The Court-packing proposal of President Roosevelt has been mentioned. That bill could have been passed if it had not been the subject of great debate in the Senate.

The measure to draft free railroad labor into the military service could have been passed.

Some of the drastic provisions which would have denied people jury trial when accused of Federal crime could conceivably have been passed had we not had the right of free and full debate in the Senate.

The orderly procedure which has been a part of our rules, along with the right of free debate, has helped to insure wise action in the Senate.

I have heard reference made only a few moments ago to the practice in State legislatures. Such practices might be satisfactory for those State legislatures. However, I believe it would be a sad day for this country, by eroding or tearing down the right of free and full debate in the Senate, if we were to adopt such practices. I am thinking of the practice in my own State legislature. It is a practice which would, I hope, never be adopted by the Senate. The spokesman for the Governor of Louisiana, or the so-called floor leader in the legislature, will make a speech that he feels adequate and sufficiently long to explain a particular measure. The time may be a half hour, or it may be 15 minutes. When the opposing side has had an equal amount of time in which to make its presentation, even in the midst of a speaker's presentation, sometimes, a member of the legislature can rise and move the previous question and thus cut off all debate, and vote the matter through.

That has been a frequent practice. When those procedures are resorted to—and there is a tendency to resort to them repeatedly in the future once the precedent has been established—the precedent of free and full debate has been broken. Long ago the precedent of free debate was broken in the Louisiana Legislature, and of course there has not been an opportunity to restore it since that time.

We have heard discussion of the abuse of free speech. We have not heard adequate discussion of the use of it. On a number of occasions, when lengthy debate was had in the Senate, it was possible, because of the length of debate, to water down and remove drastic and undesirable and unreasonable proposals in legislation that was introduced.

The so-called civil rights bills which have been introduced in recent years in many cases would deny the American people a great many civil rights beyond those they would grant to any minority or any group of people in this country.

Through free debate a group that started out as a minority, have set aside and defeated many vicious proposals, which never have been offered again, because in many instances, after they had been fully explored and debated, there was an opportunity to demonstrate that they should not be adopted.

If the Senate were to adopt the Vice President's suggestion of a previous question rule, and by a majority vote simply shut off all debate, it would be a precedent which would plague us in the future. It would be a precedent which would come back time and time again to destroy what has made this Senate great and has made this democracy strong.

I do not believe such measures can be justified.

The rules of the Senate can be changed. They have been changed in previous years. It may be less convenient for those who want to change the rules to change them in the way provided by our rules. I know that some of us vigorously fought a change in the rules in 1949. On that occasion we had lengthy debate, which I believe ran into six weeks. However, the rules were changed, and we arrived at a change of the rules which made it possible to close off debate by a two-thirds majority of the Senators elected at any time.

The result was a much tighter rule than existed before.

During this debate I have heard statements made which cannot be other than misleading. For example, Senators have quoted President Woodrow Wilson, at a time when there was no limitation on debate, and no one could close off debate. That is certainly not relevant to the situation we have before us today. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania made reference to a rule which existed hundreds of years ago in the Legislature of Poland, under which a single individual could impose a veto on anything that the legislature chose to pass. That is not relevant to the debate in which we are now engaged.

Such statements merely lead us away from the real facts.

How can anyone justify trying to undermine and destroy the rules of the Senate by saying that the Presiding Officer can hold that the rules are unconstitutional and that we have no rules, and proceed to seek to support a majority of the Senate to sustain him, and thereby completely destroy the right of free debate by a motion on the previous question, which never existed in the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator be willing to state how many Senators he thinks it should be necessary to have in opposition to a particular bill, motion, or amendment, in order to prevent it coming to a vote without the imposition of the two-thirds cloture rule?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One can use rule XIX, which no one has made reference to in the debate thus far. Subsection 1 states:

No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

I personally saw it used by Senator Knowland at one time. I do not recall whether the Senator from Pennsylvania was a Member of the Senate at that time.

It seems to me that those were most oppressive tactics. Perhaps the Senator was here at the time of the atomic energy debate, when those tactics were used.

Mr. CLARK. No, I was not a Member of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Majority leader Knowland would simply claim the floor on any amendment offered by a Senator. The Senator would not be recognized or permitted to speak for his amendment. The majority leader would claim the floor and ask the Senator offering the amendment how much time he required. He would yield to the Senator 5, 10, or 15 minutes, and at the end of that time, he would move to lay the Senator's motion on the table. So a Senator would speak simply at the sufferance of the majority leader.

However, every Senator, thanks to the rules which the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to change, had, at least, the right to make two speeches on the bill itself. He could make at least two speeches before the debate was closed.

By the tactics of Senator Knowland, if Senators were opposing the measure vigorously, and if a majority of those Senators cared to suspend the debate, they could bring the debate to a close after 96 speeches, even if there were 48 Senators speaking against the bill.

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion, based solely on my 4 years of service in the Senate, I believe a minority of as small as 15 Senators, who are sufficiently determined, can keep any measure in the Senate from coming to a vote, unless 67 Senators are willing to impose cloture.

While it has been my experience that many Senators will vote for a measure on its merits on the floor, many Senators will be opposed to voting for cloture. So, in my opinion, 15 Senators can prevent any measure from coming to a vote.

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. That is the Senator's opinion, and he is entitled to it.

I recall that in 1957, during the civil rights debate, the minority leader, after all the southern Senators on the floor had continued to debate, said that he had the pledges of two-thirds of the Senate to vote cloture. There were 18 Senators opposing the proposed legislation. He made the statement from the Republican leader's chair that he had all the votes necessary to vote cloture on this body, and even votes to spare. The Senator will recall that in 1959 a majority never did vote for cloture, but there was no doubt in my mind that if the lengthy fight then occurring had continued for another 2 weeks, Senators who had voted against cutting off debate would subsequently have reversed themselves and voted to do so.

There is no doubt, in my opinion, that if a majority had cared to persist, they could eventually have brought the matter to a vote. Perhaps they wanted to quit early at night and proceed in the easy way. Simply as a matter of convenience, they might have resorted to the use of rule XXII to shut off debate, as it would not have been easy otherwise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator remembers the extensive debate on the so-called tidelands bill. It was, I believe, the longest debate that has taken place since the Senator from Louisiana and I have been Members of the Senate, other than the civil rights debate of last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not recall whether it was the longest debate or not. I know it was long, and the reason it seemed so long to me was that I did not agree with what I was hearing, and I heard plenty of debate on that occasion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the number of Senators who determinedly opposed that bill during the nearly 7 weeks of almost interminable debate, some of it day and night debate, constituted a good many more than the 15 mentioned by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, that is true. I may say, for the benefit of the Senator from Pennsylvania and for other Senators, that as one who has been on both sides of these issues, as one who has been with those who have carried on lengthy debate, and also as one who has tried to sit out such a debate, seeking to bring a lengthy debate to a close, it seems tiresome and vexatious to a person to be required to listen over a long period of time to arguments with which he does not agree. But in the long run, I am persuaded that it is good for the country that one be required to hear those arguments, because many times there is great merit to them.

In the particular debate to which reference has just been made, the tidelands debate, the Senator from Florida was a principal sponsor of the bill. The junior Senator from Louisiana was very much interested in the proposed legislation, because it directly and vitally affected the State of Louisiana.

That bill was debated over a long period of time. What seemed to break the extended debate in that instance was when the then majority leader, Senator Robert Taft, moved to table the substitute bill, offered by those engaged in the debate. He did that not to cut off debate, but to demonstrate the lack of support that those who were fighting the bill could muster. He gave notice several days beforehand that he would move to table the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I merely wish to observe that one of the privileges and immunities of a U.S. Senator is that he does not have to listen to any other U.S. Senator if he does not want to. He has the facilities of the cloakroom and of the Marble Room to make it possible to conduct conversations, and not have to listen to what he does not want to hear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is the reason for having a rule of unlimited debate, whether one likes it or not. If a proposal is basically harmful and unsound, it is necessary to hear much of the logic against it before managing to close the debate under existing rules and precedents, even if a Senator be called upon to do nothing other than to sit and hold the floor while someone else is talking, and thus be exposed to that kind of logic.

The situation with the kind of change which is proposed is the same that occurs when a unanimous consent agreement is entered into to vote. Once it is agreed to vote 3 or 4 days or a week later, most Senators make their plans to be absent, and they are simply not here. Anyone who wants to talk can come and talk to empty Senate chairs and to an empty Chamber. But so far as having an opportunity to make his case and have others see his point of view, or even to have them compromise with him is concerned, there is very little opportunity once a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana recognizes, does he not, that the alltime record, to that time, for long speeches was made during the course of that debate by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who spoke for more than 22 hours unceasingly. The Senator from Louisiana recalls that incident, does he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator also recalls, does he not, that only the determined and continued leadership of the late Senator Taft, plus the fact that the very liberal press who were supporting the opponents of the tidelands bill, nevertheless said that they would not support them in their filibuster, brought the thing finally to a creaking end after nearly 7 weeks of debate, at which time they had more than 30 Senators on their side in opposition to the passage of the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. I should say though, that if Senators who opposed that bill were as sound in their arguments as they contended they were, and as many of them seemed to feel they were when they first started the debate, there is not much doubt in my mind that they would have been able to convince the Senate and to make their case. They had much support from the press and from State legislatures, as the Senator from Florida knows. They had an opportunity to present their case. I for one would say, assuming that they were sincere, that they should have made their case in just the fashion they did, if they felt that the bill was as bad as they contended it was on the floor of the Senate. The fact that they were defeated by an overwhelming vote, after they were heard and had made their case on the floor of the Senate, persuades me to believe that they were wrong in their view.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I believe he is right and they were wrong. However, after all, there is something to the point made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, the question of determination,

the question of conviction, whether Senators feel in their hearts that they are right, and are able to get a reaction from the public of the United States supporting their conviction, runs to the very heart of the usefulness of unlimited debate.

Senators who do not have deep convictions, Senators who do not have the support of their public, Senators who cannot satisfy the general public of their sincerity had better not start unlimited debate. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Florida is completely correct. Furthermore, under the rules as they now exist, Senators who might not want to hear the arguments of the minority are at least required to keep a quorum somewhere around the Capitol Building. Thus there is an opportunity to communicate with them. Even though they do not care to hear the speeches, at least they have to be in the Marble Room or the cloakroom or their offices, so that a quorum can be provided when the absence of one is suggested.

That is altogether different from what is proposed here, where it is simply provided that 15 days after a petition signed by 16 Senators is adopted, there will be a vote, and each Senator will be permitted to speak for 2 hours.

There is no assurance whatever, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, that anyone would be here to listen to a Senator, or even that he would be offered the opportunity to speak during the 15 days. The Senate could meet, and the majority leader could move on the day the Senate met to adjourn or recess for 3 more days.

Mr. RUSSELL. Or to recognize only Senators who planned to speak on one side of the question—the majority side. There would be no appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The Presiding Officer might be a Senator who dominated the Senate. He might be in a position to make rules or to withdraw rules, as he sees fit, and to declare one rule unconstitutional and another one as valid or applicable. If the Senate had that kind of Presiding Officer, no Senator would know whether he could be certain that the Presiding Officer was fair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The probabilities are—based upon what has been happening in this very debate—that if there were some measure as destructive as was the proposed Court-packing bill during the administration of President Roosevelt, those who had made up their minds and had decided they would vote for the measure, even before it was called up, would say on the day when the Senate met, before any Senator had an opportunity to speak: "If you wish to speak, we shall let you make your record and have it printed. But if you call for a quorum, so as to keep us here in town, instead of permitting us to go to Florida, for a vacation, or—in the summer time—to go to Maine, that will be different, and we shall insist that the Senate adjourn after meeting for 2 or 3 hours, and then we shall not be bothered with answering quorum calls."

Mr. RUSSELL. Or take a recess for 3-day periods, without the consent of the House of Representatives; and that would come within the proposed 15-calendar-day rule.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In fact, with the consent of the House, the Senate could take a recess for 15 days.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reference has been made to the previous question rule. The Senator from Georgia has engaged in research into that question much more than I have; but I am convinced that under that rule, such a motion was subject to debate itself, and that, while the motion was pending, the measure which was being moved as the previous question was still subject to amendment, and all the amendments offered were also subject to debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. No matter what that rule was, does the Senator from Louisiana believe that it was probably unwise, inasmuch as it was abandoned 154 years ago and has not been revived since then?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That certainly would appear to be the case.

But the point is that prior to 1917 there never was any limitation on debate in the Senate; and yet this country prospered very well under the Senates of those days, and I am persuaded that they did a very good job of legislating, and that very poor service to the Nation was done by dispensing with some of the traditions established by those Senates.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield again to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Florida is correct; the previous question rule that the Senate once had was repealed. I insist that if the Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States, can revive that rule and bring it back in here, he can do the same with any other rule the Senate has ever had.

The idea that the previous question rule applies only when the Presiding Officer might want it to apply or only when some Senator might want it to apply, is of course about as fallacious and nonsensical a parliamentary suggestion as any that could possibly be made. One need not tell me that the previous question could be moved on the 12th day of the session—but would not be moved on the 100th day of the session, when it is not in the rules in any event.

But the Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct: Even the old previous question rule which the Senate once had was debatable; and the minutes kept in those days show that it was debatable. The Senate Journal shows in any number of instances that one Senator moved the previous question, whereupon another Senator rose and urged the Senate not to adopt the previous question, because it would shunt aside an amendment that he desired to offer.

Mr. President, at one time I looked into this matter and accumulated so many notes that I have not been able to find all of them. But one point appealed particularly to me. It related to Senator John Carlisle of Kentucky, who served for many years in the Senate. He had previously served three terms as Speaker of the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate where he served for a considerable period of time. He was recognized as a great scholar, a great parliamentarian, and a great statesman, in the broadest sense of the word. During his service here, there obtained in the Senate a situation somewhat similar to the one which now obtains here. That situation occurred in 1891, when a Presiding Officer suggested that he was not exactly satisfied with the rules of the Senate as he found them, and stated that he might entertain a motion for the previous question. If the Senator from Louisiana will indulge me, I wish to read briefly from some of the comments Senator Carlisle then made, for I think they should appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Senator Carlisle said:

> The motion for the previous question was debatable in the English House of Commons from the time it was first established in 1604 or 1605 until the present hour, and that motion is not used there for the purpose of suppressing debate.

Mr. President, I point out here, as an interpolation, that that is the question here—namely, as to whether the previous question shall be used to suppress debate, or, to use a word which everyone can understand, to "gag" the Senate of the United States.

I now resume reading from Senator Carlisle's remarks:

> It is used for the purpose of suppressing the subject itself and enabling the body to dispose of it without voting directly upon it; and for that purpose it prevailed in this Senate until perhaps about the beginning of the present century.

In other words, it was a rule of the Senate, but was repealed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In 1806.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, in 1806, as the Senator from Florida suggests.

But now it is claimed that the Presiding Officer of the Senate is able to bring it back and impose it upon the Senate, although it was repealed in 1806.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And of course he would propose one that could not be debated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, he has not yet reached that point. But if he succeeded in suppressing debate, as he proposes to do, he would not only distort the rules of the Senate, but he would also distort the ancient and honorable motion for the previous question.

Mr. President, I may say that the ordinary rule states that a two-thirds vote is required in order to impose the previous question; and I now wish to ask whether the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to request the printing in the RECORD, at the end of this brief state-

ment by me, the pertinent provision from Robert's Rules of Order that is relied upon by the proponents of the bizarre and nebulous scheme that now is proposed to the Senate. I wish to have that done in order to show that even under Robert's Rules of Order, a two-thirds vote is required in order to impose the previous question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to point out that we are not opposed to Robert's Rules of Order; in fact, we rely upon them.

Mr. RUSSELL. But you do not rely upon them if they are found to require a two-thirds vote.

During the debate here 2 years ago, the Senator from New Mexico stated on the floor—and was vigorously seconded by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is one of the main proponents in connection with this matter—that he believed the Senate should use Robert's Rules of Order, and that it should invoke them as part of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Like women, the liberal Senators of the North, the East, and the West retain the immutable right to change our minds.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about that. Every time the Senators find they have stepped into a trap, they deny they have been on that road at all. But the fact remains on record, just the same, that they suggested the use of Robert's Rules of Order when the matter was before the Senate previously.

I would like to continue to read from the remarks of Senator Carlisle:

> Now, as I have said, the motion for the previous question itself was debatable, and therefore it afforded no opportunity whatever for closing debate. The form of the question, as it was finally modified at common parliamentary law, was that the main question be now put, and that was debatable. Mr. Jefferson says in his manual that, pending the motion for the previous question, amendments might be offered to the main question, and those amendments might be discussed also, thus broadening the scope of the debate. If the body refused to sustain the motion, that is, refused to vote that the main question be now put, then the main question was simply suppressed for that single day.
>
> Senators will therefore see that it could not possibly be used to suppress debate, because all those who desired to debate the main question had to do was to discuss the motion for the previous question until the House adjourned, and then the next day the motion for the previous question had to be made again and go through the same process. Its effect was to suspend for the time being a discussion upon the merits of the original proposition.

Mr. President, I have here a great deal more of Senator Carlisle's discussion, but I have read the gist of it. His entire remarks, I think, would be interesting to anyone who would like to go into the whole history of parliamentary procedures in the Senate. They are to be found in Volume 22, 51st Congress, second session. Page after page of his debate show that there an effort was made to impose the previous question. I will read only this sentence, because it sounds as if it might have appeared in yesterday's paper:

> In 1850, during the long debate on the admission of California, Mr. Douglas, of Illinois, offered a resolution for the previous question in the Senate, but when it came up in its order it was laid on the table without a word of debate. (Congressional Globe, 1st sess., 31st Cong., vol. 21, part 2, pp. 1466 and 1688.)

That shows the Senate did not at the time consider that the motion for the previous question was in order in the Senate when it was made by the distinguished Senator Douglas, of Illinois. I must say he was a predecessor of the present Senator DOUGLAS, and that he was known in history as the Little Giant. He was one of the truly great parliamentarians and statesmen who have served in this body.

I wish that some of the people from the area of the country from which I come had been more tolerant of him in 1860. Had they been so, it would have saved us a great deal of suffering and travail from 1861 to 1891 until we finally became free again.

Mr. President, I shall ask that an extract from Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, Seventy-fifth Anniversary Edition, be printed in the RECORD. But I would like to read a part of it:

> If less than two-thirds vote in the affirmative, the Chair announces the vote thus: "There not being two-thirds in favor of the motion, the negative has it and the motion is lost. The question is on," etc., the Chair stating the question on the immediately pending question, which is again open to debate and amendment, the same as if the previous question had not been demanded.

I have never conceded that Robert's Rules of Order superseded the hallowed rules of the Senate of the United States, because they have never been adopted by the Senate at any time. But even if some Senators did seek to invoke them in an effort to gag the Senate and to impose the will of the Presiding Officer and some few of our colleagues upon the Senate, it could not be done without a two-thirds vote.

General Robert goes on to say:

> The question may be put in a form similar to this: "The previous question has been moved on the motion to commit and its amendment. As many as are in favor of now putting the question on the motion to commit and its amendment, will rise; those opposed will rise. There being two-thirds in favor of the motion, the debate is closed on the motion to commit, and its amendment, and the question is on the amendment," etc.

I think, Mr. President, in order that we may lay aside this ghost of Robert's Rules of Order that has stalked these Halls for the past few days and on two previous occasions when this matter was before the Senate, it might be well to have this part of Robert's Rules printed in the RECORD. I am sure it will be the last time we will hear anything about Robert's Rules of Order from this time on, or that anyone will press them. The Chair stated the other day, when I asked the question, that he thought Robert's Rules of Order would be applicable, but he backed out of that after I apprised him of the fact that the previous question required a two-thirds vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the extract from Robert's Rules of Order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 29. The Previous Question[1] takes precedence of all subsidiary [12] motions except to lay on the table, and yields to privileged [14] and incidental [13] motions, and to the motion to lay on the table. It is undebatable, and cannot be amended or have any other subsidiary motion applied to it. The effect of an amendment may be obtained by calling for, or moving, the previous question on a different set of the pending questions (which must be consecutive and include the immediately pending question), in which case the vote is taken first on the motion which orders the previous question on the largest number of questions. It may be applied to any debatable or amendable motion or motions, and if unqualified it applies only to the immediately pending motion.
>
> It may be qualified so as to apply to a series of pending questions, or to a consecutive part of a series beginning with the immediately pending question. It requires a two-thirds vote for its adoption. After the previous question has been ordered, up to the time of taking the last vote under it, the questions that have not been voted on may be laid on the table, but can have no other subsidiary motions applied to them. An appeal made after the previous question has been demanded or ordered and before its exhaustion, is undebatable. The previous question, before any vote has been taken under it, may be reconsidered, but not after its partial execution. As no one would vote to reconsider the vote ordering the previous question who was not opposed to the previous question, it follows that if the motion to reconsider prevails, it will be impossible

[1] The previous question is the only motion used in the House of Representatives for closing debate. It may be ordered by a majority vote. If there has been no previous debate on the subject, 40 minutes of debate, to be equally divided between those opposed to and those in favor of the proposition, is allowed after the previous question has been ordered. [See § 3, footnote pp. 83–84.] The motion is not allowed in the Senate. House Rule 17 is as follows:

"1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

"2. A call of the House shall not be in order after the previous question is ordered, unless it shall appear upon an actual count by the Speaker that a quorum is not present.

"3. All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate."

to secure a two-thirds vote for the previous question, and, therefore, if it is voted to reconsider the previous question it is considered as rejecting that question and placing the business as it was before the previous question was moved. If a vote taken under the previous question is reconsidered before the previous question is exhausted, there can be no debate or amendment of the proposition; but if the reconsideration is after the previous question is exhausted, then the motion to reconsider, as well as the question to be reconsidered, is divested of the previous question and is debatable. If lost, the previous question may be renewed after sufficient progress in debate to make it a new question.

The form of this motion is, "I move [or demand, or call for] the previous question on [here specify the motions on which it is desired to be ordered]." As it cannot be debated or amended, it must be voted on immediately. The form of putting the question[2] is, "The previous question is moved [or demanded, or called for] on [specify the motions on which the previous question is demanded].

"As many as are in favor of ordering the previous question on [repeat the motions] will rise." When they are seated he continues, "Those opposed will rise. There being two-thirds in favor of the motion, the affirmative has it and the previous question is ordered on [repeat the motions upon which it is ordered]. The question is [or recurs] on [state the immediately pending question]. As many as are in favor," etc.

If the previous question is ordered the chair immediately proceeds to put to vote the questions on which it was ordered until all the votes are taken, or there is an affirmative vote on postponing definitely or indefinitely, or committing, either of which exhausts the previous question. If there can be the slightest doubt as to the vote the chair should take it again immediately, counting each side. If less than two-thirds vote in the affirmative, the chair announces the vote thus: "There not being two-thirds in favor of the motion, the negative has it and the motion is lost. The question is on," etc., the chair stating the question on the immediately pending question, which is again open to debate and amendment, the same as if the previous question had not been demanded.

The question may be put in a form similar to this: "The previous question has been moved on the motion to commit and its amendment. As many as are in favor of now putting the question on the motion to commit and its amendment will rise; those opposed will rise. There being two-thirds in favor of the motion, the debate is closed on the motion to commit and its amendment, and the question is on the amendment," etc. While this form is allowable, yet it is better to conform to the regular parliamentary form as given above.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia, if I may, if he will be kind enough to correct me if I misunderstand the situation. It seems to me it is rather clear that what is being asked for now is not to revive the ancient rule of the previous question which existed in the Senate until 1806, and was repealed then, and not to apply the previous question as outlined by Robert's Rules of Order and other recognized rules of order, but, instead, to adopt and make prevail on the floor of the Senate the present previous question rule of order from the House of Representatives because it happens to provide by the rule itself no two-thirds vote requirement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is very generous. I would say the object of it is to give some slight color of legality to a proposed legislative lynching of the rules of the Senate and of the Senate itself as a great deliberative body.

(At this point Mr. LONG yielded to Mr. MANSFIELD, whose remarks appear elsewhere under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks by covering a few statements that I believe to be in error. I do not at all question the sincerity of the author, but I believe they would mislead one trying to arrive at a proper conclusion on this debate. For example, I refer to the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] yesterday. He is not the only one who has made such a statement, but it seems to me he has made a number of similar statements and I think they should be put to rest.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have the page?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Page 424 of the RECORD:

> It is well known by every Member of the Senate that there is a minimum of 35, and possibly even more, Senators in number who, quite conscientiously and honestly and sincerely, are utterly and totally opposed to the program of the President-elect.

I do not know that the statement that there are 35 Senators who are opposed to everything in the program is a correct statement. I know there are Senators who are opposed to certain items in that program, but to say that 35 Senators are totally opposed to everything in the program I believe is in error.

Mr. CLARK. Twenty-five Republicans and ten Democrats.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That might be correct. I do not know it to be true that there are 35 Senators who are opposed to everything in the President-elect's program. There may be 35 who would vote against many items in the President-elect's program, but I doubt very much that there are 35 Senators who would vote against everything.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, it is a matter of opinion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. But the Senator has said that it is well known. It was not known to this Senator. We may be able to find one or two Senators who are violently opposed to everything that the President-elect has recommended, but I do not know of any who are opposed to everything that is in that program.

Then the Senator from Pennsylvania went on to say:

> If the present cloture rule remains in effect, those Senators can defeat, by delay and by filibuster, every single important measure of the Kennedy administration.

Those measures that I know of, to which the President-elect made reference, are items of the highest priority, many of which were passed by the Senate in the last Congress, and passed without the support of the administration. Most of those measures were passed with the administration recommending only certain phases or certain segments of the measures. In some instances, the administration did not recommend the bill at all. Some of those measures which were passed were vetoed by the President, and a very sizable vote, amounting almost to a two-thirds majority, was mustered for the purpose of overriding the President's veto. I assume those were some of the very measures to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has made reference, because those are the ones on which the President-elect has placed the highest priority.

So I submit that the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania would be completely in error because those 35 Senators were for the most part Members of the previous Congress. They did not filibuster similar measures which were proposed at that time. They might have voted against them.

I am reminded of the statement of a very able former Senator, Senator George Malone, of Nevada, a man whom I have always respected. His definition of a filibuster was that it is a long speech with which one does not agree. If one agrees with it, it is a profound debate.

It might have seemed that 35 Senators had some questions to ask about the new frontier program. Those favoring the program might feel that the debate was a very dilatory procedure. But if we looked upon those speeches as containing merit, as I believe many of them would, then I think it would be completely incorrect to say that those Senators delayed and filibustered those bills. There is no reason to think that they would even attempt to filibuster the bills.

They certainly let them pass the last time, and there would be every reason to believe in my judgment that they would permit those measures to come to a vote again.

Furthermore I make reference to rule XIX, which provides that a Senator may speak only twice on a legislative day. That rule is very effective in the hands of a majority leader who wishes to use it, and any Senator who observed former Senator William Knowland use the rule when the atomic energy bill was before the Senate for consideration knows what I am talking about. Each Senator could have only two speeches and that was all. If he wanted to make an additional speech, he would be ruled out of order under rule XIX, and if he wished to offer an amendment and to make two speeches on it, the majority leader would promptly move to table his amendment. I thought it was an oppressive tactic, but it was handled very effectively in the Senate in the consideration of the atomic energy bill in 1954.

---

[2] The congressional form of putting this question is, "The gentleman from ———— demands the previous question. As many as are in favor of ordering the previous question will say 'Aye'; as many as are opposed will say 'No.'"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator repeat the statement he has just finished discussing?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The statement was that if the present cloture rule remains in effect, that Senators who are opposed to everything in the Kennedy program—35 in number—can defeat by delay and filibuster every single important measure of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who made that statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Pennsylvania. I contend that the statement is completely misleading. The various measures to which the Senator made reference were for the most part, voted on in the last Congress. Some of the measures were passed, some vetoed by the President, and some stopped in the House of Representatives.

Then the statement is made by the Senator from Pennsylvania:

> The rules make it impossible for the legislative branch of our Government in general, and the Senate in particular to pass meaningful legislation to protect voting rights, speed school desegregation, and promote job opportunities.

They do no such thing. Did we not pass a Civil Rights Act in 1960, in the last Congress? I admit that the bill ran into some opposition. Another civil rights bill was passed in 1957. As one who was here, I know that the majority leader stood on the floor of the Senate and said they had the votes in 1957 to invoke cloture if he wanted to invoke it. We knew that he had the votes to do it. However, the bill was passed without any attempt to invoke cloture.

When the statement is made that the rules make it impossible to pass meaningful legislation, I suppose the Senator means the passage of a civil rights bill which would have denied Americans the right of jury trial.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It has been my view, as the Senator knows, that neither of the civil rights bills which have been passed by the Senate since I have been a Member of the Senate has been meaningful in any way. The Senator may recall that at the end of the last session I tendered my sword to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], saying that I was Robert E. Lee and he was Ulysses S. Grant, and that he had given us a terrible licking, which I still think he did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator voted for the bill. He told me he voted for it on my advice, and that my advice was that I did not like to see the bill passed because there were a great many things in it which were obnoxious to me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. I am one of his constituents, of course, and I try to follow his advice. I had trouble making up my mind about how to vote on the bill. It was his sound advice and his eloquence that caused me to vote for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator did not vote for it because I asked him to vote for it. I am sure of that fact.

We have passed two bills relating to voting rights. I hope that Senators will not feel that we must vote to prevent a fair consideration of the type of amendments that were offered when that measure was before the Senate, because some of the amendments were very fundamental to our form of government, some of the amendments being attempts to make the bill fair by having it apply generally, rather than pinpointing and persecuting certain people in one section of our country.

Then the statement is made by the Senator from Pennsylvania:

> Senators who have been here far longer than I have seen a determined group of 12 Senators or less hold up needed legislation day after day and month after month.

Mr. President, I do not know of any group of 12 Senators who have held up needed legislation day after day, month after month. It may be that the Senator was thinking of what occurred before any of the present Senators were serving in the Senate, namely, the fight over the bill to arm merchant ships, back before World War I. If reference was made to that point, then of course it must be stated that back in those days there was no rule XXII providing for the closing of debate. Therefore, any reference to that debate would not be properly applicable to the situation we have before us at the present time.

Then the Senator from Pennsylvania says in his statement:

> My good friend, the junior Senator from Arizona, Mr. GOLDWATER, has already announced his determined opposition to the program of the President-elect of the United States. He is one of our ablest as well as one of our most popular Senators. I have seen him operate in the 4 years I have been in the Senate, and I know full well that the Senator from Arizona, if he sets his mind to it, can prevent the entire Kennedy program from coming to a vote, unless we change the cloture rules.

All I can say is that the Senator from Arizona may be a very good man, but he is certainly not that much of a man.

I know what it means to stand on the floor of the Senate for a time exceeding 10 hours, or so. I have done it. I would say that, while I have high respect for the Senator from Arizona, I never thought anyone entertained the impression that he was Superman and Mighty Mouse all combined in one. I do not see how a single Senator could stop a whole program, if a majority of 65 Senators on this side of the aisle wanted to put through a program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator must read my comments in context, and they should be read in connection with the earlier statement, that there were 35 Senators who were opposed to the program of the President-elect. In my judgment and my opinion the leader of that opposition is the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I am sure he would be glad and proud to accept that designation. The Senator from Arizona and those who follow his point of view can prevent any part of the Kennedy program from being put through.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am familiar with some of the difficulties and some of the advantages of the rules which permit extended debate. I say to Senators that if a Senator opposes a measure which is favored by a majority of the Senators, he had better start talking, and talking long. Talking for an extended period becomes pretty tiring, and it certainly feels like hard work. I have no reason to believe that one Senator could stop the whole Kennedy program. He might be able to persuade others to his point of view, but he could not stop the whole program. I do not believe that the Senator from Arizona could stop the whole program. He did not stop it the last time. I doubt very much that he could stop it now.

Mr. CLARK. He stopped most of it in the special session after the convention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My impression is that most of the roadblocks we ran into were not in the Senate but in the House Rules Committee and in the President's veto power. As the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, the bills he makes reference to were in considerable number vetoed by President Eisenhower. That is something we cannot do very much about, unless we have a two-thirds majority to override the veto. That was done only once in the Eisenhower administration.

The Senator from Pennsylvania further says:

> I am the guardian of no man's conscience, but I could not conscientiously cast my first vote to knock down a specific plank in the platform of my party.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party platform does suggest that there should be a change in the rules, but it in no wise suggests that it should not be an orderly change, a change under the rules, a change after thorough consideration, and after we are given an opportunity to look into the proposed change, and after the proposed change has been studied in committee. There is nothing in the Democratic platform which suggests a disorderly procedure or disorderly approach to the problem, or an approach which would deny a right which has existed for more than a hundred years under the rules of the Senate.

There is nothing like that in the Democratic platform. There is nothing anywhere in the platform to suggest that those measures are necessary.

The rules were changed in 1947, against vigorous opposition on the part of southern Senators. The rule on closing debate was changed again in 1959. This rule has never been tried, Mr. President. We hear Senators talking about changing the rule, but nothing is said about permitting the rule to be tried.

As one who came to the Senate after having served as a clerk in the Legislature of Louisiana and on the Governor's council on occasion, I can say to the Senate that it seemed to me inefficient not to use voting machines. We always used voting machines in Louisiana. It seemed to me that it would be a good

idea to install voting machines here for efficiency. However, it seemed to the Senator from Louisiana also that it would be a good idea to serve in the Senate for a while to find out what the place was like, so to speak, before trying to change things.

Changing fundamental things without first trying them out is not the wisest thing to do.

Prior to our changing the rule, there was great difficulty in considering a rules change, because a motion to consider a change in the rules, to bring it up, required a motion that was not subject to the cloture rule. It was not subject to a cloture petition. The Senate had ruled that way many times, and had correctly ruled that way.

It had been ruled that way by the Presiding Officer, and he had been sustained by the Senate in such a ruling. When a Presiding Officer tried to overturn that precedent, the Senate overruled the Presiding Officer.

In 1959 we changed that rule, to provide that debate could be closed off by a two-thirds majority. I see no reason to believe that the rule could not be changed through the use of orderly process. Should it not be incumbent upon those who wish to change the rule to try to change it by orderly process, under the rule that they themselves voted to make a rule of the Senate, before they try to use a disorderly process, or have the Vice President try to tell us that the rules are unconstitutional? He might as well tell us the Senate has no rules whatever, except such rules as he wishes to dispense from time to time.

There was considerable discussion, also, of matters which happened in 1917, when the Senate had no rule for closing debate. Also, a statement was made that it would never be possible to proceed to a change of the rules if it was necessary to have 67 votes to shut off debate. How do we know we would ever get to the point of requiring 67 votes? How do we know there would be a filibuster against a change of the rules? If there were a filibuster, how do we know it would not be possible to get 67 votes? The Senate has not even tried.

Then he would like to destroy the fundamental liberties Senators have enjoyed to make their case and present their views to the Nation when they believe something exceedingly harmful to the Nation is sought to be done, and, by the measure here proposed, simply be denied their rights. What is proposed to be done is to have the Chair decide that the rules of the Senate are unconstitutional, rules which protect small minorities. Then someone will move the previous question. I submit that if Senators wish to change the rules, they can be changed without resort to that kind of procedure.

I recall that when I first came to the Senate in 1949, the Senate had a debate over changing its rules. A point was reached when the Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States, Alben Barkley, undertook to rule that a motion to proceed was subject to a cloture petition. I suppose many Senators had to muster a great amount of political courage to overrule that ruling of the Chair, but they did so.

A former President pro tempore of the Senate, a great Member of this body, a former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the late Arthur Vandenberg, made a speech that perhaps did not help him with political problems in his home State, but it was one of the greatest speeches I ever heard. He said that the ruling by the Vice President was error and that the ruling should be overruled by the Senate on an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Former Senator Cordon, of Oregon, made a point I shall never forget. He said that at any time the Senate, by a bare majority, wants to do violence to its rules, the Senate has the power to do so, particularly if it has the support of its Presiding Officer. But he said that at that time—and he was referring to the time when that debate occurred—the Senate was not in a position where it was compelled to resort to that extreme measure.

Mr. President, we are not in a position of being compelled to resort to the extreme measure of changing the rules of the Senate as they now exist. They can be changed in orderly fashion. Senators who might want to change the rules in order to obtain an advantage for the passage of certain legislation proposed by certain majorities, particularly when they will be publicly resisted by others, should be willing to subject themselves to discomfort over a period of time to listen to the debate on a subject on which they are not in agreement.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Louisiana has had much experience with legislative bodies. I have had some experience of that kind in the State of Georgia. Has the Senator ever heard a definition of what is commonly referred to as a steamroller?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no particular definition in mind. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia has a better one than I have. I believe I know what he has in mind.

Mr. TALMADGE. In Georgia a steamroller is commonly referred to as a majority of a body plus the presiding officer. Of course, the Senator knows what a steamroller can do. It can run roughshod over the opposition of a minority at any time it sees fit, regardless of what the rules might be, what the law may be, or what justice may be under the circumstances.

Is it not true that the advocates of the resolution are trying to create a steamroller in the U.S. Senate, with which they can run roughshod over the wishes of all other Senators?

They may represent 80 percent of the population of the United States; yet they would run roughshod over the remainder of the population.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment, to do so could be the greatest disservice they could do to themselves as well as to the Nation, because the Senator from Georgia knows that while today one group may be driving the steamroller, looking down the road, there may be a new driver on the steamroller tomorrow. Someone else will be in charge of it. One never can be certain what the final result will be. I would certainly protect their rights today if I had the power and the privilege to do so. But I must say that over a period of time, with the shifting of parliamentary majorities, and the results which go with politics, the chickens have a way of coming home to roost.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that all of us at some time or another are in the minority?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is true.

Mr. TALMADGE. When we are in the minority and the other side is operating the steamroller, they can run roughshed over us all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The attachés of the Senate will please notify all Senators that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 5]

Aiken	Engle	Miller
Allott	Ervin	Monroney
Anderson	Fong	Morse
Bartlett	Fulbright	Morton
Beall	Goldwater	Moss
Bennett	Gore	Mundt
Bible	Gruening	Muskie
Blakley	Hart	Neuberger
Boggs	Hartke	Pastore
Burdick	Hayden	Pell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hickey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Robertson
Cannon	Hruska	Russell
Capehart	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jackson	Schoeppel
Carroll	Javits	Scott
Case, N. J.	Johnston	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Keating	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Yarborough
Eastland	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McNamara	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, since this Congress has convened there has been considerable debate on the floor of this body with respect to a further proposed change in Senate rule XXII.

I will not unduly take up the Senate's time, but do want to go on record as being opposed, not only to any further relaxation of this rule, but also to taking up this matter outside the orderly procedures of the Senate. It is my opinion that the country is served well when orderly procedures are followed. For this reason, I will support a motion to refer this entire matter to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee to insure that we will take no action in haste that we will repent in leisure.

Freedom of debate in the Senate has served this great Nation of ours well over the years. Well it may be that it was subject to a few abuses, but the benefits which have been derived far outweigh the harm that would be done if this great principle was not preserved.

I know of no major legislation, and this includes two civil rights bills in the last 4 years, which has ever been prevented from consideration or passage by reason of extended debate. Why, then, is there a necessity for further relaxation of this rule?

The only reason that comes to my mind is the fact that there are moments when individuals motivated by passion or zealous zeal, and misled by misrepresentations of interested groups, call for the expediency of consideration of various measures which may later be found not to have the attraction which they appear to have at the moment.

No one attributes any ulterior motive to the good intentions that motivate individuals in these circumstances.

Without the temperate consideration of all measures affecting the public interest in an atmosphere where reason, justice, and truth can be fully explored, great harm could come to our democratic way of life. It is with this thought in mind that our Founding Fathers created this great body so as to insure the preservation of this principle.

Majority rule stampeding its will in utter disregard of minorities could wreak havoc on the Nation as a whole. This course of action follows the path down the road to tyrannical government.

In his Manual of Parliamentary Procedure, Thomas Jefferson wrote as follows:

> The rules of the Senate which allow full freedom of debate are designed for protection of the minority, and this design is a part of the warp and woof of our Constitution. You cannot remove it without damaging the whole fabric. Therefore, before tampering with this right, we should assure ourselves that what is lost will not be greater than what is gained.

Note the careful admonition of Jefferson:

> That in such tampering with this right we should assure ourselves that what is lost will not be greater than what is gained.

This is sage advice. It cannot and should not be taken lightly. It is the foundation upon which this great Republic has endured and continues to endure.

Free and unfettered debate is what gained for this great body the well deserved reputation of being the world's greatest deliberative assembly.

Section 3, of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

This provision was later changed by the 17th amendment, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

I quote these two provisions of the Constitution of the United States to point out the principle of maintaining the equality of power among large and small States insofar as representation is concerned in this body. Each State is equal. It is this concept which provides protection of the minority. We must not forget that the majorities of today may be the minorities of tomorrow.

Any further relaxation of rule XXII would, in my opinion, unduly limit freedom of debate and dangerously destroy the fundamental basic relationship that presently exists consonant with the Constitution of the United States. Wisdom, reason, and justice dictate that only in unlimited debate can we preserve individual liberties, maintain a government of law, and fully protect the rights of each State to be equally represented pursuant to the Constitution of the United States.

Only by preserving this great principle can we insure that reason, truth, and justice will prevail. Any other course will carry us down the road to tyrannical government.

My very able and distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has, in my opinion, made a great contribution in the present debate. I should like to quote a remark which he made summarizing succinctly the grave responsbility which we have pending before us. On page 32, of Senate Report 1509, relating to proposed amendments to rule XXII, under date of April 30, 1958, the able Senator stated:

> The onslaught to stifle freedom of speech on the floor of the Senate is an attack not only on the Senate itself but also on the stature, perquisites, and prerogatives of each Senator in national affairs and every other responsibility incident to the senatorship.
>
> It is an attack which threatens the whole fabric of our form of government and strikes at the very vitals of representative government.
>
> It is an attack which seeks to destroy the constitutional balance of Federal and State power and deal a death blow to the States as political entities.

Again on page 34, he stated:

> Our wise Founding Fathers were aware that the excesses of democracy can be as fearful in their consequences as are the excesses of totalitarianism. To safeguard against both extremes they gave us our republican form of government with its delicately contrived system of checks and balances of which freedom of debate in the Senate is at least an implied, if not actual, part.

These remarks are consistent with wisdom and foresight. Indeed, he is to be commended for such an invaluable contribution, not only to the Senate of the United States, but to the American people as well.

I should like to conclude my statement in opposition to the pending Humphrey-Kuchel substitute, which would permit cutting off debate by a mere majority, and the Anderson motion, which would permit cutting off debate by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, by quoting a remark made by former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, while Governor of New York, when he stated in a radio address, delivered on March 2, 1930, as follows:

> The moment a mere numerical superiority by either States or voters in this country proceeds to ignore the needs and desires of the minority, and, for their own selfish purposes or advancement, hamper or oppress that minority or debar them in any way from equal privileges and equal rights—that moment will mark the failure of our constitutional system.

These words of warning, echoed continuously from the days of Thomas Jefferson, are as valid now as they were then.

The issue before us is as basic as our freedom itself. Destroy the concept of unlimited debate by any further relaxation of Senate rule XXII, and we embark upon a course inexorably leading to the certain corrosion of liberty itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the debate on the rules question has now proceeded for several days. I should like to contribute this much to the discussion: The fundamental question which is before us, as Walter Lippmann has put it, is not whether a majority of Senators shall prevail, but what kind of majority? How large a majority on transcendental issues? As the Senators well know, the Constitution requires a larger majority on certain matters beyond the simple majority by which ordinary bills are enacted. It requires a two-thirds majority on treaty ratification. It requires a two-thirds majority on constitutional amendments. It requires a two-thirds majority on impeachment. It requires a two-thirds vote to override a Presidential veto.

Do we quarrel with these larger-than-simple majority provisions? We do not. They are there, and wisely so, to prevent us from being carried away by the passions of the moment and to make certain that merely one Senator over a simple majority will not move this body into ill-advised action or this Nation into new paths which are not likely to be trod successfully unless a preponderance of the States are in accord.

I would not presume to put the rules of the Senate on the same level as the Constitution. Nevertheless, in those rules, various procedural matters call for varying majorities. These range all the way from unanimous consent, to two-thirds, to simple majorities. And, again, the

purpose of these variances is essentially the same as that of the various types of majorities embodied in the Constitution—that this body shall proceed in an orderly fashion, with appropriate deliberation.

So let us then, each of us, divest ourselves once and for all of any superior virtue in which we may be constrained to clothe ourselves merely because we advocate that debate in the Senate shall terminate on the basis of a simple majority, a three-fifths majority, a two-thirds majority, or whatever.

And let us now narrow and reiterate the question: What kind of a majority to prevent abuses under rule XXII while still retaining that measure of extra caution on matters pertaining to the Senate's capacity for full and complete debate? Let no one make light of this capacity. It is a procedure which is intimately related to the great and unique contribution of the Senate to this Government and Nation throughout the entire history of the Republic. What is at stake here in this consideration of rule XXII is not civil rights alone. It is every issue of transcendental importance that comes before the Senate, today and tomorrow. It is an essential part of the frame within which every such issue is considered in this body. It is that unique characteristic of this body which, as it has before us and as I hope it will do after, helps to set this institution, this citadel, if I may use that term, apart from all other legislative institutions throughout the world. That uniqueness, Mr. President, clearly stems in part from the concept of full debate, because it is this concept which insures our right and underscores our responsibility to bring to bear such individual wisdom as each Senator may possess on the great issues of his time.

I am not blind to past abuses of this right of full debate. I am not blind to the fact that the exercise of this responsibility has bordered many times on the irresponsible. But that does not change the fundamental question which is involved in the consideration of rule XXII. I repeat: It is not the question of civil rights except in the most temporal sense. It is, rather, the nature of the institution itself. In this connection, I would address myself to all of the Members of the Senate and ask them to consider rule XXII in terms of the stature of a continuing Senate of which we are but momentary custodians.

And to the Members on this side of the aisle alone, I would address this additional question: When shall we act to change this rule, if indeed, change is warranted? A new situation now prevails in this Government. Members of this party have the responsibilities now not only in the Congress but also in the administration of the Government.

Speaking as one Senator, I am persuaded that further change in rule XXII is needed. The spectacle of Senators sleeping on cots in their offices, night after night, for weeks on end, in an effort to reach the point of a vote on a single isue before time would put an end to the 86th Congress, was not an edifying one. It added not at all to the stature of this body as a responsible and effective instrument of government.

I should not like to see that spectacle repeated while I remain a Member of the Senate. And I hope that it will not be repeated—ever. I favor a change in the rule to make it less likely that it will be repeated. But the question, "When to change?" remains. It remains, may I say, particularly for my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

I ask each Democratic Senator to weigh most carefully the situation as it now exists. As Democrats, we no longer have only a partial-party responsibility for the leadership of the Government. We have the whole responsibility. The Nation awaits that leadership. There are pent-up needs for action—legislative and executive—in the field of distressed areas, education, minimum wages, medical care for older citizens, and so forth. These needs can be met, and they must be met. It is the responsibility of this party to meet those needs—to meet them adequately, to meet them promptly.

During the next 4 years, there will be no blaming the failure to meet these needs on Presidential veto. The mandate is ours; the authority is ours; the responsibility is ours, in the executive branch and in the legislative branch. I do not see that we shall adequately discharge that responsibility, that we shall effectively use the authority which the people of the United States have conferred upon us, if we now, at this moment in the time of this Congress, engage ourselves within this party in a time-consuming, emotion-filled, disunifying, disrupting struggle over rule XXII.

Some will say that there is a great need in this Nation not only for action on distressed areas, on medical care, and on minimum wages, but also on a more fundamental question—the constitutional right of every citizen of the United States to equal treatment under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, regardless of where he may live in the Nation, regardless of who he may be. To those colleagues, I reply that I am fully in accord. But I say, further, that there are many paths to progress in the field of civil rights, paths dependent not at the outset of this new administration on new legislation, as is action on distressed areas, medical care, minimum wage, and similar matters.

We will have a President during the next 4 years who will lead vigorously in this fundamental field of equality of all citizens under law, a President equipped by conscience and by personal conviction to so lead, a President who will use the moral suasion of the office of the Presidency to so lead, a President armed with the inherent powers of the office, a President equipped with legislation previously passed to so lead. As we must look first to the Congress for the legislation to move the Nation forward in the realm of socioeconomic legislation, I believe we must look first to the new President for the actions which he is so well equipped to take in bringing the ideal of the equality of all citizens closer to the reality in this Nation.

It goes without saying that Members are free on this issue of rule XXII, as on all others, to vote as they deem proper. For myself, however, assessing the issue not only in terms of my personal convictions but also in terms of my responsibilities to my Democratic colleagues and to the incoming administration, I must act in a fashion which, I am persuaded, in the end will move the Nation forward most rapidly, most soundly, not only in matters of civil rights but also on all the new frontiers to which the new administration will address itself.

And I must act, too, without regard for party but as a Senator in a fashion which I believe will best gird the dignity and preserve the vitality of the Senate as an institution, as a citidel of this Government. I am persuaded that, insofar as these considerations are involved in rule XXII, a change of the kind sought in the proposal of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is desirable. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is, I am informed, in accord with me in the view that the requirement of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting should be sufficient to preserve the concept of full debate in the Senate while discouraging its abuse.

But both the minority and majority leaders believe that this matter ought first to go to the Rules and Administration Committee. We are confronted with possible rulings by the Presiding Officer of far-reaching consequence. These have never been given adequate hearing and consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. As probable chairman of that committee, I wish to assure the Senate that this proposition will receive such consideration, and that I shall leave no stone unturned to see to it that a measure of the kind proposed by the Senator from New Mexico is reported to the Senate at a later date. And, further, the minority leader joins with me in assuring the Senate that we shall do everything in our power to bring such a measure to a vote in this body.

Mr. President, I move that the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 4, to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote, as modified, together with the amendment proposed thereto by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator yielded the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to address two inquiries to the majority leader, and in so doing I express my respect, as he knows, for everything he has said, with which he knows I differ strongly.

The first question I wish to address is: What assurance do we have, if we follow the course suggested by the majority leader, that when the committee

reports back to the Senate—and there is no provision in the motion of reference for a report date, though I will say immediately to my colleague that with him as chairman of the committee I would have no qualms about that—some measure which he favors and the minority leader favors, we will not be compelled, because of the situation we will then face, to encounter a filibuster which we cannot break except by a vote of the very kind which the Senator says is unfair now to the majority in the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from New York, for whom I have a great deal of admiration and respect, that what he has is my word; and that in itself should be sufficient, and is, so far as I am concerned, in my relations with every Member of this body. I will do all I can to reasonably expedite hearings on this measure, and others, if they are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If a measure is reported, then I intend to do all I can to see that it is approved by the policy committee and reported to the Senate.

Insofar as a filibuster is concerned, I am not at all certain that there will be a filibuster, because I am not at all certain exactly what the term "filibuster" means. Sometimes it depends upon who is wearing the shoe, as to whether it is called a filibuster, an extended educational debate, or some sort of device or other.

It is my belief that if we do not operate in the manner suggested, we shall not proceed expeditiously to the consideration of the legislation which is very important to many of Senators who are interested in this particular proposal at this time. If it is going to take a great deal of time now, I think the program is in danger. If it is going to take a great deal of time later, what have we lost? We have acted expeditiously. We will have presented our arguments to the proper committee. They will have been heard. Legislation will be reported out. The policy committee will bring that legislation to the floor. I do not know what more anyone can ask for. In my opinion, the chances for success then would be better than they are now.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator agrees, then, as I understand what he has said, that it is true that once we pass this amendment and adopt the resolution, we shall then be bound by the Senate rules and we shall be unable to end debate, no matter how it may be characterized, on a motion to change the rules brought in by the Rules Committee, except pursuant to rule XXII as it now stands. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator absolutely certain that he is not bound now?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator believes that the same majority which can change the rules can also sustain the Vice President's ruling that debate may be terminated, and therefore that there is available to the Senate at this time—and there will not be available when the Senator brings in his report from the Rules Committee—a way in which the Senate can act without delaying important legislation or any other measure, and that we are inviting the very thing which the Senator feels is unjust in the rules now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not agree with the Senator from New York, and I would advise my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on all sides of this question to read very carefully the Vice President's advisory opinion and to define in their own minds just what the word "majority" means. If the opinion is examined closely, as Senators who are also lawyers should have done by this time, perhaps they will come to an understanding that the advisory opinion of the Vice President refers to a possible majority of 26, or one more than the majority of a quorum, and I think that view ought to be examined.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on a factual question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. Is the Senator aware of the fact—and I know he is—that the Rules Committee conducted hearings through a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and myself in 1958 on this very subject, that the Rules Committee considered the issue, and by a majority of 5 to 4 reported the very proposition which is known here as the Douglas plan on April 30, 1958, recommending precisely what the Senator says we should do, and that no action whatever ensued on that recommendation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I remember; yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator tell us why he believes, therefore, that we should take the tortuous course which he suggests to the Senate, without any ability to close debate, when we encountered disaster when we did exactly what he proposes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because I believe in the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. If my colleague would permit me to make a further observation, I would say I believe in the Senate, too; but I believe in the majority of the Senate and not in the minority, and I respectfully submit that the course that my colleague asks us to take delivers the Senate over to a minority. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It is my understanding that the majority leader's view is that the situation, insofar as the power of the Senate to close debate is concerned, will not be different if the issue is referred to committee and reported back and comes upon the floor at some time later in the session, from what it is now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my opinion; it is one Senator's opinion.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If that is so, I wonder if the Senator from Montana would yield for a unanimous-consent request that, assuming the majority leader's motion is adopted and his suggestion that the matter be referred to a committee is followed, when the subject again comes before the Senate, it shall be considered in all respects as the first business of this session of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know the purpose of the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I will make my proposal even more explicit. The majority leader differs from the Vice President, I believe, and certainly from the Senator from New Jersey, in his view as to the power of the Senate to bring debate to a close on this issue by a majority vote at the outset of a new Congress. Let that be as it may. If the Senator from Montana is correct, he is correct. If we are correct, as we think we are, in accordance with the Vice President's advisory opinion, then we are right. But will the Senator from Montana join the Senator from New Jersey in asking the Senate to establish now, by unanimous-consent agreement, that whatever the situation in that regard is, it shall not be prejudiced by following the course which the majority leader suggests? In substance, there would be preserved the right, by whatever form of words is appropriate, to bring debate to a close through vote by majority established under the Constitution, whether it be by motion for the previous question, motion that debate end, or whatever the form of words. I ask whether the situation in that regard would differ, when the matter comes back from the Senator's committee, from the present situation, when it is the first business of the Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I could not agree because I do not believe we have the authority to bind the Senate at a later date. The Senate in operation at that time, perhaps some months hence, will have to lay down its own rules.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator misunderstands my question, I believe. I am not asking that he bind Senators as to how they shall vote on a subject of that kind, either by reference to the Chair or by appeal from the ruling of a Presiding Officer.

What the Senator from New Jersey asks is that the Senator from Montana join me in asking the Senate by unanimous consent to agree that the situation in that regard shall not be different, insofar as the power of a majority to close debate is concerned, than it is if we consider the matter and conclude it now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I could not join with the Senator from New Jersey in that request, because I do not agree with the Vice President's advisory opinion. It is his own personal opinion. I do not believe it fits with the parliamentary facts, and on that basis I could not agree.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If the Senator from Montana will indulge me once more, I understand that the Senator from Montana disagrees with the ruling of the Vice President, and, of course, I believe the Vice President is correct.

But be that as it may, will not the Senator agree that whatever the correct situation is, we may consider the

question, when it comes back to us from the Senator's committee—if it goes to his committee—on the same basis and with no prejudice because of the fact of its having been sent there, as if we had considered the question and concluded it as the first business of this Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must admit, in all frankness, I do not quite know what the Senator is getting at, but if it would make him feel better, I would join with him and let the question be put to a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there cannot be any vote on that question.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If the Senator from Montana will indulge me further, this is not a question of a vote.

In order to protect the right of every Senator, I believe it would require a unanimous-consent agreement, and if such agreement is not forthcoming—and any single Senator may block the request—then the Senator from New Jersey is not prepared to follow the request of the majority leader. He believes that the business of the Senate—the President-elect's program, and all the rest—can be furthered better by concluding this issue now and by exercise of the power of the Senate to close debate after a reasonable debate is had before the business of inauguration occurs than by following the course the Senator recommends.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the Senator from New Jersey, for whom I have great respect and admiration, as I have for the Senator from New York, that he is entitled to his point of view, as are the 99 other Senators; and if at any time a single Senator, whether he be Democrat or Republican, does not express in the open the views which he honestly believes, I do not think he should be a Senator.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate that statement. Of course, everything we say is with the utmost respect for each other's point of view in this regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I take my seat may I say that the proposal is introduced by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is never pleasant to disagree with one's leader. It is particularly unpleasant in the present case. I feel compelled to do so, however.

I should like to begin by quoting the pledge which our party took last summer on this very issue, which has not been often mentioned in this debate, but of which we should be aware. I can certainly assure the Senators that the voters in the country are aware of this pledge. Let me read it. It is on page 47 of the Democratic platform.

In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

Members of the Senate, and particularly Members on this side of the aisle, let me call attention again to the fact that this pledge stated that action should be taken "at the beginning of the 87th Congress."

It is upon that platform that our national candidates campaigned. It was to that platform that our candidates for President and Vice President declared their support. It was upon the basis of that platform that hundreds of thousands and indeed millions of voters in the North and, yes, the West, supported our candidates. There were indeed some in the South who voted Democratic for that very reason.

It was upon that platform that many of us who ran for the Senate gave our pledge of allegiance, and received an overpowering majority from the voters. We Democrats, in my judgment, are also bound morally as well as by the mere letter of the platform to follow that declaration.

There is altogether too much of a tendency in these days to treat party platforms as something with which to bamboozle the voters, not as something to which we pledge our true support and allegiance.

The test is coming, at least for those of us on this side of the aisle, as to whether those were empty words or whether they were something which we meant.

If the motion of the majority leader is agreed to, in my judgment it will be a black day for the Senate, for the country, and for the leadership of the Democratic Party.

I wish to credit the Senator from Montana with full sincerity when he says that he feels the Senate rule should be changed, but he is saying, now is not the time to do so.

We have 10 days before the new President will be inaugurated. During that time we can find out whether the Senate is or is not in favor of a change in the rules so as to permit a majority to bring a measure to a vote. This is indeed the only period in the life of this Congress when by a majority vote we can pass upon this question.

Under the rulings of the Vice President, under the mandate of the Constitution, under the precedents of Jefferson's Manual, and under the precedents of the House and of the Senate, we can move the previous question. The previous question is not subject to debate and is decided by majority vote, and thus we can terminate debate upon the main issue and proceed directly to the issue of changing the rules.

We can do it during this preliminary period in the new Congress by majority vote, and we can only do it now. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, once the rules of the Senate in their totality are adopted either directly or implicity by acquiescence, then thereafter we can only limit debate by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting.

We know this, Mr. President. The overwhelming majority of the people in the country want a change in the Senate rules so that after full debate the majority may have the chance to vote. We also know that a small minority would deprive the people of that chance. A majority of the people want the change. Even a majority of the Senate wants it, although representation in the Senate is somewhat lopsided.

The point is that while we have a majority in favor of a change, we do not have two-thirds. We do not have two-thirds because when the question of civil rights is involved, our southern friends—and I do not question their sincerity—do not want to have the rules changed because they do not want to have the full implications of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution carried out by Congress. That is 22 votes right there.

A majority of the Senate want to do that, but not two-thirds. Some Senators from other regions will support the practice of the filibuster in order to help their friends from the South. We know that.

However, once we pass this point in the life of the Senate of a new Congress, then the two-thirds rule comes into effect, and it is goodby to effective civil rights legislation for this session. I think it is in fact goodby to civil rights legislation for the next 4 years. In the next Congress we may not be in the same position of being able to move the previous question that we are in during this interregnum before the new administration takes office.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator made the statement about the rules being——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know what the Senator has in mind. The Senator is a very able lawyer. The Senator from Illinois is not a lawyer. I say this is the one period during which we can move the previous question. In my judgment that motion can be upheld by a majority vote, and we can proceed to act upon the rules change which is now before us. But thereafter we will not have this right, because the Senate will not be proceeding under the constitutional authority to make its rules and under the rulings of the present Vice President, and consequently rule XXII in its present form will operate, and a two-thirds vote will be required.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If I understand the Senator from Illinois correctly, I believe the situation to be this. He feels that at the present time we have a right to move the previous question and bring this matter to a vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Why has that not been done? What are we waiting for?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing and ready to move it or move to table Senator MANSFIELD's motion.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know why the Senator does not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may speak on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe we all understood the situation. At the same time we felt that a certain amount of debate was legitimate, required, and necessary. I believe all of us have been trying in our own conscience to determine at what point it would be fair and seemly to say there has been enough debate of these proposals and that we should now test the main point. I believe some of us felt that we were within a day or 12 hours or 2 days, but that we had not actually arrived at that point.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator believe we have reached the Rubicon?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us try to cross it, then.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is before us the motion of the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, that I believe we should vote on.

A vote in favor of it is a vote against the Democratic platform, because the Democratic platform stated that action should be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress. Those who drafted that plank in the platform knew what they were doing. They knew that if the matter were referred to a committee, the two-thirds rule would apply when it came back to the floor and that we could never get a two-thirds majority to vote for the necessary change. That is why they used the words, "at the beginning of the 87th Congress."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wonder if I might state the view of some of us on this side of the aisle by saying that a vote for the pending motion of the Senator from Montana is also a violation of the Republican platform, which substantially, if not in the same specific terms, provides for the same thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator from New Jersey say that. I did not want to interpret the Republican platform, because it is somewhat vaguer than ours.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Only as to the time. I believe that in some instances it is a little more specific.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator say he thinks it is a moral commitment for the Members of the Senate on his side of the aisle. It is certainly a moral commitment for those of us on this side of the aisle, although it is not a moral commitment for those who repudiated the platform. Those who repudiated the platform specifically on this point, in my judgment, are not bound by it. I believe in the right of the individual conscience to dissent, but this should be stated prior to the election, so that the voters may know for what they are voting. They should not be bamboozled.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to make it very clear indeed that not only what the Senator from Illinois has stated is true about our platform, but that those who vote to support the pending motion give up all possible hope of ever changing the cloture rule during the 87th Congress, if we do not do it now. Those who vote for the pending motion do so with the consciousness that we can never do it as long as this Congress exists.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In my judgment, we forgo action in the 88th Congress as well, for reasons which I shall not go into but which are fairly obvious.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think, in response to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who asked why the previous question had not yet been moved, it ought to be made crystal clear—and some of us discussed this matter by the way, last week—that had it been moved last week, some Senator would have said, "This is really applying the gag to the Senate; there simply was not any time, really, to state our respective positions."

Therefore, there was a reluctance to apply the previous question, if for no other reason than the time factor.

Also, the previous question opens up a new experience, at least within the past 150 years in the U.S. Senate, and there was some reluctance to apply the previous question on that basis.

So far as motions to table motions were concerned, it was rather difficult for those who favor majority rule in this body, such as is proposed in the resolution offered by a number of Senators, to move to table our own motion. Therefore, the motion before us—while I intend to vote against it—surely, at least, poses a decision for us to make.

I might add, since I am attempting to make the position on this question quite clear, that for those who want to see a change in the rules, in the light of our platform commitment, a vote for the motion would surely delay any such change in the rules, while a vote against it would at least fulfill our commitment to our platform requirements and platform promises. I have heard much talk about the platform. I have heard it said that we did not promise, in the platform, majority rule. That is quite obviously taken care of by the wording. It reads:

> We urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures, so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

In this instance, the majority leader's motion is a positive motion in the sense that it is not a motion to table. To have moved to table would have killed the proposal. If a motion to table were to carry, I would be less than honest if I did not say that on the majority rule proposition we do not have the votes which would be needed to carry it, although I think we would be considerably stronger than we were 2 years ago.

On the proposal for a three-fifths majority, it appears to me that the private declarations of a number of Senators indicate that there is strength for a proposal for the proposal of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

I have said previously, and publicly, that if the time factor on the three-fifths majority proposal was of serious consequence—in other words, three-fifths after a cloture provision was filed, and then waiting 2 days—waiting 5 days or 10 days was relatively unimportant. The main point was to arrive at a point for making a decision.

So, while I regret to see this situation develop as it has, I know that the majority leader's motion is, at least, one in which there is an affirmative statement of support for the proposition of a three-fifths majority. However, at least from my point of view, I do not believe we should indicate that we will get the prompt action from the Committee on Rules and Administration that we would get by taking up the motion at this particular time. The danger, which has been cited here, is the danger of carrying over beyond January 20. I might add that that danger could have been alleviated had some Senator moved to table; but, I repeat, no Senator on the side which favors the motions was willing to move to table and apparently the opposition felt that time was on their side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana, with the understanding that I will have the right to make a further statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I felt that a motion to refer these proposals to committee would still allow debate on the proposals, whereas a motion to table would have been a gag, and there would have been no opportunity for debate, because a motion to table is not debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the graciousness of the comment of the Senator from Minnesota in this matter, that this is not a motion to kill but rather a motion to discuss.

In effect, however, if the motion of the Senator from Montana to refer is agreed to—and I do not believe the debate on it should be prolonged—it is a motion to kill. We know perfectly well that if the resolution goes to the Committee on Rules and Administration and is reported back to the Senate, it will then be confronted on the floor with a filibuster, and we will be back in the old situation. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting will be needed to limit debate.

We all know, from our experience, that that two-thirds will not be forthcoming. Our southern friends, who feel very sincerely on this subject—I do not wish to question their sincerity—will oppose it. They have allies in border States. They have a number of crypto allies north of the Ohio River who will help them out. We will not get two-thirds, even though a vast majority of the people in the country want to move forward in the field of civil rights, and even though a majority of the Senate, I believe, want to move forward.

We can test all this now, however, by motions to table and motions of the previous question which will be decided by a majority vote. We should do it now, and this is the one period in which we can do this.

If the Senate agrees to the motion to refer, then the matter is dead for 2 years. In my judgment, it is dead for 4 years. I do not wish to elaborate on why I believe it is dead for 4 years. The facts are obvious. We will have no meaningful civil rights legislation.

Our platform not only pledges itself to a change in the rules at the beginning of this session; it pledges itself to an advance in the field of civil rights. We have hitherto kept the question of civil rights out of this discussion. We have discussed the matter in terms of parliamentary procedure. We have tended to lose sight of the substantive questions and issues behind this proceeding.

We all know that about 20 million Americans suffer under various forms of legal and social stigma. We in the North have our faults in this matter. But insofar as there is a lack of equality in the North, it is not due to statutes. It is due to the attitudes of human beings.

We believe that statutes, ordinances and governmental acts which are in violation of the 14th and 15th amendments should not prevail. Many of us believe very strongly in the basic principles behind the 14th and 15th amendments—the equality of all citizens under the law. We believe there should be no first-class citizens and no second-class citizens, but that all citizens should be on a plane of equality and be judged on their merits. That is the essence of the first sentence of the 14th amendment which states:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

There are many of us who believe very intensely in the last pledge of the 14th amendment that no person shall be deprived by any State of his right to the equal protection of the law.

We believe also in the 15th amendment, that no person shall be deprived of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

We should also remember that the 14th and 15th amendments both explicitly give to Congress the power to make those provisions effective by appropriate legislation. We have that power. We have almost never exercised it or exercised it effectively. Many of us want to exercise it in a salutary fashion, in no punitive fashion whatsoever, but so that America may move forward. However, we are stymied by a relative minority of the Senate and by a still smaller minority throughout the country.

I do not want to make too emotional a speech, but we are now engaged in a great struggle with communism throughout the world. The results of that struggle will, in large part, depend on what the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America decide. Their judgment of us will depend, in large part, upon what we do in the field of civil rights.

I know our friends from the South are patriotic. I had the privilege to serve in the military forces with units which were primarily southern in character. One could not ask for better comrades in arms, comrades more courageous or more patriotic. But we are helping here also to decide the future of this Nation.

If we kill the resolution by what seems to be a purely parliamentary procedure, if we send this resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, we shall be saying, "No civil rights legislation in the next 2 years, and probably not in the next 4 years."

It is not merely that we shall be dishonoring our platform, to which many of us are bound in honor. We shall be setting back the cause of human freedom, not only in this Nation, but throughout the world.

I close with just two lines which have come into my mind from a poem by Arthur Clough. About a century ago he wrote a poem which he called A Modern Decalog, in which he gave the Ten Commandments as they would have been phrased by a Victorian Pharisee. When he came to the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," he wrote:

> Thou shalt not kill, but needs not strive
> Officiously to keep alive.

If we send these resolutions to the Committee on Rules and Administration, we shall, in effect, be voting to kill them by not trying to keep them alive and not trying to adopt them. We will allow "King Filibuster" to defeat the basic desires of the American people for a further forward step in race relations and in the dignity of man.

It has not been easy for me to make this speech. But I ask the Members of the Senate to remember their pledges, to look at the situation in the world and then to consult their consciences before they vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he contemplates the taking of any action tonight and what is in his mind with respect to the possibility of taking a vote on the motion to commit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder whether it will now be possible to propound a unanimous-consent request, in the hope that we might vote on this proposal—on a majority-vote basis, I may say—on Friday?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether the majority leader actually has propounded such a request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was broaching the possibility. I will make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. President: That the proposal of the minority leader and myself be voted on at 4 o'clock, Friday afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. If this unanimous-consent request is agreed to, will, nonetheless, the right of any Senator, whatever that right may be, be preserved and not be prejudiced by such unanimous consent—in other words, the right of any Senator to move that debate on this motion be closed, under the Constitution, at any time, even before 4 o'clock on Friday, rather than under the rules of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Then let the Senator from Illinois proceed. But do I not have a right to object?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Pennsylvania is going to object, very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, he is objecting to my proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that if it is agreed that the vote be taken on Friday, at 4 p.m., that will preclude the taking of any vote before that time.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the granting of the unanimous-consent request constitute business within the terms of the advisory opinion of the Vice President, so that any Senator will be precluded from moving to close debate on any other motion now pending, namely, either the Anderson motion or the Kuchel-Humphrey motion, under the Constitution, rather than under the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair could not give a decision at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we could not hear the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair replied that he could not give a decision at this time, because he would like to make a further study of the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The distinguished majority leader says he wishes to postpone the vote to Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. I thought many Members wanted to speak, and I thought they should have that privilege.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, I shall be ready to vote on this matter tomorrow, so we may have more time prior to January 20; and it might even be that a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Montana would be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it would be in order; and in either way we would then face the issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly there is no disposition to delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending motion at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have heard these perfervid statements made in efforts to arouse emotion to such an extent as to influence the Senate to vote to destroy itself—efforts made by waving the banner of civil rights. But anyone who has served in the Senate knows that if it had been possible to use the rules of the Senate to defeat the civil

rights bill, there would not have been a Civil Rights Act of 1957 and there would not have been a Civil Rights Act of 1960.

This is only a strawman set up here in an attempt to deal with a question much broader than the question of civil rights.

I do not know that I want this sword of Damocles hanging over my head for the next 2 years, under the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Montana. So I will object to any request that the vote be taken tomorrow, in order to have an opportunity to consult with some of those who have been associated with me in trying to preserve the rules of the Senate.

It seems to me—to judge from what the Senator from Montana has said—that it is proposed that we proceed to kill this cat by cutting off its tail by degrees. But I wish to have an opportunity to discuss this question before we vote.

So I shall object to any request for the taking of any vote tomorrow, I wish to have full opportunity to consult with some of those who have been associated with me in the attempt to preserve the Senate as a deliberative body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a further suggestion to the majority leader: As he so well knows, and as the Senate knows, I have almost a congenital disinclination to have the Senate meet on Saturday unless that is absolutely necessary. Tomorrow is Wednesday; then comes Thursday; and then comes Friday. In the interest of giving ample time to all Senators, I think perhaps the discussions could be completed by Friday, and we could agree to vote on Monday. There will be Members who will be out of the city; some of our Members may be gone. Frankly, I should like to protect them.

I do not believe that for a period of 2 or 3 days, at least, this matter is one of such haste or urgency that we have to peg the vote on it for Thursday or for Friday. I like to be mindful of the convenience of all Members of the Senate, not only one or two of them.

So I respectfully suggest that matter to the attention of the majority leader, because then no Senator can quarrel on the basis of saying that he has been shut off and has not had an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to my friend that his distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], suggested the possibility of taking the vote tomorrow. It has also been proposed that the vote be taken on Thursday; and now we have a proposal that the vote be taken on next Monday. In this job one is in the middle, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is so true. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is quite obvious.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So, Mr. President, in an attempt to extricate ourselves from the middle in which we find ourselves, I will propound a unanimous-consent request; and if it is agreed to, I shall be the most surprised and the happiest Member on this floor. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the proposal now pending before the Senate be taken at 2 o'clock on next Friday.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, at this time I should like to propound the parliamentary inquiry which I propounded before—namely, will the granting of such unanimous consent change whatever rights the proponents of these motions have or whatever rights other Senators have to move to close debate under the Constitution, rather than under the rules of the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not believe that any rights of any individual Senator would be lost as a result of agreeing to the pending request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think that ruling requires some clarification.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course no right would be lost, anyway. But a Senator does not propound a parliamentary inquiry when he rises here, whenever a proposal is made, and asks whether any Senator will have lost any of his rights under the Constitution. A Senator cannot be denied any of his rights under the Constitution. So the inquiry is an idle one.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think the question which has been put to the Chair has now been answered in the affirmative; and therefore I should like to propound another parliamentary inquiry of the Chair: Will the unanimous-consent request, if agreed to, prevent or preclude the making, any sooner than 2 o'clock on Friday, of a motion to lay on the table the motion made by the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that no action could be taken in the meantime under the request of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, then I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished occupant of the chair clarify his ruling a little, because, I say in all deference, it was not quite responsive to the question raised by the Senator from New York. I should like to know specifically whether a motion to table would be in order at any time prior to 2 o'clock on Friday. I think that was the question of my esteemed colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. That was my question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has always been the precedent in the Senate that, if we agree to a unanimous-consent request, that cuts off anything except something else done by unanimous consent. That has always been so under the rulings of the Senate, heretofore, under the Constitution, and under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but I wanted the ruling to be responsive to the question. Obviously, if the Senate gives unanimous consent, that is the end of it. But the ruling was not responsive to the question raised.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I raise this point with the Senator?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we give unanimous consent to the request, it is the opinion of this Senator that no action can take place disposing of this particular motion until that hour arrives; but when the hour arrives, we may dispose of it in a number of ways. In other words, the toolkit making possible the end of this motion would be wide open. It could be by moving the previous question. It could be by strict majority vote on the issue itself. It could be by motion to table. It seems to me we could not lose or preclude Senators of our rights, once that hour arrived, to defeat the motion or to agree to the motion, whichever way the Senate decided.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it was quite clear that the motion to table, under the unanimous consent, would not be in order until 2 o'clock Friday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it would be in order at 2 o'clock Friday on this question or the previous question motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President. I cannot let that statement go unchallenged. I have not heard of any rule in the Senate that provides for any previous question. The motion to table in the Senate, as the previous question is used in the House, cuts off all debate. It slices it off then and there. It is a sudden-death motion in the Senate. So we have no motion in the Senate known as the previous question, and I do not propose to let any statement go unchallenged to the effect that there is a previous question rule in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recognize the Senator's view on this issue. Let me put it this way: The Vice President has given an advisory opinion to the effect that the previous question would be in order. I know that holding would be challenged by the Senator from Georgia, and there would have to be an appeal from the ruling of the Chair if that were done.

Mr. RUSSELL. He did not limit it to the previous question. He said any procedure. He left the door wide open for all Senators who advocate summary gag of the Senate to put forward any motion. He did not specify particularly the previous question. He said any other procedure. That was the Vice President talking; that was not a rule of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The request of the Senator from Montana does not preclude the Senate from having a wrangle to dispose of a motion when the hour arrives. In other words, we can proceed to work on this motion with whatever tools seem to be at hand, even though some of them may seem to be of a questionable character or questionable value according to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MUNDT. However, it does not take place until the conclusion of the time specified in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The pending question is the motion of the majority leader, in which I concur as a cosponsor, to commit these measures to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That is the pending business at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the first vote of the Senate would obviously recur on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which is a debatable motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the Senate agree to vote on the pending motion at 3 o'clock Friday next. We have split the difference between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am informed that some of our colleagues will not be here on Friday. This is a relatively important issue. Some of us believe it is supremely important. I wonder whether or not, and I have discussed this question with some of my colleagues, it would be in order to have it come up some time in the afternoon of Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The same difficulty in that respect holds here. If we cannot make it Thursday or Friday——

Mr. KUCHEL. Would Thursday be agreeable?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow or Friday. I do not think tomorrow would give Members of the Senate time enough. On Thursday there are complications on this side of the aisle. On Friday there are difficulties on that side. Saturday is the day next to the day of rest.

How about Monday at 2 o'clock?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we have to play games here. I think the issue is very clearly stated. I may state to the Senate my own view so we can understand what we can or cannot agree upon. If we are to agree to a very short time, 1 day or 2 days, I see no objection; but if we are to go beyond that, then we are depriving the Senate of the opportunity to end debate under the Constitution, and it is that question, as the Senator from Rhode Island has properly said, which could be decided tonight or tomorrow morning. If we delay beyond that, we are getting closer to the time when the Vice President, who has stated what his ruling would be on this question, will no longer be in the Chair. This is the perfectly frank situation we face. Hence, no one is going to seek to take advantage of anyone else. If the majority leader wants consent to end the debate at a time certain, when Members of the Senate can come in and vote, I see no objection; but I see grave objection to Mondays and Fridays, with the argument dragging on, and our getting beyond the time when we, and those who have the same interest in this question as I do, think the question should be decided. I would be constrained to object to any request that will allow the debate to continue for a period of days more than 2 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It looks as though it will be impossible to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement, because no matter what day is selected, some Senator has an engagement. I think I should serve notice that, regardless of the list of engagements Senators may have, their business is on the floor of the Senate. We would like them to get to the floor, and we would like them to give prior consideration to these important matters, and every Senator should participate in the proceedings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the observations of the distinguished Senator from New York, I have tried to protect a Senator who is absent this evening so there would be no voting. I am trying to protect a Senator who will be gone on Wednesday and Thursday. I am trying to protect a Senator who will be absent on Friday. I make no bones about it. If I think they are going to vote the right way, I am going to try to protect them all the more. It is just that simple.

When I made the suggestion that I thought we ought to vote on Monday, it was in the hope that the faithful who have seen the light, and have seen it properly, will be back here and be recorded when the clerk intones the roll.

This is "for keeps." I know that. I am not kidding myself about it.

I am not going to make any speech tonight. I am going to save a long-winded speech for later, when the Chamber is full of Members, because there are a lot of things I have to say. I am simply going to say this much, in a substantive vein: Out of the 26 years, I have been in the minority for 22. [Laughter.]

I have become a congenital "minorityite," I guess, and I think that way.

As I think back to House days and some of the things that unfolded—like the Bituminous Coal Act; Henry Wallace's Potato Act; the National Industrial Recovery Act, with the "blue eagle"; and the Agricultural Adjustment Act, under which we "plowed under" 15 million pigs—I am glad I was born before Henry Wallace's time. Since I am a member of a large family, I might have been plowed under after 1933 myself. [Laughter.]

I have seen these things unfold, and I like to have some weapons with which to fight, as a minority Member, as I look down the road. It is that simple.

I find great comfort in the fact that even on the other good side, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, one of the first things which the House Committee on Rules did in January 1935—26 years ago almost to the day—was to modify a rule. The chairman of the Committee on Rules was called in, and he presented a rule for modification.

What was it? Up to that time a House committee could be discharged and a bill could be brought to the floor with 145 signatures. When good old John O'Connor, of New York, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, finished, the number was pushed up to 218. What was the reason? It was to make sure that all sorts of mischievous legislation did not get through the House of Representatives. It was a protection. LISTER HILL knows it. He was there. JOHN MCCLELLAN knows it. He was there. Many Senators were Members of the House at that time.

So I think in terms of a minority Member and a desire to be protected; but, more than that, a desire to have a weapon with which to protect a minority position.

I am fluid in one sense. I am against the majority proposal. I was always against it. Then the fortuities of politics put me in difficulty. I cosponsored, with the distinguished former majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, the two-thirds rule which is on the books, and also the amendment of rule XXXII. Then I discovered, when all the faithful gathered together in Chicago—and I was not a member of the Resolutions Committee—in the platform which was written was a statement that there ought to be a modification of rule XXII. What kind of modification was not stated. I am against the majority provision. What shall I be in favor of, to be in conformity with the platform?

Frankly, I do not know. Perhaps we can work something out on the basis of three-fifths. Perhaps there are other things to be considered. That is the reason the proposal should go to the Rules and Administration Committee. It will not go back to the Rules and Administration Committee, because had it come from the committee we would be considering a motion to recommit instead of a motion to commit, which we are cosponsoring today.

I think we will best serve our own interests and we will best serve the interests of the new administration if we take a second look at this matter.

The pages of history are full of language and sentiment about rules, but now we are dealing with reality.

I should like to see the Senate "get off the hook." I do not care for the business of waking up in my office every 2 hours, when it sounds as if the Pennsylvania train is going through with a full head of steam, in a filibuster.

I say to every Senator present in the Chamber that the distinguished majority leader is a man of consummate honor. I have found him to be that, in my House experience. He will be the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He says to the Senate, "Let me take the measure to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I assure Senators that it will receive a hearing and it will come to the Senate, without the necessity for putting a time tag or a day certain upon the motion."

I have that much faith in him. I have unlimited faith in him. I believe he is as good as the words he utters on the floor,

and that the measure will be returned to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe, therefore, that we serve every good purpose best by following that advice, by sending the proposal to the committee. Then, in due course, we can let this bag of confusion return to the Senate, if it must.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield, but I wish to add one comment.

It was said by my colleague that we would be operating under Senate rules, which would be the death of this proposal, and this would be the coup d' grace.

I do not believe a word of it.

When in good faith the majority leader gives that assurance to the Senate, if for any reason those honorable efforts were to be obstructed I believe it would be like falling off a log to get two-thirds of the Senators to vote for cloture. I would sign a cloture petition, because I think that would be a breach of faith, if, after reasonable debate and all of that honorable effort, we failed to come to grips with the issue which is involved.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator really believe that if the measure came to the Senate from the Committee on Rules and Administration, as I am sure it would, for I am sure every Member of this body shares the Senator's high regard for the majority leader—certainly I do—we could get 67 votes in favor of a cloture petition?

The Senator is not that naive, is he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has been written, "O ye of little faith." [Laughter.]

I have more faith than the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I am ready for the Senate to adjourn. We are not going to vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not think we should vote tonight, because there are some Members of the Senate who are unaware of what was going to occur. I think their rights should be protected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to vote tonight. I should like to have an opportunity to reflect on some of the threats which have been made this afternoon. We may determine to let this go on, or to undertake to deal with it now. We may feel it ought to be committed. I am not prepared to vote this afternoon. I should like to protect myself.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible at this time to move once again that the committee appointments referred to the Senate by the Democratic steering committee be taken up for approval.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, with deep regret I do object.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 11, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1960:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Edward C. Kenney, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Leonidas D. Coates, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

William E. Ellis	Charles K. Duncan
William S. Post, Jr.	John A. Tyree, Jr.
Harry Smith	Frederick L. Ashworth
John B. Colwell	George H. Miller
Bernard F. Roeder	Benedict J. Semmes, Jr.
Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.	
Charles T. Booth II	Bernard A. Clarey
Hazlett P. Weatherwax	William I. Martin
John L. Chew	Samuel B. Frankel
John W. Gannon	William T. Nelson
Forsyth Massey	Edward A. Wright
John S. McCain, Jr.	Edwin B. Hooper
Louis J. Kirn	Henry A. Renken
Ralph C. Johnson	Morris A. Hirsch

MEDICAL CORPS

Cecil D. Riggs
Langdon C. Newman

SUPPLY CORPS

Herschel J. Goldberg

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Joseph F. Dreith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William C. G. Church

DENTAL CORPS

Eric G. F. Pollard

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

LINE

Leonard S. Bailey	William C. Hughes
Robert H. Barnum	Thomas J. Killian
Harry R. Canady	Eric C. Lambart
Ralph G. Coburn, Jr.	William M. McCloy
Robert W. Copeland	Leslie L. Reid
James D. Hardy	Carl E. Watson
Harry H. Hess	

MEDICAL CORPS

Paul W. Greeley	Raymond T. Holden
Donald E. Hale	Hugh Warren

SUPPLY CORPS

Edward J. Costello, Jr.
Edgar H. Reeder
Harold W. Torgerson

DENTAL CORPS

Alton K. Fisher	Samuel S. Wald

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

SUPPLY CORPS

Levi J. Roberts

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

August Larson	Frederick L. Wieseman
Richard C. Mangrum	Victor H. Krulak

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Henry W. Buse, Jr.	William J. Van Ryzin
Herman Nickerson, Jr.	Raymond L. Murray

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Walter A. Churchill

Vice Adm. Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr., U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Lt. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, O18143, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Lt. Col. Alfred Frederick Ahner, O2018089, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army to the grade of brigadier general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Joseph H. Atkinson, 90A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of sections 8351 and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Joe C. Moffitt, AO419945, Colorado Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. DuBois, Jr., AO429378, Missouri Air National Guard.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Leslie C. Smith, AO661245, California Air National Guard.

Col. Emmanuel Schifani, AO663100, New Mexico Air National Guard.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Col. Edward G. Johnson, AO421750, Oklahoma Air National Guard.
Col. Enoch B. Stephenson, Jr., AO727573, Tennessee Air National Guard.
Col. Frank W. Frost, AO395495, Washington Air National Guard.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:
Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon.
Samuel D. Boykin, of Maryland.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Ernest H. Fisk, of Ohio.
Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Richard B. Freund, of Illinois.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of Maryland.
Allen B. Moreland, of Florida.
R. Smith Simpson, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:
R. Austin Acly, of Massachusetts.
Robert W. Barnett, of New York.
William L. Blue, of Tennessee.
Edward A. Bolster, of Virginia.
Clarence Boonstra, of Louisiana.
Henry Brodie, of Virginia.
Turner C. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of Washington.
Raymond F. Courtney, of Delaware.
Robert C. Creel, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Crockett, of Nebraska.
Robert B. Elwood, of Iowa.
Russell Fessenden, of Virginia.
William M. Gibson, of New York.
John J. Haggerty, of Montana.
Joseph S. Henderson, of Virginia.
Fisher Howe, of Illinois.
Henry A. Hoyt, of Pennsylvania.
James R. Johnstone, of New Jersey.
Geoffrey W. Lewis, of Virginia.
Francis A. Linville, of Maryland.
Charles H. Mace, of Ohio.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska.
Alfred Puhan, of Wisconsin.
Jacques J. Reinstein, of Georgia.
John C. Shillock, Jr., of Oregon.
Frank G. Siscoe, of New Jersey.
H. Gerald Smith, of Virginia.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
Roswell H. Whitman, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph J. Wolf, of Maryland.
Joseph A. Yager, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:
Morton Bach, of Minnesota.
Sverre M. Backe, of California.
Howard P. Backus, of Ohio.
Douglass K. Ballentine, of Texas.
Joseph T. Bartos, of Colorado.
Douglas N. Batson, of Mississippi.
Robert S. Black, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Virginia.
Lewis D. Brown, of New York.
Philip M. Burnett, of Maryland.
Gerald S. Bushnell, of New York.
Kenneth W. Calloway, of Illinois.
Robert J. Cavanaugh, of Illinois.
Antonio Certosimo, of California.
Joseph J. Chappell, of Georgia.
Keld Christensen, of Iowa.
William H. Christensen, of Ohio.
Clement E. Conger, of Virginia.
John J. Conroy, of Maryland.
William B. Coolidge, of California.
Merritt N. Cootes, of Oregon.
Peter H. Delaney, of Maryland.
Edward P. Dobyns, of Maryland.
Joseph L. Dougherty, of Iowa.
Millan L. Egert, of Maine.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado.
John T. Fishburn, of Maryland.
John I. Fishburne, of South Carolina.
John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
Richard Friedman, of the District of Columbia.
John C. Fuess, of Massachusetts.
Alton L. Gillikin, of Virginia.
James R. Gustin, of the District of Columbia.
Henry S. Hammond, of Pennsylvania.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
Herbert N. Higgins, of Texas.
Harald W. Jacobson, of Illinois.
Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland.
Miss Carol C. Laise, of West Virginia.
R. Clyde Larkin, of Maryland.
Harrison Lewis, of California.
J. David Linebaugh, of the District of Columbia.
Edward S. Little, of Ohio.
Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
Scott Lyon, of Ohio.
Donald S. Macdonald, of Massachusetts.
Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.
Oliver M. Marcy, of Massachusetts.
William K. Miller, of Illinois.
John Howard Moore, of Illinois.
Louis C. Nolan, of Florida.
David L. Osborn, of Tennessee.
Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.
Henry Clinton Reed, of Ohio.
James W. Pratt, of California.
Maurice S. Rice, of Kansas.
Eddie W. Schodt, of Virginia.
John F. Shaw, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph John Sisco, of Maryland.
Garrett H. Soulen, of Texas.
Henry W. Spielman, of Oklahoma.
Anthony Clinton Swezey, of New Jersey.
George A. Tesoro, of Maryland.
Malcolm Toon, of Massachusetts.
Jay A. Van Swearingen, of Ohio.
D. Merle Walker, of Kansas.
Livingston D. Watrous, of Massachusetts.
William L. S. Williams, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:
Charles C. Adams, of New York.
Hugh M. Adamson, of Ohio.
Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
Rudolf O. Altroggen, of Virginia.
Clifford O. Barker, of Illinois.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr., of Minnesota.
William E. Beauchamp, of New York.
H. Reid Bird, of Utah.
Archer K. Blood, of Virginia.
Charles Bridgett, of Connecticut.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
Bryant Buckingham, of Illinois.
Christian G. Chapman, of New York.
Robert A. Clark, Jr., of Oregon.
Charles T. Cross, of Virginia.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey.
Jonathan Dean, of New York.
Jefferson Dix, Jr., of Maryland.
Adolph Dubs, of Illinois.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New Jersey.
Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of California.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Arthur D. Foley, of Michigan.
Norman W. Getsinger, of Michigan.
John I. Getz, of Illinois.
Culver E. Gidden, of Texas.
Walker Givan, of the District of Columbia.
Culver Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Godfrey, of Nevada.
John G. Gossett, of Oklahoma.
Harry Grossman, of California.
Arnlioth G. Heltberg, of California.
Thomas F. Hoctor, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
John H. Holdridge, of California.
Edward W. Holmes, of Washington.
John M. Howison, of Texas.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
William B. Hussey, of California.
John J. Ingersoll, of Illinois.
H. Franklin Irwin, Jr., of New Jersey.
Mrs. Mary S. Johnston, of Massachusetts.
Paul M. Kattenburg, of Michigan.
Emery R. Kiraly, of Maryland.
Andor Klay, of Ohio.
Oris F. Kolb, of Virginia.
John L. Kuhn, of California.
Frank R. LaMacchia, of Maryland.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Edward W. Lawrence, of Virginia.
Seymour Levenson, of California.
Ralph K. Lewis, of California.
Robert S. Lindquist, of Michigan.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Walter J. Marx, of Washington.
Karl F. Mautner, of Pennsylvania.
R. Glynn Mays, Jr., of Maryland.
Neil C. McManus, of New Jersey.
John S. Meadows, of Massachusetts.
Daniel W. Montenegro, of New York.
Roland F. Moores, of Ohio.
Saul Moskowitz, of New York.
Robert C. Mudd, of Virginia.
Joseph W. Neubert, of Washington.
Christopher A. Norred, Jr., of Maryland.
John L. Ohmans, of Maryland.
Lynn H. Olson, of Minnesota.
Richard B. Parker, of Virginia.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
Chris G. Petrow, of Massachusetts.
Harry M. Phelan, Jr., of Tennessee.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.
Henry W. Prentice, of Minnesota.
Edward P. Prince, of New Hampshire.
Lewis M. Purnell, of Delaware.
Hugh C. Reichard, of California.
Peter Roberts, of California.
William A. Root, of Maryland.
William H. Rusch, of Virginia.
Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
Peter A. Seip, of Iowa.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.
William B. Snidow, of Virginia.
William B. Sowash, of Ohio.
Thomas C. Stave, of Washington.
DeWitt L. Stora, of California.
Kingdon W. Swayne, of Pennsylvania.
Henry L. Taylor, of Washington.
W. Davidson Tenney, of Maryland.
Herbert B. Thompson, of California.
Joseph B. Tisinger III, of Maryland.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
Orson W. Trueworthy, of Virginia.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Robert W. Wagner, of Michigan.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Alfred W. Wells, of New York.
Rollie H. White, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Elbert R. Williams, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.
Carroll H. Woods, of Massachusetts.
Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.
Frederick S. York, of New Jersey.
Robert L. Yost, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:
Karl D. Ackerman, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur P. Allen, of California.
Henry W. Allen, of Virginia.
Robert N. Allen, of Oklahoma.
Henry T. Andersen, of Connecticut.
Robert F. Andrew, of California.
John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
Malcolm R. Barnebey, of Texas.
Raymond J. Barrett, of New York.
George A. Berkley, of Pennsylvania.
Jules E. Bernard, of New York.
Charles K. Bevilacqua, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Helen Biggane, of California.
John A. Billings, of Missouri.
Melville E. Blake, Jr., of California.
Richard J. Bloomfield, of Connecticut.
Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
C. Arthur Borg, of New York.
Tobias J. Boyd, of Pennsylvania.
William G. Bradford, of Illinois.
William R. Brown, of Ohio.
Harrison W. Burgess, of Virginia.
Frank N. Burnet, of Alabama.

Robert L. Burns, of the District of Columbia.
Robert T. Burns, of Indiana.
Charles T. Butler, Jr., of Indiana.
Pratt Byrd, of Kentucky.
James L. Carson, of Oregon.
Maxwell Chaplin, of California.
Elwyn F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Ann Child, of California.
Arnold K. Childs, of Ohio.
Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
John S. Connolly, Jr., of Virginia.
Eiler R. Cook, of Florida.
Philip R. Cook, Jr., of Virginia.
John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
William J. Cunningham, of Connecticut.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
John M. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Walker A. Diamanti, of Utah.
Thomas I. Dickson, Jr., of Texas.
William B. Dozier, of South Carolina.
John T. Dreyfuss, of California.
Chester G. Dunham, of Ohio.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
William B. Edmondson, of Nebraska.
Xavier W. Eilers, of Minnesota.
Hunter L. Estep, of New Mexico.
Miss Barbara C. Fagan, of New York.
Thomas W. Fina, of Florida.
Gordon R. Firth, of New York.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Robert T. Follestad, of California.
Fred J. Galanto, of Massachusetts.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Charles A. Gendreau, of Minnesota.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
Ernest S. Guaderrama, of California.
Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.
Pierson M. Hall, of Illinois.
Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.
Robert W. Harding, of Florida.
William A. Hayne, of California.
Russell C. Heater, of California.
Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Robert T. Hennemeyer, of Illinois.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
John W. Jelich, of New York.
Kempton B. Jenkins, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert Kaiser, of Maryland.
John Edward Karkashian, of California.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
Andrew I. Kiligore, of Alabama.
Edward L. Killham, of Illinois.
Richard N. Kirby, of Ohio.
Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Kenneth W. Knauf, of Wisconsin.
John F. Knowles, of New Jersey.
Paul H. Kreisberg, of New York.
Elmer G. Kryza, of Michigan.
John C. Leary, of Massachusetts.
Eric G. Lindahl, of Michigan.
John A. Linehan, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Alan W. Lukens, of Pennsylvania.
John G. MacCracken, of Virginia.
Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
S. Douglas Martin, of New York.
Charles W. McCaskill, of Virginia.
Nicholas V. McCausland, of California.
Edward S. McClary, of California.
Miss Margaret J. McClellan, of Pennsylvania.
Harry R. Melone, Jr., of New York.
Dudley W. Miller, of Colorado.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Robert L. Mott, of California.
Miss Alice G. Mulhern, of Massachusetts.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Donald R. Norland, of Iowa.
Anton N. Nyerges, of Indiana.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
Richard B. Owen, of Michigan.
Neil L. Parks, of Maryland.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Virgil E. Prichard, of Oklahoma.
Jess F. Reed, of Washington.
James F. Relph, Jr., of California.
Miss Martha Jean Richardson, of Illinois.
Ralph W. Richardson, of California.
Regulo Rivera, of California.
Lucian L. Rocke, Jr., of Florida.
Robert H. Rose, of Utah.
James T. Rush, of Rhode Island.
Benjamin J. Ruyle, of Washington.
William F. Ryan, of Texas.
William E. Schaufele, Jr., of Ohio.
Richard R. Selby, Jr., of Ohio.
Herman T. Skofield, of New Hampshire.
Robert F. Slutz, Jr., of Ohio.
Miss Jean V. Smith, of Minnesota.
Richard G. Smith, of Florida.
Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
Fred A. Somerford, of Florida.
Miss Cecil Sporn, of New York.
Joseph F. Starkey, of Washington.
Lawrence L. Starlight, of New York.
Francis R. Starrs, Jr., of California.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.
Jean R. Tartter, of Massachusetts.
Charles William Thomas, of Illinois.
William W. Thomas, Jr., of North Carolina.
Miss Corabelle Tolin, of Kansas.
Charles P. Torrey, of California.
Rene A. Tron, of New York.
Philip F. Vandivier, of Indiana.
Mrs. Marjory M. Wallis, of California.
Robert B. Warner, of Michigan.
John T. Wheelock, of Illinois.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.
Lewis M. White, of Virginia.
Miss Bernadine Whitfield, of Oregon.
Miss Helen B. Wilson, of California.
Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.
Amos Yoder, of Nebraska.
Robert D. Yoder, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Jane B. Young, of the District of Columbia.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Edgar F. Garwood, Jr., of Florida.
John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.
Warren L. Swope, of Illinois.
E. Paul Taylor, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Robert B. Allen, of Virginia.
Mrs. Sara L. Andren, of Michigan.
Robert S. Ashford, of Virginia.
Paul L. Aylward, Jr., of Kansas.
Marion Augustus Baldwin, of Colorado.
Miss Dorothy M. Barker, of Louisiana.
Brady G. Barr, of the District of Columbia.
Craig Baxter, of Ohio.
George E. Belcher, of Michigan.
James O. Belden, of New York.
S. Morey Bell, of the District of Columbia.
John T. Bennett, of California.
Roger N. Benson, of New Jersey.
Miss Evelyn Blue, of New York.
Robert B. Borin, of Nebraska.
Donald W. Born, of Massachusetts.
A. Dane Bowen, Jr., of Texas.
Marshall Brement, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur H. Brunetti, of California.
Edward W. M. Bryant, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Roberta B. Bullock, of Texas.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Paul F. Canney, of Massachusetts.
Joseph D. Capri, of California.
Miss Mary T. Chiavarini, of Connecticut.
Miss Hulda Christiansen, of California.
Herman J. Cohen, of New York.
Mrs. Betty Ann Craig, of Illinois.
C. Edward Dillery, of Washington.
Harold T. Ellis, of California.
Leo Espy, of Oregon.
Harvey J. Feldman, of Illinois.
Donald C. Ferguson, of California.
Andrew J. Fink III, of California.
Robert H. Flenner, of Pennsylvania.
G. Ryder Forbes, of Virginia.
Richard D. Forster, of Colorado.
Mark J. Garrison, of Indiana.
Wever Gim, of Utah.
Charles W. Grover, of New York.
Harold E. Grover, Jr., of Florida.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
John J. Harter, of California.
James D. Hataway, Jr., of Georgia.
Mrs. Aasta B. Haugen, of California.
Roy T. Haverkamp, of Missouri.
Erland H. Heginbotham, of California.
Donald E. Herdeck, of Pennsylvania.
N. Hunt Heubeck, of Florida.
Lambert Heyniger, of New York.
George Borman High, of Illinois.
Wilbur W. Hitchcock, of New Jersey.
George R. Irminger, of Missouri.
Ralph T. Jans, of Michigan.
Chadwick Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Helen E. Kavan, of Ohio.
Robert W. Kent, Jr., of California.
William C. Kinsey, of Virginia.
William E. Knepper, of Kansas.
Charles J. Konya, of Pennsylvania.
Dennis H. Kux, of New York.
Albert A. Lakeland, Jr., of New York.
Loren E. Lawrence, of California.
Samuel Lee, of Hawaii.
John Donnelly Leonard, of Michigan.
Louis J. Link, of Kansas.
Jay H. Long, of California.
David S. Lusby, of Arizona.
James W. Mahoney, of Indiana.
Herbert S. Malin, of Florida.
Alexander C. Mancheski, of Wisconsin.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
J. Thomas McAndrew, of New York.
Stuart H. McIntyre, of Oregon.
Miss Mary E. Mellette, of South Carolina.
John E. Merriam, of California.
Miss Roberta L. Meyerkort, of Mississippi.
John J. Mullin, of California.
Robert H. Munn, of California.
Miss Marian L. Nash, of Louisiana.
James C. Nelson, of Illinois.
William C. Nenno, of New York.
A. Gregory Nowakoski, Jr., of New Jersey.
Mrs. Louise deCourcy O'Grady, of Florida.
Gerald R. Olsen, of Michigan.
Miss Maxine Phillips, of Kansas.
Bernard F. Piatek, of Illinois.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Ohio.
Virgil P. Randolph III, of Virginia.
David R. Raynolds, of Connecticut.
Robert F. Rogers, of California.
Stephen H. Rogers, of New York.
Richard Rueda, Jr., of New Jersey.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
Howard B. Schaffer, of New York.
Frank E. Schmelzer, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Theodore Sellin, of Pennsylvania.
George B. Sherry, of Maryland.
William N. Simonson, of Virginia.
Jackson L. Smith, of Florida.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur M. Stillman, of Illinois.
Edward J. Streator, Jr., of New York.
John Sylvester, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
David B. Timmins, of Utah.
John D. Tinny, of Florida.
Lewis R. Townsend, of New Jersey.
Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
James R. Wachob, of Oregon.
Jacob Walkin, of New York.
Edward T. Walters, of Texas.
Peter F. Warker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George J. Warren, of Florida.
Henry C. Wechsler, of New York.
Miss Anita R. Wharton, of Florida.
Robert E. White, of Massachusetts.
John E. Williams, of North Carolina.
Samuel G. Wise, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Philip M. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Dexter Anderson, of New Jersey.
George A. Anderson, of Iowa.
Diego C. Asencio, of New Jersey.
Bryan H. Baas, of Texas.
Richard P. Ballor, of Delaware.
Arthur C. Bauman, of Michigan.

Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
Gordon R. Beyer, of Florida.
Robert O. Blucker, of Arkansas.
Howard I. Blutstein, of New Jersey.
Michael P. Boerner, of Maryland.
Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Peter S. Bridges, of Illinois.
James E. Briggs, of North Carolina.
William A. Brown, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Lorraine P. Bruun, of Illinois.
John R. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Maurice C. Burke, of Massachusetts.
Miss Martha C. Carbone, of Washington.
Miss Marie E. Casey, of Florida.
Vincent J. Cherry, of New York.
J. Chapman Chester, of Wisconsin.
Raymond C. Collins, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert D. Collins, of California.
Peter D. Constable, of New York.
Thomas E. Cummings, of the District of Columbia.
John M. Curry, of New York.
Walter L. Cutler, of Maine.
Curtis C. Cutter, of California.
William P. Deary, of New York.
Francis De Tarr, of California.
John M. DuPont, of Maine.
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, of Wisconsin.
Rudy V. Fimbres, of Arizona.
Bruce A. Flatin, of Minnesota.
Robert S. Gershenson, of Pennsylvania.
William L. Givens, of Tennessee.
Leopold Gotzlinger, of Ohio.
Benson Lee Grayson, of New Jersey.
Marion L. Gribble, of New York.
Thomas Gustafson, of Oklahoma.
John T. Haldane, of the District of Columbia.
Charles H. Hallock, of Virginia.
Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
John J. Helble, of Illinois.
Gerald B. Helman, of Michigan.
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler, of New York.
Marvin J. Hoffenberg, of Maryland.
Harold E. Horan, of Texas.
Herbert Eugene Horowitz, of New York.
James D. Johnston, of California.
Miss C. Patricia Junk, of Ohio.
William P. Keasbey, Jr., of California.
Lowell C. Kilday, of Wisconsin.
Barrington King, Jr., of South Carolina.
George L. Kinter, of Vermont.
John W. Kizler, of Texas.
David Korn, of Missouri.
Gerald Lamberty, of Wisconsin.
George M. Lane, of Massachusetts.
Nelson C. Ledsky, of Ohio.
Shepard C. Lowman, of Texas.
Arthur L. Lowrie, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Luers, of Illinois.
Miss Loreice E. Lutfy, of Michigan.
Mrs. Marcia L. Martin, of California.
Richard C. Matheron, of California.
Frank A. Mau, of Wyoming.
Mrs. Wilma E. Mayo, of Florida.
Vernon D. McAninch, of Texas.
Sherrod B. McCall, of Illinois.
Miss Carmen McKee, of Washington.
Carl H. McMillan, Jr., of Maryland.
Francis J. McNeil III, of Florida.
Henry R. Mills, of Kansas.
William H. Mills, of California.
Richard M. Moose, of Arkansas.
Donald R. Morris, of New York.
Miss Dorothy H. Myers, of Maryland.
Theodore C. Nelson, of Connecticut.
Russell E. Olson, of Illinois.
Theodore K. Osgood, of Massachusetts.
Douglas R. Perry, of Maryland.
J. William Piez, of Colorado.
Mrs. Ann Pomroy, of Illinois.
Miss Jane M. Potter, of Maryland.
Miss Georgiana M. Prince, of Illinois.
Roger A. Provencher, of Colorado.
Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia.
Robert G. Rich, Jr., of Florida.
Paul Roman, of California.
J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen E. Schneider, of Illinois.
Peter Sebastian, of New York.
Walter John Silva, of Massachusetts.
Donnell D. Smith, of Illinois.
R. Peter Spicer, of Ohio.
Michael Sterner, of New York.
Ulrich A. Straus, of Michigan.
Miss Constance V. Stuck, of Arkansas.
John Susko, of Pennsylvania.
Herbert D. Swett, of California.
Eugene S. Szopa, of Maine.
Thurston F. Teele, of Massachusetts.
Harry E. T. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Martha E. Turnbull, of Ohio.
Robert E. Waska, of Texas.
Harry Weiner, of New York.
Miss Winifred S. Weislogel, of New Jersey.
Miss Virginia A. Weyres, of Wisconsin.
James W. White, of Florida.
Kenneth D. Whitehead, of Utah.
William M. Woessner, of New Jersey.
Sidney L. Woollons, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Donald M. Anderson, of Louisiana.
Roy J. Apel, of California.
Stanley Baldinger, of Minnesota.
Michael S. Bank, of New York.
William H. Bartsch, of the District of Columbia.
Jerry P. Baugh, of Pennsylvania.
William F. Beachner, of Washington.
Paul J. Bennett, of Iowa.
Edward C. Bittner, of Pennsylvania.
Robert R. Blackburn, Jr., of California.
Felix S. Bloch, of New York.
Jay H. Blowers, of Florida.
Archie M. Bolster, of Virginia.
Miss Alix S. Bouldin, of California.
Charles W. Bray III, of Texas.
M. Lyall Breckon, of Oregon.
William E. Breidenbach, of New York.
Miss Lucy Therina Briggs, of Maine.
Jere Broh-Kahn, of Ohio.
Frederick Z. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Kathleen C. Bruguiere, of California.
Pierce K. Bullen, of Florida.
David W. Burgoon, Jr., of Illinois.
John A. Cantwell, of New York.
Clive Chandler, of Washington.
David P. Chandler, of New York.
George E. Chewning, of Virginia.
Walter S. Clarke, of Maryland.
Paul M. Cleveland, of Virginia.
William M. Clevenger, of New Jersey.
Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California.
John James de Martino, of the District of Columbia.
Albert N. DeMott, of New York.
Frazier Draper, of Florida.
James A. Duran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
James M. Ealum, of Oklahoma.
Craig R. Eisendrath, of Illinois.
Thomas O. Enders, of Connecticut.
James P. Farber, of Florida.
Miss Dagmar Frahme, of Ohio.
Albert A. Francis, of the District of Columbia.
Sidney Friedland, of Wisconsin.
Rogelio Garcia, of New York.
Jay R. Grahame, of Virginia.
Terry G. Grant, of Illinois.
Terrence T. Grindall, of California.
Howard R. Gross, of Virginia.
Brandon H. Grove, Jr., of New Jersey.
Frank J. Haendler, of Illinois.
Miss Thurza Maureen Harris, of Kansas.
Samuel F. Hart, of Mississippi.
John P. Heimann, of Illinois.
Sean M. Holly, of New York.
Henry A. Holmes, of Kansas.
Arnold M. Isaacs, of Illinois.
Andrew R. Kay, Jr., of New York.
Samuel C. Keiter, of New York.
Dalton V. Killion, of California.
Richard N. Kilpatrick, of South Carolina.
Miss Carolyn E. Kingsley, of Nebraska.
Gilbert H. Kinney, of the District of Columbia.
Donald Kreisberg, of New York.
Norbert J. Krieg, of Maryland.
Perry W. Linder, of California.
Joseph P. Lorenz, of New York.
Edmund D. Lyons, of Illinois.
Hugh Cooke MacDougall, of New York.
Gifford D. Malone, of New York.
William H. Mansfield III, of Connecticut.
Edward Marks, of California.
Douglas G. Marshall, of California.
William W. McGrew, of New York.
James A. McNamara, of California.
W. Graham Metson, Jr., of California.
Donald F. Meyers, of Wisconsin.
Frank Micelotta, of New York.
Hawthorne Q. Mills, of California.
James M. Montgomery, of New Jersey.
John H. Moore, of Tennessee.
Tom R. Moore, of Tennessee.
Alvis Craig Murphy, of Ohio.
George Clay Nettles, of Alabama.
Minot B. Nettleton, of New Jersey.
Allen G. Noble, of New York.
Daniel A. O'Donohue, of Michigan.
George W. Ogg, of New Jersey.
John R. Oleson, of Wisconsin.
Edward L. Peck, of California.
Nicholas Platt, of Virginia.
James I. Powers, of Idaho.
Kenneth W. Preston, of New York.
William H. Price, of Florida.
Charles T. Prindeville, Jr., of Illinois.
Datus Proper, of Pennsylvania.
William T. Pryce, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick S. Quin, of New York.
Robert I. Randolph, of California.
Donald E. Rau, of Wisconsin.
Frank M. Ravndal, of the District of Columbia.
John D. Rendahl, of Minnesota.
Thomas J. Riegert, of Ohio.
Gerald A. Rosen, of New York.
James Sartorius, of Kansas.
David G. Shaw, of New York.
Gilbert H. Sheinbaum, of New York.
James M. Shoemaker, Jr., of Virginia.
Henry Sears Sizer, of New York.
Richard J. Slott, of Indiana.
Robert W. Smith, of Missouri.
John D. Spangler, of Tennessee.
Craig M. Stark, of California.
John W. Stephens, of Texas.
Robert S. Steven, Jr., of Rhode Island.
James Stromayer, of Illinois.
Miss Aleta D. Styers, of Indiana.
James P. Sullivan, of Pennsylvania.
Louis A. Tananbaum, of Colorado.
John B. Tipton, of Illinois.
James L. Tull, of Iowa.
Charles W. Walker, of California.
Jerome V. Wattel, of New York.
Leonard B. Weddle, of Indiana.
Mrs. Melissa F. Wells, of California.
Walter G. West, of Colorado.
Robert D. Westfall, of California.
Marshall W. Wiley, of Illinois.
Larry C. Williamson, of California.
Robert T. Willner, of Connecticut.
Thomas F. Wilson, of Michigan.
Michael van Breda Yohn, of Connecticut.

Franklin Hawley, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Herbert V. Olds, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Toshio G. Tsukahira, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

David H. Cohn, of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Ralph H. Cadeaux, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 7, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8,

vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Kenneth P. Allen, of Texas.
Andrew F. Antippas, of Massachusetts.
William D. Boggs, of West Virginia.
Richard Thomas Booth, of Michigan.
Francis R. Campbell, of Minnesota.
Louis N. Cavanaugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
James Ford Cooper, of Michigan.
Harold H. Dorland, of Minnesota.
William F. Eaton, of Maryland.
Wayne G. Granquist, of Massachusetts.
Paul J. Hare, of the District of Columbia.
Donald F. Hart, of Massachusetts.
Ernest H. S. Holm, of Massachusetts.
George Merwin Humphrey, of Pennsylvania.
George Lockwood Kelly, of Georgia.
William F. Kingsbury, of New Jersey.
William H. Marsh, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Katherine I. Ronald, of New York.
Robert J. Ryan, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Irving L. Sanders, of Washington.
Larry W. Semakis, of New York.
A. Louis Sheitelman, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Peggy Stewart, of Tennessee.
John H. Wilde, of Massachusetts.

Michael Marchese, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Nelson H. Brickham, Jr., of Virginia.
William W. Copeland, of Missouri.
Donald F. Ewing, of New Hampshire.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William P. Hughes, of Maryland.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Henry Dearborn, of New Hampshire.
Richard B. Freund, of Illinois.
Paul L. Guest, of California.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
John Miles, of Illinois.
Paul B. Taylor, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Howard L. Parsons, of Iowa.
Maurice F. W. Taylor, of California.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

J. Lawrence Barnard, of the District of Columbia.
Kennedy M. Crockett, of Texas.
William R. Duggan, of Colorado.
Adolf B. Horn, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Herbert Reiner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Cyril L. F. Thiel, of Illinois.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. King, of Maryland.
Sumner C. Reed, of Texas.
L. Edward Shuck, Jr., of Hawaii.
Guy A. Wiggins, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Victor H. Dikeos, of California.
Howard H. Palmatier, of Florida.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America:

John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Arthur H. Brunetti, of California.
Gerard J. Levesque, of Massachusetts.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Julio Javier Arias, of Arizona.
James N. Leaken, of California.
Lionel B. Miller, of Massachusetts.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Merle E. Arp, of Iowa.
Charles H. Barr, of Washington.
James K. Bishop, Jr., of New York.
Alfred P. Brainard, of Washington.
Gordon S. Brown, of California.
Thomas J. Burke, of New York.
Moises L. Cantolla, of California.
Charles W. Carey, of California.
James H. Cheatham, of Tennessee.
Harry E. Christie, of Maryland.
Thomas C. Colwell, of California.
Miss Mary Glasgow Curtis, of Missouri.
Alfred Forman Daiboch, of New Jersey.
Rolfe B. Daniels, of California.
John W. DeWitt, of Pennsylvania.
David H. Dinwoodie, of Colorado.
Felix Dorough, of Alabama.
William H. Edgar, of the District of Columbia.
Adolph H. Eisner, of Florida.
Carroll L. Floyd, of California.
Robert M. Fouché, of South Carolina.
Miss Martha C. Frautschi, of Wisconsin.
Robert H. Frowick, of Connecticut.
Paul John Glasoe, of New York.
Miss Mina Shayne Goldman, of New York.
Richard Harding, of Virginia.
Robert Y. Hayashida, of Hawaii.
Jean J. Hediger, of New Jersey.
Peter T. Higgins, of California.
Miss Audelia V. High, of Illinois.
Richard Hines, of New York.
Miss Jane D. Hoffman, of Maryland.
Richard C. Howland, of New York.
L. Richard Jackson, of Missouri.
Curtis W. Kamman, of Arizona
Thor H. Kuniholm, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph E. Lee, of Idaho.
Richard W. Lowrance, of Missouri.
Walter A. Lundy, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Lettie M. McSpadden, of California.
Thomas W. Mapp, of California.
Robert W. Mashek, of New York.
Ralph R. Moore, of Massachusetts.
Robert J. Morris, of Iowa.
Gerald H. Murphy, of New York.
John D. Negroponte, of New York.
Joseph K. Newman, of New Jersey.
Robert O'Neil, of New Jersey.
Benjamin R. Parks, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Perkins, of Indiana.
William B. Pogue, of California.
Miss Judith Ann Purdy, of Kentucky.
Lawrence R. Raicht, of New York.
Miss Virginia Randolph, of Pennsylvania.
Richard C. Reidler, of Pennsylvania.
P. Peter Sarros, of New York.
Richard D. Scarfo, of Massachusetts.
Louis Schwartz, Jr., of Illinois.
John C. Shea, of Pennsylvania.
Harrison B. Sherwood, of Minnesota.
William T. Shinn, Jr., of Minnesota.
Miss Barbara F. Sweeney, of New York.
Daniel Taher, of Pennsylvania.
Alan R. Thompson, of the District of Columbia.
Samuel B. Thomsen, of California.
Stephen Lee Wailes, of Florida.
W. Cramer Widenor, of New Jersey.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert C. Benedict, of California.
K. Marshall Berg, of Iowa.
Royal D. Bisbee, Jr., of Florida.
William K. Braun, of Ohio.
Robert H. Carlson, of Virginia.
Stephen M. Carney, of the District of Columbia.
Philip W. Carroll, of Maryland.
Darrell D. Carter, of Illinois.
Thomas S. Cleveland, of Missouri.
Joe B. Cox, of Ohio.
Robert N. Crowell, of Nevada.
John L. DeWitt, of Pennsylvania.
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr., of New York.
Guy A. Fasoli, of California.
Jay W. Gildner, of Minnesota.
Richard J. Gordon, of Maryland.
Jeffrey Gould, of the District of Columbia.
Richard T. Hamilton, of Virginia.
Clyde J. Hanna, of California.
Arnold C. Hanson, of Maine.
Daniel J. Herget, of Maryland.
Dwight B. Herrick, of New Jersey.
Arthur S. Hoffman, of California.
Abraham N. Hopman, of New York.
Roy W. Johnson, of New Jersey.
George F. Killmer, Jr., of California.
Hugh L. Kirkpatrick, of Texas.
Max W. Kraus, of Maryland.
Henry C. Krohn, of Virginia.
Mark B. Lewis, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Ellen I. McCullough, of New Jersey.
Mrs. Sara M. MacDonell, of South Carolina.
Edwin C. Pancoast, of California.
Renzo Pagin, of Virginia.
Stephen N. Sestanovich, of California.
Donald T. Shea, of California.
Robert V. Shinn, of Tennessee.
Howard R. Simpson, of California.
John M. Stuart, Jr., of New York.
Robert H. Welch, of Ohio.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Thomas M. Bartholomay, of Pennsylvania.
Paul S. Berry, of Massachusetts.
Thomas R. Blackshear, of California.
Daniel F. Cameron, of Massachusetts.
John DeNoia, of New Jersey.
John T. Dickmeyer, of Massachusetts.
E. Lee Fairley, of Maryland.
Owen H. Faust, of Florida.
Jack B. Fawcett, of Colorado.
Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.
Herbert Freeman, of New Jersey.
Robert L. Gordon, of Virginia.
Miss Elinor Halle, of Ohio.
John F. Hogan, Jr., of Maine.
Mrs. Mary M. Johnson, of Texas.
Donald J. Kent, of Ohio.
Albert H. Kline, Jr., of New Jersey.
Lawrence C. Laser, of Maryland.
William N. Lyons, of Kansas.
Robert G. Mahon, of California.
Lewis W. Pate, of North Carolina.
Michael C. Pearson, of Massachusetts.
Michael B. Peceri, of Florida.
Arthur J. Porn, of Wisconsin.
William H. Pugh, of New Jersey.
John W. L. Russell, Jr., of New York.
Keith B. Schofield, of Idaho.
Francis S. Sherry III, of Florida.
Michael F. Stern, of Montana.
Alfred J. Waddell, of Ohio.
Hugh R. Waters, of the District of Columbia.
Harry F. Weber, of Connecticut.
Richard A. Wheeler, of the District of Columbia.
Walter P. White, Jr., of Alabama.
Jack E. Wyant, of Washington.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John P. McCullough, of New York.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

George K. Adams, of Virginia.
John M. Anspacher, of Maryland.
Herbert A. Ferguson, Jr., of Virginia.
Russell S. Hibbs, of Missouri.
Francis J. Jeton, of the District of Columbia.
Giles M. Kelly, of the District of Columbia.
Richard C. Loebs, of the District of Columbia.
William N. Morell, Jr., of Maryland.
Everett C. O'Neal, of Ohio.
Leonard J. Saccio, of Connecticut.
Anthony L. Sileo, of Connecticut.
John R. Vought, of New York.
John H. Waller, of the District of Columbia.
William C. Wild, Jr., of California.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Mark T. Benson, of California.
Maynard H. Fourt, of Illinois.
William E. MacFarlane, of Virginia.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1966. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1960. (Reappointment.)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John H. Winchell, of Colorado, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1967. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotenitary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

W. Wendell Blancke, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic.

Joseph Palmer 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria.

R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger.

Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

John P. Weitzel, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Andrew A. Caffrey, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

John Feikens, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

C. Nils Tavares, of Hawaii, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Hawaii.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Joseph M. F. Ryan, Jr., of Maryland, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, domestic relations branch, for the term of 10 years.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Walter C. Wallace, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms expiring August 3, 1964:

Dr. Hugh Hudson Hussey, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Dr. Robert Morgan Stecher, of Ohio.
Dr. William Lowell Valk, of Kansas.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Daniel J. McCauley, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Edward K. Mills, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Arthur Alden Kimball, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1965.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Dr. Noah N. Langdale, Jr., of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the term expiring January 27, 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

John P. Weitzel, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mark Sullivan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

John L. Newbold, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1965.

H. Holmes Vogel, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

To be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency:

Harland Bartholomew, of Missouri.
Edward Burling, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Donald C. Hyde, of Ohio.
F. Moran McConihe, of Maryland.
William H. Moss, of Virginia.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Charles H. King, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954.

Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William R. Forbus, Alexander City, Ala., in place of W. M. Stewart, retired.

Wilson T. White, Athens, Ala., in place of D. L. Yarbrough, retired.

Malcolm R. McLellan, Brewton, Ala., in place of W. H. Schad, transferred.

Walter H. Bryan, Columbia, Ala., in place of G. I. Oakley, removed.

Hoyt E. Perdue, Crane Hill, Ala., in place of J. H. Pittman, retired.

Clem Mynard, Enterprise, Ala., in place of H. C. Heath, retired.

J. Fred Wilcutt, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson, retired.

Dorothy V. Vandiver, Hackleburg, Ala., in place of F. K. Frederick, retired.

Ramon N. Days, Sr., Magazine, Ala., in place of Zada Davis, resigned.

Armstead L. Hayes, Notasulga, Ala., in place of J. G. Rea, retired.

Julia G. Oliver, Panola, Ala., in place of A. G. Schmitz, retired.

Thomas O. Rudder, Stevenson, Ala., in place of E. O. Mann, retired.

J. Carson Whitson, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegee, resigned.

Jessie W. Hagood, Town Creek, Ala., in place of J. W. Davis, transferred.

Samuel W. Carpenter, Jr., Wedowee, Ala., in place of J. F. Wilson, retired.

Travis B. Edmondson, Woodland, Ala., in place of R. T. Yarbrough, retired.

ALASKA

Thomas L. Jackson, Sr., Kake, Alaska, in place of R. R. Martin, resigned.

ARIZONA

Paul E. Violette, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

Nancy L. Terry, Oracle, Ariz., in place of L. K. Basteen, retired.

Charles F. Adams, San Carlos, Ariz., in place of C. H. Higgins, resigned.

Eva H. Sutherlin, Thatcher, Ariz., in place of F. M. Martin, removed.

Anna R. Bohanan, Window Rock, Ariz., in place of E. E. Barnhill, retired.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield; transferred.

Cline C. Pile, Charleston, Ark., in place of C. W. Spiller, retired.

Clarence E. LaCotts, De Witt, Ark., in place of F. E. Stephenson, retired.

Everett L. Hall, Hazen, Ark., in place of L. A. Tyson, resigned.

Oscar H. McKamey, Jr., Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.
William H. Jones, Jasper, Ark., in place of D. C. Jones, transferred.
Wilbur Gale Hanna, Luxora, Ark., in place of F. R. Rogers, transferred.
Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomason, deceased.
Ralph W. Bolain, Pea Ridge, Ark., in place of F. F. Wood, retired.
Hubert C. Robbins, Jr., Piggott, Ark., in place of H. M. Jinks, resigned.
William B. Naylor, Pleasant Plains, Ark., in place of J. G. Royer, deceased.
James G. Still, St. Joe, Ark., in place of Pleas Fowler, deceased.
Worrence Whitlow, Strawberry, Ark., in place of Marvin Taylor, retired.
Joe L. Mills, Sulphur Springs, Ark., in place of M. E. Whaley, retired.
Eugene K. Bartholomew, West Fork, Ark., in place of E. R. Robinson, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Merrill I. Walstad, Bell, Calif., in place of Harry Bergseid, retired.
James N. Bonner, Bellflower, Calif., in place of W. M. Martin, transferred.
George V. Peetris, Big Bear Lake, Calif., in place of R. F. Smith, resigned.
Florence L. McQueen, Big Sur, Calif., in place of E. J. Ewoldsen, resigned.
Willis W. Brown, Bijou, Calif., in place of L. F. Hillhouse, removed.
O. James Bergman, Buena Park, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.
Merle G. Andrew, Calimesa, Calif., in place of Pansy Lockett, resigned.
Richard J. Williamson, Camino, Calif., in place of A. B. Peirsol, resigned.
Audrey C. Hagood, Carlotta, Calif., in place of C. E. Warden, removed.
Royal C. Brown, Chico, Calif., in place of J. H. Vaughan, retired.
Walter H. Miller, Chino, Calif., in place of B. L. Phillips, retired.
Lona A. Mitchell, Clarksburg, Calif., in place of J. B. Long, retired.
Laura B. Morgan, Clayton, Calif., in place of J. D. Blocking, resigned.
William T. Sprague, Compton, Calif., in place of C. L. Veitch, deceased.
Paul A. Helms, Culver City, Calif., in place of P. H. Jarrett, retired.
Maxwell M. Jamieson, Dana Point, Calif., in place of L. G. Jamieson, deceased.
Alberta F. Kinne, Douglas City, Calif., in place of V. M. Davison, resigned.
Helen M. Lowey, Downieville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costa, retired.
Robert J. Hazard, Edwards, Calif., in place of J. A. Gregory, resigned.
Raymond Johnson, Etna, Calif., in place of H. D. Ashby, retired.
Joseph T. Collins, Fair Oaks, Calif., in place of L. I. Webb, retired.
William C. Buckley, Greenfield, Calif., in place of Guido Berti, resigned
Ray E. Wheeland, Hesperia, Calif., in place of R. F. Walters, retired.
Lulu Ellen Spradlin, Homeland, Calif. Office established December 16, 1949.
Fridolph E. Nelson, Keyes, Calif., in place of L. M. Hinson, retired.
Virginia M. Benedict, La Honda, Calif., in place of E. J. Willett, resigned.
Earl R. Baker, Lakewood, Calif. Office established December 31, 1956.
Noriyuki Tashima, Livingston, Calif., in place of John Healy, deceased.
Walter T. Robinson, Mariposa, Calif., in place of W. C. Quigley, retired.
M. Craig Friel, Jr., Napa, Calif., in place of E. L. Kincaid, retired.
Oral J. Potts, Ojai, Calif., in place of G. L. Busch, retired.
John R. Riley, Orange Cove, Calif., in place of A. L. Schoepf, deceased.
Valda L. Daniel, Plaster City, Calif., in place of A. G. Ackley, resigned.
Rollo L. Van Slyke, Port Hueneme, Calif., in place of A. J. Haycox, retired.
Jean F. Johnson, Proberta, Calif., in place of F. M. Mills, retired.
Kenneth G. Drown, Ramona, Calif., in place of F. M. Raub, retired.
Virginia M. Rowland, Richgrove, Calif., in place of B. R. LeClair, resigned.
Henry C. Peterson, Ridgecrest, Calif., in place of E. E. Fowler, retired.
Minnie P. Lynn, Rio Oso, Calif., in place of J. E. Butler, resigned.
Ray E. Taylor, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.
Jewel D. McQuaid, San Ardo, Calif., in place of M. F. Fluker, deceased.
George K. Ingham, San Bruno, Calif., in place of D. P. Morrison, deceased.
V. Earl Roberts, San Diego, Calif., in place of W. E. Krenning, removed.
Novel B. James, Santa Ana, Calif., in place of F. R. Harwood, deceased.
Nancy M. Baranger, Santa Fe Springs, Calif. Office established September 1, 1958.
Dorothy E. Finn, Sausalito, Calif., in place of T. M. Bradley, retired.
Dallas P. Murphy, Shingle Springs, Calif., in place of L. E. Heinz, resigned.
George F. Fortney, Standard, Calif., in place of O. O. Wiseman, transferred.
Mahlon L. Short, Strathmore, Calif., in place of L. B. Wallace, retired.
Carol B. Gamble, Suisun City, Calif., in place of M. R. Wolfskill, retired.
Barry D. Duncan, Summerland, Calif., in place of Opal Lambert, resigned.
George G. Hollis, Jr., Sun Valley, Calif., in place of Fred Jacobsen, retired.
Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana, Calif., in place of D. M. Benedict, retired.
Harold D. Dean, West Covina, Calif. Office established September 6, 1958.

COLORADO

Wesley H. Amrine, Cortez, Colo., in place of W. W. Winegar, resigned.
Lawrence D. Kuhnke, Hudson, Colo., in place of J. W. Baldwin, retired.
Malcolm R. Loesch, Montrose, Colo., in place of F. H. Buskirk, deceased.
Leslie M. Cogswell, Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.
Loie E. Norris, Sugar City, Colo., in place of Edward Termer, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Philo J. Perham, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.
William B. Blackman, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.
Sarah B. Friedman, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.
Julia A. Wharton, Colebrook, Conn., in place of B. M. Turberg, retired.
Austin M. Ackerman, Jr., Durham Center, Conn., in place of A. M. Ackerman, retired.
John J. Dilworth, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.
Ernest N. Weir, East Glastonbury, Conn., in place of L. A. Weir, retired.
Jared A. Pratt, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Guptill, deceased.
Peter Perun, Middlefield, Conn., in place of R. A. Chadsey, resigned.
Allen G. Warner, Sr., New Milford, Conn., in place of J. J. Berger, resigned.
Raymond S. Manning, North Franklin, Conn., in place of R. R. Browning, retired.
Diogenes P. John, Norwich, Conn., in place of W. P. Moran, retired.
Marian R. Evenden, Plymouth, Conn., in place of M. E. Ryan, retired.
Edward E. Moseley, Rowayton, Conn., in place of H. L. vonDwingelo, deceased.
Erwin Schultz, Terryville, Conn., in place of D. P. Hurley, retired.
Peter A. Koops, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.
Donald C. MacDonell, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.
Arthur Manzi, Woodbury, Conn., in place of P. F. Cassidy, removed.

DELAWARE

John W. Shellenbarger, Clayton, Del., in place of J. B. Thompson, Jr., retired.
Thomas R. Purnell, Georgetown, Del., in place of H. T. Swain, retired.

FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.
Marvin O. Boone, Barberville, Fla., in place of M. V. Biggs, retired.
Harlow J. Schutt, Boynton Beach, Fla., in place of E. S. Pierce, retired.
Robert K. Tillman, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.
T. Grayson Screws, Fellsmere, Fla., in place of H. E. Kesler, deceased.
James F. Rylant, Fernandina Beach, Fla., in place of Louis Goldstein, retired.
Marion M. Woolley, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.
James E. Combs, Glen St. Mary, Fla., in place of J. E. Franklin, retired.
Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.
Charles D. Sams, Mayport, Fla., in place of L. H. Brown, resigned.
David L. Hilldale, Oak Hill, Fla., in place of J. H. Hilldale, deceased.
Arthur R. Van Valkenburg, Pinellas Park, Fla., in place of M. M. Stevenson, retired.
Ruth G. Long, Roseland, Fla., in place of D. C. Taylor, retired
Gordon J. Burris, Sebring, Fla., in place of R. N. Durrance, retired.
Warren C. Harden, Sopchoppy, Fla., in place of O. M. Ashmore, retired.
Richard F. Weinmann, Sorrento, Fla., in place of Floie Torbert, retired.
Joseph William Penrod, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.
Edward S. Raymond, Venice, Fla., in place of R. E. Shallberg, retired.

GEORGIA

Wanda C. Putman, Brooks, Ga., in place of Hugh Henderson, retired.
Pearl O. Hester, Conley, Ga., in place of E. M. Holmes, resigned.
Curtis C. Land, Hazelhurst, Ga., in place of A. D. Finley, retired.
Louise W. Murphy, Moreland, Ga., in place of D. L. Murphy, Sr., deceased.
Florence C. Logan, Sautee-Nacoochee, Ga., in place of L. L. Logan, deceased.
Angus A. Gillis, Soperton, Ga., in place of C. T. Ware, removed.
Charles R. Sprayberry, Trion, Ga., in place of C. S. Bell, deceased.

HAWAII

Mitsuo Watanabe, Kaunakakai, Hawaii, in place of J. D. Lewis, Jr., retired.
Phyllis Y. Takase, Kualapuu, Hawaii, in place of R. M. Shimizu, deceased.

IDAHO

H. Kay Thatcher, Carey, Idaho, in place of A. A. York, deceased.
Anna G. Bailey, Grand View, Idaho, in place of H. S. Bailey, deceased.
Roy B. Fields, McCall, Idaho, in place of C. L. Burdett, retired.
Earl Wright, Jr., Murtaugh, Idaho, in place of Parley Perkins, retired.
Vern Chandler, Salmon, Idaho, in place of F. W. Hanmer, retired.
James E. Jensen, Shelley, Idaho, in place of H. T. Leavitt, removed.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.
Clarence P. Seibert, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.
Billy D. Elkins, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.
Walter W. Savage, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.
Richard A. Markuson, Batavia, Ill., in place of A. J. Mier, retired.
John S. Fair, Belvidere, Ill., in place of P. I. O'Brien, retired.

Rex H. Carter, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.
Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.
Glenn E. Jones, Bulpitt, Ill., in place of M. N. Ceyte, deceased.
Delbert H. Pittman, Cisne, Ill., in place of Gordon Perry, retired.
Mary A. Tipsord, Cooksville, Ill., in place of O. L. Dean, deceased.
Arnold L. Ide, Cornell, Ill., in place of J. R. Jirus, deceased.
Clell H. Freeman, Dawson, Ill., in place of C. B. Stanton, deceased.
Carl S. Yates, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.
Delbert J. Larsen, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.
Lillian L. Asbell, Edwards, Ill., in place of M. E. Mulvaney, retired.
Robert J. Ertner, Elizabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny, deceased.
John H. Blackburn, Emington, Ill., in place of M. E. Conroy, retired.
J. Howard Meade, Enfield, Ill., in place of C. M. Jordan, deceased.
Irma L. Dodds, Eola, Ill., in place of G. L. Dodds, transferred.
Aldo Morotti, Farmington, Ill., in place of Owen Kelly, retired.
Harold E. Ririe, Flanagan, Ill., in place of M. D. O'Brien, retired.
Robert M. Maller, Geneva, Ill., in place of A. N. Modaff, resigned.
Kenneth L. Pflaum, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.
William N. B. Miller, Godfrey, Ill., in place of H. E. Calame, retired.
Floyd L. McCracken, Greenville, Ill., in place of D. J. McAlister, retired.
Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.
Raymond F. Cromwell, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.
Gordon R. Bartman, Lansing, Ill., in place of W. E. Erfert, retired.
Allen J. Gharst, Loda, Ill., in place of H. E. Goodell, retired.
James W. Hettermann, McHenry, Ill., in place of E. R. McGee, retired.
Samuel P. Heern, Makanda, Ill., in place of J. E. Brewer, resigned.
Tom H. Mason, Marietta, Ill., in place of J. A. McCance, retired.
Albert L. Edwards, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.
Robert V. Newell, Mattoon, Ill., in place of H. A. Lange, deceased.
Charles H. White, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.
Frank D. Talley, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.
Clyde H. Steffee, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.
Carl L. Karlson, Nachusa, Ill., in place of C. H. Strong, retired.
Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.
Joseph A. Gossett, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.
Raymond C. Foley, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.
Roy D. Deppe, Percy, Ill., in place of J. L. McCuen, resigned.
John Craig Templeton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of T. A. Denton, transferred.
Robert L. Delap, Piper City, Ill., in place of S. W. Lane, deceased.
Charles R. Lacy, Pittsfield, Ill., in place of A. B. Caughlan, retired.
Raymond R. Yahnke, Plainfield, Ill., in place of L. V. Keeley, deceased.
Gerald W. Sears, Plano, Ill., in place of I. W. Nelson, retired.
Gerald C. Miles, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.
Joe M. Stoddard, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.
James A. Blender, Raritan, Ill., in place of F. E. Overstreet, declined.
Leonard E. Kaffenberger, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.
Richard F. Moffitt, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.
Robert C. Johnson, Richton Park, Ill., in place of Veronica Scheidt, retired.
Michael C. Mott, Rio, Ill., in place of N. S. Junk, retired.
Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe, Ill., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.
Arthur M. Mulford, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.
Leonard A. Graham, Shobonier, Ill., in place of O. W. Morell, transferred.
Chester C. Heindel, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.
Lester Lippincott, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.
Michael W. Gunning, Jr., Tamms, Ill., in place of R. O. Lackey, deceased.
Howard M. Welsh, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.
Charles W. Weaver, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.
John R. Morse, Virginia, Ill., in place of C. R. Wilson, retired.
Wendell C. Kepner, Warren, Ill., in place of V. C. McGinnis, retired.
Charles D. Allen, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.
Jane L. Gray, Wellington, Ill., in place of M. E. Stewart, retired.
John W. Magnuson, Wilmette, Ill., in place of L. J. Orr, retired.
Walter E. Rose, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.
Harold H. Hertzberg, Winthrop Harbor, Ill., in place of C. A. Shimko, resigned.

INDIANA

Hayward A. Claybaugh, Argos, Ind., in place of N. D. Thompson, retired.
Roscoe W. Owen, Avilla, Ind., in place of M. M. Pepple, retired.
Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.
Glenn E. Ayers, Boonville, Ind., in place of Edward Bracher, retired.
Harry R. Shidaker, Bremen, Ind., in place of H. G. Carbiener, retired.
Robert E. McKain, Carthage, Ind., in place of J. E. Porter, removed.
Jerry R. Wall, Coal City, Ind., in place of W. L. Wells, transferred.
Arthur R. Wilkerson, Commiskey, Ind., in place of Fred Corbin, Jr., resigned.
Gerald E. Esarey, Decker, Ind., in place of R. M. Cornett, retired.
Harold E. Newberg, Donaldson, Ind., in place of C. C. Garrison, retired.
Lloyd Goodwin, Edwardsport, Ind., in place of M. F. Shepard, retired.
Virgil R. Myers, Francesville, Ind., in place of O. O. Welden, retired.
Max W. Wagner, Hartford City, Ind., in place of O. D. Hendricks, retired.
Betty L. Sherrill, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of L. J. Britton, deceased.
Philip Earl Buecher, Jasper, Ind., in place of Albert Rumbach, deceased.
Vernie J. Wright, La Crosse, Ind., in place of C. D. Watson, retired.
Lester S. Weir, Lagrange, Ind., in place of H. G. Groat, retired.
Walter E. Zabel, Lanesville, Ind., in place of J. L. Green, retired.
John F. Braun, Lawrenceburg, Ind., in place of B. H. McCann, retired.
Flossie I. Wolfe, Leo, Ind. Office established April 6, 1957.
J. George Bascom, Lynn, Ind., in place of D. B. Mann, deceased.
Norval W. Chamness, Marshall, Ind., in place of H. E. Delp, retired.
Robert M. Walters, Matthews, Ind., in place of Bertha Dorton, retired.
Robert R. Overton, Monon, Ind., in place of W. S. Buss, retired.
Harold H. Scott, Monterey, Ind., in place of C. A. Good, retired.
Arthur L. Meyer, Moores Hill, Ind., in place of L. H. Barkley, retired.
George M. Weaver, Morgantown, Ind., in place of Dewayne Hamilton, transferred.
Opal W. LaFollette, New Market, Ind., in place of P. L. Smith, deceased.
Morris L. Drybread, Nineveh, Ind., in place of L. C. Ramey, removed.
Harry E. Fields, Norman, Ind., in place of C. M. Bowman, retired.
Vita J. Hutchinson, Oakville, Ind., in place of B. E. Garrett, removed.
Mary L. Butler, Pershing, Ind., in place of C. E. Rodenberg, deceased.
Jack V. Porter, Roachdale, Ind., in place of W. E. Etcheson, retired.
Thomas F. Kinder, Rockport, Ind., in place of C. H. Wetzel, retired.
Lynn A. West, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of Avis Carlile, retired.
Harold L. Yoho, Solsberry, Ind., in place of C. W. Hudson, resigned.
Robert H. Lucas, Spencer, Ind., in place of J. C. Rice, retired.
Charlotte L. Hudson, Spencerville, Ind., in place of M. I. Ward, declined.
Ernest D. Chambers, Springport, Ind., in place of W. C. Bunner, deceased.
Warren W. Robinson, Tippecanoe, Ind., in place of A. B. Rhodes, retired.
George S. Wilkerson, Trafalgar, Ind., in place of J. E. Truman, deceased.
John R. Carpenter, Union City, Ind., in place of E. T. Livengood, retired.
Herbert A. Hedges, Universal, Ind., in place of M. E. Lewis, retired.
J. Howard Hetzler, Wabash, Ind., in place of A. E. Reynolds, deceased.
Warren P. Roberts, Wheatfield, Ind., in place of C. R. Keene, deceased.
Charles E. Carey, Whitestown, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
Lowell W. Rush, Windfall, Ind., in place of M. E. Martin, transferred.

IOWA

Raymond J. Donovan, Bernard, Iowa, in place of W. F. Dunn, retired.
Lloyd R. Peterson, Casey, Iowa, in place of P. G. Thompson, retired.
Theodore W. Swensen, Decorah, Iowa, in place of O. A. Jaeger, retired.
David H. Crenshaw, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.
Joseph F. Whelan, Elberon, Iowa, in place of G. B. Dolezal, retired.
Ralph B. Speers, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. R. Bahne, retired.
Harris J. Twedt, Jr., Ellsworth, Iowa, in place of B. M. Risetter, retired.
Leo J. Truhlar, Ely, Iowa, in place of F. W. Elias, retired.
Thomas J. Hamilton, Epworth, Iowa, in place of S. J. Callahan, retired.
Milton A. Hillman, Essex, Iowa, in place of L. R. Carson, retired.
Thelan A. Elthon, Fertile, Iowa, in place of A. M. Eikenbary, retired.
Henry E. Judge, Garwin, Iowa, in place of E. L. Ochs, retired.
Joseph N. Shaner, Glidden, Iowa, in place of F. W. Franzwa, deceased.
Maryellen J. Beaver, Harvey, Iowa, in place of M. M. Bennett, retired.
G. Elaine Thompson, Hinton, Iowa, in place of W. A. Spies, transferred.
Harland H. Hanson, Holstein, Iowa, in place of H. O. Micheel, retired.
Joe G. Panzi, Lehigh, Iowa, in place of R. E. Whipple, deceased.
Marie L. Quick, Lockridge, Iowa, in place of Lena Fritts, retired.
Hansel A. Lowe, Maxwell, Iowa, in place of E. L. Wood, retired.
Chester L. Watts, Mondamin, Iowa, in place of D. M. Beaman, retired.
John L. Shaw, Mount Auburn, Iowa, in place of H. J. Greenwalt, retired.
Mabel Alverson, Popejoy, Iowa, in place of G. M. Schneider, resigned.

Leon L. Casten, Postville, Iowa, in place of Keith Gray, retired.
Delbert D. Flynn, Riverside, Iowa, in place of J. R. Shebek, retired.
Gale C. Eggland, Roland, Iowa, in place of C. M. Fatland, retired.
John F. Foss, Salem, Iowa, in place of M. L. Barton, deceased.
Rex V. Ritz, Selma, Iowa, in place of W. W. Fulton, retired.
Frank E. Bridgewater, Sharpsburg, Iowa, in place of E. C. Long, deceased.
Shirley E. Hendrix, Silver City, Iowa, in place of F. A. Deitchler, retired.
Harry E. Harbeck, Sioux City, Iowa, in place of H. J. Gleason, retired.
Jonas Christianson, Slater, Iowa, in place of M. B. Chader, deceased.
Dorothy L. Thorson, Somers, Iowa, in place of L. I. Brayton, retired.
Haldene W. Gurney, Tracy, Iowa, in place of E. D. Johns, resigned.
Richard D. Hulse, Van Meter, Iowa, in place of L. B. Miller, retired.
Willard E. Leiran, Waterville, Iowa, in place of M. A. Slattery, retired.
Donald F. Deeny, Waucoma, Iowa, in place of M. J. Blong, transferred.
Elijah L. Simpson, Wesley, Iowa, in place of H. H. Gerdes, retired.

KANSAS

Myron W. Miller, Attica, Kans., in place of L. F. Heath, transferred.
Nolen E. Bond, Dodge City, Kans., in place of C. V. Houlton, retired.
William D. French, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.
Henry M. Miller, Galesburg, Kans., in place of I. L. Magner, transferred.
Walter W. Johnson, Harper, Kans., in place of W. W. Nye, transferred.
Kenneth N. Kahle, Hoxie, Kans., in place of E. V. Hedge, retired.
Clifford M. Funston, Independence, Kans., in place of Benjamin Taylor, retired.
Max A. Johnson, Jamestown, Kans., in place of S. E. Murray, retired.
Daryl E. Daniels, Johnson, Kans., in place of A. M. Nall, retired.
Bennie A. Parker, La Crosse, Kans., in place of A. E. Elias, retired.
LeRoy P. Drake, Leona, Kans., in place of J. L. Dennis, retired.
Lorn R. Lahey, Sr., McCune, Kans., in place of C. E. Mansfield, retired.
Warren E. Joy, Narka, Kans., in place of W. V. Joy, transferred.
LaVerne C. Bovard, Ness City, Kans., in place of J. E. Clouston, retired.
William H. Strohwitz, Offerle, Kans., in place of W. E. Berry, deceased.
Eleanor M. Hewitt, Oneida, Kans., in place of J. E. Sparling, retired.
William A. Kramer, Ozawkie, Kans., in place of Guy Baker, deceased.
Edwin W. Lemmond, Parsons, Kans., in place of R. J. Sharshel, retired.
William A. Atchison, Pauline, Kans., in place of W. H. Cox, resigned.
Daryl G. Thornton, Republic, Kans., in place of M. J. Gardner, retired.
Albert C. Hoffman, Russell, Kans., in place of R. K. Artas, retired.
Howard L. Robinson, Sabetha, Kans., in place of G. I. Althouse, retired.
Lloyd W. Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

KENTUCKY

Freeman Fitch, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.
Harold R. Stone, Berry, Ky., in place of C. F. Vest, retired.
Harry G. Burton, Blaine, Ky., in place of Enoch Wheeler, retired.
Cecil M. Higdon, Blue Diamond, Ky., in place of G. S. Lindon, resigned.
Harold W. Griggs, Calvert City, Ky., in place of E. E. Dees, retired.
Sally M. Conniff, Clermont, Ky., in place of C. B. Riley, retired.
Joseph R. Powers, Cloverport, Ky., in place of R. H. Miller, deceased.
Alice A. Bonar, Crittenden, Ky., in place of W. H. Lillard, resigned.
Irene P. Mullins, Cromona, Ky., in place of Esther Branham, deceased.
Kermit L. Tussey, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of J. M. Magee, retired.
Georgia H. Wilkerson, Dixon, Ky., in place of M. W. Blackwell, retired.
James A. Collinsworth, Ezel, Ky., in place of Roy Murphy, retired.
Willard O. Taylor, Fairdale, Ky., in place of O. H. Martin, deceased.
James S. Hinton, Jr., Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of Gilbert Adams, retired.
William F. Day, Foster, Ky., in place of L. D. Boseke, retired.
Pauline A. Clift, Fredonia, Ky., in place of L. B. Young, retired.
Van L. Latta, Fulton, Ky., in place of N. W. Carter, Jr., resigned.
Donald W. Orme, Germantown, Ky., in place of F. E. Jordan, deceased.
Katherine Kirkland, Gravel Switch, Ky., in place of J. M. Lane, removed.
Clara P. Norris, Guthrie, Ky., in place of E. R. Paine, deceased.
Bryant J. Nugent, Jr., Hawesville, Ky., in place of W. T. Miller, retired.
William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.
Billy G. Rose, Hazel Green, Ky., in place of D. C. Rose, retired.
James E. Peavey, Liberty, Ky., in place of C. L. Sharp, retired.
M. Elvadine Riggs, Loretto, Ky., in place of M. H. Buckler, retired.
William B. Mathews, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.
James E. Morris, Neon, Ky., in place of J. M. Caudill, resigned.
James H. Hicks, New Haven, Ky., in place of C. R. Johnson, resigned.
Mary Stevens, Olive Hill, Ky., in place of W. H. Roe, removed.
William H. Smith, Owenton, Ky., in place of H. C. Thomas, transferred.
Smith C. Ledford, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of K. L. Walker, retired.
James G. Dismuke, Salvisa, Ky., in place of N. M. Ramsdell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Murat B. Decouz, Jeanerette, La., in place of C. M. McGowen, retired.
Warren A. Hurst, Kentwood, La., in place of J. H. Broyles, deceased.
Alma L. Farrar, Lillie, La., in place of C. C. Barron, transferred.
Lola K. Frusha, Newllano, La., in place of J. H. Smith, transferred.
John J. Blackwell, Pearl River, La., in place of E. J. Mohr, resigned.
Everett Hill, Pitkin, La., in place of C. W. Carson, retired.
Beatrice A. Croft, Pride, La., in place of J. L. Townsend, retired.

MAINE

Robert L. Boyd, Boothbay Harbor, Maine, in place of E. H. Foss, retired.
Gordon L. Stitham, Mars Hill, Maine, in place of L. V. Keenan, retired.
Dana M. Williams, Monson, Maine, in place of H. E. Johnson, deceased.
Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine, in place of M. B. Manson, deceased.

MARYLAND

G. Lucille Bunting, Bishopville, Md., in place of H. R. Ringler, retired.
Paul C. Stockslager, Funkstown, Md., in place of R. E. Howard, removed.
Harry E. Phillips, Lutherville-Timonium, Md., in place of E. W. Sperry, resigned.
Maurice E. Murray, Woodsboro, Md., in place of H. W. Barrick, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Helene V. Schwartz, East Sandwich, Mass., in place of J. R. Raymond, retired.
Arthur W. Kerr, Feeding Hills, Mass., in place of J. D. Cleary, retired.
Bennett W. Boynton, Rowley, Mass., in place of S. F. Knowles, Jr., retired.
Phyllis D. Bellavance, West Mansfield, Mass., in place of E. E. Chaffin, retired.
Kathryn M. Mango, Woronoco, Mass., in place of E. P. Hatton, retired.

MICHIGAN

Budd A. Goodwin, Adrian, Mich., in place of P. F. Frownfelder, retired.
Robert C. Mason, Augusta, Mich., in place of J. B. Woodrow, Jr., transferred.
Aulbirt D. Cox, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.
Bernice C. Gould, Brant, Mich., in place of Bruce McFall, transferred.
Kenneth S. King, Cassopolis, Mich., in place of O. J. Breece, retired.
Harriet E. Burditt, Cement City, Mich., in place of L. M. Taggart, removed.
Elmer Conley, Charlotte, Mich., in place of H. E. C. Rogers, retired.
Neva A. Dalton, Concord, Mich., in place of A. L. Hyliard, deceased.
Arthur F. Frank, Conklin, Mich., in place of H. D. Harrison, retired.
Jack S. Paul, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of G. A. Stahl, deceased.
Charles H. Pratt, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.
Oscar A. Ohman, Gladstone, Mich., in place of B. R. Micks, retired.
Roger A. Camfield, Gobles, Mich., in place of L. A. Wauchek, resigned.
James Patejdl, Harbert, Mich., in place of O. W. Tornquist, retired.
Delia A. Bickham, Hessel, Mich., in place of Frances Lindberg, retired.
Warren Barrie, Hillman, Mich., in place of G. R. Sabourin, resigned.
Urho J. Koski, Houghton, Mich., in place of J. C. Healy, removed.
Frederick J. Goossen, Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of W. K. Peters, resigned.
Jake Dyk, Hudsonville, Mich., in place of E. E. Hubbard, retired.
William E. Hackelberg, Indian River, Mich., in place of H. B. Martin, retired.
Selden W. von der Hoff, Interlochen, Mich., in place of R. J. Buller, retired.
John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.
Eva M. Densmore, Kaleva, Mich., in place of J. E. Rengo, retired.
Richard F. Beardsley, Lapeer, Mich., in place of R. L. Taylor, retired.
Lawrence G. Chappel, Marlette, Mich., in place of N. F. Smith, resigned.
Albert H. Manley, Midland, Mich., in place of B. E. Voorhees, Jr., resigned.
Vernon L. Erskine, Moran, Mich., in place of I. J. Gille, retired.
Roland H. Bramer, Nahma, Mich., in place of E. A. Hruska, deceased.
Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
Marie A. Pitts, New Buffalo, Mich., in place of J. M. Littlejohn, resigned.
Abe Newmyer, New Era, Mich., in place of C. M. Russell, retired.
Dixie R. Steadman, New Lothrop, Mich., in place of L. F. Flynn, retired.
Carl T. Redding, North Adams, Mich., in place of B. F. Taylor, retired.
William C. Badgero, Onaway, Mich., in place of E. W. Kenrick, retired.
Donald E. Green, Orchard Lake, Mich., in place of M. L. Hawkes, transferred.
Roy F. Bergstrom, Oscoda, Mich., in place of L. J. Hartel, resigned.
Turley N. Thompson, Ossineke, Mich., in place of H. E. Vredenburg, retired.
Richard E. Jackson, Palmyra, Mich., in place of A. C. Johnston, transferred.

Carl J. Geller, Pewamo, Mich., in place of M. E. Doane, retired.
William F. Johnson, Quincy, Mich., in place of N. D. Potter, retired.
William R. Froelich, Rogers City, Mich., in place of L. D. Larke, resigned.
Cecil L. Erfourth, Rudyard, Mich., in place of P. C. Carr, retired.
Erwin H. Kubath, Saint Joseph, Mich., in place of E. M. Evans, retired.
Richard W. Emmons, Sand Creek, Mich., in place of B. B. Morse, retired.
Charlena Shaver, Silverwood, Mich., in place of L. P. Temple, deceased.
Velma M. Weatherwax, Somerset Center, Mich., in place of G. W. Fisher, retired.
Gerald A. Ostrander, Trout Lake, Mich., in place of E. C. Hudson, retired.
Addison L. Pauley, Tuscola, Mich., in place of H. M. Aldrich, resigned.
Orlo E. Alexander, Vanderbilt, Mich., in place of O. E. Niles, transferred.
Lawrence A. Frith, Vermontville, Mich., in place of R. K. Kilpatrick, transferred.
Robert E. Flaherty, Watervliet, Mich., in place of J. R. Crumb, retired.
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.
Ray L. Ogden, Wolverine, Mich., in place of H. A. Marcotte, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Hugh O. Smith, Alexandria, Minn., in place of H. W. Long, deceased.
Esther M. Nelson, Babbitt, Minn., in place of E. J. Shega, resigned.
Luther L. Quist, Barrett, Minn., in place of O. A. Jacobson, transferred.
Edward J. Noreen, Bayport, Minn., in place of T. J. McGonigal, retired.
Frank J. Kolbinger, Becker, Minn., in place of G. S. Dyson, retired.
Henry S. Blexrud, Caledonia, Minn., in place of E. J. Crotty, retired.
Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.
Marion G. Berge, Castle Rock, Minn., in place of D. W. Burton, deceased.
Ronald L. Kent, Clarissa, Minn., in place of L. M. Berczyk, retired.
Mildred E. Mester, Coleraine, Minn., in place of W. L. Franti, deceased.
Donald C. Carrigan, Cosmos, Minn., in place of D. W. Anderson, transferred.
Lura Mae Myers, Cottage Grove, Minn., in place of R. G. Johnson, resigned.
Edward J. Johnson, Crosby, Minn., in place of H. M. Koop, retired.
Raymond E. Staffanson, Farwell, Minn., in place of J. O. Opheim, retired.
Laverne W. Martin, Gibbon, Minn., in place of H. G. Carlson, deceased.
William E. Kieren, Gilbert, Minn., in place of Herman Frajola, retired.
Harry L. Solberg, Goodridge, Minn., in place of C. E. Peterson, transferred.
Leonard W. Stanton, Graceville, Minn., in place of V. P. Fermoyle, deceased.
Ray E. Ewalt, Harmony, Minn., in place of T. A. Brokken, retired.
Leslie M. Olson, Hartland, Minn., in place of I. C. Stensrud, retired.
Lloyd G. Hable, Hector, Minn., in place of M. P. Dahlheim, transferred.
Stanley G. Helgerson, Hopkins, Minn., in place of I. C. Elmquist, retired.
Hilson L. Stewart, Humboldt, Minn., in place of J. S. Easter, retired.
Carlton L. Anderson, Ironton, Minn., in place of R. J. Mayheu, retired.
Leo J. Redig, Ivanhoe, Minn., in place of J. L. Gilson, retired.
Donald M. Lynch, Kasota, Minn., in place of J. O. Barklow, resigned.
Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.
Richard C. Zimmerman, Kent, Minn., in place of L. C. Clark, transferred.
Herbert F. Zelmer, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.
Robert F. Entzion, Knife River, Minn., in place of Grace Congdon, deceased.
Signe L. Sletta, La Salle, Minn., in place of Alfred Sletta, retired.
James R. Dingwall, Lowry, Minn., in place of Vern Weaver, deceased.
Hardin H. Kindler, Lynd, Minn., in place of A. H. Roloff, retired.
Homer J. Piets, Meadowlands, Minn., in place of Ross Andrews, retired.
H. Burdette Bryant, Mendota, Minn., in place of C. T. Newhouse, retired.
Everett M. Viitala, Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of H. H. Schur, resigned.
Gladys M. Sorenson, Murdock, Minn., in place of L. H. Egerstrom, transferred.
Alton E. Davis, Oakland, Minn., in place of M. W. Cole, transferred.
George M. Wellnitz, Odessa, Minn., in place of A. C. Wahoske, retired.
Charles T. Trane, Pelican Rapids, Minn., in place of H. N. Halvorson, retired.
Conrad J. Christie, Royalton, Minn., in place of H. L. Fisher, transferred.
Donald W. Sand, Russell, Minn., in place of E. M. Swanson, retired.
Vernon L. Nelson, Saint Francis, Minn., in place of R. E. Leathers, retired.
Robert L. Penne, Saint James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.
Lawrence E. Hanson, Santiago, Minn., in place of G. M. Wold, resigned.
Sherman A. Granberg, Scandia, Minn., in place of E. M. Hawkinson, resigned.
Harold O. Turbenson, Silver Bay, Minn., in place of F. V. Erickson, resigned.
H. Orville Berg, Solway, Minn., in place of M. S. Dalby, transferred.
Orville H. Eidem, Spring Park, Minn., in place of Marguerite Linquish, retired.
Eino R. Latvala, Tamarack, Minn., in place of D. W. Brekke, transferred.
Edward W. Malone, Wabasha, Minn., in place of S. E. Drury, retired.
Leonard L. Baker, Windom, Minn., in place of W. A. Lienke, deceased.
Earle H. Welty, Winona, Minn., in place of C. B. Erwin, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Willis M. Clark, Bassfield, Miss., in place of N. R. Evans, retired.
John M. McGowan, Sr., Camden, Miss., in place of S. L. Mansell, transferred.
James P. Allen, Fayette, Miss., in place of E. M. Huttenlocher, retired.
Floy P. Humphreys, Lorman, Miss., in place of E. Y. Alsworth, retired.
Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.
John R. Long, State College, Miss., in place of H. E. Wamsley, retired.

MISSOURI

Curt J. Meinz, Altenburg, Mo., in place of A. W. Mueller, retired.
Forrest H. Forderhase, Berger, Mo., in place of H. C. W. Strothmann, deceased.
Gladys I. Woods, Blythedale, Mo., in place of C. M. VanHoozer, retired.
Ernest D. Gallivan, Bolivar, Mo., in place of Ralph Gravely, transferred.
Eleanor L. Tillerson, Callao, Mo., in place of W. P. Clarkson, deceased.
Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
Thomas D. Neuschafer, Center, Mo., in place of B. F. Coleman, retired.
Norman E. Paul, Chilhowee, Mo., in place of L. H. Inglish, retired.
Ida W. Summa, Gentry, Mo., in place of F. L. Summa, deceased.
Donald M. Medsker, Graham, Mo., in place of M. M. Fleming, retired.
Anton Foss, Hunnewell, Mo., in place of J. E. White, retired.
David C. Baumann, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhart, transferred.
Fred H. Tanner, Jefferson City, Mo., in place of C. A. Platt, deceased.
Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Kansas City, Mo., in place of A. F. Sachs, retired.
Clarence W. Hunsperger, Jr., Koshkonong, Mo., in place of H. M. Swain, retired.
Fay L. Warren, Larussell, Mo., in place of L. H. Thomas, transferred.
Willard R. Mohns, Lee's Summit, Mo., in place of J. F. Stevenson, retired.
Joseph M. Brown, Leonard, Mo., in place of P. T. Keith, retired.
Robert B. Crain, Madison, Mo., in place of W. W. Eubank, retired.
Wanda P. Wilson, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of E. S. Spencer, deceased.
Harold F. Courtois, Mineral Point, Mo., in place of P. C. Walton, retired.
Robert E. Hemphill, Monett, Mo., in place of G. C. Fulton, retired.
Beulah I. Wood, New Cambria, Mo., in place of J. M. Baker, retired.
John W. Aufder Heide, Owensville, Mo., in place of E. E. Smith, retired.
Harold E. Becker, Palmyra, Mo., in place of D. H. Sosey, retired.
Leo R. Martin, Revere, Mo., in place of E. A. Blakely, retired.
Iris W. Sheehan, Risco, Mo., in place of J. J. Anders, retired.
James H. Huffman, Rockville, Mo., in place of A. C. Bennett, retired.
Wilbur W. Ross, Urich, Mo., in place of J. L. Gates, retired.
Glenn S. Bliss, Warrensburg, Mo., in place of H. M. Cash, retired.
Leroy A. Vanzandt, Washburn, Mo., in place of G. B. Windes, retired.
Harold E. Williams, Waynesville, Mo., in place of V. V. Long, retired.
Sidney F. Kittel, Weaubleau, Mo., in place of D. G. Hammond, transferred.
Loyd V. Howell, Hyaconda, Mo., in place of E. W. Kurtz, retired.

MONTANA

Kenneth M. Hall, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulson, deceased.
Leonard E. Erikson, Hungry Horse, Mont., in place of H. D. Howell, resigned.
Norman J. Wagner, Lewistown, Mont., in place of E. J. Coyle, retired.
Lee M. Enochson, Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of N. P. Miller, retired.
Edward F. Kahoe, Philipsburg, Mont., in place of A. S. McKenzie, retired.
Elwin Claire, Wolf Point, Mont., in place of W. B. McCracken, transferred.

NEBRASKA

William R. Wynne, Alma, Nebr., in place of R. H. Rennecker, retired.
Wilber H. Roesch, Falls City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Elam, retired.
Walter D. Yokley, Genoa, Nebr., in place of A. D. Irish, transferred.
Donald L. Keyes, Inman, Nebr., in place of J. M. McMahan, deceased.
Norman G. Urwin, Murray, Nebr., in place of M. L. Brendel, retired.
Robert L. Beckett, Stella, Nebr., in place of R. C. Briggs, transferred.
John W. Putnam, Tecumseh, Nebr., in place of L. C. Kuster, retired.
Eugene W. Hicks, Western, Nebr., in place of C. S. Haddix, transferred.
Carroll L. Falk, Wilcox, Nebr., in place of J. W. Brawner, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George W. Caird, Colebrook, N.H., in place of R. A. Hicks, retired.
Ada E. Widman, East Hampstead, N.H., in place of L. M. Tait, retired.
Leo G. Laroche, Hooksett, N.H., in place of D. P. St. Germain, deceased.
Noel A. Dube, Salmon Falls, N.H., in place of P. J. Duffy, retired.
Harry D. Perkins, Smithtown, N.H., in place of S. A. Brown, retired.
Marjorie A. Kimball, South Danville, N.H., in place of M. M. Heath, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Schubert, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.

Carl A. Brueckner, Allenhurst, N.J., in place of A. G. King, deceased.

Michael C. Tornillo, Brielle, N.J., in place of A. L. Kroh, retired.

James P. DeMaio, Sr., Cedar Grove, N.J., in place of O. P. Jacobus, retired.

Robert E. Moore, Jr., Closter, N.J., in place of A. M. Sweet, resigned.

Samuel H. Rifkin, Dutch Neck, N.J., in place of H. R. Tindall, resigned.

Herbert J. Engelhardt, Egg Harbor City, N.J., in place of M. R. Stone, deceased.

Walter Hamilton, Jr., Fieldsboro, N.J., in place of Elizabeth Hamilton, deceased.

V. Edith Mixner, Goshen, N.J., in place of H. C. Shaw, deceased.

Hazel B. Fisher, Island Heights, N.J., in place of E. V. Sharp, retired.

Margaret M. Warden, Lakehurst, N.J., in place of H. J. Fucille, removed.

Harry E. Blackman, Lakewood, N.J., in place of W. H. Applegate, deceased.

Frederick P. Rees, Lawrenceville, N.J., in place of F. B. Harker, retired.

Arthur W. Nevius, Liberty Corner, N.J., in place of E. J. Burnett, retired.

Marie J. Holloway, Magnolia, N.J., in place of J. M. Schmidt, retired.

Elwood B. Croll, Milford, N.J., in place of Wilmer Lawrence, retired.

Thelma C. Cooper, Navesink, N.J., in place of C. C. Cooper, deceased.

Stanford B. Tidaback, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.

Ralph H. Donnell, Park Ridge, N.J., in place of J. J. McNally, retired.

Kenneth G. Wright, Pine Beach, N.J., in place of C. J. Gray, deceased.

F. Robert Siebert, Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., in place of C. A. E. Snyder, Sr., deceased.

Arthur B. Jahn, Ridgefield, N.J., in place of H. J. Formon, deceased.

Joseph L. Yearly, Riverton, N.J., in place of M. E. Haas, retired.

Herman E. Gallaher, Sayreville, N.J., in place of A. F. Schmitt, retired.

Charles T. Camp, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.

Merrill M. Tucker, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.

Marjorie E. Houghtaling, Vernon, N.J., in place of A. E. Baldwin, deceased.

Shirlee W Thompson, Vincentown, N.J., in place of H. S. Elbert, removed.

Jesse W. Landon, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Ann A. Earling, Capitan, N. Mex., in place of J. A. Kent. Failed to return from military duty.

Audrey M. Owen, Corona, N. Mex., in place of B. H. Roberts, resigned.

Levi Martinez, Tierra Amarilla, N. Mex., in place of P. J. Martinez, retired.

Laudente T. Quintana, Jr., Wagon Mound, N. Mex., in place of H. M. Vigil, transferred.

NEW YORK

John D. Wolcott, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.

Robert K. Baker, Argyle, N.Y., in place of A.C. Hall, retired.

Robert H. Britt, Barneveld, N.Y., in place of W. C. Wells, retired.

Francis J. Finnick, Canandaigua, N.Y., in place of F. R. Cougevan, deceased.

Bruce H. Busch, Caroga Lake, N.Y., in place of Burton Yates, retired.

Albert E. Johnson, Cementon, N.Y., in place of H. W. Johnson, retired.

George L. Mapes, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.

Nellie P. Johnson, Chichester, N.Y., in place of Helen Bennett, retired.

Robert J. Auborn, Cleveland, N.Y., in place of E. A. Westcott, Jr., retired.

Foster W. Taylor, Cobleskill, N.Y., in place of L. R. Mann, retired.

Jean N. Van Kleeck, Cragsmoor, N.Y., in place of N. C. S. Garritt, resigned.

Kenneth R. Smith, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.

John J. Frazer, Earlton, N.Y., in place of H. G. Haines, retired.

Anna M. Phillips, Ellington, N.Y., in place of R. M. Seekins, retired.

Bredena C. Kinyon, Findley Lake, N.Y., in place of J. L. Hull, deceased.

Nellie M. Rice, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.

John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.

Robert H. Simm, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.

Theodore J. Palcic, Gowanda, N.Y., in place of P. W. Christenson, retired.

Hamilton C. Fish, Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.

Ellen M. Newman, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.

William J. Von Atzingen, Greenville, N.Y., in place of W. P. Stevens, retired.

Robert C. Haring, Groton, N.Y., in place of C. R. Gleason, retired.

Mildred L. Brannon, Hadley, N.Y., in place of V. B. Hawk, retired.

Roscoe E. Conklin, Hartwick, N.Y., in place of J. A. Bush, retired.

Edward A. Byrnes, Haverstraw, N.Y., in place of E. A. Ganson, resigned.

Charles R. Porteous, Hillsdale, N.Y., in place of M. A. Wilber, removed.

Helen M. DeGolia, Hinsdale, N.Y., in place of E. S. Baxter, deceased.

George W. Stevens, Hobart, N.Y., in place of O. B. Brockway, retired.

Leta B. Hayward, Honeoye, N.Y., in place of Pauline Clement, deceased.

Wilbur S. Williams, Hudson Falls, N.Y., in place of L. F. Howland, retired.

Lenora M. Turner, Indian Lake, N.Y., in place of J. F. Farrell, retired.

Frank G. Shosenburg, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of O. K. Palm, deceased.

Carl J. Barry, Kent, N.Y., in place of R. K. Fishbaugh, deceased.

Franklyn J. McCoy, Lake George, N.Y., in place of H. J. Smith, retired.

Hazel M. Carr, Lisbon, N.Y., in place of E. E. Jones, deceased.

William A. Stolworthy, Lynbrook, N.Y., in place of M. A. Cahill, retired.

Robert J. Whelan, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.

Olga C. Bennett, Mayfield, N.Y., in place of W. F. Agnew, retired.

Shirley C. Egler, Mountainville, N.Y., in place of B. S. Ketcham, retired.

Rachel B. Hoose, Mount Vision, N.Y., in place of J. P. Hetzler, deceased.

James S. D'Agostino, New Hartford, N.Y., in place of B. F. Green, retired.

Mary G. Losty, New Lebanon, N.Y., in place of M. L. Smith, retired.

Kenneth A. Hotaling, New Paltz, N.Y., in place of C. S. Van Valkenburg, Jr., resigned.

Edward A. Groves, Niagara University, N.Y., in place of V. E. Trunk, resigned.

Mildred T. Wadsworth, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.

Audrey L. Manzo, Ocean Beach, N.Y., in place of E. C. Nolin, resigned.

Norman T. Sullivan, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Robert E. Reavis, Piermont, N.Y., in place of L. L. Hunt, resigned.

Elsie J. Barber, Pine Bush, N.Y., in place of G. H. Stanton, retired.

John T. Wallace, Pine Hill, N.Y., in place of M. J. Passenar, retired.

Roscoe C. Odell, Pleasantville, N.Y., in place of L. D. Olmsted, deceased.

George L. Clemons, Port Henry, N.Y., in place of L. J. Hollister, Jr., retired.

Howard B. Stickney, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.

Edward G. Kling, Ronkonkoma, N.Y., in place of J. L. Friedman, retired.

Aldo G. Bodratti, Round Top, N.Y., in place of H. M. Engelmann, resigned.

Clifford D. Nellis, St. Johnsville, N.Y., in place of E. S. Bierman, retired.

William J. Dunson, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

Robert F. Schiener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.

Dorothy E. Burr, Savona, N.Y., in place of E. E. Mulliken, deceased.

William H. Dunn, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.

Ernest J. Chiovini, Schodack Landing, N.Y., in place of M. P. Van de Wal, retired.

Neva B. Gulvin, Seneca Castle, N.Y., in place of M. P. Leadley, deceased.

Joseph F. Patrick, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.

George H. Martin, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.

Lucy B. Manglass, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.

Robert N. Wolverton, Trumansburg, N.Y., in place of B. L. Wixom, deceased.

Dorothy R. DuMond, Ulster Park, N.Y., in place of C. H. Schoonmaker, retired.

Ralph H. Walker, Westfield, N.Y., in place of F. S. Richardson, retired.

Clarence M. Ostrander, West Hurley, N.Y., in place of L. E. Joyce, retired.

Joseph J. Giordano, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.

Dorann E. Oldenburg, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

Gerald C. Allen, Whitney Point, N.Y., in place of M. C. Wilcox, deceased.

Dominic V. Panichi, Wynantskill, N.Y., in place of I. R. Puffer, deceased.

Royden W. McCullough, Wyoming, N.Y., in place of G. F. Powers, Jr., transferred.

Irene I. Carson, York, N.Y., in place of V. A. Spring, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard G. Crissman, Aberdeen, N.C., in place of E. E. Maurer, removed.

Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N.C., in place of Galusha Pullium, removed.

Clyde T. Shaw, Asheboro, N.C., in place of W. C. Craven, removed.

Alma S. Nelson, Atlantic, N.C., in place of B. T. Nelson, resigned.

Daniel H. Autry, Autryville, N.C., in place of B. B. Jaynes, transferred.

Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.

Kelly M. Holmes, Bolton, N.C., in place of S. M. Blue, retired.

Melvin H. Crisp, Brasstown, N.C., in place of Iowa Green, retired.

Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N.C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.

James A. Rooks, Jr., Brunswick, N.C., in place of Redden Gaskin, retired.

Ray Wright, Bryson City, N.C., in place of W. T. Martin, retired.

Ruley G. Wallace, Carthage, N.C., in place of C. B. Shaw, retired.

Arlie R. Cox, Central Falls, N.C., in place of A. M. York, retired.

John P. Tuttle, Clayton, N.C., in place of P. A. Williams, retired.

Gordon B. Powell, Clinton, N.C., in place of J. B. Darden, resigned.

Horace C. Aldridge, Crossnore, N.C., in place of T. C. Dellinger, retired.

Jay T. Baker, Dallas, N.C., in place of G. L. Friday, resigned.

Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.

Raymond H. Hoots, Edneyville, N.C., in place of J. W. Nesbitt, retired.

Sion Chester Rogers, Elizabethtown, N.C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.

John O. Gettys, Ellenboro, N.C., in place of of W. C. Stockton, resigned.

Alton B. Parker, Fairmont, N.C., in place of T. S. Teague, retired.
Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N.C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
Paul R. Hambright, Grover, N.C., in place of B. F. Bird, retired.
Willard W. Reavis, Hamptonville, N.C., in place of B. F. Gough, retired.
Wallace K. Crawford, Hayesville, N.C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
Hugh D. Morrison, Hendersonville, N.C., in place of Columbus Few, retired.
Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N.C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.
Maude T. Brown, Hillsboro, N.C., T. E. Bivins, resigned.
Bonnie L. Mason, Holly Ridge, N.C., in place of C. C. Hines, Jr., deceased.
James A. Rouse, Hubert, N.C., in place of J. N. Starling, resigned.
John F. Mewborne, Kinston, N.C., in place of E. R. Wooten, resigned.
Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N.C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.
Roby J. Maley, Lexington, N.C., in place of S. J. Smith, retired.
Kirby W. Greene, Jr., Linwood, N.C., in place of F. H. Shoaf, transferred.
James D. Cobb, Lumber Bridge, N.C., in place of D. G. Clifton, declined.
Wayne Jefferson Edwards, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.
F. Ray Frisby, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.
Erlean S. Stevens, Mayodan, N.C., in place of J. V. Highfill, retired.
Lucile R. Eagle, Misenheimer, N.C., in place of C. A. Dry, resigned.
Charles W. Craig, Mount Holly, N.C., in place of J. W. Nantz, Sr., resigned.
Rose M. McMillan, Parkton, N.C., in place of V. D. Martin, retired.
Hugh C. Greenwood, Roaring River, N.C., in place of Bessie Caudill, retired.
Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N.C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
Carroll O. Jenkins, Robbinsville, N.C., in place of W. G. Carver, removed.
James A. Ward, Rosehill, N.C., in place of M. L. Carr, resigned.
Carl G. Underwood, Sr., Saint Pauls, N.C., in place of B. R. Stone, resigned.
Edward V. Gore, Jr., Shallotte, N.C., in place of I. B. Parker, retired.
Rhoda L. Lewis, Sneads Ferry, N.C., in place of N. M. Millis, retired.
Charles C. Small, Sophia, N.C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.
Maxwell G. Rush, Southern Pines, N.C., in place of A. G. Pierce, resigned.
William V. Langley, Staley, N.C., in place of M. I. Siler, retired.
Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N.C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
Don D. Cogdill, Jr., Sylva, N.C., in place of T. W. Ashe, retired.
Eugene P. Satterthwait, Tarboro, N.C., in place of T. T. Thomas, retired.
J. Alton Leonard, Toast, N.C., in place of P. Y. Snow, retired.
Fred W. Harper, Wake Forest, N.C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.
John T. Eastridge, Warrensville, N.C., in place of A. O. Ashley, retired.
Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N.C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N.C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.
Arthur C. Meares, Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.
Joseph Howard Revis, Whittier, N.C., in place of M. P. Williams, retired.
Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N.C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.
Charles M. Taylor, Winnabow, N.C., in place of J. J. Henry, resigned.
Joseph H. Poindexter, Yadkinville, N.C., in place of W. F. Van Hoy, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.
Wilfred J. Haas, Hazen, N. Dak., in place of Ronald Keeley, deceased.
Michael A. Sperle, Kintyre, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Ellingson, deceased.
Reinhart Stradinger, Mercer, N. Dak., in place of B. C. Hjelle, retired.
Arthur G. Bilden, Northwood, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Halverson, retired.
Berthold E. Sackman, West Fargo, N. Dak., in place of K. A. Peterson, deceased.

OHIO

Edward E. Bickhard, Antwerp, Ohio, in place of M. E. Bakle, retired.
Orlan L. Hines, Ashville, Ohio, in place of S. L. Smith, deceased.
Robert H. Cassel, Aurora, Ohio, in place of M. P. Mowl, retired.
Robert D. Fisher, Beach City, Ohio, in place of W. J. Miller, retired.
George A. Bowers, Jr., Bellville, Ohio, in place of C. C. Dill, transferred.
Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.
Charles H. Davis, Bethesda, Ohio, in place of A. H. Bolon, retired.
Hester H. Holman, Brilliant, Ohio, in place of R. B. Craven, removed.
C. William McFarland, Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of F. G. Schalmo, retired.
Gene V. Okey, Chandlersville, Ohio, in place of Z. M. Wolfe, resigned.
Orville E. Fuhrer, Clarington, Ohio, in place of S. B. Maury, deceased.
Dwight M. Peffley, Jr., Clayton, Ohio, in place of B. M. Lockwood, resigned.
Robert W. Meyers, Cleves, Ohio, in place of M. C. Dick, retired.
Clifford O. Shell, Columbiana, Ohio, in place of S. E. Tidd, retired.
Raymond F. Lusk, Columbus Grove, Ohio, in place of C. A. McCrate, deceased.
Richard W. Olinger, Dayton, Ohio, in place of G. H. Mundhenk, retired.
Harold T. Deselms, Freeport, Ohio, in place of K. E. Caldwell, transferred.
Thomas S. McCrea, Fresno, Calif., in place of C. H. Barth, transferred.
Joseph J. Smerke, Gates Mills, Ohio, in place of K. H. A. Haberecht, resigned.
Ernest W. Jones, Glouster, Ohio, in place of D. P. Mooney, retired.
Virginia G. Bortel, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.
Arthur K. Siefer, Higginsport, Ohio, in place of L. L. Seyler, retired.
Charles R. Cramer, Iberia, Ohio, in place of D. E. Wake, resigned.
Donovan J. Huntsberger, Kidron, Ohio, in place of H. R. Sprunger, deceased.
V. Kathryn Whisler, Laurelville, Ohio, in place of F. M. Lappen, retired.
Richard J. Neuhardt, Lewisville, Ohio, in place of C. R. Pollen, removed.
B. Joanne Seifert, Litchfield, Ohio, in place of C. E. Fratz, transferred.
Charles R. Scott, Lodi, Ohio, in place of V. A. Miner, retired.
Henry J. Climer, Londonderry, Ohio, in place of W. D. Smallwood, transferred.
Paul E. Hess, Ludlow Falls, Ohio, in place of J. R. Gallagher, deceased.
Roger A. Barker, Lynchburg, Ohio, in place of E. S. Reames, retired.
Glen R. Stimmel, Malvern, Ohio, in place of H. H. Hart, retired.
Ruth C. Menker, Maria Stein, Ohio, in place of U. B. Menker, deceased.
Alonzo D. McGlumphy, Martins Ferry, Ohio, in place of O. C. Frantz, retired.
Harry E. Munson, Mesopotamia, Ohio, in place of L. L. Ford, deceased.
Frederick B. Gatch, Milford, Ohio, in place of F. W. White, retired.
Paul F. Thomas, Millersport, Ohio, in place of H. D. Bowers, retired.
Dorothy B. Smith, New Burlington, Ohio, in place of E. G. Miller, retired.
Donald E. Hurless, Ohio City, Ohio, in place of V. D. Spahr, Jr., resigned.
Walter S. Pfeiffer, Orient, Ohio, in place of J. L. Crawford, retired.
George J. Johnson, Painesville, Ohio, in place of J. J. Cawley, retired.
James W. Speakman, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.
Ralph E. Hecker, Pataskala, Ohio, in place of M. N. Johnson, resigned.
Leo C. Blackburn, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of F. E. Smith, resigned.
Marvin W. Wolford, Rawson, Ohio, in place of Pearl Burket, retired.
Neva M. Beatty, Sedalia, Ohio, in place of P. T. Shepherd, retired.
Gordon R. Lanker, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.
Harold H. Haggard, Urbana, Ohio, in place of P. H. Gifford, deceased.
Clair R. Guthrie, Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of L. L. Newland, deceased.
Robert G. Stephenson, Wellston, Ohio, in place of G. W. Rupp, retired.
Paul L. Rood, Westerville, Ohio, in place of S. O. Kreischer, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Daryl D. Milford, Byars, Okla., in place of D. E. Jones, transferred.
Don A. Neumeyer, Council Hill, Okla., in place of H. H. Swadley, retired.
Ford H. Sims, Martha, Okla., in place of W. O. Rowsey, deceased.
Claude D. Van Kirk, Mountain View, Okla., in place of Blanche Zoellner, retired.
Floyd P. Butler, Poteau, Okla., in place of Monroe Burton, retired.
Peggy R. Pierce, Ratliff City, Okla. Office established January 1, 1953.
Josephine R. Bayliff, Rosston, Okla., in place of R. J. Price, retired.
Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grisby, resigned.
Frank J. Hininger, Spencer, Okla., in place of H. F. Legg, retired.
Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mils, resigned.
Emory J. Davidson, Vinson, Okla., in place of J. R. Chitwood, retired.

OREGON

John R. Nieland, Canby, Oreg., in place of H. I. Brown, retired.
Deyo A. McLendon, Gearhart, Oreg., in place of Antoinette McKechnie, retired.
Jack B. Knight, Jefferson, Oreg., in place of C. C. Miller, retired.
Paul V. Mill, Junction City, Oreg., in place of I. R. Howard, retired.
Edna B. Carl, Oswego, Oreg., in place of G. H. Carl, deceased.
Marshal F. Dunkin, Troutdale, Oreg., in place of R. D. Hewitt, retired.
William H. Fieldman, Veneta, Oreg., in place of W. E. Elliott, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

John B. Cook, Alexandria, Pa., in place of R. N. Lankard, resigned.
Ross B. McIlwain, Apollo, Pa., in place of N. B. Fiscus, retired.
Arnold J. Polidori, Archbald, Pa., in place of R. A. McHale, retired.
Lois M. Brown, Armagh, Pa., in place of R. O. Trexler, retired.
George D. Yoder, Ashland, Pa., in place of H. J. Betz, deceased.
John J. Gallagher, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa., in place of M. K. Kerns, retired.
Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNelis, retired.
Richard Wasser, Bedminster, Pa., in place of M. F. Wasser, retired.
C. Earl Garland, Bethlehem, Pa., in place of J. W. Dawley, retired.
Erma I. Gibson, Bolivar, Pa., in place of H. N. Byers, retired.
Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
Robert E. Dibble, Cedars, Pa., in place of Isadore Sacks, deceased.
Wayne H. Winton, Centervile, Pa., in place of E. A. McBride, retired.
William L. Laird, Claysville, Pa., in place of H. O. Campsey, retired.

Emma Jane Kimmel, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.
Augusta T. Archfield, Devon, Pa., in place of J. F. Woodruff, transferred.
William C. Hoffman, Dingmans Ferry, Pa., in place of L. S. Seymour, deceased.
Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.
Warren S. H. Reppert, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.
Elmer B. Herman, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
Paul R. Moore, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of P. N. Lindner, resigned.
Frank H. Marshall, Fairview Village, Pa., in place of A. M. Young, retired.
Floyd G. Kulp, Franconia, Pa., in place of N. L. Kulp, retired.
Jacob G. Appler, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.
Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.
Ella A. Eggenberger, Greeley, Pa., in place of E. L. Rosencrance, resigned.
Doris M. Harvey, Grindstone, Pa., in place of A. W. Kovach, resigned.
Edward H. Yonker, Holmes, Pa., in place of N. G. Landenberger, retired.
Carl E. Duble, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Fisler, retired.
Margaret Jane Knight, Industry, Pa., in place of A. W. Ewing, retired.
William A. Helman, Irwin, Pa., in place of W. B. Lewis, removed.
Victor J. Westerberg, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.
Harry E. Himes, Jr., Kittanning, Pa., in place of J. P. King, retired.
J. Gomer Saul, Kutztown, Pa., in place of G. R. Frey, retired.
Oswald E. Lombardi, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of E. A. Deming, retired.
Andrew Evanitsky, Jr., Lakewood, Pa., in place of C. G. Reynolds, retired.
David G. Riggle, Ligonier, Pa., in place of C. F. Cairns, retired.
Marie J. Schoppy, Locust Gap, Pa., in place of J. J. McDonnell, removed.
Gilbert A. Garvey, Lost Creek, Pa., in place of Tillie Kuchinsky, retired.
Emma M. Neuland, Lucinda, Pa., in place of F. G. Neuland, retired.
Gordon R. Hockenbrock, McAlisterville, Pa., in place of L. I. Leister, retired.
Frank A. Stantone, Jr., Malvern, Pa., in place of C. P. Kennedy, retired.
Homer G. Jeffries, Marion Center, Pa., in place of R. M. Dodson, retired.
Henry L. Haines, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.
Steward H. Hartman, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.
Julia M. Arrowood, Mehoopany, Pa., in place of D. R. Sheehan, retired.
William E. Thumma, Millersville, Pa., in place of J. M. Hartman, deceased.
Blaine E. Klingman, Milton, Pa., in place of E. M. Crawford, retired.
Howard D. Hoffman, New Albany, Pa., in place of F. J. Murphy, retired.
Earle C. Householder, North Apollo, Pa., in place of D. E. Held, retired.
Henry R. Beitler, Old Zionsville, Pa., in place of H. S. Miller, retired.
Sterryl W. Walter, Penns Creek, Pa., in place of J. C. Showers, retired.
Frederic H. Barth, Philadelphia, Pa., in place of R. A. Thomas, retired.
Herbert E. Hoover, Rheems, Pa., in place of J. B. Henry, retired.
John M. Holland, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.
William E. McClearn, Stoneboro, Pa., in place of W. D. McIntire, retired.
Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Johnston, retired.
Arlyn B. French, Susquehanna, Pa., in place of D. J. Scales, Jr., deceased.
Raymond C. Burkhart, Terre Hill, Pa., in place of B. E. Weaver, retired.
Esther T. Williams, Thorndale, Pa., in place of L. E. Port, retired.
Milton F. Ward, Tioga, Pa., in place of R. S. Kayzer, retired.
Alice F. Burdick, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.
George W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of N. W. Nase, resigned.
Crawford M. Mackley, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of C. L. Johnston, retired.
Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.
Carl F. Hynek, Jr., Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.
W. Nevin Martin, Willow Street, Pa., in place of R. E. Sayres, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Edilberto Rivera, Aibonito, P.R., in place of M. C. Abraham, retired.
Anardi Agosto Baquero, Canovanas, P.R., in place of Carmen Villalobos, retired.
Hector L. Candelas Beveraggi, Cidra, P.R., in place of Luis Lugo, retired.
Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P.R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.
Rita Peterson de Torrens, Dorado, P.R., in place of C. A. deTorrens, retired.
Luis Mercado-Calderon, Fajardo, P.R., in place of Adela Delpin, retired.
Aurelio David, Jr., Hatillo, P.R., in place of Ester Lacomba, retired.
Roberto DeJesus-Correa, Loiza, P.R., in place of H. F. Matos, retired.
Juan Sanches De Jesus, Vega Baja, P.R., in place of R. O. Colon, removed.

RHODE ISLAND

Raymond A. Piccolo, Bradford, R.I., in place of T. F. Eldridge, deceased.
Harold D. Cutting, Jr., North Kingstown, R.I., in place of Ralph Campbell, retired.
Richard J. Vitullo, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carlisle E. Hammett, Converse, S.C., in place of E. S. Drake, retired.
H. R. Ford Cherry, Jr., Enoree, S.C., in place of L. O. Thornton, retired.
Alton L. McLellan, Hamer, S.C., in place of W. F. McLellan, deceased.
W. Robert Cooper, Jr., Lane, S.C., in place of J. A. Montgomery, retired.
Lewis G. Leverett, Langley, S.C., in place of L. F. Beard, retired.
Monroe H. Hutto, Montmorenci, S.C., in place of J. L. Berrie, deceased.
Bette J. Perritt, Peedee, S.C., in place of I. M. Perritt, retired.
Margaret H. Leary, Troy, S.C., in place of R. A. Russell, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inez I. Haenfler, Avon, S. Dak., in place of L. V. Marek, retired.
Elvera Pitzl, Eden, S. Dak., in place of G. A. Pitzl, deceased.
Harold I. Reilly, Madison, S. Dak., in place of S. A. Tomeraasen, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Warren D. Blackburn, Bells, Tenn., in place of G. W. Mobley, deceased.
James F. Miller, Brownsville, Tenn., in place of J. A. Hudson, deceased.
Allie Louise W. Anderson, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.
Rufus T. Roberts, Corryton, Tenn., in place of D. L. Clapp, transferred.
David F. Ross, Cottagegrove, Tenn., R. B. Cox, transferred.
Helen A. Bowman, Cumberland Gap, Tenn., in place of A. M. Fulton, retired.
Norma L. Clement, Ellendale, Tenn., in place of T. S. Peek, retired.
Robert W. Johnson, Enville, Tenn., in place of L. E. Parker, retired.
Earl W. Ogle, Gatlinburg, Tenn., in place of E. M. Ogle, deceased.
Reuben P. Taylor, Gleason, Tenn., in place of W. L. Newberry, retired.
Howard F. Newell, Harrison, Tenn., in place of L. G. Wilson, resigned.
Jack W. Carey, Hartsville, Tenn., in place of J. S. McMurry, deceased.
Leon W. Crews, Hollow Rock, Tenn., in place of W. R. Rice, retired.
Dorothy M. Hunter, Huntland, Tenn., in place of A. E. Staples, retired.
Harry A. Waddington, Luttrell, Tenn., in place of J. C. Davis, retired.
M. Greer Raulston, Monteagle, Tenn., in place of C. P. Fults, retired.
Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.
Herman R. McEwen, Petersburg, Tenn., in place of H. B. Whitaker, retired.
Reece Liles, Petros, Tenn., in place of W. E. Hobbs, retired.
Carl B. Barnes, Prospect, Tenn., in place of C. E. Reed, retired.
Beatrice W. Norris, Ramer, Tenn., in place of C. L. Majors, retired.
Basil Hubert Nunley, Riceville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Higginbotham, retired.
Melvin L. Kilgore, Richard City, Tenn., in place of J. B. Hackworth, removed.
John B. Howe, Rogersville, Tenn., in place of G. B. Kyle, retired.
Lillian C. Boyd, Rossville, Tenn., in place of W. J. Frazier, retired.
William P. Shofner, Shelbyville, Tenn., in place of D. B. Shofner, retired.
Jerome C. Ables, South Pittsburg, Tenn., in place of Lois McReynolds, retired.
Thomas R. Carothers, Wartrace, Tenn., in place of A. S. Shriver, retired.

TEXAS

Jasper L. Ellison, Abernathy, Tex., in place of W. A. Richter, resigned.
John L. Rose, Albany, Tex., in place of W. K. Wood, retired.
George D. FitzSimmons, Jr., Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen, removed.
Albert A. Hubbard, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
John Clarence Stockton, Alvord, Tex., in place of W. E. Howell, transferred.
Harold S. Roberts, Andrews, Tex., in place of M. M. Burkett, retired.
Clemmie W. Woodard, Azle, Tex., in place of E. G. Parker, retired.
Arlene H. Burks, Blossom, Tex., in place of L. H. Clark, retired.
James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
Earl F. Stubblefield, Bogata, Tex., in place of W. G. King, retired.
Esom D. Rushing, Broaddus, Tex., in place of Oma Wall, retired.
Benjamin W. Pearce, Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns, deceased.
Norman A. Webster, Charlotte, Tex., in place of Edna Martin, retired.
Malcolm O. Daugherty, Cherokee, Tex., in place of Graves Burke, retired.
Carroll L. Byrd, Childress, Tex., in place of J. A. Hilburn, retired.
Rupert C. Tucker, Claude, Tex., in place of C. W. Appling, retired.
Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
Thurmon O. Storey, Deport, Tex., in place of C. H. Nobles, retired.
Homer R. Granberry, Douglassville, Tex., in place of E. E. McMillian, Jr., removed.
Howard C. Johnson, Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of Hargrove Smith, resigned.
John D. Zahn, Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey, resigned.
Russell W. Smith, Floresville, Tex., in place of E. W. Franklin, retired.
Robert M. Gring, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
James D. Wheeler, Jr., Garland, Tex., in place of F. B. Crush, resigned.

Willie G. Bain, George West, Tex., in place of Ella Bartlett, retired.
Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose, Tex., in place of W. E. Porter, retired.
Graydon W. Baze, Gorman, Tex., in place of D. M. Moorman, retired.
R. T. Saling, Jr., Henrietta, Tex., in place of Lem Ashinhurst, retired.
Waunita A. Lynch, Highlands, Tex., in place of C. L. Hill, retired.
Clara J. Loesch, Industry, Tex., in place of E. A. Raeke, resigned.
Charles M. Martinson, Jr., Jasper, Tex., in place of H. R. Hancock, transferred.
J. Austin Rigney, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.
Ronald A. Helfenstine, Kennedale, Tex., in place of Sallie Helm, resigned.
James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.
George E. Scratchley, Laredo, Tex., in place of J. R. Goodman, retired.
Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
John H. Garrett, Lone Star, Tex., in place of A. C. Mestayer, resigned.
Grattus H. Pamplin, McKinney, Tex., in place of D. O. Davis, retired.
Darwin B. Grayson, Marquez, Tex., in place of A. D. Woods, Jr., transferred.
Charlie Scaff, Matador, Tex., in place of E. F. Springer, retired.
Lloyd A. Adams, Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
Wilbur H. Borcherding, Nash, Tex., in place of E. B. Pounds, retired.
Hugh Clifford Ryan, Pasadena, Tex., in place of C. T. Coolidge, retired.
Ralph R. Richardson, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.
Henry W. Lester, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of G. L. Fowler, deceased.
Virginia Blair Taylor, Ponder, Tex., in place of J. L. Riggs, resigned.
Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.
Carl S. Halliday, Port Lavaca, Tex., in place of G. R. Thayer, transferred.
Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
Louise E. Crump, Saint Jo, Tex., in place of D. L. Boone, transferred.
Arthur E. York, Jr., Seagraves, Tex., in place of D. E. Williams, resigned.
David E. Adams, Selman City, Tex., in place of E. A. Sutherlin, retired.
Milton B. Ford, Slaton, Tex., in place of T. E. McClanahan, retired.
Robert I. Thompson, South Houston, Tex., in place of P. T. Hoovestol, deceased.
Eugene L. Mickey, Sweeny, Tex., in place of H. B. Vezey, retired.
Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.
Edgar Harris, Timpson, Tex., in place of J. J. Compton, retired.
Junius D. Metz, Waco, Tex., in place of L. C. Alexander, retired.
Floyd D. Inman, Warren, Tex., in place of L. M. Bradberry, retired.
Charles Allen, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
David F. Renfro, Zavalla, Tex., in place of C. A. Barge, Jr., transferred.

UTAH

Mable A. Wilstead, Castle Gate, Utah, in place of J. W. Nielsen, retired.
Jay R. Farmer, Centerville, Utah, in place of H. D. Roberts, retired.
Jack E. Christensen, Logan, Utah, in place of Eugene Yeates, retired.
Max G. Johnson, Midway, Utah, in place of N. A. Burgener, retired.
VeRee C. Cox, Orangeville, Utah, in place of E. R. Curtis, retired.
Fred W. Cooper, Provo, Utah, in place of W. R. Green, retired.
Glen P. Kunzler, Willard, Utah, in place of L. J. Baird, retired.

VERMONT

Esther L. Sweatt, Craftsbury Common, Vt., in place of B. W. Farrar, retired.
Wilmer E. Bowen, Derby, Vt., in place of M. E. Boucher, retired.
Carroll E. Brown, East Ryegate, Vt., in place of R. G. Franklin, resigned.
Dorothy M. Lyman, Hinesburg, Vt., in place of L. H. Riggs, transferred.
Wendell E. Morse, North Ferrisburg, Vt., in place of S. M. Hicks, deceased.
Lyndell C. Wood, South Royalton, Vt., in place of G. M. Goodrich, retired.
Sheridan P. Dow, Waterville, Vt., in place of O. P. Shattuck, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Winfrey W. Grizzard, Amelia Court House, Va., in place of L. O. Scott, deceased.
Richard L. Wingfield, Appomattox, Va., in place of E. L. Smith, retired.
Mary E. Lynch, Bowling Green, Va., in place of F. G. Beale, retired.
Carroll D. Harrison, Cartersville, Va., in place of L. A. Baker, retired.
Mary H. Colvin, Catlett, Va., in place of B. M. Guy, retired.
Roy L. Norman, Cedar Bluff, Va., in place of R. L. Williams, resigned.
Wilbur F. Fitzgerald, Cheriton, Va., in place of W. M. Upshur, Jr., deceased.
Beulah J. Skeens, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
Noble Conley Bishop, Duffield, Va., in place of E. P. Tompkins, retired.
Jo Pierson Horne, Fort Blackmore, Va., in place of E. C. Turner, resigned.
William C. Deming, Front Royal, Va., in place of A. O. Haley, retired.
Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.
Martin Luther Garraghty, Goode, Va., in place of J. S. McCauley, retired.
Austin F. Robinson, Great Falls, Va. Office established November 1, 1959.
Virginia G. Kiser, Grundy, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.
Rose L. Hottel, Haymarket, Va., in place of R. C. Smith, retired.
Charles H. Arrington, Hays, Va., in place of I. M. Baker, retired.
Oscar E. Wooldridge, Huddleston, Va., in place of M. J. Turner, deceased.
Hamilton W. Shoop, Meredithville, Va., in place of R. M. Taylor, removed.
Thelma E. Addington, Nickelsville, Va., in place of R. L. McConnell, retired.
William B. Anderson, Onley, Va., in place of W. O. Brittingham, resigned.
Reuben N. Falls, Pembroke, Va., in place of P. M. Johnson, resigned.
Francis J. Riley, Portsmouth, Va., in place of S. F. Kirby, retired.
George M. Pomeroy, Providence Forge, Va., in place of J. R. Parker, Jr., resigned.
Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.
Carl F. Eppard, Stanardsville, Va., in place of E. L. Southard, retired.
Carl A. Parsons, Jr., Sugar Grove, Va., in place of E. M. Calhoun, deceased.
William B. Gwathmey, Walkerton, Va., in place of R. S. Sheppard, retired.
Andrew W. Gallagher, Warsaw, Va., in place of R. C. Sanders, transferred.
Aubrey C. Marshall, Woodstock, Va., in place of J. W. Bailey, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Leon A. Mawson, Charlotte Amalie, V.I., in place of Alvaro de Lugo, deceased.
Charles E. Clarke, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Adele Berg, resigned.
Ralph E. Delemos, Kingshill, V.I., in place of I. A. Hansen, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret M. McCormick, Anawalt, W. Va., in place of Wash Hornick, Jr., resigned.
Ivan H. Scarbro, Ansted, W. Va., in place of M. L. Taylor, retired.
Ruby L. Teets, Aurora, W. Va., in place of G. R. Mason, resigned.
Amos L. Whittington, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of E. K. Beitz, resigned.
Sally L. Eller, Capels, W. Va., in place of M. A. Arnold, resigned.
Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.
Nettie L. Hurd, Craigsville, W. Va., in place of S. B. Herold, retired.
Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.
Veon C. Cox, East Rainelle, W. Va., in place of U. W. Grimes, retired.
John E. Edens, Elkview, W. Va., in place of J. E. Hafer, retired.
Leonard R. Northcraft, Friendly, W. Va., in place of Lula Griffin, retired.
Hagan P. Riggs, Gary, W. Va., in place of W. M. Boardman, retired.
Helen L. Buchanan, Gilbert, W. Va., in place of H. A. Buchanan, resigned.
Martha K. Hope, Hansford, W. Va., in place of O. G. Toney, retired.
Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.
Ruby E. Blevins, Hemphill, W. Va., in place of P. J. Groseclose, retired.
Lakey E. Fink, Hendricks, W. Va., in place of W. H. Ryan, retired.
Ison T. White, Jr., Hopemont, W. Va., in place of Herman Taylor, retired.
Edward L. Chrisman, Kearneysville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Hammond, retired.
Mildred D. Moore, Lesage, W. Va., in place of L. M. Galford, resigned.
Mason H. Myers, McComas, W. Va., in place of B. S. Watts, retired.
Troy O. Harden, McConnell, W. Va., in place of Nellie Robinette, deceased.
William R. Hudnall, Marmet, W. Va., in place of M. K. McIntyre, retired.
Carl F. Nichols, Middlebourne, W. Va., in place of H. H. Crumrine, deceased.
Erva Winston Cooper, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.
Harry H. King, Osage, W. Va., in place of A. J. Nemeth, resigned.
Earl J. Delaney, Parsons, W. Va., in place of Myrtle Blackman, retired.
Laurel H. Clovis, Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of L. C. Foster, retired.
William J. Blackburn, Ravenswood, W. Va., in place of W. S. Myers, resigned.
George B. Jordan, Ripley, W. Va., in place of H. E. Starcher, removed.
Claude G. Pownall, Romney, W. Va., in place of C. J. Powell, retired.
Glen McKeever, Ronceverte, W. Va., in place of C. P. Ott, retired.
Dillard R. Walker, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of W. L. Warden, resigned.
Raymond A. Addis, Superior, W. Va., in place of S. L. Sinnett, retired.
Victor J. Robinson, Tams, W. Va., in place of R. F. Wildey, resigned.
Harold R. Wiles, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.

WISCONSIN

Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.
Milton L. Dickinsen, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.
Earnie V. Ostrom, Brookfield, Wis., in place of W. G. McCoy, transferred.
Harley O. Rolland, Chaseburg, Wis., in place of J. W. Johnson, transferred.
George H. Poukey, Cumberland, Wis., in place of M. G. Dunham, retired.
Harold D. Baker, Dousman, Wis., in place of L. P. Mundschau, retired.
Robert W. Olson, Footville, Wis., in place of Nellie Drew, retired.
Kenneth J. O'Hern, Forestville, Wis., in place of E. P. Naze, transferred.
Phoebe J. Pinkley, Fountain City, Wis., in place of W. R. Hartley, retired.
A. Lyman Arnquist, Glenwood City, Wis., in place of H. E. Lauber, resigned.
Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

Rogert W. Novy, Hillsboro, Wis., in place of E. C. Hammer, transferred.
Dwain A. Pierrard, Kennan, Wis., in place of V. J. Adomaitis, transferred.
Kenneth R. Jacobs, Knapp, Wis., in place of J. D. Purvis, transferred.
John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.
Harley L. Prell, New Richmond, Wis., in place of L. N. Hughes, retired.
James P. Meyers, Potter, Wis., in place of R. G. Duchow, deceased.
John H. Johnson, Prentice, Wis., in place of C. A. Lundborg, retired.
Chester F. Meyer, Richfield, Wis., in place of G. H. R. Frey, deceased.
Dolores M. Tabbert, Somers, Wis., in place of C. C. Ruthe, resigned.
Dallas E. Dimmer, Stanley, Wis., in place of W. L. Hanley, retired.
Robert M. Boche, Star Prairie, Wis., in place of J. E. Casey, retired.
Robert C. Herman, Thorp, Wis., in place of W. S. Wagner, retired.

WYOMING

Kenneth W. Birch, Cokeville, Wyo., in place of V. C. Bennion, resigned.
Chester L. Zwemer, Deaver, Wyo., in place of R. A. Olsen, retired.
Alice L. Hahn, Edgerton, Wyo., in place of H. E. Moore, retired.
Johnnie A. Thon, Lusk, Wyo., in place of A. B. Mills, retired.
Faye T. Sankey, Mills, Wyo., in place of M. E. Nolan, retired.
Harold V. Baas, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. R. Gage, resigned.
Alexandria C. Yokel, Wilson, Wyo., in place of Hazel Titus, retired.
Thomas J. Ferguson, Wolf, Wyo., in place of T. B. Butler, retired.
Warren H. Moore, Worland, Wyo., in place of P. F. McClure, deceased.
Marguerite A. Braziel, Yoder, Wyo., in place of C. V. Malone, transferred.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James W. Griffin, Berry, Ala., in place of T. M. Karrh, retired.
Frances M. Cruise, Hull, Ala., in place of F. V. Mason, retired.

ARKANSAS

Earl D. Miller, Alexander, Ark., in place of M. A. Gassner, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Ruth R. Kuhn, Fulton, Calif., in place of Stella Sprague, retired.
Paul B. Boyd, Glendale, Calif., in place of M. L. Green, retired.
Glen D. Roe, Lamont, Calif., in place of Margaret Campbell, resigned.
Diana L. Gauthey, Mammoth Lakes, Calif., in place of A. M. Webb, resigned.
Chester W. Seely, Moffett Field, Calif., C. V. Schessler, resigned.
Marie C. Mize, Mountain Center, Calif., in place of E. M. Beach, resigned.
Gailon C. Muzzey, Topanga, Calif., in place of H. E. Rolfe, resigned.

COLORADO

Charles P. Swift, Lyons, Colo., in place of L. A. Drage, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Stanley B. Gregory, Cannondale, Conn., in place of R. S. Gregory, retired.

FLORIDA

Allen F. Kendall, Jensen Beach, Fla., in place of W. C. Johnson, retired.

GEORGIA

Effie R. Rhodes, Aragon, Ga., in place of G. W. Stroupe, retired.
Frank P. Pierce, Chickamauga, Ga., in place of M. L. Deck, retired.
Harvell M. Upchurch, Hapeville, Ga., in place of C. M. Sisson, deceased.
William E. Bedgood, Harrison, Ga., in place of J. G. Jackson, retired.

HAWAII

Chieko I. Shimabukuro, Papaaloa, Hawaii, in place of Alexander Cameron, retired.

ILLINOIS

Keith R. Whittaker, Rockbridge, Ill., in place of R. W. Jacobi, retired.
Eugene R. Serrot, Rushville, Ill., in place of H. F. Markell, retired.

INDIANA

Darrell E. Winning, Greenwood, Ind., in place of Raymond McClain, retired.
Carl E. Livers, Loogootee, Ind., in place of L. M. Cissell, retired.
Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
Charles E. Inks, Plymouth, Ind., in place of Jesse Yoder, retired.
Wanda L. Grimes, Tangier, Ind., in place of H. L. S. Peters, removed.

IOWA

Gerald L. Aker, Davis City, Iowa, in place of V. M. Hill, transferred.
Jeannette E. Rohwer, Dixon, Iowa, in place of A. H. Rohwer, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Roscoe M. Bates, Sadieville, Ky., in place of R. F. Gillispie, transferred.
Laura P. Smith, Sebree, Ky., in place of Milton Ashby, retired.
Mary F. Hill, Stone, Ky., in place of J. S May, retired.
Arnold D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, Ky., in place of L. D. Rose, retired.
Francis E. Ryan, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayno Hayden, resigned.
Amanda N. Blackford, Wilmore, Ky., in place of C. W. Mitchell, retired.
Paul R. Simmons, Worthville, Ky., in place of Nellie Clubb, retired.

MAINE

Louis J. LaCroix, Calais, Maine, in place of N. F. Townsend, deceased.
Dwight E. Lander, Stratton, Maine, in place of H. T. Ricker, retired.

MICHIGAN

Robert H. Gorsline, Milford, Mich., in place of V. E. Boyle, removed.

MINNESOTA

Charles A. Lindstrom, Lake Park, Minn., in place of H. G. Torgerson, retired.
James M. Beecher, New Ulm, Minn., in place of Elmer Backer, resigned.

MISSOURI

Edwin E. Frye, Canton, Mo., in place of H. M. Ward, deceased.
Virgil O. Fleming, Holts Summit, Mo., in place of R. A. McCleary, retired.
Glenn E. Peer, Linneus, Mo., in place of R. M. Butterfield, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Dallas R. Bennett, Bassett, Nebr., in place of F. C. Diehl, deceased.
Vincent L. Nelson, Palisade, Nebr., in place of S. A. Troutman, transferred.
Donald K. Rowe, Ralston, Nebr., in place of E. R. Henkel, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

James E. Posten, Atlantic Highlands, N.J., in place of H. W. Posten, retired.
William T. Minkoff, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.
Robert W. Jordan, East Brunswick, N.J. Office established April 1, 1959.
Paul J. Sulla, Manville, N.J., in place of W. F. Janusz, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harveleigh M. White, Method, N.C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.
Katie B. Miller, Moyock, N.C., in place of M. F. Dunston, retired.
Thadis M. Oxendine, Pembroke, N.C., in place of J. R. Lowry, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Duane F. Egeberg, Argusville, N. Dak., in place of H. K. Hanson, transferred.
Richard R. Benson, Fortuna, N. Dak., in place of M. I. Abell, retired.

OHIO

Robert D. Bates, Ashtabula, Ohio, in place of R. J. Goggin, deceased.
Orville C. Hoover, Salem, Ohio, in place of L. D. Beardmore, deceased.
Jennie V. Barge, Yorkshire, Ohio, in place of Pearl Guillozet, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Henry D. Friend, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of F. M. Shaw, deceased.

OREGON

Wilbur A. Wellborn, St. Helens, Oreg., in place of C. W. Wickman, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lyle T. Streeter Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.
William W. Donley, Eightyfour, Pa., in place of W. E. Zediker, retired.
Betty J. Peters, Marysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Raisner, removed.

TENNESSEE

Harold C. Wilt, Santa Fe, Tenn., in place of L. D. Mullins, deceased.

TEXAS

Ross D. Gunn, Gilmer, Tex., in place of E. R. Knowles, retired.
Georgie L. Henderson, Hart, Tex., in place of Herbert Williams, resigned.

VIRGINIA

William D. Sawyer, Accomac, Va., in place of K. C. Ross, retired.
Howard J. Ainsworth, Three Lakes, Wis., in place of Gaylord Helmick, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Col. Charles R. Roderick, 5266A, Regular Air Force, for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code.

Capt. William H. Schmidt, 59883A, who was appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 86th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of captain, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties of a dental officer, and with date of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Kava, Stanley F., AO877804.
Morey, John B., AO660787.

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Baxter, Charles L., AO3091708.
Calloway, Aldred V., AO3031133.

To be captains, USAF (chaplain)

Bowers, George P., AO2234468.
Klein, Stanley H., AO1863077.
Klewin, Thomas W., AO2217717.
Nordstrand, Henry A., AO3059618.
Wendland, Clinton E., AO2217271.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Anderson, Daniel H., AO3044791.
Breneman, William L., AO3088837.

DeMouy, Edward H., AO3075069.
Dorsey, Charles L., AO2249671.
Fenske, Herbert D., AO3078120.
Flanagan, Paul, AO3077673.
Ladyman, George H., AO3079449.
Lindberg, Evan F., AO2244949.
Rue, Nelson B., Jr., AO3076092.
Santacroce, Thomas A., AO3077029.
Schneider, Robert A., AO3076207.
Smith, Robert R., AO3090304.
Straub, John J., AO3043276.
Wilson, Charles L., AO3077172.
Wilson, Roy D., AO3076364.
Zick, Herbert R., AO3043284.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Cox, Charles M., AO3077700.
Dejmek, Homer W., AO3043820.
Martinick, Stephen G., AO3000634.
Parkel, Charles O., Jr., AO3045477.
Paterson, William, AO3043840.
Wade, William M., Jr., AO3045590.

To be captain, USAF (Medical specialist)

Vodopic, Mary A., AJ100037.

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Ball, Lola M., AN2241926.
Curry, Cassandra C., AN2242336.
Frost, Nelda V., AN1912815.
Fueller, Jean M., AN2214467.
Gray, Geraldine J., AN2242382.
Jeffries, Sarah M., AN1906478.
Pipas, Nancy A., AN2243696.
Schoepke, Luella M., AN2242146.
Sever, Caroline E., AN2242218.
Singer, Dorothy L., AN2244104.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Brinson, Alfred C., AO2245094.
Peyser, Daniel B., AO3060635.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (chaplain)

Auer, Robert F., AO3060291.
Bizer, Waldemar A., AO3059805.
Black, Bobby C., AO3061096.
Browne, Vincent T., AO3060833.
Chilton, Donald O., AO3060910.
Condon, Thomas W., Jr., AO3059731.
Doonan, John A., AO3061019.
Elliott, Francis L., AO3060465.
Francis, Donald K., AO3059653.
Grimmett, Philip E., Jr., AO3013514.
Hall, Darrell E., AO3060288.
Hayes, Harold E., AO3060945.
Hines, Dale A., AO3059874.
Hunt, Asa E., III, AO3059771.
Kilpatrick, August C., AO2099293.
McGrory, John R., Jr., AO3060248.
Moreau, Ernest P., AO3060952.
Rasberry, John E., AO3059685.
Schneider, Edward L., AO1908220.
Smith, Eldon R., Jr., AO3059965.
Smith, Malcolm E., AO3059490.
Tabb, Robert W., AO2032872.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Derby, Dennis R., AO3075065.
Story, William R., AO3075139.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

Shaw, Fred A., Jr., AO3088711.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical specialist)

Ryckeley, Martha E., AR3078614.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Anderson, Darlene A., AN3089744.
Bailey, Mary J., AN2243546.
Bareford, Betsy J., AN3089449.
Buckley, Ethel M., AN3044742.
Connolly, Janet M., AN3078743.
Downey, Gertrude A., AN3091503.
Green, Adele M., AN3088728.
Hernandez, Rosa, AN2243228.
Johnson, Betty L., AN2242743.
Nelson, Ethel A., AN3075948.
Ohrt, Valerie A., AN2243410.
Prusko, Joan R., AN3089972.
Ray, Barbara J., AN2243105.
Small, Mary P., AN3089720.
White, Betty J., AN3044834.
Wilson, Eleanor M., AN3089688.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (Nurse)

Soverel, Susan W., AN3090536.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains

Allison, Robert L., AO3018570.
Anderson, Clarence R., AO875527.
Ballard, Carrol C., AO3013096.
Barker, Frederick N., AO810794.
Bauer, Kenneth G., AO2255822.
Beall, Jack L., AO3011617.
Bennett, Robert F., AO3011729.
Boss, Luther D., AO3009849.
Bower, Richard J., AO3022826.
Brooksher, William R., AO3007279.
Brown, Charles W., AO3003953.
Brown, James M., Jr., AO3007802.
Browne, Charles H., AO370377.
Browning, George E., AO2001228.
Brunner, Leroy P., AO590341.
Busbee, Roderick M., AO3009851.
Bush, Horace I., AO2234476.
Calton, Aubrey L., AO3012917.
Campbell, Robert E., AO3024568.
Campion, Daniel J., Jr., AO3012238.
Castleberry, Ronald G., AO3024925.
Chambers, Russell C., AO3007300.
Choromokos, Jame, Jr., AO3009550.
Church, James W., AO3013190.
Cirrito, Joseph F., AO1851557.
Clark, Peter J., AO3012242.
Claytor, David L., AO685817.
Cohen, Marvin I., AO3007822.
Cole, William Y., AO687929.
Crutchfield, Don F., AO3013922.
Curran, Hugh O., AO3016222.
Damewood, Logan A., AO3011000.
Davis, John H., AO3023889.
Densmore, Peter K., AO3011539.
Dolins, Stanley L., AO1859942.
Donahue, John F., AO3007849.
Duke, Rodger C., Jr., AO3013472.
Eason, Edwin R., AO3023063.
Endres, William J., AO3012813.
Espiritu, Roger S., AO3010080.
Fellows, Allen E., AO3022495.
Foley, Matthew J., AO676367.
Gahn, Dennis B., AO2215987.
Garrison, Joseph B., AO1574754.
Gibson, Roger M., AO3015312.
Glasgow, Warwick H., AO3023477.
Glass, Davis H., AO3013167.
Goldhammer, Richard A., AO3011592.
Gorman, Charles W., AO1853238.
Gould, Jack K., AO1633894.
Grieder, William F., AO3005984.
Halkett, Ian W., AO3009941.
Hannan, Joseph J., AO3013587.
Harris, William E., AO3010175.
Hess, Gene, Jr., AO3023363.
Hodge, Donald W., AO3023512.
Hoffman, Robert D., AO3016832.
Holmes, Carroll F., Jr., AO3013084.
Horne, Constance J., AL3007436.
Houston, Thomas M., AO3007933.
Hunt, Melvin D., AO3011101.
Ingram, Robert C., Jr., AO3012746.
Jarrett, Russell V., AO2254982.
Jenkins, Charles L., AO3012840.
Jewel, John R., AO3010933.
Johnson, Alvinus P., AO3023451.
Johnson, John B., AO3013790.
Johnson, Robert W., AO3005213.
Johnston, Rufus L., AO3004298.
Katz, Richard E., AO3012846.
Keener, Harold I., AO3023864.
Keith, Robert M., Jr., AO3022544.
Kibler, Austin W., AO3012967.
Kidder, James R., Jr., AO3021722.
Kilroy, Denis M., AO3013843.
Kirchhoff, Keith D., AO3004355.
Kirk, Robert C., AO3021636.
Klinger, Charles W., Jr., AO3009821.
Kochenderfer, Harold D., Jr., AO3014089.
Langford, Alvin L., AO3015241.
Langford, Andrew C., AO1852489.
Linden, Albert J., AO3024427.
Loessberg, Frank J., Jr., AO3024486.
Maloney, Robert J., AO3012676.
Martin, Frank J., Jr., AO3010456.
Martinez, Gustavo E., AO2245573.
Marzullo, Raymond J., AO709891.
Mathes, Houston E., AO3007999.
McCarthy, Thomas E., AO3023272.
McInnis, Donald L., AO3016625.
McMaster, Billy C., AO3015243.
Medford, Raymond R., AO1856185.
Miller, Edward H., AO673912.
Miller, Eugene E., AO3010706.
Milloy, Allan B., AO1861263.
Millwee, Robert A., AO699700.
Mirth, Joseph D., AO3023584.
Moise, Robeson S., AO3014450.
Moore, Edward D., AO591000.
Moore, LeRoy J., AO2215310.
Morrison, Kenneth H., AO3003829.
Muntean, John V., Jr., AO3023800.
Murph, Leonard R., AO808578.
Negendank, Donald C., AO3021704.
Nelson, Richard L., AO3012314.
Nelson, Roy E., AO1910924.
North, Richard A., AO706099.
O'Connell, John M., AO3007575.
Ormerod, Sidney, AO588020.
Page, James E., Jr., AO575828.
Pardi, Angelo V., AO590807.
Payton, John, Jr., AO667343.
Peoples, Paul L., AO3023371.
Perfili, Thomas E., AO1908953.
Perkins, Raymond W., AO2066112.
Perry, William E., AO943548.
Peters, Roy L., AO3009658.
Petrie, Orville L., AO3012521.
Pratt, Rex K., AO2221333.
Pryor, William J., AO3007611.
Quenstedt, Calvin C., AO3012881.
Quirk, John H., Jr., AO1910538.
Radke, Thomas L., AO3008083.
Ray, Pascal M., Jr., AO3024651.
Rehm, Daniel J., AO3023234.
Reilly, Dwight W., AO3016518.
Reinberg, David, AO3009911.
Richards, Norman L., AO3008092.
Richmond, Myles S., AO3012689.
Roehling, Arthur J., AO701806.
Rumohr, Milton L., AO3010867.
Rushefsky, Ellis, AO3022069.
Sadler, Fred, AO3009533.
Sammons, Colvin L., AO1903141.
Sanders, Ned M., AO3013453.
Sasaki, Robert T., AO3018393.
Sayles, Duvahn W., AO2255008.
Schmidt, John N., AO3022781.
Schoenbauer, Ralph A., AO3022411.
Schwanekamp, Clement F., AO712232.
Seal, Robert S., AO3013697.
Simonson, John C., AO1297439.
Singleton, Clarence H., AO3007661.
Smith, Jesse M., AO3018643.
Snook, Robert H., AO3023503.
Solomons, James I., AO749550.
Spencer, Frank E., Jr., AO3014746.
Starnes, William H., AO2249387.
Stearman, Ealum L., AO3017289.
Stebick, James A., AO3022646.
Thuemmel, John P., AO3014806.
Tilmans, Henry M., AO3013295.
Tomoyasu, Kazuto, AO3009789.
Trimeloni, Bianca D., AL1910955.
Turner, Russell A., II, AO2248514.
Unrath, Richard A., AO3008173.
Upstill, Charles W., AO1101699.
Varvi, Charles J., Jr., AO3023590.
Vellines, Charles H., AO3021606.
Ventimiglia, Charles N., AO3016509.
Waldron, Karl M., Jr., AO815434.
Walker, Fenton G., AO3022652.
Walker, Raymond B., AO3012953.
Waters, George G., AO3008179.
Watson, Robert B., AO3016764.

Weidner, Robert C., AO3022763.
Wells, David S., AO3008186.
Wesley, Clare J., AO3007732.
West, Thomas F., AO3023869.
White, Marcus D., Jr., AO3022941.
Whitesell, William J., AO3010735.
Williams, Fred E., IV, AO2224716.
Williams, Robert L., AO1576814.
Williamson, Howard L., AO3011666.
Windom, Robert W., Jr., AO3024730.
Winter, Charles T., AO3022357.
Wolf, Anthony E., AO3011018.
Wolters, Thomas E., AO3023849.
Wood, Patrick H., AO3022663.
Young, John E., Jr., AO2093103.

To be first lieutenants

Abhalter, Robert J., AO3026462.
Adams, Robert N., AO2209232.
Adams, Winfred P., AO3008849.
Ahlefelder, Henry J., AO3050036.
Alberts, John R., AO2211986.
Alewine, Martin A., AO3032609.
Anderson, Donnie L., AO3047200.
Anderson, Theodore G., AO3035552.
Anderson, Warren L., AO3057634.
Anthony, Alexander E., Jr., AO3053691.
Armstrong, Frank A., III, AO3038696.
Ashenberger, Richard H., AO3047166.
Ashley, Daniel L., Jr., AO3021013.
Athanas, Athas J., Jr., AO783164.
Aulbach, George F., Jr., AO3051318.
Avila, Miguel A., AO3051768.
Bachelor, James T., AO3048269.
Bacik, James J., AO3064187.
Backhaus, Murray D., AO3050615.
Bain, Donald W., Jr., AO3046955.
Barinowski, Robert E., Jr., AO3020008.
Barnaby, Richard E., AO3058482.
Barnes, Robert C., AO3056375.
Bartleson, Fred D., Jr., AO2206970.
Barton, Larry K., AO3068388.
Bassett, Cecil A., Jr., AO3027329.
Battaglia, Joseph H., AO2205357.
Bauer, Richard F., AO2211724.
Baumgardner, Max E., AO3057249.
Beaman, Paul C., AO3030995.
Beard, Harry R., AO3036107.
Beard, James P., AO2205277.
Becker, Stanley H., AO3047846.
Becker, Thomas C., Jr., AO3031611.
Behunin, Otto E., AO3038219.
Benge, Bobby J., AO2209872.
Bengston, Don S., AO3036511.
Bennett, Clyde E., AO3052195.
Berg, Waldo G., AO3016710.
Berkley, Dale W., AO2209750.
Bernasconi, Louis H., AO2204687.
Bertelsen, James P., AO3031361.
Berthold, David F., Jr., AO3028891.
Beveridge, Roy D., AO3017259.
Billy, George J., AO3049131.
Binford, Robert C., Jr., AO3029112.
Bingham, William A., Jr., AO3021184.
Bird, John R., AO3027597.
Birkner, Harry, AO2211140.
Bischoff, Keith M., AO3053029.
Bixby, Marvin D., AO3038893.
Bjerke, Gerald C., AO3053868.
Blackwell, William B., AO3058885.
Blair, James A., AO2205565.
Blandin, Richard O., AO3064399.
Blank, Emanuel T., AO2204610.
Blanton, John W., AO3028545.
Bleacher, Ralph D., AO3048113.
Blunck, Kurt G., AO2210869.
Bohan, Eugene J., AO2208390.
Boivin, Richard H., AO3064251.
Bolls, Dillard D., AO2204373.
Bond, Gerald E., AO3028532.
Bonner, Otis L., Jr., AO2207028.
Burkholm, Christian A., Jr., AO3053381.
Bowles, John E., AO3027078.
Boyd, Billie F., AO3058183.
Bradshaw, John B., AO3030041.
Brasuell, Rollo W., AO3019033.
Braud, Samuel P., III, AO3056252.
Breaux, Ellis J., Jr., AO2210499.
Bridewell, Joseph A., AO3027495.
Briggs, Ronald A., AO3039100.
Broderick, George T., AO3036557.
Broker, John A., Jr., AO3027082.
Brooks, Kenneth L., AO3051624.
Broussard, William F., AO3027549.
Brown, Francis J., AO3030431.
Brundrett, Wallace M., Jr., AO2210684.
Bunn, Eustace, Jr., AO3064401.
Buzard, Lyman E., AO2228359.
Cadmus, Harold R., AO3051683.
Caldwell, James G., AO3029959.
Calhoun, James N., AO3029409.
Calkins, Ronald R., AO3049342.
Cameron, Paul A., Jr., AO3020686.
Campbell, Gerald E., AO2210844.
Campbell, Thomas J., AO2206329.
Cancelliere, Philip R., AO3047956.
Cannon, Floyd L., AO3053533.
Cannon, James A., AO3020295.
Canon, William R., AO3027088.
Carlino, Victor J., AO3052879.
Carlson, Kenneth D., AO3035432.
Carpenter, Joe V., AO2206141.
Carroll, William R., Jr., AO2206975.
Carter, William E., AO2208881.
Casey, Thomas A., AO3034947.
Chafey, Frank D., AO2208883.
Chaikin, Howard M., AO3051956.
Cherry, Donald N., AO3050862.
Cherry, James L., AO3050156.
Christiansen, Evan C., AO3040759.
Christiansen, Roger H., AO3048250.
Christianson, Howard L., AO2208301.
Ciriello, Basil L., AO3053171.
Clark, Clifford D., AO3057589.
Clark, Henry F., AO3053385.
Clark, Ralph L., AO3052488.
Clark, Robert M., AO3028481.
Clark, Robert S., AO2205917.
Clary, James C., AO3058110.
Clayburn, Grant B., AO3047307.
Clayton, John F., AO3039942.
Clemens, Ralph O., Jr., AO3058887.
Clifford, Robert V., AO2208990.
Cole, Victor P., AO3032452.
Coleman, Marvin L., AO2204379.
Colleran, Joseph A., Jr., AO3036990.
Conlin, Robert A., AO1853347.
Conway, John E., AO3047568.
Cook, Frank E., AO3027861.
Cooper, James W., AO2210602.
Cordner, Floyd B., AO2208492.
Corrigan, Clayton H., AO2207629.
Courtright, John F., AO3029020.
Cover, Jerry S., AO3053159.
Cox, Roy L., AO3064808.
Crafton, William T., III, AO3054188.
Crain, Ervin T., AO3058856.
Crawford, Cyril J., AO2204728.
Crawford, James C., AO2209754.
Crews, Marvin A., AO3048863.
Crisler, Harold F., AO3059092.
Crowther, Walter E., AO2208396.
Croyle, Benny D., AO3046742.
Crumbaker, David M., AO2204659.
Currie, Julian M., AO3030180.
Curtin, Donald R., AO2209346.
Curtis, Thomas H., AO3058888.
Curzon, Daniel J., AO3028424.
Cushwa, Phillip C., AO3038112.
Custer, Jack E., AO3020899.
Cutler, John W., AO3050976.
Dailey, Keith G., AO3039686.
Dailey, Robert R., AO3029116.
Daly, Gerald J., AO3064755.
Daniel, Henry L., Jr., AO3028067.
Daniel, James E., AO3047219.
Daugherty, Tim T., AO2209728.
Daughtry, John F., AO2211180.
Davenport, George W., AO3048815.
Davis, Clifford B., AO3008575.
Davis, David H., Jr., AO2205332.
Davis, Kenneth A., AO3052306.
Davis, Ray D., AO3027946.
Deghuee, John F., AO3038643.
Demarco, Patrick, AO3026615.
Dible, Harry D., AO3027426.
Diebolt, Mark T., AO3049792.
Diehl, William C., Jr., AO3053582.
Dillon, Larry A., AO2211849.
Dissette, Grant W., AO3056142.
Diven, William L., AO3046461.
Dockery, George E., AO3029615.
Dora, George I., Jr., AO3051964.
Doying, Robert G., AO3040421.
Doyle, William H., AO3058983.
Dreibelbies, George A., AO3048634.
Drobot, John J., AO3040168.
Drury, Richard T., AO3028902.
Dubois, James W., AO3029025.
Duell, Frederick K., AO3051348.
Duet, Daniel S., AO3039644.
Duffy, Thomas K., AO3038037.
Dugard, George A., AO2204922.
Dunagan, Eddie D., AO3036776.
Durdin, Thomas N., AO3027103.
Dutton, Charles J., AO3027788.
Dyes, Lynn S., AO3057957.
Easom, Charles H., AO3028295.
Ebner, Stanley G., AO3050624.
Edick, Gerald T., Jr., AO3052417.
Ehrhart, Donald R., AO3053216.
Ellis, Bobby M., AO3064671.
Emig, Charles W., AO2211780.
Enbysk, Howard R., AO3046211.
Enevoldson, Einar K., AO3058360.
Engel, George W., Jr., AO3028689.
Erickson, Paul E., AO2205415.
Estes, James F., AO2210576.
Eubanks, Robert E., AO3032327.
Evancho, Michael E., Jr., AO3048641.
Evans, Robert E., AO2209765.
Evert, Jack K., AO3050902.
Ewing, William V., AO2207569.
Falck, Louis K., Jr., AO3026822.
Falconieri, Louis, AO3030213.
Farha, Jimmie L., AO3021459.
Feiler, David C., AO3037426.
Felciano, Franklyn M., AO2211727.
Fennewald, Joseph A., AO3038395.
Fenton, George C., AO2209612.
Ferguson, Charles L., AO2207272.
Fikes, Charles O., AO3057479.
Fine, Boris A., AO3017823.
Fitzsimmons, James M., AO3051350.
Flanders, Edward D., AO3038274.
Fleming, Peter M., AO3049678.
Flynn, John J., Jr., AO3036943.
Forbes, James D., AO3049679.
Forgas, James A., AO3046310.
Fox., Thomas E., AO3046827.
Frazier, Allison A., AO2208195.
Frey, Frank T., AO3052538.
Fry, Lyle M., AO2210124.
Frymire, Randolph W., AO2210375.
Fults, Jim, AO2207420.
Furr, Robert H., AO3027562.
Furtner, Ralph W., AO3047710.
Gagen, Neil A., AO2207378.
Gaiser, William L., AO3018736.
Gardner, Richard A., AO2211345.
Garner, William D., AO3046868.
Garrick, Howard T., AO3030887.
Gatz, Richard M., AO3026616.
Gavitt, William F., Jr., AO3051336.
Gebhardt, Richard F., AO3058616.
Gerard, Richard C., AO3049390.
Gholson, Gerald E., AO3008813.
Gibson, John F., AO3028632.
Gilliam, Alton H., AO3052643.
Gilmore, Wiley C., AO3027951.
Giordano, Robert L., AO2211336.
Givens, Richard E., AO2204700.
Glenn, Lloyd F., Jr., AO3047968.
Gomas, Roger A., AO3048124.
Gonzales, Carlos, AO3020724.
Gordon, Archibald E., AO3026707.
Gore, Robert R., AO3050193.
Gorman, Rodney J., AO3040355.
Goss, Eugene T., Jr., AO3048256.
Goss, Gerald, AO3026601.
Gough, Thomas H., AO3037202.
Gould, Gerald L., AO3052347.
Grafton, Edward S., AO2204660.
Graham, Edward J., AO3051957.
Graham, William W., AO3029904.
Grainger, Wayne F., AO3027794.
Green, Jimmy R., AO2209757.
Green, Phillip R., AO2210628.

Greenberg, Lester, AO2218903.
Grumbach, Delbert T., AO2212068.
Guemmer, Arthur P., AO3058794.
Guerney, Walter S., AO3058310.
Gunnell, Earl L., AO2207175.
Guthrie, Robert K., AO2204406.
Guyton, Sam M., Jr., AO3038040.
Haas, Phillip E., AO3050631.
Haber, Joseph M., AO3009179.
Hackett, Michael H., AO2205792.
Hahn, Ernest R., AO3028715.
Hall, William W., AO2204834.
Hairston, Victor E., AO3027873.
Hale, Ira D., Jr., AO2210125.
Hall, James F., AO3051791.
Hamann, Robert A., AO3046495.
Hammond, Constance, AL3008958.
Hancock, Pascal E., AO3052338.
Hanna, John J., AO1864948.
Harbour, Elbert E., AO3017519.
Hardee, John H., AO3029423.
Hargraves, William F., II., AO2206505.
Harker, Perry W., AO2204984.
Harrell, Charles E., AO3030389.
Harrington, Charles F., AO3024485.
Harris, Frank E., AO3057871.
Harris, James T., AO943056.
Harsh, Eugene S., AO3030162.
Hart, Richard H., Jr., AO3049988.
Hartman, Lee C., Jr., AO2205285.
Harvey, John B., AO3031437.
Hastings, John C., AO3052886.
Hatch, John E., AO3038409.
Hathcock, James R., AO3052686.
Heap, Donald E., AO3035223.
Heckrotte, Robert P., AO3021744.
Heidrich, Robert A., AO2206051.
Heller, John J., AO2204739.
Helms, Patrick G., AO3048827.
Hemm, Valentine F., AO2205864.
Hemphill, Thomas R., AO3052229.
Hendrix, James E., AO3057271.
Henning, Robert G., AO3020262.
Herder, Robert H., AO3051247.
Herrington, Don L., AO2209774.
Hester, Hal B., AO3029121.
Hill, George T., AO3028717.
Hill, James J., AO2208593.
Hill, Marvin C., AO2211814.
Hillegas, Dale H., AO3040619.
Hobart, David W., AO3052905.
Hoffman, Robert W., AO8016775.
Hoger, James R., AO3046028.
Hokanson, John M., AO2208197.
Holland, John T., AO2211787.
Holme, Melvin R., AO3049516.
Holt, William B., Jr., AO2208153.
Howe, Dan O., AO3020415.
Howley, John J., Jr., AO3012261.
Hoyda, John A., AO3008597.
Hudson, Edwin C., AO3046679.
Huey, Peter D., AO2210522.
Hughes, Frank A., AO3040297.
Hughes, James C., AO2210264.
Hummel, Ronald L., AO2204617.
Hunt, Homer R., AO3048830.
Huntington, Glen M., AO3056164.
Hurley, James J., AO2207323.
Huyett, Melvin A., AO3033879.
Hyre, Frederick G., AO3018704.
Ingraham, Gale A., AO3049688.
Isler, James R., AO2211532.
Iverson, Alan R., AO3050463.
Iverson, William L., AO3027883.
Jackson, Glen A., AO3031612.
Jackson, Keith W., AO3036171.
Jameson, Randolph C., AO2211404.
Janes, Norman W., AO3052476.
Jelarcic, Roland J., AO3037996.
Jenkins, Ivan R., AO2206464.
Jessen, Cris, AO2210417.
Jochen, Clarence H., AO3027142.
Johnson, Arlan D., AO3035013
Johnson, Benny F., AO3047260.
Johnson, Charles M., AO2206511.
Johnson, Daniel M., AO3039315.
Johnson, Herbert P., Jr., AO3052075.
Johnson, William B., AO3053356.
Jones, Herman A., AO3053253.
Jones, Owen R., AO3036999.
Jones, Robert E., AO2205866.
Jones, Robert F., AO2206912.
Jordan, Edward P., AO3029802.
Jordon, Donald L., AO3027445.
Juneo, Robert A., AO3052766.
Kaneshige, Thomas M., AO2208075.
Kannawin, William L., Jr., AO2208500.
Karczewski, Charles G., AO3037666.
Kasbohm, James R., AO3056169.
Kasbohm, Thomas F., AO2206739.
Kaul, Fred R., AO2204567.
Kellerstrass, Ernst J., AO2207831.
Kelley, Gerald V., AO3008360.
Kelly, Joseph M., AO3034924.
Kepley, J. H. Allen, AO2211666.
Kersting, Ronald A., AO2205799.
Kerzon, Warren J., AO3052843.
Ketchum, Lowell D., AO2210951.
Kindel, James C., AO2209925.
King, Hubert G., Jr., AO3047716.
Kitch, John I., Jr., AO3050825.
Klaerner, William H., AO3020730.
Knickerbocker, Stanley P., AO3053705.
Knight, John A., AO3053650.
Knoble, Charles P., AO3064770.
Knopf, Roger A., AO3038770.
Koho, Robert B., AO2209776.
Kosel, Howard E., AO2208103.
Krecklow, Charles W., AO3020019.
Krueger, Kenneth J., AO2210303.
Kuske, Elwood C., AO3029464.
LaBrake, Donald F., AO3051387.
Labrie, Norman G., AO3034948.
Lachance, Paul L., AO3051388.
Lafave, Kenneth E., AO2211405.
Lafleur, Ray C., AO2211583.
Lanuari, Robert, AO3051502.
Landon, Kenneth S., AO2208306.
Lang, Allen D., AO3064269.
Lang, Henry S., Jr., AO3026674.
Langley, Duane D., AO3047080.
Larson, Gerald D., AO3038720
Lawrence, Gerald C., AO3032364.
Lea, Randall J., AO3000206.
Leaverton, Charles W., AO3031694.
LeBlanc, Arthur R., Jr., AO3064271.
LeBlanc, LeRoy F., AO3051672.
Leiter, Bernard M., AO3057227.
Lembruno, Salvatore J., Jr., AO2208021.
Leonard, Rupert A., Jr., AO3033545
LePage, Francis W., AO3057126.
Link, William T., AO3029241.
Lisle, Alan G., Jr., AO3028910.
Little, Glenn T., AO3026945.
Lohse, Wallace C., AO2230709.
London, Richard J., AO2210839.
Long, Joseph T., Jr., AO3027157.
Long, Thomas M., AO3046331.
Lucas, Billy D., AO3053490.
Lucke, Daren L., AO3046468.
Luther, James N., AO2207385.
Luttrell, Alfred N., AO2210681.
Mackrell, Roy J., AO2210485.
Maddox, John W., AO2206376.
Maddox, William L., Jr., AO2206925.
Magee, Ralph W., AO3039962.
Magruder, Paul T., AO2205313.
Magtutu, Paul W., AO3026732.
Mahew, James H., AO2209685.
Makowski, Henry A., Jr., AO2207046.
Mangum, George S., AO3052832.
Manion, Adelbert J., AO3008845.
Mann, Wayne A., AO3051391.
Marchon, Donald F., AO3028948.
Marcum, Ronald P., AO3009156.
Mardre, George L., Jr., AO3033259.
Markey, William L., AO3028990.
Markowitz, Harold, Jr., AO3052221.
Marlin, James W., Jr., AO3048945.
Marquez, Leo, AO2208327.
Marriot, Joseph R., AO3008846.
Marsh, Donald D., AO3028550.
Marsh, Gary E., AO2208307.
Marshall, James C., AO3028383.
Marshall, William F., Jr., AO3029085.
Marshall, William L., AO3027164.
Martin, Charles H., Jr., AO3027514.
Martin, Charles J., AO2207138.
Martin, George D., Jr., AO2215705.
Martin, John T., Jr., AO3053675.
Martin, William R., AO3047984.
Mather, Alvin E., AO3047467.
Mathis, Paul C., AO3028270.
Maurer, George C., AO3029377.
Mayfield, William E., AO3009201.
Mays, Robert C., AO3056970.
McCarley, Martin L., Jr., AO3033063.
McClellan, Roy A., AO3053163.
McClelland, Lester C., AO2205932.
McCoid, James H., AO3057128.
McCormick, Carl O., AO2205432.
McCormick, Everet C., AO3038118.
McDowell, Gerald A., AO2211409.
McFarlane, Raymond E., AO3048094.
McGinnis, James G., AO3034785.
McGovern, Gerald, AO2209498.
McKay, Peter R., AO3057964.
McKelvey, James L., AO3027965.
McKemey, George R., AO2207405.
McKenzie, Robert M., AO2209763.
McLaughlin, Howard J., AO3052968.
McManis, Charles E., AO3030817.
McPartland, Robert A., AO3058514.
Mecham, Ray, AO3029181.
Melancon, Joseph L., Jr., AO3058071.
Mellor, Ashel R., AO2211302.
Melton, James H., AO3036580.
Menadier, Arthur C., AO2208026.
Menna, Richard J., AO3047671.
Metcalfe, Frank W., AO2210431.
Metzger, James C., AO3048095.
Meyer, Donald H., AO3052366.
Michaud, Carroll R., AO3027516.
Millar, William L., III, AO3051465.
Miller, Eric E., AO2205388.
Miller, Gene A., AO3027172.
Miller Robert J., AO2206775.
Miller, Robert S., AO3054388.
Mills, Edgar C., Jr., AO2207907.
Mills, Michael M., AO3038121.
Minich, Keith J., AO3052514.
Mitchell, James D., AO2206470.
Mitchell, Wallace E., AO3052630.
Mitchum, Joseph J., AO3026877.
Mittelman, Leonard, AO3047700.
Moake, Milton D., AO3053529.
Mobley, John O., Jr., AO2211005.
Mock, Robert P., AO3035990.
Monsees, James M., AO3047425.
Moon, Frank A., AO3035137.
Moore, Curtis D., AO3027609.
Moore, Jim A., AO3052480.
Moore, Ray E., AO2210883.
Morales, John J., AO3008381.
Morris, Dan, AO3026976.
Morrison, Mot J., AO3048186.
Motley, Albert E., Jr., AO3026971.
Mounce, Jimmy R., AO2211547.
Mozzicato, John J., AO2205570.
Muller, Karl H., AO3050118.
Munro, Robert D., AO3053616.
Munson, Lloyd M., AO3016912.
Murphy, Edmund P., AO1907413.
Murphy, Lee E., Jr., AO3049366.
Murphy, Luther G., AO3027053.
Musser, Herman W., AO3051229.
Nagy, Charles S., Jr., AO3034704.
Nardi, Gary L., AO3058816.
Neary, Donald O., AO3052503.
Neely, Joseph A., AO3057448.
Nelson, Elton M., AO1864167.
Nelson, Frank L., AO3051967.
Newell, Milton O., AO3054828.
Newsome, Winfred T., AO3021032.
Nicholas, Michael C., AO2210783.
Nichols, Dennis E., AO3021246.
Nichols, Donald C., AO3027899.
Nichols, James C., AO3031040.
Nicholson, Charles E., AO3019052.
Nickens, Walter M., AO3053581.
Nishimoto, Hiroshi, AO2203077.
Nixon, Russell V., AO3026981.
Noble, Richard J., AO3046285.
Noonan, Francis D., AO3030059.
Norris, Darrell E., AO3053883.
Norris, James M., AO3064328.
Nottingham, William H., AO3046122.
Nuckolls, Norman L., AO3043588.
Odell, Frederick M., AO3014858.
Officer, Lyn R., AO3057577.
Opitz, Stephen J., Jr., AO3051901.
Ormand, Lowell W., AO3028277.
Orme, Gordon R., AO3029189.

Orr, Gary W., AO3029222.
Osborne, William R., AO3028919.
Otteson, David E., AO3046376.
Overall, Douglas, AO3027462.
Owen, James M., AO3046126.
Oyler, Duane E., AO3030331.
Parker, Benjamin F., AO3029439.
Parker, William R., AO3046610.
Parkhurst, Kenneth M., AO3027253.
Parsons, William P., AO3020926.
Partridge, James D., AO2206030.
Payne, Marvin L., AO3035531.
Payne, William M., AO3029246.
Pearring, Jerome R., AO3048479.
Pearson, Morris W., AO3037545.
Pedroff, Peter S., AO3053832.
Penfield, Eugene A., AO3051798.
Perdue, Raymond G., Jr., AO3047427.
Perkins, John H., AO3033449.
Perkins, Thomas E., III, AO3027401.
Perrin, Leroy J., AO2211588.
Perroots, Leonard H., AO3032426.
Perry, Elza, Jr., AO2204520.
Perry, Johnny L., AO3026510.
Perry, Joseph J., AO3026567.
Peters, Leroy R., AO3029192.
Petersen, Nohl D., AO2255458.
Peterson, James A., AO3050514.
Peterson, Thomas C., AO2209155.
Petrie, Russell G., AO2210893.
Petteway, Clark H., AO3029386.
Pew, Robert M., AO3022961.
Pfeiffer, Charles A., AO2210030.
Pfister, Kenneth L., AO3035991.
Phillips, John, AO2208557.
Piper, Robert B., AO3013864.
Pizarro, Lawrence M., AO3064695.
Plummer, Robert H., Jr., AO3052353.
Poe, Joe E., AO3039334.
Pokrant, Edmund R., AO2211526.
Poore, Jack A., AO3056339.
Postas, John R., AO3016858.
Poteet, Bobby S., AO2210126.
Poteete, John D., Jr., AO3050913.
Potter, Frederick R., AO2208607.
Potts, George S., AO2211128.
Powell, Jack H., AO3039411.
Powell, Merrill T., AO3064445.
Powell, William Y., AO3008995.
Pralle, James R., AO3033581.
Pratt, William E., Jr., AO3057844.
Prentiss, Richard C., AO3031877.
Price, John H., Jr., AO3027357.
Pursley, Edward E., AO3050953.
Pusey, Frank O., AO2205675.
Pyne, Wallace R., AO2238214.
Quinlan, John P., AO3046502.
Rabinowitz, Keith N., AO3052361.
Radder, Paul E., Jr., AO2212040.
Rader, Paul L., AO2211284.
Ragland, Samuel F., Jr., AO2204992.
Rajcich, Rudolph I., AO1861407.
Ransom, Charles E., AO3028096.
Ranz, Dale M., AO3064631.
Rapuano, Joseph M., AO2211731.
Reade, Harold C., AO2209737.
Reed, Jack N., AO2206613.
Reed, John W., AO2209077.
Reeves, John H., AO3040743.
Reichelderfer, John W., AO3052245.
Reilly, James J., AO3046290.
Rentz, Charles A., AO3032762.
Reynard, Nathan H., AO3051827.
Riggs, Douglas C., AO3053199.
Riley, Mitchell B., AO3032764.
Rist, Monroe D., AO3038125.
Robbin, Rudolph C., AO3029863.
Roberds, Donald W., AO3046785.
Roberson, Merle L., AO3037749.
Robertello, Gerald J., AO3048583.
Robertson, James E., AO3027386.
Robertson, Valden L., AO3038289.
Robinette, Jerry O., AO3020841.
Robinson, Earl J., AO3027313.
Robst, Paul K., AO2205817.
Rogers, John C., Jr., AO2211074.
Rogers, Robert I., AO3049722.
Roscoe, Edward P., AO3064245.
Ross, Alfred P., Jr., AO2204941.
Roy, Vincent P., AO3051270.
Ruhm, Kenneth B., AO3051365.
Rund, Matthew H., AO3027910.
Runkle, Robert H., AO3016950.
Rush, John E., AO3052940.
Russell, Charles R., AO2211909.
Ryan, Jack B., AO3032787.
Ryan, Kenneth E., AO3032820.
Sachs, Robert L., AO2207861.
Saffel, Robert T., AO3051454.
Saindoux, Edward L., AO2205133.
Salem, Harold D., AO3027257.
Salter, James E., AO2236050.
Sanders, Robert G., Jr., AO2205657.
Sanders, Robert L., AO3014794.
Santagati, Ronald S., AO3036590.
Sato, Janet T., AL3008873.
Saurs, Robert R., AO2210612.
Sawyer, Dallas D., Jr., AO3037440.
Saylor, John C., Jr., AO3031099.
Sayre, George M., Jr., AO3009990.
Schadel, Harold A., AO2210127.
Schaefer, William E., AO3049222.
Schafer, David F., AO3019913.
Schalow, Russell A., AO3051717.
Schell, Lawrence A., AO3047882.
Schilling, Franklin N., AO3049372.
Schlier, Frank G., AO2206239.
Schneider, Harold L., AO1857258.
Schnieders, Thomas H., AO3040641.
Schroter, Dodsley A., AO3019203.
Schumann, Albert W., AO3047832.
Schutz, Clifford M., AO3053777.
Schwab, John R., AO3048846.
Schwartz, James W., AO3028702.
Schwenk, Larry D., AO3030511.
Schwertner, Harold W., AO3027197.
Scott, Ronald W., AO3050473.
Scott, Thomas D., AO3029621.
Scriven, Gilbert A., Jr., AO1911320.
Seback, Albert J., AO2209932.
Seddon, John J., Jr., AO3048714.
Seig, Louis, AO3019130.
Sessa, Patrick C., AO3026829.
Shaner, Carl W., AO2211794.
Sharkey, Byron L., AO3049941.
Sharpe, Hardy R., Jr., AO3012949.
Shattuck, Alan H., AO3048001.
Shaver, John H., Jr., AO3064370.
Shaw, John R., AO2208312.
Shepherd, Charles E., AO3056217.
Shotts, Donald L., AO2209609.
Shular, Robert D., AO2204995.
Simitjis, Thomas G., AO3033390.
Simpson, Manford E., AO3039549.
Simpson, Philip Y., Jr., AO2219043.
Sinclair, Patricia S., AL2255568.
Slates, Donald H., AO2206870.
Slaton, Frank T., AO3031658.
Sleater, Joseph K., Jr., AO3051765.
Small, Leland F., AO2211522.
Smiley, Richard M., AO3057498.
Smink, Carl R., AO4004730.
Smith, Bruce A., AO3037739.
Smith, David W., AO2206947.
Smith, John E., AO2204308.
Smith, John K., AO3017253.
Smith, Kenneth L., AO3034649.
Smith, Needham V., AO3009010.
Smith, Raymond F., AO3009396.
Smith, Robert A., AO3009395.
Smith, William T., AO3057148.
Sparks, Gerald D., AO3050443.
Spence, James B., AO3053769.
Spicka, Charles F., AO2210593.
Spratt, Victor M., Jr., AO3026754.
Stallard, Donald E., AO3052236.
Staller, Kenneth W., AO3039169.
Stanley, Frederick W., AO3036001.
Stannard, Warren E., AO3050358.
Stanonis, Benedict A., AO3018164.
Stark, Frederick T., AO3027062.
Starling, Laramie D., AO3038855.
Starrett, Charles O., Jr., AO3046566.
Steadman, William L., Jr., AO3050608.
Steele, Ralph D., AO2210392.
Steerman, Jefferson C., Jr., AO3048202.
Steever, William, Jr., AO3051587.
Steinbrunner, Donald T., AO3020885.
Stetson, John R., AO3050411.
Stevens, Eldon L., AO2056837.
Stewart, Frederick N., AO3036250.
Stieneker, Roy S., AO2247664.
Stiffler, Robert M., AO3026595.
Stitt, Howard D., AO3027485.
Stocker, John R., AO2211373.
Stoeckle, Edward R., AO3040735.
Stokes, Elbert R., AO3027359.
Stone, Don W., AO3029224.
Strittmatter, Leonard E., AO3027983.
Strong, Jeridan, AO3020935.
Sukut, Arlyn A., AO3029286.
Sullivan, John J., AO3034861.
Sullivan, Robert L., AO3046244.
Sutherland, Donald E., AO3028753.
Swanson, Stanley O., AO3049734.
Sweet, Gerald E., AO3053452.
Swett, Ben H., AO3046481.
Taylor, Billy G., AO3057848.
Taylor, Donald M., AO3046292.
Taylor, James P., AO3020996.
Teed, Charles M., AO3027486.
Terrell, Everett K., AO3029867.
Terry, Glenn T., AO3053100.
Thedford, Jack L., AO3020962.
Thomas, James R., AO3052387.
Thomas, Marshall W., AO3021037.
Thomas, Oscar L., AO3026835.
Thomason, Thomas L., AO3029101.
Thompson, Vern E., AO3029840.
Thorpe, Roscoe P., AO1847279.
Thouvenelle, Norman J., AO3020792.
Tibbetts, Therice E., AO3052573.
Tiger, Paul M., Jr., AO3050282.
Tiggeman, Ralph D., AO3037039.
Titus, Terrence R., AO3039286.
Todd, Thomas E., AO2206176.
Toney, Robert L., AO3033293.
Tooke, Richard E., AO3052899.
Torgersen, Thomas A., AO3052508.
Tracy, Bryce L., AO3020252.
Trahan, Whitney J., Jr., AO3020811.
Trexler, Charles C., Jr., AO3019916.
Tronolone, Andrew, Jr., AO3028735.
Trout, Myron B., AO3033324.
Underhill, George, Jr., AO3046483.
Ursini, Samuel M., AO3046535.
Utman, Howard W., AO3046850.
Valor, Norman H., AO2252250.
Van Hook, James R., AO3048353.
Vannier, Vern F., AO3027772.
Van Speybroeck, Donald J., AO2210497.
Vermeys, Carlton P., AO3056840.
Vestal, William A., AO3028553.
Vickers, Douglas B., AO2210297.
Viach, William R., AO3020793.
Wachter, Paul G., Jr., AO3053442.
Wadman, John F., Jr., AO2204860.
Wadsworth, Gene P., AO2208293.
Wagoner, Paul D., AO3058534.
Waite, Lawrence A., Jr., AO3032581.
Waits, Kenneth D., AO3036755.
Walker, Fernie J., AO3029399.
Walker, Joseph E., AO3046139.
Walker, Whitney C., AO3028962.
Wall, Jerry D., AO3019988.
Wall, Robert P., AO3038104.
Wallace, Jarrell R., AO3029624.
Walsh, Venice L., AO3037684.
Walton, Robert G., AO2208329.
Ward, Charles W., Jr., AO3046450.
Ward, David M., AO3028554.
Ward, Ronald J., AO3027925.
Waterman, Donald J., AO2208435.
Watkins, Donald L., AO3030940.
Waunch, Robert L., AO3052253.
Webb, Clarence L., AO3048852.
Webb, Gerald M., AO3047160.
Weber, Erwin A., AO3047516.
Wedgeworth, Roy M., Jr., AO3017125.
Weems, Joe F., AO2205556.
Wege, William F., AO3048011.
Welty, Wayland D., AO3010975.
Whalen, Donald L., AO3032408.
Wheeler, William H., AO3049064.
Whetstone, Jerry E., AO3053603.
Whistler, Joseph Y., AO3032785.
Whitmore, Joe I., Jr., AO2204668.
Wiese, Richard B., AO3032846.
Wilhelm, John A., AO2206129.
Will, Jimmy D., AO2210659.
Williams, Bill C., AO3019065.
Williams, Rodney P., AO2209686.
Wilson, Harold L., Jr., AO2204914.

Wimbley, Charles O., AO2205902.
Winkler, Roy N., AO3052960.
Winter, Donald H., AO3039675.
Woelfel, Joseph F., AO3048517.
Wolf, Raymond E., AO2205456.
Wood, Carl E., AO3021269.
Wood, Ernest M., AO3035334.
Wright, Sidney J., AO3027328.
Wunderman, Charles R., AO3035855.
Wyman, Robert C., AO3029012.
Yamamoto, Toru, AO3046654.
Yanuzzi, Nicholas, AO3009162.
Yates, Douglas B., AO2206476.
Yearsley, William R., AO3032231.
Young, Wayne C., AO3019940.
Yount, Charles F., AO3026488.
Zahhos, Danny, AO3053872.
Zambiasi, Raymond J., AO2211716.
Zeybel, Henry L., AO3048733.
Zieg, James E., AO2204669.
Ziehe, Gerald D., AO2204606.
Ziel, George R., AO3050192.
Zielezienski, Joseph A., AO3052551.
Ziker, Allan A., AO3053638.
Zink, Donald L., AO2255158.
Zopf, William D., Jr., AO3053785.
Zvetina, Edmund J., AO2253643.

SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates

Bales, Francis A., Jr., AO3103830.
Berg, Donald J., AO3103779.
Bowles, James E., AO3103885.
Cain, James E., AO3104415.
Canter, Ronald M., AO3104121.
Chandler, Charles R., AO3103905.
Clink, Richard H., AO3104293.
Demuth, Herman J., AO3103907.
Drew, Philip M., AO3103883.
Flaherty, George C., AO3104087.
Giambri, Philip, Jr., AO3104426.
Granskog, John, AO3103832.
Gunn, Donald J., AO3103874.
Hawkins, John L., AO3104348.
Hein, James L., AO3103960.
Holzman, Harold F., AO3103962.
Hough, Clarence W., AO3103844.
Huckabee, Gerald P., AO3103925.
Hullender, John R., AO3104302.
Klein, Carl J., AO3104044.
Maney, Edward R., AO3103976.
Manske, Robert G., AO3104265.
Meier, Jerold R., AO3103980.
Mleynek, Roger G., AO3104111.
Mundy, William E., AO3104221.
Regan, Thomas A., AO3104322.
Rever, Louis G., AO3103854.
Schaff, William J., AO3104080.
Sides, Dennie L., AO3103840.
Spencer, Richard C., AO3103857.
Stauber, Ralph O., Jr., AO3104095.
Tesoro, Salvador R., AO3104330.
Tillander, John P., AO3104103.
Vache, Floyd A., AO3104083.
Van Allen, Ernest E., AO3103937.
White, Craig M., AO3104178.
Zaricor, Wayne M., AO3104337.

Distinguished officer candidate graduates

Coles, Allan E., AO3110030.
DeBell, Joseph J., AO3110047.
Doughty, Jack C., AO3109995.
Moore, John I., AO3109963.
Parsley, Derrel C., AO3109938.
Wittmaack, Charles S., AO3109747.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bloyder, Joseph J.
Farner, Robert D.
Giering, Edmund J., III.
Manly, James H.
Parker, Frederic C.
Vegoda, Paul R.
Walter, Raymond C., Jr., AO3095623.
Weiss, David W.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one, a Year of Action for America's Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 10, 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, few people in this Nation have been more concerned—or more effective in improving the conditions of our senior citizens than my colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. He is a most able, informed, and constructive member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Last Thursday he delivered a major address on the problems of America's 16 million senior citizens as we found them in the studies of this subcommittee. He also set forth a program of legislation which I know every Senator will want to be aware of.

I should like to call attention to the fact that Senator RANDOLPH called for passage early this year of legislation to provide medical care for the aged, through social security, in line with S. 65, which I introduced yesterday. Senator RANDOLPH said:

> The only practical way to assist the aged in financing their medical care, on a dignified and sound fiscal basis, is to extend the social security system to include medical insurance. This would then be an earned right, not a charity handout.

This was based on his conclusion that "freedom, dignity, and independence are the basic promises of the American way of life. Without them, the years that we add would be meaningless."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address by Senator RANDOLPH, to the senior citizens of Metropolitan Washington, sponsored by the Jewish Community Center of the District of Columbia, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE, A YEAR OF ACTION FOR AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, to the Conference of Senior Citizens, Jewish Community Center, 1529 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., January 5, 1961)

One of the measures of a civilization is the degree to which it is concerned with the welfare of its weakest and oldest members. Yet, we, in our civilized society, seem lower on this scale than do some of the more primitive cultures, particularly with reference to the disposition of our aged population. Too often the older person in our society is left unwanted and rejected. He is put on the shelf, placed in a passive role and deprived of the opportunity to make any positive contribution to the community. He sits in a rocking chair, as so many thousands of our mental patients do, unemployed and unrecognized, with little to look forward to but the waning years of deterioration.

Finally, alone in this "roleless" role, he may become senile and be consigned to a public institution simply because no other facilities are available. This consignment of our aged to a faceless anonymity stems largely from the failure of a youthful, virile and dynamic society to make a place for the values of accumulated experience and wisdom. But what a tremendous loss to the productivity of the economy; what a heavy burden on the taxpaying community; what a death blow to the health of so large a portion of our Nation.

Contrast this pattern with that of other cultures. In the primitive nonliterate society of the Bemba Tribe of Africa, as in the ancient and sophisticated culture of pre-Communist China, the aged are held in honor and esteem. The elders confer in all matters affecting the welfare of the community, and those who are nearing the end of life are accorded the highest authority in affairs of religion and government.

If a civilization is to be appraised in part for its concern for its weaker and more unfortunate members, our treatment of the aged stands as an eloquent indictment of our failure to measure up to our own professed ideals. It is a sad commentary on our times that men and women who have devoted their talents and energies to help our Nation achieve greatness should be cast off and neglected by the society that they themselves helped make strong.

Man's ancient dream of three score and ten is a present reality, and greater advances are visible on the horizon. A child born in 1900 could expect to live to the age of 47. Today, a child can look forward to 23 additional years—almost 1 more year for every 2 since 1900. Certainly, this is one of the great achievements of our age bringing us ever closer to new frontiers in man's development. It is a frontier roughly comparable to the human territory opened up by the perceptions of modern psychology and phychiatry. Of all the changes brought about in this revolutionary 20th century, this "quiet revolution" at the far end of the life cycle may be the most important.

It is within this frame of reference that I should like to discuss with you the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging and the current important topic of medical care for the aged.

As you know, the Senate created a subcommittee in 1959 to conduct a comprehen-

sive study of the problems of America's 16 million senior citizens and to make recommendations for meeting these problems. We have viewed our responsibility not only as a matter of obtaining the most important facts, or making objective studies, but more importantly, of insuring that our research and study do not end up as merely a dust-collecting report. We have had as our aim, and we have partially fulfilled it, that of translating our report into actual legislation, into real improvement in the conditions of our older citizens.

We listened not only to the experts here in Washington; we heard not only hundreds of State and local officials who deal with the elderly in their home communities, but we heard also from the senior citizens themselves. This was an inspiring but humbling experience for us. Many of them said that too often others speak for them: "Social workers, doctors, administrators, psychologists all speak for us," they said. "We rarely get a chance to speak for ourselves."

I want to tell you now that they spoke well and freely and with great dignity of their personal problems and of the inadequacies of existing programs. But one theme they expressed to us over and over again: "We don't want pity and we don't want charity. We do want and we intend to secure the conditions under which we can be independent, productive American citizens."

What we found in general was that the problems of nearly 16 million senior citizens today—who will number 20 million in just a few years—simply cannot continue to be handled in a piecemeal, patchwork fashion. Ours is the wealthiest society in history. We have no economic reason to fail to provide adequately for our senior citizens. America clearly has the ability and much of the necessary knowledge to solve these problems. It needs only the willingness to commit itself to their solution.

All of you have been deluged with figures on the aged population, but among the many statistics we have collected in our subcommittee, perhaps the most startling is that one out of every three persons reaching the age of 60 today has a parent or close relative over 80 to be concerned about. Thus, on the eve of their retirement, older Americans will have either older parents or relatives still alive and potentially dependent for support; and in just a few short years, two out of every three persons reaching retirement age will be in the same position.

Increased life expectancy will double the population over the age of 85 in the next 20 years. If we add to these changes the potential improvements in cancer and heart research, we can look forward to large numbers living to 100 or to 120.

This means a tremendous pressure on our health resources. Thus, we found it emphasized and reiterated from coast to coast that the No. 1 problem of America's senior citizens is to meet the cost of medical care when their incomes are lowest and their disabilities highest. This is the problem which paralyzes their present and makes a nightmare of their future. This is the problem which became a major domestic issue in the present campaign and to which President-elect Kennedy has committed the new administration early this year.

Despite all the conflicting arguments and contending ideas, I should like to set forth for you some of the data as developed by our most objective, impartial data-collecting agency. The National Health Survey was established by the Congress to provide accurate and reliable knowledge on the health conditions of the American people. Its methods and techniques are of the highest quality known to the field of survey science. Through its careful research, we have evidence of the following:

1. The rate of chronic illness (such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes, arthritis, etc.) among the aged is more than double that for younger groups, those under 45 years of age—77 percent versus 34 percent.

2. Although they constitute less than 9 percent of the total population, the aged make up more than 55 percent of all persons with limitations due to chronic illness.

3. The average number of physician visits among the aged is 36 percent greater than for the general population.

4. The aged spend approximately twice as many days (15) in general hospitals as does the rest of the population.

5. The proportion of the aged hospitalized in general hospitals for more than 1 month is nearly 60 percent greater than the proportion prevailing in the rest of the population, 38.8 percent as against 24.6 percent.

Some have asserted that older people have plenty of income and can take care of their own medical, nursing and drug bills. But no matter how the statistics are arranged at least half of the aged, approximately 8 million people, are living below the minimum income for an uncomfortable low level of living. At today's prices, millions are living in poverty. Half of the retired couples have less than $2,500 income to live on. One out of every three men and three out of every four women have less than $1,000 per year in income. These are figures from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

It is asserted also that older citizens have savings or liquid assets to meet their financial needs. But keep this in mind: Those with low incomes have little savings, and 4.6 million aged families had no liquid assets at all; 3 million more aged families had less than $500.

It is also often claimed that voluntary insurance programs can meet the problem. Here again, let us look at the figures. Approximately 8 million of our aged have no health insurance at all and those that do have some, as you know, pay relatively high premiums for relatively small benefits. How many of you have had policies canceled or nonrenewed? How many others of you have converted your policies from group insurance to individual insurance and have had to pay increased premiums from 80 to 300 percent? This is what is known as the privilege of conversion.

I do not want, in any way, to criticize the willingness of members of the insurance industry to help solve the problem. They are performing a most important function and the legislation I propose will, in my view, expand private health insurance business far beyond our current horizons, just as the amount of life insurance soared in the Nation with the passage of the Social Security Act 25 years ago.

The only practical way to assist the aged in financing their medical care on a dignified and sound fiscal basis is to extend the social security system to include medical insurance. This approach will permit the older person during the course of his working life to pay a small premium and have a paid up medical insurance policy upon retirement. This would be an earned right, not a charity handout.

A program of medical insurance should be available to all retired aged persons including those not eligible for social security benefits. The cost of including the non-OASI aged can be borne by small appropriations from the General Treasury. As time goes on, the numbers who do not have social security will become negligible.

This method of meeting the No. 1 problem of the aged emphasized dignity and self-reliance in contrast to the charity approach or the humiliating consignment of the aged to their families or relief. It is fiscally sound; it is uniform in application; and it does not add these costs to State and local governments already overburdened with tax and revenue problems for pressing public services. As you know, I joined last year with Senator McNAMARA, chairman of the subcommittee, and 22 other Senators in cosponsoring a bill to accomplish this end. It sets forth what should be the essential elements of any good bill in this field:

1. The prevention of illness, where possible, through early diagnosis.

2. Hospitalization for acute treatment only.

3. Convalescence and rehabilitation in qualified nursing homes.

4. Home health services which may reverse the rapidly rising costs of hospitalization and improve health services generally.

5. The alleviation of high costs of drugs and medicines.

This is not a comprehensive care-for-the-aged program. It is a modest, balanced program of medical benefits.

It is a program on which I campaigned and on which, in part, the people of West Virginia have returned me to office. It is a program which I believe this administration will move quickly to fulfill as indicated by the Democratic platform and by the campaign commitments of President-elect Kennedy. We will soon have an atmosphere of positive leadership rather than the threat of a veto in such matters—an almost revolutionary change in climate.

You have doubtless heard and will again hear the argument that the legislation passed in August 1960, which contains provisions for assistance to the medically needy, is an adequate solution to the problem. Let me emphasize to you that I consider this legislation helpful in expanding the public assistance approach but it does not in any way meet the essence of the problem; namely, that a prepaid insurance approach which accords the aged adequate medical care is a right rather than a charity.

In my own State of West Virginia, the legislature in a special session authorized the adoption of a medical assistance program for needy aged. But after reviewing the fiscal and human problems involved, the legislature memorialized the Congress to pass the social security method as soon after it met as possible.

In brief, the inadequacies of the present legislation are the following:

1. It does not prevent dependency, it increases it.

2. It cannot go into effect in any State until that State raises the revenue to match Federal funds and adopts the program.

3. There is no assurance to the individual as to what medical benefits he will receive or who will be included since this depends on individual State action.

4. It does not provide for an insurance method of meeting the problem.

5. Administrative costs involved are necessarily great because of the expenses that must accompany the program through detailed investigation of incomes, resources, relative responsibility, etc.

6. It burdens the States with heavy costs in attempting to meet locally what is essentially a national problem requiring a national solution through social security insurance.

One of the encouraging aspects of the prepaid insurance approach is that young Americans today approve of this idea, and why shouldn't they? They will be old someday themselves and they are quite willing to participate today to meet their own medical expenses when they, themselves, retire.

I have stressed the matter of health insurance for the aged because it is so immediate and critical an issue. I have also stressed it because next week the White House Conference on Aging will assemble and you will want to express your views as to that conference. I hope it will not fail to see this problem in broad perspective and to recommend constructive measures for its solution.

There are a number of other major recommendations proposed by our subcommittee which will be considered this year and which I shall only list for you.

1. The establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging concerned full-time with the full range of problems of America's aged and available as an eloquent spokesmen for senior citizens everywhere.

2. Abolition of discrimination in employment solely because of age. Government contractors and subcontractors should take the leadership in breaking down age discrimination in industry.

3. Acceleration of the present program of direct loans to nonprofit groups for housing the elderly at rentals which they can afford.

4. Improvement in the quality of care and rehabilitation in the Nation's commercial nursing homes through the establishment of model standards and financial support to nursing homes which meet these standards.

5. Pursuit of meaningful activities in retirement through the establishment of senior citizens training service program which will enable older persons to serve in community activities.

6. The protection of an older person's income through more adequate social security benefits more closely alined to previous earnings than is now the case.

Freedom, dignity, and independence are the basic promises of the American way of life. Without them, the years we add would be meaningless. But they require a strong social, economic, and health base if they are to be more than a hollow heritage to which added years mean only social ostracism. The golden age ought to be the opportunity to reach one's outer limits. The latter half of life ought to be a time when we will be free of our fetters and have a chance to soar to whatever heights we are capable of reaching. None of us has realized all his gifts and talents. None of us has fulfilled all his promise.

What I propose today is a means to help all of us grasp that chance when it comes. For we have before us the luminous possibility that a child born today or tomorrow can look forward to a healthy childhood, productive midyears and a creative old age.

The Future of the Republican Party—Address by Senator Case of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most successful campaigns in last November's historic election was that waged by our able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The Senator from New Jersey, a Republican, won with consummate ease in the State of New Jersey in his general election campaign last year. In December, the National Press Club asked the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] to appear before one of its meetings, and asked him to speak on "The Future of the Republican Party."

I was privileged to attend the National Press Club meeting at which the Senator from New Jersey delivered a highly interesting and thought-provoking speech.

I commend, not only to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, but to my Democratic colleagues as well, the comments which the Senator from New Jersey made; and I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the speech which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(Text of opening remarks prepared for delivery by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE to a National Press Club luncheon, Washington, D.C., on Friday, December 16, 1960)

When I was trying to put in order my thoughts on the subject which was assigned to me for today, I kept coming back to the question: Why are people so interested in the future of the Republican Party; why don't they show an equal interest in the future of the Democratic Party?

I suppose the answer is that everybody takes the future of the Democratic Party for granted. They just assume it is in pretty good shape and can take care of itself.

Apparently people in general are less sanguine about the continued existence of our party.

Now I am quite confident the Republican Party will endure. Unlike Oliver Wendell Holmes' wonderful one-horse shay, we successfully survived our first 100 years and there is still a great deal of life left in this tough old elephant. Our candidate for the Presidency almost won last month. If he had gotten just one more vote in each election district in the country he would have had more than a majority of the popular vote. With even fewer additional votes, cast in the right places, he would have won the election. If that had happened, I probably wouldn't have been your guest today—one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle might well be discussing with you the future of the Democratic Party.

In addition, we won two additional seats in the Senate and 22 in the House and, overall we held our own in the gubernatorial contests which occurred on November 8.

I think we'll be around a good while yet and will disappoint anyone whose interest in our condition reflects his morbid fascination with the death struggle of an organism not much longer for this world.

But I know that's not the reason for the interest of most people in how the Republican Party is doing. Generally speaking, those who are concerned about our future want us to continue to exist and want our health to improve.

Is this concern based upon an affection for the ideology that the Republican Party is supposed to stand for? Perhaps so in a few cases, but in most cases I am quite sure it is not. Those of you who disagree violently with traditional Republican ideology are just as much interested, indeed in many cases more interested, in the continued existence and increased vigor of the Republican Party than those who are devout adherents of that traditional philosophy.

This interest in our party and this concern about its future has its basis, I believe, in a pragmatic recognition that America needs two strong parties—a party in power, capable of governing, and an effective opposition party.

One function of an opposition party is to watch and criticize. But it has another essential function. It must provide an alternative, in being, to which the people can readily turn when, for any reason and at any election, they are dissatisfied with the party in power. Accordingly, it must be a moderate party—a party of the center. It must not stand for doctrines repugnant to a majority of the people, or which any legitimate group within the country feels would endanger its vital interests. Otherwise, it does not represent a feasible alternative to the party in power.

I firmly believe that our Republican troubles of recent years stem from the fact that we have not adequately met this second requirement of an opposition party. What has come to be commonly regarded as Republican doctrine is just unsatisfactory enough to the majority of Americans for them to keep us out of power in the Nation, and more and more within the States, for an indefinite period.

Republicans have controlled both Houses of Congress for only 4 years out of the last 29. We've held the Presidency for only two terms out of the last seven, and then only by reason of the enormous personal popularity of a war hero who is generally regarded as being above all parties. We have only 16 Republican Governors out of 50, and in only 14 States do the Republicans hold both houses of the legislature.

Such minority status, long continued, leads inevitably to a constantly shrinking base of politically active membership, a constantly smaller and less representative constituency and, eventually, to complete desuetude. Already we have been the underdog for longer than is good for us or for the country.

What should we do about it?

To anticipate one of your questions, I am sure you will not be surprised to hear me say that we should not follow the advice of those who would have us turn our faces resolutely against what they term "me-too-ism," raise the laissez-faire banner of Hayek and Von Mises and, eschewing our mistakes of the past, proclaim our allegiance to the Constitution according to its most literal exponents. To do this would make no sense in terms of the needs of America and the world. And it makes no sense politically.

Certainly, I don't want to beat a dead horse. Yet there are people still around who profess to believe that the reason Republicans don't win more elections is that we fail to offer a sufficiently conservative alternative to the Democrats and that, in consequence, great masses of conservative Americans stay at home or sit on their hands.

On this point, I think the results last month speak for themselves. But because it has been claimed that the religious issue and other unusual factors distorted the 1960 picture, I should like to go back to the Senate races in 1958.

In 1958 the Republicans lost 13 Senate seats. Can anyone seriously suggest that Senator Bricker was defeated by Senator Young because Bricker was a "me-too" candidate, or that that explains the defeat of Senator Purtell of Connecticut, Governor Handley in Indiana, Senator Potter in Michigan, Senator Thye in Minnesota, Senator Malone in Nevada, Congressman Kean in New Jersey, Senator Watkins in Utah, Senator Hoblitzell or Senator Revercomb in West Virginia, or Senator Barrett in Wyoming? The two other Senate seats the Republicans

lost that year were in California and Maine; certainly in neither case was the Democratic victor more conservative than his Republican opponent. By the way, 1958, was the year Senator Knowland ran for Governor in California. Does anyone think he lost because he failed to present the voters of his State with a meaningful choice?

This argument simply does not hold water and more and more conservatives have come to recognize this, as evidenced even by some comments in the pages of the National Review and other conservative periodicals. Yet many of those who now recognize that this is not the way to immediate political success still argue that the conservatives should be allowed to take over the Republican Party.

By some it is claimed that if this happened the South would desert the Democratic Party en masse and join with the Republicans to make a new majority conservative party.

Frankly, I'm convinced this would never happen. The southern Democratic politicians are quite happy where they are and I've seen no evidence that the Democratic Party is about to throw them out. And, apart from the civil rights issue, I don't believe the South, as a whole, is any more conservative than the rest of the country.

But there are those who urge that the Republican Party should take this course regardless of its political consequences, simply because it is the right thing to do and because it would at last offer the American people a meaningful choice.

But is this the reason for the existence of our American political parties—to divide the country and to require us to choose up sides? If so, we've neglected a lot of opportunities. Why shouldn't our parties seek to divide us along sectional lines, or class lines, or interest lines, or economic lines, or religious lines, or any number of other lines? If our parties exist chiefly to give the people a meaningful choice, wouldn't any of these be just as meaningful as a choice between the innovators and the conservators?

One of the outstanding facts about this blessed country of ours is that we have had the good sense to maintain a two-party system which avoids dividing the country along any lines. On the contrary, our system tends constantly to draw us together, puts a premium on the adjustment and compromise of differences, and muffles extremists of every sort. In consequence, it makes possible a degree of domestic order and peace which is little short of a miracle in a democracy comprising a territory as large, a multiplicity of conflicting interests as great, and a population with racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds as diverse as ours.

Organized society cannot exist unless these interests and differences are either suppressed, as in a totalitarian regime, or composed, as in our democracy.

Our success in composing these differences is due in great part to the fact that the process takes place within each of our two great parties and not in a conflict between parties. We should not be surprised or upset by this. It is a condition of our success in self-government.

Admittedly, this conception has no attraction for the true believer or the passionate crusader. It is the opposite of utopian. Yet, I believe, it is right.

There are people who imagine they can find in political or social strife a personal answer to the riddle of existence. Happily most Americans don't feel impelled to follow that will-of-the-wisp.

Happily, too, most Americans continue to turn a deaf ear to those who urge that ideological politics is an essential stimulus to creative thinking. This does not represent public complacency. It represents plain commonsense. Cerebration so feeble it cannot function without such stimulation is a dispensable luxury.

But what does one say to those who honestly (though, as I believe, mistakenly) fear that our greatest danger is the destruction of our free enterprise system, our Federal form of government and our pluralistic society? This, I think: That the way to protect and preserve these institutions and the great values they represent does not lie in forcing the American people to choose between a party of progress and a party of principled reaction. It lies in offering what the American people rightly believe is possible: sound progress consistent with the preservation of these institutions. And it lies in offering this gladly because it is right and just, not grudgingly as if making a reluctant concession to political expediency.

If, at any time, either of our parties should take an extreme and dangerous course, the remedy would not be for the other party to fly to the opposite extreme, but for it to move even more solidly to the center. If it does, the first party will be forced quickly back to a moderate course. For this is what the American people want.

This gives a pretty fair clue, I think, if any was needed, to my view of the course our party should follow. How do I propose to implement it?

Frankly, I've no blueprint for this. The only answer I can see is for those of us who believe that the Republican Party can be a party both of progress and of preservation of the fundamental values which are our heritage to continue our efforts to make the Republican Party such a party in fact and in the eyes of the American people. I'm convinced that our party cannot continue to exist as an effective member of the American two-party system if it conceives of its role solely, or even principally, in terms of preventing the Democrats from "turning the corners too fast."

Each of us will have to do his part in his own way and in his own place. For myself, I shall continue, in the Senate and in my activities in my home State and elsewhere, to support policies and candidates with this view of our party's role. I am sure that my like-minded colleagues in the Congress and in political office and positions of party leadership will do the same. Naturally, we shall seek to make ours the prevailing position within the party and to persuade the people of the United States that this in fact is so. Eventually, I believe we shall succeed because I am convinced we are on the right side.

There is no thought here of reading those who disagree with us out of the party or of failing to keep our party open to any legitimate point of view that may differ with our own. Here we can take a lesson from the Democrats. Look, for example, at their announced roster of Senate leaders. Senator MANSFIELD as majority leader, Senator HUMPHREY as majority whip, and Senator SMATHERS as chairman of the majority policy committee constitute as pretty a blend of moderate, liberal, and conservative opinion as one could hope to find. They have no trouble in accommodating violently conflicting views or personalities and they manage to enjoy themselves while they are doing it. Indeed, it seems to me that one of the chief natural advantages possessed by the Democrats is a certain lighthearted approach to all phases of political activity. We Republicans may not in fact take ourselves too seriously, but it sometimes seems that way. Politics is indeed serious business, but I am sure that the light touch often helps the Democrats get their serious business done.

Unless I miss my guess, there's going to be plenty of opportunity for the Republicans in Congress who feel as I do (and there are quite a few of us around) to show that we mean what we say. Some commentators have suggested that the President-elect may move slowly in attempting to put his campaign pledges into effect. But certainly in the next session we must deal with many important matters left undone by the last Congress, including aid to education, minimum wage legislation, medical care for the aged, depressed areas legislation, housing and urban renewal, immigration, civil rights and, in the Senate, eliminating the filibuster. And mutual security will again be a vitally important issue.

On all these matters the record shows the division of opinion among the Democratic Members of the Senate and of the House. On most, if not all of them, Republican support and Republican votes will be necessary in order to enact adequate legislation. In my judgment such support and votes will be forthcoming. On some of them a strong Republican prod may be necessary. I believe that this, too, will be provided.

This should go a long way to counteract the unfortunate impression created by the alacrity with which some Republicans jump to the leadership of bipartisan coalitions which oppose progressive measures in many of these fields. At the very least it would be a refreshing change to see Republicans pulling the Democrats' chestnuts out of the fire in the right way.

I'm certain, too, that it would be approved by the great majority of Americans, including rank-and-file Republicans all over the country. It could give us a real start toward rebuilding public confidence in the Republican Party and help bring nearer the day when the Republican label will again be the political asset it used to be rather than the political liability it now is in so many parts of the Nation. And how wonderful it would be never again to be greeted, "Hey, CASE, how come you're a Republican?"

Our Salt-Polluted Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 10, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a résumé of my remarks delivered before the Surgeon General's National Conference on Water Pollution, Washington, D.C., December 12, 1960, and an excerpt from an article entitled "Watering Rocket Bases," published in Time magazine for December 19, 1960.

There being no objection, the remarks and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SALT-POLLUTED WATERS

Surgeon General Burney, distinguished guests, and delegates of the conference:

"Water, water everywhere
Nor any drop to drink."

The rhyme of the Ancient Mariner referred to the salt-polluted waters that make up more than three-fifths of the earth's surface. There are 320 million cubic miles of the stuff.

How much is that? Well, it takes about 3 acre-feet of water to make a million gallons. And there are 640 surface acres to a square mile. And a cubic mile would be 5,280 feet deep. So, a cubic mile of water in millions of gallons should be 640 times 5,280 divided by 3.

And that multiplied by 320 million should approximate the gallonage of salt-polluted waters in the oceans of the earth. That is, if my formula is correct and if your multiplication is accurate.

HEAVILY SALINE

How much more salt and otherwise minerally polluted water exists in underground pools and streams, I lack the imagination to estimate. But our knowledge of artesian supplies and shallow wells that are heavily saline in character indicates that a tremendous reserve does exist when man achieves the conquest of desalination and demineralization.

We are at work on this job. In 1952 Congress passed a bill which authorized a program of research contracts with private and public institutions in the desalination of water. It attracted little general attention at the time. We had difficulty getting appropriations. I recall once when a Boston scientist was being badgered by questions as to what he would do with the money asked. "If I knew what we would find out," he replied, "we wouldn't need the research."

But we did get some funds and in 1953 research contracts were made with some of the organizations or institutions which had shown some interest in the field.

First thoughts were of sea water because of its abundance. California Congressmen Fletcher, McDonough, Phillips, and Engle, the latter now Senator, had all pushed bills on the subject in the House. Senators Anderson, of New Mexico; O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Cordon, of Oregon; Hayden, of Arizona; Wiley, of Wisconsin; and Johnson, of Texas, were among those most active in the Senate. My special interest stemmed from a fairly intimate acquaintance with alkali water and its brackish cousins in the arid and semiarid regions of the West.

ORGANIZED BY JENKINS

The initial program was organized in the Interior Department by David Jenkins of Ohio. Subsequently Secretary Seaton created a full-fledged Office of Saline Waters and placed former Nebraska Congressman Dr. A. L. Miller in charge. His professional knowledge and energetic direction have done much to bring the program to where it now is—one of the most promising and constructive activities of the Federal Government in the whole field of water conservation and utilization.

Research contracts on various processes have been carried on with both oceanic and inland waters. In 1955 we extended and expanded the original authorization. By 1957 a number of processes showed real promise. Senate committee hearings developed testimony which supported the belief that results warranted practical, full-size demonstration plants. In 1958 Congress passed and President Eisenhower approved a bill to authorize five practical-size demonstration plants—three to deal with sea water, two to treat inland brackish waters.

This program is now under way. The location and the processes of each one are revealing as to the nature of this water pollution problem and the range of solutions.

Plant No. 1 is now 40 percent complete at Freeport, Tex. It will convert 1 million gallons per day of gulf waters into potable drinking water at an estimated cost of 97 cents per 1,000 gallons. If increased to a 10- or 15-million-gallon capacity, the cost can be cut in half, it is believed. This plant will use what is known as the long-tube vertical distillation process.

Plant No. 2 will be at Point Loma, San Diego, Calif. Ground-breaking ceremonies are being held the 19th of this month. It, too, will produce 1 million gallons per day, using water from the Pacific Ocean in a multiple effect evaporation process.

Plant No. 3 will be at Webster, S. Dak. Contracts for it have recently been signed and construction will start in the spring. This plant, using electro-dialysis with water passing through membrane stacks, will treat waters that are about 2,200 parts per million in solids. Many towns of the West have a constant battle with such waters that eat out or clog water pipes and sewer lines with a variety of effects upon the human system. Its capacity will be 250,000 gallons per day and the cost is expected to be in the vicinity of 50 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Plant No. 4 will be at Roswell, N. Mex. There, water will be used that has a hardness of 24,000 parts per million. A process will be used of forced vapor circulation with drop condensation.

Plant No. 5 will be located somewhere on the east coast of the United States to work on waters of the Atlantic Ocean. The process will probably be an adaptation of natural freezing similar to one that has received considerable publicity for use by the new State of Israel.

COST ESTIMATED

Dr. Miller envisions an eventual cost of water recovery by these methods approximating 30 to 35 cents per 1,000 gallons. This can be put alongside of an average distribution cost for American cities of 35 cents as estimated by the American Waterworks Association.

Now I am aware of the fact that probably most of you expected me to talk about man-caused pollution of our waters. But this matter of treating brackish underground and salty sea waters may be more closely related to man-polluted waters than appears at first glance.

The contaminated waters of the Potomac River flow into the Atlantic Ocean. And even the longest of rivers winds at last into the sea. The very process of distillation and recovery which are being developed in the saline water program may offer the answer to many local water-pollution problems with which your conference will deal.

And may I remind you that the disposal of atomic wastes probably carries the ultimate threat in water pollution. Radioactive raindrops disturb not only water supplies but milk and growing crops. Even lead-lined boxes deposited at sea offer cause for concern—especially since bathysphere divers last summer discovered that fish living at the bottom of the ocean's deepest trench depend upon oxygen carried to them by deep-sea currents.

IMPORTANT TO MAN'S SURVIVAL

One of the stanchest supporters of the desalination program has been Senator ANDERSON, for many years chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. His interest springs, in part, from his belief that what is developed in this program may be important to man's survival in an atomic age.

This program of desalting or demineralizing the great, ultimate reserves and storehouses of the world's water in the oceans and the underground reservoirs may seem so vast as to be discouraging as are some of the profit-protecting practices employed by industry and the topsy-grown habits of modern life which pollute our streams. But progress is being made.

President Eisenhower once said: "Pessimism never won any battle in war or in peace." That essentially is the message of cheer that man finds in the Christmas message. What man inwardly feels he ought to do, he may, with confidence, try to do. There is a good plan for this world and its people.

[From Time magazine, Dec. 19, 1960]

WATERING ROCKET BASES

In a shower-taking, lawn-dousing, pool-splashing Nation that casually consumes about 300 billion gallons of water a day, it seems curious that water should be a national defense problem.

But it is—particularly to the U.S. Air Force, which is building a network of underground Atlas and Titan rocket-launching sites in the arid inland wastes of New Mexico, South Dakota, and Oklahoma. In these areas available water is apt to be brackish, highly contaminated with minerals and salts that make it unpleasant and harmful for men and missiles alike. In addition to satisfying the need of parched humans, the bases must also slake the huge thirst of the rocket complex: thousands of gallons of water are needed to cool intricate machinery and to air-condition control rooms 25 to 35 feet below the surface.

TAPPED OFF

To help solve its water problem, the Air Force has signed up Ionics, Inc., a 12-year-old Cambridge, Mass., company staffed largely by professorial veterans of MIT and Harvard. Less than 2 years ago, Ionics unveiled the Nation's first municipal water-desalting plant at Coalinga, Calif.; since last June, Ionics has been transforming 250,000 gallons a day of unpotable water into good water for the town of Oxnard, Calif., at a cost of 20 cents per thousand gallons—half the amount that most U.S. cities pay for their water. About 50 more company plants are in operation or projected from Alaska to the Persian Gulf.

Ionics' specialty is purifying brackish water, which has a maximum of only 10,000 parts of dissolved contaminants per million parts of water. The Ionics system is much more costly in converting sea water, where the contamination rate is 35,000 parts per million.

Under traditional purification methods, salt or brackish water is either heated to a vapor and then condensed, leaving foreign matter behind, or else it is frozen into ice, thereby separating out the brine, and then remelted to obtain a pure product. The Ionics system, developed by Executive Vice President Walter Juda, does neither. It is an electrical process that exploits the natural attraction of opposite charges. Ionics uses a 4-foot stack of 18-by-20-inch plastic membranes, one thirty-second inch thick and one twenty-fifth inch apart, between which the brackish water circulates. When voltage is applied across the stack, positively charged ions of impurities are drawn through one set of membranes, while negatively charged ions go through the other set of membranes. The concentrated brine is tapped off, leaving a continuous stream of fresh water.

ENOUGH WATER?

Ionics' specialization in brackish water makes its purification system particularly suitable for the missile bases. From local deep wells, highly mineralized water will soon be pumped into a dozen desalting units with a daily capacity of 500,000 gallons, enough to supply a town of 5,000. That amount of water is only a drop in the bucket to the United States as a whole. But the significance of desalinization research goes beyond its immediate importance to national defense, looks ahead a scant 20 years, when Americans will be using 600 billion gallons of water a day—more than today's readily available supply.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1961

(Legislative day of Monday, January 9, 1961)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, out of our partial and fragmentary conceptions, knowing that we see as but through a glass darkly, we turn to Thee who dwellest in the effulgence of perfect light. We come with the consciousness that to abide in Thee is to find our own completeness.

We, Thy children, on this wandering island in the sky—a speck amid the vastness of space—would look up to Thee in faith and in hope, as from our tasks we turn aside for this dedicated moment.

In a time when Thy earth children are peering so constantly into the universe without, we come asking that Thou make real to us the universe within, where Thou hast taught us that the kingdom of Heaven is to be found.

Give us to see that there lies our fortune and destiny, where truth may walk in shining garments, and goodness grow glorious, and all that is excellent and beautiful, unselfish and of high repute, may make our inner lives even as the garden of the Lord.

We ask it all in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, January 10, 1961, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Finance Committee.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, as of December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES POLICIES, ACTIVITIES, AND DISPOSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the month of August 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on flight pay with respect to the United States Coast Guard, for the 6-month period preceding January 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENSE OF MAINTAINING AND OPERATING WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925, RELATING TO FEE CHARGED FOR LEARNERS' PERMITS

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13 OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM PAYING FEES IN COURTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EMPOWERMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION TO ADMINISTER OATHS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DEFENSE OF SUITS AGAINST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ARISING OUT OF THEIR OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN SCOPE OF THEIR EMPLOYMENT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POWER FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO APPOINT CERTAIN POLICEMEN

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN SEMITRAILERS BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of 5,000-gallon capacity semitrailers by Department of the Army from Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich., dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORIZATON OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS WITHOUT NECESSITY OF SETTLEMENT BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of October 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE SUCCESSORS TO THE PRESIDENCY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 342. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 343. A bill for the relief of Elias Michael Kaimakliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 344. A bill to amend the Seneca Leasing Act of August 14, 1950, 64 Stat. 442; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 345. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 346. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 347. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to provide that the number of meals served to schoolchildren in a State participating in the school-lunch program shall be considered a factor in determining the apportionment of funds under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 348. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require proof of settlement of State and local tax claims as a condition to transferring a certificate or permit issued to a carrier by motor vehicle under the provisions of such part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HART, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PELL):

S. 349. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 350. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; and

S. 351. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 352. A bill to prohibit, within the District of Columbia, unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (by request):

S. 353. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson Area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command Training Site, Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 354. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range;

S. 355. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta Area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes;

S. 356. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain land in the Granite Creek Area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes; and

S. 357. A bill to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 358. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent conveying certain lands in the town of Powell, Wyo., together with improvements, to the Shoshone Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 359. A bill to provide for reconveyance to the State of Maryland of a tract of land located on the campus of the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, which was previously donated by the State of Maryland to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 360. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MORTON (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 361. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 362. A bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 363. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 364. A bill to repeal the Act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 365. A bill to provide for increasing the storage capacity of the Bumping Lake Reservoir, Yakima River Basin, Washington; and

S. 366. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Pig War National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 367. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 368. A bill for the relief of Gomes Antonio de Phino (de Pinho);

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Lily Ang (Mrs. Chih Shing Hwa);

S. 370. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Kyzenewski and daughter, Barbara Binienda; and

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Adamska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Marco Arturo Modaffari; and

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Myung Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 374. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 375. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Department of Local Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 376. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CHAIRMAN AND MAJORITY OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 30) naming the chairman and majority members of the Select Committee on Small Business, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

ASSISTANCE TO THE SENECA NATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Seneca Leasing Act of 1950. Under the provisions of that act, the Seneca Nation is precluded from spending more than $5,000 annually of its income from the leasing of land within the Cattaraugas, Allegany, and Oil Springs Reservations for its administrative expenses. This provision is clearly out of date. It allows no room for inflation and it takes no account of the fact that the Council of the Seneca Nation, an elected body, is perfectly able to determine honestly and fairly what expenditures are necessary for the welfare of the nation.

It is only realistic, Mr. President, to recognize that the expenses which the Seneca Council must dispose of in arranging necessary services for the Nation are greatly in excess of $5,000. Furthermore, in view of the great disruption of the Seneca community as a result of the Allegheny River reservoir project now being constructed in Pennsylvania, I am sure that further expenses will come up. This arbitrary limit is a handicap, not a help, to the Seneca Indians today. I am hopeful that it can be eliminated at an early date.

I should like to add, Mr. President, that I yesterday saw and spoke to a delegation of the Seneca Nation which had come here to Washington to confer with the Corps of Engineers on their programing for the Kinzua Dam construction. This whole project has been a blow of the severest magnitude to the Seneca Nation, in view of the treaty rights which they have long held over this land. It is my intention—and I hope other Senators will concur in this effort—to do everything possible to assist the Seneca Nation in accommodating itself to the hardships that are being imposed upon it as a result of the congressional authorization and appropriation for the Kinzua Dam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 344) to amend the Seneca Leasing Act of August 14, 1950, 64 Stat. 442, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BEALL, BIBLE, BRIDGES, BUSH, CLARK, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GRUENING, HARTKE, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KEATING, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, SYMINGTON, and YOUNG of Ohio, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation service in urban and metropolitan areas. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 345) to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we all learn with the passage of time, and consequently the bill I have introduced is a revised and hopefully much improved version of the bill, S. 3278, which passed the Senate with broad bipartisan support last year on June 27.

After careful study of the extensive testimony given by administration officials and others during 5 full days of hearings before the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, and after extensive consultation with experts in the field, this new bill has been prepared. I believe it provides most of the major features necessary to assure a truly sound, comprehensive, and long-range approach to the problem of urban transportation, which is one of the most critical problems facing urban America today.

I am happy that so many of my colleagues have joined with me in sponsoring this legislation and that the American Municipal Association, representing 13,000 cities and towns across the country, is supporting the bill.

I might mention that since the end of last session there has been a growing recognition of the problem to which the bill is directed. Both the Democratic platform and the recent report of Mr. James M. Landis cited the need for immediate action on urban mass transportation. And just last week the task force on housing and urban development, headed by Mr. Joseph McMurray, recommended early passage of legislation similar to S. 3278.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Briefly, the major features of this bill are:

First. A program of low-cost, long-term loans up to $100 million in the first year after passage, with additional loans up to $150 million in subsequent years, to preserve and improve essential mass transportation service through the provision of facilities and equipment such as terminals, stations, adjacent parking lots, new commuter cars and buses, and through the coordination of such facilities with highway and other transportation facilities.

Second. A priority of loan assistance to areas making substantial progress toward the development of a positive workable program or to areas threatened with serious deterioration or loss of essential mass transportation service. A workable program would include the preparation of comprehensive plans for the community and urban area as a whole, preparation of detailed comprehensive mass transportation plans as an integral part of the general land use plans, development of the necessary financial, administrative, and organizational arrangements needed to equitably provide mass transportation improvements and service for the area as a whole, and enlistment of appropriate private and public participation and support.

Third. A requirement that no assistance be given to any area after 3 years unless substantial progress has been made on a workable program for the area involved.

Fourth. A requirement of evidence that any transit agency or private carrier benefiting from the assistance is undertaking a plan for long-range improvement of its mass transportation service.

Fifth. A program of technical assistance to communities and broad scale research on such vital questions as the

relationship of land use and transportation planning, costs of traffic congestion and its effect on economic productivity, commutation patterns, Government organization and financing problems, and technological developments.

Sixth. A $75 million mass transportation planning and demonstration grant program to enable State and local agencies to prepare detailed areawide mass transportation improvement plans, and to enable the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to select a limited number of pilot demonstration projects for assistance which he determines would make a significantly important contribution to the development of research data and information of general application in the field of mass transportation. These demonstrations would be for the purpose of actually testing the effect of such factors as service frequency, fare levels, and transfer, feeder, and parking facilities on mass transportation service, and to test the relative cost and benefits of such operations.

TWOFOLD ACTION NEEDED

These provisions, I believe, are imperative to meet the two critical needs—short-range emergency action to preserve and improve essential mass transportation service that is seriously deteriorated or on the verge of collapse, and to provide funds for the research, planning and experimentation we must have for sound, long-range improvement.

The twofold approach is inseparable. For without the long-range research, planning, and experimentation, the short-range action will remain just that—short-range, haphazard, and not fully productive.

On the other hand, all the long-range research, planning, and demonstration may well be in vain if we do not preserve and protect the huge investment that has already been made—an investment that would be prohibitively expensive to replace if once it is lost—as Los Angeles is now painfully learning.

To illustrate this point, Mr. C. M. Gilliss, the executive director of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority testified last year that they are considering just a primary system of rail rapid transit for the city which would cost in the neighborhood of $350 to $450 million. He pointed out that Los Angeles once had a fairly extensive railroad system for the area which has since been abandoned entirely, almost all the rights of way included.

THE FEDERAL INTEREST

I believe there is no need to dwell at length on the magnitude of the urban transportation crisis and the consequent tremendous interest and stake that the Federal Government has in helping to solve it. One need only point to the preponderant majority of the Nation's population whose daily lives are affected by it or to the fact that the urban areas are the economic backbone of the Nation and that traffic jams and congestion take a tremendous toll in time and money wasted in the cost of moving goods, in hurting commercial business, and in jeopardizing the tremendous investment that the Government has made in the national highway program.

For those who may wish to pursue this aspect at greater length, I refer to the statement which I made at the time of introduction of S. 3278 which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28 on page 6674 and to the report on that bill by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in the 86th Congress, 2d session, Report No. 1591, printed on June 15, 1960.

However, while there is an obvious Federal interest in urban mass transportation problems as a means of contributing to the solution of the total urban transportation crisis, one may nevertheless question whether the need might be met by funds from private sources and by the efforts of States and local governments.

With respect to the question of private financing, it is evident that the financial condition of many transit and rail lines is such that borrowing at commercial rates would result in higher fixed charges of principal and interest than could be recovered through lower maintenance costs and possible passenger revenue increases. In such cases private borrowing would only increase losses.

The conclusion that mass transportation carriers are unable to utilize commercial sources is substantiated by the experience of the $500 million guarantee loan program provided for by the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958.

The act guarantees commercial lenders against any losses sustained through loans to the railroad industry for capital expenditures and maintenance of property. As of the middle of last year, loan applications had been filed for somewhat more than $90 million and approval had been given for $53 million. However, none of the loan guarantee applications were for the purpose of directly improving rail commuter service. In some few cases, the improvements sought by the railroads have been of such a nature as to provide small incidental benefit to their commuter services.

As for the activity of local communities, while some communities have neglected the problem, the large majority of local govenments are exerting very great and increasing efforts in a variety of ways to preserve, improve, and expand existing mass transportation services.

However, the public debt of State and local governments has risen 165 percent since 1950, or 15 times as fast as the Federal debt increase of 11 percent in the same period; this has imposed severe strains on their ability to cope with the problem.

Local governments are particularly hampered by a convergence of forces requiring public expenditures at an accelerating pace on a diminishing tax base.

Most urban communities have been required to operate within constitutional debt limits and with considerably smaller allocations of funds from Federal and State Governments than the local communities originally contribute in taxes to those bodies.

In addition, the core cities which must provide mass transportation for a rapidly expanding areawide population have suffered a loss of retail sales and real estate tax revenue as traffic congestion drives more and more commercial business to outlying areas beyond the jurisdiction of the central city.

The same adverse effect on the tax base of the central city has resulted from the flight of middle- and upper-income families to the suburbs, leaving the core area with a predominantly low-income population which makes the smallest contribution to the revenue of the city but which requires the highest proportion of social and welfare services. But the families moving beyond the city's jurisdiction generally continue to require adequate transit services to and from the city.

Another serious drain on the city's tax base is caused by road and highway construction which replaces taxable property with nontaxable asphalt and cement. It was noted during the hearings that 68 percent of the land space of downtown Los Angeles is devoted to streets, highways, access roads, loading areas, and parking facilities. A similar decrease in tax-yielding land usage is being experienced by other cities.

As Mayor Celebrezze stated during the course of his testimony:

> In Cleveland our basic tax is a real estate tax. We have now the inner belt freeway which is in the process of completion. That is 3½ miles, and at a cost of some $75 million. But the sad part of it was that it went through a commercial district, and it took about $30 million worth of taxable property off the tax duplicate. Of course, it does not stop there. Then you have the question of maintenance. Well, part of the maintenance comes out of your gasoline tax, but taking care of the slopes and cutting the grass comes out of general operating funds, and therefore you have a greater burden on your general operating funds, and your tax duplicate keeps going down.

Finally, limited political jurisdictions have made it extremely difficult for most cities to make the areawide improvements necessary if mass transportation service is to be of maximum effectiveness. Most new suburban communities—already overburdened by the costs of providing new schools, roads, sewerage, gas facilities, fire and police protection—are hard pressed to help the central cities provide better mass transportation services. State governments are faced with much the same problem by virtue of the fact that many of the metropolitan areas either cross or border State lines. A great deal of commutation is thus interstate in character.

I think, therefore, that a need for the bill has been clearly demonstrated and that the most appropriate form of assistance at this time would be low-cost loans, and planning funds for long-range research, planning, and demonstration. The provision of a new source of funds would help overcome the severe obstacles facing State and local governments in their attempts to improve mass transportation services. The provision for low interest rates would help insure that the acceptance of additional economic burdens by the mass transportation carriers will not further aggravate their losses.

To elaborate on the six points I have mentioned, the provision for low-cost loans is designed to meet both this short- and long-range need. It will give the State and local governments a source of funds to help save those critical commuter lines and bus companies teetering on the brink of collapse. At the same time the bill gives them the flexibility to make some long-range improvements that are obviously needed, perhaps for removal of a stub-end terminal in one city, perhaps park-and-ride facilities in the fringe area adjacent to a bus or rail depot in another community.

Incentive is provided to encourage State and local governments to initiate a positive workable program because a priority is given to those areas that are making substantial progress, particularly in two key areas—planning and organization.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ESSENTIAL

I stress planning because as we are coming to realize, transportation, particularly the $40 billion highway program, has a profound and lasting impact on the urban landscape. There are two problems here: the highway may attract and spawn growth in an exceedingly reckless way to the serious detriment of the urban area as a whole, from the standpoint of placing immense burdens on suburban communities to provide all the public facilities, from schools to sewers, that are necessary to service the industries, housing developments, and service trades that spring up around the highway interchanges and along the route, to mention just one possible detriment.

On the other hand, take the very best designed of our highways and assume that it is located in an obvious transportation corridor, where the need for such a highway from a traffic standpoint is plain and where the urban area, because the population is increasing, should grow. Suppose then a housing subdivider comes along and starts building a large tract along both sides, with a dozen access roads leading to the highway, all pouring cars onto the highway at 12 different places, where two access roads might have done the job. Or suppose the service trades decide to abandon the central city and build a "miracle mile" or a "miracle two-mile" or three- or four-mile row of commercial activity along the highway, each store with its own ingress and egress. Or suppose some developers start building high-rise apartments near the highway and double the demand for its use. What you have is a virtually total loss of the highway as an effective transportation facility. And a huge waste of money in the process.

Both of these interrelated problems are caused by a lack of comprehensive, areawise planning that has the force of public acceptance and official support. With the comprehensive plan the urban area would know whether it should have a particular highway in a particular location, and what its effect would be on the development and welfare of the entire community. And once having decided on its location, a comprehensive plan would give political leaders a rational basis for planning land use development so that the highway does not become obsolete by the time it is built.

The very same problems can occur with mass transportation developments. They too can exert a powerful force on land use development; and improper land use development can nullify the effectiveness of the mass transportation development.

Thus the priority to areas where substantial progress is being made on the preparation of comprehensive plans for the area as a whole, and thus the cutoff on assistance to the area after 3 years unless substantial progress has been made.

I might add, parenthetically, that this encouragement-requirement provision for comprehensive planning as a condition for mass transportation would also help solve the kinds of highway problems I have just mentioned.

But I must point out that this bill I have introduced does not provide funds for general comprehensive planning. We have the section 701 urban planning program for this purpose, and I believe it is imperative that this program be improved, better enforced, and better financed, if this mass transportation bill and the existing highway program are to realize their maximum potential.

Unfortunately this program is limping along in pathetic fashion. Last year approximately $4 million was appropriated for what is one of the most crucial of all our undertakings in urban areas. And we must get away from the so-called one-shot comprehensive plan. Planning is an on-going process. It must evolve with changing needs and desires and, most importantly, it must be effectively tied in to the political decision-making process. It seems to me that when the Federal Government spends the public's money, it is the Government's duty to cut through the self-delusion engendered by the glossy master plan that is sometimes almost mass produced and then promptly shelved forever by the public officials who are supposed to use them as a basis for more informed and rational policymaking. Much could be done by vigorous administration to make sure that the planning agencies receiving the funds are effectively tied into the decision-making process and are not mere appendages which plan much but accomplish little.

REGIONAL AGENCIES

The other key element of the workable program—organization—is equally important, but a more difficult problem. This raises, of course, the question of regional government, or more precisely functional regional agencies, for transportation in this case. It simply does not make sense, to take my own area as an example, to have the New York Port Authority building bridges and tunnels and setting tolls, and at the same time have it completely disregard the impact of these efforts on the commuter railroads and buses coming into the city. This is not to say that the port authority, as it is presently constituted and financed, is capable of providing overall transportation service, but it is to say that the public suffers enormously when one hand does not know what another is doing.

But I will skip this question, and limit myself to the problems involved in providing just mass transportation for the urban area as a whole. We all know that urban growth has long since spilled over a multiplicity of political boundaries. In fact, 53 of our 200 or so major urban areas border or cross over State lines. This presents enormous organizational and financing problems in providing adequate mass transportation service for the area. For one thing, someone is going to have to make the mass transportation improvements. Of necessity the major effort is going to have to come from the core city, for Scarsdale is surely in no position, wealthy as it may be, to renovate the New York subway system or the New Haven Railroad. But, while the leadership and primary impetus is going to have to rest with the core city, it stands to reason that New York is going to be more concerned with its commuters from the Bronx than it is going to be with the commuters from Newark, N.J., or Greenwich, Conn., despite the fact that the welfare of them all is equally important to the urban area as a whole.

The same problem exists for practically every urban area, although in somewhat less insoluble form. It seems to me that we have to develop the organizational structure capable of providing mass transportation improvements that will be of the maximum benefit to the urban area as a whole. And that simply will not happen unless a way is found to finance the costs equitably among those who are benefiting. Fortunately there are some promising developments along this line, particularly right here in Washington. Philadelphia has formed a Passenger Service Improvement Corp. which is trying hard to seek the cooperation of the surrounding communities which would benefit from the improvements undertaken.

This bill will encourage this progress where it is necessary.

FEDERAL RESEARCH

On the Federal level, there is an urgent need for broad-scale study and research on a number of vital questions about which we know virtually nothing, and which would be of great general value to those who must deal with urban transportation problems across the country.

For example, there is a need for the development of techniques and standards for relating housing, urban renewal, and other land use plans and programs with mass transportation plans and programs. Certainly the Housing and Home Finance Agency should examine its mortgage insurance programs from the standpoint of the impact of those programs on land use development, and the impact of that land use development on transportation plans. It could profitably undertake studies on the economics of mass transportation operations, as the American Municipal Association has recommended, to determine what it takes to stay alive in this field. It could yield immensely helpful information for the guidance of public policy at all levels

of government on the costs of traffic congestion and its effect on productivity, on the price of goods, and on economic growth. And it could study and evaluate technological developments, which might be suitable for application in mass transportation to provide better service at lower cost.

PLANNING AND DEMONSTRATION

Finally, the bill provides for 50–50 matching grants to encourage comprehensive and detailed mass transportation planning and to undertake a limited number of pilot demonstration projects of an experimental nature.

I stressed the need earlier for general comprehensive land use planning. Once that is completed, the community must then develop a comprehensive and detailed mass transportation plan as an integral part of the general plan. At present there is absolutely no program for comprehensive mass transportation planning. In a few instances the Bureau of Public Roads has helped finance a few comprehensive transportation or highway plans in urban areas which have gone somewhat into mass transportation needs.

I am hopeful that this work will continue, and that the recent announcement of the experimental procedure for making joint use of 701 funds and 1½-percent funds will help to more effectively coordinate land use and transportation planning in urban areas.

But the kind of planning envisioned here is relatively expensive and the great bulk of the Bureau of Public Roads planning funds must of necessity go into technical studies, origin and destination studies, highway design and engineering plans, and so forth.

Consequently there has been virtually no mass transportation planning, and a great deal urgently needs to be done. This was particularly stressed by the administration officials who testified on S. 3278 last year. For example, Harland Bartholomew, testifying as Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission commented that "mass transportation plans for our growing American communities have long been neglected" for two reasons: the long-held attitude that mass transportation was "the exclusive field of private enterprise" and "the belief, and the ill-favored hope that with the advent of the private automobile there would be no further need for extension of the mass transportation system."

He went on to state:

> We only recently have come again to realize that mass transportation is a most necessary public service. Proper community development depends in many ways upon the free movement of people between places of residence, work, and shopping. Mass transportation as one of the means of achieving that free movement exerts a profound influence upon the direction of community growth. It can stimulate either an orderly or a disorderly and unbalanced growth, a congested or dispersed pattern of development. In short, mass transportation can be a major tool in shaping the form of the city. As such it can, or should, be a major element of the city plan. Properly designed it can become virtually the dominant means of shaping the large city's structure. Thus, each metropolitan city should have a comprehensive plan for directing its future growth in which the mass transportation element is fully coordinated with the pattern of land use and zoning, the open space, park and recreation pattern, the location of rail, air, and waterway terminals, the width and arrangement of major streets, highways, and expressways, and with all the other things that are normally considered as parts of the comprehensive city plan. Mass transportation thus becomes or can become a significant factor in the economic and social welfare of the community.

He concluded by saying:

> S. 3278 will encourage and stimulate much needed planning for metropolitan city areas and particularly for mass transportation planning as an urgent and dynamic part thereof. It will thus meet one of today's greatest public needs.

The bill last year, however, authorized no money for such planning. This bill does.

Together with funds for planning, the bill also makes two-thirds of the amount appropriated under section 4 available for extending assistance for a limited time on the same matching basis to undertake a limited number of particularly worthwhile pilot demonstration projects.

I am firmly convinced that this is one of the most promising efforts that could be made. It would provide the kind of immediate and tangible effort which, if the evidence derived from the tests confirmed theories on the value of mass transportation, would provide a dramatic breakthrough, I am sure, in our attempts to solve the urban transportation crisis. On the other hand, if the tests disprove the value of mass transportation, we would be in a much better position to formulate subsequent policies accordingly.

At present we have virtually no information, for example, on what effect a 5- or 10- or 25-cent reduction in fares would have on ridership of the service that was being tested. We do, however, have quite a bit of information on what happens when fares go up. Ridership goes down. Nor do we know what would happen if service frequency were increased, or free transfers were provided, or feeder service tied in, or buses run in low-density areas where it would not otherwise be economically feasible to operate, or multistoried parking facilities provided in a fringe area adjacent to a rail station. Perhaps husbands would find peace of mind in their marital battles over who is going to get the car each day, and perhaps, instead of a community expense, investors would find a bonanza in financing such parking facilities.

And even more important, we do not know what the relative merits of any of these improvements would be—which brings me to one of the most important new concepts of the bill.

COST-BENEFIT STUDIES

This is the so-called "cost-benefit" study to determine which individual transportation improvement alternative provides the greatest social and economic benefit toward meeting total urban transportation needs at the lowest overall social and economic cost.

It is not enough to say we must spend so much money to supply a commuter railroad with all new air-conditioned coaches. We have to take that cost and determine its social and economic benefit in terms of such factors as the relief it gives the riders—who are only a part but nevertheless still a part of the population we are trying to benefit with any transportation improvement—and in terms of such factors as ridership trends, the savings—if any—on street repair, traffic control, downtown parking facilities, and so forth. We then ought to examine what the same amount of money would provide in terms of possible alternate transportation improvement, weighing those costs and relative benefits, and then compare the two.

Perhaps, in terms of overall costs and benefits, it would be much wiser to spend the money to maintain certain fare levels rather than to buy the air-conditioned commuter cars. Or perhaps it would be wiser to extend bus service, or add to our highway and street capacity.

If our aim is to give the taxpayer his dollar's worth, it is absolutely imperative that we undertake these cost-benefit studies, complex and difficult and sometimes intangible as they may be.

Once we have made some progress in this effort, we will then be in a position to forge a truly new outlook—a concern with how to best meet our total urban transportation needs so as to provide the greatest amount of benefit to all segments of the community in the most economical manner possible—which I am sure will involve a strengthening and coordination of all forms of transport—rail, bus, highway, helicopter, and probably others we have not even thought about yet.

Mr. President, I believe this bill has been refined and perfected to a considerable extent since its passage by the Senate last year, and I am sure that it can be further improved with proper and extensive hearings. But I earnestly hope that the Congress will pass and that the President will sign such legislation this year, for the time is growing short.

The bill (S. 345) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1961."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The greatest part of the Nation's population, economic wealth and defense productivity is located in the rapidly expanding urban and metropolitan areas of the country, many of which are interstate in character;

(2) The social-economic welfare and vitality of such areas, the satisfactory circulation of people and goods in and between such areas, and the efficacy of highway, urban renewal and other federally-aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration of mass transportation service, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of sufficient comprehensive land use and mass transportation planning.

It is the declared policy of the Congress to assist wherever possible the States and their political subdivisions to provide the services and facilities essential to the health and welfare of the people of the United States.

It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) stimulate a full-scale effort by all levels of government in the study, research,

and planning of ways to more effectively relate and coordinate mass transportation developments with housing, urban renewal, and other land use developments in urban and metropolitan areas, and of ways and means by which mass transportation can most economically contribute to meeting total urban transportation needs, and thereby protect and enhance the value of highway and other federally-aided programs; and

(2) assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in providing necessary facilities and equipment to preserve, protect, and improve essential mass transportation service, and to assist them in the testing and development of long-range improvements in the field of mass transportation which will best contribute to the development of a more coordinated, efficient, balanced and economical transportation system as an integral part of comprehensive plans for the land use development of the area as a whole.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized from time to time to call upon and confer or participate in conferences with interested governmental departments and agencies, State and local officials, industry representatives, and independent experts to assist in solving immediate and critical problems involving mass transportation service in any area and to assist in formulating plans and programs to further the objectives of this Act. Persons participating in any such conference shall be reimbursed for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending any such conference.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to request directly from any executive department, agency or instrumentality information necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, agency or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information directly to the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to State and local governments undertaking comprehensive mass transportation planning and is authorized, by contract or otherwise, to make studies of and publish information on such questions as (1) procedures for relating housing, urban renewal and other land use plans and programs to mass transportation plans and programs; (2) commutation patterns and travel habits; (3) the economics of mass transportation operations; (4) costs of traffic congestion and its effect on economic productivity and urban growth; (5) procedures for evaluating relative costs and benefits of mass transportation projects in terms of overall urban transportation costs; (6) governmental organizational and revenue problems and procedures in providing regional transportation services; (7) technological developments in mass transportation; and (8) other related matters of general applicability.

(d) The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, which shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PLANNING AND DEMONSTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator is authorized to make mass transportation planning grants to States, counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities established under State or local laws or interstate compact; and other agencies and instrumentalities designated by the Governor of the State and acceptable to the Administrator as capable of carrying out the provisions of this section; to help finance comprehensive mass transportation surveys and plans to aid in solving problems of traffic congestion and facilitating the circulation of people and goods in urban and metropolitan areas through the development or improvement of bus, surface-rail, underground, and other mass transportation systems, and their coordination with highway, parking, and other transportation facilities in such areas.

(b) Such surveys and plans shall embrace, to the maximum extent feasible, the entire region which forms an economically and socially unified urban or metropolitan area, taking into consideration such factors as population trends, patterns of urbanization, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, institutional, and other activities.

(c) The Administrator shall prescribe appropriate regulations pertaining to the use of planning grants extended under this section, which may include but need not be limited to (1) inventory and evaluation of existing transportation facilities and traffic management procedures; (2) estimates of present and future transportation needs; (3) population and population density projections; (4) study of and coordination with local and regional land use and economic development plans and where necessary their further development; (5) studies to evaluate the relative social and economic costs and benefits of alternate transportation programs and plans to meet total urban transportation needs; (6) formulation of a mass transportation improvement program and preparation of a detailed physical plan including design and location criteria of new mass transportation facilities and their coordination with highway, parking and other transportation facilities; (7) a determination of mass transportation improvement priorities based on relative urgency, together with cost estimates for such improvements; and (8) development of necessary financing plans and administrative and organizational measures necessary to carry out the foregoing.

(d) In the processing of applications for the purpose of undertaking mass transportation surveys and planning for areas embracing several municipalities or other political subdivisions, the Administrator shall make planning grants to those applicants best qualified to plan for the area as a whole and to make a continuing contribution to the fulfillment of such plans, and shall encourage the participation and cooperation in the formulation of such plans by other interested municipalities, political subdivisions, public agencies, or interested parties in order to achieve maximum acceptance of such plans by the area as a whole. The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent feasible, encourage the utilization of previous pertinent and related plans and studies for the area involved so as to avoid unnecessary repetition or duplication of effort.

(e) The Administrator may make planning grants to applicants for an intrastate portion of a metropolitan area that embraces two or more States, specifying such requirements of cooperation and coordination with other applicants for the same metropolitan area as he deems appropriate.

(f) The Administrator may conduct studies of the various mass transportation programs and plans for urban areas throughout the United States and may make a limited number of grants for limited periods of time with respect to particular pilot demonstration projects which he determines would make a significantly important contribution to the development of research data and information of general applicability relating to the improvement of mass transportation service and the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Not to exceed two-thirds of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (h) of this section may be used for such demonstration project grants. The Administrator shall use such grants to test the effect of such factors or combination of factors as service frequency, fare levels, availability of transfer and feeder service, availability and location of parking facilities, speed of service, condition and placement of facilities and equipment, and technological developments, on public acceptance of mass transportation service and on the relative costs and benefits of such operations.

(g) A grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated cost of the work for which the grant is made. All grants made under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this Act, as may be prescribed by the Administrator. No portion of any planning grant made under this section shall be used for the preparation of detailed engineering plans for specific facilities and equipment. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made under this section.

(h) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $75 million to carry out the purposes of this section, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

FEDERAL LOANS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator is authorized to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, States, counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States, public agencies, and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State, to finance the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas, and for use in coordinating highway, bus, surface-rail, underground, parking, and other transportation facilities in such areas: *Provided*, That the total amount of purchases and loans which are outstanding at any one time under this section shall not exceed $250,000,000, but not to exceed $100,000,000 prior to July 1, 1962. As used in this section, the term "facilities and equipment" shall be construed to include land, terminals and stations, right-of-way, parking lots and ramps, track and electrification facilities, mass transportation common carriers, and any other real or personal property necessary and useful for the development and operation of an economic, efficient and balanced transportation system; but such term shall not be construed to include public highways.

(b) No such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental expenses, or any operating expenses connected with any mass transportation operation.

(c) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms, and all securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment, and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations or otherwise.

(d) No securities or obligations shall be purchased, and no loans shall be made, including renewals or extensions thereof, which

have maturity dates in excess of fifty years. Interest shall be charged on loans made under this section at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall not be more than the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (j) of this section.

(e) In cases where any person, agency, or corporation engaged in providing mass transportation service, including a lessee or conditional vendee, is necessary to the utilization of the assistance extended by this Act, the Administrator shall require such evidence as he deems appropriate that such person, agency, or corporation is ready, willing, and able to utilize such assistance and is undertaking a plan for long-range improvement of its mass transportation service.

(f) In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall consider the extent to which there is being initiated in the area involved a positive workable program (including preparation of comprehensive plans for the community and urban area as a whole, and detailed comprehensive mass transportation plans as an integral part thereof, development where necessary of the financial, administrative and organizational arrangements needed to equitably provide mass transportation improvements and service for the urban area as a whole, enlistment of appropriate private and public participation and support, and such other steps as are necessary) for the development of a more coordinated, efficient and balanced transportation system for the area as a whole. The Administrator shall give priority to the applications of those eligible applicants which he determines (1) are making substantial progress toward the development of a workable program as described in this section; or (2) are threatened with a serious deterioration or loss of essential mass transportation service.

(g) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section, subsequent to three years after the date of enactment of the Act, with respect to any area to be benefited by such assistance unless substantial progress has been made toward the development of a workable program (as described in subsection (f) of this section) for such area.

(h) The Administrator shall compile such information on projects assisted under this section as he deems appropriate to the development of research data generally applicable in the field of mass transportation.

(i) The Administrator shall require that any financial assistance extended under this section is coordinated to the greatest extent possible with other projects assisted by Federal, State and local governments for the same area.

(j) In order to finance activities under this section, the Administrator is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time and to have outstanding at any one time, notes and other obligations not exceeding $250,000,000, but not to exceed $100,000,000 prior to July 1, 1962. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall not be more than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Administrator of such notes or other obligations, and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator to be issued hereunder and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(k) Funds borrowed under this section and any proceeds shall constitute a revolving fund, which may be used by the Administrator in the exercise of his functions under this section.

(l) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsection (c) (2), of the Housing Act of 1950. Funds obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this title shall be availabale for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(m) As used in this section, the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH BILL

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act. The purpose of the amendment is to change the formula by which funds for school lunches are distributed among the several States and territories participating in the program.

As the law now requires, funds are distributed to the States and territories according to two factors—the amount of per capita income in the State and the total number of school-age children within the State.

There is no objection to using per capita income as one element in the allocation formula. Many of the Federal grant-in-aid programs make use of this factor. It helps States with relatively low incomes to get proportionately larger assistance.

However, it is difficult to justify the distribution of Federal aid under this program according to the number of school-age children in each State. In some States only a small fraction of these children are served meals under the program—as low as 13 percent in one eastern State. This may be due to any number of reasons, such as lack of demand by the students or lack of interest by the schools themselves. In other States the proportion of schoolchildren eating lunches provided by the program exceeds 60 percent—in Louisiana slightly above 70 percent. The national average is about 32 percent.

The bill I have introduced would change the apportionment formula to reflect the size of the school lunch program in each State, instead of merely the number of children. The allocation to any State would then be based on the number of lunches actually served in the State under the program, as well as on the State's per capita income.

If enacted, this amendment would bring about a more equitable and effective distribution of these Federal grants. The amount of Federal assistance per meal served would be made more nearly equal. States would be stimulated to examine their present school lunch programs to see if all their children who need nutritious lunches are getting them.

The total amount available for the program throughout the Nation would not be changed by this bill. That amount is of course determined annually by the Congress in the appropriation for the school lunch program.

Improving our school lunch program is an important step in strengthening the educational system of the Nation. A hungry child is seldom an attentive student. I hope that this Congress will take this action to reduce hunger in the school while seeking to improve the school itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 347) to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to provide that the number of meals served to schoolchildren in a State participating in the school lunch program shall be considered a factor in determining the apportionment of funds under such act, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 31 of my colleagues, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1961." Patterned after the World War II and Korean conflict GI bills, this proposal provides for educational readjustment for the 4¼ million veterans of the post-Korean cold war—from January 31, 1955, the termination date of such training under the Korean GI bill, to July 1, 1963, the date of termination of the draft—who served for longer than 6 months each, at a rate of 1½ days of schooling for each 1 day of service, but not to exceed 3 years schooling, at a payment of $110 monthly for single veterans, up to a maximum of $165 a month for a married veteran with two children. It also provides for guaranteed home and farm loans, and for vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans.

As Senators know, after extensive hearings, careful research, and considered debate, a cold war veterans GI bill was passed by the Senate during the 86th Congress by a vote of 57 to 31. Today, time and events dictate even more strongly the passage of this program, for these reasons:

First. It is a matter of individual justice, because only about 46 percent of our young men serve under current draft

procedures, leaving the 54 percent who do not serve with a headstart in the economic struggle unless these veterans are furnished some educational training.

Second. It is a matter of national economic benefit, for it assures that some 4¼ million men will have a chance for professional or technical training that will increase productivity and minimize serious, heavy unemployment.

Third. It is a matter of national security, for it will greatly improve the attitude and morale of men called to service.

Mr. President, in the years immediately ahead, this Nation must move forward on all educational fronts. We must experiment with new ideas and new programs in order to make our educational system and the products of that system preeminent in the world. But in moving toward this goal, we cannot afford to overlook the value of established programs that have proved out well, from the standpoint both of the individuals concerned and of society as a whole. And that is the kind of program we have in the cold war GI bill, for here we can point to positive accomplishments and results from our past dealings with the veterans of this Nation.

In enacting the two previous GI bills, for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, the Congress wisely provided two of the most farsighted, beneficial programs ever known to any society or government. In education alone the two previous GI bills gave the Nation 450,000 engineers and 180,000 doctors and nurses. They provided training for more than 150,000 physicists, chemists, and other scientists. About 230,000 teachers—our most sorely needed trained human resource, now in very short supply—are now available because of these bills.

But the college-trained professionals constitute only a part of the national dividends that will accrue from this measure.

Equally important are the technicians and skilled workers who will be produced by the training in schools below college level and by on-the-job and on-the-farm training. These types of training which will be pursued by almost half of the persons expected to seek training under the cold war GI bill, are more important than ever before.

As pointed out in the hearings on the cold war GI bill, and more recently by the report of the President-elect's task force on area redevelopment, below-college training provides a means by which to make a direct attack upon the chronic unemployment which persists in some parts of our economy, even during relatively prosperous times.

Evidence on this point was presented in our hearings by Kenneth C. Carl, director of vocational education, Williamsport Technical Institute, Williamsport, Pa., when he stated that:

> I found that in Pennsylvania with one-tenth of the unemployment of the United States we had jobs available. Through a survey of the 14 major labor market areas of Pennsylvania I compiled a list of 228 occupations for which there were jobs open, and 197 of these occupations were seeking people with less than college training but with very definite skills. All of these occupations were listed with the Pennsylvania State Employment Service. Jobs are going begging in the midst of serious unemployment. But I emphasize they are skilled jobs, jobs for which prior training or experience is a must.
>
> The answer surely is in training our unskilled, and perhaps equally in retaining those among our unemployed whose skills have become less important to our economy due to the swift changes that are taking place in our industries as a result of technological advancements and automation.
>
> Permit me for a few minutes, gentlemen, to turn to the economic aspects of the situation. I speak only of Pennsylvania. From 1950 to 1958, a matter of 8 years, the taxpayers of this State paid almost $1½ billion—I repeat, billion—in unemployment compensation. During these same years, a further $870 million was paid in direct relief by the department of public assistance. I could not attempt to calculate the loss to the State and the Nation by this state of affairs. An unemployed citizen pays few taxes. He takes from the pot rather than contributing to it. The skill of the worker is in a very real sense a brick in the foundation upon which the prosperity of our Nation is built.
>
> We are greatly concerned about our unemployment problem in Pennsylvania. We know the occupations we need to train for; we have surveyed the unemployed people and find that 65 percent of them are interested in learning a new occupation or further updating in their skills.

So, actually, many of our unemployed of today are out of work because they are not suitable for the jobs that are open or the jobs that will be developed. This is especially true of a large number of our cold war veterans. In looking for postservice work, they find that their military service has provided very little to qualify them for civil skills. In general, they are unskilled or wrong skilled, which constitutes a technical handicap that they can do very little to overcome by themselves. Well-planned vocational programs and guidance are essential to prepare these young people for the jobs that they need and that the Nation needs to have them fill.

The cold war GI bill provides a truly wise and beneficial program, one well calculated to restore to a young man what he has lost—time, the most critical time of his life, for he goes to military service during the very period when normally he would be preparing himself for adult life. In our recent past, readjustment rights helped the returning serviceman to achieve substantial parity with his contemporaries who did not have to serve. I submit that we have equally cogent reasons for restoring these rights to today's serviceman.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, the draft is taking only a minority of our draft-age youth. So let us squarely face the fact that the draft is operating inequitably and will continue to operate inequitably within the foreseeable future. More than one-half of the young men in the draft-age group will never perform a substantial period of military service. As was concluded in a Library of Congress research paper, dated May 13, 1959:

> It is apparent that only 530,000 of the 1,500,000 males reaching age 26 (in 1963) will have entered military service for 2 years or longer. This is 46 percent—less than 5 out of every 10. Another way of stating the estimate of service for all males aged 26 in 1963 is that 1.3 more of those who reach age 26 by June 30, 1963, can expect to escape substantial military service as compared to those who reach age 26 by June 30, 1958.

Since the needs of the cold war are such as to require the continuation of the draft law and its accompanying inequities, the least a grateful government can do is to remove the unnecessary burdens of honorable military service. The readjustment benefits in the cold war GI bill are well designed to achieve this purpose by restoring, in part, educational and other opportunities lost by the young men who are called upon to contribute a share of their lives to the national cause. In short, readjustment benefits give the young men who perform substantial tours of military duty some means by which they can catch up with contemporaries who stay behind.

Why should not we give these boys this recognition and assistance now, without waiting until some warlike incident goads us into action in this field.

We may expect that a law like this one will eliminate many occasions for application of the draft, by increasing the incentives for volunteering for military duty. It will, we may hope, desirably lower the age level of those entering the service, from those who have tried to finish college first, to those who will need help to finish college later. It should eliminate many complaints that a young man's future is too uncertain under present laws, by allowing him a full range of scheduling his education and his military service. Finally, it should greatly improve the morale of those in the Military Establishment, by clearly showing that the American Government and people do, indeed, appreciate and recognize the great service they are doing all of us.

Soviet Russia is now educating more than twice as many engineers, more than twice as many scientists, and more than twice as many doctors, as is the United States of America. It is later than many think. It is time to act.

In brief summary, Mr. President, the cold war GI bill should be enacted for the following reasons:

First. It is an act of justice, because only 46 percent of our young men serve militarily under the present operation of the draft law. This law intends to help that 46 percent gain back some lost time, and their educational opportunity, which without this bill is lost forever.

Second. It will help our Nation produce more schoolteachers, doctors, medical technicians, scientists, and engineers, whose services are critically needed; it will help increase the brainpower of the Nation, our most neglected asset. There is now a shortage of 140,000 schoolteachers in America, and the shortage grows yearly.

Third. The veterans make the highest grades of any comparable sized group in our colleges. It is the best and most economical investment in developing our brainpower yet found by the American people. Some of our greatest scientific authorities have testified that unless we step up our educational effort, Russia will be ahead of us in the sciences by

1969. Admiral Rickover, after visiting Russia, warned us that the great danger we face from Russia is not in her present armaments but in her efficient schools.

Fourth. Under the World War II GI bill, 7,800,000, or one-half, of the more than 15 million veterans, took training. Of these 29 percent, or 2,262,000, went to college. Of the more than 4,750,000 veterans of the Korean conflict, one-half, or more than 2 million, took training under the GI bill; and 51 percent of these, or slightly over one million, went to college. From these GI educational bills—for World War II and the Korean conflict—the Nation obtained an additional badly needed 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 physical and research scientists, 450,000 engineers, and 230,000 schoolteachers. The cold war GI bill is badly needed now, to do the job, to continue developing and increasing our brainpower.

Fifth. It will be a sound, self-liquidating investment, for its education and vocational training program will so greatly raise veterans' earning power that within a few years their increased income taxes will more than pay the costs of the program. This is based upon actual proof from the Bureau of the Census, which shows that the training received by veterans under the World War II and Korean conflict bills is paying the Government more than a billion dollars a year more in taxes than it would collect without such training, and that those bills will pay themselves out by about 1969. This bill is not one at the expense of the taxpaying public; education is the one certain method of strengthening the taxpaying public.

Sixth. Last year, the Congress appropriated about $40 billion to the Defense Department, over $2½ million more for atomic development, and over $3½ billion more for foreign aid, all to support the cold war. This is a total of over $45 billion a year for the cold war.

The highest estimate of the cost of the cold-war GI bill is only a minor fraction of these figures.

Seventh. The annual cost will not upset the budget, because as the expense of educating the Korean conflict veterans phases out, the cold-war veterans' educational expense will take its place. It will not be an expense for the next generation, because just as the cost of the World War II veterans' bill will be paid out by increased taxes paid by those veterans alone before 1970, so the cost of educating these cold-war veterans will be paid out of their increased taxes, due to their higher brainpower, before their normal earning years are over.

Eighth. The pending bill is not as generous with cold-war veterans as the Korean conflict law was. For cold-war veterans, there is no mustering out pay and there are no business loans; and the minimum service period for educational benefits is 6 months, instead of only 3 months required of World War II veterans and Korean veterans. The payment of $110 a month now will buy only as much as $78 would buy in 1952. In addition, the average college tuition rate in America has gone up 71 percent since 1952. The average veteran must obtain loans or hold a job on the side, in order to go to college under the GI bill.

Ninth. It will, in brief, equip the breadwinners of many thousands of American families to provide a better standard of living and to become more productive and useful citizens. This bill is not a giveaway; it is an investment in the future of America.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I anticipate that hearings on the bill will be scheduled in the near future, to explore the exact manner in which this program would most equitably fit our cold-war veterans in their readjustment needs. We must begin a program that will tell the people of America that our draft law does not cause certain of their sons to lose 2 years from their competitive civilian lives, but, instead, provides a challenging opportunity for honorable and patriotic service to the country which will be suitably recognized, rather than subject them to any disadvantage in comparison with the 54 percent who do not serve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF COLD WAR GI BILL, ENTITLED THE "VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961"

This bill provides readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans, i.e., persons who perform active duty in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. Basic eligibility period extends from January 31, 1955, the end of the Korean conflict, to July 1, 1963, the termination date of the compulsory draft law. Eligibility period respecting vocational rehabilitation training, limited to veterans with service-connected disabilities, covers both post-Korean veterans and veterans who first entered on active duty between end of World War II and beginning of Korean conflict. (See specific dates below.) Applicable throughout the bill is a requirement of discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

Educational and vocational training assistance: Eligibility conditioned upon 6 months or more active duty or discharge for service-connected disability. Period of education or training (not to exceed 36 months) is calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of active duty. During educational period veteran receives monthly allowance, as follows: For full-time college training the monthly allowance would be: If no dependents, $110; if one dependent, $135; if more than one dependent, $160. Veteran must begin education or training within 3 years after discharge or enactment of bill, whichever is later; and must complete education within 8 years after discharge or enactment of bill, as case may be. No allowance shall be paid for any period prior to September 1, 1961. Persons enrolled in courses of education on September 1 would be entitled to allowances from that date, although they could not receive payment until after bill's enactment. All education or training ends on June 30, 1973, except that certain career enlistees may use their educational entitlements beyond that date.

Vocational rehabilitation training for disabled veterans: Eligibility conditioned upon need of training, as determined by Administrator of Veterans Affairs (VA), to overcome handicap of disability rated at 10 percent or more and incurred on active duty either between the end of World War II (July 25, 1947) and the beginning of the Korean conflict (June 27, 1950), or subsequent to the end of the Korean conflict (January 31, 1955). Disabilities rated at 30 percent or more enjoy presumption that training is needed; in cases involving disabilities of less than 30 percent, veteran must clearly show that disability has caused a "pronounced employment handicap." Period of training generally limited to 4 years; however, in appropriate cases, additional time is granted. Training may be in college, below college, or in any other type of training designed to lead to the veteran's vocational rehabilitation. Although no overall termination date applies to the program, there are dates beyond which veterans may not train. Generally veterans may not train more than 9 years after discharge, or 9 years after enactment of the bill, whichever is later. In certain hardship cases, these limitations may be extended by 4 years. During rehabilitation period, VA pays tuition, cost of books and other school expenses, and veteran receives monthly subsistence allowance, as follows: For full-time institutional training, the monthly subsistence allowance would be: if no dependents, $75; if one dependent, $105; if more than one dependent, $120.

Loan assistance: Eligibility conditioned upon 6 months or more of active duty, or discharge for service-connected disability. Widow of veteran who died of service-connected disability would also be eligible. Loans are for purpose of purchasing (a) homes, including farm homes, and (b) farmlands, livestock, etc., to be used by veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Loans are subject to guarantee fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of loan amount, to be used to cover losses on loans. Interest rates and maturities of loans controlled by laws applicable to World War II and Korean veterans, now and in future. (Under Public Law 86–73, maximum interest rate was fixed at 5¼ percent per annum.) Guarantee loan program ends on July 1, 1973, with an additional year for processing loan applications received by VA prior to such date. In addition, in certain small towns and rural areas, and until June 30, 1962, VA may lend up to $13,500 directly to veteran when private capital is not available for guarantee loan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 349) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators HILL, HUMPHREY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, SMITH of Massachusetts, SPARKMAN, KUCHEL, CHAVEZ, EASTLAND, MAGNUSON, KEFAUVER, SMITH of Maine, PASTORE, YOUNG of Ohio, HART, MCGEE, BYRD of West Virginia, GRUENING, DOUGLAS, FULBRIGHT, WILEY, SYMINGTON, BIBLE, BARTLETT, METCALF, LONG of Missouri, NEUBERGER, and PELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of this bill, I desire to commend the Senator from Texas highly for calling for this very constructive program. It will be of tremendous value

to the young men who are taken out of civil life to serve in the national defense for 2 years. They are entitled to the opportunities which this legislation proposes. It will be one of the most valuable programs that has been presented to the Senate in some years. I associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Texas and I am delighted to be associated with the bill as a cosponsor as I was in the 86th Congress; so I take this opportunity to express my gratification that the Senator from Texas has again introduced the bill which seeks to recognize a responsibility which the Nation owes to those who forfeit other opportunities in order to serve our Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Texas and also the Senator from Alaska in connection with this particular measure. I am very proud to be permitted to be a cosponsor of the bill, along with the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alaska. I believe that if the bill becomes law, it can do more to forward the educational development of our young men and young women than can almost any other piece of legislation. We found that out under the original GI bill of rights, which has paid, in dividends to this country, untold rewards—a tremendous accomplishment.

So I certainly hope the Congress will look favorably, and also that the new administration will look favorably, upon the proposal of the Senator from Texas; and I am very happy to join him in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the kind remarks of these two distinguished Senators, and also I am very appreciative that they have joined in sponsoring the bill—not as a compliment to me, but because of the need which exists in the country.

This fall I traveled over the United States to some extent, and I found more interest in this proposed legislation among young people than in any other legislation before the Congress. I found widespread interest in this measure among all sections of our people, of all ages.

I want to thank the distinguished majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] for cosponsoring the bill. We have cosponsorship from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until Friday, January 13, 1961, for additional cosponsors. I am not superstitious about that day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO BAN AGE BIAS IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills which deal with discrimination in employment because of age.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 350. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; and

S. 351. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 352. A bill to prohibit, within the District of Columbia, unjust discrimination in employment because of age.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age against a major portion of the Nation's labor force, of whom nearly 28 million are 45 years of age or older.

Identical proposed legislation will be introduced in the House of Representatives tomorrow by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York, who cosponsored similar proposed legislation with me in the 86th Congres.

Mr. President, the first of the three bills would prevent businesses engaged in interstate commerce from practicing such discrimination, and the other two bills would outlaw it in firms holding Federal contracts or subcontracts, and in companies located in the District of Columbia.

Federal leadership in the drive to prevent and eliminate unjust, unreasonable discrimination against older workers on account of their age is imperative. If our resources of skilled manpower are to prove adequate to the demands of an expanding economy, and if many of the mature citizens now on the public assistance rolls are to regain their dignity and self-sufficiency as productive, useful working members of society. The many artificial age limitations now operating can severely limit job opportunities, hinder advancement, and lead to the premature retirement of experienced, valuable workers only 45 years old, and sometimes younger. If the age limit of 45, which is all too frequent in private industry, were in force in the U.S. Senate, where the average age is 57, 91 Members of this Chamber could be declared as overage.

The National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment would declare it to be unlawful for firms in interstate commerce to refuse to hire, to discharge, or to otherwise show bias against any person in respect to employment because of his age when no such distinction is warranted by the reasonable demands of the job. Neither could such employers utilize the services of any employment agency, placement service, labor organization, or other agency which engages in age discrimination. Labor unions could not maintain membership requirements or other procedures which tend to restrict or rule out job opportunities, or adversely affect wages, hours, or working conditions because of a worker's age. Similar prohibitions would apply under the provisions of the other two bills, and in the case of violations by companies holding Federal contracts or subcontracts these contracts would be subject to cancellation.

Job discrimination because of age has already been recognized as a major economic problem requiring governmental action in nine States including New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Alaska. They have laws on the books banning it in private industry, and, in most cases, in unions and employment agencies as well. The bills I am proposing would enable the Federal Government to play a leading role in meeting this problem just as it did in a similar situation some two decades ago through the establishment of Federal minimum wage and hour standards. Where a State law already exists to prevent age bias in employment, the Federal Government could give the State agency administering it the authority to prohibit such discriminatory practices by local firms engaging in interstate commerce.

Once a worker 45 years old or over loses his job for whatever reason, this source of income will probably be lost to his family for a longer time than it would were he a few years younger. The U.S. Labor Department reports that older workers often meet resistance when seeking a new job, and consequently are unemployed for longer periods. In October 1960, for example, about 38 percent of the unemployed in the 45 to 64 age group had been out of work for 15 weeks or longer, whereas the proportion of jobless in all age groups seeking employment for nearly 4 months or more was about 31 percent.

A study of comparative job performance by age which was undertaken by the Labor Department in 1960 among officeworkers, a group where age bias is especially prevalent, shows that both the employer and the older employee can be the loser when this kind of discrimination is practiced.

In the era of productivity, frequently mentioned by employers as the reason they set an upper age limit for new officeworkers, the Labor Department found that the differences, overall, between the younger and older groups were insignificant. However, while output per manhour varied widely among workers of all ages, large proportions of older workers exceeded the average job performance of younger groups. Finally, older workers had a steadier rate of output, with much less weekly variation, than their younger colleagues.

Not only is job discrimination for this reason unwarranted in such employment, but the absence of more mature, experienced employees may mean lower productivity standards in some firms without them. Previous private and government sponsored studies had shown that older workers have attendance and safety records equal or superior to those in younger age groups.

That this type of job prejudice is not insurmountable, and that it can be dealt

with very effectively by government authorities is demonstrated by what has happened following the passage of State laws. In New York, which already had a good record when it came to hiring older workers, about 25 percent of the hiring orders placed with the State employment service contained an age restriction prior to the passage of the McGahan-Preller Act in 1958, forbidding age discrimination in employment. Subsequently the figure dropped to under one-half of 1 percent.

Today, the majority of Americans over 45 are members of the labor force and they account for some 37 percent of all workers. Labor experts expect that ratio to remain fairly steady through 1975 when an estimated 33 million workers will be in the older age group. If Congress will act to provide the Federal Government with the appropriate responsibility and authority, we can look forward to a time in the near future when discriminatory employment practices based on age will become obsolescent, while the skills of the older worker will be much in demand.

Under the terms of the proposed National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment dealing with firms engaged in interstate commerce, the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor could issue cease and desist orders against violators and authorize the reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay. Further violations would subject the employer to contempt of court proceedings. Under the District of Columbia Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment, similar enforcement machinery would be at the disposal of the Chairman of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board in the District of Columbia in dealing with businesses located there. The three bills also provide for judicial review along with conciliation, technical assistance and other aids to both employees and employers.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of the Army, I introduce five bills providing for the reservation, for the use of the Department of the Army, of certain public lands in the State of Alaska. I ask that these bills be received and appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the listing of the bills, five letters sent to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Army requesting this action and explaining the purpose thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bills, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 353. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 353 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to effect the statutory withdrawal from the public domain of 256,000 acres of land in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for continued use as the Yukon Command training site. In connection with the programs carried on by the Army units in Alaska the Yukon Command requires a trainfire area and ranges for field artillery and tank firing. The land originally selected for this purpose was designated as the Chena River maneuver site. However, when it became apparent that the use of that land in the intensive manner proposed by the Army would interfere with civilian programs, a substitute area was sought. The site agreed upon is comprised of 256,000 acres of mountainous land east of Eielson Air Force Base. On June 4, 1957, the Department of the Interior granted the Yukon Command permission to conduct maneuvers in this area.

On July 2, 1958, the U.S. Army District Engineer at Anchorage, Alaska, filed an application with the office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior at Fairbanks, Alaska, requesting that the 256,000 acres be withdrawn from the public domain and set aside solely and exclusively for military use. Notice to the effect that an application, serial No. Fairbanks 020174, had been filed by the Department of the Army for the withdrawal of the lands described therein from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, was published by the Bureau of Land Management at page 5804 of the Federal Register July 31, 1958 (F.R. Doc. 58-5837; filed, July 30, 1958; 8:47 a.m.). The notice provided that for a period of 60 days therefrom objections would be received by the Bureau of Land Management at Fairbanks, Alaska.

However, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to accomplish the withdrawal. Since, under the provisions of the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27, Public Law 85-337), no lands in excess of 5,000 acres can be withdrawn from the public domain except by act of Congress, legislation must be enacted if the 256,000 acres involved are to continue available for military use. The attached draft bill is designed to effect a withdrawal of those lands for 10 years, extendible for one 5-year term, thereby assuring periodic reviews of the military requirements and use of the property.

The application for withdrawal included the detailed data required by section 3 of the aforementioned act of February 28, 1958. As brought out in more detail in the application, the land is within the Fourth Judicial Division, Alaska, approximately 20 miles southeast of Fairbanks contiguous to the east boundary of Eielson Air Force Base.

In furtherance of the military mission outlined above and in compliance with the act of February 28, 1958, the Department of Defense on June 14, 1960, submitted a proposal for the enactment of legislation designed to effect the withdrawal of the lands involved. However, no action was taken thereon by the 86th Congress. Accordingly, the attached draft bill is submitted for consideration of Congress with the recommendation that it be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 354. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 354 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to effect, for the use of the Department of the Army, a statutory withdrawal of 607,800 acres of public domain lands in the Fairbanks area, approximately 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska. As part of the air defense of Alaska, the Department of the Army has established Nike-Hercules batteries near the Eielson Air Force Base. In addition, in connection with field artillery and tank-firing exercises, the Army has established a Yukon Command training site adjacent to the Eielson Air Force Base on 256,000 acres of land, which embraces within it the Nike battery sites.

It is essential that troops manning Nike batteries be afforded an opportunity to perform service practice firing of the weapon at least once a year. Troops within the continental United States are accordingly transported annually to Fort Bliss, Tex., for this purpose. Because the ranges at Fort Bliss are already operating with capacity schedules, and inasmuch as the time and money to transport troops from Alaska for this purpose would be of major significance, the Department of the Army sought an alternate surface-to-air missile range in Alaska. Moreover, practice firing under Alaskan climatic conditions is patently desirable. The site selected is approximately 63 miles long, 13 miles wide at its western end and 20 miles wide at its eastern end, comprising an area of 607,800 acres of public domain land immediately adjacent to the Yukon Command training site referred to above.

Utilization of this range will permit practice firing from one of the Nike battery sites established as part of the regular air defense of Alaska, thereby eliminating the need for any new construction. This service firing

by Nike-Hercules units will require approximately 3 months each year. In order to integrate Department of the Army requirements, to the extent practical, with those of the civilian economy of Alaska, it is planned to conduct these firing sessions during the winter months when climatic conditions are such that civilian activities will be reduced, if not halted. This also affords, to the units and equipment, training under optimum conditions.

On February 10, 1959, the U.S. Army district engineer at Anchorage, Alaska, therefore, filed an application with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, at Fairbanks, Alaska, for the use of the land involved for 3 months annually for a 10-year period with an option to renew for an additional 5 years and requested that the lands be segregated in order to preclude further disposition thereof under the public land laws. Notice to the effect that the application, serial No. Fairbanks 022929, had been filed by the Department of the Army was published by the Bureau of Land Management as a notice of proposed withdrawal and reservation of lands at page 2312 of the Federal Register for March 25, 1959, and page 4218 of the Federal Register for May 26, 1959 (F.R. Doc. 59–2482, filed Mar. 24, 1959, 8:47 a.m.; and F.R. Doc. 59–4405, filed May 25, 1959, 8:49 a.m.).

On September 4, 1959, after the Department of the Army had given assurances that there would be no contamination of the area because unexploded missiles will be recovered, the Department of the Interior granted to the Department of the Army the right to use the 607,800 acres described in the aforementioned application during the period December 15, 1959, to March 15, 1960. During that period, the Commanding General, U.S. Army, Alaska, successfully conducted practice firing tests that underscored the military requirement for this range. The continued ability to test these weapons, and the men operating them, under extreme climatic conditions, including temperatures of 60° below zero, is considered to be vital in fulfilling the mission of the troops involved.

Because the Department of the Army requires utilization of the land involved for only 3 months of the year, the possibility was explored of obtaining use of the land, without effecting a withdrawal from appropriation under the public land laws, and to permit disposition of these public domain lands subject to the Army use. However, the Department of the Interior, which is responsible for the administration of the public land laws, has determined that the Department of the Army cannot have the privilege it seeks without a withdrawal of these lands. It was further determined that the proposal to effect a reservation for use subject to disposition under the public land laws subject to the right of the Army to the use of the area for a 3-month period each year is unworkable, there being no provision in the public land laws for dispositions of that type. Accordingly, the Department of the Army, because of its urgent requirement for the use of this Nike range, determined to proceed with the request to withdraw the lands involved from all forms of appropriation but subject to maximum multiple use thereof.

In addition to providing, in the application referred to above, a detailed description of the land involved in the proposed legislation, this Department set forth the data required by section 3 of the aforementioned act of February 28, 1958. As brought out in more detail in the application, the land is approximately 40 miles east of Fairbanks adjacent to the Yukon Command training site which, in turn, is adjacent to the Eielson Air Force Base. While the Army will require use of the area annually, from December 15 to March 15, all of the lands and resources will be available for use by the public during the rest of the year.

A review by the field representatives of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army indicates that none of the lands involved have been withdrawn or reserved for any other use, but that approximately 71 unpatented mining claims have been filed. Because the missile firing practice will be accomplished during the height of the winter, the interference with civilian exploitation of potential sources of mineral deposits will be minimal.

In view of the urgent military necessity to assure continued availability of this range for use by the Nike troops in Alaska, Congress is urged to enact the attached draft bill which also provides for any use and disposition of the lands not incompatible with the Army's use during the annual December 15 to March 15 firing sessions.

In furtherance of the military mission outlined above and in compliance with the act of February 28, 1958, the Department of Defense on 21 June 1960 submitted a proposal for the enactment of legislation designed to effect the withdrawal of the lands involved. However, no action was taken thereon by the 86th Congress. Accordingly, the attached draft bill is submitted for consideration of Congress with the recommendation that it be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 355. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 355 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to effect the statutory withdrawal from the public domain of 572,000 acres of land in the Big Delta area, Alaska, adjacent to Fort Greely. A military reservation was established at Big Delta, Alaska, in 1942 with the construction of airfield facilities on 14,460 acres of public domain lands made available for that purpose. In 1948 the military reservation was placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force and designated as the Big Delta Air Force Base. Following the establishment of the Arctic Indoctrination School, the installation was transferred in 1955 to the Department of the Army and named Fort Greely after agreement had been reached with the respective Committees on Armed Services in accordance with title VI of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365). Fort Greely, presently comprising 30,791 acres of land, has been developed at a cost of $33,116,389.

The land proposed to be withdrawn was made available to the Department of the Army under permit from the Department of the Interior in November 1950 and has been used continuously by this Department since that time as a maneuver and testing area for the U.S. Army, Alaska, the U.S. Arctic Test Board, and the Cold Weather and Mountain School. It has been designated as the Fort Greely Maneuver Area.

Although the initial permit issued by the Department of the Interior expired, the use of the property was extended by authority of the Secretary of the Interior on a temporary basis. On the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Defense, it has been determined that long-range testing and maneuver requirements in Alaska necessitate the withdrawal of the 572,000 acres of land involved from all forms of entry and from appropriation in order to assure their continued availability.

Accordingly, on April 2, 1958, the U.S. Army district engineer at Anchorage, Alaska, filed an application with the office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior at Fairbanks, Alaska, requesting that the 572,000 acres be withdrawn from the public domain and set aside solely and exclusively for military use. Notice to the effect that an application, serial No. Fairbanks 019269, had been filed by the Department of the Army for the withdrawal of the lands described therein from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, was published by the Bureau of Land Management at page 3071 of the Federal Register May 8, 1958, (F. R. Doc. 58–3480; filed, May 7, 1958; 8:53 a.m.). The notice provided that for a period of 60 days therefrom objections would be received by the Bureau of Land Management at Fairbanks, Alaska.

However, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to accomplish the withdrawal. Since under the provisions of the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27, Public Law 85–337), no lands in excess of 5,000 acres can be withdrawn from the public domain except by act of Congress, legislation must be enacted if the 572,000 acres involved are to continue available for military use. The attached draft bill is designed to effect a withdrawal of those lands for 10 years, extendible for one 5-year term, thereby assuring periodic reviews of the military requirements and use of the property.

In addition to containing a complete description of the property proposed for withdrawal, the above-mentioned application for withdrawal sets forth in detail the data required by section 3 of the aforementioned act of February 28, 1958. As brought out in more detail in the application, the land is within the Fairbanks Recording Precinct, Fourth Judicial Division, south of the Alaska Highway between the Richardson Highway on the east and the Little Delta River on the west. Inasmuch as the intensive utilization of the property for military purposes since 1950 has precluded its availability for other use and development, withdrawal of the lands at this time will have no effect on the local economy.

In furtherance of the military mission outlined above and in compliance with the act of February 28, 1958, the Department of Defense on June 14, 1960, submitted a proposal for the enactment of legislation designed to effect the withdrawal of the lands involved. However, no action was taken thereon by the 86th Congress. Accordingly, the attached draft bill is submitted for consideration of Congress with the recommendation that it be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 356. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 356 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to effect the statutory withdrawal from the public domain of 51,400 acres of land in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, adjacent to Fort Greely. A military reservation was established at Big Delta, Alaska, in 1942 with the construction of airfield facilities on 14,460 acres of public domain lands made available for that purpose. In 1948 the military reservation was placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force and designated as the Big Delta Air Force Base. Following the establishment of the Arctic Indoctrination School the installation was transferred in 1955 to the Department of the Army and named Fort Greely after agreement had been reached with the respective Committees on Armed Services in accordance with title VI of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365). Fort Greely, presently comprising 30,791 acres of land, has been developed at a cost of $33,116,389.

In connection with the programs carried on by the Army units in Alaska it is necessary to have an area in which equipment testing maneuvers can be carried out and also an area that can be devoted to aerial drop testing. The land selected for the equipment testing maneuver area comprises an area of 48,200 acres contiguous to Fort Greely extending southeastward to Granite Creek. The drop test area is comprised of 3,200 acres in a strip of land 1 mile by 5 miles on the east side of Richardson Highway near the equipment testing maneuver area in a manner designed to permit ready access for recovery of materiel and personnel.

On December 6, 1955, the U.S. Army district engineer at Anchorage, Alaska, filed an application with the office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior at Fairbanks, Alaska, requesting that the 51,400 acres be withdrawn from the public domain, and set aside solely and exclusively for military use. Notice to the effect that an application, serial No. Fairbanks 012203, had been filed by the Department of the Army for the withdrawal of the lands described therein from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, was published by the Bureau of Land Management at page 9313 of the Federal Register, December 13, 1955 (F.R. Doc. 55–10007; filed, December 12, 1955; 8:52 a.m.). The notice provided that for a period of 60 days therefrom objections would be received by the Bureau of Land Management at Fairbanks, Alaska.

However, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to accomplish the withdrawal. Since, under the provisions of the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27, Public Law 85–337), no lands in excess of 5,000 acres can be withdrawn from the public domain except by act of Congress, legislation must be enacted if the 51,400 acres involved are to be available for military use. The attached draft bill is designed to effect a withdrawal of those lands for 10 years, extendible for one 5-year term, thereby assuring periodic reviews of the military requirements and use of the property.

Since the filing of the application for withdrawal in 1955, the Department has submitted to the Bureau of Land Management the detailed data required by section 3 of the aforementioned act of February 28, 1958. As brought out in more detail in the application, the land is within the Fourth Judicial Division, Alaska, approximately 2.5 miles southeast of Delta Junction between the Richardson and Alaska Highways extending southeastward to Granite Creek.

In furtherance of the military mission outlined above and in compliance with the act of February 28, 1958, the Department of Defense on June 14, 1960, submitted a proposal for the enactment of legislation designed to effect the withdrawal of the lands involved. However, no action was taken thereon by the 86th Congress. Accordingly, the attached draft bill is submitted for consideration of Congress with the recommendation that it be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 357. A bill to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 357 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to effect a statutory reservation of use of 4,706 acres of land in the Campbell Creek area, Alaska, for continuation as an impact area at Fort Richardson, Alaska, for tank and artillery firing.

The military installation currently designated as Fort Richardson was established in 1939 on lands withdrawn from the public domain and set apart for that purpose. The installation, which serves as headquarters for the U.S. Army, Alaska, is currently comprised of 150,927 acres of public domain lands and 2,611 acres of fee-owned lands acquired at a cost of $62,459 and developed for military use at a cost of $155,096,073.

The land involved in this proposal was originally withdrawn from the public domain for use of the War Department in 1944 and has been intermittently used by the Army since that time. The withdrawal and reservation for military use of 84,000 acres of land under Public Land Order No. 253 of December 7, 1944, was revoked by Public Land Order No. 576 of March 29, 1949. Thereafter, on May 11, 1950, the Secretary of the Army advised the Secretary of the Interior of the Army's requirement for 9,065 acres, part of the larger area previously withdrawn and reserved under Public Land Order No. 253, and requested these lands should once again be withdrawn from the public domain and set aside for military use. On June 21, 1956, the Department of the Army agreed to delete part of the area, reducing it to 8,465 acres.

Notice to the effect that an application, serial No. Anchorage 023002, had been filed by the Department of the Army for the withdrawal of land described therein from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, was published by the Bureau of Land Management in the Federal Register for July 6, 1956 at page 5016 (F.R. Doc. 56–5336; filed July 5, 1954; 8:41 a.m.). The notice provided that for a period of 60 days therefrom objections would be received by the Bureau of Land Management at Anchorage, Alaska.

Following a further review of Army requirements, the U.S. Army district engineer at Anchorage, Alaska, amended the application for the withdrawal on May 23, 1957, by further reducing the area involved to 4,706 acres designated as tract M, Fort Richardson.

Because the land involved had been contaminated during its original Army use under the 1944 withdrawal, the Secretary of the Interior by Public Land Order 2029 on December 15, 1959, withdrew 4,706 acres involved from all forms of appropriation as a public safety measures, as set forth with a full description of the lands in the Federal Register for December 19, 1959, at page 10310 (F.R. Doc. 59–10755; filed Dec. 18, 1959; 8:46 a.m.).

However, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to reserve the 4,706 acres involved for the use of the Department of the Army. Under the provisions of the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27, Public Law No. 85–337), no lands in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for one defense project may be withdrawn or reserved since the date of its enactment. Because the Secretary of the Interior withdrew, for the Department of the Army, 1,271 acres of land at Fort Richardson under Public Land Order 1673, dated July 2, 1958, as amended by Public Land Order 1840, dated April 29, 1959, the reservation for use of the additional 4,706 acres cannot be accomplished except by act of Congress. Legislation must, therefore, be enacted if the 4,706 acres involved are to continue available for military use. The attached draft bill is designed to effect a reservation of use of those lands for 10 years, extendible for one 5-year term, thereby assuring periodic review of the military requirements for use of the property. In the interim, the Department of the Interior, in response to a request therefor from the Department of the Army, has granted the Department of the Army permission to use the lands involved pending consideration of legislation by Congress. The permit requires the Department of the Army to (1) post roads, etc., and notify the public concerning the status of the land and the danger of trespassing; (2) take precaution to prevent fire; (3) take precaution to pre-

vent pollution or contamination of the streams in the area; and (4) act promptly to submit legislation under the act of February 28, 1959.

Since the filing of the application for withdrawal in 1950, the Department has submitted to the Bureau of Land Management the detailed data required by section 3 of the aforementioned act of February 28, 1958. Inasmuch as the former utilization of the property for military purposes has precluded its availability for other use and development, reservation of the lands for Army use at this time will have no effect on the local economy.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, because of inaction on the part of the two previous Democratic Congresses, I am forced to introduce again a bill which will cost the U.S. Government not one cent and yet will benefit the University of Maryland immeasurably.

This bill provides for the reconveyance to the State of Maryland of a tract of land, 9.8826 acres in size, now held by the Department of Interior and located on the campus of the university at College Park, Md. This land was donated to the United States by the State of Maryland in 1935. At that time it was on the outermost boundaries of the university; however, due to the rapid growth of the university during the past 25 years, the physical facilities of the university that are now in active use completely surround the land proposed to be reconveyed.

By way of background, in the 85th Congress, I introduced S. 2563 which provided for the reconveyance to the State of Maryland of 14¼ acres of land, including two federally owned and occupied buildings thereon. That 14¼ acres included the 9.8826 acres covered by this bill.

Because the Department of Interior objected to S. 2563 unless it was amended to, first, provide that the State of Maryland pay the fair market value of the improvements on the land; and second, provide for replacement facilities for the bureaus occupying the buildings (the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries), I amended my bill to exclude the buildings, land upon which they lie, and the parking facilities adjacent thereto. That bill, S. 2211, is identical to the one I am introducing today.

The Department of the Interior then objected to the revised bill on substantially the same grounds that it objected to the first one. I can only speculate as to the Department's reasoning since the new bill in no way affected the Government facilities. It affected only the unused and unoccupied land drastically needed by the university if it is to move ahead with its building program on schedule.

It is my opinion, that rather than recognize or comment on the merits of the then S. 2211 as written, the Department of the Interior chose to use the bill as a lever to achieve its own aims, that is, to get modern buildings and facilities at other sites more suitable to the functions of the Bureaus concerned.

However justifiable the need for new facilities for those Bureaus is, the demand should not be tied to my bill to reconvey the unused and unoccupied land to the University of Maryland. Relocation of those facilities is unrelated to the reconveyance of this land.

That additional classroom and dormitory facilities are needed at the university in increasing numbers is pointed up by the fact that enrollment at the University of Maryland has increased from 1,868 undergraduate and 133 graduate students in 1935 to 9,275 undergraduate and 2,119 graduate students at College Park in 1959. It is projected that by 1970 there will be over 20,000 undergraduate students and by 1975 over 27,000 undergraduate plus more than 5,000 graduate students at the College Park plant.

These figures alone should be enough to convince the U.S. Government that it should give back to Maryland the land in question—land that is not and will not be used by the Federal Government and is in no way needed by it; but which at the same time is needed by the University of Maryland and can be put to immediate use by it.

Mr. President, I urge in the strongest possible terms that this bill be acted upon by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate at an early date so that the land can be effectively utilized in the very near future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 359) to provide for reconveyance to the State of Maryland of a tract of land located on the campus of the University of Maryland, College Park, Md., which was previously donated by the State of Maryland to the United States; introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPROVAL OF NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Messrs. BRIDGES and COTTON], the Senators from Rhode Island [Messrs. PASTORE and PELL], and the Senators from Massachusetts [Messrs. SALTONSTALL and SMITH], I introduce a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill, and excerpts from a report by the House Committee on Public Works on H.R. 12467, a companion bill introduced in the 86th Congress by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks. Mr. MCCORMACK has reintroduced the bill in the present Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the announcement and excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 374) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The announcement and excerpts presented by Mr. BUSH are as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

WASHINGTON, January 11.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH introduced today a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

Joining the Connecticut Senator in sponsorship of the bill are his colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD; Senators BRIDGES and COTTON, of New Hampshire; Senator MUSKIE, of Maine; Senators PASTORE and PELL, of Rhode Island; and Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH of Massachusetts.

A companion bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the majority leader, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Senator BUSH said the compact, already ratified by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire, proposes "a unique experiment in Federal-State relations.

"For the first time, the many Federal agencies concerned with flood control, conservation, and development of water and related land resources would be brought into a continuous, close cooperative relationship with the New England States."

The compact would create a Northeastern Resources Commission on which would serve one representative from each signatory State and seven representatives of Federal departments or agencies having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development.

The proposed commission would be charged with responsibility to recommend to the States and the Federal Government "changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources," including the coordination of efforts for (1) the collection and interpretation of basic data; (2) the investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects; and (3) the scheduling or other programing of the construction and development of such projects.

Each representative on the commission, State and Federal, would have equal voting rights, but no action taken would be binding unless approved by a majority of the State members and a majority of the Federal representatives.

Senator BUSH said the voting provisions of the compact caused Federal agencies to oppose similar bills which he and Congressman MCCORMACK introduced last year, although they strongly endorsed their objectives.

"I am confident that these difficulties can be overcome," Senator BUSH said, "and that this Congress will ratify the compact."

REPORT ON H.R. 12467

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 12467 is a further promising step in the long-term effort to promote the beneficial

use of the water and related land resources of the New England States by encouraging close coordination through an agency created by interstate compact of the activities of the respective States with each other and with the related water and land use programs of the Federal Government. The bill reflects the initiative of the States themselves, four of whom—New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts—have already ratified the compact. Maine and Vermont are in the process of enacting ratifying legislation. Inasmuch as article X of the compact provides that it shall become effective when enacted into law by any three of the States and by the United States only, the enactment of H.R. 12467 is now required to put the compact into effect. The committee believes that the commission created by the Northeastern water and related land resources compact could and should become an effective vehicle for coordinating the complex of administrative agencies, State and Federal, with responsibilities in the field of water resource development and that the enactment of this legislation should prove of substantial assistance and encouragement to the intensive development and use of such resources for the benefit of the people of New England and of the Nation.

The compact which is incorporated in the bill provides for full Federal participation through seven members to be appointed by the President from the various Federal departments and agencies having the responsibility for Federal programs related to water resource development. However, the compact agency will have no authority to undertake programs of its own whether in the field of construction or operation. As set forth in article V of the compact, the agency's responsibility is merely to recommend to the States and the United States and the agencies thereof "changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources," including the coordination of efforts for (1) the collection and interpretation of basic data; (2) the investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects; and (3) the scheduling or other programing of the construction and development of such projects. While it is contemplated that the commission will make use of existing agencies for any investigations or research required to carry on its own coordination activities, the compact grants power to the commission to make its own investigations and to conduct its own research.

BACKGROUND

New England has the longest history of intensive economic development in the Nation. Richly endowed by nature with a stimulating climate, adequate rainfall, and numerous fine rivers and natural harbors, and rich in soils, minerals, and forests, it has suffered from lack of adequate planning and coordination in the use and exploitation of its surface waters. An early and intensive industrial development and the requirements of a large population have created serious problems of water pollution. Floods have become increasingly more destructive as the flood plains have been built up except for some areas where flood protection projects have been initiated. A series of storms and hurricanes in the past few years has done severe damage to beach and harbor developments, including many which are important to the Nation's commerce.

In no area of the Nation is the need for close cooperation among the States of the region with the Federal Government more apparent. With the exception of Maine the States are relatively small and all the major streams are interstate. The harbors are important to the Nation's commerce and to national defense. No greater contribution can be made to the efforts of the people of this country to achieve the wise use and husbandry of their natural resources than to bring about effective cooperation in State and Federal programs in the water resources field.

HISTORY OF THE COMPACT

The recognition of the water and land resources potential in the New England area dates back to the early days of the country but it was not until the occurrence of the severe floods in the middle thirties which caused great devastation and loss of life to a heavily populated area, that the need to control the surface waters for public benefit was first brought home. As a result in 1936 the Congress in the first National Flood Control Act authorized the Corps of Engineers to make intensive studies of flood control needs in the major river basins of the New England area, including the Connecticut, Merrimack, and Thames Rivers. Following completion of these studies, comprehensive plans were developed for these major basins for flood control and related purposes. These plans are gradually being carried out by the construction from time to time of key reservoirs, levees, and channels. Federal and State agencies realized, however, that this Federal program was only one aspect of the overall land and water problem. In 1950, therefore, the first of the so-called interagency studies was authorized by the Congress for the New England area. In effect, it set up the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee composed of the six New England States and New York and the Federal Departments of Interior, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Army, HEW, and the Federal Power Commission. In the work of the Committee all the member agencies and States operated on a basis of complete equality, each having a single voice and vote. The efforts of this Committee culminated in a monumental 46-volume report which cost the Federal Government alone $6 million to prepare, and took well over 4 years in the making.

The result of this great joint endeavor was to present an inventory of all water and land resources, to identify the problems and obstacles, and to set up plans and programs for achieving the full development economically justified and needed for the growth of the economy. The problem which now faces the States and Congress is how to make effective use of the labors which have occurred and of the great mass of data and plans which have been accumulated and prepared. The Governors of the New England States and the Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources of the Federal Government agreed in 1956 to create a Northeastern Resources Committee as an agency for the coordination of the State and Federal plans and programs for development of the water and land resources of New England. The committee was set up with representatives of the same States (except New York) and Federal agencies as on the Inter-Agency Committee. However, the Northeast Resources Committee has proved of only limited effectiveness. In the absence of formal organization the problem of financing even its limited administrative budget has proved perplexing. The lack of official status has created problems of efficient channeling of recommendations to the operating organization in the States and Federal Government. Evidence has accumulated that there is need for a formally established agency to supplant the loose committee system of coordination. The decision to create a compact agency was reached at a meeting of the New England Governors' conference held at Hartford, Conn., on March 2, 1959. The New England Governors agreed unanimously at that meeting to introduce enabling legislation in each of the States which would authorize the States to enter into a compact creating a commission to carry on more effectively the work of coordination which the Northeastern Resources Committee had begun. It is this compact, already adopted by four of the New England States, which is now presented for the approval of Congress.

POSITION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

All of the Federal agencies concerned and the Bureau of the Budget have strongly endorsed the purposes of the bill but they do not support the principle of equality of representation embodied in the compact, under which each representative on the commission, State and Federal, would have equal voting rights. They have expressed apprehension on several grounds to this principle, although apparently it worked well in the case of both the informal predecessor agencies, the New England-New York Interagency Committee and the Northeastern Resources Committee. The Federal agencies seem to fear that the Federal Government may be committed by the vote of its representatives, and that the commission so constituted may somehow interfere with the jurisdiction of the United States and the powers and prerogatives of the various Federal agencies.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It may be true that the voting members of most administrative agencies established under compacts are exclusively representatives of the States, but this rule is by no means without exceptions, nor is it necessarily the best system. The Potomac River Basin compact, established in 1939, for example, provides for an interstate commission with three members from each of the signatory States and three members appointed by the President of the United States. All are voting members.

The committee is convinced that insofar as the New England area is concerned the best possible results in water resources development can best be achieved by granting to the Federal representatives on the compact the right to vote. Each compact is a unique and individual one applying to a particular area, and there is no hard and fast rule governing the makeup of any particular compact that has been created to date. It is true that this will be one of the few compacts up to the present which will have Federal representatives in a voting capacity, but the committee is convinced that this right will not in any way injure or affect any of the rights that the Federal Government and the agencies themselves now have in the field of water resources and related programs in the New England area.

What needs to be recognized is that the problem of coordinating State and Federal efforts in the field of water resource development and utilization is a very difficult one. Even within the Federal establishment alone the problem of coordination has proved to be a severe test of administrative ingenuity and ability. Similarly, within each of the respective States there is a real administrative problem in coordinating the various State agencies. When the agencies of several States, as well as those of the Federal Government, must all pool their resources and work as a team, the problem becomes one of tremendous complication. It is hard to say that any one form of organization has proved to be so effective as to exclude the possibility that some other way of doing the job could be better either generally or in a particular situation, and the arbitrary position of the Federal agencies on this question is not supported by any demonstration that the Federal observer system has proven a great success.

Another important consideration in weighing the Federal agency position on this bill is that this compact is already far along to consummation. It has been signed by four of the States and is in process of being approved by the legislatures of the two other States which participated in its preparation. The burden of proof, and a heavy one, is upon those who urge that this compact be dis-

carded and that the States be required to start all over again.

In order to eliminate any possibility that the commission could exceed its intended functions and arrogate to itself any authority beyond making recommendations or carrying on studies or research, the committee has adopted an amendment proposed by the Department of Justice in its report on the bill but has strengthened the suggested language by adding in the clean bill the italicized words:

"Nothing contained in said compact or in this consent thereto shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right, power, or jurisdiction on the United States *or any agency thereof* in and over the region which forms the subject of said compact, or as authorizing the Northeastern Resources Commission to impair or in any manner to affect any such right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States."

Additionally, the clean bill makes clear beyond question that the Federal agency representatives are responsible to the respective heads of their agencies.

The voting responsibility of the Federal members will probably lead to appointment of employees having a higher degree of trust and influence within their respective agencies than members appointed as observers. The voting feature should be of help on this problem. This particular form of representation was adopted not with the intention of binding the Federal agencies nor, indeed, would it be possible to bind them in this compact, but rather in the thought of leading to increased responsibility in their expression of agency views and of agency programs.

It is emphasized that this commission is specifically established as a planning and coordinating agency. It has no authority to construct projects. It has no authority to expend any money other than the modest sums required for its own office staff, and it has no authority to approve or authorize projects on behalf either of the States or of the Federal Government. Congress, of course, will always have the final word with respect to the authorization of projects, and of providing funds for their construction and operation.

The proposed compact seems to conform squarely with the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, submitted to the President in 1955 by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Secretary of the Interior McKay, and which the President transmitted to the House of Representatives on January 17, 1956, with a letter of endorsement (H. Doc. No. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In his letter the President said:

"Set forth in the report is a pattern for the widest possible public participation in water resources projects. Organizational changes are recommended to coordinate more closely Federal and non-Federal activity and to make possible more effective executive guidance. The intent of these proposed changes is to provide the States and local water resources agencies a more adequate voice in the planning and development of projects and facilitate joint participation by all of the affected Federal interests. By this type of cooperative effort we should be assured that all possible uses of water are adequately considered."

The committee has added an authorization for appropriations limited to $50,000 a year which is the same limit of obligations which the States have included in the compact as their own aggregate commitment. Any additional expenditures to support the Commission would require new legislation.

There is no royal road to effective coordination of the work of the numerous agencies in the various strata of government, State and Federal, which have a stake one way or another in water resource development. The agency created under this bill seems as well calculated to achieve substantial results as any other, and perhaps better than most.

This bill is a constructive and much-needed step to insure the efficient employment of the funds and efforts of the States and the Federal Government in the solution of the water control problems of the New England States, and the committee recommends its enactment.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs.

This bill will—

First. Set up a new Cabinet office, the Department of Urban Affairs, and define its powers and duties.

Second. Provide for the statutory basis and administrative framework necessary for the handling of local problems in which the Federal Government has a direct or cooperating interest.

Third. Transfer the activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to the new Department..

Fourth. Authorize the President to transfer to the new Department such functions and agencies as he may deem desirable to further the purposes of the act, including activities relating to the government of the District of Columbia.

Fifth. Establish an Intergovernmental Reference Service within the new Department to assist the legislative and executive departments and State and local governments. It will act as a national clearinghouse, research center, and consulting service on all matters relating to intergovernmental relations.

Sixth. Authorize coordination of Federal services. This will provide an organized effort to achieve a maximum coordination of Federal programs and activities affecting State and local governments, including the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is not intended to encroach upon the rights and duties of each local governmental agency to provide for its citizens. It does, in fact, reaffirm their authority by creating a Department that will recognize their sovereignty while coordinating activities among them for their common good and providing them with an approachable Federal agency through which they might clear the Federal activity within their domain.

Our society has gradually changed from a rural to an urban one. Two-thirds of our citizens now live in urban communities. We have gone along now for many years with certain programs designed to help our States and local governments, but we have tried to pretend that the Federal Government actually had no relation to them or no responsibility with respect to them.

Nevertheless, Federal-municipal relations have steadily increased in frequency and in importance. The time has come for the Federal Government to take a comprehensive view of the needs of urban communities and its relation to them, and this can be done best by the establishment of a separate Department in the executive branch.

The bill which I have introduced has some characteristics which it is hoped will merit consideration. It attempts to pull together and place in one department as many of the Federal-State programs as possible. And it attempts to set up a departmental framework capable of administering them, a framework and a definition of powers and duties capable of orderly growth. Authority is also provided for the transfers of functions which the President feels is desirable to further the purpose of the act.

We must bear in mind that the problems which this act attempts to solve are not confined solely to large cities or metropolitan areas. These problems are found in communities of our Nation which are both large and small. They are problems of housing, health and welfare, education, and community development. The same problems which confront cities also confront the counties, towns, townships and the many other small special districts that have been established to perform governmental services for our people.

These many problems can no longer be ignored. The problems of local governments should be represented in the executive branch equally with the representation given to business, by the Department of Commerce; to labor by the Department of Labor; and to farmers by the Department of Agriculture.

I earnestly hope that Congress will begin action quickly to permit this type of representation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 375) to provide for the establishment of a Department of Local Affairs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the year of 1961, much attention will be given to one of the truly tragic occurrences in these United States of America, that event of historical importance known to the world as the War Between the States.

However, as out of every incident some good must come, so was the case with the Civil War. For there arose to great heights and recognition one of America's truly inspirational Presidents, Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln is a name held in the highest esteem by all peace-loving American citizens, and countless monuments have been erected in his honor.

Yet, in the State of Indiana there exists a tract of land in Spencer County, whereupon the great emancipator spent his formative years, from the ages of 7 to 21. And within the confines of the original farm area owned by Lincoln's father lies the grave of the woman to whom Abraham Lincoln attributed his every success, Nancy Hanks Lincoln.

Yet, Mr. President, in the portion of southern Indiana commonly known as Lincoln County, there is much to be revered and remembered about this great American, this man who so solemnly and sincerely dedicated his every effort toward the protection of civil liberties, in order that this Nation might arise as the truly great democratic power that it was intended to be.

Indiana has established as State parks the Lincoln State Farm and the Nancy Hanks Lincoln Memorial in this area. But what humble recognition to pay to an area where the boy, Abe Lincoln, developed and matured into the great American that he became.

Realizing the significance and need for proper tribute to this area, the National Park Service has recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that it be established as a unit of the National Park Service.

And so, Mr. President, in order that such tribute might be effected, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the acquisition of this land by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted as a part of my remarks a statement of the U.S. Department of Interior relative to the Lincoln homestead.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 376) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF HISTORIC SITES AND BUILDINGS—NANCY HANKS LINCOLN STATE MEMORIAL, IND.

In southern Indiana lies the farmland where Abraham Lincoln spent much of his boyhood, youth, and early manhood. Adjacent also is the grave of his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln. She died in 1818 when Abe was but a 9-year-old, and was buried on a gentle knoll not far distant from the Lincoln farm home.

The Lincolns moved to Indiana from Kentucky in the late fall of 1816. They spent the first hard winter in Indiana in a rude "half-face" camp. Not until the next year did Tom Lincoln, Abe's father, erect a more substantial log dwelling. In October, 1818, Nancy Hanks Lincoln was stricken with milk-sickness, a deadly swamp fever common to that region, and within a few days was dead.

Little more than a year later, Tom Lincoln returned to Kentucky, married the widow Sarah Bush Johnson, and brought his new wife and her three children back to the Pigeon Creek farm in Spencer County, Ind. The Lincolns lived there until 1830 when the family, including the 21-year-old Abe, moved to Illinois.

It was during these Indiana years that the character of Lincoln was shaped and on the boy was placed the stamp of the frontier that was forever to be associated with the man. In these years Lincoln became an avid reader and a master of cross-roads debate. His ready wit, inquiring mind, and gift for oratory were developed here, and it is evident that his affinity for the law and for politics dated from the years on the Indiana frontier.

When the Lincolns left Indiana for Illinois the 21-year-old Lincoln was ready to take a man's part in the world. The years in southern Indiana, a region more akin to Kentucky and the South than to the North, had provided a gentle transition from one section of the Nation to another. This background, throughout his life, gave the man an understanding of and sympathy for the South, which enabled him to meet with compassion and insight the supreme crisis which destiny thrust upon him in 1861.

The Indiana years were crucial in the emotional and intellectual growth of Lincoln. The land which was the Lincoln farm is a tangible reminder of the years when Lincoln the boy became Lincoln the man.

Approximately 22.6 acres of land in the original farm owned by Thomas Lincoln is now owned by the State of Indiana and is a part of the Nancy Hanks Lincoln State Memorial. While the authenticity of the exact cabin and grave sites is based on tradition only, the identification of the Lincoln farm land is positive.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I noted with interest and appreciation the remarks made 2 days ago by our majority leader concerning reform in the presidential electoral system, and his three legislative proposals to bring about changes in our present arrangement for nominating and electing a President and Vice President of the United States. Also, the senior Senator from Maine has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 1, which deals generally with the same subject.

These proposals and the thoughts accompanying them are creative ones worthy of serious study and consideration by all of us. I believe that the whole subject of modifying our electoral system is one which should and will receive a great deal of attention during this present Congress. The interest surrounding this matter of course has been generated by the closeness of the recent presidential election and statements made on the subject by both Vice President NIXON and President-elect Kennedy. Many new ideas will be proposed and many plans debated in former Congresses will be set forth again, I am sure.

Today I introduce a joint resolution which passed the Senate during the 81st Congress. The joint resolution embodies the so-called proportional plan that abolishes the electoral college but retains the electoral vote. This plan took the form of Senate Joint Resolution 2 in the 81st Congress and was known as the Lodge-Gossett bill. This joint resolution was reported in the Senate, Senate Report No. 602, on June 30, 1949. It received the necessary two-thirds vote and passed the Senate with amendments on February 1, 1950. The joint resolution failed in the House of Representatives when a motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution was rejected on July 17, 1950. I am told that this is the first joint resolution in a hundred years dealing with electoral college reform that has ever passed the Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, as passed by the Senate, provided for a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to elect the President and Vice President at a general election. Each State would have the number of electoral votes which equaled the number of Senators and Representatives it is entitled to in Congress. Each candidate would be credited with the same proportion of the electoral vote of each State as the proportion of the total popular vote he received within that State. The two Houses of Congress would choose the President if no one candidate received at least 40 percent of the electoral vote for President.

This plan substitutes the more balanced formula of the number of Senators and Representatives for the present winner-take-all arrangement. This at the same time gives some protection to small States, recognizes population differences, and elects a President under a much more direct expression of the popular will.

As we consider the issue of electoral college reform in this session, it seems to me that the Lodge-Gossett plan should be before us for appropriate consideration. I therefore submit for appropriate reference a Senate joint resolution embodying this plan.

I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the desk through the close of business of January 12.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1961, the names of Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. LONG of Louisiana were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 11) to amend the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961.

EXPANSION OF WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be added as an additional cosponsor of S. 109, relating to the expansion of the water conversion program, and that on subsequent printings of the bill his name be added.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENCOURAGING EDUCATION AND STRENGTHENING STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill which I introduced yesterday (S. 293), to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected thereon, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTIONS WITH ISRAEL AND THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTIONS OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Preisdent, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from executive A, 87th Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic, signed at Washington on December 21, 1960, and executive B, 87th Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and Israel, signed at Washington on September 30, 1960, transmitted to the Senate on yesterday by the President of the United States, and that the conventions, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic for the avoidance of double taxation of income, the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, and the elimination of obstacles to international trade and investment, signed at Washington on December 21, 1960.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the proposed convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State. 2. Income-tax convention with United Arab Republic, signed December 21, 1960.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and Israel for the avoidance of double taxation of income and for the encouragement of international trade and investment, signed at Washington on September 30, 1960.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the proposed convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State. 2. Income-tax convention with Israel, signed September 30, 1960.)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate yesterday received from the President the recess nominations of the following:

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador;

W. Wendell Blancké, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic;

Joseph Palmer 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria;

R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger;

Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana;

Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania; and

Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

The nomination of Noah N. Langdale, Jr., of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the term expiring January 27, 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Sundry lists of persons named for promotion in the Foreign Service, and for appointment as Foreign Service officers of various classes, and consular and/or diplomatic designations for career and Reserve officers, and persons who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate as Foreign Service officers of various classes, and consular and/or diplomatic designations for career, Reserve, and Staff officers.

In accordance with the committee rule, the pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days from receipt.

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to advise Senators that on Friday at 10 o'clock a.m. the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hear Mr. Orville Freeman, whose name has been sent to us as the nominee for the position of Secretary of Agriculture.

NOTICE ON HEARING ON ROBERT F. KENNEDY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ATTORNEY GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 13, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Attorney General-Designate.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

Address on Communist cold war strategy, delivered by him at the Conference on Soviet Cold War Strategy, at Paris, France, on December 1, 1960.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address by him on significant aspects of our economic problems.

ELIMINATION OF WASTE: HOW THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION CAN SECURE THE FUNDS FOR ITS NEEDED PROGRAMS WITHOUT UNBALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, obviously, there will be many long overdue needs which the administration of President-elect Kennedy will wish to satisfy.

Indeed, our new national leader has repeatedly made clear his purpose to seek, with the aid of Congress, adequate education facilities, adequate housing, aid to depressed areas, resource development, and other requirements of our growing population.

In the recent presidential campaign, the Republican opposition expressed fear that to satisfy these needs, to carry out the declared purpose of our President-elect, to fulfill the commitments of the Democratic platform, vast additional sums would be required which, in turn, would further unbalance the budget so gravely unbalanced during the last 8 years and require, as an alternative, increased taxation, and so forth.

President-elect Kennedy has replied that these needs can, to a considerable degree, be met by economies and by the elimination of waste. Where are these wastes?

WASTE IN DEFENSE

The most conspicuous wastages are probably in the Armed Forces, with a budget of approximately $40 billion, where the duplication and triplication of purchasing in the three branches of the Defense Department could be eliminated by consolidation and also by the elimination of negotiated contracts.

Our able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], pointed out on this floor, on June 13 last, that over 86 percent of the Defense Department's contracts in 1959 were let by negotiation and not by competitive bidding. At the time—in a moving, dramatic presentation—Senator DOUGLAS pointed to item after item which the Defense Department purchased at prices far exceeding what any one of us could obtain them for at the local hardware store. He showed us $1.50 cable, operator headsets purchased by the Air Force for $10.67; $3.89 wrench sets for $29; 25-cent lamp sockets purchased by the Navy for $21.10; 50-cent pieces of aluminum purchased for $10; 50-cent drill bushings for over $8 apiece; and so on and on. Senator DOUGLAS also cited numerous examples of items which the Defense Department was declaring surplus while other departments of the Government were purchasing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

WASTE IN THE AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, another greater wastage, perhaps the least justifiable of all—takes place in the agricultural program—the cost of which, in the last 8 years, has far exceeded the total of our Government expenditures in this field in all past American history and where the storage bill alone for our steadily mounting surpluses amounts to over a billion dollars annually. In this connection; I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a very illuminating article on how to solve the farm problem, by Robert Haney Scott, recently published in the New Leader. I recommend its careful reading to my colleagues in Congress and to the executive branch of our incoming administration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEITHER CROP RESTRICTION, PARITY PRICES, NOR THE BRANNAN PLAN HAS TAUGHT US HOW TO SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM

(By Robert Haney Scott)

In 1959, the U.S. Government spent an estimated $5.4 billion on farm price support and related programs. This includes $325 million for the soil bank program, $1.7 billion for purchases of commodities for storage, and a whopping $1 billion merely to store the mounting surplus quantities of wheat, cotton, corn, eggs, etc., in various elevators, bins, caves, and other receptacles throughout the countryside. A dollar burden on the community of a similar amount is probably also involved, though hidden from open view, which takes the form of consumer expenditures for farm products at prices higher than they would be on an unsupported market. It seems strange that a nation subjected to inflationary pressures and heavy tax burdens should behave in this masochistic way.

If these funds diverted to agriculture had been applied to a reduction of the Federal debt, the result would have been a beneficial lowering of interest rates and interest charges on the debt. Or perhaps taxes would have been cut. Or the funds could have been used for aid to education. The range of possible alternative benefits from the use of these funds is wide indeed—and, if farm-aid programs are to be retained they should be carefully scrutinized and justified.

The fact is that there is practically no justification for the farm programs on strictly economic grounds; and a great deal of justification can be found for their complete abolition.

On political grounds, however, the issue is cloudy. At Agincourt on St. Crispin's Day, 1415, Henry V led his yeomen, armed with longbows, to victory over the French Army. Since then, the farmer has enjoyed a highly respected place in society. By his moral standards, his perseverance against the elements, his constancy, his stabilizing conservativeness, and the way of life he represents, he continues to this day to command the respect of his city neigbors—and rightly so. It is, therefore, not with equanimity that society anticipates the possibility of widespread poverty among farmers. They have society's sympathy. They also have the balance of political power on many issues, and this can be disregarded by most Congressmen only by placing their political future in great peril.

For the sake of argument let us assume not only that it is politically expedient to aid the farm community, but that society as a whole really feels that farmers should be subsidized in one way or another, and that their occupation should be supported as a way of life—as an example for society to emulate. No longer is the question, "Should we aid the farmer?" but rather, "What is the best way to aid the farmer?"

In developing an answer to this question it is useful to look separately at three essentially different farm programs, all now being employed by the U.S. Government.

First, there are crop-restriction programs such as the soil bank. Under the soil bank, farmers are paid by the acre for retiring some part of their land from production, which is supposed to reduce the output of farm commodities. There is some doubt that it actually achieves a reduction in output because farmers, quite naturally, retire their poorest land and devote more time and greater intensity to cultivating the remaining land. It has been estimated that although some 8 percent of the land was placed under the soil bank, food, and feed output was only 2 percent lower than it otherwise would have been. One thing is certain—that the reduction in output, if any, is not proportionally as great as the proportion of land retired from production.

But again, for the sake of argument, let us assume that the actual output of farm commodities is significantly lower under the soil bank than it otherwise would have been. Does this restriction of output really aid the farmer? The answer is simply that no one really knows. And yet $325 million a year is spent on this program. Certainly, the farm owner receives the benefit of the Government's payments, but with a smaller volume of commodities to market he may take a more than offsetting cut in income.

Let us examine this proposition a little more closely. With a reduction in the amount of food products supplied to the market, a rise in food prices should result. If this rise is relatively large, then the income loss incurred from reduced sales is more than offset by the income gain resulting from the higher price. Specifically, the percentage rise in price must be greater than the percentage reduction in sales volume, if farm income is to rise. On the other hand, if the percentage rise in price is less than the percentage reduction in sales, farmers face a net reduction in income. Since there is no certainty that a large rise in price will be forthcoming as a result of a reduction in supplies, one cannot conclude unequivocally that the farmer is better off under crop restriction programs. Most economists would probably hazard the guess that the farmer is better off, but only the most venturesome would attempt to estimate how much better off. Thus, there is no way of determining whether this program is worth its cost.

It is important to note that, for a restriction program to be successful, farm commodities must rise in price significantly, to the bane of consumers. We therefore find ourselves in the curious position of burdening taxpayers with a program that is of doubtful effectiveness in aiding farmers and of certain effectiveness in harming consumers. The confusion is compounded when it is pointed out that farmers are taxpayers and consumers as well, so the program may not be worth its cost even to the farmer himself.

A second program, which may be called parity price and storage, is the source of the much-discussed farm commodity surplus problem. What is parity price? I like to picture a social gathering at which the Secretary of Agriculture draws from a hat some numbers which, on the following day, are announced as the parity prices. In fact, of course, elaborate computations are involved in determination of a parity price. Data are collected on farm costs and farm commodity prices. The ratio of the index of prices received to the index of prices paid is called the parity ratio. Based on 1910–14 as 100, this ratio has run in the low eighties in the recent past, implying, in a sense, that farmers are living at about 80 percent of par with their 1910–14 relative standard.

A parity price level is that price level necessary to maintain the parity ratio at 100 percent. The point is that someone decides that the proper support prices should maintain the parity ratio at 75 or 90 or some other percent. The relevance of the statistics is rapidly obscured. The 1910–14 base is virtually meaningless, and the arbitrary choice of the ratio to be maintained is seldom justified in rational terms. The primary function of the imposing statistics seems to be their psychological effect upon Congressmen who must carefully rationalize their behavior as just or fair.

Having thus been determined, the support price is maintained by Government purchase and storage of commodities that remain un-

sold at that price. A wheat farmer, for example, will deposit his wheat in an elevator and obtain a loan on it from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The amount of the loan is determined by the support price. If, in subsequent months, the price goes higher, the farmer may sell his wheat and pay off the loan. If it fails to go higher he can allow ownership of the wheat to revert to the Government. If this year goes like last, there will soon be 1.5 billion bushels of wheat in storage.

Government storage costs currently amount to over $1 million per day for wheat alone. But administrative costs are high as well, partially because there is a crop restriction aspect to the parity price program. In order to obtain a loan on his wheat, the farmer must have a marketing card which he receives when he is given an allotment on his land which tells him the number of acres of his land that can be planted in wheat. He will, quite naturally, plant acreage on that part of his land from which he would expect to obtain the largest yield. The upshot is that Government agents must measure every wheat field each year. (An acquaintance of mine said that last year he had to plow under 15 acres which had been planted by mistake—a rather common phenomenon.)

At times, the Government can recoup some of its expenditure by selling a portion of the surplus holdings. This has been done to a limited extent under aspects of the foreign aid programs (Public Law 480). Such surplus sales at bargain prices are usually accepted with gratitude by the recipient countries, but our relations with other countries which sell these commodities on the world market suffer appreciably.

Taken by itself, it may be said that the farmer is unequivocally better off under the parity price and storage program. But when taken in conjunction with the allotment program the answer is, again, unclear. Removal of allotments coupled with reductions in support prices might, in the long run, lead to either greater or smaller farm income. Once more it seems strange that a program which results in a tremendous burden on the taxpayer, higher than necessary food costs to the consumer, and of uncertain benefit to the farm community, should continue to be renewed year after year after year.

The third plan, the well-defined program known as the Brannan plan (named after President Harry Truman's Secretary of Agriculture), is presently used to support the income of wool producers. (It is more widely used in other countries.) Again some fair price is selected and the Government buys all that is produced at this price and then resells it all at what the market will bear. In fact, however, the Government may not handle the goods themselves, but merely pay the producer the difference between the fair price and what he received from its sale on the market.

Regardless of the technique used, the economic results are the same. Under this program there is no doubt that the producer is better off, and no doubt that the taxpayer bears the burden. But here, unlike the other two programs, consumers are at least as well off as they would be in the absence of any program, and may be much better off. It hinges upon the response of producers to the support price. If the amount supplied is the same under the support price, then the consumer's position is unchanged. If, however, suppliers expand their output, it probably can all be sold only at a lower market price with the advantage accruing to the consumer. But then the interests of taxpayers and consumers are at opposite poles. To the extent that the consumer is better off, the taxpayer is worse off because of the greater differential between the fair price and the market price.

A summary of the argument to this point is aided by reference to the chart below. Let the three farm programs be represented along the top: crop restriction (CR), parity price and storage (PP and S) and Brannan plan (BP). Farmers, taxpayers and consumers are represented along the side. Inside the chart is placed a "B" if the group being considered is better off, and "W" if it is worse off, under the relevant program.

	CR	*PP&S*	*BP*
Farmer	B?	B?	B
Taxpayer	W	B	W
Consumer	W	W	B

In filling in the chart, it has been assumed that the farmer is, in fact, better off under both the crop restriction and parity price programs. Although there is some doubt about this, as was pointed out above, those who champion these programs are being given the benefit of it.

The chart tells the story immediately. Farmers are thought to be better off under all programs. Taxpayers are worse off under all programs. Consumers are worse off under the first two programs but better off under the Brannan plan. It is interesting to note that, presently, extensive use is made of the first two programs and only wool is supported under the Brannan plan.

Some words of caution are in order, however. First, "B" and "W" have not been assigned numerical values. No one knows how much better or worse off each group is, and there is no way of measuring this even in dollar terms, let alone in terms of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The hedonistic calculus has never been refined to a degree which would enable one to say that taking a dollar from a taxpayer and giving it to a farmer results in a net increase in the community's happiness. So, even if dollar figures were inserted, these would fail to give the whole answer.

Second, the categories used are not mutually exclusive—that is, one individual may appear in more than one category.

Nevertheless, as a general guide the chart explains quite a lot. It explains, for example, why farmers cannot make up their own minds in favor of one program or the other. The American Farm Bureau tends to favor programs suggested by the Department of Agriculture which include longrun gradual removal of controls altogether. The Farmers' Union favors rigid price supports and production controls by allotments. The Grange favors not one but a system of parity prices which would be different for the consumer's market, the feed market and the international market. And there is considerable internal disagreement in these organizations.

The chart explains why taxpayer associations are against farm supports in all those areas where farmers contribute a relatively small proportion of the tax bill. (These associations are usually silent on the issue in predominantly agricultural States.) It offers further evidence in support of the belief that consumers are relatively impotent as an interest group. Otherwise, they would have been instrumental in tilting the balance in favor of the Brannan plan long ago. If a choice must be made from among these three possibilities, then the overall argument strongly suggests the Brannan plan

But a different plan which would engender a great deal of support from professional economists, is, for some strange reason, seldom offered as a possibility even though it is superior on all counts. The burden to the taxpayer is minimized, consumers stand to benefit, and there is no doubt as to its effectiveness in aiding the farmer. Furthermore, no surplus problem would arise and only relatively minor distortions of basic price relationships would be brought about by it. Finally, it satisfies our basic sense of justice. What is this panacea? It is simply a system of direct lump-sum payments to farmers.

Let us examine this argument in greater detail. Last year it was suggested in Congress that a maximum be established on support payments to any one family. This resulted from the disclosure that, in 1958, some 67 farms each received payments under the soil bank program of over $50,000; the largest payment amounted to $278,000. Something about this seemed a bit unfair. It blurs the image of the poor farmer. Obviously, imposition of a payment maximum would spoil the intended effect of the program, and is, therefore, unreasonable. If a farmer has that much land and retires it all from production, he is complying with the intent of the program—restricting crops. In doing so he is giving up the income he could otherwise have made by producing crops.

But careful reasoning informs us that the other programs have this same built-in bias in favor of the large and presumably wealthy farmer. Assume that one farmer would earn a gross annual income of $1,000 in the absence of price supports, and another farmer $10,000. Now suppose that commodity prices are supported at a level 100 percent higher, that is, prices are doubled. One farmer's gross is now $2,000, the other's is now $20,000. Wealthy farmers are being greatly benefited by support prices; poor farmers are still poor. Another example is that of the farmer who loses his crop from hail or drought. What good does it do him to know that prices are being supported at high levels this year when he has nothing to sell? Under all the programs there are still plenty of marginal farmers, those barely making a go of it.

Thus, none of the existing programs achieves what we really set out to achieve—a just income for farmers. The large and powerful farm, likely to be managed by city-dwelling farmers, tends to grow larger and more powerful. The small independent farmer is helped, but imperceptibly. If it is a way of life we are trying to maintain, these programs operate in the wrong direction.

Give $500 a year to every family worker on the farm. This would cost around $2 billion; giving it to family and hired farmworkers (not including seasonal workers) would cost around $2.5 billion. These figures are less than our combined Government payments for storage, soil bank and other programs. They would be much smaller if payments were made only to those farmers whose products are now being sold at support prices. A man and his wife living on the farm would have an income of $1,000 a year plus whatever they could make from the farm's operation. With this direct subsidy, any farmer should be able to make a living wage.

What would be the benefits of this porgram?

1. It would cost the taxpayer significantly less than he is now paying.

2. Poor farmers would benefit relatively more than rich ones; it would be a progressive subsidy.

3. Consumers would pay, and producers receive, market prices for farm products rather than distorted prices, as is now the case.

4. There would be no surplus problem. Any stored goods could be used to stabilize farm commodity supplies and prices by evening out commodity flows to the market, and to serve as a protection against drought, war, or other catastrophies.

5. Elaborate farm controls would be abolished along with the concomitant administrative expense. There would no longer be any reason to measure every wheat field each year.

6. We would know, at least in dollar terms, just how much the farm support program costs. As it is now, dollar costs do not reflect true costs because no account can be

made of the effect of the various programs on prices.

7. The distortion of relative prices brought about by the present programs would be eliminated. This is a particularly important point to economists. It is quite clear that price distortions will alter the direction of resource allocation not only in the industry directly affected by Government pricing policies, but in related industries as well. Examples of such distortions are numerous. When corn prices are high, too little corn is fed to pigs and pork prices rise; too much land under irrigation is used to raise corn, and too little used for vegetables; too much labor and steel is used in production of equipment for corn farmers—too little in other manufactures. Malallocations of resources of this type would tend to disappear under the direct-payment plan.

8. Land values, all out of proportion now, would tend to adjust to an appropriate equilibrium. As it is, because of high land prices, too much land on the fringes of urban areas is retained in farms which might otherwise be developed for industrial or dwelling use.

There are, of course, problems involved in the implementation of such a direct-payment program. Some questions to be answered, for example, would be: Who will be eligible to receive benefits? How much would be paid? But surely the necessary administrative techniques would be less difficult to work out than those now being used.

Another problem, however, which would have to be handled carefully for psychological and sociological reasons is the farmer's response to a system of gifts in which his pride may be injured. In this age of enlightenment, however, a tactful handling of the program could overcome this obstacle. After all, what farmers now receive are gifts in disguise, and highly inequitable ones at that. But if this obstacle proves formidable, ways could be devised to cover up the gift aspect of the program. It could be called an incentive payment, or the payment could be tied in with the first units of product offered on the market by those authorized to receive them.

Under the programs now in force the situation is bound to get much worse before it can possibly get better. One of the drawbacks of our democratic system seems to be that things are left to reach a stage of crisis before remedial action is taken. Let us hope this does not happen in this case. A break in these programs is bound to come sooner or later, and the longer we wait the more difficult it will be.

WASTE IN THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, there is a tremendous waste in the foreign aid program. The illusion has persisted that the friendship of other nations can be purchased with American dollars. In the application of that program, the idea seems to have prevailed that if the medicine applied to unsatisfactory conditions in any of the more than 100 nations now receiving Uncle Sam's benevolence fails to relieve or cure, larger doses of the same medicine should be applied. There is every reason to believe and hope that under President Kennedy the foreign aid program will be administered far more efficiently, far more effectively, and far more realistically.

One of the many reasons for the past failures of the foreign aid program, of which the United States is now reaping the bitter fruit, is the support which our past administration has given to dictators. Instead of supporting the Democratic aspirations of the people of the nations to whom the aid is going, we have helped strengthen and perpetuate the tyrannies of which they were the victims. A striking illustration of this is revealed in an article called "The Spanish Labyrinth," by Robert J. Alexander, appearing in the recent issue of the New Leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPANISH LABYRINTH

(By Robert J. Alexander)

One of the gravest and potentially most dangerous errors of U.S. foreign policy in recent years has been our unqualified support of the government of Generalissimo Francisco Franco. The United States has been guilty in this instance of a mistake which has also characterized many of its actions in Latin America and elsewhere. It has concentrated on the military aspects of its position in the world, without paying any attention to the political and psychological effects of the policies followed. Sooner or later we are likely to pay a terrible price for such shortsightedness.

Our policy toward Spain since 1953 has been determined by the fact that we have a number of naval and air bases on Spanish soil. These bases were established as the result of an agreement between the United States and Franco, under some of the most peculiar circumstances to be found anywhere in the world. The United States was forced to agree to restrictions on the religious liberties and freedom to marry of its servicemen who were not Catholics. By self-imposition, U.S. soldiers, sailors and airmen cannot wear their uniforms off base—in itself a tacit admission that the presence of the bases is not welcome to most Spaniards.

In spite of elaborate precautions, inevitable incidents have arisen between U.S. military personnel and Spaniards. They have resulted from the drinking proclivities of our servicemen and their tendency to drive ponderous military vehicles at reckless speeds through towns and villages whose streets were built to accommodate a single man on a horse. They have arisen, too, from the great disparity between the pay of the U.S. servicemen and their Spanish counterparts, not to mention the average Spanish civilian. All these incidents might have been expected—and probably were. They are not the peculiar fault of U.S. airmen or soldiers; they are bound to occur whenever one country's armed forces are on another's territory.

The most serious problems, however, are not those involving GI's in Spain. The really dangerous circumstances arise from our moral, military, economic and political backing of the Franco regime. During the last 7 or 8 years we have stood forward as the great defender and supporter of this dictatorship, which was imposed by a bloody civil war and was an ally of our enemies during World War II.

We have sponsored the entry of Franco Spain into one United Nations agency after another—including the main body of the U.N. itself. Our ambassador has seen fit to speak on the Spanish radio in praise of the Franco regime and our great friendship for it, as well as to go out of his way to cultivate intimate personal relations with members of Franco's immediate family. President Eisenhower likewise thought it proper to go to Spain and give Franco a bearlike embrace.

Eisenhower's demonstration, though less vital than many other actions we have taken, probably did more to arouse bitter discontent against the United States among broad layers of the Spanish people than anything else. Many Spaniards were incredulous that the man who led the Allied armies in Europe in World War II, and who in 1945 had promised the early liberation of Spain, could behave this way. After the incident, few Spaniards could any longer take seriously our position as leaders of the free world.

As a result of all of these events, a profound change has occurred in the attitude of the anti-Franco opposition in Spain toward the United States. During World War II the Spanish people ardently sided with the Allies, and looked with particular friendliness upon the United States. Thousands showed this support by helping Allied servicemen escape the Nazi.

I was in Spain on an extended visit in 1951 and even then America's standing was still very high in the eyes of the opposition. This year, when I returned, I found that all this good will had evaporated. Every single member of the opposition with whom I talked—and I saw members of virtually all the important groups except the Communists—was bitter in denunciation of U.S. behavior. Individual reactions varied—some people expressed only sad regret at U.S. abandonment of the cause of democracy in Spain; others were violently hostile toward America. In general, the attitude was reflected in the wide popularity of Fidel Castro, who was admired not only because he had overthrown Batista and was carrying out an agrarian reform, but because he was doing to the Yankees what many a Spaniard now yearns to do.

Continuation of the present U.S. policy is contributing to an ultimate crisis in Spain. At the moment, things seem eminently quiet there—it seems to be the one place where the United States doesn't have to worry. However, this is a Potemkin facade. The longer the present policy continues, the more serious will be the final accounting. As things now stand, when Franco falls or disappears, the United States goes with him. In the minds of the average Spaniard we have so completely associated ourselves with the Franco regime that any movement against him, or any demonstration of hostility to his regime after it has gone, will inevitably also be a show of enmity toward us, too.

At present in Spain we are faced with the paradoxical and absurd situation in which the world's greatest democracy is seen (quite correctly) as the principal support of a hated tyranny, of which even its friends have grown tired, while the Soviet Union, the world's most potent dictatorship, is able to pose quite effectively as the champion of freedom and democracy. The only major country which denounces the Franco regime for the dictatorship it is is the U.S.S.R. The only radio station broadcasting anti-Franco propaganda, day after day, is the so-called Radio Pirenaica in Prague. The only opposition group able to get its position before the Spanish people is the Communist. Franco, of course, does his utmost to strengthen the position of the Communists in Spain by the simple expedient of picturing all who oppose him as Communists. Under the circumstances it is understandable why many of the less sophisticated Spaniards tend to see in the Communists and the Soviet Union their principal allies in the struggle against the dictatorship.

The situation grows increasingly critical the longer we continue our present policy because today there is no viable alternative to Franco. He himself has seen to this. The key to his maintaining power has been prevention of the emergence of an individual or a group of sufficient prestige and support to offer a reasonable successor should anything happen to Franco. By continuing our political support, stepped-up economic aid,

and moral blessing of his regime, we are playing a key role in assuring that there is no foreseeable answer to the question, "After Franco, what?"

As a result, it is going to be difficult for post-Franco political leaders to feel friendly toward the United States. At best we can expect a suspicious neutralism. Only if the United States changes its attitude in the near future, and makes unequivocally clear its support of democracy in Spain, can we expect anything more than this. Franco, after all, is not going to live forever; he has just turned 68.

Several ingredients are necessary for a new policy in Spain. First and foremost is the dispatch of an ambassador who, rather than beng an apologist for the Franco regime, will make clear his belief in democracy in all countries—including Spain. The formula of "an abrazo for the democrats and a formal handshake for the dictators" is nowhere more needed than in Spain.

Second, U.S. diplomatic officials must change their attitude to the regime and stop holding the opposition at arm's length, fearful that, if they have contact with members of the opposition, Franco will be "annoyed."

Third, the United States should use its tremendous influence in contemporary Spain in favor of the development and growth of the democratic opposition. We should make it clear to Franco that we cannot continue to underwrite the economy, or any other aspect of his regime, unless he does at least three things:

1. We must demand declaration of a continuing general political amnesty which will not merely be a trap to encourage the opposition to come into the open so its leaders can again be picked up and jailed. (So long as the price of open political opposition is prison, torture, and possible death, there can be no revival of freedom in Spain.)

2. We must insist on freedom of the press. It is principally through the press that new figures can begin to emerge on the Spanish political scene, real political discussion can be revived, and an exchange of ideas about the country's major problems can be undertaken.

3. We must demand freedom of organization, both political and trade union. Well-organized democratic political parties and labor organizations will be the best guarantee that the transition from the Franco regime can be carried out in a peaceful and orderly manner. To organize any political party other than the Falange, or any labor group other than the official one, is a crime. As long as this continues only those groups most efficient in clandestine and subversive work are able to function with any effectiveness. In practice, this means the Communist Party.

Such a program may appear to be "intervention," but the United States is intervening in Spain today—on the side of Franco—with the most flagrant, open backing. I can see little wrong with telling Franco that we find ourselves unable to extend further loans, grants, or other help so long as his regime remains the kind of government it is now.

Sooner or later, relaxing the bonds of the dictatorship will undermine Franco's position, and no one knows that better than Franco. Were he a younger man, one could be almost certain that he would absolutely refuse to concede to our pressure. However, a characteristic of Franco's skillful political manipulation has been that he is always concerned with the period immediately ahead; presumably he is now concerned only with staying in office in the immediate future—if possible until he dies. Our refusal to continue economic or other aid unless Franco democratizes his regime would present him with a situation in which he might well agree to such liberalization. For the alternative, within a matter of weeks or, at most, months would certainly bring an economic crisis more serious than any he has had to face. It would also mean risking the considerable gains in the international arena his regime has made—thanks to our help—and returning to the position of an international pariah. Strong pro-Franco elements—the large economic interests and the armed forces in particular—can be expected to oppose such a risk.

One other factor is to be borne in mind. The opposition is not the only element concerned with what will come after Franco. Powerful individuals and forces inside the regime itself are equally worried. A program of gradual liberalization such as has been suggested here would offer these elements an alternative to the chaotic situation many now fear will come with Franco's passing. And they might be expected to bring great pressure on him to accept. Thus, Franco might well be faced with rapid disintegration of his regime if were he to resist an American demand for liberalization backed by a threat to cut off economic and other aid.

If Franco resisted, he might well turn on the United States. Franco certainly has no principled devotion to us, or to the free world. He might harass our bases or even demand their removal. He might give increased opportunity to the Communists, while still keeping democratic elements muzzled, to support his constant argument that all who oppose him are Communists. However, such actions would be hazardous. Spain has changed in the last decade. The groups backing Franco are by no means so united in his support as they once were. They are certainly not going to risk losing all the advantages they have acquired just to keep a sexagenarian in power a couple of years longer. In attempting to resist, Franco might find that he brought about his own downfall.

Spain is one case in which it is imperative that we cease to think only in military terms. We will lose our bases anyway. If we do not use our influence to force Franco to liberalize his regime, the next government will undoubtedly make closing our bases one of its first acts. We will be left not only without bases, but with a hostile Spain. It would seem preferable to run the immediate risk to the bases if by doing so we can at least recapture some of the friendship we once had among the Spanish people.

WASTE IN CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. GRUENING. Finally, Mr. President, there is the shocking wastage in the field of civil defense. The subject has been thoroughly and penetratingly discussed on the floor of the Senate by our able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. He summarizes his views most effectively in a recent article in the Progressive, in which he refers to civil defense as the "Billion-Dollar Boondoggle."

It should be clear by this time that the billion dollars which has been spent in the last 7 or 8 years on this front has been completely wasted. The only civil defense that is possible is the defense which comes through the strong deterrent power of the Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force. The wiggling and wobbling of the civil defense administrators between recommending evacuation or backyard shelters reveals the nonsensicality of the whole program. Civil defense should be abolished forthwith and the additional millions of dollars which would be spent on it, were it to continue, should be applied to needed and desirable projects.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator YOUNG's article from the December issue of the Progressive be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive, December 1960]

CIVIL DEFENSE: BILLION-DOLLAR BOONDOGGLE

(By Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG)

Businessmen, American taxpayers, and seasoned poker players agree on one axiom: "Never throw good money after bad."

Government at all levels should apply this maxim in those agencies where expenditures have been demonstrably futile. There is no better place to begin than the wasteful, fantastically muddled Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, with its satellites in State and local governments.

The civil defense program is a grand illusion. In terms of money it is ludicrous. Through diligent and relentless application of poor planning, confused thinking, and colossal ineptitude, the men charged with the defense of civilians in event of war have managed to squander more than $1 billion of taxpayers' money since 1951, exclusive of $100 million worth of surplus Government property turned over to civil defense agencies. The time has come to abolish this billion-dollar boondoggle and adopt a realistic approach to the entire problem of civil defense in this nuclear age.

The indictment of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization reads like a roster of malpractice: waste; inefficiency; unrealistic, in fact schizophrenic, planning; and inability to overcome public apathy which is rapidly burgeoning into widespread public resentment.

The current daily outlay for civil defense activities by the Federal Government alone is more than $120,000. State and local funds are spent at approximately the same rate. Other Federal agencies also spend money and devote staff time to civil defense projects. This amounted to $6 million last year. If Congress had not wisely slashed the OCDM's budgetary request, Federal spending on this useless agency would be doubled for the current year.

Of the appropriated funds, more than 60 percent is siphoned off for salaries and expenses, much of it to the hacks and defeated officeholders for whom the OCDM has become a convenient and comfortable haven in the political storm. Political has-beens, rejected by their fellow citizens, enjoy top salaries in the Office of Defense Mobilization, and do little except talk vaguely about survival, distribute literature, plan alerts to annoy their neighbors, and distribute countless reams of literature. Some of the plush private offices of even regional civil defense directors are enough to make a Member of the Congress feel deeply impressed. Interestingly enough, more than 40 percent of the personnel of this agency draw salaries of $10,000 a year or more.

Of the money spent for civil defense, approximately 40 percent is wrung from the taxpayers of States and municipalities, where tax dollars grow increasingly scarce, and where vital programs for schools, hospitals, and housing die for lack of funds. In place of a desperately needed school, many communities may receive a screeching siren, a few stretchers, some two-way radio equipment for civil defense officials to play with, and an occasional alert to confuse the citizenry whether in event of a nuclear attack they should run, or hide—or do both.

Only recently the auditor of the State of Ohio began an audit of the nearly $2 million in surplus property donated to civil defense organizations in Ohio during the last few years. The result so far is a sad commentary on the entire civil defense program—one I feel sure has been repeated in all of the States receiving similar Government property.

In many of the counties, a good percentage of the property could no longer be located. It included barber kits, garbage cans, outdoor lampshades, adding machines, shaving kits, and a thousand other gimcracks of absolutely no use in case of an emergency. Generators, typewriters, adding machines, aluminum pitchers, and sundry other items somehow wound up in the homes of local civil defense directors, county commissioners, or other State and local employees. Hardly any of it was found where it would do any good in a nuclear attack.

Perhaps the whole mess can be best summed up by the following statement in the report on one of the most populous counties in the State: "Opportunity to avail themselves of the various bargains in surplus property has served as an incentive to being in the civil defense setup, we are told."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS pointed out an even more absurd waste of funds in his home State of Illinois. There the Civil Defense Corps of the city of Carpentersville (population 12,000) was given almost $350,000 of Federal surplus property, or more than the Chicago Board of Education received during the entire school year.

At Athens, Ohio, home of Ohio University, there is a new 3,200-foot concrete airstrip, built by civil defense at a cost of $195,000. The only hitch is the university doesn't own an airplane. This airstrip was intended to handle civil defense air traffic when the university was named last year as the emergency seat of Ohio State government. However, Athens no longer is the official emergency civil defense capital. There is now no specific site, unless some civil defense official has selected another city within recent weeks.

Only recently, hundreds of thousands of dollars of stockpiled penicillin had to be destroyed because it was found to be useless by the Food and Drug Administration. In Ohio alone more than $100,000 worth has been destroyed thus far with more to come. Hundreds of other stockpiled items which should not have been purchased in the first place are similarly going to waste.

It is the program on the national level that spawns the growth of city and State organizations and multiplies the waste. If we cut off the head of the bureaucratic octopus in Washington, its wasteful satellites in States and cities will soon wither away.

Americans are tired of schemes to provide identification bracelets for teenagers to exchange; of millions of contradictory pamphlets; of screeching sirens; of highly publicized bomb shelter honeymoons; of policemen loafing on civil defense duties, waiting for a bomb to drop, while many of our city streets are unsafe after dark; of high-salaried boondogglers; of waste and inefficiency; of silly, shortsighted planning—they are tired of the whole confused mess.

In Columbus, the capital of my home State of Ohio, $700,000 of local funds was squandered on a traffic light control system designed to facilitate evacuation in event of a nuclear attack. Local civil defense officials also issued a 4½-pound, 2-inch thick manual for evacuation. If one took the trouble to read it—and I doubt that one in 5,000 residents has—he would learn that he is to hop in his car and leave by the shortest route immediately upon hearing the attack warning.

Can any reasonable person imagine all of the nearly half million people in Columbus—or the entire population of any other city—trying to evacuate at one time? Even assuming ample warning time, which is not likely, the chaos would be unbelievable. How many persons fleeing in panic would heed Columbus' $700,000 traffic signals? Or 4½ pounds of evacuation regulations?

What is the basis of civil defense planning? The blunt answer is, there is none. Civil defense plans suffer from a bad case of schizophrenia. Unbelievable as it may sound, at one and the same time OCDM advocates both evacuation and shelter programs.

In Cleveland, Ohio, evacuation is preached. Residents are told to flee on highways toward a neighboring city—whose residents are told to flee toward Cleveland. In Buffalo, N.Y., the program, paradoxically, is to seek shelter—to hide. Do we run, or hide, or both? OCDM has no answer to this question.

The truth is the theory of evacuation in this missile age is not only silly but dangerous. Enemy submarines off our coasts could hurl rockets with nuclear warheads as much as 1,500 miles inland with accuracy. We would be lucky to have 3 minutes warning.

Intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from within the Soviet Union would take 15 to 18 minutes to strike airfields, missile bases, or other targets. It is absurd even to consider the possibilities of evacuation under these circumstances. The thermonuclear weapon, with its tremendous destructive power, and the missile, with its great speed, have now made evacuation not only impractical but impossible.

Yet, in Washington, D.C., and other major American cities last spring, mystified residents received in the mail a map for use in evacuation. Routes and directions were carefully explained, to the confusion of all. No thought was given to the fact that even if the map were deciphered, the monumental traffic jam which would result would practically insure that scarcely a citizen would ever reach the highway outside the city.

At the same time OCDM was distributing its evacuation map, it was beating the drums vigorously, almost hysterically, for a bomb shelter in every backyard. Estimates of various plans range from New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's modest $20 billion proposal to other authoritative estimates of $100 billion from those experts who, it is to be assumed, would dig deeper and permit greater luxury for a generation of underground Americans.

Governor Rockefeller, probably the most enthusiastic advocate of the shelter theory, actually proposed that the Legislature of the State of New York enact laws making it compulsory that every home or building be equipped with a bomb shelter. Now, if a State wants to suggest that citizens build shelters, that is something no one could object to, though one might quarrel with the reasoning. But for Government, either State or Federal, to assume the power to force people to build shelters is a sizable intrusion on individual rights. New York's legislators wisely refused to adopt Rockefeller's proposal.

The conditions of modern warfare make shelters of little or no use in saving American lives. Were we to be attacked with intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen warheads, the total destruction and remaining radioactive elements would be such that underground shelters in basements and backyards would offer little, if any, protection. Hundreds of square miles would be covered with deadly contamination, and the lethal effects would last not for hours or weeks, but for months, or even for years.

Shelter enthusiasts have pictured their subterranean suburbia as the sure-fire antidote for nuclear destruction. The fact remains that the most optimistic estimate of the devastation of nuclear attack, despite a network of shelters, places probable death at 50 million Americans with some 20 million others sustaining serious injuries. Significantly, in my own State of Ohio, I know of no civil defense official who himself has taken the trouble to build a shelter.

Assuming for the sake of argument that shelters would save lives, there is no assurance that they would not be outmoded by more advanced weapons or that they would offer any protection against an attack even more deadly than a nuclear attack—biological warfare. Shelters in basements and backyards, even if there were sufficient warning to enable persons to enter them, might prove huge firetraps in urban centers in the colossal conflagration which experts say would certainly follow an atomic attack. Does any responsible government official wish to embark on a $20 to $100 billion questionable gamble under these conditions?

Assuming further that some Americans did have shelters that saved their lives in a nuclear war, what sort of world would they come up to? What would have happened to the buildings and to the atmosphere? What would they do for food once their 2-week bomb shelter supply was exhausted? This is not a pretty picture to paint, but it is the truth—the cold, hard facts of survival in a nuclear war.

For too long now, our citizens have been confused and confounded with the periodic multimillion-dollar doses of psychological pablum administered by the OCDM. This may explain the failure of the American public to take seriously the contradictory programs of this agency. Steadily, Americans have reacted against the hysteria, the alarms, and the practice alerts of the Cassandras in the top echelons of the civil defense agency and their toy-soldier paid underlings in American municipalities. It may indeed be possible to fool people for a while, but they cannot be fooled for long. Reaction to the hopeless shenanigans of the OCDM has changed from an early tolerant amusement, willing to suffer the games of an amateur agency, to massive indifference, and finally to boiling indignation over an arrogant bureaucracy which has repeatedly proved itself inept, inefficient, and, as one letterwriter put it to me, "a damned nuisance."

Despite warning signs of growing wrath among Americans, OCDM officials proclaimed the nationwide practice drills last May a huge success. They do not seem to realize that the behavior of most people—those who went along with the game—in a mock attack is not the behavior to expect in the presence of an actual attack. Directions and orders of civil defense officials, heeded automatically in rehearsal, would be ignored in the horror of nuclear war.

All of us can be proud of the hundreds of thousands of patriotic Americans who, as civil defense volunteers, give their time and efforts, often at great risk to themselves, in times of flood, fire, and other natural disasters. I honor those who have performed valuable service while paid civil defense officials directed them from behind desks. These fine men and women can and will render equally needful service as auxiliary firemen, special policemen, and deputy sheriffs. Or, a volunteer national disaster corps could be created to utilize their services—an organization devoted solely to enabling Americans to help their neighbors without the doubtful leadership of the present OCDM. In times of disaster in America neighbors have always come forward as do the Red Cross and other agencies.

The defense of our civilians is a vital part of our national defense—it is too important to be entrusted to civilians wearing armbands. It should be under the direction of those who know most about defense—the Armed Forces of the United States. In Canada and in England, the military control civil defense activities. In any case, in the event of a missile attack, a national emergency would be declared and the Armed Forces would take over.

Next January a new President will take office without commitment to OCDM leaders or to their program. Let us hope that this new administration will move swiftly to disband the OCDM before it becomes a perma-

nent drain on taxpayers. Its performance in the past makes it clear that the entire problem should be wrested from its hands and should be reappraised with these questions in mind:

Since evacuation is impossible in the event of nuclear attack, would any mass shelter program be adequate to protect our civilian population?

If any shelter program is practical at a cost within attainment, considering our national needs and objectives, how should it be implemented?

If a shelter program is not practical in this frame of reference, what can we reasonably do beyond education to help our citizens in event of nuclear war?

As the defense of American civilians is a major factor in the defense of our country, should this responsibility be entrusted to our Armed Forces? Are not trained military officers better qualified to save the lives of civilians in time of war rather than bureaucrats enjoying fat salaries as civil defense officials?

Coupled with these efforts, we should initiate a vigorous and continuing campaign of education on realistic self-protection in a nuclear war using all the media of communication at our command—television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and our schools.

In my view, no civil defense program will adequately protect our citizenry should war strike. The survival of 180 million Americans—indeed, of all mankind—depends not on civil defense but on peace. It depends not on futile shelter programs inspired by a caveman complex, but on solid, workable international agreements to disarm. Shelter building represents a psychology of fear. We ought to be talking about building homes for our people rather than hoodwinking them with foolish prattle about underground shelter. We should be considering ways to feed the two-thirds of humanity who go to bed hungry every night rather than telling Americans to store away a 2-week supply of food in useless holes in the ground. Instead of wasting untold billions on a national network of bomb shelters, we should put just a portion of these dollars into forging links of friendship with other peoples. The friendship we shall earn will contribute far more to our safety than shelters to jump into after it is too late. It is interesting to note that many of those who talk the loudest about civil defense talk the least about peace.

Civil defense today is a myth. It is based on theories as antiquated as mustache cups, tallow dips, and Civil War cannon balls. In the nuclear age, there can be no realistic civil defense program. We must devote our efforts to the utmost toward finding a peaceful solution to the world's problems. It is our only permanent shelter.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these are not, by any means, the only areas where the performance of the past 8 years can be substantially improved upon, its errors rectified, and the waste stopped. But in these fields I have cited, alone, I conservatively estimate that at least $5 billion a year may be saved, and possibly a much larger sum.

I recommend this for the consideration of the incoming administration and to my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must take time to advise the distinguished Senator from Alaska that his statement was in contravention of the understanding that Senators should not exceed the 3-minute rule, because I think we have a firm agreement that a Senator shall be recognized for 3 minutes, and no more. Then, after an intervening speech, he can be recognized again. I think I must take it upon myself to monitor that rule until it becomes a habit of mind in the Senate. I do not mean to be offensive, but I had a distinct understanding with the majority leader that Senators would not exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is correct, but the Senator from Alaska asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute, and there was no objection.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a reply?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate the correctness of the comments of the Senator from Illinois, but I should like to say, in defense of the slight prolongation of my remarks, that part of my time was used by the majority whip in complimenting the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] on the bill to take care of post-GI veterans. That is why part of my time was used up by worthwhile remarks delivered to good purpose that were not made by me, and I am happy that my able friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was here to commend the legislation sponsored by Senator YARBOROUGH.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Alaska always merits a compliment.

DISTINGUISHED FEDERAL CIVILIAN SERVICE AWARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today five career Federal employees received the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service. I take this opportunity to congratulate each of these gentlemen, Bert B. Barnes, W. S. Hinman, Jr., Frederick J. Lawton, Richard E. McArdle, and William McCauley. They have performed outstanding services to the Nation, not only during 1960, but over careers that span more than 3 decades.

The honor these men receive is well deserved. Far too often we fail to recognize the dedicated service of the Federal employee. They truly are the backbone and mainstay of our Federal system.

I am especially pleased to see among those being honored my good friend Dr. Richard E. McArdle, the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service. He has demonstrated capable leadership and imagination in both public and private forestry efforts. Because of Montana's great timber resources, we have come to know Dr. McArdle well, and we know firsthand his excellent grasp of forestry problems and needs.

Dr. McArdle is a man who knows where he should be going in forestry and he does not hesitate to say so. Under the guidance of such men as our Chief of the Forest Service we can meet our Nation's timber needs and we can also conserve and expand our forest resources through such programs as research and reforestation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the January 4, 1961 issue of the Washington Post announcing these awards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE OF 2.4 MILLION U.S. WORKERS GET TOP CIVIL SERVICE AWARD

(By Thomas Wolfe)

Five career men were singled out from the Government's 2.4 million civilian employees yesterday for the Nation's highest honor to her civil servants—the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

The five, all from the Washington area, will receive medals at a White House ceremony January 11. They are:

Bert B. Barnes, 61, of 4658 South 36th Street, Arlington, Assistant Postmaster General in Charge of the Bureau of Operations.

Wilbur S. Hinman, Jr., 54, 333 South Glebe Road, Arlington, Technical Director of the Army's Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratories.

Frederick J. Lawton, 60, of 9905 East Bexhill Drive, Kensington, a member of the Civil Service Commission.

Richard E. McArdle, 61, of 2907 Rittenhouse Street NW., Chief of the Agriculture Department's Forest Service.

William R. McCauley, 67, of 305 North West Street, Falls Church, Director of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation in the Labor Department.

The President based his selections on recommendations of a Board headed by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

FROM GRATEFUL NATION

"Through these awards," said the President in a special memorandum, "a grateful Nation honors these men who have dedicated their highest abilities to serving the best interests of this great country.

"I take this opportunity to express my faith in the skill and devotion to duty that characterize the Federal work force. These characteristics provide a firm basis for the Nation's continued progress in the future."

Barnes, a native of Holladay, Tenn., was honored for playing "a vital role in providing a vastly improved postal service for the American people despite unprecedented increases in mail volume." Barnes started as a clerk in the Memphis Post Office in 1920, is the highest ranking Post Office official who has worked his way up through the ranks, and won the Department's highest honor—the Distinguished Service Award—last year.

BRILLIANT LEADERSHIP

Hinman, a native of Washington, was cited for brilliant leadership of scientists and engineers in the creation of new electronic techniques and having both military and civilian uses, and for his own technical contributions. He joined the Government in 1928 as an assistant radio engineer with the Bureau of Standards, became technical director of the Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratories in 1953, and has won many awards for his own scientific achievements, particularly his work with proximity fuses and weather observing instruments.

Lawton, also a native of Washington, was credited with signal success in improving Government management, in perfecting the Federal budget system and in furthering advancements in personnel management.

Lawton began working from time to time as a Government messenger while attending Georgetown University, was graduated in 1920, joined the Treasury Department in 1922, received a bachelor of law degree from Georgetown in 1934, became executive assistant to the Director of the Budget in 1938,

was appointed Director of the Bureau of the Budget in 1950 and Civil Service Commissioner in 1953.

VITAL FOREST RESOURCES

McArdle, a Government forester for 36 years, has served in all major forest regions of the United States and, the President said, "his imagination, vision and inspiring leadership have brought exceptional progress in the development and protection of vital forest resources for the American people now and for generations to follow." McArdle, a native of Kentucky, received a Ph. D. degree from the University of Michigan and devoted his early career to research in forestry.

McCauley was hailed for unusual foresight, judgment and executive competence in developing the Federal Employees' Compensation System to serve the human needs of the times. McCauley began his career in 1918 as a clerk with the U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission, the original version of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, and became Director of the Bureau in 1946. He is regarded as a pioneer in the field of workmen's compensation legislation, forerunner of all American welfare laws.

TWO SIGNIFICANT CEREMONIES IN METROPOLITAN NEW YORK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the year 1964 will mark the opening of the New York World's Fair, an event of epochal significance not only to the city and State of New York, but also to the Nation and to the world. It is therefore fitting to note that today, at Flushing Meadow Park in Queens, the formal opening ceremonies of the New York World's Fair administration building will be conducted. The New York World's Fair is a project of immense magnitude, and will present to all nations not only the image of America but also the image of the entire world as it moves forward into the great era of challenge that lies ahead.

Aptly coincidental with the opening of the new World's Fair administration building is the dedication today of the Throgs Neck Bridge connecting the New York boroughs of the Bronx and Queens. This splendid and impressive $92 million suspension bridge, which crosses the East River at the head of Long Island Sound, will, in addition to siphoning off excess traffic from the Bronx-Whitestone and Triborough Bridges, serve to open an additional gateway between Long Island and expressways leading to New England, New Jersey, upstate New York, and points south and west. Its significance for the future World's Fair is that the bridge and its roadways will form part of the network of new and rebuilt roads now being prepared for the historic 1964–65 event.

Appropriately, therefore, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority and the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp. are joining today in dual dedication ceremonies both to mark the two great individual achievements and to symbolize the close mutual significance existing between them. In extending warm congratulations to the officials of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority and the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp. on this memorable occasion, I know that I speak for the citizens of New York State, and indeed for all Americans, when I express best wishes for the full success of the two great undertakings which today celebrate in common their opening ceremonies.

A STATEMENT OF PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS AND OBJECTIVES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Republican Party has to a large degree during the course of its history been a conservative party. Particularly this has been true during this century.

The Republican Convention of 1960 was as universal an expression of conservatism in its speeches as any such meeting that has been held during my lifetime. In spite of this, there have been sufficient portions of Republican platforms that have not hewn to the conservative line to have caused defections in voting which have placed the party in a minority position.

Realizing the inability of the conservative element of the party, and they were by far the majority in the Republican Convention, to convince to a sufficient degree the policy-making level of the party that the party should be conservative in nature in its positions, a number of conservatives, including myself, set out after the convention to determine what might be done to correct this. This study has taken many months. It included a visit to London and study there by one member of the group, when the conservative center was studied to determine what effective means the British had used to reinstate their position.

We have become even more convinced as a result of the recent presidential election that the conservative position has merit and should be, by and large, the guiding light of our party. Mr. Sam Lubell, in an article appearing in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Tuesday, January 10, in discussing the vote in the presidential election, said, after displaying some figures, "Those figures show—and this may be the hidden meaning of the closeness of the 1960 election—that the country cannot be turned back to the old New Deal days." And we further realize that the presidential election of 1960 clearly indicates a majority of the voters repudiated the rash and reckless proposals of the Democratic platform. We see arguments leaning toward the conservative position.

In the preparation of our proposals to be considered by not only Republicans but anyone interested in the present position of both parties, we have attempted to put conservative philosophy into workable suggestions to help solve domestic problems and foreign problems as they relate to America. The first of these documents is now ready. So that my colleagues who are interested might have a chance to study them, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT OF PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS, AND OBJECTIVES

During the past quarter of a century, America has become a society of competing pressure groups. The feeling has become almost universal that the individual by himself and unorganized—is virtually helpless to achieve what are, at bottom, individual goals—economic well-being generally, a rising standard of living, improved education, cultural development, and dignified human treatment in social and economic relationships.

Energetic, but often self-seeking servitors of these individual wants have during the period formed, or immeasurably strengthened, powerful organizations geared to achieve material gains for the individual which he finds it increasingly difficult to bring about by himself. Hence the flourishing of such organizations as labor unions, farm organizations, racial groups, civil liberties groups, consumer groups, nationality groups, cooperatives, educational associations, and even so-called cultural and artistic groups.

To the degree that such organizations successfully render desired services to their members, but remain within a limited and circumscribed sphere of activity, they can be viewed as legitimate instruments of the individual, doing collectively what cannot be done nearly so well by the isolated individual acting alone.

But it cannot be emphasized strongly enough, that these pressure group organizations often serve to aggrandize their own leaders and bureaucracy as well, sometimes at the expense of the membership. And, what is more important, all of these pressure group organizations even when functioning properly serve only a part of the individual's needs. In an ominous development, however, many of these organizations increasingly act as though they were empowered to serve the total man, the individual member in all his manifold aspects.

To take the most obvious contemporary example, the labor unions would now speak and act for the individual union member, not merely in his capacity as an employee facing management, but in his capacity as a citizen. Thus, in the name of its members, who in many cases have not been consulted, the union leadership takes official positions on issues ranging from the minimum wage to U.N. action in the Congo, and endorses and supports, with money contributed from the hard earned wages of their members, favored political candidates for public office ranging from city alderman to the Presidency itself.

It is instructive to note, parenthetically, that some labor unions, aiming at the "total man," set up vacation resorts (at reduced rates), publish newspapers, establish schools, engage in cultural activities (like hiring professional choral groups), and thereby seek, also, to mold their members along predetermined cultural, intellectual and ideological lines. In all this totalistic organizational activity, the individual is often submerged, swamped and treated as a manipulable statistic. It may happen, as it almost always does, that the same individual is at once a worker, a member of a minority or religious group, a war veteran, a parent of school-age children, a member of a political party, of a fraternal order, or of a cooperative, and of course he is always a consumer. Yet some of "his" organizations tend more and more to speak for him as a "total man," crushing his individuality and diversity through the organization's power and voice.

Even where the organization restricts its activities to more narrow (and hence more legitimate) channels, the individual members are frequently opposed to large portions of the program. But they typically lack the time, the energy, the resources, or the courage (sometimes it takes heroic audacity), to "buck the machine"—to oppose the organization's leadership and bureaucracy.

So serious has this development become that on November 20, 1960, the Catholic Bishops of the United States devoted their

annual statement to decrying this situation. The statement opens by pointing out that:

"The history and achievements of America stand as a monument to the personal responsibility of free men. Our institutions and our industry, the fruit of the American sense of responsibility, have in the past inspired, guided, and helped many other nations of the world. If our future is to be worthy of our past, if the fruit of America's promise is not to wither before it has reached full maturity, our present preeminent need is to reaffirm the sense of individual obligation, to place clearly before ourselves the foundation on which personal responsibility rests, to determine the causes of its decay and to seek the means by which it can be revived."

It then calls for a renewal of the sense of personal responsibility, initiative, and of individual obligation; it deprecates the inordinate demand for benefits to be secured through organization pressures; it is critical of placing excessive and constant reliance on the U.N. and asks for objective evaluation of the moral aspects of U.N. activity; it laments the widespread cynical reaction to the revelations by the McClellan rackets committee of dishonesty, waste, and malfeasance in labor relations; it speaks out against the growing conformity and mechanization imposed on individuals by organizations, and the favored treatment increasingly being given to these anonymous, organizational men; and it reasserts the worth and dignity of the individual when it declares that "even the most universal evil and the threatened mechanization of man can be made to yield before the just and determined wills of individual persons."

Americans largely fall into one of four categories with respect to pressure group organizations: (1) they may be truly voluntary members agreeing with all or most of the policies enunciated by their leaders; or (2) they may be pressured or forced by economic necessity into joining the pressure organizations, agreeing only partially or not at all with the official policies; or (3) they may successfully resist joining such organizations; or (4) finally, as members of the most numerous ethnic or religious groupings of the Nation, they may consider it unnecessary and even humiliating to organize themselves as do the minority or so-called underdog groups.

All of which means that there are literally scores of millions of Americans who are either outside the organized pressure groups or find themselves represented by organizations with whose policies they disagree in whole or in part. These millions are the silent Americans who, thus isolated, cannot find voice against the mammoth organizations which mercilessly pressure their own membership, the Congress, and society as a whole for objectives which these silent ones do not want. They thereby have become "The Forgotten Americans" despite the fact that they constitute the majority of our people.

The Republican Party in this era in which so many pressure groups are seeking to dominate the "total man" is the vehicle and the voice for the dragooned and ignored individual, "The Forgotten American." It too recognizes that those private activities which are essential to the successful functioning of a modern society have tended to become institutionalized in huge organizational units which, themselves growing larger with each passing year, continuously narrow the area in which the individual may act freely, decisively, and effectively. The fundamental problem which confronts the Republic is to find the means to protect individual freedom, action, and responsibility without hampering or destroying those processes and techniques which a modern industrial society must employ if it is to survive and develop.

The phrase, "to protect individual freedom, action, and responsibility" does not, in this context, refer to those measures which have been adopted in the past quarter of a century intended to protect our people against the hazards, risks, and vicissitudes of economic life. No nation in all history has achieved the degree of economic security for the overwhelming majority of its citizens which has been reached by the United States in the 20th century. Unfortunately, during this development, little thought has been given, and less action has been taken, to help the individual to secure, in his individual capacity, the greatest possible scope for effective personal activity.

Increasingly, the vital decisions are being made either directly through private organizational action or as a result of political and social influences and pressures exercised by organizations on government. Many of these organizations within the limits of their legitimate goals and functions are essential to the maintenance of our highly productive economy or for the economic protection of the people whom they represent. Nevertheless, inherent in the very nature of organization itself is the inevitable tendency to oligarchy and bureaucracy, and toward suppression of individual initiative and personal responsibility, even where such suppression is benevolently motivated and applied for the more effective attainment of humanitarian goals. The good of the organization tends to become the predominant consideration while the individual member grows more rapidly anonymous, an increasingly helpless automaton unable, and eventually unwilling, to exercise free choice and personal responsibility.

"A fresh evocation of the principle and practice of personal responsibility can revivify our society and help to stem the seemingly inexorable march toward the automation of human beings and the steady loss of that freedom which is man's distinctive attribute. It will cure the mental lethargy and inertia which permit organizations to usurp, mainly, by default, the rights of their members. It will stimulate a self-reliance which will automatically restore the balance between freedom and security. It will reject unwarranted pressure from groups that seek unjustly to aggrandize their power and will restrict them to their lawful ends." [1]

Inasmuch as the Federal Government has by its actions, often at the cost of weakening State and local government as well as private and community life, contributed substantially to the growth and development not only of its own power, but to the expansion and strength of private organizational power, the Republican Party believes that the Federal Government must begin to consider and adopt measures designed to halt this dehumanizing trend in our society. We therefore set forth the following principles and proposals as a fundamental guide for governmental action on the Federal level, as a means for giving voice to the suppressed views and feelings of the millions of "Forgotten Americans" who constitute the substantial majority of our society.

I. INFLATION

During the past 8 years of the Republican administration, the Nation has enjoyed unparalleled economic prosperity. Never in our history have there been so many jobs, have so many of our people been employed at high wages and in skilled occupations. Never have so many of our children completed not only high school but college as well, thereby acquiring the higher skills which generally bring greater economic rewards. But what is frequently overlooked is that during those same years the private savings, insurance holdings, and pension funds of our citizens have grown to enormous proportions never before attained. What is more, the policies of the Republican administration have been largely successful in warding off inflation and in thus safeguarding against any serious decline in value of these tremendous private resources.

In November of 1960, private savings and insurance in the United States reached an alltime high of almost $307 billion. At the same time participation in private pension plans (exclusive of social security) has grown to enormous proportions. In December of 1960, some 20 million persons were enrolled in private pension plans with more than $40 billion set aside in trust or with life insurance companies to meet the benefits expected by 25,000 plans. (These figures do not include other types of private benefit plans such as health insurance and other forms of fringe benefits.)

These accumulations of private savings, insurance, and pension funds are a tribute to the strength and persistence of the traditional American ideal that the basic responsibility for safeguarding himself and his family against the hazards of old age, sickness and economic disaster, and for providing his children with the opportunity for education and for acquiring higher economic skills rests primarily with the individual. Thus the protection of these private savings, insurance and pension funds presently constitutes the most important domestic problem facing our Federal Government.

The Democratic Party platform is an ominous threat to the financial security of the American people, the overwhelming majority of whom now possess substantial savings, insurance and pension rights. It threatens not only those who live on fixed incomes in the present, but the future of every family which through thrift and present sacrifice has sought to make provision for the future. The reckless and spendthrift promises of the Democratic platform could be carried out only by means of a program of Federal spending so tremendous as to require either an enormous increase in taxation or a policy of deficit spending leading to uncontrolled inflation.

Few are so gullible as to believe that the new administration would dare to implement these promises by means of increased taxation. The tax burden our Nation bears is already so heavy as to verge on the intolerable. Any substantial increase would of necessity be borne by all of our people, not merely the few with the larger incomes. No surer prescription for the political defeat of any administration can be imagined, and so we may rest assured that such an increase in taxation will not be attempted.

But to the irresponsible spenders the siren song of further Government borrowing is irresistible. Unbalanced budgets, growth of the national debt, increase in the interest the Government must pay on that debt, are as inevitable as the sequence of night and day. Inflation will run rampant, the purchasing power of the American dollar will melt away like snowdrifts in the spring sun, and our hard-working and thrifty people will watch in stupefied dismay as the value of their savings, their insurance, their pension funds diminish each day, ultimately perhaps to vanish entirely.

The presidential election of November 8, 1960, clearly indicates that a majority of the voters rejected the rash and reckless proposals of the Democratic platform. The Republican Party, therefore, despite its minority status in the Congress, pledges itself to resist with all its strength, and through every appropriate legislative procedure, any proposal which would lead to inflation and its inevitable consequence of diminishing the value of the savings, the insurance, and the pension funds of the American people. We further pledge ourselves to combat any attempt to add to the already unbearable burden of taxation which rests on our citizens unless it can clearly be shown that such new taxes are essential to the national

[1] Statement of the Catholic Bishops, op. cit.

security and that a heavy preponderance of our citizens recognize such necessity and willingly accept the additional burden.

A striking illustration of how "The Forgotten American" feels on the subject of inflation and its disastrous consequences for him is the voting pattern in certain areas of Florida where large numbers of elderly, retired persons have taken up permanent residence.

The Republicans carried the State of Florida, but the contrast in voting between east and west coast areas of the State is startling. Thus, on the east coast, the city of Miami and the Miami Beach area were carried by Kennedy. The east coast is predominantly both the playground and the retirement area for the well-to-do and the rich. Such localities as Miami, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Boca Raton, Delray, Daytona Beach, Ormond Beach, and St. Augustine have become synonyms for wealth. Few whose sole source of income is a social security, civil service, railroad retirement, or small private pension could afford to live in those areas.

On the other hand, the Florida west (or gulf) coast, in many of its towns and cities has a tremendous concentration of retirees who fall into those categories. Gulf coast towns like St. Petersburg, Bradenton, and Clearwater; counties like Pinellas, Sarasota, and Manatee, have enormous populations of elderly retired folk living on small fixed incomes or savings. Nevertheless, these areas were carried by NIXON, they reelected their Republican Congressman, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, and what is most significant, they swept into local office practically all of the Republican candidates. Thus, Republicans won 20 of 21 races, running rampant in Pinellas County which includes St. Petersburg and Clearwater; won 21 of 22 contested races in Sarasota County, and took 10 of the 11 contested local races in Manatee County, the seat of Bradenton. What is more, a majority of the voters over 50 years of age, voted Republican in the last election.

These overwhelming Republican victories among elderly retired voters living on small incomes, demonstrates the complete failure of the spendthrift Democratic platform to attract these voters. This is especially significant because that platform held out the very bait which the Democrats so strongly believed would appeal to elderly voters—medical care for the aged. The bait was totally ineffective. To the contrary, the only reasonable inference that can be drawn from the tremendous Republican triumphs in these Florida west coast areas is that the elderly voters were scared to death of what the Democratic platform would do to the value of their small pensions, incomes, and savings, and against that fear, the promise of medical care for the aged carried not the slightest weight.

The Democrats will probably argue that most of the voters from that area are Republicans who migrated to Florida from Northern and Western States and merely continued old voting habits. Even if this were true, it doesn't minimize the significance of their refusing to fall for the promised Democratic handout. But this argument is entirely without merit. For it is equally true that Florida east coast retirees are also migrants from the North and West, and politically, they behaved quite differently. No, the important distinction between the two groups is their economic status—the well-to-do retirees of the east coast as contrasted with the most modest and even poor retirees living in the gulf towns.

II. LABOR

(a) Labor unions enjoy many special privileges and immunities under Federal law. By far the most important of these is the exclusive right to represent all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining, even if the union has been selected as bargaining agent by only a narrow majority, which in many circumstances under our existing law, in fact constitutes only a minority. Under the law, those employees who do not wish to join, as well as those whom the union for whatever reason excludes from membership, can neither bargain for themselves nor select any person or agency other than the union so designated to bargain for them. They are, in reality, the involuntary principals of agents imposed upon them by law. In granting unions this right, the Government, in effect, has bestowed upon them the power of government itself. Although this provision of law has a certain usefulness in the area of collective bargaining, it results in the most serious injustice to those employees who wish to join the union but are excluded by the union itself. They have no voice in helping to determine the union's bargaining demands and policies, are not permitted to do their own bargaining, and they are compelled to accept and work under the terms and conditions of the agreements between the union and the employer, even if they find such terms and conditions highly unsatisfactory.

Moreover, in certain industries there is a widespread practice whereby employers recruit their labor force through the local unions in the particular area. This is particularly true in those industries where the most highly skilled, and consequently the most highly paid employees are needed to perform the work. It is precisely in these industries where union membership exclusionary policies are most widely and persistently applied. As a result, untold numbers of completely qualified workers, who for one reason or another are denied admission to union membership, are excluded not only from many jobs, but particularly from the most highly paid jobs as well.

The Republican Party, therefore, strongly denounces these exclusionary policies and advocates measures to end them. It firmly believes that no union should enjoy the unique and precious privilege of exclusive representation in collective bargaining if it arbitrarily excludes from membership those qualified workers who wish to join the union.

(b) A fundamental right: The right of an American citizen to express his political preferences, and to give his support to the candidates and party of his choice is the fundamental political right on which our democratic society is based. Any interference with this right must be viewed with the greatest alarm. One of the most vicious forms of such interference is to exert economic coercion on a citizen in order to compel his support for a particular political party, candidate or program by threatening him with the loss of his livelihood if he withholds such support.

Thus, to take a hypothetical example, if an employer compelled his employees to contribute to a particular candidate or party as a condition of holding his job, the American public would be shocked beyond measure. An outraged public opinion would quickly compel such an employer to desist from this exercise in political blackmail. Fortunately, instances of this type are so rare, as for all practical purposes, to be nonexistent.

Yet, there is one important and substantial area of American life in which precisely this form of political blackmail is well-nigh universal. Today, the vast majority of labor unions operate under collective bargaining agreements which require employees to join the union and pay periodic dues and initiation fees as a condition of holding their jobs. Regardless of what use the money an employee must pay to the union is put, no matter how objectionable he finds such use to be, if he refuses for that reason to pay his dues, the union can, and usually does, force the employer to fire him under the union-shop contract.

Every union today is using substantial portions of the funds collected from membership dues and initiation fees in behalf of specific candidates, parties, and political programs. The overwhelming majority of these unions have compulsory union-membership contracts. Many employees who favor rival candidates, parties, and platforms, are nevertheless compelled, to contribute their money to support candidates, parties, and political programs they bitterly oppose or lose their jobs. This widespread practice constitutes the most nakedly brazen form of political coercion which exists in our society, and around which the "liberal-labor" elements have succeeded in erecting an "iron curtain" of public misinformation and consequent apathy. As a result of this conspiracy of silence and of the sentimental belief that a union is always the underdog in its dealings with an employer, a belief assiduously cultivated by union leaders and their "liberal" allies, unions have been able to destroy the fundamental civil rights of an untold number of their members, who are truly the underdogs in their relations with their union leaders.

The Republican Party, therefore, pledges itself to make the strongest effort to correct this intolerable injustice by proposing and supporting measures which will restore to all of our citizens their basic human and constitutional rights to express and support their political preferences completely free from any form of restraint, interference, or coercion.

(c) Law and order: One of the firmest pillars upon which American society rests is the proposition that law and order are an absolute essential for the preservation and improvement of our democratic way of life. A profound respect for the law and an abhorrence of disorder and anarchy are deeply ingrained in the American character.

There is one significant area where the disobedience to law and the resort to serious violence and physical coercion in complete disregard of fundamental rights is so widespread, so persistent, and so ignored that it constitutes a genuinely serious menace to the preservation of our free institutions. This situation shockingly illuminates the inconsistency, yes, the hypocrisy of many, particularly within the Democratic Party and its "liberal allies," who are so vehement in demanding obedience to the laws which they approve.

Labor disputes, increasingly, are erupting into violence. More and more, strikers and picket lines use force and intimidation to prevent employees who so desire from working and other individuals from entering upon their own property and operating their own establishments. In certain sections of the country where much of this type of unlawful violence occurs the police and the public authorities make little or no attempt to enforce the law by preventing the violence or by protecting those who wish to exercise their legal and constitutional rights. Again the sentimental myth of the union as underdog has been so arduously propagated by those who are most vociferous in demanding obedience to the law in other areas that the public has been completely misled and brainwashed into dangerous apathy.

We propose to do all we can to arouse the public to demand the elimination of this dangerous threat to our liberties and to the democratic structure of our society. We would prefer to leave this problem to solution on the State and local level where traditionally it belongs. But there are two factors which make this impracticable and thus require Federal law and the exercise of Federal power in order to attain an effective cure for this malignant social evil.

First, labor unions have attained their present size and strength, and hence their

ability to defy the law, as a result of a series of special benefits, rights, privileges, and immunities bestowed upon them by Federal statutes, and enjoyed by no other type of private organization or institution in our society. We enumerate a few of these:

1. Unions are immune from taxation.

2. Unions are practically immune under the antitrust laws.

3. Unions are immune, in many situations, against the issuance of injunctions by Federal courts.

4. Unions can compel employees to join unions in order to hold their jobs.

5. Unions can use funds, which their members have been compelled to contribute in order to hold their jobs, to finance political programs and candidates which some of these members strongly oppose.

6. Unions have been given the absolute right to deny workers admission to union membership, and, in practical effect, are able to deny many workers access to jobs in general and to the higher-paying jobs in particular.

7. Unions have the exclusive right to act as collective bargaining agents even for those workers who either do not wish to join the union or who are excluded from membership in it, even arbitrarily.

8. Unions have the right, in some situations, to invade the privacy of workers, even against their will, thus depriving them of a legal right enjoyed by all other individuals in our society.

9. And finally, and of the greatest significance, the granting of these rights by Federal law has resulted in the exclusion of the States from many of the areas covered by these Federal laws, and the States may not lawfully act in these areas. This is known as the doctrine of Federal preemption.

Second, labor disputes involving unlawful picket-line violence, as well as sabotage, threats, assaults on workers both at their homes and at their places of work, vandalism, destruction of property, even bombings, have occurred in many parts of the country. But law enforcement against these illegal activities has been most lax in the industrial North, particularly in the giant urban centers in some of the States in that section of the country.

A shocking example of such lawlessness, and of the lawlessness of the Democratic municipal administration in refusing to enforce the law, occurred recently in Philadelphia. General Electric's plants in Philadelphia were about to be struck by Jim Carey's IUE (International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO). General Electric notified the city authorities it intended to try to maintain operations and asked police protection for employees who might prefer to work and who would have to cross picket lines to do so.

Democratic Mayor (and ADA big wheel) Richardson Dilworth, 2 days after the 3-week strike ended, publicly denounced General Electric and declared that the company had sought to "blackmail" the city into using its police to get nonstrikers through the picket lines. He charged that General Electric had threatened to move its plants out of Philadelphia unless the city cooperated.

Dilworth said the union agreed not to resort to mass picketing if General Electric would agree not to try to keep its Philadelphia switch-gear plant working; he said that the company refused "that compromise." He also said that first attempts to get nonstrikers through the picket lines showed that it couldn't be done without a risk of trouble—as public safety was involved in an area with schools nearby.

Mayor Dilworth's statements, and his position, are a complete demonstration not only of his lawless refusal to perform his public duties and his fundamental contempt for law and order, but of the unbelievable hypocrisy which characterizes many so-called liberals when they profess their deep concern for civil rights in other parts of the country, particularly with respect to racial problems in the South.

First of all, it must be clearly understood that when a strike occurs which is not caused by any unlawful act of the employer, but is merely a result of his refusal to grant the union's demands (as was the situation in Philadelphia), the struck employer has not only a legal, but a constitutional right to continue to operate his plant and to have free access to his property; and any of his workers whom he invites to do so, have both a legal and constitutional right to refuse to join the strike and to enter his property, and continue working. This fundamental right which has existed from the beginning of our Republic was completely affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case arising more than 20 years ago under the Wagner Act, organized labor's favorite piece of legislation. Not one jot or tittle of this legal doctrine and the basic right which it protects has ever been whittled away by any subsequent judicial decision. It is the law of the land today and every public official in the United States has both a legal and moral duty to honor it, and where the nature of his office so requires, to enforce it. Where this right is violated through threats, intimidation, coercion, or violence, it is the constitutional obligation of State and local officials to prevent such violence, protect the victims of it, and punish the perpetrators, because such misconduct constitutes not only a breach of State or local law, but because all law enforcement officials in the United States, on every level of government, are sworn to obey and enforce the Federal Constitution.

Another point to be remembered is that there is almost universal agreement that a mass picket line constitutes intimidation per se and inevitably leads to violence by pickets when nonstrikers, exercising their constitutional rights, seek to cross the picket line. As a matter of fact, mass picketing, as such, is specifically outlawed in a number of States.

Thus when Mayor Dilworth plainly implies that the readiness of Carey's union to call off its mass picket line if the company agreed not to operate its plant, constitutes a just and reasonable compromise, he is actually saying that there is nothing wrong, either legally or ethically, with one party offering to cease its illegal or immoral conduct against the other party, only if the latter agrees not to exercise its legal and constitutional rights. This may be a compromise according to Dilworth, but the overwhelming majority of Americans will recognize it for what it is—unadulterated "blackmail" of which "The Forgotten American is also a victim.

It should also be added that Dilworth and those who share his views justify their breach of trust in refusing to enforce the law by pointing to the risk of trouble involved—in the Philadelphia case because public safety would be endangered because of the proximity of schools in the area of the strike.

As a general proposition, of course, this is never an excuse for permitting law and order to break down, for permitting deliberate flouting of the law with complete immunity for the culprits, and for giving free reign to disorder, anarchy and chaos. But the Dilworths profess great horror when they believe that laws of which they approve are being defied, and demand total enforcement to the full extent of State, local, and Federal governmental power. One need only recall their reactions to and conduct in connection with such events as the Little Rock, Ark., school episode, the Autherine Lucy episode at the University of Alabama, and the current school difficulties in New Orleans.

A final appropriate commentary on Dilworth's conduct is the following statement which appeared in the story concerning the Philadelphia strike in the November 5, 1960, issue of the magazine Business Week:

"Generally, in Philadelphia, the Dilworth attack on GE (General Electric) was considered an ill-advised adventure, but not too surprising considering the mayor's prolabor orientation."

And it might be added that this orientation is not a matter of surprise either. Mayor Dilworth's election to office and his political survival depend on his support by the labor union leaders, and he, as well as they, know it.

The reason for such lawless refusal to enforce the law is not far to seek. The governments of these cities and of most of the States in which they are located are in the hands of Democratic administrations which depend for their political survival on appeasing, even kowtowing to the labor union elements who are responsible for such lawlessness. That these elements and their sympathizers are not ungrateful is quite apparent in the results of the 1960 presidential election. The resources, time, energy, money, and efforts of the labor union leaders and their supporters and subordinates, were indispensable to the election of Senator Kennedy. These union activities contributed substantially to securing the overwhelming Democratic margins in New York City, Buffalo, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Newark, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Detroit, which made possible the winning of the huge electoral total in the States in which these cities are located. To expect the governments of these cities and their States to cure this intolerable and anti-American malady is to believe in miracles. Thus, we are reluctantly forced to conclude that only the Federal Government can take effective action to remedy a condition which spreads like a malignant cancer through the American body politic. The Republican Party, therefore, pledges itself to propose and support legislative measures to eliminate violence in labor disputes and thus to restore order and a respect for law in that most important area of our national life, and, in so doing, regain for "The Forgotten American" some of the fundamental rights which have been stolen from him.

(d) Landrum-Griffin Act: in 1959 Congress adopted the Landrum-Griffin Act by overwhelming margins and it was signed into law by President Eisenhower. In so doing, our Government for the first time recognized the need for Federal regulation of labor unions in order to eliminate corruption and crime, and to protect rank-and-file union members against the tyranny, possible and sometimes actual, of their own labor leaders. We strongly supported the enactment of this law and will as strongly resist any effort to weaken the safeguards for the American worker which it provides. In fact, we are of the opinion that the Bill of Rights provisions in the Landrum-Griffin Act which protect rank-and-file members in the exercise of their rights as union members need strengthening. And they need it precisely in that area where a huge majority of the Democratic Party in the Senate succeeded in seriously weakening these safeguards by compelling the union member to bring a private suit to enforce his rights instead of requiring an appropriate Federal official or agency to bring such suit in his behalf, as was originally provided by the proposal offered by Senator MCCLELLAN, the chairman of the Senate's Labor Racketeering Committee.

The Republican Party, therefore, will propose amendments to the Landrum-Griffin Act to remedy this serious defect by giving the rank-and-file union member the aid and support of the Federal Government in seeking to vindicate his legal rights which have been violated by his union or its leaders.

(e) The right to strike: Free and voluntary collective bargaining is the surest guarantee of the preservation of a genuinely democratic society based primarily on an economic system of free enterprise. An indispensable element of free collective bargaining is the right of employees, acting in concert, to withhold their labor in their effort to induce employers to grant them favorable terms and conditions of employment. This right to strike, subject to certain necessary limitations in the public interest, also constitutes a basic civil liberty. And even though strikes sometimes inflict some economic hardship on the public, a democratic society must be willing to pay that price and insist upon the preservation of the right.

There is, however, another aspect of the right to strike which our public officials, and the public itself, have hitherto largely ignored. Although strikes may sometimes inconvenience the public, they always impose hardship on the strikers and their families. The loss of wages resulting from even a short-lived strike can mean economic disaster for the striking employee and his dependents. Thus, no strike should be embarked on unless the decision to do so unquestionably reflects the will of the employees themselves, the very people who are sure to suffer hardship because of the strike.

It is true that many union constitutions require a favorable strike vote by a majority of the union members actually voting before the union officers are authorized to call a strike. However, there is no law requiring that such a vote be taken. As a result, many strikes are called by union leaders without adequate consultation with their membership; others are begun on the basis of votes taken by a show of hands in an open union meeting where those who do not favor a strike fear to indicate their opposition. In these situations, as usual, "The Forgotten American" is ignored, and no effort made to determine his wishes.

We Republicans believe that, in reaching a decision of such momentous import to all the wage earners in the struck establishment, certain minimum safeguards should be established by law to guarantee that the decision truly reflects the real wishes of an actual majority of the employees in such establishment. Only by such legislation can the American people be certain that the principles of personal responsibility and individual obligation, which, as we have pointed out, are essential to the preservation of a free, democratic, and moral society, are being effectively preserved.

The Republican Party therefore supports legislation on the subject of strike votes based on the following simple requirements:

1. A strike shall be unlawful unless notice of intention to strike is given to all those concerned at least 30 days prior to the actual commencement of the strike.

2. At any time after such notice has been given, and prior to the termination of the strike, a petition may be filed by an employee with the National Labor Relations Board, asking the Board to conduct an election by secret ballot among the employees in the establishment to be struck, on the question of whether they favor a strike or its continuation. If such a petition is supported by 30 percent of said employees, the Board shall conduct such an election and the strike or its continuation shall be lawful only if a majority, so voting, cast their ballots in favor thereof.

This procedure has ample precedent in the existing law governing representation, decertification, and deauthorization elections presently conducted by the Board, and the Board's own administrative requirements and procedures in connection with such elections. These are all based on the principle that such elections will be held upon a showing that a substantial minority of the employees involved (never in any case more than 30 percent) want such election to be held. The principle is eminently sound and we strongly advocate its extension to the important matter of the strike vote.

(f) Government employees: There are over 2 million Federal Government civilian employees whose jobs and the terms and conditions of whose employment are established and defined by Federal law. Many of these employees belong to bona fide and legitimate labor unions. From time to time these unions have asked Congress to authorize them to engage in collective bargaining with their Government agency employers.

In Federal Government employment there is only one employer—the people of the United States expressing their will through Congress and acting through the supervisory personnel in the various executive departments and agencies. All those who are on the payroll from the head of the agency down to the worker in the lowest classification are equally employees of the people of the United States.

Therefore, it is our opinion that wages, hours, fringe benefits, vacations, holidays, sick leave, etc., are properly matters to be determined by Congress through legislation and are not a proper subject of collective bargaining. The appropriate way to deal with the people of the United States in their capacity as Government employer is to petition Congress to make the requested changes in the law. This is the proper relationship between the people in their private capacity and the people in their capacity as Government employer. It is the procedure which all other segments of our population must follow in their dealings with the Federal Government—Federal employees should not be an exception.

However, we realize that in the enormously expanded Federal bureaucracy, supervisory personnel often exercise their authority in an arbitrary, inequitable, and sometimes tyrannical fashion. Favoritism, discrimination, persecution against subordinate employees often exists and is always possible. Congress has done little by way of legislation to deal with these problems, and in the nature of things legislation is scarcely the way to handle them justly and effectively. It is here that a proper area exists for genuine collective bargaining.

The Republican Party, therefore, recognizing that Federal employee unions are purely voluntary associations which do not have the right to strike, favors the enactment of legislation compelling responsible Government officials to bargain with unions of the employees in their agencies concerning grievances, disputes, alleged inequities, etc., as long as these do not invade the area of wages, working conditions, benefits, etc., reserved for the Congress. This is the democratic way for dealing with individual inequities, injustices, persecutions, favoritism, discrimination, and arbitrary exercise of power by supervisory Government officials generally.

III. SOCIAL WELFARE

"Although personal responsibility and initiative have been our national characteristics, explaining in large measure our country's progress in human welfare, yet pressures are growing for a constantly greater reliance on the collectivity rather than on the individual. An inordinate demand for benefits, most easily secured by the pressures of organization, has led an ever-growing number of our people to relinquish their rights and to abdicate their responsibilities. This concession creates a widening spiral of increasing demands and pressures with a further infringement on personal freedom and responsibility. * * * Intensive socialization can achieve mass benefits, but man and morality can be seriously hurt in the process." [2]

[2] Statement by the Catholic Bishops, op. cit.

For the past 8 years, under a Republican administration, the American people as a whole have enjoyed unparalleled prosperity. Never in all history have the people of any nation had more jobs and received higher wages. As a result, private savings, insurance, and pension rights and benefits are at an all-time high. Rare is the worker or family which doesn't have some savings or insurance and the number coming under private pension plans has increased tremendously.

It is therefore quite natural that our people should be deeply concerned about any political program, which by causing inflation, will destroy the value of their savings, their insurance, and their future as well as present pension benefits. Therefore, in order to guard against any such possibility the Republican Party adopts the following policy:

We will oppose the initiation or expansion of any Federal welfare program requiring the expenditure of Federal funds unless such program meets the following conditions:

1. Taxes will not be increased.

2. Deficit spending which necessarily results in the creation of new money, unbalancing of the budget, growth in the size of the national debt, and increase in the interest obligations of the Federal Government, all of which inevitably lead to inflation and a decline in the value of our money, must not be resorted to. Private savings, insurance and pension funds cannot otherwise be protected.

3. Benefits under these programs shall be limited only to those States and localities which clearly demonstrate a need for such aid, and affirmatively demonstrate their inability to meet these needs entirely out of their own resources.

4. States receiving such aid shall match Federal contributions on a scale not less than the highest annual sums previously allotted by the State to comparable programs.

5. Wherever a program is absolutely essential and universally demanded, and it appears that it cannot be financed on the Federal level without resort to additional taxation or deficit spending, the entire Federal budget should be scrutinized with the most meticulous care. Every existing spending program should be examined with an eye to determining whether it can be cut down or even entirely eliminated. There is no doubt that there are many items in the Federal budget which are relatively so unimportant or so unnecessary that they can be reduced or discarded without any harm to the public welfare. There is no reason why such a process of Government cost cutting and reduction cannot in most cases, provide the necessary Federal funds for other more important and essential programs which would otherwise require resort to heaping new tax burdens on the already overloaded taxpayer, or to inflationary deficit spending.

The Republican Party believes that the tremendous growth in recent years of private savings, insurance and pension funds is a clear indication that our people believe in the traditional American principle that the primary responsibility for their financial security rests with the people and not with the Government. We therefore strongly favor the extension and expansion of these private accumulations and plans and will encourage all private associations, organizations, and institutions in our Nation to participate in extending them by a program of new and increased tax deductions under the Federal income tax. We urge employers to move forward rapidly in setting up transferable insurance and pension programs for their employees. We strongly support the efforts of labor unions, through the collective bargaining process, to help in securing such transferable programs for the employees they represent.

As an example of how these private plans are increasing, the IAM (International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO), reports that the collective bargaining contracts of that union in 1960 include provisions for group retirement or pension plans in 40 percent of the contracts as compared with 4 percent in 1950, and group hospitalization and medical service in 86 percent of the contracts as compared with 17 percent in 1950.

If such a development continues, we can look forward to the day when the mandatory tax-financed governmental programs of social security will decline in importance as a source of financial security for our people; and that instead of being the main financial support of an increasing number of our retirees, social security will become only a minor and supplemental source of such support, the bulk of which will come from private plans established through private initiative and voluntary participation.

IV. EDUCATION

Most American colleges and universities are being forced to raise their tuition fees to cover even a part of their costs. As a result, many families find that financing the higher education of their children is extremely difficult. We believe that higher education for American youth is not only desirable but increasingly essential both in the national interest and for the sake of these young people themselves. We therefore believe that the Federal Government, which absorbs so much of the income of the American people in the form of taxes, should provide some relief in order to encourage and make possible a college education for those who have the ability to perform academic work on the college level.

Providing an education for their children is traditionally the responsibility of the American family and not of the Government. Hence, a Federal program to aid our young people to secure a college education should, wherever possible, avoid the form of Federal grants with their accompanying proliferation of Federal bureaucracy and Federal supervision, which not only wastes funds through unproductive administrative costs but creates a risk of undesirable Federal intervention in the educational process.

The Republican Party therefore strongly advocates a program of tax relief for families with children attending college. We will propose and support measures to give every family a substantial additional deduction for each child attending college. Such deductions will be limited to families in which the net taxable income does not exceed $20,000 after all exemptions and deductions have been taken, including the proposed deduction for children attending college.

To compensate for any loss of revenue resulting from such measures, other Federal programs of direct aid to college students should gradually be reduced, accompanied by the reduction or elimination of other less important Federal spending programs.

V. REVISION OF SENATE RULE XXII

The Republican Party opposes any relaxation of rule XXII which would have the effect of limiting the right of extended debate in the Senate.

The Senate has always prided itself on its justified reputation as the most deliberative legislative body in the world. The power of a minority to prevent the majority from engaging in hasty and ill-considered legislative action is consistent with the scheme of checks and balances and separation of powers written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers which were designed to provide the same protection.

Nevertheless, the Republican Members of the Senate have rarely resorted to extended debate during the past decade. Actually, it has been the Democratic Members of the Senate, including some who are most vociferous in wishing to erase rule XXII, and to limit debate, who have engaged in the "filibuster" not only most frequently but on almost every occasion when it has been used in recent years. We do not mention this in condemnation of those who have resorted to this procedure. To the contrary, it is our intention to do all we can to preserve the right to utilize it as an essential safeguard against hasty and ill-considered legislative action.

The election on November 8 of this year clearly indicates that more than half of the voters rejected the extremely radical and spendthrift platform of the Democratic Party. Therefore, we feel that we have a moral obligation to resist the imposition of that platform on an unwilling public. Because of our minority positions in the Senate, we Republicans do not have nearly enough votes either to halt this reckless Democratic program or to compel its modification along saner and less extravagant lines. The volume of new Federal spending which the implementation of the Democratic platform would require must result either in an intolerable increase in the already unbearable burden of Federal taxation or in deficit financing on a scale which would make galloping inflation inevitable. We are certain that political considerations will make this latter course the one most likely to be adopted by the new Democratic administration. The history of the 20 years preceding 1953 bears witness to the cogency of our belief.

We do not intend to sit idly by while the wages, the savings, the insurance, the pension funds, and the social security benefits of our people are reduced to a mere fraction of their present value.

It is our purpose therefore to bring home to the American public the full import and catastrophic impact of the Democratic legislative proposals which will be introduced to implement their platform. This can be done most effectively by subjecting each of these measures to the most exacting scrutiny and the most extensive and informed debate on the Senate floor. No aspect of these proposals should remain undiscussed. The American people have a right to know what they signify down to the last detail. To achieve this goal of public education on these vital issues, extended debate in the Senate is absolutely essential. We shall therefore resist with all our strength any attempt to curtail such debate.

VI. ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

The purposes for which the electoral college was established by the Founding Fathers under the Constitution have long been abandoned. Consequently the distribution of electoral votes as a result of the winner-take-all procedure which now prevails bears little relationship to the popular vote received by the candidates in each State. The likelihood that a candidate who receives most of the popular votes will nonetheless lose to a rival who gets only a minority of the ballots, becomes more pronounced as presidential elections tend to become closer.

The Republican Party therefore supports those measures designed to modify the electoral college procedure to make it more reflective of the will of the electorate while retaining as many as possible of those desirable features which the Founding Fathers incorporated in the procedure.

One desirable incidental effect of such reform will be to put less of a premium on irregularity, fraud, and corruption in the conduct of our presidential elections. The Democratic Party maintains political machines led by political bosses in the large industrial cities of the North. These bosses and their machines seem to be able to deliver a Democratic margin of victory of whatever size is required to carry the entire State. The recent election has demonstrated that this ability is to a substantial degree based upon resort to irregularities and suspicious practices in the way the election process from initial registration to final counting is conducted. If the State's electoral vote does not go to the winner of the State in toto there will be less temptation to engage in these unwholesome practices. Another highly salutary effect of proper electoral-college reform will be the transformation in the platforms of both major political parties. These platforms will cease to be heavily in favor of specific geographical areas, particularly the giant urban centers, and will tend increasingly to take a national rather than a localized point of view. "The Forgotten American" will thus be aided in regaining his appropriate place in the deliberations of both parties.

VII. FOREIGN POLICY

We believe that stimulating the national pride is even more important than increasing our national prestige. For too long have we permitted the tail to wag the dog—deferred to the ineffectual, even harmful policies of other nations, often in a fashion detrimental to our own national interests, yes, even to our national security.

It is high time that we ceased fearing to give offense to so-called neutralists, unpredictable friends, unreliable allies, and even to the enemies who are resolved upon our destruction. In doing so, we have usually earned, not their respect, but their contempt, and have convinced them that they can push what they mistakenly regard as their own national interests at the expense of ours, at the expense of the security of the free world itself.

We think it is high time that we made clear to the rest of the free world that we are at least as necessary to their survival as they are to ours, and if we are not afraid to speak the truth, even more so.

The fact is plain but we either fear or are ashamed to acknowledge it—if we go down, the whole free world goes down; if we survive, all other nations have a realistic basis for hope of their own survival. Actually, if they genuinely desire freedom and independence, the United States alone is their only hope. Starting from this fundamental premise, a policy which reflects such an attitude will inspire the very respect that we have been trying to buy, and dispel the contempt which we have actually bought instead.

The free world is living under a stifling pall of fear—fear of the Soviet Union. Neutralism, coexistence, appeasement, pacifism, unilateral disarmament and suspension of nuclear testing are all products of this enervating fog of fear that smothers the free world and paralyzes its will to engage in strong and decisive action.

We Republicans therefore insist that an effective foreign policy should adhere to and develop from the following fundamental policy positions:

1. A hard anti-Communist line both in foreign affairs and with respect to internal subversion, despite attempts by some of our fearful allies to soften our position.

2. The protection of American interests and freedom should always be the primary objects of our policy regardless of foreign pressure to the contrary.

3. A complete distrust of the Soviet Union based on the knowledge that the Soviet Union will never honor an agreement which imposes disadvantages upon it. Direct proof of Soviet bad faith is not obtainable because of the Iron Curtain. But no such proof is necessary. The Soviet record speaks for itself, and the burden is on it to prove, by concrete evidence, that it is acting in good faith.

4. Immediate resumption of nuclear testing.

5. Absolute opposition to admission of Red China into the United Nations and a publicized readiness to withdraw from the

U.N. if such admission is granted. We should take a leaf from the book of little Belgium which has threatened to withdraw unless certain U.N. activities in connection with the Congo are halted.

6. Reliance on ourselves in the development of our foreign policy. The tendency "to delegate excessive responsibility to an organization is discernible also in the realm of international affairs. Some manifest no sense of personal responsibility in the affairs of the international community. On the other hand, many citizens seem to feel that our mere adherence to the United Nations absolves us from further responsibility in the international order and that decisions made by the United Nations, regardless of their objective value, are always to be regarded as morally right.

"Admitting the undoubted value of a policy of supporting the United Nations and recognizing the genuine contribution it has made in many areas, we must understand clearly that the citizens of this country, and of all countries, have a responsibility to judge and to evaluate the United Nations' deliberations and decisions according to objective norms of morality universally binding. This involves also the duty of citizens to make proper representation of such judgment to their respective governments."[2]

7. More insistence that our major allies assume some of the burdens, particularly in the field of foreign economic aid, that we have shouldered practically alone for all these years.

8. Refusal to permit the surrender of a single inch of free territory anywhere in the world to the Communist powers, where the retention of such territory represents a military advantage to ourselves or our allies, or where such surrender would have the psychological effect of impairing the morale of our allies, strengthening that of our Communist enemies, or indicating weakness to the rest of the world. Such surrender can only thicken the pall of fear which weighs so heavily throughout the free nations, and in resisting the efforts of some of them to get us to make such surrender, to remember that their efforts are primarily inspired by this fear.

9. In giving aid, military and economic, the most generous allocations should go to those of our friends and allies who have demonstrated a longtime reliability and a continued willingness to resist the enemy. Others should receive such aid only if it is clearly demonstrated that granting it, in actuality, strengthens American security.

10. Our attitude to nations in the non-Communist world should be determined on the basis of a greater emphasis on their friendship for the United States and their willingness to resist communism than on the ideological character of their governments and the nature of their domestic policies.

11. Where opposition movements to Communist regimes exist, whether inside or outside the Soviet and Soviet satellite nations, encouragement and concrete aid should be given to those movements publicly and proudly.

12. The United States must remain fully and effectively armed.

In adopting these positions, we repudiate the policies of the Democratic administrations which led to the conquest of China by the Communists, the Soviet enslavement of eastern and central Europe, and our involvement in the Korean war which that same policy, having gotten us into the war, prevented us from winning.

We are certain that these positions reflect the basic and often inarticulate attitudes of the overwhelming majority of all Americans, "The Forgotten American," and their pride in and love for their country. Resting on this certainty, we profoundly proclaim this Republican program to the people of the United States.

[2] Statement of the Catholic Bishops, op. cit.

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a lecture I delivered to the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala., on November 14, 1960.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LECTURE DELIVERED BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE THE AIR WAR COLLEGE, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Gentlemen, I begin by making some assumptions with regard to our national objectives. I do not mean to suggest that these assumptions are self-evident, in the sense that everyone agrees with them. If they were, Walter Lippmann would be writing the same columns as George Sokolsky, and Herblock would have nothing to draw cartoons about. I do mean, however, that I take them for granted, and that everything I shall be saying this morning would appear quite idiotic against any contrary assumptions. Moreover, I suspect they are shared by most of this audience: I count on finding here a greater urbanity toward world affairs than one would encounter at a meeting, say, of the committee for achieving world peace by making democracy work in the Congo.

Assumption 1: The ultimate objective of American policy is to help establish a world in which there is the largest possible measure of freedom and justice and peace and material prosperity; and in particular—since this is our special responsibility—that these conditions be enjoyed by the people of the United States. I speak of the largest possible measure because any person who supposes that these conditions can be universally and perfectly achieved—ever—reckons without the inherent imperfectability of himself and his fellow human beings, and is therefore a dangerous man to have around.

Assumption 2: These conditions are unobtainable—are not even approachable in the qualified sense I have indicated—without the prior defeat of world communism. This is true for two reasons: because communism is both doctrinally, and in practice, antithetical to these conditions; and because Communists have the will and, as long as Soviet power remains intact, the capacity to prevent their realization. Moreover, as Communist power increases, the enjoyment of these conditions throughout the world diminishes pro rata, and the possibility of their restoration becomes increasingly remote—becomes, at the end of the road, a cause that is absolutely and irretrievably lost for as long as we can see into the future.

Assumption 3: It follows that victory over communism is the dominant, proximate goal of American policy. Proximate in the sense that there are more distant, more positive ends we seek, to which victory over communism is but a means. But dominant in the sense that every other objective, no matter how worthy intrinsically, must defer to it. Peace is a worthy objective; but if we must choose between peace and keeping the Communists out of Berlin, then we must fight. Freedom, in the sense of self-determination, is a worthy objective; but if granting self-determination to the Algerian rebels entails sweeping that area into the Sino-Soviet orbit, then Algerian freedom must be postponed. Justice is a worthy objective; but if justice for Bantus entails driving the Government of the Union of South Africa away from the West, then the Bantus must be prepared to carry their identification cards yet a while longer. Prosperity is a worthy objective; but if providing higher standards of living gets in the way of producing sufficient guns to resist Communist aggression, then material sacrifices and denials will have to be made. It may be, of course, that such objectives can be pursued consistently with a policy designed to overthrow communism; my point is that where conflicts arise they must always be resolved in favor of achieving the indispensable condition for a tolerable world—the absence of Soviet-Communist power.

This much having been said, and I would hope agreed to, the question remains whether we have the resources for the job we have to do—defeat communism—and, if so, how those resources ought to be used. This brings us squarely to the problem of power and the uses a nation makes of power. I submit that this is the key problem in international relations, that it always has been, that it always will be. And I suggest further that the main cause of the trouble we are in has been the failure of American policymakers, ever since we assumed free world leadership in 1945, to deal with this problem realistically and seriously.

In the recent political campaign two charges were leveled affecting the question of power, and I think we might begin by trying to put them into proper focus. One was demonstrably false; the other, for the most part, true.

The first was that America had become, or was in danger of becoming, a second-rate military power. I know I do not have to dwell here on the absurdity of that contention. You may have misgivings about certain aspects of our Military Establishment—I certainly do—but you know any comparison of overall American strength with overall Soviet strength finds the United States not only superior, but so superior both in present weapons and in the development of new ones that our advantage promises to be a permanent feature of United States-Soviet relations for the foreseeable future.

I have often searched for a graphic way of impressing our superiority on those Americans who have doubts and misgivings, and I think Mr. Jameson Campaigne has done it well in his new book, "American Might and Soviet Myth." Suppose, says Mr. Campaigne, that the tables were turned, and we were in the Soviet's position. "There would be more than 2,000 modern Soviet fighters, all better than ours, stationed at 250 bases in Mexico and the Caribbean. Overwhelming Russian naval power would always be within a few hundred miles of our coast. Half of the population of the United States would be needed to work on arms just to feed the people." Add this to the unrest in the countries around us where oppressed peoples would be ready to turn on us at the first opportunity. Add also a comparatively primitive industrial plant which would severely limit our capacity to keep abreast of the Soviets even in the missile field which is reputed to be our main strength.

If we look at the situation this way, we can get an idea of Khrushchev's nightmarish worries—or, at least, of the worries he might have if his enemies were disposed to exploit their advantage.

The other charge was that America's political position in the world has progressively deteriorated in recent years. The contention needs to be formulated with much greater precision than it ever was during the campaign, but once that has been done, I fail to see how any serious student of world affairs can quarrel with it.

The argument was typically advanced in terms of U.S. prestige. Prestige, however, is only a minor part of the problem; and even then, it is a concept that can be highly misleading. Prestige is a measure of how other

people think of you, well or ill. But contrary to what was implied during the campaign, prestige is surely not important for its own sake. Only the vain and incurably sentimental among us will lose sleep simply because foreign people are not as impressed by our strength as they ought to be. The thing to lose sleep over is what people, having concluded that we are weaker than we are, are likely to go off and do about it.

The evidence suggests that foreign peoples believe the United States is weaker than the Soviet Union, and is bound to fall still further behind in the years ahead. This ignorant estimate, I repeat, is not of any interest in itself; but it becomes very important if foreign peoples react the way human beings typically do—namely, by taking steps to end up on what appears to be the winning side. To the extent, then, that declining U.S. prestige means that other nations will be tempted to place their bets on an ultimate American defeat, and will thus be more vulnerable to Soviet intimidation, there is reason for concern.

Still, these guesses about the outcome of the struggle cannot be as important as the actual power relationship between the Soviet Union and ourselves. Here I do not speak of military power where our advantage is obvious and overwhelming but of political power—of influence, if you will—about which the relevant questions are: Is Soviet influence throughout the world greater or less than it was 10 years ago and is Western influence greater or less than it used to be?

In answering these questions, we need to ask not merely whether Communist troops have crossed over into territories they did not occupy before, and not merely whether disciplined agents of the Cominform are in control of governments from which they were formerly excluded; the success of communism's war against the West does not depend on such spectacular and definitive conquests. Success may mean merely the displacement of Western influence.

Communist political warfare, we must remember, is waged insidiously, and, also, in deliberate stages. Fearful of inviting a military showdown with the West which they could not win, the Communists seek to undermine Western power on the battlefields where the nuclear might of the West is irrelevant—in backwoods guerrilla skirmishes, in mob uprisings on the streets, in parliaments, in clandestine meetings of undercover conspirators, at the United Nations, on the propaganda front, at diplomatic conferences—preferably at the highest level.

The Soviets understand, moreover, that the first step in turning a country toward communism is to turn it against the West. Thus, typically, the first stage of a Communist takeover is to neutralize a country. The second stage is to retain the nominal classification of neutralist, while in fact turning the country into an active advocate and adherent of Soviet policy. And this may be as far as the process will go. The Kremlin's goal is the isolation and capture, not of Ghana, but of the United States—and this purpose may be served very well by countries that masquerade under a neutralist mask, yet in fact are dependable auxiliaries of the Soviet Foreign Office. What difference does it make whether Nkruhmah is a disciplined Communist as long as his public policies and intrigues accelerate Soviet ascendancy in Africa?

To recite the particulars of recent Soviet successes is hardly reassuring.

Six years ago French Indochina, though in trouble, was in the Western camp. Today Northern Vietnam is overly Communist; Laos is teetering between communism and pro-Communist neutralism; Cambodia is, for all practical purposes, neutralist.

Indonesia, in the early days of the Republic, leaned toward the West. Today Sukarno's government is heavily besieged by avowed Communists, and for all of its neutralist pretentions, is a firm ally of Soviet policy.

Ceylon has moved from a pro-Western orientation to a neutralism openly hostile to the West.

In the Middle East, Iraq, Syria, and Egypt were, a short while ago, in the Western camp. Today the Nasser and Kassem governments are adamantly hostile to the West, are dependent for their military power on Soviet equipment and personnel in almost every particular follow the Kremlin's foreign policy line.

A short time ago all Africa was a Western preserve. Never mind whether the Kikiyus and the Bantus and the Bakongos enjoyed Wilsonian self-determination: the point is that in the struggle for the world between communism and freedom that vast land mass was under the domination and influence of the West. Today, Africa is swerving violently away from the West and plunging, it would seem, into the Soviet orbit.

Latin America was once an area as safe for the West as Nebraska was for NIXON. Today it is up for grabs. Our Latin American country, Cuba, has become a Soviet bridgehead 90 miles off our coast—a condition which we seem powerless to affect. Castro's triumph has been a shot of adrenalin to latent anti-Americanism, and today that ugly phenomenon is shaking its fist throughout every nation of Central and South America. In some countries the trend has gone further than others: Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela are displaying open sympathy for Castroism, and there is no country—save the Dominican Republic whose funeral services we recently arranged—where Castroism and anti-Americanism does not prevent the government from unqualifiedly espousing the American cause.

Only in Europe have our lines remained firm—and there only on the surface. The strains of neutralism are running strong, notably in England, and even in Germany.

What have we to show by way of countersuccesses? We have had opportunities—clear invitations to plant our influence on the other side of the Iron Curtain. There was the Hungarian revolution which we praised and mourned, but did nothing about. There was the Polish revolution which we misunderstood and then helped guide along a course favorable to Soviet interests. There was the revolution in Tibet which we pretended did not exist. Only in one instance have we moved purposely and effectively to dislodge existing Communist power: in Guatemala. And contrary to what has been said recently, we did not wait for outside pressures and world opinion to bring down that Communist government. As everyone knows, we moved decisively to effect an anti-Communist coup d'etat, and there is no need to apologize for what we did. We served our national interests, and by so doing we saved the Guatemalan people the ultimate in human misery. If there be doubts, ask the Hungarian people. Ask the Cuban people.

Think along on Guatemala, gentlemen, for this is our single triumph. We have held the line in some places—in Lebanon, in Berlin, in the Formosa Straits—but nowhere else in the farflung battle for the world have we extended the influence of the United States and advanced the cause of freedom.

I think then we may take it that unless radical changes are made on our side, the situation will progressively worsen until the United States is at bay—isolated and besieged by an entirely hostile world. What changes? It is one thing, but it is everything: We will have to shed the attitudes and techniques of the Salvation Army, and start behaving like a great power. To gain respect, not prestige.

I do not mean to disparage the Salvation Army. I do mean, however, that the affairs of nations are not determined by good will tours, alms giving, gestures of self-denial, rehabilitation projects and discussion programs. The affairs of nations are determined—for good or for evil—by power.

The Soviet Union has not gotten where it is today, heaven knows, through the attractiveness of its doctrines and practices. It has set its sights on distinct, concrete targets—on geographical areas or power centers which it means to infiltrate and eventually conquer—and then it has turned the full weight of its national power, plus the power of the international apparatus it controls, to these particular targets. The United States has never viewed the world struggle in quite this way—as, in effect, a military campaign where one isolates his objective, marshals his forces, and takes it.

Rather, we have proceeded on the tacit assumption that virtue has its own reward, and that our only real problem is to make sure that the world perceives our virtue.

Moreover, we entered this supposed contest for world approval with a kind of guilt complex. Perhaps, as our learned commentators say, the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima had something to do with it. But I suspect the cause lies deep in America's past—in our traditional attitude toward power politics. Having been brought up on childish myths about the evil of European power politics—an attitude so neatly summed up in the Wilson slogan about being "too proud to fight"—Americans felt uneasy when the rights and duties of the greatest power on earth suddenly fell upon them at the end of the Second World War. In order to prove that we were unlike our predecessors in power—selfish, ambitious, warlike—we began to lean over backward, and to gear our policies to the opinions of others. There are notable exceptions—as when, for example, we have submitted to the imperatives of self-defense: in Greece, in Korea, in the Formosa Straits, in Berlin. But in theme and thrust and motive American foreign policy has been primarily an exercise in self-ingratiation.

I am, of course, oversimplifying the case; but not, I think, exaggerating it. Call into question any aspect of American policy, and the argument you will hear after all the others have been laid to rest is some variation of the world opinion theme. Foreign aid, deference to the United Nations, and cultural exchange program, the exchange visits of American-Soviet leaders, summit conferences, the nuclear test ban, advocacy of general disarmament, the proposal to forgo the protection of the Connally reservation, anticolonialism, the refusal to intervene in Cuba and the Congo—all of these programs and postures and attitudes have a single common denominator: an effort to please world opinion. Indeed, many of these policies are frankly acknowledged by their proponents to be contrary to the immediate interest of the United States; and yet they must be pursued, we are told, because of the overriding importance of having the world think well of us. This sluggish sentimentality, this obsession for pleasing people, has become a matter of grand strategy; has become no less than the guiding principle of American policy. It is leading us, for all of the good intentions it implies, to national and international disaster.

There are three fairly plain reasons—aside from the fact it is a substitute for a real foreign policy—why deference to world opinion is so harmful to American interests.

First, it is self-defeating in the sense that the very admiration and respect that we covet is denied to us the moment we go out and beg for it. Human beings and nations being what they are, behavior by a great power is never honored beyond the first flush of surprise that it has happened. The

would-be beneficiaries of our concessions and self-denials soon construe them as weaknesses, and want more. Does anyone seriously suppose that our generous decision to permit the Panamanian flag to fly over American territory in the Canal Zone will placate the Panamanian nationalists? The gesture is bound simply to whet the mob's appetite and transfer its sights to bigger targets.

Second—and I speak now in terms of propaganda impact—a long history of trying to prove your good faith when it had never really been open to question has the paradoxical effect of raising doubts about your good faith. It is partly a matter of protesting too much; and partly a matter, when you are up against the likes of the Soviet Union, of getting into a certain kind of contest with a skunk. When we, with our record, enter into a propaganda contest with the Kremlin, with its record—when we try to match Soviet professions of love of democracy and peace, and hatred for armaments and colonialism, we invite the world to look upon us, as it looks upon the Soviets, as propagandists with something to hide. We lose our natural advantage over the Soviets, established by our record and our deeds. By not taking the superiority of ourselves and our cause for granted, we forbid others to take it for granted, and we find ourselves forced to make a new plea before the bar of "world opinion" every time Pravda opens its mouth.

Third, in deciding to gear our policies to world opinion, we have chosen the standard that is most vulnerable to manipulation by our enemies. What is world opinion? Who participates in the poll? How do you measure it? Well, to begin with, the term is a misnomer. When we talk about world opinion, we are not talking about a consensus of 2 billion human beings, most of whose opinions we know literally nothing about; we are talking about that tiny segment of the world's population that can make itself heard. Intellectuals, journalists, the organizers of street mobs. But these real sources of world opinion are, historically, prime targets for Communist infiltration. Because of their critical importance in the kind of struggle we are now witnessing, these are precisely the areas in which Communist agitators and propagandists have been most active over the years. Thus, it is only natural that Communist influence in such areas should be far out of proportion to communism's real strength in the world. When we permit world opinion to determine our policy toward Trujillo and Syngman Rhee, we are in effect, giving our mortal enemies a voice in our own councils.

So much for the dangers of entrusting our national fate to the judgments of others—of our well intentioned refusal (I must say it again) to play the role of a great power. Let me briefly turn now to five concrete situations, and suggest in broad outline how a nation, fully cognizant of the rights and duties that befall the guardian of Western civilization, might deal with them.

CUBA

We begin by denying that the way to rid the hemisphere of Castro is to break relations with Trujillo. Pushing Trujillo around is relatively painless and provides an occasion for enthusiastic togetherness in the OAS; but Trujillo is not an enemy and a threat to the United States. Castro and his Communist patrons are, and it is to dangerous enemies that the disciplinary power of the United States is properly addressed. We should therefore make it clear in the most explicit terms that Communist governments are not tolerated in this hemisphere—and that the Castro regime, being such a government, will be eliminated.

Since it is better to act in concert with our fellow American Republics, we would try to secure their support by whatever discreet reminders are necessary of America's importance to their economic and political well-being. We would then proceed with the relevant economic embargo against Cuba, supported, if necessary, by a naval blockade. We would anticipate riots in the streets of Rio, Caracas and Mexico City, which we would ignore. And while showing our hand as little as possible, we would groom, and if necessary openly assist, a successor government which we would confidently expect to see in power in 6 months.

AFRICA

We begin by asserting that it is a Western protege and a Western responsibility. We should insist—we of the West—on credit for bringing the African masses this far. We should also remember our own early attempts to create a government for ourselves—years of argument and indecision—we must therefore recognize the difficult, but necessary task of elevating them to the point, culturally, economically, and politically, where they are capable of responsible self-government, but we should add that we do not, for that reason, propose to turn them over to the ravages of communism.

It may be that native leaders will emerge who are friends of the West and who, with our support, can lead their peoples to some measure of orderly, progressive self-government. Perhaps Colonel Mobutu is such a leader, but probably we shall never know. For in the 8 weeks in which Western fortunes in Africa were resting on his shoulders, we seem not to have lifted a finger to help him. Today, events in the Congo, with the active cooperation of the United Nations, are moving toward a return to power of the pro-Communist, Lumumba.

Where such leaders have not emerged, the West must hold on. We cannot acquiesce in independence movements when independence means a return to savagery or Communist domination. Much less can we afford to jump on the bandwagon of anticolonialism and so accelerate the mad rush toward anarchy and Soviet peonage. In areas where Western power still prevails, the full weight of American diplomacy must be employed to sustain it. In areas that have already fallen under Communist influence, we must proceed, overtly and covertly, to restore Western influence.

Perhaps the answer is an interim African protectorate, administered by an association of Western nations. The purpose of such a protectorate would be to preside over a crash program for preparing the African people economically, politically, and culturally for the responsibilities of self-government in an atmosphere conducive to the triumph of Western concepts of justice and freedom. Such a policy would be denounced in many parts of the world as reactionary, chauvinistic, and oppressive. Such recriminations we would have to endure. For there would be no doubt in our minds that the colonial system, even in its present stage of development, is better for the African people than the misery and chaos into which they are now plunging headlong.

We would hold onto Africa, in part because Western survival there is essential to victory over communism, but no less because we know that the privilege of being born in the West carries with it the responsibility of extending our good fortune to others. We are the bearers of Western civilization, the most noble product of the heart and mind of man. If, in Africa, the West has failed in the past to do the full measure of its duty, then all the more reason for doing our duty now.

Disarmament: We begin by announcing that we are against it. We are against it because we need our armaments—all of those we presently have and more—the weapons for limited war—that we do not have.

We know that armament races throughout history have always been a symptom of international friction—not a cause of it. And we know that friction does not disappear by rival nations suddenly deciding to turn their swords into plowshares. No nation in its right mind will give up the means of defending itself without first making sure that hostile powers are no longer in a position to threaten it. The Communist leaders are, of course, in their right minds. They may preach general disarmament for propaganda purposes. They may also seriously promote mutual disarmament in certain weapons in the knowledge that their superior strength in other weapons would leave them, on balance, decisively stronger than the West. Thus, in the light of the West's weakness in conventional weapons, it might make sense for the Communists to seek disarmament in the nuclear field. If all nuclear weapons suddenly ceased to exist, much of the world would immediately be laid open to conquest by the masses of Russian and Chinese manpower.

I do not suggest that any of our responsible leaders take disarmament seriously. They certainly do not favor unilateral disarmament, and they know the Soviets are not going to join us in any mutual disarmament that is not to their advantage. What I object to is saying we favor disarmament. The danger here is that we become hoisted by the petard of our own propaganda.

This has already happened in the critical matter of nuclear tests—so vital to our national security. We originally agreed to suspend our tests, partly on the sentimental notion that the Russians were seriously interested in devising an adequate system of inspection and controls—but mostly because we felt the pressure of a "world opinion" we helped create concerning the dangers of radioactive fallout and the ultimate horrors of a nuclear holocaust. Yet now when the illusions about Soviet intentions have been dispelled, and though the danger of fallout from the kind of underground and stratospheric testing we propose is nonexistent, we still find it difficult to resume testing for fear of offending the brooding omnipresence of world opinion.

I fear the same consequences will follow from our attempts to match Soviet propaganda concerning the desirability of general disarmament. Already, strong pressures are bearing down upon us to "do something" about it. And Western leaders, unlike the men in the Kremlin, characteristically find such pressures difficult to resist.

The function of our propaganda should be to educate the people of the world about the realities of life—not to promote an escape from them. Plain talking on the subject of disarmament would do much to further this education.

The United Nations. We begin by not taking it seriously. The United Nations has its useful functions, but the formulation and conduct of American foreign policy is not among them.

On past occasions, when we have subordinated to United Nations policy our own notions of how to wage the cold war effectively, Western interests have suffered—the Korean war, the Suez crisis, the Iraqi revolution, this year's events in the Congo and many others. This is not an experience that should surprise us when we remember that United Nations policy has been the common denominator of the foreign policies of 80-odd nations, some mortally hostile to us, some indifferent to our interests, nearly all less determined than we to save the world from Communist domination. In the future, with the growing influx of allegedly neutral nations from Asia and Africa, continued American deference to the United Nations will invite the very direst consequences.

I submit that the important event at the recent session of the United Nations was not what communism did with its right hand: Khrushchev's shoe-banging display and the

dirty names he called Western leaders—but what communism accomplished with its left—the successful campaign to get all of the serious themes of the current Soviet foreign policy line endorsed by a block of allegedly neutralist nations. Messrs. Tito, Nkrumah, Sukarno, Nehru, and Nasser—though their proposals were pro-Soviet in every particular—became a kind of a "centerist" block whose favor we found ourselves earnestly courting. This bizarre turn of events is one indication that the power center of the United Nations has moved sharply to the left. And there are others: The resolution against nuclear testing, the impending resolution calling for the immediate end of all colonialism, the connivance of the United Nations in Lumumba's return to power.

We must liberate ourselves, our own people and other people, from the superstition that international policies—in order to be good—must have the approval of the United Nations. This is part of liberating ourselves from the confining clutches of world opinion. There may be occasions when the United Nations can be utilized to provide a broad base to policies that further Western interests. But when submission of a matter to the United Nations will predictably muddy the waters and obstruct the pursuit of American policy, then we must, as we did in the case of Berlin, quietly insist on settling the problem elsewhere.

EASTERN EUROPE

We begin by having serious designs on it. Since communism is organically expansive, it follows—given the laws of momentum and inertia—that American policy cannot succeed by attempting, merely, to hold what we have. American policy must be geared to the offensive. Our appetite for Communist territory must be every bit as keen as theirs for non-Communist territory. Our efforts to extend freedom behind the Iron Curtain must be no less vigorous than their never-ending campaign to spread the influence of communism in the free world.

We should encourage the captive peoples to revolt against their Communist rulers. This policy must be pursued with caution and prudence, as well as courage. For while our enslaved friends must be told we are anxious to help them, we should discourage premature uprisings that have no chance of success. The freedom fighters must understand that the time and place and method of such uprisings will be dictated by the needs of an overall world strategy. To this end we should establish close liaison with underground leaders behind the Iron Curtain, furnishing them printing presses, radios, weapons, instructors: the paraphernalia of a full-fledged resistance.

We must—ourselves be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes. Assume we have developed nuclear weapons that can be used in land warfare, and that we have equipped our European divisions accordingly. Assume also a major uprising in Eastern Europe such as occurred in Budapest in 1956. In such a situation, we ought to present the Kremlin with an ultimatum forbidding Soviet intervention, and be prepared, if the ultimatum is rejected, to move a highly mobile task force equipped with appropriate nuclear weapons to the scene of the revolt. Our objectives would be to confront the Soviet Union with superior forces in the immediate vicinity of the uprisings and to compel a Soviet withdrawal. An actual clash between American and Soviet armies would be unlikely; the mere threat of American action, coupled with the Kremlin's knowledge that the fighting would occur amid a hostile population and could easily spread to other areas, would probably result in Soviet acceptance of the ultimatum. The Kremlin would also be put on notice, of course, that resort to long-range bombers and missiles would prompt automatic retaliation in kind. On this level, we would invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union, and accepting a local defeat. Had we the will and the means for it in 1956, such a policy would have saved the Hungarian revolution.

I have not, now, solved all of the problems of the world. You have given me, after all, only 50 minutes. I would hope, however, to have indicated a general approach to them.

I would be the first to agree that it is hard counsel I have urged upon you, but I would beg you to remember that hard problems beget hard solutions. The hard part—if I may close on a reflective note—is not to analyze the problem: it is easy enough to agree, intellectually, that we must put our national power to use if we are to survive. It is not hard even—when we consider the stakes—to make the sacrifices, material and human, that may be entailed. The hard part is to convince ourselves that what we must do is the right thing to do. For most Americans share a vague feeling that recourse to power is somehow immoral; and so much of our international behavior has reflected this psychological block. Power, however, is an inevitable product of the human condition. Someone has to have it. In our day, the American people possess most of the power in the world. We may regard this fact as a blessing, or as a curse—but there it is. The only relevant question is whether we will use that power for good ends or permit others to use their lesser power for evil ends. Power confers responsibilities—moral responsibilities. Might does not make right, but right cannot survive without might and without using might. History is not the story of the triumph of virtue, though virtue when properly supported has sometimes triumphed. The people of the world and their leaders do not rally instinctively behind good causes: if that were true, the plague of communism would long since have disappeared from our planet. They do, however, rally behind good causes that are energetically and purposively pressed, and that show promise of winning. If we simply summon the courage of our convictions, the blessings of a moderately tolerable life will soon fall on others, as well as ourselves. And future generations will honor us.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post on the 4th of January. What Mr. Lippmann said in that article was so close to the thought I sought to express yesterday that I should like to read two paragraphs from it.

The recognition that there may be various kinds of majorities is deeply imbedded in the Constitution. Simple majority rule—one more than half a quorum—is by no means the general principle of the Constitution. Constitutional amendments, the expulsion of Members, the overriding of the President's veto, require two-thirds of all the Senators elected. Treaties and impeachments require two-thirds of those present and voting. Why these variations? Because these are questions which involve the whole Nation, it may be for war, the Constitution requires that such grave decisions shall have a large not merely a simple majority.

In my view it is important, indeed vital to our liberties, to preserve the principle that for great issues, for issues that affect deeply great regions or sections of the Nation, there should be required more than a simple majority. For we must never forget that majorities are not always liberal and that they may be quite tyrannical. It is, I have always thought, a short view of history to equate simple majority rule with the defense of the civil rights of Negroes. The civil rights of all Americans will be safer if within the Senate, which represents the Federal principle, we do not give absolute power to simple majorities.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I stated in the debate of 1959:

In every instance where the Constitution deals with something more than a majority vote, there is a provision for a two-thirds vote. When, then, when we are considering a proposal which would put a gag upon the right of Senators to speak and might deprive some States of their right to voice opinions on the floor of the Senate, why should we adopt anything other than a two-thirds requirement as set forth in the Constitution in all the instances I have related?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to refer the resolution, as modified, together with the substitute amendment proposed thereto by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and others, to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday morning the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security held what was in my opinion one of the most significant hearings of recent years.

The hearings involved the so-called Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and the witness was Dr. Charles Santos-Buch, one of the founders of the committee.

This hearing was significant because it constituted a clear demonstration of the need for congressional investigations. It illustrated the ability of congressional committees to expose Communist circumventions of existing laws—circumventions against which the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice are unable to take effective action unless they are provided with new or amended legislation.

It has significance, too, as a demonstration of the blind prejudice that unfortunately exists in some parts of the American press on the specific question of congressional investigation of Communist activities.

No one complains when congressional committees investigate gangsters or hoodlums or the KKK or racketeering in the trade union movement or monopolistic violations by big business. It is only when congressional committees undertake the investigation of Communist subversion that the brickbats start to fly, and that editorials begin to appear in respected national newspapers, questioning the propriety and constitutionality of the investigation.

This is something that perplexes me. Perhaps it is because I am old fashioned, but for my part I regard Communists as political hoodlums, as gangsters of the mind whose crime is infinitely more evil than larceny or dope smuggling or white slavery or the other standard crimes of our criminal underworld. The Communist sin is one of the mind, and more offensive than one of the flesh.

In yesterday's hearing we were presented with proof that the Castro regime financed the full-page New York Times advertisement with which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee announced itself to the public on April 6, 1960. We were presented with proof that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had from its inception violated the Foreign Agents' Registration Act. We were presented with proof that Mr. Robert Taber, the head of the committee, had committed perjury when he testified before the subcommittee on May 5.

The proof today is conclusive. But, before this proof was made public, the Subcommittee on Internal Security was the target of an international campaign designed to ridicule the subcommittee and the hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

It is a sad commentary on the intellectual climate of our times that a well known and once revered American periodical and many American newspapers, basing themselves on the columns of this periodical, gave unwitting assistance to this campaign—without troubling to check on the facts. This is a situation which, I believe, calls for some comment.

In May 1960 the Subcommittee on Internal Security held its first hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The subcommittee had solid reasons for investigating the possibility of collusion between this pro-Castro organization and the Castro Government. The specific reason for the hearings was to determine whether there may not have been a circumvention of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act which warranted examination with a view to possible legislative remedy.

Among the first group of witnesses called before the subcommittee was Mr. Kenneth Tynan, a British drama critic who was one of the signers of the full-page advertisement in the New York Times. He was called before the subcommittee on the reasonable assumption that, as a signer of the advertisement, he might be able to shed some light on its origin and financing.

In last October's issue of Harper's magazine, Mr. Tynan wrote an article entitled "Command Performance," which purported to be an account of his appearance before the subcommittee. It was a mendacious and clearly libelous article, which charged the subcommittee with asking a whole series of questions that were never asked. Some of these questions were so preposterous that any reader who accepted Mr. Tynan's version at face value would have to conclude that the subcommittee was composed of incompetents and idiots who lack all sense of propriety and judicial procedure.

Part of Mr. Tynan's purpose in writing this article was to portray himself as an injured innocent, unjustly hailed before a barbarous and ludicrous inquisition. But it was also part of his purpose—and I believe a rereading of his article will demonstrate this—to defend the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, to ridicule the subcommittee's investigation, and to turn public opinion in this country and abroad against the Senate subcommittee.

Because of Mr. Tynan's obvious predilection for people like Alger Hiss and for pro-Communists and things pro-Soviet, I was not surprised by the quality of his article.

To my mind, the article simply provided further proof that Mr. Tynan is a pro-Communist liar.

I do not wish to waste the time of the Senate by itemizing all of the falsehoods contained in Mr. Tynan's article in Harper's. I dealt with some of his most brazen lies in my letter to Harper's—which I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I would like to comment, however, on one of Mr. Tynan's statements, because in it he accomplishes the rare intellectual feat of telling a lie, within a lie, within a lie. I quote from Mr. Tynan's article:

> We then moved on to the Cuba advertisement. Hilarity, hereabouts, began to displace dread; such was the caliber of the inquisition that astonished amusement became the only possible response. Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? No.

Neither these questions nor any questions remotely resembling these were asked of Mr. Tynan. He was asked simply whether he knew anything about the finances of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee—to which he replied that he did not.

This is a horse of an altogether different color from—"Was the ad paid for with Cuban gold?" But what is even more interesting than Mr. Tynan's imaginary question is Mr. Tynan's imaginary answer. He replied, according to his article, that the ad was not paid for with Cuban gold.

We are led to this compound conclusion:

First. Mr. Tynan lied about the question which, he said, was asked of him.

Second. Even if such a question had been asked, Mr. Tynan either lied in his article when he pretended to be in a position to answer the question negatively—or else he lied in his hearing when he told the subcommittee that he knew nothing about the finances of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Finally, if this question actually had been asked of Mr. Tynan, and if he actually had knowledge which enabled him to reply to the question, Mr. Tynan would now be guilty of perjury—because the ad was, in fact, paid for with Cuban gold.

I submit that any man who can crowd so many lies into the framework of one small statement is a virtuoso.

As I have said, Mr. Tynan's article did not surprise me. What did surprise me was that Harper's magazine accepted this article—which was libelous, if untrue—without troubling to check the facts with the Subcommittee on Internal Security or to obtain its version of the story.

Such a procedure, I submit, was indefensible, even if the author had been a person of less questionable repute than Mr. Kenneth Tynan.

It was all the more indefensible because the article in question was written by an author with Mr. Tynan's antecedents. Here was a man who bore all the stigmata of the intellectual fellow-traveler.

He was and is an avowed Castro fellow traveler.

He masterminded the anti-American spectacular for British television which brought protests from its three most prominent liberal participants—Mr. Norman Cousins, Mr. Norman Thomas, and Dr. Robert Hutchins. Messrs. Cousins, Thomas, and Hutchins protested because they had not been aware that their individually filmed interviews would be used to bracket them with Alger Hiss and a whole string of known Communists.

Mr. Cousins' wire of protest, which received considerable press attention, complained of the "serious misrepresentations" that were made to him—by Mr. Tynan—at the time his participation was solicited.

The editors of Harper's were aware of these things—and these things should have raised at least a few questions about Mr. Tynan's credibility in their minds.

But the editors of Harper's apparently considered it unnecessary to check for accuracy, since it was only the Subcommittee on Internal Security that was being maligned.

The article was printed.

An advance press release was issued that made Mr. Tynan's article the most publicized contribution to the October issue of Harper's.

The Mayfair Agency, which is a division of Harper & Brothers, distributed a circular to libraries across the country which listed "Command Performance" by Mr. Tynan as 1 of the 10 most significant articles of the month.

Many American editors, because they accept Harper's as a responsible and authoritative magazine, swallowed Mr. Tynan's mendacious story and wrote columns criticizing and ridiculing the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

There were also, I am told, many critical newspaper editorials, based on Mr. Tynan's article, in Great Britain, Canada, and other countries.

I would like to say a few words about what happened when I attempted to reply to Mr. Tynan.

Mr. Tynan's article appeared in the last week of September. On September 30, immediately after I had read the article, I wired Mr. John Fischer, the editor of Harper's, protesting against the fact that no effort had been made to consult me or to check the facts in Tynan's article with the subcommittee—and I requested permission to reply in approximately equal space.

Harper's agreed to publish a reply of considerably shorter length as a letter to the editor. My reply was mailed to them on October 14. It was published

in the January issue, 3 months after Tynan's article had appeared.

I am personally at a loss to explain this timelag—a lag which, in my opinion, largely vitiated the effect of my reply. Perhaps a week or 10 days, but no more than this, was lost in negotiations with Harper's lawyers. The lawyers wanted ironclad proof for every statement made in my letter; and they insisted, in addition, that I sign a statement holding Harper's blameless if Mr. Tynan should sue for libel. I believe I am correct in stating that Mr. Tynan, when he submitted his original article, was not called upon to sign any comparable statement by the editors of Harper's. The legal standards that apply to U.S. Senators must apparently not be applied to liars and fellow travelers who malign Members of the Senate.

After all this, my reply to Kenneth Tynan finally appeared in the January issue of Harper's. My letter was followed by a reply from Mr. Kenneth Tynan, as false and intellectually dishonest as his original article. And, winding up the discussion, there was a commentary by the editor, Mr. John Fischer. Mr. Fischer did not discuss the merits of my reply to Mr. Tynan, but simply declared that congressional investigations have done far more harm than good and that "the pursuit of wrongdoers should be left to the police agencies and their punishment to the courts."

Mr. Fischer's philosophisizing reveals an abysmal ignorance of the function of congressional committees and of the capabilities of the police agencies and the courts. Not all wrongdoing is covered by existing legislation—and where it is not so covered or where there are loopholes, wrongdoers are free to thumb their noses at the police and the courts. The hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee constitute a classic example of the ability of congressional committees to uncover wrongdoing against which the police and the courts were unable to act—thus pointing the way to new or reinforced legislation.

I believe that Harper's magazine owes an apology to the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, to the U.S. Senate, and to the American people. And I personally hope that they will see fit to apologize for providing Mr. Tynan with a platform for his mendacious attack on the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and for their inexcusable procedure in printing his lying article without taking the elementary precaution of ascertaining the true facts.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it would be well to state for the RECORD that this magazine, when it is sent through the mails, is being subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I serve with the Senator on the Internal Security Subcommittee and also on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I know that everything the Senator from Connecticut is saying today is true.

Mr. DODD. I thank my distinguished and able colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Tynan's article entitled "Command Performance," published in Harper's magazine for October 1960; my letter to the editor of Harper's, Mr. Tynan's reply to my letter, and the editor's note, all published in Harper's for January, 1961; an editorial entitled "Senator Dodd's Anti-Red Zeal Clouds the American Image," published in the Providence Journal of October 4, 1960; an editoral entitled "Defiling America," published in the Washington Post of September 28, 1960; and an editorial entitled "First Amendment," published in the New York Times of October 5, 1960.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Harper's magazine, October 1960]

COMMAND PERFORMANCE: A BRITISH CRITIC'S REPORT ON HIS INTERROGATION BY A SENATE COMMITTEE

(By Kenneth Tynan)

On May 5 of this year I paid my first visit to Washington, D.C. It was long overdue; I remember chiding myself as I stepped off the early plane from New York, for although I had been working as an English journalist in America for more than 18 months, I had somehow never found time for a trip to the Capital. I was glad of a chance to repair the omission, the more so because I planned to return to my London home at the month's end, and the opportunity might not repeat itself. The day was hot and blue, and the city looked green and gracious through the windows of the airport taxi. Fairer weather could not be imagined for sightseeing; and, my wits contentedly numbed by a tranquilizing tablet, I had almost forgotten the purpose of my journey when my lawyer, who had traveled with me from New York, leaned forward and told the driver to pull up at the main entrance of an imposing, characterless office block that lay just ahead of us.

"That's the New Senate Office Building," he said. We entered it together. I straightened my tie and buttoned my jacket, in the breast pocket of which was a subpena I had received, about 8 days before, instructing me to present myself for questioning before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate.

Since November 1958 I had been employed as the Broadway drama critic of the New Yorker—a post that had been offered me, to my flattered amazement, shortly after the lamented death of its former occupant, Wolcott Gibbs. At that time I was reviewing plays for the London Observer, whose editor generously allowed me to accept the offer and spend two theater seasons in New York. I was no stranger to America; annually, since 1951, I had crossed the Atlantic to inspect the current Broadway crop and report on its merits in the English press.

When I responded to the New Yorker's summons, I brought with me to Manhattan a profound and sympathetic curiosity about America, an American wife, and a small daughter bearing an American passport. Also, and inevitably, I brought with me a bundle of convictions about life in general, and the chances of its continued existence on this endangered planet. I was (and am) a supporter of the British Labor Party; I endorsed (and endorse) the campaign for nuclear disarmament; and I took part in the inaugural trudge of protest to the atomic weapons establishment at Aldermaston. Halfway across the Atlantic, aboard the *Ile de France*, a midwesterner who was one of my table companions, asked me almost rhetorically whether I believed in socialized medicine; and, when I said I did, inquired much less rhetorically whether I had told that to the editor of the New Yorker, and whether I didn't think somebody ought to inform him. He was not smiling; but I am afraid I smiled, rightly judging that the editor would consider my private opinions none of his business. During my stay with the magazine, many minor changes in my copy were suggested. Nearly all of them had to do with grammar, syntax, and redundancies; none was political.

To turn out a weekly theater piece is not, unless you are Flaubert, a fulltime job; and I was delighted when Associated Television—one of the largest organizations in British commercial TV—invited me to produce for them a program on the general topic of American nonconformity. What especially allured me about the project was that it might enable me to crack, if not splinter, a fallacious image of American life that had become rooted in many good English minds during the McCarthy era—namely, the idea that America was a monolithic stronghold of sameness, peopled by faceless organization men. My own experience had taught me that this notion was absurd; I knew that the country abounded in dissidents of all kinds; and this was as it should be in a nation that was founded, after all, on the right to dissent.

Hence I embraced the job, and flew to London in the summer of 1959 to compile, after exhausting debates with my employers, a list of articulate and representative American nonconformists. The program was filmed that fall—in New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles—with an exiguous budget, a crippling schedule, and a cast necessarily restricted to people who were both willing and available at the time of shooting. In January of this year, the show was transmitted in England under the title of "We Dissent"; a late-nite, 90-minute cultural gesture, it consisted of statements made by 20-odd lively American mavericks on the state of nonconformity in general and the nature of their own noncomformity in particular.

WE DISSENT

Dissent in the arts was supported by Norman Mailer, Jules Feiffer, Alexander King, Mort Sahl, and a clutch of "beat generation" boys, including Allen Ginsberg, Bob Kaufman, and Lawrence Ferlinghetti. Norman Cousins excoriated the nuclear arms race; Kenneth Galbraith summarized his qualms about the affluent society; the Reverend Maurice McCrackin explained why he chose imprisonment rather than pay income tax for military purposes; and there were cogent contributions from Norman Thomas, Robert Hutchins, and C. Wright Mills.

America being by definition the greatest capitalist country on earth, it followed that socialism and dissent would frequently be allied. Accordingly, I also included one admitted member of the Communist Party (Arnold Johnson); and four speakers reputedly linked with the extreme left—Clinton Jencks, of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers' Union; the Reverend Stephen Fritchman of the Unitarian Church; Dalton Trumbo, the Hollywood screenwriter; and Alger Hiss, to demonstrate that even a man who had been imprisoned for giving perjured testimony about alleged espionage activities could still speak his mind freely in America. Apart from Mr. Trumbo, none of them came out with specifically Socialist opinion, unless you count Mr. Jencks' suggestion that the formation of a labor party, on the English model, would be a good thing for American politics. After lengthy discussions with the production staff of Associated Television,

we decided to exclude American dissenters of the extreme right such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, William F. Buckley, Jr., and the imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. Their participation, it was felt, might have caused British viewers to construe the program as a slanted piece of anti-American propaganda.

The British press reaction to the show was generally enthusiastic, though a few critics animadverted on the camera work, and several more expressed their amazement at the distressing mildness of American dissent. The response in America, where the show had not been seen, was much more emphatic. A number of southern newspapers dubbed it subversive, and the New York Daily News, in an editorial headed "Here Are Your Hats, Gentlemen," charged the participants with fouling their own nests, and urged them to hop aboard the next boat to England, Russia, or China. Immediately afterward, the Messrs. Cousins, Hutchins, and Thomas wrote to me, protesting against the context in which I had placed them; and I received a letter from Benjamin Mandel, formerly the business manager of the Daily Worker and now the research director of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, asking for a full transcript of the program.

I told Mr. Mandel that the transcript belonged to Associated Television, whither I advised him to direct his request. I assume that it was granted, because on February 25, 1960, a fully documented attack on the program was delivered on the floor of the Senate by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, the vice chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee and an ex-employee of the FBI. To say that the Senator spoke with feeling would be to do him less than justice; he spoke with the fiercest sort of retributory zeal. He described "We Dissent" as a fraud and a prime example of the kind of irresponsible criticism that undermines the Western alliance; he also condemned its outrageously one-sided nature, and a condensed version of the script was reprinted, at his petition, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of his speech was sent to me (by whom I know not), and I foolishly consigned it, duly read, to the wastepaper basket. It nettled me, of course, but I took it in a spirit of fair comment, and assumed that there the subject would end. I could not, as it turned out, have been wronger.

Later in the spring of 1960 I received a letter from a fledgling organization called the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, asking me whether I would lend my name to a forthcoming advertisement in the New York Times that was intended as a rebuttal of the incomplete and frequently inaccurate accounts of the Cuban revolution that were then appearing in the American press. (I had written, for the January issue of a national magazine, an article about Havana that mentioned Fidel Castro sympathetically; hence, I imagine, the appeal for my signature.) The ad cited, and factually disputed, a number of tendentious remarks about Castro's regime that had been printed in Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, and the New York Journal-American. It went on to state that Castro's purpose was to give Cuba back to the Cubans, and concluded by emphasizing the need for full and unbiased reportage. Having assured myself that the factual points made in the ad were valid, I appended my autograph to the list, which included Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, James Baldwin, and half a dozen others, of whom I had not heard.

Soon afterward the ad hit print. I do not think it gave much aid or comfort to America's enemies, although I have no doubt that it offended a great many American companies whose Cuban interests were being imperiled by Castro's social upheaval. Time magazine took a swift and lofty swipe at the signatories; but I noted with pleasure a quotation in the same publication from a speech by Herbert L. Matthews, a senior member of the New York Times' editorial board. "I have never," said Mr. Matthews, "seen a big story so misunderstood, misinterpreted, and badly handled as the Cuban revolution." Consoled by Mr. Matthews, I stopped fretting and returned to the familiar task of explaining to the readers of the New Yorker the nature and quality of the live entertainment available in the immediate neighborhood of Times Square.

EIGHT SHAKY DAYS

I was leaving my apartment en route for the theater (the date was April 27) when a little man emerged from the elevator and thrust into my hand an envelope containing a subpena from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. It commanded me to appear in Washington about 40 hours later, and it was blank in the section that called for a statement of the subject matter with which the investigation was concerned.

My first response was bewilderment, and my second dread—the kind of nebulous chill that besets all of us when the finger of officialdom points straight in our direction. Economic fears swelled up; supposing I was publicly smeared, would my American earnings be jeopardized? And how could I answer the committee's questions without fatally comprising my integrity? I canceled the theater and phoned a lawyer who wired the committee and successfully demanded a postponement of 8 days. They were, without question, the strangest and shakiest 8 days of my life. I put through a call to the British Embassy in Washington, and asked whether a Senate committee was entitled to subpena a visiting foreign journalist; I was told that anyone—of whatever nationality—could be summoned to Washington as soon as he set foot on American soil. It was just my bad luck, I gathered, that I happened to be the first nonresident alien ever to have been congressionally subpenaed. I then called an English correspondent, stationed in Washington. He was scarcely more encouraging.

"They've never done this to a European journalist before," he said, "but there's no reason why they shouldn't. They could subpena the Pravda man if they wanted to. And frankly, old chap, it's hard enough to be liberal out here without people like you coming along and sticking your necks out."

Had I been, perhaps, prematurely international in my approach? I talked to the editor of the New Yorker, who was superficially unperturbed, though below the surface he was clearly a little rattled, as I gathered from his pleasure when I told him that my hearing was to be held in camera. Private interrogations are like auditions; if the performer shows signs of star quality (i.e., if his leanings toward communism are distinct and provable), he is usually recalled for a public session. Finally, I telephoned Norman Mailer to find out if he had received a subpena. He hadn't, and was somewhat irked that he hadn't. At his request, I asked my lawyer why he had been overlooked. "Well, for one thing," he replied, "Mailer isn't employed by anyone." In other words, he had no job to lose.

On May 3, 2 days before my appearance in Washington, George Sokolsky of the Journal-American devoted his whole column to excerpts from my television show, linked by comments expressive of his puzzlement and disgust. He did not mention me by name; nor have I any idea how he gained access to the transcript. Twenty-four hours later he returned to the assault, quoting from C. Wright Mills and Alger Hiss, and professing never to have heard of Jules Feiffer. His last sentence was: "Whoever picked this gang did not know America, but I shall give you more of this." But he never did. The next day was May 5, the date of my trip to Washington. Instead of naming and blasting me, as I had anticipated, he wrote a piece about college girls and their place in society. I cannot escape the suspicion that, in some crucial, irreparable way, I let Mr. Sokolsky down.

CURVE BALLS

Before I ventured into the room in which I was to be quizzed, I had learned a little about the habits, procedures, and history of the Internal Security Subcommittee. I knew that it was 10 years old, that its anti-leftism was virulent, and that it had been prominent in the abortive investigations of Owen Lattimore and the Institute for Pacific Relations. I also knew that it accepted only the fifth (or self-incrimination) amendment as a legitimate excuse for refusing to answer its questions; to be mum for any other reason could lead to a citation for contempt of Congress. Not at all idly, I wondered if any other Western democracy had ever entrusted such extraordinary powers to the politicians in its legislature. This subcommittee can call anyone in America to question without stating in advance what the questions are to be about. It can punish lies with charges of perjury, and silence with the threat of imprisonment, unless the witness is willing to declare that, by answering, he might be branding himself a criminal. That such authority should exist outside a court of law struck me at the time (and strikes me still) as highly unconstitutional. Throughout the session, I had to keep reminding myself that I was not in England. The task was not overwhelmingly difficult.

The room in Washington was cool and oblong, abutting onto the resonant public chamber. A slim table ran down its midst. When I arrived, with my lawyer, there were assembled the subcommittee's attorney, a florid, genial man named Julien Sourwine; a couple of secretaries; a records clerk; an official stenographer; and the research expert, Mr. Mandel. Senator DODD had not yet arrived, and there were some jocular conversational preliminaries, mainly concerned with the wonderful efficiency of the Senate Office Building's new intercom system. "The only people we have trouble hearing," said Mr. Sourwine slyly, "are the witnesses."

Finally, with no apology, and the most perfunctory greeting, Senator DODD turned up 30 minutes late and took his place as acting chairman, flushed, frowning, and silver-haired. I identified myself, and was duly sworn in; whereupon, the hearing began. The questioning was done mainly by Mr. Sourwine, beaming with encouragement, though Senator DODD leaped in from time to time with supplementaries of his own. We started off on my TV show: Was it not, said Mr. Sourwine, expressly designed to hold the United States up to ridicule and contempt? (I should like to quote verbatim, but since I have been forbidden access to the transcript, I must resort to oratio obliqua.) I explained that that was not the aim of the program; that it had been intended to combat the false idea, common in Europe, that America was a land of intellectual conformity. I was then asked how I had contacted such people as Arnold Johnson, Clinton Jencks, and Dalton Trumbo, all of whom, Mr. Sourwine said, had been named by sworn witnesses as past or present members of the Communist Party (Jencks in testimony before this subcommittee, Trumbo in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities). By means of the telephone, I said, and by means of addresses supplied in England. With whom, in England, had I discussed the program?

This stunned me; it had not occurred to me that the authority of an American committee might extend to England. I replied that I had discussed it with the production staff that had been assigned to me by Asso-

ciated Television. But what were their names? (Thus Mr. Sourwine.) Their names, I pointed out, were listed on the credit titles. In consequence, every one of them was entered into the record; even the cutter of the show may have some very rough questions to answer should he ever apply for an American visa. Again, I was asked to confirm that the show had been slanted in the direction of anti-Americanism. I replied by drawing the subcommittee's attention to the testimony of Prof. Eugene Rostow of the Yale Law School, who had been present in the studio throughout the transmission. When it was over, the narrator had asked him whether he thought America should demand a right to reply.

"Oh, not at all, not at all," he had told the viewers. "I don't think this program was unfavorable to America. Of course, it doesn't present the whole story, but it didn't purport to do that. It presented a very interesting and very significant part of the story of American life."

At this point Senator DODD broke in, and inquired how I had got on to Gene Rostow, who was a friend of his. As untriumphantly as I could, I said that we had telephoned the U.S. Embassy in London and asked them if they could recommend to us a visiting American intellectual whose comments on the show would be informed and impartial. Professor Rostow had been their first choice.

We then moved on to the Cuba advertisement. Hilarity, hereabouts, began to displace dread; such was the caliber of the inquisition that astonished amusement became the only possible response. Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? No. Did I know any of the other signatories? Sartre and de Beauvoir by reputation; Mailer, Baldwin, and Capote, socially. Was I—and it was here that my fear melted into a deep intestinal chuckle—was I aware that President Eisenhower had made a speech in which he stated that the Castro regime was a menace to the stability of the Western Hemisphere? No, I was not. And did I think myself justified in holding opinions that openly defied those of the President of the United States? I brooded over this for a long, incredulous moment, and then replied that I was English, and that I had been forming opinions all my life without worrying for a second whether or not they coincided with those of the President of the United States. (Had my wits been active enough, I might have pointed out that Senator DODD himself, as a Democrat, must sometimes have found himself in the heretical position of having to defy President Eisenhower.)

Utterly unperturbed, Mr. Sourwine then flung me a curve ball. Had I or had I not contributed an article to a certain quarterly magazine (which he named, though to avoid libel I had better not)? I said I had. Was I aware that it was notorious as a Communist-front publication? I was not. How had I come to write for it? The editor had called me up, told me that he ran a small-circulation organ of culture and liberal opinion, and invited me to contribute; ever ready to assist embattled little magazines at no inconvenience to myself, I had offered him a thousand words on the current Broadway season. They had previously appeared, I added, in the impeccably non-Communist pages of the London Observer; nor had I received (or demanded) any payment for the reprint.

UNSPENT PASSION

Here, I think, the session would have ended, had I not urged my lawyer to request that there be entered into the record a statement that I had prepared the night before. It ran as follows:

"As an English journalist, I have paid regular annual visits to the United States for the past 9 years. I have spent the past two winters here as guest drama critic of the New Yorker; during this period I have also been employed by the Observer, a London weekly newspaper. I am a visitor to the United States, not an immigrant or a resident alien; nor have I done anything during my stay to belie the statement I made when my visa was first granted—namely, that I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party or of any affiliated organization. It may be worth adding that the only organizations to which I pay dues are the Royal Society of Literature, the Critics' Circle, and the Diners' Club.

"In answering the questions that the committee may put to me, I am perfectly willing to reply to any queries about my activities in the United States; and I have no intention of invoking any of the amendments to the Constitution. I should like, however, to express my regret that the committee should have seen fit to employ its authority to subpena a visiting journalist. It has not done so before, to the best of my knowledge; and I respectfully suggest that there may be better ways of demonstrating to the world this country's traditional regard for freedom of speech. Constitutionally, of course, it is within the committee's power to subpena whom it chooses; I merely submit that governmental grilling of foreign newspapermen is not a practice that one instinctively associates with the workings of Western democracy. It is true that the Soviet Government has frequently censured—and sometimes expelled—visiting journalists with whose opinions it disagrees. I can think of several American correspondents to whom this has happened. I leave it to the committee to decide whether this is a wholly desirable precedent.

"As I understand it, the function of a congressional committee is to gather information on the basis of which new legislation may be recommended. I cannot help finding it anomalous that a foreign visitor should be compelled to contribute to the legislative processes of a country not his own. I am profoundly interested in the making of English law; but I am modest enough to feel that the making of American law is none of my business."

After that, I was allowed to quit the chamber. A clerk trotted after me, and asked me to sign a form that would entitle me to claim a witness fee of $12. His pen contained bright red ink—"No political connotation, of course," he said tactfully, and was gone. I left the building and lunched with a peppery liberal journalist who has been covering the Washington scene since the thirties. He told me that things had loosened up a lot since McCarthy died, and I think he wondered why I looked so quizzical.

I flew back to New York and to a new hazard, not unconnected (I somehow suspect) with the subcommittee's investigation. The immigration authorities had discovered a technical oversight in my passport; my permit to work in the United States had accidentally been allowed to expire, and there was a distinct chance that I might be deported. After a lot of effort, inconvenience, and legal consultation, I managed to leave New York in my own time, on my own terms, and of my own volition. I even contrived to pay my lawyer's bill, which amounted to close on $1,500. On the credit side, I had $12, plus what Milton called a "new acquist of true experience from this great event." I am not sure, however—to pursue the quotation—that I had "calm of mind"; nor can I say, with any truth, that all my passion was spent.

THE EASY CHAIR—DODD VERSUS TYNAN: A DEBATE ON CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

(Guest columnists this month are Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, and Kenneth Tynan, British drama critic. Their comments on Mr. Tynan's article, "Command Performance," raise some fundamental questions about free speech, a free press, and the proper role of congressional investigating committees. They are followed by an editorial note on points not covered by either of the debaters.)

(By Senator DODD)

In its issue for October, Harper's ran an article by Mr. Kenneth Tynan, British drama critic, purportedly describing his appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, on May 5, 1960. Mr. Tynan's article was full of inaccuracies, some minor, some grave. I regret that Harper's saw fit to print Mr. Tynan's statement without troubling to check his version of the facts or his allegations with the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

In the paragraphs that follow, I present the other side of the story.

Mr. Tynan was one of several witnesses called before the subcommittee for the purpose of attempting to obtain more information about the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which announced itself to the public with a full-page advertisement supporting Castro in the New York Times for April 6, 1960. Since Mr. Tynan was one of the signers of this advertisement, it was reasonable for the subcommittee to assume that he might be able to shed some light on the organization and on the origins and financing of the New York Times advertisement.

The hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have not been completed and it would therefore be improper for me to venture a final opinion. I assure you, however, that the Subcommittee on Internal Security had solid reasons for investigating the possibility of collusion between this pro-Castro organization and the Castro government. The specific reason for the hearings was to determine whether there may not have been a circumvention of the Foreign Agents Registration Act which warranted examination with a view to possible legislative remedy.

As one item in a much larger case, there is the shocking fact that the Secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Miss Joanne Grant, repeatedly invoked the fifth amendment when called before the subcommittee and asked a long series of questions relating to Communist affiliations and associations with the Castro government.

The hearings were held in executive session, as is the subcommittee's general custom with initial hearings. The purpose of this procedure is to assure privacy to those witnesses who have only information to give and to protect those against whom the evidence is fragmentary or inconclusive or completely incorrect, as occasionally happens.

The subcommittee had made no public charges or allegations against Mr. Tynan, nor has it sought to expose him or harass him. A statement has, however, become necessary by way of replying to the serious public allegations which Mr. Tynan has now made against the subcommittee.

Mr. Tynan has endeavored to convey the impression that the subcommittee's action in calling him as a witness constituted a violation of freedom of the press. This is nonsensical. Under its mandate from Congress, the subcommittee has the right and the duty to request information from visitors and residents, aliens and nationals, journalists and nonjournalists, if it has reason to believe that the information requested has a direct bearing on the matter under consideration. If the prerogatives that normally apply to freedom of the press are respected, I fail to see how a request for information, per se, can constitute an infringement of freedom of the press.

In Mr. Tynan's own case, there is another reason for rejecting his plea for immunity from congressional committees.

As a foreign journalist in a democratic country, Mr. Tynan (who has now returned

to England) was completely free to think and write what he pleased about American politics. But when Mr. Tynan participated in a full-page advertisement in the New York Times obviously intended to exert pressure on the State Department in favor of the Castro regime, he was not expressing an opinion—he was engaging, with American citizens and with an American organization, in a political pressure action vis-a-vis the American Government. There is no law preventing a visiting journalist from doing so; but at the point where he does so, in my opinion, he assumes the same responsibilities as the American citizens with whom he is cooperating.

To deal with all of the inaccuracies in Mr. Tynan's article would require a 5,000-word article. Let me mention only those that I consider particularly glaring.

Mr. Tynan said that he was unable to quote verbatim because he had been "forbidden access" to the transcript. Copies of testimony, for obvious reasons, cannot be mailed out until the testimony has been released for publication. But in the long history of the subcommittee, no witness or his counsel has been denied access to the transcript of his own testimony in executive session. The fact is that Mr. Tynan never requested access.

Mr. Tynan stated that the questioning started with his TV show, "We Dissent." The record shows that it started with the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee," and his relations with it. The effect of this inversion of the facts is to create the impression that Mr. Tyman was really called before the subcommittee because of his TV program and not because of his involvement with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

When questioned about his relations with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Mr. Tynan stated that he was not a member, that he had not contributed to it, that he had simply given his signature to the statement which was printed in the New York Times. * * * On these points, Mr. Tynan's account in Harper's was accurate. At other points, however, his account lapses into the kind of fantasy that is difficult to explain.

"Such was the caliber of the inquisition," wrote Mr. Tynan, "that astonished amusement became the only possible response. Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? No."

I can state categorically that neither these questions nor any questions similar to them were asked of Mr. Tynan. Since he consistently took the stand that he knew nothing about the organization or workings of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, however, I cannot help marveling that he should now be able to respond with so firm and knowledgeable a "no" to imaginary question number two: Was the ad paid for with Cuban gold?

According to Mr. Tynan, he was asked whether he thought himself "justified in holding opinions that openly defied those of the President of the United States" on the question of Cuba. The question addressed to Mr. Tynan by the counsel for the subcommittee had nothing to do with opinions; it had to do with political action. The question was whether he had taken the action of participating in the petition, knowing that it ran completely counter to the policy of the U.S. Government. Such a question, I submit, was valid.

As is essential and proper in all such cases, Mr. Tynan was asked some general questions about his background.

He was asked whether he had in March 1960 contributed an article to Mainstream, a periodical which consistently toes the party line and which was identified as a publication of the Communist Party in the Guide to Subversive Organizations published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951. Mr. Tynan agreed that he had contributed the article in question, but he said that he had done so without knowing whether it was a Communist publication, and without troubling to ask.

He was also asked about the program which he had produced for the British Television Network which purportedly dealt with the matter of dissents and dissenters in America. I found Mr. Tynan's discussion of the program in his Harper's article a prime example of intellectual fuzziness. In his article he maintains the pretense that his program placed a heavy emphasis on the Socialist point of view because in a capitalist society socialism and dissent are so frequently identified. Under the Socialist caption, he bracketed a long string of Communists and pro-Communists. Unless my information is completely mistaken, the great majority of Mr. Tynan's colleagues in the British Labour Party take the stand that communism has nothing to do with democratic socialism and that socialism is being libeled when Communists are identified as Socialists.

The proud tradition of dissent in America was represented on Mr. Tynan's program by several legitimate dissenters like Robert Hutchins, Kenneth Galbraith, Norman Thomas, and Norman Cousins. But I challenge Mr. Tynan's contention that our tradition of dissent is in any way represented by most of the other members of his tendentiously composed amalgam—by Communists, party-liners, and a convicted perjurer, by beatniks, eccentrics, a dope addict, and a self-described expert on sex deviation.

Some of the eccentrics displayed no definite political bent. But so far as political viewpoints were represented, it was a pro-Communist viewpoint that predominated.

There was Arnold Johnson, legislative director of the Communist party, one of the 28 Communists sentenced to prison under the Smith Act.

There was Clinton Jencks, head of the United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, which was expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of its Communist control. In hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in October 1952, Jencks was identified by two witnesses in sworn testimony, as a member of the Communist Party and he invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions about his Communist associations.

There was a Rev. Stephen Fritchman of Los Angeles, whose many associations with Communist-front organizations are recorded in the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of September 12, 1951, and December 7, 1956, and who invoked the fifth amendment when he was asked about his membership in the Communist Party and his other pro-Communist activities.

There was Dalton Trumbo, one of the "Hollywood Ten" sentenced to prison for contempt of Congress because they refused to answer questions relating to their membership or activities in the Communist Party. At the hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in October 1947, Trumbo's party membership card was produced and he was subsequently identified as a member of the Communist Party by six witnesses.

Finally, there was Alger Hiss. "We Dissent" described Hiss as someone who had been convicted of perjury in a famous trial. It failed to mention the fact that one count of the conviction was that he had perjured himself when he denied turning over secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers, a self-admitted Soviet agent; nor did it mention the fact that Hiss had been identified as a member of the Communist underground in Government by at least three independent witnesses in testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee on August 3, 1948, and before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 2, 1951, and February 19, 1952, respectively.

The so-called dissenters were not simply members of the panel. Clinton Jencks was presented as the spokesman for nonconformist trade unionism in America; the Rev. Stephen Fritchman as the spokesman for nonconformist religion in America; Dalton Trumbo as the spokesman for nonconformist Hollywood writers. Only one of this group, Arnold Johnson, was formally identified as a Communist or Communist sympathizer, nor was any reference made to the fact that they had all either taken shelter behind the fifth amendment like the Reverend Fritchman, or else had been identified as Communists as stated above.

Mr. Tynan obviously thinks otherwise, but, for my own part, I believe that there was no place on such a program for a single Communist or party liner. I submit that Moscow agents and Moscow dupes have absolutely nothing in common with the American tradition, that they are not even dissenters but rigid totalitarian conformists who would deny the right of dissent to others.

For my own part, too, I must marvel at either the miraculous workings of the laws of chance or the rare esoteric knowledge of the roster of fifth amendment cases which enabled Mr. Tynan to select, with unerring accuracy, names like Clinton Jencks and Dalton Trumbo and Stephen Fritchman, which command recognition by 1 American in 1,000 and probably by no more than 1 Englishman in 10,000.

Mr. Tynan asserts that part of the purpose of this program was to demonstrate that America was still a land where the tradition of dissent was very much alive. I challenge this assertion. If the English language has any meaning, his program portrayed America as a land where conformism and fear of nonconformism prevail and where dissenters are persecuted, deprived of passports, incarcerated, and blacklisted.

The program was severely criticized by three of its participants, Mr. Norman Thomas, Mr. Norman Cousins, and Dr. Robert Hutchins. Mr. Cousins and Mr. Thomas both told me that they were in basic agreement with the description of the program which I presented to the U.S. Senate on February 25. Mr. Cousins, in a cabled protest to the Associated Television Network, said that he had not been informed that his interview would be used in the context of "What's Wrong With America," and he vigorously protested the misrepresentations that had been made to him at the time he did the recording. He requested permission to organize a 90-minute television program on the subject of "What's Right With America." I made a similar proposal in my speech in the Senate and in a letter to the head of Associated Television. Mr. Tynan, who believes in freedom of speech, apparently was opposed to a counter-program, although it is not clear whether Associated Television consulted him before deciding not to accede to our request.

Under ordinary circumstances, Mr. Tynan's testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security would probably not be published because it is admittedly fragmentary and inconclusive. Since Mr. Tynan has publicly broached the matter, however, I shall recommend that, in proper time, his testimony be printed together with all the other testimony on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee."

BY MR. TYNAN

Senator DODD overestimates my capacity for total recall. There is not one sentence of verbatim transcription in my whole account of the interrogation. Nor did I pretend there was. I was working without a transcript and said so. I paraphrased what I could recall of the strange proceedings, in the manner of a drama critic outlining the plot of a play. I had returned to England

shortly after the hearing, and it was not until more than a month later that I finally decided to write about it. I naturally sought legal advice about getting hold of the transcript. I was told that it was unavailable to me, and that under the Subcommittee's standard procedure I would not be permitted to have copies or photostats made. This nettled me, since it meant that the factual evidence would be in the hands of the other side; all the same, I decided to go ahead and write the piece from memory. * * * What I didn't realize at the time was that I could have inspected it if I had been in Washington. As I was in London, this notion never occurred to me. * * *

Hence I got the order of events slightly wrong, and either misheard or misremembered two questions. I take the Senator's word for it that I wasn't asked whether I was paid for signing the Fair Play for Cuba ad; I was merely asked what I knew about its financial background. By the reference to "Cuban gold," I hoped to clarify a similar question about the ad's sponsorship, since it was perfectly obvious, in the context of the hearing, that the subcommittee thought the Cuban Government had paid for it. In a recent TV interview broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Senator DODD quoted me as having said "on the record" that I "didn't know who paid for the ad." This seems odd, in view of the fact that he now claims I was never asked any such question.

His other points arise out of pure, understandable petulance. The Fair Play for Cuba ad was not a political pressure action vis-a-vis, the American Government; it was addressed solely to newspaper readers and recommended no action other than fuller and fairer reportage of the Cuban situation. The Senator further says that I was questioned about participating in a petition that ran counter to the policy of the U.S. Government; I said I was questioned about holding opinions that ran counter to that policy. The difference between holding opinions and publicly expressing or endorsing them seems to me infinitesimal; or at least it ought to be, in a reasonable society. When, for example, an American newspaperman in London writes an article lambasting British policy, I feel no patrotic urge to have him hauled up for questioning about his loyalty to Mr. Macmillan.

A sort of reflex action now prompts me to ask the Senator a few questions. If the purpose of interrogating me was to elicit information about the "fairplay" committee, why were no subpenas sent out to such other signatories of the ad as Norman Mailer, Truman Capote, and James Baldwin? Why was most of my hearing concerned not with Cuba but with my TV program on American dissent? How does the Senator justify the subcommittee's demand that I should name the employees of an English TV company with whom, in England, I had discussed my TV show? And is there not a touch of impertinence in questioning me at length about a program that neither Senator DODD nor any other member of the subcommittee had seen? And is not that impertinence compounded by the fact that the Senator's friend, Prof. Eugene Rostow, dean of the Yale University Law School, had stated in the closing session of the show: "I don't think this program was unfavorable to America. It presented a very interesting and very significant part of the story of American life?" And is the Senator not aware that I wholeheartedly supported the screening 2 days later on the same network, of an unrehearsed discussion entitled "Right To Reply," on which the merits of my own program were freely debated by a group of panelists including Dean Rostow?

For the Senator's benefit, let me clarify a few things about the show itself. There was nothing "esoteric" or "miraculous" in our knowledge of fifth amendment cases. The indictments of Dalton Trumbo and Clinton Jencks were widely reported in the European press; and the circumstances of the Hiss case are part of the common knowledge of our time.

As to the Reverend Stephen Fritchman, he is the minister of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles (one of the three cities in which the program was filmed). We had been repeatedly informed that the Unitarian Church was among the most independent, and least conformist, of all American religious groups. We did not know that Reverend Mr. Fritchman had ever taken the fifth or any other amendment, though even if someone had told us, I doubt whether we would have dropped him from the show; we were concerned with his religion, not his politics.

Senator DODD asserts that it was the pro-Communist viewpoint that predominated. Can he really have studied the transcript? If he had, he would know that Clinton Jencks spoke in favor of an American labor party on the British pattern; that Dalton Trumbo advocated socialism without jails, and that Mr. Fritchman passionately extolled the American tradition of religious liberty. Even Arnold Johnson, who was expressly identified as a member of the Communist Party, did nothing more subversive than object to the imprisonment of American citizens because of their political beliefs. And Alger Hiss? He deplored the spread of conformity, described the American legal heritage as one of our finest areas of valuable nonconformity, and called America a dynamic, growing, developing country.

Does Senator DODD really disagree with this testimony? And would he like to repeat his statement, made over CBC–TV, that my program featured sex perverts, when it did nothing of the sort? (It included one spokesman for a society dedicated to the reform of the laws against homosexuality.) And what about the other 20-odd people who appeared, apart from the four whom Senator DODD regards as legitimate dissenters?

The truth is that I cannot understand what the Senator means by legitimate dissent. It looks as if he meant safe, uncontroversial, toothless dissent; which by my definition is not dissent at all. If I were invited to produce a program on British dissenters, I would feel myself bound to include advocates of civil disobedience and members of the Communist Party; if I did not, the British press would undoubtedly call me unfair, and complain of my conformist bias. It saddened me, incidentally, when Norman Cousins protested against my program. He was fully informed about its nature and purpose; I attribute his lapse of memory to the fact that he was interviewed on the press day of the magazine he edits, and may not have absorbed everything that was told him.

Senator DODD points out, as evidence of his magnanimity, that the subcommittee has not sought to expose me; as what, I wonder, could I possibly be exposed? I must, however, agree with him that I gave an article to a magazine called Mainstream without troubling to ask whether it was a Communist publication. I seem somehow to have got out of the habit of asking these indispensable questions. In the past decade I have contributed pieces to Vogue, Harper's Bazaar, the Atlantic, Harper's, the New Yorker, Holiday, Theater Arts, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Paris Review without bothering to inquire about the editors' political affiliations. In future I shall be more careful.

George B. Merlis, an American tourist who was arrested last summer by the Russian secret police and expelled from the U.S.S.R., has sent me a copy of a letter he has written to Senator DODD. His alleged offense was distributing copies of the pro-American magazine, Amerika. "While I was in the custody of the secret police of the Soviet Union," he tells the Senator, "no attempts were made to question my political beliefs. I can safely say that I was better treated by these dread agents of a totalitarian state than Mr. Tynan was treated by elected representatives of a democracy. The actions of your committee are shameful." If it is any comfort to Mr. Merlis, I would never dream of judging America by the behavior of Senator DODD; nor would anyone I know and respect. We know an exception when we see one. But we cannot help bristling, and being regretfully amused.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Neither comment reaches to the underlying question: What is the proper role of congressional investigating committees?

Senator DODD's legal right to summon a foreign journalist is not open to question; but his judgment in so doing certainly is. A little forethought should have warned him that journalists are likely to write about such experiences—with highly damaging results to America's reputation. (It is fortunate that Mr. Tynan's article was published in this country rather than abroad, where the repercussions almost certainly would have been much worse.) And no explanation can ever erase the impression that the committee's line of questioning was likely to discourage free expression of political views in the press and on the air.

Indeed, the whole record of congressional inquiries into un-American activities indicates that they have done the United States far more harm than good. They have turned up remarkably few subversives who had not already been spotted by the FBI or other security agencies. But they have furnished mountains of ammunition to hostile propagandists; they have made it infinitely harder to recruit good men into public service; and, particularly during the McCarthy era, their excesses corroded the fabric of American life.

Moreover, when a legislative body takes on the additional roles of policeman and judge, it breaks down the traditional boundaries between the three branches of Government. It undermines our basic doctrine of separation of powers, which holds that legislative committees should confine themselves to developing information needed for wise legislation; while the pursuit of wrongdoers should be left to the police agencies and their punishment to the courts. Perhaps the Tynan episode will help a little to encourage legislators to stick to their proper jobs—and to consider in advance the consequences of their actions.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1960]

DEFILING AMERICA

If one begins with a premise that divided opinions are a threat to internal security, one is bound to end by despising the first amendment. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, like its House counterpart, the Committee on Un-American Activities, has done this throughout the whole of its history. Both congressional bodies have conceived it to be their business to expose and censure ideas of which they disapprove.

The latest and most embarrassing instance of this attitude is recounted in the October issue of Harper's by Kenneth Tynan, drama critic of the London Observer, who served as guest critic of the New Yorker during the last two theater seasons. Mr. Tynan helped to produce in England, a television program titled "We Dissent" in which 20-odd maverick Americans expressed some heterodox views. He also allowed his name to be used in a newspaper advertisement appealing for fair play for Fidel Castro. For these enormities he was subpenaed by the Internal Security Subcommittee and interrogated at length regarding his beliefs and associations.

The first amendment was meant to forbid just this sort of impediment to free expression. Its premise is that internal security grows out of freely voiced criticism and the resolution of conflict through untrammeled public discussion. But the Committees' thought police tactics inhibit dissent by calling those who express it to official account for their views. Mr. Tynan, an Englishman, understands the first amendment far better than his inquisitors. He said to them with admirable restraint and understatement:

"I respectfully suggest that there may be better ways of demonstrating to the world this country's traditional regard for freedom of speech. Governmental grilling of foreign newspapermen is not a practice that one instinctively associates with the workings of Western democracy. It is true that the Soviet government has frequently censured—and sometimes expelled—visiting journalists with whose opinions it disagrees."

The hideous fact about Mr. Tynan's tale is that it is true. It will be heard around the free world—to the bitter shame of the United States. What propaganda can the Internal Security Subcommittee possibly prevent one half so damning as the defilement of America which it perpetrates itself?

[From the Providence Journal, Oct. 4, 1960]

SENATOR DODD'S ANTI-RED ZEAL CLOUDS THE AMERICAN IMAGE

Our ineffable neighbor from Connecticut, Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD, has been at it again.

In the current edition of Harper's magazine, British Journalist Kenneth Tynan offers a marvelously sardonic report of a secret grilling he underwent last spring at the hands of Mr. DODD, in the Senator's capacity as vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and that group's counsel, Julien Sourwine. Mr. Tynan is the dramatic critic of the London Observer, and recently completed a 2-year stint as guest critic in this country for the New Yorker magazine.

While he was over here, Mr. Tynan did two things that displeased Senator DODD's committee. He lent his name to a newspaper advertisement urging fairer reporting of the Cuban revolution, and he produced for a British TV network a 90-minute program called "We Dissent," which presented the views of a mixed bag of American mavericks, including one acknowledged Communist and Alger Hiss. Mr. Tynan says he signed the ad because he objected to a number of tendentious remarks about Castro's regime in various U.S. publications, and that the TV program was designed to show Britons that America was not a monolithic stronghold of sameness, peopled by faceless organization men.

But Senator DODD took a far darker view of Mr. Tynan's motives. So he summoned the British critic before his subcommittee and pelted him with a whole series of accusatory questions. Did he receive Cuban gold for lending his name to the advertisement? Was not the TV show expressly designed to hold the United States up to ridicule and contempt? And so on and on; one needs to read the whole Harper's article to catch the full flavor of the impression the inquisition made upon Mr. Tynan.

There was one question, though, that really took the cake. Did he think himself justified, Mr. Tynan says he was asked, in holding opinions that openly defied those of the President of the United States?

"I brooded over this for a long, incredulous moment," the British critic writes, "and then replied that I was English, and that I had been forming opinions all my life without worrying for a second whether or not they coincided with those of the President of the United States."

Mr. Tynan believes this is the first time a congressional committee has subjected a visiting foreign journalist to such a questioning, and he told the Dodd group, with wonderful British understatement, that "governmental grilling of foreign newspapermen is not a practice that one instinctively associates with the workings of Western democracy."

After the hearing, Mr. Tynan encountered some difficulties, which he suspects were not wholly coincidental, with the U.S. immigration authorities. But "after a lot of effort, inconvenience, and legal consultation, I managed to leave New York in my own time, on my own terms, and of my own volition."

The whole business cost Mr. Tynan some $1,500. It cost the reputation of the United States in Great Britain a great deal more than that.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 1960]

FIRST AMENDMENT

Too frequently in the past congressional committees seeking to preserve the security of the United States have failed to understand the meaning of the first amendment, confusing dissent with disloyalty, criticism with subversion. That was McCarthyism, which has declined but has not yet died. Too frequently in the present do we still see evidence of the same mentality, in both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and its counterpart, the House Un-American Activities Committee.

At the present moment the Internal Security group is the more obvious offender. It is attempting to force the scientist Linus Pauling to reveal the names of persons who helped collect 11,000 signatures to a 1958 petition urging an international agreement to stop testing nuclear weapons—something that the committee apparently feels had a subversive tinge to it at the U.N. then, although the U.S. Government is pursuing the same objective at Geneva now. Dr. Pauling says that to make public the names of those who helped circulate the petition might lead to reprisals. Whether or not his fears are justified, it is evident that the committee is pursuing its usual policy of harassment of suspected leftwingers and dissenters in its pursuit of Dr. Pauling.

The mentality of the Senate committee is well illustrated by another matter that has recently come to light. This was its degrading action last spring in questioning Kenneth Tynan, the British drama critic who was then visiting this country, about his views on Cuba and about the script of a television show he had helped produce in England voicing the opinions of a number of well-known American dissenters. To suggest, as the questioning did, that there was something wrong in Mr. Tynan's holding political opinions contrary to those of the President of the United States makes the committee appear even more ridiculous than it is and—something much more important—undermines American democratic principles.

And—just to remind ourselves that all the infringements of personal liberty are not committed by Congressional committees but sometimes are committed by their State counterparts—Dr. Willard Uphaus is still in a New Hampshire jail.

THE COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, American cotton producers have always depended upon foreign markets. From its inception the industry has exported on the average about 50 percent of its production. As a Senator from a great cotton-producing State and as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have always concerned myself with the problems in the world cotton market.

A strong export market for our cotton is essential to the economic health of the entire cotton industry. It is certainly essential to the economy of Arkansas. Cotton is by far the most important crop produced in my State. In 1959 the value of the cotton crop was over $276 million and represented 53 percent of the total value of all Arkansas crops. In that year Arkansas' proportionate share in export sales of cotton was approximately 750,000 bales—half of the State's total production. A total of 7,200,000 bales of U.S. cotton was exported in the last marketing year reducing the carryover to almost one-half of the level of 4 years ago. Exports this marketing year are expected to reach 6½ million bales and, if domestic consumption is at the expected level, the carryover will drop to about 6¾ million bales next August—a decrease of 800,000 bales from last year. This is approximately a normal carryover.

Many people here and abroad fail to appreciate the important role played by the U.S. Government in the world cotton market. I wish to invite to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Dr. M. H. Horne, Jr., which appeared in the September 1960 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Dr. Horne, a noted economist with extensive experience in cotton economics, discussed the leadership of our Government in the world cotton market. One of the significant points in his article was an exposition of the advantages which our leadership provides to other cotton exporting nations. The United States, according to Dr. Horne, plays the role of the residual supplier on the world market thus bringing greater market stability to other cotton exporting nations. In filling the role of residual supplier and as the world price leader, the United States has provided a little recognized source of strength to weaker cotton-producing nations.

He also points out that world cotton consumption is now increasing at the rate of 1.5 million bales a year and that until the 1955–56 season our share of the postwar export market declined drastically with corresponding benefits to foreign producers. With the implementation of the export subsidy program in 1955–56, American cotton producers began to enjoy a more equitable share in the world market. Since then, foreign production has increased but at a reduced rate. In looking to the future Dr. Horne takes the position that our cotton farmers' hopes for a real comparative advantage in the world market rest with improvements in technology which will lower production costs. In other words, the cotton farmer must produce more efficiently if we are to hold our own in the world market.

Another interesting piece pertaining to the cotton industry appeared in the New York Times of January 9. This article contains a brief résumé of the vast changes which have taken place in cotton production in recent years. As an indication of the advances in the tech-

nology of cotton production, the article points out that in 1939 it took three times the acreage to produce a crop which was 300,000 bales less than used to produce the 1960 crop. Mechanization on cotton farms has replaced hand labor to a great extent, although there are still many cotton producing areas in my State and others that depend on a certain amount of hand labor. The technological revolution in cotton farming promises to be the means by which the farmer, in spite of rising costs of machinery and other materials, can put out a better product at a lower cost per pound. If our farmers can continue the trend toward more efficient production I am confident that we will be able to maintain our fair share of the world cotton market. I hope that the cotton industry can agree upon a program for consideration by the Congress and the new administration which will not jeopardize the export markets for our cotton.

I commend both of these articles to the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON

(By M. K. Horne, Jr.)

Cotton is a clear case of an agricultural commodity for which the U.S. Government functions as the world price leader. This is true by virtue of some simple arithmetic. During the past five seasons we supplied 32 percent of the cotton which moved in world trade. Of some 40 other cotton-exporting countries there was none which could account for even half so much. The basic decisions governing the general price level at which we export cotton are made by one agency, the Federal Government. In other words, one decision-maker determines the price for a third of the international trade in cotton. So long as the foreign world depends upon us for this large fraction of its imports, we can, by withholding cotton except at a certain price, draw the whole market up toward the general vicinity of that price. And so long as we hold big stocks, we can, by selling cotton at any price, drop the whole market down toward the vicinity of that price.

This position of price leadership is accentuated by the fact that virtually all our competitors in cotton exports—Mexico, Egypt, and so forth—have neither the local finances nor the supplies of foreign exchange to permit them the luxury of holding their cotton through periods of price weakness. Only the United States can afford this dubious luxury.

Our role as the price leader is far from a comfortable one. Whenever price leadership exists in any commodity, the smaller competitors enjoy quite a trading advantage. When market conditions are tight and sales are easy to make, they can raise their prices up to or above that of the leader. When the market is glutted, they can nearly always continue making sales by cutting their prices slightly below that of the leader.

This is just the situation which has bedeviled the makers of U.S. Government policy toward cotton. In the season before last, for example—August 1, 1957–July 31, 1958—this country obtained 41 percent of the world trade in cotton. This was because the volume of trade was relatively strong. Last season, on the other hand, was one of recession in the world cotton trade, and we received only 22 percent of the business.

THE ROLE OF RESIDUAL SUPPLIER

It is charged, quite correctly, that in these circumstances the United States serves merely as the residual supplier of cotton to the world. Other countries, by selling below our price when necessary, can assure themselves of a market for their production year after year. In crudest terms, we take whatever market they leave us.

It is a great oversimplification, of course, to generalize in this manner without regard for differences in quality and merchandising efficiency. The quality of cotton is a thing of vast importance, complexity, and—I must add—controversy; but if space permitted a discussion of this subject we still would find that in a broad sense our country functions as the residual supplier.

There naturally is much criticism of the Government for allowing itself to be caught in this weak bargaining position for the world market. Indeed the existing law undertakes to rid us of this position by ordering the Commodity Credit Corporation "to make cotton available at prices not in excess of the level of prices at which cottons of comparable qualities are being offered in substantial quantity by other exporting countries."

The difficulties are apparent. If the United States were a small factor in the world cotton trade, the Government could not be the price leader even if it wanted to. But since it actually is such a large factor, the Government does not really have the power to abandon the role of price leadership. If we try to follow the prices of our competitors downward, we may drive them down further. We could find ourselves following downward a price which we ourselves were driving downward.

There seem to be only two routes by which we could escape the burden of price leadership. One would be by continuing to become a smaller and smaller factor in the world cotton trade until at length we no longer held the power to affect the price so decisively. We are much closer to that position now than in decades past. Indeed within recent years we seem to have experienced short periods in which the world received a foretaste of this condition. During 1955 particularly, for a number of months the United States was virtually out of the world market because, seemingly for the first time, other countries were pressing to sell more than enough cotton for the entire immediate export demand. For the first time the sellers of foreign-grown cotton were not competing primarily with the United States but rather with one another—and the world price took a steep plunge.

The other route would be by taking the Government out of its role as maker of the general price level for U.S. cotton. It holds this role by means of support programs which tend to set a floor for prices and of large stock holdings which tend to set a ceiling at the level where these stocks may be released upon the market. In addition the law authorizes export subsidies which cause the export price to differ from the domestic. Currently a payment-in-kind subsidy on exports is in effect.

If the Government relinquished this entire function, the United States apparently would no longer serve as the world price leader because there would be no concentration of the basic pricemaking power. The whole structure of the world market presumably would be radically changed. It would resemble much more closely the classical concept of many buyers and many sellers, none in a position of special dominance.

The following comments, however, will deal with the situation in which we are today, in which we have been for a long time, and in which we shall be for some indefinite future time: the situation of the price leader.

THE EFFECT UPON FOREIGN PRODUCTION

The foremost cotton-producing countries of the foreign free world read like a roster of the strategically placed nations in the struggle for progress and freedom: India, Egypt, Mexico, Brazil, Pakistan, and so on. Surely we must have careful regard for their economic stability and progress. What is their interest in the U.S. cotton policy?

Few kind words are ever said for it in international councils, but as a matter of fact, this policy, must have served as an enormous boon to the progress of less-developed nations.

The fundamental nature of cotton prices is not too commonly understood. On the demand side, it is fundamental that cotton is an industrial raw material. Seven-eighths of the retail value of the typical product is added after the fiber leaves the farm. The notion that the mills can make quick and easy shifts between cotton and rayon belongs to theory, not to fact. Such shifts do occur, but they typically require years of sustained technical and merchandising effort. In the short-run, the quantity of raw cotton consumed does fluctuate quite importantly, but the fluctuations are governed by the requirements of the spinning mills throughout the world. These requirements change as the mills respond to the up-and-down motion of the textile cycle. On the supply side, the quantity available in any short-run period is seriously affected by changes in the weather all over the world. These short-term fluctuations in both demand and supply are not caused by the price of raw cotton, nor can small price changes bring them into equilibrium. A tendency toward wide short-term fluctuations in prices is inherent.

In today's world, important expansion in cotton production requires long-range plans and substantial investments—even, to a considerable extent, in the underdeveloped countries. More and more, any significant expansion depends on great irrigation projects. Such investments involve great risks. It seems inescapable that U.S. cotton policy has served effectively to remove most of the price risk involved, as well as maintaining the world price during most of the postwar period at levels which were quite attractive to the foreign producer.

Under these conditions foreign free-world production rose to 12.4 million bales in 1950–51—approximately equaling its prewar peak—and from that point proceeded to build up rapidly to 17.5 million in 1958–59. This is indeed a healthy rate of growth, and it takes on greater meaning from the fact that in the decade of the 1950's the main trend of U.S. production was forced downward by acreage restrictions.

In addition to maintaining the world price, our cotton policy has provided reasonable assurance to every foreign producer that he could market his crop virtually every year, while we ourselves absorbed the impact of fluctuations in our annual volume of exports ranging from 7.5 to 2.2 million bales. Such is the lot of the residual supplier. In absorbing the main shock of changes in the supply and demand situation, we maintained the only important stock of surplus cotton in the world, even when our carryover reached 14.5 million bales in August 1955.

If we have regard solely for the interests of the foreign producing nations we evidently should think long indeed before abandoning our role as the great stabilizing factor in the cotton markets of the world. I would judge that few if any forms of foreign aid have meant so much to the strength and progress of the weaker nations.

THE EFFECT UPON U.S. EXPORTS

What, on the other hand, is in the direct national interest of the United States?

I would think, first of all, that our policy needs to be based on a deep understanding

of the basic economics involved—the real nature and function of supply, of demand, and of price. This is a prime obligation of a country which holds the burden of such overtowering leadership. I refer most emphatically, to the supply, demand, and price of this particular commodity. We cannot afford the luxury of theoretical generalizations any more than we can afford that of narrow minded self-interest.

In the present structure of the world market, it is futile for this country to try to free itself from the handicaps of price leadership. In struggling to do so, we would batter and punish other nations far more than we would help ourselves. And we still would find it impossible to export some normal portion of our production each season, as other nations tend to do.

Our real interest calls for a longer view. Though we are obliged to play the part of the residual supplier, we can profitably direct our attention to the size of the residual. We cannot keep this from fluctuating a great deal between one season and the next, but we surely can take rational measures aimed at protecting or expanding the average size of the residual over a period of years. The residual involved is, in simplest terms, the gap between total consumption and production of cotton in the entire foreign world. If that gap disappears we have virtually lost our export market. If it expands, our exports are bound to expand.

Many forces determine the long-range trend of foreign consumption and production. Some of them are entirely outside the province of our national policy or of private industrial policy. Others are within the proper reach of our influence. Sales promotion has a significant bearing on the volume of cotton consumption. Techniques of industrywide promotion which have been pioneered for the past two decades in this country are now being transported to 14 leading foreign nations by means of Public Law 480 programs, with major contributions coming from industry groups both in this and in the foreign countries involved.

In this context it is most interesting to examine the function of price. While our role as price leader is a handicap within the time span of a single marketing season, it certainly need not be if we can project our thinking over a period of years. Over the years—and only then—the price of cotton does indeed become a major influence upon the quantity consumed and the quantity produced. Whether we like it or not, our Government holds the power, through price, to influence very materially the trend of both consumption and production abroad. This great power can be used with reasonable regard for the direct interest of our own producers as well as those in foreign lands.

A basic source of optimism is the spectacular rate of growth in foreign cotton consumption. In the whole foreign world—Communist included—cotton consumption has increased in every single year since 1943–44. It has doubled since 1946–47. It exceeded its prewar peak level in 1950–61, reaching 24.6 million. From that point it has climbed upward to 36.9 million in 1958–59, and perhaps to 38.5 million in 1959–60. An average increase of 1.5 million bales per year.

Surely in this dynamic market situation it is not greedy for the United States producer to hope that he might maintain his export market at the same average level, or even share modestly in the market expansion. The fact is, however, that throughout the postwar period of 1955–56, the upward trend of foreign production not only equaled but exceeded the tremendous growth in consumption, so that our residual part of this market was trending downward and our export market was headed toward extinction. In the season of 1955–56 the Government embarked on a program of substantial export subsidies. In the ensuing years foreign production has continued an upward trend, but the pace of the increase has been sharply reduced, so that the residual between foreign consumption and production has begun to show an upward tendency and the outlook for United States exports across the years has improved.

A CHANGING PRICE POLICY

In the meantime, the farmer is making a real effort to move with reasonable speed toward the point where he can hold a sound place in the world market without reliance on the export subsidy. Much has been achieved in the field of education on the real market significance of the cotton price. The prices received by farmers for cotton have had a pronounced downward trend over the past decade. The old clamor for 90 percent of parity is seldom heard today. In 1958, with urging from the cotton industry and the cotton farmer, new legislation was adopted which set the support price on a downward course. For the season beginning August 1, 1960, it has been announced that the export subsidy will be reduced from 8 to 6 cents, accompanied by an offsetting reduction of almost as much in the support price to the farmer. More of this could occur in future years. The declining prices received by the farmer are the more significant because they come in an environment of rising prices for the factors of production. Not many American cotton farmers, even in the most efficient bracket, give much evidence of prosperity today. Neither, incidentally, do many cotton farmers in other lands.

In the cost of production, the great disadvantage of the American cotton farmer is the price of labor. In many other aspects of production he has a competitive advantage. As progress is made in the use of machines, chemicals, and scientific techniques in replacement of labor, the hopes of this country for a real comparative advantage in cotton production become brighter. The possibilities of such progress, even to the point of sensational breakthroughs in several key problem areas, are quite enormous. If in the next decade the technology of cotton production remains rather dormant, it is likely that our genuine economic claim upon a large place in the world cotton market will decline. If great technological progress is made, as it can be, the United States farmer probably will achieve a real comparative advantage in the true classical meaning of the term.

USE OF MACHINERY BOLSTERS COTTON—REVOLUTION IN FARMING PUTS INDUSTRY ON AN EFFICIENT BASIS—CROP YIELD UP

The technological revolution in the U.S. cotton-growing industry finally has resulted in its emergence on a sounder basis than ever.

This change has not been made without a heavy cost to the Federal Government during the transition period. Also, thousands of families have been uprooted in the process and the number of cotton farms in the United States has steadily declined. They amount to about 1 million compared with more than 2 million 20 years ago.

Those who have been compelled to leave the cotton farms, however, have been absorbed in industry and generally their earning power has been increased. The problem now is to keep the former farmers employed in their new work and to furnish adequate housing in the big cities where most of them have gone.

U.S. DOMINANCE LIKELY

The creation of bigger and bigger cotton farms, most of them completely mechanized, has assured that the United States for years will occupy the dominant position in the world's expanding cotton-growing industry.

In the change, hand labor on the cotton farm virtually has disappeared. The yield an acre has been more than doubled and today a mechanically equipped cotton farm is operated just as efficiently as an industrial plant.

Last year's domestic crop of 14,200,000 bales was produced from a harvested acreage of 15,316,000 acres. The yield was 445 pounds an acre, down slightly from the 462 an acre in 1959.

Just what the technological revolution has meant to cotton is demonstrated by the 1930 crop, which was produced almost entirely with animal power and hand labor. In that year, the crop amounted to 13,900,000 bales, or 300,000 fewer than in 1960. Further, it was produced from a harvested acreage of 42,450,000, or almost 3 times larger than in 1960. And the yield an acre was only 157 pounds, or only about one-third of last year's crop.

The cultivation of the 1960 cotton crop was done almost entirely with tractor power. It is estimated that better than 50 percent was mechanically gathered, compared with only 43 percent in 1959.

With the implements now being used on cotton farms being improved and made larger, the personnel needed on a farm will decline further. Recently, the Department of Agriculture said that if farmers were to make the maximum use of all known technology the yield an acre by 1975 could be increased to 616 pounds, or about 40 percent more than in 1960.

Since the average yield in some of the Far West States is not far from 1,000 pounds an acre, or two bales, many in the trade believe this forecast is too conservative.

NATIONAL ALLOTMENT SET

For the 1961 crop, the national allotment has been set at 18,450,000 acres. Taking into consideration the acres allotted in 1960 to choice B growers—those that accepted a 40-percent acreage allotment for a lower support program—the acreage available for planting in 1960 will be increased by 5.3 percent. It is calculated that this year's allotment will produce a crop of 15,500,000 bales.

From its inception, the cotton industry has depended upon exports for the disposal of 50 percent of its production. In the years of high support prices, the export level dropped sharply and surplus supplies increased to a record level of 14,500,000 bales in the season ended July 31, 1956. Exports in the marketing year ended on that date were only 2,200,000 bales, or about 16 percent of the 12,700,000 bales produced that season.

Through subsidy payments, the Eisenhower administration brought the price of U.S. cotton on a competitive basis with other growths and cotton exports moved ahead in the years that followed. Despite the increase in production since, surplus stocks at the end of last season declined to 7,550,000 bales, or to almost one-half the level of 4 years earlier.

Exports this season are expected to reach 6,500,000 bales, representing about 46 percent of the production. This would compare with 7,200,000 bales in the 1959–60 season, when sales abroad amounted to roughly 50 percent of the crop produced that season.

If exports should reach their expected level and domestic consumption should amount to 8,500,000 bales, as the trade estimates, a further drop in the carryover on July 31 to around 6,750,000 bales is likely.

TRANSPORTATION IN THE COLUMBIA BASIN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial published in the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., November 25, 1960, relating to a transportation industry

convention, making appropriate comments thereon, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROADS, TRUCKERS, BARGEMEN TRADE BLOWS AT RATE DISCUSSION

(By Tom Humphrey)

It took both courage and imagination on the part of President Charles Baker and Executive Vice President Herb West of the IEWA to expose its Columbia Basin membership to a no-holds-barred discussion and criticism of inland waterways in particular and the bitterly competitive transportation industry generally at the 27th annual convention in Portland this week.

This was especially true in light of the fact that the Columbia Basin has been involved in a cold war between the railroads and the bargelines and their supporters over the current $7 million selective reduction in freight rates on wheat and a contest between the Southern Pacific and Santa Fe over control of the Western Pacific.

LIVES UP TO NAME

Billed as the "most important discussion you have had an opportunity to hear," the IEWA panel discussion of transportation problems certainly lived up to its billing. Top spokesmen for the railroads, the truck lines, the waterways and the shippers delivered hard-hitting critiques of transportation problems and the "unfair tactics" of their competitors. And with U.S. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as moderator, a panel of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho newspapermen bored into the panel with questions designed to answer the topical question: "What are the necessary ingredients for a strong, economically sound national transportation system?"

No clearcut answer to this question was obtained. But Senator MAGNUSON told a packed joint luncheon meeting of IEWA and the Portland Chamber of Commerce in discussing national transportation policy in the 1960s, that such a policy must involve keeping the transportation industry alive, competitive, and strong in a rapidly developing economy. He indicated his belief that the Congress in dealing with such complex and tricky policy questions as regulation, taxes, subsidies, user's charges, and mergers, would seek to place each segment of the transportation industry on an equal status.

ALL DEBATED

All these questions were hotly debated by the transportation panelists, who were given an extra 2 hours to develop facts and opinions on what's wrong with transportation policy.

The railroads, represented by Burton N. Behling, chief economist for the Association of American Railroads, charged that the railroads are plagued by overregulation and overtaxation and that the waterways, trucking, and air transport industries are underregulated and oversubsidized. He argued against all subsidies and for fully compensatory user charges on trucks, barges, and airlines using public facilities and for authority for railroads to engage in other modes of transportation and for greater freedom to compete in rates. He also advocated more mergers to restore the railroads to full health and vigor.

The trucking industry, represented by Welby M. Frantz, chairman of the board of the American Trucking Associations, came back by charging that the railroads are using the rate structure as a vicious weapon to attack the solvency of competitors and that they still cling to the "divine-right-to-traffic" theory. He advocated intermode arrangements and joint rate and service agreements which would employ the maximum advantages of each type of transportation and honest, intelligent cooperation of carriers and shippers to end the transportation cold war and preserve the independence of each mode.

DEFENDS BARGES

Not to be outdone, Braxton B. Carr, president of the American Waterways Operators, stoutly defended the tug-barge industry on inland waterways and lashed out at railroad proposals of a 2-mill user charge on barge traffic which he said would drive commerce off the rivers and canals of the Nation. He charged that selective rate cutting by the railroads has been the chief instrument of destruction of the coastwise and intercoastal carriers and the decline of the Great Lakes trade.

In effect, Edwin F. Steffen, chairman of the national agricultural cooperative transportation committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the spokesman for the shippers, expressed dissatisfaction with both rail and truck transportation systems. He defended exemption of certain agricultural and fishery commodities from rate regulation. But he charged that shippers have been forced into private truck transportation business to protect their interests and declared that shippers can't pay for the built-in deficiencies of the railroads.

These widely divergent, sometimes bitter, views offered no pat solutions for easing the fiercely competitive transportation battle. But they did suggest that it would be in the public interest to end the cold war between modes of transportation and get on with the business of providing the services needed at reasonably competitive prices.

And as we said in the beginning, it took courage on the part of IEWA, stanch advocate of inland waterway development, to invite spokesmen of national stature in competing modes of transportation to fire both barrels at inland navigation. Let us add that Carr, representing inland water carriers, did all right in defending them as a vital, money-saving segment of the transportation industry.

PROPOSED FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the difficulties in working out legislation affecting agriculture is the differences of opinion and general lack of agreement among farm organizations and quite often farmers themselves.

On January 5 a number of Kansas farm organizations met at Wichita, Kans., and arrived at some general conclusions and agreements on proposed farm legislation, particularly as it affects wheat.

A meeting of national farm leaders and others interested in agriculture has been called for the last of January here in Washington, D.C. It is my hope that they can reach some basic agreement on a program which will assure the farmer his fair share of the national income.

The income of the farmer has steadily declined during the past few years, while at the same time our farm surpluses have increased. The Federal budget, or Federal expenditures for agriculture have gone up, but farm income continues to lag behind the income of other Americans.

This problem is of serious concern, not only to the farmers themselves, but also to every citizen of this Nation, as it has resulted in a problem which is getting out of hand. It is one which must have attention and I can assure Senators it is not an easy problem. In fact, it is not a political problem—it is an economic one.

In 1960 farm income was over $11 billion, which is about the same as it was in 1959; however the 1951 farm income was over $15 billion, or about 25 percent greater than at the present time.

During the period from 1951 to 1961 farm costs have greatly increased by increased cost of farm machinery, labor costs, and taxes. This is the real problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the wire which I received from the representatives of the Kansas farm organizations who attended the meeting in Wichita be printed as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the wire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DODGE CITY, KANS.,
January 6, 1961.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I am happy to inform you Kansas farm groups agree on farm program in following resolution transmitted for your information and consideration. Resolution signed by Anson Horning, president, Kansas Association of Wheat Growers; J. H. Dean, general manager, Farmers Cooperative Commission Co.; P. J. Nash, general manager, Farmers Union Jobbing Association; Martin J. Byrne, president, Kansas Farmers Union; James W. Ingursen, chairman, executive committee, Kansas State Grange.

"Whereas officers and representatives of the Kansas State Grange, the Kansas Farmers Union, the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., and the Farmers Union Jobbing Association, representing virtually every wheat producer in the State of Kansas, are assembled this 5th day of January 1961 at Wichita, Kans.; and

"Whereas the aforesaid organizations have discussed effective farm programs, maintaining and improving farmer income, agreement among farm groups and benefits of an effective farm program to all parts of our economy; and

"Whereas the assembly has approved a motion for representatives of the various groups in the meeting to draw up a document showing agreement on principles discussed: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the assembly as a group adopt the general principles of the 1960 marketing program for wheat, supported by the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the National Association of Wheat Growers, and other farm groups, as offering the greatest possibilities for a farm program beneficial to wheat producers and all segments of our economy, including the consumer; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the group agrees to give active support to informing their respective membership and the general public of the principles of the program and the reasons it merits their support; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the group agrees to inform the proper legislative bodies on a State and National level of the unity of their action on this farm program."

This resolution was adopted unanimously.

ANSON HORNING.

AIR POLLUTION MENACES OUR CITIES' FUTURE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, throughout my service in the Senate I have sought on many occasions to assist

efforts directed at protection of our people against the undeniable menace of air pollution. It will be my privilege shortly to introduce further legislation which I trust will strengthen the forces seeking fundamental knowledge which is vital to the success of air pollution control programs.

In the meantime, I wish to bring to the attention of the other Members of this body an excellent, challenging, and thought-provoking article which warns that the air pollution problem is far more serious than many people appreciate, and, indeed, that it is grievous.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from a special review section of the Los Angeles Times devoted entirely to the complex question of smog.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 8, 1961]

PALL CAST ON CITIES' FUTURE

(By Ray Herbert)

The link between air pollution and the future of the Nation's metropolitan centers is inescapable.

Seemingly any carefully charted growth pattern could fall short of reaching its obvious potential if fumes, smoke, and distasteful dust particles are allowed to desecrate the urban complex without any promise of relief.

One of the Nation's leading planners believes that the surest way to insure this stable growth lies in the control or elimination of automobile exhausts. Edmund N. Bacon, executive director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission, puts it this way:

"The future of our metropolitan areas will be greatly influenced by the answer to the question of whether we strengthen the downtown areas as a center of business, commerce, and culture, as well as a residential area, or whether we allow these elements to become widely dispersed over the region."

SHOPPERS ANNOYED

Any factor he says, that can improve environmental conditions in the center city is a stroke in its favor.

Like everyone who frequents a busy downtown district, he regards air pollution caused by automotive exhaust as an annoyance to people who supply the central city's lifeblood.

"It tends to create undesirable atmospheric conditions and makes it much more difficult to keep buildings clean," he pointed out. "The destructive effect on foliage and flowers, which are so important in making downtown areas attractive, is well known."

MAJOR EFFECT

Because of this, he said, the development of a policy of exhaust control "will have a major effect on the future distribution of activities throughout the metropolitan area."

Obviously this reference would apply with particular force to cities like Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles, where the automobile is a prime factor in the movement of people.

In Pittsburgh, once the Nation's smoky city, partial control has already been effected through mandatory semiannual police inspections.

In its attempt to clean the air even further, Pittsburgh seems to be adding luster to a smog enforcement program which began after World War II. Accompanying it was the redevelopment of its downtown core, a master-planned undertaking which gave the city its famed Golden Triangle, a multimillion showcase of professional know-how and the envy of planners and developers throughout the world.

RESIDENTS LEAVE

Yet while Pittsburgh was striving to translate the objectives of its master plan into concrete and steel, it lost thousands of residents. Pittsburgh had a population of 676,000 in 1950, but the 1960 census put it at 604,000.

"We could not get talented young people to take jobs in our city," Dr. Edward R. Weidlein, retired president and board chairman of the Mellon Institute, explained recently. "One look at our grimy buildings and sooty air and they and their wives went elsewhere. Now all that has changed."

Some form of automotive exhaust control will probably play a key role in the future of the Chicago metropolitan area, a region already earmarked as one of the Nation's 10 supermetropolises in the year 2000. By then it will have a population of 11 million.

TWO MILLION CARS

Recent registration figures showed more than 2 million automobiles, trucks and buses in use now in the metropolitan region. Half of them are registered in Chicago alone, a city with 3.5 million residents.

But the particulate matter contained in dustfall—not necessarily exhaust fumes—has been the greatest single source of annoyance to Metropolitan Chicago's more than 6 million residents. Another source of trouble was the pungent odor that drifted from the Chicago Union Stockyards, but this has been largely eliminated through planned decentralization and air-washing equipment.

H. Hayward Hirsch, director of the community development division of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, believes the city's long-standing air pollutants, as such, will play a relatively minor part in the metropolitan area's planning pattern.

ZONING IMPORTANT

"Rather, much more significance will be attached to land availability, pattern of expressway extensions and area zoning which will affect distribution of land usage between commercial, industrial, agricultural and residential purposes," he explained.

In New York, the Nation's largest city, the relationship between air pollution and the planning structure of Manhattan's suburban communities is gaining increasing attention.

Regionally, the New York area must plan for a population of nearly 25 million by the year 2000. This outlook points up the telltale signs contained in a study by the New York State Air Pollution Control Board. It showed that even Long Island, a primarily residential and rural region, is generating some pollutants.

"Air pollution problems may be expected to intensify in this region, unless early control programs are instituted, because the population trend is eastward into Suffolk County," the report said.

CASE OF NIAGARA AREA

Although New York's air pollution problem is major in scope, the Niagara Frontier area outranks it in priority attention on a statewide basis.

Because vacant land is at a premium, Niagara Falls, an industrialized center with a population of 101,000, has directed much of its plant expansion into communities outside the city limits.

To regulate this fringe development, the surrounding towns and villages have put zoning ordinances to work as they affect both residential and industrial construction. The Niagara region is also relying on a $120,000 metropolitan area planning project to help guide this growth.

IDEAL PLAN

"When the project is completed," says Charles B. Read, manager of the Industrial Department of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, "it should produce an ideal plan for the future development of a very large portion of the western part of New York State."

Similarly, Wheeling, W. Va., the largest city in the heavily air polluted Upper Ohio River Valley, put its future in the hands of an areawide planner. The city lies in the heart of a raw steel-producing and coal-consuming region.

"When the master plan for Wheeling and its surrounding area was prepared," said Ivan E. Myers, executive director of the Wheeling Area Conference on Community Development, "it was recognized, as it had been previously in Pittsburgh, that control of air pollution was a major step in the development of the community."

ATMOSPHERE IMPROVES

Not long ago, Wheeling's atmosphere began to improve, largely as a result of voluntary air pollution control measures. Windows were staying cleaner longer and motorists found themselves driving downtown in midday without using their headlights, something they could not have done 5 years ago.

This extreme murkiness so often associated with air pollution in the Midwest and East has never characterized the eye-irritating variety of smog the Los Angeles area experiences. Often the smog here is invisible, or nearly so. It settles over much of the metropolitan area as a cloud of yellow-tinted fumes—the collective emissions of hundreds of thousands of automobiles, trucks, and buses.

Rigid control measures, some authorities believe, have stifled most of the other smog-generating sources.

No one will deny that Los Angeles County, like other regions suffering the manifold discomforts of air pollution, is responsible for diffusing its own atmosphere.

FREEWAYS UNMATCHED

Its freeway system, for instance, is unmatched anywhere in the world, handling—at the four-level interchange on the fringe of the Los Angeles Civic Center—more than 320,000 automobiles and trucks daily.

Yet, as one county official pointed out, the efficiency planned and built into the system has served only as an open invitation for more motorists to use the freeways and, in turn, send more pollutants into the atmosphere.

"The tendency of people to congregate in urban communities," says Dr. W. L. Faith, managing director of the Air Pollution Foundation, "puts a load of pollution into the atmosphere that will probably continue to increase until economic and politically palatable means of control are developed."

The latest figures show more than 3.2 million motor vehicles registered in Los Angeles County.

By 1980, Southern California will have 10 million vehicles traveling 120 billion miles annually, a good share of them in Los Angeles County.

Freeways and streets must be planned to handle this traffic flow. But what about the air pollution it will generate?

Dr. Faith believes the answer lies in control devices or afterburners on automobiles and trucks—a smog elimination program that will take at least 5 years.

EFFICIENT TRANSPORT

An efficient mass transportation system, now under consideration, could also help. Planners here believe it would remove thousands of automobiles from the county's streets and highways each day.

Recently, the air pollution committee of the Los Angeles County Medical Association recommended that any such system be electrically operated as a further means of reducing exhaust fumes.

In one sense, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission has already embarked on a program that it feels may ultimately result in a reduction in the number of miles driven, although not necessarily in the number of motor vehicles.

Milton Breivogel, director of the Regional Planning Commission, explained it this way:

"We have turned to a concept of decentralization of industry into balanced areas. It's our aim to provide enough space for industries, resident, commercial establishments, schools, agriculture and recreation through a detailed land use plan."

Of the county's 10 subregional areas, studies have already been completed for the southeast part of the county and the East San Gabriel Valley.

PATTERN FOR SHOPPING

"These studies, in a sense, will provide land use patterns which will serve as a format for people who live, say, in the East San Gabriel Valley to work there," Breivogel explained. "The pattern for shopping facilities and recreational uses will be laid out. Only occasionally will these people find it necessary to drive to Pasadena or downtown Los Angeles."

He said the commission, in developing this concept, is trying to encourage the creation of jobs "where the people are."

"We're thinking," he explained, "of the effect, traffic, crowded streets, air pollution, and other factors have on the human being."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the motion made by the distinguished majority leader to refer to committee the pending resolution. I strongly oppose this motion and I hope it will be defeated. Let us face facts. If successful, this maneuver will destroy any real possibility of changing rule XXII at this session.

It will gravely imperil all civil rights legislation, including even an extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

It will repudiate the solemn platform pledges of both political parties and the promises of both presidential candidates. It will shatter the hopes of what I believe to be an overwhelming majority of the American people who want to restore a semblance of democratic rule to this great legislative body.

Mr. President, the Nation is living on the threshold of outer space. Facing us are most serious and pressing questions in the field of international affairs, as well as untold domestic issues yet to be resolved.

We are engulfed by a highly competitive world of action. We were told last fall, prior to the presidential election, by both political candidates: Inaction is a key word of the past; this Nation must move forward. Yet this motion is a prelude to retreat and inaction on the very first substantive issue facing the 87th Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be a question. The Senator refers to a substantive issue. Does the Senator believe the Senate should proceed to handle all the substantive matters embraced in the platform of the two major parties without any committee consideration?

Mr. KEATING. No, I do not believe that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then why does the Senator from New York think this resolution should not be referred to committee, whereas he thinks that all other measures should be referred to committee?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very happy to explain why I do not think this measure should be referred to the committee. The reason is that we have had experience before with rule changes. We know that when proposals of this nature go to committee, they are always faced, upon return, with a filibuster. The very same thing may well happen during this session. Proposals to change the rules may very well be brought back here a week or two before the great rush for adjournment is on, at which time even the threat of a filibuster may lead to their defeat.

But we do not face that situation today; and I assume that is why the Democratic platform includes the statement that this action will be taken at the beginning of the Congress, not later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from New York recall that no later than last year, 1960, the Senate proceeded to change its rules, and voted, and by a majority vote did change the rules in the very respect to which the Senator from New York is now addressing himself?

Mr. KEATING. No, it was at the opening of the first session.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it was at the opening of the second session of the Congress—not at the opening of the Congress, but at the opening of the second session of the Congress. That particular Congress had then been in being for more than 1 year. Yet the Senate proceeded by majority vote to change the rule.

Mr. KEATING. But the change which was made was a very insignificant one.

I have no doubt that some minor change might be effected as a face-saving device. I, myself, may propose a change which might not be objected to by the Senator from Georgia; and it might well be said, when we came around to considering this one, several months hence, "Well, that is a fair change, so we will make that change, in order to comply with our political platform." And, Mr. President, technically speaking, it might be a change; but it would not be one to comply with the spirit of the platforms.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is not the complaint of the Senator from New York addressed to the fact that a majority of the Senate did not agree with him, rather than to any failure of the Senate to have an opportunity to work its will? Could not a majority of the Senate, when the matter was pending, have voted to change the rule to provide for cloture by majority vote, if a majority of the Senate had desired to do that?

The cold fact is that the Senate had the matter of a change of the rules before it in 1960; and the Senate then had a chance to work its will; and there was nothing to prevent a majority of the Senate, if a majority so desired, from including the very provision the Senator from New York is espousing here today. In the light of that situation, does not the Senator from New York think that his argument that this resolution should not be referred to committee falls rather flat?

Mr. KEATING. Let me say that, of course, whenever a majority of the Senate does not agree with the Senator from New York, he thinks the majority is wrong; and no doubt the Senator from Georgia thinks the majority is wrong when they do not agree with him. But that is not my complaint. I expect that this proposed rule might frequently work to my disadvantage; but I am seeking to give a majority of the Members of the Senate an opportunity to work their will on any legislation which comes before it.

However, I must say that my recollection differs from that of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was in error about the year. I confused the civil rights bill that was considered last year with the rule change that was acted upon in 1959. I think my error might be forgiven, however, because the Senator from New York, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and other Members always couple those matters together.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, I forgive the Senator from Georgia for any indiscretions or sins of omission or commission, of which, I am sure I have committed more than he has.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not in a position to reveal all of mine; therefore, I cannot count them here publicly on the Senate floor.

Mr. KEATING. But the point is that at the beginning of this session we are faced with exactly what we were faced with at the beginning of the last Congress; and although that change was a minor one, it was made at the beginning of the 86th Congress and not after committee hearings. We all know that the right time to legislate on this subject is now, and not many, many months hence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is correct when he says it was done at the opening of a session. But, as I recall, it was done by a vote of approximately 70 to 20—although I do not have the exact figures before me now. So at that time a majority of the Senate did have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. KEATING. But only after all other efforts to change the rule had been defeated. I voted for that change, and I believe it was a slight advance in the direction of making this body a democratic one. I certainly was not satisfied or pleased with the change which was made, for it was only a small step in the right direction.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this point will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to point out to my colleague how correct he is, because

that change made no change whatever in the score of some 23 efforts, with only 4 successes, because all 4 of the successes were attained when the rule required the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members present and voting. But notwithstanding the fact, for example, that on 2 of those occasions—in 1950—when more than 60 percent of the Members present and voting sought to effect cloture, they were unsuccessful. So my colleague is absolutely correct when he says the change made in 1959 was not meaningful in terms of the practicalities of the situation.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague for his comment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from New York has gone back into the origin of the rule, and then down to this good day. But in discussing matters which transpired in the last Senate, it seems to me that both the Senators from New York inveigh more against the refusal of a majority of the Senate to follow them than they inveigh against the rule. I recall that last year—and I am very certain about this—both of the Senators from New York signed a cloture petition that was brought before the Senate, but they failed to get even a bare numerical majority of the Senate to vote in favor of gagging the Senate at that time. So the fact that the rule requires a two-thirds vote, rather than just a majority—as the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] advocates, means nothing, because when he tried that last year, he did not get even a majority of the Members who voted on that proposition to vote to gag the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. What I inveigh against is not my inability to succeed in getting the Senate to adopt my point of view. But I inveigh against the possibility that a minority of the Senate can prevent a majority of the Senate from voting and from working their will on legislation.

I repeat that I am perfectly well aware that this issue goes far beyond the field of civil rights. The last time it was successful, in effect, it had to do with an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act. I do not know what my position would have been at that time, for I was not then a Member of the Senate. It might have been very regrettable, from my point of view, that unlimited debate was ended; and I recognize that such a rule change, if it had been put into effect, would have been bound to affect many of us adversely on many occasions.

But it is inconceivable to me that eventually the Senate will not come to the point of view that a majority of the Members of the Senate may direct the action of the Senate, just as the public at large thinks is the possibility now. The general public does not realize that it is possible for a group of 10 or 12 able-bodied Members of this body to prevent the Senate from acting on any issue. However, they could do that, if necessity arose, by starting at the very beginning of the session, and could stymie this legislative body from one end of the year to the other. That is a situation which, in my judgment, the American people do not condone and do not desire to have continued; and that is the reason why I oppose the pending motion.

I was referring to the great amount of talk we heard about moving forward. This is our first effort to move forward toward some new frontier, and yet we are turning backward. We know what happened to Lot's wife when she looked backward. If we do not realistically face the future as I believe we should, the same sad fate may turn out to be ours.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is now about ready to don his buckskin coat and fall in the van of those who are laying out the metes and bounds of the New Frontier?

Mr. KEATING. I want to disabuse the Senator from any such intention on my part.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said he wanted to move toward a new frontier.

Mr. KEATING. There are many features of the New Frontier which I am certain I shall oppose; but I shall never oppose the right of this legislative body to have a majority rule. I may speak at some length on a number of those proposals, but I shall never try to prevent action by the Senate, eventually, on any one of those pieces of legislation, seriously as I may be opposed to them, and I am sure I shall oppose some of them.

When I speak about the New Frontier, it is not to support the program of the New Frontier, but to point out that the very first step toward the New Frontier is a retreat, which is the action we are being asked to take in this Chamber today.

There has been a proud boast, on the part of the devotees of the New Frontier—and I do not mean to include the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] necessarily in this; he will probably be a member of the posse part of the time, and not a part of it the rest of the time, especially if he runs true to what I know to be his legislative record in the past. We were told that this posse was saddled up to go forward; and it appears now, by this device before us, that they are going to turn out to be merely "ghost writers in the sky."

The majority leader's motion to submit these proposed changes in the Senate rules to the Committee on Rules and Administration for study is, unquestionably, at this time the very surest way to insure that no meaningful and effective changes in the Senate rules take place during the 87th Congress; and I say this without impugning in any way the honor of our majority leader who is beyond cavil; we all know him to be a man of honor. We have only to look at the results of such a move made in the 85th Congress to foretell the outcome, if the motion of the majority leader shall be adopted.

In 1957, after 7 days of exhaustive and comprehensive hearings, the Committee on Rules and Administration reported favorably a change in rule XXII which is substantially the same as the proposal offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators.

It should also be noted that this hearing was preceded by equally exhaustive studies in 1947, 1949, and 1951.

In spite of the favorable report of the Rules and Administration Committee, the extensive testimony and the desire of a great number of Senators to vote on the issue of changes in the rules, there was not one vote taken which related to the proposal favored by the Rules and Administration Committee during the 85th Congress.

It does little good to try to build highways toward a better America when others are engaged in building roadblocks.

I would ask the distinguished majority leader what assurances we have that the inaction of the 85th Congress will not be a precedent for the 87th. Are we going to walk, or are we going to be paralyzed? Are we going to ride toward responsible legislation, or are we going to ride in circles around it? The need for a change in the Senate rules was no less apparent in the 85th Congress than it is now. Inaction dealt the death blow to any rules change in the 85th Congress, and inaction now would have the same sorry effect in the 87th Congress, if this motion were adopted.

Throughout the recent presidential campaign, both candidates for President and Vice President actively called for changes—at least, the candidate of my party did—in the Standing Rules of the Senate. It should also be noted that both political parties, in their 1960 platforms, advocated changes in the Senate rules. The Republican plank was even more explicit in one respect than the Democratic plank, in that the Republican plank specifically referred to rule XXII. The Democratic platform also called for changes in the rules and specifically called for such changes at the beginning of the session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the Republican and Democratic Parties' 1960 platforms relating to changes in the rules be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE 1960 REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS RELATING TO CHANGES IN SENATE RULES

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I know some persons have asserted that party platforms are meaningless, that they are not binding, that they serve merely as window dressing for the real objectives of our political parties. There

can be no criticism, in my judgment, of any member of either party who voiced his opposition to this provision of the platform before the election, as I presume would apply to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I have never subscribed to the idea that it was not possible for any member of a political party, after a platform was adopted, to remain a good party member and say, "This particular part of the platform I do not agree with." There have frequently been planks in the platforms of the Republican Party with which I have not been in agreement. I have tried always to make that clear before an election. There certainly can be no criticism of those who did that in backing the motion made by the distinguished majority leader. But if they have not done that, and the result is to have this motion carried, in my judgment, it will be a deception to a vast number of the American people who took these promises very seriously.

In my definition, a political platform is not a launching site to get a candidate or a party off the ground, but a solemn pledge of principles subscribed to and a solemn set of promises made to be kept.

We certainly misled a lot of people when we spent long hours debating and arguing and negotiating over each phrase in the platform, and listened for days to testimony on each subject, and published and circulated millions of copies of our final product, if we did not mean what we said in those documents.

And we compounded this deceit when each of our candidates traveled the length and breadth of this Nation and appeared before more than 65 million Americans in a single TV program to reiterate his firm support for majority rule in Congress, and for strengthened civil rights legislation.

Mr. President, if this motion carries, we can forever hereafter expect the most cynical, disbelieving attitude toward the good faith of our parties. Our platforms would be viewed as two gay deceivers, all form and no substance. No one likes to be fooled that way. We cannot, in good conscience, raise the hopes of the American people up, then run them down, as though we were operating an elevator instead of a responsible deliberative body.

The situation is all the more distressing because the Vice President's opinions on parliamentary questions have paved the way for prompt and fair consideration of this issue now, not later. Not until the beginning of the 88th Congress will it be possible to proceed with more dispatch and less peril of a filibuster than right now. And of course, despite my high regard for the Vice President-elect, we have no assurance from him that he will follow the precedents which Vice President NIXON has established. History records that he, as a Senator, opposed the position taken by the Vice President.

The practical effect of the Vice President's ruling is to permit a majority of Senators at this time to make changes in the Senate rules without danger of a filibuster, to permit a majority to vote the previous question, to permit a majority to sustain the ruling of the Presiding Officer; and if we act now, while the distinguished Vice President is presiding, there is no device known to me, nor I believe known to any parliamentarian, which can prevent action by a majority vote.

At any other time, one more than a mere one-third of the Senate will be in a position to block any action by a majority by engaging in a filibuster. And thus, needed legislation will be talked to death, instead of to life.

The Vice President's rulings are based upon article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Now is the time for a majority of the Senate to exercise its constitutional prerogatives. On this subject, opportunity knocks but once every 2 years. Indeed, if Vice President NIXON's opinions are rejected by Vice-President-elect Johnson, this may be our last opportunity for some time.

Inaction by the Senate with respect to changes in the filibuster rule will take its toll on many types of legislation. But let it be acknowledged that at the present time, as has been said, it is in the area of civil rights that the impact of the filibuster will be the most decisive. Hence a vote on the motion does involve a vote on the human civil rights of all citizens. All of us are well aware of the parliamentary pressures which can be brought to bear on a majority which is attempting to enact civil rights legislation. As long as the dark and menacing cloud of filibuster clings close to this Chamber, it will be impossible to enact any meaningful semblance of the pledges in this area made by both parties over and over during the recent campaign.

As a matter of fact, there are several distressing signs that vitally needed civil rights legislation is to be given a low priority in the struggle across the new frontier. I have not heard of any task force reports on this subject. We have had task force reports on a great many things. I have heard of none in the area of civil rights.

I derived little encouragement from the announcement of committee assignments yesterday. And the detachment of our vigorous new President on this issue of rules changes has not been exactly helpful, although his position, that he does not feel he should interfere with the rules of the Senate, is of course understandable under the doctrine of separation of powers. It appears to this observer that the question of civil rights legislation has become at least temporarily lost in the vast wilderness of the new frontier.

Of course, more than civil rights legislation is involved here. Rule XXII applies to everything the Senate considers. And as long as the Rules of the Senate permit a filibuster, Senators on either side of any issue may be expected to use it, and should not be criticized for doing so. This places in jeopardy every one of the controversial proposals which may come before the Senate—and let me remind my colleagues that not every filibuster has been conducted by Senators from the same States. Those who support this motion should recognize the potential perils of their action with respect to other issues having nothing to do with civil rights.

Mr. President, the Humphrey-Kuchel substitute is consistent with the practice of every State legislature in the Union. My own State of New York, for example, provides that the assembly may limit debate by a majority vote on a motion for the previous question, while the senate is able to invoke a form of cloture after 2 hours of debate by a majority vote.

Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Montana, to mention a few, are other States allowing a motion for the previous question to cut off debate. Of course, we are confronted with different issues in the Senate—but the differences are a matter of degree, not kind. And in my judgment, the differences in degree make it more, not less, important that a majority of the Senate be allowed to act after full debate.

In all since 1841, there have been over 40 measures of considerable importance filibustered by a minority in this body, with the majority unable to in any way take action.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain historical material entitled "Outstanding Senate Filibusters from 1841 to 1960."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDING SENATE FILIBUSTERS FROM 1841 TO 1960

In 1841 a bill to remove the Senate printers was filibustered against for 10 days.

A bill relating to the Bank of the United States was filibustered for several weeks and caused Clay to introduce his cloture resolution.

In 1846 the Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

In 1863 a bill to suspend the writ of habeas corpus was filibustered.

In 1876 an Army appropriation bill was filibustered against for 12 days, forcing the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws.

In 1880 a measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16 by an evenly divided Senate, until two Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

In 1890 the Blair education bill was filibustered.

The force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, was successfully filibustered for 29 days. This resulted in the cloture resolution introduced by Senator Aldrich which was also filibustered and the resolution failed.

In 1893 an unsuccessful filibuster lasting 42 days was organized against a bill for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

In 1901 Senator Carter successfully filibustered a river and harbor bill because it failed to include certain additional appropriations.

In 1902 there was a successful filibuster against Tri-State bill proposing to admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood, because the measure did not include all of Indian territory according to the original boundaries.

In 1903 Senator Tillman (South Carolina) filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item

paying his State a war claim. The item was finally replaced in the bill.

In 1907 Senator Stone filibustered against a ship subsidy bill.

In 1908 Senator La Follette led a filibuster lasting 28 days against the Vreeland-Aldrich emergency currency law. The filibuster finally failed.

In 1911 Senator Owen filibustered a bill proposing to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood. The House had accepted New Mexico, but refused Arizona because of her proposed constitution. Senator Owen filibustered against the admission of New Mexico until Arizona was replaced in the measure.

The Canadian reciprocity bill passed the House and failed through a filibuster in the Senate. It passed Congress in an extraordinary session, but Canada refused to accept the proposition.

In 1913 a filibuster was made against the omnibus public building bill by Senator Stone, of Missouri, until certain appropriations for his State were included.

In 1914 Senator Burton (Ohio) filibustered against a river and harbor bill for 12 hours.

Senator Gronna filibustered against acceptance of a conference report on an Indian appropriation bill.

In this year also the following bills were debated at great length, but finally passed: Panama Canal tolls bill, 30 days: Federal Trade Commission bill, 30 days; Clayton amendments to the Sherman Act, 21 days; conference report on the Clayton bill, 9 days.

In 1915 a filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful, and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

In 1917 the armed ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administration measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

In 1919 a filibuster was successful against an oil and mineral leasing bill, causing the failure of several important appropriation bills and necessitating an extraordinary session of Congress.

In 1921 the emergency tariff bill was filibustered against in January 1921, which led Senator Penrose to present a cloture petition. The cloture petition failed, but the tariff bill finally passed.

In 1922, the Dyer antilynching bill was successfully filibustered against by a group of southern Senators.

In 1923 President Harding's ship subsidy bill was defeated by a filibuster.

In 1925 Senator Copeland (New York) talked at length against ratification of the Isle of Pines Treaty with Cuba, but the treaty was finally ratified.

In 1926 a 10-day filibuster against the World Court Protocol was ended by a cloture vote of 68 to 26, the second time cloture was adopted by the Senate.

A bill for migratory bird refuges was talked to death by States rights advocates in the spring of 1926, a motion for cloture failing by a vote of 46 to 33.

In 1927 cloture again failed of adoption when it was rejected by 32 yeas against 59 nays as a device to end obstruction against the Swing-Johnson bill for development of the Lower Colorado River Basin.

One of the fiercest filibusters in recent decades succeeded in March 1927, in preventing an extension of the life of a special campaign investigating committee headed by James A. Reed, of Missouri. The committee's exposé of corruption in the 1926 senatorial election victories of Frank L. Smith in Illinois and of William S. Vare in Pennsylvania had aroused the ire of a few Senators who refused to permit the continuance of the investigation despite the wishes of a clear majority of the Senate.

In 1933, early in 1933, a 2-week filibuster was staged against the Glass branch banking bill in which Huey Long first participated as a leading figure. "Senators found him impervious to sarcasm and no man could silence him." Cloture was defeated by the margin of a single vote. Finally, the filibuster was abandoned and the bill passed.

In 1935 the most celebrated of the Long filibusters was staged on June 12–13. Senator Long spoke for 15½ hours, a feat of physical endurance never before excelled in the Senate, in favor of the Gore amendment to the proposed extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act. But the amendment was finally tabled.

In 1938 a 29-day "feather duster" filibuster in January–February defeated passage of a Federal antilynching bill, although an overwhelming majority of the Senate clearly favored the bill.

In 1939 an extended filibuster against adoption of a monetary bill, extending Presidential authority to alter the value of the dollar, continued from June 20 to July 5, 1939, but finally failed by a narrow margin.

In 1942, 1944, 1946, and 1948 four organized filibusters upon the perennial question of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation were successful in these years. An attempt to pass fair employment practice legislation in 1946 was also killed by a filibuster. The Senate cloture rule proved ineffective in these cases as a device for breaking filibusters.

In 1949 a motion to take up a resolution (S. Res. 15) to amend the cloture rule was debated at intervals in the Senate from February 28 to March 17 when it was amended and agreed to.

In 1950 a motion to take up the FEPC bill (S. 1728) was debated in the Senate, May 8–19, 1950, a total of 9 days. Ten Senators spoke in favor of the motion to take up (really in support of the bill) and eight Senators spoke against the motion. According to a rough calculation, the proponents of the motion and bill used 35 percent, and the opponents used 65 percent, of the space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD devoted to the subject. During the 9-day period 3,414 inches of the RECORD were consumed with discussion of FEPC and 2,835 inches with other matters.

Mr. Malone filibustered for 11 hours against the conference report on the slot machine bill (S. 3357) in December 1950.

In 1953 a prolonged debate took place on the so-called tidelands offshore oil bill. It began April 1 and ended May 5. The tidelands debate lasted for 35 days, one of the longest on record. During this debate Senator MORSE established a new record for the longest single speech. On April 24–25 he spoke for 22 hours and 26 minutes.

In 1954 an extended debate occurred in July on a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (S. 3690). The debate lasted 13 days. On July 26 Senator Knowland sought to invoke cloture on S. 3690, but his motion failed by a vote of 44 yeas to 42 nays.

In 1957 (August 28–29) during the debate on the civil rights bill of 1957, Senator STROM THURMOND made a 24-hour and 18-minute speech, the longest in Senate history.

In 1960 the Senate debated civil rights from February 15 to April 11. Actual debate on civil rights consumed 37 days, during which 45 rollcall votes were taken. Eighteen southern Senators conducted a systematic filibuster. In an effort to break the filibuster, around-the-clock sessions were held from February 29 through March 8. The Senate was in continuous session for 9 days, or a total of 157 hours and 26 minutes, with two breaks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, filibusters have not respected party lines or sections of the country, nor have they been confined exclusively to any group of issues. There could be a filibuster against a tax reduction or an effort to close tax loopholes. There could be a filibuster against a declaration of war or measures to defend our Nation. In the past, whether the issue has been a fiscal matter, conservation, economic development, immigration, the national security, statehood, or civil rights, whenever a determined minority has set out to prevent the will of the majority from being enacted, the result has been foreign to the hallowed precepts of a constitutional democracy.

I shall now discuss very briefly the changes presented.

Briefly stated, the Anderson-Morton proposal would invoke cloture through a vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting. This would be unquestionably a step towards more democratic rule in the Senate; however, it would not fully realize the wishes of a considerable portion of this body. The proponents of this change urge moderation. The moderation is twice compounded, for we are asked to send the moderate approach to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The theory of the proponents of the Anderson-Morton proposal is that the Senate should follow the middle ground in considering any change in rule XXII. My feeling is that the middle ground of the compromise should not deprive the majority in this body of a vote on questions which may be pending before the Senate at a future date. The only ground for compromise should rest in assurances of full debate for all sides of an issue through a majority rule in the Senate. Once this end is achieved, the biennial parliamentary altercations involving proponents and opponents with respect to a change in rule XXII will be resolved. For that reason I am personally strongly in favor of the so-called Humphrey-Kuchel resolution. That proposal would allow section 2 of the existing rule XXII to remain in effect and add to it an alternative provision allowing a constitutional majority of the Senate to invoke cloture after extended debate. Through this provision a majority of the Senate would be able to act on pending legislation. But the point I make is that if the pending motion were carried, we would have no opportunity to act on any of these questions—an opportunity which we now have. If the motion is defeated, we can act on the Kuchel-Humphrey substitute. If it is defeated, we can act on the Anderson-Morton proposal or any other amendments before this body for consideration. There is no power on earth, including any U.S. Senator, which, under the rulings of the present occupant of the chair of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, could get around the advisory rulings, which the Presiding Officer would make in connection with a motion to table, a motion for the previous question, or an appeal from any ruling of the Chair.

In addition to these two proposals I wish briefly to refer to one which it is my intention to offer, if the pending motion

is defeated, as I hope it will be. That is a proposal to amend the Humphrey-Kuchel substitute. Indeed, if that proposal were defeated, I would offer the same proposal in connection with the Anderson-Morton resolution. I do not in any way wish to complicate or delay the orderly disposition of any other proposals; and, of course, if the motion carries my only recourse will be to present my views to the Rules Committee, on which I serve, in the appropriate hearings. I have been informed by several of the cosponsors of the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment that they not only have no objection to my proposal, but that they enthusiastically embrace it, and they have encouraged me to present it for consideration. I believe also that even Senators who may most ardently oppose any change in the filibuster rule would regard my suggestion for the distribution of time after cloture as more satisfactory than the present practice. I would even be so sanguine as to express the hope that my distinguished friend from Georgia and other like-minded Senators would find that this suggestion would be an improvement in our present procedure.

Briefly, the purpose of this proposal would be to permit both sides of any issue before the Senate to have equal time in debate after cloture is invoked. This proposal would in no way impair, and in fact would serve to enhance, the reputation of the Senate as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Under the present cloture rule, and the amendment proposed by Senators HUMPHREY and KUCHEL, each Senator is entitled to speak 1 hour after cloture is invoked. My proposal would provide for 100 additional hours of debate after cloture has been invoked. However, the additional time would be allocated equally, without regard to party lines, among those favoring and those opposing the bill or other matter pending before this body. This would have the effect of assuring that the voice of the minority could be fully heard on all issues. Each side of the issue would be granted 50 hours, no matter how few Senators were in the minority. This is the main distinction between my amendment and the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment.

I approach the subject of changes in the rules as one who believes strongly that constructive debate is the best path to sound policies.

The present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and I both served in the House of Representatives, as did the majority leader and many other Senators, and I think we have the feeling that it was relatively infrequent that any Member's mind was changed in the debate on the floor. It has been my experience in this body that debate on the floor does change the minds of Senators rather frequently. After hearing learned argument presented by Senators on all sides of an issue in many instances my mind has been changed. The opportunity is present to hear both sides, and I should not in any way wish to interfere with very full debate on any issue.

I am equally prone to believe that under a democratic system, after such debate a vote by the majority for an issue must be possible. A majority may sometimes be wrong, but so may less than a majority, and under our Constitution, unless otherwise specified, it is the majority of the Senate, not the endurance of the minority, which must resolve the issues facing us.

Let it be clear that none of the ordained constitutional protections for the minority will be impaired to the slightest degree by a curb on unlimited debate.

I am sure that the basic precepts and principles embodied in our Constitution standing alone justify a change in rule XXII. In addition, the steadily growing volume of business handled by the Congress makes more burdensome and dangerous the lengthy talkfests which can afflict our deliberations.

The proposal cosponsored by many of my colleagues would allow the sentiment of a constitutional majority to prevail. It, too, would comply with the words of the beloved champion of minority rights, Abraham Lincoln, as he said in his first inaugural:

> A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of free people.

Therefore, I ask that every Senator from both parties who campaigned for and supported the respective platforms of our parties and did not divorce himself from that part pertaining to the present issue carefully weigh the issue and canvass his conscience in the vote on the pending motion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from New York on the comments he has made on this important subject. The Senator from New York, as our Presiding Officer well knows, is an excellent lawyer. He has indicated forthrightly the moral commitment of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party on this issue as promised to the American people last year, and the overwhelming reason and logic behind that commitment. I again renew my congratulations.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend from California for his kind words.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that the Senate proceed to vote on the Mansfield-Dirksen motion, or on any amendment or motion thereto, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, may we know whether the time will be allocated and divided?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the proviso that the time will be equally divided between the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The time is under the control of the two leaders.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is almost a quarter to 2. How much time will each side have at its disposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven and one-half minutes. The majority leader will have 37½ minutes, and the minority leader will have 37½ minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Inasmuch as I am a cosponsor of the resolution, the minority whip will handle the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader desire to yield some time? The time is under the control of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Mansfield-Dirksen motion to commit the pending resolution to the Rules Committee.

When I came to the Senate in 1957, I was assigned to the Committee on Rules and Administration. At that time eight resolutions related in one way or another to debate in the Senate were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The committee created a special subcommittee, composed of the present senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from Georgia, to hold hearings on those resolutions. Hearings were held on June 17, June 24, June 25, June 28, July 2, July 9 and July 16, 1957. I hold in my hand the printed testimony taken at that time.

Those hearings were the most comprehensive ever held on the rules governing debate in the Senate. There appeared before our subcommittee 45 individuals to testify in person. Thirty of those individuals were against any change of the rule as it then related to closure of debate in the Senate. Fifteen of those witnesses favored closure of debate. Thus, of the witnesses testifying in person, the vote was 2 to 1 against any rule change whatever.

Furthermore, the total of persons either testifying in person or submitting statements for the record was 132, of whom 100 were opposed to any rule change. Therefore, at that time, more than three-fourths of those expressing opinions to the subcommittee were opposed to any change in the rule.

Nothwithstanding that fact, the rule was changed 2 years later by resolution offered by the majority and minority leaders to provide for the closing of debate on a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, rather than two-thirds of the Senators chosen and sworn.

It was thought at that time that, upon the decisive action by majorities of both parties in the Senate, the clamor from radical groups to recreate the Senate in their own image had been laid to rest forever.

Notwithstanding that, those who would appease such radical groups, which do not believe in the Constitution of the United States, our representative form of government or the separation of powers in our republican form of government that we have created, are continuing their efforts to throttle the Senate.

Why is that true? It is true because they know the Senate, composed of 100 Members, with two Senators from each of the 50 States, constitutes the greatest defense of our system of government that we have in our country today. They recognize that a Senator from sparsely populated Idaho has the same voice in the Senate as a Senator from populous New York. They realize that Senators from small States have votes equal to those of Senators from large States. They understand that constitutional government cannot be diluted or undermined by their radical theories so long as each State has an equal voice and vote in the Senate.

Of the eight resolutions which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for hearings in 1957, not one provided for closing debate by a three-fifths majority of the Members of the Senate. So the issue which is before us today—the three-fifths issue—has never been before the Committeee on Rules and Administration. Not one word of testimony has ever been taken on that proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TALMADGE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia may have as much time as he wishes.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

One of the great features of the U.S. Senate is that it does not act with undue haste. Every Member of this body is fully aware that before action is taken on any matter, the matter should be thoroughly studied by the appropriate committee and the testimony of expert witnesses heard.

Yet we have this unstudied resolution supported by some of our colleagues and the constitutional Presiding Officer of the Senate before us on the basis that the Senate has no rules. Its sponsors would have us run roughshod over our committee system and strike down the pillars of liberty which have stood in the Senate since 1789. They go so far as to contend that the Senate is not even functioning; that thus far we are not even organized; and that we have no rules. That is the strangest philosophy that has ever advanced in this honorable body.

Mr. President, the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on the same basis as each other piece of proposed legislation which is introduced in the Senate. That committee should hold exhaustive hearings to determine whether the grassroots citizenry wants Senators gagged on the vote of a three-fifths majority before they have had the opportunity to talk an issue out before the country.

Mr. President, the philosophy of this resolution is not that which created the Constitution of the United States and has preserved this Republic. It is not the philosophy which has made our Republic the greatest Nation on earth.

Our country is unique in that its citizens enjoy the highest standard of living the world has ever known and have with it the greatest degree of human liberty that mankind has ever experienced from the dawn of history to the present time.

Mr. President, one of the principal reasons this is true is that we have an institution like the Senate of the United States wherein one having the honor and responsibility of representing a sovereign State can do so without restraint in accordance with his ideas, the wishes of his constituents, the needs of the Nation, and his duty to Almighty God.

I urge the Senate not be casual—not to act lightly and strike down a safeguard which has been so fundamental in preserving the foundation of our great Republic. I hope that by an overwhelming vote the Senate will sustain the majority and minority leaders, who have served long in this body and understand the wisdom of its procedures and the necessity for preserving them. In so voting, we shall do much to preserve the Republic of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senate will commit a tragic and irretrievable mistake, in my judgment, if it adopts the motion now before us to send to the Committee on Rules and Administration the two resolutions providing for a change in the rules. I said earlier in the debate that the Vice President of the United States performed a unique and valuable service, and a courageous and honorable one, when he announced that in his opinion, the Constitution of the United States gives to the majority of Senators, in each new Congress, the constitutional right to determine by what rules they shall be guided in their deliberations. That was the essence of the opinion which the Vice President rendered, and he gave us, thus, the opportunity at the opening of this new Congress to rid ourselves, once and for all, of the evil, vicious, undemocratic practice of filibusters.

Mr. President, I have experienced filibusters. I have sat with my colleagues in this Chamber for weeks, day and night, as we went around the clock, in an effort, finally, to bring the Senate, by sheer physical exhaustion, to an opportunity to vote.

Now, when we have this opportunity, I think it would be fatuous and foolish to throw it away and to send to committee the resolution which many Senators on both sides of the aisle have sponsored. That resolution can be adopted now. It should be adopted now. It will provide for a cloture petition to be signed by 16 members of the Senate. It will provide that after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and holidays, a constitutional majority of the Members of the Senate can determine that the time has come to vote. It will provide for 100 additional hours of debate, even after cloture has been approved by a constitutional majority.

Mr. President, I desire to recite some history. On April 30, 1958, the Committee on Rules and Administration sent to the Senate, by a bipartisan majority of its members, precisely—word for word—the text of the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I, and other Senators, have cosponsored. From April 30, 1958, through all the intervening weeks and months of the last Congress, including all of 1959, that resolution remained on the calendar, available to be taken up at any time. But it never was taken up. When the last Congress adjourned sine die, no action had been taken on the resolution, and it went down the drain.

Study the resolution? The study was made, and the Committee on Rules and Administration made a recommendation. It sent to the Senate exactly the resolution which is now before us.

On that basis, I urge Senators to stand together and oppose the motion. I question the good faith of no one in this Chamber. I have the greatest respect for my leader on this side of the aisle, and I have equal respect for the Democratic leader. But, Mr. President, this is the single occasion upon which you and I and a bipartisan majority of the Senate can make progress in American government. This, in my judgment, is the single occasion when your party's platform and my party's platform may be vindicated by constructive action, and when the evil practice of filibusters may be eliminated from the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 6 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, once again the Senate has an opportunity to strengthen its rules so that it can more effectively carry out its basic constitutional mandate to legislate.

The change in rule XXII proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators, including myself, would restore the Senate to full effectiveness as a legislative body by making it possible for a constitutional majority—51 Senators—after 15 days to put an end to filibusters.

Early last year the country and the entire world were treated to the spectacle of a filibuster in the Senate. It had its comic aspects, as most of us can remember. But, overall, it was a sorry episode; and it was damaging, I believe, to the Senate and, indeed, to the entire Congress and to the Nation as a whole.

At this time we can, and we should, put an end to such a legislative performance. Both political parties have pledged action to that end. The Republican platform, adopted last summer, states unequivocally:

> We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

Filibustering—just the ever-present threat of filibustering—has subtle and pernicious effects on the legislative process. Time and again we have seen the possibility of filibuster used to defeat, delay, or compromise proposed legislation—and not only civil-rights legislation, although in that field its workings can be seen most clearly. The consideration of measures in the fields of housing, minimum wage, immigration, and education has been impeded or thwarted in vital respects by the availability of the filibuster.

A filibuster—the effort by a minority to prevent the majority from ever reaching a vote on a measure the minority opposes—is possible only because of rule XXII. As it now stands, with the slight improvement of 1959, rule XXII provides that cloture, limitation of debate, can be secured only by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting. In practical effect, it denies a clear majority of the Senate an opportunity to vote on any measure which a sufficiently determined minority opposes. The 1959 revision was a return to the old rule of 1917, a rule which on the record proved singularly ill adapted to its purpose. Between 1917 and 1959 there were 22 votes on motions to impose cloture. Only four were successful. Adoption of a constitutional majority requirement would help the situation, but by no means would open the floodgates. Under such a requirement, nine attempts would have been successful.

The fact is that any issue which becomes the subject of filibuster is going to impel full attendance if and when a vote is reached. That is the heart of the problem—to make it possible for a vote to be reached. Then—but only then, under the present rules—a majority of the Senate can, as contemplated by the Constitution, register its will.

In the past, the argument against a change in the rules has rested on two principal arguments. One is the so-called tradition of unlimited debate in the Senate. That is purely and simply a myth, as I discovered when, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I made an exhaustive study in this regard.

Such tradition as there is—and there is somewhat less than many assume—is on the side of those who believe that the Senate's primary responsibility is to act legislatively, to approve or disapprove proposed legislation. The refusal to permit the Senate to get to the point of action, whether affirmative or negative action, is a relatively recent development. The early Senate, under its rules, precedents, and customs, had the authority to control debate effectively. And, for the most part, would-be filibusterers were restrained by insistence that Senators confine their speeches to the matter before the Senate and that Senators conduct themselves with the traditional dignity of the Senate. There was, on occasion, delay in reaching a vote; but in good time a vote could be reached. The Presiding Officer—be he John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Aaron Burr, or John Gaillard of South Carolina—was mindful of the prohibition, set out in Jefferson's Manual, against speaking "impertinently, superfluously, or tediously without let or hindrance."

The second major argument made against a change in the rule governing change in the rules is that the Senate is a continuing body. I confess that the relationship of this argument to the procedure used in making a change in the rules at the opening of a new Congress has always mystified me. In the sense that two-thirds of the Senate membership carries over from one Congress to another, the Senate is of course continuing. But pending or proposed legislation does not carry over. Bills must be reintroduced, nominations resubmitted, and committee chairmen reelected. Everyone knows that an act passed in perpetuity by one Senate can be repealed by a simple—not a constitutional—majority in the next Senate.

If one Congress cannot by legislation bind a succeeding Congress, how can one Senate bind a future one in its rules of procedure—especially in the face of the constitutional provision that each House may determine its own rules—article 1, section 5. The constitutional power to legislate is surely at least equal to the constitutional power to determine the rules. Moreover, there is no necessary or inherent conflict between them, provided we recognize, as the Vice President has explicitly stated in his advisory rulings, the right of each Senate to adopt or amend rules as a majority believes will best facilitate the business of the Senate and the discharge of its responsibilities under the Constitution.

We are acting in accord with the Constitution if we act by majority vote to change rule XXII in such a way as to make possible the termination of filibusters. The proposed change would encourage, not discourage, thorough exploration of important issues. It would improve the functioning of a vital part of our legislative structure, a structure in whose continuance lies, I believe, the best protection of the rights of both the majority and the minority.

It seems plain, to me, that one Senate cannot subordinate the constitutional power of the Senate to act legislatively, through a majority, by seeking to impose procedural restraints to prevent a majority in future Senates from working its will in determining the rules under which they will operate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of my individual views, which I made as a member of the committee, when dealing with this subject, under date of August 21, 1958.

There being no objection, the statement of views was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE XXII OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE (RELATING TO CLOTURE)—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY

At the time the Committee on Rules and Administration filed its report (S. Rept. 1509) on Senate Resolution 17 (Calendar No. 1534) I had not completed compiling certain historical data which I felt should be included in that report. Thus I obtained permission of the committee to file this information at a later date as part 2 of the report.

This report, in the form of my individual views, is in no sense a dissent to the brief majority views, to which I fully subscribe. This second part of Report No. 1509 is intended to supplement and support the fine work already done by giving more fully the history of control over debate in the Senate.

This history clearly shows, I believe, that up to about the time of the Civil War a majority of the Senate, under its rules and precedents and the dignity of its customs, did have the authority to—and for the most part did—effectively control debate and prevent filibusters by insisting that Senators confine their speeches to the question at issue and that Senators conduct themselves in a manner in keeping with the traditional courtesy and dignity of the Senate. Exceptions may be cited, but the truly representative picture of the Senate prior to the Civil War, as shown by the historical records of the Senate, is that of a body of men who observed dignity and restraint in debate, who did not consider talking to consume time a parliamentary instrument appropriate for use by the Senate. When delay by speech was tolerated the Senators engaged in this dilatory device either kept their remarks germane to the issue or the majority did not choose at the moment to insist upon strict observance of the rules and precedents. In short, as the evidence presented below demonstrates, the filibuster as a device not merely to delay but to prevent Senate action is a modern institution which finds no support or sanction in early Senate history and practice.

Under the present rules, moreover, there is an ever-present danger of this kind of stultifying filibuster. This is the evil which a majority of Senators desire to root out. Filibusters which are staged by one or more Senators merely for the purpose of delaying a vote in the Senate for a time and to bring the question dramatically to the attention of the country may or may not be justified in particular instances, depending on one's point of view.

But these filibusters do not prevent the majority from ultimately acting, and are not the kind of conduct against which Senate Resolution 17 is aimed.

THE PRESENT RULE AND PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

By their cosponsorship of Senate resolutions designed to amend rule XXII, at least 53 Senators in Congress have expressed themselves in favor of changing the standing rules of the Senate, in order to make it easier to control filibusters. Thirty-eight Senators were cosponsors of Senate Resolution 30, submitted by the distinguished Senate minority leader, Mr. Knowland, in behalf of himself, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and 36 other Senators. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] submitted Senate Resolution 17, on behalf of himself and 14 other Senators, including the junior Senator from New Jersey. In short, a majority of the Members of the Senate are in favor of amending rule XXII in one way or another, having in mind the general objective of strengthening the control of the Senate over debate.

Senate Resolution 17 was reported from the Rules Committee on April 30, 1958, and, therefore, has been a pending item on the Senate Calendar for more than 3 months.

Under the present wording of rule XXII, a limitation on debate may be imposed only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn; that is, 64 Senators at the present time. This means that in order to prevent the imposition of cloture, only 33 Senators need to vote against it or to fail to appear in the Senate, to vote either way. An absent Senator in effect votes against cloture, under the present wording of rule XXII.

Senate Resolution 30 provides that cloture may be imposed on the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Senate Resolution 17, on the other hand, provides two routes to cloture. One route, similar to that under Senate Resolution 30, is that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting may impose cloture. The other route is that cloture may be provided after a waiting period of 15 days on the affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, which at the present time would be 49 Senators. The difficulty with Senate Resolution 30, so far as the voting requirement is concerned, is that it would not constitute any significant change from the present rule. A further difficulty with Senate Resolution 30, which I only mention at this point, is that it would attempt to nullify the constitutional power of each Senate to make its own rules.

We know from the history of efforts to impose cloture from the beginning of the cloture rule in 1917 up to 1949—when the wording of rule XXII was changed from "two-thirds of those present and voting" to "two-thirds of those duly chosen and sworn"—that out of the 19 attempts to invoke cloture, only 4 were successful. Since 1949, three more attempts to impose cloture failed, and would have failed even if the rule had been "two-thirds of those present and voting," as it read prior to 1949. Since 1927, 12 attempts have been made to impose cloture. All of them failed.

In summary, since 1917, in 22 attempts to adopt cloture, 4 succeeded under the requirement that two-thirds of those Senators present and voting favor it. If rule XXII had always required two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate, the successful attempts to impose cloture would have numbered three—only one less than under the former rule requiring two-thirds of those Senators present and voting. This is the same wording as that contained in Senate Resolution 30. On the other hand, if rule XXII had, from 1919 on, permitted cloture on the basis of a majority of the entire membership of the Senate—49 Senators—the successful attempts to impose cloture would have numbered nine. These facts indicate the significance of the change proposed in Senate Resolution 30.

The change proposed in Senate Resolution 17 would restore[1] at least a modicum of control of debate in the Senate, and permit a fair application of majority rule in the deliberations.

FREE DEBATE VERSUS FILIBUSTER

The basic issue involved in the effort to secure reasonable control over debate in the Senate has been greatly confused by the very different meanings that have come to be given to the term "free debate."

It is, therefore, of first importance to distinguish at the outset between the right to debate fully the merits of a controversial subject—a right sometimes spoken of as "the right of full or free debate"—and the right to filibuster—the right to talk without any limitation other than that imposed by physical strength. The latter assumes the right to speak, not to the issue in an effort to influence a vote on its merits, but merely to consume time and thus to thwart a majority of Senators (and the Senate insofar as it has power to act as a body) in their desire to come to a vote. Nonetheless, it is often labeled by the champions of filibuster as "the right of free debate."

The confusion over the term "free debate" has not come about entirely by accident. Rather than appear as champions of the absolute right to filibuster, the opponents of amending rule XXII cast themselves in the role of defenders of minority opinion and free debate. They rest their case largely on the emotional impact of this term "free debate" and the myth that the "early Senate" deliberated under rules permitting Senators to engage in irrelevant and dilatory speech under a right of free or unlimited debate. For instance, no responsible opponent of amending rule XXII who offered testimony at the hearings of the Talmadge-Javits special subcommittee contended for no limitation whatsoever on debate in the Senate. Rather they declared for a moderate or reasonable cloture rule designed to protect the country from the tyranny of a temporary majority. They argued that the present rule provided such reasonable protection.

As already indicated, however, the experience over the last decades demonstrates that under the present rule cloture as a practical matter cannot be imposed in the face of determined opposition by even a small number of Senators. Because of this very practical fact, those who wish to defend the right to filibuster can, without seeming to be inconsistent, safely say that they advocate a reasonable cloture rule even while relying on the filibuster or the threat of it to avoid the passage of legislation which they strongly oppose. Thus it is that many people, in their attempt to understand the problem of filibusters have been confused by the semantic shell game played so deftly with the words "the right of free debate."

The problem is seen with far greater clarity if it is viewed in the light of the basic requirements of an effective and democratic legislative process. They are:

1. The minority on any pending question must have an opportunity to debate fully the merits of that question, and

2. The majority, after opportunity to the minority to debate fully any question, must have the right, if it so desires, to reach a vote on the question.

Within the scope of these two principles, I, too, believe strongly in the right of free debate. At the same time I reject absolutely the right to filibuster as repugnant to democratic procedures and as violative of the spirit of the Constitution.

Those opposed to changing the rule to make filibusters more difficult have advanced many arguments, but their main case has rested on the alleged right of a minority of Senators, usually representing a large sectional interest in the Nation (such as the South), to prevent by filibuster legislative action by a majority of Senators (but less than 64 Senators). This argument is a restatement in modern terms of the theory of concurrent majorities so ably formulated by John C. Calhoun. Under his theory legislation favored by a majority in the country as a whole should be subject to the veto of a sectional interest. The country rejected Calhoun's theory of government at the time of the Civil War, but its spirit has been reborn in the form of the modern filibuster. The only difference is that where Calhoun would have given the minority a direct veto, the filibuster applies an indirect veto. And the opposing minority need not be a sectional interest though it usually has been so.

EARLY SENATE PRECEDENTS ON FREEDOM OF DEBATE

In support of their argument that the rules should not be changed to prevent a minority from imposing a bar to legislation by veto, the opponents of rule change rely on their interpretation of the spirit of the Constitution as shown by selected excerpts from the records available to us of the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and by selected passages from the Federalist papers. The one source they do not rely on is the wording of the Constitution itself, which clearly states that except for the situations specifically mentioned therein, a majority of the whole Senate "shall constitute a quorum to do business."

They refer to the Constitution as a magnificent compromise worked out by the Founding Fathers between the big States and the little States. They speak of its checks and balances and refer to Senators as Ambassadors from sovereign States. Out of all this, they have conjured up the power, even duty, of Senators to protect States rights by the senatorial privilege of filibustering permitted under the present rules.

The fact is, however, that the available information concerning the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 as well as the views expressed in the Federalist papers which even remotedly touch on the question of debate are both meager and especially so when taken out of context, conflicting.

The junior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, in his analysis[2] of the ideas which governed the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention clearly showed, I think, that the prevailing view among the delegates favored majority control of the Senate and would have opposed the right to filibuster if that issue had been squarely raised. I am content to let this point rest on his brilliant analysis and shall not duplicate the evidence here.

The other principal bulwark of the case made out by those opposed to amending the cloture rule is the myth, previously alluded to, that from the Senate's early days the license of unrestrained and irrelevant speech—"the right to free debate"—has been a traditional and historic senatorial prerogative. The opponents to rule change rely on this myth as a strong precedent, taken alone, and also as support for their claims that the spirit of the Constitution would be somehow violated if the Senate rules were changed to make cloture a practical possibility.

The opponents of change do have trouble, however, with the fact that the first Senate rules did provide for a motion for the previous question, which under general parliamentary law, immediately closes debate and brings the pending issue to a vote. We can take it for granted, I am sure, that the Members of the first Senate, some of whom were delegates to the Convention of 1787, had freshly in mind, at the time they adopted their rules, the ideas which prevailed during the deliberations at Philadelphia.[3]

---

[1] I use the word "restore" advisedly because the problem for the present Senate as a body is to restore a semblance of the control over debate that the early Senate had during the years when the Senate earned its reputation as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

[2] See the first part of S. Rept. No. 1509, 85th Cong., 2d sess., issued Apr. 30, 1958.

[3] By the time the Senate adopted its first rules on April 16, 1789, 20 Senators had been chosen and 16 had appeared to take their seats in the Senate. Of these, 13 were present on April 16, of whom 9 had served in the Continental Congress. Of these 9, 6 had also served as delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Of the committee of 5 Senators elected to draft rules, the chairman and one other had served in the Continental Congress and another one had been a delegate to the 1787 Convention. When the

The opponents of rule change attempt to avoid this difficulty by contending that the modern use of the previous question is a perversion of that motion as used in the 17th century British Parliament and as inherited and used by the Continental Congress and the early U.S. Congress. They are aided in their contention by the confusion which has in recent years surrounded the early use of the previous question motion. Senator JAVITS in his incisive historical account of this motion, supported by the thorough and brilliant scholarship of Mr. Irving Brant, the eminent biographer of James Madison, has dispelled the confusion and made it clear that in the 17th and 18th century House of Commons the motion for the previous question was a most effective instrument of cloture.

I shall therefore not burden this discussion with the historical details of the use of the previous question motion in the House of Commons but refer those interested in a full discussion to Senator JAVITS' individual views.

In the Continental Congress the motion for the previous question was available to close debate.

In the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives [4] also this motion was a device to bring debate to a close. That this motion could also be put to other uses such as delaying further consideration of an issue is beside the point. The use the motion would serve in any given situation depended upon how the Members of the body voted. A majority by their affirmative or negative vote determined the effect of the motion.

A stronger argument available to opponents of rule change based upon the early use of this motion in the Senate (and in the House, too, for that matter) is that debate was originally permitted both on the motion for the previous question and thereafter, even if it carried, on the main question. This fact has led some students of this motion to the erroneous conclusion that debate on a motion for the previous question could be had "without let or hindrance." [5] Those who so hold, however, overlook two controlling factors: (1) Under the Senate rules in effect until 1828 the Vice President, as the President of the Senate, had authority to decide all questions of order and decorum without appeal; and (2) Thomas Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which codified the general parliamentary law in effect at the time it was compiled and which was regarded as controlling on all questions not specifically covered by Senate rules, provided in section XVII: "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question superfluously or tediously." In other words, in the British practice and the later American practice, an affirmative vote on a motion for the previous question usually was followed immediately by a vote on the main question without debate. This was so because the members of these parliamentary bodies knew that when a favorable vote was obtained on a motion for the previous question, the sense of the House was to close debate and vote on the main question. If, however, a member or two desired to develop a point considered by them important to the issue, the courtesy which prevailed in those Houses would permit the additional remarks to be made, except in times of great political tension as in the years of the Cromwellian revolution in England in the middle of the 17th century or in the turbulent days in the House of Representatives in 1811 leading up to the War of 1812. Amendments could even be offered, and I do not doubt that on occasion a Senator, after a motion for the previous question had been made or following a favorable vote thereon, was indulged while he talked germanely, even though tediously, in order to allow a colleague to reach the Chamber from some nearby place in the Capital in time to vote. I dare say that on a few rare occasions a Senator or two was even permitted to engage in extended debate in this manner while a few or more much needed votes were hurrying by stagecoach, by horseback, or by boat to reach the Senate Chamber in time. Such situations, however, were usually cared for by adjourning the debate for a day or two.

Thus it is that both sides to the controversy about the effect of a motion for the previous question are in part correct. Those who have held that the motion did bring debate to a close are right—that was certainly the usual practice. But the opponents of the rule change are also right in saying that a motion for the previous question did not shut off the opportunity to offer remarks, especially if they were brief and to the point at issue. But they are grossly incorrect in representing that in the House of Commons, in the Continental Congress, in the early Senate, or in the early House of Representatives, a Member could speak "impertinently, superfluously, or tediously" "without let or hindrance." The majority was always there to cut off a Member who was so foolish as to step beyond the boundaries of traditional parliamentary propriety and decorum and thus tempt too far the patience of the majority.[6] In short, majority rule was absolute in those days—at least insofar as "free debate" was concerned. The privilege was generally extended fully because it was rarely abused. The privilege varied inversely with the abuse.

A look at the record is persuasive.

RULES OF 1789

The pertinent rules of 1789 are as follows:

"The report of the committee appointed to determine upon rules for conducting business in the Senate, was agreed to. Whereupon.

"*Resolved*, That the following rules, from No. I to XIX, inclusive, be observed.

* * * * *

"III. Every Member, when he speaks, shall address the Chair, standing in his place, and when he has finished, shall sit down.

"IV. No Member shall speak more than twice in any one debate on the same day, without leave of the Senate.

* * * * *

"VI. No motion shall be debated until the same has been seconded.

* * * * *

"VIII. While a question is before the Senate, no motion shall be received unless for an amendment, for the previous question, or for postponing the main question, or to commit it, or to adjourn.

"IX. The previous question being moved and seconded, the question from the Chair shall be: 'Shall the main question be now put?' And if the nays prevail, the main question shall not then be put.

* * * * *

"XVI. When a Member shall be called to order, he shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he is in order or not; and every question of order shall be decided by the President, without debate; but, if there be a doubt in his mind, he may call for the sense of the Senate."

JEFFERSON'S MANUAL

The following excerpts from Jefferson's Manual also have evidential value on the early Senate usages concerning debate.

"SECTION XVII. ORDER IN DEBATE

* * * * *

"When a Member stands up to speak, no question is to be put, but he is to be heard unless the House overrule him (4 Grey, 390; 5 Gray, 6, 143).

* * * * *

"In the Senate of the United States the President's decision is without appeal.

"No man may speak more than once on the same bill on the same day; or even on another day, if the debate be adjourned. But if it be read more than once in the same day, he may speak once at every reading (Co., 12, 115; Hakew., 148; Scob., 58; 2 Hats., 75). Even a change of opinion does not give a right to be heard a second time (Smyth's Comw. L., 2, c. 3; Arcan. Parl., 17).

"But he may be permitted to speak again to clear a matter of fact (3 Grey, 357, 416), or merely to explain himself (2 Hats., 73) in some material part of his speech (Ib., 75), or to the manner or words of the question, keeping himself to that only, and not traveling into the merits of it (Memorials in Hakew., 29), or to the orders of the House, if they be transgressed, keeping within that line, and not falling into the matter itself (Mem. Hakew., 30, 31).

* * * * *

"No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously (Scob., 31, 33; 2 Hats., 166, 168; Hale, Parl., 133).

"Nevertheless, if a member finds that it is not the inclination of the House to hear him, and that by conversation or any other noise they endeavor to drown his voice, it is his most prudent way to submit to the pleasure of the House, and sit down; for it scarcely ever happens that they are guilty of this piece of ill manners without sufficient reason, or inattentive to a member who says anything worth their hearing (2 Hats., 77, 78).

"SECTION XXXII. READING PAPERS

* * * * *

"It is equally an error to suppose that any member has a right, without a question put, to lay a book or paper on the table, and have it read, on suggesting that it contains matter infringing on the privileges of the House (2 Hats., 117, 118).

"For the same reason, a member has not a right to read a paper in his place, if it be objected to, without leave of the House. But this rigor is never exercised but where there is an intentional or gross abuse of the time and patience of the House.

"A member has not a right even to read his own speech, committed to writing without leave. This also is to prevent an abuse of time, and therefore is not refused but where that is intended (2 Grey, 227)."

But most important is the preface to his Manual which is quoted in full with emphasis supplied in black brackets:

"JEFFERSON'S MANUAL [7] OF PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE WITH REFERENCES TO ANALOGOUS SENATE RULES

"*Preface*

"The Constitution of the United States, establishing a legislature for the Union under certain forms, authorizes each branch

---

first Senate reached its full strength on June 25, 1790, 18 of the 26 Senators had served in the Continental Congress and 12 had been delegates to the Convention.

In his inaugural address to the Senate on April 21, 1789, Vice President John Adams said: "It would be superfluous, to gentlemen of your great experience, to urge the necessity of order."

[4] And later, in the Senate of the Confederacy.

[5] This contention was made during the debate in January 1957 on Senator ANDERSON'S motion to adopt rules at the beginning of the 85th Cong.

[6] In the House of Commons and in the Continental Congress it was the patience of the Speaker as supported by the majority that would be tempted, and in the Senate down to 1828 it was the patience of the Vice President.

[7] Compiled by Thomas Jefferson during the time he served as Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, 1797 to 1801.

of it 'to determine the rules of its own proceedings.' [The Senate has accordingly formed some rules for its own government; but these going only to few cases, it has referred to the decision of its President, without debate and without appeal, all questions of order arising either under its own rules or where it has provided none.] This places under the discretion of the President a very extensive field of decision, and one which, irregularly exercised, would have a powerful effect on the proceedings and determinations of the House. The President must feel, weightily and seriously, this confidence in his discretion, and the necessity of recurring, for its government, to some known system of rules, that he may neither leave himself free to indulge caprice or passion nor open to the imputation of them. But to what system of rules is he to recur, as supplementary to those of the Senate? To this there can be but one answer. To the system of regulations adopted for the government of some one of the parliamentary bodies within these States, [or of that which has served as a prototype to most of them. This last is the model which we have all studied, while we are little acquainted with the modifications of it in our several States.] It is deposited, too, in publications possessed by many and open to all. [Its rules are probably as wisely constructed for governing the debates of a deliberative body, and obtaining its true sense, as any which can become known to us; and the acquiescence of the Senate, hitherto, under the references to them, has given them the sanction of its approbation.

"[Considering, therefore, the law of proceedings in the Senate as composed of the precepts of the Constitution, the regulations of the Senate, and, where these are silent, of the rules of Parliament, I have here endeavored to collect and digest so much of these as is called for in ordinary practice, collating the Parliamentary with the Senatorial rules, both where they agree and where they vary.] I have done this as well to have them at hand for my own government as to deposit with the Senate the standard by which I judge and am willing to be judged. I could not doubt the necessity of quoting the sources of my information, among which Mr. Hatsel's most valuable book is preeminent; but as he has only treated some general heads, I have been obliged to recur to other authorities in support of a number of common rules of practice to which his plan did not descend. Sometimes each authority cited supports the whole passage. Sometimes it rests on all taken together. Sometimes the authority goes only to a part of the text, the residue being inferred from known rules and principles. For some of the most familiar forms no written authority is or can be quoted; [no writer having supposed it necessary to repeat what all were presumed to know. The statement of these must rest on their notoriety.]

"I am aware that authorities can often be produced in opposition to the rules which I lay down as Parliamentary. An attention to dates will generally remove their weight. The proceedings of Parliament in ancient times, and for a long while, were crude, multiform, and embarrassing. They have been, however, constantly advancing toward uniformity and accuracy, and have now attained a degree of aptitude to their object beyond which little is to be desired or expected.

"Yet I am far from the presumption of believing that I may not have mistaken the Parliamentary practice in some cases, and especially in those minor forms, which, being practiced daily, are supposed known to everybody, and therefore have not been committed to writing. Our resources in this quarter of the globe for obtaining information on that part of the subject are not perfect. [But I have begun a sketch, which those who come after me will successively correct and fill up till a code of rules shall be formed for the use of the Senate, the effects of which may be accuracy in business, economy of time, order, uniformity, and impartiality.]"

This evidence alone suffices, I believe, to make clear that the early Senate would never have tolerated being rendered impotent days and weeks by the unseemly spectacle of Senators one after another taking turns in speaking irrelevantly and tediously merely to consume time. The very size of the Senate made a successful filibuster almost impossible. The first Senate had only 26 Members. By the time of the admission of Missouri as a State in 1821, the number of Senators had grown to 48. It was still only 66 in 1859, when Oregon was admitted. In fact it was my faith in the Senate as a great deliberative body which first made me suspicious of the myth of "free debate" and caused me to reexamine the entire question.

YEARS 1789 THROUGH 1828

Both John Adams and Thomas Jefferson presided with firmness and dignity over the Senate during their respective terms. Certainly they did not tolerate, and no one thought of attempting, the modern type of filibustering during their terms as Vice President. In the case of Adams, one can find complaints that he talked more than any Senator and lectured Senators whenever he felt it advisable to do so on matters of decorum and order in debate.

In the case of Aaron Burr, the next Vice President, some advocates for retaining the present rules have suggested that it was at his initiative that reference to the previous question was deleted in the first general revision of the rules in March 1806. I have found no evidence to support this claim. In any case, the evidence we have indicates that Burr presided over the Senate in the tradition set by Adams and Jefferson and that if he suggested the deletion of the previous question from the rules it was because it was not needed. Furthermore, we know from his farewell address to the Senate that Aaron Burr was no advocate of unlimited and irrelevant debate. On page 71, volume 14 of the Annals of Congress—8th Congress, 2d session, March 2, 1805—the editor of the debates gave the following account:

"He [Vice President Burr] doubted not but that they [the Members of the Senate] found occasion to observe, that to act without delay was not always to act without reflection; that error was often to be preferred to indecision. * * *

"That his errors whatever they might have been, were those of rule and principle and not of caprice. * * *

"That if, in the opinion of any, the discipline which had been established approached to rigor, they would at least admit that it was uniform and indiscriminate. * * *

"That the ignorant and unthinking affected to treat as unnecessary and fastidious a rigid attention to rules and decorum. * * *

"But he thought nothing trivial which touched, however remotely, the dignity of that body, and he appealed to their experience for the justice of this sentiment and urged them in language the most impressive, and in a manner the most commanding to avoid the smallest relaxation of the habits which he had endeavored to inculcate and established."

Further evidence that Burr was no friend of irrelevant speech is provided by William Plummer, a Senator from New Hampshire at the time, and of the opposite political party from Burr, who recorded in his private journal that "Mr. Burr, the Vice President presides in Senate with great ease, dignity, and propriety. He preserves grand order, silence, and decorum in debate—he confines the speeches to the point."

A succinct review of the early Senate parliamentary practice was made by Senator Robert S. Owen, of Oklahoma, on February 13, 1915. He said:

"Mr. President, that was the rule of the Senate up until 1806. At that time the rules were modified so as to omit the reference to the previous question, not by putting in any rule denying the right of the previous question, but merely omitting the previous question, on the broad theory that courtesy of free speech in the Senate would preclude any Member from the abuse of the courtesy of free speech extended to him by his colleagues, and would preclude a Senator from consuming the time of the Senate unduly, unfairly, or impudently, in disregard of the courtesy extended to him by his colleagues. The failure to move the previous question now is merely a matter of courtesy in this body, and carries with it, so long as it lasts, the reciprocal courtesy on behalf of those to whom this courtesy is extended that they shall not impose upon their colleagues who have extended the courtesy to them of freedom of debate or deny their courteous and long-suffering colleagues the right to a vote. Freedom of debate may not under such an interpretation be carried to the point of a garrulous abuse of the floor of the Senate by the reading of old records and endless speechmaking made against time, which has emptied the Senate Chamber and destroyed genuine debate in this body. At the time the previous question was dropped from the written rules of the Senate as a right under such written rules there had been no need for the 'previous question.' The previous question had only been moved four times and only used three times from 1789 to 1806—that is, during 17 years.

"There is no real debate in the Senate. Occasionally a Senator makes a speech that is worth listening to—occasionally, and only occasionally. The fact is that even speeches of the greatest value which are delivered on this floor have little or no audience now because of this gross abuse of the patience of the Senate, which has been brought to a point where men are no longer willing to be abused by loud-mouthed vociferation of robust-lunged partisans confessedly speaking against time in a filibuster, and are unwilling to keep their seats on this floor to listen to an endless tirade intended not to instruct the Senate, intended not to advise the Senate, intended not for legitimate debate, not for an honest exercise of freedom of speech, but for the sinister, ulterior, half-concealed purpose of killing time in the Senate and thereby preventing the Senate from acting, thus establishing a minority veto under the pretense, the bald pretense, the impudent and false pretense, of freedom of debate."

After Burr, the Vice Presidents down to the beginning of John C. Calhoun's term in 1825 apparently followed the pattern set by their predecessors. During a great part of this time, owing to deaths and illnesses of the successive Vice Presidents, John Gaillard, of South Carolina, as President pro tempore presided with great dignity and firmness over the Senate deliberations for many years. His firmness in controlling debate has specific significance as he was chosen President pro tempore again and again for a period extending more than 15 years.

During Calhoun's tenure as Vice President (1826), for reasons not beyond the suspicion of faction, the Senate lost control over debate and the deliberations became, for the first time, unseemly and chaotic. This created a crisis and brought on the debate over rules in 1828.

The crisis in Senate decorum and order was caused by John Randolph of Roanoke. Earlier he taught the House of Representatives to filibuster and caused the House to revise its precedents and change its rules to provide that a motion for the previous ques-

tion immediately closed debate. Randolph came to the Senate in 1825 and during his 2 years as a Member of the Senate drove it to the point of desperation by endless days of talks for hours at a time without the slightest reference to the pending business, a state of affairs until then unknown to the punctilious and formal Senate. The then Vice President, John C. Calhoun—who never himself engaged in irrelevant speech—would not call Mr. Randolph to order, holding that he had no authority to call to order on a question of the latitude of debate.

Without a change in the rules the Senate was helpless to defend itself against Randolph's irrelevancies because under the rules the Presiding Officer's rulings on order and decorum in debate were final and could not be appealed. Calhoun was bitterly at odds with both President John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay, who was then Secretary of State. Randolph's tirades were directed mostly at these two men. Though he denied it, critics of Calhoun contended that he had broken with tradition and the precedents and refused to enforce the rules for partisan political reasons. In any case, charges and countercharges flew both in and out of the Congress.

In the fall of 1826 the Virginia Legislature relieved the distress of the Senate in the 20th Congress by replacing Randolph with John Tyler as one of the two Senators from Virginia. The Senate early in the 1st session of the 20th Congress set about to restore order and in February 1828 a thorough discussion of the rules governing decorum took place. It resulted in amendment of the rules to provide explicitly that the Vice President had such authority on his own initiative, and made his rulings subject to appeal. In making the Vice President's rulings appealable the Senate intended two things: First, to strengthen Senate discipline by adding the weight of the majority to the decision of the Chair on questions of order when an appeal was taken; second, to provide protections against any possible arbitrariness on the part of a presiding officer.

The debate preceding the changes is of particular interest because it involved such a full discussion of Senate practices relating to order and decorum in debate. Excerpts (with emphasis supplied in black brackets) from it are set out below.

"[From Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., Feb. 11, 1828, pp. 295–296]

"Senator WILLIAM SMITH of South Carolina. * * * [It was a rule of the Senate for 35 years, for the President to call to order, and he, himself, had been the subject of it. He had been called to order by his late venerable friend, Mr. Gaillard. He had appealed to the Senate to say whether he was out of order, and the decision was, that there could be no appeal.] It seemed to be assumed by some gentlemen, that they were going to place a tyrant in the chair, and that against his lawless rule it was necessary to provide. This did not produce any effect on his mind. * * * [Or, suppose that a Senator were to go at length into the consideration of a subject entirely foreign to the question in hand, and talk of the Army or the Navy when the question of the proper location of a road was before the Senate? Or discuss the expediency of an appropriation, when no appropriation was contemplated? Would the Chair sit silent and permit this irrelevancy? Certainly not. If he did, an individual might talk here a whole day, and arrive at nothing. There were rules, the enforcement of which could not be taken from the Chair without making the Senate a mere nullity.] It would be, in fact, throwing a new and inconvenient duty into the hands of the Members by setting them to watch over and administer the rules, which, in reality, belongs to the President. * * * He believed that every deliberative body must have a presiding officer, and that individual ought to have the requisite authority [for conserving the order of the meeting, and advancing the progress of the public business]."

"[From Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., Feb. 12, 1828, p. 305]

"Senator DAVID BARTON of Missouri. * * * Let me suppose, said Mr. B., that this Senate, being a permanent and continuous body of but a small number of men, had gone on, as it might have done, without any written rules at all for its government to perform the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, what then would have been the power and the duty of the presiding officer? The Constitution says in one brief sentence applicable to both Houses, 'Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.' It does not say how the determination shall be made; whether the decisions of the Senate on each case as it might arise, growing up at length like the common law itself, into a code for the government of the body, shall be the rules of its proceedings; or, whether a set of arbitrary rules written a priori, and liable to be found either good or bad, upon experience, shall govern its proceedings. Either mode would be equally the determinations of the Senate, and equally obligatory on the Members and the President. Nay, sir, the long-settled practice of this body, that has gone on with the sanction of many years, might be considered a more deliberate determination of the Senate than any literal rule, even were there a literal rule to the contrary. Upon what principle is it that we daily hear the Chair declare that the unanimous consent of the Senate will dispense with a written rule, even in cases where there is no written rule to authorize such dispensation? Is it not upon the plain principle that the power that can create, can dispense with the rule? This Senate has the same right to form for itself a parliamentary law or code for its own government, that the British Parliament or any other legislative body has. Precedents made in good times were the materials of which the great system of the common law itself, so highly and so justly eulogized the other day by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Rowan] was composed. Mr. [B. said, it is an axiom derived from the experience of mankind, that we are not to look for those precedents that are worthy of being followed, or of entering into a code for our guide, to times of the highest and the worst of party excitements, such as the session of 1825–26 was. He should therefore look beyond that epoch to the halcyon days of the predecessor of the present presiding officer, and see what he [Mr. Gaillard] did. He was placed in a situation that gave him decided advantages over the present presiding officer—a situation that gave peculiar weight and dignity to his decisions, and to the practice of the Senate under his long and benign administration. He presided in a time when the present rancor of party strife was unknown. He stood aloof, in that chair, from the parties of the day. He was not looked to as the head of any great party in this Nation, contending for rule; nor were his decisions subjected to the illiberal imputation of having any ulterior object in view. Drawing precedents, then, from those times (for his experience, he said, did not enable him to go back beyond that administration), he considered the law of the Senate clearly settled, that the Vice President possessed, and ought to have exercised, the power of restraining the wholly irrelevant latitude of debate of that period, which has been so unnecessarily drawn into review upon the discussion of this amendment].

"[The officer to whom he had alluded [Mr. Gaillard] was in the constant practice of preserving order in the body, by calling back a rambling Member to the subject before the Senate, when he had gone entirely from it, even in the language of the most decent and orderly style. True, he did those things in so mild and affable manner that the Member himself did not feel that he had been reproved; and the audience who witnessed the exercise of the power, left the Senate Chamber without the impression that any Member had been out of order. His authority was the long practice of the Senate, sanctioning Mr. Jefferson's Manual as their parliamentary law, in conjunction with their few positive rules and practical determinations.] Those long practices of the body, in its best days, with the uninterrupted sanction of the Senate, he contended, were as fair and as constitutional a determination of our rules of proceedings as if they had been written down and printed upon paper or parchment, subject to constant change, as experience should afterward either approve or condemn them. He thought, indeed, such long practice was the best mode of forming a code for the government of the Senate. He went on to instance some cases in which the present Presiding Officer had, as he thought, exercised the general power of preserving order in the cases where the written rules of the Senate were silent, as if an innumerable train of amendments should be offered consecutively to each other; and in cases of considering votes carried or rules dispensed with, where no objection was heard; all of which owed its authority to the unwritten practice or determination of the body.

* * * * *

"He did not think the political friends of the Vice President ought to reject the offer to the other side of this House to settle the disputed power and duty of the Chair, to restrain the irrelevant or disorderly latitude of debate, restoring, at the same time, the right of appeal to the Senate, as a check upon the decisions of the Presiding Officer. He should, therefore, give to this amendment the support of his vote.

"Senator SAMUEL BELL, of New Hampshire. The Constitution creates the office of Vice President, and expressly imposes upon him the specific duty of presiding over the deliberations of the Senate. That duty cannot be performed, either usefully or efficiently, without the power of preserving order. The power to preserve order must therefore be necessarily incident to the office. The Senate itself cannot divest the Vice President of this power, because he holds it from the Constitution; but they may enlarge, or limit, or modify it, because this power is expressly vested in the body by the Constitution. When the Constitution gives to the Vice President the power of presiding over the Senate, it refers him to the well known usages of all legislative bodies for the extent and nature of his powers and duties. It was necessary that he should be invested with this power, because it was to be exercised from the first moment the Senate assembled, and before it was possible that they could establish rules for this purpose. There could be no assignable motive why the power so universally held and exercised by the presiding officers of all other deliberative bodies, should be withholden from the Vice President, since the Constitution gives to the Senate the power of modifying the rules he should adopt, or establishing others, as this body should think fit. The Vice President is required by the Constitution to conform to, and regulate his conduct, as a presiding officer, by the rules so amended or modified. Should he, from culpable motives refuse or neglect to conform to rules so established, he would be liable to impeachment and removal from office. Every exercise of the power of preserving order, however different in character, rests on the same principle for support. When the presiding officer calls the attention of the Members to business, or

commands silence, he is performing an act of preserving order, equally as when he requires a Member to adhere to the rules of decorum in debate. The same power which authorized the one, authorizes the other; any attempt to distinguish between them is destitute of even a colorable foundation.

"But should we believe that the language of the Constitution, which invests the Vice President with the power of preserving order in the Senate, to be ambiguous, has not that ambiguity been removed, and its meaning long since settled by the uniform practice of all the presiding officers of the Senate, and that, too, by the assent and approbation of the Senate? [That construction of the Constitution which gives to the Vice President the power of preserving order in cases where the Senate have not established any rules, is not of modern date, nor established with a view to any temporary object, but is as old as the Constitution itself. It commenced with the existence of this Government, and was continued without interruption for 35 years. Within that time, some of the ablest men this country has ever produced have presided in the Senate. When I name Jefferson and Gaillard as of the number of those presiding officers of the Senate, who believed that the Constitution invested the Vice President with this power, no man will have occasion to blush when he admits that he holds the same opinion.] These were not of that class of men who are prone to claim or exercise powers which do not legitimately belong to them.

"[Mr. Jefferson, in his Manual, compiled expressly for the use of the Senate, declares expressly, that the Vice President possesses this contested power and gives us to understand distinctly that such had been the uniform practice in the Senate. Mr. Gaillard was a Member of the Senate more than 20 years, and for a great length of time discharged the duties of a presiding officer in it. His character is well known to every Member of this body. It will not be denied, that, to an unassuming and discriminating mind, he united a knowledge of the rules of proceeding in legislative bodies seldom equaled. That he not only adopted, but carried into practice, constant and uniform practice, the power of preserving order in the Senate, which Mr. Jefferson affirmed, but which is now denied to be constitutionally vested in the Vice President, is known to many of the Members of this body.] It is true that all these distinguished men may have entertained erroneous opinions on this question, but I cannot admit it, unless upon stronger evidence than any I have yet heard. If the question were to be settled by the authority of names—and questions seem to be sometimes so settled—it would require no ordinary weight of such authority to outweigh that of such men as I have named, and several others that I might have named. I do not contend that this is the only way in which it should be settled, but I must be permitted to say that a construction of the Constitution so long and satisfactorily settled, and by such men, should not be overturned without great deliberation and reflection upon the consequence likely to result from it. By the unexpected course which the discussion of this question has taken, I have felt myself called upon to express my opinion on this question, and the grounds of that opinion. I have done it with reluctance, and with great respect for those who entertain a different opinion. It is a question on which an honest difference of opinion may exist, and as such it should be considered and treated. I do not feel any deep interest in the adoption of the amendment under consideration; yet, as I believe it will conduce to the better preservation of order under the present construction of the powers of the presiding officer of the Senate, I will give it my support."

"[From Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 1st sess., 1827–28, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 313–314–315]

"Mr. WILLIAM SMITH, Senator from South Carolina. For his own part, he never had a doubt but that the President of the Senate had the right to call to order. The very nature of his office implies that power. He was not one of those who relied upon constructive powers where they were not expressly given, but in this case he had the invariable practice of the Senate, from its commencement in 1789, up to the session of 1825, a term of 36 years, to sanction this opinion. He recollected very well that he had himself been called to order by the President of the Senate, more than once. On one occasion, a gentleman in the Chair [Mr. Gaillard] for whose memory he entertained the most profound respect, had called him to order for words spoken in debate, when he, Mr. S. himself, conceived he was correct, which induced him to appeal to the Senate, and was again told by the Chair, there was no appeal from his decision; and the Senate supported the Chair.

* * * * *

"[It is the invariable practice of the presiding officer in every legislative body in the United States, to keep order in their respective bodies, and if a Member wanders from the question in debate, to call him to order.

"[If the uninterrupted practice of the Senate for the 36 first years of its existence, for the President, in all cases, and more especially if a Member wander from the question before the Senate, in debate, to call him to order, and bring him back to that question, can weigh anything, or if the analogy of the universal usage in all other legislative bodies, and all public assemblies whatever, that look to their presiding officers to perform the office of calling to order, as an official duty, can have any weight in bringing us to a fair conclusion, we cannot doubt but that it belongs to the Chair, ex vi termini, to call to order.] What higher duty can be required of the Chair? Merely putting the question upon bills and resolutions, is certainly a minor duty. Such a duty as could well be discharged by an additional clerk, as the reading is now by the Secretary.

"One gentleman had said, there was 48 Senators in this House, either of whom could call to order. It is admitted. But suppose any one Senator should so far forget himself as to make, in the course of his argument, indecorous and unkind remarks upon any other Member to whom he might be opposed, [that were foreign to the subject before the Senate;] could it be expected that the Member assailed would rise to call the other to order in his own defense? There is no man of delicate sensibility who would do so. It would be a task too invidious for a Member who was not assailed, to take up the subject. And to what extravagance would it not lead, were the President to fold his arms and sit silent? [Or suppose the question before the Senate to be upon an appropriation for a turnpike road, and a Senator should rise in his place, and address the Chair upon the subject of an Indian treaty, or upon a naval expedition, for an hour, without once touching the subject submitted by the Chair, for the consideration of the Senate; could the President of the Senate sit in dignified silence? It is impossible to imagine he would]."

"[From Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 1st sess., 1827–28, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 318–319, 322]

"Mr. EZEKIEL F. CHAMBERS, Senator from Maryland. * * * Then we are in this dilemma: We have rules, but no one has authority to call them into action. Our predecessors must have differed widely from ourselves on these matters, or they have applied their time and their talents to small account. [The illustrious author of this book (Jefferson's Manual) had intimated a very different opinion on this subject. He had prepared and presented to the Senate for their use a parliamentary rule, sanctioned by its usage for more than 200 years, which pointed to the Presiding Officer as the individual to move in questions of order.] He then alluded to what had been called by the honorable gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McLane] and he must be permitted to think very incorrectly called, inherent power. If the honorable gentleman had reference to power of the Presiding Officer, not derived from the Constitution or laws of the United States, or rules of the Senate, he knew of none such, and utterly denied that they existed. If, on the contrary, he had reference to powers derived from these sources, he could not well perceive with what propriety the term "inherent" could be applied to them.

* * * * *

"[With the conviction of the constitutional existence of these powers in the Presiding Officer, and an entire willingness to rely on their exercise, the Senate, at an early period, 'formed,' to use Mr. Jefferson's language, some rules for its own government, but these going only a few cases, they have referred to the decision of their President, without debate and without appeal, all questions of order arising under their own rules, or where they have provided none: thus placing 'under his discretion,' as he continues, 'a very extensive field of decision.']

"On some of the plainest as well as the most important items of legislative order, the Senate had no written rule whatever. [He believed in every legislative body it was held necessary to restrain the speaker from subjects wholly and obviously foreign and irrelevant to the matter in hand. But yet, unless it had eluded his research, there was no written rule of the Senate to secure this necessary result. Not one word on the subject. If he were now to leave the subject of the rules and practice of this body, and indulge himself in a history of the beauty, the splendor, and the utility, of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, he would deny the authority of any individual in this Chamber, whether President or Member, to charge upon him a violation of order, on the hypothesis, that the lex scripta is the only rule of this House. If the lex non scripta, if anything beside the Constitution, laws of Congress, or written rules of the Senate could restrain me, I ask (said Mr. C.), where is it found, and when found I ask, does it confine the primary call to the Member, and refuse it to the President except on appeal?] This is the question, and we must not lose sight of it, and gentlemen will find the same argument which proves the authority of the Member, proves the authority of the President; and if they deny the authority of either or both, they leave us in a miserable condition, totally unable to secure the preservation of order or decorum at all. This is a state of things from which we wish to escape, and the interesting inquiry is, by what mode can we do so?

"Mr. JOSIAH S. JOHNSTON, Senator of Louisiana. I believe the right of calling to order, preserving order, and deciding on all questions of order, belongs to the presiding officer. The Chair declines to exercise the power. [The Vice President rose and explained, that he stated specifically that he did call to order in all cases, except for words spoken.] I take the distinction of the Chair. As far as the decision goes it is correct. But it supports the very argument I have endeavored to maintain—that power by which you call to order in any case, which you distinguish as ministerial, is by virtue of a right inherent in the office. There is no rule that vests that power, in any case, in the Chair. But assuming that power, how is the distinction taken between those cases, where you can act from cases of disorder arising

from words spoken? There is none in the rules. The distinction seems to be artificial. My mind cannot perceive the criterion on which the discrimination is made. The delicacy which declines the exercise of power, because it is doubtful, is meritorious. [But I am sure the Chair will never avail itself of the pretence which has been urged in this debate, that the surrender of power is favorable to liberty. Power is delegated to be exercised for the security of liberty. Liberty depends not on its being without limits and without control, but on its being regulated. The power of the presiding officer is necessary to the despatch of business, and the order and dignity of the body.] To release every Member from the restraints of the rules, and restore him his liberty to say and do what he pleases, instead of being favorable, will be fatal to liberty. It is not liberty in that sense for which government was instituted; it was regulated liberty secured by law (pp. 336–337)."

Randolph's role as the precursor of the modern filibuster is further indicated in Dr. Franklin L. Burdette's book "Filibustering in the Senate." On page 16 he says:

"In any event, it seems likely that there were no major or extended filibusters in the dignified Senate prior to the advent of the remarkable John Randolph of Roanoke."

On page 19 he says:

"One is inclined strongly to suspect that the Senate's first extended and spectacular filibusters were staged by that southern opponent of the Adamses [John Randolph]. * * * If men filibustered in the years immediately following, they at least did so with gravity and beneath the cloak of relevancy."

YEARS 1829 THROUGH 1841

Not until 1837 was there another serious attempt at filibustering. In that year the opponents of the resolution to expunge from the Senate records the 1834 resolution of censure against President Jackson attempted an "incipient filibuster," in the words of Dr. Burdette. But an incipient filibuster is far short of the object of our attention today.

In the course of debate on July 3, 1840, Senator Oliver H. Smith, of Indiana, called Senator Tappan to order—in the words of the editor of the debates—"for digressing from the question immediately before the Senate." The Chair ruled Senator Tappan out of order and he agreed that the entire debate was out of order. This appears at page 504 of volume 8 of the Congressional Globe.

A few minutes later Senator Robert Strange of North Carolina, speaking of the Senate rules said:

"When we met here at the beginning of this session, we adopted the rules lying upon our tables (p. 505, id.) and thereafter Senator Albert S. White, of Indiana, is quoted as follows:

" 'Mr. White said that the rules of the Senate were adopted every session, and the same power which adopted could modify or abrogate them at its pleasure. It had been frequently asserted in the discussion that the rules of the body were designed for the protection of the minority. This he denied. The protection thus afforded was only incidental. They were framed for the regulation of our proceedings and the guidance of our Presiding Officer.' "

Neither Senator was refuted by anyone at the time or thereafter.

I do not attach any particular significance to these remarks but perhaps those who contend that the Senate is a continuous body in all respect to the rules may want to ponder them.

A list of outstanding filibusters contained in Limitation of Debate in the U.S. Senate, by Dr. George B. Galloway, begins with the year 1841. I submit that a close study of the course of the debate on the rechartering of the National Bank in that year will not leave one convinced that a genuine filibuster occurred—at least not the destructive kind I am talking about. In fact, the bank bill passed and was vetoed by President Tyler. In speaking of this debate, Dr. Burdette said in his book at page 24:

"Not yet was filibusterism so organized that it could completely paralyze the program of the Senate."

That 1841 debate is significant, however, in supporting my main contention that the gentlemen of the old school of the pre-Civil War days, did not and could not under the Senate rules and precedents filibuster.

At various stages of the debate Henry Clay complained that the Democrats were engaging in protracted talk and were delaying the progress of the Senate's business. In answer to these charges John C. Calhoun and other Senators were vigorous in their denial of dilatory speech and also affirmed the traditions of the Senate for pertinent speech in the dispatch of public business. Excerpts from their remarks are given here:

"JOHN C. CALHOUN, of South Carolina. But he must express his hope that the Senator would not depart from that generous, liberal, and courteous habit of proceeding, which was the real honor of the Senate. Very rarely was such a thing witnessed as the attempt to thwart a measure by the mere consumption of time, or by a resort to the technicality of rules. Seldom has it been attempted to stop debate by sitting out the question * * * (June 12, 1841, vol. 10, Congressional Globe, p. 46).

"It was not his intention, and he knew it could not be the intention of any of his friends, to waste unnecessarily one particle of the time of this session; but time they would require to amend the bill, and that was all they asked. Certain he was, that no other than a fair and open opposition, on principle, was meant. As long as discussion was necessary, they should have it—beyond that, they did not look (July 12, 1841, vol. 10, Congressional Globe, p. 184).

"There never had been a body in this or any other country, in which, for such a length of time, so much dignity and decorum of debate had been maintained. It was remarkable for the fact the range of discussion was less discursive than in any other similar body known. Speeches were uniformly confined to the subject under debate (July 15, 1841, vol. 10, Congressional Globe, p. 205).

"WILLIAM R. KING, of Alabama. Nobody on his side of the House wished to see the session prolonged; all concurred, he was sure, in desiring an early period of adjournment. Mr. K. never had concurred in any attempt to defeat measures by mere delay. * * *

"WILLIAM ALLEN, of Ohio. I have ever been unwilling to break the silence of the body (the Senate) for the mere purpose of talking * * * (June 12, 1841).

"THOMAS HART BENTON, of Missouri. With respect to debates, Senators have a constitutional right to speak; and while they speak to the subject before the House, there is no power anywhere to stop them. It is a constitutional right. When a member departs from the question, he is to be stopped: it is the duty of the Chair—your duty, Mr. President, to stop him—and it is the duty of the Senate to sustain you in the discharge of this duty. We have rules for conducting the debates, and these rules only require to be enforced in order to make debates decent and instructive in their import, and brief and reasonable in their duration. The Government has been in operation above 50 years, and the freedom of debate has been sometimes abused, especially during the last 12 years, when those out of power made the two Houses of Congress the arena of political and electioneering combat against the Democratic administration in power. The liberty of debate was abused during this time; but the Democratic majority would not impose gags and muzzles on the mouths of the minority; they would not stop their speeches; considering, and justly considering, that the privilege of speech was inestimable and inattackable—that some abuse of it was inseparable from its enjoyment—and that it was better to endure a temporary abuse than to incur a total extinction of this great privilege.

"But, sir, debate is one thing, and amendments another. A long speech, wandering off from the bill, is a very different thing from a short amendment, directed to the texture of the bill itself, and intended to increase its beneficial, or to diminish its prejudicial, action. These amendments are the point to which I now speak, and to the nature of which I particularly invoke the attention of the Senate."

At the end of the session Clay and Calhoun and King engaged in the following colloquy:

"Mr. Calhoun hoped the country would now be satisfied that there had been gross delusion in the attempt made to throw all the blame of delaying the business of this extra session on the opposition. On Saturday week he (Mr. Calhoun) and his friends proposed to take the final vote on the succeeding Monday; and who had delayed the bill ever since? Was it not the gentlemen themselves? But further delay is now asked for amendments that have been gone over twice already—in the Senate and in committee—with all the consideration that could be given to them. It was now surely obvious that the consent of the Senate had gone as far as the Senator from Kentucky could expect. The Senate was now full, and no good reason could be urged why the vote should not be taken on the engrossment, with a view of coming to the final vote tomorrow.

"Mr. Clay of Kentucky said there was such a thing as a ruse de guerre. He would put it to the candor of the gentlemen on the other side to say if such was not the case in the proposition made on Saturday week to go to the final vote on the succeeding Monday. He (Mr. Clay) was, however, willing to admit that his side of the Senate had occupied its share of time; but it was hardly fair to charge him and his friends with the whole of the delay. The gentlemen themselves, in 1 day, had made 7 speeches in succession. But he would not now go into these matters. He had risen to say he would propose to the gentlemen to take the question tomorrow, at 12 o'clock, without debate.

"Mr. King said he had understood, when he made the proposition on Saturday week to take the question on the succeeding Monday, that the ostensible reason for delay arose out of the absence of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Graham], but knowing that could make no difference, he had acted in good faith; for he believed it was by arrangement that that Senator and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Rives], who was understood to be opposed to the bill, were both absent, having paired off, so that they could, without affecting the vote on this bill, attend to the necessary call for their absense. Why, they, if the gentlemen opposite were in earnest in their proclaimed desire of coming to the vote on the Bank bill—why did they introduce their loan bill, and their bankrupt bill, not to interfere, but for the purpose of delaying the final vote on this Bank bill? As to the imputation that the amendments offered by his (Mr. King's) friends were intended to embarrass the measure, he could with confidence say that there was not one of these amendments which had not been offered in good faith.

"The Senator from Kentucky had alluded to the number of speeches made in defense of these amendments by the Senators in the opposition; but the Senator seemed to forget that he himself had made nearly as many speeches as the whole of them put together.

He and his friends had consumed by far the greater part of the time devoted to the discussion of this bill. The Senator has the command of a sufficient majority. He has been offered the immediate opportunity of acting with that majority. What, then, can be the reason that, instead of acting at once, further delay is asked for on the pretence of having more amendments to offer? He [Mr. KING] now wanted the country to understand truly who it was that was causing the delay of business in this extra session of Congress. He wished the country to understand that the cause of delay does not rest with the minority."

YEARS 1846 THROUGH 1856

The next outstanding filibuster listed by Dr. Galloway occurred in 1846. The debate over this bill, relating to the Oregon territorial dispute with Great Britain, lasted about 2 months but the bill did pass. The issue was of great importance to the Nation and many Senators on both sides wanted to make their views known. Though therefore protracted, the debate as recorded in the Congressional Globe was always relevant. Time was spent but the Senate was not frustrated. As the excerpts that follow indicate, the speaking was not for the purpose of deliberately delaying action by the Senate.

Senator William Allen of Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, while opposed to the particular legislation, was nonetheless responsible for its progress as floor manager. In discharge of his responsibilities, on March 24, 1846, in the words of the editor of Globe, Mr. Allen "rose and said he desired to ask the attention of the Senate to the question of determining upon what day the Senate would be willing to take the vote upon the passage of the Oregon resolutions. It was now, he believed, forty or fifty days since the debate upon this subject was opened. How the intervening time had been consumed was known to all. He had no personal right to complain of the time consumed by other Senators in the discussion, after having himself consumed two days of the time of the Senate; but he desired, for many reasons which it would not be necessary for him to state to the Senate, that there should be some day fixed, by a general understanding, on which to bring the discussion on the subject of the notice to a conclusion. He desired that the day should be made known, if practicable, before the arrival of the day itself, in order to accommodate those of his fellow Senators who were compelled by circumstances to absent themselves for a short time, and who had named to him the necessity which existed for such absence, and who strongly desired to be present when the vote was to be taken upon this important question. By fixing the day many of those gentlemen might probably regulate their absence so as to be present on that day. By leaving the time entirely indefinite, the Senate might suddenly come to a vote, to the surprise and mortification of those who chanced to be absent; and to this extent injustice would be done to those Senators.

"He named these circumstances without naming the still greater and more important considerations connected with the great interests of the country. After some 3 or 4 months devoted to the consideration of this subject in the two Houses of Congress, it seemed to him that the Senate ought to be able to fix some day, and that not a remote one, when the sense of the Senate could be taken upon the subject. He was aware that the previous question was not in use here; he was aware it was not the habit of the Senate to pass a resolution to take a subject out of discussion, and to direct the vote to be taken on a given day; but he was likewise aware that it had been their habit to have a conversational understanding that an end would be put to a protracted debate at a particular time. It was with this object that he now rose, and he would name Saturday next as the day on which the vote should be taken. This would leave sufficient time for the exposition of the views of those Senators who still desired to be heard upon the subject. He made this proposition in order that Senators might not be taken by surprise. Much had been said about quieting the apprehension of the country. He had never indulged in that description of remark, and he thought it was entirely out of place as connected with the subject to which his proposition now had reference. He made that proposition with a view of obtaining, if practicable, a general understanding as to the time when the vote should be taken.

"Mr. Morehead said he did not know to what extent the practice to which the honorable Senator had alluded had prevailed in the Senate, to fix some given day for the decision of a pending question. Even if there was a rule of this kind, or a practice which amounted to a rule, he trusted it would not be applied to a question like that which had been under discussion for several weeks past. It was, he believed, generally regarded as the most important question which had attracted the attention of Congress for many years. He could not perceive the necessity for fixing any particular day when the question must be decided; for if they were to do so, they might, to some extent, while aiming to promote the convenience of some Members of the Senate, inflict a very great inconvenience upon other Members, by depriving them of the opportunity of delivering their views upon the question. That, he was sure, was not the object of the honorable Senator. It seemed to him, therefore, in view of the well-known courtesies of the Senate—of the well ascertained disposition of that body never, at any time, to press the vote upon any question when any considerable number were absent; and, regarding the well-known disposition which prevailed on all occasions to consult the convenience of Senators, it seemed to him that it would be quite safe to trust to that courtesy that the Senate would not, in the absence of any of its Members, insist upon a vote, or take any proceeding that would disoblige or prove a source of embarrassment or inconvenience to any. He supposed there were various Senators who yet desired to make some observations upon the subject. Being one, and the humblest of the body, and the least disposed to throw himself upon the indulgence of the Senate at any time, he should nevertheless feel disposed before the debate closed to submit his views to the Senate. There were Senators who might desire to be heard who were not present this morning, and, therefore, he would suggest to the honorable Senator from Ohio not to press his proposition, but to allow it to lie over until tomorrow.

"Mr. Allen observed that he would not protract the discussion at this time, because he was unwilling to consume the time which rightfully belonged to his honorable friend from Mississippi [Mr. Chalmers]. His object in calling the attention of the Senate to the subject was, that Senators might reflect upon it, and unite in some informal understanding respecting the time for closing the debate."

On March 26, Senator Allen again touched on the subject of coming to a vote:

"THE DEBATE ON OREGON

"Mr. Allen rose and said, that if there were no more reports to be made, he desired the indulgence of the Senate, while he recurred to some observations which he had made 2 days ago, in reference to an informal understanding that the Senate would on a certain day proceed to vote upon the passage of the Oregon resolutions. The suggestions which he had offered on a former occasion were made with a view of attracting the attention of Senators to the question of fixing a definite day on which the vote might be taken. Subsequently to that time he had had an opportunity of ascertaining the views of many Senators on this subject, and he believed he might very safely express the hope that the Senate would proceed to vote on the question on Friday week, with a view to the final settlement of it by a vote of this body. This, it would be admitted, would afford ample time for the fullest discussion of the question by those who desired to discuss it. And he would suggest, though it was a matter which was of course altogether within the power of the Senate, and in which he had no more right to have his wishes consulted than any other single Senator, still he would suggest, that, in order to afford the amplest opportunity to the Senators who had not yet spoken to deliver their views, the Senate continue to sit the whole week out.

"There was some excuse for asking the attention of the Senate to this matter, and it was found in the fact that there must of necessity be a definite period for the termination of the discussion. There was some excuse to be found in the fact that many Senators, in consequence of peculiar circumstances, would, after the next 10 days, be compelled to be absent from the body for some time, and all were anxious to be present when the vote was to be taken upon so important a question. He merely threw out these suggestions. Of course the Senate would act as they saw fit. He thought it proper, however, to suggest what he believed to be the prevalent opinion of the body as to the time for taking the vote on the question.

"Mr. J. M. Clayton said that he concurred with the Senator from Ohio that some time should be fixed for the termination of the debate, and he would be perfectly satisfied that the vote should be taken upon the day which the Senator had named. He was aware that many Senators, who would be reluctant to be absent when the vote was to be taken, would be compelled to be away for a time from the Senate. He had no desire whatever to prevent any Senator who desired to address the body upon the question from doing so; but he thought the time named by the Senator from Ohio was a reasonable time, and sufficient to allow every Senator an opportunity to express his views. He did not know that any debate which could now take place would change the opinion of a single member of that body; still he was anxious to give every one an opportunity to be heard. He could not conceive, after all that had been said, that it was possible that any benefit could be derived from protracting the debate beyond the time mentioned by the Senator from Ohio. He did not know what the proper mode was, whether by resolution or by a general understanding; he rose only for the purpose of saying that he, for one, was satisfied with the time named by the Senator

"Mr. Allen said he had stated what he understood the practice of the Senate to be. It was known to Senators that the previous question was not in use, and it had never been the practice to introduce a resolution for fixing the time for terminating a debate. This was a practice which had grown up elsewhere, but had never been introduced into the Senate; the practice was to have an informal understanding, and to carry it out, by refusing to adjourn until the question was taken.

"Mr. Niles said he concurred in the remarks of both the honorable Senators who had just spoken. He was not in favor of curtailing debate upon any question, especially upon one of great national importance like the present. At the same time Senators must be aware that it is necessary that the debate should be brought to a close; and it seemed to him that the termination of the discussion might reasonably be fixed for the day

mentioned by the Senator from Ohio. The subject had been before the two Houses for a long time. In the British Parliament they denominated a debate which lasted 12 nights a 'monster debate'; this might, with great propriety, he thought, be styled a 'monster debate,' as it had lasted nearly 2 months, and had exercised an influence on the business affairs of the country. It appeared, therefore, to him, that it was very proper that the present undefined position of the subject should be changed by taking a vote. He thought the debate should be brought to a close at as early a day as that named by the Senator from Ohio, and, that every Senator who had not yet expressed his views might have an opportunity to do so, he for one would submit to any degree of personal inconvenience, and would be disposed to sit on the 2 days in the week on which the Senate was in the habit of adjourning, and to hear 2 speeches a day.

"Mr. Jarnagin said there was no proposition, he believed, before the Senate to adjourn over; and he would remark that he saw no probability of such a motion being made in the present state of the debate, which, he trusted, would be allowed to proceed until those who had not yet had an opportunity to address the Senate might have an opportunity to do so, and then the vote could be taken. There was no precedent, he believed, in that body, for limiting debate to a given period. There was no precedent for urging forward the close of a debate to such an extent that 2 speeches must be delivered in 1 day. Some gentlemen had taken 2 days for a single speech; and, having said all they purposed saying, were now anxious to hasten the debate to a close. He, for one, did not purpose addressing the Senate upon the Oregon question; but he now entered his protest against the adoption of any rule or practice by which debate should be stifled in that body. Gentlemen might determine for themselves upon a motion to adjourn; whether it were expedient to do so without having a rule to govern them. He did not understand the Senator from Ohio as proposing anything further than to bring the matter to the notice of Senators individually. But they were told that it was necessary to put an end to the debate; that it was highly proper to have a day fixed in their own minds for its termination. That was a matter which he protested against. And he would take occasion to say that, for one, he was ready to vote now, and had been ready for 2 or 3 weeks past. But when all who desired it had had an opportunity to address the Senate, it would be time enough to take the vote.

"Mr. Woodbridge said he did not hold to the expediency of adopting any artificial rule in this case; when gentlemen had had the opportunity, which they ought to have, of addressing the Senate, it would be time enough for the Senate to act. There were two Senators absent, and he knew they would be extremely desirous of being present when the vote was taken. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Huntington], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Simmons], the latter of whom, he believed, was desirous of expressing his views on the subject, were both absent. Though he was desirous that the debate should be brought to a close, yet he was also desirous of giving to every gentleman an opportunity of discussing the question if he desired it.

"Mr. Hannegan said if he had rightly understood the Senator from Ohio, and he was confident that he had, the Senator had proposed no rule, as he was represented by the Senator from Tennessee to have done. The Senator from Ohio simply suggested to the Senate the propriety of determining informally that on tomorrow week the question should be taken. The Senator did not propose to adopt a resolution or to fasten a rule upon the Senate from which there should be no departure; but he simply proposed, as an act of courtesy to the Senators present and to those who were absent, that the time for taking the vote should be known beforehand, that no one might be taken unawares. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Woodbridge], suggested the absence of the Senator from Connecticut. If the health of that Senator were such as to permit him to be present, he would have timely notice; but if, as he had reason to believe, his health would not admit of his attendance, was the action of the Senate to be suspended on that account in a matter of this kind? He was not for preventing any Senator from expressing his views, but he held that the 9 days which would intervene between this morning and the day named by the Senator from Ohio would be amply sufficient. There were gentlemen on his side of the chamber who, though they had spoken, would like to say more, but who were willing to waive their privilege in order that this protracted debate might be brought to a close. He thought it was due to the country that the Senate should come to some conclusion upon this subject."

On April 11 Senator Allen again spoke:

"TERMINATION OF THE DEBATE

"Mr. Allen rose and remarked that he thought it might be assumed as tolerably certain that some time within the present week the Senate would proceed to vote on the Oregon resolutions. This being the case, he was of the opinion that it would be an accommodation to many Senators to have an understanding as to the exact day on which the Senate would proceed to vote upon them. And he would here state that it was his intention when they came to the vote to move to lay upon the table the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to take up that which was sent to them from the House of Representatives, in order to test the sense of the Senate upon that resolution. He was desirous that a day should be determined on, inasmuch as some of the members of the body would be unavoidably absent, he understood, within a few days, and they would like to time their absence so that it should not fall on that day when the vote should be taken.

"Mr. R. JOHNSON. Does the Senator name a day?

"Mr. ALLEN. I would propose that it be Wednesday next, or Thursday, if the Senators prefer it.

"Mr. Morehead said that for one he had not the slightest objection to fixing upon some day for terminating the debate, provided it was not to be regarded as establishing a precedent.

"[Mr. Webster here intimated that such was not the intention.]

"Mr. M. was quite willing, then, that Thursday should be the day. He would remind the Senator, however, that discussion might arise on the various propositions by way of amendment to the resolution of notice, which would preclude the possibility of taking the final vote on that day.

"Mr. R. Johnson presumed that any gentleman desiring to speak on Thursday, would not be cut off by this arrangement.

"Mr. HANNEGAN. Certainly not. But the Senate may refuse to adjourn.

"Mr. Allen stated that it was not proposed to establish any arbitrary rule, which would be contrary to the practice of the Senate. Nor was it his desire to interfere with the rights or wishes of any Senator who might desire to speak. But every Senator could resolve in his own mind that the debate should terminate, and not to adjourn before a vote was taken.

"Mr. WEBSTER. I have no objection.

"Mr. Allen then suggested that Wednesday might be fixed on.

"Mr. WEBSTER. Thursday.

"Mr. Allen acquiesced, and named Thursday.

"Mr. Moorehead suggested that a discussion, after the first vote, might arise on the various amendments, and the debate might thus be protracted beyond the day named.

"Mr. WEBSTER. Such debate would be short.

"Mr. ALLEN. It is not likely that a discussion on the amendments would be a very protracted one. After a debate of such length, every Senator must have pretty clearly determined, in his own mind, as to the form of notice for which he will vote. As regards myself, such is my unwillingness to put off the final vote on this question, that I will waive my right to reply to any remarks made during the discussion, reserving the privilege to answer on some occasion which may present itself hereafter. When a running discussion arises, it has been the usual practice of the Senate to sit it out; otherwise, we should no sooner see land, than we might be at sea again.

"Here the conversation dropped."

Finally on April 16 the Senate came to a vote, but first Senator Allen said:

"Mr. Allen then rose and said, that five-and-sixty days ago, he had opened this discussion. In the intervening debate, many things had been said to which he could desire an opportunity to reply. But in view of the public interests, as well as with a becoming regard to the patience of the Senate, he would not longer protract the discussion, by a speech which might have the effect of reopening it altogether. He should waive any right that he might have to reply to arguments urged against those presented by him, or to observations which had been made in the course of the discussion, directed more against him personally than the positions which he had assumed. He should therefore fulfill the promise made by him to the Senate a few days ago, by now moving to lay upon the table the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the accompanying proposition of amendment, with the view of now proceeding to the consideration of the resolution sent to the body from the House of Representatives, entitled 'A joint resolution of notice to Great Britain, to annul and abrogate the convention,' and so forth. This motion he made, not because he preferred the House resolution to that reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. The very fact of having acquiesced in that resolution, and reported it, was a declaration of his own preference for it, as reported, and also of the preference of a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations. But he should, nevertheless, make the motion to take up the House resolution first, because upon that resolution the Senate was obliged to act; and secondly, because, although the latter clause of that resolution was objectionable to him, he was willing to vote for it as it stood, in deference to the House of Representatives, who had sent it there by so large and overwhelming a vote; and still further, because the adoption of that resolution as it stood, by putting an end to the matter, would, in all probability, be followed by the sanction and signature of the President; whereas, if amended, and reported back, or if they passed the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the whole matter would be again sent to the House, and the question exposed to the danger of delay from a renewal of the discussion there, probably resulting in a conflict between the two Houses themselves as to the form of the notice. These, then, were the reasons which induced him to offer the motion which he now made."

One indication that Senate tradition was holding firm through the 40's was the action of the presiding officer on July 5, 1848, in ruling Senator Clayton, of Delaware, out of order for speaking on matters not pending

before the Senate. Senator Clayton at first appealed the decision but after discussion withdrew it.

Again on August 12 of the same session the Chair by a vote of 27 to 2 was overruled on an appeal from a ruling that a Senator had not been irrelevant in his remarks. This was indeed a strong demonstration that the Senate meant to live by its rules.

On April 3, 1850, Vice President Fillmore took occasion to address the Senate on the subject of decorum in debate. He reviewed the rules relating to debate in its various aspects and traced the precedents on the subject. His remarks and those of Senator William R. King, of Alabama, who presided over the Senate during the 31st and 32d Congresses as President pro tempore after Fillmore's elevation to the Presidency on June 10, 1850, follow:

"DECORUM IN DEBATE [8]

"The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no further morning business, the Chair claims the indulgence of the Senate to submit a few remarks in relation to his own powers and duties to preserve order.

"On assuming the responsible duty as presiding officer of this body, I trusted that no occasion would arise when it would become necessary for the Chair to interpose to preserve order in debate. I could not disguise the fact that, by possibility, such a necessity might arise. I therefore inquired of some of the Senators to know what had been the usage on this subject, and was informed that the general practice had been, since Mr. Calhoun acted as Vice President, not to interfere unless a question of order was made by some Senator. I was informed that that distinguished and now lamented person had declined to exercise the power of calling to order for words spoken in debate, on the ground that he had no authority to do so. Some thought the rule had been since changed, and others not; but then there still seemed to be a difference of opinion as to the power. Under these circumstances, though my opinion was strongly in favor of the power, with or without the rule to authorize it, I thought it most prudent not hastily to assume the exercise of it, but to wait until the course of events should show that it was necessary. It appears to me that that time has now arrived, and that the Senate should know my opinion on this subject, and the powers which, after mature reflection, I think are vested in the Chair, and the corresponding duties which they impose. If I am wrong in the conclusion at which I have arrived, I desire the advice of the Senate to correct me. I therefore think it better to state them now, when there is the opportunity for a cool and dispassionate examination, rather than wait until they are called into action by some scene of excitement which may be unfavorable to dispassionate deliberation and advice; for while I should shrink from no responsibilities which the office with which I am honored imposes upon me, I would most scrupulously avoid the assumption of any power not conferred by the Constitution and rules of this body.

"The question then presents itself, 'Has the Vice President, as presiding officer of this body, the power to call a Senator to order for words spoken in debate?"

"The sixth rule of the Senate is in the following words:

" 'When a Member shall be called to order by the President or a Senator, he shall sit down, and every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate; and the President may call for the sense of the Senate on any question of order.'

"It will be seen that this rule does not expressly confer the power of calling to order either upon the President or a Senator, but impliedly admits that power in each, and declares the consequences of such call.

"The constitutional provisions bearing upon this subject are very brief. The first is:

" 'The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, and shall have no vote unless they be equally divided.'

"The next is:

" 'Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."

"The first clause which I have quoted, confers no express powers, yet the general power and duties of a presiding officer, in a parliamentary debate, were well understood by the framers of the Constitution, and it can hardly be doubted that they intended to confer upon the Vice President those powers, and required of him the performance of those duties. But the power expressly conferred to make rules to regulate its proceedings, clearly conferred upon the Senate authority to make rules regulating the conduct of its Members, including its presiding officer. What, then, are we to understand from this rule?

"I have availed myself of the leisure afforded by the last recess, to look into the history of this rule, that I might, if possible, gather from it the intent of the Senate in adopting it. I find that one of the first acts of this body, in 1789, was to appoint a committee to prepare a system of rules for conducting business in the Senate.

"The committee reported a number of rules, which were adopted, and among the rest the two following:

" 'Sixteenth. When a Member shall be called to order, he shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he is in order or not. Every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate; and if there be a doubt in his mind, he may call for a sense of the Senate.

" 'Seventeenth. If a Member be called to order for words spoken, the exceptionable words shall be immediately taken down in writing, that the President may be better enabled to judge of the matter.'

"These rules remained the same until 1828; but in 1826, Mr. Calhoun, then Vice President, declared that, in his opinion, he had no authority to call a Senator to order for words spoken in debate. In 1828, the rules were referred to a committee for revision, and were reported without any amendment to these rules; but when they came up for consideration in the Senate, they were amended so as to read as they now do, namely:

" 'Sixth. When a Member shall be called to order by the President or a Senator, he shall sit down; and every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate; and the President may call for the sense of the Senate on any question or order.

" 'Seventh. If a Member be called to order by a Senator for words spoken, the exceptionable words shall immediately be taken down in writing, that the President may be better enabled to judge of the matter.'

"It will be seen by the comparison, that the proposed rule expressly recognized the authority in the President to call to order, and gave an appeal from his decision, which the former rules did not.

"It also made a distinction between a call to order for words spoken by the President, and by a Senator for words spoken, by requiring in the latter case that the objectionable words should be reduced to writing, but not in the former. On this amendment, a long and interesting debate sprung up, which may be found in Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates, volume 4, part 1, pages 278 to 341; and in this debate, though Senators differed widely as to the power of the President to call to order without the amendment, and as to the policy of adopting it, yet all seemed to conclude that, if adopted, he would have less power, and the amendment was finally agreed to by a vote of more than 2 to 1; and thereupon it is reported that Mr. Calhoun—

" 'The Vice President then rose and said that he took this opportunity to express his entire satisfaction with that portion of the amendment giving to Senators the right of appeal from the decision of the Chair, as it was not only according to strict principle, but would relieve the Chair from a most delicate duty. As to the power conferred upon the Chair, it was not for him to speak, but he assured the Senate that he should always endeavor to exercise it with strict impartiality.'

"It appears to me, then, with all due respect to the opinions of others, that this rule recognized the power to call to order in the Vice President, and, by implication at least, conferred that power upon him.

"The next question is, Does the possession of the power impose any duty to exercise it?

"The power, it will be seen, is conferred equally upon the Chair and every Member of the Senate, and in precisely the same language. Is the duty, then, more imperative upon the President than upon any and every Member of the Senate, to perform the unpleasant but necessary task of exercising it? There is a marked distinction between this rule and the corresponding rule of the House of Representatives. By the 22d rule of that body, a Member may call to order, but it is made the imperative duty of the Speaker to do so. The words are:

" 'If any Member in speaking or otherwise transgresses the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call to order,' and so forth.

"It is perhaps to be regretted, if the Senate desires that its presiding officer should perform this delicate and ungracious duty, that its rule had not been equally explicit with that of the House.

"The reason why Senators so seldom interfere by calling each other to order, is doubtless because they fear that their motives may be misunderstood. They do not like to appear as volunteers in the discharge of such an invidious duty. The same feeling must, to some extent, operate upon the Chair, unless his duty be palpable. But upon mature reflection, I have come to the conclusion, though the authority be the same, yet that the duty may be more imperative upon the Chair than upon the Senate, and that if the painful necessity shall hereafter arise, I shall feel bound to discharge my duty accordingly. I shall endeavor to do it with the utmost impartiality and respect. I know how difficult it is to determine what is and what is not in order, to restrain improper language, and yet not abridge the freedom of debate. But all must see how important it is that the first departure from the strict rule of parliamentary decorum be checked, as a slight attack, or even insinuation of a personal character, often provokes a more severe retort, which brings out a more disorderly reply, each Senator feeling a justification in the previous aggression. There is, therefore, no point so proper to interpose for the preservation of order as to check the first violation of it.

"If, in my anxiety to do this, I should sometimes make a mistake, I am happy to know that the Senate has the remedy in its own hands, and that, by an appeal, my error may be corrected without injury to anyone. Or if I have wholly mistaken my duty in this delicate matter, the action of the Senate will soon convince me of that fact, and in that event I shall cheerfully leave it to the disposition of the Senate. But I have an undoubting confidence that while I am right, I shall be fully sustained.

"I trust I shall be pardoned for making one or two suggestions on some points of minor importance. This body has been so

[8] Pp. 631 and 632, The Congressional Globe, vol. XXI, pt. I, 31st Cong., 1st sess.

long and so justly distinguished for its dignity and decorum, that I cannot but apprehend that some neglect on my part renders these remarks necessary. We all know that many little irregularities may be tolerated in a small body that would cause much disorder in a large one. The Senate has increased from 26 to 60 Members. The natural tendency of the increase of Members is, to relax the discipline—that when the strict observance of rules is most essential to the dignity and comfort of the body, it is the most difficult to enforce.

"The second rule is a very salutary one, but perhaps too stringent to be always observed in practice. It reads as follows:

" 'No Member shall speak to another, or otherwise interrupt the business of the Senate, or read any newspaper while the Journals or public papers are reading, or when any Member is speaking in any debate.'

"Mr. Jefferson, in his Manual (p. 140), which seems to be a code to common law for the regulation of all parliamentary debates in the country, says that no one is to disturb another in his speech, etc., nor to pass between the Speaker and the speaking Member. These are comparatively trifling matters, and yet the rules and law of the Senate would seem to require that its Presiding Officer should see them enforced. I trust, however, that it is only necessary to call attention to them to insure their observance by every Senator. But the practice seems to have grown up of interrupting a Senator when speaking, by addressing him directly, instead of addressing the Chair, as required by the rule.

"The Manual declares that it is a breach of order for one Member to interrupt another while speaking, unless by calling him to order, if he departs from it. It seems to me that the objection should be a very urgent one, indeed, that can justify one Member in interrupting another while speaking, and that all would find it to their advantage if this rule were more strictly enforced than it has been, and that in all cases the Senator rising to explain should address the Chair, as required by the rule.

"As presiding officer of the Senate, I feel that my duty consists in executing its law, as declared by its rules and by its practice. If these rules are too strict, it would be better to modify than violate them. But we have a common interest and feel a common pride in the order and dignity of this body, and I therefore feel that I can appeal with confidence to every Senator to aid me in enforcing these salutary regulations. I feel it my duty to say thus much before proceeding to the course of action I have decided upon.

* * * * *

"Mr. KING. I have listened with great attention to the statement of the presiding officer, and entirely concur in the views he expresses of the rights and duties appertaining to that position. It is necessary—it is essentially necessary, that those duties should be strictly performed by the Vice President, or any other presiding officer whom the Senate may select in his absence. They should feel it to be their imperative duty to enforce order, to protect persons in debate, and put down every species of disorder. I hope, therefore, that we may have this statement placed on the Journal, as a guide to other presiding officers, and I move that it be placed there, if it meets, as I trust it will, the full approbation of the Senate.

"The motion to enter the Vice President's statement on the Journal was agreed to unanimously."

In 1856 the question of Senate decorum again became a matter of debate. A Senate committee reported a motion to amend the rules to provide, among other things, that Senators when speaking were to confine themselves to the question under debate. The suggested amendment was not adopted by general assent, but the Senators for the most part also agreed that the suggested amendment merely recited the rule which had been controlling since the beginning of the Congress in 1789.

The pertinent parts of the 1856 debate with emphasis supplied in black brackets follow:

"[From the Congressional Globe of June 26, 1856, pp. 1477–1484]

"JESSE D. BRIGHT, Senator of Indiana (the President pro tempore). The Secretary read the proposed amendments to the 3d and 6th rules; which are, to amend the 3d rule by inserting, after the word 'place,' in line 2, 'and shall confine himself to the question under debate. He shall avoid personality, and shall not reflect improperly upon any State;' so that the rule will read:

" '3. [*Every member, when he speaks, shall address the Chair, standing in his place, and shall confine himself to the question under debate.*] He shall avoid personality, and shall not reflect improperly upon any State; and when he has finished shall sit down.'

"Mr. JUDAH P. BENJAMIN, Senator of Louisiana.

"I have no objection to these amendments, except to the first clause, which I deem to be entirely unnecessary, and will probably give rise to more confusion and difficulty than would occur in its absence. The first clause, which requires the person speaking to confine himself to the subject under debate, will give opportunities for constant calls to order; but we all very well know that the Senate will never refuse to hear a gentleman in any line of remark that he thinks proper to make on any public subject, if he is not guilty of any indecorum or impropriety of speech. I think the provision useless—entirely so. It is a rule which will merely give opportunities for calls to order and wrangling, as to whether or not a gentleman is in order, and is confining himself to the subject under debate—one of the most difficult questions on earth to determine. I think we had better leave that out.

"Mr. CHARLES E. STUART, Senator of Michigan. [I will only suggest, in reply to the honorable Senator, that I understand this to be the rule and the parliamentary law now.] I understand the same thing of every amendment which is proposed by the committee to our rules. There has been a difference among gentlemen as to what is the strict law, and as to what is the duty of the Presiding Officer of the Senate in enforcing the rules. [Every amendment, I believe, except that which relates to reflecting on a State, is, in my opinion, the true construction of the rules now.] The committee were induced to present this report to make the matter certain. For myself, I have no solicitude about it.

"Mr. JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, Senator of Kentucky. Mr. President, [I do not think the rules require any amendment whatever,] and it is a dangerous experiment to attempt it. I can say, for one, without entering into the subject, that I am unwilling that the rules of this body shall be changed. They have grown up from the experience of a thousand years. If a gentleman supposes he can now, by some 20 or 30 lines, add to those rules which have grown out of the experience and wisdom of a thousand Parliaments and Senate, I think he is mistaken. I hope we shall make no innovation on them; and I concur with what the gentleman from Louisiana has suggested, that we shall have more controversies and disputes growing out of it than now exist. We have enough already. I do not want any amendments whatever to the general rules of our proceedings.

"Mr. JOHN P. HALE, Senator of New Hampshire. I rise to express the hope that these amendments will not prevail, and that we shall not meddle with the rules. There is great danger, at a time when anything exciting occurs, of running into hasty legislation in passing rules or laws growing out of such events. [If this is the parliamentary law now, it is well enough as it is, without an additional rule.]

* * * * *

"Mr. ANDREW P. BUTLER, Senator of South Carolina. I do not rise to add anything to what has been said by the Senator from Kentucky, or by the Senator from New Hampshire, on the point before the Senate, but simply to call the attention of the Senate to what I think was [a very distinct declaration of this body in Mr. Fillmore's time, while he was Vice President, that the Chair had fully the power on any occasion to call any Member to order, when, in the opinion of the Chair, he was out of order.] That right being conceded to the Chair—and I am willing that some declaration of the kind shall be made now—it is not likely to lead to abuse; because, if an appeal is taken from the Chair, we shall always have the opinion of the Senate on the point raised.

"My judgment is different from yours, Mr. President, and Mr. Calhoun's. I believe that the Chair has the power. Such certainly was the opinion of the Senate when Mr. Fillmore made the communication to which I allude, in reference to his powers. Mr. King, who was then on the floor—a very experienced parliamentarian—said at once that certainly was his understanding, and he moved that the paper communicated by the Vice President be filed as the opinion of the Senate.

* * * * *

"Mr. JOHN M. CLAYTON, Senator from Delaware. * * * In the days when Gaillard occupied that seat, the order preserved in the Senate was vastly better than it has been since, as men were more cautious of what they said to each other in debate.

* * * * *

"[It is generally understood by every Member, when he rises in debate here, that he should confine himself to the subject before the Senate.] It is a matter that I think may very well be left to the sense of propriety and dignity of every gentleman here.

* * * * *

"Mr. STEPHEN ADAMS, Senator from Mississippi. Mr. President, the first objection made to this amendment is to the first clause, providing that a Member shall confine himself to the question under debate. [No one whom I have heard speak objects to the propriety of the debater confining himself to the subject matter under consideration. All experience in legislation has shown the propriety and necessity of such a rule. I understand it to be the parliamentary law by which we are already governed, and yet it is not definite, fixed, and certain; it is not provided] for by our rules or by the parliamentary law in such a manner as to give it practical effect. For this reason it is proposed to give effect to that which is recognized by every Senator, as proper in itself, by placing it in our rules.

"It is said, however, that Senators will be liable to be called to order when they are wandering from the subject, and others do not directly understand their meaning. Why, sir, the presumption is, that Senators will not intentionally violate a rule of the body. No one will say that it is wrong to require conformity to the rule, whether the departure be intentional or unintentional. Our experience proves, that Senators will sit by and listen under all circumstances, and interfere with reluctance. Our experience proves, also, that the Chair with reluctance interrupts a Senator, when he is speaking, and particularly when he is in the heat of debate. He must be guilty of a palpable violation, before either the Chair or any Senator will call him to order. I think that the confusion which Senators apprehend will not result from the proposed rule, but that good will ensue from its adoption.

* * * * *

"Mr. LEWIS CASS, Senator from Michigan. I say, then, we ought to do something. I am not very conversant with the rules; but if I understand the changes now proposed, I think they are very reasonable and proper.

* * * * *

"Mr. ISAAC TOUCEY, Senator from Connecticut. * * * These provisions will conduce to the facility of business, and to the decorum of debate, very much indeed. The only danger, in my judgment, is that they may not be enforced. If every Member who rose in his place to speak to any subject confined himself to that subject—if he abstained from personalities and reflections on any State. * * *

* * * * *

"Mr. JOHN P. HALE, Senator of New Hampshire. * * * If it be, I should not like to see the liberty of debate infringed upon here. [And when I speak of the liberty of debate, I do not mean the license of debate, for I will go as far as anybody to restrict and restrain that. But, sir, I would say of this liberty of debate, this freedom of speech (distinguishing it always from license), as was said in olden times, and as every man can say, with a great price it has been obtained;] with a very great price it has come down to us through the struggles of our ancestors in thousands of years; it has been baptized in the blood of martyrs on the scaffold, and comes to us canonized by the blessings of the good and the true, who have manifested their fidelity to the great principles of civil liberty in the history of our country ages and ages back.

"[Now, sir, while I will be second to no man in restraining license and doing what may be done to keep debate within its legitimate, its constitutional limits of propriety, I am unwilling to do anything which shall have a tendency to deprive the representatives of the people or of the State * * *.]

* * * * *

"Mr. JUDAH P. BENJAMIN, Senator from Louisiana. * * * We have had no trouble here during the time I have been a Member of this body—I do not remember a single instance where the Senate has had the slightest difficulty in conducting its deliberations—from the fact that any gentleman was going out of the subject under discussion * * *.

* * * * *

"Mr. JUDAH P. BENJAMIN, Senator from Louisiana. * * * The Senator, at the same time that he says this, declares his willingness to lay down, as broadly and clearly as any man can desire, the proposition, that [freedom of debate is not to degenerate into license or licentiousness of debate, and that under freedom of debate he does not claim license. Well, sir, that distinction is as old as freedom or debate itself is].

* * * * *

"MR. CHARLES E. STUART, Senator of Michigan. Mr. President, I have listened for some time with, I confess, no little surprise, to the various discussions on the meaning of these amendments, and the meaning of the rules. Now, so far as I know, there is no single item in the amendments proposed that changes the parliamentary law which governs all deliberative assemblies. That is my undertanding of it. [I repeat, there is not a rule of the Senate which regards debates, there is not anything in the amendments proposed, that affects this body differently from what it would be if it sat without a rule, under the parliamentary law.

* * * * *

"[I am willing that they shall strike out the portion in reference to confining a Member to the subject under debate. It will not change the law in my opinion; but it will still remain in the privilege and power of the Presiding Officer to call a Senator to order whenever he thinks he is wandering from the question under debate, without these words as well as with them.]

* * * * *

"Mr. JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, Senator from Kentucky. I simply rise to ask him if he is of that opinion, and will withdraw all the rest he has proposed, [which, he says, is but a repetition of rules already existing.] If he will do this, we can have the question disposed of at once. I hope he will do it.

* * * * *

"Mr. JAMES A. PEARCE, Senator from Maryland. The rules of the Senate are not what are ordinarily so called. The few printed rules which we have were adopted for the purpose of varying, in some instances, the parliamentary law, and adding to that law in other particulars. [The law which governs the proceedings of the Senate is generally the parliamentary law as laid down in the manual of Mr. Jefferson. The rules of the Senate, ordinarily so called, are altogether inadequate to the exigencies which arise in the transaction of the business of the Senate.]

* * * * *

"This is an indecency for which he may and should be called to order. No Member shall digress from the subject matter to utter personality. If he does, says the parliamentary law, 'Mr. Speaker shall repress him,' that is the language.

* * * * *

"Mr. WILLIAM BIGLER, Senator from Pennsylvania. [I think it would be clearly right to infer that the parliamentary law, as defined by Mr. Jefferson, is the rule governing the Presiding Officer. He has a large discretion here in calling a Member to order. In arriving at a conclusion as to the performance of that duty, I take it for granted that it is intended that the parliamentary law, as defined by Mr. Jefferson, shall be his rule of action.]

"Mr. JAMES C. JONES, Senator from Tennessee. I do not know that any such provision is necessary. I understood the Senator from Maryland to assume, and I have heard no dissent from his position, [that the parliamentary law, as defined by Mr. Jefferson, is the rule of the Senate, with such additions as the Senate has chosen, or may choose, to make for itself. I take it for granted that that parliamentary law is the rule of the Senate. It seemed to be the general impression of this body, as far as I could see, or hear, or ascertain, that they only desired the single question settled, that the Presiding Officer had the power and the right and the duty of calling a Member to order. * * * I take it for granted that the parliamentary law, as laid down by Mr. Jefferson in his manual, is the law of the Senate, unless where it conflicts with some special rule of this body.] If it were necessary, I should be willing to so define it, but I do not think it necessary. I desire to arrive at a practical result, to give the power to the Presiding Officer, to whom, in my opinion, it belongs; but it would be as well to say so expressly, and thus to relieve him from all embarrassment."

The discussion of the rules in 1856 appears to have been the last one in which Senators were generally agreed that Jefferson's Manual was, in effect, a part of the rules and that Senators were required to be relevant in their remarks. Thereafter the picture began to change. In 1863 and again in 1865 the Senate was the scene of brief but intense filibusters staged a day or two just prior to final adjournment of the short session which ended on the 4th of March of each of those years.

The filibuster in 1863 was stopped by an arbitrary ruling of the Chair. The filibuster in 1865 was successful in defeating legislation to grant the State of Louisiana again the full rights of a State. This filibuster is listed by Dr. George Galloway in his study of filibusters as the first one successfully to block legislation. By 1872 the Senate no longer required a Senator to be relevant in his remarks. In that year Vice President Schuyler Colfax ruled that "under the practice of the Senate the Presiding Officer could not restrain a Senator in remarks which the Senator considers pertinent to the pending issue."

With this ruling the Senate had abandoned effective control over debate. The day of the filibuster had arrived. In 1879 the Republicans, by successful filibuster, defeated legislation to repeal Federal election laws. In December 1890 and January 1891 in the 2d session of the 51st Congress, the Democrats staged a successful filibuster against passage of the so-called force bills. Thereafter almost every session of Congress witnessed one or more successful stultifying filibusters.

The chapter headings of Dr. Burdette's book Filibustering in the Senate significantly read as follows:

"An Instrument of Policy?" (This covers roughly the period from John Randolph's days in the Senate (1826) down through 1879); "Filibustering Unrestrained" (1880 through 1907); "The Modern Filibuster" (1908–17); and "Turmoil" (1917–40, date of publication of book).

In spite of the Senate's abandonment of Jefferson's Manual as controlling over debate, down through the years a Senator could be heard from time to time appealing to the Senate to return to the original practices. For instance, as recently as 1925 Senator Joseph T. Robinson, a distinguished and able Democratic senatorial floor leader, contended:

"No change in the written rules of the Senate is necessary to prevent irrelevant debate. Parliamentary procedure everywhere contemplates that a speaker shall limit his remarks to the subject under consideration. The difficulty grows out of the failure of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to enforce this rule."

Even today, however, the Senate does not have free or unlimited debate in certain aspects of its work. In its rule that an amendment may be tabled without prejudicing the principal measure under debate the Senate adopted a forceful check on debate—and one that was resisted for years.

For years one of the favorite but permissible and legitimate dilatory devices had been to offer amendments and then to talk about them at length.

Another instance is found in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1949. It provides that debate on Presidential reorganization plans shall be limited to 5 hours on each side. Further evidence that it is not considered unreasonable to suggest that the Senate severely limit debate and prevent other dilatory tactics was recently provided in the reciprocal trade agreements bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance. While the bill did not pass the Senate as reported, the reported bill contained severe limitations on debate admittedly designed to prevent a filibuster against Senate action to support any Presidential decision to overrule the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. In reporting the bill with these provisions the committee said the provisions were intended to prevent a successful filibuster. Some Senators who have opposed any change in rule XXII voted for the committee's severe cloture language. Indeed, it seems that we do not hesitate to restrict ourselves except perhaps in one field—that of civil rights. If that issue be raised, then it is that we hear about the historic tradition of "free debate." But we have seen that this is a myth. It is time that the opponents of civil rights cease taking refuge in that argument and debate the issue on its merits.

THE FILIBUSTER AS SEEN FROM THE SENATE FLOOR

Many of the Senate's outstanding members have condemned the filibuster in the strongest terms. Some sample comments follow:

Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma:

"No one man, no matter how sincere he may be or how patriotic his purpose, should be permitted to take the floor of the Senate and keep the floor against the will of every man in the Senate except himself, and coerce and intimidate the Senate. To do so is to destroy the most important principle of self-government—the right of majority rule. * * * My use of this bad practice to serve the people does not in any wise change my opinion about the badness of the practice of permitting a filibuster. I acted within the practice, but I think the practice is indefensible, and I illustrated its vicious character by coercing the Senate and compelling it to yield to my individual will."

Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana:

"A majority may adopt the rules, in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them. A court would make itself the subject of ridicule that should attempt to adopt rules one of which should provide that they could be changed only by a vote of two-thirds of the judges. It would not be tyrannical to make such a rule; it would be futile. The court, when wiser men graced the bench, would contemptuously, by a majority, set it aside. It is scarcely less preposterous that a legislative body should by rule deny itself the right to bring debate to an end and to proceed to a vote; nay, that it should by rule provide that so long as any Member should hold the floor and pretend to debate, there should be no vote; that though such pretense should be persisted in until it became a hollow mockery, a transparent sham, a subject of open raillery and jocularity, there should be no vote; that so long as there remains one Member with physical strength to keep the floor there should be no vote.

Senator Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama (speaking in support of his motion for majority cloture by use of the motion for the previous question in 1925):

"Every Senator who knows me knows that I have been opposed to unlimited debate in the Senate ever since I have been a Member of the Senate; that I believe in a reasonable cloture rule. But if the Senate is going to play the game of allowing deuces to run wild, to have unlimited debate, and anybody can engage in a direct or concealed filibuster if he desires to do so, I want to assure my friends that when I thought the occasion was of sufficient importance I would not hesitate for a moment, now or any other time, to use the rules of the body by which we play the game to effect the legislation that I desired. I do not blame any Senator for using those rules as long as they are the rules. I am not critical of the Senator who plays the game according to the rules; and that is the rule."

Senator John Sherman of Ohio:

"The rules of the Senate are made to expedite the public business in an orderly and proper manner. We are not here for any other purpose except to legislate, to make laws. * * * All the rules ought to aim for the accomplishment of that purpose and no other. * * * The right to debate a question broadly has been recognized by the Senate of the United States from the beginning of our Government; but when the rules of this body, intended to expedite legislation, are used as an obstruction by the minority in order to defeat the will of the majority, those rules should as soon as possible be corrected, changed, and altered."

Senator James Hamilton Lewis of Illinois:

"(The filibuster) is bringing upon this body the contempt of the Nation and the disrespect of mankind."

Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas:

"The question involved, is whether at a time when the country is suffering from a depression unparalleled in its history, at a time when legislation is badly needed, the Senate will demonstrate its unfitness and its incapacity to do business. Why not debate these issues, determine them upon their merits, and let a majority of the Senate decide?"

Vice President Charles G. Dawes (describing the end of a session):

"The most determined obstructionists are fawned upon, cajoled, flattered—anything to get their acquiescence that the Senate may do its constitutional duty—but so far in vain. It is a shameful spectacle—and yet so common that it passes here as a matter of course."

On an earlier occasion Mr. Dawes stated:

"It is amusing to note the attitude toward cloture. So jealous are the Senators of the prerogatives given individuals through the power of obstruction made possible by the absence of the majority cloture rule obtaining in all other important parliamentary bodies that they are reluctant to make use of even this kind of cloture. The idea of giving precedence of the right of the majority to perform their duties over the 'sacred right of free speech' seems more or less obnoxious. This 'sacred right of free speech' in the Senate often translates itself in practice into the right of any individual to indulge for as long a time as he desires in oratory, relevant or irrelevant to the subject under consideration. This, of course, is no true definition of the right of free speech. When the Senators vote by two-thirds to limit debate under the present cloture rule they do subjugate this ridiculous privilege to the higher duty they owe the Government under the Constitution.

"The invoking of the present two-thirds cloture rule practically negatives the arguments against majority cloture, and this may account for the reluctance to use it. Such public demonstrations of the viciousness of the present rules are not welcomed, but they have to be made. There have been many able Senators, like Oscar W. Underwood, Charles S. Thomas, Atlee Pomerene and others who, in the past, have urged the reformation of the Senate rules and pointed out the outrages upon the public interest which they, in their present form, have made possible.

"No one in the Senate, however, has yet undertaken to reform the rules by the threat to use them against the proper conduct of business until they are reformed—in other words, to use them as a bludgeon to force a reform instead of to force through some personal or sectional legislation, generally to the public disadvantage."

SUMMARY

We have seen how the early Senate by use of the motion for the previous question and the precedents in Jefferson's Manual and by the Vice President's unappealable authority to rule on questions of order and decorum held filibusters in effective check. We have noted the gradual erosion of that control over debate after the Civil War until finally it was lost.

Article I, section 5, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. A majority of the Senate in the first instance adopted the Senate rules, and a majority of the Senate may amend the Senate rules. In view of this, is it not strangely undemocratic to require 64 Senators to vote affirmatively in order to close a debate on any measure and bring it to a vote? Is it not even more strange to have a provision (sec. 3, of rule XXII) under which the Senate may not vote on a motion to change the rules as long as even one Senator wishes to prevent the vote by speaking? Of course, one Senator acting by himself cannot for long prevent a vote on changing the rules, but a few Senators (far less than a majority) can do so.

The problem of controlling filibusters is of the first magnitude because the mere threat of a filibuster affects, to more or less extent, all important and controversial legislation. In recent years successful filibusters have involved solely the legislative struggles to assure Negroes equality under the law in fact as well as in theory.

This is the emotionally charged background behind the entire controversy over cloture and the question of the Senate's adoption of "rules" (either new or old) at the beginning of each new Congress.

The country needs to find solutions to the problems involving civil rights. These problems cannot find adequate solutions as long as a minority of Senators can, by filibuster or the threat of filibuster, block legislation designed to assist Negroes in their efforts to achieve first-class citizenship. Moreover, this basic problem influences many other aspects of American life, such as education and housing. Until the Senate reforms rule XXII, we shall face almost insurmountable obstacles in our efforts to make progress in these fields.

In order for the Senate to become a more effective and democratic body, responsive to the desires and needs of the majority of American citizens, it must reform its rules and return to practices of the early days. Senate Resolution 17 is a very moderate step in this direction.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are immediately faced with the taking of the vote on the motion of the majority leader to refer this entire matter to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for its subsequent report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a brief question?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask this question for information: Did the committee of which the Senator from New Jersey was an able member, have before it a suggestion that debate could be closed by three-fifths vote?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes, that was one of several suggestions which were presented to the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was testimony taken upon that proposal?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I must confess that so far as concerns the testimony actually taken, my memory is not fresh, because I was not a member of the subcommittee which actually took the testimony. I believe there were two members of the subcommittee; I think they were the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I was not present at all its sessions.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the question immediately facing us is the prospective vote on the motion of the majority leader to refer Senate Resolution 4 to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The entire effect of agreeing to that motion will be to make it impossible for the Senate to act without inhibition on its rules. Of course, the reason for that is simply stated: If we refer the resolution to the committee, we shall then, by acquiescence, have adopted the rules of the preceding Senate, and those rules will make it impossible for the Senate to terminate debate

upon a proposed change in the rules. I suggest that this is perhaps one of the purposes—although certainly not the only one—of Senators who would vote for adoption of the motion of the majority leader.

The Vice President has already stated his opinion that at the beginning of a new Congress—which is where we are now—the Senate by majority vote can close debate upon a proposal for new or amended rules of the Senate, and that this right will persist only so long as the Senate is acting on that matter at the beginning of a new Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I should like to have an additional minute, if possible.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate should have no doubt at all about what it is doing when it votes on this motion. If the Senate votes in favor of the adoption of the motion, the Senate will deliberately be throwing away any possibility of terminating debate or preventing a filibuster against a proposed change in the rules.

Yesterday, I suggested that unanimous consent be given that if the motion is agreed to and if the resolution is referred to the committee, and thereafter is reported to the Senate, the resolution then be considered on the same basis as if it were considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. May I have an additional one-half minute?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as I disturbed the Senator from New Jersey by asking a question, for which he was gracious enough to yield, I yield one-half a minute to him.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey may proceed for an additional one-half minute.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. In short, I have asked that the Senate give unanimous consent to have the matter considered then as if it were considered at the beginning of a new Congress, and with no rights waived. But the majority leader refused to go along with me in presenting such a request to the Senate.

However, it seems to me that unless that is done, the Senate will be deliberately foreclosing itself from any chance to have uninhibited consideration of this matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent—and I may say that I do this with the knowledge of the majority leader——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, as I was about to say, I now send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read. I do this with the knowledge of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, by unanimous consent, that when the Committee on Rules and Administration reports to the Senate S. Res. 4, or any other resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to limitation of debate under rule XXII or otherwise, any rights existing under the Constitution of the United States with respect to the Senate's right to close debate by a majority vote in order to act effectively on its own rules at the beginning of a new Congress shall be preserved, and the referral of this resolution and the intervening conduct of business by the Senate shall not be considered acquiescence in such rules so as to prejudice any rights existing with respect to adoption or amendment of the rules at the opening of a new Congress.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit that request on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, and with, as I have suggested, the knowledge—although not the approval—of the majority leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The additional time yielded to the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. ELLENDER

Debate in the Senate over the past few days on the pending resolution has once again demonstrated to me that the arguments advanced for revising rule XXII are not realistic or even reasonable, but are founded upon emotion and, to a large extent, upon a propensity among some Members of this body to play politics with questions and issues about which they have little or no practical knowledge.

It is no secret that the main reason the so-called liberal advocates of a revised cloture rule have become so vociferous in their demands is their overwhelming obsession for more stringent, more obnoxious so-called civil rights legislation. In the past, they have been unable to obtain the force bills they demand, since the representatives of the areas these bills would affect the most have had available means whereby the entire Nation might be alerted to the dangerous poison which lies beneath the sugarcoating of these legislative monstrosities—bills such as part III of the 1957 and 1960 civil rights bills, the fair employment practice legislation, and the most recent attempt to have so-called enrolling officers usurp the powers of local registrars of voters, to name only a few.

In other words, it is my view that advocates of a change in rule XXII have held opponents of their plan up to public contempt and ridicule, have labeled the southern delegations as "obstructionist" and sectional, solely and simply in the course of a purely political effort.

Yet, as a practical matter, it is they who are being sectional. After all, the legislation they demand is purely sectional in character. It is directed first and foremost at the people of the South.

What proponents of these force bills would like is to be able to point the dagger of sectional legislation at the throat of the South, secure in knowledge that all weapons available to the South's elected representatives have been effectively abolished.

What is there about the civil rights issue that seems to make some completely lose their sense of perspective—yes, their sense of reason?

Take the Supreme Court, for example. Just 6½ years ago the Court was called upon to rule again upon the issue of separate but equal schools.

How logical, how sound it would have been for the Court to follow long-established jurisprudence and hold that public facilities for the white and Negro races need only be separate but equal.

Instead, acting upon impulses similar, if not identical, to those motivating the rules-change advocates today, the Court threw caution to the winds, abandoned logic law, and stare decisis, and introduced the inexact, speculative, and disputed issues of psychology and sociology into the basic jurisprudence of American constitutional law. This unwarranted decision has caused much strife, and I seriously doubt that integration will ever be forced down the throats of an unwilling people.

One would think that some Members of the Congress would have learned the lesson this experience has taught. Unfortunately, such has not been the case. Reason is laid aside; prudence has succumbed to expediency; the fires of sectionalism burn fiercely in the Chambers of both Houses of Congress.

I do not mean to be facetious but events of the past few years have often compelled me to believe that too many people have become so ensnared in the nets of their own making that they have lost completely their sense of reason.

Take the issue of majority rule, for example.

Proponents of easy cloture in the Senate cry loudly for majority rule. Events have demonstrated that they want majority rule in order to force upon the people of one area of our country a number of Supreme Court decisions, among other things, which run directly counter to the wishes of the citizens those decisions most directly affect.

Yet, what was the source of those decisions? The Supreme Court—nine men.

If Supreme Court rulings, handed down by nine men, upsetting longstanding principles of law, are consistent with the liberal demand for majority rule, then the system of mathematics I was taught in school has certainly been greatly changed.

Nine out of one hundred and seventy-eight million cannot be a majority.

The proponents of a gag rule in the Senate make a great hue and cry about their desire to protect minority groups in the Nation. I ask just how inconsistent can anyone get?

Here we see a supposedly reasonable group of men demanding complete majority rule, rule which would destroy what few rights minorities still possess, in order to purportedly protect the rights of minorities.

It might be very wise for us, at this time, to look back and reread the words of those who framed our present form of government. Let me read to Senators from the writings of James Madison, one of the principal architects of the Constitution, in the Federalist Papers.

The following is from the Federalist, No. 63, dealing with the Senate, and it is written by Madison:

"Thus far I have considered the circumstances which point out the necessity of a well-constructed Senate only as they relate to the representatives of the people. To a people as little blinded by prejudice or corrupted by flattery as those whom I address, I shall not scruple to add, that such an institution may be sometimes necessary as a defense to the people against their own temporary errors and delusions. As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought, in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers; so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people, stimulated by some irregular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by the artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn. In these critical moments, how salutary will be the interference of some temperate and respectable body of citizens, in order to check the misguided career, and to suspend the blow meditated by the people against themselves until reason, justice, and truth can regain their authority over the public mind? What bitter anguish would not the people of Athens have often escaped if their government had contained so provident a safeguard against the tyranny of their own passions? Popular liberty might then have escaped the indelible reproach of decreeing to the same citizens the hemlock on one day and status on the next."

Read against the avowed purpose of the proponents of rules change today, the excerpt from the Federalist I have just quoted reemphasizes the need for continuation of rule XXII, not its repeal or modification. Rule XXII, I might add, is the only protection the people have against momentary desires based not upon thoughtful reflection, but upon emotion, yes politics.

Of course, we have heard the argument often that unlimited debate, or the threat of unlimited debate, frustrates the majority in the execution of its will. I submit that if, in fact, such a frustration does occur, it results from the basic constitutional principles upon which our Government is founded—it is a direct result of the need for protection of minorities against the overwhelming power of pure majority rule.

This is obviously the case in connection with the present debate. I want to compliment the so-called liberal bloc in the Senate for being honest and aboveboard. While they base their case most often upon the argument for majority rule they are quite frank in admitting that the reason they want majority rule is in order to permit the expeditious passage of so-called civil rights bills. As matters now stand, they feel they are hindered, either directly or indirectly by the existence of a determined minority opposed to their legislative demands. They recognize that the minority which opposes them is bolstered by the wishes of the people they represent, and have available one of the most potent weapons available to any free people, that is, the means and ability to arouse public opinion, given a sufficient time to do so.

Hence, the liberal bloc, in order to work its will, would strip its minority opponents of the weapons they now possess.

This, according to their viewpoint, is an absolute necessity in order for their collective will to prevail. However, even while I commend my friends in opposition to me on their candor, I would remind them that they have dug for themselves a deep and dark legislative pit and are rapidly pushing one another over the side into it.

Philosophers from the time of Aristotle have argued against pure majority rule. The gist of such arguments is the changing composition of a majority. In other words, a majority on one issue is quite often a minority on another.

Given pure majority rule it is eventually possible for a hard-core minority, by combining with other minorities, on a given issue, to control the course of legislation—thus achieving the actual effect of minority rule under the guise of majority power.

Aside from the purely philosophical arguments against what is attractively termed "majority rule," I believe my good friends who so glibly and frequently demand the amendment of rule XXII should take cognizance of the fact that they, themselves, have frequently used the protection extended to minorities for their own purposes. In brief, they have utilized rule XXII in order to block action on legislation to which they might be opposed just as those of us who have opposed so-called civil rights legislation have availed ourselves of the rule's provisions.

I recall when the 85th Congress had before it the so-called Great Lakes diversion bill. The bill was considered during the closing days of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, and debate was hot and heavy. Many Senators who today demand the repeal or amendment of rule XXII were opposed to the bill. They knew that the hour was getting late, that many Senators and all the Members of the House were anxious to adjourn the Congress and begin the arduous tasks of campaigning for reelection. Tempers were short, bodies were tired.

In my judgment, if a vote had been reached on the Great Lakes diversion bill, it would have passed by a considerable number of votes. In other words, a majority favored the measure.

Yet, a minority of Senators, opposed to the bill, blocked Senate action on the measure by threatening a filibuster.

Senators might recall the following exchange, which took place during the early morning hours of August 24, 1958:

"Mr. PROXMIRE. * * * I deeply appreciate the position taken by the Senator from Illinois. I do not blame him one bit. However, I mean what I say—and I never meant anything more sincerely—when I say we have a big case to make tonight. I mean we have a big case to make. I have 756 pages of the RECORD to read, much of which still has to be read. Several pages of the RECORD have been read.

"I have the floor now and I am ready to read. I want all Senators to know, if they wish to stay and listen, there is a lot of good information to be presented. If Senators do not wish to stay, if they come back tomorrow night at this time, I will still be here reading." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 15, p. 19539.)

Of course, the junior Senator from Wisconsin subsequently stated in all seriousness, that he was not engaging in a filibuster, that he merely wanted an opportunity to lay the facts before the Senate.

I want to make it abundantly clear that I have no quarrel with those who utilize the provisions of the Senate rules in the manner in which they think best for their people, their State, and their Nation. That is not only their right, it is their solemn duty. I do, however, take issue with an argument or proposition whose premises shift and waver, almost from day to day, depending upon "whose ox is being gored," so to speak.

I also want to state that rule XXII is capable of being used to block action on legislation which, on a given occasion, might have received the votes of a majority of this body. As a matter of fact, I believe it is obvious that the junior Senator from Wisconsin used the provisions of rule XXII for just that purpose in the instance I just cited, and I commend him for it. He was convinced he was right, that the bill concerned would have injured his constituency, and he acted accordingly.

I do object, however, to those who have on past occasions used the protection accorded minorities by rule XXII, to protect their own rights, now seeking to amend rule XXII in order to deny Senators from one geographic area that same right.

As a matter of fact, I have halfway been expecting a resolution to be offered, amending the Senate rules to guarantee unlimited debate except where so-called civil rights legislation might be concerned, with the stipulation, in that case, that a bare majority could end debate at any time. Frankly, I would commend those who demand a change in Senate rules for such an approach—at least, their resolution would then be in accord with their real objectives.

The Senate should also consider another argument advanced by those who demand a change in rules; namely, that the existence of rule XXII, as now constituted, paralyzes the Senate in the conduct of its business. "Paralysis," of course, is a relative term. It is attractive and perhaps a bit seductive to those who are not familiar with the facts. However, in my opinion, about the only fair way we have of judging the future is to examine it in the light of the past.

The first Senate met in 1789. At that time, it adopted rules of procedure which, for all practical purposes, made the invocation of cloture, or a limitation on debate, the rule rather than the exception. At that time, the so-called previous question rule was in effect, which had the practical effect of choking off debate immediately.

In 1806, the Senate completely revised its rules, and eliminated the previous question entirely. From 1806 until 1917, when the rules were again amended, it was impossible to shut off debate in the Senate by moving the previous question, and the rules contained no overall provision for cloture. In this regard, it is interesting to note that during the period 1789 to 1806, the period when the previous question rule was in effect, it had been used only three times.

In addition, during the period 1806 to 1917, the Senate operated without any limitation on debate whatsoever, save for that which could be invoked by unanimous consent.

As a matter of fact, there was no provision for limiting Senate debate during the entire course of the War Between the States, although proposals to achieve that purpose were numerous. Certainly, the Union stood in grave peril during those days—certainly, unlimited or prolonged debate—even filibustering—could have worked great injury upon the Union war effort. Yet, the work of the Senate was not paralyzed, despite the lack of any limitation on debate at all. This, of itself, renders rather ridiculous the arguments of proponents of majority rule cloture to the effect that the present two-thirds rule paralyzes the work of the Senate.

During the period 1917 to 1949, cloture was obtainable by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, assuming the presence of a quorum, subject to the general exception that cloture could not be invoked on a motion to take up, it having been concluded by the Senate that a motion was not a measure within the purview of rule XII.

In 1949 agitation for an easy cloture rule came to a head. Then, as now, the right of unlimited debate in the Senate had been attacked by the proponents of so-called civil rights legislation. Then, as now, a general rules change was demanded in order to obtain action on specific legislation, namely, force bills.

In 1949, the Senate rules were changed. The amended rule XII provided that cloture could be invoked only by two-thirds of all Senators duly elected—and, in return for this concession, cloture was made applicable to a motion to take up, with the further exception that there could be no limitation of debate on a motion to take up a change

in Senate rules, or a measure which would amend or add any Senate rule.

In 1959 the Senate voted to change its rules to the effect that cloture could be achieved by two-thirds of Senators present and voting.

The history of efforts to limit debate in the Senate amply buttresses my proposition that although a quick and easy method of limiting debate is demanded by proponents of the pending resolution under the guise of general majority rule principles, their real and avowed objective is special legislation—so-called civil rights legislation, directed at the South.

In addition, as I have indicated earlier, I fear that their zeal has clouded their judgment, and that they today find themselves in the position of attempting to dispose of their birthright for a mess of pottage.

Freedom of debate has served a useful purpose in the past, as I intend to demonstrate in a few moments. It has not, as some would have us believe, either injured the national welfare or paralyzed the work of the Senate. It has, I might add, blocked action on measures which, if enacted, would have led to the downfall, if not outright destruction, of our free way of life.

During the 24 years I have served in the Senate, I have observed several legislative proposals either defeated or delayed by unlimited debate. In all cases, if these bills had been enacted in the fever of enthusiasm with which they were initially greeted, they would have made possible the complete destruction of our way of life.

Today, I will mention and partially discuss only three of these.

The first is the so-called Federal fair employment practices legislation which would have dictated to an employer whom he could hire and fire.

The second was the 1946 Full Employment Act, which, prior to amendment on the Senate floor, would have permitted Government competition with private enterprise in almost any field of endeavor, under the guise of maintaining full employment.

The third was a proposed amendment to the minimum wage law which sought to vest broad and sweeping authority in a network of bureaucratic boards—authority to fix minimum wages, without any effective ceiling, and without the consent of the employer, in nearly every area of national production. In other words, the proposal would have gone far beyond the Federal Government placing a floor under wages, and would have permitted Uncle Sam, in effect, to fix wages.

All three of these proposals were either defeated or modified as a result of the guarantee of unlimited debate.

The logical question now arises: Was the defeat of these items of legislation wise and prudent—did, in fact, the guarantee of unlimited debate achieve a meritorious purpose?

The answer must be found in the terms of the bills themselves, but before I discuss these bills, I would remind Senators that their enactment would have spelled the death knell of a free economy by:

First. Sanctioning Government-owned competition with private enterprise in any field whatsoever.

Second. Permitting the Federal Government to dictate minimum wage levels for each and every class of workers engaged in commerce, with no effective ceiling on such levels.

Third. Dictating to private enterprise whom it could hire and fire.

Now, let us look at the original Full Employment Act of 1946.

This measure was introduced on January 22, 1945, by Senators Murray, Wagner, Thomas, and O'Mahoney, and given the bill number S. 380. It was the outgrowth of some serious thinking that had been done during World War II, prompted by experiences required during the great depression of 1929–40.

Briefly, the measure sought to assure continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concentrated efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

In title, as in other ways, this was a laudable proposal. The Congress sought to lay down a policy which, if implemented carefully and in accordance with law, would make impossible a repetition of the breadlines, soup kitchens, and doles of the late depression.

One portion of the original S. 380, as it came to the floor of the Senate, provided as follows:

"To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured (the Federal Government), shall provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment."

Those were high-sounding and purposeful words. But they were deceptive words, also, because, as Members of the Senate pointed out at that time, they carried the seed of that evil weed, socialism.

Senators will note that the language called for unrestricted Federal expenditures.

Presumably, debate on the floor of the Senate later showed, the proponents had public works subsidies or similar projects in mind. But the provision of the bill did not limit such investment and expenditure to public works. It did not limit that investment and expenditure at all. Presumably, the Federal Government could have created jobs in any manner it pleased—even by going into competition with private industry.

The Federal Government, faced with the prospect of a business depression, would not have been required to limit its relief endeavors to the payment of subsidies and the creation of additional jobs through the construction of public works. Indeed not. Instead, some of the now-famous Washington planners would have suggested that the Government go into the steel business, or the automobile business, or the clothing business. It would have been possible for the Government to build plants to compete directly with private industry.

Then, of course, there is FEPC.

I do not believe I must go into detail concerning the so-called FEPC bills. They are purely and simply social legislation attempting to inject the long arm of Uncle Sam into areas which are, and should remain, closed to Federal intervention.

However, they carry attractive overtones in that they are purportedly designed to make it illegal for an employer to deny employment to any qualified person on the basis of race, religion, or national origin.

Although FEPC legislation seems to appear in each and every Congress, none thus far has been enacted and, if I have my way, none ever will be. As a matter of fact, the closest the Congress ever came to enacting FEPC legislation was back in 1950, when the House passed H.R. 4453, sponsored by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, who has never been particularly concerned about the practical effect of such legislation, but who seems intent upon maintaining his undisputed position as No. 1 spokesman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—an organization, incidentally, which cannot be accused of being either reasonable or thoughtful.

At any rate, even the passage by the House of the Powell bill did not amount to much, since as reported from the House committee it involved only factfinding functions. There was no enforcement authority provided.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the sole reason such legislation has not been enacted into law long before this is because proponents know that those of us who strenuously oppose FEPC and similar force legislation have available to us the means of rallying public opinion, through unlimited debate.

Thank God that we do, for enactment of FEPC legislation would not only mutilate what remains of good feeling among the white and Negro races in the South, but it would also be another nail driven into the coffin sought to be prepared by those who desire a socialized America. In this connection, I would like to quote briefly from the draft of a minority report prepared by my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on S. 1728, a Senate FEPC bill, introduced during the 81st Congress:

"Under our Constitution it has never been seriously questioned that a man has the right to set himself up in business, to select his own employees on the basis of such qualifications as he might within his own free and uncontrolled discretion consider advantageous to the undertaking, and to do all this without hindrance or interference. This personal freedom of contract is basic to the free-enterprise system and to the whole American concept of individual freedom.

"The far-reaching character of this provision of S. 1728 is given its true perspective when we consider that laws have been enacted governing the form or substance of contracts voluntarily entered into; that laws make illegal certain types of contracts; that the labor laws require collective bargaining as a method of arriving at contracts and affect the scope of contracts. But the right of contract is left free to be exercised between voluntary parties.

"Our history of encouragement to the men and women who give employment has been one of the compelling reasons for our unparalleled industrial success which again and again has served our Nation so well in time of need.

"But under the bill every act of the employer or any of his subordinates in hiring, discharging, promoting, or otherwise regulating conditions of employment is subject to complaint and investigation on the grounds of discrimination.

"The employer is subject to a Commission having wide powers of rulemaking investigation, and the issuance of cease-and-desist orders. But the right of trial by jury is denied and judicial review is provided with a clearly recognized inferential power to punish contempt of court orders.

"The inquiries and investigations directed by the act would vex and harass business to the point where orderly plant management and efficient production would be impossible.

"The small businessman, already overburdened, would encounter new regulations, investigations, hearings, and litigation far beyond his time, his energy, or his finances.

"Labor organizations would be subject to interference and supervision of their internal affairs. And the law which tells the employer who his workers shall be today, can be reversed and the worker told who his employer shall be tomorrow—and where and at what wages."

I turn now to the third item I mentioned previously, that is, the bill which would have given authority to a group of bureaucrats to, in effect, fix wages throughout the country.

Senators may recall that on August 1, 1945, S. 1349 was introduced in the Senate, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. That bill would have provided for a minimum wage of 65 cents per hour during

the first year of operation, 70 cents per hour during the second year, and 75 cents per hour thereafter, with the added proviso that the 65-, 70-, or 75-cent-per-hour rate in effect at a given time was to be regarded as a base or peg-point for unskilled laborers. As to the others, the Wage and Hour Administrator would have been authorized to convene industry committees empowered to define "reasonable job classifications and recommend rates to maintain wage differentials between the minimum for unskilled workers and those for interrelated job classifications."

In other words, S. 1349, as introduced, would have made 75 cents an hour a minimum wage for unskilled workers some 2 years after its approval, with power in the Administrator and his handpicked industry boards to fix higher minimum wages for semiskilled or skilled workers, based upon the 75 cents per hour minimum for unskilled workers. There was no ceiling in the bill as to what the maximum minimum wage might be.

Fortunately, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, on which I was privileged to be a member, struck this authority from the bill before reporting it to the Senate. As part 2 of Senate Report 1012 of the 79th Congress, 2d session, notes:

"The committee * * * (2) deleted all reference to the setting of minimum wages for semiskilled and skilled occupations above the proposed minimum."

Frankly, I happen to know that the reason this authority was deleted by the committee, before the bill was reported, resulted from the determination on the part of many Senators to discuss the bill in detail and at considerable length should it ever come to the Senate floor in the same form as it was introduced.

The committee, realizing that discretion was the better part of valor, deleted the wage-fixing authority which S. 1349 contained, before reporting it to the Senate for action.

Here, again, we have an example of how the right of unlimited debate has saved our people from the theft of their liberties under the guise of so-called majority rule. In my judgment, a majority of the Senate probably favored the shotgun authority S. 1349 would have given to the Administrator of Wages and Hours.

I have cited three instances which illustrate how the right of unlimited debate has assisted in preserving the basic free enterprise system of our Nation. I believe these three specific examples, taken at random, completely rebut the pious pronouncements of those who would substitute so-called majority rule for sane and sober deliberation in the Senate.

Let me repeat, had the three bills which I have listed been enacted into law—the first one fixing wages without the consent of employers; the second forcing employers to hire workers not of their choice; and the third providing the Federal Government with authority to give employment to everyone and compete with private enterprise—in my judgment, they would have destroyed private enterprise. We could have hung crepe on the door of private enterprise if those three pieces of proposed legislation had been enacted. The threat of filibuster and filibuster prevented their enactment into law.

If we need any other evidence to demonstrate the fallacy inherent in the plea of rules-change proponents today, we can find it in the words of Alexis de Tocqueville, a brilliant young French political scientist who warned, after visiting America in 1831, of the folly of so-called majority rule. I quote from volume I, "Democracy in America," by De Tocqueville:

"In my opinion, the main evil of the present democratic institutions of the United States does not arise, as is often asserted in Europe, from their weakness, but from their irresistible strength. I am not so much alarmed at the excessive liberty which reigns in that country, as at the inadequate securities which one finds there against tyranny.

"When an individual or a party is wronged in the United States, to whom can he apply for redress? If to public opinion, public opinion constitutes the majority; if to the legislature, it represents the majority, and implicitly obeys it; if to the executive power, it is appointed by the majority, and serves as a passive tool in its hands.

"The public force consists of the majority under arms; the jury is the majority invested with the right of hearing judicial cases; and in certain States, even the judges are elected by the majority. However iniquitous or absurd the measure of which you complain, you must submit to it as well as you can.

"If, on the other hand, a legislative power could be so constituted as to represent the majority without necessarily being the slave of its passions, and executive so as to retain a proper share of authority, and a judiciary so as to remain independent of the other two powers, a government would be formed which would still be democratic, without incurring hardly any risk of tyranny."

These words were written in the mid-1830's. Though over a century and a quarter old, they are good advice today. I urge Senators to heed them, and to retain the U.S. Senate as the great bastion of freedom which it is today—a rock against which the tides of mutable majorities may wash, but one which they will never destroy.

I express the hope that the pending motion to committee will be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am completely opposed to any modification of Senate rule XXII which is designed to curtail or weaken the right of extended debate in the Senate.

The Senate of the United States has always prided itself on its justified reputation as the greatest deliberative legislative body in the world. The power of a minority, yes, sometimes of even a single Senator, to act as a brake on the efforts of the majority to rush through hasty and ill-considered legislative action, is completely consistent with the scheme of checks and balances, the principle of the separation of powers, and the special character of the Senate itself, all of which were deliberately written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers for the purpose of guarding against ill-conceived action.

Moreover, it is unnecessary to emphasize that Republican Members of the Senate have rarely resorted to protracted debate during recent years. To the contrary, it has been the Democrats in the Senate, including several who are loudest in denouncing rule XXII, who have most frequently engaged in a filibuster, even exclusively so, during that same period. I do not mention this in condemnation. As a matter of fact, it is my intention to do everything that I can to preserve rule XXII in its present form, for never was the need for this rule greater than it is at this time. Moreover, it should be pointed out that rule XXII has already been relaxed. In 1959, the Senate modified the rule to permit termination of debate by two-thirds of those present and voting, instead of the more rigorous previous requirement of two-thirds of all the Members of the Senate. If predominant sentiment in the Senate at any time genuinely wishes to cut off debate, the present rule offers no obstacle.

I wish to emphasize, however, that in fighting to preserve the rule, I shall be doing so not merely for the reason that minority rights in the Senate must remain protected, but that in the present situation, the rule can be a most helpful device for enabling the forgotten American, who constitutes the majority of the electorate, to effectuate his will.

The election of last November clearly indicates that more than half of our citizens who voted rejected the reckless and spendthrift planks of the Democratic platform. Senator Kennedy's margin exceeded Vice President NIXON'S by about 114,000 votes. But 116,248 votes were cast in Mississippi for a slate of unpledged electors, 227,881 for the States Rights Party, 18,344 for the Constitution Party—Texas, 4,204 for the Virginia Conservative Party, 1,401 for the Constitution Party—Washington, 1,767 for the Tax Cut Party, 539 for the Independent American Party, and 10,373 for the Conservative Party—New Jersey, for a total of 380,757 conservative votes.

Even if the 39,692 votes of the Socialist Workers—Trotskyist—Party, the 48,031 votes of the Socialist Labor Party, and the 1,485 of the Afro-American Party are added to Senator Kennedy's total, to which they were more likely to go than to Mr. NIXON'S in the absence of candidates of their own, the popular vote against Senator Kennedy would still be by a margin of less than 114,000 over the Vice President. Moreover, these figures do not include the substantial number of Alabama voters who selected 6 out of 11 electors opposed to the Democratic platform.

In the light of these considerations, I have both a moral obligation and a public duty to resist with all my strength the efforts of the Democratic administration to impose their dangerously spendthrift programs on an electorate the majority of which has rejected them. However, because of their minority position in the Senate, Republicans do not have enough votes either to halt such reckless proposals or even to secure their modification along saner and less extravagant lines. To permit such proposals to become law would mean so enormous an increase in the volume of Federal spending as to require either an intolerable rise in the already unbearable burden of taxation or a resort to deficit financing through Federal borrowing on so huge a scale as to make drastic inflation, with its tragic effect on the personal savings, insurance, pension funds, and social security of the American people absolutely inevitable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not intend to sit idly by while these Democratic proposals push the pay envelopes, savings, insurance, pensions, and social security funds and benefits of the forgotten American ever more rapidly down the road to complete destruction, or at best reduce them to a tiny fraction of their present value.

It is my purpose, therefore, to bring home to the American public, which by its vote rejected these programs, their full import, of the catastrophic impact they will have on the hard-earned, painfully accumulated nest-eggs, to say nothing of the pay envelopes, of the American people of the United States.

I, and I hope my Republican colleagues likewise, shall subject each of these proposals to the most exacting scrutiny, the most careful examination, and, where necessary, the most extensive floor debate needed to enlighten our people as to just what they have at stake. It is imperative that no aspect of these proposed measures remain undiscussed. The American public has a right to know what they portend, and what they mean, down to the last detail. It is precisely in situations such as these, where the public welfare is so profoundly involved, that the most extensive debate becomes absolutely necessary and that rule XXII finds its strongest justification. I shall, therefore, in fulfillment of my obligation to follow the will of the American people and to protect the interests of the forgotten American, resist in every possible way any attempt to weaken rule XXII, or to curtail such essential, even indispensable, debate on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents of the motion have 20 minutes remaining; the opponents have 23½ minutes.

Does the Senator from California wish to yield any time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Florida would agree to a short quorum call, without damaging the time of either of us, unless there is a Senator present in the Chamber who wishes to speak.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we have one Senator present who desires to speak and is ready. At the same time, I want to yield to the Senator from California, who has more time, and who I understand has more requests for speaking time. I am happy to cooperate in any way I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is running.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the short period of slightly more than 170 years, the United States has grown and prospered from a group of scattered provincial settlements along the eastern seaboard into the foremost Nation of the world. The population in this period increased from less than 4 million to almost 180 million. Our people enjoy greater material abundance than any other people on earth, and the highest standard of living in the world. Even more important, the individuals who comprise our Nation have throughout the period enjoyed freedom of thought, speech, and action, and it is this very individualism in which lies the secret of our national success.

The existence of individualism in the United States is no accident, but is a direct result accomplished by the system of government inaugurated through the Constitution. It would seem logical that all of us who share in the unsurpassed benefits of our governmental system would be both informed on the mechanics of its operation and jealous protectors of both the word and the spirit of its structure.

It is indeed a disillusioning experience to be confronted with such ignorance of the spirit of the Constitution, or disdain for its accomplishments, as that with which we are confronted in the U.S. Senate by this proposal to alter the Senate rules with regard to limitation on debate. We are confronted with arguments based on Rousseau's treacherous theory of democracy—a doctrine as alien to our system of government as any of the foreign isms which we find so repugnant. Rousseau's philosophy is no more or less than rule by the unbridled will of the majority, whether the majority be large or small, temporary or continuing. In essence it is the rule of emotion, providing neither protection for individual rights nor orderly conduct of society, which is the only reason for government's existence. Our Government is not democratic, but is a federated constitutional Republic, and under the explicit terms of the U.S. Constitution, the National Government is charged with the responsibility of insuring to the people of each State a republican form of government, and thereby, charged with preventing the institution of a democracy in any State.

Individual rights cannot exist where the emotional will of the majority is absolute, and our governmental system rejects democracy for that reason. Throughout our entire structure of government there are checks instituted on the will of the majority. While these checks do not provide an aggressive weapon for the individual, or the individuals within a minority, they do insure the existence of a negative weapon by which individuals may defend their basic rights against assaults from even the majority.

One of the many of such checks on the will of the majority is embodied in the relative freedom of debate in the U.S. Senate. This check would be even more consistent with the purpose of our governmental structure were it to permit no cloture whatsoever. The present rule provides a minimum protection, and a forum for those individuals who find themselves temporarily in a minority insofar as representation in the Senate is concerned, if not among the populace as a whole.

The design of the Senate as an institution was intended to provide a degree of stability through deliberation, which, in its absence, would have been missing from the governmental structure. No less an authority than the Father of our Country, himself, attested to this fact. It is related that shortly after adoption of the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson upon his return from France, breakfasted with George Washington, and their conversation centered on various aspects of the Constitution. During the course of the conversation, Jefferson protested to George Washington against the establishment of two Houses in the Congress. Washington asked "Why did you pour that coffee into your saucer?" "To cool it," Jefferson replied. "Even so," said Washington, "we pour legislation into the Senatorial saucer to cool it." Unfortunately, in the last few decades the Senate had abdicated its intended function as a damper on hasty, impetuous, and extreme actions by the Congress. There remains, however, by virtue of the relatively free debate permitted under rule XXII, a forum for those who cherish individualism and individual rights, even for those individuals represented by a minority in the U.S. Senate; and quite possibly, this remaining check serves as a mitigant against the excesses of the majority.

The impetuosity which underlies the current effort to emasculate rule XXII constitutes more than an assault on the procedure of the Senate. This impetuosity is the embodiment of a completely radical, political philosophy, which is un-American to its very roots. Its immediate manifestation is in the form of an attack on a mode of procedure that is only one element—albeit an essential element—of the machinery by which individualism is protected in this country. It is the initial step in an effort to substitute conformity as a national characteristic for individualism, the very factor responsible for our Nation's success. It is the desire of the adherents of this new radical political philosophy to achieve absolute control of the National Government, and through its massive and numerous instrumentalities, to design a pattern of conduct for all Americans and enforce their conformity.

As novel as may be their approach, and despite their protests to the contrary, there is nothing new about the aim the conformists seek to achieve. It is as old as the writings of Lenin and Marx and is best known as state socialism. Nothing could be more indicative of state socialism than the intolerance which is exhibited by the proponents of majority cloture in the U.S. Senate toward the expression of views by Senators opposed to the welfare state measures and to the destruction of federalism. I am optimist enough to believe that the Senate has not yet degenerated to a point at which it will renounce its intended purpose and responsibility, and abjectly surrender to the autocratic forces of state socialism, who implore us to sacrifice the protection of individualism on the treacherous and alien altar of majority rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Who desires to yield time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from California suggests the absence of a quorum, subject to the understanding that no more than 2 minutes will be consumed in the call of the roll, and the quorum call will then be called off; with the further understanding that the unanimous-consent agreement will be undisturbed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I suggest that the attachés of the Senate be notified to call the offices of Senators and ask them to be in the Chamber in time for the vote.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I join in that request; and I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much time do the opponents to the motion have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 20 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 minutes to the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think we had better understand very clearly what we are to vote upon. I think all Senators know. What we are to vote on is tantamount to a motion to kill. Let us have no misunderstanding about that. It is tantamount to a motion to table every proposal to amend rule XXII which is before the Senate.

Mr. President, in my opinion, for all practical purposes, it will mean the death of this effort if it passes. I say that with the greatest affection and respect for the majority leader, because, whether we refer the measures to the Committee on Rules and Administration or not, nonetheless any Senator, including myself, could introduce a bill, which would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration also. If the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration feels like doing so—and I am sure he does—he can have hearings held on the bill. Then we shall have gained nothing—absolutely nothing—by all this procedure.

Mr. President, history shows that one does not get any amendment to rule XXII unless one does it here and now.

It has already been mentioned that we had a report recommending an amendment to rule XXII from the Committee on Rules and Administration April 30, 1958, but, Mr. President, that was not the first time. We had reports recommending amendments in April of 1947, in February of 1949, in March of 1952, and in May of 1953.

History shows that the only time we had any action was when we did it on the spot under the conditions of debate in 1957 and 1959. Otherwise, nothing happened. So without wasting any time in further argument, which Senators have heard thoroughly if they paid any attention to the debate, the fundamental point is this: The present Vice President—not the next one; I do not know what he will rule, and I am very much worried about it—has said that the Senate is proceeding under the constitutional right to end debate. Right now there is a good chance that if the majority really wishes to amend the rule, it can also end debate and thereby get itself into a position to vote. When this opportunity passes by us, with all the good will and indefatigable zeal on our side for the 60 percent rule, and even with both the majority and minority leader on our side, we can well be stood up by a minority in this Chamber, as we have been time and again on civil rights and other bills, and we will get absolutely nothing out of this effort.

Let us not forget that the American people had a pledge from my party specifically to amend rule XXII, and also a pledge from the other party specifically to modernize the rules of the Senate so that the majority could control its actions as called for by the Constitution. I say to my colleagues that this is a critically important vote. The vote comes early, but it will count for a great deal, and will not be forgotten for 4 years. The reason is that for 4 years I think we are going to be frustrated by what the Senate may do today, if we should keep these manacles upon our hands. We have now failed to strike them off in the one opportunity which the historic advisory opinion of Vice President NIXON has given us.

I had in mind, for example, moving to amend this motion in order to require a report by a day certain. Such action would not be very gracious to my colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who I think in good faith said he will bring in a report as soon as he can. It would be gilding the lily and begging the question. The point is that we have the power as the majority. It is proposed that we relinquish that power. When Senators vote "yea" on this question, they will vote to give up the power to pass effective and meaningful civil rights legislation—yes, civil rights legislation—and let the people of the United States never forget it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from New York made the point which I sought to bring about by interrogation, namely, that a "yea" vote on the motion would be a vote to throw away the decision of the Vice President. However one may regard the issues in the various proposals before the Senate as to what might be required, this vote is essentially to determine whether or not the Senate wishes to throw away the determination of the Vice President that under the Constitution the Senate has the right at the beginning of a new Congress to determine its rules. I think it ought to be regarded and recognized that that is what it is. If the procedure of referring such questions to the Rules Committee were used we would in no way be operating differently than we could operate in the middle of a session or at any time in a session. A resolution could be submitted and it could be referred to a committee. But this is the only opportunity to vote on the question and exercise what the Vice President has called the constitutional right of the Senate to determine its own rules.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, and I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make only a very short speech. I completely agree with the Senator from New York, and associate myself with his argument.

Mr. JAVITS. We have heard very great constitutional lawyers and great parliamentarians like the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has just spoken, who understand the situation so well. Whatever may be characterized as ideology, we know and understand the issue before us. It has been thoroughly debated, and the only point I wish to add is that an affirmative vote would fly in the face of and to use a harsher word, would be a repudiation of both political platforms. It could create a climate in this Chamber, in which there would be very few new frontiers. Whatever deals have been made in respect to these votes, the American people should not forget the climate which would be created in this Chamber if the motion should prevail, and it will be the duty of myself and others like me not to let them forget it, if we can help it.

I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, how much additional time do the opponents of the motion have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen and a half minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the issue on this vote is as clear as it can be. It is whether we wish to keep the opportunity of changing the rules of the Senate so as to make it possible for the Kennedy program to reach the floor and be voted on on its merits, or whether we wish to take the calculated risk that a determined minority under the present rules can prevent that program from ever coming to a vote on the merits. This is the only issue which confronts us on this vote. It is true that our party platform is explicit. It is true that our President-elect has adopted the platform, and so has the Vice President-elect. These are important subsidiary issues.

But as my friends on this side of the aisle vote on the motion, I suggest there is only one issue: Are they for the Kennedy program or against it? I realize that the distinguished majority leader and some who share his views are certainly and clearly for the program, but

I suggest in all deference that they are mistaken in their belief in two regards: First, that if the change of the rules proposed under the two pending motions goes to the Rules Committee, I am confident that it can never be debated later in the session.

Second, I believe they are mistaken in their view that to continue our discussion on this subject would be to prejudice the enactment of the Kennedy program. Nothing could be further from the truth. Without the shadow of a doubt, we could dispose of all the measures before us with respect to the rules within the next 4 or 5 days. I plead with my colleagues not to be led astray by the specious view that we will ever be able to change the rules in the 87th Congress if we send these measures to the Rules Committee, and the other equally fallacious point of view that by continuing our debate on the changes in the rules for the next few days, bringing the question to a final vote, as we clearly can do, we will be interfering in any way with the Kennedy program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, how much additional time remains to the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 11 minutes, the opponents 13½.

Mr. KUCHEL. We have 13½ minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 4, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the amendment in the nature of a substitute, are both sound and practical proposals for changes in the rules of this body. Those of us who proposed the majority rule resolution in the nature of a substitute knew full well that our chance of success was very limited. Nevertheless, it is a conviction that some of us held very sincerely, and as the Senator from Pennsylvania has noted, it is our belief that the Democratic platform commits this party as the majority party in the Congress, and the party of the executive branch of the Government, to the fulfillment of the majority rule principle in the legislative processes, and particularly as it relates to the rules.

I wish the RECORD to be clear that in 1958 the Committee on Rules and Administration has already reported a proposal similar to that which was sponsored by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], myself, and others. Insofar as the proposal "three-fifths of those present and voting" is concerned, the fact is that there are votes in this body to pass now the Anderson proposal. I think the Anderson proposal would be a decided improvement over the present situation. I said so in caucus, I have said so to the press, and I say so here on the floor of the Senate. I say that no Senator ought to be afraid that a rule which requires that three-fifths of the Senators present and voting after a cloture petition has been filed and has remained at the desk for a 2-day period, which is required under section 2 of rule XXII, is in any way an attempt to gag the Senate. A three-fifths vote would simply make it a little more possible for a majority in this body to take action.

The duty of the Members of the Senate and the duty of the Congress is to have a quorum that shall be sufficient to do business. That is what we are here for.

I know we are fighting an uphill battle. I know that if these proposals are committed to the Committee on Rules and Administration that the committee will act. I take the majority leader's word for that. He is a man of complete integrity. I am confident that we will have a rule reported to the Senate. I am equally confident that we will have a filibuster on the change of the rule.

Therefore the time to act is now. Timing in politics is as important as the substance of the issue. Any man who serves in the Senate knows it, or he would not be here in the first place.

I call on my colleagues to resolve the issue at this time. I say to them if they can vote for the Kuchel-Humphrey resolution, we would like it, but if they cannot, then let us adopt the Anderson resolution, which is an improvement over the present rule.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall oppose the pending motion, because I am against filibusters and wish to vote for the Humphrey-Kuchel resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, to amend rule XXII. I do not see how in the world we are going to get away from filibusters unless we change that rule of the Senate.

I also oppose the motion because adoption of it would prevent me from voting on Senate Resolution 6 submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself, to change the rule, so as to require that a rule of germaneness be a rule of the Senate. I have seen much time wasted in nongermane debate when an issue is pending. I believe, indeed, if we were to adopt a rule of germaneness, that we could cut our time here in half in dealing with various measures that come before the Senate from time to time. Therefore, I oppose the motion also because its adoption will not give me a chance to vote on that resolution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will vote against the motion, and I will do so because it is my belief that the rule under which we are operating ought to be changed. Unless it is changed now, the prospect of changing it later will be substantially reduced, if not completely nullified.

I do not want my vote to be construed that I shall abjectly follow what is declared to be the solemn commitment made by the political parties in their conventions. It would be wrong, in my opinion, for a Senator to abandon his honest views on what is in the best interest of his country and to vote for a measure merely because at a political convention individuals with eyes fixed avidly upon ways and means of winning an election were satisfied to make promises of the most extravagant nature, knowing that they were incapable of being fulfilled; or, if they were to be fulfilled that they would be inimical to the security of the country.

I believe the rule should be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am firmly of the opinion, regardless of what may be said to the contrary, that we have seen extravagant promises and commitments made solely for the purpose of winning votes, without any concern as to what the impact will be upon the security of the Nation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield the balance of the time in opposition to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was very happy today to hear the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] say that we will get no amendment of the rules unless we act here and now. After 8 years of experience in trying to work out something, I realize how correctly he has spoken.

I agree fully with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] when he said that the Committee on Rules and Administration will act if the resolution is referred to the committee. However, no one need be fooled by that. There is no possibility whatever that the Senate will adopt a change after it comes from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Any one who has followed the course of history here, knows it.

In 1949, which was the beginning of my experience in the Senate, eight resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Only one resolution was reported by the committee. It was reported from the committee only after a round robin was signed. Senators were required to sign a round robin that they would consider only one thing. They did not trust the Senators; they made them sign a round robin.

In the 82d Congress, four resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee. One was reported by the committee. No action was taken by the Senate.

In the 83d Congress, four resolutions were referred to the committee. One was reported from the committee by Senator Jenner, which he had promised to do. Senator Taft not only recommended that he do so, but said he would favor it. That resolution was known as Senate Resolution 20. It was placed on the Senate Calendar, and was objected to 10 times on the call of the calendar. It was well understood that nothing would be done about it.

In the 84th Congress, one resolution was referred to the committee. It died in committee.

In the 85th Congress eight resolutions were referred to the committee. One resolution was reported, but it died on the calendar.

In the 86th Congress, one resolution was referred to the committee, and it died there.

In 1953 the leadership implied that if the debate on adopting rules could be laid aside, the matter of a change in rule XXII would be taken up at a later date. The implication was brought up in two ways:

First. An admonition by Senator Taft that the business of the Congress would languish during the rules debate, and

Second. Proper resolutions to bring about a change in rule XXII had been prepared and were awaiting introduction once the Senate could proceed to organize.

In support of the need for haste, Senator Taft said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 114, column 1 and I call this particularly to the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]:

Mr. President, it is vitally important to the Nation that the Senate be a continuing body. Let us consider the situation which will arise on the 20th of January, when new Cabinet officers are to take office. We must have Cabinet officers appointed as quickly as possible. We must have officials to operate the Government.

That is the same kind of story we are hearing now. We are told "you had better act quickly, so we can operate on January 20."

Senator Taft continued:

If we should become involved in a rules fight, the discussion could go on forever. In fact, I would venture to say that if there were a majority in the Senate who wished to adopt the procedure suggested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the discussion would proceed almost indefinitely; we would continue the debate for a month in order to break the filibuster that might develop under such circumstances. Therefore, I believe it is exceedingly unfortunate to raise a controversy regarding the rules at this time and contend that the Senate must begin all over again at the beginning of the session and confront all the uncertain and difficult question that could arise under such circumstances.

There was also a leadership tactic directed at tying rule XXII to general civil rights legislation and then to talk about rule XXII as if it were a civil rights bill. This is best expressed in the 1953 colloquy between Senator DIRKSEN and Senator Jenner, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 115, column 2. Senator DIRKSEN concludes his opening comment with this sentence:

If I recall correctly from conversations with the distinguished Senator from Indiana, Mr. Jenner, if he assumes the chairmanship of the Rules Committee, I am confident one of his first acts will be to try to bring such modification to the floor of the Senate.

To which Senator Jenner replied:

When the order of business calling for the introduction of bills and resolutions is reached, I shall offer the resolution, which is based upon a report—Report No. 1256—which came from the Rules Committee at the last session. I think its adoption will take care of a great deal of the controversy which has arisen over the cloture rule.

I propose to offer the resolution to which I have referred at the first opportunity during the present session of the Congress.

To which Senator Taft replied, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 115, column 3:

I feel that the rules are adequate to deal with the present situation. I shall ask the Senate to vote to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, when the debate has been had on this question.

In 1957 Senator Knowland picked up the leadership refrain that the rules should not be changed at the first of the session; that the Senate is a continuing body, and that the aim of rules changes, that is, civil rights legislation, could best be adopted by the introduction and referral to the appropriate committee of a civil rights bill. He promised to introduce, and later did introduce, such a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the colloquy which took place on January 4, 1957, with Senator Knowland, in which he made the sort of promise he made, and also the colloquy of January 4, 1957, in which the Senator from New Mexico predicted we would end by having no rules change.

There being no objection, the colloquies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In support of this history, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 1, page 210, column 1, reports Senator Knowland as follows:

I believe the correct procedure would be to have the bill introduced next Monday, when Senators will be able to introduce bills, to urge early committee hearings, to have it reported to the Senate, and to debate it fairly and fully, as it should be debated, affecting as it does many citizens in all parts of our country. We shall have a committee to which to refer such a bill next Monday, if the Senate has any rules under which to proceed. We shall have a Committee on Foreign Relations to which to refer the President's message which will be delivered tomorrow, if the Senate has rules tomorrow. But whether the Senate has rules or not apparently will depend to no small extent upon whether this body in its judgment lays on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

On Monday next, when it will be possible to introduce proposed legislation in the Senate, I shall introduce, and I shall ask all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope, many of them on the other side of the aisle, to join with me, a proposal to amend rule 22 of the Senate. I cannot introduce such a proposal now, under the general agreement, but I should like to read it to the Senate.

I do not say this proposal is the final solution. I do not say, after a committee has met, after hearings have been had, after testimony has been taken, after there has been a study made of the traditions of 167 years and the needs of the present, that the proposal may not be greatly improved.

That is what we have committees for. But I propose to introduce, on behalf of myself and any other Senator who cares to join me, a proposal which reads:

"That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out 'except subsection 3 of rule XXII,' and (2) by striking out 'two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.'"

Section 2 would read:

"Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is repealed."

The junior Senator from New Mexico predicted that the course recommended by Senator Knowland—also by Senators Dirksen and Jenner in 1953—would bypass the adoption of rules and any change in rule XXII. I am quoted as follows in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 1, page 213, column 1:

Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from California will find that he can send his resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but that after weeks and after months it will not see the light of day on the floor of the Senate. It will not see the light of day on the floor, anymore than did the resolution of the Senator from Indiana [Mr Jenner].

The Committee on Rules and Administration wrestled and wrestled with the matter. It labored long and brought forth a mouse, and placed it on the calendar of the Senate. There it reposed, quietly. No one ever moved to bring it up.

This prediction was followed by the following colloquy taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 7, page 9349:

Mr. ANDERSON. I would also remind the Senator from Minnesota that when we had a discussion of this matter in the early days of the session, when the question was one of a change in rule XXII, there was considerable discussion about the rules of the Senate and the rights of Senators. At that time I tried to make it clear that that was probably the only chance any Member of the Senate would have at this session to vote in regard to anything even remotely resembling that subject. Since then, a number of months have come and gone; and now it is apparent that my prediction was not too bad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico was a good prophet.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said to the Senators who stood beside me then that we might not have another chance to vote on that subject at this session or, indeed, at any session, until we vote on a proposal to change rule XXII.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does that conclude the time on the part of the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the time on the part of the opponents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much time remains for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, there must be 11 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes remain until 3 o'clock.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority leader be given an additional minute beyond the time which remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me first make this clear. The Republican platform reads:

We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

But the platform does not say how or when or where or why, in any particular.

The new frontier platform, if I may be indulged that appellation, speaks about the modification of the rule, but it does not go into any specifics as such.

So it is proper legislative procedure to commit this rather controversial matter to the bosom of the Committee on Rules and Administration for further consideration. Unless I am misinformed, the three-fifths proposal has never specifically been considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have made as diligent inquiry as I could, and neither the three-fifths proposal nor the modifications of the three-fifths proposal were ever considered by the committee. That is an additional reason why the resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

But my attitude is based upon experience; and certainly experience dictates some restraint. We can move far better by restraint and by taking some time, rather than by acting too hastily now.

If I have to allude to any specifics in that field, I make so bold as to say that had there been no restraints in the Senate rules in 1937, the President would have packed the Supreme Court of the United States in 48 hours. However, it was because a group of Senators insisted on ventilating that issue and stirring the people of the country, so that great windrows began to roll in upon the Senate, that the proposal to pack the High Tribunal was finally stopped.

The rules are a restraint against monetary clamor; against the pressure of appeals. Last night I cited what I thought was a classic example. My party was at a low ebb of 87 Members in the House of Representatives in 1935. But the leaders of the majority leader, the New Deal party, knew what they had to contend with. The first thing they did in January 1935, was to change the discharge rule, by which a committee could be bypassed with 145 signatures. The majority party boosted the number of signatures required to 218, so as to make it more difficult for their own party members to rush through ill-advised, ill-considered legislation. I have seen that happen time and again.

I had the experience of voting against a bill, the first one in 1933, which was not even in print; it was introduced in typewritten form. It was euphemistically referred to as the Economy Act of 1933. Yes, we had economy. The salary of everyone on the Federal payroll was cut, as were the pensions of veterans, as well. I voted against the measure, and my political annihilation was threatened. But I saw the day when every word and comma of the Economy Act of 1933 was expunged from the statute books of the country. I was in a hopeless minority, and we could not stop that action. That is a situation in which restraint is needed.

I saw the Potato Act go on the books, an act authored and inspired by Mr. Wallace. It provided that only potatoes of a certain size could go into the market. Where is that act? It has gone. It failed in the Senate because some restraint was exercised upon it.

I saw the Blue Eagle come into existence. Under the Blue Eagle, Congress suspended the Antitrust Acts and established codes, under which a pants presser up in New Jersey was put in jail because he would not charge 50 cents for pressing a pair of pants.

I saw the time when proposed legislation came from that body over there to put strikers into the Army. My good friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, remembers that, I am sure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then over there, being politically sensitive, we used to say, "Let the Senate do it. Let the Senate stop it;" because the Senate had a weapon, an instrumentality in the rules, which the other body did not have, because all the time was rationed within the 5-minute rule, under which amendments are considered. The only weapon the minority had was the motion to recommit a bill, if they undertook to do so. That is all the restraint we had.

But what a wonderful thing that those measures went to a legislative graveyard because there were some restraints in the rules of the Senate.

I am looking down the road. There will not be time, according to the clock, for me to say much about this, but I shall mention one or two points.

If we look at page 23 of the platform of the party of hope—we are called the party of memory; they are called the party of hope [laughter]—I shall read from that platform:

> We will repeal the authorization for "right to work" laws.

Is that all that is involved? No. It is the authority of the Federal Government to preempt all authority in the field of labor legislation.

I may be the only one, but I will be here to do my full share; but unless we have these restraints, we will not stop that.

Then the platform reads:

> We pledge ourselves to repeal the limitations on rights to strike, to picket peacefully, and to tell the public the facts of a labor dispute and other antilabor features of the Taft-Hartley Act and the 1959 act.

That goes for the secondary boycott. There it is.

What weapon do we have, what restraint do we have, if it is not in the Senate rules?

Take a look at page 16 of the platform of the party of hope. What does it say?

> We shall propose the bolder and more effective use of the specialized agencies to promote the world's economic and social development.

How far do they propose to go? We cannot tell for the moment. The three-fifths majority proposal, standing by itself, may not be sufficient restraint; perhaps some other qualifications are necessary. But we are standing at the beginning of a long road. Here is the road map. Read it carefully. See what is in it. I want to be certain that if we get to a fork in that road, and it is pretty rough and tortuous, I will have some control over my own course, some weapon, some instrumentality, in order to do my duty by the public, and to articulate my responsibility as I see it.

Mr. President, if time permits, let me point out that there is a pledge for food banks to be established all over the world. It is pledged that we shall explore the possibility of shipping and storing a substantial part of our food surpluses in a system of food banks to be located in distribution centers in the underdeveloped world. That is a great one; and I should like to see how we are going to monitor the weevils in a food bank in Africa or Asia and keep the discoloration from getting into the rice crop, and all the other things that go along with that.

What lies ahead of us, I do not know. But I know there have to be restraints upon hasty and sometimes ill-advised action; and the only place where they will be found is in the Senate, not in the other body, which operates under a 5-minute rule, so that when a bill comes in, the chairman of the committee and its ranking member control all the time; and if they do not grant time to any other Member, no other Member can engage in the debate. The only hope there is for a Member to proceed under the 5-minute rule; and if he requests an extension of time, but if there is objection, he is done. In that event, his maximum contribution will be 5 minutes' worth. It is no wonder that those of us who used to serve there used to say, "Let the Senate do it."

Mr. President, I will accept the responsibility. I say I hope very much that the motion submitted on behalf of the majority leader and myself will prevail and that the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules, for further consideration, because the principal sponsor of this motion is an honorable man; and he has given the Senate his word that there will be no delay, that the resolution will be considered in the committee, and that the resolution will be brought back to the Senate. That evidence and that earnest of good faith are enough support for the motion that is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all available time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], submitted on behalf of himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. ANDERSON answered "nay," when his name was called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANS-

FIELD] to refer Senate Resolution 4, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to a further parliamentary inquiry: Would not the pending motion, if agreed to, carry with it to the Committee on Rules and Administration all the matters now pending, rather than only the one just now mentioned by the Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion, if agreed to, would carry with it only the so-called Humphrey, Kuchel, and others amendment to the resolution.

The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official business, and his pair has been previously announced by his colleague.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 6]

YEAS—50

Bartlett	Ervin	McGee
Bennett	Fulbright	Miller
Bible	Goldwater	Monroney
Blakley	Gore	Robertson
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Butler	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hickey	Schoeppel
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Smathers
Capehart	Holland	Sparkman
Carlson	Hruska	Stennis
Chavez	Johnston	Talmadge
Cotton	Jordan	Thurmond
Curtis	Kerr	Wiley
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Long, La.	Yarborough
Eastland	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McClellan	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Fong	Morton
Allott	Gruening	Moss
Anderson	Hart	Muskie
Beall	Hartke	Neuberger
Boggs	Humphrey	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Bush	Javits	Prouty
Cannon	Keating	Proxmire
Carroll	Kuchel	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Scott
Church	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Cooper	McCarthy	Symington
Dodd	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Metcalf	
Engle	Morse	

NOT VOTING—4

Case, S. Dak.	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Kefauver		

So the motion to refer to the Committee on Rules and Administration was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote just had.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement to the Senate.

After consultation with the distinguished minority leader, it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn until Friday when we adjourn later this afternoon. It is the hope of the leadership also, in view of the most recent developments, that the committees will speed up their activities insofar as hearings with regard to nominees for the incoming administration are concerned.

REFERENCE OF VARIOUS RESOLUTIONS TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the following resolutions, now on the Calendar of Resolutions and Motions Over Under the Rule, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, namely:

Senate Resolution 5 (by Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators), a resolution amending section 3 of the cloture rule of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 6 (by Mr. CASE of South Dakota), a resolution to amend rule XIX by inserting a new paragraph governing procedure on amendments and providing for germaneness.

Senate Resolution 9 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution to amend rule XXIV to add a new section 3, relative to conference committees.

Senate Resolution 10 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution amending section 134c of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)).

Senate Resolution 11 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution to amend rule XXV to increase sizes of the Committees on Finance and the Judiciary.

Senate Resolution 12 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution to amend rule III relative to reading of the Journal.

Senate Resolution 13 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution to amend rule XIX to add a new section 8 relative to germaneness of debate.

Senate Resolution 14 (by Mr. CLARK), a resolution to amend section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relative to committee hearings.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the vote which has just been taken, I think it would be a waste of the Senate's time to bring up these proposed subsidiary changes in the rules, important though I believe them to be. If the Senate is not willing to make any change in the rule to limit debate, but wishes to refer such proposals to committee—which, in my judgment, would kill the proposal for the remainder of the session—it obviously would not be willing to make changes in the other rules I have proposed. I therefore have no objection to the motion of the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also wish to state that Senate Resolution 6 is by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the committee appointments referred to the Senate by the Democratic steering committee be taken up for approval.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on this matter. I will tell my colleagues that I shall speak for approximately a half hour. At the end of my speech I will express no serious objection to the motion, but I desire to be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of Members on this side of the aisle assigned to committees by the Democratic steering committee, which was read yesterday, be considered as having been read at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Mr. Kerr (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Holland.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Mr. Ellender (chairman), Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Hart, Mr. McCarthy, and Mrs. Neuberger.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Hayden (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Humphrey.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Russell (chairman), Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Mr. Robertson (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Mr. Bible (chairman), Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Smith of Massachusetts.

Committee on Finance: Mr. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Fulbright.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Mr. Fulbright (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Dodd.

Committeee on Government Operations: Mr. McClellan (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Muskie.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Mr. Anderson (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Church, Mr.

Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Hickey.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Mr. Magnuson (chairman), Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McGee.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Eastland (chairman), Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Mr. Hill (chairman), Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pell.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Mr. Johnston (chairman), Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Randolph.

Committee on Public Works: Mr. Chavez (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Metcalf.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Mr. Mansfield (chairman), Mr. Hayden, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Hickey, and Mr. Pell.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending motion presents a slate of Democratic nominees for the various standing committees, which will shortly be passed on by the Senate.

Senators are familiar with the provisions of rule XXV, which require that all members of standing committees be elected at the opening of each Congress.

The procedure within my party used to be, in the days of Woodrow Wilson, that the steering committee would present a slate to the Democratic conference, which would then approve, disapprove, or modify that slate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer restore order in the Senate? The Senate is completely out of order.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the days of Woodrow Wilson, the procedure in my party was for a steering committee appointed by the majority leader to make committee assignment and then to report such assignments to the conference for approval. That custom was changed, I think, during a period with respect to which the minutes of the Democratic conference have been lost. In any event, it has not obtained for at least the last 10 years, and perhaps longer.

The procedure now is to have the steering committee nominate directly to the Senate, and to have the Senate elect both the majority and minority committee members in due course.

To my gratification I was appointed a member of the steering committee less than 48 hours ago. I attended the sessions of that committee at which the slate presented by the majority leader was agreed upon—frequently, I should add, after some debate and by a divided vote.

I objected within the steering committee to the slate selected for the Committee on the Judiciary, including its chairman, and the slate selected for the Committee on Finance, including its chairman.

A rather odd procedure has crept up. The man whose name is first on the list as the steering committee presents its recommendations is automatically selected to be chairman, even though he is not designated as such either by the steering committee or by the Senate.

I ask, Mr. President, that the slate selected by the Democratic steering committee for members of the Committee on Finance be printed in the RECORD at this point by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the slate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Finance: Mr. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Fulbright.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I similarly request that the slate presented by the Democratic steering committee for the Committee on the Judiciary appear in the RECORD at this point by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the slate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Eastland (chairman), Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Blakley.

Mr. CLARK. My objection to the slates, Mr. President, extends not only to the slates but also to the chairmen.

I am happy to report that I have had most friendly relations, which I hope will continue, with both the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The first vote I cast in the Senate in 1957—a voice vote, to be sure—was in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Such opposition has not changed our cordial relations. I know it will not. I am just as much opposed to him as chairman of the Judiciary Committee now as I was then, for reasons which he understands, and I think for reasons which I believe my colleagues understand, having to do entirely with the fact that the Judiciary Committee under his very able leadership has become the graveyard for all civil rights measures, forcing us into very peculiar parliamentary procedures to get any measure dealing with civil rights to the floor.

My disagreement with the chairman of the Finance Committee, the very able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is of more recent origin. It, too, has not impaired our friendly relations, and I am confident that it will not. I shall place in the RECORD a little later on today a full record of that disagreement as it has appeared in the public press.

I should like to state my reasons for my objections to certain of the proposed committee assignments, and while I shall not request a yea-and-nay vote, and probably the recommendations will be overwhelmingly approved by a voice vote, I wish the RECORD to indicate that I shall vote nay on the slate with respect to both the Finance Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

I should like to state my reasons. I am a strong proponent of the program of President-elect Kennedy. I am also a believer in the platform of my party. I campaigned vigorously for our candidate for President and our candidate for Vice President, both of whom endorsed in toto the platform of the Democratic Party. I am confident that a bipartisan majority of the members of both the Finance and the Judiciary Committees are sincerely, firmly and honestly opposed to the major portions of the Kennedy program and the Democratic platform which is within the legislative purview of those two committees. I suggest that my colleagues examine the slate of Democrats and the present membership of Republicans. I ask unanimous consent that the Republican members of the Judiciary and Finance Committees at the end of the 86th Congress may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCE COMMITTEE

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware.
FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.
WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah.
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland.
CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska.
THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois.
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska.
KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York.
NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire.

Mr. CLARK. There may, of course, be one or two changes in the list of Republican nominees. My understanding is that they have not yet been decided upon. But I am confident that those changes will be minor. I say again that I am sure any knowledgeable Senators—and I hope we are all knowledgeable regardless of how recently we were elected to this body—will appreciate the fact that there is a bipartisan majority in both of those committees which will make it difficult, if not impossible, to bring some measures advocated by the Kennedy administration to the floor in recognizable form. I do not challenge the sincerity of those who feel this way in both committees, but I feel quite strongly, insofar as my party is concerned, that it would be unwise for us to reward those who mean to wreck the program of the Kennedy administration by electing them to positions of responsibility where they will be more readily able to carry out their declared intention.

With respect to the Judiciary Committee, the area of responsibility to which I refer is civil rights. With respect to the Finance Committee, the area to which I refer is medical care for the aged tied to social security, tax reform,

including the closing of tax loopholes, and matters relating to monetary, fiscal, and debt policy.

I do not believe that we will do justice to those candidates whom we supported on that platform which we adopted if, as I say, we make it easy for those who oppose that platform to work their will. This situation arises only with respect to the Judiciary and Finance Committees. As I review the proposed membership on other standing committees, I am reasonably confident that we can expect measures sponsored by the administration—and supported also by an increasing group of liberal Republicans—to reach the floor in such shape that if we do not agree with the action of the committee, we can at least intelligently amend them on the floor to bring them more in accord with the program of the President, if that is what a majority of this body desires to do.

I turn to a more philosophical aspect of this problem. In my judgment, one of the great defects in the Congress is inadequate party responsibility. The Congress of the United States has less party responsibility than has any other legislative body in the free world. We appear here to ignore party platforms. The program of the President was ignored by many of my Republican friends during the 4 years that I have been here. I fear the program of our President-elect is similarly going to be ignored by many of my colleagues.

I am not an advocate of blind party responsibility. In my judgment it goes too far in the House of Commons. There a man's political career is seriously prejudiced, if not terminated, if he so much as dares to vote against his party leader or his party whip. I think that is wrong. In my opinion party responsibility goes too far in my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, one of the most partisan States in the Nation, I regret to state. There, if a member of the house or the senate, with any consistency at all, votes against the program of his party leadership, he is deprived of his committee seats, and pretty well hustled out of the party. I would advocate no such rule in this body.

I believe each Senator should vote in accordance with his conscience. If he does not believe in the party platform and his conscience impels him to remain within the Democratic Party, that is his business, and I would make no effort to throw him out. But I do not believe our conference should reward with promotion and with posts of seniority and privilege, such as committee chairmanships, men who have stated their honest and earnest belief that the program of our party should be defeated almost in its entirety, and certainly within the field of responsibility of the committees to which we are about to promote them.

I believe we ought to have a general rule of thumb with respect to party responsibility in the Congress of the United States, which is that those who wish to sail as officers of the Democratic ship should be prepared to fly under the colors which their party has hoisted on the masthead. This principle has been rather substantially ignored in past years. It is being ignored now in connection with the composition of those two committees.

I am aware of the delicate feelings of all of my colleagues in this body, and of the fantastic public acceptance of the notion that the Senate of the United States is a citadel where incense is burned and bells tinkled and candles lit and due obeisance made, as though to Oriental monarchs, toward those who have acquired a certain amount of seniority and are permitted to enter into what I have found to be a quite nonexistent group called the Inner Club.

But, Mr. President, seniority is not enshrined in the Constitution of the United States. It appears nowhere in any of the laws of the United States. It is not even a standing rule of the Senate. It has been frequently ignored during my short tenure here.

The distinguished Vice-President-elect, former Senator JOHNSON, of Texas, was not elected majority leader by reason of any seniority. At the time he was elected, he was a relatively junior Senator. Our present distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], who reluctantly accepted his post—and I honor him for his dedication and his concept of public duty—does not hold his post by reason of seniority. Neither does the agreeable and able majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Neither does the secretary of the Democratic conference, the very personable junior Senator from Florida, [Mr. SMATHERS]. Neither does that distinguished veteran Republican, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] hold his post as minority leader by reason of seniority; nor does his colleague, the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], hold his position by seniority.

I make the next statement with some embarrassment, although not much. I was a candidate for the Committee on Foreign Relations before the steering committee. I had the seniority to make claim to that position. However, my claim was denied, after a close vote, and seniority was ignored. I hold no bitterness for that decision. It is the luck of the draw. Actually, perhaps I can do more good for my party by remaining on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to help the President-elect put through his program to raise the minimum wage, to provide Federal aid to education, and enact many other important bills involving the welfare of the American people, which I am confident will come out of that committee, a committee which certainly carries a majority of Kennedy men on the Democratic side.

I mention the matter of seniority to show that it depends on whose ox is being gored. It can be used with great effect to maintain the status quo, to keep in positions of power those who do not wish to change in a changing world. But when seniority is suggested as an argument on behalf of the claims of some of us who are not in the status quo group, it is very easy to pass it over.

I say again that there is no personal animus in my heart about this. I am content with what has been done. Perhaps "content" is too strong a word. I mean that I am not as unhappy about it as I was earlier. It is something that I am prepared to live with in good humor. My friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] suggests that I am resigned, if not content.

But let me return to the question of how the Committee on Finance and the Committee on the Judiciary can be so constituted that the program of the President-elect will be granted a favorable reception.

I am well aware of the fact that it is almost impossible to dislodge from a committee a Senator who has been serving on it. I can well understand why a serious effort to do so might occasion some resentment. Accordingly, I had thought that the way to handle the matter would be to expand the size of the Committee on Finance from 17 to 21, and to expand the size of the Committee on the Judiciary from 15 to 17. Then I would hope that the majority leader would impress upon the steering committee—and I would be only too happy to help him in this regard—the desirability of filling those positions with Kennedy men, not anti-Kennedy men. I would hope my good friends across the aisle, while they would not slavishly follow the program of the President—and I would not ask them to—would see to it that the vacancies on the Republican side might be filled with men who recognize that this is the second half of the 20th century.

I hope no Senator will ask me to take my seat under rule XIX, section 2, for having made, in good nature, that comment.

I have pending at the desk a rule to enlarge the size of these two committees. I raised the question in the steering committee, at least loudly enough to assure myself that if I so moved there would be no second to my motion. The resolution has now been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is to be headed by the majority leader.

It may well be that at a later date during this session the majority leader will conceivably change his mind, and come to the conclusion that the only way we can get the program of the President through is to enlarge these committees. I know the majority leader is just as sincerely interested in the program of the President as I am.

So perhaps the presence of those resolutions in the Committee on Rules and Administration, to be headed by the majority leader, will serve a salutary purpose. I hope that, despite the composition of those committees, the committees at least will feel it incumbent upon them to consider promptly the major measures in the program of the President and to report those measures, whether favorably or unfavorably, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to consider them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Might I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether

his argument goes contrary to the philosophy that committees in general should reflect, insofar as possible, the balanced judgment of the Senate as a whole?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In other words, I have in mind the concept that it is desirable that the percentage of liberals and the percentage of conservatives, or the percentage of those who hew to the administration program, as against those who do not, should be approximately equal on the various committees.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Louisiana will follow me in a little elementary arithmetic, I think I can answer that question. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana, with whom I have such pleasant relations, will understand that anything I say about him is in lighter vein.

There are 65 Democrats in the Senate of the United States. In my opinion, 40 of them are committed, on the whole, to the Democratic platform and to the program of the President-elect. In my opinion, 10 of them—and I shall not indulge in personalities; I would much prefer not to be pressed as to who they are—are what I have called Goldwater Democrats. I am sure they would be pleased and honored to be counted in the category led by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

The other 15 Democratic Senators, who include my able and genial friend from Louisiana, are what I call switch hitters. They sometimes run with the hare, and sometimes run with the hounds. I think that in the coming session they are much more likely to be Kennedy men than not. They certainly were not always liberals in the last session, but I have the feeling that they are not entirely beyond reprieve. I wonder if that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not sure that it does, because to some of us it seems that these tags and labels can be very misleading. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania regards himself among the liberals, I am sure.

Mr. CLARK. No, no. I have abolished all reference to liberals and conservatives. I now speak only in terms of Kennedy men and anti-Kennedy men.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under last year's set of labels, I imagine the senior Senator from Pennsylvania would regard himself as a liberal.

Mr. CLARK. Before we change the semantics, I was happy to accept that designation, except, I must say, that when friends of mine like Arthur Krock and Bill White refer to us as so-called liberals, I still sting a bit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I had in mind was that according to the appellations, tags, and labels, which columnists like to use, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania would have been regarded as a liberal, when that term was used, as also would the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very proud to be included in that group.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana came to the floor one day and offered an amendment to provide funds for the needy aged, the blind, the disabled, and the orphaned children. Who cast deciding votes against it? The liberal Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the liberal Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. One would have thought they would have cast the deciding votes for the measure. The point I make is that it seems to me it is very confusing to understand who can be put in those categories and who cannot.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Not at present; I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Colorado.

I might reply to the Senator from Louisiana that neither he nor I was in the category of wild-eyed spenders. I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana would like to have that semantic adjective applied to him as it has been to the Senator from Illinois and me. However, it occurred to me that that particular amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana would have put the budget so far out of balance that we would never have got it back.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My recollection is that it would not have cost nearly so much as a proposal by the Senator from Pennsylvania would have cost. It seems to me that that was the kind of proposal for which one would expect a liberal to vote. It involved the providing of funds for 3 million needy persons.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana will enlighten me a little later as to what all this is leading up to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The question I had in mind was: How can we tell who is a liberal and who is a conservative, or who is a Kennedy man and who is not a Kennedy man, until after the roll has been called and we have voted?

Mr. CLARK. I think I can tell, if the Senator from Louisiana wants to know, and I shall be glad to tell him in the cloakroom after we get through.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had hoped I could conclude my questioning.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Am I to understand that the answer to the question as to who should be on committees and who should not be on committees, and how the Senator has arrived at that definition, is not to be a matter of record, but is to be the subject of a cloakroom conversation?

Mr. CLARK. No; I am perfectly willing to make the statement for the RECORD. The Senator from Louisiana knows that I was speaking in lighter vein.

I think that if the Senator goes down the list, name by name—and this I shall not do on the floor, but I urge him to do it either privately or publicly—he will find there is a majority of those two committees who have publicly, and repeatedly, expressed and voted their opposition to civil rights, in the case of the Judiciary Committee, and to tax reform, to closing tax loopholes, and to medical care for the aged under social security, in the case of the Finance Committee. Those Senators are perfectly willing to stand up and be counted. They are against the program of the President-elect, and they are proud of it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Colorado. Does he wish me to yield for a question or a comment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I was about to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes to make a comment.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; I would still like to pose what I shall say in the form of a question; but the whole discussion has got so far afield. I wanted to propose this question in order that I could understand a subsequent conversation and colloquy on the floor.

When the Senator from Pennsylvania says that sometimes those Senators run with the hares, and sometimes with the hounds, am I to understand that that is a classification on his side of the aisle, or does it apply to my side of the aisle? In other words, if it applies to the Republican side, I should know where some of us stand on our side, too.

Mr. CLARK. I would not attempt to presume to analyze the motivation or even the position of my good friends across the aisle. I think they have quite enough trouble within their own party without my trying to stir up any more.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to know where it is, and shall be happy to have the Senator enlighten me on that.

Mr. CLARK. I will see the Senator privately later.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator associate them with the hares or with the hounds? Last night, or the night before, during the wee hours, when I could not sleep, I read a very interesting comment on rabbits. I found that, contrary to being sweet, little, lovable creatures, they are probably, collectively, among the orneriest creatures on earth, not including the dogs. They should not be thought of in terms of meek and mild animals, as opposed to the dog, which is man's best friend. I just wanted to know where we over here stood in our associations with Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. I have a little story in that regard, which perhaps the Senator from Colorado will bear with. The late Senator Claude Swanson, of Virginia, the first Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of Franklin D. Roosevelt, was asked, during the 1920's to take a position on the prohibition amendment—was he for it, or was he against it? He replied with this statement:

> Back in the mountains of Virginia, and in tidewater Virginia, too, we have some very large packs of hounds. They are active, they are aggressive, they are chasing the hares in Virginia in every briar patch. The hares are having a bad time with those hounds.
>
> Those hounds are the Prohibitionists. I run with the hounds. But I am told that up near the West Virginia border there is a new kind of hare that is coming into being and is multiplying very rapidly. Those

hares have sharp teeth. They can fight back against the hounds, and they are multiplying rapidly.

Those new hares are the citizens of my State who would vote for the repeal of the prohibition amendment.

While I am presently riding with the hounds, no hound will change into a hare any quicker than I will, if I find the hares putting the hounds to rout.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not entirely. I may say that someone went antelope hunting last fall and brought in five jackrabbits. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania proposed to call up or to move to make his resolution the pending order of business? He said he could not get a second. Was that the subject on which he spoke? Perhaps either I or some other Senator on this side of the aisle would be happy to second his motion, if he wished to make it.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Colorado is referring to my proposed changes in the rules, I may say that they were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, just as the Humphrey-Kuchel and Anderson resolutions were. So they are out of the way and in committee.

If the Senator is referring to what will shortly take place on the motion to approve the designation of committee members, I have announced that I shall record my vote against that motion by voice; I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

When I have completed my remarks, which I shall be able to do in 5 minutes, if the Senator from Colorado has finished questioning me——

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. I did not know, because of the confusion—and I was trying to listen to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who will, I am sure, recognize the fact that I have been on the floor all the time he has been speaking—whether the Senator intended to call up or attempt to make his committee matter the subject of immediate consideration by the Senate or not. Perhaps some of us would be willing to assist him.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been listening to the debate and to the amplification. I had hoped that we were at the end of the Eisenhower syntax, or that at least we were moving away from the mixed metaphor. I was interested in what my friend said about switch-hitters who sometimes run with the hares and sometimes ride with the hounds. However, the term "switch-hitter" is a baseball term which is used to describe a baseball player who can hit either right handed or left handed. So I am afraid that we have the metaphors a little mixed when it is said we have a man on horseback who is batting either right handed or left handed while riding with the hounds. [Laughter.]

In order to keep the two straight, I believe we should at least clarify the matter by pointing out that now a switch-hitter is defined as a man on horseback who can bat on either side of the horse. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his interjection. Of course, technically, the Senator is correct, although I think both metaphors are applicable.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania is making a substantial contribution for the RECORD. Many political science scholars have studied this subject. The able Senator from Pennsylvania knows that his resolutions will never see the light of day. But they are now in the RECORD and will be available for future study.

As a matter of fact, it comes to my mind that there have been other recommendations about how to deal with the political power centered in this institution, as the Senator has so eloquently stated. One of the questions is whether the committee chairmen are permanent chairmen, to hold their office permanently.

Mr. CLARK. Not under the rules, but under the practice.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, we know that under the rules the committee chairmen are not permanent chairmen. Others have raised the question. I raise it here only for purposes of study.

Mr. CLARK. Under the rules, the committee chairmen have to be elected at the beginning of each Congress. But under the practice they are reappointed.

Mr. CARROLL. That is true; and as the Washington Post recently has pointed out, that is one of the built-in power features of the Senate.

The question is whether, in the fast-moving society in which we live, study and change should be in order soon. How about committee chairmanships? Do not they rotate in the United Nations and in other political bodies? Much has been written on this question.

So this is not just a humorous, idle conversation. Instead, it is a serious presentation, for which I wish to commend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his comments.

I hope that no one who either heard my remarks or will read them in the RECORD will think that because there have been one or two light touches in this debate, that means that I am not deadly serious about this matter.

I spoke once before, in this body, about how a rule in the Polish Diet providing for a veto by any Member destroyed that body in the 17th and 18th centuries. So it is that the rules of the Senate can destroy the Senate within the foreseeable future, in my judgment, unless they are drastically changed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield again, briefly?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I believe it is generally recognized by most Senators on this side that when some of us have seniority and seek to assert it, we are given the alibi of geography; but when we assert geography, we are confronted with seniority.

Mr. CLARK. And sometimes when we assert philosophy, we are given the gate.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, this means that control is lodged in the hands of only a few persons. I studied this matter years ago when I was in the House of Representatives, where the Members abide strictly by the seniority rule, because they believe no other rule is equitable.

I think this problem is most serious. I am not talking at all about what has happened to the committee assignments, but I am addressing myself to the issue, as I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has been doing.

All of us know that in political life there is no perfection; and we know there are bound to be some favors distributed. But when favors can be used in this body or in any other body by a small core of people to reward their friends and to punish others, I think the question should be looked into.

As a junior Senator, I think there should be a diffusion of such power. I have never liked political bosses, and I do not like to think that such a practice obtains in committee assignments in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Colorado, and I am in accord with his statement.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the steering committee of the Democratic Party.

In our conference of all Democratic Senators, we authorized a steering committee to act for us in the discharge of what is the responsibility of all of us. Yet we failed to see to it that the committee we thus authorized to act for us was representative of our own membership.

While three members were added—all from the Northeast—the steering committee is still heavily overrepresentative of one region of the country and of the conservative wing of our party. To my mind, Mr. President, that explains completely the assignments to committees on which we are about to pass.

Of our 65 Democratic Senators, only one-third are from the Deep South, under the broadest possible construal of what constitutes the Deep South. Yet 7 of the 16 members of the steering committee—just one less than half—are from that region.

In contrast, 12 of our 65 Democratic Senators are from that vast, heavily populated region known as the Midwest—or 16, if Oklahoma and West Virginia are counted as Midwestern, and Oklahoma participates in the informal midwestern conference which we have in our party.

But from all that region, representing at least one-third of the population of the United States, there is just one Senator on the Democratic steering committee. In other words, one region of the country, with less population than another region and with less than twice as many Democratic Senators has seven times the representation on the Democratic steering committee.

The Democratic conference, made up of all Democratic Senators, permitted this to happen. It is perhaps to be expected that an unrepresentative steering committee should propose to the Senate an unrepresentative makeup for the Finance and Judiciary Committees.

The blame for whatever damage is done to the program of the incoming Democratic President thus comes to rest squarely upon all Democratic Senators.

Mr. President, one more point: To my regret, the public press has made a great to-do about a difference of opinion between the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself. In my judgment, that controversy has been distorted and blown up out of all legitimate proportion. Of course, I believe that when one goes into politics, he must expect to "dish it out," and therefore he must learn to "take it"; and I have no hesitation at all in saying that I am willing to "take it." But I believe that somewhere there should be a true chronology of the pertinent documents in connection with this controversy between the Senator from Virginia and myself, which has been handled with great good humor by my friend, the Senator from Virginia, but has been handled with something less than that—in fact, with what I may call shrill invective—by some of my friends among the columnists.

So I should like to request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, eight documents, which I shall offer en bloc:

First, a press release summarizing a letter which I sent to all Senators on November 18, 1960, respecting a bipartisan effort to reform the rules.

Second, a column by Drew Pearson which appeared on November 21, 1960, in the Washington Post, and other papers, entitled "Senator Clark Would Revamp Senate."

Third, Senator BYRD's letter to me of December 2, 1960.

Fourth, a column by Arthur Krock entitled "Short-Lived 'Purge'," which appeared in a number of newspapers on December 6, 1960, including the New York Times and Philadelphia Bulletin.

Fifth, a letter to the Philadelphia Bulletin written by me in reply to the Krock column. I say parenthetically that the New York Times refused to print my letter in reply.

Sixth, a column by William S. White regarding myself and Senate Rules revision, which appeared in the Washington Star and many other papers, including the Philadelphia Inquirer, on December 7, 1960.

Seventh, a letter from me to the Philadelphia Inquirer in reply to the White column, which was printed on December 8, 1960.

Eighth, and finally, my letter in reply to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], dated December 9, 1960, which received in all papers, except the New York Times, comparable treatment to that given Senator BYRD's letter to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, announced today that he has written to every Member of the Senate urging bipartisan support of the rules reform effort which will be the first order of business for the Senate as soon as it convenes on January 3, 1961.

"Both party platforms call for rules reform," Senator CLARK stated. "Both party platforms call for legislative action in many fields. All of us who have served in the Senate know that many of these commitments can become law if, but only if, the rules of the Senate are modernized.

"The letter I have written to my colleagues suggests three broad areas of rules reform:

"1. Committee procedure: I propose the enactment of a committee bill of rights that would give the majority of members of a committee the right (a) to convene meetings, (b) to determine the business to be considered, and (c) to permit votes on the pending business after reasonable discussion.

"2. Senate procedure: We can no longer afford the luxury of unlimited debate if we are to attend to the legislative business of the country. I propose that a majority of the Members of the Senate be empowered to bring about a vote on the substance of the measure at hand after it has been debated at reasonable length by voting to move the previous question.

"We should also adopt a rule of germaneness in debate to be invoked when we are dealing with urgent business. In addition we should end the power of a single Member to prevent all 86 committees and subcommittees from meeting during Senate sessions, to require Journal readings and to prevent morning hour business. These changes would speed our deliberations and increase our efficiency without sacrificing anything.

"3. Conference procedure: The practice we have fallen into of appointing Senators who have fought against important amendments to represent the Senate in conferences with the House to resolve differences in the bills passed by the two Houses, does violence to the democratic process. The rule I suggest would require that a majority of Senate conferees should have voted for the bill in question.

"Finally," Senator CLARK said, "I have urged my Democratic colleagues to favor reform of the organization of our own party in the Senate in the Democratic conference to be convened on January 3. Vacancies and new positions in the leadership, the policy and steering committees must be filled in such a way as to reflect the true centers of Democratic strength in the Nation. We must not approve the designation of committee chairmen and new appointees to key committees of Members who have failed to support the national ticket or those who oppose the platform pledges in the area in which the committee has jurisdiction."

The Senator's letter solicited the comments of his colleagues on the proposals outlined above.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1960]

SENATOR CLARK WOULD REVAMP SENATE

(By Drew Pearson)

PHILADELPHIA.—Senator JOSEPH CLARK, the Democrat who started revamping the city of Philadelphia when he served as mayor, has come up with a plan to revamp the Senate of the United States. If adopted, it will produce as many Senate changes as have occurred in the staid old City of Brotherly Love since JOE CLARK started its revival.

What CLARK plans for the Senate is going to make southern Senators scream.

CLARK proposes to read Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia and Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, plus, probably, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, out of Democratic Senate councils. Since they bucked the Democratic ticket in their States, he would deny them the right to sit in Democratic caucuses where Democratic policy is fixed.

CLARK also proposes to deny any Democratic Senator the chairmanship of a committee when he disagrees with that part of the Democratic platform over which his committee has jurisdiction.

This would not affect such southern Senators as DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, who as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee has no disagreement with the Democratic platform on armed strength. He does disagree on civil rights, but that doesn't come under his committee.

However, the Clark proposal would affect Senator JIM EASTLAND, of Mississippi, who as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee has direct jurisdiction over civil rights and is in vigorous disagreement with the Democratic platform.

REWARD BIG CITY VOTE

Senator CLARK has sent letters to the other 99 Senators proposing 10 new changes of the Senate rules. In addition, he has been on the long-distance telephone to such key liberals as Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, in an effort to mobilize Senate sentiment for the rules changes well before the Senate convenes.

The changes include not merely those mentioned above, but a modification of rule XXII which governs filibustering, also the appointment of three Democratic whips, plus a very important stipulation that the Democratic steering committee must represent a true cross-section of Senate Democrats, not be stacked with old guarders or conservatives.

"It was the big city vote which elected Kennedy," Senator CLARK points out. "It was not the rural vote or the South, or even the depressed areas. If it hadn't been for the big cities, Kennedy wouldn't have come anywhere near victory."

"Yet," says the ex-mayor of Philadelphia, a city that produced a 327,000-vote margin for Kennedy, "the cities have had virtually no representation on the Democratic steering committee. And representatives of the cities have been blocked time after time in passing important legislation—blocked by the coalition of Republicans with Dixiecrats who haven't supported the ticket.

"I don't know how far we'll get," said CLARK, "but it's time for a showdown."

Note—after the 1956 Presidential election, Senator BYRD, who opposed the Democratic ticket both in 1952 and 1956, was welcomed back into the party and once again given the chairmanship of the powerful Finance Committee. Other bolters were also welcomed back. This time there's growing opposition to BYRD, including that from Gov. Lindsay Almond, once a key member of the Byrd machine. Many Democrats resent the fact that BYRD has all the advantages of a Democratic chairmanship while voting and working for the Republicans.

NEW CABINET JOB

You can be fairly certain that the present mayor of Philadelphia, Richardson Dilworth, will be given a place in the Kennedy Cabinet—if he wants it. Dilworth succeeded JOE CLARK as the third Democratic mayor of Philadelphia since the Civil War, and has continued CLARK's civic improvement program

with great success. He is one of the Nation's leading experts on urban development. And since Kennedy promised to appoint a new member of the Cabinet to handle big city problems Dilworth stands No. 1 on the list for this post.

In appointing Dilworth, Kennedy would not only benefit from the services of a good man, but would pay off a political debt. The politician to whom he owes most is Congressman BILL GREEN, Democratic boss of Philadelphia. At the Los Angeles Democratic Convention, it was GREEN who put the heat on Gov. David Lawrence and forced Lawrence to declare for Kennedy—just at the psychological moment when it helped to swing the nomination.

Then, on November 8, GREEN produced again. He helped roll up the whopping 327,000-vote margin for Kennedy—more than the total margin Kennedy received in the entire United States.

Though Dilworth and GREEN are both Democrats, there's an uneasy truce between them. Dilworth has ambitions to go places in Pennsylvania—probably run for Governor. GREEN also has ambitions—preferably the Senate. He would also like to get more control over Philadelphia.

In any event, with Mayor Dilworth promoted to the Kennedy Cabinet, GREEN's ambitions might be more easily fulfilled.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
December 2, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JOE: You have been quoted in newspapers as saying you are leading a movement in the Senate to deny attendance in Democratic caucuses to any Democratic Senator who did not endorse the national Democratic ticket and platform.

You were further quoted as saying that a Democratic Senator holding a Senate committee chairmanship should be purged from his chairmanship if he did not approve proposals in the national Democratic platform which may come before his committee in the form of legislation.

It happens that I am the only Democratic Senator who holds the chairmanship of a major Senate committee—the Committee on Finance—who remained silent and did not endorse either of the national political party presidential candidates or platforms. Therefore, it is evident that your statement was directed at me.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, likewise has been quoted as saying that I should not be chairman if I disagreed with national Democratic platform planks which might come before the Finance Committee in the form of legislation.

As the Senate will be organized when the new Congress is convened in January, I think I should be frank and advise you now of my attitude toward the Democratic platform. I do this so you can prepare your case against me with full knowledge of what my position will be. And, at the outset, it should be clearly understood that I have always refused to be bound by a caucus as to my votes in the Senate.

I have served on the Finance Committee 28 years and, by reason of seniority, I became chairman 6 years ago.

My position is simple: I will support those planks in the platform of which I approve, but taken in its entirety I regard the Chester Bowles' so-called Democratic platform as being radical, or as leading to socialism, and as being fiscally irresponsible.

Am I to be purged as chairman of the Finance Committee because I refused to support measures which I believe to be dangerous to the Republic I pledged myself to serve faithfully and to the best of my ability?

My allegiance is to Virginia where the people have elected me six times to the United States Senate. I have what is to me the supreme honor of having served in the Senate longer than any other Virginian in history. I recognize no control over my votes in the Senate from any outside influence including the national Democratic convention and a caucus of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate.

I think it would be very wholesome if you would bring your proposal to the floor of the Senate because many fundamental principles are involved. Southerners frequently have been threatened with loss of committee assignments or other prerogatives unless they support measures obnoxious to them and their constituents. Personally, I resent this.

The Democratic Party was founded by Thomas Jefferson on the principles of a system of representative government, sound and frugal, with authority divided between Federal and State Governments to prevent coercive, if not despotic centralization of power. Democrats in Virginia adhere to these fundamental principles and yield to none in their dedication.

As a Member of the Senate, I am under oath to support the Constitution of the United States. This I have done. Every President of my time has had my full support when there was need for strong national defense and when there was need for unity in international crises.

Beyond this, my unqualified allegiance to the people of Virginia has been preserved, and it will be. I know their principles. I have confidence in their judgment as to what is good for the country. I have followed their will as I understood it in the past, and I shall conform to it in the future.

To make my position very clear, specifically some of my objections to declarations in the platform are as follows:

1. I am opposed to any political manipulation of the Federal Reserve System in order to influence interest rates, or for any other purpose.

2. I am opposed to repeal of right-to-work laws which, by Federal legislation, are permissive in any State desiring such laws. The effect of the platform pledge would be to nullify right-to-work laws in 20 States where they have been enacted, and constitutional provisions which have been adopted by 8 States.

3. I am opposed to the recommendation in the Democratic platform for forced integration in every school district by 1963. Such shotgun action would destroy public education systems in many communities.

4. I am opposed to establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) which would give bureaucrats in Washington power over who is to be employed or who can be dismissed in private business. This is a field which should not be invaded by the Federal Government.

5. I am opposed to the platform recommendation for compulsory medical service and hospitalization under the social security system. I am convinced this would lead to socialized medicine, with the possibility that it would bankrupt the social security trust fund. This matter came before the Finance Committee and was fought out in the post-convention session of Congress last August. The Senate voted 54 to 41 in opposition to the Democratic platform proposal, and instead adopted a fair plan for medical service and hospitalization for those in need of it.

In the area of platform recommendations involving Federal expenditures which might easily become excessive, there are such proposals as those for much larger housing and slum clearance programs, expansion of foreign economic aid, farm price supports at 90 percent of parity, Federal guarantee of Government-promoted economic growth at the rate of 5 percent a year, Federal aid for school construction, expansion of Federal public works, more scholarship and fellowship programs, etc.

I have tried to estimate the cost of these platform recommendations; this is impossible, but they are certain to increase annual budget expenditures by billions of dollars. These would be added to the public debt or financed by increased taxation, with the result that our fiscal situation would be further weakened.

The continuing loss of gold clearly indicates declining confidence in the American dollar. In my judgment world confidence in the dollar is imperative, not only to us in the United States, but all over the world where the dollar has been regarded as a sound base for international transactions.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate on the weakness of the dollar, which is the result of excessive Federal expenditures both at home and abroad. We have been attempting to be the world's policeman, world's banker, and at the same time the world's Santa Claus. We are now beginning to see the dangerous effects of these global dispensations.

The Senate Finance Committee has jurisdiction over legislation with respect to: (1) Federal taxation, debt and interest; (2) social security, tariffs and customs; and (3) veterans' compensation, pensions and insurance. These are matters of vital interest to all of our people, individually and collectively.

I have mentioned some, but not all, of the serious matters confronting us. You are apparently proposing that questions of great public importance should be considered in the U.S. Senate on a partisan political basis alone. I propose to act on these matters and others on the basis of my most considered judgment and conviction after study of all the facts available and all the circumstances, existing and foreseen.

In my votes in the Senate I will follow the basic principle of our representative democracy that a public official owes his allegiance primarily to those who elected him. I will submit to no coercion such as you propose in performing my duties as a Senator from Virginia.

The President-elect is confronted by many great problems at home and abroad. It is my strong desire to give him my full support in all measures he proposes which I believe to be in the best interests of our Nation and our people.

Sincerely,

HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senator From Virginia.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1960]

SHORT-LIVED PURGE—SENATOR CLARK'S PLAN TO EXCOMMUNICATE CHAIRMAN BYRD BACKFIRES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, a highly vocal moralist on the sanctity of party convention pledges, proposed to colleagues the demotion of Senate committee chairmen who had failed to support the Los Angeles ticket or the platform, one or the other, his sole target in view was Senator BYRD, of Virginia, head of the Finance Committee. But his shot ricocheted, to land with much more impact on President-elect Kennedy and Vice-President-elect JOHNSON.

It develops that both have given assurance they do not intend to assist those Democrats who will attempt to redeem one of the major pledges in the Los Angeles platform that BYRD denounced. And, to complete the discomfiture of the Senator from Pennsylvania, it also develops that this assurance was given to Senator BYRD himself—CLARK's one nominee for excommunication as a party heretic.

RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

This platform pledge was: "We will repeal the authorization for right-to-work laws."

These are State statutes which the Supreme Court has validated under the Taft-Hartley Act. They make illegal employer-employee contracts which require workers, either before being employed or to retain employment after a stated period, to join a union to the extent of paying dues and being represented by it in collective bargaining. To repeal this State authority requires amendment of Taft-Hartley.

Virginia is one of the 17 States with right-to-work laws, and Senator BYRD's announcement that he would resist this repeal by Congress was well known to Senators Kennedy and JOHNSON when, at Senator Kennedy's suggestion, they called on him, after their nominations by the national party convention, to enlist his campaign support.

He reviewed his dissent to a number of platform pledges, notably the one quoted above.

KENNEDY'S CONCESSION

Senator Kennedy, with the concurrence of his running mate and in the presence also of Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, then informed Senator BYRD that the administration would not include the repeal in its legislative program.

On that assurance BYRD, while he never endorsed the national party ticket, refrained from repudiating it, as he had in 1956. He limited his campaign activity to circularizing in Virginia an antirepeal speech he made last August. Since all other Democratic Senate chairmen who indicated opposition to platform planks nevertheless endorsed the Kennedy-Johnson ticket, this left only BYRD as the object of CLARK's November 20 purge proposal.

It is true that Senator CLARK's application of his moral principle was specifically confined to Democrats who were chairmen of Senate committees. But when it assumed the form of a purge of Senators for refusing to help legislate a pledge which the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect both had disavowed, its not very bright prospect of success vanished utterly.

SENATOR CLARK'S CHOICE

If CLARK now continues to press it as a moral principle, he will rate supplemental inclusion in John F. Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage." But the general expectation is that CLARK will either absolve former Senators when translated to the political pantheon, or drop his proposal in the embarrassing circumstances.

Meanwhile, Senator BYRD offered a moral principle of his own in reply to CLARK's. And BYRD's has the additional virtue of being basic to the representative form of government established in the Constitution.

"Am I," he inquired, "to be purged as chairman of the Finance Committee because I refused to support measures which I believe to be dangerous to the Republic I pledged myself to serve faithfully and to the best of my ability? I recognize no control over my votes by any influence (outside Virginia), including the national Democratic convention and a caucus of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate."

EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVE

Instead of demoting him for this, and incidentally plunging the Senate into civil war over the seniority system, the party leaders will probably adopt the wise and equally effective course of providing the Finance Committee with a majority which no longer will follow Senator BYRD.

DECEMBER 6, 1960.

EDITOR, THE PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Your recent column, "Short-Lived Purge, Senator Clark's Plan To 'Excommunicate' Chairman BYRD Backfires," is quite an inaccurate statement of my position, past, present, and prospective, with regard to committee organization and chairmanship in the 87th Congress.

In order to set the record straight I would deeply appreciate your printing the enclosed brief summary of my views on this subject as stated on the floor of the Senate on August 31, 1960.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on how the Senate should be organized next year to enact the Democratic platform, in the event our party's candidates are successful in the November election.

I believe it important that we should reorganize the Democratic leadership so that it will represent fully and fairly the prevailing view of a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate. In this regard I would make the following points:

First, the leadership should be committed to enact the Democratic platform into law.

Second, the leadership should represent the majority view of the Democrats in the Senate. This majority view will support the Democratic platform.

Third, the best way to achieve these results, in my judgment, is, first, to provide for the appointment of three whips, in addition to the majority leader; one to represent the geographical area of the Mississippi Basin; the second to represent the Northeast of our country; the third to represent the South.

Then, if, as we all hope, the present majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], should become the majority leader, representing as he does the Mountain States and the Far West, we would have in the leadership both geographical and ideological representation on a fair basis for all Members of the Senate who are members of the Democratic Party.

Fourth, we should reconstitute the policy and steering committees of our party, so that they will fairly represent both the major geographical areas and the differing ideological views of Senators.

Consideration should also be given to merging the two committees and restating their functions.

I believe their functions should be to advise the leadership on policy and on committee assignments. Careful thought should also be given to the election of those committees by the Democratic conference.

Fifth, a majority of the Democratic members of the committees, including, in some cases, the chairman, should have signified their support of the platform in the legislative area dealt with by their respective committees. This, in my judgment, would be an essential step to enable us to support the program of the next Democratic President.

Sixth, and finally, I believe we should provide for periodical and frequent meetings of the Democratic conference at times and places convenient to the members, perhaps at lunch, in order that the leadership may report to the other Democratic Members of the Senate the recommendations which they make with respect to policy. These recommendations should be subject to full and free debate by members of the conference.

Third. Using delaying tactics while the committee is in session in order to force adjournment under the rule as soon as the Senate meets.

While the Judiciary Committee is the most glaring example of these procedures, it certainly is not alone in this regard.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN SENATE RULES TO EXPEDITE COMMITTEE ACTION

I suggest the following changes in the Senate rules:

First. Committees may meet at any time upon the request of a majority of the members of the committee.

Second. Committees may meet whether or not the Senate is in session.

Third. Upon motion concurred in by a majority of the members of a committee at any time, the chairman shall put to a vote any bill or amendment thereto, or substitute therefor, which has been called up before the committee for action, either by the chairman or a majority of the members thereof.

These suggested changes are sufficiently self-explanatory so that further discussion seems unnecessary. Either the Senate will wish to expedite committee action or it will not. My plea is that Senators be given a prompt opportunity to determine what changes, if any, they desire to make in committee procedures.

THE SENATE RULES MAKE IT EASY TO DEFEAT A MEASURE OPPOSED BY A MAJORITY, BUT ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO PASS A MEASURE OPPOSED BY A DETERMINED MINORITY, NO MATTER HOW SMALL

If Senators have learned one thing from the 2d session of the 86th Congress, it is the efficacy of the motion to table, used with such devastating effect by the minority leader during discussion of the civil rights bill. Personally, I have no objection to the present custom with respect to a motion to table. I do not think it has been abused. My plea is for a countervailing rule to require a vote on the merits of a pending matter after reasonable debate—debate no longer than that permitted by the leadership, both majority and minority, before utilizing the motion to table to defeat a measure.

The Senate has thoroughly explored, during both the 85th and 86th Congresses, amendments to rule XXII dealing with limitation of debate. In my judgment, tinkering with this rule will get us nowhere.

I believe the proper course is to restore the custom of moving the previous question.

This motion is explained in section XXXIV of Jefferson's Manual, which appears on page 383 of the 1959 edition of the Senate Manual. It reads as follows:

"When any question is before the House, any Member may move a previous question whether that question [called the main question] shall now be put. If it pass in the affirmative, then the main question is to be put immediately, and no man may speak anything further to it, either to add or alter.

"The previous question being moved and seconded, the question from the chair shall be, Shall the main question be now put?"

Jefferson's Manual points out this kind of question was first introduced into parliamentary procedure as long ago as 1604. Certainly it cannot be considered as a practice alien to Anglo-Saxon parliamentary procedure. Actually, it was used a good many times during the early years of the Republic While it is true that originally the motion was utilized in connection with the subject of a delicate nature involving high personages, or to prevent the discussion of matters which might call forth observations which could have injurious consequences, I submit that this ancient device is the proper method of dealing with the interminable delays which prevent Senate action on matters of great import to our country and, indeed, to the entire free world.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN SENATE RULES TO EXPEDITE A VOTE ON MERITS OF A PROPOSITION

First. Any Senator may move the previous question whenever any pending matter has been before the Senate in session for a total of more than 15 hours. Once the previous question is moved, the Senate shall proceed to vote thereon without further debate. An affirmative vote on the previous question: "Shall the matter pending before the Senate be approved?" shall dispose of the pending matter.

Second. No Senator shall hold the floor of the Senate for more than 2 hours except by unanimous consent.

The first suggested change in the rules has been discussed above. It is submitted that no matter to come before the Senate for action requires more than 3 hours to explain fully. Where a Senator is interrupted by a colloquy, the Senate can be relied upon to grant unanimous consent for the Senator to continue beyond the 3-hour period unless the colloquy is obviously engaged in for the purpose of further delay.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 7, 1960]

COLUMN BY WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON.—The small, quiveringly earnest band of Democratic ultraliberals is being painted—and is earnestly painting itself—into a corner even before the new Kennedy administration has begun.

The coming new Senate party leadership would in itself have tended to isolate these passionately self-righteous fringe men. For with the moderate Senator MIKE MANSFIELD at the top of that leadership and the sensibly liberal Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as his No. 2 man, the ultraliberals will have lost at the outset their main previous guarantee to public attention.

While Vice-President-elect LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas was Senate leader, they could always present themselves as bravely suffering under the heavy yoke of southern leadership. But not all their genius for loud martyrdom can now make MANSFIELD of Montana out to be same 19th century plantation overseer.

And not even their talent for making it appear that no one else is really concerned with civil rights can overcome this fact: HUMPHREY was an effective advocate in this field before they were much heard of nationally.

But amid all these realities, what have the ultraliberals—as led by Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania—now done? They seem to have settled upon two policies for the new Congress—and the new administration—which would set a high mark in political ineffectuality of their group.

Senator DOUGLAS has indicated he wants the Senate to go at once into a disruptive fight over the filibuster rule. The first effect would be indefinitely to delay President-elect Kennedy's real legislative program. The second would be unnecessarily to divide the Democrats at the moment they were putting into office a new President—elected by a most narrow popular margin.

The third would be to reward the moderate southerners, who made Kennedy's election possible, with a smack in the face from a wet sack. Now, other people don't want to do this right off—not, certainly, until more important business has been done.

But these are, after all, only such unimportant Democrats as President-elect Kennedy, Vice-President-elect Johnson, and Senators Mansfield and Humphrey.

Senator CLARK, for his part, has proposed a kind of loyalty oath, a measure for forced conformity, upon Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, for not having supported the Democratic presidential ticket. Senator DOUGLAS—naturally—is reported also interested in such a procedure. The end purpose would be to oust BYRD from his chairmanship of the Senate Finance Committee.

This absurd witch hunt from the left-wing would lay down the amazing principle that Senate committees are not the instruments of the Senate itself but rather of some partisan group—or subgroup. It also assumes that DOUGLAS, CLARK, and company are the sole custodians of the true faith, the sole determiners of who is entitled to what in the Senate.

And it has one other small defect. If CLARK and DOUGLAS should push this effort as revenge—as BYRD has publicly invited them to do—they would be fortunate to find one-fourth of the Senate in their support.

Now, BYRD's political views are not the views of even one-third of the Senate. But at least four-fifths of the Senate admires the integrity of HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia. And at least four-fifths of the Senate has read the Constitution. It provides that each State shall select its own Senators. It does not—not yet at least—say that those Senators and their actions must have the approval of PAUL H. DOUGLAS or JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Have you ever wondered why it is that the ultraliberals are so depressingly inept when it comes to performance? For answers, see above.

DECEMBER 8, 1960.

To the EDITOR, THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER,
Inquirer Building,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: May I submit that both your editorial "The Move To Purge Senator BYRD," and William S. White's column of the previous day on the same subject miss the main point of my efforts to change the rules of the Senate and the organization of the Democratic Members of that body.

Nobody is trying to purge anybody.

Nobody is following the Kremlin-type doctrine which requires every party member to stay in line, regardless of his personal convictions.

Nobody, in Mr. White's intemperate words, is engaging in an absurd witch hunt from the leftwing which would lay down the amazing principle that Senate committees are not the instruments of the Senate itself but rather of some partisan group—or subgroup.

Quite the contrary is the case.

My position is quite simple:

1. Committee chairmen and all members of committees are nominated in their respective party caucuses and elected by the Senate itself.

2. Seniority is enshrined in neither the Constitution, nor the laws of the land nor any Senate rule. It is merely a custom which has frequently been ignored.

3. No one has a vested right in any committee position. He serves at the pleasure of his colleagues.

4. Those who aspire to be officers on the Democratic senatorial ship should be prepared to sail under the colors that fly on the Democratic masthead.

5. Those who oppose the Democratic platform and failed to support the Democratic candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency have little claim to positions of leadership in that party.

Winston Churchill and WAYNE MORSE, when confronted with similar situations, "crossed the aisle" and joined that party whose principles were more nearly in accord with their own.

6. I think it important that the Democratic leadership in the Senate be prepared to support the program of the Democratic President of the United States. To make this possible a good many changes in the present organization and rules of that body are important.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

DECEMBER 9, 1960.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HARRY: Thank you for your letter of December 2, with reference to the national Democratic ticket and platform and the relation thereto of Senators elected as Democrats.

Because our frequent disagreements about legislation and about politics have not impaired our friendship or the affection and respect I feel for you, I think it important that my position be made crystal clear to you. Accordingly, I am replying with equal candor to your frank statement of views.

We Americans often boast, and justifiably so, of the merits of the two-party system. But let us ask ourselves why parties exist, and what are the essential attributes of a party system. The party system is the means by which the people, in a national election, express their approval of one or another set of principles. These principles are put before the people in two ways: in the party platforms adopted by the parties at their conventions, and in the declarations of the candidates for President and Vice President.

As you know, the 1960 platform of the Democratic Party was adopted by delegates duly chosen by all 50 States. The candidates of our party for the Presidency and Vice Presidency declared repeatedly their unqualified support for the platform during the campaign for the offices to which they were elected.

When the people have made their choice between two sets of policies and principles, in a presidential election, they have a right to expect that legislation embodying those policies and principles will be considered promptly and carefully by the Congress. They have a right to expect that the congressional majorities who are members of the President's own party will so organize the Senate and the House that the President's measures can receive such consideration.

What is at issue here is not whether a Senator who disagrees with his party's platform and failed to support the candidacy of the President of his own party should vote against his own convictions or those of the people of his State. I have never suggested that, and I do not do so now.

What is at issue is the urgent need to make the Senate of the United States more responsive to the will of the American people as reflected by the views of the representatives elected to public office: "to improve congressional procedures," as the platform pledges, "so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House."

I suggest that these fundamental democratic ideals are not served by the perpetuation of unfair and archaic rules and practices (1) that permit legislation supported by majorities in both Houses of Congress to be killed in committees not representative of the Congress as a whole; (2) that permit committee chairmen to ignore the will of a majority of the members of their committees concerning the convening of committee meetings, organization of their committees, scheduling of committee business, and taking final action on important proposals after reasonable debate; (3) that permit committee chairmen and other committee members who have fought against floor amendments approved by the Senate to constitute a majority of the conferees appointed to represent the Senate in ironing out differences with the House.

Certainly democratic procedures are not served by the continuation of the rule requiring a two-thirds vote to close debate, which has not been invoked successfully since 1927. The Senate can no longer afford the luxury of unlimited debate if it is to attend to the legislative business of the country. I strongly support a change in the cloture rule to fulfill the platform pledge recited above by authorizing a majority of the Members of the Senate to vote on the substance of the pending business after it has been debated at reasonable length.

No general Senate rules revision has been undertaken since 1884, and the rules of the Senate of the 86th Congress presented a sorry patchwork, with many omissions and obsolete provisions. Plainly a rule of germaneness in debate, similar to the one in effect in 43 of the State senates, including the upper houses of Pennsylvania and Virginia, should be available when the Senate is dealing with urgent legislative matters. Can there be any justification for continuing the dictatorial power now given to a single Senator to prevent all 86 committees and subcommittees from meeting during Senate sessions, to require extended Journal readings and to prevent the Senate from attending to routine business?

Some Democratic Senators will, I presume, oppose such changes. So be it. There is room under the large Democratic senatorial tent for a wide variety of political views.

I agree with you that each Senator owes allegiance to the people of his State whom he has been elected to represent (I would add that he has a higher allegiance to the people of the United States). But in his capacity as a committee chairman, a Senator is chosen not by the people of any one State but by his colleagues in his party in the Senate. And in this capacity also, he owes an allegiance to those who have elected him. By custom, chairmanships are assigned on the basis of seniority. But this is a custom, not a provision of the Constitution, a statutory law, or even a standing rule of past Senates. It is a custom which the Senate has not always followed slavishly, either in recent years or in earlier times.

Your letter expresses eloquently and forcefully your philosophy in opposition to the Democratic platform and the stated position on a number of major platform issues of President-elect Kennedy. I respect the integrity of your views, though my views permit me to support enthusiastically the platform and the position of the President-elect in the areas you have cited. But I, also, respect the right of the majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate to decline, if they so choose, to nominate for a committee chairmanship a Senator who has issued an open declaration of war against important measures which will come before his committee with the backing of the Democratic Convention, the Democratic President, and the majority of Democratic Senators, including so vital a part of the President's program as his bill for medical benefits for retired persons under social security. This is not a question of purging, because a chairmanship is a privilege conferred by the party members in the Senate subject to the approval of the Senate as a whole, not a right conferred by a Senator's constituents.

I would not necessarily take this position if the Senate had rules which would limit the power of a committee chairman to impede or prevent consideration and action on measures endorsed by the majority party and its President. But you and I know full well that under the present rules and practices a chairman has powers over the course of legislation that can be employed to delay, or even to prevent, Senate consideration of important legislative proposals, and those powers have been frequently so employed.

As long as such powers are reposed in committee chairmen, without effective check, it seems to me that the whole body of Democratic Senators—who owe allegiance to their own constituencies and their own consciences, just as you do to yours—must as a matter of their own responsibility and integrity favor the appointment to chairmanships of Senators who reflect to a reasonable degree the views and philosophy of the party as a whole.

I propose no coercion against you or any other Senator. I merely ask that you sail under the colors which fly on the Democratic masthead if you wish to be an officer of the Democratic senatorial ship.

With warm personal regards and very good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senator From Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very courageous speech, which was very much needed. I think we can learn something from history in this matter.

During the period from 1900 to 1912 there was a great deal of criticism of the U.S. Senate on the ground that it did not represent the people and the sentiment of the country. It was called the "Millionaires Club." David Graham Phillips, the famous writer, wrote a book called, "The Shame of the Senate." Lincoln Steffens and others went into the processes by which Senators were selected. Cartoons were published. I think, on the whole, it was the public's belief that the membership of the Senate primarily represented big corporations and people of great wealth, and not the people of the Nation. This opinion was justified.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me an interjection, that was before the constitutional amendment provided for the direct election of Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

I believe it was in 1905 that Senator Robert M. La Follette entered the Senate from the State of Wisconsin and rose to make his maiden speech before the then Members of the Senate. The entire membership of the Senate rose and left the Chamber, and he spoke to empty seats. If one reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he can find that address. It was a very good one. Senator La Follette made the statement that many of those who were temporarily absent would be permanently absent in the course of the next few years.

The State of Wisconsin, along with the State of Oregon, was one of the earliest States to advocate the direct election of Senators. The people in the Nation, more and more, felt that they should have a more direct chance to choose Members of the Senate; and in what was known as the progressive movement, which overlapped both political parties, we adopted the constitutional amendment, to which the Senator has referred, which lodged the election of Senators in the voters of an entire State, rather than in the State legislatures. This created a much more representative Senate. In addition, the direct primary spread rapidly over the Nation. By the time of La Follette's second term the composition of the Senate was, indeed, very different from the group which walked out on him in the year 1905.

I think it is perfectly true that the composition of the Democratic Senators on this side of the aisle certainly does not in general represent the sentiment of the Democratic Party in the Nation as a whole, and that the control of the Democratic Party in the Senate does not represent the National Democratic Party. Indeed, on certain vital issues, as we have seen this afternoon, it is directly contrary to the principles of the national party.

I think the vote which we just took this afternoon, an hour ago, proves that statement. I have made a hasty tabulation. I think a majority of the Democratic Senators voted against the provision which was in our platform calling for a change of rule XXII at the beginning of the session, to provide for the ability of the majority to terminate debate.

Let me now say what I said yesterday. I respect a man who, finding that he cannot agree with the platform of his party, announces that fact.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I have just been handed a compilation as to how the vote went, which I think will interest the Senator. On the motion to commit, 18 Republicans voted "yea" and 16 "nay"; 32 Democrats vote "yea" and 30 "nay." The Senator is, therefore, correct in what he has said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I think it is a very manly position for one to say, "I cannot accept the platform of my party. I must oppose it." If he is then elected as a Member of the Senate, or if he carries over as a Member of the Senate, he should certainly vote his conviction. However, I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Pennsylvania that this does not give him a claim upon being placed in charge of legislation on the very subject matter about which he disagrees with the principles of his party. While he may claim the right of individual conscience, it does not carry with it any proprietary rights of being chairman of the committee which will deal with the subject matter. We now have in many cases the reverse of this principle which the Senator from Pennsylvania has been advocating, namely, the more a Senator opposes the national position of our party, the more he will be rewarded—provided he comes from the proper section of the country.

I go even further than this to say that if a Senator kept silent while he ran for office but allowed the impression to go out that he was committed to the platform, and then came on the floor of the Senate and voted against it, then he would not have been fully frank with the voters. And if he pledged support openly to the platform of the party, and then subsequently voted against it, I would expect that, if the electorate were alert, they would be put on notice. I do not wish to be sanctimonious in this matter, but I, myself, would find it very hard in good conscience to do that.

The truth of the matter is that the Democratic membership of the Senate represents very inadequately the interests of the great mass of Democratic voters in the country. While I would prefer to have this matter discussed at the Democratic caucuses, it is somewhat hard to do that. We have been advised by the leadership to take our differences to the floor. So I am simply conforming to the general advice given on the matter.

I think what has happened this afternoon and for years in the past raises a very serious question. I think the voters in future presidential elections will be quite justified in asking: "You have put this in your platform, and your candidates for President and Vice President declare their allegiance to this, but can you carry it out once you are elected?"

That question was raised many times with me during the last election. I declared myself to be in favor of civil rights legislation. I think my record has always been that I have supported such proposals. My Republican opponent said:

Yes; but can you deliver?

My reply was quite frank:

I do not know whether we can deliver. I know pledges have been made and I expect these pledges to be fulfilled. So far as I am concerned I can only govern myself, and I will vote for the measures in the Democratic platform to which I give my support. There was therefore only one way I could vote today.

The great value of a speech like that of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not in the immediate votes gained, but in the raising of a standard to which people in the Nation and in the Senate can repair.

Former Senator La Follette had no support, I think, in 1905, when he made his initial speech, but by 1913 one of the things which he was advocating—namely, the direct election of Senators—had become the law of the land.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois also remembers, does he not, the revolution—and it was in all respects a revolution—in Senate procedures which took place in 1913 under the leadership of Senator John Kern of Indiana?

At that time, while there were many more committees than there are now, yet some 28 ranking Democratic Members of committees were expelled from the positions to which they thought they had a right, under seniority provisions, as chairmen. Younger Senators, who had far less seniority, who supported the program of President Woodrow Wilson, the new freedom, were put in their places by action of the Democratic conference.

The result was that the major measures of the new freedom were enacted in the Congress which first met in 1913. This could never have been done had not that parliamentary revolution taken place.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely correct. What I fear has happened today, under the successful motion to refer the proposed amendments to rule XXII to the Committee on Rules and Administration, is that meaningful civil rights legislation has been killed not only for this session of Congress but also, in all probability, for the next 4 years as well and also, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated, that in all probability the program of the Democratic Party and of the President-elect will have extremely rough sledding and it will be very difficult to get it passed.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for raising these issues. It is never easy for us to rise on the floor of the Senate and to express our opinions in regard to these matters. We know the barrage of attacks by columnists to which we will be subjected, and that this is not the way to rise within the Senate hierarchy, but we simply wait for the ultimate decision of the American people. I have confidence that in 8 or 10 years we shall either have some changes in the composition of our party or we shall have some changes in the procedures of the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very courageous speech. I shall vote with him and against the committee selection in question.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Illinois for his kind comments, and I welcome his support.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Senate approved the list of Democratic committee appointments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution itself has not been taken up for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 29).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is this a motion to consider the resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is not a motion to approve the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, and this is the resolution with regard to the Democratic members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 29.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be put to a vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I shall vote "No," with respect to the membership of the Committee on Finance and of the Committee on the Judiciary. I would not wish to have my vote construed as being in opposition to membership on the other committees, but I do not think it is worthwhile to ask for a severance.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am in favor of the appointment of all of these members of committees mentioned in this resolution, and certainly I recognize the right of the Democratic Party to pick them. However, I wish to say a few words in connection with the Committee on Finance, and I am going to ask for a division of the question. I ask that we vote first on all of the appointments except those for the Committee on Finance, following which I shall confine my remarks to less than 5 minutes in support of the confirmation of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as chairman of that committee.

Mr. President, I move that we approve all of the nominations in the resolution (S. Res. 29) except those relating to the Committee on Finance, and that the Senate take action on those separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the provisions of the resolution (S. Res. 29) with the exception of lines 16 through 19, inclusive, on page 2, which relate to membership on the Committee on Finance.

Without objection——

Mr. CLARK. No, Mr. President, it is not without objection at all. I have already stated my objection. I wish to be recorded as objecting, for the reasons stated earlier.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer put the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. (Putting the question.)

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the parliamentary situation, we have now approved all of the appointments except those relating to the Committee on Finance. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the proposed membership of the Committee on Finance, and certainly I support the designation of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as chairman. I now move that the provision of Senate Resolution 29 with respect to the Finance Committee be agreed to.

During the history of our great country there have been many great Americans who have presided as chairmen of the Senate Committee on Finance. But never has the Senate Committee on Finance had as its chairman a greater, more able, or more stalwart American than the chairman, Senator HARRY F. BYRD. I am confident the overwhelming majority of the U.S. Senate join with me in their respect for and confidence in the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I know his confirmation as chairman of the committee will be sustained by an overwhelming majority of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. BUTLER. I withhold the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call for a division.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, before the vote is had, I associate myself with

the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. I believe that the Senator from Virginia is one of the most able men we have ever had as chairman of the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, and I wholeheartedly associate myself with the remarks which the Senator from Delaware has made in connection with that illustrious Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I think it takes a very particular, peculiar, and unusual brand of courage to do what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] did. He disagreed with major parts of his party's platform, and he so stated. He did not think it wise to support the presidential candidate, and he did not.

I think we are taking a very queer direction in this body when we must aline ourselves as Kennedy men or non-Kennedy men. I see no great mandate given by the American people to this body to rush recklessly and headlong into a spendthrift program, and I, as one American, am very happy to have the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as chairman of the Finance Committee.

Actually, if we come down to cases, neither presidential candidate received over 50 percent of the vote, and if we would add the odd votes to the total of Vice President NIXON, the mandate is very clear that the country wants a more conservative approach to its problems, not a reckless approach such as the wilderness men of the new frontier are approaching on their trail today. I am very happy to support the Senator from Virginia in this position.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware, and to take this opportunity to pay my own tribute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I think he probably has a better grasp of the fiscal matters with respect to the Government of the United States and the economy of our country than has any other Senator. He is a conscientious and courageous man of dignity and friendship for all. He has been a great force for stability in the United States in connection with our Government's responsibilities for its solvency and for the fiscal integrity of the United States. I certainly am glad to have this opportunity to make these remarks concerning this great Virginian and Senator of the United States. I hope that every Senator will vote for him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I have had the opportunity of serving with Senator BYRD of Virginia on the Finance Committee and I wholeheartedly subscribe to the statement that he is one of the best informed men in the U.S. Senate on the fiscal policies of our Government.

As chairman of that committee he has done more to preserve the solvency of our country than any other man in the U.S. Senate.

I am proud to join his many friends on both sides of the aisle in supporting his confirmation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are many on this side of the aisle who agree implicitly with everything that has been said by our friends on the other side of the aisle in praise of Senator BYRD. The present speaker took much the same position with respect to platform matters at Los Angeles that was taken later by the distinguished Senator from Virginia. The Senator from Florida has already expressed his views in committee, and he understands that all members of the majority party in the Democratic Steering Committee followed the same course adopted by the committee in its report, other than our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, who certainly has the right to take the position which he has taken. I respect his right to take his position. It is all right. I want the equal right to take such an opposing position myself when I vary from the opinion of any or every other Senator. We stand for that principle in the Senate. For a while this afternoon, until the vote, it looked as if we might not.

I believe there is no use of our having a yea and nay vote now, because I do not believe there is any one in the Senate—certainly there are not very many—who may wish to criticize in any way the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, who is one of the greatest living Americans, and for whom we have the greatest respect, and deep affection. I hope there will be no insistence upon a yea and nay vote, because I know some Senators have already gone home. I suggest that we have a division and terminate the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I understand a division vote has been requested.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that anyone should try to change the seniority rule of the Senate in order to dislodge from committee chairmanship certain Senators whom they do not like or whom they wish to remove so that they can pass legislation they desire. The Senator from Virginia is one of the greatest patriots this country has ever produced. He is sound fiscally; he is sound from almost every other standpoint. It would be a tragedy, and nothing less than a tragedy, if he were removed as Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate. This country owes $292 billion, which is more than is owed by all the countries in the world put together.

We would owe more than that sum if it were not for Senator HARRY BYRD. As an American, as a Member of the Senate, I am proud of him. I am proud of what he has stood for, and I would hate to see what would have happened to this country if he had not been chairman of that Finance Committee. I have little patience with those who are willing to change the seniority rule in order to try to ram down the throats of the Senate programs that they could not obtain otherwise. I have little patience with people who would try to change the chairmen of committees in order to try to ram down the throats of Senators programs which the Senate may not wish.

I was hoping there would be a yea-and-nay vote on this question, but it appears there will not be one. However, as one Senator I wish to be on record as supporting the designation of HARRY BYRD as chairman of the Finance Committee 100 percent.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I believe that the question which has been raised in debate here is a serious question, and I wish to submit some very brief views on it. Section 3 of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Senate shall be composed of two Senators from each State. Article VI of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Senators shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution.

I respectfully submit that those provisions of the Constitution clearly contemplate that any man who is elected a Senator shall exercise his God-given intelligence in acting as a Senator, and they clearly bind him by his oath of office to vote for what he thinks is in the welfare of his Nation.

I would like to say that I am a Democrat. I have supported all Democratic candidates for office in the area where I vote since I became 21 years of age. There are a great many Democrats who do not agree with provisions of the Democratic platform. I am satisfied that there are many Republicans who do not agree with the provisions of the Republican platform.

I am not going to brag too much about either platform. This is so because when I think of the platform adopted at Los Angeles and the platform adopted at Chicago, I am reminded of a story which Judge Walter Siler, of Chatham County, N.C., used to tell about an old couple from Chatham County who went down to Fayetteville, their shopping center, to do their fall shopping.

In those old days, people traveled by covered wagon. They took one day to drive down from Chatham to Fayetteville; they spent the next day shopping; and on the third day they returned home. They were accustomed to camp out in the open on the hill that overlooks Fayetteville. The old couple, John and Mary, had gone down to Fayetteville to do their autumn shopping. They had completed their shopping, and they had gone back up to the campsite and were waiting for the fire that they had kindled to burn high enough to cook their supper. While they were waiting, Mary checked over some of the bills that she had paid for the articles she had purchased. She said to her husband, "John, you know, some of those merchants down there in Fayetteville are crooked. They have charged us for a lot of stuff we didn't get. Just look here."

She picked up one of the bills and read: "So many yards of calico, so much; ditto, so much; so many yards of gingham, so much; ditto, so much."

She said, "I never bought any ditto. They charged me for something that I

didn't get. You get on one of the horses and ride down there and find out about this."

So John got on a horse and rode down to Fayetteville. After a time, Mary saw him coming back. She hollered to John and said, "What did you find out?"

He said, "Mary, I found out that I'm a damned fool and that you are ditto." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have read both platforms. I sat on one of the committees that supposedly drafted one of them, although I must confess that I did not participate very much in that operation. I think, frankly, that anyone who tries to test anyone's fidelity to party by either one of those platforms is going to suffer a case of intellectual schizophrenia.

Most platforms are like the speech Herbert Hoover made at Elizabethton, Tenn., in 1928. At that time Al Smith was running as the candidate of the Democratic Party. I supported him. He advocated repeal of the 18th amendment to the Constitution. The Republican candidate, Herbert Hoover, was strangely silent on that subject. Finally he scheduled a speech at Elizabethton, Tenn., and it was announced in advance, with great fanfare, that he was going to make clear his position on the 18th amendment and prohibition in that speech.

The whole country waited with bated breath for that speech. The only thing Mr. Hoover said on that subject in that speech was this: "Prohibition is a noble experiment." Those who opposed prohibition said, "Mr. Hoover is against prohibition, because he said it was an experiment. An experiment, after all," they said, "is something that is tried and fails. Therefore Mr. Hoover is against prohibition."

Other people, who supported prohibition, said, "Mr. Hoover said prohibition is noble. Mr. Hoover is a noble man. Since he said prohibition is noble, he is in favor of prohibition."

There are a great many things in both platforms which were adopted by the major parties this year that are about as explicit on the subjects they purport to deal with as Mr. Hoover's speech at Elizabethton, Tenn., in 1928, with reference to prohibition.

For example, in the Democratic Party platform we have many promises to give financial assistance to practically everyone in the United States, and virtually everyone scattered all over the face of the earth. The Republicans have the same kind of promises in their platform.

Both platforms promise that we are going to balance the budget.

Well, Mr. President, I do not think that either party can perform on those two sets of promises.

Let us say that a certain Senator serves as chairman of a committee. If a bill is introduced in the Senate to give money to people scattered all over the face of the earth because the platform promises it in the guise of foreign aid, the one who introduces the bill will say that that bill is to carry out a platform pledge and that the chairman of the committee must vacate his post if he does not favor it. The chairman says, "I will oppose the bill. Our platform says we are going to balance the budget. When I oppose that bill I am carrying out our party platform pledge to balance the budget." This shows how absurd and unworkable this proposition is.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal in this Chamber about second-class citizenship. We are told by the proponents of this proposal that if a Senator, in the honest exercise of the judgment the Good Lord gave him, comes to the conclusion that his duty to his country requires him to reject a provision of the party platform, he should be made a second-class Senator and denied the right to hold or aspire to the chairmanship of the committee. He is to be reduced to this status not because he has failed to keep his oath to support the Constitution, or because he has failed to do his duty to his country, but because he has not accepted as valid some gobbledygook put into a party platform by people who are not authorized by the Constitution to control either the conscience or judgment of Senators.

I am a Democrat. I believe that one of the finest things ever said was said by the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, when he said:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Mr. President, we cannot reconcile with that statement of Thomas Jefferson any proposal which says that a Senator shall be penalized for exercising in an honest manner the judgment which the Lord gave him merely because his conclusion may differ from the gobbledygook in a party platform. In my judgment, the proposal is clearly an effort to exert tyranny over the minds of Senators under the specious pretext that they owe a mental subservience to the platform of their party which transcends their duty to their country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the steering committee, in its wisdom, has acted on this and all other matters which came before it. By overwhelming vote, with one dissent, the selections for chairmen of all committees, including the Finance Committee, and the addition of new members for all committees, including the Committee on Finance, were approved.

In line with the request made by both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Maryland, and other Senators in the Chamber, I move the vote now be taken on the action taken by the Democratic steering committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe that the minority fully concedes that the selection of committee members on the majority side lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of the majority. We freely concede and recognize also that the selection of committee chairmen is the function and prerogative of the majority.

But we do believe that there is a minority interest in this whole matter quite aside from the so-called party attribute or aspect of the problem before us, because involved is the integrity of the seniority rule. If there were nothing else involved, that would be involved in itself.

Certainly if at some future time—and hopefully the time will not be too remote—we become the majority party, the same problem of the integrity of the seniority rule would raise its head again and would have to be resolved.

So we do have an interest in the subject.

Then we have still another interest. That is the esteem and the affection we entertain for the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It has been my pleasure to know him for a long time. We know him to be impeccably honest, but we know more than that. In a rather feverish age of shifting opinion, he has the courage to assert his convictions against the whole world. He has done so fearlessly, freely, and courageously, even though it earned for him, on occasion, the opprobrium and the stigma of some of his own party members.

So to the extent that I can convey this sentiment on behalf of the minority, I say to him today, from the floor of the Senate, that our affection for him is undiminished. Our confidence and sense of trust in him is intact. We admire him for the sterling citizen that he is and for the great contribution he has made to the well-being of the country.

I often think of a sentiment I once echoed on the floor of the House years ago, when we had the debate and, finally, the vote on the so-called Townsend bill. It was rather interesting to me to see how some otherwise resolute persons had suddenly caved in on that proposition. I remember when we finally resolved the question, I was given 10 minutes, and the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK was given 10 minutes, to close the debate. The galleries were filled.

Perhaps I should not have said it, because it struck deeply, and it hurt; but I said then: "Cowards die many times before they are dead. The valiant never taste of death but once."

HARRY BYRD, in my book and in our book, is a valiant public official. Because of him, and others like him, the Republic is kept on the beam. It is because of his valor, his sacrifices, and his contributions that today, in a disordered world, where organized, free government is in jeopardy on every continent on the globe, we still have free government and a free Republic on this continent.

So, my distinguished friend from Virginia, we salute you because we love you. We know how fearlessly, on highly controversial matters, where there is clamor, pressure, and political appeal, and where ofttimes the easy course is to yield, you, without fear or favor, and without any concern for your political future, have spoken your piece. Well can we understand the sense of endearment that the people of the great Commonwealth of Virginia have for you.

I salute you.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained in my office, by appointment, when the question of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] being retained as chairman of the Finance Committee was considered. I ask unanimous consent

that the few remarks I am about to make may appear in the RECORD before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Member of the Senate I have always found the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to be cooperative in giving opportunity for hearings and in discussing finance problems. He has a broad understanding of the problems involved in the Nation's finances and taxation. He is frank, and he makes perfectly frank to one, when one presents a question, how he considers the problem presented and how that problem should be met.

He has had the respect of members of his committee. I had the opportunity to serve on that committee for a brief time.

The Senator from Virginia has had a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. I know of no man who is held in more respect by his fellow Members than the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

In addition, he is much respected as a leader of good government in the Commonwealth of Virginia for many, many years; and in Virginia and throughout the country he is respected for the steadiness and standfastness of his views of problems, no matter how difficult or how political they may be from his point of view as a Member of the U.S. Senate and as a leader of his party in Virginia.

So I certainly want to add my brief words to those which have been spoken today in favor of retaining the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that there was just one vote against the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to Senate resolution 29 as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That members of the majority on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Mr. Kerr (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Holland.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Mr. Ellender (chairman), Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Hart, Mr. McCarthy, and Mrs. Neuberger.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Hayden (chairman), Mr. Russell, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Humphrey.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Russell (chairman), Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Mr. Robertson (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Mr. Bible (chairman), Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Smith of Massachusetts.

Committee on Finance: Mr. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Fulbright.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Mr. Fulbright (chairman), Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Dodd.

Committee on Government Operations: Mr. McClellan (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Muskie.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Mr. Anderson (chairman), Mr. Jackson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Hickey.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Mr. Magnuson (chairman), Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McGee.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Eastland (chairman), Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Blakley.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Mr. Hill (chairman), Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pell.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Mr. Johnston (chairman), Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Randolph.

Committee on Public Works: Mr. Chavez (chairman), Mr. Kerr, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Hawaii, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Metcalf.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Mr. Mansfield (chairman), Mr. Hayden, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Hickey, and Mr. Pell.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have all the recommendations of the Democratic steering committee now been accepted by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution to appoint the chairmen and Democratic members of the standing committees has been agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following be the chairman and majority members of the Select Committee on Small Business: Senator John Sparkman, of Alabama, chairman; Senator Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Senator George A. Smathers, of Florida; Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Senator Alan Bible, of Nevada; Senator Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia; Senator Clair Engle, of California; Senator E. L. Bartlett, of Alaska; Senator Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey; Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was considered and agreed to.

FOOD FOR THE STARVING

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last night in an important documented telecast, the Huntley-Brinkley team of NBC called America's attention most graphically to the tragedy that stalks in the wake of the warring factions in the Congo.

Pictures of children dying of starvation, faces of hope and expectancy in the midst of misery, were translated by the television more clearly than a common language could possibly express.

The plain bare facts, outlined by Chet Huntley, are that 200 of these children along with some adults, innocent victims of the Congo political strife, will die each day. This information comes direct from United Nationals officials who are heroically trying to make the pitifully small food shipments now on hand do their maximum work in avoiding deaths.

America historically has been able to pick up the cries of the innocent victims the world over when disaster strikes and thousands are threatened with starvation. Due to the warfare in Southern Kasai Province, the fate of some 300,000 Baluba natives rests with an early and effective effort to meet these challenges.

The scarce supply now, according to this prize-winning broadcasting team, permits, from the dwindling supplies of available food, a diet of 800 calories a day, mostly of American and Scandinavian food.

It is heartening to realize that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is organizing the supply of foodstuffs from its member nations, but it is not yet working. Each delay means that some 200 or more, usually the children and the very old, will perish as this multi-national organization gears to do the task. According to present information, the real needs to insure against widespread starvation may not be met for more than 2 months.

It seems to me that here is a problem where the United States, with its larders bulging with surplus foods, with military storehouses having readily available in our European bases vast quantities of emergency rations packaged for all kinds of climates, and with other foods in cans and weatherproof containers, could use its bounty in behalf of suffering people.

Certainly we do not need to wait 2 months with the casualties from starvation increasing daily to be able to do something. We know how to move and what to send. The great International Red Cross, cooperating with the World Health Organization, stands ready to distribute what little food is now available.

While we spend millions each month on aiding the U.N. security forces in an effort to keep the peace in this troubled and tortured section of the world, we

could spend a few million more to get the food available from present military stores moved to the emerging continent of Africa to show again America's deep concern for all manner of peoples of the world.

Airlift is available now on a few hours notice to put large quantities of food into this area on an emergency basis for the relief of the starving. I feel that if we but start the flow through airlift with our lightweight, concentrated military emergency rations, and through use of our aircraft, the rest of the world—particularly the nations of Western Europe—would accept our leadership in moving now—not 2 months from now—to show concern in a humanitarian way for those who may otherwise perish before the supply of larger quantities of foodstuffs can be delivered by conventional transport methods.

Regardless of the changeover of control of the administration, these starving people cannot wait. Action within the next 36 hours is possible if the order is given by the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Emergency funds for such humane use are now available for this purpose, without need for new legislative authority. But our country can set an example among the nations in our concern for all manner of peoples the world over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has shown his understanding of the needs of peoples throughout the world. This is just another indication of the humanitarian aspect of his character. I certainly think that again—as in the case of the Development Loan Fund and the Development Bank—he has come forward with a worthy suggestion; and I hope that what he has said here on the floor will be considered most seriously downtown.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the able majority leader for his kind words.

TWO CLERGYMEN ELECTED TO ALASKA LEGISLATURE BY WRITE-INS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, firsts are always interesting, and very frequently are significant. One that is both interesting and significant is the recent election of Rev. Segundo Llorente, a Catholic priest, to the House of Representatives of Alaska.

I got to know Father Llorente over a decade and a half ago, when, as Governor of Alaska, I was visiting, along the Bering Sea coast, some of the remoter and more inaccessible communities of that vast area.

I believe it to be a fact, and it is confirmed at least by an article about Father Llorente, in the current issue of Time magazine, that he is the first Roman Catholic priest ever elected to legislative office in any State of the Union.

Father Llorente is a scholar. Within a few years after arriving in Alaska, he wrote a most excellent book entitled "In the Land of Eternal Ice." It is in Spanish, and it merits translation.

One of the striking facts about his election was that he was a write-in candidate. By an interesting coincidence, another clergyman was likewise elected to the same House of Representatives by a write-in campaign. He is the Reverend Kenneth Garrison, of Fort Yukon. He is a Protestant clergyman, a lay minister in the Church of God.

By a further coincidence, these two clergymen represent sparsely settled areas, including the two extremities of the mighty Yukon River. The 20th District, to be represented by the Reverend Garrison, includes the northeastern corner of Alaska, and extends southward beyond where the Yukon River enters the State from Yukon Territory, Canada. The 24th District, which will be represented by the Reverend Llorente, includes the Yukon delta, where the river's various mouths debouch into the Bering Sea. The population of Rev. Garrison's district is predominantly Athapascan Indian; that of Father Llorente's, Eskimo.

I ask unanimous consent that the article about Father Llorente, entitled "Maverick Among the Eskimos," from the current issue of Time magazine, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAVERICK AMONG ESKIMOS

All along the lower Yukon, Eskimos in sealskin mukluks last week mushed their snarling dog teams to a place called Alakanuk—which means, in Eskimo, "It's a mistake."[1] They came to tell their political problems to a priest, for the Rev. Segundo Llorente, S.J., has just been elected to Alaska's State legislature, the first Roman Catholic priest to hold elected legislative office in a U.S. State.[2]

Almost as short (5 feet 7½ inches), at least as well padded (187 pounds), and even more cheerful than most of the Eskimos he serves, Jesuit Llorente, 51, is a maverick candidate—a write-in whose bishop almost forced him to resign. He is also a maverick priest. For 14 years, he has served as an official marriage counselor—first appointed by the territorial court, now by the new State's supreme court. As State official he cannot refuse to marry anyone legally free to marry. And however invalid they may be in the eyes of his church, he has performed ceremonies (though not Catholic ones) for both Protestant and divorced couples.

LA PALOMA ON THE YUKON

Spanish-born Father Llorente decided to be a priest when he was 7, joined the Jesuits at 16. "I wanted to be a missionary," he says. "I just put an atlas in front of me and I spotted Alaska. A kid feels very holy. I thought, 'Christ died for me on the cross, so I'll die for Him in the snow.'" (Segundo's brother Armando, also a Jesuit missionary, is serving in the sun as a student adviser in Castro's Havana University.)

Llorente came to the United States in 1930. He took his 3 years of theology at St. Mary's College in Kansas, and was ordained a priest in 1934. A year later he was in Alaska. "I heard him when he first came up the Yukon on a boat in the summer of 1935," says Eskimo trader, John Elachik. "He was singing La Paloma so loud we could hear him way up the river. We thought he was drunk."

The Eskimos soon learned that while Father Llorente never drank more than an occasional beer, he was one of the most exciting things that ever hit the tundra. He in turn made the Eskimos sound five times as colorful as they are, in stories he wrote for a Jesuit monthly in Spain, whose publisher began collecting his pieces and printing them in paperback books (there are now nine, all brisk sellers). Father Llorente also writes, in English, for the Fairbanks News-Miner, whose managing editor rates him "the best stringer we've got."

SNEEZE IN THE DARK

His daily life provides plenty of material—like the story about the time his dogsled plunged through a hole in the Yukon ice. "It was bottomless," he recalls as he waves his elbows to show how he tried again and again to crawl out on the ice, only to have another piece break off and dunk him. "We broke through 73 feet that way. Twice I gave up. But life is sweet."

Jesuit Llorente has served in various Alaskan missions, including 3 years north of the Arctic Circle. But his most arduous work began in 1950 when he was assigned to Alakanuk, on a Yukon delta island. Here he found 3,000 Eskimos and fewer than 100 whites—a parish of 4,000 square miles of tundra, which freezes solid in the winter's 17-hour, 35-below-zero nights.

He built a wooden church with his own hands, moved into a shed behind it. Father Llorente found himself coping with many a problem he had not learned about in his Jesuit schooling—the extra clerical work, for example, caused by the Eskimos' practice of changing their names whenever a member of the family dies, so that the returning spirit would not know whom to haunt. He soon laid aside his clericals (though he uses vestments at Mass). "I don't need identifying clothes," he explains. "They know me if they hear me sneeze in the dark."

NECESSARY EVIL

Last September, Father Llorente heard that the Eskimos of Alaska's 24th district were planning to write in his name as Democratic candidate for the State legislature. Promptly he asked his bishop, the Most Rev. Francis D. Gleeson, S.J., who told him it was all right to take the job provided that he did nothing to get himself elected. The final count: 210 for Father Llorente, 93 and 91 for his two opponents. At this point, Bishop Gleeson began to have second thoughts—especially in a year when Protestant-Catholic tensions had become an election issue. He asked Representative-elect Llorente to resign, and the priest dutifully sent his bishop a note of resignation addressed to Alaska's Governor William Egan, together with a letter explaining why it should not be forwarded ("If I don't go, I failed the voters").

Last week the smiling Eskimos of the 24th district heard good news over the short wave: Bishop Gleeson had changed his mind; Father Llorente could serve. Explained the bishop: "In this particular district, for a priest to act as a legislator can be of real benefit to the people, but in general I would call it something along the lines of a necessary evil."

---

[1] Because in gold rush days, stern-wheelers bucking the summer current traditionally mistook this unpromising spot for a trading post 6 miles upriver.

[2] Closest to setting a precedent was Father Gabriel Richard, one of the founders of the University of Michigan, who was elected a territorial delegate to the U.S. Congress in 1823 before Michigan became a State in 1837.

Said Llorente: "It's a great testimony to the strength of American culture when a Spaniard who is a Catholic priest is elected to the legislature by Eskimos."

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY FUELS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the coming of the space age has brought new emphasis on the old word "energy." Energy launches rockets and missiles into space.

We read of rocket fuels that generate this energy. They are solid or they are liquid and they are superior.

Many people who will hear or read these words will instantly think of energy in terms of words that have outer space significance, rather than down-to-earth words such as "coal" or "oil" or "natural gas." Instead, they will think of words that are directing public attention up and away from the old reliables.

Yet, Mr. President, "coal," "oil," and "gas" are the plain, simple words that are truly symbolic of the energy that powers our modern civilization.

I am in favor of progress, but sometimes I believe we are so caught up with the glamor and tinsel of life that we lose sight of the basic things that make our civilization tick.

So I believe firmly that it is good for us to pause in our mental orbiting around things, and to study the fundamentals of our life's essentials.

I am, therefore, asking this body to stay earthbound with me in the less rarefied atmosphere of our daily existence, and perhaps rediscover a few facts about life on this planet. One such fact is that right here in our own backyard we still have available a vast and ancient storehouse of energy that has been only partially tapped, and about which we still have much to learn. I am referring to coal, our most abundant energy source—a fuel that supplies nearly one-quarter of the energy used in the United States.

Without it we might not have had the industry with which to build the rockets and the missiles that we launch into space.

About a dozen years ago the railroads and domestic consumers were two of the largest coal consumers. Of the two, the larger market was the railroads, which used about 100 million tons a year. Home consumption was not far behind.

Several things then happened:

The diesel locomotive revolutionized railroad motive power, so that in 1959 the railroads consumed less than 3 million tons of coal.

The home-heating market dwindled rapidly, although millions of homeowners still heat with coal.

The expansion of natural gas pipelines and the growth of the fuel-oil industry was the basis for conversion from coal to gas or oil for home heating.

Natural gas has also gone into the business world and the industrial market, so that today one-half of the gas production goes into this market.

Residual oil imported by tankers to the industrial markets of the east coast has also entered the competitive energy field.

All these factors have operated without a national fuels policy to give guidance to these industries.

The resolution establishing a joint congressional committee to study the fuels of our Nation, that I am supporting, has to do with this important study; and after ascertaining the facts, this committee will report its facts, findings, and recommendations to the appropriate committees of Congress, in order that they will submit a national fuels policy to the Nation.

Industry is expanding along with our population, in order to satisfy the growing demand for more goods and services.

This expansion calls for more and more power, and the fuels of the Nation will be called upon to produce this power.

The booms and recessions of the business cycle will always substantially affect the course of progress, and the fuels industries recognize that in the energy demands there will be a stabilizing influence that will keep fuel production on an even keel in the future.

It is true that the fuels of our Nation may not be as glamorous as some of the newer and more exotic fuels being used in the space age. But to the American with his feet on the ground, the fuels of this Nation are still the key factor in the Nation's economy.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION OF PROPOSAL TO CHANGE RULE XXII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 498 of the daily RECORD for yesterday, January 10, in the first column, the last paragraph, fourth line from the bottom, before the word "majority," the word "possible" should be inserted; and the last word in that paragraph, "retained," should be "examined," instead.

So the RECORD should read, and I quote the last sentence in that paragraph as it should be:

If the opinion is examined closely, as Senators who are also lawyers should have done by this time, perhaps they will come to an understanding that the advisory opinion of the Vice President refers to a possible majority of 26, or 1 more than the majority of a quorum, and I think that view ought to be examined.

I ask that the permanent RECORD be accordingly changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point, or is he through?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am through on this point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to take this opportunity, since the Senator has brought up the question of rule XXII and the advisory opinion, to ask this question: Is it not his opinion that in this matter, it having been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, when the committee brings forth a report, and it is debated on the floor of the Senate, any amendments to the committee's report will be in order?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that the Humphrey-Kuchel amendment which was offered in the Senate and discussed in the past few days can again be offered and again be debated, if that is desired?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask this further question. Is it the understanding of the majority leader that in any question of the possibility of the Senate's considering this matter before any rules are adopted as continuing rules of the Senate, the problem as to whether or not a majority or two-thirds can adopt those rules might come up on a motion for the previous question, and there is certainly a strong difference of opinion on the previous question, as to whether it takes a two-thirds vote under Robert's Rules of Order, or possibly a majority vote under Jefferson's Manual, to adopt the previous question and close debate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am unable to answer the Senator's question in that respect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding, as one individual Senator, that would be a debatable question, as to whether it takes a two-thirds vote or a majority vote to adopt the previous question, assuming that the Senate would be willing to adopt the previous question, which has not been adopted, as I understand, since 1917, and was adopted only 4 times before that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four times before 1806.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, 1806.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts is entitled to his opinion, but I think the opinions of other Senators may be at variance with the expression he has just expounded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure that is true, but the expression I have expounded, as one Senator, comes from a study of the rules and the advisability of proceeding at all without referring this matter to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have nothing to say. The Senator has stated his opinion, and I would prefer to let the matter rest there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his consideration.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention to adjourn this evening until Friday. It is not anticipated that much, if anything, in the way of business will be transacted on Friday. Then it is hoped that, at the conclusion of business on Friday, we shall be able to adjourn over to Tuesday.

I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 13, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Communist Cold War Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last December I had the privilege of participating in the International Conference on Soviet Cold War Strategy at Paris.

There were some 450 or 500 delegates—almost 3 times as many as the sponsors had expected. Most of the delegates came from Europe, but the Conference also included a Philippine member of Parliament, two Vietnamese, two representatives of President Kasavubu, a representative of Prime Minister Tshombe of Katanga, and Prieto Laurens of Mexico.

The many distinguished Europeans who actively participated and gave the Conference their blessing included Paul Henri Spaak; Paul Von Zeeland; Maurice Schumann, head of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber; M. Michelet, Minister of Justice; former Premier Rene Pleven; Madame Patenotre, Vice President of the Chamber of Deputies; Emil Roche, President of the Economic Council; Arthur Conte and Maurice Faure, Members of the Chamber of Deputies and former Cabinet Ministers; Salvador de Madariaga; Richard Jaeger; Anthony Kershaw, M.P.; Lord Birdwood; also former Italian Cabinet Ministers; Randolfo Pacciardi, and Matteo Lombardo, President of the Italian Association of NATO.

There were approximately 12 British delegates, fairly tightly organized, and acting under the formal leadership of Lord Birdwood.

The American delegation showed a good deal of esprit de corps, although it had no formal organization. It included Senator Keating and myself; Eugene Lyons; Chris Emmet; Forrest Davis; David Martin; Ben Mandel; Mr. William Rusher, of National Review; Col. Ewell, of the Strausz-Huge group, and a few others.

I was asked to address the Conference on the question of Communist infiltration into free world governments and Communist manipulation of free world public opinion through propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent to have that address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE CONFERENCE ON SOVIET COLD WAR STRATEGY, PARIS, FRANCE, DECEMBER 1, 1960

I am honored to participate in this First International Conference on Communist Cold War Strategy.

It is high time that the free world embarked on a systematic and continuing study of Communist cold war strategy. Over the past 15 years, the whole of Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba have been lost to the Communists. On top of the sweeping victories it has scored in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, world communism is today bidding boldly and at an accelerated tempo for new areas of control. Everywhere the free world is on the defensive.

This record of failure and disaster is too persistent to have been the product of the laws of chance. We have lost and lost and lost because we have persistently failed to understand. I would go further and say that we have lost because we have refused to face up to the facts—and facts are the beginning of all understanding.

But we must understand, because time is running out for the free world. Another 15 years like the past 15 years and there may be no more free world to defend.

We have been losing the cold war partly because we have failed to understand its total character, partly because we have been amateurs fighting against professionals. The Soviets have been winning the cold war, first, because they have, from the beginning, accepted it as a total war, to be waged with all their resources and on every plane, and second, because they have, through their specialized training institutions, developed scores of thousands of practitioners in the art of total political warfare.

There is nothing in our previous history and nothing in our experience as freemen which might have prepared us to contend with the phenomenon of total war—a war waged by a thousand different means, a war in which the enemy conducts an integrated offensive on every plane of human activity—the economic, the political, the diplomatic, the psychological, the social, the cultural—a war conducted by stealth and subversion and Pavlovian techniques.

With the political warfare weapon, the Communist enemy has moved over and around the military defenses of the free world to secure beachheads deep in our rear areas.

This enemy has a coordinated long-range strategy for victory, in which he uses all methods and means against us.

Never has the situation been as perilous as it is today.

The West has lost its nuclear monopoly, and its ability to deter Soviet aggression has, in consequence, been seriously impaired. The Communists have become more aggressive, more arrogant, more contemptuous than ever. The symbol of this new attitude is Prime Minister Khrushchev pounding his shoe on the table at the United Nations. And this arrogance has been accompanied by a shift in tactics which makes the Communists, in my opinion, infinitely more dangerous than they have been heretofore.

Going back to Lenin's earliest directives, the Communists have always planned their activities so that one portion of them has been above ground, another portion under ground. But in recent years, the Kremlin has been placing an increasing emphasis on subterfuge and subterranean operations.

In the old days, Communist movements, while they conducted part of their operations underground, nevertheless used to identify themselves as Communist movements. The Chinese Communists never pretended that they were anything else but Communists—even though a lot of wishful thinkers in the Western World insisted that they were really agrarian reformers. Under the deposed Arbenz regime in Guatemala, and under the Castro regime in Cuba the international Communist movement succeeded in coming to power in countries that were strongly Catholic and basically anti-Communist. They did this by exploiting certain legitimate grievances and by encouraging the people to believe—yes, and encouraging the American State Department to believe—that they were not really Communists.

In the old days, the Communists would conduct most of their front operations in a manner that made them clearly discernible and identifiable. There was the League Against War and Fascism, there was the World Peace Congress, there was the Stockholm peace petition, and there were many other operations like these where Communist initiative and Communist control were apparent to all but the willfully blind. Today, instead of creating front organizations of their own, the Communists are operating increasingly through infiltration in organizations established under non-Communist auspices.

The Communists must be combated on two levels therefore: above ground and under ground—but increasingly the battle has become one against their subterranean forces.

The free world has had a limited success in fighting the Communists in the open—fighting them, that is when they are clearly identified as Communists. In my own country, the Communists have been forced out of control of a number of important trade unions. In France and Italy, operating against very great odds, the anti-Communist trade union organizations have made some modest headway. But even in the open phase of the struggle, we have not really done very well.

In the United States, key unions like the Harry Bridges' Longshoremen's Union, the United Electrical Workers Union, and the American Communications Union are still under Communist domination—despite all the efforts of independent trade unionists and of government.

In France and Italy, the Communist-dominated CGT and UGT still embrace by far the majority of the organized workers. Nor has any serious dent been made in these countries in the vast apparati of Communist-dominated cultural, social, fraternal, and benefit organizations which play so important a role in the Kremlin's manipulation of Western public opinion.

In England, known Communists either control or exercise a large measure of control over the powerful Mine Workers Union, the General Transport Workers Union, the Elctrical Workers Union. The dangerous degree to which the Communists had succeeded in infiltrating and taking control of British trade unions was dramatically revealed at the recent Labor Party conference where the Communists and pro-Communists pushed through a motion calling for unilateral disarmament.

In Japan, the Communists are also the single strongest force in the trade union movement. Through the Teachers Union, which they dominate completely, the Communists are teaching young Japanese children that the U.S.S.R. is their real homeland, and that the United States is an aggressive imperialistic power.

This subterranean attack on the free world, as it is being executed today, displays five major prongs.

There is the infiltration in the organs of government, through which the Kremlin obtains much of its intelligence and through which it frequently succeeds in inducing the governments of the free world to do precisely what the Communists would like them to do.

There is the infiltration in press and radio and television and entertainment, which the Communists use to confuse western public opinion, to exercise pressure on government policy, and to turn one Western country against another.

There is the infiltration in organizations established under non-Communist auspices—which the Communists then used as pressure groups in support of a nuclear test ban or some other Soviet foreign policy objective.

There is the street mob, organized around fraudulent nationalist and non-Communist slogans, which is becoming an increasingly important instrument of Soviet policy. The terrible power of this weapon was driven home to the whole world, Soviet and non-Soviet, when a Communist-organized mob prevented the President of the United States from visiting a friendly foreign country.

Finally there is the new type of crypto-Communist movement best typified by Castro—a movement which operates behind an innocent facade of nationalist and reform slogans. If such a movement could come to power 90 miles from the shores of America, in a country as unlikely for a Communist takeover as Cuba, then its possibilities are almost unlimited.

One cannot cover everything in one speech. My chief remarks tonight will be directed to the twin question of Communist manipulation of public opinion and Communist influence on government policy.

Communist propaganda, when it is clearly identified as Communist propaganda, the free world can cope with. The trouble is that 99 percent of the articles and publications and radio and TV programs that serve the Communist cause cannot be clearly identified as Communist propaganda.

In certain cases some doubts can be raised by proof that some of the principals involved have long records of affiliation with Communist-front organizations. But far more often than not those who are used to transmit the Communist propaganda line are not Communists or pro-Communists, but simply innocents.

The innocents include sentimentalists; wrongheaded, softheaded and muddleheaded intellectuals; and the so-called angry young men—the neurotic rebels against parental and governmental authority who always exaggerate tenfold the faults of their own country. But the innocents also include many decent, intelligent people—fundamentalist humanitarians whose very humanitarianisms makes it impossible for them to conceive of a regime that is utterly without morality or totally evil.

There are no innocents under communism—this peculiar invertebrate phenomenon exists only under democracy. And it is exceedingly difficult to cope with the innocents in freedom-loving societies. They cannot be prosecuted because they do not violate the law. They cannot be accused of conniving with the Communists because, except in rare cases, they do not consciously connive. And there is no way of muting them without violating the basic principles of our free society.

The innocents, in fact, are just about untouchable. If you criticize a Communist, the brickbats will come mostly from the fellow-traveling claque and fellow-traveling press. This one can ignore. If you criticize a fellow traveler, all the innocents will join the assault upon you. This can be serious. And if you dare to criticize an innocent for giving aid and comfort to the Communists, almost the entire press, from left to right, will charge that justice and decency have been affronted. This can permanently mar a man's public reputation.

Let me give you an illustration of how the Communist propaganda operation is sometimes unwittingly assisted by publishing houses that are certainly not Communist, but which are influenced by authors, editors, or personal contacts who harbor sympathies for the Soviet Union in toto, or else for some aspect of Communist policy or for communism in a specific geographic area.

As I left America, two books on Cuba were about to come off the press. One is a book by a former Communist, Nathaniel Weyl, an expert for several decades on Latin American affairs. It is a solid, carefully documented yet dramatic work that tells the story of Castro's rise to power and of the manner in which he was abetted by naive American sentimentalists, deluded liberals, and open philo-Communists. The other book, entitled "Listen, Yankee," was written by C. Wright Mills, a Columbia University sociologist with no particular expertness on Latin America, a charter member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. "Listen, Yankee," as you probably guessed from the title, is a scurrilously anti-American and pro-Castro diatribe. But it was printed by the highly reputable, even conservative, publishing house of McGraw-Hill, and the chances are that it will enjoy a circulation many times greater than the anti-Castro book.

"Listen, Yankee" was printed simultaneously in hard-cover and paperback edition. I am told that the initial printing will exceed 150,000. The advance advertising was on a scale generally reserved for works of the first magnitude—works like Churchill's memoirs. The December issue of Harper's magazine contains a lengthy reprint from "Listen Yankee" as its No. 1 item; and Harper's has advertised its December issue in the New York Times and other papers with full-page reproductions of the cover of "Listen, Yankee."

And so, despite the fact that the Castro regime has now been openly exposed as Communist, despite the fact that it has been denounced by the American Government and that the governments of all the other American states have turned against it, despite the open embraces between Khrushchev and Castro, despite the berserk anti-American propaganda conducted by Castro, despite all these things it is still possible in America to get a pro-Castro book printed by a highly reputable publishing house, advertised and distributed on the scale of a top bestseller, and favorably reviewed in some of the great pillars of the American press.

There is nothing new about this situation, of course. When the Chinese Communists were bidding for power, the only books on China that became bestsellers were the ones that portrayed the Reds as agrarian reformers. And when Castro was bidding for power, there was no dearth of reputable commentators and reputable newspapers to assure us that he was not a Communist, but an idealist.

Among the most prominent expounders of the myth that Castro was really a reformer was Herbert L. Matthews, former New York Times correspondent in Cuba. Castro, said Mr. Matthews in the early days, believes in—I quote—"liberty, democracy, social justice, the constitution, and free elections." He likened him to Abraham Lincoln. Many months after Castro came to power, Matthews said, and again I quote: "This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word, and there are no Communists in any positions of control." Mr. Earl Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, told the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that Mr. Matthews' articles in the New York Times "served to inflate Castro to world power and world recognition."

There are some who will say that all this is accidental. For my own part, I do not think it is an accident. There is pattern here, there is organization, and there is purpose—and despite all the innocence that certainly prevails in the foreground, in the background, if you delved deeply enough, I am certain that you would find the real organizers.

How does one cope with such a situation? I confess I do not know. This is one of the problems to which we must find an answer.

It is almost as difficult, but for other reasons, to deal with the problem of Communist infiltration in government. There are many people in my own country and, I am afraid, even more people in other countries, who will raise the cry of "McCarthyism" at the mention of Communist infiltration in government. Let us review a few pertinent facts.

Alger Hiss, one of the top officers of the State Department and the secretary of the founding conference of the United Nations, was identified as a Communist agent and was convicted of perjury for denying that he turned over state secrets to Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Soviet agent.

Harry Dexter White, who, as the energetic assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in effect ran the American Treasury, has also been proved, beyond any reasonable doubt, to have been a Communist agent.

Frank Coe, onetime assistant to White, was compelled to resign as head of the International Monetary Fund when he took the fifth amendment in reply to the question: "Are you a Communist agent?" Mr. Coe is now in Communist China.

Think of the implications of this: Communist agents have at different times directed the American Treasury, the International Monetary Fund, and one of the key offices in the U.S. State Department.

It would be foolish to believe that all the Communist infiltrees have been removed from the U.S. Government, that the problem of infiltration no longer exists. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that in our country and in every other country of the free world, the international Communist movement has greatly stepped up its infiltration of government offices. The Communists, moreover, do not infiltrate in a haphazard way. Their infiltration is planned and directed. Intelligence is the lesser part of their purpose; their major purpose is to mess up, to misdirect, Western foreign policy. If China happens to be the area of interest at a given moment, they will try to achieve positions of influence in government that enable them to influence its policy vis-a-vis China. If plans are made for a Castro-Communist takeover in Cuba, then it can be taken for granted that simultaneously the Communists will endeavor to direct intellectual adherents with backgrounds in Latin American affairs into various desk positions where they can exercise their talents.

All this can be taken as axiomatic. But the free world is asleep to this danger.

I have the greatest admiration for British law and the fairness and respect for law that pervades British society. Let me however draw the attention of my British friends to a few disturbing facts. Bruno Pontecorvo and Burgess and Maclean were able to defect safely to the Soviet Union. Alan Nunn May was apprehended and sentenced—but on the basis of information provided by Igor Gouzenko in Canada, Klaus Fuchs was also imprisoned—but here the FBI provided the lead. On their own, the British security forces have not apprehended a single major Communist agent. What reason can there be for this? I can think of no other reason than a general lack of awareness, at both public and governmental level, of the extent of the danger.

I do not say this in reproach. I believe that my own country is somewhat more alert. But even in my own country only a small part of the job has been done.

The question is sometimes asked: What difference can one Communist or several Communists in government make? I shall answer this with a few examples.

During World War II, for reasons which have never been properly explained, the

British Government abandoned the nationalist forces of General Mihailovich in Yugoslavia and threw its support behind the Communist army of Marshal Tito. Not a single one of the British or American officers attached to Mihailovich recommended that he be abandoned; on the contrary they all strongly recommended that we support him. How did it come about that the West abandoned Mihailovich and, in effect, installed communism in Yugoslavia?

It has recently become a matter of public record that one of the officers in charge of the Yugoslav and Near Eastern desks in British intelligence was a British Communist, who later became an important public functionary of the British Communist Party. Perhaps this explains the British switch to Tito.

In 1943, the U.S. Government decided to make $200 million in gold available to the Chinese Nationalist Government to be paid upon demand. The gold was urgently needed by Chiang to maintain the value of the Chinese currency, to pay his troops, and for other pressing obligations. But despite repeated requests from Chiang, 2 years later, in 1945, only $27 million had been paid over. Why?

The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has been engaged in the examination of the voluminous diaries left by former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. In these diaries, there is recorded a frank exchange between Harry Dexter White and Frank Coe, both now identified as Communist agents. In this exchange which took place on May 10, 1945, they make it clear that they have sabotaged the transfer of gold to the Chiang government with every artifice and excuse at their disposal.

In the privacy of his own office White admitted that the United States had absolutely no legal grounds for delaying shipments. He said—I quote: "We have been successful for over 2 years in keeping them down to 27 million."

Deploying their various infiltrations and their psychological warfare weapons with great skill, the Communists have frequently been able to manipulate Western public opinion and Western policy in the manner of Pavlov conditioning his dogs.

There has been a whole series of critical situations in which the Communists have succeeded in persuading the majority of the people in the non-Communist world to believe what the Kremlin wished them to believe, and in persuading Western governments to do what it wished them to do.

The Communists achieved one of their first major successes in the realm of psychological conditioning at the time of the 1944 Communist insurrection in Greece. If you look back through the American newspapers of that time, you will find that a great majority of our editors, our public officials and public opinion molders in general, attacked Prime Minister Churchill for his courageous decision to put down the Communist insurrection. They did so because, in one way or another, they were led to believe that Churchill was intervening against the heroic Greek resistance fighters, and not against a Communist insurrection which had already gone to the point of mass executions of anti-Communist citizens. Today, of course, everyone agrees that Prime Minister Churchill did the right thing. In fact, he did the only thing. But very few people stopped to consider how it was that the Communists were able completely to befuddle our mental processes and destroy our sense of balance.

They achieved a success of even greater magnitude when they succeeded in persuading so many people in the free world that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists but simple agrarian reformers.

We should have learned from China—but we did not. Ten years after the Communists seized power in China, we fell for precisely the same shell game in Cuba: Castro was not a Communist but a simple reformer. So said Herbert Mathews in the New York Times, and so said many people in our own State Department.

As the recent and perhaps most striking example of the psychological manipulation of public opinion and Government policy we have the West's calamitous retreats in the negotiations for a nuclear test ban—retreats clearly induced by the international hysteria which the Kremlin has so cleverly fostered and exploited.

First, we said that the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear testing could not be separated from that of general disarmament, because of the enormous Soviet advantage in conventional arms. We said, too, that there could be no disarmament without inspection.

Then, under the public clamor for a test ban, we agreed to a voluntary moratorium and to negotiations for a test ban in isolation from the problem of general disarmament.

We originally said that the moratorium would be a temporary 18-month arrangement, and that our decision at the end of that time would be dependent on the progress of the Geneva negotiations for a test ban. Having failed to make any serious dent in the Soviet opposition to adequate inspection, we have now extended the moratorium for another year.

Worse than this, in the Camp David announcement of last March 29 President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan accepted the principle of a voluntary moratorium on undetectable tests—that is on tests below the size of a Hiroshima-type bomb—if the Soviets are willing to accept inspection of tests of detectable magnitude. This, I submit, makes a mockery of the principle of inspection, on which the free world had previously based its entire approach to disarmament.

And while these concessions were being made by the West, the cries and lamentations echoed through the press and the meeting halls and the government corridors of our country, openly or implicitly urging still further concessions to the Soviet viewpoint in an effort to achieve a test ban agreement.

Most of those in the ranks of the test ban movements are unquestionably decent innocent people, who are properly horrified at the thought of nuclear war, and of the mutations that might conceivably—although no one is really certain—result from continued atmospheric testing.

It is a measure of Communist adroitness in psychological warfare that they are still able to use the specter of fallout from nuclear testing to stimulate the test ban hysteria—although it is clearly apparent to every sensible person that the nuclear powers, if they resume testing, will not and, indeed, need not, conduct any tests that contaminate the atmosphere. The tests will be underground or above atmospheric altitude.

How do we extricate ourselves from our defensive posture? How do we cope with Communist infiltration in government and the press, with the Communist manipulation of pressure groups, with Communist psychological warfare, with the fraudulent nationalist movements masterminded by communism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America?

Let me close my presentation with one concrete proposal. I have said we have been losing the cold war because we have been amateurs fighting against professionals. So long as this situation persists, we shall continue to lose the cold war. To help overcome this handicap, a group of U.S. Congressmen—and I am proud to be a member of this group—have proposed the creation of a Freedom Academy.

The function of the Freedom Academy would be, first, to develop systematic knowledge of all aspects of the Communist conspiracy; second, to develop a science of counteraction against Communist subversion that will see us through the perilous period ahead and ultimately pave the way for victory; and third, it would train Americans and nationals of other free countries in the science of total political warfare, as it must be waged by freemen.

With every day's news it becomes clearer that the old methods of defense against communism are not enough. The free world, and in particular, the great Western Powers, must master the new dimensions of conflict the Soviets are employing against them and they must go over to the offensive, using all of their strength and wisdom. We must have a total mobilization of our minds and wills and spirits. If we fail, let us have no illusions about the penalty—for ourselves and for our children.

The universal triumph of freedom, on the other hand, would open the way to the utmost heights for mankind as a whole.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Significant Aspects of Our Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a major task of the new Congress will be to consider and speedily adopt essential programs for bolstering the economy. This is particularly crucial in areas of unemployment or of substantial lag in business activity, resulting in economic slowdowns and loss of jobs.

However, this is not strictly a job for Uncle Sam. Rather, appropriate efforts must also be made by States and local communities. The task is to find the right formula for sharing the responsibility for stimulating the economy.

In tackling this problem, we also need to maintain a proper perspective. It is true that we have about 4 million unemployed. Naturally, we seek full job opportunities for all our people. Nevertheless, it is important that we not just look at the negative side of the picture. Consequently, we need to remember that while unemployment is deplorable and should be rectified as quickly as possible, our Nation also has almost 68 million employed, the highest number in our history.

Recently, I was privileged to comment on significant aspects of our economic problems, in an address over radio stations in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

With a new administration soon taking over the reins of government there is a great

deal of speculation on the upcoming proposals for policies and programs for stimulating the economy, as well as other aspects of our national life.

Naturally, we want to move ahead in all fields affecting the welfare and security of our people and country. However, it's also important that we keep our heads; that we adhere to sound economic principles and not recklessly adopt programs that would further devaluate the dollar and thus undermine the economy; that we do not unwittingly expand an already gargantuan Federal Government into areas where States and local communities can better serve the people; and, most important, that we remain strong economically, militarily, and spiritually to prevent the outspreading of communism and a third world war. This is still the No. 1 challenge.

NEEDED: MORE EFFECTIVE TRADE POLICY

The survival of freedom, in competition with communism—and the fulfillment of the economic needs of our people—requires an effective, well-coordinated economic policy for the future.

The tide of the East-West battle will rage on many fronts.

With an almost universal recognition—except for Red China—that nuclear war would mean global suicide, the coming years, I believe, will witness greater emphasis on economic contests between the Communists and free nations of the world.

The design of a more effective policy is absolutely necessary if we are to win that battle.

Today our country is faced with serious challenges to its economy: Globally, the Communists can be expected to compete—in cutthroat fashion—for more and more world markets; serious problems exist among Western Allies to resolve; the outflow of U.S. dollars is threatening our gold reserves; our agriculture-industrial production plants are looking increasingly to foreign markets for consumers; our domestic economy—in many areas—is being hard hit by the inflow of foreign-made goods; the economic slowdown—resulting in reduction of jobs—must be dealt with speedily and effectively.

Recognizing the significance of these, and related problems, the Nation, I believe, needs to develop a more effective trade policy for the future.

What does this mean?

First, we need a comprehensive study—and correlation of information—on the following: A global survey for potential markets for U.S.-produced products; analysis of world needs for new, or different, products that can be produced by our farms and factories—in Wisconsin and across the Nation; renewed efforts to resolve the economic problems that now prevent the flow of goods—many of which are in surplus—to potential consumers elsewhere in the world; the impact of the growing competition from the Communist bloc; survey of fundamental shipping problems, including trade routes; subsidization of shipping; development of adequate port and harbor cargo handling facilities; further tearing down tariff quotas and other barriers to U.S. products in international competition, and others.

Today, the American economy possesses the greatest agricultural-industrial production plant in the history of the world. Except for a few other highly industrialized nations, the rest of the world offers a tremendous market for our productive capacity. Because of the tragically low incomes and standards of living, however—as well as competition from other industrial nations—it has not been possible to utilize our potential to its fullest extent in supplying these markets.

If, however, proper steps are taken, I am confident that the resources, know-how, ingenuity, and great production capacity of the U.S. free enterprise system cannot only hold its own in international competition for the newly developing markets, but greatly strengthen our domestic economy through larger participation in world trade.

To help accomplish this objective, I recently proposed the establishment of a National Economic Council. The purpose would be to provide top-level planning of economic policies and programs. This would include better coordination of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to national economic development and the role of America in world economy.

In addition, the Council would evaluate conditions and long-range trends in the domestic and world economies, and make recommendations for national policy as well as provide guidance for planning within our free enterprise system.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Genesis 28: 16: *Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not.*

O Thou who art present everywhere, we rejoice that within the sanctuary of Thy love, there is a refuge and haven for all burdened hearts and baffled minds.

Grant that in the midst of life's crises and catastrophes we may hear Thy voice of gentle stillness and know that Thou art near.

Help us to begin each day with a valorous and virile faith which can never be eclipsed by moods of doubt and despair.

May we be lifted out of all gloomy and hopeless tempers of mind as we strive to build the temple of peace.

Touch us with the contagion of the confident and truthful spirit of our blessed Lord in whose name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 9, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

Once again it is my constitutional duty to assess the state of the Union.

On each such previous occasion during these past 8 years I have outlined a forward course designed to achieve our mutual objective—a better America in a world of peace. This time my function is different.

The American people, in free election, have selected new leadership which soon will be entrusted with the management of our Government. A new President shortly will lay before you his proposals to shape the future of our great land. To him, every citizen, whatever his political beliefs, prayerfully extends best wishes for good health and for wisdom and success in coping with the problems that confront our Nation.

For my part, I should like, first, to express to you of the Congress, my appreciation of your devotion to the common good and your friendship over these difficult years. I will carry with me pleasant memories of this association in endeavors profoundly significant to all our people.

We have been through a lengthy period in which the control over the executive and legislative branches of Government has been divided between our two great political parties. Differences, of course, we have had, particularly in domestic affairs. But in a united determination to keep this Nation strong and free and to utilize our vast resources for the advancement of all mankind, we have carried America to unprecedented heights.

For this cooperative achievement I thank the American people and those in the Congress of both parties who have supported programs in the interest of our country.

I should also like to give special thanks for the devoted service of my associates in the executive branch and the hundreds of thousands of career employees who have implemented our diverse Government programs.

My second purpose is to review briefly the record of these past 8 years in the hope that, out of the sum of these experiences, lessons will emerge that are useful to our Nation. Supporting this review are detailed reports from the several agencies and departments, all of which are now or will shortly be available to the Congress.

Throughout the world the years since 1953 have been a period of profound change. The human problems in the world grow more acute hour by hour; yet new gains in science and technology continually extend the promise of a better life. People yearn to be free, to govern themselves; yet a third of the people of the world have no freedom, do not govern themselves. The world recognizes the catastrophic nature of nuclear war; yet it sees the wondrous potential of nuclear peace.

During the period, the United States has forged ahead under a constructive foreign policy. The continuing goal is peace, liberty, and well-being—for oth-

ers as well as ourselves. The aspirations of all peoples are one—peace with justice in freedom. Peace can only be attained collectively as peoples everywhere unite in their determination that liberty and well-being come to all mankind.

Yet while we have worked to advance national aspirations for freedom, a divisive force has been at work to divert that aspiration into dangerous channels. The Communist movement throughout the world exploits the natural striving of all to be free and attempts to subjugate men rather than free them. These activities have caused and are continuing to cause grave troubles in the world.

Here at home these have been times for careful adjustment of our economy from the artificial impetus of a hot war to constructive growth in a precarious peace. While building a new economic vitality without inflation, we have also increased public expenditures to keep abreast of the needs of a growing population and its attendant new problems, as well as our added international responsibilities. We have worked toward these ends in a context of shared responsibility—conscious of the need for maximum scope to private effort and for State and local, as well as Federal, governmental action.

Success in designing and executing national purposes, domestically and abroad, can only come from a steadfast resolution that integrity in the operation of government and in our relations with each other be fully maintained. Only in this way could our spiritual goals be fully advanced.

FOREIGN POLICY

On January 20, 1953, when I took office, the United States was at war. Since the signing of the Korean armistice in 1953, Americans have lived in peace in highly troubled times.

During the 1956 Suez crisis, the U.S. Government strongly supported United Nations action—resulting in the ending of the hostilities in Egypt.

Again in 1958, peace was preserved in the Middle East despite new discord. Our Government responded to the request of the friendly Lebanese Government for military help, and promptly withdrew American forces as soon as the situation was stabilized.

In 1958 our support of the Republic of China during the all-out bombardment of Quemoy restrained the Communist Chinese from attempting to invade the offshore islands.

Although, unhappily, Communist penetration of Cuba is real and poses a serious threat, Communist dominated regimes have been deposed in Guatemala and Iran. The occupation of Austria has ended and the Trieste question has been settled.

Despite constant threats to its integrity, West Berlin has remained free.

Important advances have been made in building mutual security arrangements—which lie at the heart of our hopes for future peace and security in the world. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization has been established; the NATO alliance has been militarily strengthened; the Organization of American States has been further developed as an instrument of inter-American cooperation; the Anzus treaty has strengthened ties with Australia and New Zealand, and a mutual security treaty with Japan has been signed. In addition, the CENTO pact has been concluded, and while we are not officially a member of this alliance we have participated closely in its deliberations.

The atoms-for-peace proposal to the United Nations led to the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Our policy has been to push enforcible programs of inspection against surprise attack, suspension of nuclear testing, arms reduction, and peaceful use of outer space.

The United Nations has been vigorously supported in all of its actions, including the condemnations of the wholesale murder of the people of Tibet by the Chinese Communists and the brutal Soviet repression of the people of Hungary, as well as the more recent U.N. actions in the Congo.

The United States took the initiative in negotiating the significant treaty to guarantee the peaceful use of vast Antarctica.

The U.S. Information Agency has been transformed into a greatly improved medium for explaining our policies and actions to audiences overseas, answering the lies of Communist propaganda, and projecting a clearer image of American life and culture.

Cultural, technological, and educational exchanges with the Soviet Union have been encouraged, and a comprehensive agreement was made which authorized, among other things, the distribution of our Russian-language magazine Amerika and the highly successful American exhibition in Moscow.

This country has continued to withhold recognition of Communist China and to oppose vigorously the admission of this belligerent and unrepentant nation into the United Nations. Red China has yet to demonstrate that it deserves to be considered a peace-loving nation.

With Communist imperialism held in check, constructive actions were undertaken to strengthen the economies of free-world nations. The U.S. Government has given sturdy support to the economic and technical assistance activities of the U.N. This country stimulated a doubling of the capital of the World Bank and a 50-percent capital increase in the International Monetary Fund. The Development Loan Fund and the International Development Association were established. The United States also took the lead in creating the Inter-American Development Bank.

Vice President Nixon, Secretaries of State Dulles and Herter and I traveled extensively through the world for the purpose of strengthening the cause of peace, freedom, and international understanding. So rewarding were these visits that their very success became a significant factor in causing the Soviet Union to wreck the planned summit conference of 1960.

These vital programs must go on. New tactics will have to be developed, of course, to meet new situations, but the underlying principles should be constant. Our great moral and material commitments to collective security, deterrence of force, international law, negotiations that lead to self-enforcing agreements, and the economic interdependence of free nations should remain the cornerstone of a foreign policy that will ultimately bring permanent peace with justice in freedom to all mankind. The continuing need of all free nations today is for each to recognize clearly the essentiality of an unbreakable bond among themselves based upon a complete dedication to the principles of collective security, effective cooperation, and peace with justice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For the first time in our Nation's history we have consistently maintained, in peacetime, military forces of a magnitude sufficient to deter and, if need be, to destroy predatory forces in the world.

Tremendous advances in strategic weapons systems have been made in the past 8 years. Not until 1953 were expenditures on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars a year; today we spend 10 times as much each day on these programs as was spent in all of 1952.

No guided ballistic missiles were operational at the beginning of 1953. Today many types give our Armed Forces unprecedented effectiveness. The explosive power of our weapons systems for all purposes is almost inconceivable.

Today the United States has operational Atlas missiles which can strike a target 5,000 miles away in a half-hour. The Polaris weapons system became operational last fall and the Titan is scheduled to become so this year. Next year, more than a year ahead of schedule, a vastly improved ICBM, the solid propellant Minuteman, is expected to be ready.

Squadrons of accurate intermediate range ballistic missiles are now operational. The Thor and Jupiter IRBM's based in forward areas can hit targets 1,500 miles away in 18 minutes.

Aircraft which fly at speeds faster than sound were still in a developmental stage 8 years ago. Today American fighting planes go twice the speed of sound. And either our B–58 medium range jet bomber or our B–52 long range jet bomber can carry more explosive power than was used by all combatants in World War II—Allies and Axis combined.

Eight years ago we had no nuclear-powered ships. Today 49 nuclear warships have been authorized. Of these, 14 have been commissioned, including 3 of the revolutionary Polaris submarines. Our nuclear submarines have cruised under the North Pole and circumnavigated the earth while submerged. Sea warfare has been revolutionized, and the United States is far and away the leader.

Our tactical air units overseas and our aircraft carriers are alert; Army units, guarding the frontiers of freedom in Europe and the Far East, are in the highest state of readiness in peacetime history; our Marines, a third of whom are deployed in the Far East, are constantly prepared for action; our Reserve Establishment has maintained high standards of proficiency, and the Ready Reserve now numbers over 2½ million citizen-soldiers.

The Department of Defense, a young and still evolving organization, has twice been improved and the line of command has been shortened in order to meet the demands of modern warfare. These major reorganizations have provided a more effective structure for unified planning and direction of the vast Defense Establishment. Gradual improvements in its structure and procedures are to be expected.

U.S. civil defense and nonmilitary defense capacity has been greatly strengthened and these activities have been consolidated in one Federal agency.

The defense forces of our allies now number 5 million men, several thousand combatant ships, and over 25,000 aircraft. Programs to strengthen these allies have been consistently supported by the administration. U.S. military assistance goes almost exclusively to friendly nations on the rim of the Communist world. This American contribution to nations who have the will to defend their freedom, but insufficient means, should be vigorously continued. Combined with our allies, the free world now has a far stronger shield than we could provide alone.

Since 1953, our defense policy has been based on the assumption that the international situation would require heavy defense expenditures for an indefinite period to come, probably for years. In this protracted struggle, good management dictates that we resist overspending as resolutely as we oppose underspending. Every dollar uselessly spent on military mechanisms decreases our total strength and, therefore, our security. We must not return to the crash program psychology of the past when each new feint by the Communists was responded to in panic. The bomber gap of several years ago was always a fiction, and the missile gap shows every sign of being the same.

The Nation can ill afford to abandon a national policy which provides for a fully adequate and steady level of effort, designed for the long pull; a fast adjustment to new scientific and technological advances; a balanced force of such strength as to deter general war, to effectively meet local situations and to retaliate to attack and destroy the attacker; and a strengthened system of free world collective security.

THE ECONOMY

The expanding American economy passed the half-million-dollar mark in gross national product early in 1960. The Nation's output of goods and services is now nearly 25 percent higher than in 1952.

In 1959, the average American family had an income of $6,520, 15 percent higher in dollars of constant buying power than in 1952, and the real wages of American factory workers have risen 20 percent during the past 8 years. These facts reflect the rising standard of individual and family well-being enjoyed by Americans.

Our Nation benefits also from a remarkable improvement in general industrial peace through strengthened processes of free collective bargaining. Time lost since 1952 because of strikes has been half that lost in the 8 years prior to that date. Legislation now requires that union members have the opportunity for full participation in the affairs of their unions. The administration supported the Landrum-Griffin Act, which I believe is greatly helpful to the vast bulk of American labor and its leaders, and also is a major step in getting racketeers and gangsters out of labor-management affairs.

The economic security of working men and women has been strengthened by an extension of unemployment insurance coverage to 2.5 million ex-servicemen, 2.4 million Federal employees, and 1.2 million employees of small businesses, and by a strengthening of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. States have been encouraged to improve their unemployment compensation benefits, so that today average weekly benefits are 40 percent higher than in 1953.

Determined efforts have improved workers' safety standards. Enforcible safety standards have been established for longshoremen and ship repair workers; Federal safety councils have been increased from 14 to over 100; safety awards have been initiated, and a national construction safety program has been developed.

A major factor in strengthening our competitive enterprise system, and promoting economic growth, has been the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws over the last 8 years and a continuing effort to reduce artificial restraints on competition and trade and enhance our economic liberties. This purpose was also significantly advanced in 1953 when, as one of the first acts of this administration, restrictive wage and price controls were ended.

An additional measure to strengthen the American system of competitive enterprise was the creation of the Small Business Administration in 1953 to assist existing small businesses and encourage new ones. This agency has approved over $1 billion in loans, initiated a new program to provide long-term capital for small businesses, aided in setting aside $3½ billion in Government contracts for award to small business concerns, and brought to the attention of individual businessmen, through programs of information and education, new developments in management and production techniques. Since 1952, important tax revisions have been made to encourage small businesses.

Many major improvements in the Nation's transportation system have been made:

After long years of debate, the dream of a great St. Lawrence Seaway, opening the heartland of America to ocean commerce, has been fulfilled.

The new Federal Aviation Agency is fostering greater safety in air travel.

The largest public construction program in history—the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—has been pushed rapidly forward. Twenty-five percent of this system is now open to traffic.

Efforts to help every American build a better life have included also a vigorous program for expanding our trade with other nations. A 4-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1958, and a continuing and rewarding effort has been made to persuade other countries to remove restrictions against our exports. A new export expansion program was launched in 1960, inaugurating improvement of export credit insurance and broadening research and information programs to awaken Americans to business opportunities overseas. These actions and generally prosperous conditions abroad have helped push America's export trade to a level of $20 billion in 1960.

Although intermittent declines in economic activity persist as a problem in our enterprise system, recent downturns have been moderate and of short duration. There is, however, little room for complacency. Currently our economy is operating at high levels, but unemployment rates are higher than any of us would like, and chronic pockets of high unemployment persist. Clearly, continued sound and broadly shared economic growth remains a major national objective toward which we must strive through joint private and public efforts.

If Government continues to work to assure every American the fullest opportunity to develop and utilize his ability and talent, it will be performing one of its most vital functions, that of advancing the welfare and protecting the dignity, rights, and freedom of all Americans.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

In January 1953, the consumer's dollar was worth only 52 cents in terms of the food, clothing, shelter and other items it would buy compared to 1939. Today, the inflationary spiral which had raised the cost of living by 36 percent between 1946 and 1952 has all but ceased and the value of the dollar virtually stabilized.

In 1954 we had the largest tax cut in history, amounting to $7.4 billion annually, of which over 62 percent went to individuals mostly in the small income brackets.

This administration has directed constant efforts toward fiscal responsibility. Balanced budgets have been sought when the economy was advancing, and a rigorous evaluation of spending programs has been maintained at all times. Resort to deficit financing in prosperous times could easily erode international confidence in the dollar and contribute to inflation at home. In this belief, I shall submit a balanced budget for fiscal 1962 to the Congress next week.

There has been a firm policy of reducing Government competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in the discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial industrial installations and in addition

the curtailment of approximately 550 industrial installations operated directly by Government agencies.

Also, an aggressive surplus disposal program has been carried on to identify and dispose of unneeded Government-owned real property. This has resulted in the addition of a substantial number of valuable properties to local tax rolls, and a significant monetary return to the Government.

Earnest and persistent attempts have been made to strengthen the position of State and local governments and thereby to stop the dangerous drift toward centralization of governmental power in Washington.

Significant strides have been made in increasing the effectiveness of government. Important new agencies have been established, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Council of Economic Advisers was reconstituted.

The operation of our postal system has been modernized to get better and more efficient service. Modernized handling of local mail now brings next-day delivery to 168 million people in our population centers, expanded carrier service now accommodates 9.3 million families in the growing suburbs, and 1.4 million families have been added to the rural delivery service. Commonsense dictates that the Postal Service should be on a self-financing basis.

The concept of a trained and dedicated Government career service has been strengthened by the provision of life and health insurance benefits, a vastly improved retirement system, a new merit promotion program, and the first effective incentive awards program. With no sacrifice in efficiency, Federal civilian employment since 1953 has been reduced by over a quarter of a million persons.

I am deeply gratified that it was under the urging of this administration that Alaska and Hawaii became our 49th and 50th States.

AGRICULTURE

Despite the difficulties of administering congressional programs which apply outmoded prescriptions and which aggravate rather than solve problems, the past 8 years brought notable advances in agriculture.

Total agricultural assets are approximately $200 billion—up $36 billion in 8 years.

Farmowner equities are at the near record high of $174 billion.

Farm ownership is at a record high with fewer farmers in a tenant-and-sharecropper status than at any time in our Nation's history.

The food-for-peace program has demonstrated how surplus of American food and fiber can be effectively used to feed and clothe the needy abroad. Aided by this humanitarian program, total agricultural exports have grown from $2.8 billion in 1953 to an average of about $4 billion annually for the past 3 years. For 1960, exports are estimated at $4.5 billion, the highest volume on record. Under the food-for-peace program, the largest wheat transaction in history was consummated with India in 1960.

The problems of low-income farm families received systematic attention for the first time in the rural development program. This program has gone forward in 39 States, yielding higher incomes and a better living for rural people most in need.

The Rural Electrification Administration has helped meet the growing demand for power and telephones in agricultural areas. Ninety-seven percent of all farms now have central station electric power. Dependence upon Federal financing should no longer be necessary.

The Farm Credit Administration has been made an independent agency more responsive to the farmer's needs.

The search for new uses for our farm abundance and to develop new crops for current needs has made major progress. Agricultural research appropriations have increased by 171 percent since 1953.

Farmers are being saved approximately $80 million a year by the repeal in 1956 of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery.

Since 1953, appropriations have been doubled for county agents, home agents and the Extension Service.

Eligibility for social security benefits has been extended to farmers and their families.

Yet in certain aspects our agricultural surplus situation is increasingly grave. For example, our wheat stocks now total 1.3 billion bushels. If we did not harvest 1 bushel of wheat in this coming year, we would still have all we could eat, all we could sell abroad, all we could give away, and still have a substantial carryover. Extraordinary costs are involved just in management and disposal of this burdensome surplus. Obviously important adjustments must still come. Congress must enact additional legislation to permit wheat and other farm commodities to move into regular marketing channels in an orderly manner and at the same time afford the needed price protection to the farmer. Only then will agriculture again be free, sound, and profitable.

NATURAL RESOURCES

New emphasis has been placed on the care of our national parks. A 10-year development program of our national park system—Mission 66—was initiated and 633,000 acres of park land have been added since 1953.

Appropriations for fish and wildlife operations have more than doubled. Thirty-five new refuges, containing 11,342,000 acres, have been added to the national wildlife management system.

Our Nation's forests have been improved at the most rapid rate in history.

The largest sustained effort in water resources development in our history has taken place. In the field of reclamation alone, over 50 new projects, or project units, have been authorized since 1953—including the billion dollar Colorado River storage project. When all these projects have been completed they will have a storage capacity of nearly 43 million acre-feet—an increase of 50 percent over the Bureau of Reclamation's storage capacity in mid-1953. In addition, since 1953 over 450 new navigation flood control and multiple purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers have been started, costing nearly $6 billion.

Soil and water conservation has been advanced as never before. One hundred and forty-one projects are now being constructed under the watershed protection program.

Hydroelectric power has been impressively developed through a policy which recognizes that the job to be done requires comprehensive development by Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise. Teamwork is essential to achieve this objective.

The Federal Columbia River power system has grown from two multipurpose dams with a 2.6 million kilowatt capacity to 17 multipurpose projects completed or under construction with an ultimate installed capacity of 8.1 million kilowatts. After years of negotiation, a Columbia River storage development agreement with Canada now opens the way for early realization of unparalleled power, flood control and resource conservation benefits for the Pacific Northwest. A treaty implementing this agreement will shortly be submitted to the Senate.

A farsighted and highly successful program for meeting urgent water needs is being carried out by converting salt water to fresh water. A 75 percent reduction in the cost of this process has already been realized.

Continuous resource development is essential for our expanding economy. We must continue vigorous, combined Federal, State and private programs, at the same time preserving to the maximum extent possible our natural and scenic heritage for future generations.

EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is already a milestone in the history of American education. It provides broad opportunities for the intellectual development of all children by strengthening courses of study in science, mathematics, and foreign languages, by developing new graduate programs to train additional teachers, and by providing loans for young people who need financial help to go to college.

The administration proposed on numerous occasions a broad new 5-year program of Federal aid to help overcome the classroom shortage in public elementary and secondary schools. Recommendations were also made to give assistance to colleges and universities for the construction of academic and residential buildings to meet future enrollment increases.

This administration greatly expanded Federal loans for building dormitories for students, teachers, and nurses training, a program assisting in the construction of approximately 200,000 living accommodations during the past 8 years.

There has been a vigorous acceleration of health, resource, and education programs designed to advance the role of the American Indian in our society. Last fall, for example, 91 percent of the Indian children between the ages of 6

and 18 on reservations were enrolled in school. This is a rise of 12 percent since 1953.

In the field of science and technology, startling strides have been made by the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In little more than 2 years, NASA has successfully launched meteorological satellites, such as Tiros I and Tiros II, that promise to revolutionize methods of weather forecasting; demonstrated the feasibility of satellites for global communications by the successful launching of Echo I; produced an enormous amount of valuable scientific data, such as the discovery of the Van Allen radiation belt; successfully launched deep-space probes that maintained communication over the greatest range man has ever tracked; and made real progress toward the goal of manned space flights.

These achievements unquestionably make us preeminent today in space exploration for the betterment of mankind. I believe the present organizational arrangements in this area, with the revisions proposed last year, are completely adequate for the tasks ahead.

Americans can look forward to new achievements in space exploration. The near future will hold such wonders as the orbital flight of an astronaut, the landing of instruments on the moon, the launching of the powerful giant Saturn rocket vehicles, and the reconnaissance of Mars and Venus by unmanned vehicles.

The application of atomic energy to industry, agriculture, and medicine has progressed from hope and experiment to reality. American industry and agriculture are making increasing use of radioisotopes to improve manufacturing, testing, and crop raising. Atomic energy has improved the ability of the healing professions to combat disease, and holds promise for an eventual increase in man's lifespan.

Education, science, technology and balanced programs of every kind—these are the roadways to progress. With appropriate Federal support, the States and localities can assure opportunities for achieving excellence at all levels of the educational system; and with the Federal Government continuing to give wholehearted support to basic scientific research and technology, we can expect to maintain our position of leadership in the world.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The first consequential Federal civil rights legislation in 85 years was enacted by Congress on recommendation of the administration in 1957 and 1960.

A new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice has already moved to enforce constitutional rights in such areas as voting and the elimination of "Jim Crow" laws.

Greater equality of job opportunity in Federal employment and employment with Federal contractors has been effectively provided through the President's Committees on Government Contracts and Government Employment Practices.

The Civil Rights Commission has undertaken important surveys in the fields of housing, voting, and education.

Segregation has been abolished in the Armed Forces, in veterans' hospitals, in all Federal employment, and throughout the District of Columbia—administratively accomplished progress in this field that is unmatched in America's recent history.

This pioneering work in civil rights must go on. Not only because discrimination is morally wrong, but also because its impact is more than national—it is worldwide.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Federal medical research expenditures have increased more than fourfold since 1954.

A vast variety of the approaches known to medical science has been explored to find better methods of treatment and prevention of major diseases, particularly heart diseases, cancer, and mental illness.

The control of air and water pollution has been greatly strengthened.

Americans now have greater protection against harmful, unclean, or misrepresented foods, drugs, or cosmetics through a strengthened Food and Drug Administration and by new legislation which requires that food additives be proved safe for human consumption before use.

A newly established Federal Radiation Council, along with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, analyzes and coordinates information regarding radiological activities which affect the public health.

Medical manpower has been increased by Federal grants for teaching and research.

Construction of new medical facilities has been stepped up and extended to include nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities.

The vocational rehabilitation program has been significantly expanded. About 90,000 handicapped people are now being rehabilitated annually so they are again able to earn their own living with self-respect and dignity.

New legislation provides for better medical care for the needy aged, including those older persons who, while otherwise self-sufficient, need help in meeting their health care costs. The administration recommended a major expansion of this effort.

The coverage of the Social Security Act has been broadened since 1953 to make 11 million additional people eligible for retirement, disability, or survivor benefits for themselves or their dependents, and the social security benefits have been substantially improved.

Grants to the States for maternal and child welfare services have been increased.

The States, aided by Federal grants, now assist some 6 million needy people through the programs of old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the totally and permanently disabled.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

More houses have been built during the past 8 years—over 9 million—than during any previous 8 years in history.

A historic new approach—urban renewal—now replaces piecemeal thrusts at slum pockets and urban blight. Communities engaged in urban renewal have doubled and renewal projects have more than tripled since 1953. An estimated 68 projects in 50 cities will be completed by the end of the current fiscal year; another 577 projects will be underway, and planning for 310 more will be in process. A total of $2 billion in Federal grants will ultimately be required to finance these 955 projects.

New programs have been initiated to provide more and better housing for elderly people. Approximately 25,000 units especially designed for the elderly have been built, started, or approved in the past 3 years.

For the first time, because of Federal help and encouragement, 90 metropolitan areas and urban regions and 1,140 smaller towns throughout the country are making comprehensive development plans for their future growth and development.

American communities have been helped to plan water and sanitation systems and schools through planning advances for 1,600 public works projects with a construction cost of nearly $2 billion.

Mortgage insurance on individual homes has been greatly expanded. During the past 8 years, the Federal Housing Administration alone insured over 2½ million home mortgages valued at $27 billion, and in addition, insured more than 10 million property improvement loans.

The Federal Government must continue to provide leadership in order to make our cities and communities better places in which to live, work, and raise families, but without usurping rightful local authority, replacing individual responsibility, or stifling private initiative.

IMMIGRATION

Over 32,000 victims of Communist tyranny in Hungary were brought to our shores, and at this time our country is working to assist refugees from tyranny in Cuba.

Since 1953, the waiting period for naturalization applicants has been reduced from 18 months to 45 days.

The administration also has made legislative recommendations to liberalize existing restrictions upon immigration while still safeguarding the national interest. It is imperative that our immigration policy be in the finest American tradition of providing a haven for oppressed peoples and fully in accord with our obligation as a leader of the free world.

VETERANS

In discharging the Nation's obligation to our veterans, during the past 8 years there have been:

The readjustment of World War II veterans was completed, and the 5 million Korean conflict veterans were assisted in achieving successful readjustment to civilian life;

Increases in compensation benefits for all eligible veterans with service connected disabilities;

Higher non-service-connected pension benefits for needy veterans;

Greatly improved benefits to survivors of veterans dying in or as a result of service;

Authorization, by Presidential directive, of an increase in the number of beds available for sick and disabled veterans;

Development of a 12-year, $900 million construction program to modernize and improve our veterans hospitals;

New modern techniques brought into the administration of veterans' affairs to provide the highest quality service possible to those who have defended us.

CONCLUSION

In concluding my final message to the Congress, it is fitting to look back to my first—to the aims and ideals I set forth on February 2, 1953: To use America's influence in world affairs to advance the cause of peace and justice, to conduct the affairs of the executive branch with integrity and efficiency, to encourage creative initiative in our economy, and to work toward the attainment of the well-being and equality of opportunity of all citizens.

Equally, we have honored our commitment to pursue and attain specific objectives. Among them, as stated 8 years ago: Strengthening of the mutual security program; development of world trade and commerce; ending of hostilities in Korea; creation of a powerful deterrent force; practicing fiscal responsibility; checking the menace of inflation; reducing the tax burden; providing an effective internal security program; developing and conserving our natural resources; reducing governmental interference in the affairs of the farmer; strengthening and improving services by the Department of Labor, and the vigilant guarding of civil and social rights.

I do not close this message implying that all is well—that all problems are solved. For progress implies both new and continuing problems and, unlike presidential administrations, problems rarely have terminal dates.

Abroad, there is the continuing Communist threat to the freedom of Berlin, an explosive situation in Laos, the problems caused by Communist penetration of Cuba, as well as the many problems connected with the development of the new nations in Africa. These areas, in particular, call for delicate handling and constant review.

At home, several conspicuous problems remain: Promoting higher levels of employment, with special emphasis on areas in which heavy unemployment has persisted; continuing to provide for steady economic growth and preserving a sound currency; bringing our balance of payments into more reasonable equilibrium and continuing a high level of confidence in our national and international financial systems; eliminating heavily excessive surpluses of a few farm commodities; and overcoming deficiencies in our health and educational programs.

Our goal always has been to add to the spiritual, moral, and material strength of our Nation. I believe we have done this. But it is a process that must never end. Let us pray that leaders of both the near and distant future will be able to keep the Nation strong and at peace, that they will advance the well-being of all our people, that they will lead us on to still higher moral standards, and that, in achieving these goals, they will maintain a reasonable balance between private and governmental responsibility.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1961.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, next Monday is suspension day. There will be one bill under suspension, House Joint Resolution 107. That is a joint resolution exempting from Federal excise-tax admissions to inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the inaugural committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I inquire of the gentleman, that resolution just refers to official functions and not to functions that are not official?

Mr. McCORMACK. I just read the title of the resolution. It further says "for admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961, and all amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of any subsequent President-elect, shall be exempt from the tax on admissions imposed by section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman that my inquiry in that regard was prompted by the fact that there has been some idea in some quarters, as I understand, that the so-called gala event to be staged by the party of the gentleman would be covered by this resolution, and it is my understanding that it is not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will let the gentleman's observation stand for the RECORD without challenging it, because I am not in a position now to either affirm or to say that my opinion is to the contrary.

Mr. HALLECK. Possibly I should not have raised the point.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, the gentleman properly raised the point.

Mr. HALLECK. But there had been that view on the part of some, and my understanding, gained from some of our people on the Committee on Ways and Means, is that that event which is not properly, as I would understand it, a part of the official inauguration, would be subject to whatever the existing law is.

Mr. McCORMACK. From a hasty reading of the joint resolution I note in section 3 that the net proceeds realized by each inaugural committee shall be donated by such committee to charity.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman.

ACTIVITY UNDER AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC LAW 875—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 47)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, pursuant to section 8 of that law.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

EIGHTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 46)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 22(a) of the act of June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 2a), I transmit herewith a statement prepared by the Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, showing (1) the whole number of persons in each State, as ascertained by the Eighteenth Decennial Census of the population, and (2) the number of representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the existing number of representatives by the method of equal proportions.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 48)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 45)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 2022), the third annual report covering U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the year 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

DISCOVERY OF MINERAL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Fourth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the eighth semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1961.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia, JAMES C. DAVIS, be permitted to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like to ask the gentleman if the business that he announced for Monday is the only business for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The so-called painless method of packing the Rules Committee will not come up next week?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to hold the gentleman out of order in the use of that language.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

235. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

236. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a revised estimate of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in each State and the District of Columbia, pursuant to section 104(b)5, title 23, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to section 6 of Public Resolution No. 74, 70th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

238. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under sections 7 through 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to 50 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Agriculture.

239. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the general sales manager for the month of August 1960, relating to developments, and all sales and disposals with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

241. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

242. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, relating to the number of officers receiving monthly flight pay during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased Members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

244. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 24 short tons of bauxite furnace residues now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

245. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,800,000 carats of sapphire material consisting of approximately 1,478,000 carats of Montana natural sapphires and approximately 322,000 carats of cuttings from synthetic sapphire boules, now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

246. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 42 short tons of block and lump steatite talc now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

247. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

248. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

249. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

250. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

251. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia," to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

252. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report for the year ended December 31, 1960, pursuant to the act incorporating the company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

253. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

254. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

255. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the procurement of 5,000-gallon-capacity semitrailers by the Department of the Army from Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

256. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 15th annual report on the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

257. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

258. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

259. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

260. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

261. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952 by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

263. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

264. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

265. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

266. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

268. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

269. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

270. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

271. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

272. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

273. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 28, entitled 'Judiciary and Judicial Procedure,' of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

275. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

276. A letter from the Secretary, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make the Panama Canal Company immune from attachment or garnishment of salaries owed to its employees"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

277. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting report for the calendar year 1960, on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 as required by section 503, title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

278. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting report with respect to positions in the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, subsection (c) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule, pursuant to title V, section 503(a), Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

279. A letter from the Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency, transmitting report of positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, pursuant to section 503, title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

280. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting proposed draft of legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator

of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen"; to the Committee on Public Works.

261. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting proposed draft of legislation, entitled, "A bill to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title"; to the Committee on Public Works.

262. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation, entitled, "A bill to delete the limitation on the amount which may be made available to the States in a fiscal year for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws and their system of public employment offices; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2375. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2376. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2377. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2378. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2379. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2380. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend section 313 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to extend the presumptive period with respect to service connection of multiple sclerosis for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2382. A bill to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable in the case of a taxpayer or spouse who is a woman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2389. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 2390. A bill to repeal the Hatch Political Activities Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2391. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2392. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Customs Enforcement Division in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2393. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2394. A bill to prohibit the transfer to the General Services Administration of custodial employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit the retirement on full annuities, without regard to age, of those officers and employees with 30 years or more of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 2396. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2397. A bill to require public financial reports from Members of Congress, certain civil and military officers, and select employees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and related departments and agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 2398. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 2399. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans without regard to age limitations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to restore for 1 year the right of certain veterans to apply for national service life insurance, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to restore for 1 year the right of certain veterans to apply for national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 2402. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide for a program whereby the Federal Government may guarantee bonds issued by States and municipalities in carrying out construction programs for certain public sanitary facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2404. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2406. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2407. A bill to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2408. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2409. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2410. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2411. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2414. A bill to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act, authorizing grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, providing special project grants for postgraduate public health training, providing for Federal guarantee of loans for construction of group practice medical or dental care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2415. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2416. A bill to provide annuities from the civil service retirement and disability

fund for widows of Government employees for certain additional periods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend sections 322 and 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increased benefits for parents of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for middle income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2420. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2421. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a portion of a route on the Interstate System in New York, known as the Lower Manhattan Expressway, and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection with such route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2424. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2427. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2428. A bill to continue for 3 years the present A and B program for producers of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2429. A bill to prohibit damage to, or destruction of, any shipment of freight or express moving in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 2430. A bill to name the new Federal building at the new Government center in Boston, Mass., as the "Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Building;" to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2431. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the Signers for Freedom Stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 2432. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to supervisory and other postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2433. A bill to modify existing law with respect to certain salary levels, position descriptions, and service credit for automatic step increases of supervisory and other postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,500 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 2435. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend sections 4387 and 9387 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of a subsistence allowance of $90 per month to members of the senior division of the Army or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2437. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 2438. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2439. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deferment of income from service contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2442. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and survivors, and for insured disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount which a taxpayer may deduct on account of expenses paid for the care of his or her dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2445. A bill to authorize grants to assist the States in strengthening professional nurse education, in order to relieve the shortage of well-trained professional nurses and to meet the requirements of Federal, State, and local governmental hospitals and health agencies, as well as of nongovernmental hospitals and other employers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2446. A bill to provide that hydraulic brake fluid sold or shipped in commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain specifications prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, to provide for reimbursement to the city of New York of certain unusual expenses incurred by that city during the meeting of the United Nations in September and October 1960; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2448. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2449. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2450. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2451. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 2452. A bill making the day on which electors of President and Vice President and Members of Congress are elected a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 2453. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at or near Oak Hill, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2454. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 with reference to claims arising out of the death of members of the Armed Forces of the United States as the result of enemy action after cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 2455. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled prior to the date their policy lapsed but who failed to make timely application for waiver; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning and conversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide that funds of the United States may be expended for construction of certain vessels only when such construction is carried out by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2459. A bill to require the use of humane methods of trapping animals and birds on lands and waterways under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to permit the furnishing of an additional electric typewriter for the use of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2461. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2462. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2463. A bill to create a new eastern division, comprising the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa, out of the southern division of the Northern California Court District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2464. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2465. A bill to provide a program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2466. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes (this act may be cited as the Federal Employees Safety Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2467. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2468. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2469. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the Stevens Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 2470. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2471. A bill to provide that until the national debt is retired, not less than 10 percent of the net budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year shall be utilized solely for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2472. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 2473. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the Signers for Freedom Stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of certain deceased veterans having serious service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2475. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2476. A bill to establish a National Spelling Commission to reform the spelling of English words, to publish the U.S. Official Dictionary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2477. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2479. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2480. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2481. A bill to prohibit, within the District of Columbia, unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the granting of continuance in district courts to members of State legislatures in accordance with State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State; to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 2485. A bill to provide standards for the issuance of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 2486. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2487. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2488. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 2489. A bill to correct an inequity in the promotional procedure for postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2492. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2493. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 2495. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2496. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported shelled walnuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 2497. A bill to amend section 5051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 2498. A bill to provide for the use of withholding taxes for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 2499. A bill to create a new eastern division, comprising the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa, out of the southern division of the northern California court district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 2500. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2501. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of political parties for their radio and television expenditures in presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2502. A bill to establish a Federal Presidential Election Board to conduct preference primaries in connection with the nomination of candidates for President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2503. A bill to authorize U.S. district court sessions at Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2504. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 2505. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2506. A bill granting approval of Navajo Indian irrigation and San Juan-Chama as participating projects of Colorado River storage project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is under a disability may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without having attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2508. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 2509. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the Signers of Freedom Stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 2510. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2511. A bill to provide for grants to States and local governments to enable them to construct needed public works and improvements and thus to provide employment for persons who are unemployed; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2512. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2513. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the 90-day service requirement applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability shall be reduced to 60 days in the case of World War I veterans: to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend section 541 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to the widows of certain veterans in receipt of pension at the time of their death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2517. A bill to provide that in determining income of World War I veterans and their widows for the purpose of ascertaining eligibility for pensions, payments under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be taken into account; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2518. A bill to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2519. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2520. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is a student attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 2522. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to require voting machines to be used for the purpose of electing Federal officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 2523. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2525. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2526. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2527. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2528. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 2529. A bill to extend the application of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 with respect to the retirement of certain individuals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning and conversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 2531. A bill to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 438 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2532. A bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2533. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foregn Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2535. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2536. A bill to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2537. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 2538. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 2539. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2540. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent conveying certain lands in the town of Powell, Wyo., together with improvements, to the Shoshone Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2541. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to prescribe conditions under which certain periods of employment shall be considered creditable service; to the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2543. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide that any annual leave credited to an employee at the end of a leave year which is in excess of the maximum amount which can be carried over into the next leave year shall be credited to the employee's sick leave account; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2544. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2545. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 2546. A bill to amend sections 411 and 412 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide that certain claims against Czechoslovakia shall be considered as timely filed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 2547. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 2548. A bill to provide for the gathering, evaluation, and dissemination of information, and for the formulation of plans, which will aid in the maintenance of a high level of prosperity in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 2550. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2551. A bill to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2553. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, to enlarge the service area of the Sacramento canals unit of the Central Valley project to include Yolo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 2554. A bill to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2555. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in oversea areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2556. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 2558. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 2559. A bill to establish an Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to require periodic reports to the Congress concerning action taken to carry out the policy of the Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2561. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2562. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States which was reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the Attalla City Board of Education, Attalla, Ala.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2563. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2564. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Sequoyah, the famous Cherokee Indian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2565. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2566. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturer's excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2568. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the nonrecognition of taxable gain where property is involuntarily converted into other income-producing property, whether or not the new property is similar to the property so converted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2570. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS (by request):

H.R. 2571. A bill to authorize Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2572. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2573. A bill to increase the price of newly mined domestic gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 2575. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2576. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2577. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2578. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 2579. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the prevention of pernicious political activities (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to make them inapplicable to State and municipal officers and employees, to permit limited partisan political activities by Federal officers and employees in certain designated localities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2581. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2582. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2583. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2584. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2585. A bill relating to the credits against the employment tax in the case of certain successor employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 2586. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 2587. A bill to extend the postage rates for books and other educational materials to 8-millimeter films and 8-millimeter film catalogs for educational use; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for contributions and gifts to nonprofit industrial development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2589. A bill to provide for a study of the need for additional national cemeteries

in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2590. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2591. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 2592. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2593. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 2594. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 2595. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2596. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation designating the last Friday in April as Arbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to provide for amending section 3 of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act (64 Stat. 319) as amended (64 Stat. 458); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 130. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the State exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte, Luzon, and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during

the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination in employment of workers middle-aged and older; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer for a cure for cancer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Res. 97. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 98. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 99. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 98; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Res. 100. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 101. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 102. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Res. 103. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 104. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2237, 86th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 105. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the House of Representatives on general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Ljubo Yasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Filip Yasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Ng Kow Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Bruno Granelli (also known as Luigi Granelli); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Freda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Epaminonda Eddie Marsal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Pietro Dattoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cordasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Nilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schneck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 2608. A bill for the relief of James W. F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Wilson and her minor child, George Stephen Wilson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2610. A bill for the relief of Madison E. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2611. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Ward and Billy W. Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2612. A bill for the relief of Annibale Cuozzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2613. A bill for the relief of Franco Citrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 2614. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Holzer Carr (also known as Irmgard Treder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 2615. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor Wang Ta Ng and his wife, Alice Siu Har Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H.R. 2616. A bill for the relief of Habib Mattar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2617. A bill for the relief of Dr. Constantine Cerkez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Maria Castillo Cantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 2619. A bill for the relief of Gerard Puillet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Clara Reeves Valentich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Isidoro G. Montiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Roberto Santini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marlene Brandon Curtiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Chong Son Zee and Ng Lee Gean Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Wong Tit Man, Chan Ying Nor, Wong Wai Yee, Wong Wai kon, Wong Wai Moon, and Wong Wai Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2626. A bill for the relief of Betty Michicko Kameshima Gudnason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Ricardo and Carmelita Jaranilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2628. A bill for the relief of See Kwong Ong, Shui Sum Ong, Shun Mei Ong, Sin Kog Ong, and Shun Ngor Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2629. A bill for the relief of Tom Fook Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Chuan Mai Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2631. A bill for the relief of Mrs. King-Ngu Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Cellino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2633. A bill for the relief of Agnes Schoberl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2635. A bill for the relief of Ante Gulam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 2636. A bill for the relief of Mr. Kisaku Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Harold Jankiowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2638. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masa Shimotsuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2639. A bill for the relief of Maria Kahale de Sami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2640. A bill for the relief of Yoko Takayashiki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2641. A bill for the relief of Magdolna Rep de Dudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Domenico Antonelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 2643. A bill for the relief of Donald Grovsnor, also known as Donald Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Hyo Hyun Byun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2645. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Alice Klimowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zabel Tauit Soultanian (also known as Mrs. Zabel Tauit Sultanian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 2647. A bill for the relief of Giacomo R. Foggia, his wife Leonilda Foggia, and their minor child, Louisa Marie Foggia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 2648. A bill for the relief of Georgia Arvaniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2649. A bill for the relief of Leonidos Varvitsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 2650. A bill for the relief of Monicilo Velickovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2651. A bill for the relief of Radomir and Jelena Acimovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Mihajlo Radosavljevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2653. A bill for the relief of Constantina Dina Koudounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2654. A bill for the relief of Vlado Parojcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 2655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pamela Gough Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2656. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leon B. Ketchum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 2657. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Milica Mihich (nee Milica Dedijer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2658. A bill for the relief of C. W. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane R. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 2660. A bill for the relief of Margrit Binder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Benedicto Villanueva Delos Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2662. A bill for the relief of Rosario Saporito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2663. A bill to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Alfred C. Petty, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 2664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irena Ratajczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liesel (Emmerich) Kohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Adelina Rosasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife, Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 2668. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Berthold Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Agostini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 2670. A bill for the relief of Luisito P. Guanlao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2671. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Bonavita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2672. A bill for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 2673. A bill for the relief of John A. Dutka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Eva Nowik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 2675. A bill for the relief of Santa Giamalva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Bernhard P. Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2677. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Langro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Miss Johanna Machtilda Persoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 2679. A bill for the relief of J. Eufracio Nunez Armenta (also known as Jose Contreras Sierra); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2680. A bill for the relief of Joseph Albert De Coster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2681. A bill for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 2682. A bill for the relief of Christine Kligge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2683. A bill for the relief of Richard W. Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2684. A bill for the relief of Mohan Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2685. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 2687. A bill for the relief of Miss Helen Pappiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Nella Sophia Boltz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Julio Pineiro-Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 2690. A bill for the relief of Evangelina Kotake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution commending Mrs. Ada Rogers Wilson, of Texas, as the author of the musical composition entitled "America Victory! America Liberty"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

31. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition with approximately 200 additional signatures to a petition filed January 6, 1961, by Robert and Ruth Sicular, and others, East Bay Community Forum for Civil Liberties, Berkeley, Calif., requesting the abolishment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

32. By Mr. KOWALSKI: Petition of the mayor and board of councilmen of the city of Torrington, Conn., pointing out the economic problems faced in that area and urging that additional defense contracts be channeled to plants there; to the Committee on Armed Services.

33. By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of Pomona Grange No. 23, Bradford-Sullivan Counties, Pa., favoring the election of a President and Vice President by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast made us in Thine image and likeness, and hast implanted within us deep desires which the material world can never satisfy.

We are conscious, as we come, that Thou needest no sacrifice our hands can bring, or any offering of praise our lips can frame; but because we live in Thy world and share Thy bounty, because we breathe Thine air and Thy power sustains us, because Thy goodness and mercy follow us all our days, and Thy love blesses us continually, we magnify Thy glorious name.

Lead us in the stress and strain of this new day upon which we have entered, and of the new week soon to dawn, when in the national life there comes the changing of the guard. Hear the fervent prayer of our heart: "America, America, God shed His grace on thee." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, January 11, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the message of the President on the state of the Union was read in the House on yesterday, and appears in the RECORD of yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD today without its being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Once again it is my constitutional duty to assess the state of the Union.

On each such previous occasion during these past 8 years I have outlined a forward course designed to achieve our mutual objective—a better America in a world of peace. This time my function is different.

The American people, in free election, have selected new leadership which soon will be entrusted with the management of our Government. A new President shortly will lay before you his proposals to shape the future of our great land. To him, every citizen, whatever his political beliefs, prayerfully extends best wishes for good health and for wisdom and success in coping with the problems that confront our Nation.

For my part, I should like, first, to express to you of the Congress, my appreciation of your devotion to the common good and your friendship over these difficult years. I will carry with me pleasant memories of this association in endeavors profoundly significant to all our people.

We have been through a lengthy period in which the control over the executive

and legislative branches of government has been divided between our two great political parties. Differences, of course, we have had, particularly in domestic affairs. But in a united determination to keep this Nation strong and free and to utilize our vast resources for the advancement of all mankind, we have carried America to unprecedented heights.

For this cooperative achievement I thank the American people and those in the Congress of both parties who have supported programs in the interest of our country.

I should also like to give special thanks for the devoted service of my associates in the executive branch and the hundreds of thousands of career employees who have implemented our diverse Government programs.

My second purpose is to review briefly the record of these past 8 years in the hope that, out of the sum of these experiences, lessons will emerge that are useful to our Nation. Supporting this review are detailed reports from the several agencies and departments, all of which are now or will shortly be available to the Congress.

Throughout the world the years since 1953 have been a period of profound change. The human problems in the world grow more acute hour by hour; yet new gains in science and technology continually extend the promise of a better life. People yearn to be free, to govern themselves; yet a third of the people of the world have no freedom, do not govern themselves. The world recognizes the catastrophic nature of nuclear war; yet it sees the wondrous potential of nuclear peace.

During the period, the United States has forged ahead under a constructive foreign policy. The continuing goal is peace, liberty, and well-being—for others as well as ourselves. The aspirations of all peoples are one—peace with justice in freedom. Peace can only be attained collectively as people everywhere unite in their determination that liberty and well-being come to all mankind.

Yet while we have worked to advance national aspirations for freedom, a divisive force has been at work to divert that aspiration into dangerous channels. The Communist movement throughout the world exploits the natural striving of all to be free and attempts to subjugate men rather than free them. These activities have caused and are continuing to cause grave troubles in the world.

Here at home these have been times for careful adjustment of our economy from the artificial impetus of a hot war to constructive growth in a precarious peace. While building a new economic vitality without inflation, we have also increased public expenditures to keep abreast of the needs of a growing population and its attendant new problems, as well as our added international responsibilities. We have worked toward these ends in a context of shared responsibility—conscious of the need for maximum scope to private effort and for State and local, as well as Federal, governmental action.

Success in designing and executing national purposes, domestically and abroad, can only come from a steadfast resolution that integrity in the operation of government and in our relations with each other be fully maintained. Only in this way could our spiritual goals be fully advanced.

FOREIGN POLICY

On January 20, 1953, when I took office, the United States was at war. Since the signing of the Korean armistice in 1953, Americans have lived in peace in highly troubled times.

During the 1956 Suez crisis, the U.S. Government strongly supported United Nations action—resulting in the ending of the hostilities in Egypt.

Again in 1958, peace was preserved in the Middle East despite new discord. Our Government responded to the request of the friendly Lebanese Government for military help, and promptly withdrew American forces as soon as the situation was stabilized.

In 1958 our support of the Republic of China during the all-out bombardment of Quemoy restrained the Communist Chinese from attempting to invade the offshore islands.

Although, unhappily, Communist penetration of Cuba is real and poses a serious threat, Communist dominated regimes have been deposed in Guatemala and Iran. The occupation of Austria has ended and the Trieste question has been settled.

Despite constant threats to its integrity, West Berlin has remained free.

Important advances have been made in building mutual security arrangements—which lie at the heart of our hopes for future peace and security in the world. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization has been established; the NATO alliance has been militarily strengthened; the Organization of American States has been further developed as an instrument of inter-American cooperation; the Anzus treaty has strengthened ties with Australia and New Zealand, and a mutual security treaty with Japan has been signed. In addition, the Cento pact has been concluded, and while we are not officially a member of this alliance we have participated closely in its deliberations.

The atoms-for-peace proposal to the United Nations led to the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Our policy has been to push for enforcible programs of inspection against surprise attack, suspension of nuclear testing, arms reduction, and peaceful use of outer space.

The United Nations has been vigorously supported in all of its actions, including the condemnations of the wholesale murder of the people of Tibet by the Chinese Communists and the brutal Soviet repression of the people of Hungary, as well as the more recent U.N. actions in the Congo.

The United States took the initiative in negotiating the significant treaty to guarantee the peaceful use of vast Antarctica.

The U.S. Information Agency has been transformed into a greatly improved medium for explaining our policies and actions to audiences overseas, answering the lies of Communist propaganda, and projecting a clearer image of American life and culture.

Cultural, technological and educational exchanges with the Soviet Union have been encouraged, and a comprehensive agreement was made which authorized, among other things, the distribution of our Russian language magazine Amerika and the highly successful American exhibition in Moscow.

This country has continued to withhold recognition of Communist China and to oppose vigorously the admission of this belligerent and unrepentant nation into the United Nations. Red China has yet to demonstrate that it deserves to be considered a "peace-loving" nation.

With Communist imperialism held in check, constructive actions were undertaken to strengthen the economies of free world nations. The U.S. Government has given sturdy support to the economic and technical assistance activities of the U.N. This country stimulated a doubling of the capital of the World Bank and a 50-percent capital increase in the International Monetary Fund. The Development Loan Fund and the International Development Association were established. The United States also took the lead in creating the Inter-American Development Bank.

Vice President NIXON, Secretaries of State Dulles and Herter and I traveled extensively through the world for the purpose of strengthening the cause of peace, freedom, and international understanding. So rewarding were these visits that their very success became a significant factor in causing the Soviet Union to wreck the planned Summit Conference of 1960.

These vital programs must go on. New tactics will have to be developed, of course, to meet new situations, but the underlying principles should be constant. Our great moral and material commitments to collective security, deterrence of force, international law, negotiations that lead to self-enforcing agreements, and the economic interdependence of free nations should remain the cornerstone of a foreign policy that will ultimately bring permanent peace with justice in freedom to all mankind. The continuing need of all free nations today is for each to recognize clearly the essentiality of an unbreakable bond among themselves based upon a complete dedication to the principles of collective security, effective cooperation and peace with justice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For the first time in our Nation's history we have consistently maintained in peacetime, military forces of a magnitude sufficient to deter and if need be to destroy predatory forces in the world.

Tremendous advances in strategic weapons systems have been made in the past 8 years. Not until 1953 were expenditures on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars a year; today we spend 10 times as much each day on these programs as was spent in all of 1952.

No guided ballistic missiles were operational at the beginning of 1953. Today many types give our Armed Forces unprecedented effectiveness. The ex-

plosive power of our weapons systems for all purposes is almost inconceivable.

Today the United States has operational Atlas missiles which can strike a target 5,000 miles away in a half hour. The Polaris weapons system became operational last fall and the Titan is scheduled to become so this year. Next year, more than a year ahead of schedule, a vastly improved ICBM, the solid propellant Minuteman, is expected to be ready.

Squadrons of accurate intermediate range ballistic missiles are now operational. The Thor and Jupiter IRBM's based in forward areas can hit targets 1,500 miles away in 18 minutes.

Aircraft which fly at speeds faster than sound were still in a developmental stage 8 years ago. Today American fighting planes go twice the speed of sound. And either our B–58 medium range jet bomber or our B–52 long range jet bomber can carry more explosive power than was used by all combatants in World War II—Allies and Axis combined.

Eight years ago we had no nuclear-powered ships. Today 49 nuclear warships have been authorized. Of these, 14 have been commissioned, including 3 of the revolutionary Polaris submarines. Our nuclear submarines have cruised under the North Pole and circumnavigated the earth while submerged. Sea warfare has been revolutionized, and the United States is far and away the leader.

Our tactical air units overseas and our aircraft carriers are alert; Army units, guarding the frontiers of freedom in Europe and the Far East, are in the highest state of readiness in peacetime history; our marines, a third of whom are deployed in the Far East, are constantly prepared for action; our Reserve establishment has maintained high standards of proficiency, and the Ready Reserve now number over 2½ million citizen-soldiers.

The Department of Defense, a young and still evolving organization, has twice been improved and the line of command has been shortened in order to meet the demands of modern warfare. These major reorganizations have provided a more effective structure for unified planning and direction of the vast Defense Establishment. Gradual improvements in its structure and procedures are to be expected.

U.S. civil defense and nonmilitary defense capacity has been greatly strengthened and these activities have been consolidated in one Federal agency.

The defense forces of our allies now number 5 million men, several thousand combatant ships, and over 25,000 aircraft. Programs to strengthen these allies have been consistently supported by the administration. U.S. military assistance goes almost exclusively to friendly nations on the rim of the Communist world. This American contribution to nations who have the will to defend their freedom, but insufficient means, should be vigorously continued. Combined with our allies, the free world now has a far stronger shield than we could provide alone.

Since 1953, our defense policy has been based on the assumption that the international situation would require heavy defense expenditures for an indefinite period to come, probably for years. In this protracted struggle, good management dictates that we resist overspending as resolutely as we oppose underspending. Every dollar uselessly spent on military mechanisms decreases our total strength and, therefore, our security. We must not return to the crash-program psychology of the past when each new feint by the Communists was responded to in panic. The bomber gap of several years ago was always a fiction, and the missile gap shows every sign of being the same.

The Nation can ill afford to abandon a national policy which provides for a fully adequate and steady level of effort, designed for the long pull; a fast adjustment to new scientific and technological advances; a balanced force of such strength as to deter general war, to effectively meet local situations and to retaliate to attack and destroy the attacker; and a strengthened system of free world collective security.

THE ECONOMY

The expanding American economy passed the half-trillion dollar mark in gross national product early in 1960. The Nation's output of goods and services is now nearly 25 percent higher than in 1952.

In 1959, the average American family had an income of $6,520, 15 percent higher in dollars of constant buying power than in 1952, and the real wages of American factory workers have risen 20 percent during the past 8 years. These facts reflect the rising standard of individual and family well-being enjoyed by Americans.

Our Nation benefits also from a remarkable improvement in general industrial peace through strengthened processes of free collective bargaining. Time lost since 1952 because of strikes has been half that lost in the 8 years prior to that date. Legislation now requires that union members have the opportunity for full participation in the affairs of their unions. The administration supported the Landrum-Griffin Act, which I believe is greatly helpful to the vast bulk of American labor and its leaders, and also is a major step in getting racketeers and gangsters out of labor-management affairs.

The economic security of working men and women has been strengthened by an extension of unemployment insurance coverage to 2.5 million ex-servicemen, 2.4 million Federal employees, and 1.2 million employees of small businesses, and by a strengthening of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. States have been encouraged to improve their unemployment compensation benefits, so that today average weekly benefits are 40 percent higher than in 1953.

Determined efforts have improved workers' safety standards. Enforceable safety standards have been established for longshoremen and ship repair workers; Federal safety councils have been increased from 14 to over 100; safety awards have been initiated, and a national construction safety program has been developed.

A major factor in strengthening our competitive enterprise system, and promoting economic growth, has been the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws over the last 8 years and a continuing effort to reduce artificial restraints on competition and trade and enhance our economic liberties. This purpose was also significantly advanced in 1953 when, as one of the first acts of this administration, restrictive wage and price controls were ended.

An additional measure to strengthen the American system of competitive enterprise was the creation of the Small Business Administration in 1953 to assist existing small businesses and encourage new ones. This agency has approved over $1 billion in loans, initiated a new program to provide long-term capital for small businesses, aided in setting aside $3½ billion in Government contracts for award to small business concerns, and brought to the attention of individual businessmen, through programs of information and education, new developments in management and production techniques. Since 1952, important tax revisions have been made to encourage small businesses.

Many major improvements in the Nation's transportation system have been made:

After long years of debate, the dream of a great St. Lawrence Seaway, opening the heartland of America to ocean commerce, has been fulfilled.

The new Federal Aviation Agency is fostering greater safety in air travel.

The largest public construction program in history—the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—has been pushed rapidly forward. Twenty-five percent of this system is now open to traffic.

Efforts to help every American build a better life have included also a vigorous program for expanding our trade with other nations. A 4-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1958, and a continuing and rewarding effort has been made to persuade other countries to remove restrictions against our exports. A new export expansion program was launched in 1960, inaugurating improvement of export credit insurance and broadening research and information programs to awaken Americans to business opportunities overseas. These actions and generally prosperous conditions abroad have helped push America's export trade to a level of $20 billion in 1960.

Although intermittent declines in economic activity persist as a problem in our enterprise system, recent downturns have been moderate and of short duration. There is, however, little room for complacency. Currently our economy is operating at high levels, but unemployment rates are higher than any of us would like, and chronic pockets of high unemployment persist. Clearly, continued sound and broadly shared economic growth remains a major national objective toward which we must strive through joint private and public efforts.

If government continues to work to assure every American the fullest

opportunity to develop and utilize his ability and talent, it will be performing one of its most vital functions, that of advancing the welfare and protecting the dignity, rights, and freedom of all Americans.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

In January 1953, the consumer's dollar was worth only 52 cents in terms of the food, clothing, shelter, and other items it would buy compared to 1939. Today, the inflationary spiral which had raised the cost of living by 36 percent between 1946 and 1952 has all but ceased and the value of the dollar virtually stabilized.

In 1954 we had the largest tax cut in history, amounting to $7.4 billion annually, of which over 62 percent went to individuals mostly in the small income brackets.

This administration has directed constant efforts toward fiscal responsibility. Balanced budgets have been sought when the economy was advancing, and a rigorous evaluation of spending programs has been maintained at all times. Resort to deficit financing in prosperous times could easily erode international confidence in the dollar and contribute to inflation at home. In this belief, I shall submit a balanced budget for fiscal 1962 to the Congress next week.

There has been a firm policy of reducing Government competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in the discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial industrial installations and in addition the curtailment of approximately 550 industrial installations operated directly by Government agencies.

Also an aggressive surplus disposal program has been carried on to identify and dispose of unneeded Government-owned real property. This has resulted in the addition of a substantial number of valuable properties to local tax rolls, and a significant monetary return to the Government.

Earnest and persistent attempts have been made to strengthen the position of State and local governments and thereby to stop the dangerous drift toward centralization of governmental power in Washington.

Significant strides have been made in increasing the effectiveness of government. Important new agencies have been established, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Council of Economic Advisers was reconstituted.

The operation of our postal system has been modernized to get better and more efficient service. Modernized handling of local mail now brings next-day delivery to 168 million people in our population centers, expanded carrier service now accommodates 9.3 million families in the growing suburbs, and 1.4 million families have been added to the rural delivery service. Commonsense dictates that the postal service should be on a self-financing basis.

The concept of a trained and dedicated government career service has been strengthened by the provision of life and health insurance benefits, a vastly improved retirement system, a new merit promotion program, and the first effective incentive awards program. With no sacrifice in efficiency. Federal civilian employment since 1953 has been reduced by over a quarter of a million persons.

I am deeply gratified that it was under the urging of this administration that Alaska and Hawaii became our 49th and 50th States.

AGRICULTURE

Despite the difficulties of administering congressional programs which apply outmoded prescriptions and which aggravate rather than solve problems, the past 8 years brought notable advances in agriculture.

Total agricultural assets are approximately $200 billion—up $36 billion in 8 years.

Farmowner equities are at the near record high of $174 billion.

Farmownership is at a record high with fewer farmers in a tenant and sharecropper status than at any time in our Nation's history.

The food-for-peace program has demonstrated how surplus of American food and fiber can be effectively used to feed and clothe the needy abroad. Aided by this humanitarian program, total agricultural exports have grown from $2.8 billion in 1953 to an average of about $4 billion annually for the past 3 years. For 1960, exports are estimated at $4.5 billion, the highest volume on record. Under the food-for-peace program, the largest wheat transaction in history was consummated with India in 1960.

The problems of low-income farm families received systematic attention for the first time in the rural development program. This program has gone forward in 39 States, yielding higher incomes and a better living for rural people most in need.

The Rural Electrification Administration has helped meet the growing demand for power and telephones in agricultural areas. Ninety-seven percent of all farms now have central station electric power. Dependence upon Federal financing should no longer be necessary.

The Farm Credit Administration has been made an independent agency more responsive to the farmer's needs.

The search for new uses for our farm abundance and to develop new crops for current needs has made major progress. Agricultural research appropriations have increased by 171 percent since 1953.

Farmers are being saved approximately $80 million a year by the repeal in 1956 of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery.

Since 1953, appropriations have been doubled for county agents, home agents and the Extension Service.

Eligibility for social security benefits has been extended to farmers and their families.

Yet in certain aspects our agricultural surplus situation is increasingly grave. For example, our wheat stocks now total 1.3 billion bushels. If we did not harvest one bushel of wheat in this coming year, we would still have all we could eat, all we could sell abroad, all we could give away, and still have a substantial carryover. Extraordinary costs are involved just in management and disposal of this burdensome surplus. Obviously important adjustments must still come. Congress must enact additional legislation to permit wheat and other farm commodities to move into regular marketing channels in an orderly manner and at the same time afford the needed price protection to the farmer. Only then will agriculture again be free, sound, and profitable.

NATURAL RESOURCES

New emphasis has been placed on the care of our national parks. A 10-year development program of our national park system—Mission 66—was initiated and 633,000 acres of park land have been added since 1953.

Appropriations for fish and wildlife operations have more than doubled. Thirty-five new refuges, containing 11,342,000 acres, have been added to the national wildlife management system.

Our Nation's forests have been improved at the most rapid rate in history.

The largest sustained effort in water resources development in our history has taken place. In the field of reclamation alone, over 50 new projects, or project units, have been authorized since 1953—including the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project. When all these projects have been completed they will have a storage capacity of nearly 43 million acre-feet—an increase of 50 percent over the Bureau of Reclamation's storage capacity in mid-1953. In addition, since 1953 over 450 new navigation flood control and multiple purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers have been started, costing nearly $6 billion.

Soil and water conservation has been advanced as never before. One hundred forty-one projects are now being constructed under the watershed protection program.

Hydroelectric power has been impressively developed through a policy which recognizes that the job to be done requires comprehensive development by Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise. Teamwork is essential to achieve this objective.

The Federal Columbia River power system has grown from two multipurpose dams with a 2.6 million kilowatt capacity to 17 multipurpose projects completed or under construction with an ultimate installed capacity of 8.1 million kilowatts. After years of negotiation, a Columbia River Storage Development agreement with Canada now opens the way for early realization of unparalleled power, flood control and resource conservation benefits for the Pacific Northwest. A treaty implementing this agreement will shortly be submitted to the Senate.

A farsighted and highly successful program for meeting urgent water needs is being carried out by converting salt water to fresh water. A 75-percent reduction in the cost of this process has already been realized.

Continuous resource development is essential for our expanding economy. We must continue vigorous, combined Federal, State and private programs, at the same time preserving to the maximum extent possible our natural and scenic heritage for future generations.

EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is already a milestone in the history of American education. It provides broad opportunities for the intellectual development of all children by strengthening courses of study in science, mathematics, and foreign languages, by developing new graduate programs to train additional teachers, and by providing loans for young people who need financial help to go to college.

The administration proposed on numerous occasions a broad new 5-year program of Federal aid to help overcome the classroom shortage in public elementary and secondary schools. Recommendations were also made to give assistance to colleges and universities for the construction of academic and residential buildings to meet future enrollment increases.

The administration greatly expanded Federal loans for building dormitories for students, teachers, and nurses training, a program assisting in the construction of approximately 200,000 living accommodations during the past 8 years.

There has been a vigorous acceleration of health, resource and education programs designed to advance the role of the American Indian in our society. Last fall, for example, 91 percent of the Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 on reservations were enrolled in school. This is a rise of 12 percent since 1953.

In the field of science and technology, startling strides have been made by the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In little more than 2 years, NASA has successfully launched meteorological satellites, such as Tiros I and Tiros II, that promise to revolutionize methods of weather forecasting; demonstrated the feasibility of satellites for global communications by the successful launching of Echo I; produced an enormous amount of valuable scientific data, such as the discovery of the Van Allen Radiation Belt; successfully launched deep-space probes that maintained communication over the greatest range man has ever tracked; and made real progress toward the goal of manned space flights.

These achievements unquestionably make us preeminent today in space exploration for the betterment of mankind. I believe the present organizational arrangements in this area, with the revisions proposed last year, are completely adequate for the tasks ahead.

Americans can look forward to new achievements in space exploration. The near future will hold such wonders as the orbital flight of an astronaut, the landing of instruments on the moon, the launching of the powerful giant Saturn rocket vehicles, and the reconnaissance of Mars and Venus by unmanned vehicles.

The application of atomic energy to industry, agriculture, and medicine has progressed from hope and experiment to reality. American industry and agriculture are making increasing use of radioisotopes to improve manufacturing, testing, and crop raising. Atomic energy has improved the ability of the healing professions to combat disease, and holds promise for an eventual increase in man's life span.

Education, science, technology, and balanced programs of every kind—these are the roadways to progress. With appropriate Federal support, the States and localities can assure opportunities for achieving excellence at all levels of the educational system; and with the Federal Government continuing to give wholehearted support to basic scientific research and technology, we can expect to maintain our position of leadership in the world.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The first consequential Federal Civil Rights legislation in 85 years was enacted by Congress on recommendation of the administration in 1957 and 1960.

A new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice has already moved to enforce constitutional rights in such areas as voting and the elimination of Jim Crow laws.

Greater equality of job opportunity in Federal employment and employment with Federal contractors has been effectively provided through the President's Committees on Government Contracts and Government Employment Practices.

The Civil Rights Commission has undertaken important surveys in the fields of housing, voting, and education.

Segregation has been abolished in the Armed Forces, in Veterans' Hospitals, in all Federal employment, and throughout the District of Columbia—administratively accomplished progress in this field that is unmatched in America's recent history.

This pioneering work in civil rights must go on. Not only because discrimination is morally wrong, but also because its impact is more than national—it is worldwide.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Federal medical research expenditures have increased more than fourfold since 1954.

A vast variety of the approaches known to medical science has been explored to find better methods of treatment and prevention of major diseases, particularly heart diseases, cancer, and mental illness.

The control of air and water pollution has been greatly strengthened.

Americans now have greater protection against harmful, unclean, or misrepresented foods, drugs, or cosmetics through a strengthened Food and Drug Administration and by new legislation which requires that food additives be proved safe for human consumption before use.

A newly established Federal Radiation Council, along with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, analyzes and coordinates information regarding radiological activities which affect the public health.

Medical manpower has been increased by Federal grants for teaching and research.

Construction of new medical facilities has been stepped up and extended to include nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities.

The vocational rehabilitation program has been significantly expanded. About 90,000 handicapped people are now being rehabilitated annually so they are again able to earn their own living with self-respect and dignity.

New legislation provides for better medical care for the needy aged, including those older persons, who, while otherwise self-sufficient, need help in meeting their health care costs. The administration recommended a major expansion of this effort.

The coverage of the Social Security Act has been broadened since 1953 to make 11 million additional people eligible for retirement, disability or survivor benefits for themselves or their dependents, and the social security benefits have been substantially improved.

Grants to the States for maternal and child welfare services have been increased.

The States, aided by Federal grants, now assist some 6 million needy people through the programs of old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the totally and permanently disabled.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

More houses have been built during the past 8 years—over 9 million—than during any previous 8 years in history.

An historic new approach—urban renewal—now replaces piecemeal thrusts at slum pockets and urban blight. Communities engaged in urban renewal have doubled and renewal projects have more than tripled since 1953. An estimated 68 projects in 50 cities will be completed by the end of the current fiscal year; another 577 projects will be underway, and planning for 310 more will be in process. A total of $2 billion in Federal grants will ultimately be required to finance these 955 projects.

New programs have been initiated to provide more and better housing for elderly people. Approximately 25,000 units especially designed for the elderly have been built, started, or approved in the past 3 years.

For the first time, because of Federal help and encouragement, 90 metropolitan areas and urban regions and 1,140 smaller towns throughout the country are making comprehensive development plans for their future growth and development.

American communities have been helped to plan water and sanitation systems and schools through planning advances for 1,600 public works projects with a construction cost of nearly $2 billion.

Mortgage insurance on individual homes has been greatly expanded. During the past 8 years, the Federal Housing Administration alone insured over 2½ million home mortgages valued at $27 billion, and in addition, insured more than 10 million property improvement loans.

The Federal government must continue to provide leadership in order to make our cities and communities better places in which to live, work, and raise families, but without usurping rightful local authority, replacing individual responsibility, or stifling private initiative.

IMMIGRATION

Over 32,000 victims of Communist tyranny in Hungary were brought to our shores, and at this time our country is working to assist refugees from tyranny in Cuba.

Since 1953, the waiting period for naturalization applicants has been reduced from 18 months to 45 days.

The administration also has made legislative recommendations to liberalize existing restrictions upon immigration while still safeguarding the national interest. It is imperative that our immigration policy be in the finest American tradition of providing a haven for oppressed peoples and fully in accord with our obligation as a leader of the free world.

VETERANS

In discharging the Nation's obligation to our veterans, during the past 8 years there have been:

The readjustment of World War II veterans was completed, and the 5 million Korean conflict veterans were assisted in achieving successful readjustment to civilian life;

Increases in compensation benefits for all eligible veterans with service-connected disabilities;

Higher non-service-connected pension benefits for needy veterans;

Greatly improved benefits to survivors of veterans dying in or as a result of service;

Authorization, by Presidential directive, of an increase in the number of beds available for sick and disabled veterans;

Development of a 12-year $900 million construction program to modernize and improve our veterans hospitals;

New modern techniques brought into the administration of veterans affairs to provide the highest quality service possible to those who have defended us.

CONCLUSION

In concluding my final message to the Congress, it is fitting to look back to my first—to the aims and ideals I set forth on February 2, 1953: To use America's influence in world affairs to advance the cause of peace and justice, to conduct the affairs of the executive branch with integrity and efficiency, to encourage creative initiative in our economy, and to work toward the attainment of the well-being and equality of opportunity of all citizens.

Equally, we have honored our commitment to pursue and attain specific objectives. Among them, as stated 8 years ago: Strengthening of the mutual security program; development of world trade and commerce; ending of hostilities in Korea; creation of a powerful deterrent force; practicing fiscal responsibility; checking the menace of inflation; reducing the tax burden; providing an effective internal security program; developing and conserving our natural resources; reducing governmental interference in the affairs of the farmer; strengthening and improving services by the Department of Labor, and the vigilant guarding of civil and social rights.

I do not close this message implying that all is well—that all problems are solved. For progress implies both new and continuing problems and, unlike Presidential administrations, problems rarely have terminal dates.

Abroad, there is the continuing Communist threat to the freedom of Berlin, an explosive situation in Laos, the problems caused by Communist penetration of Cuba, as well as the many problems connected with the development of the new nations in Africa. These areas, in particular, call for delicate handling and constant review.

At home, several conspicuous problems remain: promoting higher levels of employment, with special emphasis on areas in which heavy unemployment has persisted; continuing to provide for steady economic growth and preserving a sound currency; bringing our balance of payments into more reasonable equilibrium and continuing a high level of confidence in our national and international financial systems; eliminating heavily excessive surpluses of a few farm commodities; and overcoming deficiencies in our health and educational programs.

Our goal always has been to add to the spiritual, moral, and material strength of our Nation. I believe we have done this. But it is a process that must never end. Let us pray that leaders of both the near and distant future will be able to keep the Nation strong and at peace, that they will advance the well-being of all our people, that they will lead us on to still higher moral standards, and that, in achieving these goals, they will maintain a reasonable balance between private and governmental responsibility.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1961.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that it is the intention of the leadership to request, at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SAPPHIRE MATERIAL

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,800,000 carats of sapphire material now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN STEATITE TALC

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 42 short tons of block and lump steatite talc now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN BAUXITE FURNACE RESIDUES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 24 short tons of bauxite furnace residues now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADMINISTRATION BY THE VARIOUS STATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the limitation on the amount which may be made aavilable to the States in a fiscal year for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws and their system of public employment offices; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE AWARD NOTICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copies of the Nobel Peace Prize Award notice to the Congress of the United States, issued by the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Oslo, Norway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING-TYPE FUND IN THE TREASURY FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTRACTS FOR CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct

of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UTILIZATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO CIVIL LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Ill., reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of that club, for the calendar year 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, RELATING TO CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY, RELATING TO CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS

A letter from the Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE INTERSTATE SYSTEM COST ESTIMATE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1961 Interstate System cost estimate (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Dunkirk, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvements, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MOUNT NEUBERGER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ALASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my great privilege to announce that the Board on Geographic Names has named an Alaska mountain in honor of our late colleague, Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon.

Today I have been advised that the Board has designated a mountain near the Alaska Highway, in the vicinity of Tok Junction, as Mount Neuberger.

The suggestion that this be done in memory of Alaska's stanch and unswerving friend was first made by the Alaska Legislature in March of last year, following Senator Neuberger's untimely death.

Mount Neuberger is the highest summit of the prominent mountain range which can be seen to the south and west of Tok Junction and Tanacross. It is clearly visible from the Alaska Highway, in the building of which Senator Neuberger was closely associated as a captain in the U.S. Army.

Mount Neuberger is 6,747 feet in height.

This is a wonderful and deserved tribute to a great man.

"Bring me men to match my mountains," the poet wrote long ago of Alaska.

For Alaska, for the West, for the Nation, and for the world, Senator Neuberger was such a man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Memorial 59 of the last Alaska Legislature be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 59—IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

To the Honorable FRED A. SEATON, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable JEROME O. KILMARTIN, Executive Secretary, Board on Geographic Names; the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, Senator From Alaska; and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, Representative From Alaska:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in first legislature, second session assembled, respectfully submits that:

Whereas the people of Alaska shall be forever grateful to the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger for his gallant support of our struggle for statehood; and

Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper that this Nation and especially this State should express their gratitude to Senator Neuberger and commemorate his name: Now therefore

Your memorialist urges the Federal Government to name the mountain described on the attached memorandum, which is located near the eastern gateway to the State of Alaska, Mount Neuberger as a memorial to Senator Richard L. Neuberger.

Passed by the senate March 21, 1960.

WARREN A. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

ESTHER REED,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Pased by the senate March 21, 1960.

WILLIAM E. BELTZ,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

KATHERINE T. ULENDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Certified true, full, and correct.

ESTHER REED,
Chief Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTIONS BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DUNKIRK, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions by the Common Council of the City of Dunkirk, N.Y., be printed in the RECORD. The city of Dunkirk presently faces a number of serious economic problems—not the least of which is the fact that unemployment in this area has increased to the point that Dunkirk is now officially classified as a labor-surplus area by the U.S. Department of Labor. Unemployment was 6 percent in September of 1960—the last month for which we have figures. I am also informed that, although new figures are not yet available early indications are that unemployment in this area has increased significantly since last September.

The resolutions call upon the Congress to act to provide needed and deserved assistance to Dunkirk and to all cities beset by similar economic and unemployment conditions. I share the hope of the Common Council of the City of Dunkirk that the Congress will give this issue high priority.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY COUNCILMAN LAYMAN

Whereas the Congress of the United States is contemplating the enactment of legislation to check the growth of unemployment by providing Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvements; and

Whereas the city of Dunkirk, N.Y., has been designated a labor surplus area with a substantial unemployment problems; and

Whereas the city of Dunkirk, N.Y., sorely needs such public works and improvements as the expansion and improvement of the Dunkirk Harbor, beach erosion works, etc.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Dunkirk, N.Y., memorializes the Congress to enact legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives, to all area Congressmen, and to the U.S. Senators representing the State of New York. Carried, all voting aye.

BY COUNCILMAN HUTCHINSON

Whereas the city of Dunkirk, N.Y., has been designated a labor-surplus area; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is contemplating the enactment of legislation to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor surplus areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Dunkirk, N.Y., favors the enactment of such legislation authorizing Federal loans to assist local communities in labor surplus areas to build modern industrial plants; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all area Congressmen and to the U.S. Senators representing the State of New York. Carried, all voting aye.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL GRANDMOTHERS' CLUB OPPOSING OBSCENE LITERATURE IN THE MAILS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Grandmothers Club in their October 1960 national convention in San Antonio, Tex.

This material was forwarded to me by Mrs. Muriel B. Green, an official of the Baytown, Tex., Grandmothers Club, and was signed by Florence Newhall, national president of the National Federation of Grandmothers' Clubs of America, Inc.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Post Office Department has reported an unprecedented flow of obscene material into the United States from abroad; and

Whereas the Post Office General Counsel, Mr. Herbert B. Warburton, stated that in the past months customs officials in New York have intercepted 35 mailbags full of allegedly lewd material from Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and West Germany, consisting of approximately 20,000 separate items; and

Whereas first-class mail cannot be opened for inspection, and therefore these foreign distributors of said obscene literature are taking advantage of this situation; and

Whereas we demand each secretary of every member club of the National Federation of Grandmother Clubs of America, Inc., send an exact copy of this resolution airmail, within 5 days to their Congressman, in their own handwriting to demand personal attention, and we recommend that every member of our federation also send a copy of this resolution to their Congressman at once: Be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Grandmothers' Clubs of America, Inc., go on record that we have requested a bill be passed which will warant the postal authorities the same rights given the U.S. customs officials to investigate the obscene literature arriving by first-class mail from foreign countries to be distributed in our country. It is the responsibility of every member of our vast organization to protect the youth of our country from such obscene and immoral literature.

FLORENCE NEWHALL,
National President.
VERTA KING.
MARY NARDINI.
RUTH SERNE.
RUTH MCSHANE.
MILDRED FRIES.

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND RECEPTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 40) to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials, and submitted a report (No. 2) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed $5,000 from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman.

AUTHORITY FOR CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 41) to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, and submitted a report (No. 3) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961 to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $160,000 for the period ending January 31, 1962, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period July to November 1960, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request unanimous consent that the summary, together with a statement by me, be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel and pay summary, July through November 1960

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In July numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,360,631	[3] 2,382,549	−21,918	$1,091,954	$1,078,964	+$12,990
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,327,156	1,339,717	−12,561	606,940	582,513	+24,427
Department of Defense	1,033,475	1,042,832	−9,357	485,014	496,451	−11,437
Inside the United States	2,200,548	2,220,976	−24,428			
Outside the United States	160,083	157,573	+2,510			
Industrial employment	563,612	563,673	−61			
Foreign nationals	175,354	175,731	−377	23,038	[3] 23,036	+2

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Includes 3,013 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce, engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1960, and comparison with July 1960, and pay for October 1960, and comparison with June 1960*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	July	Increase	Decrease	October	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	89,689	[1] 100,261		10,572	$41,587	$40,327	$1,260	
Commerce [2]	31,763	[3] 36,177		4,414	16,254	25,046		$8,792
Health, Education, and Welfare	63,654	62,598	1,056		30,056	28,449	1,607	
Interior	51,557	56,644		5,087	26,693	26,470	223	
Justice	30,932	31,334		402	18,123	17,479	644	
Labor	7,063	7,190		127	3,875	3,675	200	
Post Office	573,056	567,657	5,399		242,277	224,981	17,296	
State [4]	38,070	38,043	27		18,308	15,984	2,324	
Treasury	76,998	77,741		743	40,432	39,432	1,000	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	421	445		24	240	250		10
Bureau of the Budget	438	437	1		358	327	31	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	31			24	27		3
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	70	1		34	32	2	
National Security Council	64	65		1	48	46	2	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,805	1,884		79	1,182	1,162	20	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	2	3		1	1	3		2
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	4	1		3	2	1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	12	8	4		8	4	4	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	445	454		9	79	86		7
Atomic Energy Commission	6,859	6,900		41	4,472	4,378	94	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	599	606		7	357	345	12	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission [5]						1		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	757	759		2	501	480	21	
Civil Service Commission	3,607	3,580	27		2,044	1,948	96	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	4	2		4	3	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	78	83		5	46	44	2	
Development Loan Fund	147	133	14		100	90	10	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	236	239		3	157	153	4	
Farm Credit Administration	242	243		1	157	159		2
Federal Aviation Agency	39,526	38,471	1,055		22,764	21,777	987	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	7		1	4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,359	1,413		54	832	811	21	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,240	1,250		10	698	705		7
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,048	1,005	43		636	607	29	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	341	344		3	271	267	4	
Federal Power Commission	842	861		19	530	526	4	
Federal Trade Commission	799	807		8	531	507	24	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	48	47	1		35	34	1	
General Accounting Office	4,918	5,082		164	2,820	2,779	41	
General Services Administration [6]	29,132	28,997	135		12,494	12,333	161	
Government Contract Committee	28	25	3		18	19		1
Government Printing Office	6,557	6,525	32		3,142	3,646		504
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,295	11,176	119		6,387	6,057	330	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17			16	15	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	2,371		1	1,443	1,395	48	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission [5]						1		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	15,929	15,093	836		10,268	6,435	3,833	
National Capital Housing Authority	339	329	10		138	139		1
National Capital Planning Commission	45	47		2	30	29	1	
National Capital Transportation Agency [7]	13		13		2		2	
National Gallery of Art	319	329		10	127	125	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,766	1,750	16		1,084	1,034	50	
National Mediation Board	122	118	4		85	108		23
National Science Foundation	659	592	67		388	369	19	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	41	43		2	25	27		2
Panama Canal	14,320	14,118	202		6,634	4,175	2,459	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,207	2,262		55	1,100	1,056	44	
Renegotiation Board	281	283		2	210	210		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	165		4	97	92	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,016	973	43		627	594	33	
Selective Service System	6,423	6,198	225		1,874	1,786	88	
Small Business Administration	2,312	2,265	47		1,359	1,268	91	
Smithsonian Institution	1,114	1,231		117	503	539		36
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,042		20	320	304	16	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	46	2		34	30	4	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1		22	19	3	
Tariff Commission	266	276		10	175	165	10	
Tax Court of the United States	151	153		2	109	112		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,249	15,260		11	8,192	8,519		327
Texas Water Study Commission	50	50			32	31	1	
United States Information Agency	10,841	10,883		42	4,076	3,874	202	
Veterans' Administration	173,701	173,511	190		69,268	68,493	775	
Virgin Islands Corporation	591	673		82	113	107	6	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,327,156	1,339,717	9,576	22,137	606,940	582,513	34,149	9,722
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			12,561				24,427	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	[8] 1,836	1,869		33	1,322	1,290	32	
Department of the Army	381,984	385,432		3,448	175,751	183,113		7,362
Department of the Navy	[8] 343,407	347,863		4,456	167,785	169,813		2,028
Department of the Air Force	306,248	307,668		1,420	140,156	142,235		2,079
Total, Department of Defense	1,033,475	1,042,832		9,357	485,014	496,451	32	11,469
Net decrease, Department of Defense			9,357				11,437	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [9]	2,360,631	2,382,549	9,576	31,494	1,091,954	1,078,964	34,181	21,191
Net change, including Department of Defense			21,918				12,990	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] November figure includes 224 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[3] Includes 3,013 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census.
[4] November figure includes 14,497 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 14,499 in July and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 3,892 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 3,971.
[5] Expired by law, June 30, 1960.
[6] November figure includes 1 employee of the Federal Facilities Corporation as compared with 2 in July.
[7] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 86-669.
[8] Subject to revision.
[9] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agenies during November 1960, and comparison with July 1960*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	88,675	[1] 99,249		10,574
Commerce [2]	31,170	35,574		4,404
Health, Education, and Welfare	63,207	62,151	1,056	
Interior	51,101	56,205		5,104
Justice	30,607	31,017		410
Labor	6,975	7,087		112
Post Office	571,805	566,484	5,321	
State [3]	9,193	9,123	70	
Treasury	76,432	77,187		755
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	421	445		24
Bureau of the Budget	438	437	1	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	31		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	70	1	
National Security Council	64	65		1
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,805	1,884		79
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	2	3		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	4	1	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	12	8	4	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3		
American Battle Monuments Commission	12	12		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,819	6,858		39
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	599	606		7
Civil Aeronautics Board	757	759		2
Civil Service Commission	3,604	3,577	27	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	4	2	
Commission on Civil Rights	78	83		5
Development Loan Fund	147	133	14	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	236	239		3
Farm Credit Administration	242	243		1
Federal Aviation Agency	38,627	37,615	1,012	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	7		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,357	1,411		54
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,238	1,248		10
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,048	1,005	43	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	341	344		3
Federal Power Commission	842	861		19
Federal Trade Commission	799	807		8
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	48	47	1	
General Accounting Office	4,844	5,002		158
General Services Administration [4]	29,130	28,995	135	
Government Contracts Committee	28	25	3	
Government Printing Office	6,557	6,525	32	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,150	11,032	118	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	2,371		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	15,924	15,088	836	
National Capital Housing Authority	339	329	10	
National Capital Planning Commission	45	47		2
National Capital Transportation Agency [5]	13		13	
National Gallery of Art	319	329		10
National Labor Relations Board	1,738	1,724	14	
National Mediation Board	122	118	4	
National Science Foundation	656	592	64	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	41	43		2
Panama Canal	402	396	6	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,207	2,262		55
Renegotiation Board	281	283		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	165		4
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,016	973	43	
Selective Service System	6,270	6,046	224	
Small Business Administration	2,286	2,240	46	
Smithsonian Institution	1,104	1,221		117
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,042		20
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	46	2	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1	
Tariff Commission	266	276		10
Tax Court of the United States	151	153		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,247	15,258		11
Texas Water Study Commission	50	50		
United States Information Agency	2,779	2,740	39	
Veterans' Administration	172,615	172,412	203	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,268,055	1,280,719	9,346	22,010
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			12,664	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	[6] 1,796	1,828		32
Department of the Army	331,478	336,408		4,930
Department of the Navy	[6] 321,281	325,916		4,635
Department of the Air Force	277,938	280,105		2,167
Total, Department of Defense	932,493	944,257		11,764
Net decrease, Department of Defense			11,764	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,200,548	2,224,976	9,346	33,774
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			24,428	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] November figure includes 224 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] November figure includes 1,946 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,988 in July.
[4] November figure includes 1 employee of the Federal Facilities Corporation as compared with 2 in July.
[5] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 86-669.
[6] Subject to revision.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1960, and comparison with July 1960*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,014	1,012	2	
Commerce	593	603		10
Health, Education, and Welfare	447	447		
Interior	456	439	17	
Justice	325	317	8	
Labor	88	103		15
Post Office	1,251	1,173	78	
State [1]	28,877	28,920		43
Treasury	566	554	12	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	433	442		9
Atomic Energy Commission	40	42		2
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	899	856	43	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	74	80		6
General Services Administration	2	2		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	145	144	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5	5		
National Labor Relations Board	28	26	2	
National Science Foundation	3		3	
Panama Canal	13,918	13,722	196	
Selective Service System	153	152	1	
Small Business Administration	26	25	1	
Smithsonian Institution	10	10		
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,062	8,143		81
Veterans' Administration	1,086	1,099		13
Virgin Islands Corporation	591	673		82
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,101	58,998	364	261
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			103	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	40	41		1
Department of the Army	50,506	49,024	1,482	
Department of the Navy	22,126	21,947	179	
Department of the Air Force	28,310	27,563	747	
Total, Department of Defense	100,982	98,575	2,408	1
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,407	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	160,083	157,573	2,772	262
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,510	

[1] November figure includes 12,551 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 12,511 in July. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 3,892 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 3,971.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1960, and comparison with July 1960*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,407	3,484		77
Commerce	5,671	1,983	3,688	
Interior	7,774	8,181		407
Post Office [1]				
Treasury	5,122	5,180		58
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	226	248		22
Federal Aviation Agency	1,684	1,386	298	
General Services Administration	1,347	1,254	93	
Government Printing Office	6,557	6,525	32	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	15,929	15,093	836	
Panama Canal	7,358	7,172	186	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation [2]	129	127	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,447	12,452		5
Virgin Islands Corporation	591	673		82
Total, excluding Department of Defense	68,476	64,002	5,135	661
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,474	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[3] 136,150	[4] 136,638		488
Outside the United States	[3] 4,475	[4] 4,708		233
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	199,493	202,205		2,712
Outside the United States	487	502		15
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	152,805	153,812		1,007
Outside the United States	1,726	1,806		80
Total, Department of Defense	495,136	499,671		4,535
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,535	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	563,612	563,673	5,135	5,196
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			61	

[1] July totals adjusted to include industrial employment for this Department. Industrial employment in August was 243, September 240, and October 233; these figures were omitted in previous reports.

[2] July totals adjusted to include industrial employment for this Agency. Industrial employment in August was 131, September 131, and October 129; these figures were omitted in previous reports.

[3] Subject to revision.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1960 and comparison with July 1960*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	November	July	November	July	November	July	November	July	November	July
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	30						30			
Crete	46						46			
England	3,305	3,214			14		3,291	3,214		
France	22,499	21,839	17,972	17,735	4	4	4,523	4,100		
Germany	81,070	81,056	67,996	[1] 67,817	56	56	13,018	13,183		
Greece	273						273			
Japan	58,142	59,725	20,384	[1] 20,633	15,636	[1] 15,639	22,122	23,453		
Korea	6,186	5,860	6,186	[1] 5,860						
Morocco	3,120	3,355			854	837	2,266	2,518		
Netherlands	42	41					42	41		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	1	1					1	1		
Trinidad	615	615			615	615				
Total	175,354	175,731	112,538	112,045	17,179	17,151	45,636	46,534	1	1

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased 21,918 during the period July through November 1960. The total in July was 2,382,549. In November there were 2,360,631 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net decrease of 12,561 during the period from July through November 1960, decreasing from 1,339,717 in July to 1,327,156 in November. The July figure included 3,013 enumerators, clerks, etc., engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense decreased 9,357 during the same period, dropping from 1,042,832 in July to 1,033,475 in November.

In the Department of Defense white-collar employment decreased 4,822 from 543,161 in July to 538,339 in November, and industrial employment decreased 4,535 from 499,671 in July to 495,136 in November.

In June the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $12,948 million and in October it was running at an annual rate of $13,103 million.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since Congress adjourned September 1, 1960.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 175,731 in July and 175,354 in November, a decrease of 377.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 379. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 380. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 381. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458), entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 382. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the middle Gila River project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 383. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 384. A bill for the relief of Otto Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 385. A bill to authorize an exchange of certain lands in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 386. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Struve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 387. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 388. A bill authorizing the purchase and distribution of surplus agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 389. A bill to convey certain lands in West Virginia to the Business & Development Corp. of Kanawha Valley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 390. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800, the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; and

S. 391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 392. A bill to convey certain property to the Morgantown (W. Va.) Ordnance Works; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Douglas M. Foley, Henry S. Hammett, and Carroll Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. BOGGS):

S. 394. A bill to amend the Randolph Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Fausto Lavari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 396. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a deduction by life insurance companies in determining gain or loss from operations of an amount equal to 2 percent of the premiums from individual accident and health insurance contracts; and

S. 398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for life insurance companies the same treatment with respect to losses on certain investment securities as is provided for banks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 399. A bill for the relief of W. L. Benedict; and

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Keum Ja Asato (Mrs. Thomas R. Asato); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MORTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FONG):

S. 401. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 402. A bill for the relief of the York Airport Authority of York, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 403. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 404. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 405. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 406. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 407. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 408. A bill requiring the use of surplus agricultural commodities in carrying out certain foreign aid programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 409. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court;

S. 410. A bill to require that litigants in cases reviewed by the Supreme Court be accorded an opportunity for hearing before that Court, and for other purposes;

S. 411. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 412. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 413. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to provide for public records of oil and gas leases issued under such act and other instruments affecting title to such leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Mardiros and Armenuhi Maryam Budak;

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel; and

S. 416. A bill for the relief of James Lee Garrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 418. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; and

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Brisk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Albert Mackie); and

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 422. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster;

S. 423. A bill for the relief of Fotios Gianoutsos (Frank Giannos);

S. 424. A bill for the relief of William G. Fettes;

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Bonifacio Tizon;

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;

S. 427. A bill for the relief of Mardiros Budak and Armenuhi Maryam Budak;

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Hanson; and

S. 429. A bill for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 430. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to $1,000 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as a deduction for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HILL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above joint resoution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. CARLSON):

S.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the organization of the Federal Communications Commission and the manner in which the electromagnetic spectrum is allocated in the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

MINORITY MEMBERS ON STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31); which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That members of the minority on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Messrs. Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of New Jersey, and Hickenlooper.

Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Appropriations: Messrs. Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, and Schoeppel.

Armed Services: Messrs. Bridges, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Banking and Currency: Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

District of Columbia: Messrs. Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Finance: Messrs. Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Foreign Relations: Messrs. Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Government Operations: Messrs. Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Interior and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Fong, and Miller.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott,

Judiciary: Messrs. Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Post Office and Civil Service: Messrs. Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Public Works: Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, Fong, and Boggs.

Rules and Administration: Messrs. Curtis, Keating, and Miller.

MINORITY MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32); which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following be the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business:

Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York; Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Senator Winston L. Prouty, of Vermont.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE AGING

Mr. McNAMARA submitted a resolution (S. Res. 33) creating the Special Committee on Aging, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MCNAMARA, which appears under a separate heading.)

CALLING OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ENGLE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 34) expressing the sense of the U.S. Senate that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ENGLE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX RELATING TO PRINTING OF REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 35) to amend rule XIX relative to printing remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX RELATING TO LIMITATION ON DEBATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 36) to amend rule XIX relating to a limitation on debate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX RELATIVE TO TRANSGRESSION OF THE RULE IN DEBATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 37) to amend rule XIX relative to the transgression of the rule in debate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE VII, RELATING TO MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 38) to amend rule VII relating to morning business, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE IN CERTAIN LEGAL DISPUTES

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. JAVITS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 39) relating to recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), which appears under a separate heading.)

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND RECEPTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 40) to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONTINUING STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 41) to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate bill 2, a bill to permit a tax allowance for earnings reinvested in small business. Twenty-five Senators, including all other members of the Small Business Committee, joined me in introducing this bill, to permit small firms to grow from earnings.

Today I am introducing three additional bills for small business tax relief. These bills and S. 2 would complement each other to provide effective small business tax relief.

For myself and Senators HUMPHREY, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, BARTLETT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JAVITS, COOPER, GRUENING, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce a bill to provide equal opportunity for all taxpayers who wish to provide for their retirement. Under this bill, any taxpayer not covered by a "qualified plan" under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, could deduct from his taxable income the lesser of 10 percent or $1,000 and place it in reserve for his retirement.

My second bill is cosponsored by Senators HUMPHREY, SMATHERS, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JAVITS, COOPER, SCOTT, PROUTY, GRUENING, and YARBOROUGH. This bill would extend to purchasers of used property the right to use all of the more rapid depreciation methods authorized in the 1954 code for purchasers of new equipment. Present law favors large firms which usually buy new equipment and discriminates against small firms which more frequently are compelled by economic circumstances to buy used equipment.

The third bill is cosponsored by Senators HUMPHREY, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, BARTLETT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, COOPER, SCOTT, PROUTY, GRUENING, YARBOROUGH, and ENGLE. This legislation would compel the Treasury to acquiesce in decisions of the Tax Court or courts of appeal unless it takes an appeal from those decisions. All taxpayers would receive equal treatment under this provision, and it would provide an element of finality in the tax laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each of these bills lie on the table through next Wednesday in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to cosponsor them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the table as requested.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, for himself and other Senators, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by individuals;

S. 378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property; and

S. 379. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws.

SAVERY-POT HOOK RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, in behalf of my colleague [Mr. HICKEY] and myself, a bill to authorize the construction of the Savery-Pot Hook reclamation project, a participating project under the upper Colorado storage project. This project is located in both Wyoming and Colorado, and its purpose is to revivify the economy of the Little Snake River Valley.

The prospect of its construction raised by the completion of the feasibility report last year, and by the introduction of two authorization bills during the closing days of the 86th Congress, has met with very favorable response on the part of the citizens and public officials of Wyoming.

The bill which my colleague [Mr. HICKEY] and I introduce today is similar to the bill introduced by former Senator O'Mahoney and cosponsored by myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL and Mr. ALLOTT] last session. This bill was based upon my own original bill. A second Savery-Pot Hook bill is being introduced today by the Senators from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL and Mr. ALLOTT]. Their bill will contain a proviso suggested by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, relative to the crediting of revenues in the Upper Colorado Basin fund in satisfaction of reimbursable project costs allocable to each of the two States.

Our bill does not contain this provision, because in our opinion section 5–e of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956, which we are amending, contains sufficient authorization for the conclusion of any such agreement which may be necessary in the future.

I wish to make it clear, however, that should the information presented at the committee hearing on my bill demonstrate the necessity for the inclusion of further specific authorization in addition to that which is contained in the original act, we will be glad to have our bill amended to include it.

In closing, I wish to thank the Senators from Colorado, as well as Representative WAYNE ASPINALL from Colorado, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and my colleagues on the Wyoming delegation, Senator J. J. HICKEY and Representative W. H. HARRISON, for their cooperation and aid in this project. I wish to say that this cooperation bodes well for its early authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 380) to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming, introduced by Mr. McGEE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada.

I believe the creation of this additional district judgeship for my State is necessary and fully justified.

The Judicial Conference of the United States has recently recommended the creation of a temporary judgeship for the district of Nevada. At its session in March of 1960 the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended the creation of a temporary judgeship for the district of Nevada, and that recommendation was renewed in September of 1960. I should like to point out that the bill now being introduced is for a permanent judgeship.

Nevada, until a few years ago, was a one-judge State. By Public Law 294 of the 83d Congress, a temporary district judgeship was authorized to help out in the conduct of the judicial business of the district of Nevada, so that when this temporary judgeship was filled, with two able judges serving the district, we had adequate judgepower for the efficient and expedient administration of justice. As the hearings on previous bills will show, the senior judge of the district of Nevada, the Honorable Roger T. Foley, for reasons of health, retired from the bench. Following his resignation, by the terms of Public Law 294 of the 83d Congress, Nevada reverted to a one-judge State.

Prior to Judge Foley's resignation, I introduced legislation to make perma-

nent this temporary judgeship, and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary included such a provision in omnibus judgeship bills previously reported to the Senate. Unfortunately, however, none of the bills reported to the Senate were enacted into law. Since the retirement of Judge Foley, due to the provision of the law that the first vacancy occurring in that judicial district should not be filled, it is necessary now, in order to provide for two district judges within the district of Nevada, that legislation be enacted providing for an additional district judgeship for the district, just as if this temporary judgeship had not existed. That is the intention of Senator CANNON and myself in regard to the introduction of this bill.

At this point let me say that most of the temporary judgeships now existing within the United States have been recommended as permanent judgeships by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The Senate Judiciary Committee acted favorably on the proposition of two permanent district judgeships for the State of Nevada in both the 83d and 84th Congresses and, again, in the 85th Congress approved a bill (S. 2714) providing for an additional district judgeship for my State. That bill passed the Senate on August 30, 1957, and was pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House at the close of that Congress.

Evidence has been submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in the form of letters from Judge Ross, the present judge, and Judge Foley, the retired judge, showing that a great amount of one judge's time is taken up in traveling the vast distances necessary to hold court in my State.

Judge Ross' letter indicates that the travel expenses of the judges, with the attendant clerks, marshals, and other court personnel, amount, in the aggregate, to around $17,000 a year, so that with only a slight additional amount a full-time judge could be provided for this district.

In addition to the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States for a temporary judge for the district of Nevada, I had occasion to listen to Judge Biggs, chief judge of the third circuit, in testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and it was with great pleasure that I heard his own personal views to the effect that there should be an additional district judgeship provided for the district of Nevada. His position has been supported by a resolution of the ninth circuit, to which the State of Nevada belongs. His position was also supported by the then Attorney General, the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., in hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee in the 84th Congress, and by the present Attorney General, the Honorable William P. Rogers, in testimony presented in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

I fully believe that the situation which existed when the Congress granted the temporary judgeship for the district of Nevada still exists and that there is just as much need at the present time, or even more, for the additional judgepower than has ever existed. This legislation has, as I have indicated, been approved by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on many occasions, and has had the support that I have heretofore stated. It is my intention to press for enactment of this legislation in this session of the Congress. I firmly believe that it is amply warranted, justified, and long overdue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 396) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESTORATION OF HISTORIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PAY RATES OF ACTIVE DUTY AND RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the proposed measure I am about to introduce seeks to restore the historic relationship between the pay rates of active duty and retired members of the armed services.

When the Congress enacted the military pay raise bill of May 1958, it created certain inequities which have adversely affected many retired personnel. What the bill of 1958 did was to provide for a 6 percent increase rather than a proportionate increase for everyone retired prior to its effective date of June 1, 1958. This considerably weakened the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay.

This bill, in which I am joined by 24 of my colleagues, is being introduced into the Senate for the third time, and I am happy to say it has the support of the Department of Defense and other Government departments concerned.

Legislation of this nature was passed by the House last year (H.R. 11318) but unfortunately the Congress adjourned before the Senate Armed Services Committee could hold hearings on it.

I hope the Senate will give speedy consideration to this legislation. It will correct an injustice to retired personnel now currently affected and will serve to strengthen the career incentives for active-duty personnel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 401) to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Senators HICKENLOOPER, MORSE, CURTIS, HOLLAND, SPARKMAN, BRIDGES, SCHOEPPEL, MCCLELLAN, SCOTT, HUMPHREY, WILEY, PROUTY, COOPER, COTTON, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MORTON, BENNETT, HRUSKA, CHURCH, MCCARTHY, BUTLER, BARTLETT, and FONG) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL JUDGES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], to provide first, one additional Federal circuit judge for the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware); second, three additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; third, one additional district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania; and fourth, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania. In addition, the bill would make the present temporary judgeship in the western district permanent.

These additional judges are urgently needed in Pennsylvania. Despite great efforts by the judge now sitting in the Federal courts there, the backlog of cases and the time from filing of cases until trial remains far too high.

The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit should be strengthened by the addition of one circuit judge. The number of cases pending there took a sharp increase in the third quarter of 1960, and the average time from filing of appeal until final disposition exceeds 6 months.

In the eastern district there were 4,223 civil and criminal cases pending on September 30, 1960. This means that each of the 8 judges in the district had a staggering caseload of 528 cases waiting disposition at that time. It would take 2 years for the judges to dispose of this backlog if no new cases were filed, but instead, new cases are being started at a record rate. Only one of the 85 other district courts in the country has a larger number of pending cases. Three new judges in the district, as recommended by the Judicial Conference, are clearly needed.

The judges in the middle district are also in need of assistance. The chief district judge has been seriously ill for some time. The only other judge is 75 and unable, alone, to carry the full load of the judicial work of the district. New cases filed have increased substantially. One additional temporary judgeship is required, as suggested by the Judicial Conference.

The situation in the western district also calls for immediate legislation. The backlog of cases pending there on September 30, 1960, numbered 1,592. The average delay from time of filing suit to time of trial was 35 months—almost 2½ times the national average. Unquestionably this long delay has caused denials of justice in many cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 403) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF YORK AIRPORT CO., YORK, PA.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the payment of $10,114.33 to the York Airport Co., York, Pa., in settlement of its claim against the United

States for work performed in 1955 at the request of the Air National Guard.

The services in question involve boring and soil analysis work performed by the airport authority at the request of the Air National Guard, which planned to have the authority construct an 8,000-foot runway for combined military-civilian uses. The guard was prevented from paying for the services performed by the authority because of an injunction suit brought by the owner of another airport in York, Pa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 402) for the relief of the York Airport Authority of York, Pa., introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CHURCH, GRUENING, HART, JACKSON, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, METCALF, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PELL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BURDICK, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a Youth Conservation Corps.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is precisely the bill which passed the Senate in the closing weeks of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, then known as S. 812. Passage of the bill followed extensive hearings by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare headed by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, and detailed discussion within the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Briefly, the proposal describes a corps of young men between the ages of 16 and 21, trained to carry on a needed program of natural resources conservation in our National and State parks and forests.

The objective of this proposed legislation is not only to accelerate vitally needed programs of conservation, but also to provide healthful training and employment of young men—to help prevent delinquency.

Overwhelming testimony from the leaders of the conservation groups in America, as well as from groups concerned with the welfare of young people, supported the establishment of such a corps.

The proposal is to establish a corps which would eventually amount to 150,000 young men, to be trained and to work under professional conservationists at modest pay plus subsistence, for periods of enrollment of 6 months.

The bill provides for the employment of these young men in such activities as tree planting, stream-bank stabilization, timber-stand improvement, reseeding, insect control, small watershed development, and the construction and rehabilitation of outdoor recreation areas.

The work performed could be on Federal lands and—on a matching basis—on State lands.

Mr. President, we are creating no new agency, no make-work boondoggles, but a simple and direct way to channel the creative energies of American boys into the planned projects of our Federal conservation agencies under the direct supervision and leadership of our splendid forest and park rangers, wildlife management specialists, and soil conservationists.

Mr. President, it was particularly gratifying to note that the report to the President-elect recently forwarded by the Commission on Distressed Areas, headed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], included a recommendation for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

While I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that the Youth Conservation Corps must be considered as a long-term resource conservation measure, it undeniably will have the effect of providing needed employment opportunities particularly in those areas of high chronic unemployment. Indeed, in the legislation which we propose, there is specific language providing for an emphasis on recruiting for the corps from the areas of chronic unemployment.

Mr. President, I am deeply hopeful that this proposed legislation may be acted upon early in the session without the need for extensive additional hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for additional cosponsors through Monday, January 16.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I request that I also be listed as an additional cosponsor. The Senator may recall that I voted for the measure at the last session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I apologize to the Senator from Pennsylvania for not having added his name to the bill long before, because he was surely one of the active supporters of the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 404) to authorize the establishment of a youth conservation corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MANN CREEK FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished senior colleague from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and myself, I introduce, for approprite reference, a bill to authorize the construction of the Mann Creek reclamation project on the Weiser River, in western Idaho.

In the 86th Congress, my distinguished senior colleague and I joined in the introduction of a bill to accomplish this objective. That bill was referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Late in the second session of the last Congress, it received the support of the Bureau of the Budget, and its enactment was recommended by the Department of the Interior.

The project is essentially for irrigation, and would serve an area of 5,060 acres of irrigable land along both Mann and Monroe Creeks, tributaries of the Weiser River. It would cost $3,221,000.

The primary project works would be the Spangler Dam and Reservoir on Mann Creek, together with diversion facilities from the reservoir to the existing Joslin ditch, and drainage facilities for the Mann Creek area of the project.

Spangler Dam would be a rolled earthfill structure creating a reservoir of 13,000 acre-feet capacity.

Water supply for the irrigated lands in the project areas is now primarily obtained by diverting the natural flows of Mann and Monroe Creeks. However, the natural flows of the creeks are at their lowest points during the critical part of the growing season, when there is the greatest need for this water. This impedes full production, restricting crops largely to hay and grain for livestock feed.

Construction of Spangler Dam would assure adequate water supply during the entire growing season, thereby allowing greater production of livestock feed per acre, and enabling the farmers to include cash row crops in farms which are now marginal in operation. This would improve both the farmer's income and the economy of the area.

In addition to irrigation purposes, this project would benefit fish and wildlife and would provide basic recreational facilities.

A fish trap to transport anadromous fish above the dam would be constructed on Mann Creek, near its confluence with the Weiser River.

The Secretary of the Interior would be charged with arranging with appropriate State or local agencies or organizations for the operation and maintenance of basic recreational facilities.

The cost for both the fish trap and recreational facilities would be nonreimbursable.

There has been extensive local interest in this project. The farmers themselves have aided the Department of Interior's investigations. The total reimbursable costs would be repaid by the irrigators over a 50-year period, with help from surplus power revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The cost-benefit ratio of 1.31 to 1 economically justifies this project, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 405) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of providing irrigation water for approximately 5,100 acres, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and providing recreational benefits, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities of the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho. The principal works of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir, diversion facilities from the reservoir, and drainage facilities.

SEC. 2. The base period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of the construction cost properly chargeable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of any development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within said fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from such net revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration as are over and above those required to meet any other present capital costs assigned for repayment from such revenues.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mann Creek project, to construct basic public recreation facilities but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be constructed until an agreement has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works authorized by this Act as he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661, and the following), and the portion of the construction costs allocated to these purposes, together with an appropriate share of the operation, maintenance and replacement costs therefor, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Before the works are transferred to an irrigation water users' organization for care, operation, and maintenance, the organization shall have agreed to operate them in such fashion, satisfactory to the Secretary, as to achieve the benefits to fish and wildlife on which the allocation of costs therefor is predicated, and to return the works to the United States for care, operation, and maintenance in the event of failure to comply with his requirements to achieve such benefits.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy.

A similar bill was introduced during the last session, and hearings were held before the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 6 and 15 of 1959, with reference to this and similar proposals.

This bill would establish a 4-year undergraduate school for the training of our oversea representatives.

Graduates of this school would be available for the Foreign Service, for work in the State Department, and for assignments with any other agencies of the Government which represent us abroad.

Appointment to such an academy would be made on the basis of competitive examinations and on an allocation similar to that of our three military service academies.

The curriculum of the Academy should, of course, evolve from experience rather than be established at the outset through legislation.

It would seem, however, that the courses of study might well be oriented toward liberal arts, with special emphasis on the study of the history, culture, customs, and languages of the area in which the student was planning to serve.

Field studies in these countries in the summer months would be a valuable part of this training.

It would be important for the training in the Academy to be as broad as possible. With proper supervision, judicious selection of faculty, and the use of visiting professors, the students should be able to achieve the necessary flexibility of skill and viewpoints that our representatives overseas should have.

The establishment of an academy of this character would have many advantages.

First, it would result in our sending better trained representatives to foreign countries.

Second, it would provide a much broader opportunity for American young people interested in serving their country abroad.

And, third, it would provide our Government with a pool of well-trained personnel with a specialty which could be effectively utilized.

Most important, it would put the training and recruitment of Foreign Service officers on a far sounder basis. In the military service academies we have seen that the experience of a 4-year training program, with students of common interests living together, results in a spirit and dedication that can only operate to the benefit of our country.

The United States is, and for a number of years has been, engaged in a protracted conflict with the Sino-Soviet Communist conspiracy. This conflict will continue for a long time.

We are now operating three military academies, training our youth to lead us in case we are attacked in a hot war. Surely we can afford and should promptly provide a Foreign Service Academy to train our youth for the cold war in which we are being attacked economically, politically, and psychologically.

The training we provide in a Foreign Service Academy would be of great benefit not only in combating communism, but also in showing the world the opportunities that exist for a better life through freedom and democracy.

So often it is asked, "What do the peoples of the world want?"

To live in freedom and be treated with dignity; to have a better standard of living and medical care, and an opportunity to provide for themselves and their families in a world of peace. These are the things that Americans have been working on for years.

If we can sell our way of life abroad, we can win this conflict.

Our failings in this area, to date, have not come from lack of effort. Our oversea representatives, for the most part, are dedicated and hard working. However, we have not kept up with other countries in recruiting and training a skillful force of career foreign servants.

By means of the training proposed in this bill, first hundreds, later thousands of dedicated men and women who desire to serve their country effectively will have that opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 407) to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and others), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Foreign Service Academy Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to establish and maintain a United States Foreign Service Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the instruction and training of foreign representatives of the United States Government.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State may appoint or assign such officers and civilian instructors as the needs of the Academy require.

SEC. 4. The supervision and charge of the Academy shall be in the Department of State, under such officer or officers as the Secretary of State may appoint for or assign to that duty, and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

SEC. 5. In the operation of the Academy the Department of State shall work in conjunction with the Board of Trustees.

SEC. 6. (a) The Board of Trustees shall consist of—

(1) the Secretary of State;

(2) two educators of prominence appointed by the President;

(3) two Members of the United States Senate, of different political parties, appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(4) two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Members of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for two-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment.

SEC. 7. (a) The authorized number of students at the Academy shall be as follows:

(1) four students from each State, two nominated by each Senator from the State;

(2) two students from each congressional district, nominated by the Representative from the district;

(3) two students from Puerto Rico, nominated by its Resident Commissioner;

(4) three students from the District of Columbia, one nominated by each of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

(5) one hundred and twenty-eight students from the United States at large—

(A) one nominated by the Governor of each State;

(B) seventy-five nominated by the President; and

(C) three nominated by the Vice President.

(b) No person may be nominated under clauses (1) to (5), inclusive, of subsection (a), unless he is domiciled in the State or in the congressional district from which he is nominated, or in the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico, if nominated from one of those places.

(c) If as a result of redistricting a State the domicile of a student, or a nominee, nominated by a Representative falls within a congressional district other than that from which he was nominated, he shall be charged to the district in which his domicile so falls. For this purpose, the number of students otherwise authorized for that district shall be increased to include him. However, the number as so increased shall be reduced by one if he fails to become a student at the Academy or when he is finally separated from the Academy.

SEC. 8. In order to permit an orderly increase in the number of students at the Academy during the period ending not more than four years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Board of Trustees may limit the number of students appointed each year during such period.

SEC. 9. The Academy shall operate as a coeducational institution and students shall be appointed thereto on the basis of merit, as determined by a competitive examination to be given annually in each State, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, at such time, in such manner, and covering such subject matter as the Secretary of State may prescribe. Students shall be appointed in the order of their merit as established by such examination.

SEC. 10. The students of the United States Foreign Service Academy shall receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point.

SEC. 11. The course of instruction and training for students at the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State, and shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of the degree of bachelor of arts. In prescribing such course of instruction and training, the Secretary of State shall provide that special emphasis be placed on the study of the history, culture, customs, folklore, and language or languages of the nations in which students may serve and provide for field studies in such nations. The Academy may arrange to assign temporarily selected students to the Air, Military, and Naval Academies of the United States for instruction in military observation. Upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course of instruction and training, students shall be granted the degree of bachelor of arts.

SEC. 12. Each student selected for admission to the Academy shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated, he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Academy; and

(2) accept an appointment and service, as an officer or employee of the United States, in any position for which he is qualified by reason of his special training at the Academy, for at least the three years immediately following the granting of his degree from the Academy.

SEC. 13. (a) The course of study at the Academy shall, during each year of its operation, be organized as follows:

(1) the months of September to May, inclusive, shall be devoted to classroom instruction of students at the Academy;

(2) the period from June 1 to June 30, inclusive, shall be devoted to annual leave for all students;

(3) the months of July and August shall be devoted to practical field training for students at the Academy.

(b) Such field training shall consist of assigning students for service positions under appropriate departments of the Government, whether within or outside the United States, by a faculty board on field training, with the approval of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 14. (a) Each graduate of the Academy shall be available for appointment as an officer or employee of the United States, in any position for which he is qualified by reason of his special training at the Academy, in accordance with the following priorities:

(1) the Department of State;

(2) the Department of Commerce;

(3) the Department of Agriculture;

(4) the Department of the Treasury;

(5) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(6) any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of State may, notwithstanding any provision of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, appoint a graduate of the Academy as an officer in the Foreign Service of the United States.

SEC. 15. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The United States Foreign Service Academy shall have power to acquire and hold real and personal property and may receive and accept gifts, donations, and trusts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill lie at the desk for a week so that Senators who may wish to do so may cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act to require greater use of surplus agricultural commodities in carrying out certain foreign-aid programs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 408) requiring the use of surplus agricultural commodities in carrying out certain foreign-aid programs, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for more than 10 years the United States has endeavored to aid nations of the free world in improving their position and their ability to contribute to the common goal of world peace and progress.

Our foreign-aid programs have made significant contributions to that goal.

In view of the current world situation, and the prospects for the future, it would seem apparent that the need for certain types of foreign aid will continue.

In light of this prospect, it is important that the mutual security program be continually reviewed as to possible improvements or perfections in line with changing circumstances.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced endeavors to modify the Mutual Security Act in accordance with developments in our domestic agricultural situation.

The productive capacity of American agriculture is well known. Our 5 million farms are able to produce, and have been producing more food and fiber than our own population uses, and more than we have been exporting. Hence, inventories of surplus farm commodities have been accumulating.

All reliable estimates point to a continuation of this situation for some years to come.

Improperly used, this productive capacity can become an economic cancer—not only to agriculture but to the entire Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is with regret that the Chair informs the Senator from Missouri that his 3 minutes, allowed under the rule, have expired and that it is necessary to cut him off at this point.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I plan to speak on a different subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Apparently the Senator from Missouri is not aware of the new rule that has been adopted, under which each Senator has only 3 minutes as a totality.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent for additional time on a different subject?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I must respectfully object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Senator from Missouri, of course, may obtain the floor later. In view of the objection that has been raised, he may not exceed the 3-minute limitation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks on this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of Senator SYMINGTON'S remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the other hand, if used wisely, our surplus production can be an important tool in furthering the aims and goals of our country and the entire free world.

The bill I have just introduced recognizes this fact, as well as the prospect of continuing agricultural surpluses and continuing need for foreign aid.

The bill requires that, beginning with fiscal year 1962, 25 percent of the funds available for the mutual security programs—excepting military assistance and the Development Loan Fund—shall be used to finance export and sale of surplus agricultural commodities. The funds generated through this action would be used in accordance with the general purposes of the Mutual Security Act.

Under the present language of the act, section 402, $175 million is earmarked for this purpose.

Under my proposed change, the funds available would be geared to a certain percentage of the total.

In the current fiscal year, the proposed language would result in a substantial increase in funds available under section 402.

I believe the increased use of surplus farm commodities in our foreign aid is desirable, particularly in view of the long-term prospects for a continuation of each.

Therefore, I respectfully request Members of the Senate to give this proposal full consideration.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1961.

This bill will increase the annual allowance of deductions for personal exemptions from $600 to $1,000, to become effective at the beginning of the 1961 taxable year.

It is obvious to us all that the $600 figure is wholly unrealistic now, and has been for some time. The soaring cost of living has made it impossible to support an individual for $600 per year. The latest cost of living index published by the Department of Labor now stands at an alltime high of 127.4.

In adjusting the allowance, we shall not only bring our tax structure into a more realistic position, but we shall also give the general economy of the country a much-needed boost. For this measure will, in effect, release immediately nearly $200 million of spendable income weekly into the marketplace, providing thereby substantial stimulus to our national economy.

The need for such a stimulus at this time is urgent.

The latest unemployment figures released by the outgoing administration's Department of Labor, those for November, show an increase of 452,000 over October. Unemployment was shown to be over 4 million, the highest figure for any postwar November.

If the present trend continues and the economy neither improves nor worsens, the outgoing administration's Department of Labor predicts 5.2 million will be unemployed in January and 5.3 million in February. Private sources predict the number of unemployed in February will be closer to 7 million. This is the worst picture of unemployment since World War II.

The outgoing administration anticipated a $4 billion surplus this year, but this has all but dwindled away because of a gradual but persistent deterioration of business conditions. We saw in fiscal 1958 what the decline of business conditions can do to our Federal budget. In that year we experienced the highest peacetime deficit in our history, some $12 billion. It was not because of spending appropriated by the Congress, nor was it because of emergency overspending by Federal agencies. Our greatest peacetime deficit was produced because the business recession of that year reduced taxable income and thereby reduced Federal income. The Federal Government simply cannot afford to allow our businesses to slump again as they did in 1958.

Other economic indicators also show our decline. There is a stepped-up outflow of gold from the United States. The number of jobs in steel, automobiles, and machinery are down. Inventories have climbed to a new record high.

We are in the throes of another recession, and we must act quickly to help speed recovery. I believe one of the most effective ways to deal with the problem is by increasing the net spendable income of America's workers. Increasing the personal income tax exemption immediately will place an extra $200 million weekly into circulation. More goods will be purchased. More services required. Inventories will decrease, and we will see an improvement in the employment figure and tax revenues by this stepped-up industrial activity.

Mr. President, every possible means should be used to avert further recessionary periods. This is one reason why I am advocating an increase in the personal income tax exemption. This is also the reason why I have suggested to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that our committee take a broad look at the entire fiscal picture early in the session.

One of our most important duties this session will be to act and act quickly to avert further economic stagnation. I know that a broad attack will be made on this problem to reverse current trends of high unemployment, slow growth, and bad business conditions. One of the main weapons to deal with the problem quickly is to place additional spendable income into the hands of the consumer.

Now is the time to bring our tax structure for individuals and families into proper perspective. The $1,000 deduction allowance is realistic and fair, and the effects that this measure would have on the economy are urgently needed.

I earnestly hope the Senate Finance Committee will begin hearings on this bill early. Action is needed. It is needed now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 431) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to $1,000 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as a deduction for income tax purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FORMER DWELLING HOUSE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], a joint resolution which would preserve as a national monument Hamilton Grange, the private home of Alexander Hamilton in New York City.

The house was built by Hamilton in 1802 and is now located on Convent Avenue, near 144th Street, in upper Manhattan. It is owned by the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, which has attempted for several years to raise the funds necessary for the restoration and preservation of the building.

Mount Vernon, Monticello, the Hermitage—almost every schoolchild in the land knows that these were the homes of Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson. The generations of Americans who have visited them have found these houses kept much as they were when their famous owners lived there. In stark contrast is the decaying wooden house at 287 Convent Avenue in New York City, which has a corroded plaque outside with this inscription:

> Hamilton Grange: The home of Alexander Hamilton, A.B., A.M., LL.D., statesman, soldier, administrator, lawyer, captain, major general, Member of Congress, member of the New York Legislature, Delegate to the Constitutional Convention, first Secretary of the Treasury, leader of the Federalist Party. He built this house in 1802.

This Congress, sitting nearly 200 years after Hamilton's death, has an opportunity to pay homage to the memory of a Founding Father by acting on the legislation submitted today for the purpose of preserving the Grange as a national monument. It is the only home ever owned by this great American, who was so instrumental in drafting and winning approval of the Federal Constitution. Yet today the Grange is rarely visited. Most of those furnishings which have survived the visits of vandals have been moved to museums for safekeeping. The rotting timbers, the broken windows, and crumbling paint-stripped walls—these are the physical remains of the home of one of this Nation's greatest men, the man who was our first Secretary of the Treasury and created the financial system which helped guarantee the economic survival of the United States in the critical early days of our Union.

There are abundant historic and architectural reasons why the Grange should be restored and open regularly to the American public. It was here that Hamilton retired after outstanding service to his country and commuted to his law practice in Wall Street at the turn of the 19th century. In these rooms he put his affairs in order before departing one dawn for his fateful meeting with Aaron Burr. Today it is one of seven buildings prized by architects as an example of the Federal period. One of the others is New York's City Hall, which still bustles with official business daily. It has never become a historical castoff like the Grange.

Last December the Grange was designated by the Interior Department as a "historic site" and found to possess "exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States." Surely, this action paves the way now for the most serious consideration of establishing the Grange as a national monument, which would assure us that the steps necessary for its preservation will be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title,

and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brief remarks I now present may be printed in the RECORD immediately after the remarks of my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], made when he introduced a joint resolution during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to be associated with my colleague, Senator JAVITS, as a cosponsor of the resolution to make Hamilton Grange, the home of the great American statesman, Alexander Hamilton, a national monument. The accomplishments of Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, are well known. He established our National Government on a firm basis of fiscal responsibility, and thus helped to insure the permanent survival and success of the constitutional principles of government which he had done so much to build.

His house, the only home that Hamilton ever built and owned for himself, is today squeezed between a church and an apartment building on 144th Street. Federal assistance is needed to move the house from its present location to a site which will be prepared for it on the grounds of City College.

The Interior Department recognized, on December 19, that Hamilton Grange possessed exceptional value and was eligible to receive a certificate as a registered national historical landmark. Surely, it should also be eligible to receive the Federal assistance which is necessary to preserve, as it ought to be preserved, a monument to the great man who lived there.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO JUDICIAL POWER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have seen the long arm of judicial tyranny—which since 1954 has been growing to alarming proportions—stretched further, to enjoin elected Governors and State legislatures from performing their sworn duties to administer and finance public institutions.

We have even seen farmers enjoined from exercising their right as freemen to decide who shall and who shall not work for them.

We have seen set into motion trends toward judicial dictatorship, which, if allowed to continue to their ultimate conclusion, will render impotent every legislative and administrative agency of representative, constitutional government from Washington, D.C., to every State capital and down to the smallest county seats and city halls in this Nation.

Mr. President, if Federal courts can dictate how public funds can and cannot be spent, then we no longer have need of a Congress or State legislatures.

Mr. President, if Federal courts can decree what actions Governors, State agencies, and local school boards can and cannot take, then those offices and departments have become useless luxuries.

Mr. President, if Federal judges who are appointed for life, and are responsible to no one except God, can issue sweeping edicts affecting all facets of the daily lives of all Americans, then the Constitution of the United States has been reduced to an artifact of a free society which no longer exists, except in name.

When I assumed the duties of a U.S. Senator, I took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is an oath which I did not take lightly; and I would betray my trust to the people of the great State I have the privilege to represent in part if I did not raise my voice in protest against—and do everything within my power as one Member of the Senate to halt and reverse—this accelerating judicial destruction of individual freedom and constitutional government.

Two courses are open to an individual Senator who is seeking to do his duty in this regard:

One is to propose constitutional amendments to correct judicial fiats which have the effect of amending the Constitution of the United States contrary to its provisions. The other is to introduce legislation to exercise the constitutional power of Congress to determine the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Twice since I have been a Senator, I have taken both courses with respect to the crisis created by the Supreme Court's school decision of May 18, 1954. An equal number of times, I have introduced companion bills to restore that tribunal to its appointed constitutional role.

It is for the purpose of initiating such action for the third time that I rise today; and, in so doing, I serve notice that I intend to continue advocating the measures I offer with every resource at my command for as long as I have the privilege of serving in this body the people of Georgia. I urge other Senators who share my sense of alarm over the present trend of events to join with me in so doing.

Mr. President, it was 2 years ago this month that I first introduced for myself and eight of my like-minded colleagues a proposed constitutional amendment to end for all times the continuing controversy which is disrupting the progress of education in this country.

The response to the proposal was enthusiastic, and those of us who offered it were greatly encouraged by the extensive hearings which were held on it in the spring of 1959. But our high hopes were dashed when the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments voted 3 to 2 to reject it, rather than to rewrite it to meet the various objections which were raised to it.

We revised the language of the proposed amendment, to meet each of the objections which were voiced to it; and the new version was reintroduced last January. Unfortunately, in the political passions of an election year, it was not considered on its merits; and it died with the adjournment of the 86th Congress.

Now, Mr. President, we enter a new Congress and, soon, a new administration, on a note of crisis in Federal-State relations. The distracting influences which prevented a deliberate, dispassionate consideration of the Talmadge school amendment are not now present. This is a year when Senators can give undivided attention to practical, rather than political, solutions to the problems which confront us as a nation.

It is therefore, in the hope that such will be the case, particularly in the light of the alarming trends which I have cited, that today I again introduce—for myself and the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], and the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG]—our proposed constitutional amendment to restore control over public education to the States, with specified safeguards to protect the constitutional rights of every parent and schoolchild of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the joint resolution embodying the proposed amendment be read twice, appropriately referred, and printed herewith in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, every State shall have exclusive control of its public schools, public educational institutions, and public educational systems, whether operated by the State or by political or other subdivisions of the State or by instrumentalities or agencies of the State. Nothing contained in this article shall be construed to authorize any State to deny to any pupil because of race, color, national origin, or religious belief the right to attend schools equal in respect to the quality and ability of the teachers, curriculum, and physical facilities to those attended by other pupils attending schools in the same school system."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the speech which I made before the Senate on last January 28, explaining the provisions of, and need for, this measure, also be printed at this juncture in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CONTROL OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last January, eight colleagues and I introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which we sincerely felt offered a reasonable and realistic solution to the worsening educational crisis growing out of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision prohibiting separate schools for the races.

The proposal was widely acclaimed not only in the South but also in all other sections of the country. Many newspapers carried editorials commenting favorably upon it and I had a number of them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I received hundreds of letters from individuals throughout the Nation endorsing the approach proposed by the Talmadge school amendment as fair, sound, and workable.

Extensive public hearings were held last May by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments at which an impressive number of responsible and respected leaders, including some of the country's best legal scholars testified in support of so amending the Constitution of the United States. The 282-page printed transcript of testimony taken at those hearings stands as irrefutable proof of the fact that support of the Talmadge school amendment is not limited to any one region, but is national in scope.

Unfortunately, the joint resolution embodying the proposed amendment was tabled in the subcommittee by a vote of 3 to 2 as the result of some of the specious objections which were raised to it.

There were some who contended that the language was too broad.

There were others who maintained that it opened the door to economic, religious and racial discrimination.

There were others who insisted that it would nullify the guarantee of "equal protection of the laws" contained in the 14th amendment.

There were others who charged that it would result in all manner of lowered standards, capricious regulations, and restricted educational opportunity.

Of course, Mr. President, all of those fears were completely groundless, and those of us sponsoring the proposed amendment sought so to assure the members of the subcommittee. As the principal author, I advised them that the sponsors would welcome any clarifying language which they felt was needed to allay the various apprehensions which had been expressed.

It was disappointing, therefore, that the subcommittee decided to table the proposal rather than revise its wording and give the full Committee on the Judiciary an opportunity to pass on it.

Consequently, the other sponsors and I have endeavored to rewrite the original joint resolution in an effort to satisfy the objections which have been raised to it, while, at the same time, striving to preserve the original objective of restoring control over public education to the States as intended by the framers of the Constitution. The result of our efforts is contained in a new joint resolution which I shall offer for introduction and appropriate reference at the close of my remarks.

Our revised amendment would read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, every State shall have exclusive control of its public schools, public educational institutions, and public educational systems, whether operated by the State or by political or other subdivisions of the State or by instrumentalities or agencies of the State: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this article shall be construed to authorize any State to deny to any pupil because of race, color, national origin, or religious belief the right to attend schools equal in respect to the quality and ability of the teachers, curriculum, and physical facilities to those attended by other pupils attending schools in the same school system."

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that this new language for the Talmadge school amendment should serve to set at rest all the fears of those who have had doubts either as to the motives of its sponsors or as to the ultimate result of its application.

Nothing in that language, Mr. President, would relieve any State of its obligation within the context and intent of the 14th amendment to guarantee all of its citizens equal protection of the laws. It would merely assure for all time to come that insofar as public education is concerned, no State could be deprived of its constitutional right to operate its public schools in accordance with the wishes of its citizens within the limits of constitutional guarantees.

Let me point out and emphasize, Mr. President, that the Talmadge school amendment is neither a segregation nor an integration measure. It rather is a proposal to reassert affirmatively the time-honored right of local people to administer their schools on the State and local levels in accordance with prevailing conditions, circumstances and attitudes. Under it, school patrons in each State would be free to determine for themselves through their elected representatives whether segregation, integration, or some median procedure would best serve the interests of their children and State.

The basic question involved is far more fundamental than the mere matter of who attends what school. It goes to the very heart of our concept of constitutional republican government; that is, the right of local self-determination.

The bedrock of our form of government is, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, that it derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." And whenever we in this country get away from that foundation of our freedom, as of that moment we will have ceased to be a nation in which the people govern themselves.

Mr. President, I recognize that on the issue of separation of the races in the schools of the Nation there is a wide divergence of opinion and individual feelings are strong and inflamed on both sides. Many false emotional factors have been injected, and those undoubtedly account for the fact that the Talmadge school amendment to date has not been considered on its merits.

As I endeavored to stress when I introduced the original version of the amendment last year, Mr. President, the constitutional and sociological ramifications of the Supreme Court's school ruling have stirred a continuing controversy which has divided the best minds of the country.

There are two opposing camps of opinion—those who consider the decision to be the law of the land and who are determined to force its implementation regardless of the results and those, like myself, who consider the decision to be outside the scope of the Constitution and who are dedicated to seeking its reversal by every lawful means.

On one hand, there is the accomplished fact of a Supreme Court edict, while on the other hand the overwhelming majority of the people of the South will neither accept nor submit to the forced implementation of it.

The only realistic, constitutional way by which the public schools in many areas of the South can be spared the fate of being crushed between those two millstones lies in recognizing that public schools are local institutions which must be operated by local people on the State and local levels if they are to survive.

It was with the view of affording such a solution that the original Talmadge school amendment was proposed last year, and it is with that same objective in mind that the revised version is being presented at this session.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the text of my statement before the Senate upon the introduction of the original amendment on January 27, 1959, printed at this juncture in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO VEST EXCLUSIVE ADMINISTRATVE CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

"Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no one can view dispassionately the recent course of events which has resulted in the closing of public schools in various localities of the South without experiencing a deep sense of sorrow.

"Neither can one objectively contemplate a future in which those events are allowed to continue to their ultimate conclusion without experiencing a shocking sense of alarm.

"The closing of any school anywhere is a lamentable occurrence.

"The closing of a public school system is a terrible tragedy.

"The destruction of public education in an entire region of our Nation would be an unparalleled catastrophe.

"Yet, Mr. President, a realistic appraisal of the facts of the matter affords no conclusion but that that will be the inevitable result of binding the citizens of the South in the chains of circumstance now being forged around them.

"And the real losers of such an eventuality unfortunately will be those who will have the least to say about it—the schoolchildren of the South and their parents.

"The importance of education hardly can be overstated.

"With the exception of seeking the salvation of his immortal soul, man has no greater responsibility than seeing that his young are educated to the fullest extent of their abilities and are equipped spiritually and intellectually to achieve mankind's highest destiny.

"The American concept of universal education, more than any other factor, is responsible for the greatness which this Nation has achieved. And it very likely may prove to be the determining factor in the outcome of our present life-or-death struggle with international communism.

"This critical juncture in our national life is no time to permit divisive issues to rob the Nation of the minds and talents of a great segment of its youth by closing the doors of the public schools in their faces.

"It is time, Mr. President, that someone spoke out in behalf of the voiceless masses who will suffer the consequences of such rash action.

"From their standpoint there is little difference between those who would destroy public schools with bombs and those who would close them with court orders.

"The end result of both actions is the same—to deny the children affected their right to a public education.

"Let us put the question in its proper perspective.

"The constitutional and sociological ramifications of the decision of the Supreme Court that separate, but equal, education is violative of the 14th amendment have stirred a continuing controversy which has divided the best minds of the country.

"There are those who consider the decision to be the law of the land and who are determined to force its implementation regardless of the results.

"There are others, like myself, who consider the decision to be outside the scope of the Constitution, and who are dedicated to seeking its reversal by every lawful means.

"Since there is no likelihood that those two viewpoints ever will be reconciled, it is essential to the future welfare of the Nation that all citizens face up to the two incontrovertible facts of the situation. They are these: First, regardless of whether one accepts it or not, the Supreme Court's school decision is an accomplished fact which will remain so until it either is reversed by the Court itself or is nullified or modified by Congress or the people; and, second, regardless of whether one likes it or not, the overwhelming majority of the people of the South will neither accept nor submit to the forced implementation of that decision and there is no prospect of any change in that position within the foreseeable future.

"Therefore, Mr. President, unless it is the wish of the Senate and the Congress that the Nation be torn asunder and the schools of the South destroyed, action must be taken soon to resolve the issue on a realistic, constitutional basis in the light of the facts just stated.

"To those who insist that compliance be compelled by Federal force, I would point out the disastrous consequence of such an attempt in Little Rock, Ark.

"Federal bayonets are not the answer.

"To those who would have the Federal Government finance and operate the schools of the South, I would point out the abhorrent results we have witnessed in our lifetimes from the attempts by Nazi Germany and Communist Russia to control education at the national level.

"Federal control of education is not the answer.

"To those who advocate inaction and who would sit by idly and smugly while children go without an education, would point out the unspeakable hypocrisy of using children as pawns of political expediency.

"Rearing a generation in ignorance is not the answer.

"What, then, Mr. President, is the answer?

"That is a question to which I have given 2 years of serious thought and careful study and about which I have sought the ideas and advice of lawyers and laymen throughout my State and region.

"In all candor I must admit, Mr. President, that I do not believe any one man, any one legislative body or any one court could devise a comprehensive answer which would cover all situations and meet all contingencies inherent in the present controversy.

"That is why I am convinced that the historians of the future will record as one of the gravest and most costly mistakes of our Nation the decision of the Supreme Court to make judicial questions out of matters of human relations which the sum total of the experience of mankind dictates should be left to the orderly process of evolution.

"But now that the Court has arrogated unto itself the authority to release the unknown contents of this Pandora's box, I submit, Mr. President, that it is now incumbent upon Congress to act to provide for the resolution of the resulting problems and tensions in a way compatible with American constitutional concepts.

"That way, Mr. President, lies in the recognition of the fundamental fact that public schools in the United States are local institutions which have been established and are operated and financed by local people on the local level.

"That way lies in freeing the Governors, legislatures, and school boards of the individual States to deal with each situation in the light of its own peculiar circumstances and in accordance with prevailing public opinion.

"That way lies in removing external pressures seeking to force compliance with unacceptable directives and edicts and rather permitting local school patrons to determine for themselves the manner in which the schools attended by their children shall be administered.

"That way can be paved, Mr. President, by the submission by this Congress for ratification by the States of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would read as follows:

" 'Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision.'

"Under such a constitutional provision, the citizens of each State and subdivision would be left free to determine for themselves—in accordance with local conditions and procedures and prevailing attitudes—how and when their schools, would comply with the Supreme Court's school decision.

"Such a provision would prevent destruction of the public schools of the South and would end for all time any threat from any quarter of Federal control of education.

"Such a provision would assure uninterrupted instruction for all children, regardless of their color or place of residence.

"Such a provision would permit either retention of the status quo or orderly change as dictated by the requirements of public opinion and make certain that whatever change might take place would be by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

"Such a provision would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we present a united front before our enemies.

"It goes without saying that the course I advocate will not be acceptable to those who wish to further their own partisan ambitions by punishing the South or to those who prefer for selfish reasons to keep the issue unresolved.

"But I submit, Mr. President, that it offers a constitutional solution to a national dilemma which is compatible with everything that is American and affords the one way in which those of us who disagree on the constitutional and sociological questions at issue can meet on firm common ground to serve the best interests of the present and future generation of American youth.

"I sincerely believe that there is not a Member of this Congress—regardless of the degree of his personal belief on this question—who could not vote for such an amendment with a clear conscience and in complete consistency with his principles.

"As for myself I am and always have been a stanch adherent of the principle of local self-government and local self-determination. I regard it as the cornerstone of our freedom; and there is not an issue in our national life today to which I would not be willing to apply it without reservation.

"I cannot bring myself to believe that any Member of the Senate who sincerely desires to see this disruptive issue peacefully and permanently resolved, and who genuinely is concerned about the welfare of all the children of this Nation, would oppose the submission of such an amendment.

"I cannot comprehend any thinking individual ever opposing the submission of any proposition to a vote of the people or their elected representatives.

"The very basis of our form of government is, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, that it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

"That is the crux of the present effort to force a new social order upon the South by judicial dicta—it is being done without the consent of the people directly affected.

"The sentiment of the people of my State of Georgia is best summarized by two editorial excerpts.

"The first, from the column of David Lawrence in the July 3, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report, states:

" 'The question before the country today is whether communities are free to adjust their school system to meet their own local conditions and local sentiment. Those States which desire to integrate their schools ought to have the sovereign right to do so, and those which desire to operate mixed schools in some counties and separate their schools in other counties, either by color or by sex or by intelligence tests, should have the same sovereign right.'

"The second, from an editorial by Editor James H. Gray in the November 27, 1958, issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald, reads:

" 'Surely, if commonsense is going to be injected into this question—and there has been too little of that because of the political capital that is being made of the votes of minority groups—this vital principle of consent of the governed must be maintained. Obviously, it can only be safeguarded by careful attention being paid to local conditions and local sentiment. * * * Freedom cannot flourish in a society where Federal force and political whims are the predominant cementing elements.'

"It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that the 2d session of the 85th Congress in two separate enactments affirmed the local nature of public schools and provided for their control on the local level.

"In the National Defense Education Act, Congress decided:

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over, and primary responsibility for, public education.

"In the Alaska Statehood Act, Congress provided in section 6(j) that 'the schools and colleges provided for in this act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, or its governmental subdivisions.'

"The States of the South, with no disrespect to their sister State of Alaska, feel they are equally entitled to exclusive control of their schools and colleges. The amendment I am offering today, if submitted and ratified, would assure for all time that all States would enjoy that right.

"The Supreme Court in its initial decision acknowledged the variety of local problems presented by its ruling and instructed the district courts to take local conditions into account in formulating their decrees under it. However, when the Little Rock district court sought to do just that last year, the High Court reversed itself and held that integration would have to proceed despite local conditions and the public interest.

"The Supreme Court thus has sought to establish itself—without benefit of constitutional or legislative authorization—as a super board of education superior to the Constitution, to Congress, and to the consent of the people. In the course of less than 5 years it has so disrupted laws governing education that every school in the Nation now is subject to the whims of whatever five men happen to constitute a majority of the Court.

"I do not believe, Mr. President, that it is the intent of this Congress or the wish of the people of this Nation that the local schools which were paid for and are financed on the local level should be at the mercy of a court which has no knowledge of educational needs or the public interest in fulfilling them.

"Of all our public institutions, none are more needful or deserving of stability and continuity than are our schools. It is inconceivable that the younger generation can

be educated for responsible citizenship in the future under continually changing rules of instruction.

"It is basic in organized society that the rights and wishes of the individual must be subordinated to the dictates of public opinion and the requirements of public interest. And it would be well for members of all three branches of Government—executive and judicial as well as legislative—to reflect upon the fact that the source of all law is the people and that laws and court decisions are enforcible only to the degree that they conform to the consent of the governed.

"It is with the desire to invoke our heritage of the 'consent of the governed' that I herewith submit for appropriate reference a constitutional amendment which would vest exclusive administrative control of public schools in the States and their political subdivisions.

"Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution on behalf of myself and the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

"Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be read twice by its title and appropriately referred.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

"The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"The joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision." '

"Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as I observed earlier, there are those who prefer the issue and there are those who genuinely want to resolve it.

"I hope that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and of this 86th Congress count themselves in the latter category, and will be willing to stand up and be so counted.

"This amendment is compatible with everything that is American. It is the American way. It is the constitutional way. It is the way of reason and commonsense.

"I pray, Mr. President, that for the future of education in the United States this 86th Congress will give the people of America, through it, the opportunity to reclaim their constitutional rights to run their schools on the local level according to the wishes of local people."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the argument that the Talmadge school amendment would result in lowered standards, capricious regulations, restricted educational opportunity, and various fancied forms of racial, religious, and economic discrimination is a gross insult to the intelligence, vision, aspirations, and humanity of all Americans of all regions.

No responsible individual would advocate or condone any backward step in the quality or quantity of American education. All thinking citizens recognize that the great need of our Nation in this era of scientific and technological revolution is for more and better education, and the extraordinary efforts which the citizens of the South presently are making to provide such education for all children of all races, national origins, and religions bespeaks more eloquently of their sincerity and good faith in this regard than anything I might say.

There would be no curtailment or infringement of educational opportunity for children of any race in the South as the result of the incorporation of the Talmadge school amendment into the Constitution of the United States. To the contrary the actual result would be an acceleration of the present effort to improve the educational opportunity of all children to justify the confidence of the remainder of the Nation in giving specific constitutional recognition to the right of the people of the South to work out solutions to their problems in accordance with the prevailing situation in each particular State.

Mr. President, the American people will have degenerated to a sad state indeed when, as some opponents of the Talmadge school amendment contended last year, the Supreme Court and its strained interpretations of the 14th amendment are the only remaining safeguards against inferior education in this country.

Fortunately for the Nation, Mr. President, the American people do not have so low an opinion of their conscience, sense of justice and fair play and ability to manage their own affairs as do some of their detractors on the national scene.

It is to give the American people the opportunity to prove that point, Mr. President, that I introduce for myself and the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] a proposed constitutional amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be read twice, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 154) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, every State shall have exclusive control of its public schools, public educational institutions and public educational systems, whether operated by the State or by political or other subdivisions of the State or by instrumentalities or agencies of the State: *Provided, however,* that nothing contained in this article shall be construed to authorize any State to deny to any pupil because of race, color, national origin or religious belief the right to attend schools equal in respect to the quality and ability of the teachers, curriculum and physical facilities to those attended by other pupils attending schools in the same school system.' "

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I think the facts I have recited support the conclusion that the gravest internal crisis to confront this country in recent years is the abuse of judicial power.

It was to the correction of that abuse that I directed a series of four bills which I introduced shortly after assuming my seat in this body, at the beginning of the 85th Congress. I presented the same measures again early in the 86th Congress; and I am today offering them for a third time.

The bills which I propose would:

First. Require Supreme Court Justices to have as a minimum qualification of at least 5 years of substantial judicial experience.

Second. Require the Supreme Court to accord full hearings to all parties before acting upon lower court decisions.

Third. Require jury trials in all cases of contempt arising from the disobedience of any Federal court order.

Fourth. Withdraw the jurisdiction of all Federal courts over matters relating to the administration of public schools by the States and their subdivisions.

These bills—coupled with the constitutional amendment which I earlier offered for myself and nine colleagues—constitute what I consider to be a minimum affirmative program for restoring a constitutional balance of power between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the rights of the States and their individual citizens, on the other. I deeply regret that—political realities being what they are—my proposals to date have not received the serious consideration they deserve. I sincerely hope, and respectfully urge, that they be accorded full hearings and due deliberation during this 87th Congress.

The future of constitutional government and individual and States rights demands no less.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce these four bills—the first three with the cosponsorship of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—and ask unanimous consent that they be read twice, appropriately referred, and their texts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, were received, read twice by their title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 409. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"No person shall be appointed after the date of enactment of this paragraph to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least five years of judicial service. As used in this paragraph 'judicial service' means service as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a judge of a court of appeals or district court of the United States, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State."

SEC. 2. (a) The caption of section 1 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Number of justices; quorum; qualifications."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"1. Number of justices; quorum."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"1. Number of justices; quorum; qualifications."

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 410. A bill to require that litigants in cases reviewed by the Supreme Court be accorded an opportunity for hearing before that Court, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2106 of chapter 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Supreme Court shall not upon review of any case affirm, modify, vacate, set aside, or reverse any judgment, decree, or order of any court unless each party to such case has been accorded full opportunity for hearing thereon before the Supreme Court, including opportunity for the presentation of oral argument before such Court."

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 411. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) sections 3691 and 3692 of title 18 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

"§ 3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally

"Whenever a contempt charged shall consist in willful disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of any district court of the United States (other than an injunction or restraining order) by doing or omitting any act or thing in violation thereof, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, the accused, upon demand therefor, shall be entitled to trial by a jury, which shall conform as near as may be to the practice in other criminal cases.

"This section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice, nor to contempts committed in disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command entered in any suit or action brought or prosecuted in the name of, or on behalf of, the United States.

"§ 3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders

"In all cases of contempt arising from the disobedience of any injunction or restraining order the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed. This paragraph shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

"No individual may be punished for contempt arising from the disobedience of any such injunction or restraining order unless—

"(a) such individual was a party to the proceeding in which such injunction or restraining order was issued, or willfully combined or conspired with any party to such proceeding to violate any prohibition or requirement of such injunction or restraining order;

"(b) such individual before such disobedience received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (1) the service upon him of a true and correct copy of such injunction or restraining order, or (2) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions of such injunction or restraining order and the effect thereof given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof; and

"(c) the prohibitions and requirements of such injunction or restraining order were described therein with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to such individual as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby.

This paragraph shall not apply to any proceeding for the punishment of any individual for any act or omission committed in his capacity as a director, officer, employee, agent, or member of, or attorney for, any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union in disobedience of any injunction or restraining order issued against and duly served upon such corporation, partnership, association, or labor union."

(b) The analysis of chapter 233 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.
"3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally.
"3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders.
"3693. Summary disposition or jury trial; notice—rule."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 155 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements

"Every injunction or restraining order issued by any court of the United States must describe each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to each individual subject thereto as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby. Each such injunction or restraining order must name specifically each individual who is subject to each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby, except that—

"(a) an injunction or restraining order issued against any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union may be made applicable to directors, officers, employees, agents and members thereof, and attorneys therefor, without naming in such injunction or restraining order each such individual; and

"(b) an injunction or restraining order may be issued against a specifically described class or group of individuals if (1) the court determines, upon a satisfactory showing made by the applicant therefor, that each such individual cannot be named specifically and that the applicant would suffer immediate irremediable harm if such injunction or order were not made applicable with respect to such class or group, and (2) such injunction or restraining order provides specifically that it shall not apply with respect to any individual until such individual has received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (A) the service upon him of a true and correct copy thereof, or (B) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions thereof and their effect given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof.

This section shall not relieve any court or party from compliance with any additional requirement prescribed by any statute or rule of court for the issuance of any injunction or restraining order."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements."

S. 412. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "General provisions applicable to courts and judges", is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 461. Jurisdiction; limitations

"No justice, judge, or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, or review, or to issue any writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command with respect to, any case, controversy, or matter relating to the administration, by any State or any political or other subdivision of any State, of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by such State or subdivision."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"461. Jurisdiction; limitations."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the texts of the speeches which I delivered before the Senate in 1959, explaining the provisions of, and the need for these bills, be printed herewith in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States sets forth specific qualifications which must be met by those desiring to serve as President or Members of either of the two Houses of Congress.

But it is completely and strangely silent on the question of the qualifications which should be possessed by Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 2 of article II specifies that Justices shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 1 of article III provides that Justices shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall at stated times receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Those are the only references in the Constitution to the office of Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

And the only logical conclusion which can be drawn therefrom is that there is no legal limitation upon the President as to the back-

ground and experience of those he nominates to serve on the bench of the Nation's Highest Tribunal.

He could appoint a plumber.

He could appoint a high school student.

He could appoint an alien.

Or he could appoint himself.

The failure of the framers of the Constitution to require that particular qualifications be possessed by the principal jurists of the country was a source of grave concern to the citizens to whom it was submitted for ratification. The people foresaw great danger to the Republic in a wide-open Federal judiciary composed of handpicked judges appointed for life and exercising power limited only by whatever exceptions Congress might choose to make.

Had it not been for the soothing assurances of Alexander Hamilton, that point well might have jeopardized approval of the Constitution. But Hamilton called such fears a phantom and maintained that there were so few men with sufficient skill in the laws to qualify them for the station of judges that the public could count on the selection of judges possessing those qualifications which fit men for the stations of judges.

Until the last quarter of a century, Hamilton's assurances held true. But for the past 25 years we have seen the fears of the early citizens of this Republic realized.

We have seen men appointed to the High Tribunal totally devoid of any of the tributes which Hamilton would have considered to "fit men for the stations of judges."

We have seen appointments made on the basis of political persuasion rather than the qualifications of the appointees.

The great mischief done by the resulting revolutionary innovations in constitutional law is evidenced by the growing demand throughout the Nation for Congress to enact legislation restoring the Supreme Court to its appointed constitutional role.

To illustrate my point, Mr. President, let us look at the present composition of the Supreme Court.

Of the nine Justices, only five have had any judicial experience and one of those received his experience as a police court judge. With the exception of Justice Brennan, none of the Justices had prior judicial experience of more than 5 years.

Only two of the nine Justices ever served as judge of a State or Federal court of general jurisdiction.

Only one of the nine Justices ever served as judge of a State appellate court.

Only three of the nine Justices ever served as judge of a Federal appellate court inferior to the Supreme Court.

The backgrounds of the other Justices are ones of Governor, Attorney General, Government official, and professor.

A majority of the members of the present Court did not even devote their major efforts to the professional practice of law before they were appointed to the Bench.

It is small wonder then, Mr. President, that the Supreme Court in recent years has been totally lacking in the restraint which must be inherent in the judicial process if judges are to adjudicate the cases and issues before them in the light of the Constitution, the law and precedent rather than their personal prejudices or political opinions.

The importance and necessity for judges to be possessed of restraint inherent in the judicial process was magnificently stated by a Member of this body—the learned and distinguished senior Senator from North Caroline [Mr. ERVIN], who himself is a graduate of the bench—in an address before the Texas bar in 1956. I would like to read from his remarks as follows:

"What is the restraint inherent in the judicial process? The answer to this query appears in the statements of Hamilton. The restraint inherent in the judicial process is the mental discipline which prompts a qualified occupant of a judicial office to lay aside his personal notion of what the law ought to be, and to base his decision on established legal precedents and rules.

"How is this mental discipline acquired? The answer to this question likewise appears in the statements of Hamilton. This mental discipline is ordinarily the product of long and laborious judicial work as a judge of an appellate court or a trial court of general jurisdiction. It is sometimes the product of long and laborious work as a teacher of law. It cannot be acquired by the occupancy of an executive or legislative office. And, unhappily, it can hardly be acquired by those who come or return to the law in late life after spending most of their mature years in other fields of endeavor.

"The reasons why the mental discipline required to qualify one for a judicial office is ordinarily the product of long and laborious work as a practicing lawyer, or as an appellate judge, or as a judge of a court of general jurisdiction are rather obvious. Practicing lawyers and judges of courts of general jurisdiction perform their functions in the workaday world when men and women live, move, and have their being. To them, law is destitute of social value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents. An additional consideration implants respect for established legal precedents in the minds of judges in courts of general jurisdiction and all appellate judges other than those who sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States. These judges are accustomed to have their decisions reviewed by higher courts and are certain to be reminded by reversals that they are subject to what Chief Justice Bleckley of the Supreme Court of Georgia called the fallibility which is inherent in all courts except those of last resort if they attempt to substitute their personal notions of what they think the law ought to be for the law as it is laid down in established legal precedents."

Mr. President, the fact that a man may possess a brilliant intellect, have fine attributes of character, and be actuated by the loftiest of motives does not necessarily qualify him to serve as a judge. Men who are excellent teachers, successful executives, and outstanding legislators do not automatically possess those characteristics which shape the temperament of a true judge.

Regardless of how one many feel about given decisions of the Supreme Court, any fairminded person will agree that its present members are gentlemen of notable attainment and outstanding accomplishments in their fields. But the fact nevertheless remains that the majority of them have not labored as practicing lawyers or as judges in State and Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court. Consequently, events have found them either unable or unwilling to subject themselves to judicial restraint or to sublimate their own beliefs and conclusions to the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the land.

For the past 25 years the Senate has made little use of its constitutional power to advise with and consent to the appointments of Supreme Court Justices by the President. By and large, confirmations have been made without record votes.

It is more than passing strange to note, Mr. President, that the degree of judicial usurpation of legislative power has been in the same proportion that the Senate has failed to exercise its power and responsibilities with respect to the confirmation of Justices.

Congress has the power to restore the Court to its proper function, not only through the limitation of its jurisdiction but also under paragraph 18, section 8, article I of the Constitution which provides:

"The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

It is under authority of that paragraph, Mr. President, that I today introduce for appropriate reference and consideration a bill proposing the addition of a new paragraph to section 1 of title 28 of the United States Code. That new paragraph would read as follows:

"No person shall be appointed after the date of enactment of this paragraph to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least 5 years of judicial service. As used in this paragraph, 'judicial service' means service as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a judge of a court of appeals or district court of the United States, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State."

Since the Constitution is silent as to the qualifications which Justices should possess, Mr. President, I feel it is incumbent upon Congress to bind the Chief Executive by at least minimum requirements which must be met by his appointees to the Nation's highest bench.

Since Congress already has acted to determine the number of Justices who sit on the Court, the amount of their salaries, the conditions of their retirement, and the number of their assistants, surely it is not unreasonable that it now should take steps to make certain that the Justices themselves are possessed of the tempering influence of detached consideration of legal problems which can be attained only through the highest type of judicial experience.

I do not believe anyone will dispute the fact that it is in the best interests of this Nation and of the Supreme Court that Congress act to assure that Supreme Court Justices henceforth will be selected only from among the country's best available legal talent.

The preservation and maintenance of our constitutional, republican form of government demands such action.

I sincerely hope that it will be forthcoming during this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I herewith submit my bill and ask that it be read twice and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 880) to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEARINGS FOR LITIGANTS IN CASES REVIEWED BY SUPREME COURT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I view with grave concern the increasing tendency of the Supreme Court of the United States to act upon lower court decisions without hearing oral arguments on the points at issue.

There is nothing in the rules of the Supreme Court authorizing the determination of cases without oral arguments unless they are waived by the parties concerned. Yet, during the 1957–58 term that tribunal acted without benefit of hearings in a total of 153 cases.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the list of those cases as compiled at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress be printed at this juncture of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CASES DECIDED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1957 TERM IN WHICH NO ORAL ARGUMENTS WERE HEARD

"1. *Virginia* v. *Maryland* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 3.
"2. *Arkansas Public Service Commission* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 4.
"3. *Krasnov et al.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 5.
"4. *Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railroad Co. et al.* v. *Frozen Food Express et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 6.
"5. *Simpson et al.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 7.
"6. *McCrary et al.* v. *Aladdin Radio Industries, Inc., et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 8.
"7. *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Crafts* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 9.
"8. *Nationwide Trailer Rental System, Inc., et al.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 10
"9. *White et al., doing business as Kitsap Automatic Dispenser Co. et al.* v. *Washington* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 10.
"10. *Monson Dray Line, Inc.* v. *Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc., et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 11.
"11. *Willits et al.* v. *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 11.
"12. *Lincoln Building Associates* v. *Barr et al., doing business as Swim for Health Association* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 12.
"13. *Cottrell* v. *Pawcatuck Co. et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 12.
"14. *Gibralter Factors Corp.* v. *Slapo et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 13.
"15. *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Premier Peat Moss Corp. et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 13.
"16. *Four Maple Drive Realty Corp.* v. *Abrams, New York State Rent Administrator, et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 14.
"17. *Watson* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 14.
"18. *Albanese* v. *Pierce et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 15.
"19. *U.S.* v. *Vorreiter* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 15.
"20. *Uphaus* v. *Wyman, Attorney General of New Hampshire* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 16.
"21. *Lewis* v. *Florida* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 16.
"22. *McGee* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 17.
"23. *Gutierrez* v. *Arizona* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 17.
"24. *Gibson* v. *Thompson* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 18.
"25. *Palermo* v. *Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 20.
"26. *Hobart* v. *Hobart* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 21.
"27. *New Orleans Insurance Exchange* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 22.
"28. *Hurt* v. *Oklahoma* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 22.
"29. *Association of Lithuanian Workers et al.* v. *Brownell, Attorney General* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 23.
"30. *Banta* v. *U.S. et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 33.
"31. *Banta* v. *U.S. et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 34.
"32. *Times Film Corp.* v. *City of Chicago et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 35.
"33. *Edwards* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 36.
"34. *Corsa* v. *Tawes* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 37.
"35. *Ford* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 38.
"36. *District Lodge 34, Lodge 804, International Association of Machinists* v. *L. P. Cavett Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 39.
"37. *Wometco Television and Theatre Co.* v. *U.S. et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 40.
"38. *Swift et al.* v. *Borough of Bethel, Pa., et al.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 40.
"39. *Williams* v. *Simons*, 355 U.S. 49.
"40. *In Re Lamkin* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 59.
"41. *Poret et al.* v. *Sigler* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 60.
"42. *Lee You Fee* v. *Dulles* (per curiam), 355, U.S. 61.
"43. *Stinson* v. *Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 62.
"44. *City of Nashville* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 63.
"45. *American Public Power Assoc.* v. *Power Authority of New York* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 64.
"46. *Turner* v. *Wright* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 65.
"47. *Rosenbloom* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 80.
"48. *In re Latimer* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 82.
"49. *Barr* v. *Matteo et al.*, 355 U.S. 171.
"50. *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Ohio Railroad Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 175.
"51. *Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Co.* v. *Dixie Carriers, Inc.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 179.
"52. *Mounce* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 180.
"53. *World Insurance Co.* v. *Bethea* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 181.
"54. *Seatrain Lines, Inc.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 181.
"55. *Camo et al.* v. *Pennsylvania* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 182.
"56. *Keco Industries, Inc.* v. *Cincinnati and Surburban Bell Telephone Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 182.
"57. *In Re Reteneller* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 183.
"58. *Walsh* v. *First National Bank and Trust Co. of Scranton, Pa.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 183.
"59. *Virginia* v. *Maryland* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 269.
"60. *Railroad Express Agency, Inc.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 270.
"61. *Carson* v. *City of Washington Court House, Ohio* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 270.
"62. *Nelson* v. *Tennessee* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 271.
"63. *MacDonald* v. *LaSalle National Bank, Conservator* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 271.
"64. *Rosengard* v. *City of Boston* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 272.
"65. *Southern Railway Co.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 283.
"66. *N. H. Lyons Co., Inc.* v. *Lubin, Industrial Commissioner of N.Y.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 284.
"67. *Grossman* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 285.
"68. *Trotter* v. *Hall* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 285.
"69. *Southern Railway* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 370.
"70. *One, Incorporated* v. *Olesen* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 371.
"71. *Sunshine Book Co.* v. *Summerfield* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 372.
"72. *Zavada* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 392.
"73. *Karadzole* v. *Artukovic* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 393.
"74. *Strauss* v. *University of the State of N.Y.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 394.
"75. *Taylor* v. *Kentucky* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 394.
"76. *Emray Realty Corp.* v. *Weaver* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 395.
"77. *Alleghany Corp.* v. *Breswick and Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 415.
"78. *Honeycutt* v. *Wabash Railway Co.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 424.
"79. *Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co.* v. *Corporation Commission of Oklahoma* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 425.
"80. *Spevack* v. *Strauss* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 601.
"81. *Sears* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 602.
"82. *Texas ex rel Pan American Production Co.* v. *City of Texas, Texas* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 603.
"83. *Oosterhoudt* v. *Morgan* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 603.
"84. *Roel* v. *New York County Lawyers Association* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 604.
"85. *Barnes* v. *National Broadcasting Co., Inc.* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 604.
"86. *Mills Mill* v. *Hawkins* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 605.
"87. *Klig* v. *Rogers* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 605.
"88. *Thrillens, Inc.* v. *Morey* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 606.
"89. *Rowland* v. *Texas* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 606.
"90. *Bendix Aviation Corp* v. *Indiana Department of State Revenue* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 607.
"91. *Carlson* v. *Washington* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 607.
"92. *Barnes* v. *Columbia Broadcasting System* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 608.
"93. *Gostovich* v. *Valore* (per curiam), 355 U.S. 608.

"*356 U.S.*

"1. *American Motors Corp.* v. *City of Kenosha* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 21.
"2. *Zivnostenska Banka* v. *Stephen* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 22.
"3. *Houston Railway Co.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 23.
"4. *Marshall* v. *Brucker* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 24.
"5. *Howard* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 25.
"6. *Shelton* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 26.
"7. *Ferguson* v. *St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 41.
"8. *Hurley* v. *Ragen* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 42.
"9. *Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.* v. *Loew's, Inc.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 43.
"10. *Forman et ux.* v. *Apfel Liquidating Receiver et al.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 43.
"11. *Peoria Transit Lines, Inc.* v. *City of Peoria* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 225.
"12. *Cantwell* v. *Cantwell* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 225.
"13. *Pratt* v. *Dept. of the Army* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 226.
"14. *Strong* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 226.
"15. *Matles* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 256.
"16. *U.S.* v. *Diamond* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 257.
"17. *Mendoza-Martinez* v. *Mackey* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 258.
"18. *Dandridge* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 259.
"19. *Butler* v. *Whiteman* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 271.
"20. *Georgia* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 273.
"21. *Jung* v. *K. and D. Mining Co., Inc.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 335.
"22. *New Yorker Magazine, Inc.* v. *Gerosa* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 339.
"23. *Van Newkirk* v. *McNeill* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 339.
"24. *Philyaw* v. *Arkansas* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 340.
"25. *Caine* v. *California* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 340.
"26. *Pogar* v. *New York* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 341.
"27. *Chauffeurs, Teamsters and Helpers Local Union 795* v. *Newell* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 341.
"28. *Yates* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 363.
"29. *Ratner* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 368.
"30. *Sacher* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 576.
"31. *Babcock* v. *California* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 581.
"32. *North Western-Hana Fuel Co.* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 581.
"33. *Porchetta* v. *Ohio* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 582.

"34. *New York Trap Rock Corp.* v. *Town of Clarkston* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 582.
"35. *Alhambra Gold Mine Corp.* v. *Alhambra Shumway Mines, Inc.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 583.
"36. *Browning* v. *Kansas* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 583.
"37. *Ellis* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 674.
"38. *Amlin* v. *Verbeem* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 676.
"39. *Hill* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 356 U.S. 704.

"357 U.S.

"1. *DeFebio* v. *County School Board of Fairfax County* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 218.
"2. *Cash* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 219.
"3. *Rogers* v. *Richmond* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 220.
"4. *Morand* v. *City of Raleigh* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 343.
"5. *Dunn* v. *County of Los Angeles* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 344.
"6. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Milk Drivers and Dairy Employees Local Unions Nos. 338 and 680, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, AFL–CIO* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 345.
"7. *Klaw* v. *Schaffer* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 346.
"8. *Glanzman and Bowery Enterprises* v. *Schaffer* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 347.
"9. *Washington* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 348.
"10. *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 566.
"11. *First Methodist Church of San Leandro* v. *Horstmann* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 568.
"12. *Columbia Broadcasting System Inc.* v. *Atkinson* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 569.
"13. *Pennsylvania* v. *Board of Directors of City Trusts of Philadelphia* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 570.
"14. *National Biscuit Co.* v. *Pennsylvania* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 571.
"15. *Primbs* v. *California* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 572.
"16. *Joines* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 573.
"17. *Indiviglio* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 574.
"18. *Ross* v. *Schneckloth* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 575.
"19. *Giordenello* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 576.
"20. *Urrutia* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 577.
"21. *Hansford* v. *U.S.* (per curiam), 357 U.S. 578."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am as opposed to gag rule in our courts as I am to gag rule in our legislative chambers. Freedom of speech and the right to be heard are inherent in our American tradition and when they are infringed upon it is the duty of Congress to provide an immediate remedy through the legislative process.

It is my conviction, Mr. President, that the ends of full justice are not being served by the present procedures of the Supreme Court, and it is out of that deep conviction that I herewith introduce for appropriate reference a bill to add a new paragraph to chapter 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, which would read as follows:

"The Supreme Court shall not upon review of any case affirm, modify, vacate, set aside, or reverse any judgment, decree, or order of any court unless each party to such case has been accorded full opportunity for hearing thereon before the Supreme Court, including opportunity for the presentation of oral argument before such Court."

I believe it is in the best interests of all Americans, Mr. President, that such a law be enacted at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1155) to require that litigants in cases reviewed by the Supreme Court be accorded an opportunity for hearing before that Court, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROCEDURE OF U.S. COURTS IN ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN INJUNCTIONS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the true significance of the term "civil rights" has become obscured by the political connotations given it in recent years.

Historically and constitutionally, the civil rights of the American people are those inalienable individual freedoms which are insured in perpetuity by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

They are the rights which begin with freedom of religion and extend through all other rights not prohibited to the individual by the Constitution.

They do not include fancied rights synthesized in the imaginations of political opportunists as lures for the votes of this or that pivotal minority.

Neither are they sometime things to be alternately enjoyed and denied according to the dictates of expediency or the whims of whatever majority may be in control of Congress at any given time.

Our Founding Fathers knew from the lessons of history that people lose their civil rights because of governmental action. And it was in recognition of that fact of life that they wrote into the Bill of Rights express prohibitions against any governmental interference with the enjoyment of them.

While it hardly is likely that the framers of our form of government considered any of the rights which they enumerated in the Constitution to be any more or less important than others, it is more interesting to note that only one was specified more than once.

That is the right of trial by jury which is guaranteed in four separate passages of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Section II of article III provides that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury."

The fifth amendment states that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous offense, unless on a presentation or indictment of a grand jury."

The sixth amendment guarantees that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

And the seventh amendment specifies that "in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved."

No other conclusion can be drawn from the sum of those four passages, Mr. President, but that the men who founded this Nation considered the right of trial by jury to be fundamental to the preservation of individual liberty and the maintenance of constitutional government.

It is more than coincidental, Mr. President, that those who have cried the loudest for legislation to force compliance with their notions of civil rights also are those who have been the most active in seeking to weaken, circumscribe, and destroy the right of trial by jury.

The most recent case in point is found in the debates leading up to the unfortunate passage of the misnamed Civil Rights Act of 1957 by the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Proponents of that legislation wanted a statute which would have permitted the summary punishment without jury trial of individuals accused by the Attorney General of the United States of violating someone's civil rights. They argued in defense of their position that Congress already had set the precedent for such action in enacting 28 regulatory acts beginning with the Interstate Commerce Commission Act of 1887.

Happily, that bill was shorn of its infamous part III by the Senate; but, unhappily, with regard to voting, it placed an unconstitutional qualification upon the right of trial by jury in that it authorized Federal judges to impose jail sentences up to 45 days and fines up to $300 without jury trials.

It cannot be denied, Mr. President, that Congress in conditioning the right of trial by jury and by placing a dollars-and-cents premium upon its exercise violated the constitutional prohibition against the enactment of laws respecting the enjoyment of rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I wish to reiterate, Mr. President, the strong feelings about that so-called compromise which I expressed before the Senate at the time it was adopted. I said:

"If a thing is right, it is right and it must be upheld. If it is wrong, it is wrong and it must be denied.

"There is no middle ground when it comes to fundamental truths and basic rights. The question of right and wrong is a question of black and white. There can be no shading of gray in the definition of either.

"That is true of the right of Americans to trial by jury.

"That right either is fundamental or it is not.

"That right either is guaranteed by the Constitution or it is not.

"That right either is inalienable with the individual or it is not.

"If our Founding Fathers had meant that the right of trial by jury should depend upon the benign generosity of an appointed Federal judge, I believe they would have so specified in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"If our Founding Fathers had felt that it was constitutional for appointed Federal judges to incarcerate American citizens for 45 days and fine them $300 on their own arbitrary motions, I believe they would have so provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

It was on that same occasion, Mr. President, that I sought to emphasize that the mere fact that trial by jury has been denied in 28 instances is no justification for denying it a 29th time. As I stated at that time:

"Jury trial opponents have sought to make much of the fact that there are now 28 laws under which Congress has authorized contempt proceedings without jury trials. Granted that that is true, it must be pointed out that none of them apply to individuals; and, even assuming they did, there is no logic under which justice can be built upon injustice or two wrongs added together to make a right."

One of the most lamentable developments of modern history, Mr. President, has been the ever-broadening tendency to extend the jurisdiction of courts of equity so as to invest them, in effect, with the enforcement of criminal laws.

The result has been to frustrate the administration of justice at the hands of a jury of one's peers and to substitute government by injunction for government by law.

The right of trial by jury, both in criminal cases and in suits at common law, was aptly described by the distinguished senior Senators from North Carolina and South Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JOHNSTON] in their minority views on the Senate version of the 1957 civil rights bill as "the best part of the inheritance of America from England." They emphasized that trial by jury "is the best security of the people against governmental oppression" and pointed out that "tyranny on the bench is as objectionable as tyranny on the throne."

The early history of this Nation affords a graphic example of the tyranny which results from denial of trial by jury in the

attempt by King George III to enforce the Stamp Act and other oppressive measures through the courts of admiralty, in which trial by jury was not permitted.

As we all know, our forefathers listed deprivation of "the benefits of trial by jury" as one of the "injuries and usurpations" which led them to fight for their independence.

Those who contend that trial by jury should be limited or denied because juries sometimes do not convict, either forget or choose to ignore that the basis of American jurisprudence is that the accused is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. Only in totalitarian countries is it otherwise, and, to my mind, it would be far better for 100 guilty men to go free than for 1 innocent person to be punished.

No free man, Mr. President, should be forced by his government to place his life, freedom, or property in jeopardy except upon the judgment of a jury of 12 of his equals.

It is true, Mr. President, that juries sometimes err. But I submit that it is far more likely that any error made will be made by 1 judge secure in his life tenure than by 12 impartial citizens cognizant of the fact that their fates, too, might someday rest in the hands of their peers.

I am in complete agreement, Mr. President, with the words of the great liberal, the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who declared in this Chamber in advocating the adoption of the Norris-La Guardia Act in 1932:

"I agree that any man charged with contempt in any court of the United States in any case, no matter what it is, ought to have a jury trial. It is no answer to say that there will sometimes be juries which will not convict. That is a charge which can be made against our jury system. Every man who has tried lawsuits before juries, every man who has ever presided in court and heard jury trials knows that juries make mistakes, as all other human beings do, and they sometimes render verdicts which seem almost obnoxious. But it is the best system I know of. I would not have it abolished; and when I see how juries will really do justice when a biased and prejudiced judge is trying to lead them astray I am confirmed in my opinion that, after all, our jury system is one which the American people, who believe in liberty and justice, will not dare to surrender. I like to have trial by jury preserved in all kinds of cases where there is a dispute of facts."

It is out of that conviction, Mr. President, that I am today introducing a bill proposing to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code to guarantee that all individuals cited for contempt in Federal courts shall have "a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed."

Furthermore, Mr. President, my bill specifies that no person can be bound by a Federal injunction unless one of three essential conditions is met. They are: First, unless the individual is a party to the proceeding; second, unless the individual is named in the injunction and is served with a true copy of it; or third, unless the injunction is read and explained by a judge in open court in the presence of the individual named in it.

The measure would apply, Mr. President, in all cases of contempt of court involving individuals except in those instances of contempt committed in the presence of the court.

Mr. President, I have made my bill applicable only to individuals for two reasons: First, because the right of trial by jury is one of those rights vested by the Constitution in the individual; and second, I have no desire to upset the Nation's body of regulatory law without a full study of all its ramifications.

However, I wish to state before the Senate that I personally favor assuring the right of trial by jury in all cases in which there are facts to be determined with the one exception of cases of direct contempt committed in the presence of the court. And I would be pleased to join with those who profess interest in protecting the civil rights of Americans to make certain that every American, corporate and individual, is accorded that right when before the courts.

The enactment of such a law, Mr. President, would protect all Americans from abuses arising through misuse of the judicial power of contempt and would constitute the most significant civil rights legislation to come out of Congress since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce my bill to be read twice and appropriately referred and ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed at this juncture as a portion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1231) to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) sections 3691 and 3692 of title 18 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

"'§ 3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally

"'Whenever a contempt charged shall consist in willful disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of any district court of the United States (other than an injunction or restraining order) by doing or omitting any act or thing in violation thereof, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, the accused, upon demand therefor, shall be entitled to trial by a jury, which shall conform as near as may be to the practice in other criminal cases.

"'This section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice, nor to contempts committed in disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command entered in any suit or action brought or prosecuted in the name of, or on behalf of, the United States.

"'3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders

"'In all cases of contempt arising from the disobedience of any injunction or restraining order the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed. This paragraph shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

"'No individual may be punished for contempt arising from the disobedience of any such injunction or restraining order unless—

"'(a) such individual was a party to the proceeding in which such injunction or restraining order was issued, or willfully combined or conspired with any party to such proceeding to violate any prohibition or requirement of such injunction or restraining order;

"'(b) such individual before such disobedience received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (1) the service upon him of a true and correct copy of such injunction or restraining order, or (2) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions of such injunction or restraining order and the effect thereof given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof; and

"'(c) the prohibitions and requirements of such injunction or restraining order were described therein with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to such individual as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby.

This paragraph shall not apply to any proceeding for the punishment of any individual for any act or omission committed in his capacity as a director, officer, employee, agent, or member of, or attorney for, any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union in disobedience of any injunction or restraining order issued against and duly served upon such corporation, partnership, association, or labor union.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 233 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec.

"'3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally.

"'3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders.

"'3693. Summary disposition or jury trial; notice—rule.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 155 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'§ 2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements

"'Every injunction or restraining order issued by any court of the United States must describe each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to each individual subject thereto as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby. Each such injunction or restraining order must name specifically each individual who is subject to each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby, except that—

"'(a) an injunction or restraining order issued against any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union may be made applicable to directors, officers, employees, agents and members thereof, and attorneys therefor, without naming in such injunction or restraining order each such individual; and

"'(b) an injunction or restraining order may be issued against a specifically described class or group of individuals if (1) the court determines, upon a satisfactory showing made by the applicant therefor, that each such individual cannot be named specifically and that the applicant would suffer immediate irremediable harm if such injunction or order were not made applicable with respect to such class or group, and (2) such injunction or restraining order provides specifically that it shall not apply with respect to any individual until such individual has received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (A) the service upon him of a true and correct copy thereof, or (B) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions thereof and their effect given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof. This section shall not relieve any court or party from compliance with any additional requirement prescribed by any statute or rule of court for the issuance of any injunction or restraining order.'

"(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements.'"

REMOVAL OF JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS OVER THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, responsible criticism of the usurpations of the Supreme Court of the United States is being heard with increasing frequency.

Throughout the Nation there is a swelling public outcry for Congress to act to restore the Court to its appointed constitutional role as the interpreter rather than the giver of the Nation's laws.

The Court's arrogations of legislative power and encroachments upon the rights of States and individual citizens have become so flagrant as to draw the stinging rebuke of the Conference of State Chief Justices.

The High Tribunal, according to the judges of the highest courts of the individual States, has adopted the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint; has assumed primarily legislative powers; and has allowed the individual views of its members to override a dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted.

The State chief justices declared that the Supreme Court's recent decisions "raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men."

The concern of the country about this situation prompted the significant debates which took place during the 2d session of the 85th Congress on the question of the so-called Jenner-Butler and Smith bills.

I supported both measures wholeheartedly and expect to give my support to the same or similar bills during the 86th Congress.

However, it was my conviction then—and it is my conviction now—that as worthy as those or similar pieces of legislation may be, they do not go far enough to correct for all time the judicial trends which are so alarming to those of us who believe the Constitution of the United States means word for word what it says.

That is true because they do not seek to correct the decision which set the pattern for the current wave of judicial usurpation—the Supreme Court's ruling of May 17, 1954, in the case of *Brown et al* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U.S. 483, 98 L. ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686, 38 A.L.R. 2d 1180) which held that State and local governments could not operate public schools for different races on a separate, but equal, basis.

Undoubtedly the reason that decision has not heretofore been included in any of the proposed corrective measures lies in the false emotional factors which have been injected into the school question by those who are more interested in pandering to the prejudices of minority groups for political gain than they are in preserving constitutional government or assuring the best possible public education for all the young people of America regardless of their color or place of residence.

But, Mr. President, I wish to point out and to emphasize as vigorously as I know how that so long as that decision is allowed to stand this Nation will never be free from the threat of judicial dictatorship and the Constitution and the rights of the American people will forever be subject to the whims of the men who transiently occupy the Supreme Court Bench.

The Brown decision represents a complete departure from judicial decisions based on the Constitution, the law, and established legal precedents. It substitutes in their stead bald court edicts based upon so-called modern authority and the personal opinions of the Justices.

The Brown decision raises grave constitutional questions, the disturbing and far-reaching ramifications of which cannot be obscured by a racial smokescreen.

It is to those constitutional questions that the bill I today shall introduce and that my present remarks are addressed.

I shall say for the benefit of the professional race baiters and the chronic bleeding hearts, Mr. President, that the races are living together in harmony and mutual respect in my State of Georgia. They are solving whatever racial problems Georgia may have on the local level in accordance with local wishes. I am confident those good relations will continue, regardless of what the future may bring.

I say that, Mr. President, because Georgia citizens of all races recognize that the question involved is one far more fundamental than the issue of who goes to which school. They are aware that it goes to the very heart of constitutional government—the balance between a Federal Government of limited powers and State and local governments exercising all other powers.

In writing the Brown decision the Supreme Court ignored 105 years of judicial precedent, the clear meaning of the 10th amendment, and the obvious intent of the 14th amendment.

It overruled at least 5 of its own decisions, at least 18 Federal district and circuit court decisions, and at least 59 State and territorial court decisions.

It cited as its only authority books and treatises on sociology and psychology written by men on questionable background and doubtful loyalty.

It was unable to point to a single law or legal precedent to support its decision. It could not, because there were none; they were all on the other side.

It substituted modern authority for the Constitution, intangible considerations for legal precedent, and we-cannot-turn-the-clock-back doctrine for the intent of the framers of the Constitution and its amendments.

The Court found it necessary to jump a number of high hurdles in order to reach its desired conclusion.

Its first hurdle was the 14th amendment itself.

Briefs submitted at the request of the Court showed that the same 39th Congress which promulgated the 14th amendment established separate schools for the races in the District of Columbia. They further pointed out that of the 37 States in existence at that time, only 5 abolished separate schools contemporaneously with the ratification of the 14th amendment, and 3 of those later did so.

Even in the face of such preponderance of evidence that the 14th amendment was not intended to abolish separate schools, the Court pleaded ignorance. It said the record was "inconclusive," and maintained that it could "not turn the clock back to 1868."

The Court then went on to ignore the language of the 5th section of the 14th amendment, which provides that Congress is to enforce it with "appropriate legislation." The fact that Congress had never seen fit to do so with respect to public schools was lost upon the Court in writing its decision in the Brown case.

The second hurdle which the Court had to clear was the 10th amendment.

The 10th amendment reserves to the individual States all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government; and education is one of the many functions left—by virtue of constitutional silence—to the States. Nowhere in the Constitution can there be found any wording which, either by direction or innuendo, deprives the States of the right to administer their school systems in accordance with local wishes.

The Court did not regard that fact even worthy of consideration. It brushed the 10th amendment aside as if it did not exist, and did not even mention it in its ruling.

The Court's third hurdle was that of its own decisions upholding the "separate, but equal" doctrine laid down in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537) in 1896, and upheld by that tribunal as late as 1950.

It was at that point in its deliberations that the Court came up with its new theory that separate schools are "inherently unequal," and held that Plessy against Ferguson was bad sociology not supported by modern authority.

It was at that point that the Court introduced, via footnote 11 of the Brown decision, the nine so-called modern authorities on sociology and psychology on which it relied for its finding that separate schools are unconstitutional.

The Harvard Law Review, in commenting on the ruling, stated:

"In dealing with prior cases, especially *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, the Chief Justice did not seek to demonstrate that the Court had once blundered. His point, rather, was that these prior decisons were simply outmoded in present-day society (68 Harv. L. Rev. 96)."

Thus was introduced a new rule for testing constitutionality—the rule of whether a law or practice is, in the opinion of the judges, outmoded.

In the Brown case, the Court did not hold that the facts disclosed by the briefs and arguments presented before it justified a departure from the separate, but equal, doctrine. It held, rather, that psychological knowledge was of greater validity than the facts and the law.

The Court conceded that the cases before it demonstrated equality of school facilities in respect to all tangible factors. But it maintained that its decision could not turn on such tangible factors, but, rather, must have its basis in intangible considerations.

On that premise it declared:

"Whatever may have been the psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected."

It is an elemental rule of law that a court may not consider treatises in a field other than law unless the treatises themselves are the very subject of inquiry. The Supreme Court itself has so held in a number of cases.

In *Pinkus* v. *Reilly* (338 U.S. 269) the Court held that the use of nonlegal materials in a case was illegal, illogical, and unfair.

In *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.* v. *McGrath* (341 U.S. 292) the Court said the use of such material constituted a denial of "the rudiments of fair play" and amounted to "condemnation without trial."

In *U.S.* v. *Abilene & Southern Railway Company* (265 U.S. 347) Justice Brandeis wrote:

"Nothing can be treated as evidence which was not introduced as such."

That rule was universal until the Supreme Court found it standing in the way of the decision it was determined to render in the Brown case.

And what of the modern authority upon which the Court based its decision?

Two of the six principal authorities listed by the Court—Theodore Brameld and E. Franklin Frazier—have between them been members of, or identified with, 28 organizations declared by the Attorney General of the United States or the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives to be Communist, Communist fronts, or Communist dominated. A third of the six—K. B. Clark—was, at the time of the arguments before the Court, on the payroll of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a so-called social-science expert—a highly irregular procedure in view of the fact that the NAACP was the principal plaintiff in those cases.

The book, "An American Dilemma," written by Dr. Karl Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist, on grant from the Carnegie Foundation, was cited in its entirety by the

Supreme Court as an authority for its ruling. Sixteen of the contributors to that book have lengthy records of pro-Communist activity, in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee. One of them, Negro educator W. E. B. DuBois, who contributed to 82 portions of the book, has been cited no less than 72 times by the committee. He filed briefs on behalf of executed atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and sent a message of condolence upon the death of Joseph Stalin.

It was in that book that Myrdal declared, on page 13, that the U.S. Constitution is impractical and ill suited for modern conditions and characterized its adoption as nearly a plot against the common people. Furthermore, he openly avowed that liberty must be forsaken for what he called social equality.

By declaration of the Supreme Court, Dr. Myrdal and his book have now become modern authority, and what was aptly termed by one of the Nation's foremost authorities on constitutional law, Hon. R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga., as "corpus juris tertius in American pseudo-socio-law."

The dangers inherent in substituting sociological and psychological theories for law are obvious.

U.S. Circuit Judge Jerome Frank recognized that, when he wrote that such generalizations and the "inferences derived therefrom are almost certain to be importantly false. For the consequences of the operation of certain customs or group attitudes are often canceled out by the consequences of other conflicting customs and attitudes."

Even the latest book cited in footnote 11, "Personality in the Making," by Witmer and Kotinsky, states:

"Unfortunately for scientific accuracy and adequacy, thoroughly satisfactory methods of determining the effects of prejudices and discrimination on health or personality have not yet been devised, nor has a sufficient number of studies dealing with the various minority groups been made."

Writer Edmond Cohn, who agrees with the result of the Brown case, nevertheless critized the use of sociological authority and stated the danger therein in these words:

"The word 'danger' is used advisedly, because I would not have the constitutional rights of * * * Americans rest on such flimsy foundations as some of the scientific demonstrations in these records."

Since the behavioral sciences are very young, imprecise, and changeable, their findings have an uncertain life expectancy, and today's observations very likely will be canceled by tomorrow's theories.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, is it right that our fundamental constitutional rights should be conditioned upon the latest psychological literature or scientific theory?

As surely as day follows night, if the Supreme Court is permitted to use psychology and sociology books instead of law books as the basis for its decisions, there is no area of American life which it cannot touch and attempt to revolutionize whenever it may take the notion.

Those who feel it is proper for Myrdal to be the authority for the school decision had best reflect, Mr. President, on how they would like for Freud or Kinsey to be the authority for rulings on their States' laws governing public conduct.

In basing the Brown decision on so-called modern authority, the Supreme Court was guilty of what it itself has frequently condemned.

For example, as late as 1952, Justice Frankfurter wrote in his decision in the case of *Beauharnais* v. *People of Illinois* (343 U.S. 250):

"Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution for problems as intractable as the frictions attrituable to differences of race, color, or religion. * * * Certainly the due process clause does not require the legislature to be in the vanguard of science—especially sciences as young as human ecology and cultural anthropology. * * * It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community."

Commenting on that obvious inconsistency on the part of the Court, Mr. Pittman, to whom I earlier have referred, stated:

"The Court admitted it didn't know enough about sociology, human ecology, and cultural anthropology to decide racial issues in 1952. But by 1954 the Justices had become so expert in pseudo-socio-science a la Myrdal that they abandoned the Constitution, the law, reason, and commonsense to embrace a doctrine unknown to God and unknown to any other government of law in the history of civilization."

When the Justices found the 14th amendment did not mention schools and decided its legislative history was "inconclusive," the Court should have declared, as it did in the case of *Ullman* v. *U.S.* (360 U.S. 427) in March 1956, that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process."

The Court has ruled time and again that it has no authority to amend the Constitution; yet the evidence that it sought to do so in the Brown case is irrefutable.

It is plain even to the layman that the Supreme Court's decision had the effect of amending the Constitution.

Article V clearly sets forth the fixed methods of amending the Constitution, and amendment by judicial decree is not one of them.

Everyone will agree, I believe, with the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in the famed *Marbury* v. *Madison* decision (1 Cranch 137, 174–175, 2 L. Ed. 60, 72) of 1803:

"The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it."

The implications of that ruling were forcefully analyzed by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina—a former member of the Supreme Court—in an address before the Illinois State Bar Association. He declared:

"If the latter be true, a written Constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law, it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

"If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitution defender."

Or, as aptly expressed last year by the erudite and distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]:

"If court decisions are laws, when a court makes a decision, it makes a law; when it reverses a decision, it repeals a law; when it modifies a decision, it modifies a law."

To accept a contrary view, Mr. President, would be to nullify the constitutional concept of Congress as the Nation's only lawmaking body.

The legislative powers granted by the Constitution are vested exclusively in Congress. The first line of the Constitution says that, and, as I have pointed out, the framers of the 14th amendment sought to make certain that only Congress should implement the new and dangerous powers which it embraced by specifying that only Congress should have the power to enforce it.

Article VI of the Constitution defines the "law of the land" as the Constitution of the United States and the laws and treaties made under its provisions. The Founding Fathers were careful to exclude Executive orders and judicial decrees from that definition.

The framers of the Constitution knew the importance of a free, courageous, virtuous judiciary. But they also knew that a pliant, servile, and time-serving judiciary would be a deadly enemy of free society and a republican form of government. Consequently, they were careful to set the judicial branch up as a coordinate and independent department of government but also were careful to put a check on it by vesting in Congress the authority to fix its jurisdiction.

The Supreme Court's Brown decision has done great harm to this Nation, because through it the Court has shown its willingness to disregard our written Constitution and its own decisions, to invalidate the laws of the individual States and substitute for them a policy of its own, supported not by legal precedents but by the writings of social scientists.

Every thinking American knows that surrender to the Supreme Court of the power to amend the Constitution at will will vest in that tribunal power to make changes inimical to the public welfare and eventually will lead to a complete loss of control of the Government by the people.

That is why, Mr. President, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to add a new section to chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code which would read as follows:

"No justice, judge, or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, or review, or to issue any writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command with respect to, any case, controversy, or matter relating to the administration, by any State or any political or other subdivision of any State, or any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by such State or subdivision."

However much some citizens may applaud the Brown decision, Mr. President, they will accept the manner in which it was handed down only at the peril of exposing themselves to some future application of the same theory of legislation by judicial decree.

Unless the application of that concept of judicial lawmaking is stopped now by the enactment of legislation such as I am today proposing, the inevitable result will be to substitute for constitutional government a judicial oligarchy under which the executive and legislative branches and the State and local governments will exercise only such powers as the Supreme Court deems fit to grant them.

Constitutional government as we heretofore have known it and the philosophy upon which the Brown decision was based are incompatible. So long as it is allowed to stand, the liberties and heritage of freedom which Americans in all regions so zealously cherish are in great jeopardy.

If the Brown decision is allowed to stand, Mr. President, then we have no Constitution and no laws—only what the Supreme Court on any given occasion may say the Constitution and the laws are.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce my bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1593) to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR THE ITEM VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have for many years been concerned about the need to permit the President of the United States to veto items in appropriations bills without having to veto the entire bill. I need not today go into the background or the reasons for adopting this much-needed and worthwhile governmental reform. It is a subject which has been before the Congress time and time again.

In a nutshell, if we provide the President with the power to veto items in an appropriation bill, we will go a long way toward eliminating waste and pork barreling and enabling the Government of the United States to operate more economically and efficiently.

Last year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44, on this subject which was cosponsored by Senators CAPEHART, CLARK, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MORTON, PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, SCOTT, and CARLSON, all of whom have indicated that they again want to cosponsor this measure.

Mr. President, it is absolutely imperative that we do something about the item veto right away. Many States have successfully provided their chief executives with this needed and constructive power of the purse. It is clear from their experience that the Federal Government and the taxpayers of America would benefit materially from the institution of the item veto.

There is some question as to whether the item veto can be established by legislative action or whether a constitutional amendment is necessary. I think it must be done by constitutional amendment; but I am entirely agreeable to attempting to do it by legislative action.

If that could be done it would, of course, be preferable from the point of view of the time element. I have indicated to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that I shall be happy to join with him in his efforts to this end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution and of a statement which I have prepared stating my opinion that the granting of the item veto power to the President must be done through the means of a constitutional amendment appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

The statement presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING ON THE MEANS BY WHICH TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT ITEM VETO POWER

It is my opinion, that the grant of power to the President to veto items of an appropriation bill will have to be through the medium of a constitutional amendment.

The constitutional provision involved in this matter is the first sentence of article 1, section 7, clause 2 which reads:

"Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it."

The words of this sentence are very explicit, the President has the power to sign it (appropriation bill or any other bill) or to return it with his objections. The latitude necessary to interpret this provision so as to permit item vetoes cannot be admitted. It would be too deliberate a departure from the literal and ordinary meaning of the words. As the phrasing of the sentence is free from ambiguity, there is no occasion for construction.

"In expounding the Constitution of the United States, every word must have its due force, and appropriate meaning; for it is evident from the whole instrument, that no word was unnecessarily used, or needlessly added. The many discussions which have taken place upon the construction of the Constitution, have proved the correctness of this proposition; and shown the high talent, the caution, and the foresight of the illustrious men who framed it. Every word appears to have been weighed with the utmost deliberation, and its force and effect to have been fully understood. * * *" (*Holmes* v. *Jennison* (1847) 14 pet. 570.)

This provision in giving a qualified negative over legislation cannot be narrowed or cut down by Congress. See the *Pocket Veto* case (1929) 279 U.S. 655, 677–678. Arguendo it may be said that if Congress cannot narrow this provision, neither can it broaden this provision. "No light is thrown on the meaning of this constitutional provision in the proceedings and debates of the Constitutional Convention * * *" (The Pocket Veto case, supra, p. 675).

PROPOSED STUDY AND REPORT ON FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at the close of the last Congress I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 211, which had as its specific purpose the establishment of a five-man commission to study and report on the organization of the Federal Communications Commission and the manner in which the radio spectrum is allocated in the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

At the time when I introduced that measure, I indicated that the development of so valuable a natural resource as the radio spectrum is a matter of paramount importance. The spectrum is a publicly owned natural resource, the significance of which increases year by year as its use for varied purposes grows. It has long been apparent that the capacity of this resource was not unlimited and that its effective utilization cannot be expanded indefinitely. The interdependence of regulatory measures and technology in making possible the most effective use of the spectrum requires as careful planning and administration as does any other natural resource. Unless our Government knows specifically the current use of the spectrum and what its future needs are, or are likely to be, the best interests of the United States will suffer.

Demands by nongovernment users are increasing as each day passes. The space age that is upon us has created a demand for spectrum space that must be met. Yet, as was evident at the time, there was and is no high-level agency within the Government which resolves the conflicts arising among Government interests, much less those arising between governmental and nongovernmental interests. There is no overall national telecommunications policy. This is deplorable.

I now introduce again a joint resolution calling for the creation of this special commission, in which the members will be appointed by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the President, as well as by the Federal Communications Commission. I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

I think it would be helpful at this point to review the various comments made over the past ten years with regard to the lack of an overall national telecommunications policy and the need for some central agency which will be charged with the responsibility of allocating this valuable resource—the radio spectrum—to both nongovernment and government users if we are to have the most effective and efficient use of this resource.

As early as 1951, in the report of the President's Communications Policy Board, headed by the distinguished Dr. Irving Stewart, and entitled "Telecommunications: "A Program for Progress," it was recognized among other things that:

Measured in terms of spectrum space rather than in number of discrete frequency channels, the Federal Government's share of the spectrum, though not so great as is commonly believed, is nevertheless large. While we do not know that it is out of proportion to the Government's responsibilities, it must have the most adequate justification and

careful management if the greatest benefit is to be obtained from it.

There is need for a continuing determination of the changing requirements of Federal Government users both among themselves and in relation to the requirements of other users.

In addition, the President's Communications Policy Board's conclusions were:

1. Fundamental changes in telecommunications require the overhaul of Government machinery for formulating telecommunications policy and for administering certain telecommunications activities in the national interest.

2. The Communications Act of 1934 established a system of dual control of the radio frequency spectrum. This dual control arises largely from the fact that the regulation of private telecommunications is a function of Congress exercised through the FCC, while the operation of Government telecommunications is primarily a function of the Executive. For example, the assignment of frequencies to military services is an exercise of the President's powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

3. The Federal Communications Commission, though needing further strengthening, should continue as the agency for regulation and control of private users.

4. The President has exercised this power to assign frequencies through the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee, made up of representatives of the using Government agencies. While this committee should continue as a forum to arrange the use of the spectrum in such a way as to avoid interference, it is not an adequate means for keeping in order the large portion of the spectrum occupied by Government agencies.

5. The Telecommunications Coordinating Committee has served a useful function and should continue as a mechanism for interdepartmental discussion of telecommunications matters.

6. The whole Government telecommunications structure is an uncoordinated one and will be even less adequate in the future than it has been in the past to meet the ever-growing complexities of telecommunications. A new agency is needed to give coherence to the structure.

7. There is need for a better determination of the division in the national interest of frequency space between Government and nongovernment users. To achieve that end, close cooperation between the Federal Communications Commission and the proposed new agency will be necessary.

THE SOLUTION RECOMMENDED

The urgency of the need for remedial steps in telecommunications organization calls for prompt action.

We recommend the immediate establishment in the Executive Office of the President of a three-man Telecommunications Advisory Board served by a small, highly qualified staff to advise and assist the President in the discharge of his responsibilities in the telecommunications field. Its task would include formulating and recommending broad national policies in this field, and giving advice and assistance in the formulation of policies and positions for international telecommunications negotiations.

In spite of the recommendations of the President's Communications Policy Board, the actions taken thereafter merely contributed to the drifting and vacillation in this area. Warning signals about the inadequacy of the program were referred to on numerous occasions by various people and technicians and others interested in the problem.

In 1956, Mr. C. W. Loeber, in a document entitled "Regulation and Administration of Telecommunications in the United States," recommended, after discussing the deficiencies in the national telecommunications program, that—

A national policy be developed promptly, preferably with congressional guidance, as to the kind of radio service which would be authorized and licensed by the Federal Government. Because of the serious shortage of radio frequencies such policy is needed urgently to avoid a breakdown in radio service essential to the national defense, safety of life and property, and economic welfare of the country.

He also concluded that—

The present methods within the Government for the coordination of frequency assignments are cumbersome and inefficient. They do not insure that such assignments are made in the overall national interest and do not provide needed flexibility of adjustment to meet the rapidly changing circumstances. They have in the past prevented U.S. delegations to international conferences from having negotiable positions.

In 1957, Mr. T. H. Nesbitt, in a paper entitled "Inadequacy of U.S. Telecommunications Policy and Its Effect on the National Security," submitted to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, concluded:

The United States has no effective centralized fountainhead of telecommunications authority by which it can weld together the many diversified and conflicting interests into an effective mechanism which will best serve the national interest.

In 1958, Dr. Edward L. Bowles, consulting professor of industrial management, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and specialist in communications and electronics, submitted a special report to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and stated, with respect to allocations and other communications policy, that—

There is no high-level agency within the Government to resolve conflicts arising among governmental interests, much less those arising between governmental and nongovernmental interests. Government policy and administrative development have not kept pace with technical and industrial development in communications. The modernization of the national air control facilities presents, in itself, a vital problem. Radar and other communications developments in the military area, under present lack of overall administration, promise to present serious conflicts with civil communications, including interference with television broadcasting, if allocations plans are not scrupulously coordinated. In ordinary circumstances, a lack of overall unity may be simply inconvenient; in times of emergency it can prove disastrous * * * techniques have advanced at a prodigious rate and two existing new modes of radio communication have been discovered; ionospheric and tropospheric scattering. The military have particular reason to be interested in the potentialities of these new techniques. Ionospheric scattering points to new applications in the lower VHF band, tropospheric scattering, the UHF band.

In 1959 there is to be an international radio conference. Our needs must be clearly understood if we are to plead them successfully and secure them by international agreement. There is thus an imperative need for a critical study of the radio spectrum in terms of governmental and nongovernmental needs.

Recently, a staff report prepared for the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, concluded, among other things:

14. The general problem of worldwide communications involves a complex and interrelated set of economic and political as well as technical considerations. Thus, any plans for such an important step as space service requires reevaluation of broad national policies in the field of communications. At the present time, such policies do not appear clearly defined. Moreover, the mechanism for establishing policy is unclear.

15. The most careful and comprehensive study should be undertaken by the executive branch without delay to examine elements of public policy concerned with communications, specifically as related to—

(a) The identification of central Federal authority for communication policy.

(b) The evaluation of such policies in the context of space telecommunications.

(c) The implications with regard to traditional U.S. practice, wherein private commerical interests rather than the Federal Government are responsible for both domestic and oversea communications.

Only in the last 2 weeks, James N. Landis, in the report on regulatory agencies which he prepared, also referred to the lack of coordination in the communications field, both internationally and domestically.

In 1963, there is scheduled to take place in Geneva, an Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, at which negotiations regarding additional frequency channels among foreign countries are to take place. I note that the Department of State, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interdepartment Advisory Committee are presently making plans for this conference. I especially want to commend Commissioner T. A. M. Craven for his work in this area, because, as I understand, he has pioneered and pushed this program, in order to prepare our Government's position.

I know there are various approaches to this problem; but I think the wisest course is the establishment of the type of commission called for by the joint resolution I am introducing today. I am hopeful that the Senate will act quickly, so that this program of developing an overall national telecommunications policy will not be delayed any longer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to establish a commission to study and report on the organization of the Federal Communications Commission and the manner in which the electromagnetic spectrum is allocated in the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Rules Committee. The resolution, I believe, normally would go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but I think

we have cleared it with the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If there is no objection, we would like it to go directly to the Rules Committee. It will save a little time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection. I think that course would be preferable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MCNAMARA. In connection with the referring of the resolution, I have a very brief statement which I wish to make.

The White House Conference on Aging is now over.

The hundreds of delegates who participated in the 4-day Conference are returning to their home States rededicated in their desire to attack the problems that accompany retirement and old age.

It will take some time, of course, to digest and discuss the mass of information and ideas generated by the White House Conference.

But there is one immediate, tangible result: This is the knowledge that the Federal Government, as demonstrated by the calling of this Conference, is keenly aware of the problems affecting the elderly and the need to do something about them.

But we must not believe that the Federal Government, simply by conducting this Conference, has discharged its obligations or responsibilities in this vital area.

On the contrary, the Conference has shown anew that meeting the problems that exist today, and the new ones of tomorrow, requires redoubled efforts on the part of all levels of government, of public and private organizations, and of individuals.

Over the past 2 years it has been my honor to serve as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I am proud of the contributions we have been able to make.

But I am even more impressed by the complexity of the job we have taken on and the work that remains to be done.

Thus, I propose in the resolution I have offered today the establishment of a Special Senate Committee on Aging to carry on and expand the work begun by the subcommittee.

The special committee, which would not have legislative functions, would be empowered to conduct studies in many fields connected with retirement and aging, and make recommendations which would be directed to standing committees having legislative jurisdiction.

I have been delighted with the cooperation and advice received in the past from the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and I am pleased that he has no objection to the creation of a special committee.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement in support of the measure.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 33

Whereas our great and satisfying success in making possible a longer life for a large and increasing percentage of our people has produced, and will continue to produce, new and serious strains in the fabric of our social and economic life; and

Whereas since the sixteen millions of people 65 years of age and older in the United States will have increased to twenty million by 1975 it is incumbent upon us now to attempt to discover what social and economic conditions will enable our older citizens to contribute to our productivity and to lead meaningful, satisfying, independent lives; and

Whereas the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has amassed a wealth of information on the subject which is unmatched anywhere, which should be kept current and mined for possible answers to particular facets of the problem; and

Whereas that subcommittee has shown that although specific elements of the problem may call for action by various legislative committees the problems themselves are highly interrelated, require coordinated review and call for recommendations based on studies in depth of the total problem; and

Whereas that subcommittee has concluded that this subject is of such grave concern to the Nation as to require the full time and attention of a special committee of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Aging and to consist of Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through January 31, 1962, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants, and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1962.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA ON CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Nothing distinguishes our society more from the underdeveloped nations of the world than our concern with the conservation of human life. Nothing in our system of living has been more intended than to prevent death.

We have made great strides toward this end. Life expectancy in this Nation has increased almost 1 year for every 2 since 1900.

Yet, at a very time when we are attempting to exert a worldwide leadership to convince these underdeveloped nations that our way of life is most rewarding, we are faced with the paradox of our success in conserving life.

Yes, we have increased life expectancy. No greater achievement has been recorded than the reduction of infant mortality. We have made great gains in sustaining health in middle and old age. We have adjusted our productive system to prevent deterioration of living conditions.

We have placed emphasis on the protection of children and women. We have written laws to assist the disabled workman and the unemployed workman. No nation enjoys a greater standard of living than ours.

We have made it possible in this Nation for more and more persons who have contributed to their society to live on beyond the years of regular employment.

Now we are faced with the problems which these great achievements have created—the problems of living in a dignified and satisfying retirement. Have we achieved success in extending life only to allow it to wither in declining years? Or does conservation of human life mean more than mere existence?

That our concern with human life goes beyond sustaining mere existence is borne out, I believe, by recognizing that our older citizens face unique problems. There is a growing realization that social action on behalf of the aging should be based on concern not only with biological problems but also with mental and social problems.

This Senate recognized these problems, this paradox, and, in a world of competing philosophies, the importance of finding solutions to them when it authorized the creation of a Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

I am proud of the record of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman. In a short interval, with a small staff, we have been able to gather a wealth of information, outline the dimensions of the total problem, and have recommended priorities for action. We are now underway with the essential and difficult task of translating facts and study into legislative accomplishment.

For example, we were able to illuminate the difficult area of medical insurance for the aged, and last year we introduced a bill with 23 cosponsors. It is a bill which combines a balanced medical program with a sound, dignified insurance method of financing. We hope—with a new, positive climate in Washington—that this bill will be enacted shortly.

But the outlines of problems, the presentation of priorities for action do not constitute actual solutions and improvements. These are the great objectives before us as we make effective use of what we have learned. Solutions, analyzed in depth, will be brought before this body for consideration. For the concerns of an increasingly aging population grow in size and complexity at an alarming rate. They affect not only the aging, but all of us who will be growing old. They affect children seeking decent nursing homes for stricken parents. They affect mature workers wrought with fear of age discrimination in employment. They affect us as parents, as children, as wives or husbands, and as members of families who see in others and in ourselves the lengthening of years. They affect us as taxpayers, for the problems of aging are our business and as a people we pay a large part of the costs. As one report states: "Short of birth itself, and death, scarcely any fixed pattern of man's story affects all mankind more."

Here are some basic facts which indicate with what we must cope:

There are now more than 16 million Americans over 65 and there will be 20 million in just 15 years.

Six million are now over 75 and, in a few years, this will rise to 9 million.

Some 13 million people today spend an average of 11 years in retirement; in 40 years, some 20 million will be spending 20 years in retirement.

These and other facts raise a number of questions that demand thorough and systematic consideration by a special committee of the Senate with a special view of the interrelated nature of the total problem.

For example, what is an adequate income for varying categories of older Americans? The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently estimated that a modest budget for retired elderly couples in 20 cities, as of 1959, was slightly over $2,800 for the median. Although the figures are not exactly comparable, the Census Bureau reports for the same year that the median total money income for families with aged heads, either fully retired or working part time, was $2,522. These figures show that about one-half of retired couples are attempting to live on incomes uncomfortably or desperately below the minimal figures for a decent American standard of living.

Second, what new social arrangements are called for by the dramatic changes in the age-structure of our older population? To what extent is the American society as a whole being alerted to such changes? As a result of increased longevity, we are moving toward a ratio of 2 persons aged 60 and over for every 3 persons just entering old age. Today, the ratio is only 1 to 3. In other words, the trend is toward a doubling of this ratio within 40 years. This means that young Americans, in their early twenties today, will be facing the challenge of preparing not only for their own retirement problems, but also for those of their parents who will still be living, in their eighties and older.

How will these and similar quiet revolutions in population affect the Nation's patterns of consumption, savings, housing, and financial responsibility, to mention only a small fraction of the far-reaching implications of an aging population?

Third, given the demonstrated possibilities of rehabilitative and restorative medicine among the aged, what new health facilities and personnel are called for, and what is the accessibility of such facilities to the aged? Approximately one-half of the aged persons in today's nursing homes could, through such restorative techniques, be released from them for more active participation in their family and community affairs.

Fourth, what share of the national income should be devoted to public and private programs for the aged, and in what particular types of programs? Today, no more than 4 percent of the national income is devoted to public and private programs of pensions, OASI benefits, and OAA payments.

The economic effect of an aging population will be great. Not only will more people have to devote their lives to caring for the aged, but the whole pattern and tempo of employment will, in time, be changed. It would seem important, then, that consideration be given to preventing the aged from becoming too great a burden on their younger contemporaries. But are we capable of devising public policy which would result in the aged remaining fit and independent in their homes with a continuing contribution to our society?

Some of what I have noted here are old but changing problems. Some are new. By far the most serious of the new problems is the ever increasing emergence of great-grandparents dependent upon grandparents themselves retired and unable to meet the burdens of advanced years. The burden of support in our modern, urban, industrialized society has become a cooperative family-voluntary-public responsibility.

One of the most adequate descriptions of today's conditions of the aged has been written by Dr. Heinz Woltereck in the preface of his book "A New Life in Your Later Years." He said:

"In our century, the potential improvements of human existence have surpassed those of previous historical periods beyond all possibilities of comparison. Science and technics have achieved success upon success. In the world of sport, one record after another is constantly being broken. In short, our physical and mental abilities have both increased to an astonishing degree. These facts no longer surprise us; we have come to take them for granted. Yet there is one aspect of these new developments, possibly the most important consequence of all, which we can observe daily and which, nevertheless, has as yet made hardly any impact on public opinion. This is the increase in the life span of civilized man. Since our grandparents' day, the average expectation of life has, roughly speaking, doubled. As a result, the attainment of the later years in life, or of very old age, is no longer an exception in civilized countries, but is becoming the rule there.

"Until recently, neither our views on the status of the old in our society, nor our social measures, have kept pace with this situation. We are now only beginning to realize slowly that this new social group, the elderly and the old must be fitted into our social organization and suitably cared for. * * *

"Many of us ask ourselves whether the additional years or even decades that have been granted to us are actually worth living, or whether those who dread old age are not, in fact, right."

These comments spotlight another emerging and serious problem involving the aged: the progressive decline in the proportion of men over 65 in the Nation's labor force. In 1890, about 70 percent of the men over 65 were in the labor force; in 1959, the proportion was 34 percent and the trend continues downward.

Reemployment of the older segment of the aging population in regular types of jobs may be an unrealistic objective for many reasons, including employer prejudice, automation, health and not the least, a growing desire among many to retire to a life of new and more interesting activity. Whatever the reason, the innumerable problems arising from the decline of the older man in the work force are self evident.

For if the vast majority are to go into retirement, they should not have to view this with guilt feelings as years of parasitism. Retirement is no longer characterized as a period of withdrawal, but as an opportunity for pursuit of a wide variety of avocational interests, civic service, personal development and recreation. It should be an honorable period of life, deserving dignity and respect to continued contributions different from, but as important as, the ordinary job.

To quote again: "* * * old age is the fate of us all, the goal of all our lives. It is a great and fine task to seek the correct solution to a problem that will finally set free the noblest values known to humanity. It is up to all of us to create the appropriate conditions for this purpose."

I have noted here the complex problems of the aged facing this Nation and our moral obligation to solve them. I have described briefly the need for a special committee as the vehicle to find the solutions.

Let me now examine in some detail the job that faces this special committee. But before I do, it may be helpful to review very briefly the work of the subcommittee in fulfilling its function as charged by the Senate.

The adoption of Senate Resolution 65 in 1959 creating the existing subcommittee was an important recognition by the Senate of the need for a systematic reexamination of a growing and changing problem. It placed in the spotlight of national attention the needs of 16 million Americans over 65. It symbolized, in legislative terms, the extent to which the senior citizens of this Nation have emerged as an area of national concern.

It established a clear point of contact for learning the views, recommendations, needs, and grievances of senior citizens. The voluminous correspondence received from older persons all over the Nation describing individual problems, and seeking answers to felt needs attests to its role in partially filling a national vacuum.

A sentiment now exists among the aged—emphasized and reiterated to us from coast to coast—that the action of the Senate in establishing this subcommittee promised a new era for senior citizens and symbolized concretely the concern of the U.S. Senate for their welfare.

The elderly of this country are hopeful that the Senate has not kindled a romance which is fated to burn out quickly. Many asserted that their disillusionment with conditions in their "golden years" already is high. Additional anxiety and bitterness can only result if this new study is not sustained and does not lead to affirmative action.

Extensive hearings began in Washington when a score of nationally recognized experts presented the best thinking in the field of aging to the subcommittee. In addition, the subcommittee received testimony from Federal agencies concerned with various aspects of the aging problem. It then heard the views of approximately 50 national organizations concerned with the problems of older citizens, providing them an opportunity for the first time to describe their plans and programs, to set forth major problems as seen in their own experience, and to offer their own recommendations for action.

Besides the hearings, the subcommittee surveyed the views of thousands of persons and organizations throughout the country through interviews and correspondence.

But hearings with national experts and surveys were not considered enough. The subcommittee went to the nation's communities where the practising experts are. These are public officials, heads of voluntary agencies—state and local—who work full time with older people and daily are on the firing line. Above all, however, the ones who know their problems best are the aged themselves. And these are the citizens that rarely get a chance to speak for themselves.

The subcommittee spoke directly to older citizens not only at the hearings, but in visits to the living accommodations of the aged. Visits were made to nursing homes,

homes for the aged, senior centers, housing developments, areas being redeveloped, hospitals, retirement hotels, and retirement villages.

I believe that I ought to emphasize at this point that the older Americans who spoke to us were quite insistent that they sought not charity but the conditions under which they can be independent, and self-respecting.

Out of this activity, the subcommittee collected extensive data.

It collected data to show how this problem of aging developed and how it became of great national importance.

It collected information which depicts factually the conditions of the elderly in this country. This includes data on employment, income problems, health, financing medical care, nursing homes, housing for the elderly, social services, and education.

And out of its hearings and study came the subcommittee reports including:

1. "The Aged and Aging in the United States;" expert views, hearings.
2. "The Aged and Aging in the U.S.—Summary of Expert Views."
3. "Federal Programs for the Aged and Aging."
4. "National Organizations in the Field of Aging."
5. "Survey of Major Problems and Solutions in the Field of the Aged and Aging."
6. "The Aged and Aging in the United States, the Community Viewpoint" (seven volumes).
7. "The Aged and Aging in the United States, a National Problem, a Report to the Senate."
8. "Health Needs of the Aged and Aging."
9. "Health Needs of the Aged and Aging—Highlights of Testimony."
10. "Comparison of Current Health Insurance Proposals for Older Persons."
11. "The Aged in Mental Hospitals," a report.
12. "The Condition of American Nursing Homes."
13. "The Status of Aged Women in the United States."
14. "Aging Americans: Their Views and Living Conditions."
15. "Background Studies Prepared by State Committees for White House Conference."
16. "Voluntary Organizations in the Field of Aging."

A report of the subcommittee will be filed by January 31 under the 1960 resolution. It will contain sections on financing medical care, the need for a decent income, the importance of emphasizing research, the problems of the aged mentally ill, productive activity in retirement, and the role of a Federal organization for aging.

The hearings and reports constitute only the supporting phases of the subcommittee's work. Out of these grew a program of legislation introduced in this Chamber last year.

Some of this legislation expended existing programs. But much of it consisted of pioneer approaches to the problems of the aging.

Bills introduced which actually came to a vote in the Senate included:

1. An appropriation of $50 million for direct loans to nonprofit groups to provide housing for older persons at rentals they can afford. (This was reduced to $20 million in conference.)

2. The Senate Housing Act of 1960 would have raised the authorization for direct loans for elderly housing to $75 million; it also included provisions requiring social, recreation, and health facilities for the elderly; in addition, it provided for special subsidies for elderly in public housing.

3. The Retired Persons Medical Insurance Act (S. 3503). The bill which I originally introduced came to a vote in a modified version and just missed passage. It is the area of legislation which has first priority this year and eventually we, in the Senate, will face up to the necessity of the times by passing the bill.

In the pioneer field, I introduced bills to: (1) end age discrimination in employment (S. 3726); (2) to protect purchasing power of retiree savings (S. 3684); (3) provide employment retraining possibilities for older citizens (S. 3793); and (4) establish an Office of Aging in the Federal Government (S. 3807).

It is no longer possible, as it once may have been expedient, to ignore or shrug off these problems and the urgent need to solve them. This legislation prepared after long and careful study should be considered and adopted by the Senate. I intend to reintroduce all these bills.

But what has been done to date is but a portion of the total task which faces us. We have many legislative ideas but they are few when considering the total problem. We have much research and many surveys but these are just the beginnings of what we need to know.

Consider here the areas where such detailed surveys are needed and what we must do with the information. They are:

Pensions: Detailed study must be given to protecting the financial independence of Americans through effective pension systems both public and private. While the Senate has made a number of studies in the area of pensions, little has been done to study them in the light of other problems of the aged.

Nursing home: A thorough study and evaluation of nursing homes must be undertaken. This is one of the most vital means of obtaining necessary health care available to older citizens. We must learn how the quality of care of the Nation's nursing homes can be improved so as to restore disabled persons to independent living.

Medical insurance: This area of need is at the legislative stage. Efficient and effective methods of meeting the medical costs of all senior citizens on a dignified basis can be enacted. Continued studies are needed to reduce excessive hospitalization and increase the efficiency of medical organization.

Mental hospitals: We must find effective means of reducing the number of older persons entering mental hospitals and remaining there for many years. This area of care is the third most costly to State government.

Health: We must learn how to speed up the process of putting into effect the proven research knowledge of today. Many lives can be saved and people can live longer and healthier lives if we could put into practice the knowledge we already have.

New research: We must widen the area of our scientific knowledge by investing in basic research which is our brightest promise to eliminate disability and deterioration with age.

Employment: This Nation with all its technological know-how must find the means for insuring that the skills of older persons can be maintained in the face of a rapidly changing technology.

Housing: We must make a comprehensive study of what kinds of housing best suit the requirements of older persons and we must evaluate the new trends toward retirement hotels and villages.

Continued activity: An examination must be made of the best means to keep older people in mental and physical activity so they can avoid becoming has-beens in this period of social change.

Education: A study must be made of the value and the feasibility of providing the opportunity for retired and older persons to continue educational pursuits left earlier in life because of the necessity of earning a living. It also should examine the feasibility for providing educational possibilities for those who never had them in their youth. It is entirely within the realm of reality that such educational activity could add years of productive contribution to the Nation by the Nation's older citizens.

I have said before, but I believe I cannot repeat too often, that the most impressive and emphatic demands of our aged have been the insistence that they do not want charity. They seek only the dignity of life that should go with old age. They do not want to be dependent on their children nor burdens on their society. What they want is not to be blocked from continuing their contributions nor forgotten in their needs. These needs can be outlined in the "Declaration of Objectives for Senior Americans" which I set forth last year:

1. An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.
2. The best possible physical and mental health which medical science can make available and without regard to economic status.
3. Suitable housing, independently selected, designed, and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.
4. Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.
5. Equal opportunity to employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.
6. Retirement in health, honor, dignity, after years of contribution to the economy.
7. Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreation opportunities.
8. Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.
9. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.
10. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

To achieve these goals means extensive work in several areas by a committee equipped to undertake the task.

It is clear that a great task confronts a special committee of the Senate on aging. It would focus on the totality of the problem and thus provide the Senate with the knowledge to contribute mightily to improving the conditions of America's aged.

One of the crucial lessons we have learned as a subcommittee is that the problems of older persons are not contained within a narrow subject-matter compass. They cut across the gamut of governmental responsibility; each segment fades into the other and is affected by it.

Income, for example, is related to employment; housing is closely connected with employment and income and health; medical care becomes the concern of finance. A number of committees of the Senate are concerned with pieces of the problem, but there is presently no committee which is concerned with their relationships, which can view them as a whole—just as older persons themselves are whole people. The special committee therefore should have wide representation on it and in turn it can become a major resource for the relevant standing committees as they consider legislation in this field.

I have said that the problems of the aging are growing in size, scope, and complexity. It is a safe statement to add that these problems will be major matters of congressional concern in the next several years. The more than 16 million aged today will become 20 million in the not-too-distant future.

There is now a staff—small, but active—and a base of information unparalleled in the Nation from which to undertake the kinds of studies outlined here.

It needs to be expanded, to be given the tools with which to do the job.

For the question is, will we face up to the great challenge confronting our localities, our

States, and our Nation, and learn how to foster the social and economic setting in which contributions can flourish and the problems of the aging can be turned into positive civic benefits.

The sinews of the American Federal system are strengthened when States are strong, and they exercise their responsibilities. But the Federal system is weakened when the national Government does not accept and fulfill its proper share of the total obligations.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution urging the President to call a White House Conference on Narcotics. The resolution provides for the setting up of a conference similar to the White House conferences we have had on education and on youth, and the conference on aging just concluded. Last year I proposed a similar resolution, but no action was taken in the Senate. The same proposal did, however, pass the House, where it had the unanimous backing of the 30-member California delegation.

Narcotics addiction is a serious problem in the United States. The traffic in narcotics keeps increasing every year. The number of narcotics arrests tripled in California between the years 1952 and 1959. New York State shows a similar pattern. Narcotics addiction has its most tragic impact on our teenagers, and is perhaps the strongest element in the acceleration of juvenile delinquency in this country. Without a strong, coordinated, and effective Federal program, no State can cope with the problem because the control of narcotics coming in from Mexico, the Far East, and other foreign areas is a Federal responsibility.

The situation has become so serious in the last few years that we can no longer disregard the need for a new and bold approach to the problem. The resolution I am today submitting calls on the proposed narcotics conference to recommend:

First. Ways and means of securing more uniformity in State and Federal enforcement of narcotic statutes and their penalties, and to delineate more clearly Federal, State, and local authority.

Second. The substance of a directive clearly defining procedures and jurisdictions between existing governmental agencies in this field.

Third. Machinery for a continuing consultation between the United States and other nations, particularly the Governments of our neighbors, Mexico, and Canada, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, working through existing United Nations facilities, as well as engaging in unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require.

Fourth. A proposal for a Federal-State hospitalization program for the purpose of protecting the narcotics addict from the inevitable results of his addiction, and to protect society from the danger and expenses of the uncontrolled actions of the addict. And

Fifth. Such other matters as will contribute to the solution of the national problem of narcotics.

Such a program will bring the full force and effect of the President behind the problem and focus national attention on it. Only with this kind of a sweeping assault on the problem can we hope to solve it.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a telegram sent by President-elect John F. Kennedy, on October 5, 1960, to the Honorable Stanley Mosk, attorney general of California, in which President-elect Kennedy stated that, if elected President, "I will convene the White House Conference on Narcotics as soon as it is reasonably practical."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire telegram be printed as a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 34), submitted by Mr. ENGLE, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the smuggling of narcotics and the illicit use of narcotics are serious national problems; and

Whereas the inability to achieve both a tighter control over the unauthorized importation of narcotics into this country and over the illicit use of narcotics by addicts and others in this country is causing increased nationwide concern; and

Whereas the traffic in, and addiction to, narcotics are serious problems affecting the Federal Government and the several States; and

Whereas narcotics contribute to juvenile delinquency and greatly add to the expenses of law enforcement and the cost of running the courts and the judicial system of our country; and

Whereas the departmental councils of the executive branch previously appointed have not successfully solved the problems of narcotics control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics, patterned after previous White House conferences, such as those on education and children and youth. Such Conference should be broadly representative of persons dealing with such problems at the State and local levels, and should also include, but not be limited to—

(1) an appropriate number of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(2) representatives of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government concerned with such problems, including, but not limited to, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury; the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Department of State; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that this Narcotics Conference should undertake to recommend—

(1) ways and means of securing more uniformity in State and Federal enforcement of narcotic statutes and their penalties, and to delineate more clearly Federal, State, and local authority;

(2) the substance of a directive clearly defining procedures and jurisdictions between existing governmental agencies in this field;

(3) machinery for a continuing consultation between the United States and other nations, particularly the Governments of our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, working through existing United Nations facilities, as well as engaging in unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require;

(4) a proposal for a Federal-State hospitalization program for the purpose of protecting the narcotics addict from the inevitable results of his addiction, and to protect society from the danger and expenses of the uncontrolled actions of the addict; and

(5) such other matters as will contribute to the solution of the national problem of narcotics; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the White House Conference on Narcotics should submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its recommendations with respect to the problems relating to the traffic in, and addiction to, narcotics, and any other results of its deliberations.

The telegram presented by Mr. ENGLE is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 5, 1960.*

Hon. STANLEY MOSK,
Attorney General:

Have long been aware that the traffic in illicit narcotics is one of our major law enforcement problems. I am told that all the marihuana and approximately 75 percent of the heroin being peddled in your State of California originates outside the United States. The Federal Government must obviously assume some responsibility for halting the international traffic in narcotics. This will mean that we must uses every enforcement agency at both the State and the local level and that we must enlist the cooperation of our good neighbors on our borders.

I am aware of House Resolution 431, which was adopted in April of this year suggesting a White House conference. In addition, Resolution 20 adopted by the National Conference of Attorney Generals in July called for a similar conference on this problem. I believe such a conference can serve a valuable purpose. It should seek a method for securing uniform State-Federal enforcement: It should recommend a method for implementing machinery for consultation between the United States, Mexico, and Canada; and it should consider a Federal-State hospital program for the addict, as well as such other appropriate matters that will help alert the Nation, and contribute to the solution of the narcotics problems. In answer to the question in your telegram I assure you that, if I am elected President, I will convene the White House Conference on Narcotics as soon as it is reasonably practical.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

PROPOSED SENATE RULE CHANGES DESIGNED TO STREAMLINE THE PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE AND TO MAKE THEM FAIRER FOR ALL CONCERNED

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, four proposed changes in the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions, submitted by Mr. CLARK, were received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 35

Resolved, That paragraph numbered 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Upon the request of any Sen-

ator who has been recognized, his remarks upon any subject may be delivered in writing, and if so delivered shall be printed in the Congressional Record in the same manner as if those remarks had been delivered orally."

SEC. 2. S. Res. 121, Eightieth Congress, first session, agreed to July 23, 1947, is repealed.

S. RES. 36

Resolved, That paragraph numbered 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Whenever any Senator has held the floor for more than three consecutive hours, an objection to his continued recognition shall be in order at any time, and, if such an objection is made, the Senator shall yield the floor.".

S. RES. 37

Resolved, That paragraph 4 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended to read as follows:

"4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer transgress the rules of the Senate the Presiding Officer shall, either on his own motion or at the request of any other Senator, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall take his seat, and may not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. Any Senator directed by the Presiding Officer to take his seat, and any Senator requesting the Presiding Officer to require a Senator to take his seat, may appeal from the ruling of the chair, which appeal shall be open to debate."

S. RES 38

Resolved, That rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to morning business) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"8. One hour, if that much time be needed, shall be set aside for the transaction of morning business on each calendar day at the opening of proceedings or, if the Senate is in continuous, around-the-clock session, at noon. The period for morning business may be extended upon motion, which shall be nondebatable, approved by majority action. No Senator may address the Senate for more than three minutes during the period for morning business, unless he has obtained leave by unanimous consent to address the Senate for a longer time."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that explanatory statements in regard to the proposed rule changes may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first proposal would amend the Senate rules to permit any Senator who has been recognized to have a speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in normal type without having to read any or all of the text.

The rule requiring a Senator to read each and every word of his speech to a sometimes nearly empty Chamber in order to have his remarks appear in normal size print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wastes an inordinate amount of time. The adoption of a rule that speeches may be printed in the RECORD, whether delivered in full or not, will make it possible for Senators to get their remarks to the press and in the RECORD without taking the time of the Senate to read them—valuable time which could be devoted more profitably to many other purposes.

It is interesting to note that many a Senator, including this one, has taken advantage of an informal custom by which a long speech is placed in its entirety in the RECORD in normal type although only the first and last lines are read. Some Senators are not willing to engage in this harmless subterfuge. Would it not be better to adopt the suggested rule and avoid this hypocrisy? Surely no one can seriously contend that the reading of a long speech to an empty Chamber is an appropriate part of either the legislative process or debate.

The proposal is one in a series of rules changes sponsored by the Senator from Pennsylvania during the current session to streamline Senate procedures. A rule requiring Senate debate to be germane to the pending business and one to permit Senate committees to sit when the Senate is in session were previously introduced.

The second proposal would amend the Senate rules to permit any Senator to object when another Senator holds the floor for more than 3 hours during Senate debates.

In the 18th century when the Senate had 26 Members and the legislative calendar was brief and did not contain matters of urgent importance to many millions of people, there was time to permit individuals to engage in filibusters. There is no time for such tactics in the 1960's. Marathon speeches by any one Senator in a body which now numbers 100 Members should not be tolerated.

I submit that no Senator needs more than 3 hours to expound his views on any specific matter coming before the Senate for action. Senators will judge for themselves whether they can recall a single occasion on which any Member took more than 3 consecutive hours to state his views on any subject when his purpose was not purely one of delay. I recall no such occasion.

When a Senator is interrupted repeatedly by a colloquy the Senate can be relied upon to grant unanimous consent for the Senator to continue beyond the 3-hour period, unless the colloquy is obviously engaged in for the purpose of delay. If he cannot get such consent, he would still have the right under rule XIX to speak once more on the same subject during the same legislative day, if he can obtain recognition.

I am reminded of Oliver Wendell Holmes' apology when he delivered a particularly long opinion one day as a member of the Massachusetts Supreme Court: "I did not have time to write a short one." A 3-hour speech is hardly a short one, but the Senate should take the time next January, when we determine the rules we will operate under during the 87th Congress, to make sure that no future speech is longer than that.

The third proposal would modify Senate rule XIX, requiring a Senator to take his seat without a ruling by the Chair that he has spoken disparagingly of another Senator, which has become a deterrent to frank and free debate.

Rule XIX, sensibly revised, is quite unobjectionable, but it has been construed to permit a Senator at any time to interrupt another Senator, raise a point of order and require that Senator to take his seat without any ruling on the part of either the Presiding Officer or the Senate that the Senator called to order has violated the rule. All Senators will recall the several instances of abuse of the rule which have occurred during this session of Congress.

In the 2d half of the 20th century, the courtly procedures of the late 18th century frequently seem out of place. Ordinary courtesy, however, is still the rule of conduct between mature individuals. In the heat of debate, Senators may violate rule XIX, and if they do, should properly be required to take their seats. But this should never be done unilaterally entirely upon motion of the Senator who takes affront. In each instance the Chair should state whether, in its opinion, the rule has, in fact, been violated.

If the Chair's ruling is in the negative, the Senator should be permitted to proceed without taking his seat, subject to an appeal from a ruling. Similarly if the Chair rules, adversely to the Senator holding the floor, the latter should have the right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair before being required to take his seat.

The other proposal would regulate the transaction of morning business to provide a regular hour for such business each day and limit individual speeches during the morning hour to 3 minutes each.

The other rule change I am suggesting today—to regulate the transaction of morning business—is also intended to speed Senate business. The term "morning hour" is a misnomer under our present practice. It is well known that 2 hours, from noon to 2 p.m., are frequently used for morning business on new legislative days. I suggest that we limit morning business to 1 hour daily, unless a majority of Senators vote to extend the period, and that the 3-minute limit on individual speeches, which is a custom now honored as much in the breach as in the observance, be written into the Senate rules. The morning hour is a valuable and appropriate time for the delivery of remarks by Senators on current events and other miscellaneous business. My proposed rule would make it impossible for one Senator to block the holding of a morning hour daily even if the Senate is meeting in recessed or continuous session, and yet it would curtail the overall time spent on matters nongermane to the pending bill or resolution.

REPEAL OF THE SELF-JUDGING CLAUSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself, Senator MORSE and Senator JAVITS, I am resubmitting my resolution to repeal the so-called self-judging reservation which limits our adherence to the World Court.

In the past 2 years there has been considerable debate on this issue, much of it quite heated. I suspect that much of the strong support, and much of the strong opposition, proceeds from exaggerated concepts of what the resolution seeks to do.

So let me briefly state the purpose of the resolution and give its historical background. In 1946 the U.S. Senate voted to adhere to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The Foreign Relations Committee proposed an amendment to except "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America." So far so good. These words were not necessary, since they were merely reiterated an idea which is spelled out very clearly in the statute of the Court, but they do no harm.

But then, on the Senate floor, and without committee approval, eight additional words were added, and it is these which my resolution seeks to repeal. These are the words, "as determined by the United States of America." In other words, we reserve to ourself the right to judge, in each case, whether we think a dispute is domestic, or whether we will accept the Court's jurisdiction.

It takes only plain commonsense to see that this negates our whole acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction, and it makes each submission a

purely voluntary act. And commenting on such a clause in another nation's adherence, the late Judge Lauterpacht, a Briton, said exactly that.

The purpose of my amendment is a modest one. It merely seeks to go back to what the Foreign Relations Committee recommended in 1946. It merely seeks to go back to the language which the State Department approved at that time, and which it consistently supported ever since. It merely seeks to restore the language which the American Bar Association supported at that time, and which it has consistently supported ever since.

And the American Bar Association ratified that position, after extensive debate and thorough consideration, at its convention in Washington last year. And my amendment merely seeks to restore the language which has been consistently supported by the American Society of International Law.

Why is it important to repeal this self-judging reservation?

There are several reasons.

First, any limitation contained in the acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction by one party is automatically given also to its adversary in any suit as a reciprocal right. Thus, if we sue country A, that country can claim all of the provisions of our reservation, and can decide that in its own view, the dispute is within its domestic jurisdiction and not subject to the Court's jurisdiction. This has already occurred in several famous cases. The reservation, in short, is a boomerang.

Second, the U.S. self-judging reservation has encouraged other nations to adopt similar reservations. The overall effect has been the discouragement of the principle of judicial settlement of international disputes.

So if we believe in the Court at all—if we think a strong World Court would serve the national interests of the United States, we should take this small step toward increasing its effectiveness.

This leads us to the question: Would a stronger Court serve the national interests of the United States?

This is an easy question to answer.

The United States is the world's largest trading and commercial nation. It has very important business interests abroad. Business and commerce require legal methods of settling disputes, of adjudicating claims and of collecting debts. A judicial system is most useful to the protection of creditors' rights. We are creditors. The lawyers in the United States who have had a substantial practice in counseling U.S. business interests abroad have consistently, through their professional associations, advocated the course which I propose today.

Further, as a nation which is deeply involved in world affairs, and which has a tremendous interest in world stability, we sense a very great need for the development of institutions, on a world level, which will give a sense of stability and organization to the world community.

At the present time, our self-judging reservation puts our great influence on the wrong side, from the viewpoint of our own interest.

What do we risk if we pass this resolution?

Very little. The remaining language in our reservation still excepts domestic matters. The Court's statute still excepts domestic matters. But we submit to the Court the question of whether an issue is domestic or not.

Now an analysis of the conduct of the judges of the Court, made by the committee on international and comparative law of the American Bar Association indicates that the judges of the International Court of Justice have been most cautious in their judgment of what lies within the Court's jurisdiction and what is a matter of domestic jurisdiction. There is no reason to suspect that this will change.

I have heard some who fear that judges from Russia or other Communist countries might seek to extend the Court's jurisdiction. Just the reverse is true. The Russians take the most extreme position to protect national sovereignty. They are distrustful of the Court and seek to limit its effectiveness.

As a matter of fact, not a single Communist nation has agreed to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court.

Indeed, I think it is safe to say that the passage of this repeal would make very little immediate difference. But it is important because the United States is precisely the country that should be seeking to widen the Court's sphere of activity. Our leadership should be exerted in that direction. At the present time, unfortunately, it is exerted in the opposite direction.

This is a very limited issue. I am at a loss to understand the controversy it has stirred up. In a way, however, this might well have a healthy effect. A heated controversy produces education. Many people come to shout and stay to think.

This is a measure that was endorsed by President Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy, and has had the support of every public official who ever dealt with the problem.

In presenting this resolution, I am aware that it will require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate, and that a slight degree of controversy may lead many to believe that the cause is lost.

I have no sympathy with this counsel of defeat. I hope that hearings will be held promptly, that the issue will be thoroughly ventilated, and that we will have a debate on the Senate floor and a vote. I view this as an important educational process, as well as an important step toward national maturity. Defeat will not be tragic, because public discussion will result in public education.

I am confident that if this resolution is examined on its merits it will receive the backing and support of an overwhelming majority of the Senate Members on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) relating to recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, on behalf of himself and Mr. MORSE and Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That S. Res. 196 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, agreed to August 2, 1946, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the deposit by the President of the United States with the Secretary General of the United Nations, of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning—

"a. the interpretation of a treaty;

"b. any question of international law;

"c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"*Provided*, That such declaration shall not apply to—

"a. disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

"b. disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States; or

"c. disputes arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the United States specially agrees to jurisdiction.

"*Provided further*, That such declaration shall remain in force until the expiration of six months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration."

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN NEEDY CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am honored that one of our new colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], desires to become a cosponsor of S. 306, which I introduced on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. This bill would amend the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for aid to dependent children. I ask unanimous consent that her name be added when the bill is next printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EVALUATION OF CERTAIN RECREATIONAL BENEFITS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, some days ago I introduced a bill which has been designated S. 121. I request unanimous consent that there be joined as cosponsors of the resolution the distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPITAL BUDGET FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1961, the names of Senators METCALF, HART, and GRUENING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 195) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) on January 6, 1961.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WATER POLLUTION RESEARCH LABORATORY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 10, 1961, the name of Mr. JACKSON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 325) to establish a Federal Regional Water Pollution Control Research Laboratory in the Pacific Northwest and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) on January 10, 1961.

VETERANS READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 11, 1961, the names of Senators CANNON, BURDICK, MCCARTHY, and CARROLL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 349) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and other Senators) on January 11, 1961.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be added as a cosponsor on S. 3, S. 198, and S. 324, and that his name be added at the next printing of the bills. The Senator has received the consent, in each instance, of the principal sponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL MINERALS POLICY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 210) to establish a National Minerals Policy, and that his name be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is at the desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, proposing creation of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study. This measure was introduced January 9, 1961, by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for himself and other Senators, including the junior Senator from Indiana, who now addresses the Senate.

On behalf of the Senator from West Virginia, and as one of the cosponsors, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution remain at the desk through Monday, January 23, 1961, in order that additional time be afforded Senators who may desire to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk as requested.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPOSED CRATER-LONG LAKES DIVISION, SNETTISHMAN PROJECT, ALASKA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on a plan of development for the proposed Crater-Long Lakes Division, Snettishman project, Alaska, pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618) (with accompanying papers).

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON SAVANNAH RIVER, GEORGIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA (S. DOC. NO. 6)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 29, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted July 16, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—AUTHORITY TO REVISE BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the week I introduced a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. Through sheer inadvertence I presented the wrong copy of the bill we drafted. The bill was minus one rather important provision.

I should like to preserve the number and also the sponsorship, so I ask unanimous consent that the new bill be substituted for the old bill and printed as such under the same number and with the same sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF PHILIP G. LEWIS TO BE POSTMASTER OF RUMFORD, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I want to record my condemnation of the very, very shabby and unfair treatment given to Philip G. Lewis, the acting postmaster of Rumford, Maine.

Mr. Lewis has been nominated for appointment as permanent postmaster three times in three successive years—in February 1959; in January 1960; and on January 10, 1961. Yet, his confirmation by the Senate has now been blocked for 2 years—without any reason given and without any challenge having been made to either his qualifications or his moral character.

I have promptly supported his nomination each time it has been sent to the Senate, by immediately sending my card of approval to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—although I had no part in the selection of Mr. Lewis for nomination for the position of permanent postmaster.

That original selection was made by Hon. Robert Hale, in 1958, when he was the Representative from the First Congressional District. The selection was made on the most valid basis that Mr. Lewis was a career postal employee, whose service started in 1936, and whose service had been both honorable and efficient.

I have made repeated, but unsuccessful, attempts to get the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service either to report the Lewis nomination for action by the full Senate or to have hearings on the Lewis nomination, so that any objections to him could be brought out into the open and in all fairness Mr. Lewis and his supporters be given a chance to answer such objections.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD copies of letters of August 10, 1959, and August 26, 1960, which I sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1959.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you will recall, I have spoken to you several times about the Maine postmaster nominations pending before your committee and have repeatedly urged favorable action on them by the committee.

I am disturbed that there remain 11 Maine postmaster nominations before the committee unacted upon as this session approaches a close. If these nominations are not acted

upon before the end of the session, they will die and have to be resubmitted by the President next year.

Knowing that it is the policy and procedure of the committee to require clearance or "no objection" from both of the two Maine Senators on each of these nominations, I have tried to cooperate completely with the committee by responding immediately when receiving the nomination cards from the committee.

In that connection my records show that on February 24, 1959, or nearly 6 months ago, I formally notified the committee of my approval of the following Maine postmaster nominations, which, as yet, have not been acted upon by the committee:

Eugene P. Duran, East Corinth, Maine; William A. Frizzle, Ocean Park, Maine; Mina C. Kent, Beals, Maine; Edward L. Larrabee, Bath, Maine; Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine; and Florence P. Pendleton, Islesboro, Maine.

My records further show that on April 6, 1959, or over 4 months ago, I formally notified the committee of my approval of the nomination of Philip E. Plante to be postmaster at Machias, Maine, but that the committee has not yet acted on this nomination.

My records further show that within 2 days after the following nominations were received by the Senate, I formally notified the committee on July 8, 1959, my approval of: Joseph H. Albert, Lewiston, Maine; Lee E. Cox, Brooks, Maine; and Pauline L. Sawyer, Cambridge, Maine.

Finally, my records show that on July 24, 1959 (within 3 days after the nomination was submitted), I formally notified the committee of my approval of the nomination of Louis W. Borden to be postmaster at Orrington, Maine.

I am sure that the committee must have good reasons for not having acted on these Maine postmaster nominations, but I do believe that in all fairness to these nominees that if there is any opposition registered against any or all of them, that hearings should be held without delay so as to vote these nominations up or down before the end of the session rather than killing them by nonaction.

In closing, may I in all friendliness point out to you that in the years of 1949 through 1952, although all Maine postmaster nominations were made by a Democratic President and the nominees were Democrats, I recognized the political prerogative of the President and the Democrats to control the postmaster selections. Consequently, even though as a Republican I had no voice in those selections, I did not take advantage of my senatorial position to block in any manner committee approval of those 1949–52 Democratic nominations. I refused to resort to partisan political obstructionism.

By the same token, I trust and hope that partisan political obstructionism on the part of Democrats will not block your committee's approval of these Republican nominees before the end of the session.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you will recall, I have spoken to you several times about the Maine postmaster nominations pending before your committee and have repeatedly urged favorable action on them by the committee.

I am disturbed that there remain five Maine postmaster nominations before the committee unacted upon as this session approaches a close. If these nominations are not acted upon before the end of the session, they will die and have to be resubmitted by the President next year.

Knowing that it is the policy and procedure of the committee to require clearance or no objection from both of the two Maine Senators on each of these nominations, I have tried to cooperate completely with the committee by responding immediately when receiving the nomination cards from the committee.

In that connection, my records show that on January 22, 1960, or nearly 7 months ago, I formally notified the committee of my approval of the following Maine postmaster nominations, which, as yet, have not been acted upon by the committee: Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine; Karl T. Spruce, Bradley, Maine.

My records further show that on February 6, 1960, or over 5 months ago, I formally notified the committee of my approval of the nomination of Gordon L. Stitham, to be postmaster at Mars Hall, Maine, but that the committee has not yet acted on this nomination.

My records further show that within 1 day after the following nominations were received by the Senate, I formally notified the committee on August 25, 1960, my approval of Wallace Campbell, Fort Fairfield, Maine; Marion P. Davis, Hebron, Maine.

I am sure that the committee must have good reasons for not having acted on these Maine postmaster nominations, but I do believe that in all fairness to these nominees that if there is any opposition registered against any or all of them, that hearings should be held without delay so as to vote these nominations up or down before the end of the session rather than killing them by nonaction.

In closing, may I in all friendliness point out to you that in the years of 1949 through 1952, although all Maine postmaster nominations were made by a Democratic President and the nominees were Democrats, I recognized the political prerogative of the President and the Democrats to control the postmaster selections. Consequently, even though as a Republican I had no voice in those selections, I did not take advantage of my senatorial position to block in any manner approval of those 1949–52 Democratic nominations. I refused to resort to partisan political obstructionism.

By the same token, I trust and hope that partisan political obstructionism on the part of Democrats will not block your committee's approval of these Republican nominees before the end of the session.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I wish to call specific attention to the final two paragraphs of each letter, in which I stated:

In closing, may I in all friendliness point out to you that in the years of 1949 through 1952, although all Maine postmaster nominations were made by a Democratic President and the nominees were Democrats, I recognized the political prerogative of the President and the Democrats to control the postmaster selections. Consequently, even though as a Republican I had no voice in those selections, I did not take advantage of my senatorial position to block in any manner approval of those 1949–52 Democratic nominations. I refused to resort to partisan political obstructionism.

By the same token, I trust and hope that partisan political obstructionism on the part of Democrats will not block your committee's approval of these Republican nominees before the end of the session.

I wish to make it clear that I do not believe that the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee was the person blocking and holding up committee approval of the Lewis nomination. To the contrary, I have always found him most understanding, fair, and sympathetic.

All of us in this body are aware of the operating policy of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to refrain from taking any action on postmaster appointments until both of the two Senators from the State of the nominee register with the committee either approval or no objection to a nomination.

It is crystal clear that Mr. Lewis has been deprived of appointment as permanent postmaster at Rumford, Maine, either by the objection of the junior Senator from Maine to him or by the refusal of the junior Senator from Maine to send the committee a clearance card on Mr. Lewis.

In view of the fact that Mr. Lewis is a career postal employee, with 25 years of honorable and efficient service, and is well respected in his community, and in the absence of any charges against him, I can only conclude that his confirmation was blocked solely by sheer partisan politics.

This, I say, is a disservice to an honorable and efficient postal career man. I am proud to say that I have never opposed a postal nomination made by a Democratic President.

THE 3-MINUTE RULE IN THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee has prepared a strictly factual survey dealing with the so-called 3-minute rule as it relates to the transaction of routine business during the morning hour under rule VII of the Senate rules.

I ask unanimous consent that this study, which is up to date and which may be of value to all Senators, regardless of party, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 3-MINUTE RULE IN THE SENATE

I. BACKGROUND

Rule VII of the Senate Rules provides as follows:

"1. After the Journal is read, the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:

"The presentation of petitions and memorials.

"Reports of standing and select committees.

"The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

"Concurrent and other resolutions.

"All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

"2. Senators having petitions, memorials, pension bills, or bills for the payment of private claims to present after the morning

hour may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof, and said petitions, memorials, and bills shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them as having been read twice and referred to the appropriate committees, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the official reporter of debates for publication in the RECORD.

"It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any memorial, petition, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce this rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator.

"3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up: Provided however, That on Mondays the calendar shall be called under rule VIII, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in rule VIII.

"4. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"5. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

"6. Only a brief statement of the contents, as provided for in rule VII, paragraph 5, of such communications as are presented under the order of business 'Presentation of petitions and memorials' shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and no other portion of such communications shall be inserted in the RECORD unless specifically so ordered by vote of the Senate, as provided for in rule XXIX, paragraph 1; except that communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States, territories, and insular possessions shall be printed in full in the RECORD whenever presented, and the original copies of such communications shall be retained in the files of the Secretary of the Senate.

"7. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

On the subject of debate during morning business, the following is quoted from "Senate Procedure" (at pp. 272–273):

"Debate, speeches, addresses, or remarks are not in order at the beginning of a new legislative day, prior to the conclusion or during the consideration of morning business upon a demand for the regular order, except by unanimous consent; nor is debate on a report during this period in order, except by unanimous consent.

"It is not in order during the introduction of bills and joint resolutions to read a speech into the RECORD over an objection.

"A discussion by a Senator of a bill which he desires to introduce is not in order upon objection being made.

"During the transaction of morning business a speech by a Senator is not in order unless on a question of personal privilege.

"In 1914, the Chair ruled that remarks of a Senator, prior to the conclusion of morning business, are not in order unless there is some question pending before the Senate."

In the same book of precedents and procedures entitled "Senate Procedure" by the Senate Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian, Messrs. Watkins and Riddick, respectively, reference is made at page 368 to a statement by the Chair on morning business, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 1, page 481, as follows:

"In order that the routine business of the morning hour may be accomplished with dispatch and promptness, a certain order has been laid down in the rules for the transaction of such business. The first order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials; next come reports of committees; then the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, followed by the submission of concurrent and other resolutions.

"Ordinarily it does not take very long to go through the morning business. Because of the fact that many Senators come to the Chamber for the purpose of presenting petitions and memorials, submitting reports, or introducing bills and joint resolutions, or other resolutions, the rules provide that there shall be no debate and no speeches on any subject during the consideration of morning business. Of course, after the morning business is concluded, so long as there remains a part of the morning hour, debate is permissible. The Chair is sure that all Senators will realize that it is not quite fair to Senators who have come to the Chamber in order to take part in the transaction of morning business to be required to wait until speeches are made, either on a subject which may be before the Senate or on any other subject.

"Therefore, the Chair desires to announce that, without any Senator making a point of order to that effect, the Chair expects to enforce the rule against the making of speeches of any kind by any Senator during transaction of morning business, in order that the routine business of the Senate may be promptly dispatched.

"In 1921, the Chair ruled that the reference of a resolution coming over from a previous day was not debatable until the conclusion of the morning business.

"A Senator who is recognized during the transaction of morning business and presents a proposed unanimous-consent agreement for a final vote on a bill cannot hold the floor upon objection being made to such request."

Again, quoting from "Senate Procedure" (at pp. 368–370):

"'Morning business,' as defined by the Chair, is certain routine business prescribed by the rules that may be transacted during the first 2 hours of the meeting of the Senate, but may be closed before then when so announced by the Chair.

"The procedure for and nature of morning business is set forth in paragraph 1, of rule VII, and that order of morning business, which must be transacted each new legislative day after the Journal is read, cannot be dispensed with except by unanimous consent, and within that hour during the consideration of morning business, a Senator can make an address only by unanimous consent.

"When the Senate convenes following a recess, morning business is in order only by unanimous consent or pursuant to an order of the Senate agreed to by unanimous consent.

"Until the morning business is concluded, which includes laying before the Senate resolutions going over under the rule, or until 1 hour has elapsed, a motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill on the calendar is not in order.

"When morning business has been concluded, even prior to the hour of 1 o'clock, under paragraph 3 of rule VII, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a specific bill or resolution on the calendar out of its regular order (except on Mondays when the call is under rule VIII) is in order.

"It was held on one occasion that during a call of the calendar under rule VIII, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill notwithstanding an objection, was not in order prior to the hour of 1 o'clock.

"In one instance it was decided that morning business should be resumed following a recess taken under that order of business from 12:45 to 12:55 p.m.

"A motion prior to the conclusion of morning business to make a bill a special order is not in order; it requires unanimous consent.

"If morning business has not been concluded by 1 o'clock, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a matter after that hour is in order, despite the fact that morning business has not been completed.

"The rule being in the alternative, such a motion is in order after the close of morning business, although the hour of 1 o'clock has not arrived.

"A motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution, or a motion to print a matter as a document upon objection is not in order during the presentation of petitions and memorials.

"Unanimous consent is required for the introduction of a Senate resolution or the presentation of a committee report after the conclusion of morning business.

"When the morning hour is consumed by the consideration of an order designating the membership of the standing committees of the Senate, morning business may be presented thereafter only by unanimous consent.

"Under a unanimous consent agreement restricting the business of the Senate to consideration of certain specified matters, and excluding other business not unanimously recognized as urgent, it was held that following an adjournment, morning business could be transacted by unanimous consent only."

"Senate Procedure" states further that:

"The Senate has a practice of transacting morning business following a recess of the Senate (in the same legislative day) under unanimous consent agreement to transact such business under a speech limitation for each item submitted. A single objection would block such procedure" (p. 371).

"The Senate, by unanimous consent, which would waive the morning hour, may transact any business during the morning hour and according to such procedure as it desires. * * *

"It is in order, during the morning hour after the conclusion of the morning business, to move to proceed to the consideration of a bill which has been made the unfinished business, and the consideration of bills during the morning hour has no effect on the unfinished business" (p 376).

II. HISTORY

From the foregoing, it would appear that there is no Senate rule providing for speeches or debate in the Senate during the morning hour as defined in rule VII. In 1949 the Chair (Vice President Barkley presiding) ruled that, when the Senate operates under

rule VII, speeches are not in order. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 1, p. 1329.)

The so-called 3-minute rule, as it has been observed in recent times in the Senate, appears to be a practice which the Senate has adopted from day to day. Without a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to it, the rules prevent the practice.

An examination of the daily RECORD discloses that the practice did not obtain at all prior to the 83d Congress. Until that time and during the first days of the first session of the 83d Congress, whenever a Senator desired to speak during the morning hour, he was first required to obtain unanimous consent for that purpose. For example, on February 27, 1953, Senator COOPER sought and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate for a short time upon a bill which he was introducing. After he had proceeded for some time on this subject and he had yielded to another Senator, Senator Taft made the point of order that, since the Senator from Kentucky had obtained unanimous consent to make a few remarks only, his remarks should be completed and the Senate should proceed with the regular business. Thereafter, by unanimous consent, the Senator from Kentucky was permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 2, pp. 1462, 1465.)

Thereafter, on the same day Senator Taft made the observation that "speeches during the morning hour should be confined to 2 minutes with reference to some bill which is being introduced or on some matter that is related to the business of the morning hour." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 2, p. 1466.)

On March 23, 1953, Senator Taft, addressing himself to a unanimous-consent request by another Senator (that he proceed for not to exceed four minutes,) announced that he would make no objection to such requests when limited to not more than two minutes but that he would object for a request to speak for a longer time during the morning hour. He expressed the hope that the Parliamentarian would keep time and that the Presiding Officer would enforce the terms of such a unanimous consent request. The Vice President then stated that "in the light of the understanding with the Majority Leader, in the future unanimous-consent requests to speak during the morning hour will be limited to 2 minutes and the Parliamentarian will keep time." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 2, p. 2182.)

On March 25, 1953, Senator Taft, in his capacity as majority leader, sought and obtained unanimous consent for Senators to place matters in the RECORD, "with the usual limitation of 2 minutes on speeches." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 2, p. 2265.) This appears to be the first time that such a blanket unanimous-consent request was made in accordance with a practice which has more or less continued to the present time.

The time limitation on speeches during the morning hour has generally varied between 2 minutes and 5 minutes. During the 83d Congress, when the Republicans had control of the Senate, the limitation appeared to have uniformly been kept at 2 minutes. This 2-minute limitation was followed during the 84th Congress when the Democrats were in control of the Senate. But thereafter on occasion the limitation was varied. Thus, on February 18, 1957, Majority Leader JOHNSON sought and obtained unanimous consent to a speech limitation of 3 minutes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 2, p. 2091.)

On June 17, 1957, Senator JOHNSON sought and obtained unanimous consent to a 5-minute limitation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 7, pp. 9309–9310.)

Recent practice has been to confine the unanimous-consent limitation to a 3-minute period for speeches during the morning hour.

The limitation itself has been applied to each of several items in cases where a Senator is addressing the Senate on more than one item. It has not been construed prior to this session of the Senate to apply to all of the items to which a Senator wishes to address himself, whether the limitation has been 2 minutes, 3 minutes, or 5 minutes. The Chair has so ruled since 1953. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 3, p. 3104; vol. 103, pt. 5, p. 6513; vol. 104, pt. 4, p. 4729.)

However, on January 5, 1961, Minority Leader DIRKSEN observed that, since the so-called 3-minute time limitation was not a rule of the Senate but rather "an understanding of accommodation," there should be a clear limit of 3 minutes on each Senator regardless of the number of items he had to dispose of, and he requested that such a time limit be strictly enforced. Majority Leader MANSFIELD concurred. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 130–131.)

On January 10, 1961, Minority Leader DIRKSEN made reference to the foregoing colloquy, and stated it had been agreed that the 3-minute rule should apply to individual Senators, and that no matter how much subject matter a Senator might have to submit in the morning hour, the 3-minute rule should be imposed.

Senator RUSSELL then observed that, while the 3-minute limitation was highly desirable, this agreement should not completely exclude a Senator from rising twice during the morning hour and that "after other Senators have had their opportunity during the morning hour, a Senator who previously has been recognized should be permitted to rise again and obtain permission, if the hour of 2 o'clock has not been reached, in order to introduce a bill or submit any other matter he may wish to submit in the morning hour." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 464.)

When a Senator has exceeded the time limit provided under the unanimous consent agreement, a demand for the regular order will require the Chair to enforce the provisions of the agreement. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 7, pp. 9309–9310.)

On January 17, 1959, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, criticized the practice of permitting Senators to hold the floor for more than 3 minutes under a unanimous consent agreement limiting statements of Senators to 3 minutes during the morning hour. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 1, p. 798.)

SEGREGATIONIST DISORDERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA—SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SCARSDALE, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all Americans should be properly alarmed by the affront to the dignity of the Nation, and to the respect for law and the Federal courts shown by the disorders at the University of Georgia. These incidents have for the moment resulted in flouting Federal court orders which require the university, a creature of the State, to accept two Negro students in compliance with the constitutional mandate against the unequal application of the laws by virtue of race and color. I believe that this is a clear example of why this problem is not a local problem. The courts of the United States are involved, the Constitution of the United States is involved, and the prestige of the United States abroad, so much talked about during the campaign, is involved. Hundreds of millions in the world whose skins are yellow or black are reading about this situation. I am sure the Communists will see that they are fully briefed with the usual addition of falsehoods and exaggerations.

In the face of such a national situation, it is a sad commentary that only this week, by our action on the Senate rules, we have seriously jeopardized our own ability for passing civil rights legislation in this session. Yet the Congress must back the courts on this question of discrimination in education opportunity. The full majesty of our Government must be brought into play to make it clear to those who have breached the public order that the Nation will not tolerate it. Such measures as added authority to the Attorney General in these cases and technical and financial aid to educational systems subject to them are essential.

In this same connection, we in other parts of the country cannot be complacent, either. The front page of the New York Times today carries a story about the barring of a youth from a country club in the fashionable suburb of Scarsdale, N.Y., because he was born Jewish. All credit must go to the Rev. George F. Kempsell, Jr., of the Church of St. James the Less of Scarsdale, N.Y., for his magnificent stand on human rights. I have been the first to say that law is essential to prevent constitutional deprivations of opportunity, but cannot be expected to reach social discrimination. Yet social discrimination is equally reprehensible in terms of the morals and spirit of the country, and must be equally condemned even if it cannot be effectively reached by law. The moral climate of the country set here in the Congress has a great deal to do with the elimination of social discrimination, too. Every American is entitled to be a citizen of the first class under the Constitution, according to our laws. This is the promise of our country.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a supplement to my remarks of January 9 concerning the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on the Dixon-Yates contract, I invite to the attention of my colleagues an excellent item appearing in the New York Times of January 10 entitled "High Court Denies Dixon-Yates Plea." It contains these very significant paragraphs:

All during 1954 and early 1955 the Democrats in Congress attacked the project as bringing high-cost private power into a public power system. Then, in 1955, the city of Memphis decided to build its own power plant, reducing the demands on TVA.

On July 11, 1955, President Eisenhower ordered the Dixon-Yates contract terminated.

By that time a Senate investigation headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, had brought Mr. Wenzell's role to public attention. The AEC, after considering that problem, told Dixon-Yates that it considered the contract unenforceable and would pay them nothing.

The reference to the fine work of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on this case should serve as a reminder of the outstanding public service performed by the senior Senator from Tennessee and by other Senators in this

body who had the courage to stand up and fight this unconscionable deal. Their efforts caused the administration to run for cover, and the recent Supreme Court decision represents the culmination of their fine dedicated work in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH COURT DENIES DIXON-YATES PLEA—6–3 RULING HOLDS UNITED STATES NEED NOT PAY $1.8 MILLION FOR ENDING POWER CONTRACT

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—The Supreme Court struck down today a $1,867,545 award to the Dixon-Yates power group for the cancellation of its contract with the Government.

The Court held the contract unenforcible because of illegality in the negotiations. It said Adolphe H. Wenzell had violated the conflict-of-interest laws by acting both for the Government and for the private interests involved.

The vote was 6 to 3.

Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote the 44-page majority opinion. Joining him were Justices Hugo L. Black, Felix Frankfurter, William O. Douglas, Tom C. Clark, and William J. Brennan, Jr.

A dissent by Justice John Marshall Harlan was joined in by Justices Charles E. Whittaker and Potter Stewart.

The decision writes an epilog to one of the great political issues of the Eisenhower administration.

President Eisenhower and his aids stanchly defended the Dixon-Yates contract against powerful Democratic assaults until it was abandoned. Then administration lawyers turned on the contract and termed it legally worthless. They won their point today.

The power group was formed by Middle South Utilities, Inc., headed by Edgar H. Dixon, and the Southern Co. headed by the late Eugene A. Yates. Its formal name was Mississippi Valley Generating Co.

Dixon-Yates was to build a $107 million plant in West Memphis, Ark., to supply electric power to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA, in turn, was to release an equivalent amount of power to the Atomic Energy Commission.

AIMING AT TVAC

The Eisenhower administration's purpose in arranging the contract was to stop expansion of the TVA. The authority had proposed a new steamplant at Fulton, Mo., to take care of growing demands from both the AEC and municipal customers.

The idea was originally put forward at the end of 1953 by Joseph M. Dodge, then Director of the Budget Bureau. After lengthy negotiations a contract was signed by Dixon-Yates and the AEC, the contracting agency for the Government, on November 11, 1954.

All during 1954 and early 1955 the Democrats in Congress attacked the project as bringing high-cost private power into a public power system. Then, in 1955, the city of Memphis decided to build its own power plant, reducing the demands on TVA. On July 11, 1955, President Eisenhower ordered the Dixon-Yates contract terminated.

By that time a Senate investigation headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, had brought Mr. Wenzell's role to public attention. The AEC, after considering that problem, told Dixon-Yates that it considered the contract unenforceable and would pay them nothing.

Dixon-Yates sued in the Court of Claims, demanding $3,500,000 for its costs in starting work on the contract and for damages. The Court of Claims awarded the company $1,867,545.56, rejecting the Government's legal defenses.

The issues canvassed in Chief Justice Warren's opinion today were whether Mr. Wenzell's conduct had violated an 1863 conflict-of-interest statute and, if so, whether that made the contract unenforceable.

The 1863 statute is a criminal law, providing a maximum of 2 years in prison and a $2,000 fine for anyone who acts as an agent for the Government in any dealings with a business in whose profits he is "directly or indirectly interested."

Mr. Wenzell was a vice president of the First Boston Corp., a New York investment house. He came to Washington at the Budget Bureau's request as an unpaid consultant on the Dixon-Yates affair.

COURT'S REASONING

The first question before the Supreme Court was whether Mr. Wenzell met the statutory test of being an "agent" of the Government in the negotiations. The Court found that he did. The dissent agreed.

The second question was whether Mr. Wenzell had been directly or indirectly interested in the profits to be made by the private power group and thus met the other half of the statute's definition of a conflict of interest.

There were numerous instances, Chief Justice Warren said, when "Wenzell seemed to be more preoccupied with advancing the position of First Boston or the sponsors (Dixon-Yates) than with representing the best interests of the Government."

At another point the opinion remarked that "Wenzell's primary allegiance was to First Boston" and his loyalty to the Government "fleeting."

The Chief Justice said it was irrelevant that Budget Bureau officials had known of Mr. Wenzell's dual role—a fact relied on by the Court of Claims. The opinion said these officials could not exempt him from the statute. The Chief Justice gave no weight to the fact that First Boston eventually agreed to handle the Dixon-Yates financing without fee.

Finally, the majority opinion said that, although the statute was phrased only in criminal terms, its policy strongly suggested that contracts made in violation of the law should not be enforced.

Justice Harlan differed only with the majority conclusion that Mr. Wenzell had been sufficiently "interested" in private profits from the contract to come within the statute. He said the possibility that Mr. Wenzell might eventually profit from the deal was wholly speculative at the time of his work for the Government.

Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin argued the case for the Government. Dixon-Yates was represented by John T. Cahill and William C. Chanler of New York.

DIXON IN EUROPE

Mr. DIXON'S office here reported he was in Europe and therefore unavailable for comment.

THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the summer issue of the Southern California Law Review an article by Mr. Carl Q. Christol entitled "The Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

In it, Mr. Christol reviews the effects of the so-called Connally amendment upon the jurisdiction operation of the International Court. I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in particular I wish to invite attention to the conclusion and the paragraphs preceding it in which the writer states:

The United States, with its tremendous, and ever growing, private investments abroad, is both actually and potentially a claimant nation. Thus, America's practical, as well as its ideological interests, seem to lie in the direction of the widest possible access to the Court. So long as the American declaration accords reciprocal rights to other states to use our reservations, including the self-judging amendment, it is clear that the United States will find it difficult to receive a hearing in the Court.

In my opinion, this article is one more worthwhile and accurate argument bearing out the need for the repeal of the so-called Connally amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE[1]

(By Carl Q. Christol[2])

The International Court of Justice was constructed upon the foundation of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The latter during its existence had been favored with a well conceived statute, with a systematic set of rules, and between 1922 and 1946 had decided 32 cases, and had rendered 26 advisory opinions. Continuity with the experience of the past was accepted as an important value when the revision of the statute was considered by delegates representing 44 States at the Washington Committee of Jurists Conference, Washington, D.C., April 9–20, 1945, and by Commission IV on Judicial Organization at the San Francisco Conference, June 1945.

The statute of the present Court was brought into force as a part of the United Nations Organization, when on October 24, 1945, the Court officially became the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The new Court was inaugurated at the Hague on April 18, 1946, when the first judges took oaths of office by making solemn declarations to exercise their powers impartially and conscientiously.

I. THE COURT AND PROBLEMS OF JURISDICTION

Probably the most important, and certainly the most discussed, provision of the statute of the Court is article 36, which deals with the jurisdiction of the Court. Although the present language of article 36 is almost identical with that contained in the jurisdictional article of the former Court, this result was reached only after serious inquiry. Despite the pleas of a majority of the states present at San Francisco for a broader jurisdiction than had previously existed, the United States and the Soviet Union joined hands to prevent the Court from receiving automatic or compulsory jurisdiction over international legal disputes. The principle of voluntary jurisdiction was written into article 36, although it was provided that member states might accede to compulsory jurisdiction at their discretion.

---

[1] This paper was delivered before the Pacific Southwest Regional Conference on International Law held at the School of Law, University of Southern California, in cooperation with the American Society of International Law, March 4–5, 1960.

[2] Ph. D., 1941, University of Chicago; LL.B., 1947, Yale University. Professor of International Law and Political Science and chairman of the Political Science Department, University of Southern California.

It should be noted that such automatic or compulsory jurisdiction, if provided for, would have prevented a state from unilaterally divesting the Court of jurisdiction in legal disputes in which the particular state was involved. However, and this is frequently overlooked, even if compulsory jurisdiction had been written into article 36, such provision would have been subject to a very important limitation, namely, article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter. This article provides that the Charter "does not authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter."

It will be seen that article 36(1) permits the Court to resolve all cases referred to it by the parties. Assuming consent by the parties, the jurisdiction of the Court may be extremely broad. On the other hand, article 36(2) specifies four distinct areas of jurisdiction, all of which the signatories accepted in a single package as being suitable subjects for compulsory jurisdiction. Article 36(3) permits accession to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court on a basis of reciprocity. Article 36(6) is of special interest to the United States because of the apparent conflict between this provision and the American declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.[3]

On July 24, 1946, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously reported Senate Resolution 196,[4] the "World Court Compulsory Jurisdiction Resolution," for favorable Senate action. The original resolution excluded the court from jurisdiction on "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." During the hearings Senator Warren R. Austin had suggested that proviso "b" be amended to read "disputes which are held by the United States to be with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."[5] After testimony that such an amendment would be "an extremely retrogressive step and would be taking away with one hand what we purport to be giving with the other,"[6] the subcommittee presented the resolution in its original form.

However, on the floor of the Senate, the foregoing proviso "b" was amended by Senator Connally by the addition of the clause "as determined by the United States." During the discussion of the amendment it was assumed that the United States would be a consistent defendant and only an occasional plaintiff. After a brief debate which took place at the close of a tiring session in August and in a manner which in retrospect appears to have been almost casual, the Senate adopted the amendment by a vote of 51 to 12. This action has been described as representing a "basic distrust of the international legal process,"[7] and as being founded on "a vague apprehension of danger, as exhibited in this nervous quest for security from law, which it is difficult to comprehend."[8]

Was there a real need for the United States by unilateral action to avoid the Court's prerogative of determining what constitutes "domestic jurisdiction" by depriving the Court with one hand of a range of jurisdiction which the United States had simultaneously conferred upon the Court with the other? Could the Court be relied upon to distinguish for itself between matters of domestic jurisdiction, which it was prohibited from adjudicating without the consent of the parties, and international legal disputes which were within its jurisdiction? We can determine from the vantage of the present if the fears of the proponents of the Connally amendment were irrational, or whether they were based on valid insights, by examining some of the decisions of the Court.

II. COURT HOLDINGS RESPECTING ITS JURISDICTION

The conservative quality of the Court can in part be illustrated by its decisions respecting the extent of and limitations upon its own jurisdiction. Adequate evidence is available on this score, for in all but three of its contentious cases the issue of jurisdiction has been dealt with by the Court. In 10 contentious cases the Court held that it possessed jurisdiction, while in 12 such cases (the Monetary Gold Removal Case, being counted in each total) the Court declined to exercise jurisdiction. The reasons advanced by the Court in each instance appear to be entirely reasonable and justifiable, although in some instances the holding could have gone the other way without evoking justifiable criticism.

In the cases described herein the Court reasoned that it had jurisdiction. In the Channel Islands or Minquiers and Echeros case,[9] the Court had jurisdiction since the case was submitted under an ad hoc agreement between the parties. The Case Concerning Sovereignty Over Certain Frontier Lands,[10] also reached the Court under an ad hoc agreement. The Case of the Monetary Gold Removed From Rome[11] originally reached the Court on this basis, though Italy was later permitted to oust the Court of jurisdiction. In the Ambatielos case,[12] the Court was required to construe treaty terms to determine if it had jurisdiction. In the Haya de la Torre case,[13] the Court granted Cuba the right to intervene. The Swedish Guardianship case[14] reached the Court under a special agreement whereby Sweden and the Netherlands conferred upon the Court jurisdiction in a matter which normally would have fallen within the municipal jurisdiction of one of the states. The Court held in the Nottebohm case,[15] that it retained jurisdiction in a case when it possessed jurisdiction at the time the complaint was filed. The case was properly heard even after the expiration of the declaration conferring compulsory jurisdiction on the Court. In the Indian Passage case,[16] the Court held that it possessed jurisdiction as soon as an application had been filed, even though the case was brought before the defendant had knowledge that the plaintiff had accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The Court also held that a case could be brought even though diplomatic remedies had not been exhausted, although in this case the Court decided that such remedies had been exhausted prior to the institution of the suit. And in the Anglo-Iranian case,[17] the Court granted interim relief pending a decision as to whether or not there was probable jurisdiction on the merits. Since this relief was granted against the opposition of a sovereign state it is the broadest view

---

[3] Article 36 of the Court Statute includes the following provisions:

"1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

"2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

"a. the interpretation of a treaty;

"b. any question of international law;

"c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

"4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

"5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

"6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

[4] *"Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the deposit by the President of the United States with the Secretary General of the United Nations, whenever that official shall have been installed in office, of a declaration under paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning—

a. the interpretation of a treaty;

b. any question of international law;

c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided, That such declaration should not apply to—

a. disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

b. disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Provided further, That such declaration should remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until the expiration of six months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration." Hearings on S. Res. 196 Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 79th Cong., 2d Sess. 1 (1946).

[5] Id. at 36.

[6] Id. at 84.

[7] Preuss, The International Court of Justice, the Senate, and Matters of Domestic Jurisdiction, 40 AM. J. INT'L L. 720, 722 (1946).

[8] H. Lauterpacht, cited by Preuss, id. at 734.

[9] Minquiers and Echeres Case, [1953] I.C.J. Rep. 47.

[10] Case Concerning Sovereignty over Certain Frontier Land, [1959] I.C.J. Rep. 209.

[11] Case of the Monetary Gold Removed from Rome in 1943, [1954] I.C.J. Rep. 19.

[12] Ambatielos Case, Preliminary Objection, [1952] I.C.J. Rep. 28; see also Ambatielos Case, Merits, [1953] I.C.J. Rep. 10.

[13] Haya de la Torre Case, [1951] I.C.J Rep. 71.

[14] Case Concerning the Application of the Convention of 1902 Governing the Guardianship of Infants, [1958] I.C.J. Rep. 55.

[15] Nottebohm Case, Preliminary Objection, [1953] I.C.J. Rep. 111; see also Nottebohm Case, Second Phase, [1955] I.C.J. Rep. 4.

[16] Case Concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory, Preliminary Objections, [1957] I.C.J. Rep. 125.

[17] Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Case, Preliminary Objection, [1952] I.C.J. Rep. 93.

as yet expressed as to the jurisdictional powers of the Court.

The Corfu Channel case[18] has been referred to as one in which the court overreached itself in taking jurisdiction. The United Kingdom filed an application and Albania stated in its letter of July 2, 1947: "The Albanian Government would be within its rights in holding that the Government of the United Kingdom was not entitled to bring the case before the Court by unilateral application, without first concluding a special agreement with the Albanian Government. [I]t is prepared notwithstanding this irregularity in the action taken by the government of the United Kingdom, to appear before the Court. The Albanian Government wishes to emphasize that its acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction for this case cannot constitute a precedent for the future." Thereupon, Albania appointed its agent "in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 3, of the Rules of the Court." When the matter was heard Albania urged that despite such language of agreement it had not consented to the jurisdiction of the Court. The case stands for the proposition that once Albania conferred jurisdiction, it could not later unilaterally oust the Court of jurisdiction. On these facts it can hardly be thought that the Court acted in excess of reasonable jurisdiction or that it abused its discretion. As the Court was announcing its decision, both countries agreed in writing that the Court might determine the substantive rights of the parties, including the question of whether Albania owed damages. In upholding the British claim for damages the Court decided the exact amount due. Although the power to determine the exact amount due seems to be implicit in the reference respecting the duty to pay damages, Albania asserted that this holding went beyond the authority conferred on the Court. Consequently Albania has to this date failed to comply with the judgment.

In seven cases the Court held that it did not have jurisdiction in cases in which an application was filed against states which had not acceded to the jurisdiction of the Court. In the case of the Monetary Gold Removed from Rome,[19] the Court permitted the plaintiff to oust the Court of jurisdiction when Albania, a necessary party, refused to participate in the case. In the Norwegian Loans case,[20] the Court refused jurisdiction upholding Norway's use of France's then existing self-judging reservation.[21] In the Asylum case,[22] the Court held that it did not have jurisdiction to give an interpretation of its prior judgment when a subsequent effort was made to obtain rulings on matters not raised in the original action or resolved by the decision. It was held in the Case of the Aerial Incident Concerning Israel and Bulgaria[23] that the Court lacked jurisdiction despite Bulgaria's grant of jurisdiction to the Permanent Court of International Justice. This grant did not vest in the present Court power to hear the case since Bulgaria had not become a member of the new Court prior to the dissolution of the old Court. In the Interhandel case[24] it was held that the Court would not take jurisdiction because Switzerland had failed to exhaust its remedies in the courts of the United States. Consequently, the Court did not reach the assertion by the United States that the Court was ousted of jurisdiction by the American claim that it had reserved to itself the unilateral determination of what constituted domestic jurisdiction.

The numerous refusals by the Court to take jurisdiction should put at ease those who conceive of the Court as hungry for additional power, as not having a suitably precise form of law to interpret, or as being unable to distinguish between technical legal arguments.

III. COURT HOLDINGS RESPECTING CUSTOM AS A SOURCE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Custom is a traditional source of international law. A continuing problem is to prove the existence of international custom so that the Court may through its imprimatur give to custom the more formal status of a judicial decision. In providing answers respecting its jurisdiction the Court has had occasion to refer to custom as well as other sources of international law.

The Court has established exacting conditions to determine if customary law on specific subjects does in fact exist. Thus, it has insisted that custom depends on two rather formidable tests. In the first place, it is necessary to show the requisite generality of conduct upon which all custom depends. Secondly, it has been necessary for the proponents of the customary law to convince the judges fairly and by a suitable preponderance of the evidence that the custom has reached such a stage that it is illustrative of existing legal obligations. It is only when custom meets these tests that custom can help the court in resolving the extent of its jurisdiction.

This judicial attitude does not suggest that the Court is anxious to extend the range of its jurisdiction without suitable reason. Neither does it suggest that the Court is unwilling to tackle the hard job of judging whether international custom has matured to the point that it can be acknowledged as a source of law.

IV. DOMESTIC JURISDICTION AS AN ALLEGEDLY UNCERTAIN CONCEPT IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

"Domestic jurisdiction" generally refers to that area of jurisdiction of the state not bound by international law. The concept assumes that there are certain subjects with which a state must concern itself, which, although they have some relation to international matters, are so vitally connected with the needs of a nation that they must be reserved to the exclusive determination of the nation, e.g., matters of immigration, tariffs, the Panama Canal, and whatever subjects states by treaty wish to include within the concept as respects their mutual affairs. Of course, it is quite clear that there are many gradations between the extreme, on the one hand, of subjects exclusively within the control of a given state, and on the other, those subjects which are irrefutably of an international quality. Law has always been forced to cope with gradations between extremes, and has long since proceeded on the intelligent basis of deciding each case on the merits, if and when it arises.

It is well recognized that states may wish by international agreement to deal with matters, which though admittedly domestic, are clearly alined with international problems. It is also recognized that such agreements may specifically provide that if disputes arise on such matters they may be settled in an international tribunal. The Permanent Court of International Justice's Tunis and Morocco Nationality Decrees, 1923, case,[25] involved just this situation, and the Court there held that the treaty granted jurisdiction to the Court to resolve a typically local matter, namely, a problem respecting nationality.

It is extremely unlikely, in view of the Court's conservative outlook toward its jurisdiction, that it would decide matters of domestic jurisdiction unless it were clearly empowered to do so via a specific treaty. The other sources of international law would appear quite inadequate to enable the court to effect such a major tour de force. After considering these factors a committee of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association recently concluded:

"In matters where the United States has been sufficiently concerned to make its view known, and has clearly and unambiguously opposed the assertion of new principles of international law applicable to matters hitherto within states' domestic jurisdiction, the risk of a finding by the International Court that this country is subject to such new principles of international law in derogation of its presently established 'domestic jurisdiction' is small indeed.[26]"

Thus, from a technical view of the law, and as a result of views expressed by the Court, it is extremely unlikely that the Court will suddenly kick over the traces and embark wildly upon an irresponsible modification of long held principles. If the Court were to be given the power by the United States to determine, by applying international law, whether a given problem was, according to international law, either domestic or international, it is next to impossible to conclude that the Court would confuse these matters.

V. FOREIGN POLICY AND THE RULE OF LAW

American participation in the Court involves more than the Connally self-judging amendment as a limitation upon the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. It especially involves the way in which American pronouncements that we are a law abiding and a law respecting nation are received abroad. In this regard it is often heard abroad that America's position is at best ambivalent. We pay lipservice to our noble views toward law and justice, but our practice is somewhat different, and a more restrictive matter. One need hardly be reminded that abrasive conduct along such lines is not an effective selling point for democracy abroad.

Thus, one hears the view that the United States has continued the Connally amendment in order to be judge and jury in its own case in the event it wishes to avoid living up to the commitment made respecting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The United States, it is said, insists on "going it alone" at a time when it is urging the virtues of international cooperation in a world community, and at a time when the onrushing demands of the social complex favor an imaginative type of leadership from one of the major democratic leaders in this world's ideological competition. The United States should not lend its prestige to a reservation which results in America's being charged with contributing to something less than full support for the rule of law in international affairs.

It is also well known that a number of distinguished international lawyers, including several members of the Court, have concluded that the amendment is illegal as being opposed to America's acceptance of Article 36(6) of the statute. It will be recalled that this section in clearcut language confers upon the Court the duty to determine

---

[18] Corfu Channel Case, Preliminary Objection, [1948] I.C.J. Rep. 15; see also Corfu Channel Case Merits, [1949] I.C.J. Rep. 4.

[19] Case of Monetary Gold Removed from Rome in 1943 [1954] I.C.J. Rep. 19.

[20] Case of Certain Norwegian Loans [1957] I.C.J. Rep. 9.

[21] Subsequently France eliminated this self-judgment reservation.

[22] Asylum Case, [1950] I.C.J. Rep. 266; see Haya de la Torre case [1951] I.C.J. Rep. 71.

[23] Case Concerning the Aerial Incident of July 27, 1955, Preliminary Ojections, [1959] I.C.J. Rep. 127.

[24] Interhandel Case, Preliminary Objections, [1959] I.C.J. Rep. 6.

[25] Nationality Decrees Issued in Tunis and Morocco, P.C.I.J., ser. C, No. 2 (1923).

[26] American Bar Association Section of International and Comparative Law, Report on the Self-Judging Aspect of the United States Domestic Jurisdiction Reservation with Respect to the International Court of Justice 50–51, August 1959.

if and when a matter falls within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state. Judges Lauterpacht and Spencer, for instance, held that the amendment has rendered null and void the entire American Declaration, thereby entirely ousting the United States from access to the Court. Judges Klaestad and Armond-Ugen, on the other hand, have concluded that the amendment is only invalid so far as it attempts to confer on the United States the right to determine if a matter falls within its domestic jurisdiction, and that the balance of the American adherence to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court is operative.

Despite the assumptions of Senator Connally to the contrary, the United States, with its tremendous, and ever growing, private investments abroad, is both actually and potentially a claimant nation. Thus, America's practical, as well as its ideological interests, seem to lie in the direction of the widest possible access to the Court. So long as the American Declaration accords reciprocal rights to other states to use our reservations, including the self-judging amendment, it is clear that the United States will find it difficult to receive a hearing in the Court.

America's vital interests require adherence to the rule of law in world affairs, and this can be achieved through an effective Court with a jurisdiction broad enough to permit it to serve as a dispute-resolving and peace-securing institution. The Court, as an institutionalized legal device, surrounded by effective safeguards, is unquestionably one of the best means, both ideologically and practically, to protect America's broad interests in the modern world.

VI. CONCLUSION

The proponents of the Connally amendment argue that if states were to vest in the Court the power to decide important issues, such conferring of jurisdiction would result both in a depletion of the state's sovereignty and would also require the Court to exercise a broad choice as between conflicting principles and rules. However, in America it is generally recognized that the judicial process requires that a choice be made between conflicting principles and rules. Indeed, for us, such a process is the very essence of the common law. It is a worldwide premise that the very essence of the judicial function is to make a reasoned choice between opposing legal claims. The choice is made subject to the "overriding primacy of the existing law."[27] As Dean Griswold, of Harvard Law School, has recently written, the judicial process "involves making law" in a sense, but it is not legislation. It is an essentially judicial process, an important function which courts have always carried out, and without which our legal system could not effectively function.[28] However, it is true that international law is somewhat less certain and detailed than municipal law and this means that the area of judicial discretion is somewhat broader and the need for qualified judges is of the first order of importance.

The history of both international courts clearly shows that when the Court is used, the rights of the states are determined not by the unilateral assertion of their opponents, but by the rule of law. The Court's work also demonstrates the existence of a consistent jurisprudence characterized by a uniform administration of law and by a tradition of fairness. The conservative attitude of the Court respecting the extent of its jurisdiction has established general confidence that disputes before it will be resolved in a legal atmosphere and upon available principles and rules of law.

When the judges have decided that the Court possesses jurisdiction in a given matter they have acted in accordance with a high sense of responsibility in order that the Court may be an effective international institution. On occasions when conflicting rules and principles have been argued the Court has referred to basic international interests and important international values in order to resolve practical problems. Thus the Court has been able to clarify and to some extent develop international law and contribute to the prospect of peace in the world community.

The very existence of the Court is of considerable value. Its growing jurisprudence will provide for international stability and security. As its standards become more definite one may anticipate that there will be a greater inclination on the part of states to seek ordered change through law rather than disorderly change through force. And if states may prefer not to go to law, the presence of the Court may serve as an added inducement to diplomacy rather than force.

There is no reasonable basis for apprehension respecting the work or the decisions of the Court. Rather, it should command our confidence and we should use it whenever we are confronted with an international legal dispute. By so using the Court and by eliminating our self-judging reservation we will enhance the contribution of the Court, serve our own interests, and give notice to the world of our fundamental dedication to the rule of law in world affairs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand it is now the procedure of the Senate that a Member of this body should make only one insertion in the RECORD at a time, during the morning hour, and that after the insertion of the first piece of material he should then take his seat and wait for other Senators to proceed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is it not the case that the Senator is permitted to have 3 minutes in the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may have 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he can make five insertions in the RECORD in 3 minutes he is entitled to do so?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may discuss two or three subjects in 3 minutes, but he should not use more than 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask how much time the Senator from Illinois has remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Department of Labor has just released the unemployment figures for December 1960, showing a total number of 4,540,000 unemployed. This is an actual uncorrected average of 6.4 percent of the working force and if seasonally corrected it amounts to 6.8 percent of the working force.

In addition, Mr. President, I have had computations made of the full-time equivalent unemployment of the involuntarily part-time workers. This comes to an additional figure of 1,171,000. If we total the two, the actual figure for all involuntary unemployment is around 8 percent. Indeed, on a combined basis, the overall figure is over 8 percent.

Mr. President, I think the conclusion is clear that the incoming Kennedy administration is inheriting a very serious recession from its predecessors. These figures moreover cover merely December 1960, and all the indications point to a further great increase in unemployment during the last month.

I ask unanimous consent to have the above table printed in the RECORD, which brings out these facts.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The above table brings up to date the full-time equivalent unemploymenet tabulation through December 1960. Figure for other months are given for comparison.

Date	Unemployed persons	Persons who worked part time because of economic factors			Full-time equivalent unemployment	
		Total	Usually work full time	Usually work part time	Of part-time workers	Total
1959:						
July	3,744	2,580	863	1,726	1,250	4,994
August	3,426	2,547	1,003	1,544	1,182	4,608
September	3,230	2,014	933	1,081	928	4,158
October	3,272	2,173	1,034	1,139	946	4,218
November	3,670	2,339	1,196	1,143	1,001	4,671
1960:						
July	4,017	2,789	1,120	1,669	1,280	5,297
August	3,788	2,854	1,218	1,636	1,285	5,073
September	3,388	2,549	1,319	1,230	1,036	4,424
October	3,579	2,483	1,329	1,154	1,004	4,583
November	4,031	4,741	1,434	1,307	1,126	5,157
December	4,540	2,771	1,454	1,317	1,171	5,711

[27] Lauterpacht, the Development of International Law by the International Court 399, (1958).

[28] Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 23, 1958, p. 7.

Rate of unemployment (does not include any allowance for involuntary part-time)

	Seasonally adjusted	Actual
July	5.4	5.5
August	5.9	5.3
September	5.7	4.8
October	6.4	5.0
November	6.3	5.7
December	6.8	6.4

TAX TINKERING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of December 12, 1960, entitled, "Tax Tinkering."

This editorial cites the need for more reasonable depreciation allowances to help stimulate the economy and remove a longstanding inequity of our American business system.

There seems to be general agreement among tax experts in this country that our depreciation allowances are in need of an overhaul.

There is controversy, however, over whether this should be a basic overhaul, or whether such reform should be undertaken only on a selective or industry-by-industry basis.

Because the Wall Street Journal reflects the views of an important and responsible segment of the business community, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial I have referred to.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX TINKERING

The tax structure in general is inequitable, but the rules governing depreciation allowances are more inequitable than some others.

Because these regulations are antiquated and unreasonable, they impose a disproportionate cost penalty on American business. Thus they may well be a drag on the increased economic growth so many people profess to want these days. For one practical consequence, U.S. firms have been increasingly drawn to operations in Europe, where depreciation and other tax arrangements are considerably more realistic.

So there's not much question that a thoroughgoing reform of depreciation rules should be high on the priority list of the new administration and Congress. Unfortunately, there are some rather pecular ideas floating about as to how this should be done.

One such notion is that any liberalization of depreciation allowances should be selective—that is, so as to stimulate only those parts of the economy the Government wants stimulated. An advocate of this view is reported to be Prof. Walter Heller, to whom Mr. Kennedy has offered the post of chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Almost everything, it seems to us, is wrong with this approach. How, for instance, does the Government get the wisdom to know what economic areas should be stimulated?

Moreover, the economy is not such a simple organism that this or that part can be automatically stimulated at Government will even if Government had the wisdom. If Washington wants to see higher steel output, a special depreciation easing for that industry may or may not have that effect; the important consideration will still be demand.

But the worst aspect of the selective approach is that it makes an inequitable setup even more inequitable. There is no basis in principle for permitting some companies tax easement denied to others.

What is needed is not Federal tinkering but a basic overhaul. That kind of reform would indeed be beneficial to the economy as a whole. But it should also be undertaken because it is the right thing to do.

TAXPAYER'S VOLUNTARILY REPORTING DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article in the Wall Street Journal of December 23, 1960, reporting "a considerable degree of success" in the Treasury Department's drive for voluntary income tax reporting of dividends and interest payments.

This, I am sure, is a matter in which all of my colleagues are interested.

Perhaps you recall, Mr. President, that in recent years there has been considerable agitation for a system under which dividends and interest payments would be subject to a withholding tax similar to the one now used on wages.

Such a system, I have always felt, would place an enormous burden on the Internal Revenue Service and on the banks, savings and loan institutions, and corporations that would be involved.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I note this report by the Treasury Department regarding the success of its voluntary plan.

I believe my colleagues also will be interested in the fact that the dollar volume of dividends and interest reported last year was up 14 percent and 24 percent, respectively, compared with a year earlier.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the story referred to printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY ENCOURAGED BY RISE IN TAXPAYERS VOLUNTARILY REPORTING DIVIDENDS, INTEREST

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury reported "a considerable degree of success" in its drive for voluntary reporting of taxable income from dividends and interest payments. If the campaign continues to be succesfsul, it is likely to damp congressional proposals for withholding dividend and interest taxes at the source.

Treasury Under Secretary Scribner, in a letter to leaders of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, reported "significant increases" in the number of 1959 individual income tax returns that reported dividend and interest income.

Of a total of 60.3 million tax returns last year, 5.9 million returns reported $10.3 billion in dividends. It is estimated that total corporate dividends last year were $13.2 billion. Compared with the year before, the number of returns that reported dividends was up 16 percent and the dollar volume of the dividends reported was up 14 percent.

BANKS' AID SOUGHT

"Of even greater importance, in my opinion," said Mr. Scribner, "was the fact that 9.4 million of last year's returns showed $4.5 billion in interest payments. Compared with the year before, the number of returns listing interest was up 26 percent and the dollar volume reported was up 24 percent."

The Treasury started its voluntary-reporting campaign last year. It solicited the help of banks, savings and loans institutions, and corporations, and gave them reminders to send to their depositors and stockholders. When sentiment mounted in Congress for withholding-tax legislation, first on dividend income and eventually on interest income, Treasury men went up on Capitol Hill to plead that the voluntary plan be given a chance. If it doesn't work, they told Congress, then go ahead with your withholding plan.

One reason the Treasury men gave for hoping that the voluntary plan would work is the enormous burden that a withholding scheme would place on the Internal Revenue Service, both to administer the withholding tax fairly and to handle the large number of tax returns that would result, particularly for small investors.

The Treasury's pleas were successful, and the campaign in Congress withered away. It is certain to be given another look by the Kennedy administration, however; the President-elect has promised an examination of the whole tax structure with an eye to closing its "loopholes." Also, the fate of the withholding scheme will hinge in part on who succeeds Mr. Scribner as the Treasury's tax policy expert. Some Treasury men who look favorably on the voluntary scheme, it is said, will be asked to stay in the new administration.

TOTAL GROSS INCOME UP

Mr. Scribner's report to the congressional leaders gave some figures on Americans' income as a whole, as well as on their dividend and interest income. Last year's 60.3 million individual returns listed total adjusted gross income of nearly $305.8 billion; in 1958 a total of 59.1 million individual returns listed adjusted gross income of $281.1 billion.

Of the 60.3 million individuals and families who filed returns for last year, 47.5 million wound up liable for taxes after calculating exemptions and deductions. Their tax bill: a whopping $38.9 billion, up $4.5 billion from 1958.

AFL–CIO PREPACKAGED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that the President-elect has been considerably weighted down by the burden of decisions since his election on November 7. But I noted in an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of December 27, 1960, that there is at least one group of people who are willing to relieve him of some of this burden. At the same time, of course, they are reminding him of an election debt that he owes to them. According to this editorial, the AFL–CIO top command has called an emergency meeting in Washington, D.C., on January 5. The express purpose of this meeting will be to present to the former junior Senator from Massachusetts a prepackaged legislative program. This program will include, among other things, remission of income tax for 2 months and skipping payroll deductions for that period, as a measure against recession.

As the editorial states, this bit of news, coupled with the President-elect's own program, as so far defined, means one important thing: The sacrifice that he said he would call upon the American people to make will be a sacrifice in the purchasing power of their dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST IN CASE

Although the attractions of Florida are usually overpowering to the union bosses at this inclement season, the AFL–CIO top command has decided to hold an "emergency" meeting in Washington January 5. This probably qualifies as gallantry above and beyond the call of duty, but the boys have a reason.

Just in case Mr. Kennedy is in danger of forgetting his election debt, the union bosses want to remind him that they are around. The possibility would seem remote, inasmuch as Mr. Kennedy has plucked his Secretary of Labor out of the ranks of the AFL–CIO, but the sentiment seems to be against taking chances. So the brass will gather before the Inauguration Day, in the belief that there is a sufficient urgency to justify manifesting their presence in advance of their annual convention at Miami Beach in February.

The executive council of 29 members is prepared to lighten Mr. Kennedy's cares by submitting a prepackaged legislative program. This envisions, among other points, remission of income tax for 2 months and skipping payroll deductions for that period, as a measure against recession. But the union leaders hope to put unemployment compensation on a permanent basis of 39 weeks, instead of 26 as in most States, and to raise social security payments 10 percent and to generate a "high velocity dollar." This is a dollar that would be spent quickly to take up slack in the economy.

Mr. Kennedy's own program, as so far defined, consists of raising the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25, extending medical care to the elderly under social security, launching a program of Federal aid to education, and handing out subsidies to depressed areas.

All in all, we should say that the AFL–CIO program, added to his program, would certainly produce high velocity inflation, at the very least, for it would pack further costs in the billions on the Government while reducing Federal revenues with which to meet them by at least one-sixth. The inevitable prospect is for deficit spending.

Mr. Kennedy stated in his acceptance speech at Los Angeles last summer that he was going to call on the people for sacrifice. Everything in sight suggests that the principal sacrifice will be in the purchasing power of their dollars.

CASTRO REGIME

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, during the past 2 years since the Castro regime assumed the reins of the Government of Cuba our relationship with that country has deteriorated steadily to such a point that earlier this month it was necessary for us to withdraw diplomatic recognition of the Government of Cuba.

Certainly every thoughtful American, who has witnessed the rapid decay of relations between our country and Cuba, fully realizes the pro-Communist, anti-American trail which Castro and his henchmen have been following.

For this reason, it is difficult, if not impossible, for me to understand the recent remarks of a supposedly well-educated American concerning the present Cuban Government.

The conclusions drawn by Paul Baran, an economics professor, in a speech delivered recently in Pala Alto, Calif., were so shocking that I wish to call them to the attention of my colleagues. The professor is quoted in an editorial, "They Call It Education," which appeared in a recent issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this revealing editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY CALL IT "EDUCATION"

The guest speaker strode to the platform and began: "Fidel Castro is one of the great men of this century." The audience leaned forward. "I wish more countries had more Castros," the speaker continued. "I consider him one of the most brilliant men I have ever met."

The distinguished speaker went on to tell how Cuba had stockpiled enough goods to last it 2 years and how Russia is supplying the one needed commodity, crude oil. The country is progressing despite "the relentless hostility of the United States," the gentleman said.

Why has not Castro permitted free elections? Why, said the speaker, simply because the opposition to the regime is disorganized and a free election would give them an opportunity "to take form and become organized." Besides, the gentleman said, "an election now would merely help the counter-revolutionists."

The speaker said he feared direct intervention in Cuba's affairs by the United States, either the landing of U.S. Marines or the equipping of a free Cuba invasion force.

Communists in Cuba? Never fear, the gentleman said. Castro does not like the Communists because they did not fight vigorously enough against Batista. Of course, the speaker granted, individual Communists may have access to Cuban leaders.

The man sat down and the audience applauded vigorously.

This affair did not take place in some hall reserved for a Communist Party cell meeting. The speaker does not claim to be a Communist.

This gathering of students took place at Cubberley Auditorium in Palo Alto, Calif., and the speaker was Stanford Economics Prof. Paul Baran, just back from a 3-week tour of Cuba during which time he was escorted by none other than Castro himself.

And all of this parades under the heading of "education."

FOREIGN AID ILLEGAL?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in Life Lines in its issue of December 30, 1960, entitled "Foreign Aid Is Illegal," be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

In the past I have not attacked the foreign aid program as illegal, but there appears to be some merit to the allegations made in this editorial to the effect that foreign aid is, in fact, illegal, according to disclosures made by my good friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who is quoted in this editorial.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID IS ILLEGAL

There is an old saying which goes: "If you want to have friends, be a friend for the sake of genuine interest in the welfare of others. If you want to make a lifelong enemy, offer your help to a friend for the sake of personal gain."

That America's foreign aid program has been losing friends for America is now becoming evident in almost every quarter of the globe. That American dollars have not and cannot halt the spread of communism certainly should be evident. We have made no real progress in recent years and the mistaken enemies of freedom have made significant progress where we have failed. Is it because we have tried to buy friendship with our dollars? Is it because the administration of our foreign aid has left the impression among the countries receiving it that we were not actually interested in them at all, but we were just looking out for our own best interest? Or is it because the whole concept of foreign aid, as it is now operated, destroys the pride of the countries getting it, and thus causes them to hate America? These are soul-searching questions to which every American should seek the true answer.

Yet, in a large sense, it is impossible for the average American, yes, even a Congressman or Senator to find the answers, for much of the foreign aid program is shrouded in a cloak of secrecy too thick to be penetrated. Just who has received American aid? How much has each country received? For what purpose has the money been spent? What has it accomplished? These are legitimate questions for taxpayers to ask—but they are not questions to which you can get answers.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to collect taxes "in order to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Please note that this refers to the debts of the United States. It does not refer to the debts of Great Britain, Austria, Greece, Denmark, France, and the Netherlands—although all these countries have been paying off their own debts with our tax money.

Senator SAM ERVIN of North Carolina, who for many years was an associate justice of his State's supreme court, expressed his opinion of the illegality of our foreign aid program in a speech in the U.S. Senate. He said: "I do not think we are empowered to take tax money and give it to neutrals merely to advance their welfare. I believe, that under the Constitution, we have no right to take tax money and spend it for any purpose except that which is calculated to promote the general welfare of the United States. Our Government is not an eleemosynary institution and the Constitution does not authorize it to act as such."

Of course, Senator ERVIN is exactly right. The power of the Congress stems from the Constitution. The Constitution is—in theory—the supreme law of the land. The President's single sworn duty is to "preserve and defend the Constitution." All Senators and Representatives take an oath to support and uphold the Constitution. They have no powers except those enumerated in it. And yet, for the past 15 years, the Constitution has been circumvented and ignored.

Also, every effort has been made to prevent the individual citizen from interfering in this illegal giveaway program. The Supreme Court, in the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, decided that the ordinary taxpayer may not sue the U.S. Government to keep it from spending his tax money in an unconstitutional manner. Furthermore, there is no legal machinery by which the ordinary citizen can insist that Members of Congress should observe the law as embodied in the Constitution. Even the recourse of the ballot box is denied the ordinary citizen. The people of America have never been given an opportunity to vote on foreign aid.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there will soon be offered in this body a number of bills dealing with the question of civil rights, many of which I have been asked to cosponsor. Last summer President-elect Kennedy requested Representative EMANUEL CELLER of New York and me to put into legislative or bill form the civil rights plank of the Democratic platform. We have proceeded with that task, which is nearly completed. Before introducing that legislation, however, we wish to confer with the representative of the Attorney General-to-be, but not as yet appointed, who will be in charge of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. This brief statement is made to explain why I shall not cosponsor other civil rights measures which otherwise I would have been happy to do.

CERTAIN CHARGES AGAINST THE DELAWARE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Monday I had the unpleasant task of outlining certain charges against three officials of the Delaware State Highway Department, and at that time I asked for their removal from office.

Fully recognizing that this was primarily a State problem, but nevertheless since this was a State agency which spends millions of Federal funds under the Federal Highway Act, I felt that the Senate and the Bureau of Public Roads should be alerted.

Among the charges presented were kickbacks on contracts, the acceptance of lavish gifts and entertainment, conflict of interest, and the solicitation of political contributions from employees and contractors doing business with the State.

Since that time the State highway commission has adopted a new code of ethics which in the future will prohibit such practices, and I commend them for this step in the right direction; however, I still do not withdraw my suggestion for the removal of the three men specifically mentioned last Monday.

Mr. J. Gordon Smith, chairman of the highway commission, does not deny having directed business to his personally controlled companies, and while he says he will in the future not direct any more business to companies which he personally owns, nevertheless he is insisting upon his right to direct business to companies which are controlled by the immediate members of his family.

Mr. Haber, while admitting the acceptance of gifts mentioned, insists that no favors were granted nor none expected by the contractors who made these gifts, some of which were valued as high as $500.

This is the same defense which was given by the recipients of the mink and vicuna coats, the deep freezes, and Persian rugs.

It is not just a question of, Has a criminal law been violated? There is a moral code expected of public officials.

Both men deny they have done anything wrong but end up promising they will not do it again.

Last Monday I listed several of the gifts which had been accepted by Mr. Haber from these contractors. Today I extend this list and refuse to accept as an explanation Mr. Haber's argument that he should not be criticized for having accepted these cash gifts since he turned them all over to charity.

My question is, "Why did he accept them in the first place and what charities got the six $100 bills which are listed below?"

In 1956 Mr. Haber received a present of $100 in cash from Howard P. Wilson, of the Wilson Construction Co. In 1957 Mr. Haber received another Christmas present of $100 in cash from the same Mr. Wilson. In 1958 from the same source he received another $100 cash Christmas gift. In 1959 he received again the usual $100 in cash as a Christmas present from Mr. Wilson.

In 1958 there is another $100 cash gift which Mr. Haber received from the Edgell Construction Co.

Both of these contractors, Edgell Construction Co. and the Wilson Construction Co., are suppliers and contractors doing considerable road construction business for the State of Delaware, and Mr. Haber is the keyman who approves their work, their contracts, and their overruns.

In addition to the above cash gifts, there is one other gift which Mr. Haber received upon which he placed a valuation of approximately $500. This was a gift primarily of landscaping services and material furnished by Ralston & Gordy, a contracting company.

This company prepared, seeded, and fertilized the lawn for his new home and made certain improvements in his driveway, including curbing, etc. These improvements were valued at approximately $500 and were furnished by this contracting company whose owners were doing business with the State highway department.

Another gift was a portable television set which was given to Mr. Haber by the Franklin Builders.

Mr. Haber has admitted the acceptance of all these gifts, and I again ask the question "How much evidence of impropriety will be needed by the Delaware State Highway Commission to remove Mr. Haber from the public payroll?"

The State highway department and its adoption of a new code of ethics has stopped the practice of soliciting kickbacks as political contributions from its employees. I commend them for this step; however, solicitations from employees is only a part of the collecting which has been permitted under the chairmanship of Gordon Smith.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Gordon Smith and the supervision of Mr. Richard Haber there have been bold solicitation of political contributions from contractors doing business with the State of Delaware and, on occasions, employees of the State highway department have been permitted to make these solicitations while on official duty and even while driving a State car.

One such solicitor was a Mr. G. Clarence Reihm. Mr. Reihm is an employee of the Delaware State Highway Department working out of the New Castle office. As a designated solicitor he has been collecting kickbacks from employees of the highway department averaging from 1 to 2 percent of their paychecks, and he has been taking this cash and turning it over to his superior, Mr. Roy Hawke, another employee of the highway department. He estimates his average monthly collections from these employees at around $300, with about one-half of the employees contributing.

On another occasion, Mr. Reihm was assigned to sell $25 tickets to a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner and he was given orders to solicit from certain contractors doing business with the State of Delaware. To five contractors he sold a total of 42 tickets, collecting $1,050. The solicitation for the sale of these Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner tickets was made while he was on official time and driving a State-owned car.

As evidence that this practice of assigning State highway department employees to solicit political contributions from employees and contractors doing business with the State was not unknown to Mr. Haber—and certainly it could not have been unknown to Mr. Gordon Smith either—I quote Mr. Haber's own answers:

Question. Mr. Haber, are you aware of the practice of the State highway department employees soliciting political contributions from employees and from contractors?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. And these solicitations are made on State time using State vehicles?

Answer. I assume they are; yes, sir.

Question. And these solicitations are made by people who deal with the contractors for the State highway department?

Answer. Some of them, yes, sir; but once again this is nothing new. This has been going on for a long time.

I call attention to another glaring example of solicitations of political contributions from contractors doing business with the State highway department.

The Petrillo Bros., Inc., operate a general contracting and material business and do considerable work for the Delaware State Highway Department.

On May 2, 1957, Mr. Denny A. Petrillo, of Petrillo Bros., Inc., received a telephone call from Mr. Garrett Lyons—now deceased—the chairman of the Democratic State committee, asking that he stop by Mr. Lyons' home on Faulk and Shipley Roads. The appointment was arranged for around 9 p.m. on May 2, 1957.

When he arrived at Mr. Lyons' home he was admitted by Mr. Lyons and found a top official of the Delaware State Highway Department also present.

The discussion was about a maintenance and material contract that the State was soon going to advertise.

Mr. Petrillo was given to understand that if he would make a $5,000 contribution to the Democratic Party he would

get a good share of the orders for a material contract that was soon to be awarded.

After thinking this offer over Mr. Petrillo decided to go along with the proposal, and the following morning, May 3, 1957, he went back to Mr. Lyons and gave him a $5,000 check payable to the Democratic State committee.

This check is identified, as follows: Check No. 668, dated May 3, 1957, payable to the Democratic State committee, drawn on the account of the Petrillo Bros., Inc., at the Equitable Trust Co., Wilmington, Del. This same day, May 3, 1957, this check was deposited by the Democratic State committee to their account in the Delaware Trust Co. in Wilmington.

Subsequently the highway department advertised for bids, and as agreed the Petrillo Bros. were awarded the contract.

This is but one example of the bold solicitation for political contributions, which have been in effect demands upon these contractors.

Over the past 4 years, the Petrillo Bros., for example, have been shaken down for another $10,000 in contributions to the Democratic State committee, some of which were in the form of checks and others were requested to be in the form of cash. Certainly these forced political contributions had the inevitable result of being recognized as extra costs of doing business in the State of Delaware and ultimately ended up by being added up to the contract prices of building our State and federally supported highways.

Recognizing the serious question raised by the solicitation of political contributions from corporations as well as the contributions themselves, I directed an inquiry to the Attorney General of the United States asking this question: "Are corporate contributions to political parties legal under any circumstances?" In reply I was furnished a memorandum calling my attention to section 610, title 18, United States Code, which is the basic Federal law restricting the political activities of corporations. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, January 3, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your letter of December 22, 1960, addressed to the Attorney General has been referred to me for reply. You inquire about individual and corporation contributions to political parties.

You will appreciate, I am sure, that a complete answer to this question calls for my legal opinion on the interpretation and application of criminal statutes which I am not authorized to provide. However, I enclose a copy of an informal memorandum which sets forth the text of the relevant statutes and contains some observations thereon which I believe you may find helpful.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

HAROLD R. TYLER, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

MEMORANDUM RE (1) ARE CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES LEGAL UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES? (2) ARE INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES LEGAL WHEN SUCH PAYMENTS HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF BEING EITHER SHAKEDOWNS OR BRIBES TO OBTAIN SPECIAL FAVORS FROM A STATE AGENCY?

1. FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS RELATING TO CORPORATIONS

Section 610, title 18, United States Code, is the basic Federal law which restricts the political activities of corporations. It reads:

"SEC. 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations or labor organizations

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

The first of the two provisions in section 610 has the effect of making it unlawful for any national bank or any corporation organized under any law of Congress to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office. This portion of the law is not limited to Federal candidates or Federal elections and the prohibition would appear to include expenditures in local and State elections.

The second portion of section 610 relates to corporation and labor union contributions and expenditures in connection with candidates for Federal office.

The Federal election laws do not apply to corporate contributions or expenditures to State or local candidates and unless prohibited by State law such contributions or expenditures would appear to be legal.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES

The Federal election laws are primarily designed to insure a fair and honest election of Federal candidates. The election law statutes do not restrict individual or corporate contributions or expenditures to political party candidates for local or State office.

Section 611, title 18, United States Code, which is closely related to the general subject prohibits political contributions by firms or individuals (but does not include corporations) contracting with the United States.

EXPANDING FEDERAL AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recommendations for the extension and expansion of the National Defense Education Act were reported yesterday by a panel of 20 distinguished Americans and leading educators appointed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming. Among their important recommendations are those for a $25 million program for 25,000 4-year Federal undergraduate scholarships; ending the requirement for the so-called disclaimer affidavit for college loans; and doubling the allowability of college student loans to a particular institution. It is vital that this report should not be overlooked, and I shall introduce a bill to implement it.

There has been a growing awareness that substantial assistance must be given to strengthen our higher education system and its capability in the years ahead to train and develop the talent essential to free world leadership. It is very clear that this is not being done by the existing program, which was a pioneering program, admirable in itself, and a great tribute to this administration and to Congress, but which now needs to be strengthened.

The education panel consisted of leading figures of national reputation. They are: James E. Allen, Jr., commission of education, New York State; Louis T. Benezet, president, Colorado College; Arthur Bestor, professor of history, University of Illinois; J. Douglas Brown, dean, Princeton University; Dr. James Conant, of New York City; John E. Cosgrove, assistant director of education, AFL–CIO; Willis E. Dugan, professor of education psychology, University of Minnesota; J. W. Edgar, commission of education, Texas; Lynn A. Emerson, of Maryland; Martin Esses, superintendent of schools, Akron, Ohio; Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman-Kodak, Rochester, N.Y.; Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president, American Red Cross; Rt. Rev. Frederick G. Hochwalt, executive secretary, National Catholic Education Association; Devereux C. Josephs, of New York City; R. M. Lumiansky, dean of graduate school and provost, Tulane University; Wheeler McMillen, vice president, Farm Journal, Inc.; Lorimer D. Milton, president, Citizens Trust Co., Atlanta, Ga.; A. L. Sachar, president, Brandeis University; Ruth A. Stout, assistant secretary, professional relations, Kansas State Teachers Association; and E. W. Strong, vice chancellor, University of California.

The 86th Congress approved legislation which included additional funds for the NDEA of 1958 and for aid to land-grant colleges. The most significant item in the appropriation was an increase of almost $28 million for NDEA programs, bringing the total appropriation close to the maximum authorizations of the act and within $1,400,000 of the 1961 budget estimate submitted by

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other appropriation items in the law include $58,430,000 for the student loan program; nearly $58 million for science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction; $40,872,000 for vocational education; and $20,750,000 for graduate fellowships.

Another act of the 86th Congress was to attach to a minor bill a $500 million increase in the loan authorization ceiling of the college housing loan program. This bill incorporated legislation which I had sponsored. The Congress thus provided relief for college and university housing financing. This loan authorization will be absorbed largely in meeting pending requests of nearly $300 million now before the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But there still remain areas of urgent need in financing academic, administrative, and other related college facilities.

The NDEA is a pioneer effort and it must be regarded as a beginning if millions of young trained minds are to be fully developed in colleges and universities equipped to cope with the steadily rising registration by 1970.

The education gap in terms of manpower already means:

From 100,000 to 200,000 high school graduates in the top quarter of their class are not pursuing a college education because of insufficient funds; college costs are up 33 percent since 1956 and are expected to rise another 33 percent by 1964, considerably faster than average family incomes.

By 1970, the number of professional-technical jobs will total 12 million compared to 7 million in 1960, although there is no assurance that we will have trained personnel to handle them since nearly one-third of the 26 million new members of the 1970 labor force are expected to lack a high school education.

By 1970, a shortage of thousands trained to serve in foreign lands as employees of government and business.

To close the education gap, combined public and private sources will have to be investing an average of $10 billion annually by 1970.

If the education gap is allowed to widen and a serious shortage of highly skilled manpower develops in the United States, it portends serious consequences for the success of related efforts that government, private industry, and labor must make.

The current report should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that the 87th Congress must be fully alert and responsive to the national interest in and concern for higher education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "School Act Expansion Urged by 20 Experts," written by Erwin Knoll, and published in the Washington Post of January 13, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL-ACT EXPANSION URGED BY 20 EXPERTS

(By Erwin Knoll)

A massive expansion and 5-year extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 were recommended yesterday by a panel of 20 leading educators.

They urged retention of every school-aid program now authorized by the act, inclusion of a substantial Federal scholarship program and addition of English language instruction to the subject fields the act is designed to strengthen.

The act, which expires June 30, 1962, was passed by Congress in the aftermath of the first Soviet satellite launching. It provides Federal funds to bolster instruction in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages, and authorizes Federal loans to undergraduate students, graduate fellowships and aid for vocational training.

The educators' report was released yesterday by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who said he was in agreement with their recommendations.

"Basic to our consideration of the National Defense Education Act," the educators added, "is our belief that the Federal Government has an obligation to help identify and bring to fruition the full potential of every youth. Further, it is our belief that failure to do this will imperil not only the individual, but the Nation and the free world."

One of the panelists, the Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, executive secretary of the National Catholic Educational Association, said he could not agree at this time to any increased Federal support for education beyond the specific recommendations in the report.

The educators were divided on whether a Federal scholarship program should be administered by the States or by institutions of higher learning, but they agreed that such a program should provide an initial amount of $25 million, increasing to a total of $100 million in the next 4 years.

Individual grants of up to $1,000 would be based on merit and need, with an additional $500 going to the institution in which the recipient is enrolled.

The educators proposed establishment of the student loan program on a revolving fund basis, doubling of the $250,000 ceiling now in effect for Federal loans at a single institution, extension of loans to students in 2-year technical institute programs, repeal of the loyalty disclaimer affidavit which has been widely criticized by colleges, and extension to all school and college teachers of the loan forgiveness provision now applied only to public school teachers.

COMMENTARY ON GREATNESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 8 contained an editorial about the formal counting of the ballots which had been cast by members of the electoral college. It expressed with eloquence what was in the hearts and minds of many who saw Vice President NIXON announce the victory of his opponent. The Inquirer says that the Vice President's remarks were "a historic commentary on the American system of government." They were also a commentary on the greatness of the man who made the remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Republicans and Democrats of the Senate and the House, rising in unison to accord Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON a standing ovation, were showing their respect for an extraordinary man who had just demonstrated, once again, his unwavering resolve to hold the national interest high above party considerations.

Strange twists in the course of history placed Mr. NIXON in a very unusual situation—without precedent for a hundred years. As Vice President he was directed by procedure set forth in the Constitution of the United States to preside over the formal counting of ballots that decreed himself the loser—and John F. Kennedy the winner—in the presidential election.

This might have been a time for bitterness or embarrassment but it wasn't. Mr. NIXON combined good humor with dignity and solemnity appropriate to the occasion. He climaxed the ceremony with a short address that will long be remembered as a historic commentary on the American system of government.

"In our campaigns, no matter how hard fought they may be, no matter how close the election may turn out to be, those who lose accept the verdict," Mr. NIXON said. He extended congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Kennedy and to Vice-President-elect LYNDON B. JOHNSON as they prepare to assume grave duties and responsibilities "in a cause that is bigger than any man's ambition, greater than any party. It is the cause of freedom, of justice, and peace for all mankind."

We hope that all Americans, regardless of which candidate they favored in the November election, will join Mr. NIXON in giving the incoming administration the support which these perilous times demand from all of us.

GRIT AWARD TO HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I offer the following insertion for the RECORD because of the insight it offers into the background of one of the recently elected Members of the House.

Grit, a weekly newspaper which is published in Williamsport, Pa., but which has a remarkably widespread national circulation, regularly makes awards to persons of outstanding ability. Although Mr. SCHNEEBELI was nominated for the Grit Award in 1959, the editors bypassed his name only because he was then a candidate to fill the seat from the 17th District of Pennsylvania, which had been left vacant by the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush. The editors believed that the article would give Mr. SCHNEEBELI an unfair advantage over his opponent. After Mr. SCHNEEBELI was elected in a special election and then reelected last November, Grit went ahead with the award.

It gives me great pleasure to offer the following article about my colleague from Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the article from Grit be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI CITED FOR WORK IN FUND RAISING

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI is equipped with the enviable qualities so needed in public and civic life.

He is serious, but at the same time friendly; he is deliberate, but can also act quickly when the occasion demands. He is calm and unruffled, but speaks his mind when necessary; he has convictions, but also appreciates the opinions of others.

Associates also have found that Mr. SCHNEEBELI possesses a combination of rare

business ability and tireless energy—attributes from which Williamsport has benefitted handsomely in recent years.

LOCAL GROUPS AIDED

In addition, Mr. SCHNEEBELI has a genial disposition not easily disturbed. He can disagree with vigor while maintaining an atmosphere of good humor and conciliation.

It's little wonder, then, that Williamsport civic, welfare, and other organizations have called on him so often to assist in management and fund raising. And it's little wonder that Mr. SCHNEEBELI responds, because he has such an intense desire to help his community—just as he is striving so earnestly to do for a larger area today as a dedicated, hard-working Congressman.

It is for his wide range of civic service to his fellow men that Grit this year singles out Mr. SCHNEEBELI for one of its awards for meritorious community service.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI was nominated for a Grit award in 1959 and would have been presented the citation but for the fact that he was selected by Republican conferees to run for the congressional seat made vacant by the death of Alvin R. Bush. Grit's board of directors believed that it would have given Mr. SCHNEEBELI an unfair advantage over his opponent to cite his many commendable civic contributions at a time when he was competing for public office. Therefore, though greatly deserving, he was passed up in the final selection.

PRAISED FOR CIVIC WORK

Now that Mr. SCHNEEBELI has won the full 2-year term to Congress in his own right, the political objection no longer applies, and he can properly be extolled for his many good civic works.

Though removed from active on-the-scene civic leadership by his larger services in Washington, his efforts on behalf of his community go on and on.

A case in point is the Williamsport Hospital.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI has been a member of the board of managers at the hospital since June 17, 1958. When, in August of that year, the board looked around for a general chairman for its campaign for funds to provide a school of nursing and a nurses' residence, the one man who stood out as the best choice was HERMAN SCHNEEBELI.

RECEIPTS TOP GOAL

A tribute to the chairman's resolute effort is shown by the fact that a whopping $875,000—$130,000 above the fund goal—was raised in the campaign.

"The wonderful results attained in the drive were due, in large measure, to the organizational ability and the efforts of HERM SCHNEEBELI," said Daniel W. Hartman, executive director of the hospital's building program and for many years administrator of the hospital.

And Paul G. Wedel, present administrator at the hospital, describes Mr. SCHNEEBELI "as a sincere and conscientious member of the board of managers who has shown a tremendous interest in the hospital."

This valuable hospital expansion program now is nearing fruition. The new building, containing a residence and educational facilities for student nurses and an auditorium for staff and other meetings, is now about two-thirds finished, with construction expected to be completed April 30.

The structure will house 138 student nurses and will be in use next summer.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI and his aids in the campaign must have a real feeling of pride as they watch this hospital addition become a reality.

OTHER GROUPS BENEFIT

Other organizations also have benefited from Mr. SCHNEEBELI's selfless efforts.

In 1958, he was a member of the steering committee which directed a campaign for funds staged by Lycoming College. In addition, he aided in the advance solicitation in the drive.

A total of $1,001,120 was contributed in the campaign—the largest sum of money ever subscribed in Williamsport for the support of any welfare or educational undertaking.

"Mr. SCHNEEBELI showed a deep interest in the college," commented Dr. D. Frederick Wertz, Lycoming president. "He gave wise counsel and advice in overall planning."

One of Congressman SCHNEEBELI's favorite organizations is the Lycoming United Fund, of which he long has been a booster and director. His interest in the United Fund doubtless developed from his connections with the Community Chest, predecessor of the United Fund. He served as Community Chest campaign director in 1951 and as president of the chest in 1952 and has had a part in all chest and United Fund drives since 1947.

PRESIDENT OF BOARD

President of the board of trustees of the Williamsport YWCA, he also served as chairman of a YWCA drive which had a quota of $125,000 and raised $130,000.

For 2 years—1954 and 1955—he served by appointment as a member of the Williamsport School Board, where another member said of him:

"I never saw anyone grasp problems as quickly as HERM SCHNEEBELI. And he also could find the right answers."

In 1959, Mr. SCHNEEBELI served as chairman of a Williamsport Chamber of Commerce committee which conducted a nine-session course in "Practical Politics for the Businessman."

This course on politics was so popular that the chamber of commerce is now operating two different classes on the subject for local business and professional men.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI evidently followed his own precepts well, for, as the Republican nominee, he was elected to Congress April 26, 1960, from the 17th District to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of Alvin R. Bush. Last November 8, he was elected to a regular 2-year term in the House of Representatives in Washington. He is a member of two important House committees—Public Works and Banking and Currency.

COMMENT ON ELECTION

Mr. SCHNEEBELI's successful move from a businessman merely interested in politics for the betterment of his country to a legislator able to work for such betterment on the scene in Washington was so unusual that it drew special comment from such noted writers as Victor Riesel.

Because he was elected by the people, the 17th District Congressman goes to the people for advice.

One of his earliest acts after taking office was to send to the 100,000 voters in the district a questionnaire covering the many facets of Federal Government. Constituents were asked to list their answers to questions on subjects ranging from foreign affairs to taxes.

Fifteen thousand replies—a remarkable response—were received, giving Congressman SCHNEEBELI a clear view of the thinking back home.

In Williamsport, Mr. SCHNEEBELI also has been a director of the chamber of commerce; active in the chamber's LIFT campaign, and its industrial development bureau, of which he was a vice president, and a member of the group's sales team seeking new industries for the Williamsport area.

One of Mr. SCHNEEBELI's principal interests is his church—Trinity Episcopal. At Trinity, he has been a vestryman, member of the finance committee, and chairman of the every-member canvass committee. Under his leadership, Trinity has steadily increased the size and proportion of stewardship pledges toward the church budget.

"From a pastor's viewpoint, however," said the Reverend William B. Williamson, D.D., former rector at Trinity, "Mr. SCHNEEBELI's most valuable asset is his creating, with his lovely wife, of a strong and healthy Christian home. The Schneebeli family possesses one of the best church attendance records in the parish, and each member has been happily engaged in some phase of the work and life of the church.

"Regardless of his busy life and schedule, this fine churchman always makes and takes time to be of service to his parish."

Mr. SCHNEEBELI, also was a board member of the Williamsport Council of Churches in 1957.

ACTIVE IN BUSINESS

He has been active in the Williamsport area business world since 1939, when he became commission distributor here for the Gulf Oil Co. Between 1931 and 1939 he was employed by Gulf, working in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky, and traveling in six States from New York to North Carolina.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI also is president of the Muncy Motor Co. and has a major financial investment and partnership in four oil and tire businesses in Lycoming and Tioga Counties.

He is vice president of the oil information committee, a member of the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, and a director of the First National Bank of Williamsport.

During the Second World War, Mr. SCHNEEBELI served 44 months as captain of the Ordnance department, U.S. Army. He was an executive officer at three plants manufacturing high explosives.

He was born July 7, 1907, of naturalized Swiss parents in Lancaster. His father, Alfred Schneebeli, was general manager for the largest silk broadcloth manufacturers in the United States and supervised five plants in three States.

HERMAN SCHNEEBELI was graduated in 1930 from Dartmouth College, where he was a classmate of Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York Governor, who visited this area to help him in his congressional campaign.

GOT MASTER'S DEGREE

After obtaining his A.B. degree at Dartmouth, Mr. SCHNEEBELI received a master's degree from the Amos Tuck School of Business Administration at the same college. Prior to attending Dartmouth, he was an honor student at Mercersburg Academy. He is now serving as Williamsport area chairman of a Mercersburg $1 million development campaign.

In Williamsport, Mr. SCHNEEBELI is a member of Garrett Cochran Post No. 1, American Legion; the Elks' Lodge, and a 20-year member and former director of the Kiwanis Club.

September 21, 1939, he married Mary Louise Meyer, of Bellefonte, who also has been active in community affairs. She is a graduate of Hood College, a former president of the Williamsport Home, a director of various parent-teacher associations, and head of the Episcopal women of the Williamsport Archdeaconry.

The Schneebelis, who live at 870 Hollywood Circle, have two daughters—Marta Louise, a freshman at Hood College, and Susan Jane, a senior at the Williamsport High School.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. SCHNEEBELI now must spend a great deal of his time with congressional work—both here and in Washington. At the same time and despite his busy schedule, he has maintained his close and helpful ties with local religious, civic, and welfare organizations.

These groups know that they can always depend on HERM SCHNEEBELI for assistance and counsel even as he continues to work with vigor and dedication in his larger sphere in Washington.

NEEDED: OPTIMISM, NOT PESSIMISM, ON U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, there are—regrettably—about 4½ million unemployed and economic slowdowns in some businesses and industries.

As President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message pointed out, however, the country is still moving ahead with levels of employment and output of goods and services unsurpassed in our history.

In dealing with these economic difficulties, let us face some facts of life: the antidote to an economic setback is not to throw up our hands and scream "depression." Psychologically, this could help to create one; perhaps it has already made the situation more difficult in this case.

Nor should Uncle Sam be expected to bear the whole burden of pump priming the economy—as some would propose. The Treasury is not a bottomless pit, kept full by an invisible genie, creating new money without cost to the taxpayers.

All segments of the U.S. economy have a vested interest in, and a fundamental responsibility for helping to resolve, our economic problems. Among other things, this means attempts to create jobs for the unemployed and keeping the wheels of our free enterprise system rolling forward at a good rate of progress.

Now, what can be done?

In my judgment, new efforts are needed to encourage greater confidence in—not attempt to undermine—our economy; encourage greater investment in enterprises—large and small; encourage business and industry to share profits with labor and consumers; encourage a responsible attitude by labor in wage and benefit demands; and as necessary, expand Government programs for highway building, airport construction, and so forth; and loosen up money policy; but only as necessary.

In all of this, of course, it is extremely important not to take action that would spur inflation and further depreciate the dollar.

The Nation—I am confident—will be able to deal swiftly and successfully with the economic slowdowns and unemployment—if we first, encourage the cooperation of all segments of the economy to deal with the situation; second, realistically emphasize the positive aspects of the picture—not enlarge the negative out of perspective; and third, get rid of the pass-the-buck attitude of let Uncle Sam do the whole job.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States—and the world—face great, broad-scope economic challenges, if we are to promote maximum progress for mankind.

As we can resolve the major problems now blocking development, however, I believe it would mean great things:

First. For the highly developed nations like the United States, in terms of creating new markets and opportunity for our industrial, agricultural, business, and service interests.

Second. For the peoples of less-developed areas, now literally needing "everything," to lift standards and promote economic progress.

To accomplish these objectives will require long-range global planning and cooperation among nations.

In addition to efforts by individual nations, I believe the establishment of a United Nations World Resources Board could make a constructive contribution in this field.

The purpose would be to, first, evaluate present and future needs of humanity around the globe; second, survey the resources of the world—human, natural, industrial, agricultural; and third, make recommendations on how to more effectively channel these vast resources to serving mankind.

Far too many of the nearly 3 billion people are existing on pitifully low standards of living;

The economies of the world's 118 countries—except for a few—are still greatly underdeveloped; and

The existence of "have not" peoples and nations continue to be hotbeds of unrest in the world—and the targets of Communist piracy,

The establishment of a World Resources Board—for example, under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations—could, I believe, perform the following functions:

First. Correlate existing studies—and, as necessary, undertake new ones, to fill in gaps of knowledge—of human need and natural resources on a global basis.

Second. Propose ways and means on how available resources—such as the surplus foodstuffs in the United States, and the great industrial-agricultural production capacity of the United States, and other advanced nations—could be more effectively mobilized to lift standards of living.

Third. Make recommendations as to how potential resources could better be utilized to serve humanity.

Fourth. Promote smoother, faster flow of commodities—including removing barriers now obstructing traffic—from sources of supply to places of demand.

Fifth. Prepare long-range plans as to how nations, individually, bilaterally, regionally, and internationally, can more effectively cooperate to meet the growing needs of a fast-expanding world population.

We recognize, of course, that today, a great many programs are underway by nations, individually and collectively, to promote progress in this field.

However, the design of larger scope, longer range global plans, I believe, would provide guidance for exporting nations and result in a faster development and utilization—particularly in less-developed areas—of nations' own natural resources.

Unfortunately, the facts of life, especially those involved in the East-West conflict, continue to create difficult problems which sometimes act as a deterrent to economic progress.

Nevertheless, I believe that such a study—creating a new global perspective—would be beneficial, for: (a) Speeding the time when more people could live better; and (b) shifting the emphasis from militarism—now absorbing vast resources and manpower—toward economic humanitarian progress.

SEMIANNUAL JOINT ORIENTATION CIVILIAN CONFERENCE TOUR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, while Congress was in recess last fall the Defense Department conducted its semiannual Joint Orientation Civilian Conference tour of major defense establishments in the United States.

Mr. Virginius Dabney, the distinguished editor of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch was among the 70-odd civilians attending the conference and making the tour.

Upon his return to Richmond, Mr. Dabney published his impressions in signed articles appearing in the Times-Dispatch on October 16, 18, 20, 21, and 23, 1960. They are informative, interesting, and reassuring.

Mr. Dabney is a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, winner of the Pulitzer Prize, twice winner of the Sigma Delta Chi Award, and an author and lecturer of national reputation.

I think his views on our national defense posture should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAST-TO-COAST VISIT TO DEFENSE BASES VASTLY REASSURING—I

(By Virginius Dabney)

The writer returned recently from a 10-day coast-to-coast visit to Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations. It was a vastly encouraging journey. The personnel of our Armed Forces from the top ranks to the lowest, is extremely good. The expertness with which officers and men handle modern weapons of great complexity is reassuring. Every American would profit from such a trip.

The Department of Defense offers an opportunity of this sort every 6 months to some 70 to 75 civilians from all parts of the United States. The journey just concluded was the most elaborate yet offered. Not more than half of all our generals and admirals on active duty have had a comparable opportunity to observe the various branches of the service in action, we were told.

Reeling taxpayers who fear that this trip was at their expense should relax. Everybody in the group paid his own expenses. It was emphasized that what we witnessed were normal training operations, and that these operations would have had to be staged, whether or not members of this Joint Orientation Civilian Conference were present.

The trip began at San Diego, Calif., where the great naval base was visited, along with the huge marine base at Camp Pendleton. One night was spent on the aircraft carrier *Kearsarge*, which engaged in simulated antisubmarine warfare 50 miles at sea. Then northward to Vandenberg Air Force Base, on the California coast, and the two adjacent naval bases at Point Arguello and Point Mugu. After viewing the Atlas, Titan, and Samos missiles, and the elaborate installations surrounding them, we flew to the North American Air Defense Command (Norad) at Colorado Springs. Here the Governments of

the United States and Canada conduct a far-flung operation involving radar and other devices to warn this continent of any oncoming missile or bombing attack.

Thence, to headquarters of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) near Omaha, Nebr., where there is an amazing complex of world-wide controls covering both bombing planes, armed with thermonuclear bombs, and intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads, all poised and ready to strike, if word should ever come from Norad at Colorado Springs, or elsewhere, that an attack on the United States is on the way. Release of our nuclear bombs or missiles must be cleared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington and the President of the United States.

Next stop was the immensely impressive Infantry Training School at Fort Benning, Ga., which gave us a new concept of the role of modern infantry in war. The last leg of our flying trip was from Fort Benning to Washington, where we had a conference with Defense Secretary Thomas Gates and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Some cynical readers may surmise that we were given a lot of carefully prepared propaganda by the generals, admirals and others who briefed us, and that maybe we were just a gullible bunch of pushovers. But let it be said for the record that this group of civilians included a great many well-informed people who began the journey with an inquiring, even skeptical point of view. Among them were three college and university presidents, plus some of the foremost figures in America in steel, automobiles, aluminum, machine tools, utilities, insurance, banking, journalism, law, and so on.

Yet, if a single one of these 70-odd individuals finished the trip without an enhanced admiration for the men in our armed services and the job they are doing, I failed to find him. On the contrary, the unanimity was so great that it would have been difficult to have obtained such universal agreement from this group on any other subject. It was for all of us a truly memorable experience.

NAVY, MARINES "ON THE BALL" IN ANTISUB AND AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE—II

(By Virginius Dabney)

Antisubmarine operations, with submarines "attacking" our aircraft carrier through a screen of defending destroyers, planes, and helicopters, and heavy depth-bomb explosions and rocket firing, were fascinatingly realistic events on the program during the day and night we spent on the carrier *Kearsarge* off San Diego. This was the opening of a 10-day visit by 70 civilians to defense installations from coast to coast.

The *Kearsarge*, a 41,000-ton vessel commissioned in 1946 and named for the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* which sank the Confederate cruiser *Alabama* off the coast of France in 1864, is a unit of the 1st Fleet, commanded by Vice Adm. Charles Melson. Admiral Melson is a distinguished Richmonder and former Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy.

He was on board for these demonstrations, along with Rear Adm. R. L. Townsend, commander Carrier Division 17. Capt. P. W. Jackson was in direct command of the *Kearsarge*.

All these officers impressed us as dynamic, "on the ball" types, fully conversant with their duties. The *Kearsarge* is one of about nine carriers in the U.S. Navy which have been assigned the primary duty of antisubmarine warfare. All the others are attack carriers whose primary mission is to launch planes for attack against enemy coasts, troops, planes, or ships.

The antisubmarine maneuvers centering in the *Kearsarge* were executed in the Pacific, some 50 miles at sea. The carrier was screened by destroyers, while helicopters and rocket-firing planes circled overhead. The destroyers and destroyer escorts dropped depth bombs in attempting to kill the subs. These bombs, packing 250 pounds of TNT, sent geysers of water high into the air, and shudders through the steel hull of the *Kearsarge*, at least a quarter of a mile away. One could only imagine the destructive potential of a depth bomb with power equivalent to thousands of tons of TNT. It is hard to see how any submarine could survive such a concussion.

Another demonstration was that of jet flying from the carrier deck. There was also the firing of a Sidewinder air-to-air missile, which hit the target unerringly, and night flying, with deck takeoffs, landings, and rocket firing.

All these operations were carried out with great efficiency and dispatch, even though the ship was shrouded in fog a part of the time.

The great Camp Pendleton marine base, a short distance up the California coast, was our next objective As on board the *Kearsarge*, we were routed out of bed at 6 a.m. A bugler stationed in the hall of our barracks rent the air with reveille, and an excellent brass band at once began playing loudly under our windows.

A realistic amphibious assault by the marines was a fascinating feature of our visit. The landing force approached through the fog and the naval guns began bombarding the trenches and pillboxes of the defenders. The assaulting marines landed from amphibious craft which disgorged them on the beach.

The latest method of destroying one pillbox after another was demonstrated. First a white phosphorous bomb, thrown at the pillbox at close range, enveloped it in blinding white smoke. This virtually immobilized the defenders and prevented them from firing at the assaulting party. Under cover of this thick smoke, a marine would rush forward and plant a demolition bomb at the base of the pillbox. This would shake up the defenders still further. Then came the coup de grace—an assault on the pillbox with a flamethrower. The long tongue of searing, clinging fire effectively wiped out any remaining defenders.

A notable feature of the amphibious landing was the new concept of vertical envelopment, or assault by helicopter. The mobility of the amphibious ships—all having speeds in excess of 20 knots—also was impressive.

On a range at another part of Camp Pendleton, we witnessed an effective demonstration of marine firepower. It involved aircraft with rockets and napalm fire bombs, and firing by tanks, howitzers, and ontos (which last is a multibarreled tank-killing weapon). All showed great accuracy and precision.

The demonstrations at Camp Pendleton were under the able overall supervision of Gen. H. R. Paige, commanding general of the 1st Marine Division, and Vice Adm. Howard A. Yeager, commander, amphibious force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

UNITED STATES LEADS SOVIETS IN SATELLITES BUT LAGS IN DEEP SPACE PROBES—III

(By Virginius Dabney)

The United States is making rapid progress in perfecting its intercontinental ballistic missiles, and has developed effective operational missiles in every category, both long and short range. Not only so, but in the launching of satellites, we now are clearly ahead of the Soviet Union, despite impressions to the contrary created by Russia's success in putting up its first sputnik. In the exploration of deep space, on the other hand, the Soviets are definitely ahead of us.

These conclusions are based on documented, official statements made to the 70 members of the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference which recently visited Army Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

Many facts concerning this country's missile, satellite, and deep space capability were given us in a briefing by Rear Adm. Jack P. Monroe, range commander of the naval missile facility at Point Arguello, Calif. Admiral Monroe was concerned over the "amount of misinformation and the number of uninformed people who are discussing these matters." The admiral impressed us as articulate and informed.

He spoke of the "report that Russia has produced more large missiles than the United States, and is capable of producing such missiles at a faster rate." But he attached little importance to this, saying that "Russia has an entirely different set of military requirements," and "there is no reason for us to match Russia missile for missile." He added that the United States "has the greatest military capability the world has ever seen." In all this Admiral Monroe was speaking officially for the Pentagon.

We viewed the great Atlas, Titan, and Discoverer missiles on their launching pads at Point Arguello and at nearby Vandenberg Air Force Base. Although there have been a number of misfirings of these enormously complex mechanisms, they are being steadily perfected, and their accuracy is increasingly phenomenal, even at ranges of up to 6,000 miles.

Still more important is the upcoming Minuteman missile, which is expected to be the backbone of our striking force in the coming years. It is not yet operational, but is well ahead of schedule. Atlas and Titan have liquid fuel propellants, but Minuteman, with its solid propellant, promises significant advantages in terms of faster reaction, economy, mobility and ease of maintenance, handling, and storage.

General White, Air Force Chief of Staff, has said that "it will be entirely feasible to deploy Minuteman missiles on railroad cars—which would move at random over the Nation's vast rail network." Thus an enemy will have an almost impossible task in trying to knock out the Minuteman bases in a surprise attack. (A similar difficulty presents itself already to an enemy in the case of our nuclear submarines equipped with Polaris missiles. In addition, of course, we have bomber bases, equipped with nuclear bombs, and placed strategically around the rim of the Soviet Union.)

All this would seem to make improbable a surprise nuclear attack from the U.S.S.R. For it is a virtual certainty that if such an attack were mounted against us, the industrial heart of the Soviet Union would be laid waste immediately by our missiles and bombers. When the Minuteman is operational, this instant retaliatory blow will become even more of a certainty than it is today.

How do we stand vis-a-vis the Soviets with respect to satellite launchings? Admiral Monroe put it this way:

"Of the 27 U.S. shots, there are 13 still orbiting as I talk to you today, 7 of them alive and talking back to us. The Navy alone has more operating satellites in orbit than the rest of the world put together.

"How many payloads do the Soviets still have in orbit? One dead satellite orbiting the Earth and one dead satellite orbiting the Sun. From our satellites, the United States has extracted many, many times the scientific information from space that the Soviets have."

There is also the impending development of an operational Samos satellite, designed for reconnaissance purposes, and counted on to replace such reconnaissance planes as the U–2. Samos, when ready, will be capable of photographing enemy bases, launching sites and industrial plants from heights far beyond the reach of rockets or ground artillery fire.

But if we are ahead of Russia in the production of efficient satellites, they are "clear-

ly ahead" of us in probing deep space. This, said Admiral Monroe, is due to their greater foresight. They began developing powerful boosters years before we did, with the result that we still cannot match their thrust.

"However," says the admiral, "this has no military significance. We have the Polaris and Atlas warheads with their capability of devastating a city with one hit, and equipped with boosters which will send them as far as we are ever likely to want to send them." He conceded "that greater booster capability could be used by us for the scientific investigation of space; to put a man on the moon; to examine the planets, etc."

Hardening of our missile bases is in process. This means, among other things, putting them underground, so that nothing short of a direct hit from a nuclear explosive could seriously damage them.

At Vandenberg Air Force Base, in charge of Maj. Gen. David Wade, commander of the First Missile Division, and former chief of staff of the Strategic Air Command, Atlases and Titans stood ready for launching. Already the Titan has been put underground. It stands in a silo 165 feet deep and 40 feet wide, with an intricate maze of steel and cables to elevate it to ground level for launching. The silo is covered by two huge steel and concrete doors, weighing 283 tons each. Here again, in the hardening of these missile bases, we have a great deterrent against a surprise Soviet attack.

Vandenberg Air Force Base is primarily a training base, but it also has the capability to launch. Purely operational bases for Atlas are situated in Nebraska, Wyoming, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Washington, and New York. The Cape Canaveral base in Florida is solely for training, research and experiment.

The enormous complexity of these missiles explains why some of them fizzle on the launching pad or fail after launching. An Atlas has about 300,000 separate parts. Some 80,000 pairs of cables connect the Atlas blockhouse to the launching pad. The chances for a mechanical failure here are obviously great. Yet these colossal engines of destruction are being perfected steadily.

NORAD AND SAC ON 24-HOUR ALERT FOR POSSIBLE BOMB ATTACK—IV

(By Virginius Dabney)

An astounding maze of electronically controlled maps and charts, dials and computers, with telephones reaching to the White House and the Pentagon, and planes poised with thermonuclear weapons on bases spread over the free world, are vital elements in the defense of the United States and Canada against surprise attack.

Instant reaction is called for by this carefully planned system of controls, set up at the North American Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, and the Strategic Air Command near Omaha. These enormously intricate installations were visited by the writer and some 70 other civilians recently at the invitation of the Department of Defense.

Norad at Colorado Springs is the nerve center of the continental warning system against any oncoming nuclear weapon. SAC near Omaha is the place where the retaliatory thermonuclear offensive power of the entire Western World can be mobilized on a few minutes' notice. Once the White House and the Joint Chiefs of Staff gave clearance, missiles and bombs of incredibly destructive effect would rain down on any enemy.

The great objective, of course, is to strike back before that enemy could launch an effective surprise attack on us. Norad and SAC headquarters are on the alert 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. So are SAC's bombing crews, which stay near their planes, night and day, at U.S. bases on this continent and all over the globe, ready to take off instantly, their planes loaded with nuclear weapons.

SAC headquarters is in direct communication with some 80 bases. We saw a striking demonstration of this. Sitting at a single switchboard, an operator got immediate answers from such spots as Dahran in Saudi Arabia, Thule in Greenland, High Wycombe near Oxford, Torreon in Spain, and Guam. As soon as this SAC operator picked up the receiver and plugged in, his opposite number at a U.S. base thousands of miles away was answering. It showed what alertness and split-second timing we are getting in our defense setup. That, of course, is what we must get, if we are to survive.

Norad headquarters at Colorado Springs is not particularly impressive as a building. Unlike much of SAC near Omaha, Norad is above ground, and is apparently vulnerable to a bombing attack. The "hardening" of this facility by putting it underground seems desirable. Norad is ably commanded by Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, U.S. Air Force, with Air Marshal C. Roy Slemon, Royal Canadian Air Force, as deputy commander.

Both General Kuter and Marshal Slemon are acutely disturbed over what they think is inadequate speed in the development of an effective U.S. anti-missile missile. General Kuter puts it this way:

"The United States and Canada now stand completely naked against an attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles. The North American Air Defense Command has no defense against them; it has no way of even knowing that an ICBM with its load of mass destruction is coming, or where its cargo will be dumped. A solution to the problem is on its way, though. * * *"

General Kuter and Marshal Slemon both feel, however, that greater haste in getting such a solution is needed. They are deeply convinced that an anti-missile missile, "either the Nike-Zeus or a concept like it," is vitally required. They fear that the Soviets will develop such a defense missile first. Then, relying on it to keep our missiles from reaching them, they may think an all-out thermonuclear attack on us is relatively safe—and launch it.

Norad's principal warning system consists at present of a 70,000-foot high wall of radar screens far to the north, designed to tell us if enemy bombers—not missiles—are approaching. There are three lines of radar in this system: (1) The distant early warning line (DEW), stretching across the top of the continent in the Canadian Arctic and Alaska; (2) the mid-Canada line, 600 miles to the south; (3) the pinetree system, crossing the continent on both sides of the United States-Canadian border.

A warning system designed to pick up missiles is, however, under construction. This ballistic missile early warning system (BMEWS) will have long-range radar beams fanning out over the polar regions to identify the tracks of missiles soon after they are fired. The first of these stations, with radars the size of football fields and capable of detecting a missile at a distance of 3,000 miles, is scheduled to go into operation this fall at Thule, Greenland. Two others, in Alaska and England, are being rushed to completion.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, the virile commander in chief of SAC, is acutely aware of his huge responsibility in having at his fingertips the launching—subject to White House approval—of what is perhaps the most terrible concentration of destructive force the world has ever seen. "Peace Is Our Mission," the motto of SAC, is inscribed on SAC literature. Yet the war potential of this headquarters is enormous and awe-inspiring.

It is not necessarily true that we will wait for an enemy to strike first. A SAC colonel said recently that if we are certain that the enemy is going to attack us, we could try to beat him to the punch.

SAC headquarters is 45 feet underground, and if necessary, can be self-sustaining, with water, rations, and supplies sufficient for the duration. Alternate communication lines from SAC to points all over this and other countries have been set up, so that if one line is knocked out, another will immediately go into action.

Jet bombers and fighters stand poised on nearby Offutt Air Base, ready to go into instant action. The huge B–52 and B–58 bombers are so highly mechanized that whereas a B–47 has 17 crewmen, the more modern planes have only 6. The even bigger, faster, and more powerful B–70 will have only three.

But it costs nearly $1.5 million to train a B–52 commander, and the plane itself is immensely expensive. General Power is greatly worried over how to retain more of his skilled personnel. Between 1954 and 1959, no fewer than 145,670 airmen at SAC separated from the service. Replacement costs for the loss of training and experience of these men is put at the staggering figure of $2.8 billion.

Those in charge at SAC are hopeful that Congress can be persuaded to make pay and living conditions in the Air Force more attractive, so that more men will make their careers in that branch of the service. This, they argue, would save money, and would also bring increased efficiency.

ALERT BENNING INFANTRY SCHOOL TYPIFIES EFFECTIVE U.S. DEFENSE—V

(By Virginius Dabney)

The sharp, alert handling of this country's defense capabilities in all branches of the service was nowhere more strikingly evident than at the U.S. Army Infantry Training School at Fort Benning, Ga.

Many in our group of 70 traveling civilians approached Fort Benning with a feeling that seeing the infantry in action probably would be somewhat anticlimactic, after the excitement of viewing antisubmarine warfare in the Pacific, a marine amphibious landing on that same ocean, intercontinental ballistic missiles poised on their launching pads in California, jet planes roaring past at far beyond the speed of sound, and the intricate maze of dials, computing machines and other electronic devices at Colorado Springs, and Omaha, designed to warn the country of any impending attack, and, if, necessary, to mount a paralyzing, pulverizing retaliatory blow.

But there was nothing anticlimactic about the infantry at Fort Benning. On the contrary, its manifold activities were a revelation.

Anybody who thinks of the U.S. infantry soldier of today as an old-fashioned footslogger engaged in humdrum duties of the sort assigned to infantrymen in World War I, or earlier, had better think again.

The infantryman of 1960 is a fast-moving, well-trained, "on the ball' fighter, often motorized, packing tremendous firepower, and operating in close liaison with the U.S. Air Force.

We saw numerous split-second demonstrations of these operations, in which individuals and units exhibited astonishing marksmanship with pistols, automatic rifles and artillery; demonstrated adeptness in the use of grenades and flamethrowers, and showed ability to lay down barrages accurately on distant enemy terrain.

We witnessed the blastoff of the Honest John missile, which roared out of sight beyond the horizon, propelled by a jet of orange flame, and the smaller Little John rocket. The infantry has a whole arsenal of effective and accurate rockets and missiles which includes the Redeye, Lacrosse, Hawk, Pershing, Davy Crockett, and Corporal. Fitted with nuclear warheads they can be tremendously destructive against enemy tanks, aircraft, or ground forces.

Fort Benning is also noteworthy for its crack parachute units, which undergo rigid training. The parachutists put on a mass jump while we were there. It included not only scores of men but the parachuting down of quantities of supplies. Even jeeps and large trucks were set down from great heights. Truly the mobility of modern infantry is tremendous.

The rangers, among the toughest soldiers in the world, gave a demonstration. Like all rangers, these men had volunteered for a 2-month period of hardening, which includes 3 weeks in the Florida swamps and 3 more in the Georgia mountains, with most operations at night. The men go into the wilderness with practically no rations, and are ordered to subsist on what they can find. Tasty delicacies include rattlesnakes, alligators, acorns, and wood fungus.

Rangers learn hand-to-hand fighting, including judo. Two of them put on an exhibition for us in which one came at the other with a knife, a pistol, and a bayonet. In each case the unarmed ranger disarmed the other with a lightning maneuver which sent the weapon flying. The unarmed ranger, growling menacingly, then deftly hurled the other to the ground with a thud that would have cracked the bones of a less hardened citizen. All rangers are taught to growl when confronting an enemy. It is felt to distract said enemy and to throw him off balance psychologically—which it probably does.

Maj. Robert Rogers, the original ranger, who fought in the French and Indian War back in the 18th century, had as his first rule "Don't forget nothing." The rangers don't.

It is noteworthy that every graduate of West Point is required to complete the ranger course or the parachute course at Fort Benning. Most of them complete both. This affords an idea of the sort of sharply honed, dedicated leadership the U.S. Army enjoys today.

Congratulations are in order for the commanding general at Fort Benning, Maj. Gen. Hugh P. Harris. He runs one of this country's genuinely effective and impressive military installations.

From this infantry training school in Georgia we journeyed to Washington for a final conference at the Pentagon with Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was heartening to see and hear these men in the flesh. Secretary Gates, General Lemnitzer of the Army, Admiral Burke of the Navy, General White of the Air Force, and General Shoup of the Marines were calm, confident, and realistic. They repeatedly emphasized their desire for peace, while stressing that the United States may be facing the greatest crisis in its history. They reiterated that this country is the most powerful on the globe, and that we must keep it that way, as the surest means of avoiding a nuclear war. Complacency, they said, is the last thing called for.

The almost incredible complexity and costliness of modern weapons is such that our defense budget is bound to be enormous for many years to come. The problem of balancing our needs against available funds, of trying to guess what the Russians will do, and to checkmate them, calls for intelligence, vision, and sound thinking.

Our group of 70 civilians from all parts of the country and from many businesses and professions, ended our 10-day tour with the feeling that we are getting this sort of leadership and planning in the top echelons of our Defense Establishment. The group also acquired a genuine admiration for the competence and courage of the officers in the lower military ranks, and for the noncoms and privates on whom effective execution depends.

All in all, it was a journey which greatly enhanced and strengthened our faith in the United States of America.

ENFORCEMENT OF 3-MINUTE RULE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in connection with the move, which has the support of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, to develop and enforce a real 3-minute rule during the morning hour, it might be of interest to know that the problem of keeping time is one which has confronted the Senate for many years.

A few years ago, I happened to be in Athens, Greece. While there, I visited a museum where there were being shown some of the things which were being uncovered in excavations which were taking place. One of the articles was what was said to be a 6-minute sandglass which, when turned over, would require 6 minutes for emptying.

I suggest that in view of the desirability of the 3-minute rule during the morning hour, the appropriate officials of the Senate consider placing at the well of the Chamber a 3-minute sandglass, which will act and operate with complete impartiality, regardless of who may be addressing the Senate.

It occurs to me that it will be difficult for the clerks at the desk to watch the clock and be certain of when, exactly, 3 minutes have expired. In fact, the clocks in the Senate are not built on a minute-hand basis, but on a 5-minute basis. Furthermore, someone may momentarily divert the attention of the clerks or the parliamentarian for a question, and thus the matter of keeping time exactly on the 3-minute basis would be a little onerous. However, if we had a 3-minute sandglass, it would be visible, it would be absolutely impartial, and it would help to fortify the rule which the leadership on both sides of the aisle has sought to establish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL QUESADA, ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in March of 1959 I voted for the confirmation of Gen. E. R. Quesada as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I did so with great misgivings—which I expressed on the floor of the Senate on March 11, 1959. At that time I said:

> I hope that General Quesada will bear these facts in mind as the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and that it will not be necessary for me at some later time to call attention to the misgivings I have stated here on the floor today.

On March 18, 1960, I returned to the floor of the Senate on the same subject. By this time my misgivings had blossomed into full-fledged distress, and I felt it was imperative that Congress take action to stop the unreasonable and arbitrary practices in the Federal Aviation Agency under the leadership of General Quesada. I saw no hope for a lessening of these practices so long as the head of the agency not only made the rule and charged pilots with violating them, but acted as judge, jury, and prosecutor. I was concerned not only about the strangulation of civil aviation in this country, but about the direct assault on our democratic processes.

Today I am once again here to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues and to urge the new Congress to take immediate steps to cure the ills of our FAA operation. Only then can we return civil aviation to the healthy soil it needs for realizing its great potential.

At this point I should like to quote from testimony last month before the House Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee by Mr. J. R. Hartranft, Jr., president of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. In the statement that follows I believe Mr. Hartranft does an excellent job of sizing up the situation:

> Unnecessary regulations, which make no contribution to safety in flight, overzealous enforcement resulting in part from a burgeoning bureaucracy's rapid expansion and lack of a system of meaningful appeals from actions taken by FAA in its quasi-judicial role are all factors which could spur a decline in this vital segment (general aviation) of civil aviation. Add to these the trend in FAA to place inspection and examination functions, formerly performed by private industry into the hands of its own employees * * * and the placement of professional military personnel in critical posts in this civilian agency—and you have a serious situation which can be corrected only by amending the Federal Aviation Act. While basically a few provisions in an otherwise sound law can be blamed for some of the excesses which we will place before you, the flaws in the act probably have been accentuated by an overly aggressive administration of that act during its first 2 years.

Before going any further I should like to say that if the FAA practices described by Mr. Hartranft served to achieve greater air safety—an objective General Quesada claims is the incentive for his method of operation—I would look upon

those practices with much more tolerance, and I think Mr. Hartranft would join me.

But let us look at the official accident statistics:

In the first year of General Quesada's operation of the Federal Aviation Agency:

Scheduled airlines had more accidents than in 1958, more passenger and crew fatalities than in 1958, more fatalities per plane mile flown than in 1958.

General aviation had more accidents than in 1958, more fatal accidents than in 1958, more fatalities than in 1958, more accidents, fatal accidents, and fatalities per plane-mile flown than in 1958.

In 1960 commercial airliners in this country flew 58,400,000 passengers a total of 393,039,700,000 miles. In so doing, there were 65 accidents in which 327 passengers and 37 crewmembers were killed. The number of deaths was 138 higher than in 1959, and 235 more than in 1958. The death rate, in terms of number of passengers killed per hundred million miles flown, was unofficially computed at 0.93, against an official 0.65 rate for 1959, and a 0.43 rate for 1958.

In other words, the accident rate in aviation has gone up in this country; and to General Quesada goes the unfortunate distinction of being in command of the Federal Aviation Agency when the first fatal midair collision occurred between two scheduled airliners while flying on instruments under positive control of the FAA's Air Traffic Control System.

Blame for our soaring accident rate certainly cannot be laid on any diminution of activities on the part of the Federal Aviation Agency. On the contrary, the record shows that during General Quesada's administration, enforcement activities more than doubled, rules and regulations mounted abundantly, and the size of the Federal Aviation Agency shot up and spread out in all directions.

For the fiscal year 1961 the FAA operation cost per airplane is estimated at $6,236. In 1954 it was estimated at $1,507 per airplane. In other words, it is anticipated it will be over five times as much for fiscal year 1961 as it was in 1954.

In 1958 it was $4,089 per airplane. These figures are based on total registered aircraft. If we have the estimated active aircraft—and those are the ones that are actually flying—the FAA cost for fiscal 1961 per airplane becomes $9,519.75. Let me say this covers all airplanes. It covers Piper Cubs and everything else. Some of them are not worth $9,519.75, but that is what it is costing the American taxpayer per airplane to have the Federal Government administer them at this time. This year the Federal Aviation Agency received an appropriation of more than $690 million. It employs more than 38,000 people. The Federal Government is thus spending an average of $6,000 per airplane to control the certification and operation of 108,000 aircraft, of which only 72,000 are in active operation. The FAA is employing therefore one-third of a man for each airplane.

As a matter of fact, the number of active aircraft is about 72,000; the FAA employs 38,000 persons. In other words, there is one person working in the FAA for every two airplanes that are active and registered in the United States today.

I have just given the Senate some of the black and white facts and figures. But for a real evaluation of the FAA operation it is equally important to take a look at the factors that cannot be put into a statistical column.

I refer to the attitudes and practices within the FAA that are throttling the development of civil aviation in this country. I refer to the kind of attitudes and practices one associates with a strong-armed police operation—where intimidation, fear, and harassment dominate the atmosphere. The chief victims of this operation are the pilots in general aviation. The general aviation fleet in this country comprises 96.2 percent of the total civil aircraft fleet, and those airplanes fly more hours each year than any other segment of the aviation industry. I wish to emphasize that. Most people think that the greatest amount of flying done in this country is done by the commercial airlines. That is not the case at all. The general aviation fleet, and that means airplanes owned by private persons and businesses, comprises 96.2 percent of the total civil aircraft fleet, and flies more hours than any other segment in aviation.

I am not overlooking the fact that scheduled airline pilots are also being victimized by FAA's unreasonable and arbitrary practices but in no way are they the targets of the contempt meted out to their country cousins—the thousands of small private pilots engaged in all kinds of business, agricultural, industrial, air taxi, and pleasure flying.

I should like to have a few of these general aviation pilots speak for themselves.

Last month in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, Mr. Robert E. Monroe, executive director of the National Aviation Trades Association, had this to say about the FAA's rulemaking activity:

> The quality of the Agency's rulemaking activity leaves much to be desired. The Agency presents little or no statistical or other evidence in presenting its proposals. Rules are rationalized from opinions or selected specific instances—not from a statistically valid body of knowledge. The facts and the evidence should be developed before rulemaking takes place—not afterward, as in the case of the medical regulations which have been the source of so much disagreement.
>
> In the matter of safety, the Civil Aeronautics Board advises us that they have no record of any accidents in which the pilot's physical condition was a causative factor. The CAB has provided a great number of causative factors of accidents. Yet the rulemaking activity of the FAA has paid little heed to the historical causes of accidents and has instead concentrated its attention upon rulemaking to eliminate pilots for not meeting questionable medical standards, reaching an arbitrary chronological age or just making it too inconvenient for the private pilot to go get a medical examination.
>
> Thus, despite the fact that there is no statistical evidence to substantiate the need for such a development, the Agency's Civil Air Surgeon has embarked upon an empire-building program to build medical centers * * * to provide free examinations to rejected applicants and to establish inspection personnel to investigate the medical profession to see if they are qualified to give a physical examination which is simpler than an insurance examination.
>
> Thus the Agency pursues research, rulemaking and empire-building programs for purposes insignificant to the cause of accidents, while major action on the causes of accidents goes wanting.

In a statement before the same House committee, Mr. Robert E. Trimble, a certificated pilot testifying as a private citizen, had this to say on the same subject:

> I am concerned about FAA's rule which forbids airlines to employ pilots over age 59 in their normal jobs. I object to the substance of the rule, the way it has become law and the effect it has had on the public mind to downgrade all older competent pilots.
>
> This has been accomplished by innuendo, by the use of edict, and without direct congressional consideration which I believe should be accorded a law of such import and precedent. I believe there has been an inappropriate use of facts, backed by the full prestige of a Government agency making an appeal to fear.

Concerning the unbridled authority of the FAA operation, Mr. Kay McMurray, executive administrator of the Airline Pilots Association, made this statement before the same House committee:

> In its understandable zeal to improve the air-traffic system, and the functioning of the Federal Aviation Agency for this purpose, the Congress in adopting the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 made the Administrator practically a one-man dictator in all civil aviation matters. The Administrator is required only to give notice under the Administrative Procedures Act and is then free to adopt practically any rule he desires, no matter how arbitrary. If he should decide, as he has, that his new rule is only an interpretation of an existing regulation, even the requirement of notice is not provided. In the present Administrator, Congress has truly created a one-man czar over the entire aviation industry and its personnel. He is empowered to legislate at will in the multitude of areas coming under the jurisdiction of the Agency. If the particular Administrator happens to be arbitrary, naive, or capricious, the citizens affected by his orders have no appeal except to the Federal courts or the Congress.

Early last year the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, of which I am a member held extensive hearings to review the operations under the Federal Aviation Act. The testimony we heard was replete with reports on the intolerable practices that pervade the FAA operation. Perhaps one of the most capricious rulings of the Agency was its action on the matter of near-miss reporting. I should like my colleagues to hear the following testimony before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee presented last year by the Airline Pilots Association:

> During our previous testimony before this committee, we reviewed our belief that the Administrator's action in eliminating the pilots reporting of near-misses had eliminated one of the best channels for the determination of deficiencies in the air traffic control system. * * * We believe that one of

the avenues whereby present ATC deficiencies can be determined is through this reporting medium and we again urge the Administrator to give consideration to some procedure whereby this valuable information will be made available to our regulatory agency and others.

The Administrator has stated that the pilot reporting of near-misses was discontinued because some pilots would make these reports simply to avoid punitive action. Such statement reveals a lack of knowledge on the part of the Administrator of the previous procedure utilized; it is also an impractical approach to safety problems. The fact is that a pilot report of a near-miss never protected him against punitive action, and a review of the previous CAB procedure on the subject will indicate that the pilot did not escape punitive proceedings purely as a result of his report. The Administrator should not become so obsessed with enforcement as to neglect serious air safety problems.

This irrational attitude on the part of General Quesada and his Agency in the matter of near-miss reporting is alone sufficient grounds for Congress to take immediate action.

Members of the aviation industry have made a number of constructive recommendations to correct the situation. But today I shall confine myself to what I believe are the primary essentials.

First, we must put at the helm of the Federal Aviation Agency a true public servant—a man who has a high regard and respect for civil authority and whose thinking is not dominated and influenced by his military background or military loyalties.

Second, we must return the democratic process to the Federal operation of civil aviation. We must amend the Federal Aviation Act to make certain that it contains a system of checks and balances that will make it impossible for one man to make the rules and to act also as judge, jury and prosecutor.

I am confident that these basic changes will help immeasurably to reestablish the spirit of cooperation and mutual trust that once existed between the Federal Government and the aviation industry. Only then can we hope to make air travel as safe as is humanly and technically possible.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sorry I did not know my friend from California was going to speak upon this subject or I would have been in the Chamber to hear his entire address. I heard enough of it to know that it is a sort of an attack on General Quesada and his administration of the FAA.

I did hear the Senator from California discuss costs. I am one who has complained bitterly about the cost of government. I am not trying to excuse the per airplane cost or the total cost of the FAA, but does not the Senator agree that the new centers, the new radios, and the new radars—radars which we have never had before, by the way, for air navigation—contribute a great deal to the total cost?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not have any doubt about it, but what I am saying is, notwithstanding the fact that we have increased the number of employees in the Federal Aviation Agency to 38,000, which is one employee for every two airplanes engaged in active flying in this country, and notwithstanding the fact that today the Federal taxpayers are paying over $9,000 for every airplane which is licensed and active today, including the Piper Cubs which are sitting on the Washington-Virginia Airport, the accidents have increased. More people are being killed and there are more accidents. What I am saying is that we are simply not getting the job done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I say to my friend from California that nobody deplores accidents in the air or anyplace else any more than I do, but I do not see any relationship between the cost and the increase in accidents. I suggest that so long as men fly in aircraft there are going to be accidents, deplorable as they are. That we have not had more accidents in this country in the air to me is one of the great miracles of our times.

I have been flying for 31 years, and I am utterly amazed that tens of thousands of people have not been killed in accidents. I am convinced that only the vigilance of the pilots, and the care they show for each other in the air and on the ground, has made it possible not to have more accidents.

There was a terrible accident in New York not long ago. Lord only knows if we will ever find out what caused that accident. I think certainly there was a human mistake involved someplace.

Can we prevent accidents in the future? As I say, so long as we have a man involved—or even without a man being responsible—I am afraid we will continue to have air accidents, no matter how hard anyone works to cut them down.

I suggest that if we tried to attach to automobiles the increased costs of the States resulting from the effort to cut down the automobile accident rate, we could say the same thing. Regardless of the amounts we have spent in the way of increasing our efforts to cut down automobile accidents, those accidents seem to increase.

I recall with great shame the fact that in my State of Arizona last year nearly 500 people were killed on the highways, regardless of the fact that we had never before spent as much money, time or manpower in the effort to get people to slow down and to be careful.

I had one other point, which is that the Senator was attacking General Quesada——

Mr. ENGLE. The administration of General Quesada. I have not attacked General Quesada personally. I never have. I do not intend to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator does not attack General Quesada?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not attack him personally. I think he is a charming gentleman. I certainly differ with his administration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then we will say General Quesada's administration.

Mr. ENGLE. I say that the accident rate has gone up. We fly more miles and more hours, but the accident rate has gone up, while the cost to the Federal Government per airplane for this program has gone up, and while the number of employees in the FAA, to cut down the accident rate, has increased to such a point that we have 38,000 employees in the Federal Aviation Agency, with only 72,000 active airplanes.

The rate has gone up. One would expect more accidents if one had more airplanes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to point out that the changes which General Quesada has made in the application of regulations, in my mind, have not had time yet to have any real effect. I think he has been in office only for a maximum of 2 years. It might not be that long. There were a number of years which had gone by with lax enforcement of the regulations, and again I say we should feel very fortunate that we have not had a much more severe accident rate than we have had, because prior to the time General Quesada took office there was no real enforcement of the air regulations. I hope whoever replaces him will not lean so far in the direction of not enforcing the regulations, simply to make a few pilots happy, so that we may endanger, again, more and more people. I have to disagree as to the statement that the private pilot has been abused.

I say to my friend that I disagreed with General Quesada when he would not allow any appeals from his decisions. I do not think we should have any administrative body in this country which is so arrogant and so high and mighty as to say, "There is no appeal."

Mr. ENGLE. How does the distinguished Senator like the 60-year-old provision? I know the Senator is a qualified jet pilot and is more than 50 years of age. I suspect he would be able to "herd" an airplane for quite a while yet.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I told the General one morning that I had to disagree with him in respect to the 60 years of age provision, because I was getting up to where I could scratch it. That is a personal matter.

We were talking about the private pilots. The 60 years of age provision does not apply to private pilots, but only commercial pilots.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are many interested private pilots who have said to me that there were abuses and that enforcement of regulations was long overdue.

I say also to my friend, who is a pilot, that in 31 years of flying I have never had anyone ask to see my license. As a matter of fact, if the Senator is interested to know the truth of the matter, I do not know where my license is. If some examiner were to ask me, as the examiners are supposed to, to produce a license, I would have to go through a lot of old boxes to find it.

In effect, all I needed to do in order to be able to fly in the last 31 years was to find somebody who was brave enough to give me time to solo in an airplane. Nobody has bothered to check up to see whether I am qualified or whether I can fly the aircraft which supposedly I fly around.

I have discussed this with the Senator before. In all of these years no one has

ever questioned whether I can fly on instruments. I know pilots by the dozens in this country who fly on instruments, who have not been authorized to do so and who get away with it. A lot of accidents may be caused by people trying to do things they are not qualified to do.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator permit me to comment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. General Quesada has not done anything about that. The Senator makes a good point. I got my private license in 1941, and I have never had a check ride, other than when I asked for one myself, or when I qualified for multiengine rating. I got a multiengine rating last summer, and I had to get it myself, because I had to fly the twin-engine airplane.

I have never been asked to go on a check ride. General Quesada is not dealing with those things. That is not what has upset the pilots.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will allow me to interject, the program has been started. I will say that it is very hard to "ride herd" on tens of thousands of pilots, which is the number there are.

I do not say there should be such a tight enforcement; I merely point out the extreme laxity we did have.

Mr. ENGLE. Which we still have in that particular area.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One other area as to which there has been a great deal of complaint is the matter of the medical examinations. I know it is inconvenient for a person to go to a certain specified doctor instead of to his own doctor. The Senator and I both know this is not an involved physical examination. There is nothing difficult about it. On the other hand, I can recall the days when all I did was to pick up the telephone and say to my doctor, "My physical has run out. I need a new card." Over it would come to me. I could have had diabetes, I could have had a heart attack, I could have had any number of things happen to me. The doctor was not examining me, but merely, as the result of a telephone conversation, giving me my medical approval. In this process he might put a risk in the air.

I have disagreed with many private pilots in that regard. I think a qualified man in aviation medicine should look at these men.

Mr. ENGLE. The third-class physical examination I get as a private pilot is something that any general practitioner can give. The physician should not give a certificate on the basis of a telephone conversation. That is a violation of law, and no private pilot justifies that. But the private-pilot examination provides that, if the applicant can hear the whispered voice at 3 feet and has 20/30 vision, he can pass it. If the applicant is only fairly warm, he can get through.

What we object to is that special examiners are being employed, thus putting us to great expense, to pass a very simple examination that any country doctor can give. When we come into the commercial area, where we consider the licenses of commercial and transport pilots, we make no objection to special medical examinations. But we believe that for the average pilot, with such requirements as hearing the whispered voice at 3 feet and having eyes that can be corrected to a tolerance that is certainly easy for anyone to pass, it is perfectly ludicrous to require that an applicant travel 50 or 100 miles to get such a physical examination. We do not believe that is necessary. We believe it is unnecessary harassment.

But that is not the main objection that private pilots have to the Federal Aviation Agency today.

The private pilots complain about the FAA today because it has become a "cop" organization. I flew recently with a pilot from my hometown to San Francisco. The pilot was a good operator. He flies an Aereo Commander. He told me that he reported a near-miss. The FAA has been trying to find why collisions occur and asks for such reports. The first thing he knew he had the FAA all over him examining him as to whether or not he was wrong when a jet came off Hamilton Field and buzzed him. He did not like it, and he said, "From now on I will never report any more near-misses."

The pilots are put on the spot. The military aviation agency sent out word to all its pilots—and we have copies of the letter—that they should not report any more near-misses. The AOPA, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, did the same thing. That is not the only thing they do.

We pilots do not like it because we no longer have a friend on the ground. We have a "cop" who sits down there getting ready to arrest us.

Coming into my hometown of Red Bluff, I report over Corning and say where I am and that I want the altimeter setting, the wind direction, and so forth. I am supposed to be flying at a certain altitude VFR on a particular heading. If I give my altitude as 3,000 feet, but do not say "descending, bango" they have a citation on me. That is the kind of thing the pilots confront. They are not dealing with an organization that helps them any more. If a pilot gets in the soup, or in bad weather or "on top" and needs help, he does not think he can call those people any more and get help. He knows that if he calls them, as soon as he lands on the ground, his license will be pulled. That is the objection to the FAA.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know how the Senator thinks we are going to cut down air accidents if we do not have someone playing the role of "cop" somewhere.

Mr. ENGLE. They have not been reduced to date.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not agree. Perhaps I am an exception. Perhaps people try to help me because I needed more help than others. But I have yet to experience any feeling that the man on the ground was not trying to help me. In fact, with the new system of reporting, and asking my position, I feel much safer than I used to without that system. I now know who is near me, in what direction he is going, and how fast he is traveling. As we move faster and faster in the air the human factor becomes more and more important. When we flew at 80 or 90 miles an hour it was not too important, but when we now fly at 400 to 600 miles an hour the human factor becomes extremely important, and we have more of an attempt on the ground to help the man in the air than we had before.

I have never experienced such help as we are able to get today with the equipment we have on the ground and the men operating it. I have the highest regard for the men who operate the control towers, the radio stations, and the control centers. There are many things that need to be done to improve them, but I must disagree with the Senator from California when he suggests that we should be free to go willy-nilly any place we want to go, on or near established airways.

Mr. ENGLE. I have not suggested such procedure.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is objecting to reporting his exact position, and whether he is going up or going down.

Mr. ENGLE. No, I was not objecting to that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That requirement is a part of the air regulations.

Mr. ENGLE. I was not objecting to that requirement. I do not want words put in my mouth. I believe the pilot should so report. What I was objecting to were the technical charges of violations that are filed when a pilot leaves out the word "descending," or "climbing," or some other term that is wholly technical. Of course, when a pilot wants to land he ought to check in. One does that anyway for his own protection and for the information he needs to land on the ground safely. That is not the type of thing to which I object. I do not object to the positive control that is exercised today over the commercial airlines and on established routes. But I say that private pilots object to the kind of administration of General Quesada.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not surprised that the private pilot objects. I can remember the carefree days of flying when one jumped into his bird and off he went. No one, not even his wife, at times, knew where he was going. I do not think we can still follow those practices. I believe, frankly, we require more regulation in the air than we have been having for a private pilot, a commercial pilot, or a military pilot. I would not like to slide back into the lax days that we had before General Quesada's administration. If he has been abusive in certain areas, then I think the opposition party can certainly be careful in selecting a man to see that he does not have those particular areas in which he can be abusive. But I do not think he is abusive. While General Quesada is tough and hard, we had to have a tough and hard man, because we have for years developed aviation with a feeling that we could still use the air regulations of the 1910's and the 1920's to govern the operation of jet aircraft. I think the Senator would be the first to admit that the late improvements that have occurred in the past 4 years in airways and airways design, in the

establishment of altitudes, separation procedures, holding procedures, electronics, and the application of radar to all types of aircraft have considerably increased safety in the air.

Mr. ENGLE. It is not on the record—the safety record is worse.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will let me finish, he will find I am agreeing with him. I do not care how many radars we install or how much electronic control we have. So long as a man is operating those devices, since man is not infallible, he will make mistakes, and the Senator knows as well as I do that approximately 94 percent of all aircraft accidents are attributable to pilot error, whether in connection with military, commercial, or private aircraft.

Mr. ENGLE. No, I do not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the latest figure I have seen. It is in that neighborhood.

Mr. ENGLE. Of course, when a pilot is dead, the easiest thing on earth is to blame him. That is the way the problem is often handled. The pilot is not present to speak for himself. I am reminded of the statement of General Quesada the other day in talking about what happened in the recent TWA-United Air Lines collision, when he had no business talking about that accident.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Permit me to finish and then I shall yield. This is a point the pilots resent. Sure, lay it on the pilot. But there were three agencies involved in the accident in New York recently. First, there was the crew of the Constellation; second, there was the crew in the United Air Lines plane; third, there was the crew on the ground.

I said to Mr. Quesada, "You will have to explain what your people were doing. We did not give you radar in order to provide your people with ringside seats on midair collisions. When you observe two blips coming together on your radar, we expect you to do something about it and not sit there and say, "The two blips have disappeared. Now what has happened?"

It is easy to blame the pilots, since they are dead.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I said at the outset I did not care to discuss the recent crash because I do not know anything about it and I do not think anybody else does, to tell the truth. But I state that approximately 94 percent of aircraft accidents are attributable to pilot error. The Senator from California has been flying long enough to have seen accidents that are plainly the result of pilot error. I could recite them by chapter and verse. There are instances of pilots flying in bad weather, which is bad judgment. There are instances of pilots flying equipment that is faulty and long overdue for inspection; and that is bad judgment. There are instances of pilots attempting to return to a field after an engine has quit. That is the most common cause of accidents. They know better. However, they say, "Oh, I am different. I can make it." The next fellow he is talking to is the Lord.

Mr. ENGLE. If he goes in that direction.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, I think they do. I do not believe anyone can fix the blame in an accident like the one the other night over New York.

Mr. ENGLE. I am not trying to fix the blame. General Quesada should not try to fix it either. It is not his responsibility. It is the responsibility of the CAB. He knows that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My friend from California knows as well as I do that, much as we do not like to say it, accidents will occur in the air, just as they will occur on the ground. In my opinion it is much simpler to avoid an automobile accident than it is to avoid an airplane accident. However, we seem to be blind to the fact that more people are hurt and killed on the highways than in the air. In fact, more people are killed in bathtubs every year than in any other way or any other kind of accident.

Mr. ENGLE. But we do not regulate bathtubs, and we do not set up a Federal agency that costs $790 million a year to regulate the use of bathtubs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is about the only thing the Democrats have not thought of regulating. They will get to it, I am sure.

Mr. ENGLE. The Republicans have been running the show for the last 8 years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we have laws and regulations, and do not enforce them, we should take them off. I will close—because I know my friend from California is in a hurry to get away—by saying that of course the private pilots are unhappy. They have been complaining to me. They give me the devil because they know I have been sticking up for General Quesada. One of the vice presidents of my company sends me very bitter letters from time to time. If he could do so, he would take my license and hide it somewhere, so I could never fly, because I have stuck up for Quesada.

A type of man like General Quesada has been long overdue. It is necessary to be tough about regulation. It is not wise to let the pilots do anything they want to do in the air. If that is not attended to we will not get the kind of safety in the air that both the Senator from California and I look forward to.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I believe that he should very carefully listen to his partner, and he should listen very carefully to the pilots, and also to the members of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and other flying organizations. The Flying Farmers, the Executive Pilots Association, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, all take the same attitude I have taken here today. It may be possible that the Senator's position is wrong.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield for one more moment, I should like to say that I am a member of the AOPA, but I disagree with their approach to this subject. I have listened to commercial pilots and private pilots on this question. I hardly ever fly across the country that I am not invited into the cockpit to listen to an effort to pin General Quesada's ears back.

That will not change my view. What we need is strict enforcement of air regulations, just as we need strict enforcement of traffic laws on the ground. I do not want us to get into the position of having a weak application of our air regulations. That is my whole point.

Mr. ENGLE. We do not object to strong enforcement of fair regulations. We just do not want to be regulated out of the air; that is all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have known Elwood Quesada longer than the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from California has known him. I believe that what the Senator from Arizona has said is correct. I am not talking about that. I am talking about something else entirely.

The State of the Senator from California did not go for Kennedy in the election, it is true. Washington, Idaho, Montana, and the rest of those States did not go for Kennedy. New Mexico did. I like Elwood Quesada very much. The fact is that Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, did not go for Kennedy, and they all got something. Poor New Mexico, which went for Kennedy, and was responsible for Texas going for Kennedy, did not get a thing. I am trying to make this statement. Believe it or not, we will see about it.

NATION PERILED BY LACK OF HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH OF AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while Congress was in adjournment last fall, it was my privilege to visit several of our major universities and colleges in Texas and in other States. On many occasions, I made it a point to ask college administrators, professors, and students about their experience with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. As one of the cosponsors of the measure, I have been keenly interested in following this program.

In all of my inquiry, I turned up only one major complaint about the National Defense Education Act program. That complaint was that the program simply is not nearly big enough to meet the need. I heard that complaint many, many times.

That is a justified complaint. I thoroughly concur in it. I believe that we ought to have scholarships established under the National Defense Education Act for the benefit of undergraduate students as well as scholarships for graduate students.

For that reason, I was particularly pleased to note that a panel of 20 of the Nation's most distinguished educators has recommended widescale expansion and 5-year extension of the National Defense Education Act.

Among those who signed the report were James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University; Dean J. Douglas Brown, of Princeton University; Prof. Willis E. Dugan, of the University

of Minnesota; and from my State, Texas Commissioner of Education J. W. Edgar.

A portion of the report reads:

Basic to our consideration of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is our belief that the Federal Government has an obligation to help identify and bring to fruition the full potential of every youth. Further, it is our belief that the failure to do this will imperil not only the individual, but the Nation and the free world.

In that connection I wish to point out that of the young people whose aptitude tests show they could go to college and assimilate a college education, not only for their own benefit, but could do it rapidly enough to represent a gain to our economy and our economic system, only 50 percent actually go to college.

One of the major recommendations of the panel is that a $100 million Federal scholarship program should be set up over the next 4 years.

The loan program under the present act is too little and almost too late. The colleges have dozens of applications for each loan that they can make to needed students.

From what I have found from inquiry on this matter, I am in basic agreement with the panel and many other Senators that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 should be substantially enlarged. As a nation, we are wasting our most valuable natural resource when we continue to fail to develop the brainpower and skill of our young people to the maximum. It is a waste we cannot afford.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Mr. Erwin Knoll, from the January 13, 1961, edition of the Washington Post, entitled "Educators Urge More U.S. Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS URGE MORE U.S. AID

(By Erwin Knoll)

A massive expansion and 5-year extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 were recommended yesterday by a panel of 20 leading educators.

They urged retention of every school-aid program now authorized by the act, inclusion of a substantial Federal scholarship program and addition of English language instruction to the subject fields the act is designed to strengthen.

The act, which expires June 30, 1962, was passed by Congress in the aftermath of the first Soviet satellite launching. It provides Federal funds to bolster instruction in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages, and authorizes Federal loans to undergraduate students, graduate fellowships and aid for vocational training.

The educators' report was released yesterday by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who said he was in agreement with their recommendations.

"Basic to our consideration of the National Defense Education Act," the educators added, "is our belief that the Federal Government has an obligation to help identify and bring to fruition the full potential of every youth. Further, it is our belief that failure to do this will imperil not only the individual, but the Nation and the free world."

One of the panelists, the Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, executive secretary of the National Catholic Educational Association, said he could not agree at this time to any increased Federal support for education beyond the specific recommendations in the report.

The educators were divided on whether a Federal scholarship program should be administered by the States or by institutions of higher learning, but they agreed that such a program should provide an initial amount of $25 million, increasing to a total of $100 million in the next 4 years.

Individual grants of up to $1,000 would be based on merit and need, with an additional $500 going to the institution in which the recipient is enrolled.

The educators proposed establishment of the student loan program on a revolving fund basis, doubling of the $250,000 ceiling now in effect for Federal loans at a single institution, extension of loans to students in 2-year technical institute programs, repeal of the loyalty disclaimer affidavit which has been widely criticized by colleges, and extension to all school and college teachers of the loan forgiveness provision now applied only to public schoolteachers.

The report called for authorization of additional graduate fellowships, extension to elementary schools and colleges of programs now designed to strengthen guidance and counseling in secondary schools and doubling of funds now authorized for research into such developments as educational television.

A stinging minority report was issued by Arthur Bestor, professor of history at the University of Illinois, who wrote:

"Committees, I discover, will always agree to spend more money, whether or not they agree on anything else. I cannot conscientiously subscribe to a report like the present that refuses to discriminate the conspicuously valuable program from the comparatively worthless one, and devoutly pray Congress to make its sun to rise on the evil and the good alike."

Bestor proposed limiting funds to three areas: (1) Student aid in the form of loans, scholarships, and fellowships; (2) selective aid for academic facilities only, leaving it to local communities to pay the full cost of the frills to which they may be addicted; and, (3) establishment of a series of national institutes in various subject fields to revise curriculum and bring the schools into direct touch again with the active world of science and scholarship.

Signers of the majority report included New York State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr.; President Louis T. Benezet, of Colorado College; Dean J. Douglas Brown, of Princeton University; James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University; John E. Cosgrove, assistant director of education, AFL–CIO; Prof. Willis E. Dugan, of the University of Minnesota; Texas Commissioner of Education J. W. Edgar; Lynn A. Emerson, educational consultant.

Also, School Superintendent Martin Essex, of Akron, Ohio; Marion B. Folson, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; President Alfred M. Gruenther, of the American Red Cross; Monsignor Hochwalt; Devereux C. Josephs, former Chairman of the President's Commission on Education Beyond the High School; Dean R. M. Lumiansky, of Tulane University; Lorimer D. Milton, chairman of the Howard University Board of Trustees; President Anne G. Pannell, of Sweet Briar College; President A. L. Sachar, of Brandeis University; Ruth A. Stout, former president of the National Education Association, and Vice Chancellor E. W. Strong, of the University of California.

VOICE OF AMERICA NEEDS IMMEDIATE STRENGTHENING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, only last Monday I urged that we make an immediate reappraisal of our Voice of America and other public information programs directed to Cuba and Latin America.

Since then two highly significant reports concerning America's startling shortcomings in the world information field have come to my attention.

The first is from a Methodist missionary, Rev. H. T. Maclin, who recently returned from the Congo. One of Texas' best known and most able editors, Mr. H. M. Baggarly of the Tulia Herald, published this account of Rev. Maclin's report:

He said that we Americans, primarily through missionary activity, have done a good job in teaching the Africans to read. But after that job was accomplished, we gave them nothing to read. Instead the Russians are flooding the country with interesting reading material.

The Russians are beaming 480 hours of radio programs each week to the Congo in five different dialects simultaneously—almost around the clock. The people have small battery operated radios which pick up these broadcasts.

Meanwhile, the Voice of America beams two hours of programs a week to the Congo—all in French.

But Mr. President, we have no broadcasts in the native languages, which almost all the people speak.

The missionary said he not only predicts the triumph of communism in the battle for the minds of the Congolese—he will guarantee it.

The Voice of America is doing little more in Cuba and Central America.

Mr. President, many Senators must have read the article written by Murrey Marder and published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1961, concerning the report of President Eisenhower's Committee on Information Activities Abroad. Mr. Marder said:

The report includes some of the most sweeping recommendations—and some of the bluntest admissions of shortcomings—ever made in the information field with Government participation.

Mr. President, there can be no denying that one of the most powerful and deadly weapons in the cold war arsenal is truth. Unfortunately, Communist lies and propaganda in overwhelming mass dissemination quantities can be powerful, too, particularly where truth is not told so often or so emphatically.

For us, a nation actively working for peace and working to avoid a shooting war, and actively engaged in a cold war, it seems to me dangerous and foolhardy that the administration has failed to give us the informational leadership to keep this vital phase of our national strength at least on par with the enemies of the free world.

Mr. President, we Americans are supposed to be the best salesmen in the world. We should not simply fight for parity; in distribution of information with the Communist world; we should outdo our opponents in getting the truth to the peoples of the world, so that they may know the truth, and by comparing it with the falsehoods they get from the other side, learn the values of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Vast Expansion of USIA Activities Abroad Urged in Report to President," written by Murrey

Marder and published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAPS IN AFRICA AND AMERICAS CITED—VAST EXPANSION OF USIA ACTIVITIES ABROAD URGED IN REPORT TO PRESIDENT

(By Murrey Marder)

A bold surge forward in the size and concept of the task required to project the U.S. image to a world in ferment was recommended yesterday by a White House study group.

"Infinite possibilities for constructive change and equally great potentialities of danger" loom ahead in this decade, said President Eisenhower's Committee on Information Activities Abroad.

Former Assistant Secretary of Defense Mansfield D. Sprague headed the nine-man committee of Government policymakers and outsiders. They spent 9 months studying the operation of all U.S. oversea information work, plus the psychological impact abroad of its diplomatic, economic, military, and scientific programs.

Concrete, dramatic, and timely action was urged to overcome admittedly huge gaps in U.S. information activities especially in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The report includes some of the most sweeping recommendations—and some of the bluntest admissions of shortcomings—ever made in the information field with Government participation. They come, ironically, in the dying hours of the Eisenhower administration. Some of them mesh with—and even exceed—proposals being considered by the incoming Kennedy administration.

While the report comes from an outgoing administration, two of the committee members will continue to serve in the new administration: CIA Director Allen W. Dulles and Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant, who is slated for another foreign policy post.

This is likely to give the report more stature than "just another study" by an administration in eclipse and could help stimulate bipartisan action on Capitol Hill.

In language partially cushioned in kindness to the current administration, the report nevertheless finds, in effect, that the United States must seize itself by the scruff of the neck and intensify its efforts.

Among its findings:

"The scale of the total U.S. information effort will have to be progressively expanded for some time to come. There is urgent need for substantial increases in the critical areas of Africa and Latin America."

"In Africa * * * we lack basic knowledge of the processes by which information and ideas are communicated * * * we lack sufficient information specialists * * * we lack contacts.

"In Latin America the immediate outlook is more disturbing than promising * * * greater efforts are needed.

"Communist China presents a baffling and threatening problem for official information activity.

"We are now in a period when the mission and style of diplomacy is changing * * * The prospect is for a period of protracted nonmilitary conflict between the free world and the Communist system" which "will reach into every portion of the globe." The outcome will depend considerably on the degree to which "we are able to influence the attitudes of people."

Among correctives proposed:

"A new approach in developing a major program of assistance to educational development abroad." This might include assistance "in building and equipping model schools, laboratories, and libraries abroad" and regional institutes and training centers, as symbols of American help.

The possible development of "large mobile training centers to provide basic skills in health, agriculture, and mechanical trades to thousands of trainees at a time." Another suggestion was opportunity scholarships for education, to be awarded in open competition to young people of various countries.

Without mentioning President-elect Kennedy's plan for a peace corps of Americans to work abroad, the report similarly suggested a "program of training for young Americans to work abroad in performing such tasks as school teaching and assisting in village development."

Expansion of exchange of persons programs was urged, with training specially tailored to students or leaders brought here for study, plus a "nationwide system for hospitality to foreign visitors."

Possible creation of "a new quasi-independent foundation for international educational development to give voice and leadership to the broad program." Sprague said this envisions something like the National Science Foundation in which Government representatives, educators, and scientists could join.

Within the Government, creation of a National Security Institute, preferably under the National Security Council, was advocated to provide high-level training for the interrelated aspects of the present world struggle—economic, diplomatic, information—and military agencies.

"Our diplomacy * * * increasingly must give greater emphasis to the factor of public opinion in the handling of major conferences and negotiations, in the selection and training of members of the Foreign Service and in our treatment of foreign visitors."

Continuance of the Operations Coordinating Board of the National Security Council, to gear in all Government work in these fields, was strongly urged. This was obviously aimed at a known tendency in the incoming Kennedy administration to cut down on the layers of NSC organization; the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy has advocated lopping off the OCB.

President Eisenhower, in an exchange of letters with Committee Chairman Sprague, said he was "in full and instant accord" with "much of the report" and "a great many of its conclusions and recommendations." He said he has asked the Departments concerned to begin studying this document of exceptional value.

The President said he shared the committee's view about information needs in Africa and Latin America, and called the Government training ideas "worthy of serious attention."

Programs of educational development, he said, could prove to be the most meaningful of all, but he cautioned—as did two of the committee members in expressing reservations—that these should be "well defined in scope and timing * * *."

No price tag of any kind was put on the barrage of ideas in the report.

The 19-page document made public is only a portion—Sprague said about 40 percent—of the full study made for the White House. The remainder will stay classified for reasons of security and sensitivities of Allied countries, said Sprague, but the "guts of the report," he added, "is public."

Sprague, in contrast to news reports during the recent presidential campaign—when this document was not yet in finished form—said, "We did not consider it part of our job to determine the status of U.S. prestige in any part of the world."

The group, however, did make use, he said, of a U.S. Information Agency study of prestige after the Soviet launching of Sputnik I.

The current report itself found:

"Without question the launching of the first sputnik gave the Soviet Union a psychological triumph which has profoundly affected its image as a technically advanced nation, and as a great military power."

This feat in one branch of technology was systematically exploited with considerable success by the Russians, the report said, "as evidence of the dynamism of the entire Soviet system."

The United States continues to have "overall superiority in science and technology," the report said, but because of widespread belief in a Soviet lead it may take "some revolutionary scientific breakthrough to reestablish the degree of American technological prestige."

In addition to Sprague, Dulles, and Merchant, members of the committee included George V. Allen, who recently resigned as USIA Director; Gordon Gray, Special Assistant to the Preisdent for National Security Affairs; John N. Irwin II, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; C. D. Jackson, former adviser on psychological warfare to President Eisenhower and now a top executive of Time, Inc.; Karl G. Harr, Jr., Special Assistant to the President for Security Operations Coordination, and Philip D. Reed, a member of the U.S. Advisory Committee on Information and Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Gray and Merchant expressed reservations about the recommendations for foreign educational development, which Gray termed "imprecise," and both said they also were unconvinced that a proposal for a Foundation for International Educational Development was practical.

Executive director for the Sprague committee was Waldemar A. Nielsen, loaned by the Ford Foundation. Nielsen, a former Government information official, is one of several persons being considered for appointment as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in the Kennedy administration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the sincerity of purpose, intellectual honesty, and integrity of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I am for him and what he proposes.

However, there has been a vacancy in a judgeship in Laredo, Tex., where, for the first time, there is as a candidate a man who is a graduate of the University of Texas. He was graduated at the same time Robert Anderson, who is now Secretary of the Treasury, was graduated. Why cannot that man be a U.S. judge?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, who ranks fifth, I believe, among all the Members of this Senate in seniority, is probably better able to answer that inquiry, because of his long experience in this body, than I am. He knows there are many steps which must be taken and there are many persons who must be satisfied.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I understand that, and I do not want to interfere.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There is pending, from the present administration, the nomination of another man for this judgeship. It has never been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. A Democratic President does not occupy the White House now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has been speaking about the good will which we can develop in Latin America. Why not appoint, from Texas, a person who is able and who is of Latin American extraction? Why not appoint a man from Texas? Please believe me when I say that I am speaking in my own right. Jack Kennedy would not have been elected President unless the majority of the

voters in Texas and New Mexico had voted for him.

I maintain that I did as much in New Mexico and Texas as anyone else in behalf of his election. I am for him.

Someone from Idaho, who was against Kennedy, got a job. Someone from California, who did not vote for Kennedy, did not get a job. Persons from other States, who did not favor Kennedy, got jobs.

I am speaking in behalf of a Texas man, and a Mexican.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I feel I am in the same category with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All right; but there is in Laredo a man who as U.S. judge would be an honor to the Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that a Democratic administration is not yet in power. Until that administration takes office, it cannot appoint judges.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I simply say that I worked for the Senator in his campaign, and have no apologies whatsoever. I am still for the Senator, and shall be for him. But why cannot someone having a Mexican name, a graduate of the University of Texas, be a judge in Texas?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Among our honored Latin citizens of Texas, many held public office, duly elected by the people of Texas. Mayor Raymond Telles, an American of Latin descent, is mayor of the fifth largest city in Texas, El Paso. State Senator Henry Gonzales is senator from Bexar County, which includes San Antonio, our third largest city, and was elected by the people of Texas.

And, let me make this very clear to the extremely able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico as well as all of my close friends among the American citizens of Latin descent in Texas, the senior Senator from Texas has not yet or never will oppose any qualified Texan or other American for office because he has as you say "a Mexican name." You may be sure that that applies not only to Judge Salinas, but to any man. In my books, there are no hyphenated-name citizens—they are all Americans.

We have State district judge after district judge of Latin ancestry with Spanish names sitting in every county that borders on the Rio Grande from Brownsville to Laredo, in Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr, and Webb Counties.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are the ones who carried the State of Texas for Kennedy.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In practically every single county bordering on the Rio Grande from the mouth of the Rio Grande to Laredo are judges of Latin ancestry. They are wonderful judges. I believe all of them, with possibly one exception, are graduates of the law school of the University of Texas, which is one of the great law schools of this country, and of which Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark is a graduate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not recommending a graduate of the Catholic University of America or Georgetown University; I am recommending a graduate of Southern Methodist University, believe it or not.

Let me tell the Senator from Texas one thing. I know Texas. It gave a 200,000-vote majority to Eisenhower in 1956. One-third of the majority for Kennedy and JOHNSON in 1960 came from Corpus Christi.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his great contribution to the victory of Kennedy and JOHNSON in Texas. The Senator came into Texas and campaigned for the Democratic ticket. He spoke at San Elizario, which dates back to the 17th century, having been founded in the 1600's. He is the only U.S. Senator who ever spoke there. He spoke at other places in Texas. We are grateful for his contribution to the Democratic victory in our State. It was a magnificent contribution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But we have not got a break in having the proper persons appointed. I should like to have them get a break.

Please believe me when I speak about the judgeship at Laredo. I do not want to interfere with the prerogatives of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas or the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]; but I want the Senators from Texas to consider these persons.

When the senior Senator from Texas was first elected, I worked very hard for him among the Mexicans in the counties along the Rio Grande. I begged them to vote for the Senator. All I am asking now is that the Senator consider them. They are people, too.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I express my thanks publicly to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico for his aid in the election race of 1957, when Senator Price Daniel left the Senate and I came to the Senate. The senior Senator from New Mexico was active on my behalf. Two Members of this body from other States were most generous, and went beyond convention and custom to aid me in that campaign. The senior Senator from New Mexico and a Senator from another State helped me materially in that race by sending telegrams to large segments of voters to whom they were well and favorably known, and with whom they had close and strong ties. I count that influence of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico as second to none. At times we have spoken in Texas on the same programs. He had very great influence in my State during the Kennedy campaign last fall; and I wish to assure him that the plea he is making today is not falling on deaf ears.

I do not wish to embarrass him by telling him now what pleas I have already made to the incoming administration; but I assure him that I take very deep personal interest in the welfare of the millions of American citizens of Spanish ancestry, because I have campaigned with them for 8 years and they are among my stanchest friends.

I wish to say now to the Senator from New Mexico that at this time I must leave the Chamber, to go to my office, because in my office there is now waiting to meet me a delegation headed by Mr. Albert Pena, of San Antonio, one of the Bexar County commissioners, who was responsible for the victory this year in Bexar County, whereas in the previous election we lost there. I am going immediately to my office, to meet with them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before the Senator leaves, I wish to say that from the Arkansas line to the New Mexico line, on the southern border, if it had not been for the support of American citizens of Spanish ancestry, the result of the election would have been quite different. Is that not true? I worked very hard in that campaign. I try to have citizens of Spanish ancestry, like myself, treated as American citizens; I do my utmost to have them treated properly, as they should be. I expect to participate in a similar campaign again.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. Since he has brought up this political matter, I wish to thank the other Senators on this side of the aisle on behalf of the Democrats of Texas. Nineteen Democratic Senators came into Texas last fall and campaigned for the Democratic ticket; and that had a marked effect on the outcome of the election. I now see in the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who has been in our State; and the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], also campaigned in our State. He and I addressed a joint rally at San Antonio, Tex., composed principally of Spanish-name citizens of Latin extraction. We had a rally in Mission Park, San Antonio, the last week of the campaign. That rally was addressed by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico, and I had the privilege of making a short talk there. At that rally there were 10,000 persons with Spanish names; and it was the largest rally I saw in the campaign in Texas, except those addressed by the presidential and the vice presidential candidates themselves. So I am very grateful for the help which has come from our sister State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not like to have references made to hyphenated American names, such as Irish-American, Jewish-American, or similar names. All Americans should be referred to as Americans, no more and no less. During the war the citizens of New Mexico wore the American uniform, and we do not like to have any of them designated as hyphenated Americans. Although all of my blood is Spanish, I wish to have all Americans referred to as Americans, no more and no less.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when I finish the remarks I am about to make, or when the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] finishes his remarks, if he speaks after I finish, the Senate stand in adjournment until next Tuesday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPORTATION OF HAMISH MacKAY AND WILLIAM MACKIE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two private bills, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Albert Mackie).

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed, upon a request being made by Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Albert Mackie), to take such action, including the payment of all traveling expenses, as may be necessary to effect the immediate return to the United States of the said Willia Niukkanen.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Willia Niukkanen shall, upon his return to the United States, have the same residence status as that which he had immediately prior to the commencement of deportation proceedings against him in 1952.

(b) From and after the date of enactment of this Act, Willia Niukkanen shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced.

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay.

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed, upon a request being made by Hamish Scott MacKay, to take such action, including the payment of all traveling expenses, as may be necessary to effect the immediate return to the United States of the said Hamish Scott MacKay.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hamish Scott MacKay shall, upon his return to the United States, have the same residence status as that which he had immediately prior to the commencement of deportation proceedings against him in 1949.

(b) From and after the date of enactment of this Act, Hamish Scott MacKay shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, few cases of individuals who have become involved with the various agencies of the Federal Government have aroused as much interest and protest in my State as has the deportation last November of two longtime Portland residents. Hamish MacKay and William Mackie.

When I introduced private bills on these two cases last year, I outlined the facts which led to the deportation action by the Immigration Service. These presentations appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13 and May 24, 1960. Since then, the appeals of Mackie and MacKay to the U.S. Supreme Court have been denied, and Mackie has been sent to Finland and MacKay to Canada.

The Supreme Court decision was 5 to 4, with a brilliant dissenting opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas and concurred in by three of his colleagues. During the last session of Congress I presented that dissenting opinion for inclusion in the RECORD when I introduced the bill seeking to stay the deportation of these two persons; and I shall refer to it later in this speech, when I call attention to the last paragraph of the dissenting opinion.

Of course, we need to remember that when we deal with deportation cases, we deal with administrative law procedure. We deal with a procedure which does not allow a jury trial. We need to keep in mind that these deportations were consummated without the deportees having the privilege of being judged by their peers in an American jury box. Therefore, the court review is always on the basis of the administrative act of an administrator of the Immigration Service.

These cases also involve a particular field of the law in which broad discretion is allowed an administrative officer. There has to be a showing that there was an abuse of discretion, or a capricious and arbitrary act on the part of the administrative officer, in order to get a court to reverse the finding of the administrative officer.

I think these two cases may help call the attention of the Congress of the United States to the desirability of changing our code in respect to cases such as come before the Immigration Service, to provide for a procedure that would entitle the "defendant"—and I put the word "defendant" in quotation marks, because, in effect, that is what these deportees are—to a jury trial for the passing of judgment in connection with the problem of finding facts. When we deal with cases such as these, there has to be a weighing of veracity. There has to be a consideration of the very subjective question, Who is lying? Who is telling the truth?

I take the position that an American jury is best qualified to pass on the question, after all the evidence is in, Does the preponderance of this evidence show that the individual in fact has been guilty of subversive conduct; that the individual in fact, for example, as in these particular cases it is charged, is a Communist? But that question needs to be covered in a subsequent bill, which I shall introduce later in this session of Congress, because I am convinced that there is a need for review of the procedures now applied by the U.S. Immigration Service.

I am satisfied that too frequently the U.S. Immigration Service is guilty of gross injustice in its course of conduct. As one who is a stanch believer in and defender of that precious safeguard in our constitutional system known as the system of checks and balances, I believe that the time has come when an effective check must be placed upon the Immigration Service in connection with its findings of fact.

I do not know of better proof of the desirability of such procedural reforms than the two cases which I shall now describe and discuss.

HISTORY OF MACKAY

In brief, the facts are these: Hamish MacKay was born near Calgary, Canada, in 1905. His father, James MacKay, was a native of Scotland, who had lived in North Dakota and became an American citizen by naturalization. His mother was a native-born American. They moved to Canada in 1903, and James MacKay became a Canadian citizen in 1905.

With his parents, Hamish MacKay came to the United States in 1924; he returned briefly to Canada; then came back to North Dakota for permanent residence in the United States in 1928. MacKay became a resident of Portland, Oreg., in the early 1930's, after having lived in Illinois, where he served in the National Guard.

The Immigration Service brought deportation proceedings against Hamish MacKay in 1949. It alleged that MacKay had been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that advises, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the U.S. Government, and that he was subject to deportation under the act of October 16, 1918—40 Stat. 1012, as amended.

After enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, proceedings were brought against MacKay under that act, too. Mr. MacKay has pursued his legal remedies through the Board of Immigration Appeals and the courts ever since, denying that he was active in the Communist Party, as charged by the Immigration Service. These activities were alleged to have occurred in the late 1930's.

Over the years, MacKay has followed a trade, raised a family, and participated in many community affairs in Portland. He is a carpenter; he is the father of two sons, one of whom served for 2 years in the U.S. Army and received an honorable discharge. His youngest son is still in high school in Portland. I understand that this year he was captain of his high school football team. MacKay obtained a divorce from his first wife on the grounds of abandonment, and received custody of their two children.

I digress to point out that the court, in that divorce action, had an opportunity to adjudge the parents. It had an opportunity to decide which of the two parents should receive custody of the two minor children. As the Presiding Officer and my other lawyer colleagues in the Senate know, in practice the children usually go to the mother, unless there is a very strong case that can be shown to the court why they should not go to the mother. I only want to point out what the record shows, that in this case the court assigned custody of the two minor children to the father.

Mr. MacKay has since remarried. His former wife was the Government's chief witness against him in the deportation case.

It is quite true that the courts, up to and including the U.S. Supreme Court, have upheld the action by the Immigration Service. But that does not mean that justice has been done in the case.

That does not mean the judgment of the Immigration Service is right on the merits; but, as I previously pointed out, it means that under the technicality of the laws alluded to, there was not any proof which satisfied the court that the Immigration Service was guilty of any abuse of discretion or guilty of an arbitrary and capricious act.

That is the MacKay case. Before I finish, I shall send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which would seek to bring him back to the United States and to put him in the same status he enjoyed prior to his deportation.

HISTORY OF MACKIE

If anything, the deportation of the other individual, Mr. William Mackie, was even more unfortunate. Mackie was born in Finland in 1908 during a visit there by his parents, both of whom were American citizens. They were natives of Finland, and had returned there for a visit. The Mackie name in Finland had been Niukkanen, and it is that name by which William Albert Mackie was carried in the immigration files. The "m" in his first name was erroneously dropped, and it appears as "Willia Niukkanen."

He was in Finland only for a few months, then was brought back to the United States by his parents. When his parents went to Finland, interestingly enough, they had two very small children they took to Finland with them. Those children were born in the United States. This particular individual was born while his parents were visiting relatives in Finland. His parents stayed in Finland for about 10 months after the birth of the baby, and then brought him to the United States when he was 10 months old.

He has never seen Finland since. He does not speak Finnish. He has lived in this country during all the rest of his 58 years of life. He has now been deported to Finland. He knows of no relatives. He has no friends there. He does not speak the language. As I shall point out later in my speech, he is generally referred to in Finland today, in the cause celebre which the case has created not only in Oregon but also now in Finland, as the American refugee in Finland.

Mackie has lived most of his life in Portland, Oreg. One of his brothers was a civilian construction worker at Wake Island at the time of the Japanese attack in 1941. He was presumed lost at sea. Mackie himself served 2 years in the National Guard, and was called into service in 1940. He was discharged for reasons of his age; in 1942 he was again considered for military service, but was not accepted for medical reasons.

During the rest of World War II, Mackie worked in the shipyards of Washington and Oregon, and became a painting contractor in 1947. Two sisters and his father live in Portland. He has committed two petty offenses; in 1928 he was convicted of stealing a chicken at The Dalles, Oreg., and of possession of beer in Idaho during prohibition.

In 1952, the Immigration Service brought deportation proceedings against him on grounds that he had participated in Communist activities, and was a deportable alien for that reason. Mackie denies membership in the Communist party but did attend meetings which he thought were on unemployment. Even the Government witnesses agreed that there had been no discussion of violence or overthrow of the Government at those meetings, but only discussion of labor conditions, relief, and the like.

The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court last spring held that Mackie may be deported, and he was in fact sent to Finland last November. When I introduced a private bill on his behalf last year, I quoted extensively from the dissent of four Supreme Court judges. It concludes:

> A man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his entire life should not be sent into exile for acts which this record reveals were utterly devoid of any sinister implication.

Mr. President, suppose we consider this case in the worst possible light in which it could be put. I should like to have the case considered on the basis of the assumption, which the record would seem to clearly indicate would be a false assumption, that Mackie in fact is a Communist.

Should he have been deported to Finland? Should we have imposed him upon Finland? Should a man who was born in Finland, who was brought to the United States at the age of 10 months, be deported to Finland? Whatever he developed into, he developed while living in the United States. He is the product of his life in the United States.

If we take the worst possible hypothetical by way of a presumption in this case, Mr. President, Mackie is the product of the United States, not of Finland. That is why there is so much resentment in Finland about what we have done. That is why as a delegate on the U.S. delegation at the United Nations this last fall time and time again, as one protest after another reached the members of the Finnish delegation and members of the other Scandinavian delegations, I had to answer the question and the criticism, "Why did the United States deport to Finland a man who was the product of the United States?"

Assume for the moment he is a Communist. If he is a Communist, he became a Communist in America. If he is in any way dangerous, does someone seek to tell me we have reached the point in the United States that we lack the procedures and that we lack the administrative officers necessary to deal with such a person? He is our problem if he is in fact a Communist, which I am satisfied from the record he is not.

It has been my position, Mr. President, that the FBI, our own law enforcement agencies, ought to be able to keep tabs on one individual moving about in our midst, as to his course of conduct. If he participates in a course of conduct which is inimical to the security of the United States, we have laws already on the books to take care of him.

What I am pointing out is that we stand convicted before the world of a shocking example of inhumanity to man. I say from the Senate today to the American people that their Government cannot justify this shocking example of inhumanity to an individual who has lived his entire adult life in the United States, who has dependents, who owned his home and his automobile, and who participated in and contributed to the civic life of his community.

Of course, like all human beings he, too, has his frailties; and when one speaks out against the injustice that was done Mackie, it does not mean that he in any way condones the frailties of the individual concerned. But I am looking at the question from the standpoint of what is just, right, humane, and moral so far as my Government is concerned. I rise today to point out the justifiable criticism that we must expect if we continue this injustice. I protest the situation by urging that we proceed now to make amends, and make clear to the world that once the Congress of the United States is aware of such an example of inhumanity to another human being, we must seek to right the wrong. My proposed legislation would do so.

PROTESTS AGAINST DEPORTATIONS

The senior Senator from Oregon does not speak alone on this subject. Throughout my State there is solid public opinion support on the part of individuals and groups aware of the situation. In my State one Republican newspaper after another has written devastating editorials in criticism of the conduct of our Government in connection with this case. Those Republican editors in my judgment are unanswerably right, because this is a grave injustice.

A government never should consider itself so impersonal that it can permit this kind of personal injustice to continue without its being righted. I like to boast about the fact that in a democracy human values are always uppermost in the carrying out of the objective of a democratic form of government. Here is an instance of a great human value which in my judgment has been greatly wronged and besmirched by the Immigration Service as a result of this deportation.

Although this is a more dramatic case than the MacKay case—a deportation to Canada, our neighbor to the north—protest after protest has been issued in regard to our sending MacKay back to Canada.

They asked the question, "Why do you not take care of your own problem citizens? Why deport to us what may be a problem citizen for us to take care of, when even in the MacKay case also, whatever he became, he became what he is while living in the United States?"

We ought to recognize these cause-and-effect relationships. In this instance, too, we should put him under the strictest surveillance necessary, if in fact any proof can be shown that he is a security risk.

It is not an emotional argument that I make, but rather I bespeak a very deep conviction and dedication of my own. I happen to think that what we have done in both these cases is to be an immoral course of action, which I cannot reconcile with my church view, a course of action which as a Christian I

cannot reconcile with Christian teaching. As a religious man I say to the American people, "watch out for your liberties and your freedoms, if your Government ever starts to follow a public policy course of action in relation to men and women within our citizenry that cannot be squared with Christian teachings."

I have mentioned Christian teachings only because I happen to be a Christian. But I say to the followers of other faiths who believe in a Divine Being, who believe in a God, that this course of action on the part of the U.S. Government cannot be reconciled with the teaching of their religion, either.

I know what to expect when one raises his voice in protest against a course of action that has been taken against alleged Communists. But I have been smeared before. There will be those who, for partisan reasons, will try to read into my defense of these two deportees—a defense limited entirely to questions of procedure that was followed in connection with their deportation, and in regard to what I consider to be the inhumanity of their deportation—that I myself must be a pretty leftist fellow. That would not be the first time that was said about the Senator from Oregon.

However, as on all former occasions, it would likewise be without a scintilla of justification, because I yield to no man in the Senate or elsewhere in the country in my detestation and abhorrence of everything Communist. But I know that the way to beat the threat of communism is not to adopt police state methods ourselves.

This is an example of a police state method. This is Communist technique. We ought to eliminate it from the administration of justice in the United States. We ought to recognize the responsibility of our American society for the creation of whatever behavior patterns motivate these two deportees. We ought to recognize sociological causation so far as their behavior record is concerned, and we ought to determine what current activities they may be engaged in that might be subversive.

But we should not engage in cruel and inhuman punishment under a technicality of the law that permits the immigration authorities to deport such persons. Here is a chance for Government to show its humanity in individual cases, the kind of humanity that a Lincoln in individual cases time and time again manifested, to the everlasting thrill of Americans, as we have discovered on studying the history of the humanity of a Lincoln—the kind of humanity that has characterized great leaders of American history from the time this Republic was born.

It sometimes takes time. It takes constant repetition, more and more spreading of the facts, to make the Government and the people of the country aware of an injustice such as this.

I shall continue to plead with the Senate and with Congress and with the executive branch of the Government to right what I think is a shocking wrong that has been practiced under the administration of our existing immigration laws in connection with these two cases.

I think it can be said of the Mackie case, too, that while the deportation may be legal, it is not just. It was for that reason that I appealed last fall to President Eisenhower to exercise clemency in these two cases. I based my appeal first, on the cases themselves. There was no indication whatsoever that either man's presence in Portland, Oreg., was a threat to anyone.

That has been brought out in editorial after editorial by Republican editors in my State.

APPEAL FOR CLEMENCY

Each man had dependents he would have to leave behind; neither had friends, close relatives, or a way to make a living in the country to which he was to be sent. In Mackie's case, he did not even know the language.

It has always seemed to me that the institution of executive clemency was developed to provide justice in just such cases. There was nothing but a kind of national vindictiveness to be served by deporting Mackie and MacKay for activities of the depression years, a vindictiveness which serves no purpose and brings destruction upon two American families.

Let us look at the human factors involved. Let us place ourselves, in our imagination, for just a moment in either one or both of those households. Let us ponder the human feelings, the grief, the sadness, and the shock to the children and to the other members of their families. Does anyone mean to tell me that the cause of justice has been well served, or that the well-being of my country has been well served by producing great grief and sadness in these two homes, by deporting two breadwinners to places where they cannot earn their bread?

If we look at the human effect we cannot escape, in my judgment, the conclusion that this is not right. It certainly was not necessary. It was not necessary to deport them, because, as I said before, we already have on the statute books adequate legal restrictions to make certain that the security of our country would be protected from any misbehavior that these men might engage in, if we assume the worst.

A second reason why I thought the exercise of executive clemency was called for was the impact of the two cases upon our international standing. I wrote to Secretary of State Herter to this effect on October 25, 1960. After reviewing the facts, I told Secretary Herter: "If these men are deported, their deportations are going to play right into the hands of those who stir up Communist propaganda. We just cannot reconcile our sending them out of the country with our claim of fair and impartial justice for the individual in the United States. I believe that someone should see to it that the President's personal attention is called to these two cases and I feel that you, as Secretary of State, are the person to do this because of their impact on our foreign relations."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 25, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just returned from Oregon where I found a great deal of public criticism, both in the press and among leaders in the State, with respect to the proposed deportation actions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service concerning two residents of Oregon, William Mackie and Hamish MacKay.

These two cases represent a shocking example of inhumanity to man. After a careful study of the facts, I introduced the bill, S. 3543, on May 13, 1960, to terminate the deportation proceedings against Mackie. On May 24, 1960, I introduced a similar bill, S. 3587, on behalf of MacKay. Due to the lateness of the dates upon which these bills were introduced, the Senate Judiciary Committee did not have time to complete action on them.

The extremely harsh nature of the actions proposed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in these cases becomes evident when we consider these facts: William Mackie was born in Finland of naturalized American citizens, who had returned to Finland for a short visit. Actually, Mackie spent only 2 or 3 months in Finland during his infancy and then was brought back to the United States. He does not speak the Finnish language and he has not been in Finland since he was an infant. Mackie attended grade school and high school in Portland, Oreg., and became a house painter by trade. He served in the U.S. Army in World War II and was given an honorable discharge. He married an American citizen and they have a son, who is captain of his football team in one of the Oregon schools. William Mackie is a law-abiding citizen, owns his own home and takes care of his parents.

Hamish MacKay was born in Canada and came to the United States with his parents for permanent residence in 1924. After returning to Canada for a brief period, MacKay returned to the United States in 1928 and in the early 1930's came to Portland, Oreg. He married an American citizen and has two sons. MacKay is a carpenter, and has clearly established that he is a law-abiding citizen.

Both men were guilty of some indiscretion in the 1930's in that they attended some Communist-front meetings, but they strongly contend that they are not Communists. In a dissenting opinion on Mackie's appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Douglas observed that a man "should not be sent into exile for acts which this record reveals were utterly devoid of sinister implication."

In my opinion, the only thing that can save these men now is Executive clemency. I am satisfied, after reviewing the facts, that these are cases in which the President of the United States should take affirmative action to assure that justice is done. If these men are deported, their deportations are going to do us great harm in our foreign relations and will play right into the hands of those who stir up Communist propaganda. We just cannot reconcile our sending them out of the country with our claim of fair and impartial justice for the individual in the United States.

This is a matter that I would not bring to your attention if I did not think it is of serious importance. I believe that someone should see to it that the President's personal attention is called to these two cases and I feel that you, as Secretary of State, are the person to do this because of their impact on our foreign relations.

It is my hope that the President will take action to prevent a miscarriage of justice with respect to these Oregon residents.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the reply of the State Department was in the negative. It took the position that the deportations would have no impact upon international relations. William Macomber, writing for the Secretary, said:

It is believed that the deportation of these two persons would have no significant impact on our foreign relations. The deportation proceedings in both of these cases are based on subversive activities of the persons involved. The Department of State does not consider, therefore, that it would be appropriate to approach the President in behalf of these men.

I believe it should have been for the President to decide whether or not it was appropriate for him to consider the cases. Here again I believe that he should have had called to his attention by the Secretary of State what I have described as these shocking examples of inhumanity to man which were practiced by our Government in these two cases.

So I say that the State Department was entirely wrong. It could not have been more in error about the effect of these cases on opinion abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Mr. Macomber be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 15, 1960.

The deportation of aliens is a matter coming entirely within the jurisdiction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Upon informal inquiry of the central office of that Service, it has been ascertained that Mr. MacKay applied for a suspension of deportation proceedings on the ground that he has 10 years of good behavior. This application was denied by the Board of Immigration Appeals and his case is now pending before the courts.

Mr. Mackie also made application for suspension of deportation on the basis of 10 years' good behavior. His application was denied by the Board of Immigration Appeals on the ground that there was no evidence of a clear break from his former political ideologies. Arrangements have been made several times for Mr. Mackie's deportation. However, each time his deportation has been held up by various court actions. He was last scheduled for deportation on Sunday, October 23. At the time he applied for a restraining order from the district court, but this was not granted. On October 25, Mr. Mackie submitted his case to the Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

It is believed that the deportation of these two persons would have no significant impact on our foreign relations. The deportation proceedings in both of these cases are based on subversive activities of the persons involved. The Department of State does not consider, therefore, that it would be appropriate to approach the President in behalf of these men.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

ADVERSE REACTION ABROAD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Scandinavian delegates at the United Nations were fully informed of the cases, and many of them spoke to me about them. The Finnish delegates were especially disturbed that the United States could act as it did in the Mackie case. They refer to him as a refugee from America.

Newspaper comment in Finland has been outright insulting toward the United States, as they make fun of our claim to power, dignity, and respect for the individual. These are not Communist or Communist-line newspapers, either. One of these columnists wrote in the Paivan Sanomat—Daily Dispatch—an organ of the Social-Democrat Party:

He [Mackie] has been declared an undesirable citizen; he has been accused of communism by McCarthyites; President Eisenhower rejected his appeal; and now he is here—a man without papers or chattels—a penniless refugee in a borrowed coat amidst wintry frosts and blizzards.

Mr. President, that is a typical Finnish editorial. That is a typical Finnish reaction. This case has done us irreparable damage. This case is a horrible example of a miscarriage of justice in the United States. We have not only an opportunity but I believe a moral obligation to right this wrong, to change this impression of the United States abroad, to admit that we are in error in the handling of this case; bring him back to the United States, and put him under surveillance, if necessary, and to bring to an end the cruel and inhuman treatment of which the United States stands convicted in public opinion in many parts of the world in respect to these two cases.

The newspaper goes on to say:

That is enough of human fate. And yet he comes of a country said to be of the free world, especially the promised land of personal freedom. After this, who can believe in their pretty slogans and respect for the individual? These are hollow phraseology, intended to cover the truth. * * * Freedom there is questionable, although it is used as a decoy to gain friends. In this case, anyhow, the truth is stronger and more cruel than fiction.

I ask unanimous consent that the translation by Mr. S. Syvanen of Astoria, Oreg., of this entire column which appeared in the Paivan Sanomat of November 23, 1960, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN IN TORNI

(Excerpts from Eskonen's column in the Paivan Sanomat (Daily Dispatch), organ of the opposition group (non-Communist) of the Social-Democratic Party. Issue of November 23, 1960)

(The man) William Mackie, originally Viljo Albert Niukkanen sits in the lobby of Hotel Torni writing letters to send across the Atlantic. From there a great power, called the advance guard of the free world, rushed him here to the barren soil of the north, where he happened to be born some time during the first decade of our century. His parents were U.S. citizens, but the son could not get citizen's rights, regardless of decades of trying.

After all he has sacrificed his labor power in building that great country and, during those years, fought—arms in hand—for its defense. His brother was killed in the war for America (at Wake Island); his father is over 80 and sorely needs the support of his son, but none of these facts have helped William Mackie. He has been declared an undesirable citizen; he has been accused of Communism by McCarthyites; President Eisenhower rejected his appeal, and now he is here—a man without papers or chattels—a penniless refugee in a borrowed coat amidst wintry frosts and blizzards.

That is enough of human fate. And yet he comes of a country, said to be of the free world, especially the promised land of personal freedom. After this, who can believe in their pretty slogans and respect for the individual? These are hollow phraseology, intended to cover the truth.

Mackie, alias Niukkanen, has denied he is a Communist. But what's the difference? With this brand on his forehead, immigration officials believe in it, and deportation followed.

And even if Niukkanen were a Communist, could this be a defense for the American way of life, for immigration officials, for President Eisenhower? Not according to our way of thinking. Freedom of thought is one of the basic, inalienable human rights, no matter how much effort for its suppression has been made and still is, all over the world. More glaringly absurd is such persecution of opinion in a country which declares itself to be the model of all liberty, and which is said to be the opposite pole to everything antiliberty.

Even more absurd such persecution seems when it is known that Communists in America have very little influence and possibilities to work out their program.

So we must conclude that the country, guilty of deporting Niukkanen, is hardly more democratic than a fully cultivated dictatorship. Individual freedom there is questionable, although it is used as a decoy to gain friends. In this case, anyhow, the truth is stronger and more cruel than fiction. The man is (in Torni) a living evidence of this.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, similar sentiments about the United States were expressed in another Finnish newspaper which represents the Social Democrats, this time the right wing of that party. This editorial, written by Ville Vaitelias in the Suomen Sosialidemoskraatti of November 21, 1960, is very similar, so far as its political reputation is concerned, to the Republican editorials published in my State protesting this case.

The editorial from the right wing of the Finnish journalistic profession begins:

Freedom in the great western power behind the puddle is esteemed so dear that it cannot be afforded to quite everybody. Some Finnish-born house painter might be a person of such insignificance that an exception must be taken in his case, so that the others will understand the value of their freedom.

That is a sarcastic editorial. It might be described as an editorial that jeers America. I favor following a course of action in these cases which will produce editorials that will cheer America, instead of jeer at it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST HYSTERIA

(Comment by Columnist Ville Vaitelias in the Suomen Sosialidemoskraatti, November 21, 1960.)

No matter if this painter has resided in the United States since he was 8 months old—51 years—giving the full weight of his

labor to the best of his ability to his homeland, for the good of the United States, serving with all his strength in his country's defense forces during World War II, and otherwise acknowledging and feeling the United States of America to be his only and real homeland.

And so it happened to William Mackie, whose Finnish name is Viljo Niukkanen, that some highly placed American officials found him as an undesirable person. They investigated and pondered what to do with a guy like this; and lo and behold discovered this rascal, William Mackie, during the years of great unemployment had been a member in organizations which sought for living rights for the unemployed, and plainly a Communist. It would very likely overthrow the entire American freedom system if such revolutionary person were allowed to remain in his sweet homeland, the United States of America. Thus, his one-way free ride to Finland, whose citizen he is acknowledged to be by some indefinite paragraphs, and where there are many other Communists.

And there is no help in trying to fight; in protestations that one never belonged to Communists; no pleas have helped in the situation.

Of course we understand that a country's laws must be followed. If according to the laws, William Niukkanen really must be deported, what else can be done. But according to our judgment the case, by no means, is self-evident, for it is dependent on high officials deliberations whether to let William stay or deport him to faraway land of his birth, where he has no known relations, nobody he knows and whose language he doesn't understand.

One would surmise that a great power for reasons of prestige would try to avoid such an unpleasant hubbub as is raised in the case of William Niukkanen, and which in all likelihood will not quiet down in the near future.

It is quite impossible for us to understand the Communist hysteria still seeming to prevail in America. Workers' political movement in the country is almost nonexistent; there are apparently but a handful of Communists and these are feared as the plague. It seems that the capitalists, nor their henchmen can set communism in proper threads. It is proclaimed as the incarnation of all evil and crime, or, going to the other extreme as high idealism—as is done by one son of the bourgeoise, Jussi Talvi, in his last published novel. In both cases the same phenomenon is involved—Communist hysteria. It is not understood that the roots of communism are imbedded in quite basic human needs, which must be satisfied—but also can be directed and transformed, if desiring to do so.

After all the important thing to do is to take matters calmly, here in Finland—as well as behind the puddle. Under hysteria, only foolish deeds are committed, as evidenced in the typical case of William Niukkanen.

Translator's note: The right wing of the Finnish Social Democratic Party—this is from their paper—is allied with Finland's conservatives of the Kokoomus Party.

"Puddle" refers to the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another Finnish newspaper called our action barbaric, and said there had been a very strong reaction in Finland to the news of the deportation. It called that action a severe blow to the prestige of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Lawyers for Two Deportees Plan to Continue Efforts," published in the Portland Oregonian of November 19, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWYERS FOR TWO DEPORTEES PLAN TO CONTINUE EFFORTS

Attorneys for William A. Mackie and Hamish Scott MacKay—Gerald A. Robinson and Nels Peterson—announced Friday that deportation will not conclude their own efforts to bring them back to America.

Robinson said, "We will do it someway, either under this law, under private bills in Congress or changing of the law (Walter-McCarran Act) itself."

MacKay and Mackie's deportations Friday climaxed more than a decade of effort by the U.S. Immigration Service, following the law which says that any person who has been a member of the Communist Party is deportable.

ACTION STARTED IN 1952

First proceedings were begun against Mackie on June 17, 1952, charging him with membership from 1937 to 1940.

First section against MacKay was August 29, 1949, and he was charged with membership in the Communist Party from 1936 to 1941.

Both men have steadfastly denied they were Communists or had ever advocated any overthrow of the Government, but they admitted to membership in the Workers' Alliance, an organization they said was working for unemployment relief. MacKay was in the National Guard. Mackie in the Army. Neither applied for naturalization until it was too late.

MacKay, born in Canada, came to the United States more than 30 years ago, when he was 21. Mackie, born in Viipuri, Finland, while his parents were back there on a visit, was brought to Portland when he was 10 months old.

FINNISH NAME "WILLIA"

His Finnish name is really William Niukkanen, mistakenly written without the "n" on immigration entry records. Thus on deportation records he is known as Willia Niukkanen. He and his father have always used the name Mackie here. Mackie will be 52 Thanksgiving Day, Thursday.

He will arrive in Finland sometime Saturday or early Sunday.

Finnish newspapers have reported considerable public indignation over what they have termed the barbaric action of the U.S. Immigration Service.

FINLAND WON'T ACT

The Kansan Uutiset, a Helsinki, Finland, newspaper reported by cable Thursday night that the Finnish President because of the Constitution cannot bar Mackie's entry. The newspaper, one of two in that city which had urged some action to thwart what was called barbaric action on the part of the U.S. Immigration Service, said Thursday there has been very strong reaction there to news of the deportation and called it a "severe blow to prestige of the United States."

No word has ever been received here of any Canadian action to bar McKay, although that government did so in one recent case of a Seattle woman, born in Victoria, who was then ordered deported to England.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable aspects of these cases is the outcry that went up in my State over the affair. They are not simply a cause celebre of the radical fringe which always tries to make America look bad, no matter what it does.

Instead, the action of the Government is being protested by the whole community of our State. It is recognized that these two men are no threat to anyone's security. On the contrary, they are very much needed in Portland, Oreg., for the economic security of their own families. They have been accepted in the normal activities of the Portland area and in their business associations in the city of Portland. Editors, clergymen, chamber of commerce leaders, Republicans, Democrats, and parents' groups have all stood up to be counted in protest to this action by our Government.

If anything, newspaper reaction in Oregon has been about as acid as it has been in other countries. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD editorials from the Oregon Statesman, the Coos Bay World, the Capital Press, the Astorian Budget, and the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Statesman, May 17, 1960]

Senator WAYNE MORSE has introduced a bill to make it possible for William Niukannen, Portland house painter under order for deportation, to remain in the United States. Niukannen was charged with Communist association which he denied. He was only an infant when brought to this country from Finland, so whatever guilt he has accumulated is strictly American, not absorbed in his native country. The Morse bill should pass. In fact it should be broadened to limit deportations to those who had reached the age of discretion at the time of entry.

[From the Coos Bay World, Oct. 27, 1960]

OPPORTUNITY FOR MERCY

Portlanders William A. Mackie and Hamish Scott MacKay may, in the end, be deported to Finland and Canada, respectively, but their case has provided a marvelous example of bureaucratic indifference to sensibilities and logic, and has called forth the support of many people in both high and low places.

Both men have lived in this country for many years—the Finn since he was a few months old (he's now 51), and the Canadian since 1928. Both men attended several meetings of a Communist-front organization in the 1930's, as did a lot of men and women who'd now rather forget about it, and because of this activity they are ordered deported by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and they've about run out of redress in the Federal courts.

Senator MORSE introduced a bill to permit them to stay in the last session of Congress, but the bill didn't have time to go through. He'll try again next January, if he's permitted that much time.

A number of pleas for Executive clemency have been made to President Eisenhower. This is the ideal type of case by which an executive can utilize the power of mercy given him by his office. We hope the President can see his way clear to do so in the case of Mackie and MacKay.

Letters and telegrams to the President, at the White House in Washington, might be helpful at this time.

[From the Astorian Budget, Nov. 11, 1960]

ACTION NEEDED

There should be administrative action at Washington to prevent the deportation of H. S. MacKay and William A. Mackie from Portland to Canada and Finland respectively, since their case has drawn so much attention and created so much public doubt whether these men deserve deportation.

Evidently there is no recourse in the courts for the two men. Every legal method to prevent deportation seems to have been tried.

The worst that has been proved against the two is that once, years ago, they belonged to Communist front organizations. There is considerable evidence that they both long ago eschewed communism.

It is noteworthy that the newspapers in Finland, to which country Mackie is to be deported, have taken interest in his case, and call the action of the U.S. Immigration Service barbaric.

[From the Oregonian, Nov. 19, 1960]

LAW AT FAULT

"If the law supposes that," said Mr. Bumble, "the law is a ass, a idiot."

Dickens' line might be applied to the prolonged cases of Hamish MacKay and William Mackie, which came to an end this week with their forcible deportation to Canada and Finland, respectively.

We do not weep for MacKay and Mackie. The record is clear that they were deeply involved in the 1930's in the Communist conspiracy. They knew what they were doing. The courts have, through all levels including the U.S. Supreme Court, affirmed their meaningful association with the Communist Party. They have had every benefit, in detail, of the due process of law over the past decade. There is reason for official belief that they have not substantially altered their loyalties.

Although there are extenuating circumstances in each case, both are aliens and have chosen to remain so during long residence in this country. MacKay was born in Canada shortly after his parents moved from the United States, and applied for Canadian citizenship. Mackie was born in Finland during a brief visit there by his parents, who did not have U.S. citizenship though they considered themselves residents of America.

The offense, in each case, based on law dating from 1918, involved the combination of lack of citizenship and membership in the Communist Party. Such offense is punishable by deportation to country of origin. It has, with respect to both MacKay and Mackie, been adequately proved.

But these facts do not alter the certainty that the execution of the law in these cases will substantially damage the image of America in the eyes of the world.

It suggests that the Nation that leads the free world is so fearful of its security that it must expel two insignificant men, one of whom once wrote on Portland sidewalks "Join the Communist Party" and the other of whom distributed copies of a Communist-front newspaper. We are not actually so timid, of course; we tolerate thousands of persons who did things as subversive as did MacKay and Mackie, but they have the protection of citizenship.

It suggests that American liberty is not all it has been cracked up to be, else why would we have laws in which the punishment appears so incongruous in relation to the offense?

Unfortunately, we have not heard the last of these men and their problems. Each will remain, in his new abode, a symbol of the inflexibility of U.S. law. Their Canadian and Finnish neighbors may well ask themselves: "Why, if this man is so dangerous to America, should we thank America for sending him to us?"

An answer of sorts to that question should come with the amendment of the law responsible for the whole disgraceful business. It is, to paraphrase Mr. Bumble, idiotic to bind ourselves with a law which in its execution makes our country appear so ridiculous, not only to observers abroad, but also to those Americans who cherish the spirit of liberty and tolerance that brought this Nation into being.

[From the Capital Press, Nov. 25, 1960]

UNJUST DEPORTATIONS

The deportation from the United States of William A. Mackie, Portland housepainter, and Hamish Scott MacKay, Portland carpenter, both foreign-born, will stand as an indictment against the United States until it is reversed.

The deportation is a carryover from the principles of McCarthyism that a man accused of being a Communist becomes ineligible for justice tempered with mercy.

Mackie and MacKay, during the depression 1930's, joined organizations which held out hopes for desperate, crushed people that there was a Utopia. Many people joined such organizations, much as many others joined Townsend plan groups, with the thought only of helping themselves and others out of straitened circumstances. Even in instances where such groups were controlled by Communists, many of the members intended no disloyalty to the United States.

But past membership in such an organization, regardless of the circumstances of that time and regardless of an individual's demonstrated loyalty to the United States, still makes a foreign-born resident subject to deportation. It was under the strictest interpretation of this rule that the U.S. Immigration Service was able to send Mackie back to Finland (where he spent only his infancy) and will be able to send MacKay back to Canada this weekend.

The legal technicalities of this basically unfair and inhumane decision to uproot two men from their families and their life's work, on the legal pretext that they are dangerous to American society, will be lost upon the people of the world, as indeed they are lost upon a great many American citizens. The impression will be created, and correctly so, that American Government, in this instance at least, does not exist for the protection of the people, but for their persecution.

This affair may yet have a happy ending, fortunately. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE has promised to submit legislation to the Congress convening in January which will reverse these unjust deportations and bring back two good American citizens to where they belong.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editor of the Oregon Statesman is a political opponent of mine, but he is a distinguished Oregonian, a great citizen of my State, a former Republican Governor of my State, and one of the recognized leaders of the Republican Party in my State. He has raised his voice as well as taken his pen in hand to protest this shocking injustice.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittee on Immigration will give prompt and favorable consideration to these bills. I do not think it is at all amiss for me to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The other day I told him I planned to introduce these bills and that they would come before his committee. I said I hoped I could have early hearings on them.

He urged me to introduce the bills. He said he did not know very much about the MacKay case, but that he recalled very distinctly last November reading in the press about the Mackie case. He said he was very much surprised, on the basis of the statement of facts published concerning the Mackie case, that Mackie had been deported. He assured me that very thorough consideration would be given to my two bills, because, he said, if injustice has been done, it ought to be righted.

I want the Senator from Mississippi to have this public acknowledgment of my appreciation of the fairness with which he received my presentation to him in conference the other day about my great concern over these two cases.

Mr. President, I have spoken at greater length than I had intended to speak, but I have done so because I well know how important it is, in view of the tremendous schedule which confronts every committee of the Senate, including the Judiciary Committee, to have what, in a very real sense, might be considered a minor or subordinate matter sort of shunted to one side, while we proceed with great questions of public policy and affairs of state. But I wish to stress once more that I know of no affair of state more important to the maintenance of a vital democracy than an affair of state which seeks to right an injustice to a single individual, I care not how lowly he may be.

In my opinion, these two cases present such an atrocious example of injustice that they should be handled quickly by the Senate and promptly sent to the House for action on the legislative front.

Mr. President, I now introduce for appropriate reference two bills, one dealing with the MacKay case and one dealing with the Mackie case. In these bills I seek to provide that these two deportees be returned to the United States and that they be placed in the same status in which they were prior to their deportation. That does not mean—and I stress this point—that the bills give them clearance; that the bills in any way estop the Government from exercising further jurisdiction over the individuals. All the bills do is to set aside the deportation. If proof can be adduced that in any way these two persons are a threat to the security of our land, then I say: Put them under surveillance.

In due course of time, under a new administration, I shall seek to call the cases to the attention of the new President of the United States, because my relationship at the White House, under the new administration, will be somewhat different from what it has been during the past eight years.

I shall endeavor to make that representation to the President of the United States in person, because I believe the new President should have called to his personal attention what, in my opinion, is a shocking example of man's inhumanity to man practiced by the United States Government in respect to these two cases.

Mr. President, may it be understood that my request to introduce the bills also includes a request that they be printed in the RECORD at the opening of my statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH AND SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a group of distinguished Americans, experts on

the problems of medical care and its costs, yesterday presented to President-elect John F. Kennedy a timely report on health and social security for the American people.

This task force, headed by Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, of the University of Michigan, a preeminent figure in the social-welfare field, joined the growing list of those who, after careful study and consideration, have come to the conclusion that financing medical care for the aged can be done most soundly through social security.

Right now some 2,500 Americans have concluded the White House Conference on Aging considering similar proposals as have been made by President-elect Kennedy's task force.

All of this is a valuable contribution to the store of knowledge we need to adopt adequate legislation to solve this severe medical problem of our senior citizens.

Because of the wide interest in this subject, and in the report of the task force, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH AND SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

An adequate standard of health and welfare for all of the American people requires the leadership and support of the Federal Government.

The American people have recognized and accepted the responsibility of the Federal Government to help improve health and welfare services. This principle requires effective implementation in 1961.

The task force has confined itself to the most immediate necessities for Federal action and does not present its recommendations as a complete program for health and welfare. We have been deeply conscious of the need for selectivity in the light of the cost of such proposals in relation to the other imperative and immediate fiscal and administrative demands upon the Federal Government. We have also been concerned about the most effective and practical methods of meeting these costs and are proposing fiscally sound methods to achieve the desired objectives. Our proposals place a major reliance on the self-financing methods of contributory social insurance and repayable loans supplemented only where clearly necessary by funds from the general revenues.

A. MEDICAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS

The United States can be proud of its remarkable and continually improving health and medical care personnel, facilities, and programs. Yet, in our country there are still significant medical care needs which can and should be met and which can only be met if the Federal Government takes a more vigorous role in the financing, organization and stimulation of health and medical care.

1. Medical care for the aged and other social security beneficiaries

The only sound and practical way of meeting the health needs of most older people is through the contributory social security system. This system permits people to contribute during their working years to the relatively heavy costs of medical care in their later years. Full freedom in the choice of qualified physicians and medical facilities would be assured. The proposal uses the tried and tested insurance method of payment for hospital and medical care with which millions of Americans of working age are familiar through Blue Cross and other private insurance. The same general considerations apply to widows, surviving children, and permanently disabled persons who are receiving social security payments.

Scope of Medical Care Benefits

Hospital and related institutional costs place such an impossible heavy financial burden on these groups of people that these costs should receive the major emphasis in any program. Moreover, the hospital is increasingly becoming the center of health activities in the community—as it should be. But at the same time the plan should include incentives to use appropriate alternative personnel and facilities of a less costly and noninstitutional character.

The essential benefits in any such program at this time should include: (1) inpatient hospital services, (2) outpatient hospital diagnostic services, (3) skilled nursing home services, and (4) home health services, such as visiting nurse services.

The inpatient and outpatient hospital services would be effective approximately 1 year after enactment of the legislation. To give time to make necessary arrangements skilled nursing services and home health services would be available 2 years after enactment. By including in the legislation provisions which would give an individual two units of skilled nursing home service for 1 day of hospital service and adequate home health services there would be an incentive to use these out-of-hospital services.

There are those who contend that there are not sufficient personnel and facilities to make it feasible to put this program into effect at this time. Certainly, incentives should be created for the establishment of additional personnel and facilities as recommended subsequently in this report. But this should not be a reason for delay in instituting an insurance program. One of the most important ways in which personnel and facilities are stimulated and more equitably distributed is by providing a mechanism for paying for such services. Assurance of continued financial support for services is one of the key elements in the development of personnel and facilities.

Administration of Medical Care Program

The legislation would clearly provide that—

(1) In no way will any of its provisions socialize medical care;

(2) Free choice of physician, hospital, and nursing home are assured to every individual by law;

(3) There would be no supervision or control over the practice of medicine;

(4) Providers of service would be paid on the basis of reasonable cost as may be mutually agreed to by the provider of service and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and any agreement could be terminated upon notice by either party;

(5) Providers of service could designate an agent to negotiate arrangements with the Federal Government;

(6) A national advisory council would be established including outstanding persons in the hospital and health fields. The council would be consulted in the development of policy and regulations in the administration of the program.

(7) General definitions for participating hospitals, skilled nursing homes, and agencies providing home health services would be indicated in the statute. The Secretary should be authorized to use appropriate State agencies in determining whether a particular hospital, skilled nursing home, or home health agency meets the definition for participation.

Financing of the medical care program

The cost of the medical care benefits should be fully financed by contributions to the insurance system. The costs of various alternatives are shown in table 1.

A plan which involved initial contributions of about 0.5 percent of taxable payrolls (one-quarter percent each on employers and employees) during the first 5 to 10 years and then stepped-up contributions to about 0.8 percent (0.4 percent on each party) would permit the development of a reasonably adequate benefit program consistent with a consideration of the financial effect of the new contributions on the contributors and the economy.

TABLE 1.—*Estimates of early year [1] and level premium cost [2] for the Anderson-Kennedy amendment of 1960 and various suggested modifications as a percent of taxable payrolls*

Specifications of medical insurance plan	Early year costs with taxable earnings base of—		Level premium costs with taxable earnings base of—	
	$4,800	$7,200	$4,800	$7,200
A. Anderson-Kennedy amendment [3]	0.39	0.34	0.58	0.53
B. Anderson-Kennedy amendment with elimination of $75 deductible	.47	.41	.72	.65
C. Anderson-Kennedy amendment in (A) plus eligibility at age 65/62	.53	.46	.73	.66
D. Anderson-Kennedy amendment in (A) plus eligibility at age 65/62 and elimination of $75 deductible	.64	.56	.91	.83
E. Anderson-Kennedy amendment in (C) plus survivors and disabled beneficiaries	.57	.50	.77	.70
F. Anderson-Kennedy amendment in (D) plus survivors and disabled beneficiaries	.69	.61	.96	.88

[1] Early year costs are defined as the costs for the year 1962 assuming all features of the program are fully operative for the entire year.

[2] Level premium cost is the average cost for the long run.

[3] As offered in the Senate, August 1960. The amendment included insured persons age 68 and over.

Source: Chief actuary, Social Security Administration, Jan. 5, 1961. The estimates differ slightly from those used in mid-1960 due in part to the 1960 changes in the OASDI program and some revisions in the assumptions.

The contributory insurance system should be authorized to provide funds for—

(1) Community demonstration projects relating to the development of personnel and facilities to meet the health needs of individuals under the program;

(2) Community projects on the means to increase the adequacy of personnel and facilities;

(3) Consultative services to the States looking toward methods for helping develop adequate facilities within each State, and bringing their services and their facilities up to needed levels of performance.

The Secretary should make recommendations to the President and the Congress to encourage the development of economical and appropriate forms of health care which are a constructive alternative to hospitalization.

Coverage of aged not insured under social security

Many of the noninsured aged are already protected under other existing programs. Thus, under recently enacted provisions of law Federal civil service annuitants will soon have medical care protection. Veterans who are eligible for veterans' pension or compensation are entitled to hospitalization. Accompanying legislation can be enacted by Congress so that railroad retirement annuitants will have benefits no less favorable than social security beneficaries. The small remaining group can be taken care of by the States under the new program of

medical assistance to the aged. Enactment of the medical insurance plan will relieve the States of a substantial long-run cost involving probably more than $300 million annually. If experience demonstrates that the existing financial or other plan provisions of the Federal medical assistance legislation are not adequate to meet this residual need, then further Federal legislation can and should be enacted as the need is demonstrated.

The benefit, financing, administrative, and other implications and alternatives in this program have been discussed with the Commissioner of Social Security. The details of a sound and workable plan consistent with the above program are in the process of completion by the Commissioner for the consideration and appropriate action of the incoming Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. Medical education and medical manpower

In order to achieve the administration's objective with respect to medical care for the aged as well as the health of the population as a whole, it is essential that the Federal Government take prompt action to increase the supply of medical and other health personnel including physicians, dentists, nurses, public health personnel, and social workers. It is a matter of national concern that according to the Bane report to the Surgeon General 40 percent of all medical students come from the 8 percent of the families with the highest incomes.

A program for medical education and medical manpower should consist of the following interdependent components which are listed in the order of urgency:

1. Federal support for maintenance and expansion of educational activities in the health field consisting of—

(a) A program for the basic suport of operating costs to maintain these institutions.

(b) A program which would give institutions an incentive to expand the training of personnel.

This part of the program would involve Federal expenditures of approximately $10 to $20 million in the first year.

2. Federal aid for the construction of new educational facilities and renovation and expansion of existing facilities for the purpose of increasing the numbers of persons being trained in these fields.

This would consist of—

(a) Planning grants to institutions to achieve these objectives ($400,000).

(b) Alteration of existing facilities for expansion ($25 million for first year).

(c) New construction of facilities including expansion of existing schools and establishment of new ones. Within this category, with regard to physican training, priority should be given to expansion of existing schools and the establishment of new 2-year schools. (The Federal commitment would be about $25 million for the first year but actual expenditures would be substantially less.)

3. Federal grants to institutions for scholarships and fellowships for students. This would involve Federal expenditures of about $10 to $20 million for the first year. These educational grants should be available to students so they could attend a medical school without regard to residence or other arbitrary restrictions not related to the ability of the applicant.

The program recommended by the task force would involve Federal funds of about $70 to $90 million in the first year. The cost will increase to about $270 million by the fourth year and is likely to remain at approximately that level. This is only about one-half of the existing research grant program of the National Institutes of Health. The expenditure of these sums is essential for national growth and effective performance.

3. Medical research

The needs for medical research and research education have been admirably documented in the report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research under the chairmanship of Boisfeuillet Jones. The principles and recommendations in the Jones report would well serve as a longer-run guide to policy and appropriations in this field.

Federal support of the direct costs of medical research should be continued at approximately its present level for the next fiscal year. However, the educational and research activities of institutions receiving grants from the National Institutes of Health are handicapped at the present time by the limitation in the appropriation act on indirect costs. This limitation now at 15 percent of the direct cost does not cover the actual indirect expenses. This acts as a deterrent to new research and reduces the available institutional funds for educational purposes. The Federal Government as it does in other grants for research, should realistically meet the total costs of the research for which it makes grants through the National Institutes of Health. The first year cost would be about $20 million additional if this policy were applied to initial and renewed research grants only. The longer-run cost of this policy would be about $50 million annually.

4. Medical care facilities

The proposed medical care for the aged program will require additional facilities to be constructed over a period of time. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program has resulted in a significant increase in hospital beds, especially in small communities. There still remains, however, a substantial need for the construction and renovation of kinds of facilities required for the care of the older age group, especially in urban areas.

The first emphasis should be given to the following components in a program for facilities expansion:

(a) An increase in existing Federal grants under the Hill-Burton Act for facilities for long-term care including public and nonprofit skilled nursing home and other chronic disease facilities ($10 million annual increase).

(b) Long-term low-interest Federal loans for construction, renovation, and expansion of nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes according to approved State plans ($100 million annually). A combination of loans and grants should be permitted.

(c) Long-term low-interest Federal loans for construction, renovation or expansion of facilities for medical group practice and group practice agencies or organizations (direct to the groups or agencies concerned, without the intervention of States) ($5 million annually).

An exploration should be made of possible ways in which existing legislation relating to loans to proprietary skilled nursing homes under the Small Business Administration could be amended to increase the proportion of cost guaranteed up to 95 percent provided the homes met the standards of construction and continued operation prescribed by the U.S. Public Health Service as a part of a State plan.

The Secretary and the Surgeon General should take the leadership and initiative within existing legislation to encourage the development of outpatient diagnostic and treatment programs. Expansion of services in this setting will be of great importance to the successful operation of the medical care program for the aged.

5. Establishment of a National Academy of Health

The President should take the necessary steps to arrange for the establishment of a National Academy of Health comparable to the National Academy of Sciences. The purpose of such a nongovernmental, independent Academy would be twofold:

(a) To recognize and honor the significant achievements of leaders in health research, teaching, care, and administration, and

(b) To insure a continuing body of recognized integrity, responsibility of purpose, and breadth of competence for advice to the Government and the public on questions affecting health.

6. Creation of a National Institute of Child Health

As an important new step in a broader program for the improvement in family and child health and welfare services, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary, should, by administrative action, establish a National Institute of Child Health within the National Institutes of Health. Such action would recognize the administration's concern not only with the welfare of aged, but with its children and youth.

The establishment of the National Institute of Child Health would not require additional Federal expenditures for research for the fiscal year 1962. An allocation from existing funds should be made for an initial administrative organization. Subsequent allocations of funds would be included within the budget of the National Institutes of Health.

The high incidence of mental disease, the terrifying problems of juvenile delinquency, the burden on family and community resources for the care of the mentally retarded, all attest to the need for a concentrated attack on problems of the development of the child. Research into the physical, intellectual, and emotional growth of the child is at present severely handicapped by the absence of a central focus for research that exists in other fields such as heart disease and cancer. Within this Institute will be concentrated research workers in the fields of genetics, obstetrics, psychology, and pediatrics as well as basic scientists who will channel their efforts into the study of the normal processes of human maturation from conception through adolescence.

Such a research program will have a profound impact on the medical care and practice in this Nation by emphasizing the care of the whole individual rather than the fragmentation of the patient into particular diseases. The research grants from this Institute will stimulate programs necessary to ascertain those genetic and environmental factors that lead to the development of a physically and mentally healthy adult. Such an institute should help bring to each child of this Nation—normal, gifted, or retarded—complete fulfillment of his true potential.

B. SERVICES TO FAMILIES, CHILDREN, AND OLDER PERSONS

A nation's strength lies in the well-being of its people: families, children, and older persons. Welfare services support this well-being in times of stress and constitute, therefore, an essential part of any effective social security program. It seems appropriate after 25 years that the welfare grant-in-aid provisions of the Social Security Act, especially those involving families and children, be reexamined to determine how they can be made more adequate to meet current social and economic needs. The following specific recommendations in this section are made with this objective in mind.

7. Assistance to children of an unemployed parent

In order to meet the growing emergency needs of families affected by unemployment a temporary provision (until June 30, 1962) should be added to title IV of the Social Security Act which would authorize the inclusion of children in need because of the

unemployment of a parent among those eligible for aid to dependent children. The provision would be temporary pending the development of the plan proposed in recommendations 8 and 12.

8. Preparation of a family and child welfare services plan

The Secreary of Health, Education, and Welfare should be requested to develop for submission to the President and the Congress, prior to the expiration of the temporary amendment to aid to dependent children, a family and child welfare services plan which would bring together in one program the resources of Federal aid to the States under the Social Security Act for assistance and social services to needy families and children and community social services in such areas as juvenile delinquency prevention, services to the aging, and other related programs designed to strengthen community life. This would not affect titles I and X of the Social Security Act relating to the aged and the blind, respectively.

9. Strengthening and streamlining administrative organization

The strengthening of services to families, children, and older persons also could be advanced through administrative action looking to a more effective organization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The following suggestions should be explored:

(a) Elevation of the Children's Bureau from its present location within the Social Security Administration to the Secretary's office to serve its original purpose as a staff agency concerned with all the problems of child life and the promotion of new programs to meet them rather than with program operation.

(b) Designation of the special staff on aging as an Office of Aging to advise and assist the Secretary in a similar role with respect to the problems of older persons. This office would not carry any administrative functions.

(c) Creation of an Institute of Family and Child Welfare Research associated with the Social Security Administration to combine the present research and demonstration functions enacted in 1956 and now vested in the Social Security Administration, including those of the Children's Bureau in the child welfare field.

(d) Transfer of the administration of the maternal and child health and crippled children grant programs to the Public Health Service.

(e) Transfer of the administration of the child welfare services program to the Social Security Commissioner pending the development of the combined family and child welfare services plan recommended in the task force report.

This plan would combine the advantages of assuring spokesmen for the needs of children and older persons at the top level of policy decision in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with those implicit in a comprehensive approach to research, health, and welfare services at the operational level. (See also related recommendations 6 and 12.)

It appears that no new legislation would be required to carry out these administrative suggestions since all program responsibilities are now vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and he is empowered to carry them out as he sees fit.

WALTER H. "SKEET" HUNT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I sadly announce to the many friends of Walter H. "Skeet" Hunt that "Skeet" passed away at 10 o'clock this morning at his home in Biloxi, Miss.

For the new Senate Members, I think that they would like to know that "Skeet" Hunt was one of the most beloved employees the Senate of the United States ever had. He first came to the Senate in 1933, under the sponsorship of Senator Pat Harrison, as a private on the police force. He became a lieutenant on the police force and for many years was special officer of the Senate, until he was forced to retire by reason of health in 1959, ending 26 years of faithful service to the Senate.

All of the older Senators will remember "Skeet" for his good spirits, for his minstrel songs, for his comedy, and as a great chef.

In addition, Mr. President, he was a man of extreme loyalty and of unimpeachable integrity. "Skeet" was a great man in any way one considered him.

His specialty, as Members will recall, was cooking the shrimp and the other seafood from his native Biloxi.

Services for "Skeet" will be held at the Church of the Nativity in Biloxi at 3 o'clock Sunday afternoon.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, apparently there is no other Senator who desires recognition. I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 17, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1961:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard A. Evans.
Robert B. Bell.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Paul A. Sweeney, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1963, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Arnold S. Turetsky, Congregation Ohev Tzedek, Youngstown, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all men, bless us with wisdom and courage to be Thine instruments in the creation of a free world, wherein none shall be master and none shall be slave, wherein all shall share the blessings of freedom.

Make us free, too, O God, that we may fulfill our mission.

Make us free from smugness and cold indifference.

Free from pride and the abuse of power.

Free from pettiness and unreasonable stubbornness.

Free from the sometimes poison of blind partisanship and self-interest.

Free from prejudice and colorblindness.

Free from all that is debasing in life, that we may never lose the vision of that day when weakness shall grow strong, and strength shall grow kind, and all men shall know themselves as the sons of God.

כי מלאה הארץ דעה את ה'
כמים לים מכסים.

Isaiah 11: 9.

When "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters that cover the sea."

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 12, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY UNTIL FRIDAY NEXT, AND FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 106) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, January 18, 1961, it stand adjourned until 11 a.m. Friday, January 20, 1961; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Monday, January 23, 1961.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the reading of the budget message from the President of the United States the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

CANNON] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I had assumed that the legislative business would be first in order for today and the speeches would come on later. Would the reading of the President's budget message be the first order of business today?

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. It is expected that the gentleman from Missouri will make his speech after the President's message is read?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I made the request at the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that. Would his request then precede the other orders that have been entered for today relating to Members who died after the adjournment of the last Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize all Members who desire to address the House after the President's message has been read and the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri have been completed.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTING OFFICIAL INAUGURAL FUNCTIONS AND MEDALLIONS FROM FEDERAL EXCISE TAX

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 107) exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all amounts paid (whether paid on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution) for admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961, and all amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of any subsequent President-elect, shall be exempt from the tax on admissions imposed by section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 2. Official medallions which are designed by, and manufactured under the authority of, the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961 and which are sold under the authority of such committee (whether sold on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution), and official medallions which are designed by, and manufactured under the authority of, the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of any subsequent President-elect and which are sold under the authority of such committee, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by section 4001 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 3. The net proceeds realized by each Inaugural Committee shall be donated by such committee to charity.

SEC. 4. For purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Inaugural Committee" has the meaning assigned such term in section 1(b)(2) of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act (36 U.S.C. 721(b)(2); 70 Stat. 1049).

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, briefly, House Joint Resolution 107 is designed to exempt admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961 from the Federal excise tax on admissions. It also provides a similar exemption for admission tickets that are sold by the authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of any subsequent President-elect. In addition, this joint resolution would exempt the official commemorative medallions which are designed by and manufactured under the authority of the Inaugural Committee on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961 and any subsequent President-elect from the Federal excise tax on jewelry.

Mr. Speaker, the proceeds realized by the Inaugural Committee from the sale of admission tickets to the inaugural parade grandstand, to the inaugural ball, to the inaugural symphony concert, and to committee-sponsored receptions.

Mr. Speaker, I want those words noted by my colleagues—this refers to proceeds realized from the sale of admission tickets to inaugural committee sponsored receptions and activities only, as well as from the sale of official medallions, are used to defray the expenses incurred in providing the facilities required for these events as well as conducting other nonrevenue producing ceremonies that have become a traditional part of our highest occasion of state. This is a nonprofit-making operation which cannot inure to the benefit of any individual since the joint resolution expressly provides that any net proceeds realized by the Inaugural Committee's activities shall be donated to charity.

Precedent for the admissions tax exemption provided by this joint resolution is found not only in the legislation enacted in prior inaugural years which granted similar exemptions, but also by analogy to a number of admissions tax exemptions provided in our present Internal Revenue Code for nonprofit activities generally.

The question was raised the other day as to whether or not this would apply to the gala activities on January 19, in other words, an activity similar to political dinners or other fundraising activities on behalf of either party. Under the longstanding rulings of the Treasury, such activities are already exempt from admissions tax. This resolution has no application to events such as the gala affairs and other fundraising affairs for either of the parties since it applies only to admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee. Such events are in the same status as dinners and other affairs that are run throughout the year by both parties such as political dinners to raise funds for both parties. So, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the resolution has no application at all to the gala affair and is confined strictly to those official activities in connection with this and future inaugurals, and when we say "official activities," we mean those activities sponsored by the Inaugural Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if any of my colleagues want to ask me some questions, I will be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Has this sort of legislation run down through the years?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that in past inaugurals there has been similar legislation as to admissions—in 1933, 1937, and 1941. I do not think there was any in 1953 and 1957. I do not know why there was not. I do not think they requested it. They certainly would have got it had they wanted it, because I know I would have voted for it and been glad to cooperate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understood from a circular I received in the mail purporting to come from the gentleman's office, that a similar proposition was put up to the House following the 1952 election, that it passed the House but did not pass the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my recollection, too, in some recent inauguration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There was similar legislation in 1949. I was here in 1953. In 1953 and 1956 there was no request for an exemption so the matter never came before us. In 1949 there was a request. We passed it in the House but it got tied up in the Senate. It never was enacted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This applies only to the District. It does not apply to anything outside the District?

Mr. McCORMACK. It does not apply to events outside the District. These current functions take place in the District of Columbia in connection with the inaugural and are sponsored by the Inaugural Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I will say further in respect to the last inauguration that the committee of guarantors here in the District composed, as I understand it, of business and private individuals, had to make up a considerable amount of

deficit, a large portion of which represented the excise tax. The inauguration is a matter of great national interest and importance, and as far as I am concerned I can see no real valid objection to this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. If no other Member desires me to yield I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the inauguration of a President is an event of great importance to all of our people and, in fact, to all the world. It should not be a partisan affair. I recognize, of course, that our Democratic friends will get greater enjoyment out of it than will my Republican colleagues, but the President of the United States is the President of all our people and his inauguration and the official functions in connection with it, it seems to me, should have our wholehearted support. As far as I am concerned I want any inaugural of a President, no matter who he may be or what party he belongs to, to be as noteworthy an event in the history of our Nation as possible.

The committee in charge of official functions believes this exemption is necessary; I shall, therefore, support it. I am constrained, however, to make some observations about the way this matter is being handled.

First, we have known for a long time that we would have an inaugural in January of 1961. Why was not this matter brought to the attention of Congress during the last session while Congress was sitting, when the committees were organized and could have considered the legislation and brought it to the floor in the normal way after committee consideration and with a committee report on the merits of the legislation?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this should not be a partisan matter; but I would point out that to my knowledge no exemption from the tax was requested and certainly none was enacted with respect to our last two Presidential inaugurals, 1953 and 1957.

I realize that deficits were incurred with respect to those inaugurals which had to be made up by private guarantors, and if the events had been exempted from the excise taxes the deficits would have been less. Recognizing that a deficit is possible, and that, I think, is one of the justifications given for this legislation by the proponents, I would inquire at this time as to why the one event which normally produces a surplus has this year been taken out of the official functions and turned into a partisan affair with the announced objective of using it as a fundraising event for the Democratic National Committee. I refer to the so-called gala event with $100 tickets and $1,000 boxes. This action can be interpreted only as an attempt to make the inaugural affair a partisan event, which it should not be.

There is another event which has just come to my attention that I believe is completely out of place in the inaugural events. That is the one sponsored by the official committee and referred to as the Young Democrats Reception and Dance.

If inaugurals of our Presidents are going to be turned into strictly partisan political affairs and spectaculars to enrich party coffers, we will make a mockery of what should be a great national event that we and all of our people can be proud of.

I would caution my Democratic colleagues and the Inaugural Committee that some things are being done in connection with this inaugural which throw suspicion on your objectives.

I repeat, I am going to support this resolution and I do so with the principal purpose of emphasizing that inaugural events should be and must be nonpartisan affairs. I urge only that they be kept that way.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Will the gentleman explain to me—I was going to ask the majority leader this question—why this resolution is specific in what it exempts?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It exempts functions under the jurisdiction of the official Inaugural Committee.

Mr. BECKER. It does mention specifically the medallions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That has to be mentioned specifically because it is under a different section of the code. That has to do with jewelry.

Mr. BECKER. None of these other tickets are going to be sold by the Inaugural Committee?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gala is not a part of the official function. As I tried to point out, they took over what was normally an official function and made it a completely partisan function; yet it is the one event that in the past contributed toward avoiding a deficit. I think it was a mistake to take that item out and use it for political purposes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin can tell us approximately how much money we are talking about here?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In terms of the fiscal affairs of the 1956 inaugural, we are speaking in terms of about $60,000 in tax revenues.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I understand that the symphony function that is to be put on during the inaugural will be under the auspices of the Inaugural Committee?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is the official committee.

Mr. BROWN. That is, of course, very high cultural entertainment. What is the difference between that entertainment event and the gala? Why should not they all be the same?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The symphony may not draw as big a crowd as the gala, therefore the gala was taken out of the official function and made a Democratic Party function. I think that was an error.

Mr. BROWN. Without criticizing the Inaugural Committee, why would the committee take jurisdiction over a symphony concert and not take jurisdiction over a vaudeville performance?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not on the committee. I cannot answer that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It was pointed out in a report submitted to me by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means that if the deficit is to be made up by the guarantors, in all probability that would be a deductible item with respect to their income tax.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As far as the net loss to the Government is concerned, it would be below the figure I mentioned, because the guarantors would have this as a deductible item on their individual returns; that is, if they have to make up any deficits.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the folks in Hollywood who come here to put on a major part of this event receive any special benefit financially?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will be on their own?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would expect that they would be only too glad to volunteer their services, and I imagine they are.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Except for the advertising, that might be true.

Mr. McCORMACK. It would surprise me greatly if I found out afterward that they received compensation.

I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] said, that all inaugurals should be as nonpartisan as is humanly possible. They are our highest occasion of state. I can remember 4 and 8 years ago, in the nonpartisan spirit of those two inaugurals, when friends of mine who were Democrats came to me and asked me for inauguration tickets. I said to them, "What do you want to be here for?" I wanted to take care of my Republican friends from Massachusetts and elsewhere to the extent that I could. So, I made it very nonpartisan from my angle. I wanted to see my friends who were active Republicans—and I have many of them—enjoy these festivities. I am proud of my Republican friends and I am trying to convert them to the Democratic Party, hoping that they will see the light some day. But, nevertheless, they are my friends, so I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin said. Unfortunately, one reception and dance was termed "young Democrats." It is "young people." I understand that both young Democrats and young Republicans are going to be there and other bipartisan young people. This was intended for those young folks

to attend the inaugural who could not afford $25, and I think the charge is $8. So, I thoroughly agree with everything my friend said, but I can assure the House that this is not a partisan affair and the proceeds, if any, will go, as all net proceeds, to charity. This activity is under the authority of the Inaugural Committee. The partisan fundraising activities of both parties are already exempt.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Of course, the gentleman, as I gather, admits that the real mistake was made in titling this affair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me say rather than say it was a mistake, it was unfortunate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would also call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that, in describing the event, he said the tickets are available through the Young Democratic Inaugural Festivities Committee. So, apparently they have also got a Young Democratic Inaugural Festivities Committee set up as part of this function, and it seems to me that that goes a long way in turning this affair from a nonpartisan affair to a partisan affair, and that is what I raised objection to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been informed that this is a subcommittee of the Inaugural Committee, so just for the record I want to make that observation. It is primarily for young people—including young farm people, students, children of Congressional Medal of Honor winners over age 16 and so on.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I will insert at this point in the RECORD a more detailed statement on House Joint Resolutions 107 and 108.

House Joint Resolutions 107 (McCORMACK) and 108 (HALLECK) would exempt from Federal excise tax, admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee. The legislation would apply on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1961 and on the occasion of the inauguration of any subsequent President-elect.

Section 1 provides that amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Inaugural Committee on such occasions shall be exempt from the admissions tax. As to the 1961 inaugural program, the exemption will apply to ticket sales to the grandstands to view the inaugural parade, to the inaugural ball, to the inaugural symphony concert, and to committee-sponsored receptions. Those are traditional events in connection with inaugural ceremonies.

Section 2 provides that official medallions designed by the Inaugural Committee and manufactured and sold under authority of such committee shall be exempt from the tax on jewelry sold at retail. Many of those medallions issued as official commemorative souvenirs of the 1961 inauguration will be made of bronze and are not subject to the retail tax. However, some of them will be made of silver and will be subject to the retail tax on jewelry unless this exemption is granted.

Section 3 provides that if the Inaugural Committee realizes a net profit on its activities, such net profit shall be donated by such committee to charity. By requiring the net proceeds to be donated to charity, it is made clear that the Inaugural Committee will not retain any net proceeds from any of its activities.

The Inaugural Committee was specifically created by act of Congress, approved on August 6, 1956. The 1957 Inaugural Committee in total operations sustained a deficit in excess of $166,000 which had to be made up by private guarantors.

The chairman of the 1957 Inaugural Committee recommended that exemption from the admissions tax be restored in connection with the 1961 inaugural activities. The cochairman of the 1961 pre-Inaugural Committee, appointed prior to the recent election, made similar recommendations. The preinaugural cochairmen were respectively the chairman of the District Republican and Democratic committees.

Similar legislation granting exemption from admissions tax, as provided by section 1, has been enacted for the Presidential inaugurations in the past. It was not done in 1945 because of the war when the inauguration ceremonies took place at the White House. There was no exemption at that time because there were no tickets issued or sold.

In 1949, when legislation to accord similar exemption from admissions tax was last considered, it passed the House by vote of 199 to 49 but failed to pass the Senate by vote of 45 to 47. At that time the stringent wartime suspension of exemptions from admissions tax was still in effect. Admissions to church and charitable events, to grade school and high school programs, to agricultural fairs, and other nonprofit activities were subject to 30-percent admissions tax. Senate debate in 1949 was concerned largely with amendments to exempt agricultural fairs, baby oils and creams, etc. Understandably, Senate decision in 1949 seemed to hinge on the vexing problem of timely legislative consideration and action on restoring pre-World War II exemptions in whole or part.

Since 1949, pre-World War II exemptions from admissions tax have been restored (Revenue Act of 1951) and many additional exemptions have since been accorded (Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954; Internal Revenue Code of 1954; Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958; and miscellaneous acts). Thus, today, in contrast with the situation in 1949 when similar legislation was last considered, admissions are exempt when the proceeds are for the benefit of churches, educational organizations, tax-exempt charitable organizations, civic symphony societies, chautauqua programs, athletic events to support the U.S. Olympic Association; and school or college athletic events for support of retarded or crippled children. Also now exempt are admissions to nonprofit agricultural fairs; to concerts conducted by nonprofit civic associations; to swimming pools and other places providing facilities for physical exercise; historical home and garden tours; and admission to historical sites, museums, planetariums, amateur theater performances, baseball games, and rodeos operated by nonprofit organizations.

Prior legislation did not include exemption from the retail excise tax applicable to sale of official silver medallions commemorative of the inauguration. But since there will be no profit accruing to the Inaugural Committee out of its activities (any net proceeds will go to charity), it seems appropriate to accord that exemption as well.

Bronze and silver medals will be sold. Only the silver medals would be subject to the 10-percent retail excise tax.

It has been the custom to design and strike a special commemorative medallion on the inauguration of the President-elect, usually showing a profile of the President-elect in bas-relief on the face side, and an appropriate national symbol, such as the Presidential Seal or the Great Seal of the United States, on the obverse side.

The Inaugural Committee holds copyright to the design. It has full authority to control manufacture and sale.

Outline of inaugural activities, Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee and civic Inaugural Committee: The Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee conducts the official inaugural ceremony at the Capitol where the Presidential oath is administered and the President delivers his inaugural address. The expense involved in the erection of the platform and seats to witness the ceremony at the east front of the Capitol Building is paid by funds appropriated to the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee. No admission charge is made for that ceremony.

Other inaugural functions, such as the inaugural parade immediately following the swearing-in ceremony at the Capitol, the inaugural ball that evening, the inaugural symphony concert on the previous evening, the reception and dance planned for young people by the Young Democratic Inaugural Festivities Committee as a subcommittee of the Inaugural Committee on January 18, the reception for Governors the afternoon of January 19 and the reception for distinguished ladies the preceding day, are conducted by the Inaugural Committee appointed by the President-elect pursuant to the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956. (36 U.S.C., sec. 721.) The Inaugural Committee derives its funds from the sale of tickets to the parade grandstands and box seats to the inaugural ball, inaugural symphony concert, and the January 18 reception and dance, from sale of official inaugural medallions, sale of inaugural programs, and minor miscellaneous receipts.

Civic Inaugural Committee, expense of nonrevenue producing facilities and events. Expenses of the Inaugural Committee are underwritten by private guarantors. These guarantors include not only local trade and business groups but many national corporations and nonresident individuals motivated by civic purposes. In case receipts from ticket sales and sales of medallions and programs fall short of expenditures, recourse must be had against the guarantors. The 1957 Inaugural Committee incurred a deficit of $166,000 and had to make recourse against its guarantors to the extent of 15.29 percent.

The Inaugural Committee incurs substantial expense for nonrevenue producing facilities and events. For example, provision is made for the President's reviewing pavilion in front of the White House to accommodate the President and Vice President and their families, members of the Cabinet and personal guests, at a cost of approximately $45,000. Immediately adjoining facilities, known as the White House-east and White House-west reviewing stands, accommodate distinguished guests including members of the diplomatic corps, Governors and their wives, Members of Congress and their wives, Congressional Medal of Honor winners, and other honored guests. The cost of such facilities approximates $130,000. The reception for Governors and the reception for distinguished ladies, in keeping with the dignity of such events, are undertaken by the committee as host.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second on this resolution because I think that we should not act upon this resolution until we see if the Inaugural Committee has a deficit or not. We have been given no assurance to date that the Inaugural Committee, in selling their inaugural ball tickets, their parade tickets, and the other functions that are carried on in connection with this inaugural, will actually operate at a deficit. Also, in the last two inaugurals, the Inaugural Committee, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES, has said, put on a festival here in the

District to raise money to pay the cost of the inauguration. Entertainment was brought in from all over the United States. Tickets were sold so that the cost of the inaugural could be met and so that no public funds would be used.

This year a new arrangement has been entered into. This festival or gala is being used as a political fundraising activity and is not a part of the inaugural ceremonies. For that reason this resolution is before us, to subsidize the other activities of the inaugural through tax exemption.

It seems to me that this particular resolution should be delayed until we see if the Inaugural Committee actually does have a deficit. It does not seem to me that it is good politics on the part of the majority party to have this as the first tax bill of the New Frontier.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with others who have spoken on this subject that it is more than a little strange that the first legislation to come to the floor of the House in this new session is to deprive the Federal Treasury of badly needed revenue.

This is in contrast to the inaugurals of 1953 and 1957 when the Republicans made no effort to obtain tax exemptions incident to the installation of a Republican President.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] that this legislation ought not to be considered at all until after the inaugural and there has been an accounting of the funds. To say that it really makes no difference because profits, if any, will go to charity, is a poor argument. I am not disposed to turn over to inaugural committees the disposition of funds, which otherwise would go to the Treasury, to charities of their selection.

I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the fiscal year 1962 I send you budget and legislative proposals which will meet the essential domestic needs of the Nation, provide for the national defense, and at the same time preserve the integrity and strength of our Federal Government's finances.

With this budget, I leave to the new administration and the Congress a progressive and workable financial plan which recognizes national priorities and which reflects my confidence in the strength of our economy now and in the years to come.

A budget surplus was achieved in the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1960. A narrowly balanced budget is anticipated for fiscal year 1961. The recommendations in this budget provide for still another balanced budget, with a surplus, in fiscal year 1962. The achievement of balanced budgets this year and in the coming fiscal year will help foster noninflationary prosperity at home and strengthen confidence in the dollar abroad.

Despite the persistence of hardship in some local areas, economic activity continues at a high level. It is imperative for the extension of economic growth at a high and sustainable rate that the budget be kept balanced and that we act responsibly in financial matters.

For 1962 the budget estimates reflect expected gains in the national economy and provide for carrying programs forward in an efficient and orderly manner. The estimates also reflect, as in previous years, the budgetary effects of proposed changes in legislation, including the cost of certain new programs. Most of the legislative proposals have been previously recommended. I again urge their enactment.

In total and in its parts, this budget embodies a sensible and forward-looking plan of action for the Government. In brief, it provides for:

1. Increasing our own military capabilities and promoting increased strength in other free-world forces;

2. Advancing activities important to economic growth and domestic welfare;

3. Continuing assistance to the less-developed nations of the world whose peoples are striving to improve their standards of living;

4. Increasing support for scientific activities in outer space;

5. Achieving savings by making desirable modifications in existing programs and by charging users the costs of special benefits received by them; and

6. Continuing present tax rates to maintain the revenues needed for a sound fiscal plan.

The policies and proposals in this budget will enable us to meet fully our national and international responsibilities and to promote real and sustainable national progress.

GENERAL BUDGET POLICY

This budget, like each of the seven which I have previously sent to the Congress, reflects the conviction that military strength and domestic advancement must be based on a sound economy, and that fiscal integrity is essential to the responsible conduct of governmental affairs. A surplus in good times, as provided in this budget, helps make up the deficits which inevitably occur during periods of recession. To ignore these principles is to undermine our strength as a Nation through deficits, unmanageable debt, and the resulting inflation and cheapening of our currency.

An 8-year effort has been made by this administration to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar. This effort, which was a necessary undertaking in view of the heavy depreciation of the dollar's purchasing power following World War II, has had a large measure of success, but the problem of maintaining reasonable price stability will require close and continuing attention in the future.

Our national economy is strong and our national welfare continues to advance. Despite a leveling out in economic activity during the latter part of the calendar year just ended, the total market value of all goods and services produced in our country in the calendar year 1960 increased by approximately $20 billion over the preceding year and crossed the half-trillion-dollar mark for the first time in our history. Personal incomes increased more than 5 percent over 1959, the previous record high. The Economic Report will describe the trends which indicate that further substantial increases can be expected during the calendar year 1961, carrying the gross national product and personal incomes to new highs.

The budgetary outlook for the future reinforces the need for self-discipline in meeting current national demands. Over the next 10 years and beyond, we will be faced with the consequences of many commitments under present laws for nondefense expenditures, in addition to the heavy military burden we must continue to bear.

We can confidently expect that a growing economy will help pay for these commitments. As the labor force grows and employment expands, as business discovers new techniques of production and invests in a larger and more efficient productive base, the national output and income will grow, and with them our ability to finance needed public services. But our resources will not be unlimited. New and expanded Federal programs being urged by special groups are frequently appealing, but, added to existing commitments, they threaten to swell expenditures beyond the available resources.

The Federal Government cannot reasonably satisfy all demands at the same time. We must proceed first to meet those which are most pressing, and find economies to help pay their costs by reappraising old programs in the light of emerging priorities. We must encourage States and localities to increase further their participation in programs for meeting the needs of their citizens. And we must preserve and strengthen the environment in which individual initiative and responsibility can make their maximum contribution.

Our unsatisfactory balance of international payments provides another compelling reason for pursuing sound financial policies. The relationship between our budgetary actions and the balance of payments needs to be carefully examined to assure a minimum adverse effect. Whether the dollar will continue to enjoy high prestige and confidence in the international financial community

will depend on the containment of inflation at home and on the exercise of wise restraint and selectivity in our expenditures abroad.

The need for concern about our spending abroad is not strange or surprising. It results from the recovery, profoundly desired and deliberately encouraged by our country, of the major centers of production in Western Europe and Japan following the devastation and disruption caused by war. To reflect this developing state of affairs, changes are now required in some policies established in earlier years. Therefore, I have prescribed certain actions in international transactions under direct governmental control and others are under study. Such measures, combined with proper financial prudence in the handling of domestic affairs and strong export promotion, should significantly improve our balance of payments.

In summary, if we plan wisely and allocate our resources carefully, we can have both public and private advancement. Sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets will sustain sound economic growth and, eventually, will make possible a reduced tax burden. At the same time, we can have necessary improvements in Federal programs to meet the demands of an ever-changing world. If, however, we deliberately run the Government by credit cards, improvidently spending today at the expense of tomorrow, we will break faith with the American people and their children, and with those joined with us in freedom throughout the world.

BUDGET TOTALS—1961

Current estimates indicate a close balance in the 1961 budget. On the newly adopted basis of excluding interfund transactions, expenditures are estimated at $78.9 billion and receipts at $79 billion, resulting in a budget surplus of $0.1 billion. The revenue estimate reflects a justifiably optimistic view as to the course of our economy, based on circumstances described in my Economic Report.

Last January, I proposed a budget for 1961 that showed a surplus of $4.2 billion. The enactment by the Congress of unrecommended expenditures and the unwillingness of the Congress to increase postal rates reduced this prospect by approximately $2 billion. In the meantime, lower corporate profits have materially reduced our expectation of tax collections from this source.

The small surplus of $79 million currently estimated for 1961 takes into account an assumption that postal rates will be increased not later than April 1, 1961.

Despite the congressional increases in the budget last year, the present estimate of $78.9 billion for 1961 expenditures is about $900 million less than the figure of $79.8 billion which appeared in the budget a year ago. The apparent reduction results from (1) the elimination, as announced in last year's budget, of certain interfund transactions totaling $0.7 billion from the current estimate of expenditures and (2) the shift of employment security grants of $0.3 billion to trust fund financing as provided by law. As explained elsewhere in this budget, these changes affect receipts as well as expenditures and do not affect the surplus.

Apart from these accounting adjustments, the increases and decreases from last year's estimate of 1961 expenditures are approximately offsetting.

Major increases from the original budget include $766 million for Federal employee pay raises; $554 million in losses of the postal service because rates were not increased as proposed; $269 million for defense programs; $188 million for health, education, and welfare activities; and $164 million for civil space activities.

Major decreases from the original estimates include $600 million for interest on the public debt; $496 million for the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation; $311 million for veterans compensation, pensions, and readjustment benefits; $93 million for the Export-Import Bank; and $50 million for military assistance. In addition, a reduction of $160 million is estimated under the proposal to reduce the postal deficit in 1961 by increasing postal rates effective April 1. Other reductions, including a normal downward revision in the allowance for contingencies, total $210 million.

BUDGET TOTALS—1962

For the fiscal year 1962, my recommendations provide for $82.3 billion in budget receipts and $80.9 billion in budget expenditures. The resulting budgetary surplus of $1.5 billion will permit another modest payment on the public debt.

The estimate of receipts in 1962 is $3.3 billion higher than the current estimate for 1961, and $4.6 billion more than the receipts actually collected in 1960. Expenditures are also increasing, from a total of $76.5 billion in 1960 to $78.9 billion currently estimated for 1961 and $80.9 billion proposed for 1962.

Budget expenditures: The increase of $1.9 billion in estimated expenditures between 1961 and 1962 reflects several factors which are worthy of special note.

First, outlays for our Nation's defenses are estimated to rise by $1.4 billion in 1962 to a total of $42.9 billion. Much of this increase reflects continued emphasis on certain expanding defense programs, such as Polaris submarines, the Minuteman missile, the B–70 long-range bomber, a strengthened airborne alert capability, airlift modernization, and modernization of Army equipment. These improvements are for the purpose of keeping our military might the strongest in the world.

Second, the budget provides for substantial continuing efforts to support the cause of freedom through the mutual security program. Expenditures for this program in 1962 are estimated at $3.6 billion, an increase of $250 million over 1961.

Third, civil space vehicles and space exploration will require $965 million in 1962, up $195 million from 1961, and $564 million more than in 1960. In total, the recommendations in this budget provide for $9.4 billion in expenditures in 1962 for carrying forward research and development efforts, of which $7.4 billion is for major national security purposes. The total represents an increase of $770 million over 1961. As part of the overall research and development effort, increasing Federal support for basic research is being provided. This budget includes $1 billion for the conduct and support of basic research in universities, industrial establishments, Government laboratories, and other centers of research.

Fourth, increases in expenditures are proposed for certain activities important to domestic well-being and to the future development of our Nation. These include, among others, broadening medical care for the aged; making major improvements in transportation programs; continuing development of our natural resources at a new record level of expenditures; improving our health and welfare programs; providing assistance for construction of elementary and secondary schools and college facilities; assisting areas of substantial and persistent unemployment; and fostering rural development. Expenditures in 1962 for labor, education, health, welfare, community development, transportation aids and services, and conservation of natural resources are estimated to total $8.6 billion, an increase of $627 million over 1961.

To some extent these recommended budget increases are offset by proposed reductions which can be effected in existing programs through improved operations and through changes in present laws. These reductions result from a continuous search for ways to restrain unnecessary expenditures in going activities, to recognize real priorities of need, and to assure that Federal programs are carried out in an efficient manner.

Savings are proposed and can be achieved through modification of activities which, in their existing form, require a disproportionate or wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. For example, States, localities, and other non-Federal interests should assume a greater share of the costs of urban renewal, local flood protection, and the building and operating of schools in federally affected areas. The Congress should act on proposals to encourage nongovernmental financing, and reduce reliance on direct Federal financing, in such activities as home loans for veterans and for military personnel, and the expansion of rural electrification and telephone systems. Certain grants and benefits should also be reviewed and revised, including those for agricultural conservation, civil airport construction, airline subsidies, housing aids no longer needed for readjustment of World War II veterans, and agricultural price supports, particularly for wheat.

Benefits to the general taxpayer are also proposed in the coming fiscal year and later years through the enactment of measures to charge users for special services which they derive from particular Government activities. Among these are proposals to eliminate the postal deficit and to provide more adequate taxes on aviation and highway fuels.

Budget receipts: Estimated budget receipts of $82.3 billion in 1962 are based

on an outlook for higher production, employment, and income as the calendar year 1961 progresses. The accompanying table shows the sources of budget receipts for the fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Budget receipts

(See special analysis B in pt. IV of this document)

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate
Individual income taxes	$40.7	$43.3	$45.5
Corporation income taxes	21.5	20.4	20.9
Excise taxes	9.1	9.3	9.7
All other receipts	7.1	6.7	6.9
Total	78.5	79.7	83.0
Deduct interfund transactions (included in both receipts and expenditures)	.7	.7	.7
Budget receipts	77.8	79.0	82.3

Extension of present tax rates: It is necessary to extend for another year the present tax rates on corporation income and the excise taxes which are scheduled for reduction or termination on July 1, 1961. The excise tax rates scheduled for reduction include those on distilled spirits, beer, wines, cigarettes, passenger automobiles, automobile parts and accessories, and transportation of persons; the 10-percent tax on general telephone service is scheduled to expire. Unless these tax rates are extended, the Federal Government will lose an estimated $2.6 billion in revenues in 1962, and $3.7 billion on a full annual basis.

Changes in fees and charges: In the conduct of certain of its activities, the Government provides special services, sells products, and leases federally owned resources, which convey to the recipients benefits above and beyond those which accrue to the public at large. In fairness to the general taxpayer, the cost of these services or the fair market value of the products and resources which are transferred to private use should be recovered, wherever feasible, through adequate fees and charges. To this end, the Congress was requested last year to provide increased fees and charges for a number of special benefits. With the one exception of fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases no final action was taken. The Congress is again requested to raise postal rates to eliminate the postal deficit and to act favorably on the proposals for increased highway and aviation fuel taxes and for a number of other fees or charges.

The present highway fuel tax rate should be increased by one-half cent per gallon and the resulting rate of 4½ cents should be continued through 1972. This step is necessary to permit timely completion of the Interstate System. It will also make possible the repeal of the unwise diversion from the general fund to the trust fund of excise tax receipts amounting to 5 percent of the manufacturers' price of passenger automobiles and automobile parts and accessories; this diversion is presently scheduled by law to begin July 1, 1961, and to continue for the fiscal years 1962 through 1964. The Congress should also raise the excise tax rate on aviation gasoline from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon; impose the same excise tax rate on jet fuels, now untaxed; and retain the receipts from these taxes in the general fund to help pay the cost of the Federal airways system. Other aspects of these recommendations are set forth in the discussion of transportation programs in this message.

Estimated savings to the general taxpayers from more adequate fees and charges

[In millions]

Proposal	Fiscal year 1962
Increase postal rates	$843
Support highway expenditures by highway use taxes:	
Repeal pending diversion of general fund excise taxes to trust fund (and increase motor fuel tax)	810
Transfer financing of forest and public lands highways to trust fund	38
Charge users for share of cost of Federal airways:	
Increase taxes on aviation gasoline and retain in general fund	38
Tax jet fuels	62
Increase patent fees	7
Increase miscellaneous fees now below costs	9
Total savings	1,807

Public debt: Achievement of the proposed budget surplus for 1962 will enable the Federal Government to make another modest reduction in the public debt. It is estimated that the public debt, which stood at $286.3 billion on June 30, 1960, will decline to $284.9 billion by the end of fiscal year 1961 and to $283.4 billion on June 30, 1962.

If the Congress accepts the proposals in this budget, and the proposed budget surplus for fiscal year 1962 is achieved, at the end of that year the Government will have some operating leeway within the permanent debt limit of $285 billion. Due to the seasonal pattern of tax collections, however, it will again be necessary for the Congress to provide a temporary increase in the debt limit during 1962. The present temporary debt limit of $293 billion expires June 30, 1961.

The Congress is again urged to remove the 4¼-percent statutory limitation on new issues of Treasury bonds, which remains a serious obstacle to efficient long-run management of the public debt. The marketable debt is still too heavily concentrated in securities of relatively short maturity, with almost 80 percent of the total coming due within 5 years. Although interest rates have declined in recent months, the continued existence of the interest rate ceiling limits the flexibility of debt operations by the Treasury. It effectively prevents the Treasury under certain circumstances from lengthening the debt by offering longer term securities or exchanges at maturity and, more importantly, it reduces considerably the possible use of the advance refunding technique, which offers the greatest promise for lengthening the average maturity of the debt.

RECEIPTS FROM AND PAYMENTS TO THE PUBLIC

The budget totals exclude the transactions of funds held in trust by the Federal Government as well as certain other transactions affecting the flow of money between the public and the Federal Government as a whole. Trust fund operations are an important factor in this flow and are consolidated with budget transactions to measure the Federal Government's cash receipts from and payments to the public. In this consolidation, certain transactions involving no flow of cash between the Government and the public are eliminated.

Expenditures from trust funds are financed through taxes and other receipts which are specifically designated to serve the special purposes for which the funds were established. About one-half of total trust fund transactions are accounted for by the old-age and survivors insurance system. Other important programs carried on through trust funds include the railroad retirement system, the Federal employees' retirement systems, disablity insurance, unemployment compensation, grants for highway construction, purchase of insured and guaranteed mortgages, and veterans life insurance. In certain areas of Government activity, notably labor and welfare, trust fund expenditures far exceed the amounts spent through budget funds and, with the taxes levied to finance them, exert a considerable influence on the economy of the Nation.

Total receipts and expenditures of trust funds more than tripled during the decade of the fifties, and passed the $20 billion mark in 1960. In 1962 they are both estimated to total $25.2 billion. Total receipts from the public in 1962 are estimated at $103.1 billion and payments to the public at $101.8 billion, with a resulting excess of receipts of $1.3 billion.

Federal Government receipts from and payments to the public

(See special analysis A in part IV of this document)

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate
Receipts from the public	$95.1	$99.0	$103.1
Payments to the public	94.3	97.9	101.8
Excess of receipts over payments	+.8	+1.1	+1.3

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE TAX SYSTEM

There is a continuing need for a reappraisal of the tax system to assure that it operates equitably and with a minimum of repressive effects on incentives to work, save, and invest. Continued close cooperation between the Treasury and the committees of the Congress is necessary to formulate sound and attainable proposals for the long-range improvement of the tax laws.

However, as the development of a comprehensive tax revision program will take time, the Congress should consider promptly this year certain changes in the tax laws to correct inequities. For example, it is again recommended that the Congress promptly consider amending the laws on taxation of cooperatives to provide for more equitable taxation by insuring that taxes are paid on the income of these businesses either by the cooperative or by its members.

It has been many years since certain of the tax laws which now apply to the Nation's various private lending institutions and to fire and casualty insurance companies became effective. The Congress should review these statutes and the tax burdens now carried by lending institutions and insurance companies to determine whether or not inequities exist and to remedy any inequitable situations which may be found. The Treasury Department has underway studies relating to the operation of the existing statutes in this area. These studies should be of assistance to the Congress in any such review.

There is a need for review of present depreciation allowances and procedures. More liberal and flexible depreciation can make a major contribution toward neutralizing the deterrent effects of high tax rates on investment. A better system of capital recovery allowances would provide benefits to those who invest in productive plant and equipment and would encourage business expenditures for modernization and greater efficiency, thus helping to foster long-range economic growth. By bringing the allowances for American business more nearly into line with those available to many foreign producers, improved depreciation procedures would not only strengthen the competitive position of American producers, but their benefits would also accrue to American workers through increased productivity and greater job opportunity.

The depreciation rules should not be substantially liberalized, however, without accompanying remedial legislation with respect to the taxation of gains from sale of depreciable property. The legislation recommended last year to treat income on disposition of depreciable property as ordinary income to the extent of the depreciation deductions previously taken on the property is an essential first step.

IMPROVEMENTS IN GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

During the past 8 years major improvements have been made in the organization of the executive branch of the Government. An executive Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established to give Cabinet status to its important programs. The organization of the Department of Defense was strengthened to bring it more closely into line with the requirements of modern warfare. A National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created to provide effective civilian leadership over appropriate parts of our national space program. The Council of Economic Advisers was reconstituted and reorganized to strengthen its internal administration and clarify its relationships with the President. Functions of coordinating governmental planning for defense mobilization and civil defense were consolidated. The establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency brought about substantial improvements in aviation programs.

Many of the numerous organizational improvements were effected by Presidential reorganization plans authorized by the Reorganization Act of 1949, which has now expired. The Congress should renew that authority and make it permanently available for all future Presidents in the effective form as originally enacted. The task of conforming Government organization to current needs is a continuing one in our ever-changing times.

Executive Office of the President: The duties placed on the President by the Constitution and the statutes demand the most careful attention to the staffing and organization of the President's Office. While the present organization of the Executive Office of the President reflects many constructive steps taken over a period of years, much remains to be done to improve the facilities available to the President. The first requirement for improvement is for the Congress to give the President greater flexibility in organizing his own Office to meet his great responsibilities.

Specifically, the Congress should enact legislation authorizing the President to reorganize the Executive Office of the President, including the authority to redistribute statutory functions among the units of the Office; to change the names of units and titles of officers within the Office; to make changes in the membership of statutory bodies in the Office; and, within the limits of existing laws and available appropriations, to establish new units in the Executive Office and fix the compensation of officers. Such action would insure that future Presidents will possess the latitude to design the working structure of the Presidential Office as they deem necessary for the effective conduct of their duties under the Constitution and the laws. Enactment of such legislation would be a major step forward in strengthening the Office of the President for the critical tests that will surely continue to face our Nation in the years to come. These matters are obviously devoid of partisan considerations.

My experience leads me to suggest the establishment of an Office of Executive Management in the Executive Office of the President in which would be grouped the staff functions necessary to assist the President in the discharge of his managerial responsibilities. In an enterprise as large and diversified as the executive branch of the Government, there is an imperative need for effective and imaginative central management to strengthen program planning and evaluation, promote efficiency, identify and eliminate waste and duplication, and coordinate numerous interagency operations within approved policy and statutory objectives. The establishment of an Office of Executive Management is highly desirable to help the President achieve the high standards of effective management that the Congress and the people rightfully expect.

I have given much personal study to the assistance the President needs in meeting the multitude of demands placed upon him in conducting and correlating all aspects of foreign, political, economic, social, and military affairs. I have reached the conclusion that serious attention should be given to providing in the President's Office an official ranking higher than Cabinet members, possibly with the title of First Secretary of the Government, to assist the President in consulting with the departments on the formulation of national security objectives, in coordinating international programs, and in representing the President at meetings with foreign officials above the rank of Foreign Minister and below the rank of Head of State.

Recognizing the personal nature of the relationship of each President to his Cabinet and staff, I am not submitting formal legislative proposals to implement these latter two suggestions, but I do commend them for earnest study.

Other improvements: Several other organizational reforms should be considered by the Congress:

First, a Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at Cabinet level the presently fragmented Federal functions regarding transportation activities.

Second, legislation should be enacted to strengthen the position of the Chairmen of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board by vesting in them the executive and administrative duties of their agencies. The legislation should provide that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission be designated by the President. These steps would place these Chairmen generally on a comparable basis with the chairmen of other regulatory bodies. In the case of the National Labor Relations Board, the legislation should vest all regulatory responsibilities under the National Labor Relations Act in the Board. Additionally, the responsibility of the President to control and supervise the exercise of executive functions by all Federal regulatory bodies should be clarified.

Third, action should be taken to consolidate the civil water resources functions of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, and the responsibilities of the Federal Power Commission for river basin surveys, in order to bring about long needed improvements in the coordination of the increasingly important Federal civil water resources activities.

REVIEW OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR FUNCTIONS

The remaining sections of this message discuss the budget and legislative proposals for 1962 in terms of the functions they serve. In the following table, estimated expenditures for 1962 are compared with the actual figures for 1960 and the current estimates for 1961 for each of nine major functional categories.

The expenditure total for 1962 includes an allowance for contingencies, which is intended to provide for unforeseen developments in existing programs and for programs proposed in this budget but not itemized separately.

Budget expenditures
[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate
Major national security	$45.6	$45.9	$47.4
International affairs and finance	1.8	2.3	2.7
Commerce, housing, and space technology	2.8	3.8	3.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources	4.8	4.9	5.1
Natural resources	1.7	2.0	2.1
Labor and welfare	4.4	4.5	4.8
Veterans services and benefits	5.1	5.2	5.3
Interest	9.3	9.0	8.6
General government	1.7	2.0	2.1
Allowance for contingencies		(1)	.1
Total	77.2	79.6	81.5
Deduct interfund transactions (included in both receipts and expenditures)	.7	.7	.7
Budget expenditures	76.5	78.9	80.9

[1] Less than $50 million.

MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY

The deterrent power of our Armed Forces and the forces of our allies is based on a carefully planned combination of nuclear retaliatory weapons systems together with worldwide deployment of ground, naval, and air forces in essential forward areas, backed up by strong ready reserves. These forces make up a collective security system for the free world more versatile and powerful than any military alliance in world history.

Our Nation's objective in pursuing a policy of collective security is peace with justice for all peoples. However, while we strive to eliminate the fear of war among nations, we must maintain our military strength. The recommendations made in this budget provide for an increasingly strong defense posture along with a strong national economy.

Expenditures for major national security programs in fiscal year 1962 are estimated to be $47,392 million, or $1,462 million more than for 1961. The bulk of the increase is for the military functions of the Department of Defense, reflecting mainly evolutionary growth in our country's defense programs. Military assistance in conjunction with the efforts of our allies will continue to provide the free world with modern weapons and equipment, thus strengthening the collective defense. Programs of the Atomic Energy Commission continue to emphasize weapons development and production while also providing increases for research and development on peaceful applications of atomic energy. Expenditures for stockpiling and for expansion of defense production will again decline as nearly all stockpile objectives have been met.

Department of Defense—Military: Recommended new obligational authority of $41,840 million for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1962 reflects the continued policy of adapting the Defense Establishment to expected longrun requirements. Expenditures in 1962 are estimated at $42,910 million, which is $1,410 million more than the estimate for the current fiscal year.

Major national security
[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Department of Defense—Military:				
Military functions:				
Present programs	$41,215	$41,500	$42,879	$41,809
Proposed retirement pay legislation			31	31
Military assistance	1,609	1,700	1,750	1,800
Atomic energy	2,623	2,660	2,680	2,598
Stockpiling and expansion of defense production	180	70	52	40
Total	45,627	45,930	47,392	[1] 46,278

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $44,761 million enacted for 1960 and $45,912 million (including $289 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

This increase reflects, in part, certain steps recently taken to increase the readiness of our military commands. These steps can be financed in 1961 mainly within available appropriations. However, some supplemental appropriations will be required for this year and are included in this budget.

The recommendations for 1962 continue a strong posture of readiness and add to the capability of our military forces.

To take full advantage of the results of scientific and technological developments, rapid and sometimes drastic changes must continually be made in military forces and programs. Just a few years ago the United States was programing twice as much money for manned bomber systems as for strategic missile systems. The budget for the coming fiscal year, by contrast, programs more than four times as much for strategic missile systems as for manned bomber systems. Similarly, defense against ballistic missile attack took only a small part of the total capital investment in continental air defense as recently as the fiscal year 1957, whereas in the coming fiscal year it will be a substantial percentage of the total. There has been a gradual shift from guns to missiles on surface ships, and from conventional to nuclear power for submarines. For surface ships, the relative utility of nuclear or conventional power is a question that requires case-by-case consideration in each year's shipbuilding program. In total, there has been an increased emphasis on versatile and modern multipurpose military units equipped and prepared for all forms of military action—from limited emergencies to a general war.

Forces and military personnel: To carry out basic military missions, this budget provides for a total strength in our Active Forces of 2,492,900 men and women on June 30, 1962, the same as now estimated for the end of fiscal year 1961 and 4,000 over the yearend strength originally planned for this year. A supplemental appropriation is being requested to provide for this 1961 increase, which is primarily to bring our naval forces to a greater degree of preparedness.

The Active Forces to be supported include an Army of 14 divisions and 870,000 men; a Navy of 817 active ships, and 625,000 men; a Marine Corps of 3 divisions and 3 aircraft wings with 175,000 men; and an Air Force of 84 combat wings and 822,900 men.

Worldwide deployment of these forces, and of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as well, requires a considerable amount of travel to and from duty stations. The dollar limitation on travel established by the Congress in the 1961 appropriation for the Department is not sufficient to cover all essential travel costs of military and civilian personnel. Accordingly, it is recommended that this limitation be increased by $54 million for the fiscal year 1961 and that no limitation be imposed for 1962.

If the Reserve components of our Armed Forces are to serve effectively in time of war, their basic organization and objectives must conform to the changing character and missions of the Active Forces. Under modern conditions the quality and combat readiness of the Reserve forces are more imporant than numbers. The nature of warfare has changed so drastically during the last decade that the whole concept of the roles and missions of the Reserve forces must be reevaluated.

Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been directed to make a new study of the Reserve missions and requirements. This should be aimed at the objectives of efficiency, economy, and promoting administrative effectiveness. As a first step toward a more fundamental revision, this budget provides for a reduction in the number in the Army National Guard and Army Reserve paid for participation in Reserve training from the present 400,000 and 300,000, respectively, to 360,000 and 270,000 by the end of fiscal year 1962. These recommended Reserve personnel strengths are fully adequate to meet the needs of our national defense. The statutory minimum placed on the personnel strength of the Army National Guard in the 1961 Department of Defense Appropriation Act should not be continued. The excess strengths which have been provided by the Congress above my recommendations in the last several years are unnecessarily costing the American people over $80 million annually and have been too long based on other than strictly military needs. Even with the proposed lower Reserve personnel strengths, the cost of pay, allowances, travel, and operation and maintenance for the military Reserves will amount to well over $1 billion in 1962.

Strategic forces: The strategic forces provided for in this budget consist of a combination of nuclear weapons systems of land-based and carrier-based aircraft, fixed and mobile missiles of intercontinental and intermediate range, and oversea missile systems under the military command of mutual defense treaty organizations. The composite capability of these forces represents an enormous destructive potential and should deter any potential aggressor.

Up to the present time our strategic striking forces have relied in large measure on manned bombers. Manned bombers—both land-based and carrier-based—will continue to be required. However, with the advent of operational missile systems, more and more of the strategic force in the years ahead will be composed of fixed-base and mobile ballistic missiles—both land- and sea-based. The recommendations in this budget reflect this change.

By the end of fiscal year 1962, the largest part of the planned squadrons of the Atlas ballistic missile system will be operational, and a significant number of the planned Titan missiles will be in place and ready. The solid propellant Minuteman missile system is now well along in development, and the first missiles are scheduled to become operational during the calendar year 1962. Funds are requested for 5 additional Polaris submarines, making a total of 19 submarines which will have been fully funded, and for the procurement of long leadtime components of 5 more; procurement of the appropriate number of Polaris missiles to arm these submarines is also planned, as is the continued development of a much longer range version of the Polaris missile.

Thor and Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missiles, provided to our allies overseas under the military assistance portion of the mutual security program, add still another important element of strength to the strategic forces.

All production of B–52 and B–58 manned bomber aircraft is scheduled to end in the calendar year 1962. However, as indicated in my special message to the Congress last August, additional effort is being devoted to the development of the B–70 long-range bomber. Funds are included in this budget to continue work in 1962 on the airframe and engine, and on the essential subsystems.

In addition to the forces equipped uniquely for nuclear attack, the tactical fighters and missiles of the Air Force also contribute importantly to our strategic capability. Deployed overseas, with an increasing all-weather strike capability, these tactical forces can deliver megaton-class nuclear weapons to potential enemy targets.

As a further step in strengthening the strategic forces, the Navy has been authorized to increase significantly the proportion of attack aircraft aboard carriers of the 6th and 7th Fleets. This action will substantially increase the capability of those fleets to strike enemy targets.

The very diversity of our weapons systems has created an increasing need for fully integrated operational planning. To meet this need, the Secretary of Defense has established a special staff group composed of members of the services and representatives of unified commands contributing forces to our nuclear strike capability. I have recently approved the integrated strategic operational plan prepared by that group and recommended by the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The advent of nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missiles in the hands of a potential adversary has confronted this Nation with a problem entirely new to its experience. The speed with which these weapons could be delivered against us and their tremendous destructive power make them suited to use by an enemy for surprise attack. Accordingly, this budget will continue the major effort underway during the last few years to increase the protection of our forces from surprise attack. Except for the first few squadrons of Atlas, all Atlas and Titan missiles are being deployed in hardened underground sites. All fixed-base Minutemen missiles will be so deployed. There will also be mobile squadrons of the Minuteman. The submarine Polaris system, of course, lends itself ideally to mobility and concealment and should be able to survive under all conditions.

There has also been an intensive effort to make the manned bomber force increasingly less vulnerable. Some 4 years ago the Air Force began the dispersal of these aircraft and commenced construction of special alert facilities to assure that one-third of the force could be airborne within 15 minutes of warning of an attack. Both of these programs are substantially completed. Under emergency conditions, the long-range bomber force could also use a large number of additional bases throughout the country.

As a further measure, steps have been taken to provide the heavy bomber force with an airborne alert capability. Funds are provided in this budget to continue to train crews and to acquire spare parts and other materiel so that a substantial portion of the heavy bomber force could immediately mount a 24-hours-a-day, 365-days-a-year airborne alert, should that step ever become necessary in an emergency.

Air defense forces: The emergence of the ballistic missile threat has, of course, required a revamping of our air defense forces. The speed and destructiveness of the nuclear armed ballistic missile have placed an extremely high premium on timely warning of an attack. Therefore, systems designed to provide such warning have been receiving urgent attention.

The ground-based ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS—involving a cost of nearly a billion dollars, has already been largely financed. Work on this system has been greatly accelerated and is proceeding as fast as practicable. The first of the three sites is now in operation. The second site will be in operation this year, substantially increasing the coverage. The third site is planned to become operational somewhat later. When the entire system is in full operation, our air defense forces and civilian population, as well as the strategic retaliatory forces, should have 15 minutes of warning of intercontinental ballistic missile attack.

The matter of reliable warning of ballistic missile attack is of such crucial importance to the safety of the Nation, however, that a number of other approaches are also being explored. The most advanced of these is the satellite-borne missile early warning system, Midas, which is now under accelerated development. Midas is designed to detect an enemy missile attack at the time of launching; this could about double the amount of warning time available to our military forces and civilian population. Substantial funds are included in this budget to continue development of this system at a high rate.

With the increasing reliability, accuracy, payload, and sophistication of the ballistic missile, our problem of safeguarding against surprise attack will become ever more onerous. Development of an active defense against ballistic missiles is progressing. The Nike-Zeus antimissile system is proceeding under the highest national priority, and funds for its Pacific range test facilities are included in this budget. Funds should not be committed to production until development tests are satisfactorily completed.

The entire problem of detection, tracking, and destruction of the attacking missile must be dealt with as a whole. Every avenue of research which offers any reasonable chance of success must be explored beyond the present frontiers of knowledge. That is the purpose of the group of studies now underway, which has been designated by the Department of Defense as Project Defender. Additional funds to continue this project through the coming fiscal year are also included in this budget.

As long as a manned-bomber threat to this Nation exists, we shall have to maintain a reasonable degree of defense against it. The Air Force now has underway a large-scale program for improving the capability of its existing fighter interceptor force, particularly against the low-level manned bomber. The Bomarc B ground-to-air missile program has already been funded. Production is going forward, and missiles will be delivered to the air defense units over the next few years. Additional funds are recommended to complete and modernize the Nike-Hercules ground-to-air missile system.

The Bomarc B and Nike-Hercules, together with the early models of these missiles and the very substantial force of supersonic-manned interceptors armed with air-to-air guided missiles, provide a formidable defense against manned-bomber attack. To provide the detection, warning, and control for these forces, an extensive network of radars and communications lines is being maintained and modernized. Funds for additional construction and for the procurement of equipment are included in this budget.

Sea-control forces: Control of the seas is vital to the maintenance of our national security. The naval forces, which are being provided during this fiscal year with new combat ships and increased personnel, carry the primary responsibility for this important mission.

The 1962 budget provides for active naval forces consisting of 817 combatant and support ships, including 14 attack carriers, 16 attack carrier air groups, 11 carrier antisubmarine air groups, and 37 patrol and warning air squadrons.

New and modernized ships to be delivered in 1962 from prior year authorizations will enhance the combat capability of the naval forces and permit the replacement of older ships. Among the new and modernized ships to join the

fleet in 1962 will be the first nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*; the first nuclear-powered cruiser, the *Long Beach*, armed with Talos and Terrier surface-to-air missiles; three nuclear-powered attack submarines; four Polaris submarines; and several guided-missile destroyers.

The 1962 shipbuilding program provided in this budget will further improve the fleet and help offset the increasing number of overage ships. The program consists of construction of 30 new ships and conversion of 22 others. In addition to the five Polaris fleet ballistic-missile submarines, new ships will include seven guided-missile frigates, three nuclear-powered attack submarines, six escort vessels, and nine amphibious, supply, and research ships. The conversion program includes 14 destroyers, 1 communications relay ship, 1 missile range-instrumentation ship, and 6 conventionally powered attack submarines.

A great deal of emphasis in the 1962 shipbuilding program is on antisubmarine warfare. Progress has been made in antisubmarine warfare organization and tactics. Improvements have been made in weapons and equipment, particularly antisubmarine rockets, torpedoes, and sound detection gear. However, the fast, deep running, nuclear-powered submarine of today is exceedingly difficult to detect and attack. An increase in the capability to detect and destroy enemy submarines is needed. Additional funds are requested in this budget for research and development in this area.

Tactical forces: The tactical forces include ground, naval, and air elements which are organized and trained to deal with cold war emergencies and limited war situations, as well as to be prepared for combat roles in the event of a general war. Recommendations in this budget will continue the modernization and improve the effectiveness of the tactical forces.

This budget provides for a further increase in procurement for the ground forces. Procurement of additional quantities of rifles and machineguns employing standard ammunition of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will fill the high priority needs of the Army and Marine Corps forces; the M–113 armored personnel carrier will be made available for high priority Active Army forces; the M–60 tank will be provided for the Army's highest priority deployed forces; and increasing quantities of new field communications equipment, vehicles, and self-propelled weapons will be produced.

The Army and Marine Corps will continue to buy a wide variety of tactical guided missiles and rockets, including initial quantities of the Pershing, a solid-propellent missile; a new lightweight shoulder-fired assault weapon; the Davy Crockett, which provides infantry units with a close-range atomic support weapon; and missiles such as Hawk and Redeye for defense of field forces against air attack.

Army aircraft procurement proposed for 1962 provides for 261 new aircraft compared to 229 in the 1961 program, and includes funds for surveillance and utility planes, as well as for medium cargo helicopters.

The tactical forces of the Army are supported by the tactical air wings of the Air Force, which will also be provided with an increased capability under these budget recommendations. Funds are provided for continued procurement of F–105 supersonic all-weather fighter-bombers. These aircraft, with their low-altitude performance characteristics and large carrying capacities for both nuclear and nonnuclear weapons, will strengthen significantly the air support available to tactical ground units.

Continued modernization of our existing fleet of military airlift aircraft is needed. Although the cargo and troop transport airlift now available is generally adequate, much of the fleet is approaching obsolescence. Last year a program was started to acquire the best existing transports for the most immediate needs and also to develop a new aircraft specifically designed for cargo and transport needs. The budget includes funds to continue the orderly development of this program.

Proposed legislation: Legislation is again recommended to make the necessary adjustments in military retirement pay so as to reestablish for all retired personnel the traditional relationship of their pay with active duty pay. This relationship was broken for those retired prior to June 1, 1958, when the 1958 Military Pay Act increased active duty pay without a comparable increase for those on the retirement rolls. The people affected are in most cases those who have fought through two or three of our major wars. Legislation to correct this situation should no longer be delayed.

Basic long lines communications systems in Alaska which are now operated by the Army, Air Force, and the Federal Aviation Agency should be sold to private enterprise for operation and development under appropriate regulatory supervision. Legislation is recommended which will permit the sale of these Government-owned communications facilities under adequate safeguards.

The need for maintaining the relatively small naval petroleum reserves for strictly military purposes no longer exists. Legislation is therefore recommended to transfer responsibility for the administration of these petroleum reserves from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior.

The need for manned aircraft, and for the pilots and other persons necessary to fly them, is declining gradually as more and more missiles enter the inventory of our operating forces. During the transitional period it will be necessary to remove from flying status a number of officers whose professional and managerial skills are still required by the services. The complete loss of flight pay which such removal now entails would represent a serious hardship to many officers who have served their country well and who believed they would qualify for flight pay as long as they maintained their flying proficiency. To help ease the transition which this group faces as a result of conversion to new weapons systems, the Congress should make provision for appropriate financial relief by reducing flight pay gradually for officers removed from flying status because of changing technology.

The provision of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 requiring prior congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels is inappropriate and should be repealed. Pending its repeal, the required authorizations for 1962 should be enacted promptly so that national security planning and preparation can go forward with the least possible delay. Further, in enacting the authorizations, the Congress should allow flexibility in the administration of the Department of Defense procurement programs to meet changing threats and take advantage of technological breakthroughs.

The Capehart military family housing program has admirably served its purpose. Over the last 6 years, more than 100,000 such family units were provided at a time when they were badly needed. It is now apparent that the most urgent family housing needs of the Department of Defense have been met. However, in order to place under contract presently authorized projects and to provide for a final increment of 2,025 units in 1962, it is recommended that a 1-year extension of the existing authority be enacted.

In 1958 I recommended to the Congress a comprehensive program for reorganizing the Department of Defense. While many of these recommendations were enacted, and substantial progress has been made in implementing them, one area still needing attention is the method of providing funds for the Department. As a first step, appropriations have now been enacted on a broad category basis but with specific limitations by service. I now recommend that the Congress, in acting upon the appropriation structure for the fiscal year 1962 for the Department of Defense, give earnest consideration to a plan which would make the necessary authorizations and appropriations to that Department to be administered by the Secretary, but with a substructure of sufficient identification which will retain for the Congress its constitutional prerogatives of raising and supporting the military forces of the United States.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization: The evolutionary changes in warfare that have taken place over the last decade have had a profound effect on the military plans and programs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These plans are again being reviewed and studied to take account of new weapons, better organization of the NATO military forces, and more direct channels of command to carry out NATO objectives effectively.

It is expected that the revised military plans for NATO will recognize the changes that have taken place. However, the menace of Communist military strength is growing. The NATO alliance remains vital to the security of the United States, no less than to the security of the other NATO allies. The United States will continue to contribute to the constructive and defensive tasks it has assumed.

Some changes in U.S. force deployments may become advisable in light of continuing studies of overall U.S. programs. Nevertheless, the United States will continue to provide a fully effective strategic deterrent force and will contribute to the forward deployed forces of NATO.

Military assistance: U.S. military planning has long recognized the importance of allied forces in maintaining the security of the free world. Military assistance under the mutual security program helps to strengthen the forces of more than 40 nations. New obligational authority of $1.8 billion is recommended for military assistance for 1962 to provide training and materiel for essential maintenance and modernization of forces in the countries receiving aid.

In light of the expanding scope and cost of vital military programs being borne by the United States, we cannot continue indefinitely to provide military equipment on a grant basis to nations which now have the economic and financial capability to shoulder more of the burden of the common defense. The recent improvement in the financial position of many of our allies has highlighted the need for greater sharing of this burden.

Some of the Western European countries have now assumed full financial responsibility for equipping their own military forces, in which the United States had assisted earlier. We are confident that as full partners in the common defense all nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who are able to assume this responsibility will do so. In 1962 military assistance to our Western European allies will be concentrated on selected types of new weapons and on the training required for their effective use.

This budget also reflects the continuing need to develop and maintain effective forces in other nations which are faced with serious threats of internal subversion or external aggression. Individually, and within mutual defense organizations, such as the South East Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the Central Treaty Organization—CENTO—these forces play vital roles in the defense of vast areas, predominantly in Asia and the Near East. Assistance to these nations will be concentrated largely on the strengthening of conventional forces. In addition to its military value, this assistance in the common defense effort contributes to the sharing of technical knowledge and strengthens the bonds of friendship and mutual respect among the nations of the free world.

Atomic energy activities: In 1962, expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission are estimated to be $2,680 million, compared with an estimated $2,660 million in 1961. There will be increases in several program areas, but these will be largely offset by reductions elsewhere, notably in the procurement of uranium concentrates.

Expenditures for the production of nuclear weapons in 1962 will increase over 1961, while those for the development of weapons will continue at the same rate. Work will be carried forward in 1962 to improve methods for seismic detection of underground nuclear weapons tests. The Atomic Energy Commission is also cooperating with the Department of Defense in the improvement of methods for detecting high altitude tests.

In the naval reactor program, continued efforts will be made to develop longer lived nuclear fuel. The development of a nuclear ramjet engine for missiles and of nuclear powerplants for use at remote military installations will be pursued. The efforts to develop a nuclear engine for military aircraft will be continued in 1962 on one technical approach.

Peaceful uses of atomic energy: Fundamental to progress in the peaceful uses of atomic energy is a sound and balanced program of basic research in the physical and life sciences. An important segment of this work is high energy physics. Last July, the United States began operating the alternating gradient synchrotron at the Atomic Energy Commission's Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island at the highest energy level ever attained anywhere in the world. During fiscal year 1962 two more high energy accelerators, at Cambridge, Mass., and Princeton, N.J., will begin operation. A high intensity accelerator is under construction at the Commission's Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, Ill. Legislation is again proposed to authorize construction at Stanford University of a high energy linear electron accelerator which will be 2 miles long.

The development of civilian atomic power is being carried forward intensively. Expenditures of $250 million estimated for 1962 will support major development efforts on seven reactor types, and preliminary studies and experimental work on a number of other reactor concepts. The breadth and scope of our technology in this field are unmatched in the world.

The next 18 months will see further advances toward our long-term objective of making atomic energy an alternative and economic source of power at home and abroad. The total number of major Government-owned experimental power reactors in operation will increase by 5 to a total of 10, and the number of power reactors operating in public and private utility systems will increase from 3 to 10. The 1962 budget proposes additional funds for cooperative arrangements with private and public power groups in undertaking atomic power projects which would further the objectives of the program.

Jointly with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission is pursuing Project Rover to develop a nuclear-powered rocket for possible future space missions. Expenditures for this project will increase in 1962. Continued emphasis will be given to development of small, long-lived nuclear power sources for space vehicles and other special applications. With the completion of a major experimental device in 1961, expenditures for long-term development of thermonuclear power will decrease somewhat, but the research work will continue at about current levels.

Stockpiling and expansion of defense production: Expenditures for stockpiling and expansion of defense production are estimated to decrease from $70 million in 1961 to $52 million in 1962, as outstanding contracts for delivery of strategic materials are progressively completed or terminated. Most of the objectives for the strategic stockpile are completed, and no new expansion programs are in prospect.

Of major concern now are the storage and maintenance of large quantities of strategic materials and the orderly disposal over a period of years of surplus materials. Efficient management is hampered because these materials are in several inventories, each subject to different statutory requirements. Therefore, legislation is being developed to enable consolidation of the inventories of strategic materials and provide uniform procedures for disposing of surplus materials whenever disposal will not seriously disrupt markets or adversely affect our international relations.

Nonmilitary defense: Closely related to the major national security programs are the civil defense activities of the Government. These activities are discussed with other community facilities programs in the commerce, housing, and space technology section of this message, under which the expenditures for civil and defense mobilization are classified.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

The national security and prosperity of the United States under conditions of peace and freedom require us to maintain our position of world leadership. Thus we must continue to assist in developing the resources and skills needed in many parts of the non-Communist world for the common defense and for economic growth.

Since the end of World War II, military and economic programs launched by the United States have helped to make possible the reconstruction of Europe and have thwarted the advance of Communist domination in most other areas. In recent years, the focus of these efforts has been shifting increasingly to the broader and more difficult problems of helping less-developed countries maintain their independence, build the foundations of growth, and advance the welfare of their people. Accordingly, increasing emphasis is being placed on such aspects of our international programs as development loans, technical assistance, and educational exchange. Greater use of multilateral channels is being fostered.

Expenditures for international affairs and finance programs in fiscal year 1962 are estimated at $2,712 million. The increase of $401 million over 1961 expenditures is due mainly to a greater volume of loan disbursements by the Development Loan Fund, to the second payment of our subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank, and to the expansion of activities in Latin America and Africa.

New obligational authority of $3,102 million is recommended for fiscal year 1962. This is a decrease of $105 million from the amount estimated for 1961. Increases for special assistance, commodity grant programs, and the second subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank are more than offset by the nonrecurrence of the 1961 supplemental appropriation requested for the new inter-American social and economic cooperation program.

Mutual security program: The military portion of the mutual security program was discussed as an integral part of our national security effort in the preceding section of this message. For the total mutual security program, this budget recommends new obligational authority of $4,000 million for 1962, of which $1,800 million is for military assistance, $1,950 million for economic and technical programs, and $250 million for contingencies.

The 1962 recommendation has been determined with consideration for our present balance of payments situation and the steps being taken to improve it. I have recently directed that the use of the funds provided for assistance abroad should emphasize the purchase of the necessary goods and services in the United States. Such foreign procurement as may continue will be largely confined to less-developed countries, most of which do not increase their dollar reserves to any significant extent but tend rather to use their earnings to increase their imports.

Organization and financing of international programs: Attention has been given constantly to the problem of improving the organization and administration of our international programs. For example, most of the recommendations of the President's Commitee To Study the Military Assistance Program have already been fully or partially adopted. As required by section 604 of the Mutual Security Act of 1960, further analysis is being made of ways to improve the overall management and coordination of our various assistance programs. These studies will provide the basis for specific recommendations on organization later in the year when the detailed mutual security program for 1962 is presented to the Congress. Other studies concerning possible changes in the appropriation structure are currently under way.

In addition to possible improvements in the organization of foreign economic activities, the Congress is urged to consider means by which funds can be provided through the normal budgetary process to meet the needs of more than one specific fiscal year. This applies particularly to programs of long-term economic development and technical assistance in the training of manpower and the creation of basic economic, social, and governmental institutions. The provision of longer term financing should not only enable a more effective use of aid but, in the long run, should be more economical.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Economic and financial assistance:				
Mutual security—Economic:				
Development Loan Fund	$202	$275	$425	$700
Defense support	741	705	665	650
Special assistance	255	250	256	298
Technical cooperation	172	183	190	203
Other	114	112	119	99
Mutual security—Contingencies	129	150	220	250
Subtotal, mutual security—economic and contingencies	1,613	1,675	1,875	2,200
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program			50	
Inter-American Development Bank	80		110	110
International Development Association		74	62	62
Export-Import Bank	−323	−100	−4	
Commodity grants for emergency relief and development abroad (title II, Public Law 480) and other	107	285	151	257
Subtotal, economic and financial assistance	1,477	1,934	2,243	2,628
Conduct of foreign affairs:				
Department of State, administration of foreign affairs	$215	$210	$228	$233
Proposed legislation for Philippine claims			49	49
Tariff Commission and other	4	4	3	3
Foreign information and exchange activities:				
United States Information Agency	113	125	138	140
Department of State, exchange of persons	24	37	50	48
Total	1,833	2,310	2,712	[1] 3,102

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $2,672 million enacted for 1960 and $3,207 million (including $666 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

Eligibility for assistance: Legislation is again requested to allow greater flexibility in providing assistance to certain countries which are not in a position to meet the requirements of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act—Battle Act. Complex, time-consuming waiver procedures are now required for cases in which our own interests would be clearly fostered by the prompt extension of aid to countries endeavoring to reduce their dependence on the Soviet bloc.

Mutual security program

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Military assistance	$1,609	$1,700	$1,750	$1,800
Economic (including technical) assistance	1,484	1,525	1,655	1,950
Contingencies	129	150	220	250
Total, mutual security	3,223	3,375	3,625	[1] 4,000

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,226 million enacted for 1960 ($1,331 million military, $1,895 million economic and contingencies) and $3,931 million estimated for 1961 ($1,800 million military, $2,131 million economic and contingencies).

Economic and financial assistance: The efforts of less-developed countries in mobilizing their domestic resources for economic growth will have to be supplemented during the next decade by continued investment from the economically more advanced countries. This investment will have to come from four major sources.

First, an increasing share should be private capital, which could increase directly the productive capacities within these countries. Among the steps taken by the U.S. Government to foster this goal are the negotiation of investment treaties and the provision of information on investment opportunities. Efforts are also being made to use, where appropriate, existing guarantee authority. Private sources, such as foundations and other specialized groups, should also continue their substantial contributions to the oversea schools, hospitals, and churches, so important in promoting democratic society.

Second, increased investment may be expected through international organizations. In addition to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development there are now the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank. These institutions are supported by contributions from many countries. Also, the United Nations Special Fund is receiving increasing subscriptions from member countries. Further, the Congress should authorize the United States to join the countries of Europe and Canada in the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development which will replace the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. The new organization will extend and invigorate the practice of consultation among its members and will help find ways to facilitate the flow of investment funds to less-developed countries.

Third, a greatly increased share of the needed investment must come from the bilateral programs of other industrialized nations. In the post-World War II era many of the other developed countries have succeeded in rebuilding their economies and have established a high rate of economic growth. In recent years they have substantially increased their gold and foreign exchange reserves. The time has come for such countries to augment materially their financing of the growth of the less-developed areas, and there is evidence of growing willingness on their part to do so. Strenuous efforts are being made to persuade our partner nations to accelerate significantly the pace at which they are taking on responsibilities for economic assistance as well as for the common defense.

Finally, commonsense, good will, and national interest require that the U.S. Government continue substantial assistance. The needs of the less-developed countries cannot be met wholly by the efforts of private investors, international organizations, or other industrial countries.

Loans for economic development: In 1962, the United States will pay the second installments of its subscriptions to

both the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank. However, successful development in many countries is dependent upon additional loans from outside sources. The Export-Import Bank expects to commit $602 million for development loans, and this budget proposes that $700 million be made available in 1962 to the Development Loan Fund. Both agencies now have requests for a variety of productive projects in such fields as electric power, transportation, and industrial facilities. In some countries, such as India and Pakistan, loans will be needed on a basis broader than individual projects to insure the success of development plans.

There is a pressing need to approve financing for development projects in several countries over and above the level of funds presently available to the Development Loan Fund. Accordingly, a supplemental appropriation of $150 million for 1961 is required. This supplemental request, if approved, together with funds already appropriated for 1961, would make available the full amount requested in the 1961 budget.

Mainly because of earlier commitments, expenditures by the Development Loan Fund are estimated at $425 million in 1962, an increase of $150 million over 1961. The Export-Import Bank plans to finance its operations without incurring net budget expenditures in 1962 by encouraging private lenders to participate in its loan programs, by using funds obtained from repayments and interest on prior loans, and by selling notes from its large portfolio.

Loans of the Development Loan Fund will continue to be made repayable largely in local currencies in order not to draw on the limited foreign exchange resources of the recipient countries.

Latin America: A supplemental appropriation of $500 million is recommended for 1961 for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program which was authorized by the last Congress. This amount represents the total authorization and therefore no further appropriation will be required for 1962. These funds will be used for a broad range of projects of direct benefit to the people of Latin America in such fields as housing, education, agricultural improvements and land utilization.

When plans become firmer, a supplemental appropriation for 1961 should be requested for earthquakes reconstruction in Chile under the $100 million authorization enacted by the last Congress. To cover interim needs a $20 million grant from mutual security contingency funds has been made available to Chile, and surplus agricultural commodities valued at $29 million are being shipped under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480.

Defense support and special assistance: New obligational authority of $650 million for 1962 is proposed for defense support, a reduction of $25 million from 1961, and $298 million is recommended for special assistance, an increase of $66 million over 1961. These programs not only help maintain substantial military strength by free world countries rimming the Soviet bloc, but also include special economic programs in certain vital countries, and provide for the continuance of other special programs such as malaria eradication. The increase in special assistance funds recommended for 1962 is due principally to the growing need for aid to Africa. Other countries which have had a traditional interest in that continent may be expected to continue the constructive work started there, and their assistance, like ours, should increasingly be channeled through an expanded United Nations effort which we have proposed.

In estimating the requirements for defense support and special assistance, full account has again been taken of the substantial amount of economic assistance in the form of surplus agricultural commodities which may be programed under Public Law 480. For 1962, the budget estimates provide for placing almost complete reliance on Public Law 480 for financing the Government programs for export of surplus farm products, but the mutual security program will continue to finance exports which cannot readily be programed under Public Law 480. The requirement that a specified portion of mutual security funds be used to finance exports of these commodities should be eliminated.

Technical cooperation: The scope and effectiveness of our technical assistance activities have been expanding, and this trend may be expected to continue. Experience has shown that improved human resources within a country are just as vital to development as capital assistance from without. New obligational authority of $203 million is requested for 1962 for technical cooperation programs, compared with $184 million enacted for 1961. Part of the increase is for a larger contribution to the United Nations Special Fund and United Nations technical assistance programs to support the continuing expansion of their work which has been made possible by larger contributions from other countries.

Contingency fund and other assistance: Events of the past year have reemphasized the need for a fund to provide the President with the flexibility to meet international contingencies which cannot be foreseen in the budget. The situation in Africa continues fluid, and major emergency requirements are possible in other areas as well. To provide for such contingencies new obligational authority of $250 million is recommended under the mutual security program for 1962, about the same as provided for 1961. This is the minimum amount required for the coming year consonant with the responsibilities of the President.

Funds are also authorized under the Mutual Security Act for administration and for contributions to specialized programs such as those for refugees, atoms for peace, and children's welfare. For these purposes, new obligational authority of $99 million for 1962 is recommended. This amount is $6 million higher than available for 1961, due mainly to expanding administrative needs in Africa and Latin America.

Conduct of foreign affairs: In 1962, the Department of State plans to expand further its activities in three important areas of its work. The number of diplomatic and consular posts in Africa is expected to increase from 36 in 1960 to 49 by the end of 1962. A Disarmament Administration has been established within the Department of State, and expansion of this activity is proposed. The Department will also intensify its efforts to increase U.S. exports, complementing efforts of the Department of Commerce.

During the calendar year 1960, there were 17 countries in Africa which gained their independence. Official representation with these new governments must be established as early as possible and preparation must be made for representation in other countries soon to become independent. Because of the large number of new nations, a supplemental appropriation for 1961 is requested to cover costs of establishing new diplomatic and consular posts in Africa and raising certain existing consulates to embassy status.

Legislation previously recommended to authorize payment of certain war damage claims of the Philippine Government should be enacted at an early date. The Congress should also act promptly to remove the existing reservation on acceptance by the United States of jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice—the World Court.

Foreign information and exchange activities: Substantial increases have been recommended in the 1962 budget for exchange programs and the programs of the U.S. Information Agency in Latin America and Africa, made possible, in part, by reductions in activities in Western Europe. It is essential that these activities be stepped up in these areas to the extent of our ability to do so effectively. The 1962 budget recognizes this need. However, if the developing situation indicates both a further need for additional resources and an ability effectively to utilize them, we should stand ready to expand further these efforts. In Africa, 20 new information centers requiring sizable initial costs will be put into operation in 1961 and 1962, mostly in the newly independent countries. In Latin America, special efforts will continue toward expanding and strengthening activities of the binational cultural centers. Construction of new, more powerful radio facilities for worldwide broadcasting is underway in North Carolina, with completion expected in December 1962. Initial activities are underway toward the construction of a radio facility in Liberia. In 1962, further improvement of facilities of the Voice of America abroad is proposed by quintupling the transmitter power in the United Kingdom and by procurement of a transportable radio relay station to meet special needs on short notice.

The budget also provides for an expansion of cultural presentation activities and exhibits at international fairs abroad. Funds for this purpose are included in the estimates for the U.S. Information Agency instead of being appropriated to the President as in previous

years. The trade mission segment of the program is included in the estimates for the Department of Commerce.

Activities under our cultural exchange agreement with the Soviet Union continue to progress mainly under private auspices. There are plans to exchange three Government-sponsored exhibits beginning this spring, each of which will be shown in several cities. A supplemental appropriation is proposed for 1961 to take advantage of this opportunity to demonstrate American achievements to a wide segment of the Russian people.

Further expansion in the programs of the Department of State for the exchange of persons is proposed in 1962, particularly in Africa. Continuing support of workshops and foreign university chairs in American studies, as well as assistance to American-sponsored schools abroad, is planned. An increase in the Department's new program of cultural and educational development abroad will permit many new contacts between foreign and American universities. The 1962 estimates include funds for the continued development of the Hawaii Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West.

COMMERCE, HOUSING, AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY

The Federal Government provides a wide variety of aids to transportation, operates the postal service, fosters local and private initiative in housing and urban renewal, provides financial and other aids to small businesses and to areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and helps finance civil defense preparations. Expenditures for many of these and other commerce and housing programs will continue to increase as workloads rise and past commitments for construction and expansion fall due. Moreover, the Government's outer space activities are requiring substantially increased expenditures. Nevertheless, the total expenditures of $3.4 billion estimated for the fiscal year 1962 for commerce, housing, and space technology are $413 million less than the expenditures now estimated for 1961, primarily because legislation is proposed to increase postal rates and thus eliminate the postal deficit financed from the general fund.

Space exploration and flight technology: Civil space activities being carried forward under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration include: (1) The development of larger and improved space vehicles, new types of propulsion and equipment, and a wide range of necessary supporting research and development; (2) the development of systems of meteorological and communications satellites; and (3) the search for new knowledge about the universe through unmanned, and eventually manned, space exploration. The NASA also carries on research related to new and improved types of aircraft and missiles, chiefly to support programs of the military services.

Expenditures for civil space programs are estimated at $965 million during fiscal year 1962, which is $195 million more than in 1961 and $564 million more than in 1960. Appropriations of $1,110 million for 1962, and supplemental appropriations of $50 million for 1961, are recommended in this budget. Legislation is being proposed to authorize the appropriations required for 1962 and to provide permanent authorization for later years. In addition, amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 are again being proposed to improve the organization and management of the space programs.

We have just cause to be proud of the accomplishments of our space programs to date and can look forward with confidence to future achievements which will succeed in extending ever further the horizons of our knowledge.

Commerce, housing, and space technology

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Space exploration and flight technology	$401	$770	$965	$1,110
Promotion of aviation:				
Federal Aviation Agency	508	640	730	686
Civil Aeronautics Board	60	87	82	84
Promotion of water transportation:				
Department of Commerce	269	279	338	293
Coast Guard	238	262	272	296
Panama Canal Company	(1)	16	10	
Provision of highways	38	39	(2) (2)	(2)
Postal service:				
Public service costs	37	49	63	63
Postal deficit under present law	488	897	843	843
Proposed rate revisions		−160	−843	−843
Community development and facilities:				
Urban Renewal Administration	108	159	208	310
Other	22	25	31	4
Public housing programs	134	153	170	183
Other aids to housing:				
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:				
Present program	−20	−35	−64	
Proposed premium increase			−164	
Federal Housing Administration	−53	3	21	53
Veterans housing loans:				
Present program	206	100	115	150
Proposed limitation on eligibility			−30	
Federal National Mortgage Association	−30	113	75	285
College housing loans	201	172	200	100
Farm housing loans and other	−25	−39	26	12
Other aids to business:				
Small Business Administration	63	58	94	24
Proposed area assistance legislation			10	83
Other	33	56	58	71
Regulation of commerce and finance	58	67	74	73
Civil and defense mobilization	46	50	81	104
Disaster loans and relief	−1	14	7	9
Total	2,782	3,784	3,371	[3] 3,993

[1] Less than $½ million.

[2] Reflects proposed financing of Federal-aid highways in national forests and public lands from highway trust fund.

[3] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,784 million enacted for 1960 and $4,612 million (including $203 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

The first attempts to develop communications systems have met with outstanding success with both the Echo I passive communications satellite, which has reflected signals between widely distant stations on the ground, and the Courier active communications satellite of the Department of Defense, which has stored and relayed messages transmitted to it from the ground. We are now ready, therefore, to take the first steps leading to a practical satellite communications system for commercial use. While the special nature of space operations makes it necessary and proper for the Government to take the lead in advancing the needed research and development of satellites for commercial communications use and to conduct the launchings, private industry should participate in the development phase and should be aggressively encouraged to assume the costs of the establishment and operation of the commercial system. The recommendations in the 1962 budget, including a supplemental estimate for 1961, provide for moving ahead rapidly with the development of an active communications satellite system for commercial use, and anticipate that private concerns will provide $10 million in 1962 in support of the program.

In the field of meteorology we have also achieved success with the Tiros I and Tiros II satellites. The 1962 recommendations provide for further experiments with more advanced Tiros and Nimbus satellites, which may provide the basis for an operational system for weather forecasting and research.

In the program for manned space flight, the reliability of complex booster, capsule, escape, and life-support components of the Mercury system is now being tested to assure a safe manned ballistic flight into space, and hopefully a manned orbital flight, in calendar year 1961. Further testing and experimentation will be necessary to establish whether there are any valid scientific reasons for extending manned space flight beyond the Mercury program.

In unmanned space exploration, the scientific information received from our earth satellites and space probes has taught us a great deal about the earth and surrounding space. In the near future, the first launching under the Ranger unmanned lunar exploration program will take place. This program will eventually include the increasingly complex Surveyor and Prospector series. Investigations in the vicinity of the planets Mars and Venus are planned under Project Mariner with initial launchings scheduled for 1962. Large earth-orbiting astronomical and geophysical observatories are also planned as successors to our present scientific satellites.

The success of many of the advanced projects planned for 1962 and future years will depend on the success of the new and powerful Centaur and Saturn launch vehicles. Steady progress has been made on these boosters, which use proven liquid propellant in the lower stages and advanced liquid hydrogen propellant in the upper stages. The weight-lifting capability of the Saturn launch vehicle will surpass any currently known to exist.

Transportation and communication: Few segments of our economic system are

more essential to economic growth and national defense than an adequate and efficient transportation and communication network. This budget reflects important actions underway to modernize Federal transportation and communication programs. As a basis for future legislation, the Congress also has before it a comprehensive study of our Nation's transportation system completed last year by the Secretary of Commerce.

Aviation: The expanded program to improve air traffic control and navigation services, begun in 1957, is advancing rapidly under the direction of the Federal Aviation Agency. Over this period budget expenditures for the promotion of civil aviation have risen from $219 million to an estimated $811 million for 1962. Large numbers of radars and instrument landing aids, as well as many new navigation aids and other airway facilities, have been placed in operation. Substantial progress has been made in achieving joint use of facilities for air defense and air traffic management purposes. The improvements being provided and those now under active development by the Federal Aviation Agency will help assure accommodation of a growing volume of air traffic with maximum safety and efficiency.

The continuing expansion of the modernization effort will cause expenditures of the Federal Aviation Agency to rise by $90 million to an estimated $730 million in 1962. New obligational authority of $686 million is being requested, primarily for procurement of additional equipment, for operating the airways system, and for conducting research and development of new equipment and techniques.

New legislation is recommended to authorize appropriations for continuing Federal grants-in-aid for airport construction beyond 1961. In this legislation, the present method of providing new obligational authority by contract authorization in substantive legislation should be changed to appropriations which are subject to the normal executive and congressional review process, but still provide for adequate advance planning by localities. For 1962, this budget includes recommended appropriations of $40 million, which is $23 million less than the presently authorized level. The reduction reflects the sound policy that the level should progressively be reduced and that, after a reasonable transition period, users and benefiting communities should assume full responsibility for the construction of airports, which should be largely self-financed.

Legislation is again recommended to establish a Federal corporation to operate the Washington National and Dulles International Airports in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. This arrangement will provide greater management flexibility to meet changing requirements and permit more business-like operations.

Subsidies to local-service airlines, including intra-Alaska operations and helicopter services in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York, continue to be excessive. These Federal payments currently average about $12 per passenger-trip for all trips of local-service carriers. The reduction in subsidy expenditures of the Civil Aeronautics Board from $87 million in 1961 to $82 million in 1962 reflects the large nonrecurring payments in 1961 to reduce the backlog of unpaid subsidies from prior years rather than any reduction in accruing subsidies. According to current Board estimates, subsidies will rise to a peak in fiscal year 1963 and will remain above $80 million through 1966. Strong demands for additional services and for new routes to smaller communities could cause further increases in subsidies because the potential traffic is inadequate to pay the full costs of the services.

The dependence of these local-service carriers on the Federal Government should be reduced. Toward this end positive action is needed from both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Congress. The Board should discontinue the least essential routes and stops in accordance with its use-it-or-lose-it policy, and should also develop other means of limiting Federal support. The Congress should review the basic promotional policy of the Federal Aviation Act, giving special attention to the question of whether the national interest justifies continuing substantial Federal payments to sustain deficit operations for service to points with very limited traffic.

Domestic trunk airlines, now self-supporting, provide more passenger miles of transportation than any other common carriers. In view of this evidence of the industry's growing maturity, the Congress should enact legislation to make trunk lines ineligible for subsidies after a period of subsidy-free operations. This will remove a potential burden on Federal resources.

Airway user charges: The civilian users of the Federal airways system enjoy substantial benefits from the large and growing Government outlays for improved traffic control and navigation services. Federal costs for operating and improving the airways system, excluding airport grants and weather and other indirect services, now approach $600 million a year. It is wholly appropriate that civilian users begin to assume a more reasonable share of these costs, most of which are now borne by the general taxpayer.

To achieve this purpose, it is again recommended that the present tax on aviation gasoline be increased from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and that the 4½-cent tax rate be extended to jet fuels, which are now tax free. In addition, receipts from the existing and proposed aviation gasoline taxes should be placed in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund as at present. There is no sound reason for using these taxes to finance highway construction. The airlines should be assured that these tax increases may be reflected promptly in fare adjustments.

Promotion of water transportation: The steadily rising cost of operating U.S. merchant ships is seriously hampering our efforts to achieve a healthy, competitive merchant marine industry. Net expenditures by the Department of Commerce, chiefly the Maritime Administration, in 1962 are estimated at $338 million, up from $279 million in 1961. Expenditures for replacement of war-built cargo ships are estimated to rise by $23 million, and outlays for operating subsidies are expected to be $32 million more than in 1961.

In order to assist the shipping industry to achieve lower costs and a stronger competitive position, the Government has recently initiated a new research and development program. A primary objective of this program is to make available the new equipment necessary to mechanize shipboard operations along the lines already well established in shoreside industries. The full cooperation of Government, industry, and labor will be required to assure the success of this program. Established practices and legislative policies must be reassessed, and attention must be focused on measures most likely to enhance the competitive position of U.S. merchantmen in international trade. If the United States is to maintain its position as a maritime nation, if the industry is to be reasonably profitable and less dependent upon Government aid, and if maritime employment is to be stable and wages high, continuous bold innovations are necessary.

It is again requested that the inflexible 3½-percent interest rate on ship mortgage loans made by the Maritime Administration be replaced by authority to charge the Government's full cost for such loans.

Expenditures by the Coast Guard are estimated at $272 million in 1962, which is $10 million more than in 1961. This increase reflects the operation of new loran stations, higher repair and maintenance costs, modernization of facilities, and replacement of equipment, such as patrol vessels, rescue helicopters, and aids to navigation.

Construction will continue on the Balboa Bridge across the Panama Canal. Widening of the canal from 300 to 500 feet in the area of the Continental Divide will also continue, in order to accommodate increased ship traffic. As a result of some increase in toll revenues and some decrease in capital outlays, budget expenditures of the Panama Canal Company in 1962 will be $6 million less than in 1961. The Company should be authorized to reimburse the U.S. Treasury for various costs associated with its operations which are not now recovered, including the increased annuity payable to the Republic of Panama in accordance with the treaty of 1955, and legislation to this end is proposed.

Following extensive study, I have concluded that the commercial activities of the Panama Steamship Line should be discontinued and the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company has been requested to take appropriate steps to do so. Commercial shippers now using the Panama Line have been notified of this action, and complete cessation of commercial activities of the line is to be accomplished by February 10, 1961. Thereafter, the activities of the line should be confined solely to the transportation of passengers and freight for the account of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government. This action will undoubtedly require a reappraisal of the line's operations, including

a review of the need for supplying company-owned shipping services to the Panama Canal Company from the continental United States, in the light of national maritime considerations and established Government policy to avoid undue competition with private enterprise.

Highways: The Interstate Highway System has progressed considerably since the enactment of the Highway Act of 1956, with almost 10,000 miles now open to traffic. Active work is underway on another 14,600 miles, of which approximately 1,600 miles are expected to be open to traffic by the end of calendar year 1961. To continue this progress and assure timely completion of the Interstate System, two important legislative actions are required. The highway fuel tax should be increased to 4½ cents per gallon, as previously recommended, and the rate should be continued at this level through 1972, instead of reverting to 3 cents on July 1, 1961, as provided by present law. The unwise diversion of automotive excise taxes from the general fund to the highway trust fund, also scheduled for July 1, 1961, should be rescinded.

Adoption of these recommendations will make it possible to complete the Interstate System in 1973 to meet the traffic needs for which it is designed. The enactment of my previous recommendations to (1) transfer financing of forest and public lands highways, which for the most part are components of the Federal aid systems, from the general fund to the highway trust fund and (2) retain the receipts from aviation gas taxes in the general funds, will not extend this planned completion date. Under the proposed program, Federal payments from the trust fund for highways in fiscal year 1962 are estimated at $3,029 million, up from $2,868 million in 1961.

The Secretary of Commerce, in a report submitted to the Congress this month, is presenting a current estimate of $37 billion as the total Federal cost of the Interstate System. The estimated construction costs of this 41,000-mile system are about $1 billion less than in the 1958 estimate, but the new total includes the cost of highway planning and administration not previously included.

Postal service: During recent years, the Post Office Department has been conducting a large-scale modernization program to improve the delivery of mail and to reduce handling costs per unit. For example, a new system of mail transportation and distribution is now providing overnight delivery of letter mail within all principal metropolitan areas. Modern mail processing systems with electronic and mechanical equipment developed under the direction of the Department are already in operation in 17 major postal facilities, and similar installations will soon be in use in 48 others.

While the modernization program has increased the efficiency of postal operations and will contribute to savings in future costs, it cannot materially reduce the enormous postal deficit. In fiscal year 1962 this deficit is estimated at $843 million, after deduction of the $63 million estimated cost of services benefiting the public at large computed in accordance with the principles used by the Congress in previous years. The deficit is largely the result of the enactment by the Congress in the postwar years of postal pay increases without corresponding rate increases.

In the Postal Policy Act of 1958, the Congress established the policy that postal rates should be kept high enough to recover postal expenses except for the cost of certain public services as fixed by appropriation acts. In accordance with this policy, rate increases adequate to cover such expenses were proposed to the Congress in 1959 and again in 1960. No rate legislation was enacted in either year. With record postal deficits in prospect for the current fiscal year and for 1962, rate increases must be provided promptly to achieve a self-supporting postal service. Accordingly, I strongly urge that additional revenue of $843 million be provided for the fiscal year 1962 and that the higher rates be made effective by April 1, 1961, in order to reduce the postal deficit for the fiscal year 1961. Such action is necessary to eliminate the drain upon the Treasury of this mounting deficit for which there is no justification in law or in equity.

Housing and community development: During the past decade, housing construction and improvement have gone forward at the highest level in history. The housing shortages of the postwar period have been largely met, and the housing conditions of the great bulk of the population improved. At the same time, major new governmental and private programs have begun to reverse the blight and deterioration afflicting our urban areas. Thus, a solid base has been laid for greater progress in the decade of the sixties.

In the future, as in the past, the best results will be obtained by emphasizing leadership and financial participation by private industry and by local and State public agencies. Federal assistance can be most effective, most consistent with our free institutions, and least costly to the taxpayers if it emphasizes the supplementary action needed to help overcome obstacles to private and local accomplishment.

The major needs for the immediate future can best be met by assuring private groups and local governments of the continuing availability of existing Federal programs. Unfortunately, at the present time most housing programs require legislative action at frequent intervals merely to continue present operations. These programs are no longer experimental. Their continued availability should not depend upon the enactment of legislation which also often includes controversial changes. Rather, the major existing housing programs, like most other Federal programs, should be authorized permanently subject only to normal annual budgetary review by the executive branch and the Congress.

Urban renewal: The nationwide program to rebuild and rehabilitate our cities continues to grow. By the close of the current fiscal year, an estimated 68 projects in 50 cities will be completed, another 577 projects will be underway, and planning for 310 more will be in process. These 955 projects will ultimately have required a total of almost $2 billion in Federal grants to pay two-thirds of the net cost. If present trends continue, approximately the same amount may also be needed for Federal purchases of mortgages to finance construction of housing connected with the same projects. This Federal aid will generate much greater private and local investment and will result in substantial increases in property values and in tax revenues to local public agencies.

This vital program should move forward on a basis which gives adequate assurance to local communities of continuing Federal assistance and also places proper emphasis on local participation. Accordingly, permanent authority should replace the present annual statutory limitations on Federal grants, with annual amounts provided through the normal appropriation process. Further, the local share in project costs should be increased from one-third to one-half to reflect more adequately the increases in local tax revenues and other direct benefits to the communities participating in the program. For the fiscal year 1962 new obligational authority of $300 million is recommended.

Urban planning: The various housing and urban renewal programs and the Federal-aid highway program have important impacts on the character and development of our rapidly growing metropolitan areas. To help assure that these aids make the maximum contribution to sound community development, the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator have established a new procedure for the joint use of urban planning grants and Federal-aid highway research and planning funds for comprehensive metropolitan planning. This procedure is intended not only to produce better planning for the use of Federal, State, and local funds, but also to encourage effective coordination and cooperation among the many local governments and the State and Federal agencies engaged in metropolitan development activities. To help carry out the new approach, as well as to aid mass-transit planning and to meet other expanding requirements, it is recommended that the present statutory limitations on appropriations for urban planning grants be removed and that the appropriation for such grants be increased to $10 million for 1962 from the $4 million appropriated for 1961.

Public housing programs: By the close of the fiscal year 1962 an estimated 522,000 federally aided public housing units will be occupied, and construction will be underway on 49,000 more units. Another 49,000 units will be under contract for Federal contributions but construction will not yet have been started on these units. In view of the large number of authorized units not yet under construction, no additional authorization is recommended in this budget. Expenditures for contributions to local authorities will increase in 1962 largely because of subsidies required on newly occupied units.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: A year ago legislation was recommended to provide needed increases in the insurance reserve of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures the share accounts of institutions representing the largest source of home mortgage financing. Because of the continuing rapid growth of these institutions, the Corporation's reserves are still only 0.66 percent of the insured liability, and legislation is even more necessary now. Therefore, it is recommended that the present unnecessarily high requirement for investment in stock of the Federal home loan banks be reduced, and that insured savings and loan associations be required to make additional prepayments of insurance premiums of approximately the amounts of that reduction. The objective should be to build up the secondary reserves of the Corporation until total reserves reach 2 percent of the insurance liabilities. This proposal would cause a much more rapid increase in the insurance reserves of the Corporation, by adding an extra $164 million in 1962. It would not significantly increase the costs to member associations, but would allocate more realistically the combined resources of the home loan banks and the Corporation.

Insurance of private mortgages: The Federal Housing Administration expects to increase its commitments to insure mortgages from about 800,000 housing units in the fiscal year 1961 to over 900,000 units in 1962; about 40 percent of the 1962 commitments will be mortgages on newly built houses. However, since the present amount of insurance authority will be used up within the next few months, prompt action is needed to prevent interruption of this important program. The Congress should remove the present ceiling on this authority so that home buyers, builders, and lenders can count upon the continued availability of Federal mortgage insurance.

Legislation should also be enacted to make permanent the authority to insure loans on home improvements, which expires October 1, 1961. This program, initiated in 1934, has proved to be an important aid to modernization of existing homes, and its continuance should no longer depend on periodic congressional action.

Statutory ceilings on interest rates for certain types of mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration, as well as for direct and guaranteed loans of the Veterans' Administration, have from time to time limited the effectiveness of these programs. In the past, the Congress has recognized the need for some increased flexibility in such interest rates in order to attract adequate private capital. In the present situation, the interest rate ceiling of 5¼ percent on housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration is a serious obstacle to adequate private financing. The similar ceiling on insured mortgages for rental housing, especially for the new housing program for the elderly, and the ceiling of 4½ percent on family housing for members of the armed services also discourage private financing. As previously recommended, these ceilings should be increased or removed by the Congress. The success of the new mortgage insurance program for nursing homes in obtaining private funds through slightly higher interest rates illustrates the importance of adequate flexibility in such rates.

Veterans housing loans: The last Congress extended the veterans direct housing loan program of the Veterans' Administration for another 2 years, provided new obligational authority of $150 million for such loans for each of the fiscal years 1961 and 1962, and provided for a 2-year extension of the loan guarantee program for World War II veterans. The need for continuing the readjustment benefit programs of direct loans and loan guarantees for World War II veterans has long since passed.

Changes are recommended in the direct loan program to (1) confine this program, beginning July 26, 1961, to veterans of the Korean conflict, (2) extend the program for Korean conflict veterans from the present termination date of July 25, 1962, until February 1, 1965—the same termination date as for loan guarantees for these veterans—and (3) finance the extended program from funds already authorized, augmented by funds from repayment of loans previously made. These changes will permit a satisfactory program of aid for veterans of the Korean conflict with expenditures of $85 million in 1962, a reduction of $15 million from 1961.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program: Authority for the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Committee expires October 1, 1961. Under present unrealistic interest rate limitations, this program cannot contribute substantially to the financing of guaranteed home loans to veterans in remote areas. Other federally insured loans are, however, being placed for borrowers in such areas and for members of minority groups. The Committee is also now trying to find private financing for mortgages eligible for special assistance by the Federal National Mortgage Association. This program should, therefore, be extended for another 2 years.

Mortgage purchases: Mortgage financing requirements for housing for displaced families, for elderly families, and in urban renewal areas, will continue to increase in 1962. Despite the progress made by the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Committee in finding some private financing, the bulk of the financing needs for these types of housing will continue to be met through mortgage purchases by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance functions. The Association will require, for this purpose, additional new obligational authority of $250 million in 1962; the legislation should authorize provision of this amount through the appropriation process.

Through its secondary market operations trust fund, the Federal National Mortgage Association will purchase an estimated $1 billion of insured and guaranteed mortgages of all types at market prices. Unlike the special assistance program, which is wholly financed by the Federal Government, almost all of the necessary funds for secondary market operations will be provided by sale of debentures to private investors and by purchase of common stock by mortgage sellers. New obligational authority of $35 million, however, is estimated to be required for additional Treasury subscriptions to the Association's preferred stock.

College housing: Legislation enacted by the last Congress provided sufficient authority to continue the present college housing program into the fiscal year 1962. I have previously recommended a new program to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide Federal assistance for university facilities of all types through loan guarantees and grants. As a transition to that new and broader program, new obligational authority of $100 million for college housing loans is recommended for 1962. Together with funds from existing authorizations, this will permit new loan commitments of $200 million in 1962.

Promotion and regulation of business: The Federal Government provides a variety of direct and indirect aids to business enterprises. At the same time, Federal regulatory agencies and programs enforce competition and regulate monopoly in many specific areas.

Small business: Federal assistance to small business will continue to grow in 1962. Financial aid under the Small Business Investment Act to both small business investment companies and to State and local development companies is increasing at a rapid rate. The number of such investment companies is expected to exceed 400 by the end of June 1962, compared to 109 in June 1960, thus expanding the supply of private capital available to small businesses. Other loans by the Small Business Administration will continue at a high level, as will the efforts to assist small businesses in obtaining a larger share of Federal procurement and research contracts and in improving management methods. Special efforts are being made to provide assistance to firms displaced by urban renewal projects and firms in labor surplus areas.

Legislation should be enacted to extend the important program of loans to local development companies, which otherwise expires at the end of the current fiscal year. In addition, legislation is again requested to extend the privilege of simplified filings under the Securities Act of 1933 to a wider range of securities issues, and thus to facilitate small business financing.

Area assistance: The Department of Commerce, with the assistance of 16 other departments and major agencies, has further extended in the past year the wide range of Federal aids to local communities suffering from severe and chronic unemployment. However, private groups and local public officials must provide the primary initiative in finding successful permanent solutions for the difficult problems of their specific areas.

For the past 5 years I have repeatedly recommended legislation which would provide the authority necessary for more effective Federal assistance without merely substituting temporary Federal aid for indispensable local leadership.

Alternative proposals enacted by the Congress, which would have been less effective and more expensive, have been vetoed. The Congress is again urged to enact sound legislation to permit reasonable increases in Federal aid through a program of loans and grants. This program should continue to be administered by the Secretary of Commerce to avoid establishment of an unnecessary new agency. Appropriations of $83 million for 1962 are requested to initiate the expanded Federal program.

Export expansion: The national export expansion program launched early last year by the Department of Commerce has already had considerable success. This budget includes recommendations for additional appropriations to help achieve further increases in exports and to place greater emphasis on encouraging travel to the United States.

New York World's Fair: The Secretary of Commerce, at my request, is developing plans, in anticipation of authorizing legislation, for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair scheduled to open in the spring of 1964.

Regulation of commerce and finance: Under this budget, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board will be further strengthened. The appropriations recommended for these five independent regulatory agencies will finance a staff 40 percent greater than at the end of 1956, an expansion clearly required by the growth of regulated industries, by new legislative responsibilities, and by the increased complexity of the problems involved. Numerous improvements in agency operations to simplify procedures and reduce backlogs are anticipated from a series of management studies made in recent months. The increasing workload of these agencies increases the need to adjust or impose charges on the regulated industries or activities sufficient to cover the costs of administration.

The antitrust laws should be strengthened by legislation (1) requiring large businesses to notify the antitrust agencies of proposed mergers, (2) empowering the Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases when civil procedures are planned, and (3) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek preliminary injunctions when it is likely that a proposed merger would violate the law.

Civil and defense mobilization: Prudent concern for the protection of the civilian population from hazards in a nuclear world makes it necessary to recommend increases for 1962 in appropriations for civil defense. The largest increases for nonmilitary defense will provide funds for increasing medical stockpiles and for the first full-year cost of a program begun in 1961 to match State and local costs for civil defense personnel and administration. Additional funds are also requested for procurement of radiological equipment and for strengthening Federal activities in emergency health and manpower programs.

The Congress and the executive branch have recognized that civil defense is the joint responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments. As exercise of its partnership, the Federal Government has, by leadership and example, implemented a national shelter policy, which recognizes the fallout shelter as the best single nonmilitary defense measure for the protection of the greatest number of people. Under this policy the Federal Government has instructed people in protective measures, conducted a sample survey of existing shelter capabilities, accelerated shelter research, and constructed prototype shelters for example and guidance. Moreover, the Congress has been urged to provide funds for inclusion of fallout shelters in appropriate new and existing Federal buildings. Funds and appropriate legislation are being requested to accelerate these activities in 1962.

In order to strengthen the program, legislation is being proposed to require appropriate fallout shelters in certain new private construction where the Federal Government provides some form of financial assistance. This legislation will also provide for a 1-year program of grants to States to assist in the construction of fallout protection shelters in selected State buildings. Upon the enactment of this legislation, supplemental appropriations will be required.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In the fiscal year 1962, Federal programs for agriculture will continue to require heavy expenditures for much the same reason as in the immediately preceding years: the lack of adequate modifications in the price-support laws to make them conform to the increased efficiency and growing productive capacity of the agricultural industry.

Estimated expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1962 are $5.1 billion, which is $165 million more than the estimate for the current year and $263 million more than was spent in 1960. Total new authority to incur obligations requested for 1962 is $4.6 billion, which includes $936 million to restore, to the extent necessary, the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from previous price-support losses, and $1.7 billion to reimburse the Corporation for estimated costs and losses through fiscal year 1961 of other programs financed through that agency.

Each year that the current unrealistic price-support program is continued complicates further the production adjustments that will have to be made before present Government controls over farm operations can be relaxed. Carryover stocks of wheat continue to rise. Current indications are that by July 1, 1961, wheat stocks will amount to about 1.5 billion bushels, which is more than an average year's production and 2½ times an average year's domestic consumption. Carryover stocks of corn and other feed grains have risen each year since 1952, and by the fall of 1961 are expected to reach 82 million tons, or about one-half an average year's production. While cotton carryover stocks are expected to be down slightly by the beginning of the fiscal year 1962 as compared with a year earlier, the cotton program continues to be a substantial drain on the budget, principally as a result of the sale of cotton abroad at prices substantially lower than support levels.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:				
Commodity Credit Corporation—price support, supply, and purchase programs	$1,480	$1,423	$1,537	$936
Commodity Credit Corporation—special activities:				
Public Law 480 (titles I and IV)	1,232	1,285	1,303	1,353
International Wheat Agreement	66	72	71	89
National Wool Act	93	62	66	59
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	192	208	175	163
Other	6	−2	−2	----
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	90	100	110	284
Sugar Act	74	74	85	81
Other	44	42	51	51
Subtotal	3,278	3,264	3,396	3,017
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones	330	328	340	255
Financing farm ownership and operation:				
Farmers Home Administration	249	264	231	225
Farm Credit Administration	−3	4	4	3
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:				
Conservation reserve:				
Present program	324	354	357	330
Proposed legislation for extension and expansion	----	----	19	19
Agricultural conservation program:				
Program total	237	236	234	238
Under CCC special activities	(1)	(−4)	(−8)	----
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program)	131	151	163	166
Research and other agricultural services	293	336	357	352
Total	4,838	4,936	5,101	[2] 4,605

[1] Less than $½ million.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $5,151 million enacted for 1960 and $4,696 million (including $23 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

Among the many aspects of the price-support program in need of major changes, the most urgent is the enactment of realistic price-support legislation for wheat. It is imperative that the Congress take early action so that farmers can make the necessary adjustments in their plans. Because of the time lag between enactment of new price-support legislation and its budgetary impact, legislation enacted in this session of the Congress can have little effect before the 1963 budget. My previous recommendations for wheat legislation allow for considerable latitude in method of approach as long as the legislation deals realistically with the problem.

The last session of the Congress did not extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to bring additional land into the conservation reserve. Since the rental rates needed to induce farmers to place large quantities of surplus-producing land in the conservation reserve depend in large part on levels of price supports, it would be unsound to attempt to set such rates high enough to compete with the present unrealistic level of price supports, particularly for wheat. Therefore, legislation proposed by this administration to extend the conservation reserve through the calendar year 1964 and to expand the program from the present level of 28.6 million acres to a maximum of 60 million acres should be enacted only if satisfactory legislation for wheat is also enacted. An expanded conservation reserve would not be effective unless largely concentrated in areas producing wheat and other surplus commodities. For this reason, the Secretary of Agriculture should be provided with specific authority to give special consideration, in allocating conservation reserve funds, to those States and regions where curtailment of the production of wheat or other surplus commodities is consistent with long-range goals for adjusting production.

Stabilization of farm prices and income: In fiscal year 1962, expenditures for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and income are estimated at $3.4 billion, which is $132 million more than the amount currently estimated for 1961, and $118 million more than expenditures in 1960. Expenditures for these programs are not subject to regular annual budgetary control, since they are determined mainly by the loan, commodity purchase, and other price-supporting activities that the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to carry out under existing laws. In 1962 farm price support and related activities account for about two-thirds of the estimated expenditures for agricultural programs. The budget estimate assumes that yields per acre of price-supported crops for the 1961 crop year will be in line with recent years. It also assumes a continued favorable level of exports of farm commodities.

This high level of expenditures reflects, directly or indirectly, the continuation of present price supports in the face of a volume of agricultural production that cannot be absorbed by the domestic and world markets at currently supported prices. Total farm production for the calendar year 1960 established an alltime record both on an absolute and a per capita basis. It was 29 percent above the 1947–49 average, and was achieved with 30 percent fewer farmworkers and 6 percent fewer crop acres.

Surplus wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and other commodities are being utilized in our food for peace program to promote economic development and common defense and to provide emergency relief for needy people abroad. The largest part of the program is the sale of farm commodities for foreign currencies under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480. Because of the size of past sales, particularly a 4-year agreement with India, additional authority of $1.1 billion is recommended for the remainder of the calendar year 1961. Titles II and III of this act provide for donating surplus commodities to foreign governments primarily for emergency relief needs and to private relief organizations in support of their activities abroad; over 55 million people benefited this past year from these donations. Continuation of the programs currently carried on under titles I and II will require legislation this year to extend them beyond December 31, 1961.

Surplus agricultural commodities are also made available to the needy at home through the direct distribution program of the Department of Agriculture, which is carried on under the permanent appropriation for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities and through the Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus disposal operations. In the fiscal year 1960, there were donations of 526 million pounds of surplus food, valued at $59 million, directly to needy families in the United States. In October 1960, there were 3.3 million people in the United States receiving surplus foods through these programs; additional persons benefited from food donations to the school lunch program and to institutions providing aid to the needy.

Since the Sugar Act expires on March 31, 1961, prompt legislative action extending this program is required. In line with my previous recommendation, the Congress should amend the act to provide the President with urgently needed flexibility in the allocation of quotas.

The National Wool Act, which expires on March 31, 1962, should be extended, and its financing should be shifted to a direct appropriation basis.

To conserve fiscal resources and to implement the principle that identifiable recipients of certain special services should pay for them, legislation is again proposed to permit the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to include its administrative expenses in determining appropriate premium rates for crop insurance.

Rural electrification and telephones: Expenditures of the Rural Electrification Administration are estimated at $340 million for 1962, and new obligational authority of $255 million is recommended, including $100 million for telephone loans and $145 million for electrification loans.

The Rural Electrification Administration has made a major contribution to the development of rural America. About 97 percent of our farms now have central station electric service, as compared with 11 percent in 1935. The telephone program also is making a real contribution to a better rural America by improving rural telephone service.

The expanding use of power in the areas served by electric cooperatives, however, requires substantial amounts of new capital each year to provide additional generating capacity and heavier transmission and distribution facilities. More than half of the total power sales by the REA system are made to rural industrial, recreational, and other nonfarm users. These nonfarm users comprise about 80 percent of the new customers being added.

The capital needs of the Rural Electrification Administration are being financed currently by loans from the Treasury at 2-percent interest. Loans are made to borrowers at this same rate. While special treatment of these programs through favorable Federal financing was justified in earlier years, the progress that has been made by the local systems in achieving the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act and in developing financial stability indicates that the time has come to plan for methods of financing other than through the Federal Government. To that end, legislation should be developed for a federally chartered institution to finance the future requirements of the rural electrification and rural telephone programs. Such an institution should be owned and managed by the REA borrowers subject to the examination and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. To launch the new institution on a sound basis, it should be assisted initially by a Federal loan, with provision for orderly retirement of the loan. Future capital needs of the REA borrowers should be met by the sale of the institution's obligations to the public. Provision should also be made for loans by the institution on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture to borrowers who are unable to qualify for regular loans.

Farm ownership and operation: Expenditures for the loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration are estimated at $231 million for 1962, compared with $264 million estimated for 1961. Loans are made by the Farmers Home Administration to borrowers who are unable to obtain credit from other sources at interest rates currently prevailing in their communities, in order to finance farmownership and enlargement, farm operations, and soil and water conservation. Direct loans for farmownership and soil and water conservation are supplemented with private loans insured by the Federal Government.

Legislation previously recommended to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make these types of loans should be enacted. Included in this legislation is a proposal to place the operations of the Farmers Home Administration on a revolving fund basis.

Authority to make loans under the farm housing loan program expires June 30, 1961. Extension of this separate farm housing loan authority is not recommended, since loans similar to the farm housing loans would be authorized under the general legislation being recommended relating to the loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Legislation should be enacted, as recommended previously, to require the States to share a greater part of the costs of farm disaster relief assistance.

Conservation of agricultural resources: Expenditures in 1962 under the conservation reserve program are expected to be $357 million under existing legislation. If legislation extending and expanding this program is enacted as proposed in

this budget, additional expenditures of $19 million in 1962 would result. Under the proposal, there would be a net increase of 10.5 million acres during the 1962 program year, bringing the total at the end of that year to 39 million acres. However, most of the increase in expenditures required for the 1962 program would not occur until 1963 and later fiscal years. To the extent that additions of land to the conservation reserve result in curtailment of the production of price-supported agricultural commodities, the added expenditures resulting from extension and expansion of this program will be accompanied by lower outlays for price supports.

An advance authorization of $100 million is recommended for the 1962 agricultural conservation program. This will affect primarily the expenditures for the fiscal year 1963. In recent appropriation acts the Congress maintained this program at a level which far exceeded my recommendations. As a result, expenditures for the agricultural conservation program are estimated to be $236 million in 1961 and $234 million in 1962. The $100 million advance authorization, together with other aids for soil and water conservation, will provide substantial incentives for the Nation's farmers to meet our high-priority conservation needs.

Federal cost-sharing assistance in the future under this program should be concentrated on conservation measures which will foster needed shifts to less intensive uses of cropland, and assistance should be eliminated for practices which increase capacity to produce agricultural commodities already in surplus supply. Continuation of cost sharing for output-increasing practices directly conflicts with the recommended expansion of the conservation reserve program under which cropland is removed from production.

New obligational authority of $66 million is recommended for the upstream watershed programs, including $46 million under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Of this amount, $10 million is for initiating construction of projects involving an estimated total Federal cost of $70 million. Expenditures under these programs are expected to be $65 million in 1962, which is an increase of $12 million over 1961 and $21 million over 1960. New obligational authority requested for the Great Plains program totals $10 million, the same as for 1961.

Research and other agricultural services: Expenditures for research, education, and other agricultural services in 1962, including $17 million for purchases of foreign currencies to finance research and market development programs abroad, are estimated at $357 million, which is an increase of $22 million over 1961. This increase reflects primarily additional support for the research programs of the Agricultural Research Service and continuing progress on laboratory construction.

Rural development: The rural development program inaugurated by this administration is successfully stimulating economic progress and growth in low-income farming areas of the Nation. It is becoming widely accepted as a major national approach to helping families in these areas. By June 30, 1961, it is expected that some 350 counties in 39 States will be participating in the program. Among the impressive gains reported in participating areas are the following: (1) New farm crops have been introduced and production on small farms improved; (2) the number of jobs has increased through the establishment of new industries and enlargement of others; (3) income has increased from nonfarm sources such as recreation, tourist services, and expanded business activities; and (4) educational and training programs have been inaugurated for those who have little opportunity to enter commercial farming.

The Federal Government supports this program principally through a redirection and strengthening of existing services and activities. Emphasis is placed on cooperation among Federal and State agencies and local groups. In the Department of Agriculture, the program is conducted as a part of the continuing responsibilities of 10 of its agencies, with general leadership furnished by the Extension Service, for which an increase of $2 million is estimated in this budget. Other Federal departments and agencies have accelerated their activities that contribute to the aims of the rural development program. These agencies include the Small Business Administration, and the Departments of the Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. All of these activities are carried out under the general guidance of the Committee for Rural Development program which was established by Executive order.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Sound development of our natural resources is necessary to meet the needs of our growing population and expanding economy. The budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1962 provide for appropriate Federal participation in the development, conservation, and use of these resources, in cooperation with State and local agencies and private interests.

Federal expenditures for natural resources are estimated to be $2.1 billion in 1962 compared with $2 billion in 1961. These expenditures are higher than in any previous year.

Water resources: Approximately two-thirds of the Federal expenditures for natural resources in 1962 will be for water resources activities. The programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation will require expenditures estimated at $1.2 billion—a record level. Of this amount, $1 billion will be spent on construction. This includes $976 million for continuation of work on projects started in 1961 or prior years, $11 million for first-year expenditures on 37 proposed new project starts, and $13 million for advance planning of projects needed in later years. A large share of the construction expenditures of these agencies will be for multiple-purpose river basin projects, including flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, and in some cases related recreational and fish and wildlife benefits.

For the Corps of Engineers, the budget includes appropriations of $15 million for starting 31 new projects and an additional number of smaller projects costing less than $400 thousand each. The estimated total cost of building these new projects is $302 million. Appropriations of $6 million are also recommended to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to begir. construction on five new projects, with an estimated total cost of $141 million, and to make a loan for one small reclamation project for which the total Federal commitment will be $5 million.

The 1962 program of the Bureau of Reclamation includes protective works for the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, as required by law in connection with construction of Glen Canyon Dam.

It is again recommended that the Congress authorize construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers	$867	$930	$930	$932
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Reclamation	209	240	305	290
Power marketing agencies	34	41	36	36
Indian lands resources	59	68	63	64
Public domain lands and other	35	45	50	50
Tennessee Valley Authority	12	55	103	30
Federal Power Commission	7	8	9	9
International Boundary and Water Commission and other	12	15	19	20
Forest resources	220	263	311	248
Mineral resources	65	66	67	82
Recreational resources	74	87	101	105
Fish and wildlife resources	68	75	84	85
General resource surveys and administration	51	58	60	61
Total	1,713	1,951	2,138	[1] 2,012

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $2,533 million enacted for 1960 and $2,049 million (including $139 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

A few months ago agreement was reached between the United States and Canada on the basic terms of a treaty for the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. The proposal envisages the construction in Canada, within a 10-year period, of three major reservoirs and the construction by the United States of the authorized Libby project in northern Montana. The substantial flood control and power benefits which will result from this agreement will be realized at a much earlier date with materially less cost than would be the case if they were provided by unilateral rather than by cooperative endeavor. The location of the proposed storage reservoirs will not interfere with the cycle for salmon and other anadromous fish, which constitute an

important economic and recreational asset of the Pacific Northwest. The Senate should give prompt attention to the ratification of the treaty when it is presented. Following this ratification, preconstruction planning of Libby Dam should be started by the Corps of Engineers.

The previous Congress enacted legislation to authorize negotiation of an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint construction of Amistad (Friendship) Dam on the Rio Grande, and appropriated $5 million for this project. The 1962 budget includes $12 million to finance further work on the dam as soon as the technical details relating to its construction are approved by the two Governments.

Legislation should be enacted to place the financing of the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior on a revolving fund basis, retaining annual review and control by the Congress.

Net budget expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority are estimated at $103 million in the fiscal year 1962. The increase of $48 million over the current year will be largely for construction of power and navigation facilities. Under the authority to sell revenue bonds, enacted in August 1959, the TVA issued $50 million of such bonds in November 1960. The Authority plans to issue an additional $140 million in the fiscal year 1962 which, together with power revenues, will provide funds for continuing construction of power facilities and for starting construction of a new steam powerplant in the eastern part of the TVA power area. Construction will continue on Wheeler and Wilson locks and on the navigation features of the Melton Hill project, financed by appropriated funds. The Authority plans to make a payment of $50 million from power proceeds to the Treasury in fiscal year 1962, of which $40 million is a dividend and $10 million is a return of Government capital. A similar payment, estimated at $51 million, is being made in 1961.

The 1961 and 1962 programs of the TVA contemplate the acquisition of certain coal land or mining rights, on which options have been taken, in the eastern portion of its coal supply area. Since it has not been clearly established that such acquisitions are necessary to assure an adequate reserve of coal for TVA's operations, I have directed that these actions not be taken without specific Presidential approval.

Research conducted by the Department of the Interior over the past several years has reduced substantially the cost of obtaining fresh water from saline water. Two demonstration plants for conversion of sea and brackish water into fresh water will be completed in the fiscal year 1962. Appropriations of $3.5 million are recommended for starting two additional plants in 1962, one at Roswell, N. Mex., and the other at a location to be selected on the east coast.

River basin planning commissions: In addition to the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and International Boundary and Water Commission, several other Federal agencies participate in phases of water resources programs. The Department of Agriculture assists local groups in watershed protection and flood prevention; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has responsibility relating to control of water pollution; and the Federal Power Commission has broad river basin planning authority in connection with licensing construction of private power projects. The Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and other agencies also participate in certain aspects of water resources projects. Furthermore, activities of State and local agencies and private interests in the field of water resources are of increasing importance. Only with coordinated planning on the part of all groups concerned can there be assurance that all possible uses of water are adequately considered.

To provide for comprehensive, coordinated planning, legislation is being submitted to authorize the President to establish water resources planning commissions as needed in the various river basins or regions. These commissions would be composed of Presidentially appointed members from the various Federal agencies and the States. They would prepare and keep current comprehensive integrated river basin plans. This proposed general authority would be an improvement over separate laws such as those which established the two ad hoc river basin study commissions for the Southeastern and Texas areas.

Cost sharing for local flood protection: The varied requirements for financial participation by State and local interests in local flood protection projects have resulted in inequities among the various beneficiaries of such projects. In the case of projects of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture, non-Federal contributions range from zero to over 60 percent of flood protection costs. In previous budget messages, legislation has been recommended to provide an equitable, uniform minimum of 30 percent non-Federal cost sharing for all flood protection projects. Although the Congress did not act on that proposal, a forward step was taken in the Flood Control Act of 1960, which provides for a uniform minimum of 20 percent non-Federal cost sharing on local flood protection projects of the Corps of Engineers authorized by that act. The Congress is urged to broaden this action by requiring a minimum of 30 percent cost sharing on all local projects providing flood protection benefits which are authorized in the future for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture.

Public domain and Indian lands: In the fiscal year 1962, expenditures for the conservation and development of the public domain lands, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, will be $43 million, somewhat higher than in 1961. Receipts from grazing fees, timber sales, and mineral leases on the public domain lands, including the Outer Continental Shelf, are estimated at $221 million in the fiscal year 1962, an increase of $55 million over the revenues estimated for the current year. A portion of the estimated increase will result from the increases authorized last year in the fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases. Some of these revenues are shared with States and counties. Shared-revenue payments to these governmental units in 1962 from the public domain lands amount to $58 million.

Estimated expenditures of $63 million for the management of Indian lands in the fiscal year 1962 include $33 million for construction of roads; for irrigation facilities; and for buildings and utilities, mainly additional school facilities for Indian children who reside on lands held in trust by the United States.

Forest resources: Some increases in expenditures of the Forest Service in 1962 are needed to carry forward its long-range development program for the national forests. These increases will be for forest roads and trails and for forest protection and utilization, including forestry research, fire prevention, and recreational facilities. A supplemental appropriation of $69 million is being requested for the fiscal year 1961 to enable the Forest Service to pay for those portions of the forest lands of the Klamath Indians which are not sold to competitive bidders by April 1, 1961—as required by Public Law 85–731—with expenditures estimated in the fiscal year 1962. These increases will be offset in part by an expected decrease from the expenditures of $33 million in 1961 for firefighting in the national forests—the highest annual expenditures on record.

Management of the national forest lands yields substantial revenues, mostly from timber sales and grazing permits. These receipts—which are in addition to the amounts cited earlier under public domain lands—are estimated at $156 million in the fiscal year 1962. Shared revenue payments to the States in 1962 are estimated at $29 million.

Legislation is recommended to provide authority for the Secretary of Agricultrue to complete acquisition of the remaining lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe area of the Superior National Forest in order to preserve this unique wilderness area for public use.

Mineral resources: Amendments to the Helium Act during the last session of the Congress authorize a long-range program for conserving vital helium resources. Under these amendments, effective March 1, 1961, private industry will be encouraged to finance, build, and operate plants to recover helium for sale to the Department of the Interior. Where necessary, the Secretary of the Interior may take direct steps to conserve this important resource. The program is to be financed from borrowing authority, subject to the appropriation process. Supplemental borrowing authority of $12 million for the fiscal year 1961 is recommended so that the Bureau of Mines can start the program promptly, and provision is made in the 1962 budget to augment this initial amount by $15 million.

The Bureau of Mines will continue its research on improved methods of production and utilization of coal and other minerals. Under recent legislation, the Department of the Interior will contract with educational, trade, and other organizations for research aimed at early

solutions to some of the problems confronting the coal industry.

Recreational resources: The rapidly expanding use of public recreational facilities is placing great demands on the resources of our national park system. The estimated increase of $14 million in expenditures of the National Park Service from 1961 to 1962 will provide for needed maintenance and rehabilitation of the park areas and for operation of new facilities and areas added to the system in recent years. Prompt action should be taken on legislation, as recommended last year, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire three of the remaining undeveloped seashore areas for the national park system. Such action will enable these areas to be preserved for public benefit.

The forthcoming report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission will provide a comprehensive survey of outdoor recreational resources and needs. The report should be useful as a guide for Federal, State, local, and private interests in their plans for meeting increasing needs for recreation.

Fish and wildlife resources: Expenditures for fish and wildlife resources in the fiscal year 1962 are estimated at $84 million, an increase of $9 million over the current year. Part of the increase will be for management and operation of fish hatcheries and wildlife refuges by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Outstanding refuges recently established by the Secretary of the Interior are the Arctic, Kuskokwim, and Izembek wildlife ranges in Alaska, comprising 11.2 million acres, with unique values as waterfowl breeding grounds and with wilderness areas of scenic beauty. Increases for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries are for construction of oceanographic research facilities, and for biological and technological research to be initiated in 1962 under a special foreign-currency program to aid the fishing industry.

General resource surveys: Expenditures of the Geological Survey will increase primarily as a result of increased interest and participation by the States in the cooperative programs for topographic and geological mapping and water-resources investigations.

LABOR AND WELFARE

The labor and welfare programs of the Federal Government have assumed in the last decade a growing role in meeting human needs in our increasingly complex, urbanized society. These programs provide manpower, health, education, science, economic security, and welfare services of great importance to the entire population and also assist many special groups, such as the aged, the children, the disabled, the unemployed, and the needy.

Budget expenditures for labor and welfare programs in the fiscal year 1962 are estimated at $4.8 billion, an increase of $276 million over 1961. In the last decade these budget expenditures have more than doubled. Labor and welfare benefit payments from the social security and other trust funds, supported largely by payroll taxes on employers and employees, have increased fivefold in the same period to an estimated $19.6 billion in 1962.

Labor and welfare

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Promotion of education:				
National Science Foundation, science education	$57	$65	$69	$74
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Assistance to schools in federally affected areas:				
Present programs	258	264	173	102
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	60	93
Defense education program	129	161	190	194
Vocational education and other	65	73	79	80
Other, primarily Bureau of Indian Affairs	60	64	69	73
Promotion of science, research, libraries, and museums:				
National Science Foundation, basic research	63	90	119	138
Department of Commerce:				
Bureau of the Census	100	38	19	17
National Bureau of Standards and other	17	28	54	77
Other	31	47	58	40
Labor and manpower:				
Department of Labor:				
Grants for administration of employment services and unemployment compensation [1]	325	-------	-------	-------
Repayable advances to unemployment trust fund	-------	36	−42	-------
Other	29	47	48	47
Other, primarily Selective Service System and National Labor Relations Board	57	64	66	67
Promotion of public health:				
National Institutes of Health	348	439	516	540
Hospital construction and research grants and activities	146	157	170	153
Grants for construction of health research facilities	26	26	25	30
Community and environmental health	58	75	101	104
Grants for construction of waste treatment facilities	40	41	43	50
Other	199	234	240	251
Public assistance:				
Present programs	2,061	2,162	2,290	2,291
Proposed legislation for medical care for the aged	-------	-------	25	25
Correctional and penal institutions	46	49	52	52
Other welfare services:				
School lunch and special milk programs:				
Present programs	234	245	155	326
Proposed legislation to extend special milk program	-------	-------	94	95
Other, primarily vocational rehabilitation	68	78	84	105
Total	4,419	4,483	4,759	[2] 5,025

[1] By law the receipts and expenditures for employment security grants are shown as trust fund transactions for 1961 and 1962, and as budget transactions for 1960.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $4,574 million enacted for 1960 and $4,937 million (including $34 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

Our estimated expenditures of $24.4 billion from budget and trust accounts for labor and welfare programs for 1962, an estimated $13 billion will be for benefits and services for elderly persons. When benefits for veterans and others are added, total estimated expenditures in 1962 for benefits and services for persons who are 65 and over exceed $16 billion.

New obligational authority recommended for 1962 for labor and welfare programs in the budget totals $5 billion, and is $88 million more than estimated for the current fiscal year. The largest program increase is for public assistance, including medical care for the aged. The proposed appropriations for hospital construction grants are lower than the amounts enacted for 1961, but expenditures will increase by $13 million as a result of commitments under obligational authority provided in prior years. Recommended appropriations, as well as estimated expenditures, for programs to assist federally affected school districts are reduced for 1962 in view of the modifications proposed in those programs.

Education: The vitality of our democracy and the productivity of our economy depend in large measure on the development of our human resources through an effective educational system. Primary responsibility for education rests with the local communities and States and with private institutions and groups. The strength of our American educational system flows from its freedom and this broad basis of support. Thus, the Federal role in education is properly a supplementary one, limited primarily to providing assistance where there is a special national concern. For such assistance, the Federal Government will spend in all budget categories about $1 billion in 1962 for educational activities, including college housing loans and readjustment aid to veterans, but excluding indirect assistance through research contracts and grants.

In the last few years, it has become increasingly clear that the national interest requires an expansion of Federal activities in the field of education. Accordingly, I recommended in 1958, and the Congress enacted, the National Defense Education Act to assist students, particularly those interested in science, mathematics, and languages, and to help States improve school facilities and services. I have also recommended repeatedly and again recommend the enactment of temporary legislation to provide Federal assistance for construction of primary and secondary school classrooms and for construction of college classrooms and supporting facilities.

As outlined in last year's budget message, the proposed program would stimulate and assist in the construction of $3 billion of public elementary and secondary schools in the next 5 years by a Federal commitment to pay half the debt service—principal and interest—on school bonds. The cost to the Federal Government over a 39-year period would be about $2 billion. To help institutions of higher education finance construction of required facilities, the legislation would authorize a 5-year program which

would provide (1) Federal guarantees of principal and interest on $1 billion of non-tax-exempt bonds to be sold by colleges to private investors and (2) Federal grants, payable over 25 to 35 years, of 30 percent of the principal of $2 billion of bonds to be issued by colleges. The aggregate Federal cost of the aid to institutions of higher education would be about $600 million.

The precise requirements for Federal aid to local school districts are difficult to determine because of the inadequacy of available information on the classroom needs of districts in various parts of the country and on their financial capacity to meet these needs. Accordingly, funds are included in the budget for improvement of education statistics, including data on local school construction requirements and the actions local communities and States are taking to meet them.

National Science Foundation educational activities: Expenditures of $69 million in 1962 are estimated for graduate fellowships in science and mathematics and for other programs to train new scientists, to improve the teaching of science and mathematics, and to stimulate interest in scientific careers. This represents more than a fourfold expansion in the training programs of the National Science Foundation in 5 years.

Schools in federally affected areas: The Federal Government has recognized an obligation to assist school districts in which enrollments are significantly increased by its activities. Legislation for this purpose was enacted as a temporary measure during the Korean emergency. However, legislation providing aid to districts with children whose parents both reside and work on Federal property was made permanent in 1958. The budget provides funds required to meet Federal obligations under this program.

The programs of assistance to school districts on behalf of pupils whose parents work on Federal property but live on private taxable property expire on June 30, 1961. This budget includes $93 million to cover the cost of extending the program for operating grants, but on a modified basis which would discharge more equitably than the expiring legislation the Federal responsibility to these districts. In the case of construction grants, where general aid for needy districts is again proposed, no separate provision is included for continuing the special program for federally affected districts. It is recommended, furthermore, that the Congress defer consideration of any extension legislation until after it has considered and enacted the broad program of Federal aid for school construction which is being recommended. The Congress would then be in a better position to determine the kind of support which should be provided to discharge the Government's obligations to these areas.

Defense education program: The National Defense Education Act, which will be in its fourth year in 1962, the last under the current authorization, has provided outstanding assistance to American education. Expenditures under this act in 1962 are estimated to be $190 million, an increase of $29 million from 1961. The proposed 1962 appropriation of $194 million will provide modest increases for fellowships, language and cultural training centers, counseling institutes, and area vocational programs. The amount requested for student loans for 1962 is estimated at the 1961 level pending further information as to the rate of applications.

I am again recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that requires a student seeking aid to supply an affidavit stating that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This requirement is unwarranted and discriminatory.

Science and research—Including libraries and museums: The advancement of our national security and welfare depends in great measure upon the strength and progress of American science. The Federal Government plays a major role in the development of the Nation's scientific capacity through the research programs of many agencies.

Expenditures for promotion of science, research, libraries, and museums in 1962 are estimated to be $251 million, which is $48 million more than in 1961 and over three times the amount 5 years earlier. In addition to these figures, there are large amounts of expenditures for research and development included in other functional categories.

New scientific knowledge which stems from basic research is indispensable to the technological progress of modern industrialized society. Expenditures of $119 million are estimated for general purpose basic research grants by the National Science Foundation, chiefly for research projects and facilities, including the support of national research centers and the improvement of graduate school laboratories. This represents an increase of $29 million over 1961 and a sevenfold expansion in these activities in 5 years. Many other agencies are engaged in the support and conduct of basic research where it is recognized that such fundamental research is important and desirable in the attainment of their objectives.

Increased funds are included in the budget for the National Bureau of Standards, particularly for the completion of the major laboratories and service buildings at its new Gaithersburg, Md., site. Expansion is also provided in the regular scientific program of the Bureau, including initiation of a program for research projects abroad financed with foreign currencies which the Government holds in excess of its normal needs.

Certain scientific areas of broad national interest have been given special attention in recent years by the Federal Council for Science and Technology. These include long-range programs for oceanography, high-energy physics, and the atmospheric sciences, which will be further expanded under this budget. Part of the financing of these activities is included in other functional categories.

The scientific program for the Antarctic is developed, financed, and managed by the National Science Foundation with logistic support from the Department of Defense. Under this program the United States is cooperating with many other nations in the peaceful development of the Antarctic.

Government statistical services: An estimated $56 million in obligations is provided throughout the budget for gathering, processing, and disseminating the statistical information which is used by Government, private institutions, and individuals in policy formulation and decisionmaking. Increases in 1962 for collecting the regular recurring statistics are more than offset by the decrease from the funds required in 1961 for the Eighteenth Decennial Census.

Further improvement is planned in the scope and reliability of statistical data on current economic and social conditions. These include information on retail and service trade, foreign trade, manufacturing, construction, crop and livestock production, prices, manpower utilization, characteristics of the unemployed labor force, health and medical care, vital statistics, and education. Provision is also made for completion of the processing and publication of the results of the 1960 decennial census, for taking the 1962 Census of Governments, for planning the 1963 economic censuses, and for continuing a substantial portion of the work, begun over a year ago, looking toward a major revision of the Consumer Price Index.

Labor and manpower: The manpower programs of the Department of Labor and other labor agencies help maintain an efficient labor market and a healthy national climate in labor-management relations.

Employment security: Of particular importance are the job-placement services and unemployment compensation payments made through the State employment security offices. In addition to general job-placement services, farm people are assisted in finding industrial work, and workers in depressed areas are helped in finding jobs in other areas.

Last year the administration proposed, and the Congress enacted, amendments to the Social Security Act that placed Federal receipts and expenditures for the employment security program on a trust fund basis starting July 1, 1960. This is the same arrangement that is used for other social insurance programs. Expenditures for this program are now expected to exceed the 1961 tax receipts, and the Treasury, as authorized by present law, will advance to the trust fund the additional $36 million needed in 1961. This advance will be repaid with interest in 1962 from the excess of receipts which will come from the increased Federal unemployment tax rate taking effect on January 1, 1961, from 0.3 percent to 0.4 percent of covered payrolls.

Based on the level of claims for unemployment compensation, this budget estimates $41 million more than enacted to date for the limitation on 1961 grants to States for administering unemployment insurance and employment services. Together with the $326 million already enacted, this brings the estimated 1961 requirement to $366 million, which is in excess of the $350 million annual ceiling

established by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1960. In view of the number of workers now filing claims for unemployment compensation, it is necessary to ask the Congress to remove this ceiling so that adequate funds can be provided to pay claims promptly.

Last year, coverage of unemployment compensation was extended to about 60,000 additional workers, but further legislation is still needed to extend unemployment compensation to some 3 million workers, most of whom are employed in small businesses employing fewer than 4 workers each. Such action, together with action by States to increase the amount and duration of unemployment compensation benefits, would provide more adequately against economic hardship for the Nation's work force. This program has proved to be one of the most successful means for combining the interest of the economy as a whole with the interest of the individual worker.

Other labor programs: In the last several years the operating programs of the Department of Labor have been strengthened by additional funds and new legislation. The 1962 budget provides an increase of $4 million in appropriations to strengthen further such activities of the Department as the enforcement of the Labor-Management Reports Act and the statistical and research programs of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Last year the Secretary of Labor endorsed expanded coverage and a moderate adjustment in the level of the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. This recommendation is repeated. Legislation should also be enacted to make the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act more effective. Legislation is again proposed to assure equal pay for equal work and to improve the laws relating to hours of work and overtime pay on Federal construction projects.

Health: Americans enjoy a high standard of health service. About three-quarters of the more than $25 billion devoted annually to health services and facilities in this country is being spent through private channels. However, State and local as well as Federal agencies also play an important role.

Promotion of public health: The Federal Government's contribution toward improved health care for the American people has been increasing rapidly in recent years. Expenditures for the promotion of public health in 1962 are estimated at $1.1 billion, more than twice the amount spent only 5 years earlier. Total Federal expenditures for all health programs in the various categories of this budget (including military and veterans hospitals) are about $4 billion.

In 1962, expenditures by the National Institutes of Health for medical research and training will represent about half the total spent for promotion of public health. The programs of the National Institutes will have multiplied more than threefold from 1957 to 1962.

The budget for 1962 recommends appropriations of $540 million for the National Institutes, compared to the $560 million enacted by the Congress for 1961. While this is $20 million less than the 1961 appropriation, it actually represents a substantial program increase for medical research and training. The reduction results from the elimination in 1962 of nonrecurring projects and from the transfer of programs to other parts of the Public Health Service which were included in the total for the National Institutes of Health for 1961. These decreases more than offset increases for new research activities. Expenditures by the Institutes will rise by an estimated $76 million in 1962.

Appropriations of $153 million for hospitals, mainly construction grants, are recommended for 1962. Although this is less than the level of appropriations for 1961, it will not result in a decrease in federally assisted hospital construction. On the contrary, it is anticipated that expenditures in 1962 for this program will be at an alltime high because of the prior authorizations and the volume of construction which has been initiated but not yet completed. The appropriation recommended for 1962 will permit initiation of new projects for general hospital beds, which, together with construction not federally assisted, will be sufficient to provide for growth in population, cover current obsolescence, and reduce the backlog by over 5,000 beds. The 1962 appropriation will also permit starting the same volume of new projects for specialized facilities for long-term care as is provided for in the appropriation for the current year. In recognition of the need for medical care facilities and the continuing rise in the cost of hospital services, new legislation is proposed to encourage coordinated community and regional planning of hospital facilities, to augment research on design and operation of hospitals, and to permit use of grants for high priority modernization projects.

Federal grants for construction of health research facilities in the last 5 years have materially helped expand our Nation's medical research capacity. This budget continues appropriations for this purpose at the full authorization of $30 million.

One of our greatest national health needs is the expansion of existing schools and establishment of new schools to train doctors and dentists. The shortage of physicians, already a critical factor in the rising cost of medical care, will become increasingly acute as the population and the demand for medical services increase. The Congress should at an early date enact legislation to authorize $100 million of matching grants over a 5-year period to stimulate construction of additional medical and dental school facilities.

Legislation should also be enacted to authorize a loan guarantee program to facilitate the construction of clinics for the group practice of medicine and dentistry. The sharing of such clinics by groups of physicians and dentists is economical in terms of reducing capital expenditures for such purposes and leads to more complete care for the patient by enabling the practitioners to combine their diverse skills.

In our urbanized and industrial society, environmental and community health is assuming increasing importance. Appropriations of $104 million for 1962 are proposed for Public Health Service activities in these fields. Increased funds are provided to augment the research and operating arms of the Public Health Service in the fields of air pollution, water pollution, community sanitation, and radiological health control activities. Larger amounts are also proposed for community health service activities to make the benefits of improved medical knowledge more widely and quickly available. Legislation is again recommended to authorize greater Federal leadership in combating air pollution.

The budget also includes an appropriation of $50 million for construction of waste treatment works, the full amount authorized for this program. These funds will help stimulate local action to correct immediate pollution problems. The control of water pollution is principally a local responsibility and requires greater financial and enforcement efforts by local interests. The Federal Government can most appropriately assist State and local governments through legislation (1) to strengthen its enforcement powers under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and (2) to provide flexibility assuring that highest priority is given to waste treatment construction grants for projects which contribute to the reduction of pollution of interstate and coastal streams. Legislation to accomplish these and related objectives should be enacted by the Congress.

Of daily importance to each of us is the work of the Food and Drug Administration in establishing and enforcing standards of safety for food and drugs. The 1962 budget continues a longstanding policy of strengthening this agency, which in 1962 will spend three times as much as it did 5 years earlier.

Legislation should be enacted to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University and to provide for construction of a new teaching hospital. Such legislation would give essential support to Howard University's program of medical education and end the divided responsibility and control now existing.

Social insurance and other welfare: Since the Social Security Act first became law in 1935, the United States has made great strides in its public income maintenance programs, both under the social security system and other public retirement systems. Today 93 percent of our workers are protected under the basic old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program or under other Federal or State-local retirement systems. To assist the unemployed we also have the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, and the Federal Government further provides or helps finance assistance to needy groups through other programs.

In 10 years the benefit payments made because of loss of income due to old age, death, disability, or unemployment under Federal, State, and local programs have trebled, rising in the calendar year 1960 to approximately $26 billion, of which about $24 billion was paid from federally administered or federally aided programs. Benefits were paid during the calendar year 1960 to an average of more

than 20 million families or single persons. The cost of these benefits, 6 percent of our national income, is funded from employee and employer contributions and taxes. Benefit payments and taxes under laws already in effect will increase greatly over the years.

Social insurance: The Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system now covers 9 out of 10 American workers and their families. In fiscal year 1962 it will pay $12.9 billion in benefits to an average of 16.5 million people of all ages, including 12 million persons aged 65 and over. Coverage should be extended to Federal civilian employees and self-employed physicians, the largest groups of regularly employed persons in our economy not now covered by this system.

Benefit payments and administrative costs are paid from trust funds supported by payroll taxes shared equally by workers and employers and from contributions of the self-employed. The combined employer-employee rate is now 6 percent of covered payrolls. Under present law it will rise by steps to 9 percent in calendar year 1969. Expenditures for the administration of this vast insurance system will be increased in fiscal year 1962 to cope with the increased workloads resulting from extension of disability protection to workers below age 50 and from other amendments enacted by the last Congress.

Public assistance: Total Federal expenditures for public assistance and medical aid in 1962 under existing law are estimated to increase by $128 million over 1961, largely reflecting the cost of the newly enacted medical assistance program for the aged. In 1962, the Federal share of payments for an average of 6.3 million recipients is estimated to be $2.3 billion, which is 58 percent of the total. Caseloads for old-age assistance and aid to the blind are declining moderately, while caseloads for aid to dependent children and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are increasing.

Medical care for the aged: In recent years, the American people have greatly improved their ability to obtain and pay for medical care through private and nonprofit health organizations. This approach has produced excellent results and should be preserved.

However, some aged persons are finding it increasingly difficult to pay for the medical services which they require. Medical and institutional care for the aged financed by public funds—Federal, State, and local—is currently estimated to cost over $1 billion annually. The last Congress authorized substantial expansion in Federal assistance for medical care of the aged through (1) increased Federal participation under the regular old-age assistance program and (2) a new program of medical assistance for the aged who are not recipients of public assistance but who nevertheless require aid to pay their medical and hospital bills.

In the 1962 budget, $400 million is included in the amount shown for public assistance for the old and the new programs of medical care for the aged. There will be a substantial increase in these expenditures in future years under existing law as additional States participate in these programs.

Extension of medical care assistance to the aged through a voluntary program under Federal-State-local auspices—as authorized by the Congress—is sound national policy both from a fiscal standpoint and from the standpoint of encouraging the widest participation of private as well as public agencies in the improvement of medical care for this group. However, under the program approved by the Congress many of the aged will still not be able to obtain needed protection against catastrophic hospital and medical expenses even though under ordinary circumstances they are able to pay their normal medical bills. The Congress is therefore urged to broaden the existing program in keeping with the recommendations which were made by this administration last spring. This would further increase the number who receive assistance.

Public action in providing assistance for medical care and the sharply rising costs of hospital and medical care underline the need for more adequate information regarding medical costs and the best methods of organizing to meet them. This budget provides for augmented research in medical economics under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Likewise, it expands the related program of research and demonstration projects on causes of dependency for which appropriations were first authorized last year.

Military service credits: Both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act provide that military service during certain periods of military conflict should be counted toward the rights of employees in determining benefits even though the employee made no contribution during this period. As has been previously indicated, it is appropriate for the Federal Government to reimburse the trust funds for the cost of benefits paid on the basis of such military service credits. But it is not sound policy for the Government to pay more than the true cost of such benefits or to pay both the railroad retirement and old-age and survivors and disability insurance trust funds for the same military service credits, as the present law requires.

Under statutes now in effect the Federal Government has paid the railroad retirement account an estimated $400 million more than the estimated cost of military service benefits. At the same time the Federal Government is obliged to reimburse the old-age and survivors and disability insurance trust funds for an estimated $450 million for military service benefits. The Congress is again urged to enact legislation to recover the overpayments to the railroad retirement account and to transfer them to the social security trust funds to cover the Government liability. Pending action on such legislation, no appropriations are included in this budget for military service payments to these trust funds.

Other welfare services: Between 1950 and 1960, the number of disabled people rehabilitated annually through the Federal-State rehabilitation program increased by 48 percent, to 88,000. The budget for 1962 includes enlarged appropriations of $97 million for this program, mostly for grants to State agencies for the rehabilitation of an estimated 103,000 persons.

The authorization for the special milk program, financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, expires June 30, 1961. Appropriations are recommended in this budget to reimburse the Corporation for costs of the 1960 and 1961 operations. This program was originally established as a temporary measure to aid the dairy industry. An evaluation presently underway in the Department of Agriculture will provide a basis for determining the proper level of the program. Pending the results of this evaluation, an appropriation of $95 million is included under proposed legislation to provide for a continuation of the special milk program in 1962 through a regular annual appropriation. Including this amount, grants to the States through the school lunch and special milk programs of the Department of Agriculture would be $250 million in 1962.

Our society must continue to encourage all our citizens to achieve the maximum degree of self-realization and economic independence. There are two large groups which as a nation we have recognized must be given special attention—the 16 million aged persons and the 65 million children and young people under 18. A White House Conference on Children and Youth was held last spring. Widespread local and State preparations have been made also for this month's White House Conference on Aging. Such conferences can help State, local, and Federal agencies, as well as private organizations and individuals, to increase opportunities for the aged and for the youth of our land.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Budget expenditures for veterans' programs are estimated to total $5.3 billion in 1962, which is $69 million more than in 1961. Continued increases in pensions for non-service-connected disabilities and deaths and in costs of medical care are expected to be largely offset by a decrease in readjustment benefits for veterans of the Korean conflict.

Expenditures for pensions are estimated to increase in 1962 principally because World War I veterans and survivors of World War II veterans will continue to be added to the pension rolls. These additions reflect both the number of World War I veterans reaching age 65 by 1962 who will be able to meet the eligibility standards and the effect of the liberalizations provided in the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

The decline in the education and training assistance provided to veterans of the Korean conflict foreshadows the approaching end of this second historic venture in providing readjustment assistance for wartime service. Henceforth, the bulk of the veterans expenditures will be for pensions, compensation, and medical care benefits. Because of the growth in non-service-connected disability and survivor pension costs, veterans expenditures will continue to increase for many years under laws now in effect.

In the 6-year period 1957–62, annual pension, compensation, and medical care expenditures will have risen by over $1 billion. This increase is in part the result of liberalizations in pension laws and improved standards of medical care. It also results from the advancing age of our veterans, which makes more of them or their survivors eligible for benefits. The trends are illustrated by the fact that from 1957 to 1962 there will be a net increase of 750,000, or about 20 percent in disability and survivor cases on the rolls. Of the 22½ million living veterans, 1 out of every 7 will be receiving compensation or pension benefits at the end of 1962.

An increasing proportion of the total expenditures of the Veterans Administration is attributable to disabilities, diseases, or deaths not related to military service. Between 1957 and 1962, non-service-connected costs will increase by 70 percent, rising from less than one-third to nearly one-half of all budget expenditures for veterans services and benefits.

This trend raises serious questions about the further expansion of veterans programs, particularly since veterans, their dependents, and survivors of veterans total about 80 million people or over two-fifths of our total population. The improvement in recent years of general welfare programs, for which veterans as well as others are eligible, coupled with the improvements in veterans programs, has reduced the justification for providing additional special benefits to veterans on the basis of non-service-connected factors. Any further expansion of non-service-connected benefits would create serious inequities of treatment between veterans and others in our population. I particularly oppose measures which would increase or make available non-service-connected pensions for veterans of World War I contrary to the principle of need incorporated in the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

Veterans services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new-obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	$383	$233	$128	$72
Loan guarantee and other benefits	132	131	77	9
Unemployment compensation	5			
Compensation and pensions:				
Service-connected compensation	2,049	2,038	2,026	2,026
Non-service-connected pensions	1,263	1,512	1,717	1,487
Burial and other allowances	56	55	55	55
Hospitals and medical care	904	982	1,025	1,025
Hospital construction	57	63	66	75
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities	33	31	27	40
Other services and administration	179	182	174	174
Total	5,060	5,227	5,296	[1] 4,963

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $5,169 million enacted for 1960 and $5,438 million (including $58 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

Readjustment benefits: Expenditures for readjustment assistance, estimated in 1962 at $205 million, continue their decline from a post-Korean high mark of about $900 million in 1957. The principal reduction is in the education and training program, in which the average number of Korean conflict veterans participating will be reduced to 85,000 in 1962, compared to 288,000 in 1960 and 170,000 in 1961.

The previous Congress extended until July 25, 1962, the home loan guarantee program as it applies to veterans of World War II. The direct loan program was similarly extended for both Korean conflict veterans and World War II veterans. It is clear that continuation of direct loan assistance and of loan guarantee assistance is no longer required to help World War II veterans in their readjustment to civilian life 15 years after the end of that war.

Veterans, like other citizens, can and should participate in the regular housing programs when their special readjustment needs resulting from military service have passed. The loan guarantee program for World War II veterans should therefore be terminated as of July 25, 1961. Changes proposed in the veterans direct loan program have been described with other housing programs elsewhere in this message.

Legislation is again recommended to provide vocational rehabilitation for peacetime ex-servicemen having substantial service-connected disabilities. This would add to other benefits which the Federal Government provides peacetime ex-servicemen, such as unemployment compensation, employment service, and reemployment rights. On the other hand, there is no justification for the extension of special educational or housing benefits to peacetime ex-servicemen. Such benefits cannot be justified by conditions of military service and are inconsistent with the incentives which have been provided to make military service an attractive career for capable individuals.

Compensation and pensions: Expenditures for service-connected death and disability compensation benefits continue a slow decline from their 1959 peak as compensation rolls are reduced by the deaths of veterans or their widows and by the transfer of many aging veterans to pension rolls. These decreases are offset in small part by the addition of veterans of the Korean conflict and of peacetime ex-servicemen or their survivors. Compensation will be paid to an average of 2,397,000 veterans and survivors of veterans in 1962 compared to 2,410,000 in 1961 and 2,428,000 in 1960.

The continued rise in expenditures for non-service-connected pensions, however, will more than offset the decline in compensation payments. Approximately half of all World War I veterans over 65 will be receiving pensions by the end of 1962, and the pension rolls will carry an average of nearly 2 million veterans and survivors in 1962. The Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 is expected to increase expenditures by adding over 100,000 new beneficiaries to the rolls at an estimated additional cost of $77 million in 1961. These additional expenditures also reflect higher rates for many veterans on the rolls before July 1, 1960.

Hospitals and medical care: The budget includes expenditures of approximately $1 billion for hospital and medical care for eligible veterans in 1962, an increase of $43 million over 1961. The increase will permit continued improvement in the quality of medical care in the hospitals and clinics. The new 1,000-bed hospital at Brecksville, Ohio, is scheduled to be opened in 1962 and the new Palo Alto, Calif., hospital addition will be fully activated. Hospital and domiciliary care will be provided for an average of 141,500 beneficiaries per day in Veterans' Administration, contract, and State facilities, and a total of 3,622,000 visits for medical services are expected to be made by veterans to outpatient clinics and to private physicians on a fee basis.

Hospital construction: An appropriation of $75 million is proposed for 1962, the same as for 1961, as the second step in carrying out a 12-year hospital modernization program of $900 million initiated in 1961. Of the 1962 appropriation, $26 million will be for construction of a 1,250-bed replacement hospital at Wood (Milwaukee), Wis., $11 million will be for replacement of 500 beds at Charleston, S.C.; the remainder will be for planning a new 580-bed general hospital at Atlanta, Ga., planning the replacement of approximately 1,000 beds in the Los Angeles, Calif., area, and for a large number of modernization projects.

Administration: The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration—other than the direct costs of administration of medical, dental, and hospital services—in 1962 are expected to be $162 million, slightly less than in 1961. Reductions in administrative costs are expected to accrue in future years from the program now underway to convert the recording and payment of veterans benefits to automatic data processing equipment.

INTEREST

Interest payments are estimated to decrease by $400 million to $8.6 billion in the fiscal year 1962. These payments are almost entirely for interest on the public debt and represent 11 percent of budget expenditures.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	New obligational authority and budget expenditures		
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate
Interest on public debt	$9,180	$8,900	$8,500
Interest on refunds of receipts	76	83	83
Interest on uninvested funds	10	10	10
Total	9,266	8,993	8,593

Market rates of interest have been decreasing from the levels prevailing last year. This makes it possible for the Treasury to pay, on the average, lower interest on securities issued to refinance maturing obligations. The reduction in the public debt during the year, facilitated by the surplus in the budget in

1960 as well as currently, is also helping to a lesser extent to reduce interest payments.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Expenditures for general government activities are estimated to rise by $89 million to $2.1 billion in the fiscal year 1962. The increase is primarily for more construction of Government buildings and for strengthening the tax collection system.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1962
	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate	
Legislative functions	$109	$137	$130	$100
Judicial functions	49	53	56	56
Executive direction and management	12	14	15	15
Central fiscal operations:				
Internal Revenue Service	360	412	446	450
Other	198	207	218	218
General property and records management	367	417	467	516
Central personnel management and employment costs:				
Department of Labor	190	212	216	216
Civil Service Commission:				
Present programs	21	74	95	95
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	−45	−45
Civilian weather services	54	57	66	70
Protective services and alien control	$217	$241	$247	$250
Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia:				
District of Columbia	28	48	66	63
Other	63	75	81	75
Other general government	28	34	12	17
Total	1,695	1,982	2,071	[1] 2,096

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,664 million enacted for 1960 and $2,073 million (including $131 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1961.

Central fiscal operations: The 1962 budget includes an increase of $36 million in new obligational authority to $450 million for the Internal Revenue Service. This will finance the second year's cost of a program to provide more effective enforcement of our tax laws and will thus reduce the revenue losses which arise from the failure of some individuals and business to report their incomes fully or accurately. Ultimately, all aspects of tax administration capable of being mechanized will be handled electronically. With the growth of the economy, tax returns are increasing in volume and necessarily become more complex. Installation of the new and modernized system for the processing of these returns will make possible the collection of taxes with lower expenditures than would otherwise be the case. Legislation should be enacted to authorize the adoption of tax account numbers which are needed for mechanical and electronic processing.

Legislation to authorize the consolidated reporting by employers of wages for income tax and social security purposes should also be enacted. Such legislation would produce considerable savings for both employers and the Government by reducing paperwork and would also help in enforcing the tax laws. Nearly 4 million employers could be relieved of the need to file for social security purposes 14 million separate quarterly wage reports each year covering over 230 million wage items. The Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have already agreed on the cooperative steps to be taken for improved administration of the tax laws and the social security system once such legislation is enacted.

Presidential office space: There is a pressing need for providing future Presidents with modern and efficient office facilities. My experience during the last 8 years strongly confirms the conclusion of the Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space that present facilities "are outmoded, overcrowded, inefficient, and not consistent with effective and well coordinated management of the highest office of the executive branch of the Government." The Commission recommended: (1) a new building to house only the White House office on the site of the existing Executive Office Building; (2) a new building for other units of the Executive Office; and (3) remodeling of the west wing of the White House for use as quarters for visiting dignitaries.

As a first step in carrying out these recommendations, the Congress should provide funds for constructing a new Executive Office Building on the west side of Lafayette Square, and this budget includes $26 million of new obligational authority for this purpose. More than two decades ago, the Congress wisely provided new quarters for the Supreme Court of the United States. In recent years, major improvements and expansions have been made in the facilities necessary to carry on the increasingly complex and important duties of the legislative branch. The next logical step is to remedy the serious deficiencies in the office space of the Chief Executive of the United States. I strongly urge the Congress to give early attention to the needed building as well as to the other recommendations of the Commission.

General property and records management: New obligational authority of $516 million is requested for the general property and records management activities of the General Services Administration, predominantly for management of existing buildings, construction of new buildings, purchase and distribution of supplies, and custody of Government records. Of this total, $212 million is for the construction of Federal office buildings, $26 million more than enacted for 1961. Budget expenditures for new buildings will be $169 million in 1962, nearly 50 percent above the 1961 level. This large increase results from an acceleration in construction initiated in 1959 to remedy some serious deficiencies of space which interfere with effective operations in many Federal agencies.

The expanded program of the General Services Administration for improving the utilization of excess Federal personal property is accomplishing significant results. Transfers of property in 1962 from agencies having an excess to those which can use it are expected to be $350 million valued at acquisition cost, compared to $218 million in 1960.

As a part of an overall program for improving supply management the responsibility for the procurement and distribution of subsistence items for the civilian agencies has been centralized in the Veterans' Administration. Substantial progress has also been made toward centralizing in the Veterans' Administration the procurement and distribution of medicines, drugs, and pharmaceuticals for the civilian agencies. Progress is also being made in transferring from the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration responsibility for managing the supplies of certain items which are used by civilian agencies as well as by the military services.

Central personnel management and employment costs: Appropriations of $147 million are recommended in 1962 for the Department of Labor to provide unemployment compensation for former Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen. Another $69 million will be required for workmen's compensation for present and past Federal employees. The new obligational authority recommended for the Civil Service Commission includes $26 million to finance the Government's share of the new health benefits programs for retired Federal personnel. The remaining appropriations in this category are predominantly for administration of the civil service system.

A long-range policy should be established for financing the civil service retirement system, which covers over 90 percent of Federal civilian employment. Previous recommendations to accomplish this objective should be enacted. This legislation would assure continued availability in the fund of the full amount of the net accumulations from employee contributions and would establish a definite basis for meeting the Government's share of the costs consistent with the principle that its full faith and credit support the authorized benefits.

Under present law, an appropriation of $45 million would be required for 1962 to finance the cost of civil service retirement benefits enacted in 1958 for certain retired employees and certain widows or widowers of former employees. Without this appropriation these benefits could not be continued. Legislation is again recommended to assure that in 1962 and later years such benefits are paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund on the same basis as other benefits, without specific annual appropriation.

A number of outmoded and inconsistent statutes now regulate the employment and compensation of retired military personnel in civilian positions with the Government. We should replace this legal maze with a single, rational statute which would eliminate unnecessary dual payments, adequately safeguard the civilian career service, and permit the Government to hire members of this group possessing needed skills under conditions that are fair to the individual.

Efforts must be continued to improve Federal job evaluation and other pay practices so as to make Federal pay, including that at the executive level, more comparable with private enterprise. This is essential to recruit and retain superior personnel for Federal programs,

particularly in the middle and upper professional and managerial positions, and to overcome the severe competitive disadvantages with which the Federal Government must now contend in recruiting personnel.

To help attain this objective, the accuracy of comparisons of Federal salary rates with private business rates should be improved. Funds are recommended in this budget for the Department of Labor to continue its recently expanded surveys which provide annual reports on salaries currently paid in private business. In time the Federal Government should make full use of this information as a guide in fixing salaries for its own officers and employees.

Legislation should be enacted to provide a system of survivorship annuities for the widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States comparable to the system already in effect with respect to the other Federal courts.

Civilian weather services: The successful launching of meteorological satellites has created vast possibilities for increasing our knowledge about the atmosphere and for improving daily weather services and forecasts. To realize some of this potential, an appropriation increase of $9 million over 1961, to a total of $70 million, is recommended for the Weather Bureau for 1962. This increase will provide for the establishment of processing facilities to permit the immediate use of worldwide cloud data received from satellites, as well as for increased research in applying this new source of information to improve understanding of atmospheric motion. The budget also continues the efforts of the past several years to transfer to Weather Bureau appropriations the financing of certain meteorological activities of other Federal agencies which are national in scope and serve both civilian and military needs.

Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia: The expenditures required to meet the Federal share of the financing of governmental operations in the District of Columbia will increase substantially in 1962, primarily because of loans authorized in prior years to meet capital requirements of the area, including a metropolitan sewage system to connect with the Dulles International Airport.

A constitutional amendment to permit residents of the District to vote for President and Vice President is now before the States for ratification. The States should act promptly on this amendment.

Another basic step, recommended on many past occasions, would be the restoration of home rule for the 764,000 District of Columbia residents. I repeat my recommendation in this respect. Such local self-government is essential not only to carry out our democratic principles, but also to remove excessive and unnecessary responsibilities from the Federal Government.

To promote the further development of democratic institutions, and in keeping with the growth of local self-government, the Congress should authorize representation of the Virgin Islands and Guam in the Congress through nonvoting territorial deputies.

Intergovernmental relations: Federal financial assistance to State and local governments plays a large role in financing their operations. In 1962 such aid, including budget and trust funds, will amount to $7.9 billion and account for a substantial portion of total annual State and local revenues. Continuous attention must be given to Federal-State-local fiscal interrelationships so that they reflect the proper distribution of responsibilities. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established in 1959, can make an important contribution through its work in reexamining intergovernmental relations and fiscal problems.

In this field, a uniform Federal policy is needed (1) defining immunity from local taxation on the use or possession of Federal property in the custody of contractors and lessees, and (2) governing payments in lieu of taxes made by the Government to localities on certain real properties. Legislation on these matters should be enacted in accordance with the recommendations made by the administration in the last session of the Congress, which call for partial restoration of immunity from taxation of Federal property in the hands of contractors or lessees and authorization of a system of payments in lieu of taxation on certain real properties in cases of local hardship.

Other recommendations: It is again recommended that the Employment Act of 1946 be amended to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power now specified in that act.

In support of our position of world leadership, legislation is again recommended to liberalize and modernize our immigration laws. The quota system should be brought up to date by revising the methods of determining, distributing, and transferring quotas, and the total number of immigrants admitted under quotas should be doubled. A permanent program for admission of refugees should also replace the inadequate and piecemeal legislation now in effect.

The enactment of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, the activities of the Department of Justice in enforcing these statutes, and the contribution of the Civil Rights Commission in identifying basic problems and legislative action required, represent significant progress in the field of civil rights. To permit the Commission to explore more thoroughly the necessity for further legislation in this field, its life should be extended for another 2 years. As part of an effort to extend civil rights in education to all our citizens, the Congress should enact legislation to assist State and local agencies to meet costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs. Also, legislation should be enacted to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity to make permanent and expand, with legislative backing, the important work of the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

The seriously congested conditions in the courts require that the Congress give early consideration to the creation of additional Federal judgeships as proposed by the Judicial Conference.

It is important that the Congress enact legislation, such as that passed by the House of Representatives last year, to reimburse Americans for certain World War II property damage.

A system of awards to recognize outstanding civilian achievements should also be established, as previously recommended.

Legislation should be enacted to incorporate the Alaska Railroad to place its operations on the same basis as other Federal activities of this type.

Last spring, legislation was introduced in the Congress to enlarge and change the boundaries of the site for the National Cultural Center in accordance with the design for the structure contemplated as a national center for the performing arts on the banks of the Potomac. It is important that such legislation be enacted as early as possible so that the fund-raising activities of the Center's Board of Trustees may be energetically continued.

I have repeatedly urged construction of a freedom monument symbolizing the ideals of our democracy as embodied in the freedoms of speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition. I still believe such a living, ever-building monument would be fitting.

IMPROVEMENTS IN BUDGETING

The budget process is a means of establishing Government policies, improving the management of Government operations, and planning and conducting the Government's fiscal role in the life of the Nation. Whether that role is increasing, decreasing, or remaining unchanged, the budget process is perhaps our most significant device for planning, controlling, and coordinating our programs and policies as well as our finances. Thus, the President and the Congress will always need to give attention to the improvement and full utilization of the budget system.

Improvements in presentation: The budget totals in this document reflect a technical accounting adjustment which affects budget expenditures and budget receipts equally, and does not affect the budget surplus for any year. This is the exclusion from the totals of expenditures and receipts, for all years shown in this document, of certain interfund transactions, mainly interest payments to the general fund of the Treasury by wholly owned Government enterprises which have borrowed from the Treasury. The amounts involved continue to be included in the figures for each function and for each agency, but are deducted in one sum to reach expenditure totals. Similarly, they continue to be included as miscellaneous budget receipts of the Treasury, but are deducted to arrive at the total of budget receipts. Since the beginning of the present fiscal year, various statements and reports on Government financial operations have been eliminating these interfund payments from budget totals.

Steady progress is being made in applying the principles of performance

budgeting. In this budget, the appropriation pattern or activity classifications of several agencies and bureaus have been improved and greater use is being made of program and workload measurement data. Cost-type budgets, which present the most adequate measure of financial performance, are used for more than 80 appropriation accounts for the first time. With these additions, about two-thirds of the appropriation accounts are now presented on a cost-type basis.

Funding arrangements: Recommendations placed before the Congress in this budget are again based upon the principle that authority to incur budget obligations and make expenditures should be granted in appropriation acts, rather than in substantive legislation handled outside the regular appropriation process. Of course, the budget totals include—as they have for many years—all of the new obligational authority actually granted each year and the subsequent spending, no matter what the method by which provided. The Congress ought to pass upon all new obligational authority in a regular systematic way as part of the appropriation process. We must never be led into thinking that special funding arrangements, which are a claim against budget receipts or borrowing, are somehow not a part of the budget or not a cost to the taxpayers.

From time to time, the Congress has enacted legislation and appropriations under which additional sums become available for obligation and expenditure annually without further congressional action. These are so-called permanent appropriations. In a few cases, such as interest on the public debt, permanent obligational authority may be desirable. In many other cases, however, permanent appropriations give unnecessary preferential treatment. A complete congressional review is needed of all such provisions of permanent authority, including those to use borrowed money, to enter into contracts ahead of appropriations, and to use collections to supplement appropriations. Those provisions which cannot be fully justified at this time should be repealed.

It is again recommended that major business-type activities of the Government be placed on a revolving fund basis, through which receipts can be used to meet obligations and expenditures, subject to annual review and control by the Congress. Such a system, which is presently applied successfully to all of the Government-owned corporations and many unincorporated Government enterprises, provides a clear display of the business-type nature of these activities, their income or loss from current operations, and the extent to which they are adding to or using up the Government's capital assets. In accordance with legislation enacted in response to a previous recommendation, the loan guarantee program of the Veterans' Administration is thus presented in this budget. Legislation should be enacted to provide revolving funds for the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

A few mixed-ownership Government corporations having authority to draw money from the Treasury or to commit the Treasury for future expenditures are presently outside the Government's budget system. This is largely because of the unrealistic and inconsistent distinction the law now makes between wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, even though both may affect the Government's finances. All Government corporations with such authority, namely, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the banks for cooperatives, and the Federal intermediate credit banks, should be brought within the flexible budget provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, and thus within the normal budgetary and reporting structure of the Government.

The extensive recommendations made a year ago for the control of foreign currencies generally were adopted by the Congress, and this action has proved helpful in obtaining more adequate budget control of these resources. However, there still remain various special provisions of law, requiring reservations of currencies for certain programs, that hinder the Government in making the wisest use of the foreign currencies coming into its hands. They should be repealed. Expenditures of all foreign currencies owned by the Government and used for its activities should be controlled through the annual budget process and should be accounted for in the same way as dollar expenditures.

The budget process in the Congress: Although the President presents one budget for the entire Government to the Congress each year, the Congress considers the budget in a multitude of pieces rather than as a whole. The financing methods outside the regular appropriation process, already mentioned, are but one phase of this problem. Another is the tendency to require a double budget process each year for certain agencies—requiring them, first, to seek legislation to authorize appropriations annually and, second, to seek their appropriations. The subcommittee arrangement and time schedule for processing appropriation requests further fragments the budget process. The complete separation of the handling of tax legislation from the consideration of appropriations and expenditures adds to the total problem.

The Congress should therefore provide a mechanism by which total receipts and total appropriations—and expenditures—can regularly be considered in relation to each other. Further, substantive legislation with respect to all continuing programs should be written so that new legislation is not required each year, thus permitting the budget and appropriation process to proceed in an orderly manner.

In accordance with recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, legislation was enacted in 1958 authorizing the Congress to establish limitations on accrued expenditures as a means of enabling more direct control over spending. Limitations were proposed for selected accounts in the last two budgets, but were rejected by the Congress without exception. Therefore, and since the law providing for accrued expenditure limitations expires in April 1962, no such limitations are proposed in this budget.

Provision of item veto: Future Presidents should have the authority to veto items of appropriation measures without the necessity of disapproving an entire appropriation bill. Many Presidents have recommended that this authority be given to our Chief Executive, and more than 80 percent of the States have given it to their Governors. It is a necessary procedure for strengthening fiscal responsibility. As in the case of other vetoes, the Congress should have the authority to override an item veto.

In my first budget message to the Congress, I described the philosophy of this administration in the following words:

> By using necessity—rather than mere desirability—as the test for our expenditures, we will reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government. We are convinced that more progress and sounder progress will be made over the years as the largest possible share of our national income is left with individual citizens to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will buy, and what they will save and invest. Government must play a vital role in maintaining economic growth and stability. But I believe that our development since the early days of the Republic, has been based on the fact that we left a great share of our national income to be used by a provident people with a will to venture. Their actions have stimulated the American genius for creative initiative and thus multiplied our productivity.

This philosophy is as appropriate today as it was in 1954. And it should continue to guide us in the future.

Over the past 8 years, we have sought to keep the role of the Federal Government within its proper sphere, resisting the ever-present pressures to initiate or expand activities which could be more appropriately carried out by others. At the same time, the record of this administration has been one of action to help meet the urgent and real needs of a growing population and a changing economy. For example, Federal expenditures between 1953 and 1961 for aids to education have more than doubled; outlays for public health have more than tripled; civil aviation expenditures have more than quadrupled; highway expenditures are five times the 1953 level; and urban renewal expenditures are more than seven times as great.

The major increases in spending which have taken place have not been devoted to the tools of war and destruction. A military posture of great effectiveness and strong retaliatory capability has been maintained without increasing defense expenditures above 1953, despite rising costs. We have, fortunately, been able to direct more of our public resources toward the improvement of living conditions and the enlargement of opportunities for the future growth and development of the Nation.

By applying the test of necessity rather than desirability to the expenditures of government, we have made significant progress in both public and private affairs during the past 8 years. And it is significant that requirements have been met while holding budget expenditures to a lesser proportion of the national income than in 1953.

The 1962 budget has been designed to promote further advancement for all of our people on a sound and secure basis. In that spirit, I commend it to the consideration of the next administration and the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 16, 1961.

BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the year every responsible business closes its ledgers and issues a balance sheet. By the same rule, every man entrusted with great responsibility at the close of his term renders an account of his stewardship.

We have here this morning, in the document just read from the desk, a report by the President of the United States to the Congress at the close of a long and eventful administration covering 8 years, one of the most critical periods in world history

The first impression that strikes us—with the impact of a locomotive at a grade crossing—is that after 8 years, in which the Government has enjoyed the largest revenues ever received by this or any other nation, we are closing the 8 years with the largest and most unmanageable national debt in all the tides of time.

During the same 8 years we have consistently and repeatedly increased the cost of living—a matter of profound interest to every housewife in America—and accompanying it the further depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar to the lowest point since the first dollar was struck from the Philadelphia mint.

This budget is another recordbreaker—the last of a series of recordbreakers from the present administration. In some respects it tops them all. In certain respects it is a carbon copy of past budgets.

As with the original version of the last budget, and one or two before, an outstanding feature of this 1962 budget is that it presumes a surplus of $1.5 billion to be applied to reduction of the debt.

On its face, it proposes that the Government live within the optimistically estimated income.

That we do so is an urgent national necessity to stop the outflow of gold; to stop the rising cost of living; to avoid further cheapening of the dollar; to restore confidence; to avoid ultimate national insolvency.

And the President presumes a razor-thin surplus of $0.1 billion—$79 million, to be precise—in his revised assumptions and recommendations for the current fiscal year 1961 ending next June 30.

But we have learned by sad experience that no prediction of a budget surplus can be taken at face value, and certainly that is true of these 1961 and 1962 budgets just read to the House.

Here is a table showing how far and how often the original budgets finally missed the mark:

Variations in deficit and surplus estimates under the Eisenhower administration

[In billions]

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result
1954 budget	(1)	−$3.1
1955 budget	−2.9	−4.2
1956 budget	−2.4	+1.6
1957 budget	+.4	+1.6
1958 budget	+1.8	−2.8
1959 budget	+.5	−12.4
1960 budget	+.1	+1.2
1961 budget	+4.2	[2]+.1
Total for last 7 years	+1.7	−14.9
1962 budget estimate	+1.5	

[1] Submitted by previous administration but revised and administered by Eisenhower administration.
[2] Latest official estimate (in 1962 budget).

NOTE.—Highway trust fund, which began with fiscal 1957, not included.

This budget appears optimistic in the extreme, especially as to revenue assumptions. All of the plausible economic reasoning and crystal gazing in the world does not alter the final results. It is the height of fiscal folly to repeatedly budget to or near the hilt of optimistic forecasts and demonstrated uncertainties. It violates every rule of prudence not to allow a clear safety margin as a hedge against overestimates and to provide for unforeseen national emergency items. The comparative figures just inserted are as plain as day on that point.

It again proposes, like every past budget, another extension of Korean war tax rates, 8 years after the close of that war.

It proposes new taxes and revenues. It proposes another postage increase. It proposes a higher gas tax. It proposes a new jet fuel tax.

Yet in past messages, the President expressed the "firm belief that tax rates are still too high." Again in the message just read, the President says sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets eventually—"eventually" is the word used—will make possible a reduced tax burden. That is in the same budget calling for new and increased taxes and revenues and extension of war taxes in time of peace.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Am I correct in assuming that now, as the gentleman will have after Friday a President of his own party, it would be within the province of that President to submit any revision of this budget that he sees fit to submit? Moreover, in view of the fact that the gentleman's own party now controls the Congress by a majority of three to two, would it not be completely within the power and authority of the gentleman and his people to make whatever revisions in respect of taxes or expenditures that they might see fit to make?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman begs the question. The question before us is, What has this administration done? The President has just made a report here of what he has done. He has had 8 years in which to make any reform he desired to make. He has had 8 years to recommend any measure he desired to recommend. Certainly, 8 years is time enough for him to present some practicable and workable system under which we could have sought methodical and significant reductions in the national debt, and which would have brought about the economies which he promised 8 years ago. They promised to economize—to retrench expenditures—to reduce spending. Instead, they have increased Government spending beyond all peacetime records.

Mr. Speaker, the projected surpluses of $1.5 billion for 1962 and the $100 million for 1961 were arrived at solely by including a number of contingencies and tenuous assumptions. For example:

Certain contingencies surrounding projected surpluses, 1961 and 1962

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962
1. President's budget figures are stated as being in the black by	+79	+1,468
2. If proposal to increase postal rates effective Apr. 1, 1961, is not adopted (partially refused once; wholly refused several times)	−160	−843
Then 1961 is in the red and 1962 is reduced	−81	+625
3. If ½ cent added highway fuel tax (to 4½ cents) is not adopted (it was once refused), presumably the diversion from the general fund to the trust fund, scheduled for July 1, 1961, of certain excise taxes on automobiles and parts and accessories, for which the ¼ cent is a substitute, might not be repealed. If not, the 1962 surplus would be reduced by		−810
Then both 1961 and 1962 are in the red by	−81	−185
4. If proposed transfer of financing of forest and public lands highways from general fund to trust fund is not adopted (thrice tried and failed), the 1962 surplus would be reduced by		−38
Then both years would be in the red by	−81	−223
5. If proposal to increase tax on aviation gas by 2 cents (to 4½ cents), and to keep it out of the highway trust fund is not adopted (tried before and failed), the 1962 surplus would be reduced by		−38
Then both years would be in the red by	−81	−261

Certain contingencies surrounding projected surpluses, 1961 and 1962—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962
6. If proposed new tax of 4½ cents on jet fuel is not adopted (tried before and failed), the 1962 surplus would be reduced by		−62
Then both years would be in the red by	−81	−323
7. If new proposal for temporary premium rate increase for Federal Home Loan Bank Board is not adopted, the 1962 surplus would be reduced by		−164
Then both years would be in the red by	−81	−487
8. If proposal for another 1-year extension of Korean wartime corporation income and excise tax rates, including repeal of scheduled expiration of 10-percent general telephone tax, is not adopted, the 1962 surplus would be reduced (the telephone tax alone is $366,000,000) by		−2,593
Then both years would be in the red by	−81	−3,080

NOTE.—Other revenue proposals in the budget, relatively minor, omitted above. General budget revenue assumption is that there will be a "rising level of business activity throughout most of calendar year 1961."

This budget proposes to take from the people $82.3 billion in 1962, the highest take in any year, peace or war, since the foundation of the Republic. That is $3.3 billion more than the currently estimated income for fiscal 1961, which in turn is shown as $1.2 billion above 1960.

It proposes the spending of $80.9 billion without the highway fund and $84.1 billion including it for comparability with the earlier years. That is also a record high without the highway fund and $2.2 billion more with it. It is $2 billion above the present estimate for the current fiscal year of 1961.

It is $4.6 billion above fiscal 1960. And it is $20.9 billion above the promise they made in the 1952 campaign of a $60 billion budget. The closest they ever came to that promise was in 1955 when they spent $64.4 billion.

He again urges restraint in the message today. It was only 2 years ago that the President declared war on excessive spending. He said:

> I think every place we are spending too much money. * * * We must start right from the biggest and go right down to the smallest.

He decried what he termed "loose handling of our fiscal affairs." But the budget he submitted shortly thereafter proposed to spend even more. And it also proposed increased appropriations, both large and small. And so does this one—in which scores of items are higher than last year.

This budget proposes new obligating authority of $80.9 billion; it recommends $84.2 billion counting the highway fund. That which a few years ago was transferred from the general fund—but which is still there, as all taxpayers will note, can only be interpreted as the forerunner to higher spending in the future. And it is the incredible sum of $21.4 billion above the first year expenditure of the present administration, fiscal 1954.

So Mr. Speaker, as in the past, some features of this budget do not comport with their talk of economy, self-restraint, and hope of tax relief within a balanced budget and reduced public debt. It is not the first time the messages and pronouncements go in one direction and the budget recommendations in another.

And as noted, the razor-thin revised estimate of a $79 million surplus in the current year of 1961 is produced by inserting one of the most unpopular and unlikely contingencies. They include another postage rate increase, but advance its effective date from July 1 back to April 1, 1961. That one retroactive item of $160 million converts a deficit into a projected nominal surplus. That is exactly one-tenth of 1 percent—a mere pittance, a wholly unreliable and absurd margin in the context of a $79 billion budget.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago one of the most influential members of the President's Cabinet succinctly summarized the present situation. He said:

> We have to recognize that there are two things that this country, rich though it is, powerful though it is, simply cannot afford: We cannot afford an atomic war, and we cannot afford a debasement of our currency.

Circumstances compelling mere mention of these two unthinkable contingencies by such a responsible source manifest their existence and emphasize the fact that we not only cannot brush them aside but that we must do everything within our power, at all costs and at all sacrifices, to avoid them. The prospect of bare survival in either case leaves us no choice.

The constantly growing area of communism is inexorably extending around the world. We are beleaguered from every side. We face great odds both at home and abroad. Our enemies, with superior armaments, more advanced technology, and the bluntly announced intention of burying us, are ruthlessly and relentlessly pressing the situation. But we are accepting optimistic reports with little concern and no apprehension for the future.

At home we are saddled with the greatest debt in world history and lacking in the self-discipline to do anything about it. And we have been spending money on useless and obsolete military devices and systems and even more profligate nonmilitary projects.

As we have accumulated deficits in our financial transactions with other nations, they have accumulated surpluses of our dollars.

As we have lived beyond our income, we have thereby cheapened and softened the dollar and they have hardened their currencies.

As we have cheapened the dollar, they have returned it to us and demanded the gold with which we guaranteed it.

As we have roared toward the borders of fiscal insanity, we have hiked and rehiked the cost of living for every family in America and correspondingly deflated the value of the dollar.

As we have indulged these inflationary excesses, we have wiped out over 50 percent of the face value of every life insurance policy, every pension, every savings account.

As we have continued to blithely spend more than we took in, and for nondefense things we could get along without, we have inflated and mushroomed our national debt. People will not buy our long-term bonds. The Treasury has been forced into the short-term, inflationary money market on a hand-to-mouth basis at prohibitive rates of interest. Approximately 80 percent of our monstrous marketable debt comes due during the next 5 years—$75 billion of it this year alone.

At the heart of our national finances is a simple, inescapable fact, easily grasped by anyone. It is that our Government—any government—like individuals and families, cannot spend and spend more than they take in without courting disaster. With governments, continued deficit spending inevitably leads to debasement of its currency. A man without self-respect forfeits the respect of others. A dollar is only as valuable and reliable in the eyes of others as it is in our own. And that, Mr. Speaker, all theories, rationalizations, explanations, and minimizing to the contrary, is the essence of today's distrust of the American dollar—once the unit of value among the currencies of the world.

The genesis of the distress of the dollar; the tenuous nature of our fiscal condition; the ever-increasing cost of setting the breakfast table, buying a house, and providing other necessities; the causes of the now deepening depression; the glee of Khrushchev as we daily become more heavily involved—the genesis of every critical situation can be traced in the budget just received from the President.

WHO PREPARES RECORDBREAKING BUDGETS?

Mr. Speaker, all fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget. It presumably includes only what he recommends. The President transmits it. He is directed by law to submit such tax, spending, and appropriation requests as in his judgment are necessary. He is in complete command. It includes only what he urges, what he approves, what in his judgment is necessary. He is by law required to recommend cuts in appropriations of any magnitude he feels are unwarranted by the necessities of the situation and to suggest revisions of basic legislation to correspond.

So, when Congress receives these recordbreaking budgets, as in the past 8

years and as of today, that is the responsibility of the executive department. That is their asking price.

EIGHT PROFLIGATE YEARS

Mr. Speaker, the present administration was elected in 1952 on the strength of unequivocal promises to "clean up the mess in Washington."

They were going to economize. They were going to retrench expenditures, they were going to reduce personnel. They promised to balance the budget.

They were going to reduce the monstrous public debt—a debt accumulated largely in fighting World War II.

They promised to banish inflation and reduce the cost of living.

They would restore the purchasing power of the dollar.

They promised. And the people approved.

But they have not delivered on a single one of these. The record is clear. It cannot be hidden. It cannot be explained away.

By way of summary, here is the record:

THE NATIONAL DEBT—RECORDBREAKING

The national debt when they took office in January 1953 was $267,393,784,247.66—that was the figure on January 2. After 8 years of administering the Treasury, they hand back a debt of $290,174,764,757.12. That was the figure on January 3, 1961—week before last. An increase of almost $23 billion. They hand back a mortgage of nearly $1,600 against every man, woman, and child in America.

Appraising it on a fiscal year basis, the debt stood at $266.1 billion in July 1953, the beginning of their first full fiscal year of responsibility for the budget. In the budget received today, they hand back a debt estimated at $284.9 billion as of July 1961. An increase of nearly $19 billions in 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, have they kept their promise to reduce the debt? Does the performance measure up to President Eisenhower's words in the campaign of 1952:

> Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

HIGHER SPENDING—RECORDBREAKING

Have they reduced spending? In fiscal year 1954, the first fiscal year they were in complete control, they spent $67.5 billion. Today, they hand back a budget proposing the spending of $80.9 billion in fiscal 1962, without the highway fund and $84.1 billion with it. Increases of $13.4 and $16.6 billion, respectively, over the first year. It exceeds the war year of fiscal 1953—the last of the Truman administration—by $10 billion including the highway item.

When the books balanced for the first time in fiscal 1956, they proudly announced that spending had finally been bridled—it was under control at last, they said. And many people took them at face value. The spending proposed in President Eisenhower's budget today exceeds 1956 by $17.9 billion.

We pointed out at the time the facade of budget surpluses shown for some years was not erected by retrenchment of expenditure, but by unprecedented rising national revenues secured from near-record tax rates including Korean war taxes in time of peace—though the war ended 8 years before. And in the budget today, the President again asks extension of the war taxes, plus new taxes, to cover the recordbreaking spending recommendations and to show an apparent surplus. They would never have shown a surplus in any year in the absence of war taxes. The budget received today is in the red by at least $3 billion identified without the war tax extension and additional revenue legislation he urges.

UNBALANCED BUDGETS—RECORDBREAKING

They promised to balance the budget—to throw away the red ink. Instead, they used more of it. For the 8 fiscal years 1954–61, ending this next June 30, as shown by the budget today, the cumulative budget deficit is $18 billion. They mired the Treasury that much deeper in the red. That is the record of the present administration. That is the end result. They have not lived within income.

And they went in the red in a period of record national income and with war taxes extended at their insistence in time of peace. They spent all they collected, then borrowed more and spent that.

As the budget discloses, and as we have heretofore documented, in the 7 fiscal years 1954–61 already closed out, they took in national revenues aggregating the astronomical sum of $150 billion more than in the immediately preceding 7 years under the previous administration. Likewise, they spent approximately $163 billion more. They incurred greater budget deficits; whereas leaving out the 3 Korean war years of 1951–53, there was a surplus in the other 4 years under the previous administration. They increased the national debt $20.2 billion in these last 7 years, whereas, the previous administration had reduced it more than $3 billion in the immediately preceding 7 years.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING—RECORDBREAKING

When charged with excessive expenditures they have justified deficits on the ground that it was for national defense. There was no choice. We have to be prepared against Khrushchev. But emphatically contrary to that version, the preponderance of increased spending has been in the nondefense items, not the defense budgets. This is the area where all manner of new and expanded programs have been installed—many for things we could get along without or defer until we could afford them. But they went out and borrowed money for them.

The statistical detail is included, but the record is so plain that all may read: The present administration, in the 1962 budget received today, recommends spending $16.6 billion more than in 1954, the first year. Of that increase, only $500 million is in defense but $16.1 billion is in the nondefense category. That is a 78-percent increase for nondefense. Incredible, but true, that in a time of national peril we should borrow so much money indiscriminately for nondefense things we could defer or do without or at least amortize as we go along.

HIGHER COST OF LIVING—RECORDBREAKING

Mr. Speaker, one especially appealing promise was to stop the rising cost of living. That was something every family could measure when they went to the market. But they have hiked it further—the inevitable result of inflationary spending beyond income. The official price index now registers new high water marks every 30 days.

When they took over in January 1953 the index was 113.9. When the new Secretary of Labor takes office next Friday he will inherit the latest index showing 127.4 for last November. The index hit new highs in 8 out of 11 months reported for 1960.

REDUCED VALUE OF THE DOLLAR—RECORDBREAKING

Every family, every businessman, every factory worker, every farmer must meet the relentlessly higher living and operating costs with a dollar that is worthless and less practically every 30 days.

They promised to harden the dollar and banish erosion. But as usual they have retracted. When they took over in January 1953 the dollar was worth 52 cents. It was already cheapened by the pressures of deficit war spending. But they assured us they would stop the decline. Mr. Speaker, it has never been worth that much from that day since. It has continued to drop steadily. The latest official index from the Department puts its value at less than 47 cents—and shows a persistent decline matching the corresponding increase in the cost of living.

HIGHER BUDGET REQUESTS—RECORDBREAKING

They were going to cut the appropriation requests and reduce the swollen bureaucracy. And in the first few months, they slashed the pending Truman budget for fiscal 1954 which had, of course, been written at a time when we were at war in Korea and did not know when it would end. Then the fighting stopped. That left the war pipeline clogged with unused billions of previous appropriations. So they cut the new appropriation requests and spent the pipeline. But spending continued unchecked—and has never stopped climbing.

President's budget estimates of appropriations

Congress:	
83d, 2d (fiscal 1955 and prior)	$57,422,327,386
84th, 1st (fiscal 1956 and prior)	62,030,092,195
84th, 2d (fiscal 1957 and prior)	68,587,724,820
85th, 1st (fiscal 1958 and prior)	73,113,555,340
85th, 2d (fiscal 1959 and prior)	81,737,060,999
86th, 1st (fiscal 1960 and prior)	83,452,687,259
86th, 2d (fiscal 1961 and prior)	[1] 84,010,398,836
87th, 1st (fiscal 1962 and prior)	[2] 81,830,000,000

[1] Subject to relatively minor revision for permanent appropriations.

[2] Includes $9,188,000,000 estimated for permanent appropriations for 1962 and $1,703,000,000 for estimated supplementals for 1961 in the 1962 budget received today.

From that day on, they have asked for higher and higher appropriations. In the first budget submitted by President Eisenhower for fiscal 1955, they asked for

$57.4 billion in the regular appropriations bills. In the 1962 budget, they ask this session of Congress for practically $82 billion. They urge nearly $25 billion above the first budget. Billions away from repeated promises.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS UP

With the current business slump and resulting widespread and alarming unemployment goes declining profits and earnings and thus less taxes collected to cover the ever-increasing spending requests. Today, the Treasury is in the market borrowing new money, increasing the debt to make up for falling revenues.

During the last month of the previous administration, December 1952, unemployment totaled only 2.5 percent of the civilian labor force. In just 1 year under the present administration, unemployment rose to 4.3 percent and in not 1 year since has it averaged less than 4 percent. What is the current situation? The Department of Labor reported last Friday that there were 4,540,000 people out of work in the month of December 1960—the largest number of unemployed in any December for 20 years. This is 6.4 percent of the labor force as they relinquish office compared with 2.5 percent when they assumed office. And the expectation is that the number will increase by another 1 million this month.

Included is a tabulation of official Department figures on unemployment during the last 9 years:

Employment and unemployment, 1952–60

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Total civilian labor force (thousands)	62,966	63,815	64,468	65,848	67,530	67,946	68,647	69,394	70,612
Total unemployed (thousands)	1,932	1,870	3,578	2,904	2,822	2,936	4,681	3,813	3,931
Percentage unemployed	3.1	2.9	5.6	4.4	4.2	4.3	6.8	5.5	5.6
December total civilian labor force (thousands)	62,921	62,993	63,526	66,592	67,029	67,770	68,081	69,276	70,549
Total unemployed (thousands)	1,564	2,676	3,039	2,657	2,723	3,374	4,108	3,577	4,540
Percentage unemployed	2.5	4.3	4.8	4.0	4.1	5.0	6.0	5.2	6.4

Source: U.S. Departmentof Labor.

FARM INCOME IS DOWN

They promised to see that the American farm family received fair prices. But the farmer situation has steadily deteriorated in the last 8 years. His costs have increased while his income has fallen. He is being squeezed between the upper and nether millstones.

In 1952, when this administration took office, the farm parity ratio stood at exactly 100. Income and expenses were in balance, based on the parity index. But, by last year, parity had dropped to 80—off 20 percent, as the following tabulations disclose:

Index of prices received by farmers, parity index, and parity ratio, annual average

Year	Prices received index	Parity index [1]	Parity ratio
1952	288	287	100
1953	255	277	92
1954	246	277	89
1955	232	276	84
1956	230	278	83
1957	235	286	82
1958	250	293	85
1959	240	297	81
1960 [2]	238	299	80

[1] Index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

In 1952, when the parity ratio was 100, net income from farming was $14.4 billion. At this point, the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar was 47 cents. By 1959, net farm income was down 21.5 percent to $11.3 billion, and the farmer's share of the food dollar was down to 38 cents, a reduction of nearly 20 percent. The following tabulation shows these reductions each year, together with the reduction of income per farm and per farm person.

Farm income data, 1952–60

Year	Net income from farming			Farmer's share of consumer's food dollar
	Total	Per farm	Per capita	
	Billion			*Percent*
1952	$14.4	$2,659	$711	47
1953	13.9	2,619	666	44
1954	12.2	2,346	654	43
1955	11.5	2,255	602	41
1956	12.0	2,421	597	40
1957	11.0	2,269	627	40
1958	13.0	2,767	748	38
1959	11.3	2,364	643	38
1960	[1] 11.6	[2]	[2]	[1] 38

[1] Preliminary estimate.
[2] Not available.

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

As an inevitable consequence of failing to keep spending within income, we are today saddled with the largest national debt that ever kindled the fires of inflation; that ever increased the cost of living; that every weakened our currency; that ever limited business activity; that ever curtailed employment; that ever jeopardized national solvency in this or any other nation in all recorded time.

The administration has been borrowing from future generations to pay current expenses. When they assumed full fiscal control in 1953, the debt was down to $266.1 billion from a World War II high of $279.2 billion. We had made some progress in paying off the war debt—and the great bulk of our debt, up until 8 years ago, was incurred in World War II. Just prior to that war, the debt represented a modest and supportable $367 for each American. Today, it represents a mortgage of nearly $1,600 for each American, with every prospect of going higher.

But all progress in paying on the war debt has been swept away in the last 8 years. Just a little over a year ago, on December 2, 1959, it reached the highest point since the Republic was founded—$292,707,614,012.11. In the budget received this morning, President Eisenhower says it will be $284.9 billion on June 30, 1961. They will have increased the debt by $18.8 billion in the 8 fiscal years 1954–61. It is evident that the surface balance of $1.5 billion in today's budget for 1962 is so dependent on uncertainties and optimistic revenue assumptions that there is every justification for speculating it will also be in the red. And that means further increasing the debt.

The administration, in 8 years, has increased the national debt as much as it was increased in the first 130 years of the Republic.

Notwithstanding record national tax takes, this administration, in 8 years, has hiked the national debt as much as it was hiked from 1933, when the country was flat on its back, to the beginning of the defense program in 1940.

Drastic public measures were taken to relieve the desperate situation of those years—and there was an abundant outcry about wild and wreckless spending. But the record speaks for itself.

A matter of urgent necessity is the stabilization of the national debt by getting it into longer term bonds. That has been a cardinal objective—and a laudible objective—of the Eisenhower administration. And they not only failed to keep pace, they have actually shortened the average maturity of the debt—from 5 years, 4 months in 1953 to 4 years, 7 months today. Far too much of the debt is in short-term paper, so the Treasury is in the market refinancing portions of the debt every week of the year. Long-term bonds are no longer attractive. Investors will not buy when they know investments will be washed away by inflation. Approximately $75 billion comes due and must be refinanced this year. The Treasury is on a hand-to-mouth basis. And it will remain so as long as we keep spending more than we take in.

For the eighth consecutive time, the President again asks that the statutory debt ceiling be temporarily raised. Paraphrasing the old saw, nothing is so permanent as a temporary increase in the debt ceiling. The once restraining influence of the ceiling has gone; it is now a mere annual gesture. Failing to live within income has given so-called temporary debt ceilings a permanent status.

The public debt—8 fiscal years

[In billions of dollars]

1. Actual increase, 7 fiscal years (1954–60):	
July 1953	266.1
July 1960	286.3
Increase in 7 years	+20.2
2. Change during 1961 fiscal year as estimated in the 1962 budget received today (from $286.3 billion to $284.9 billion)	−1.4
Increase in the 8 years July 1953–July 1961	+18.8
3. Changes during 1962 fiscal year as estimated in the 1962 budget received today (from $284.9 billion estimated for July 1961 to $283.4 billion for July 1962)	−1.5

NOTE: Old statutory debt ceiling of $275 billion raised as follows:

For fiscal 1955 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1956 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1957 by $3 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1958 by $5 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1959 by $8 billion (permanently to $283 billion); $5 billion (temporarily to $288 billion).
For fiscal 1960 by $10 billion (permanently to $285 billion); $10 billion (temporarily to $295 billion).
For fiscal 1961 by $8 billion (temporarily to $293 billion).
For fiscal 1962, budget message indicates necessity for another temporary increase. Amount not specified.

INTEREST ON THE DEBT

With inflationary pressures and decline in popularity of Government bonds attending the profligacy of living beyond income, the cost of carrying the national debt has now risen to the point where it equals what we ran the entire Government on only 20 years ago. It takes 11 cents of each dollar in the spending budget. We now pay $17,000 every minute of the day and night just for the interest charge. Incredible. Unprecedented.

Because of the the business recession, the Treasury is now getting relatively favorable rates on short-term refinancing compared to a year ago. But that is purely temporary.

Interest on the public debt

1. The Federal public debt:

	Billions
At June 30, 1959	$284.7
At June 30, 1960	286.3
At June 30, 1961 (as estimated in 1962 budget, received today)	284.9
At June 30, 1962 (as estimated in 1962 budget, received today)	283.4

Interest on the public debt—Continued

2. Interest on the debt:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1959	$7,593
Fiscal year 1960 (increase of $1,587 million, fiscal 1960 over 1959)	9,180
Fiscal year 1961 (estimated in 1962 budget)	8,900
Fiscal year 1962 (estimated in 1962 budget)	8,500

3. In the current fiscal 1961 ending this June 30, interest on the debt is to average $24,383,562 every day, $1,015,982 every hour, $16,933 every minute of the day and night in the year.

4. In the fiscal year 1962, as estimated in the budget today, interest on the debt is to average $23,287,671 every day, $970,319 every hour, $16,172 every minute of the day and night in the year.

Average length and maturity distribution of marketable interest-bearing public debt [1]

[In millions of dollars]

End of fiscal year or month	Amount outstanding	Maturity classes					Average length	
		Within 1 year	1 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	10 to 20 years	20 years and over	Years	Months
1953	$147,335	$65,270	$36,161	$15,651	$28,662	$1,592	5	4
1960	183,845	70,467	72,844	20,246	12,630	7,658	4	4
1959—December	188,269	79,941	61,609	22,139	16,494	8,085	4	4
1960—January	189,856	81,455	61,691	22,138	16,489	8,084	4	2
June	183,845	70,467	72,844	20,246	12,630	7,658	4	4
October	189,358	79,203	68,595	17,332	12,601	11,627	4	7

[1] All issues classified to final maturity except partially tax-exempt bonds, which are classified to earliest call date.

Source: Debt Analysis Staff, Office of the Secretary of Treasury.

Interest-bearing public debt, by types

[In millions of dollars]

End of fiscal year or month	Total interest-bearing public debt	Public issues													Special issues
		Total public issues	Marketable							Nonmarketable					
			Total	Bills	Certificates	Notes	Treasury bonds		Other bonds [3]	Total	U.S. savings bonds	Treasury savings notes	Treasury bonds, investment series	Depositary bonds	
							Bank eligible	Bank restricted [1]							
1953	263,946	223,408	147,335	19,707	15,854	30,425	63,980	17,245	124	76,073	57,886	4,453	13,288	447	40,538
1960	283,241	238,342	183,845	33,415	17,650	51,483	81,247	----------	50	54,497	47,544	----------	6,783	170	44,899
1959—December	287,704	244,197	188,209	39,643	19,669	44,152	84,754	----------	50	55,928	48,154	----------	7,590	184	43,506
1960—January	288,086	245,456	189,856	41,156	19,669	44,235	84,746	----------	50	55,600	47,877	----------	7,539	183	42,630
June	283,241	238,342	183,845	33,415	17,650	51,483	81,247	----------	50	54,497	47,544	----------	6,783	170	44,899
October	287,372	243,097	189,358	39,454	25,479	42,103	82,273	----------	50	53,739	47,359	----------	6,253	119	44,275

[1] Issues which commercial banks (banks accepting demand deposits) were not permitted to acquire prior to specified dates, except that: (1) concurrently with the 4th, 5th, and 6th War Loans and the Victory Loan, they were permitted to subscribe for limited investment of their savings deposits; (2) they might temporarily acquire such issues through forfeiture of collateral; (3) they might hold a limited amount of such issues for trading purposes.

[3] Consists of Panama Canal bonds, and also postal savings bonds until the last of these bonds matured on July 1, 1955.

Source: Daily Treasury statement.

Computed interest charge and interest rate on Federal securities

End of fiscal year or month	Total interest-bearing securities outstanding	Computed annual interest charge	Computed annual interest rates on all securities	End of fiscal year or month	Total interest-bearing securities outstanding	Computed annual interest charge	Computed annual interest rates on all securities
	Billions	Billions			Billions	Billions	
1953 (June)	$264.0	$6.4	2.438	1959 (June)	$281.9	$8.1	2.867
1954 (June)	269.0	6.3	2.342	1960 (June)	283.4	9.3	3.297
1955 (June)	271.8	6.4	2.351	1960 (January)	288.2	9.6	3.334
1956 (June)	270.0	7.0	2.576				
1957 (June)	268.6	7.3	2.730	1960 (October)	287.5	9.1	3.167
1958 (June)	274.8	7.2	2.638				

Source: Treasury Bulletin, December 1960.

BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS DEFICITS AND LOSS OF GOLD

Mr. Speaker, if anyone needs conclusive evidence of the precarious state of our national finances he has but to note the record of our alarming balance-of-payments deficits and the rate at which foreign nations are withdrawing gold from Fort Knox. The record is a grim warning that something must be done to correct the situation. We must put our house in order. We cannot live beyond income indefinitely.

We have already lost over $5 billion in gold in the last 3 years. The Treasury statement records a further loss every morning. And the pace is accelerating.

In the last calendar year they withdrew $134 million in gold in the first 6 months and more than $1,500 million in the last 6 months of the year. The obvious reason for this progressive increase in withdrawals is that foreign creditors are becoming increasingly apprehensive of devaluation by the United States. It is high time they were reassured. It is time we paid something on account instead of borrowing more money at high rates of interest for nondefense expenditures.

There is now deposited at Fort Knox a little less than $18 billion in gold. Of that amount $12 billion must be reserved to back our currency—even at the small ratio of 25 cents on the dollar. That leaves a margin of only $6 billion in reserve. Against that margin there are now short-term foreign claims of $19 billion—three times the legally available supply. If the doubt about the rational management of our fiscal affairs and the stability of the dollar spreads, how long will the $6 billion last?

And when the last $6 billion goes, American primacy in world finance goes with it and world chaos follows.

Further emphasizing the seriousness of the situation, the President yesterday issued an Executive order forbidding Americans from holding or acquiring gold abroad. They are required to turn it in by next June. But that will not stop the outflow—foreigners may still demand it. I include tabulations of official data in support:

Gold assets of the United States

	Assets	Change during the year or month		Assets	Change during the year or month
Dec. 31, 1957	$22,780,675,342		Calendar year 1960—Continued		
Dec. 31, 1958	20,534,104,913	−$2,246,570,429	Sept. 30, 1960	$18,684,852,496	$(−320,515,913)
Dec. 31, 1959	19,456,135,794	−1,077,969,119	Oct. 31, 1960	18,402,044,155	(−282,808,341)
Dec. 30, 1960	17,766,797,708	−1,689,338,086	Nov. 30, 1960	17,910,382,407	(−491,661,748)
Calendar year 1960:			Dec. 30, 1960	[1] 17,766,797,708	(−143,584,699)
1st 6 months (to July 1, 1960)	19,322,069,926	(−134,065,868)			
July 29, 1960	19,144,077,599	(−177,992,327)	Total decline in gold holdings in last 3 years		−5,013,877,634
Aug. 31, 1960	19,005,368,409	(−138,709,190)			

[1] In the 1st 10 days of January 1961 our gold stock further dropped by $141,704,979, to $17,625,092,729.

Source: Daily Statement of U.S. Treasury.

Our weakening gold position

[In billions of dollars]

End of calendar year—	U.S. gold stock	Gold stock (above required 25 percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold	End of calendar year—	U.S. gold stock	Gold stock (above required 25 percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold
1957	22.9	10.8	14.9	4.1	November 1960	17.9	6.3	[1]	[1]
1958	20.6	8.5	15.6	7.1	December 1960	17.8	[1]	[1]	[1]
1959	19.5	7.3	17.7	10.4					
October 1960	18.4	6.6	19.2	12.6	3-year change	−5.1	[2] −4.2	[2] +4.3	[2] +8.5

[1] Not available.
[2] Using October for comparison.

Source: Department of Commerce.

U.S. balance of payments deficits

[Millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. receipts (recorded)		U.S. payments (recorded)					Balance on recorded transactions [net payments (−) or receipts (+)]	Unrecorded transactions—errors and omissions (net receipts)	Payments deficit (−) or surplus (+)
	Exports of goods and services	Foreign long-term capital (net)	Imports of goods and services	U.S. grants and capital (net)						
				Total [1]	U.S. Government grants and capital	Private capital				
						Total	Direct			
1951	18,863	182	15,142	4,716	3,191	1,068	528	−813	470	−343
1952	18,105	141	15,760	4,083	2,380	1,158	850	−1,597	505	−1,092
1953	17,081	206	16,644	3,041	2,055	369	721	−2,398	296	−2,102
1954	17,949	244	16,088	3,788	1,554	1,619	664	−1,683	167	−1,516
1955	20,003	346	17,937	4,007	2,211	1,211	779	−1,595	446	−1,149
1956	23,705	530	19,829	[2] 5,982	[2] 2,327	2,990	1,859	−1,576	643	−933
1957	26,733	361	20,923	6,451	2,574	3,175	2,058	−280	748	+468
1958	23,325	24	21,053	6,153	2,587	2,844	1,094	−3,857	380	−3,477
1959	23,464	548	23,560	[2] 5,061	[2] 1,981	2,301	1,310	−4,609	783	−3,826
	Seasonally adjusted annual rates									
1960: 1st quarter	25,876	740	23,712	5,376	2,304	2,296	1,172	−2,472	−88	−2,560
2d quarter	27,240	608	24,084	[2] 5,976	2,812	2,308	868	−2,212	−636	−2,848
3d quarter [3]	27,844	−4	23,552	7,284	2,280	4,128	1,604	−2,996	−1,132	−4,128

[1] Includes remittances and pensions, not shown separately.
[2] Excludes U.S. subscriptions to international financial institutions.
[3] Preliminary.

NOTE.—Data exclude goods and services transferred under military grants.

Source: Department of Commerce.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES

One of the most illuminating charts is that showing the steady climb in the cost of living and the accompanying drop in the buying power of the dollar included herewith:

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
Years:			
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1953—January	113.9	113.1	52.2
1954—January	115.2	113.1	51.6
1955—January	114.3	110.6	52.0
1956—January	114.6	109.2	51.8
1957—January	118.2	112.8	50.3
1958—January	[2] 122.3	118.2	48.6
1959—January	123.8	119.0	48.0
1960—January	125.4	117.6	47.4
February	125.6	117.4	47.3
March	[2] 125.7	117.7	47.3
April	[2] 126.2	119.5	47.1
May	[2] 126.3	119.7	47.0
June	[2] 126.5	120.3	47.0
July	[2] 126.6	120.6	46.9

[1] As measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index.

[2] New record high.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar—Continued

	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
Selected months:			
1960—August	126.6	120.1	46.9
September	[2] 126.8	120.2	46.8
October	[2] 127.3	120.9	46.7
November	[2] 127.4	121.1	46.6

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Debt Analysis Staff, Dec. 28, 1960.

RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND DEFICITS AND SUPLUSES, 8 YEARS

In further substantion, is included below the customary tabulation of official data on budget receipts, expenditures, and the differences which had to be made up by issuing Government bonds. The figures for fiscals 1961 and 1962 are, of course, tentative. They rest on unwarranted optimism and highly uncertain contingencies:

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (—) or surplus (+), 8 fiscal years, 1954–61

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net "budget" receipts	Net "budget" expenditures	Deficit (—) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	$64.4	$67.5	—$3.1
2. Fiscal 1955	60.2	64.4	—4.2
3. Fiscal 1956	67.8	66.2	+1.6
4. Fiscal 1957:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	72.0	69.8	+2.2
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	70.6	69.0	+1.6
5. Fiscal 1958:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.6	72.9	—2.3
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	68.6	71.4	—2.8

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (—) or surplus (+), 8 fiscal years, 1954–61—Continued

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net "budget" receipts	Net "budget" expenditures	Deficit (—) or surplus (+)
6. Fiscal 1959:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	$70.0	$83.0	—$13.0
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	67.9	80.3	—12.4
7. Fiscal 1960:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	80.3	79.5	+.8
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	77.7	76.5	+1.2
8. Fiscal 1961 (latest budget estimate):			
(a) Including highway trust fund	82.0	[1] 81.9	[1] +.1
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	79.0	[1] 78.9	[1] +.1
Total, all 8 years:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	567.3	585.2	—17.9
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	556.2	574.2	—18.0
Fiscal 1962 (Jan. 16, 1961, budget estimates from Eisenhower administration):			
(a) Including highway trust fund	[2] 85.6	[2] 84.1	+1.5
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	[2] 82.3	[2] 80.9	+1.5

[1] Includes $549,000,000, estimated expenditure from 1961 supplementals to be submitted. And the projected surplus shown also hinges on adoption of the budget proposal to raise postage rates effective Apr. 1, 1961 ($160,000,000 estimated income in fiscal 1961).

[2] Includes revenues contemplated from new legislation proposed in the budget (continuation of Korean war excise taxes, certain new fuel taxes, repeal of pending diversion of general fund excise taxes to highway trust fund, etc.).

[3] Among other things, assumes enactment of additional $843,100,000 in postal revenue, and other revenue proposals.

Net budget expenditures—Defense and nondefense, 8 fiscal years, 1954–61

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense-military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.7	$23.7	$74.1	$74.1
. . . . .						
Fiscal 1954 (beginning July 1953)	40.3	46.9	20.6	20.6	67.5	67.5
Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	23.8	23.8	64.4	64.4
Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.6	25.6	66.2	66.2
Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	26.7	26.5	69.0	69.8
Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.3	28.8	71.4	72.9
Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	33.9	36.6	80.3	83.0
Fiscal 1960	41.2	45.6	30.9	34.0	76.5	79.6
Fiscal 1961 (revised estimates shown in 1962 budget)	41.5	45.3	33.6	36.6	[1] 78.9	81.9
Fiscal 1962 (Jan. 16, 1961, budget estimates from Eisenhower administration)	42.9	47.4	33.5	36.7	80.9	84.1
Comparisons:						
(a) Fiscal 1962 compared with last war year (1953)	—.7	—3.0	+9.8	+13.0	+6.8	[2] +10.0
(b) Fiscal 1962 compared with 1st year of Eisenhower administration (1954)	+2.6	+.5	[3] +12.9	[4] +16.1	+13.4	+16.6
(c) Fiscal 1962 compared with 1st year showing surplus under Eisenhower administration (1956)	+7.1	+6.8	+7.9	+11.1	+14.7	+17.9
(d) Fiscal 1962 compared with current fiscal year (1961)	+1.4	+2.1	—.1	+.1	+2.0	+2.2

[1] Includes $549,000,000 estimated expenditure from 1961 supplementals to be submitted, also estimated at $1,703,000,000 (all but $270,000,000 of the $549,000,000 is for nondefense.)

[2] Represents increase of 13 percent over war year of 1953.

[3] Represents increase of 62 percent over 1st year of 1954.

[4] Represents increase of 78 percent over 1st year of 1954.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING, 8 YEARS

And in substantiation of the statement that the genesis of higher and higher spending is in the nondefense category, and not for national defense, I include the above detailed tabulation of official budget figures.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE THE GOVERNMENT

The most consistently accurate barometer to future spending is the authority to commit the Treasury to future spending. That comes first. Spending follows. There has been a steady upward march in the requests from the President. As noted, in the budget today

he recommends $80.9 billion of new obligating authority for fiscal 1962. With the highway fund, it adds up to $84.2 billion.

That is above the amount enacted to date for fiscal 1961, and aggregates the incredible sum of $21.4 billion above what was provided in the first year, fiscal 1954.

I include a detailed table for the years involved. It includes the frontdoor, backdoor, sidedoor, and trapdoor appropriation techniques—everything:

Appropriations and other forms of authority to obligate the Government ("new obligational authority") (a rearrangement of budget table 7 with certain additions)

[In billions]

Type of authority	Enacted 1954	Enacted 1955	Enacted 1956	Enacted 1957	Enacted 1958	Enacted 1959	Enacted 1960	1961 Already enacted	1961 Total, proposed	1962 total, proposed	1962 compared with— Enacted 1961	1962 compared with— 1961 total, proposed	1962 compared with— Enacted 1954 (1st year)
1. Appropriations:													
a. Annual	$51.8	$45.8	$50.8	$58.9	$61.9	$67.7	$67.6	$69.1	$70.8	$70.9	+$1.8	+$0.1	+$19.1
b. Permanent (annual action not required)	6.8	6.8	7.4	7.8	8.1	8.1	9.8	9.6	9.6	9.2	−.4	−.4	+2.4
Total, appropriations	58.6	52.6	58.2	66.7	70.0	75.8	77.4	78.7	80.4	80.1	+1.4	−.3	+21.5
2. Public debt receipt authority	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.2	5.7	5.4	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.0	−.3	−.4	−2.6
3. Contract authority	.9	1.0	2.4	.3	.5	.4	.7	.8	.7	.3	−.5	−.4	−.6
4. Reappropriation of prior funds	.4	1.2	.4	.1	.2	.1	.2	.2	.2	.1	−.1	−.1	−.3
Total, all forms of authority	63.5	57.8	64.1	70.3	76.4	81.7	80.1	81.0	82.7	81.5	+.5	−1.2	+18.0
5. Deduct appropriations to liquidate contract authority previously granted	−.7	−.7	−.9	−.1	−.1	−.3	−.5	−.6	−.6	−.6			+.1
Net new obligating authority as per budget	62.8	57.1	63.2	70.2	[1] 76.3	[1] 81.4	79.6	80.4	82.1	80.9	+.5	−1.2	+18.1
6. Add highway trust fund for proper comparison with years prior to 1957:													
a. New contract authority				2.6	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	+.1	+.1	+3.2
b. Tax refunds and interest on general fund advances					.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1			+.1
Grand total	62.8	57.1	63.2	72.8	[1] 80.0	[1] 84.9	82.6	83.6	85.3	84.2	+.6	−1.1	+21.4

[1] The budgets for 1959 and 1960 recommended several large supplementals for the respective immediately preceding fiscal years (1958 and 1959) which normally should have been carried in the regular bills for the ensuing year or were otherwise unusual or special items which tend to distort comparisons between years.

THREE WAYS TO STATE SIZE OF 1962 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, the traditional basis of the budget totals does not disclose the full magnitude of the ebb and flow of money in and out of the Treasury. A principal reason is the exclusion of trust funds—social security, unemployment, highways, certain retirements, and similar provisions. There is interest in the matter and I accordingly present a tabulation on a more inclusive basis:

3 ways to state the size of 1962 budget

[In billions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Estimate of surplus
1. The administrative budget: This is the one most commonly used. Its ingredients are "net budget" receipts and "net budget" expenditures. It shows net budget expenditures against what might be termed general, unsegregated Treasury receipts. It is the one which shows the $1,500,000,000 surplus projection. The administrative budget totals are	$82.3	$80.9	$1.5
2. The cash budget: This is the term often applied to what the budget message refers to as "Receipts from and payments to the public," an effort to portray the magnitude of the ebb and flow of funds between the Government and the public. Briefly, this combines "budget" figures (the administrative budget) and trust fund receipts and expenditures, and then eliminates intragovernmental and intrafund transactions which do not represent flow of funds either to or from the public (see tables, p. M11 and p. 981). As explained below, this method, as used in the budget, does not disclose the full magnitude. The cash budget totals are	103.1	101.8	1.3
3. A 3d method: The cash budget calculation (No. 2 above) understates the full scope of Federal income and outgo. This is because budget receipts and budget expenditures are stated, as in the past, on a net basis. This is to say, certain receipts are not shown as "budget receipts," but rather are offset against gross budget expenditures, thus arriving at net budget expenditures. These receipts are collections of interest, repayment of loans, postal revenues, and other income (primarily from outside the Government) of Government corporations, the postal service, and various revolving funds. The budget makes the distinction in this respect basically because such receipts are available for use or reuse (respending) by the corporation or other enterprise concerned and thus are not available for general appropriation purposes. (In the case of postal receipts for services rendered, budget totals reflect only the net deficit or surplus.) Counting such receipts as receipts, rather than as offsets to expenditures, the following tabulation more fully reflects the ebb and flow of funds:			
Net budget receipts (same as item 1)	82.3		
Receipts treated in the budget as offsets to gross budget expenditures (see table 9, p. 18)	10.3		
Trust fund receipts (p. 922)	25.2		
Gross budget expenditures (net budget expenditures plus receipt offsets mentioned above)		91.2	
Trust fund expenditures (p. 922)		25.2	
Subtotal	117.8	116.4	1.4
Deduct intragovernment and intrafund transactions not directly involving the public (same items as are referred to in "cash budget" calculation in No. 2 above; see p. 981)	−4.4	−4.6	.2
Total (ebb and flow between Government and public)	113.4	111.8	1.6

Mr. Speaker, the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, said:

The first step toward determining what ought to be done in the finances of this country, is to estimate, in the best manner we can, its capacity for revenue; and the proportion between what it is able to afford, and what it stands in need of, for the expenses of its civil and military establishments.

Mr. Speaker, the imperative necessity of the times is that we live within our income and stop piling up more debt to be passed on to future generations. As Hamilton inferred—and he was a wise man—we ought not to be spending money we do not have for things we can get along without. We ought to dispense with every nonessential expenditure. The stakes are too high.

When the country was flat on its back in the great depression of the 1930's, the large accelerations of public expenditures served immediate humanitarian purposes, but little more than that. They did not appreciably revitalize the economy. From 1933 to the beginning of the defense program in 1941, pump-priming expenditures did not prime the pump. Unemployment persisted. In 1933 about 25 percent of the civilian labor force was out of work. The lowest it got in the next 6 years was 14 percent. Not until the defense buildup in 1941 did it drop below 10 percent. The pump did not prime.

Other pertinent economic indicators of the time show that not until the defense and war programs of the 1940's was there striking improvement in the situation. The pump did not prime.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say we welcome any suggestions in respect to any item coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. We do not process the back-door appropriation bills. We are pleased to note the President urgently concurs that we ought not to have back-door bills. It is spending in the dark. It ties the hands of the President in the ability to coordinate Government spending. And it keeps the Congress in the dark. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

The several revenue proposals are, of course, a matter for the legislative committees. But for items referred to the Committee on Appropriations, we welcome suggestions. We are ready to begin consideration of the budget.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for 6 of the last 8 years, the Democratic Party has been in control of the Congress of the United States, both the Senate and the House. During all that time there has been a continuous buildup of back-door appropriations, back-door appropriations where they turn over to the executive offices of the housing setup, for instance, the urban renewal setup, and a half a dozen other agencies, money over which there is absolutely no control by the Congress in any way whatever of the amount that can be spent, and not as much as there should be on the part of the Executive.

If we are going to have any kind of intelligent approach to the budget of the United States it is going to be necessary that we do away with the back-door approach, that is, the setting up of a billion or two billion dollars or even three or four, to Government agencies to manipulate as they please. If we are going to have that sort of thing then we are going to be in bad trouble.

The best thing that was done in the last 8 years happened last year when there were no new appropriations of the back-door variety handled in the last end of the session.

I am very much disturbed about the whole picture. We are going to be in trouble if we do not clamp down on the agencies. We have got to do away with the back-door business, and we have got to cut down on the direct appropriations for specific purposes on the part of the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we all listen with interest on occasions such as this and pay particular attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. It should be noted that the gentleman from Missouri, as has been so well pointed out, has occupied the position of chairman of the committee for the past 6 years. This simply means that he and his party have had control of the Appropriations Committee by a ratio of 30 to 20. During those years they have had control of the Congress by an overwhelming majority. It is likewise true in respect to taxation. So if he complains about spending and taxes then he must accept the responsibility for his side of the aisle.

I would like to say just this thing further, if the gentleman will permit me, the President of the United States has recommended balanced budgets and from time to time we have achieved balanced budgets because some of us have really worked and tried to hold down Federal spending. We have been quite successful in that respect. We have before us today a budget which under the law is required to be submitted by an outgoing President. It is an honest budget. There is money in this budget to take care of additional programs that come under the heading of things that should be done for the people of the country. As I say, it is an honest budget; it is not a political budget; it is not a budget designed to put anybody in the hole, but a budget that has been sent to the Congress under the high responsibility of the outgoing Chief Executive. All I have to say is that if the gentleman from Missouri really means what he is talking about then he will have lots of help on this side of the aisle to stay within the limits of this budget so far as spending is concerned.

That is the part that has to do with his committee. If we have that sort of support over there then the dire consequences about which he talks will not come to pass.

The gentleman spoke so glibly of inflation, and it has been bad, but he seems to forget that the great inflationary period came under the predecessor of President Eisenhower, not during President Eisenhower's term of office. I think that a balanced budget is the only way to protect the value of the dollar that the gentleman is so concerned about. So I issue the challenge, let us stand up and be counted on this budget.

I might also point out that if the recommendations of the task forces that have been reporting to the President-elect come up here and are passed, while DICK NIXON in the campaign said that the promises would exceed $13 billion, I suggest that they will exceed $13 billion annually. I do not think we should perform on them and as far as I am concerned I am going to do all I can to hold down the cost of Government and I hope the gentleman from Missouri will help us to do the same.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TABER was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader in his plausible manner says that the Congress appropriated all of this money, but he overlooks the fact that it was done at the request and at the recommendation and urgent insistence of the administration. He fails to note that in every year the Committee on Appropriations, to which he refers, has recommended appropriation of less money than the President requested. And in every year the appropriation bills as finally enacted were below the corresponding budget estimates.

In substantiation of that, I include a tabulation of appropriations requested by President Eisenhower in the last 7 years and the amounts appropriated by the Congress in response thereto. This tabulation is limited to appropriations processed through the regular appropriation bills and handled and reported by the Committee on Appropriations to which the gentleman from Indiana specifically referred. It will be noted that the Congress reduced the appropriations requested by the President in each year and in total for all 7 years made reductions in his requests of $12,695,361,122.

Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, by sessions of Congress [1]

	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates
83d Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1955 and prior fiscal years	$57, 422, 327, 386	$54, 812, 457, 263	−$2, 609, 870, 123
84th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1956 and prior fiscal years	62, 030, 092, 195	59, 954, 284, 321	−2, 075, 807, 874
84th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1957 and prior fiscal years	68, 587, 724, 820	68, 330, 229, 608	−257, 495, 212
85th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1958 and prior fiscal years	73, 113, 555, 340	68, 070, 096, 556	−5, 043, 458, 784
85th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1959 and prior fiscal years	81, 737, 060, 999	81, 119, 818, 276	−617, 242, 723
86th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1960 and prior fiscal years	83, 452, 687, 259	81, 572, 357, 732	−1, 880, 329, 527
86th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1961 and prior fiscal years	84, 010, 398, 836	83, 799, 241, 957	−211, 156, 879

[1] Excludes permanent appropriations for refund of taxes and sinking fund and other debt retirement funds.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. My distinguished chairman has just indicated that according to his opinion, President Eisenhower can be blamed for any excess spending that has materialized in the last 6 or 8 years. The gentleman from Missouri has forgotten that in the last Congress the Congress, over the veto of the President, approved a Federal employees' pay bill that added during this current fiscal year $750 million to what the President had proposed for expenditures. This substantial increase in Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1961 is the burden or the responsibility of the Congress, not President Eisenhower.

There are other similar examples such as the public-works bill, which the President vetoed as unjustified spending at this time. These are legislative matters which were passed over the veto of the President; therefore, he cannot be

responsible for the expenditures which have and will result.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has described a condition in the Federal Treasury which requires prompt and vigorous action on the part of the Appropriations Committee in both the House and the Senate to go over all of these items with a fine tooth comb and find out places where cuts can be made. We should make those cuts and reduce the expenditures.

It is up to the Congress as a whole to stay away from these back-door appropriations and the operations that are going to cause a great deal of trouble for all of us if we continue to have these back-door appropriations.

I think that is a tremendously important thing, and that is what we should take care of ourselves just as fast as the committees of the Congress can take care of them. If we let all of the sob sisters who come in and ask for money have all they want, God help the United States of America.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. WALTER LAMBETH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a deep sense of loss that I announce to this House the passing of the Honorable John Walter Lambeth, of Thomasville, N.C., who died in Washington, D.C., as the result of a heart attack on January 12, 1961.

Mr. Lambeth was the son of the late John W. and Daisy Sumner Lambeth, of Thomasville, N.C., where he was born on January 10, 1896. He graduated from Trinity College, now Duke University, and did postgraduate work at Harvard. At the age of 25 he was elected to the State senate and afterward served several terms as mayor of Thomasville, N.C. He was a prominent business executive at the time of his election to this Congress in November 1930.

While a Member of this body he served his State and Nation with great credit and distinction. At the time of his retirement from Congress on January 3, 1939, he was a ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. In the summer of 1939 he was appointed by the Speaker of the House as an official delegate to the American Battle Monuments Commission and was sent to Europe to participate in the dedication of World War I memorials to our American veterans who died on European soil.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I felt very sorry when I read of the death of Mr. Lambeth. Walter Lambeth possessed one of the finest minds in his relationship to his fellow beings that I have ever met; a man who was a philosopher; a man who analyzed the real journey of life in relation to his fellow man. He was possessed of a profound understanding and a sweet and philosophical mind. I join my friend in expressing my deepest sorrow at the passing of Mr. Lambeth.

Mr. KITCHIN. I greatly appreciate those sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I well remember when Walter Lambeth came to the House as a Member. He was young and handsome, but a man of character and splendid ability. He was a gentleman.

I always regretted that his health was not good in his last year. We want to remember him in youth and vigor.

To his little daughter I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of deep sadness that I learned last Friday of the passing of the late John Walter Lambeth of Thomasville, N.C. Mr. Lambeth had served his State and Nation with distinction, and his many friends in Washington and his native North Carolina mourn his passing.

He was born in Thomasville, N.C., on June 10, 1896, and was laid to rest in his native community on Saturday, January 14, 1961.

Mr. Lambeth attended the public schools of Thomasville and graduated from Trinity College—now Duke University—in 1916. He later attended the Harvard School of Business Administration. Answering the call of his country, he served overseas during World War I in the Army, and on his return to Thomasville he engaged in the manufacture of furniture and in banking. In 1921 he was a member of the North Carolina State Senate, and from 1925 to 1929 he was mayor of Thomasville.

Mr. Lambeth was elected to the 72d Congress and the three succeeding Congresses and served from March 4, 1931, to January 3, 1939. He was not a candidate to succeed himself in the Congress and upon his retirement engaged in his former business pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Walter Lambeth, North Carolina and the Nation have lost a splendid citizen. To the members of his family and his countless friends I extend my deepest sympathy on their great loss. May divine providence be of comfort to all of them on this sad occasion in their lives.

FADING INFLUENCE OF NEO-NAZI GROUPS IN GERMANY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is to the credit of Western Germany under the powerful leadership of Chancellor Adenauer and his sagacious Foreign Minister, Heinrich von Brentano, that the influence of neo-Nazi propagandists has faded into weak, splintered groups, reliant upon the soapbox variety of oratory to justify their beliefs in Hitlerism.

The ultranational youth movements fostering antidemocratic dogma and hate doctrines have attracted a negligible number of West German youths.

And, although neonazism is to be found in several forms, the recent success of police of the Federal Republic of Germany in tracking down and arresting Karl Richard Baer, the last chief executioner at the notorious Nazi death camp at Auschwitz, is a salutary example of the spirit of contemporary West Germany. It affords a glaring contrast to the doctrines that prevail in the eastern half of Germany which remains in the grip of Communist captivity. In the self-styled People's Republic of East Germany, former Nazis such as Baer have been given mass amnesty in return for joining the Communist Party. Today, about one-third of the so-called East German Parliament is a rogues' gallery of Hitler alumni.

I believe this contrast is important to keep in mind. Memories of the World War II regime in Germany are still vivid. Understandably, emotions are quickly stirred at any report of incidents that recall the dark and lamentable period of the Nazis' sway. But what seems to me to be important to keep in focus is that the Germany of today is not one but two countries, each with a distinct leadership and with sharply differing political, ethical, and moral philosophies.

Under that remarkable survivor of Hitlerism, Konrad Adenauer, West Germany set out to build from scratch a political structure guided by the rule of law and respect for the dignity of the individual. History will acclaim this great statesman for his leadership in the stupendous task of physical and moral national reclamation. The Federal Republic's domestic and international program of restitution for the victims of Nazi persecution was a historic undertaking and the conscientious effort that has been made to meet obligations of unprecedented complexity is striking evidence of the integrity of West German leadership.

Deadlines for meeting the commitments made by both the Federal Republic and individual State governments have been set by law. In all, the financial obligations come to more than $6 billion, of which more than $3 billion had been disbursed by September of 1960. By June of 1960, $1.4 million in claims had been settled under the Federal restitution law. At the same time, the West German Government has discharged obligations of more than $500 million to Israel under its restitution agreement to that country. Remaining commitments of more than $350 million are to be met by 1965.

Chancellor Adenauer and his distinguished Foreign Minister, Heinrich von Brentano, exemplify the determination of the German people to stand fast by their Government's commitments in the face of enormous outside pressures.

Backed by the German business community, they flatly refused to yield to the threats of Arab boycotts against German goods if they persisted in faithfully carrying out the terms of Germany's restitution agreement to the State of Israel. They displayed a courage and moral uprightness which unfortunately has not been equaled by larger countries in the West. They have kept to their word faithfully and have demonstrated that when blackmailers are resisted, they back down.

Not to be overlooked is that the Federal Republic's restitution law provides that not only the rights of claimants but the rights of heirs and survivors of claimants shall be protected.

Against this record, the rulers of the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany have turned their backs on the survivors of nazism. No restitution payments have been made by these self-designated friends of the oppressed and persecuted. Instead, they have turned their heaviest propaganda blasts against the Federal Republic and have plumbed the lowest depths of hypocrisy in attributing to Free Germany the tolerance for nazism they have practiced so liberally themselves.

The answer, of course, is that West Germany has not hesitated to open her doors to anyone who wished to see for himself how her people, including the Jewish minority, is faring. A number of American Jewish leaders have paid frequent visits to Germany. While some have felt that progress in eradicating the fears and suspicions of the old era was not as quick as they had hoped, all have voiced complete confidence in the good will and sincerity of Germany's leaders in their efforts to expunge the last vestiges of the cancerous Hitler legacy from German life.

No such findings could have emerged from a visit to East Germany, even if it were permitted. For there, the long dark night that began with the arrival of Adolf Hitler is being perpetuated by his Communist heirs.

In their endeavor to build and strengthen the spirit and institution of democracy in their own as well as the captive portions of their land, the people of West Germany deserve our wholehearted support, understanding, and encouragement.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY ENERGY FUELS OF THE NATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in introducing the resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to carry on a study over a period of 2 years of the energy fuels of this Nation, I do so with full knowledge and understanding as to its vital importance to the general economy and the defense and security of our Nation.

There is a widespread and growing concern, both within the Halls of Congress and without, over the adequacy of the Nation's fuel and energy resources. It has become all too apparent that the lack of a sound national energy fuels policy is seriously endangering our future growth as a Nation, as well as our survival as a people.

The forecast of a population of 250 million in the United States in the next 20 years indicates an increase in annual consumption of fuel and energy of nearly 100 percent in one generation. It is clearly late already for us to ask ourselves, Where is this vast fuel supply to come from, and how will the tremendous energy demands be met?

A comprehensive policy regarding the energy resources, requirements and problems of this Nation has never been promulgated by the Congress. While fragmentary legislation affecting segments of the fuel industry have been enacted from time to time, yet these laws have never been correlated into a national overall fuels policy, and all too often bear little or no relationship to each other in seeking the common good. This condition remains true despite urgent demands by responsible study groups, officials of the executive branch, and others concerned that such a national policy must be enacted without further delay.

Previous Secretaries of the Interior, Presidential commissions, and industry committees have repeatedly urged the action being advanced in the resolution I am introducing here today.

For at least two decades, antedating even the development of atomic energy with its concomitant problems, U.S. energy experts have warned against a piecemeal approach to the Nation's fuel problems.

This Nation, despite these and other authoritative recommendations, has fallen behind other nations in developing a comprehensive national energy program.

While the European Coal and Steel Community, the Soviet Union, and more recently Canada have taken steps to define their long range aims, we have, to quote the Paley Commission appointed by President Truman and reporting to President Eisenhower, found it "hard to realize that there are limits to our Nation's material resources, and that for some materials we are approaching those limits."

The Paley Commission further said, "The essence of the energy problem is that huge further expansion of our energy supply must be accomplished in the face of limitations upon the free-world resource base which threaten to force real costs upward and which might in the event of war, cause serious shortages."

It has been asked often "just what would such a study encompass?"

It is affirmatively thought that such a study could consider the following items as a beginning for their report to the Congress for the development of a national fuels policy:

First. Fuels reserves—amount, location, feasibility of production, and probable costs of all known domestic fuel sources.

Second. Peacetime demand—probable rates of consumption by industries and localities of all energy fuels, both short term and long term.

Third. National defense—anticipated defense production requirements for domestic fuels to meet any emergency.

Fourth. Fuels import policies—extent to which American industry and other consumers have become dependent on imports of foreign oil.

Fifth. Fuels export policies—the ability of our international trade policy to strengthen domestic fuel and energy industries by encouraging their participation in foreign markets to the extent of economic competition and conservation.

Sixth. Regional consideration—the effect of present conflicting and discriminatory fuels policy, or lack of a coordinated national policy.

Seventh. Coordination of national fuels economies—the coordination of the fuels economies and policies of the United States and Canada to insure maximum benefits to both Nations.

Eighth. Transportation—present distribution facilities for fuels and anticipated demand for such facilities as energy demands grow.

Ninth. Manpower—the anticipated requirement of the Nation's energy complex for skilled manpower.

In closing, I respectfully submit this concurrent resolution for the early consideration of the House of Representatives.

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR STOCKHOLDERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which in effect will amount to a bill of rights for stockholders.

The need for this kind of legislation is underscored by the recent news stories involving the chief executives of two of our business giants, one in the insurance industry and the other in the automotive industry. These persons used their corporate power and assets to promote lucrative private deals for themselves at the expense of their stockholders.

We must close up the loopholes in the Securities and Exchange Act which permit greedy and unscrupulous corporate managements to cheat their stockholders of hundreds of millions of dollars each year. It is about time that corporate morality was brought up to the same level and subject to the same scrutiny as that of the conduct of the

individual. Public confidence in the corporate business structure of our country must be maintained.

The method of this bill is compulsory disclosure requiring controlling stockholders and officers to report their use of corporate property for their own private purposes and their interest in enterprises with which their corporation becomes involved.

In one section of the bill, the individual officers and directors will be compelled to disclose the actual ownership of their stock in the reporting corporation. This will flush out dummies and nominees of the economic underworld and of unfriendly foreign powers in vital industries.

Reports will be required of payments to individuals other than for the ordinary conduct of the business. This section will attempt to eliminate or make more difficult bribery or corporate payola.

It will also compel disclosure of any governmental contracts in which the reporting corporation is involved and whether or not any of its officers were in the Government agency concerned within 2 years of the contract. It will require disclosure of any political contributions or payments made by the individual officers or the corporation.

The act will be known as the Management Financial Interest Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1961. If enacted into law, it should increase dividends and result in increased funds being available for actual corporate business.

I respectfully request early and favorable consideration of this measure.

H.R. 1246, AN AMENDMENT TO THE IMMUNITY STATUTE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1246. In response to numerous inquiries regarding the purpose and substance of the bill, I take this opportunity to state that its purpose is to penetrate the fifth amendment conspiracy of silence of the economic underworld which has thus far impeded the efforts of congressional committees.

The bill will promote the effectiveness of the proposed House Subcommittee on Labor-Management Irregularities. Under protective constitutional procedures it will permit Congress and U.S. attorneys to grant immunity to witnesses during labor-management investigations and in other phases of interstate commerce. This will remove any legal basis for the refusal of a witness to testify.

Up to the present, most hearings on these subjects have been able to expose a mere fragment of the cancerous infiltration of criminals into the national economy. Under the handicap of the fifth amendment pleas, the hearings have given the Nation a distorted, unrealistic, and to a large extent, sterile image of what really goes on.

This new law will be an enlargement of the scope of the Immunity Statute of 1954, title 18, United States Code, section 3486(a)(b)(c), which now applies only to treason cases. The 1954 act was held constitutional and not violative of any fundamental rights by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Ullman* v. *United States* (350 U.S. 436).

The basis upon which the proposed legislation can be used in interstate commerce matters will be found in the Court's opinion where it said at page 505:

> We have already in the name of the commerce clause upheld a similar restriction on State court jurisdiction and we can find no distinction between the reach of congressional power with respect to commerce and its power with respect to national security.

The procedures of the 1954 Immunity Act which will be adopted in the new legislation provide for notification to the Attorney General of the intention to confer immunity and the consent of the Federal courts. The amendment will merely add additional phraseology to the present act to include interstate commerce, as defined in Federal statutes, including the Labor-Management Act of 1960.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Richard Bowditch Wigglesworth died last October 22. I wish to pay tribute to this man who gave the utmost of himself to the service of his country in both war and peace, as an Army officer on the battlefield, as legal and economic adviser in foreign affairs, as a most distinguished Member of this House for 30 years, as an Ambassador abroad.

There is no more certain sign of a man's devotion to the public good than that he should be unconcerned about being well known, that he should continue to the end to be concentrated entirely on objective matters of policy, that his effort should not slacken even if public recognition is less than deserved. It was inevitable that Richard Wigglesworth should be most deeply respected by the Members of this House and by all those in other parts of the Government who had the opportunity to know him. In the country as a whole, he was not recognized and praised in the measure that he deserved to be. His single-minded dedication to the public good continued unaffected to the end.

Richard Wigglesworth came from a distinguished old New England family. He attended Milton Academy, and went on to Harvard College, from which he graduated in 1912. After college he took his law degree at Harvard, and, in the same year, 1916, he was admitted to practice before the Massachusetts bar. He was introduced to public affairs even before his graduation from law school, when he served as assistant private secretary to W. Cameron Forbes, Governor-General of the Philippine Islands in 1913.

Mr. Wigglesworth served his country well in war as in peace. In the First World War he served in combat as a captain in the 76th Division Field Artillery, first as a battery commander, and later as commanding officer of the 1st Battalion, 303d Regiment. He held both the Military Order of the World War and the Military Order of Foreign Wars.

From the beginning of his public career, Mr. Wigglesworth excelled in matters of law and of fiscal policy. In 1922, he served as legal adviser to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of foreign loans and railway payments, and also as Secretary of the World War Debt Commission.

In 1924, Mr. Wigglesworth was chosen to be assistant to the agent general in Berlin, who was responsible for the collection of reparations payments. At that time he was also appointed to a committee whose purpose was to originate a more practicable plan of payments by the Weimar government. Mr. Dawes himself recognized Richard Wigglesworth's ability, and had him appointed representative and general counsel of the agencies of the Dawes plan in Paris.

In 1928, Mr. Wigglesworth was elected to serve out the unexpired term of Louis A. Frothingham in the 70th Congress. From that time until his retirement in 1958, he represented the 13th District of Massachusetts.

His work in the House was devoted mainly to budgetary and fiscal policies. He was a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and chairman of both the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Mr. Wigglesworth took an important part, therefore, in determining the expenditure of large sums of public money for most important purposes. He accepted this responsibility as a real trust; he was always most concerned that there should be no expenditure of funds derived from public revenue, from the people, which was not aimed directly at the common good, and that the people of the country, from whom the public funds had come, should themselves be the benefiters. Richard Wigglesworth was, in the full sense, a steward of his country. He examined both budget requests and the testimony of representatives of governmental agencies with the utmost care, proceeding on knowledge of facts and conditions which he had acquired by long hours of study. It has already been mentioned by other Members of this House, speaking on the occasion of Mr. Wigglesworth's retirement, that he saved the people and the Government literally billions of dollars by eliminating wasteful and unnecessary spending. At the same time, he was anxious that no consideration of persons or of influence should ever have any part in determining the use of funds.

But Richard Wigglesworth concerned himself with much more than economy in spending. He was a man of the greatest prudence, and the prudent man

is one who not only cuts out spending which is not directly to the purpose, but who has a positive idea of the necessary and proper purposes of spending. Mr. Wigglesworth knew what things were most necessary for the country, and that alone requires more than ordinary discrimination and judgment. He supported appropriations for housing construction, for example, and for aid to foreign countries. And he firmly supported the defense budgets requested by the last administration. His view of government was by no means negative; he knew that government has a positive role in sustaining the general good.

In 1958, the President appointed Mr. Wigglesworth Ambassador to Canada. The President acted with judgment. As Ambassador, Mr. Wigglesworth traveled extensively through Canada in order to create good will between the two peoples. His death caused genuine sorrow among Canadian statesmen.

Mr. Wigglesworth exercised a remarkable ability to grasp at once the economic limitations and the real possibilities of a situation. It has been said that he always went directly to the real point of a problem by analyzing it lucidly in terms of ends and means. Richard Wigglesworth's penetrating objectivity was joined not only with modesty, but also with a courtesy, a graciousness, a thoughtfulness for others which he showed not only in moments of relaxation but, more significantly, under pressure of work, as at committee hearings. We could do well to carry in our minds the image of such a man, at once a statesman and a gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart I rise to bid farewell here to a beloved friend, a comrade in the political battles of over 30 years, one whose loyalty stood the stern test of years—Richard Bowditch Wigglesworth.

Born into one of the oldest and most respected families in Massachusetts, he was privileged to add new luster and honor to the name of Wigglesworth.

His ancestors came here in the very first beginnings of America. An early ancestor was one of the first treasurers of Harvard College, a post then of great honor. Others in his family served with credit and distinction in the early life of our country.

Naturally he went to Harvard, and there won honors as an outstanding quarterback on one of Harvard's great football teams; as an outfielder of ability on the baseball team, and as a fine scholar.

Leaving Harvard he entered upon the practice of law in Boston. Upon the outbreak of war he went into the service and served with great distinction on the battlefields of France as commanding officer of the 303d Artillery, 76th Division. He was mustered out as captain.

After the war he dedicated his life to service for his country. He was secretary to W. Cameron Forbes when the latter, as Governor of the Philippines, was helping shape the destinies of that country. Later he served as a secretary in the Dawes Reparations Commission located in Paris.

While in this capacity he was drafted for the Republication nomination for Congress in the district which adjoined my own district. His service abroad prevented his campaigning, and it was my privilege to help his friends win that initial campaign. Upon coming to Congress he came to occupy an adjoining room to me in the Racquet Club for several years until he was married, and thus was born a close friendship that lasted throughout his life.

Ever imprinted in my mind will be our last talk. It was a week before he died. He called at noon from Ottawa and located me at my home in North Attleboro. He inquired about my own district outlook, the one he had previously represented, and the national campaign. He was cheerful and not too concerned with the ultimate outlook of his own illness. When I asked as to what was really the trouble he said "it was something like what you had." While we were talking, music floated over the wires and he laughed and said: "Did you hear the music?" When I replied in the affirmative he said the band plays every time they change guards out front. I cautioned him upon the need of rest but he was not too much worried.

A week later he was dead in Boston, having been brought back from Canada.

Representatives of the Canadian Government said he did not appear to be in a serious condition at that time.

Dick Wigglesworth was a man of tremendous ability and of great industry. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, he worked night and day. He had a passion for details, and his work was more effective because of a deep love of Congress.

Never yearning for the spotlight he was contented to do his work and let others get the credit. Unfortunately that was the way it was, others took the credit. It prevented him from progressing further in our political life which his talents justly earned for him. It was with great reluctance he concluded that he had reached the end of progress as far as service in Congress was concerned and turned to his other love in the field of diplomacy and foreign affairs.

As Ambassador to Canada he helped cement a good feeling between that country and his own.

The death of Dick Wigglesworth in the prime of life came as a great shock to his wide circle of friends throughout the State and Nation. To me it was fortuitously distressing.

The world is richer and better for his having lived, and to his charming wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow. We have all lost a true friend and America a great statesman and a dedicated public servant.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Richard Wigglesworth came to the Appropriations Committee almost immediately after his election to Congress in 1928. He spent a great deal of time on the Independent Offices Subcommittee and the Military Affairs Subcommittee, also with the foreign administrations' work. He was a wonderfully good examiner of witnesses who were brought before the committee, and he did a great job in finding out the things they needed, also the things they did not need, and those he stood out against and kept out of the bills just as far as he could.

He was a wonderful trader in contacts with the Senate. I remember one instance where the Senate had raised us $500 million on a bill. After he had finished his deliberations he came in to report that the Senate had raised the bill $500 million and said, "I had to give them $20 million too much." That was his attitude right straight through, never to give in on something that was not needed, and that was the thing that made him so valuable upon that committee.

It did not make any difference if we were in the minority a great deal of the time. He insisted on doing his job as best he could all the way through, and he did a wonderful job. I do not think I have run into anyone in my years here who has done a better job than Dick Wigglesworth did.

I join others in expressing my deep regret at his passing and to extend my sympathies to the fine family he has left behind.

It is seldom that we have an occasion to speak as clearly and as factually of someone who has gone, but I can do this with the greatest pleasure myself because it is deserved.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if ever a man served his country long and ably without thought of personal acclaim, that man was our late colleague, Dick Wigglesworth.

His distinguished career encompassed service in both the executive and legislative branches, but I have no doubt that the Congress was his life.

I will always remember him as a man of penetrating intellect, with a great capacity for hard work.

But I will also remember him as a warm friend, wise in his counsel, who helped me immeasurably during my early years here in the House.

One of the adjectives that has been used from time to time to describe a facet of Dick Wigglesworth's character is the word "unobtrusive."

Writing of Dick's career on the occasion of his retirement from the House, Arthur Krock of the New York Times as described him as "reticent"—and that he was, in many ways.

But there was nothing reticent about the way Dick pursued the truth in his legislative studies, and there was nothing reticent about the way he fought for the truth as he saw it.

And yet he was never abrasive in his approach.

No one realizes more than I do that much of the hard, important work, and many of the difficult decisions that are

part of our responsibilities here, come about through the efforts of Members who never consciously seek the limelight.

Dick Wigglesworth was one of the best examples of such a Member that I have known.

But the fact that he never engaged in any competition for headlines does not mean that his true worth went unrecognized, especially among his colleagues.

His was a great influence in this body, an influence for good that made its mark on all of us who were privileged to serve with him.

We knew him as a solid, honest, highly competent Member whose words deserved, and got, the closest attention and respect from both sides of the aisle.

This, to me, is the most sincere form of recognition a Member can achieve, and Dick Wigglesworth enjoyed it in full measure.

In his death the Nation has lost a public servant of the highest order whose attitude toward his obligations may well serve as a model for all of us.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to join my colleagues in paying a deserved tribute to the memory of a very wonderful man, namely, the late Richard Wigglesworth.

Beginning in the 1940's I had the privilege for several months each year of sitting in the same committee room with him, and working with him on many important matters. No finer man has ever served in this body, certainly in my time.

I never knew a man who was more conscientious and dedicated to his duties. He was able and he gave his best energies on a day-and-night basis to the country he loved. I shall always treasure the memory of our friendship and our association together through the years.

I am glad to be a citizen of a nation that produces men like Richard Wigglesworth. We are today doing ourselves honor in paying tribute to his memory. I extend my sympathy to his loved ones.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Dick Wigglesworth has been almost a member of my family for so many years that it is very difficult to realize and accept the fact that he has gone. He was like a father to my sons after their father's death and was one of the most wonderfully constructive influences on young people that could possibly be imagined. Then, when I came down here to the Congress and found him in the position he was in, respected by everyone, loved by most, doing his bit every single day and every single night, I was more than ever proud that the Bolton family and the Wigglesworth family had been so close together for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to him and express to his family here publicly our sympathy and our personal sorrow at his loss. Our love continues and will continue down the years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of a statesman spreads sorrow on a grand scale to those who knew and loved him personally, to political associates of all parties, and to those who merely admired him from afar.

So it is in the case of the late Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Milton, Mass., whose record of public service endeared him to the people of his local community, the Commonwealth, and the Nation.

At the time of his demise, on August 22, 1960, Mr. Wigglesworth was serving as American Envoy to Canada, in which capacity he had excelled for the past 2 years. For the previous 30 years he distinguished himself as Congressman from the Massachusetts 13th District and throughout the entire period enjoyed widespread confidence and respect.

Integrity, intellectual capacity, and a strong sense of personal honor stamped Mr. Wigglesworth and won him popular esteem. This was a major factor in his appointment as Ambassador to Canada, a post seldom granted to a political figure. Another major factor was, of course, his unusual qualifications.

Diplomatically inclined from an early age, Mr. Wigglesworth became secretary to the Governor General of the Philippines immediately following his graduation from Harvard University in 1913.

Returning home to further pursue his law studies at Harvard Law School, he graduated at the height of World War I, saw service as a captain in the AEF, and reentered public service in 1922 as a specialist with the Treasury Department.

Thus removed from the diplomatic field, Mr. Wigglesworth remained with the Treasury until elected in 1928 to fill an unexpired term in Congress. Dick Wigglesworth and I became Members of the Congress the same day and each of us coming from adjoining districts.

Serving throughout the remainder of the term, he quickly won the respect of his constituents, who subsequently returned him to office in 15 consecutive elections.

As a Congressman, Mr. Wigglesworth became the ranking minority member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and acted on many billions in budget requests during his committee work.

One of the most resourceful "ball carriers" on the team of the current administration, he became administration spokesman on the defense budget, and in party matters was appointed to numerous positions of national importance.

On his service as Ambassador, Mr. Wigglesworth recently reported that relations between this country and Canada were "fundamentally healthy, and they are steadily improving. We are moving in the right direction." The comments of all informed observers bear out the statement, and many attribute the result largely to the work of Mr. Wigglesworth, who, in his first year as Ambassador, traveled 25,000 miles and visited 10 Canadian Provinces, in his efforts to improve Canadian-American relations.

A multitude of friends, ranging from former constituents in Milton to the President of the United States, voiced sorrow at the news of the death of this estimable man.

The Nation can ill afford to lose such an outstanding American—

The President declared—

As Ambassador of the United States to Canada and as a former Representative in Congress, Mr. Wigglesworth served his Nation for many years with distinction and integrity.

The President described the death as "tragic."

Secretary of State Herter, who recommended Mr. Wigglesworth for the Canadian ambassadorship 2 years ago, said he learned of the death with "a deep sense of personal loss."

He had dedicated most of his life to the service of his country—

Mr. Herter said—

and he gave to public service unusual ability and a unique devotion.

From Canadian Prime Minister John Diefenbaker came the statement that Mr. Wigglesworth's qualities "endeared him to thousands of Canadians," all of whom were taken with "his kindness, his modesty, his humor, and his understanding."

To this, the American people can do nothing but to add a solemn, "Amen."

I extend to Mrs. Wigglesworth and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, some 3 years ago, our now departed friend and colleague, Dick Wigglesworth, advised us he would terminate his legislative career of 30 years' service. Before he finally left this Chamber and became the U.S. Ambassador to Canada, many of his associates in the Congress paid him a fitting tribute.

I recall talking to him immediately after these proceedings and as he expressed his gratitude for the kindnesses extended to him, he indicated that these farewells had a sense of finality more permanent than the immediate occasion then would suggest. A reflection now of that day and those tributes make them more meaningful because they accorded to an individual accolades from which he could take comfort and pride after many years of distinguished service.

One could have learned much from Dick concerning those official matters in which he was a great student and profound thinker. But from him, you would never learn of his attainments. He was neither an extrovert nor a recluse but had a balanced personality and penetrating mind that gained the respect of those who knew him.

His sudden death left behind a fine family and loving wife. They were the center of his life. To them I extend my deepest sympathy. It is my hope and

prayer that their knowledge that he was highly respected and is sorely missed by a legion of friends, might serve as some consolation to them during their bereavement.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, to the lengthening Honor Roll of this House, we add the name of former Congressman Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts. The last goodby of grieving friends took place at the funeral services that were conducted in Milton, Mass., on Oct. 24, 1960.

Dick Wigglesworth was a quiet, sincere, and conscientious Representative of the 13th Massachusetts District. In his complete devotion to his work, he often neglected to claim the credit that was due him, but his wisdom and his diligence will be remembered by all who served with him on the Appropriations Committee.

Behind his gentlemanly reserve was a richly endowed and active mind. A graduate of Harvard College, and Harvard Law School, he entered Government service at an early age, as assistant private secretary to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands. He was an artillery captain in France during World War I, and during the 1920's was a legal adviser to Government agencies in Washington, Berlin, and Paris.

With this background and experience, he had the qualifications that were immediately appreciated by the electorate when he first aspired to public office in 1928. He was chosen to fill the unexpired term of the late Honorable Louis A. Frothingham, and was reelected every 2 years throughout the 1930's, 1940's, and early 1950's.

In him was the happy combination of ability and character that, maturing with the years, could not be denied, even though Dick Wigglesworth shunned the limelight.

President Eisenhower, in recognition of his merits, appointed him as our Ambassador to Canada, where his knowledge, and insight, and diplomatic skill brought the two great neighbors of the North American Continent closer together in mutual understanding, cooperation, and friendship.

Only poets know how to weave the moving words that will express our true feelings for those we meet along the way whose lives are an inspiration for all. We sense their faith in the dignity of man, and in those values that give meaning to life, and grope for the language that speaks from the heart.

Many of us were fortunate to serve with Congressman Wigglesworth and to learn from his example the ideals of public service which illuminated his every thought and action during a lifetime of service to the Nation.

An old friend has departed.

But memories of Richard Wigglesworth live on, as the priceless heritage he left—to us.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House to eulogize our late lamented colleague Richard B. Wigglesworth, who served his people and our Nation with great distinction and devotion.

Certainly, his long career of service to our Nation as a soldier, member of Government, and legislator was outstanding. He culminated his exemplary career as U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

During his service in the Congress, as the Representative from the 13th District, Massachusetts, he displayed the qualities of leadership and statesmanship and, as to all his lifelong labors, he brought the highest principles and displayed an impeccable integrity of character. His judgement and ability, coupled with a deep devotion to Nation and state, made his long service of inestimable value.

It is with profound respect that I pay tribute to the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth whose loss is mourned not only by his State of Massachusetts but by all his fellow citizens, former colleagues, who knew him personally, or only through his great work and service.

To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, although I was not privileged to know Mr. Wigglesworth personally, like all citizens of our Commonwealth I knew of his illustrious career and his unselfish contributions to the common good as a lawyer, scholar, soldier, as a distinguished Member of this body, and as the respected Ambassador of this country to our neighbor on the north.

His life, characterized by steadfast devotion and uncompromising dedication to the ideals of truth and justice, serves to remind us all that our Nation will endure only if the most able of our citizens offer their best efforts in the cause of liberty.

Among his many achievements, his work in the field of national security affairs marked him as an outstanding patriot. Certainly no man did more to insure that the Republic was ever ready to thwart the aggressive designs of those who would deny us of our freedom than did Dick Wigglesworth.

The Republic is the richer and the stronger for his service.

I join my colleagues in extending my deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I had the unique opportunity to be represented in the Congress by Richard Wigglesworth because prior to my moving to the adjacent district I resided in the city of Brockton for many years, so all who have been noting his achievements in the national field should be interested in the outstanding job he did for his constituents. I should like to remind you that he was elected to this office time and time again with increasing pluralities, reflecting as this did the very great warmth of affection which the people of the 13th Congressional District had for him.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Richard B. Wigglesworth, one of the most oustanding Members of Congress who have ever served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. His untimely death brought sorrow to those of us who have been privileged to know him.

My boyhood was spent in Brockton, Mass., in the 13th Congressional District. Dick—or "Wiggy" as many Brocktonians knew him—was for many years my Congressman. My family, my friends, and myself were the beneficiaries of his years of faithful service to his constituents.

It was partly his example that led me to the pursuit of a career in public life. His service to his country and to his constituents was an inspiration to all who knew him.

Those who have spoken before me have recounted the many high offices in which he ably served, culminating in his appointment as an Ambassador to Canada—one of the most sophisticated of diplomatic posts. But he will live long in my memory, walking down the streets of Brockton, stopping to chat with everyone, but seeming to enjoy most the new Americans—from Lithuania, Poland, Italy, and Greece—who all knew him as a man whom they could trust—a man who was eager to resolve their problems.

Although he will walk the streets of Brockton no more, his memory will continue to inspire those whose lives were touched by his presence.

His people have suffered a great loss. At the same time they were indeed fortunate to have had a man of such outstanding character serve them.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked when I learned of the passing of Dick Wigglesworth. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory. I had the great privilege of serving in this body with Dick Wigglesworth, and I greatly valued our friendship. I considered him one of the outstanding members of the House, and an authority on defense expenditures. He was quiet, unassuming, and always affable. He was always anxious to be of assistance to his colleagues in the House and I greatly appreciate the many courtesies he extended to me.

I was sorry to see Dick Wigglesworth retire from Congress. I considered his retirement a great loss, not alone to his district, but to the entire Nation. I was happy to see him receive the appointment as Ambassador to Canada and continue to serve his country. I did not have the good fortune of seeing him after he began his diplomatic career.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Wigglesworth, and to the other members of the family.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my grief over the passing of Mr. Wigglesworth. While others have spoken of his signal merit

as a public servant, I should like to put on the permanent RECORD my knowledge of Mr. Wigglesworth as I saw him on a trip around this great globe. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations he had joined a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. I suppose it might well be said that you have to travel with a group of men around the world in a small plane to realize the greatness of your companions.

The impression that Mr. Wigglesworth left on this world, wherever we went, was one of inspired dignity. He had a sense of rich fellowship with all the people that he met. Further, many of us who thought at the time that we were grasping facts wished afterwards that we had not trusted to memory. His little black book was always out, and his notes were preserved. I remember him in Pakistan with a group of tribesmen, when this Christian gentleman from Boston gave an impression of America that I have never seen surpassed anywhere. I remember him among the poverty-stricken people in many a land, and he never turned aside. His huge sympathy was always there.

In all that we have done, all that we have said, all that we have spent, possibly one of the most lasting effects on the world that America can ever have will be through the constant example, given by this kindly gentleman, of great dignity, good will, and everlasting faith in his country and in the brotherhood for which it stands.

To his wife and his daughters, whom he loved beyond all expression, I send my deep and understanding sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of our beloved late colleague, Hon. Richard B. Wigglesworth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to a good friend, a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, who passed away on the 23d of last October.

Dick Wigglesworth served brilliantly and well since 1958 as our U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Before leaving for his post in Ottawa he had served with great distinction here in the House of Representatives for 30 years.

It was my great pleasure to become acquainted with Dick soon after I came to the Congress in June 1944. I served with him as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations for almost 14 years.

I always held Dick Wigglesworth in high esteem and respect and had great admiration for his devotion to his duties as a Member of Congress and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. His was a constructive life, and his death is a great loss to the Nation as well as to the people of Massachusetts.

I shall always think of Dick with fond memories, and again express my sympathy to his beloved wife and daughters.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Washington and the Nation are saddened over the loss of the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, who met his demise last August following half a century of devoted service to the Nation.

At the close of his life, Mr. Wigglesworth was employed as the American envoy to Canada, a post in which he distinguished himself beyond measure. To most of us, however, he is best remembered as the Representative of the Massachusetts 13th District, in which capacity he served on this floor for three consecutive decades.

Seldom is a man equipped with equal skills in the fields of politics, administration and diplomacy. But Richard B. Wigglesworth was such a man.

Dedicated to the national service from an early age, he served for a time prior to World War I as secretary to the Governor of the Philippines.

Law studies and the war interrupted his career momentarily, but he returned from the battlefields of France, determined to reenter the field of public service.

As a first step in this direction, he joined the Treasury Department in 1922, as a specialist, and continued in that capacity for 6 years.

It was then that the people of Massachusetts turned to him for leadership in the political sphere, and in 1928 Mr. Wigglesworth was elected to fill an unexpired term in Congress.

Reelected to a full term in 1930, and again in 1932, Mr. Wigglesworth was soon to be recognized as one of the outstanding exponents of New England opinion. As a result, he was able to ride out 20 years of political turmoil, winning one election after another as a member of the party out of power.

In this period, Mr. Wigglesworth became the ranking minority member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and acted on many billions in budget requests. It was natural, then, that with the return of his party to power, he became one of the administration leaders in House appropriations matters, and was elevated to several positions of national significance.

In receiving the Canadian ambassadorship, Mr. Wigglesworth broke a long-standing precedent, since few have ever risen to that position from the political ranks. His qualifications decided the matter, however, and once in office, he was quick to prove his diplomatic ability.

The Canadian Prime Minister, expressing his regrets over the death of the American Ambassador, declared that the qualities of Mr. Wigglesworth "endeared him to thousands of Canadians," who were greatly taken with "his kindness, his modesty, his humor, and his understanding."

The same can be said of all who knew him, regardless of political affiliation. To all of us he was more than just a diplomat, more than just a politician—yes, more than just a statesman. He was, in all respects, an admirable man and a tribute to the American culture he so ably represented.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, Dick Wigglesworth was one of the finest and one of the ablest men ever to serve in the Congress of the United States. He served in this body with distinction for 16 terms. It was with great regret that we learned of his decision not to seek reelection in 1958. Because of his unique ability, extensive knowledge and winsome personality, he was selected by President Eisenhower to be our Ambassador to Canada.

He was a lawyer by profession and applied his legal talents in various important Government positions before coming to the Congress. While he made innumerable contributions, always constructive, we perhaps remember him best for his tireless and outstanding work as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He always insisted on keeping the budget in balance and insisted that every item of expenditure be proven necessary.

The passing of Dick Wigglesworth was a great loss to the country, and to me it was a personal loss of a dear friend. But he still lives and will live forever. He lives in the mind and heart of all who have been privileged to work with him. His accomplishments constitute a lasting monument of the life and deeds of a truly wonderful man.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts lost an outstanding Congressman when Richard B. Wigglesworth retired from Congress in 1958, but the United States gained an eminent and successful Ambassador to Canada. Now his death has left a void both in the Government service, which he performed so ably and well, and in the hearts of his many friends.

His long and valuable service on the Appropriations Committee, and his devotion to the exacting work of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, which had the responsibility for the spending of nearly half the money in the whole U.S. budget, will be associated with his memory.

Congressman Wigglesworth bore this responsibility with the seriousness it deserved and gave generously of himself and his strength. In fact, many of his friends felt that he overtaxed his strength in order to achieve the high standard which he set for himself in this difficult work.

Others will speak of his war service and his Government service before the start of his career in the Congress. I should like to speak in a more personal vein and recall to you Dick Wigglesworth as a varsity football coach on Soldier's Field while he attended Harvard Law School.

Dick Wigglesworth had himself been an outstanding varsity quarterback, and was backfield coach. I was a lowly member of the squad.

Coach Wigglesworth was a great favorite of all the men on the squad. He was not only himself a natural athlete and wonderful player and teacher, but always friendly and gay, and never hard on his men. Although of medium size

and weight, he was a player of prominence on three of the college varsity teams—football, baseball, and ice hockey.

Dick Wigglesworth's fine and ingratiating personality, his dry sense of humor, his kindliness and charm combined to make him one of the finest men one could meet. I am happy to join in honoring the memory of this distinguished, patriotic American, of this kindly and lovable friend.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dick Wigglesworth was a shock to all of us who knew him at work or otherwise. It just did not seem right that someone who had given so much for our Nation and its citizens should leave us so suddenly.

Dick Wigglesworth was a senior Member of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations when I took my first oath of office in January 1949. However, during the 10 years that we jointly served in the House as well as on the committee, I learned that he was a man of tremendous integrity, broad vision, and dedicated service. In addition to these wonderful assets he was one of the nicest persons that I ever met.

In 1953 I was appointed to serve under Dick Wigglesworth as a member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations and for the next 8 years benefited from his patient guidance, his extensive experience in military matters, his sound judgment in committee responsibility, and his constructive leadership. I owe an unbelievable debt of gratitude to Dick Wigglesworth and will always cherish our association and revere his friendship. To his wonderful family, Mrs. Ford and I extend our deepest condolences.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when the sad news of the death of the U.S. Ambassador to Canada and our former colleague reached me last fall, I at once thought of what a privilege it had been to know Dick Wigglesworth. When I came to Congress in 1953, Dick was already a veteran Member. He was the ranking Member on the Naval Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Since the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard was in my district, I had unusual interest in matters before his subcommittee, and I will never fail to recall the patient and interested attention that he gave to my problems.

Mr. Speaker, to meet and know Dick Wigglesworth was to encounter a person of tremendous character and integrity. That feeling and a deep sense of respect came from Members of both sides of the aisle. He was always fair and anyone listening to his statements could tell that his position was first and foremost in support of what was best for his country.

I am thankful, Mr. Speaker, that I had so fine an association with a true gentleman and conscientious Member of Congress. It was a real privilege to know him and always I shall think of him with gratitude for his help and friendship. Truly, I think it can be said no finer man ever served in this House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess one of the most distinguished citizens in the history of Massachusetts, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, passed to his heavenly reward.

Before becoming Ambassador to Canada Dick Wigglesworth completed 30 years of as diligent and devoted legislative service here as any man who has ever been a Member of this House.

He served here through the years of the greatest transition period the Congress ever experienced and he saw the Congress grow into the responsibility of the most important legislative body in the world; he played a prominent and significant part in that growth.

Firm of purpose, steadfast in principles, steeped in intimate knowledge through exhaustive study, unyielding in conscientious conviction, fiercely patriotic and of gracious personality the late Richard Wigglesworth reached a height of respect and authority in this Chamber that few men have achieved in the past or will in the future.

We pray that the Almighty will grant everlasting peace to the great soul of Richard B. Wigglesworth.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was inexpressibly shocked and very deeply grieved by the sudden passing of my dear and valued friend, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, for 30 years an outstanding Member of the House and more recently our most able and distinguished Ambassador to Canada.

Congressman Wigglesworth was endeared to the Members of the House, highly respected and admired by all those who knew of his devoted and dedicated service throughout the years.

Of illustrious forebears, highly trained and educated, preeminently fitted for public service, Dick Wigglesworth's great contributions were characterized, not only by the highest order of ability, but by an unflagging fidelity to duty and a painstaking, unceasing application to the tasks at hand that has seldom been equaled in this body.

There can be no question but that his untimely passing was hastened by the rigorous round-the-clock work schedule that he imposed upon himself throughout the years of his magnificent service in this body.

This kind and esteemed friend and former colleague was one of the great men of this House. The willingness to serve, often at great personal sacrifice, of many dedicated people has marked the growth of this great Nation from its humblest beginnings. Richard B. Wigglesworth was one of these dedicated public servants who, in the finest American tradition, have carried on into this age that vision, that ability, that zeal, and that unselfish patriotism of colonial times which continue to inspire us to this day.

The sad and untimely passing of my beloved friend, Dick Wigglesworth, is truly a great loss to the whole Nation, for at the time of his death he was doing outstanding work in the important and vital post of Ambassador at Ottawa, making and cementing friendships for us with our neighbors to the north.

Because of my close friendship with him—a friendship which goes back to my college days when Dick Wigglesworth was an outstanding coach and master strategist of the Harvard football team of which I was a member—I feel a sense of deep personal loss. He was star quarterback of one of the greatest football teams that Harvard ever had. And even after he had taken up his busy career, he found time to return to the stadium and take part in coaching the Harvard team and serving as a trusted adviser of the great Percy Haughton and to the Harvard coaches.

It was during this period that I first met Dick Wigglesworth. In fact, he was one of my coaches. He was known among football men as a perfectionist, a penetrating, thorough student of the game, whom Percy Haughton considered not only as a close friend but valued assistant.

Dick Wigglesworth was interested in and prompted toward public service as early as 1913, when he became the trusted aide of Hon. W. Cameron Forbes, then Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

During World War I, he immediately joined the colors and served with distinction in France as commanding officer of the 1st Battalion of the 76th Division in that conflict, earning the Military Order of the World War and the Military Order of Foreign Wars.

After the war, he resumed his career in the public service, holding various responsible posts here and abroad.

He began his service in Congress in 1928 as representative from the 13th Massachusetts District which he so ably represented in these Halls for 16 consecutive terms until his voluntary retirement in 1958 when the 85th Congress came to an end.

Possessed of great ability, he gave noteworthy and distinguished service in this House where he achieved an inspiring record which can never be forgotten. Truly, he was a tower of strength which contributed immeasurably to the advancement of sound fiscal policies for the Nation.

Dick Wigglesworth was a man of probity, ability, and achievement. His early training in the public service was superb. Able, diligent, and possessed of special talents in finance and fiscal affairs, he was easily one of the best minds and hardest workers of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Congress.

Shortly after leaving the Congress, Dick Wigglesworth was designated by President Eisenhower as Ambassador to Canada, an appointment which received high praise in both countries. Dick Wigglesworth proved in short order that he was a good friend of Canada and a man of ability and character. His passing was mourned by two peoples who had lost an outstanding statesman and warm friend.

Dick Wigglesworth was a profoundly religious and spiritual man. The distinguished and prominent Dr. Charles E. Park, at his funeral in historic Milton Church, portrayed the philosophy and spirit that animated the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth in words more eloquent and moving than I could possibly describe.

As we recall the memories that crowd our hearts, help us with grateful insight to discover that ideal of manhood which he himself strove to follow and to fulfill: the examples it contains for us, the influence it offers us, the lessons it lays before us to be learned: His strength, always tempered by gentleness and tender consideration; his integrity always softened by patience and sympathy; his instinctive love of truth and honor and loyalty, not in words only but in conduct and action. Help us not only to admire his self-dedication to Thy holy purposes, but to make it our own. Help us not only to recognize his life-long love of country, his life-long service, his pride in her lofty standards, but to follow in his footsteps, and live in such ways that our beloved America shall be honored and trusted throughout the world as a power for all that is right and just and honorable. If we think of him with admiration as a model of true citizenship for all to follow, quicken us to see our personal challenge, and make him our own model and example, that our country may be filled with men of his temper and magnanimity.

The passing of my dear friend and beloved colleague leaves a great void in our midst. As I tender my profound and heartfelt sympathy to his gracious wife and helpmate, Mrs. Florence Wigglesworth, and his lovely family, I join them and his many friends in mourning his untimely passing. May the Good Lord bring him rest and peace in his eternal reward.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned several months ago of the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Richard Wigglesworth. We had served together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and at the time of his retirement in 1958 I joined with members of the committee in expressing real regret in anticipation of the loss of his invaluable service as a member of the committee. However, I believe we all felt that his distinguished service in the House of Representatives over a period of 30 years was fittingly climaxed by his appointment as U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to members of his family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, together with Dick Wigglesworth's thousands of friends, I was shocked and saddened when I heard of his untimely death, and I join with them in expressing my loss and sorrow.

I had the privilege of knowing Dick Wigglesworth for a number of years and I have never met a finer gentleman, modest and self-effacing, willing and competent, and with a disposition which endeared him to everyone he came in contact with. He was a devoted servant of his country and gave of his time and talents willingly and without thought of personal gain or advancement. It is not necessary for me to speak of his long service in the House of Representatives because his record is well known and highly respected by those who knew him and served with him.

He had a delightful sense of humor and was always welcomed at social gatherings. When he was in a reminiscent mood, he entertained his friends with anecdotes about his experiences and it is a significant fact that although he might poke fun at someone, there was never any rancor or ill-feeling displayed by him. I do not recall that he ever said anything derogatory about anyone.

His passing is a great loss not only to his friends but to the country he served so well. I extend my most heartfelt sympathy to his widow and children. May they be strengthened by the solace of understanding, the peace of acceptance, and the comfort of faith.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues on this occasion. Dick Wigglesworth was a friend to all, and we of New England were profoundly proud of our native son.

I found him to be a very kind man, always helpful to a colleague and vitally interested in State, regional, national, and international problems.

His appointment as Ambassador to Canada was both complimentary and wise, for his ability and experience in statesmanship eminently equipped him for this post.

The memory of Dick Wigglesworth I shall always count a rich treasure.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in this expression of sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were privileged to work closely with Dick Wigglesworth on the Appropriations Committee will all testify to his ability and complete dedication to the cause of good government.

Those of us who were privileged to know him intimately and socially will all testify to the warmth of his personality and to the gentlemanly qualities which he exemplified so well.

Dick Wigglesworth literally dedicated a lifetime to public service and there are many monuments to his good works all along the way. He will long be remembered for his devotion to his country in war and in peace, and for his selfless service to it.

My profound sympathy is extended to Mrs. Wigglesworth and to the other members of his immediate family. They have lost a devoted husband and father and our country has lost a distinguished and dedicated public servant.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, our country lost one of its most dedicated and faithful public servants. To know Richard Wigglesworth was to respect and admire him. No one could serve our country with greater devotion and no one could make a greater contribution.

Throughout his many years of service in the House of Representatives he exercised his duties and responsibilities with great care and thoroughness and, I might add, without ceremony. Despite his outstanding talents and achievements, he was modest and humble. These fine characteristics were best understood and appreciated by those of us who worked with him day by day here in the Congress.

It was my good fortune to serve for a number of years with Dick Wigglesworth on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives and there I observed his great and significant contributions to the functioning of our Government. He was for many years the ranking Republican on this subcommittee and served as its chairman on those occasions when the Republican Party was in the majority. No member of the committee examined appropriations with greater penetrating care and diligence; no member was more completely informed on the background of appropriation programs and items. He strongly opposed any waste or unnecessary expenditures, but stoutly supported those programs that he considered sound and essential to the security and well-being of our Nation.

For his great contribution, his kindness, his humility, and his devotion to principle, Dick Wigglesworth commanded the respect and affection of the officials of our many Federal agencies, our committee, and the Congress, as well as the people of Massachusetts. He has made an indelible record in the history of this Nation and we are richer and stronger by virtue of his service and our association with him. In Richard B. Wigglesworth's passing, I have lost a warm friend. To his devoted wife and family I extend my deep and understanding sympathy.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, God is good, and in his goodness he conceals the happiness of death, so that one may continue to live. And so it was with Richard B. Wigglesworth. Whether he was Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada, secretary to the Governor General of the Philippines, captain of battery E or commanding officer of the 1st Battalion, 76th Division in France, in World War I, or as legal adviser to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and many other important Government positions, he gave his best of a brilliant talent toward a career of dedicated public service.

He was a true gentleman, who quietly carried on with his good works with the high character that established his reputation as a patriot, scholar, and statesman.

There were no tasks too great, no plans too intricate, for this great American to assume.

His extended service in the Congress, from the 70th Congress through the 85th Congress, was reason enough to call him a distinguished and privileged public servant.

With deep appreciation for his great contributions to the Congress, his State, and the Nation, in peace and war, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely family.

May God bless him with deserved eternal joy.

PETITION OPPOSING PAY TV

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a petition submitted to me by 54 citizens of my district, in which they ask the Congress to adopt legislation which would ban pay TV in all forms, as being contrary to the public interest.

I do not intend at this time to discuss this issue myself, but I am glad to assist my constituents who avail themselves of one of the fundamental rights under the Constitution, the right of citizens to petition Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition and the names of the signers may appear in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The petition follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

We, residents of Norwich, Conn., respectfully petition our Congressmen and Senators to vote in favor of House of Representatives Joint Resolution 130 and Resolution 6245 of the 86th Congress, or any other legislation, which would ban pay television in all forms, as being contrary to the public interest.

We oppose all pay TV schemes and proposals because:

1. It is contrary to the American tradition the airwaves are free and in the public domain and its use by the payment of tolls subverts this tradition.

2. Free TV and pay TV cannot exist together because both would depend upon the same sources for entertainment and free TV would be eliminated.

3. Pay TV is nothing more than free TV without commercials, and the commercials would come later.

4. Pay TV would impose a financial burden upon all the American wage earners and work a hardship to persons with limited income, our older citizens, invalids and shutins dependent upon television for their entertainment, recreation, and education.

It is, therefore, our hope in forwarding this petition that you, our Congress, will heed the wishes of the great majority of American citizens and, once and for all, by legislation put a halt to this attempt to hoodwink the public.

Mr. and Mrs. John Sikorski, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. John Waldron, Norwich, Conn.; Arthur M. Fuller, Norwich, Conn.; Beatrice Myers and Rose A. Mulholland, Norwich, Conn.; James Kolodziej, Norwich, Conn.; Charles Clark, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Freaner, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. Clara Maurice, Norwich, Conn.; William A. Elam, Norwich, Conn.; Robert Bateson, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. T. Kirby, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. Martha Dayon, Norwich, Conn.; Genevieve V. Kapszukiewicz, Jewett City, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Kapszukiewicz, Jewett City, Conn.; William Kapszukiewicz, Jewett City, Conn.; Mrs. Mary Slough, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kempesta, Taftville, Conn.; Mrs. J. I. Taylor, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. Mary E. Beebe, Norwich, Conn.; Raymond S. Beebe, Norwich, Conn.; G. E. and Mary Thomas, Uncasville, Conn.; Chauncey H. Chase, Jr., Norwich, Conn.; Richard M. and Grace Powers, Norwich, Conn.; Evelyn Chase, Norwich, Conn.; Leo H. and Jeanne Belisle, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Val Luppert, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. Henry Deux, Norwich Conn.; Jerry Taylor, Norwich, Conn.; William and Jeann Nemeth, Norwich, Conn.; John Rennisol, Voluntown, Conn.; William Depot, Norwich, Conn.; Alphonse Benoit, Plainfield, Conn.; Raymond J. LaChapelle, Jewett City, Conn.; Royal W. Holmes, Jewett City, Conn.; Gerald Reynolds, Plainfield, Conn.; Ernest Beaulieu, Jewett City, Conn.; Alex Best, Canterbury, Conn.; Omer Chevrotte, Jr., Jewett City, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Holmes, Jewett City, Conn., Betty Holmes, Jewett City, Conn.; Wilbur Beckwith, Niantic, Conn.; Barbara J. Bengell, Jewett City, Conn.; Anita M. Chevrette, Jewett City, Conn.; Lorraine Gilbert, Norwich, Conn.; Christopher J. Molloy, Pawcatuck, Conn.; Rose S. Peters, Jewett City, Conn.; Edward R. St. John, Jewett City, Conn.

REMOVE INCOME LIMITATION ON OASI BENEFICIARIES UNDER 72

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 12, I introduced H.R. 2524, to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

I do not claim any originality of thought in the content of this bill. The same purpose has been sought in other bills which have been introduced. As a matter of fact, the principal point involved in the legislation which I have introduced, that the receipt of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act should not deprive an individual from earning anything that he can by gainful employment at anything he is able and qualified to do, has been a subject of controversy from the earliest days of social security legislation.

The present law, of course, places no earnings limitation on those persons who are 72 years of age or over; they may supplement their income in any way that they can, without having it affect the OASI benefits to which they are entitled in any way.

The same provision of law should be extended to those OASI beneficiaries who are 65 and over. It is not a privilege which we would extend to them. It is indeed a right, of which we now are depriving them.

The benefits which are paid out of the OASI trust fund represent a return of payments which have been made into the fund by the individual and by his employer, who may also be himself, during the entire span of his lifelong employment. No appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury are paid into the OASI trust fund. At this point, it is not only self-supporting, but theoretically self-liquidating.

The solvency of the trust fund will not be jeopardized by the effects of this bill which I have introduced. At present, OASI benefits are reduced proportionately when the earnings of the beneficiary between 65 and 72 exceed $1,200 a year. Thus, under the terms of my bill, some additional payments will be made out of the trust fund, as compared with the reduced payments now being made. But this will be more than equalized by the social security taxes which the fund will continue to collect based upon the earnings of those who continue in employment, either by themselves or by another. Not only that, but the general revenues of the Treasury will gain by the amount of the taxes upon the additional income earned by OASI beneficiaries who continue in employment.

It always has been ironical, antisocial, and inhumane, it seems to me, that a retired person who qualified for OASI benefits could receive them in undiminished amounts all the rest of his life, regardless of how much additional income he might receive from the profits of a business, from rents, royalties, dividends, and interest from investment, or almost any other type of income except that received from good, honest toil.

My bill would correct this injustice.

We have among us in the Nation's Capital this week some 3,000 delegates from the 53 States and Territories of the United States, who are here in Washington participating in the White House Conference on Aging.

I do not know what the conclusions and recommendations of this Conference may be, but I do know quite a good deal about the needs and the desires of a great many senior citizens of my State and my district. Among the foremost of the problems with which these people grapple every day is that of income maintenance.

Social security benefits which they receive are as a Godsend; but they represent at best merely a pittance, and in most instances do not provide enough for living expenses even at a bare subsistence level.

What are we doing to American enterprise, that quality which traditionally we have regarded as the source of our greatest strength and vitality, when we restrain an elderly person from giving free rein to his productive physical and mental capacity, merely because we are paying back to him the moneys which he and his employer in earlier years paid the OASI fund?

The very existence of the provision in the present law, which my bill seeks to wipe out, is a negation of American enterprise.

I say, and in this millions of Americans join me and particularly the senior citizens themselves, if a man or a woman past 65 is able and willing to earn some income doing whatever he or she can find to do, let him or her earn it and keep it—what's left after taxes, that is.

Surely any employment which these senior citizens can get, either working for themselves or on a job for another person, a firm, a corporation, an organization, or the Government will not put anyone else out of a job. It is well known that in many industries it is virtually impossible for a new employee over 40 years of age to obtain work.

Removal of the present limitation upon the amount of outside income which an OASI beneficiary between 65 and 72 may earn will be good for America, morally, economically, and practically.

MEMORIAL TO EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 12, I introduced House Joint Resolution 131 which would establish a most fitting memorial to one of the greatest statesmen of our time, the late EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who served as a Member of this body for over three decades.

Congresswoman ROGERS' public service was distinguished by her constant devotion to the ideal of freedom. Throughout her career, both in war and in peace, she was in the forefront of the struggle for human liberty and human dignity. But closest to her heart were the men and women who had served in defense of the Republic, when it was threatened by the aggressive designs of those who would destroy men's freedom. Her selflessness, in behalf of those who were disabled in the Nation's service, of the widows and orphans of those whose lives were given in the defense of our country—in fact, in behalf of all of our citizens who are privileged to defend our American heritage in time of war, is known to Americans everywhere. Congresswoman ROGERS earned the respect and love of her fellow citizens in all walks of life.

Within the district that she represented with such dedication for 35 years there is a Veterans' Administration hospital which Mrs. ROGERS quietly visited whenever there were a few free moments in her demanding schedule. The hundreds of patients at the VA hospital in Bedford, Mass., knew her and loved her. She constantly fought to improve conditions at the Bedford VA Hospital, as she did at VA hospitals throughout the country.

It may well be said that the Bedford VA Hospital is a monument of the outstanding work Congresswoman ROGERS did throughout the Nation over the years to insure that care provided to our Nation's veterans was of the highest standards.

To those of us who have lived in Massachusetts, who have known of Mrs. ROGERS' great work on behalf of veterans everywhere, the Bedford VA Hospital has been Mrs. ROGERS' hospital. The resolution I offer would merely formalize that identification by renaming it the EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Hospital.

A number of veterans organizations have urged that the hospital in Bedford be so designated. I can think of no finer tribute to the memory of one of the greatest of Americans.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 131

Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Mass., as the EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Hospital.

Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Mass., shall be known and designated hereafter as the "EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Hospital." Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such hospital is referred to shall be held to refer to such hospital as the "EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Hospital."

THE STAKES IN LAOS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed to read Monday, January 9, in the Washington Post and Times Herald a letter to the editor by R. C. Phillips III, who apparently has served previously with the American mission in Laos. I believe the letter presents an informed viewpoint which deserves the consideration of all Congressmen, particularly in view of the change of administration which is about to take place. Statements by Nikita Khrushchev and other Communist leaders would indicate that they intend during the next 6 months to subject the new Kennedy administration to particularly severe pressures which will test our determination and willingness to stand firm even though firmness requires personal sacrifice and perhaps even great peril.

The letter follows:

THE STAKES IN LAOS

In all the torrent of doubts and contradictions poured forth about Laos over the past week little has been said about what is really at stake there.

It is true that the United States is deeply involved in maintaining Lao independence. After the Geneva agreements the French withdrew all but token support from Laos. The United States stepped in to prevent Laos from disappearing as an independent country.

We knew then that Lao independence was indivisible with that of southeast Asia; and we gave it the almost total economic and military support it needed to survive.

The basic problems of Laos have not changed very much since Geneva. The Lao Government and its army have been strengthened although our assistance was never as effective as it might have been.

The Pathet Lao grew weaker in popular support as the last Assembly election proved, unfounded charges of coercion to the contrary. However, their military strength, supported by North Vietnamese training, equipment, and tribal cadres, physically indistinguishable from their Lao cousins, has not diminished.

The Pathet Lao remains the politically indigestible, North Vietnamese Communist-controlled, paramilitary organization that it has always been.

The British and the French have not changed much either. They remain opposed to any Lao Government which they cannot easily dominate and which would be strong enough to effectively oppose the Pathet Lao, because such opposition constitutes provocation. Their formula for keeping the peace in Asia is the same one Mr. Chamberlain used in Europe in 1939 with such great success.

The self-appointed experts, Mr. Lippmann last week and Mr. Unna this week, have concluded that the United States is wrong and its allies right.

Defending Lao independence is called a trigger-happy, papa-knows-bestism policy. Somehow the Communists and their assistants, witting and otherwise, are the heroes of the Lao drama while the villains are a few Lao unafraid to fight for their freedom and unashamed to still hope that the United States means what it says about protecting the rights of others as its own.

Turning our Lao policy over to the British and the French as we are evidentially doing, and seeking to establish a neutralist Lao Government acceptable to the Communists can only have one result. The historical lessons are clear from the Bolshevik revolution through Czechoslovakia and China.

Americans must come to understand that we cannot sacrifice to expediency and the myopia of others the principles for which this country stands. This subservience and weakness is losing us the trust and friendship not only of Asia, but of every newly independent country. Someday, perhaps after more territory and people slip behind the Iron Curtain, we may make a second declaration of independence—from Europe—that we so desperately need.

In the meantime, as one privileged to know some brave and principled Lao now fighting to preserve their independence, the spectacle of our casting these people down after giving them hope make us all, as Americans, seem less worthy of the ideals we so bravely profess.

R. C. PHILLIPS III.

WASHINGTON.

POTOMAC RIVER VALLEY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this body are aware, I have endeavored on many occasions to focus attention upon the proper management of our country's resources within the Potomac River Valley and more explicitly the impact of these resource uses upon the Nation's Capital. I shall not attempt at this time to labor the many instances of the past but to say summarily that the problems of protecting the beautiful natural areas for recreation, historic sites, and national shrines have been difficult in view of the many onslaughts upon them. The values of which I speak are often neglected or are not given their full measure of consideration in our rush to solve the increasing problems of our metropolis. The problems of effective planning are greatly complicated by the many divisions of State, local, and Federal Government wherein jurisdictions are often confused or conflicting.

I wish at this time to cite another specific case that should be brought to the attention of the Congress. Not only because it demands our attention on the merits but because of the possible precedent that may be established, I refer to the announced plan of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to build a sewage-treatment plant in Prince

Georges County, immediately across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon, the beloved shrine of the first President of the United States, George Washington. More specifically, the plant would be located near the mouth of Piscataway Creek. In addition, this cited location of the sewage-treatment plant is directly in the overview of Fort Washington National Park. Also, such an installation at the proposed location will bury under a sludge pit the historic and archeologically important Mayaone Indian village site. This site has excited the interest of archeologists and others historically interested in the area since it was proved to have been continuously inhabited for over 5,000 years and where Leonard Calvert negotiated a treaty with the "Emperor" to settle Maryland in 1632.

It is impossible at this time to lay before this body the details of the engineering merits and demerits regarding a sewage-treatment plant to serve this area. Nor should my remarks be construed as opposing sewage-treatment plants in an effort to prevent the discharge of sewage untreated in the Potomac River. It is beyond my credibility, however, to feel that such a plant must be located in just this precise area which will have such an adverse effect upon the esthetic environment we seek to preserve.

So many national and local organizations are so earnestly concerned over the intent to construct this plant at the proposed site, that I am sure the organizations I am about to enumerate do not represent all that oppose this installation.

Accokeek Citizens Association.
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Calvert Manor Civic Association.
Fort Washington Forest Community Association.
Mount Vernon Ladies Association.
Moyane Reserve Association.
National Parks Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Nature Conservancy.
Piscataway Hills Civic Association.
Wilderness Society.
Wildlife Management Institute.

The National Parks Service attaches great significance to the Mount Vernon area and has been ordered by the Congress to complete the George Washington Memorial Parkway. In so doing, it would hope that the approaches to this parkway as well as to Mount Vernon proper would aid in the appreciation of this general area.

Mr. Speaker, the Mockely Point sewage-treatment plant proposal is another instance in a long line that would seriously intrude on the character of our Capital City as manifested in this instance in Mount Vernon. Whether the area should be ultimately in public ownership or whether it should be zoned for appropriate residential development would be a question for seriously considered planning. The area at the present time has no zoning ordinance.

Surely the needs for a sewage-treatment plant can be met by a choice of a location that does not do such egregious disservice to our historic sites and beloved and memorable shrines.

PROTECTION OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which calls for an end to the Government engaging in business in competition with its citizens.

I believe this is an important piece of legislation which deserves the serious consideration of the Members of Congress. Private enterprise, individual initiative, the get up and go of our citizens have been the ingredients which have built the strength and power of America. We will continue to grow and prosper, to expand and to develop new opportunities for more people only to the extent that we give our free competitive system operating room.

One of the gravest dangers threatening the existence of private enterprise is the unfair competition of the Federal Government with its own citizens. It is immoral to tax a man then use that tax money to establish a business which may well cause his ruin. The natural result of the extension of Federal business enterprise will be the final destruction of private enterprise and the establishment of a system where the state owns all the means of production and we will have at the very least, state socialism, at the worst, communism.

My bill is designed to protect private enterprise in America. It will strengthen our economy and will help to reduce Federal spending. I hope this measure will be acted upon in this session. No healthier study by congressional committees could be made than to review the Federal Government's various enterprises.

DEFERMENT OF INCOME FROM SERVICE CONTRACTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2440, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and provide for the deferment of income from service contracts. The bill is in all respects identical with a similar bill which I introduced during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

In introducing this bill, I would like to remind the House again of the commitment made by the 81st Congress at the time of the retroactive repeal of section 452 and section 462, that studies would be initiated to provide proper substitutes for those sections—81st Congress, 1st session, Senate Report No. 372, page 5; see also 81st Congress, 1st session, House Report No. 293, page 4. In the interim, we enacted in section 28 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958—H.R. 8381, 85th Congress, 2d session, approved September 2, 1958, remedial legislation to apply to the prepaid income from newspaper and periodical subscriptions. The same inequities which necessitated the enactment of that legislation are present in the case of the service organizations.

The so-called service contract has become an essential part of the distribution and sale of office and household equipment, transportation equipment, and many of the other products of American industry.

Under the conventional service contract, the service agency undertakes to maintain the equipment for a specified period of time—1 year or longer—at a fixed charge usually payable at the start of the contract. In some cases, the transaction in reality is a form of insurance contract since no services are required unless there is a failure of the equipment. In other cases, where the equipment requires preventive maintenance, the service contract will also provide for preventive maintenance service calls at specified intervals over the life of the contract.

For Federal income tax purposes there were no specific rules initially prescribed for the accounting of the income from service contracts. Accordingly, taxpayers on the accrual basis of accounting usually adopted a procedure whereby the income from such contracts was deferred or amortized over the period of time during which the taxpayer would be called upon to perform the services. As a matter of accounting, this method of accounting for service income is essential to avoid a distortion of income and expenses. However, on a case-by-case basis the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has compelled some taxpayers to adopt a different method of accounting whereby service is reported when billed or accrued without regard to the obligation either to perform future services or to refund any unearned portion of the charge. Thus, within the same industry there are taxpayers accounting for service income under both the methods of accounting.

The delay in meeting this issue on our part is resulting in continuing and needless litigation between taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service. Notwithstanding decisions adverse to the Government by the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Second, Fifth, and Eighth Circuits, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refuses to recognize the right of a taxpayer to defer prepaid service income over the period during which the services are to be performed.

I understand that the Commissioner's position is predicated, in part at least, on the case of *Automobile Club of Michigan* (353 U.S. 180), which was decided by the Supreme Court of the United tSates in 1957. The Supreme Court has since granted certiorari in a similar case involving the American Automobile Association which should be argued this spring. Even if that decision is favorable, this bill will be necessary to provide a specific set of rules for taxpayers engaged in the service business.

THE DISTRESSED FARM ECONOMY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of being back in the greatest legislative body on earth is dimmed by the magnitude of problems facing us both at home and abroad.

This is my 12th term in the House of Representatives. When I first came here the world was in turmoil and knew no peace. At home we were still fighting our way out of a terrible depression and the rural districts such as I have the honor to represent were then, as now, at the bottom of the economic ladder.

I have served with the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, and President-elect Kennedy will soon take the oath of office. It is fortunate for our Nation and for the world that we have had great leaders in the White House and in the Congress during these eventful years, but time may prove that the problems facing them were relatively inconsequential when compared with the challenges of the years immediately before us.

In the few moments available to me today I will confine my remarks to but one of the major problems before us—that of a distressed farm economy—and shall leave the other subjects for discussion by more competent authorities. Because I have the honor to represent a great agricultural district I have from the beginning concerned myself primarily with the problems of agriculture and our rural economy, and it is that subject I propose to discuss briefly today.

To my knowledge, the so-called farm problem is the only major problem that has been constantly before us for the last 22 years. First, it was a question of low farm income due to the general depression of our whole economy. Then, it was a question of intensified production to meet the demands of World War II, and price controls held the lid on farm income. After the war had been won and our economy boomed with peaceful pursuits, American agriculture was again plagued by falling farm commodity prices and surplus production of certain crops.

In fairness to both great political parties and the administrations of the four Presidents with whom I have served and expect to serve, may I remind you that this problem has been with us constantly throughout my 22 years and that the only time we had no problem of surplus production and relatively low prices was during times of war and, therefore, we must conclude that the problem has never really been solved. Furthermore, may I point out as I did at the first hearings of my Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations 8 years ago the fact that farm commodity prices have been declining steadily during the last 10 years and have only recently tended to level off in the general neighborhood of 80 percent of parity.

We have talked so much about this problem of farm income that I fear our colleagues from the nonfarm areas are satiated, but I hope they will remember that we plead for justice for American citizens in rural America who are as much entitled to fair treatment as any workingman or corporate executive in Detroit, Chicago, or New York City. We ask only equality or parity with the rest of our people and we believe the basic justice of our American way of life will lead to a proper solution of our problems. Therefore, we come once more to the Congress of the United States with our plea for consideration of our difficulties and the enactment of proper legislation.

The outgoing Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, has had a miserable official existence for the last 8 years. I say this in all fairness because I have been one of his most severe critics insofar as farm commodity prices are concerned. At the same time, may I keep the record in balance by pointing out that in many respects Mr. Benson and the Eisenhower administration have performed exceedingly well in the area of agricultural programs.

From my vantage point as ranking Republican on the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations I have had a firsthand opportunity to appraise the job that has been done. I am properly proud of the great strides that have been made in all areas of agricultural research during the last 8 years. Programs which had languished in previous years saw dramatic expansion and the results of vital research are being applied in rural America today by a dynamic and effective Extension Service. Again, in the case of extension and education we have seen an end to stagnation, and extension has experienced real growth in recent years.

Soil and water conservation also came into its own during the past 8 years. All over America can be seen dramatic evidence of the stepped up campaign to conserve our priceless and irreplaceable natural resources for future generations. In addition, the small watershed protection program which had its beginning in the enactment of the Andersen-Hope legislation came into full fruition under that measure and Public Law 566. Eight years ago we had only the few large projects inching along, and today we have several hundred in various stages of planning and construction with hundreds more in the way of pending applications.

Additional emphasis has been placed upon market research and development, both domestic and foreign. The Foreign Agricultural Service, for example, was a relatively ineffective appendage of the State Department 8 years ago. Today, it is a vital arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and has had the full support of the administration as well as the Congress.

This is only a part of the story of progressive growth and development of our great farm programs during the past 8 years, but an otherwise brilliant picture has been darkened by a negative approach to the problem of farm commodity prices. As I said earlier, the decline in farm income had already started when Mr. Benson took office and he, with the help of Congress, greased the skids for a continuing decline in farm income. At the same time, outmoded and unrealistic laws led to the accumulation of a multi-billion dollar stockpile of surplus agricultural commodities which now hangs like a dark cloud over our entire rural economy.

Although I will not dwell on the history of our agricultural economy and the sad record of both Congress and the administration in this regard, I do want to establish the fact that farm people have been left little or no choice and their predicament is neither their fault nor the result of their misdeeds. We, the U.S. Government, have brought Midwest farmers to their present economic state and it is our responsibility to provide the ways and means for them to regain their lost economic ground.

As all of our colleagues with whom I have previously served know, I have fought every step of the way against the legislation, the programs, and the administration of existing laws which have brought us to our present dilemma. The course I have followed has not been an easy one, but in good conscience I felt I had no alternative and I did what I believed best in behalf of the people of my district.

The 87th Congress has now been organized and will soon be ready for business. In a few days a new President and Vice President will take their oaths of office. As we mark the beginning of a new decade we see new faces and new personalities preparing to assume the tremendous responsibilities of governing our Nation, and no domestic problem is more demanding of constructive attention and practical solution than that of our relatively low level of farm commodity prices.

One of the very few definite and decisive issues developed in the course of the recent campaign was in the field of agriculture. Candidates of both great parties sympathized with the plight of farm people, and they also pledged action to reverse the downward trend. However, I must say that the Democrats were more precise in their campaign pledges and, much to my regret, the Republican platform did not even include a reference to my goal of parity of income for farm people.

Although I believe Mr. NIXON would have done better by us than Mr. Benson, he ignored the pleas of men like myself from the Midwest and generalized the whole question in his public statements. To make matters worse, it was contended in the course of the campaign that parity prices for agriculture would lead to disastrously high prices for consumers while nothing could be further from the truth.

Another mistaken conclusion from the outcome of the election has been the contention that NIXON victories in the Midwest vindicated Mr. Benson. That simply is not so because I campaigned my district from one end to the other and if Benson had any friends among

the farmers they did not make themselves known to me. As a matter of fact, had NIXON taken our advice and come out four-square against the Benson program of low price supports he might well have carried Minnesota, Illinois, and another farm State or two which would have given him the victory he sought. Farm States reporting Republican majorities did so in spite of Benson, certainly not in support of him.

But all of that is past history and we must look to tomorrow. Mr. Kennedy and other Democratic candidates in their speeches to farm people promised new programs to restore parity of income to agriculture. As a matter of fact, Mr. Kennedy came very close to an outright endorsement of my green acres bill when he called for the raising of price supports and the mandatory retirement of the required percentage of cropland on all surplus-producing farms to balance production with consumption.

In keeping with the pledges made in the course of my own campaign for reelection, I reintroduced on the opening day of this session of the Congress my green-acres farm bill which was favorably considered by the last session. Minor revisions have been made to bring H.R. 12000 up to date and to incorporate the changes recommended by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], in behalf of himself and other colleagues from the South. I will not take the time of the House today to discuss the details of the proposal because most of our colleagues who served in the Congress last year are generally familiar with its provisions. However, I will plan to enter into such a discussion in the near future to refresh their memories and also for the edification of our new colleagues.

In the meantime, while campaign promises and pledges are still warm in your memories, may I remind the Members of Congress as well as the President and the Vice President that commitments have been made to rural America which must be kept.

We will soon have a new President and that will be the end of the alibi of a possible veto behind which many retreated in recent years when we pleaded for effective farm legislation.

We will soon have a new Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Benson can no longer be blamed for failures in Congress and in the executive branch. If confirmed by the Senate, the next Secretary will be the outgoing Governor of my State, the Honorable Orville Freeman. Although he has no real farm background such as we would all like our Secretary of Agriculture to have, he has served for 6 years as Governor of a State in which our farmers have felt most severely the pinch of a declining farm economy in the Midwest. Moreover, he has repeatedly voiced his concern for our problems and has testified before the House Committee on Agriculture in behalf of constructive new legislation. Although I naturally disagree with some of his other views, I am openminded where he is concerned and hopeful that he will, if confirmed, dedicate himself to the problems of farm people to the exclusion of other special interest groups. In that regard, he may expect my cooperation and support in his efforts to help farm people.

The great Committee on Agriculture will shortly be organized and prepared to take up the consideration of new farm legislation. As I have said many times, that committee consists of some of the greatest friends farm people ever had, and the membership of that committee has all of the ability required to develop a solution to this perplexing problem. My own green acres farm bill will be among the measures before them and I trust it will receive a full measure of consideration at the earliest possible date.

As I have said in the past and will repeat now, I am not wed to any precise language or specific provision of any measure, my own or any other. The problem we seek to solve is greater than any individual or any political party, and all of us should be prepared to set aside our partisan, sectional, or individual differences in the best interests of rural America. I will support any good farm bill without regard to the politics or other characteristics of its advocates, and I trust my colleagues will in the future, as in the past, accord a like measure of openmindedness to the proposals I personally advance.

If all of us concerned with the problem put our best thinking into a solution, and if we individually and collectively put the interests of farm people above all other considerations, then I am sure the 1st session of the 87th Congress will have a place in history as the session which moved toward the solution of this problem which has so long been before us. To this worthy objective I pledge my unqualified support.

IN SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Columbus, Ohio, together with some supporting letters from citizens of the 12th Congressional District of Ohio.

It is my understanding this resolution was prepared at the request of Mr. Ernest H. Stork, director, Department of Public Service, city of Columbus, Ohio.

A RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE EFFORTS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THOSE CIVIC GROUPS WITH SIMILAR PURPOSES

Whereas aggressive tendencies of totalitarian regimes imposed on free people threaten the security of the United States; and

Whereas the clearest threat to our security is the governmental ideology of communism; and

Whereas this ideology held by the Communist Party is antithetical to the principles which underlie the form of government incorporated in the Federal Constitution and guaranteed by it to the States; and

Whereas it is necessary that the Congress of the United States be given the opportunity to inquire into the threat of communistic and other un-American activities in order to guide and justify its course of legislative action; and

Whereas many civic and other nongovernmental organizations provide valuable assistance by being ever vigilant and inquisitive of any such threats to the security of our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Columbus:

SECTION 1. That the House Committee on Un-American Activities be and it hereby is commended on its splendid diligence in the task of inquiry into the threats to the existence and security of the Government of the United States; and furthermore

SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States is hereby notified of the support of the legislative body of the people of Columbus, Ohio, for the House Committee on Un-American Activities and any similar efforts, and are strongly urged to continue on in these endeavors; and furthermore

SEC. 3. That all civic and nongovernmental organizations who give of their time and effort in like activities to safeguard our democracy be likewise commended, notified of our support, and urged to continue such meaningful actions;

SEC. 4. That the clerk of the Council of the City of Columbus be, and hereby is, directed to communication this resolution to the Congress of the United States through the Representative of this 12th district, the Honorable SAMUEL L. DEVINE.

Adopted January 9, 1961.

WM. P. HOERMLE,
WM P. HOERMLE,
President pro tempore of Council.

Approved January 9, 1961.

W. RALSTON WESTLAKE,
Mayor.

Attest:

GORDON F. SERROTT,
City Clerk.

TWO U.S. AIRMEN IMPRISONED IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House and the American people to the plight of two U.S. airmen, Capt. John McKone and Capt. Bruce Olmstead, who are held prisoners in Lubyanka Prison, Dzerzhinsky Street No. 2, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

These are the two officers who remain from the U.S. Air Force RB–47 plane that was proceeding on a mission over the international waters of the Barents Sea on last July 1.

Quoting from the statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative in the Security Council, on the Soviet aircraft complaint:

The mission involved flying northward from England over the high seas to a point 200 miles north of the nearest land mass. From there the plane flew east into the

Barents Sea on a prescribed course which at no time was to bring it closer than 50 miles from Soviet territory.

As the world knows, this plane disappeared. The plane became the object of a widespread search in which the Soviet Government appeared, at first, to be participating in good faith. Ten days later, however, the Soviet Union proclaimed to the world that it had shot down the missing plane. At the same time, the Soviet Union claimed that the aircraft had penetrated Soviet air space and that the plane was engaged in a premeditated aggressive mission. The Soviet Government also accompanied its announcement with new threats of force and violence of a type with which the entire world has unfortunately become familiar. This intentional delay of 10 days, as Chairman Khrushchev informed us, had the cynical purpose of confusing us.

I do not intend to read into the record the entire statement proving that the claims of the Soviet Union were entirely false. The record is clear in the statement made before the Security Council by Henry Cabot Lodge. But I am interested in that the two airmen are in the prison, the address of which I gave in the first part of this statement.

It is my hope that not only the Members of Congress write to these men, but that many others who read this in the RECORD will also write to them. In addition to boosting their morale, we want them to know they are not forgotten and it would be a brainwash in the reverse on Soviet Russia. Not only must we write letters to them and help boost their morale, but certainly we must in every way, through our State Department bring pressure upon Soviet Russia for the release of these airmen, as under no circumstances should they be held prisoners of a foreign power. They were not trespassing. They were not flying over Soviet air space or Soviet territory, and a constant effort must be made by our Government for the immediate release of McKone and Olmstead.

I hope everyone will at least write and let them know that we are not forgetting them and that we are going to use all the force we possibly can to bring about their speedy release.

INAUGURAL PROGRAM REVENUE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the sentiment expressed here this morning to the effect that inaugural festivities should be nonpartisan in character. The issue presented by this resolution appears to be simple and clear and is: should certain tax revenues be surrendered by the people in favor of the inaugural committee and the guarantors of official inaugural functions? If the festivities return a profit then the revenues will simply go for charitable purposes; if the festivities fail to yield a profit then the loss is to be made up by certain unnamed guarantors of both parties. I submit that the duty of this House is to exercise its nonpartisan sentiment in favor of the people, permitting them to bestow their means upon the charities of their own choice, or to leave the guarantors to fulfill the obligation which they undertook before this resolution was proposed. The presence of the guarantors in this matter alters its nature to make it essentially private. The taxpayers should not be required to subsidize these functions regardless of the party of the President-elect in this or any other year.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 12, I introduced three bills to help correct one of the glaring inequities that exists in our society—discrimination in employment because of age. H.R. 2479 would prevent businesses engaged in interstate commerce from practicing such discrimination, and H.R. 2480 and H.R. 2481 would outlaw this practice in firms holding Federal contracts or subcontracts, and in companies located in the District of Columbia.

Identical legislation has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by my distinguished colleague from New York State, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

The object of this legislation is to afford Federal leadership in the drive to prevent and eliminate unjust, unreasonable discrimination against older workers. In view of the country's vital need for manpower it is not only shortsighted on the part of employers to refuse to hire qualified senior citizens because of their age but it is also a waste of valuable experience. We all realize that a shortage of trained manpower exists in virtually every field and at the same time a recent survey of hiring practices throughout the country by the Labor Department disclosed that more than half the openings listed with employment offices in 70 percent of the cities surveyed contained a maximum hiring age. This state of affairs is ridiculous and completely unfair.

Of course the passage of legislation declaring it to be public policy to forbid employment discrimination because of age, cannot, by itself, eliminate the problem, but it will help to foster an atmosphere conducive to an appreciation of the situation and thereby make its effectuation easier.

There simply are not going to be enough younger workers entering the working force in the years ahead to supply the growing needs of our economy. According to the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., for every increase of 2 workers in the 25–44 working age group by 1965, there will have to be 11 new workers in the 45-plus age group. This, if the gross national product is to climb to $560 billion on a labor force of only some 10 million more than present.

Business wisdom also is proving a substantial reason for expanding the employment of our older citizens.

Studies by the U.S. Department of Labor and by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York have produced these enlightening figures: Of 3,000 employers polled in 1951, the work of older employees was rated as equal to or superior to younger workers by 93 percent of the respondents; older workers have a 20-percent better attendance record than younger employees; employees 45 and over had 2.5 percent fewer disabling injuries and 25 percent fewer nondisabling injuries than those under 45, in 1956; voluntary turnover rates are less among older employees; and, the older worker is more likely to possess more skills, training, and job know-how than younger employees.

In other words, granted that there are exceptions, experience has borne out the validity of hiring older, more mature employees for numerous positions where their talents are most useful.

Job discrimination because of age, has already been recognized as a major economic problem requiring governmental action in nine States. They have laws on the books banning it in private industry, and, in most cases, in unions and employment agencies as well. The bills I am proposing would enable the Federal Government to play a leading role in meeting this problem, not by forcing firms to hire older people arbitrarily, but by prohibiting the refusal to hire, because of age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction.

Discrimination against senior citizens in the matter of employment solely on the basis of age is contrary to the basic American principles of fairplay and our deeply held belief that the primary consideration in employment should be merit and the ability to perform.

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday the delegates to the White House Conference on Aging propounded a senior citizen's charter of rights. First among these propositions was the right to be useful, and second was the right to obtain employment, based on merit. I believe the legislation Senator JAVITS and I have offered would promote the enjoyment of these rights.

May I conclude with a case in point. Statistics point up the maximum hiring age of the average firm in America as being 45 years. How many Members of this legislative body would be in favor of such a rule applying to them?

THE LATE HONORABLE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 1960, this Nation suffered a tragic and irreparable loss in the death of one of the truly outstanding statesmen of our time, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who served the people of her Fifth Massachusetts District, her State, her country, and the cause of freedom with deep compassion, unsurpassed competence, and selfless devotion for 35 years. Her unyielding dedication to peace and justice earned her the respect and love of all who were privileged to know her.

In 1925, when she was elected to succeed her late husband, John Jacob Rogers, ladies were a rarity in the Halls of Congress. No New England State had ever elected a woman to represent it in either Chamber of Congress.

She brought great gifts to the Congress. She was unusually well educated, extremely well informed, and possessed a deep sense of the true purpose of our Nation. She had worked tirelessly on behalf of the wounded and disabled veterans of the First World War, and her compassionate interest in America's wounded soldiers had been recognized by Presidents Harding and Coolidge.

Seventeen times the citizens of the Fifth District reelected her to represent them. By 1953 Mrs. ROGERS had held national public office longer than any other woman in U.S. history.

She represented the people of her district faithfully and well. She became an expert on foreign affairs, and one of the best informed members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on which she served from 1933 until 1946. She was among the first to rise on the floor of the House to protest against the persecutions in Nazi Germany. She spoke out with equal vigor and insight against the crimes and aggressions of the Communists.

Throughout her life she was deeply concerned with the welfare of those who had defended our Nation. She had devoted herself to the cause of helping America's wounded soldiers for some time before she entered Congress. With characteristic courage, she had gone to France in 1917 to support our men at the front. In 1922 President Harding appointed her his personal representative in the care of our disabled veterans, a position to which she was reappointed by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover.

When Mrs. ROGERS entered the House in 1925 she was already a recognized champion of our country's veterans. By 1947, when she assumed the chairmanship of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, she was regarded as the vigilant guardian of the rights of our millions of veterans. During World War II, as President Roosevelt's personal representative, Mrs. ROGERS surveyed military hospital facilities in Europe. She did the job thoroughly and well and achieved a distinct improvement in the medical care of our wounded soldiers.

Among Mrs. ROGERS' major contributions to our war effort was the legislation to establish the Women's Army Corps which she sponsored. The mobilization of America's women for noncombatant duties freed thousands of men for front-line service, and helped significantly to shorten the war. When peace prevailed, Mrs. ROGERS sponsored one of the most important pieces of legislation of our time, the GI bill of rights, which enabled millions of men and women who had fought in defense of our Nation to prepare for their return to civilian life. As senior member and two-time chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mrs. ROGERS was a tireless and uncompromising fighter for the rights of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. She loved them as they loved her.

Her work in administering to the needs of our wounded fighting men and of our veterans spanned almost half a century. It was a period of profound and violent change, which left nothing untouched. Throughout this turbulent era, Mrs. ROGERS' intense sense of purpose served as a beacon for all who had the good fortune of knowing her. She never wavered in her conscientiousness toward her constituents, her deep sympathy for those who had served the United States in the Armed Forces, and her abiding love for this great Nation.

Her district has lost a tireless and effective representative. Unnamed millions whom she served with such diligence and sympathy have lost a cherished friend. This House has lost a respected Member. This Republic has lost a great champion. The ideals of human freedom and human dignity have lost a courageous defender.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was truly a great American.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when EDITH NOURSE ROGERS passed away on September 10, 1960, it could well be said the country had lost one of its most dedicated public servants. To me, her death was a great personal loss because we had been close friends for over 37 years. It had been my privilege to give Congresswoman ROGERS her first start in public life. Her husband, John Jacob Rogers, was an outstanding Member of the House and was selected in 1924 to serve as a presidential elector. After being selected by the convention, it was found he was ineligible to serve because he held the office of Congressman. In considering a successor, I suggested to the State chairman the name of Mrs. ROGERS, at the same time commenting upon her popularity. She was selected and elected. Several months later her husband died, and Mrs. ROGERS was nominated as his successor. The State committee assigned me to aid in the special election, and it proved an easy victory, as indeed were all her many subsequent elections.

Mrs. ROGERS was a woman of warm sympathies, very generous, and with an ardent desire to aid all who were in need. No deserving person ever appealed to her in vain. She served overseas with the American Red Cross in 1917 and was the personal representative of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover in care of disabled veterans. Her work revealed clearly the sacrifices and patriotism of the American serviceman, and she became his stout champion. Through the years he was ever close to her heart, and her work in his behalf won for her the title of the "veterans' angel."

Her husband's service on the Foreign Affairs Committee and as author of the Rogers Act brought her an intimate knowledge of State Department affairs. She served for years on the Foreign Affairs Committee but later when freed to make a choice she elected to go on the Veteran's Affairs Committee, where she served with great distinction. For 4 years she served as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and during these years under her close supervision, great progress was made in veterans' legislation.

Much of the veterans' legislation enacted during her long service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee bore the imprint of her talents. She was the author of the legislation that created the WAC who contributed outstanding service during the war and in subsequent years. Her outstanding public service deservedly won recognition with honorary degrees from Tufts, Bates, Washington College of Law, Portia Law School, and the Lowell Technological Institute.

Her service in Congress was during a trying period in the industrial life of New England. Many textile concerns were moving South. Lowell and other communities in her district were hit particularly hard and caused her constant worry. She was a tireless worker to make life more attractive for those that remained and to bring new industries into New England. In this service she realized the contribution it would be to make life happier and more prosperous for the workers of New England. Outstanding instances could be enumerated of her success in this very important work.

In recent months Mrs. ROGERS appeared to be failing in health, but she insisted upon working with all her usual courage and earnestness. Toward the end of the session, it was impossible for her to continue and she was forced to go home for a rest. Shortly after Congress adjourned, she passed away.

Although born in Maine, she was from an old Massachusetts family. One of her ancestors was burned as a witch in Salem in the early days of the Colonies. Others served conspicuously in the industrial life of New England.

That her great work was appreciated was evidenced by the final honors paid Mrs. ROGERS by the city of Lowell, her constituents, and New England friends who were aware of the great loss they had sustained.

Thousands turned out at the church. Flags were at half mast and as the funeral procession went to the cemetery, business was halted. Thousands of mourners lined the streets in a final farewell salute.

As one of the first women to be elected to Congress, it was to her a challenge that was ever present. She had to prove that women could make excel-

lent Representatives. She measured up fully to the great challenge.

In the death of Mrs. ROGERS, Congress lost one of its most popular members; the veterans an outstanding champion; New England a zealous worker; and the country a fine American public servant. Her many fine deeds will ever be an inspiration to all who knew her.

As part of my remarks, I include at this point a guest editorial tribute, written on behalf of Mrs. ROGERS' staff, by Capt. Harold Lawrence, who was for many years a tireless and loyal assistant.

THE HONORABLE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS—ON BEHALF OF HER STAFF

(By Capt. Harold Lawrence)

Seldom in a generation, or a lifetime, or even a century, is there combined all of the godly qualities of greatness in a single human being.

Those of us who knew Mrs. ROGERS, and enjoyed the honor of working with her, knew her kindness, her consideration, and the breadth of her knowledge and understanding. We knew her strength, her energy, her tenacity, her inspiration.

We knew of her love for the people she represented and how intensely she wanted to ably serve them and help them to live a fuller and happier life in this their precious time.

We knew of the inspiring loyalty and patriotism she possessed for America, and we knew of her comprehension of the great principles upon which this glorious Nation of freedom must stand and defend against all challenges.

We knew of her devotion to the men and women who gave their lives in the service of their country that freedom shall not perish from the earth. We knew that the care and justice for the cause of veterans throughout the whole country commanded her full strength and energy.

We knew her thoughts about the senselessness of war and that she comprehended the full meaning and glory of a world at peace. We knew Mrs. ROGERS to have the courage of a lion and possessed of a determination that looked only toward victory. We knew her to have a heart as strong as sinews of steel and yet as soft as a cloud and as understanding as a saint.

We knew Mrs. ROGERS in war. We knew her in peace. We knew her in depression and adversity. We knew her through many of her great struggles. Through these troubled moments of crises her leadership was calm and wise and an inspiration to all of us. We knew of her integrity and her honor and her constant cheerfulness, her endless generosity and unselfishness.

We knew of Mrs. ROGERS' faith, her faith in people and her faith in God. We knew how very deeply this faith sustained her. We knew of her great sense of the right and of her efforts to live truthfully and justly and honorably.

We knew that the loyalty of her countless friends here in "my wonderful district", and countless friends all over the world, gave her strength and confidence in America's great destiny in a world at peace under God.

We know that all she was, all she accomplished and all she gave of her whole life has etched eternal love and respect in the minds and hearts of men and women everywhere.

We know of her great hopes and dreams for a world at peace, so that human beings everywhere could again flourish and develop their godly endowed talents.

We know that all of these things of mind and heart brilliantly lighted her sky with a magnificient gleam and an inspiring glow surrounding a beautiful golden sunset.

We knew her well. We were privileged. We were honored. We have associated with greatness fashioned by God.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the constitutional history of our country many great Americans have served in the Halls of Congress. History records that they possessed unusual qualifications, and as one qualification we find always existing in the life of every great American, whether in or out of Congress, but particularly in the Congress of the United States, that while one might be a better orator than someone else, one might possess this or that quality better than some other outstanding American, they all possessed the quality of courage.

Mrs. ROGERS was one of the outstanding Members in the entire constitutional history of our country in service in this great body. No Member that I have ever served with displayed courage to a greater extent than did Mrs. ROGERS. Between us there was a deep, strong friendship and a profound feeling of respect, evidenced not so long ago when there was talk of a Democratic controlled Massachusetts legislature redistricting congressional districts last year. Although I never thought there would be, there was some talk that they would carve up Mrs. ROGERS' district. I sent word to them, at least I made it known, that I would very much regret that being done and that I would vigiorously oppose it.

She displayed courage to a degree that is almost indescribable. I have seen it repeatedly, particularly during the dark days preceding World War II when, for example, we had the matter of the extension of the Selective Service Act here on this floor, and it carried by 1 vote, 203 to 202. She stood there like the Rock of Gibraltar in support of the passage of that bill. This evidenced the type of legislator Mrs. ROGERS was. When the national interest of our country was involved, that middle aisle meant nothing to her. Furthermore, where friendship was involved, the middle aisle meant nothing to her. And that is the way it should be.

She gave of herself untiringly to her country, to our country, and to her friends. In my opinion, from the political angle, she was the best politician Massachusetts ever had in 75 or 100 years, in either party. She could outthink, outguess, outsmart, and "outcourage" any of us.

Her passing was a great personal loss to me as well as to the people of her district. I find it difficult to express adequately the thoughts I have on this occasion when we are delivering eulogies on this lady who was so sweet and kind, but who was a grim and determined American, whose courage was without limitation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all going to miss EDITH ROGERS very much. She was always so blythe, so gay, so cheery—so very thoughtful of the big things as well as the small. One of the thoughtful little things that are so important that she did each year was to express our thanks to all the clerks, the page boys, and everybody else who serve us here. This year I missed it very much, but did not have the good sense to get up and do it myself in her memory.

So many things have been said about her capacity, her service, her consecration, that I am not going to add my words to those that have been so well expressed. But when one parts from an old friend there is a void—even though one rejoices that she has gone free.

I met EDITH NOURSE ROGERS in the early twenties when we were both in Washington with our husbands. I remember dining with them and finding my hostess, whom I had met that evening for the first time, one of the most exquisitely lovely women I have ever seen. And such a hostess. Such charm, such care of everyone at her table.

We both worked for nursing in World War I, sharing one of our chief interests from our first meeting. Our relationship continued down through the years in a most friendly, delightful fashion.

Mrs. ROGERS loved her work here and gave unstintingly of herself, especially to the veterans. She served her district as few districts are served, and I am sure that many hearts were heavy when the news of her passing came.

It was a joy to me when all those at the Women's National Press Club dinner the night the Congress reconvened this year stood for a moment of silence out of respect for this woman who had given 35 years of her life to her country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, here was one of the grand and great ladies of our time; always friendly, always pleasant, always helpful to her colleagues, always interested in all of the work of the Congress and always a champion of her people. She was truly an outstanding Member of the House.

I valued her friendship just as I esteemed her fine work, her wonderful qualities, and the contributions that she made here. I mourn her death. We shall not soon find another such wonderful, warm, invigorating personality as EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. As I think all who knew her were aware, she was dedicated to the work of that committee. It seems to me in thinking about her service, as I knew her, she had three great dedications: First to her country, which she loved so dearly, secondly to the people of her own State and congressional district, and thirdly to the great group of

veterans of all our wars. Whenever there was any legislative matter that touched the veterans or their interests she was immediately alive to it and took a most active interest and participation in anything relating to it.

As has been said here previously today, certainly she will be missed by many people who have observed and appreciated her service in this House through the years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that those of us who knew, worked with, admired, and loved our colleague, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, should pause today and pay tribute to a great leader and a great legislator.

Her absence across the aisle will be sharply felt for years to come. The warmth of her friendship, her steady bright determination to make this world a better place, are lasting tributes to a great lady.

Mrs. ROGERS was already Dean of the Women Members of Congress when I first met her at the opening of the 83d Congress in 1953. I was a newcomer at the time, but Mrs. ROGERS, as I fondly recall our first meeting on the floor of this Chamber, had friendly words of advice and encouragement for me, even though I sat across the political aisle from her. My respect and friendship for her grew over the years as our legislative work brought us together.

She was a great pioneer in the field of veterans legislation. Many major bills for veterans, including the GI bill of rights of World War II, the bill to aid Korean war veterans, bills to help the disabled and sick, establishment of the Women's Army Corps, and a permanent nurse corps for veterans, stands as a living monument to her leadership. Her ideas, as they were incorporated into these laws, helped and continue to help millions of American veterans.

Along with her work on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mrs. ROGERS also proved herself to be a dedicated soldier in the cause of a lasting peace. I am reminded of something she wrote back in the fall of 1952 which has special meaning for us today, as a new administration prepares to assume the leadership of our Nation. Her words were:

"The middle of the road doesn't contain the answer. Neither does the left nor the right. These are academic. The issue is global, not national. Peace cannot be purchased. The method of attainment must be molded by world leadership based on sound ideas, rooted in truth and nourished in world respect."

This is the challenge of our times as Mrs. ROGERS voiced it 8 years ago. Mr. Speaker, let those of us here now try to fulfill the bright promise which her words hold.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a distinguished lady who graced these Halls for over 35 years. I knew the name and deeds of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS long before I knew the woman herself. The unrestrained efforts she dedicated in behalf of the disabled veterans of this country set her on a pinnacle as their champion.

Her works were known widely and the fruits of her labor sent a glow of hope and comfort into the lives of many former servicemen and their dependents and some ray of sunshine into their existence which so often was filled with adversity and despair.

Seldom is our middle name known to many. However, all who knew our departed colleague and friend knew her as EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. Her middle name was a reminder that she was a descendant of that historical figure, Rebecca Nourse, who lived in my home city of Salem, Mass., almost 300 years ago.

There have been many occasions, Mr. Speaker, when those who had benefited from her unrelenting crusade to help our veterans, referred to her as EDITH "NURSE" ROGERS. While the personal pride I had of her association with my home city tempted me to correct these people, I must candidly admit that the name born of her benevolence is much more descriptive of her than the name of her ancestors.

The final chapter of her life has been written but as long as the world needs to recall names like Clara Barton, there will be a reason to remember EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

I have introduced a resolution in the Congress asking that the veterans hospital in Jamaica Plain in Massachusetts be called the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital.

After all of us who knew her have passed away, this memorial will serve as a reminder of one who did not forget.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS LIVES ON IN THE HEARTS OF ALL VETERANS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, soon after the 86th Congress had come to an end, death closed the career of our longtime colleague, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts.

No woman before her had ever served so many years and with such distinction in the Congress of the United States. For more than one-third of a century, she was a Member of this House, where her complete devotion to our veterans singled her out as the greatest friend they ever had in Congress.

As a young woman, Mrs. ROGERS saw firsthand the sufferings of those who fought in defense of our freedoms during World War I. She served in France in 1917, and was with the Red Cross ministering to the needs of the wounded from 1918 to 1922.

I think that was the turning point in her life. For, from then on, her mission was to help those who had sacrificed so much for the freedoms she cherished as the liberating hope for mankind. Her work in behalf of disabled veterans resulted in her election to Congress in 1925, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, the late Representative John Jacob Rogers. She was reelected every 2 years by impressive majorities.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee she became an authority on all aspects of legislation dealing with the comprehensive program of benefits for veterans that was enacted into law. She sponsored many of these bills, and on the floor she was ever vigilant and effective in debating their merits. During the intervals when her party controlled the organization of this House, it was a foregone conclusion that she would be selected as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Her leadership in that post won nationwide attention, and wherever veterans gathered they spoke with respect and gratitude and affection for Mrs. ROGERS as their champion in the Congress.

Her consideration for them was not confined to her services as Congresswoman because she was their friend long before she became their Representative. Few people know the thousands of hours she spent, outside of her official duties, in visiting the forgotten men in our VA hospitals. Her presence brought cheer and comfort to many, and the memory of her kindness will inspire them for all the years of their lives. Like her forefathers who knew that freemen must be worthy of their responsibilities, she welcomed the opportunity to be of service to others.

We are fortunate that, as one of the first women to be elected to membership in the House of Representatives, she set an example of ability and integrity that will encourage more women to participate in public life and thus enrich our representative form of government with the qualities of mercy, and charity, and the human need for one another.

On September 14, 1960, I traveled from my home city of Lawrence, Mass., to attend the funeral services for Mrs. ROGERS in Lowell, Mass. Her mortal remains were embraced by the earth on a tree-shaded slope. Nearby were the graves of those who had built the first textile mills, and the resting place of those who had fought in the Civil War.

Like those who preceded her in death, she lived her life with an immortal faith in the day to day progress of freedom, stretching toward horizons unlimited.

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was a beloved leader during her long and constructive career as a public servant. Her great and generous heart that provided for veterans even in her last will and testament has strengthened the American heritage of courage and compassion, and human dignity.

Her spirit accompanies us into the future.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress of the United States, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was already an old friend, but I got to know her here as I had never known her before. She was indeed an example to the women of the Congress, because with all her ability

and all her political knowledge she always remained truly feminine. She had a compassion, she had a love for those who were less fortunate. She gave of herself, and it is my understanding that when she passed away she was a far poorer woman than when she came into the Congress, and I suspect it is because no one ever came to EDITH NOURSE ROGERS with a sorrowful tale or a real tragedy that she did not do something to help. No one was ever turned away by EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, although probably sometimes they should have been. But do we not prefer to look back and think that that never happened? And I think toward the end of her life she showed it in her face, because as we get older we all get a few lines; some of us get a great many, but the lines in EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' face were happy lines, they were confident lines, they were courageous lines. And more than that none of us can have.

So in her passing we have lost a friend, but we can look back upon her life with satisfaction; and what I like to believe; it was a very happy life.

There are two Beatitudes that appeal to me, seeming to express her personality: Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the words of eloquent and well-deserved tribute to one of America's outstanding women.

When EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, took her place in this Hall, 31 years ago, veteran lawmakers predicted that her congressional career would be brief. To begin with, she was serving the unexpired term of her recently deceased husband, Representative John Jacob Rogers, one of the most popular members of the Massachusetts delegation. Moreover, she had to live down the fact that few women had ever been able to make their mark in Congress.

Pessimistic predictions meant nothing to Mrs. ROGERS, however. When the last Congress assembled, she was still on hand, charming as ever after three decades of distinguished service, the victor in 18 consecutive election contests, and one of the outstanding New England Representatives on the floor.

Time, and time alone, was able to drive Mrs. ROGERS from the field of public service, and we are saddened today by her absence, forced upon us by her departure from this earth.

The House mourns her loss with the same depth of emotion as that felt by her family, her friends, and her loyal constituents. Indeed, the Nation is the greatest sufferer of all, for Mrs. ROGERS loved and served the national cause with a will and determination equaled by few of her contemporaries.

Mrs. ROGERS was a public servant, in one capacity or another, throughout most of her life. Following her marriage in 1907 she became greatly concerned in international affairs; and when World War I began, she volunteered for oversea service in YMCA work for the American Red Cross. Later, as a Red Cross worker, she tended the wounded at Walter Reed Hospital, from 1918 to 1922.

Hearing of her efforts, President Harding appointed Mrs. ROGERS as his personal representative in charge of assistance for disabled veterans. The next year she was reappointed by President Coolidge, and President Hoover named her to the same post in 1929.

In the meantime, the constituents of the Massachusetts Fifth District had appointed Mrs. ROGERS to her late husband's seat in Congress and demonstrated a determination to maintain her in that capacity. Mrs. ROGERS, in turn, had shown that she took the responsibility very seriously and was soon on record as the first Congresswoman to sponsor major legislation.

An ardent patriot, she opposed the spread of totalitarianism everywhere in the world, and demonstrated her convictions by introducing a bill curbing the influx of goods from the Japanese dictatorship.

Long a friend of the American veterans, she introduced numerous pension bills for the benefit of their widows.

An early believer in military preparedness, she spoke out in the interest of national defense long before many of her male compeers had recognized the necessity for such action.

And as the lone woman member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she sponsored the bill to create the volunteer Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

At her death, Mrs. ROGERS held the record for the longest service of any Congresswoman in American history. She has set a standard which future Congresswomen will find hard to equal, and the House has nothing but praise for her service, and pleasant recollections of her charm, her ability, her courage, and her charity. There, indeed, was a distinguished American.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this eminent body to speak with sincerity about a beloved woman and distinguished legislator who represented her distrct and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. For 35 years she was a Member of this House and, throughout her career, she merited the high respect and esteem of her colleagues for her devotion and unstinting efforts for our Nation, her State, and constiutency. Above and beyond local considerations, those who have served in the Armed Forces in the wars, owe an incalculable debt for her understanding and consideration of their sacrifices.

I, as a veteran of World War II, and countless more, cannot thank her enough for the opportunity given us by her insight and efforts, to acquire an education. Indeed, many men would not have achieved their present success had it not been for the GI bill. More important, however, is the tremendous benefit, through this particular legislation, which has accrued to our great Nation. The sinews of strength given our national life in the postwar period by this farsighted legislation, was instrumental in maintaining our continued stability and in utilizing the great resources of education to revitalize, so to speak, a nation which had undergone the displacement caused by war.

So, while our eulogy may endure only of its moment, the living monuments to her work in the Congress are the countless American veterans who have benefited. Thus our great Nation is the ultimate benefactor.

It is with profound sorrow that I join my colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation, in our common bereavement over her loss. However, it is with pride that I can pay tribute in this House which she served so well, to the memory of Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and to recognize her accomplishments, not only because it was my distinct privilege to have worked with her, but also because I am sure that I speak for all my fellow veterans and, indeed, Americans.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, there are moments when heartache makes it difficult to speak. Those of us who have known EDITH NOURSE ROGERS through the years mourn today the passing of a great figure. We mourn the passing of a pioneer woman politician; and she was an excellent one. But what we feel most today is the loss of a friend, tried and true.

Many have spoken with merit of her great service in this House. Many outside of this House have spoken with equal merit of the great things that she did for our veterans.

I want to speak of her as a human being, because she was one of the most human human beings it was ever my privilege to know. There was no occasion when help could be given that she was not first to get there with that help. Many times when no one else knew that help was needed, she was uncanny in her discovery of the need. Perhaps one should say that she had a divine way of knowing when the word "sympathy" would mean so much, and when the open hand of friendship would fill a void.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of this House realize, as I have been realizing today, that very seldom was there held an occasion like this that EDITH NOURSE ROGERS did not rise to speak of the loss that she felt in the passing even of some Member that she did not know in some cases so well. She spoke because of her quality of sympathy. She spoke also because she knew that in this great body no head can fall without a great loss to the Nation.

I like to think of her humanity. I remember the time last year when she cast a vote with great political courage, and coming up to me afterwards in the Speaker's lobby said, "I hope that vote did not disturb you. You know, I cannot refuse to spend mere money when I know that people need it." I am inclined to think that her whole life was tied up

in those words. We who were privileged to walk closely with her, following the pattern set by a great woman, knew last spring that strength was not there which we had found before. However, so great was our respect for EDITH NOURSE ROGERS that not one of us ever mentioned it to her. We wanted her to know that although her physical strength might fail, the mental and spiritual strength which she brought to this body would never fail and would never leave it.

Sometimes it is said in Washington with some jocularity, that this Capitol is a place where everyone is welcomed but no one is ever missed. I would deny the last part emphatically in the case of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. As long as any one of us who served with her in this body is here, there will be a void. And the many who knew her outside of this body, together with the many in the future who will benefit through the legislation which she sponsored, "will rise up and call her blessed."

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress convenes and we seek to find solutions for the legisaltive problems now confronting our Nation, it is with deep regret and a sincere feeling of loss that we note the passing of one of our most dedicated and long-serving colleagues, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS' whole life was fired by a spirit of patriotism, a love of mankind, and a desire to serve in any capacity that might present itself—a combination of qualities rarely seen today.

During the 86th Congress it was my privilege to become acquainted with Mrs. ROGERS, and I took her to be a very kindly person, generous in her advice and counsel to a freshman Member of Congress. And, I know that I speak for the people of my district, because she was loved throughout the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as throughout the Nation.

Her background prepared her well for the public service she was to render throughout her adult life. From her father, who was a mill company executive, she acquired a wealth of knowledge about the New England textile industry and a warm compassion for her fellow men. She attended the Rogers Hall School in Lowell, Mass., and studied at the Sorbonne and at Madam Julien's school in Paris.

In the years that followed her marriage, the spirit of public service emerged brightly in the personage of Mrs. ROGERS. In 1917 she was sent to France to work for the YMCA and for the American Red Cross. She also served as a Red Cross worker at Walter Reed Hospital from 1918 to 1922. Her work became so well-known that she was appointed by President Harding as his personal representative in charge of assistance for disabled veterans. She also served under Presidents Coolidge and Hoover and assisted in the establishment of suitable veterans' hospital facilities, inspection of veterans' hospitals, and the planning of suitable hospital construction programs.

During this time, Mrs. ROGERS developed an extraordinary grasp of veterans' problems and a disciplined mind that was to enable her to approach all problems, both of national and international importance, with an extraordinary insight that was to earn her the respect of all those with whom she was associated.

On the death of her husband in 1925, Mrs. ROGERS decided to offer herself as a candidate for the remainder of his unexpired term in the House of Representatives. She became the sixth woman in political history to be elected to the House of Representatives.

At the time of her election, Mrs. ROGERS made a statement in which she said:

> I hope that everybody will forget as soon as possible that I am a woman. I have told my constituents that they may expect just the same service they obtained from my husband. I shall try to give my personal attention to every call on my office, and when I vote I shall try to represent them as accurately as my conscience will let me.

There can be no question that Mrs. ROGERS fulfilled this pledge over and above what was required of her initial statement. Her constituents reasserted their confidence in her every 2 years from 1925 to 1958. This unbroken record of service speaks for itself with what esteem she was held in their hearts and minds. There are now only six Members of the House of Representatives who can claim a longer record of service than Mrs. ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS attained a particular record of distinction in her knowledge of veterans' affairs and her championship of their needs. At the time of her death she was considered a foremost authority in the field. In recognition of her work she was awarded the American Legion's Distinguished Service Medal. She is the first and only woman to be so honored thus far.

While Mrs. ROGERS is probably best known for her work on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which she was chairman in the 80th and 83d Congresses, she also served with distinction as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee from the 73d Congress in 1933 through the 79th Congress in 1946.

She is also known as being the first woman Member of Congress whose name has been attached to a piece of major legislation. It was she who sponsored the bill that led to the establishment of the Women's Army Corps, the WAC. She also played a significant role in the drafting of the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans.

Everyone did forget very soon that Mrs. ROGERS was a woman, as she desired. Her life and her accomplishments commend themselves to the respect of all Americans. As a fellow colleague from the State of Massachusetts, and as one who respected Mrs. ROGERS for her great vitality and her outstanding record of service, I wish to be included with those other Members who have expressed their sorrow at the loss of her service to our Nation.

I would like to say this in closing: Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was truly one of God's great noblewomen.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it was a sad day for the veterans when our dear colleague, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, died during our adjournment.

She dedicated her career in the Congress to sponsoring and supporting legislation beneficial to the needs and interests of the veteran. The rights of their widows and orphans were fully protected by the enactment of laws sponsored by her.

These untiring efforts won for her a revered niche in the patriotic halls of every service organization. Her name became a password, or symbol, sacred to the memory of the men who served.

She commanded respect and influence as an authority on veterans' legislation. With brilliant alertness and an understanding of their problems—in debate—she successfully gained passage of corrective legislation, critically needed to exact fairness in the veterans' interests.

Her persistent attitude in fostering legislation that, at first, was frowned upon by the Congress, spelled success in the end.

It may be truly said that, on this earth, she was the angel of patriotism in the hearts of all Americans.

It is the cause of the veteran that will suffer in this great loss. We, her colleagues, knew her best when pleading their causes in the historic forum of the Congress.

God's will be done. The State of Massachusetts and the Congress mourn with the Nation and its veterans for the loss of our beloved leader in veterans' affairs.

And so, from all of her activities in life, I have composed an ode to her memory.

ODE TO OUR BELOVED EDITH

And so, her day is gone,
As comes for everyone to die;
And now she feels the sun
Of other worlds, To try
To live again, with those so brave,
Who passed but years before,
And know no earthly grave;
But stand to welcome her with roars
Of full approval, of her patriotic chores
On earth; yet many are there who knew,
Now salute and greet her with a happy tear,
To show the gratitude and joy that she is near;
As banners wave, while passing in review,
Thus to pay her homage in God's retinue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying our respects to our departed colleague, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and to extend my sympathy to our colleagues from Massachusetts in this great loss which they suffered. This loss which is not confined to the State of Massachusetts alone, but is felt by the entire Nation. All of us have suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. She was a friend that could always be counted on.

It was a great privilege to know Mrs. ROGERS.

I was greeted by her when I came to the House as a new Congressman. It was her custom at that time to entertain the new Members of the House at a reception in her home. I recall that this was the first social event I attended in Washington. It was a most delightful party and it gave the new Members the opportunity to meet some of the older Members invited by Mrs. ROGERS. Some of the finest friendships I have enjoyed in the House were formed at this reception.

Mrs. ROGERS was always very faithful in her attendance at the sessions of the House. I missed her at the special session late last summer, and understood she was ill at that time. However, I did not realize that her illness was so serious.

Mrs. ROGERS was interested in doing favors for others. She was always anxious to assist other Members with their problems. Her interest in the welfare of veterans has been mentioned many times this afternoon and is known throughout the Nation. Mrs. ROGERS never overlooked an opportunity to do something for the veteran, and many times was distressed because she could not do more.

Truly the House lost one of its most valued and beloved Members in the passing of Mrs. ROGERS. Along with many others, I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of her death. She richly deserves the eloquent eulogies which are being paid to her today, but I feel utterly inadequate to express my feelings on this sad occasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this body I was assigned to the committee of which Mrs. ROGERS was then the chairman. I found her, as many others have already spoken of finding her, a charming and gracious person and a true friend, one who conscientiously gave her best day in and day out to the service of her country, her State and her district.

I was pleased to hear a few moments ago that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] plans to introduce a resolution naming a great veterans hospital of her State in her honor. I cannot think of a more fitting and proper memorial to this great lady, because certainly she pioneered in the field of good medical care for the veterans of the Nation. Nowhere in this body or in the Nation did our veterans have a truer or a more constant friend that EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

I join my colleagues here on the floor in expressing deepest sympathy to her loved ones.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GARLAND] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the many that have been spoken on the floor in respect to the late Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

My hometown is Saco, Maine, and we are particularly proud in Saco that EDITH ROGERS was born there and maintained a lovely home there throughout her lifetime.

Representative ROGERS had numerous honorary degrees and she spent her life in public service. From 1918 to 1922 Mrs. ROGERS worked with the Red Cross caring for the disabled. She was appointed personal representative in care of disabled veterans by President Harding in 1922 and was later reappointed to this position by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover.

During the last Republican majority in the House, Mrs. ROGERS held the chairmanship of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. During her years of service in the House she was referred to as the "sweetheart of American veterans" for her devoted service in their behalf.

Mrs. ROGERS was one of the leading crusaders for the law that is now known as the GI bill of rights. When she died last September she was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS was the first woman to receive the Distinguished Service Cross of the American Legion.

As a lifelong resident of Saco, and as its former mayor, I know that I speak for all of our citizens when I say that we are proud that our city is the birthplace of this lady who was an outstanding legislator and who devoted her life to helping ease the problems of our veterans.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing on September 10 last of our dear and esteemed friend and colleague, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Lowell, Mass., has very deeply grieved all of us in the House.

It is difficult to describe the feelings of sorrow and grief which I felt that September morning—and we all feel still—for the loss of a very distinguished colleague and warm friend who was so dear to us.

Mrs. ROGERS, who for 35 years had been an outstanding Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, was a woman of tremendous ability, untiring energy and remarkably high purpose and zeal.

In a personal sense, she was of truly heartwarming personality and her gracious, kindly, generous nature endeared her to all of us who served with her.

Her thoughtfulness and kindness knew no bounds and she could never seem to do enough for her friends and her constituents.

Her humane spirit was unexcelled and ever responsive to any call made upon her.

Her womanly dignity, charm and grace impressed and cheered everyone who met her and brightened every place she went. Certainly no more considerate or lovely person has ever served in the Halls of Congress.

Apart from these great attributes of personality and noble humanitarianism which she possessed in such abundant and magnificent degree, EDITH ROGERS was one of the most remarkable and effective Members ever to serve in this body. She had a quick, inquiring and comprehending mind and rare intuitive powers and vision that enabled her to evaluate accurately the most profound and complex questions and problems which came before the Congress.

She was an illustrious American stateswoman of rare and unparalleled gifts, whose understanding of human nature, knowledge of public psychology and deep, incessant interest in helping the people knew no peer. In my own experience in public life, I have never known any person, man or woman, who possessed her rare faculty of understanding just what was in the minds of the people and was willing to act speedily and efficiently to render them unselfish service and assistance.

She was known in the Congress and throughout the Nation as the devoted and warm friend of the veteran and his loved ones and affectionately called the Mother of Veterans—and well she might be so termed—because there has never been anyone in or out of Congress or the public service who did so much for the veterans as Mrs. ROGERS. She was, in truth, the indefatigable, untiring and aggressive champion of the veterans cause, not only as an outstanding member and chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but in a truly personal and individual capacity in which she became the special custodian of the amputees, the paraplegics and other disabled heroes whom she visited, advised, mothered and helped, far beyond power of description, in all parts of the country.

Mrs. ROGERS not only ably and forcefully spoke for the veterans cause and acted effectively to advance that cause in the Congress, but of all her many deep, compelling interests and devoted concerns for his district, State and Nation, her love of the veteran and her unbending will to work endlessly and most unselfishly for him and his dependents was without question the great absorbing interest in the life and work of this great, magnificent, lovely American woman.

EDITH ROGERS was strong of mind and body and worked around the clock at her duties. She never spared herself even in the last few months of her busy life.

Although she had not been feeling as well as usual as the House began its heavy adjournment schedule, she never complained and would never even think of taking time for rest and relaxation. She worked tirelessly and stubbornly almost to the very end, and she died just as much a martyr in the service of her country and to the cause of her people as a gallant soldier giving his all on the altar of American patriotism.

Mrs. ROGERS was a woman of superb, inspiring courage, filled with humility in many ways, yet forthright, candid and brave in speaking her mind and standing by her convictions.

Descended from an early colonial family, she was nurtured in the historic American creed and her faith in this

country and its destiny was deep and unbounded. She lived, worked and served in the highest American tradition, sustained by her devout belief in the Almighty and the strength and encouragement that came from those who showed their appreciation for her help by stanchly and solidly supporting her cause.

In the political arena she was virtually invincible and on several occasions was reelected to Congress without opposition. Even when she was opposed, she carried her district by overwhelming margins, and people of every class, creed, color, and party flocked to her standard.

Had she so chosen, she could have stood for higher public office. However, she served, not to suit vanity or indulge in self-glorification. Moreover, her natural humility and dignity prompted her to avoid fanfare and ostentation. So great was her respect, admiration, and affection for the Members of the House of Representatives that she considered serving in the House the greatest political honor that could come to her.

Time and time again her outstanding service, and particularly her service to the veterans cause, was recognized, not only in her district and State, but on a nationwide basis. She was thus not only the Mother of Veterans but she was the darling of all veterans' organizations whose leaders and members regarded her as their most loyal, effective friend in the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS was proud, but never boastful, of her high standing, stature, and memorable contributions. Widely hailed during her life, her passing brought her even greater honors and expressions of respect bordering on reverence, and an affection such as have been seldom witnessed in the great State of Massachusetts.

Her home city of Lowell, which had been plunged into deepest grief at word of her passing, turned out by the thousands to visit her bier and pay their last tearful respects in the church where she worshiped God for many years. Thousands and thousands more attended the services and lined the streets on the day of her funeral to pay their last measure of devotion and heartfelt tribute to this great, good, and beloved lady who had served them so faithfully and well in the Congress and who had always striven to help them with highest sincerity of purpose and with every ounce of her being even unto death.

To strike a personal chord, I am very deeply touched by the passing of this lovely, gracious Christian woman who was a dear friend of mine during my service in the House. She represented an adjoining district to mine in our great State, and, while we were of different political faiths and backgrounds, we worked together for our veterans, our people, and our great Nation. EDITH ROGERS was strong and loyal in her attachments, lofty in her ideals—a woman of breadth, vision, and tolerance, always willing to listen to every point of view, always eager to help.

We deeply mourn and greatly miss our beloved EDITH ROGERS. This House will never seem the same without her gracious presence, friendly smile, and wholehearted, charming, generous nature. We have sustained a great, irreparable loss, and I feel it most keenly and deeply.

A noble spirit and dear soul has been removed from our midst. But we will long continue to remember and cherish her blessed memory, her bright, gleaming patriotism, her all-encompassing devotion to duty, and her true, warmhearted friendship.

To her bereaved family, her surviving relatives, her personal staff, and the people of her district, I sorrowfully tender my most heartfelt expressions of sympathy and condolence.

May EDITH ROGERS dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

As part of my remarks, I include the text of resolutions recently adopted by the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, and the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

The material follows:

RESOLUTION BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Whereas the life and acts of the late EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts has been most outstanding in behalf of the veterans and disabled veterans of all conflicts with an armed enemy in which the United States of America has been engaged, as well as on behalf of the public and citizens not only of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but also of the entire Nation; and

Whereas it is deemed fitting and proper that her accomplishments and devotion in behalf of veterans and disabled veterans of the United States of America during her lifetime are worthy of appropriate public recognition, in order that the name of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS might be forever remembered by her fellow men: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That in proper and suitable recognition of her services during 35 years in public office, the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans in session at the State house, Boston, Mass., on October 8, 1960, at its department executive meeting hereby adopts this resolution that the Veterans' Administration Hospital located at 150 South Huntington Avenue, Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass., be named "The EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans Hospital" of the U.S. Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the department adjutant and executive secretary be instructed to draft and present any necessary petitions to accomplish the purpose of this resolution, and that copies be sent to the Members of Congress and the two U.S. Senators from Massachusetts; and to the proper officials of the U.S. Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the department adjutant and executive secretary is hereby directed to contact the officials of the Veterans' Administration and make inquiries as to whether or not the Veterans' Administration can accomplish administratively, the naming of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at South Huntington Avenue, Jamaica Plain, the "EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans Hospital." If this cannot be accomplished administratively, he is hereby directed to have filed in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the following bill:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration facility located on South Huntington Avenue, Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass., shall hereafter be known and designated as 'The EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans' Hospital' of the U.S. Veterans' Administration."

GEORGE A. WELLS,
Department Commander.

Attest:

JOSEPH R. HAROLD,
Department Adjutant and Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 11, 1960, AT WORCESTER, MASS.

Whereas the life and many acts of the late EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Congresswoman of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, has been most outstanding in behalf of the veterans of all conflicts with an armed enemy in which the United States of America has been engaged, as well as on behalf of the public and citizens not only of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but also of the entire Nation; and

Whereas it is deemed fitting and proper that her accomplishments and devotion in behalf of Veterans of the United States of America during her lifetime are worthy of appropriate public recognition, in order that the name of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS might be forever remembered by her fellow men: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That in proper and suitable recognition of her service during 35 years in public office, the Department of Massachusetts Veterans of World War I, in session at the Aurora Hotel, Worcester, Mass., on September 11, 1960, at its administration board meeting, hereby adopt this resolution that the Veterans' Administration Hospital located at Heath Street, Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass., be named "The EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans Hospital" of the U.S. Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the department legislative committee be instructed to draft and present any necessary petitions to accomplish the purpose of this resolution, and that copies be sent to the Members of Congress and the two U.S. Senators from Massachusetts, and to the proper officials of the U.S. Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the department commander of the Veterans of World War I of Massachusetts, upon adoption of this resolution, be hereby directed to present this resolution at our national convention being held in Miami, Fla., October 9, 10, and 11, 1960, for adoption; and be it further

Resolved, That, upon adoption of this resolution by the national convention, the national commander and the chairman of the national legislative committee are hereby directed to have filed in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate the following bill:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration facility located on Heath Street in Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass., shall hereafter be known and designated as "The EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans' Hospital' of the U.S. Veterans' Administration."

EDWIN H. LOMBARD,
Department Commander.
HENRY W. JACKSON,
Resolution Chairman.
ANTHONY D. TIESO,
Department Legislative Officer.

Attest:

CHARLES O. ROLFE,
Department Adjutant.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues today in honoring the memory of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. American women everywhere can be very proud that EDITH NOURSE ROGERS helped blaze the way for service contributed by women in Congress. She was first elected to the Congress in 1925 to fill the

vacancy caused by the death of her husband, and she served her district and the country with honor and ability for 25 years until her death last year. Her service to her fellow man began much earlier, however, when she served overseas during World War I with the American Red Cross, and later received Presidential appointment from three of our Presidents to serve as their personal representative to care for our disabled veterans. One cannot begin to count the contributions Mrs. ROGERS made during her lifetime to the cause of our American war veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS' work and reputation were well known to me before my coming to the Congress in 1959, and I had admired her for many years before knowing her personally. Even though I was privileged to know EDITH NOURSE ROGERS for only a short time, my admiration for her became coupled with affection. My most vivid memory of her is of a lovely, gentle, kind, and thoughtful person. In spite of a very busy life, she always had time for the gracious word and the thoughtful gesture. I remember one incident in particular; when my mother became ill shortly after we came to Washington, and, although Mrs. ROGERS did not know my mother, she sent beautiful flowers to her, thus creating a lovely memory for my mother.

I think that EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' life can best be typified by her generosity, her sincere and genuine desire to help others, and her kindly, thoughtful character.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate today in these proceedings in which we are having an opportunity to express our appreciation for the service and life of the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who served in this body from 1925 until her death in the fall of last year.

It was my privilege to serve with Mrs. ROGERS as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; as all of us who have served with her in similar and like capacities, I can testify to the depth of her great understanding and love for veterans. No individual appeal was too small or insignificant to merit her very real concern and assistance if it were possible.

Before I came to Congress I was aware of her great service and the fact that there was nothing that mattered as much to her as taking care of our veterans. She often said that everything that we have in this country today is due to the sacrifices these individuals made in our wars to keep America free.

While I mourn her passing—and we shall certainly miss her in this Congress and in the years to come—the manner of her going was in the best tradition of what she would like to have done, for she was active in her job until a very few days prior to her death.

I am happy to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts and others in adding my all too inadequate testimony to the worth of this great lady.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the Massachusetts delegation in paying tribute to that gracious lady and dedicated legislator, our departed colleague, the late EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

For almost 7 years, it was my privilege and pleasure to serve with Mrs. ROGERS on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Through this association, I found our colleague to be a great American and a loyal friend of mankind. Mrs. ROGERS was well known as a champion of veterans. Her years of dedicated service in behalf of veterans were many. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts served long and well in the Congress.

I join with the good people of Massachusetts, her many friends and our colleagues in mourning the passing of this great humanitarian and patriot, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to serve in the Congress with EDITH NOURSE ROGERS for as long as did many of those Members who have already spoken today, but I have known and worked with her for many years within the Republican Party. I share fully the deep respect and admiration for her which has been expressed by my colleagues, and I should like to associate myself with all of their remarks.

When I first came to the Congress in 1958, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was already a veteran of 33 years of devoted service in the House. In spite of her growing years she remained as active as she had always been, and I was immediately impressed by the diligence and perseverance with which she pursued her legislative duties and promoted the interests of her constituents.

As a new Member of the Congress, there was a great deal for me to learn, and EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was always generous with her time, always willing to share with me the valuable insights she had gained during her three decades of service to the people of Massachusetts' Fifth District.

Of all of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' many wonderful qualities, I shall always remember most vividly the kindness and quiet dignity which characterized everything she did. The people of her district have lost an extraordinary representative, and the Congress has lost one of its truly great women.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sorrow that I rise to participate in this eulogy of our departed colleague, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts. Like every woman Member of this body, I have always had a special place in my heart for the "dean of the distaff side." But EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was more than that. Her unfailing courage, her integrity, the deep understanding and real wisdom which she demonstrated in her many years of service in this House, made her a leader respected and admired by all.

This House has been a wiser, and a better place because of Mrs. ROGERS' presence among us. To her friends, to her family, to the people whom she represented so long and so well, and to her successor, I extend my very sincere condolences at their great loss—and ours.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to associate myself with the fine and deserved tributes that have been paid by Members from both sides of the aisle to our late colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. It is most fitting that in her particular case, these words of respect and admiration should know no political lines because EDITH ROGERS' work here in the Congress was characterized by a nonpartisan approach.

Her mission in life, it would seem in retrospect, was to do everything within her power to provide for the welfare of the men and women who served their country in time of war.

In this purpose she displayed a fierce determination and persistence of effort that endeared her to the people she served so well for so many, many years.

Not the least notable of EDITH ROGERS' achievements was the magnificent devotion and trust shown in her by the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

This confidence in her representation was reflected, election after election, in the overwhelming support she received from her constituents.

Let no one mistake this: Mrs. ROGERS was a rugged independent in many ways, with a mind of her own, and a match for any of us in dedication to the cause for which she worked with an amazing vitality.

She was a truly great person and we shall all miss her very much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD in eulogy of Mrs. ROGERS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other Members of this body in paying respect to the late Congresswoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. Mrs. ROGERS served her district, State, and the Nation ably and well for a good many years; and I was proud to have been associated with her for 4 years as a member of the House Veterans' Committee. It was here that I had the opportunity to observe her sincere interest in problems affecting veterans and their dependents. Mrs. ROGERS, as the ranking minority member of that committee, performed unselfishly and tirelessly in their behalf.

With the passing of Mrs. ROGERS, the Congress has lost an outstanding Member, and I have lost a good friend. Mrs. Weaver joins me in extending our deep sympathy to the members of her family.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of our beloved colleague, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, filled me with sadness and a great sense of personal loss, as I am sure it did to everyone in this Chamber and everyone who knew her as a friend and associate. And the millions of veterans of our Nation's armed services could not help but feel they had lost one of their greatest champions.

Congresswoman ROGERS was a tower of strength to all of the women in the House of Representatives, helping us in our freshman years, particularly, to become better acquainted with the legislative realities so that we could better

serve our constituents. Her long years of service here, beginning in 1925, when she succeeded her husband following his death in office, gave her not only great legislative skill but wisdom in the uses of the democratic process.

Her entire person reflected love of life and fondness for the people she served. Her every action was characterized by kindness and consideration for others. Her devotion to the cause of veterans' legislation was perhaps unmatched by any other Member—certainly not exceeded by any.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was a credit to the role of women in politics and national affairs, and those of us who have taken our seats in Congress in the years following her election in 1925 found our paths as Congresswomen made easier by her outstanding record of service.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very deep sense of personal sadness and loss that I join in this tribute to our late colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Upon entering this House in 1947, it was my good fortune to be appointed to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee presided over by the distinguished gentlewoman. Her personal kindness to me, with the other new committee members, in patient cooperation through her able guidance and direction will never be forgotten in my gratitude and admiration.

Congresswoman ROGERS was an inspiration to all the men and women in this country occupied in public life, and to all those aspiring to such positions. Rich in experience, blessed with superior judgment, graced with a unique charm of personality, friendly in disposition, gentle in manner, unswerving in patriotic devotion, with the effervescence of the eternally youthful heart, she was universally acclaimed as the Nation's outstanding lady legislator and the foremost authority on veterans' legislation.

The gentle qualities of her heart account for the deep affection in which she is remembered by all who were ever privileged to know her. The keenness of her disciplined mind, coupled with her impregnable integrity, commanded the respect of all who were ever associated with her. Her unparalleled dedication to the welfare of all veterans, the veterans' widows and families has set a place apart for her in our national history as the legislative "mother of all veterans."

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS will live forever as one of the highest traditions of unexcelled service in the House of the U.S. Congress and the United States of America.

From the depths of our hearts we salute the memory of a great and noble lady while we pray the Almighty to bestow upon her everlasting peace and happiness in His Heavenly Chamber.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I speak, not for myself alone, but for all my comrades of the war with Spain. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was beloved by the veterans and the widows of the veterans of that war of long, long ago as she was beloved by the veterans, the dependents, the widows and the families of later wars. No Member of the Congress in the history of our Republic was ever more deeply enshrined in the hearts of the Nation's veterans. To have known her, to have worked with her, as a colleague in this Chamber, to have felt in close association with her the glow and the lift of her warm personality and the inspiration of her unselfish dedication. I shall forever count among the richest blessings given me. It is the hope and the prayer of all Spanish-American War veterans as that of veterans of later wars that future Congresses in the long roll of years will honor the memory of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS by carrying on her work of dedication to the cause of the veterans, accepting her creed that nothing is too costly that is needed to assure the comfort and the welfare of those who in their youth offered their lives for their country. In the passing of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS all America mourns.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened last fall to learn of the passing of our distinguished and kindly colleague, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

It was my privilege to serve under her able chairmanship of our great Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As chairman, she was fair, forthright, and very capable in her wise deliberations and counsel.

I served for many, many years with her when she was the ranking minority leader of the Veterans' Committee. I have never known any one more devoted to the disabled veterans of our Nation. Her love for them knew no bounds. She literally dedicated her life to improving the welfare of our veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS was truly one of the outstanding personalities of this generation. As Congresswoman from Massachusetts, she exemplified the patriotism, ideals, and principles of her New England forebears. She was a great lady and great American.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to her loved ones and her millions of friends our deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, whose recent death fills us all with sorrow and regret. The heart attack which wrote the final chapter to the story of a long and illustrious career took from her district and our State, an able, effective and highly respected representative. It removed from our midst a loved and deeply esteemed colleague; and lost to me a warm personal friend.

When Mrs. ROGERS first came to Congress in 1925 to replace her husband, John Jacob Rogers, who had died in the midst of his sixth term, she said she would stay in Washington only a few years. The extent of her abilities, the depth of her wisdom, and the warmth of her personality led almost immediately, however, to strong urgings on the part of her colleagues and growing support on the part of her constituents which returned her to each succeeding Congress with a tremendous majority.

The congressional service of Mrs. ROGERS from 1925 until 1960 constitutes, in fact, a world record for consecutive service by lady lawmakers. Among her closest challengers for this honor, Representative Mary T. Norton, Democrat, of New Jersey, served 26 years in the House before retiring in 1950, and Virginia-born Lady Astor served 25 years in the British Parliament until her retirement in 1944. Actually, only nine men have served consecutively in the House for a longer period than did Mrs. ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS career is distinguished, however, by far more than mere length of service. Her work with the American Red Cross immediately following World War I in caring for disabled veterans led to her appointment by President Harding as his personal representative for the care of disabled veterans, and to her reappointment to a similar post by President Coolidge and President Hoover. Since that time her interest in veterans' affairs and her dedicated efforts in behalf of the Nation's veterans have been second to none among her colleagues, and have exerted powerful influence upon the form and content of veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS played a major role in the passage of the GI bill of rights, and, as might have been expected, she sponsored and fought for the measure creating the Women's Army Corps. At the time of her death she was the ranking Republican member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, having served as chairman of the committee while the Republican Party was in control of the House of Representatives.

Always a tough and resourceful legislator, Mrs. ROGERS never for a moment let it be forgotten that she was also a very feminine and attractive woman. Her gaiety and vivacity, and her love of perky hats and lovely clothes were highlighted by her own personal trademark, a fresh flower pinned to her lapel.

I shall always remember Mrs. ROGERS as a devoted public servant of exceptional ability, with firm strength of character, winning humility, and an endearingly gentle nature. I shall mourn her as a valued personal friend.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, although there were those who differed with her views, no one ever doubted her sincerity. Mrs. ROGERS had a dedication to purpose. She really enjoyed helping people.

Having assumed her position on the committee, I trust my work will be as successful as was that of Mrs. ROGERS. I shall always remember our association on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, even in her last will and testament, our late colleague, Congresswoman ROGERS, made provision for those she served with such complete devotion during her long and illustrious career; the veterans of the United States.

Never did one person accomplish so much for so many during the 35 years that she was a Member of Congress.

Her leadership in promoting legislation of benefit to veterans was matched by

the thousands of hours that she spent in visiting the sick and disabled in our Veterans' Administration hospitals. The great heart of this remarkable woman won the everlasting gratitude of millions.

Many tributes have been paid to the memory of Congresswoman ROGERS but none more moving than those expressed by the veterans themselves.

Epitomizing their grief, their respect, and their regard is the following editorial from the September 15, 1960, issue of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes.

I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an inspiration for those who reverence the example of a life well lived in service to others.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

The veterans of America have suffered irremediable loss in the death of Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts.

Since coming to Congress in 1925 to occupy the seat of her deceased husband, Mrs. ROGERS was perhaps the foremost champion of the veteran and his dependents in the Congress of the United States.

Her service in veteran work began during World War I when she was a volunteer Gray Lady in service hospitals in the Nation's Capital. She was instrumental in organizing the Gray Ladies and spent numberless hours in aiding the wartime disabled.

Mrs. ROGERS, a woman of considerable financial means, was devoted in what she considered to be her duty to the wounded of our Nation. Many veterans can recall as she visited their wards having a $5 bill tucked into their hands as she departed.

When she came to Congress in 1925 one of her first assignments was the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. She has remained constantly on that committee and when the Republican Party was in control of the House of Representatives she served as chairman of that important body. She was the ranking minority member.

During World War II Mrs. ROGERS was one of the prime movers in pressing for legislation which later became known as the GI bill of rights. She also introduced the measure which set up the Women's Army Corps during the period of World War II.

Any veteran having difficulty in establishing what he considered to be his just rights found in the Massachusetts legislator a ready and sympathetic listener.

In later years she was a vocal and constant supporter of pension legislation for the aging veterans of World War I. As a matter of fact, on the last day in which she was in her office she told representatives of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. that she was ready to renew that battle when the new Congress convened in January.

Representatives of leading veterans organizations all expressed regrets over the passing of Mrs. ROGERS and declared that her death was an irreparable loss to the cause of veterandom. They were unanimous in lauding her efforts over the years and all termed her demise a blow to more liberal veterans legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS' 35 years of service in the Congress was the longest period that any woman has ever served in that body. Only nine Members of the 86th Congress exceeded her in length of service.

Speaking for the veterans of the Nation and their dependents, the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes mourn the loss of an outstanding legislator, a loyal and dedicated friend, and a generous and noble lady. She has crossed the river and now lies in peace under the trees. Her memory will live on.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, talent and charm are not a common combination, and all too few of our national legislators are known to excel in both respects.

An exception to the rule was EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the late Congresswoman from the Massachusetts Fifth District, who graced this Hall with her presence for three consecutive decades.

Fate has deprived us this session of the amiable, delightful, and highly capable Mrs. ROGERS, who passed away following the close of the last session. But her memory is with us yet, and shall remain so as long as talent and charm remain matters worthy of respect.

A Member of the House for 35 years, Mrs. ROGERS set the record for consecutive service on the part of a Congresswoman. As the wife of the late Honorable John Jacob Rogers, she came to Washington to fill out her husband's term, following his death in 1925. And though few expected her to long remain in the political field, Mrs. ROGERS had other ideas.

As a former Red Cross worker overseas, her interest in international affairs was intense. So was her interest in veterans' welfare. In both respects, Mrs. ROGERS excelled in committee work, and during World War II she served as the lone woman on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

By no means retiring, she led the way in opposing the spread of foreign despotism, and was one of the early advocates of military preparedness during the 1930's.

Her pen it was that set down the terms of a law curbing American trade with the Japanese dictatorship. Hers again that proposed the creation of the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps; hers that introduced many a bill for the benefit of veterans' widows.

Her fiery spirit was a vital force in rallying American womanhood to battle in the dark days of 1941–42. Her memory shall be cherished by all who remember the speed with which the women of America responded to that crisis.

We who were gifted with her friendship are honored to say today, "We knew her well; a woman of charm she was; a woman of courage, ability, and dignity."

In short, the personification of the American stateswoman—a tribute to her name, her flag, and her Nation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved colleague EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Representative EDITH ROGERS was a true and loyal friend and we will all miss her. She was a friend to all people, particularly "our boys" as she called the veterans. She was their champion and she fought for legislation that would benefit them and their families.

Mrs. ROGERS was a most unusual person. She was gay without losing her seriousness. She was chatty, but always spoke words of wisdom. She was feminine and charming. She was a lady.

The people of her district will miss her, her friends will miss her, but we all know that she performed her duties and responsibilities on this earth to the best of her ability and she will now reap the reward of eternal happiness.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our late colleague, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, is a blow from which this House will only slowly recover. We whose privilege it was to be among her associates knew her as a delightfully charming, gay, and warmhearted human being. The brightness of her personality and the pleasure of her company will linger for many years in our memories.

The grief we feel stems not only from the absence of that personality but also from the immeasurable loss to our country. That grief must surely be shared by innumerable others outside this Chamber, for the impact of Mrs. ROGERS' 35 years' service in the House of Representatives has affected the lives of millions of Americans.

What veteran of our armed services could be anything but grateful to her memory? What parent, husband, wife, or child of a veteran could ever discharge the debt owed this woman?

Her interest in veterans and their problems was first publicly displayed as long ago as World War I, when she traveled abroad on a special mission to inspect military hospitals. Three Presidents—Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover—employed her as their personal adviser on the problems of disabled veterans. She made numerous hospital inspection trips overseas during World War II.

But her greatest monument was the so-called GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II. Mrs. ROGERS was one of the prime movers and played a major role in the drafting of that memorable and magnificent legislation. Our ex-servicemen can never pay her enough homage for the zeal, energy, and intelligence with which she devoted herself to their interests.

It was Mrs. ROGERS who introduced the bill that created the Women's Army Corps, the WAC. An early and outspoken critic of Hitlerian abominations, she supported every measure she believed would focus the full might of our country upon the task of defeating the Nazis.

For 8 years I had the privilege and good fortune to serve with Mrs. ROGERS on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. She twice gave great distinction to that committee by serving as its chairman. Her devotion to the well-being of this Nation's veterans was an inspiration to her colleagues on the committee. The greatest tribute this House can pay her is to continue in the spirit of that devotion.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the late Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS had a noteworthy and unusual career, both in the Congress and in life. She won for herself a unique place in the hearts of the people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts and of the whole State. She was devoted and indefatigable, both in her legislative work and in looking after the interests of the Fifth District and its people.

She was one of the kindest persons whom I have ever known and her friends will remember her big heart and friendly interest as well as her exemplary career.

Mrs. ROGERS' interest in and devotion to servicemen and veterans dates back to

World War I when she was a Red Cross worker overseas. She was later assigned to Walter Reed Hospital. In 1922 she was appointed by President Harding as his personal representative in the care of disabled soldiers, and continued in this work for over a decade.

She has been devoted to that cause ever since, giving untiringly of herself to the personal attention and needs of the veterans, as well as in official action seeking the improvement of Government programs.

The memory of her work on behalf of servicemen and veterans deserves to be perpetuated, and that can most fittingly be done by naming a veterans' hospital in her honor. A bill has been filed to rename the veterans' hospital on South Huntington Avenue in the Jamaica Plain section of Boston as the EDITH NOURSE ROGERS Memorial Veterans' Hospital. I trust that Members of the Senate and House will join enthusiastically in thus honoring her memory.

Mrs. ROGERS was so interested and devoted in her work that she was tireless in its accomplishment. Even when advanced years had overtaken her, she thought nothing of taking a night train to Boston, motoring to Lowell, attending to the needs of her district, and perhaps speaking at a luncheon or banquet, and returning to Washington by night train the following evening. Her strength was truly the strength of 10, because her heart was pure.

We of the Massachusetts delegation have been close personal friends as well as congressional colleagues of Mrs. ROGERS. We will miss her friendship, her kindness, her devotion to duty and to her friends.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join my colleagues in paying a deserving tribute to our late colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who was one of America's most outstanding and accomplished women.

Mrs. ROGERS was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1925 to succeed her late husband, John Jacob Rogers. The people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts had great confidence in her leadership and ability as she served them from that time until the date of her death, September 10, 1960. As we all know, she dedicated her public life to sponsoring legislation beneficial to our war veterans. She possessed an extraordinary understanding of their problems and served with great distinction as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee of which she was chairman in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. ROGERS soon after I came to the Congress. It was a great privilege to have been a friend of hers. I always had great respect for her ability, untiring energy, and high purpose in life. She was indeed a heartwarming personality and most gracious and kind. I have lost a very dear friend. Her congressional district, the State of Massachusetts, and the United States of America have lost a real friend and a dedicated public servant.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was a native of the State of Maine and one of the Nation's distinguished women.

It was an honor and a pleasure to have her friendship, and it was an inspiration to be close to her great work in the Congress for veterans and for her beloved New England.

I join in tribute to a colleague, a fellow citizen of Maine and New England, and a truly great American woman.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege—though a very sad one—to join my colleagues in paying tribute this afternoon to the memory of the late EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who served so long, so effectively, and so honorably in the House of Representatives.

There is little that is new or unknown about Mrs. ROGERS that I can add to the tributes others here have paid her—friends who knew her far longer than I. But I can say, with great pride, that I knew this wonderful woman, that I was among those fortunate enough to work with her on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and that I was one among many who held her in the deepest regard and affection.

It would be impossible either to catalog the endless list of causes and activities to which she dedicated herself or to identify the limitless ways in which she served the people of her district, her State, and her Nation. She was a woman who sought nothing for herself but the satisfaction of helping others.

Her record both as chairman and as ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee was typical—even in its magnitude—of the total way in which she identified herself, and served, the causes in which she believed. Many millions of American men and women will never forget her, for she has left in their hearts many millions of memorials—memorials represented by the rights and benefits she struggled to secure for those who fought for our country.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was a bundle of energy and charm. Always on the go, she always had time for a kind word, or a helpful suggestion. Her candor and directness were softened by her thoughtfulness and her unfailing courtesy. She has left with her colleagues a permanent memory of a good and gracious lady.

While success is not always a hallmark of virtue, I believe it was in the case of our beloved colleague. For 18 consecutive terms her people sent her to Congress. For 36 years she proved her great worth through her unselfish service. She earned her victories and she has earned the love and gratitude of all Americans.

THE LATE HONORABLE KEITH THOMSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we in Wyoming lost an outstanding public servant and a very close friend in the untimely death of the Honorable Keith Thomson. In order that the Members of this House may have the opportunity to pay the tribute which they would like to him, I have asked for time next Monday following the usual legislative business for this purpose.

THE LATE DR. WILLIAM LARRABEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my first and unfortunately sad duty in addressing the 87th Congress to report the passing last November 16 of a former Member of Congress from Indiana, Dr. William Larrabee. It was my privilege to know the doctor, who was a resident of my district, and to have visited with him whenever the opportunity occurred. While he had been ill for several months, nevertheless his limited practice continued. At our last visit late last summer, during a reminiscent mood, Dr. Larrabee commented on the great advancement of the medical profession during his six decades of practice. A man of great integrity and sincerity, his example was a source of inspiration to his community and his country.

Dr. Larrabee, a Democrat, was elected a Member of Congress from the old Sixth District in 1930. Two years later, when the district was altered to include Hancock, Madison and the eastern portion of Marion County, Dr. Larrabee was elected to serve the district then known as the 11th District. He was reelected in 1934, 1936, 1938, and 1940. When the district was changed again to its present boundaries Dr. Larrabee lost to his Republican opponent, Raymond Springer, of Connersville, in the fall of 1942.

He resumed the practice of medicine in New Palestine in 1942 and continued to practice until recent months. He was a physician 60 years.

Dr. Larrabee was born near Crawfordsville, February 21, 1870, the son of Thomas W. and Anna Laurie Larrabee. He was 1 of 11 children. When 9 years old the family moved to Reedsville in Hancock County. Dr. Larrabee attended the Reedsville school and later attended Central Normal College at Danville, Terre Haute Normal College, and Central College of Physicians and Surgeons in Indianapolis, now a part of the Indiana University School of Medicine.

He began the practice of medicine in New Palestine, June 1, 1898. He and Mrs. Larrabee, the former Audrey Rupkey, were married in Irvington, November 14, 1907. Mrs. Larrabee died in 1958.

Dr. Larrabee served one term in the Indiana State Legislature in 1923–24. He is also a former member of the New Palestine town board.

Three 50-year pins were bestowed on Dr. Larrabee in a 2-year period. The Indiana Medical Society presented him with a 50-year pin in 1948. In 1949 he was granted 50-year membership pins in the Masonic lodge and the Eastern Star lodge.

Dr. Larrabee was a member of the New Palestine Christian Church, the New Palestine Lions Club, the Hancock County Medical Society, the State Medical Society, and the American Medical Society.

Dr. Larrabee's membership in the Masonic lodge included the Blue Lodge at New Palestine, the Chapter and Com-

mandery at Greenfield, and the Scottish Rite, York Rite, and Shrine in Indianapolis.

Surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Sarah Wilson, of New Palestine; Mrs. Frank Neff, of Washington; one brother, Dr. Thomas Larrabee, of New Palestine; and several nieces and nephews.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the little rural community of New Palestine, Ind., was shocked and saddened when the word was circulated on November 16 of the death of Dr. William H. Larrabee, esteemed physician and former Member of Congress. While I did not have the pleasure of serving with him in Congress, as many in this body today, in all humility, I feel that I can say that he was closer to me than to any other man in this body. To substantiate that statement, I beg your indulgence for a personal reference. Dr. Larrabee was our family physician who attended my mother at my birth and that of my four brothers and two sisters. Further, in 1928 when I was the victim of a serious siege of illness and my life hung by a thread for 9 months, next to the grace of God, it was the medical skill of Dr. Larrabee and others whom he called in for consultation that helped bring about my recovery. For this I have always been deeply grateful to him and Almighty God.

To young men in my community he was always a kind adviser. He was a man of stern principles and high ideals and exercised the same in his professional life and I am sure also in his life as a Member of this Congress. To me he served as an inspiration on many occassions. Following my illness he urged me to study medicine and offered to assist me in my educational program and, further, turn his practice over to me at the proper time. But the ministry was my goal at that time. Later, when I was prevailed upon by friends to seek a seat in Congress, the first man to whom I turned for advice was Dr. Larrabee. I can still hear his immediate reply to my question: "Walter, with your family bringing up, your background, and your training, you cannot say 'No' to the citizens of your community." His 12 years in this body endeared him to many of you; his 62 years as a physician in my home community endeared him to all of us.

I would like to take the liberty of quoting from an excellent article on Dr. Larrabee entitled "An Amazing Doctor" which appeared in the Indianapolis Star magazine, September 18, 1960, only 2 months before his death at the ripe age of 90. The article stated:

> Dr. Larrabee would give this advice to a man entering Congress: "Be yourself. Don't let the lobbyists tell you what to do. Go down there with the full intention of voting what your conscience tells you is right, regardless of politics. And keep your conscience well nourished by contacts with your Maker."

He adds:

> I've asked the Lord's help every day. My life has been spared many times when the doctors told my wife I didn't have much chance of living. The Lord has helped me and helps me yet. When you've been in medicine as long as I have, you have to believe in God.

There can be no greater tribute to Dr. Larrabee than these, his own thoughtful and inspirational words. I join with others of you and his successor, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], in expressing condolences to his survivors and members of his family, his brother, a prominent veterinarian in our home community, his sister, and his many nieces and nephews. The memory of this great man will long linger in the minds of those who knew him in this Chamber and in the minds of his fellow citizens in New Palestine.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD concerning the late Dr. William Larrabee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, fortunately for the world, men of good will are still abundant enough to keep the wheels of progress turning. And fortunately for the American Republic, a great many men of this nature are still interested in entering our political field. Yet the number is by no means gigantic, and we well may mourn the loss of any single political figure of such caliber.

It is therefore with regret that I refer to the loss of William Henry Larrabee, a former Representative from Indiana and one of our more distinguished Congressmen of recent years.

Bill Larrabee passed away last year at the age of 90, and his loss is mourned today by all who knew and loved him—and the number is by no means small.

Born shortly following the close of the Civil War, Bill Larrabee grew up on a farm in Montgomery County, Ind., where he developed a familiarity for the basic meaning of American democracy.

Inclined toward public service from an early age, he entered the teaching profession for a time before moving on to the field of medicine.

As a doctor, Bill Larrabee became known throughout the length and breadth of Hancock County, Ind., where he ministered to the physical infirmities of the local population for more than three decades.

Indiana, no less than any other State, has always sought the entrance of well-informed and able citizens into the political sphere. For this reason, Bill Larrabee was induced to serve for 4 years in the City Council of New Palestine, Ind., and 2 years in the Indiana General Assembly.

When the great depression came upon the Nation at the close of the 1920's, Bill Larrabee was still in Hancock County and still engaged in his medical practice. But again he was prevailed upon to enter politics and again he agreed, running for election to the 72d Congress.

Successful in his first attempt, he displayed at once the abilities that were to keep him in Washington for 12 years, as Representative of the Indiana 11th District.

Knowledgeable in the problems of the people, equally familiar with urban and rural issues, and highly informed on educational and medical matters, he impressed everyone with whom he came in contact, and rose to the chairmanship of the House Education Committee.

Few in my recollection displayed so quickly a ready grasp of the many issues before the House, as this affable, generous Hoosier with the warm grin and the friendly handshake.

The Nation was deeply benefited by his presence in the House between the years 1931 and 1943, in which period he aided in constructing the legislation that restored the national stability and the national confidence.

A friend to the sick and poor at all times, and a man of many talents, Bill Larrabee brightened our corner of the world for all too short a period. Yet, true to his standard generosity, he has stepped aside, that others may try their hand at the rudder of life.

We well may honor his memory, for it is one of dignity, of kindness and good will, and one that will linger in these Halls for many a year to come.

THE CHURCH'S ONE FOUNDATION

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an essay entitled "The Church's One Foundation," by Miss Kathe McDonald, of Rushville, Ohio. On the basis of this excellent speech, Miss McDonald won the district Prince of Peace contest, held January 8, 1961, a trip to the United Nations, and a gold medal.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I submit this thought-provoking essay for inclusion in the RECORD:

RUSHVILLE, OHIO, *January 12, 1961.*
The Honorable WALTER H. MOELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MOELLER: I wish to convey to you my happiness in winning the district Prince of Peace contest, January 8, 1961. I also have won a trip to the United Nations, plus a gold medal. Enclosed is a copy of my speech.

At this time I would like to thank you once again for your kind help. Your criticisms have improved my speech tremendously.

Very truly yours,

KATHE MCDONALD.

THE CHURCH'S ONE FOUNDATION

One of the outstanding qualities of Abraham Lincoln was his timelessness. He was a man who had the foresight to realize that the problems which affected mankind in his day were not stationary, but transitory, and would continue to plague all nations. From Lincoln's time, and before, to ours there has been war and struggle, with only periods of

limited peace. Today we are here to propose a solution to the problem of war, a solution whose goal is world peace.

We have only one answer to this problem, only one solution, and that lies in God, and the only way man can become bound to God is through the church.

For, you see, we of this age have grown so insolent that we say we can live without God. We, like Cain, say "Am I my brother's keeper?" and, having said this, we go on and do not wait for the answer which thunders back across the pages of time. For if we did wait for the answer, we would see, just as Cain came to know, that we are responsible, that we do hold within our hands the fate of all men everywhere.

We have been given an outstanding contemporary example of what can be done through love and the avoidance of war by that great Indian leader, Mahatma Gandhi.

Once while Gandhi was teaching school one of the boys in his class did something that harmed the whole group. It was certain that severe punishment had to be administered. Gandhi called all the boys together and explained what had been done. After explaining the deed, the punishment was named. Gandhi said: "I, your teacher, must be at fault. If I were not weak in some way, this wrong would probably not have been done. This is the punishment: I will go without food for 2 days."

Yes; Gandhi fought arrogance with humility, hate with love, war with peace, and, what is most important, he won.

God has performed great miracles for our ancestors; why, then, will He not do them for us? But, you see, before God will do something for man, man must do something for God. And what is that something? It is not easy—it is that man simply have faith and trust. If he possess these two qualities, his goal, no matter what it may be, can be reached.

Am I suggesting that war can cease, that peace can reign supreme, and that all this can happen simply through faith and trust in God? I am. Am I so naive as to think that God can, and will, do this for man? I am. You see, God's part does not worry me; it is man's part that contains the question mark. Wherein can we turn for peace if not to the Prince of Peace Himself?

Our world might be compared to a spider web. A spider web is made up of very delicate fibers, and whenever it is touched, ever so slightly as it may be, it starts a rippling vibration which travels to the farthermost circumference of the web. The world, many times in the past, has felt the destructive force of one of these rippling vibrations. But as the web can transfer evil, so also it can transfer good. Perhaps the ripples have already started, perhaps we lie on the verge of a tremendous tidalwavelike convolution. This is our aim.

Let us look at one isolated ripple in this web of the world.

An American, whose friend taught a school of Negro children in Jamaica, had a rule that everyone who told a lie had to receive as a punishment seven strikes on the hand with a strap. One day little Lotta lied and was called up for her punishment. The teacher was reluctant to strike the little girl, and at her cry of pain following the first stroke he broke his resolution and could not proceed. He looked at the boys and asked, "Is any boy willing to bear the rest of Lotta's punishment?" Immediately Jimmy rose and said, "Please, sir, I will," and came forward to receive the remaining six strokes.

Here we have the echo of that answer uttered so long ago, when Isaiah replied to His question, "Here am I, Lord; send me." If this simple act can send its ripple to us here in the State of Ohio; how much more would it take to ripple the United States, or North America, or the world.

It would be impossible to name all the great people who have spread love and hope to fear-stricken peoples throughout the world. A brief list would include such people as William Carey, Stanley Jones, Jane Addams, William Booth, David Livingstone, and Albert Schweitzer.

But these isolated ripples are not enough, what we need is one big ripple. But you see, before we have a ripple, first we need a spark to set it off. Surely the spark is in the making.

We have tried the League of Nations and we now have the United Nations, and yet both these organizations have somewhat failed peacewise because they have lacked these two essential qualities of faith and trust; both in one another and in God. Let us now propose a new conference, a conference based on faith and trust. Let this conference table span the world and let its delegates put aside their grievances and come believing in themselves, in one another, and in God. This then will be the first true peace conference, and from it the spark might very well be struck that will ripple the world.

Yes, we can postpone this, we can wait, and the world will wait, and God will wait; but the question is, Can we afford to wait? Can we sit back and see ourselves challenged by another Hitler, another Mussolini, and another Stalin?

Why is it that all wars have led to insecurity and to more struggles and war? Why? Because every war was fought because man believed he could settle his problems in his own way. Are we now going to keep bumping our heads against the indestructible wall of hate, or are we going to climb that wall and come upon the green vale of love beyond? We must act now to stamp out war.

Ay, let us build an army, let its banner be held high, let the cross be its emblem, let nations be its ranks, and let us march this army, the army of God on earth, let us march this army into a better kingdom, a kingdom where love and brotherhood reign supreme, under the shining face of the Lord of the world. Let this army personify Sabine Baring-Gould's words when he said, "Like a mighty army moves the church of God." Let us ring the church bells everywhere, and ripple the winds of the world as we plant the reign of peace on earth.

DRAGON BY THE TAIL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us, I am sure, are often disturbed by what is going on today in the entertainment industry, particularly in the fields of film and television which have mass audiences, including a very large percentage of the youth of this country.

The situation has become so critical of late that J. Edgar Hoover, as one of the country's top law enforcement officers, had felt compelled to speak out against the fact that adultery, abnormality, and adulation of criminals are the themes of a substantial number of today's film offerings; that there are some unscrupulous leaders in the film and television industries who value money above morals and whose lust for bigger and bigger profits lead them to turn out so-called entertainment of this type.

Like many American parents, Mr. Hoover is deeply concerned about the corrupting and degenerating influence such entertainment has on the youth of America. He feels there is no doubt but that it is partly responsible for the growing rate of juvenile crimes, viciousness, and depravity.

There is another development in these industries which is also highly disturbing. As most of you know, the Hollywood film industry was infiltrated in the past by some 300 to 400 since-identified Communist Party members. Public demand forced Hollywood to clean house when they were uncovered.

Now the Communists are openly moving back into the industry. A number of frequently identified Communists are back at work writing, producing, or otherwise associated with films, some of which are only thinly disguised, Communist-serving, anti-U.S. propaganda.

We have learned of late that for years certain studios have engaged in a kind of Communist black-market operation—hiring Red agents in the industry under fictitious names.

The anti-Communist code of the film industry, proclaimed in the Waldorf Declaration of 1947, has also become open hypocrisy and a complete mockery because of the actions of certain independent producers and also of some of the major studios.

But I do not rise to speak today, Mr. Speaker, about this dismal and discouraging aspect of current developments in the film and television industries. I rise to speak on an opposite theme—to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, and the public as well, a recent incident in the entertainment industry that is encouraging, heart warming, and inspiring.

This is what happened: Not long ago, a television show entitled "Dragon by the Tail"—with Barbara Stanwyck, one of the great film stars of former years, in the leading role—was being filmed in a Hollywood studio. The show is a drama which highlights the threat communism poses to the United States.

In one scene, Miss Stanwyck, confronted by an agent of the Chinese Communist government in Peiping, is defending her country—our United States of America—against statements and threats he has made against it. Her replies to him, of course, are part of a prepared script which she had studied and rehearsed. The words in the script were defiant, courageous, and patriotic.

Let me quote the words of an eyewitness to the event as to what happened at this point on the studio set:

> I was on the set when the scene was filmed and have never heard a speech with such impact * * *. During the delivery [of these words] Miss Stanwyck became caught up with what she was saying. Midway through, her emotions overcame Barbara Stanwyck

the actress, and she spoke as a patriotic woman in defense of the country she loves.

Several phrases of the speech were spontaneous. The emotion which gripped her was not in pretense. At the conclusion of the speech, when she said, "you keep your Red, cottonpicking hands off my country," she was crying.

This I can vouch for, even though the tears are not too evident on the screen.

When the director, Jacques Tourneur, yelled "Cut!" there was complete silence on the stage. I'm sure all those present, like I, had a lump in their chest which kept them from talking. Gradually, the producer, William H. Wright, and others of the cast and crew walked over to Barbara. Many shook her hand as they spoke to her.

My personal reaction was that this is the kind of talk we don't hear much of these days. It made me proud to hear an American say these words. Especially since I I knew they came from the heart of a very patriotic woman who at the time was not acting.

Miss Stanwyck was so carried away she forgot her lines. She left out some of them—and added words and phrases of her own. I have myself viewed this brief scene from "Dragon by the Tail" and can vouch for the fact that, as the eyewitness reported, there were tears in her eyes when it ended.

And now I would like to read the words she actually spoke in this scene—words which, in part, were spontaneous, unrehearsed—the outpouring of her love for her country:

THE RED AGENT (CEDRIC). There are 600 million people in China. At least 4 or 5 million will survive. They will take over the world.

BARBARA STANWYCK (JOSEPHINE). And all the others? What about them? They can just die, I suppose. Your own country. How can you sell it out like this? All those people. * * * Ah, you're going to be one of those 5 million survivors, aren't you? Big new warlord. Well, I've got news for you. It's not going to happen, because we're not going to let it happen. And there are America, England—all the rest of us. We're going to stop you. Now what have you got to say to that?

CEDRIC. Flag waving, Josephine? It's so out of date.

STANWYCK. Oh, is it? Well, loving your country is never out of date. How can you not love your country? The place where you came from—where you've got neighbors and friends and well—the popcorn and baseball teams. You're going to wipe all that out? Well, you let me tell you something: you'll never wipe out the Dodgers, whoever they're playing for—Brooklyn, Los Angeles, or Peoria, Ill. Now you and your pals in Peiping, you keep your cottonpicking, Red hands off my country.

Mr. Speaker, this, too, is Hollywood. The Hollywood of the real America. Yes, there are purveyors of crime and filth for profit in the film and television industries. There are also those who toy with treason. But there are real patriots there, too. Many of them. Lovers of their country and of freedom. Enemies of communism and every other tyranny.

We hear too little of this side of the entertainment industry. Too little of the Barbara Stanwycks—so little we sometimes forget how many of them there are.

In this instance, the entertainment industry has expressed a belief that needs much more frequent expression, a belief too seldom expressed in some of our institutions of higher learning and in certain segments of the press and other communications media: "Loving your country is never out of date. How can you not love your country?"

I hope that the Members of this House, if they have the opportunity to do so, will watch for this scene when "Dragon by the Tail" is presented on the NBC–TV network on the evening of January 30.

GOLD DEPLETION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recent and urgent effort on the part of the President to halt the flow of American gold overseas brings into sharp focus the serious domestic and international economic situation confronting the United States. Those of us in the Congress who have been urging, during the past several years, vigorous action on the part of the Executive to protect American industry and our vanishing gold reserves can take a small measure of satisfaction in realizing that at long last the national administration to some extent has awakened to the dangerous condition of our economy.

I am afraid, however, that it is once again a question of "too little and too late" on the part of our Government. The countries of Western Europe that have benefited so much during the past decade from a generous donation of American foreign aid dollars and low American tariffs show little evidence of helping their benefactor in his hour of economic distress. I think it is indeed tragic that the United States, so careless in the past with its dollars overseas, must now resort to depriving American servicemen stationed abroad of the presence of their dependents in order to conserve our dwindling gold reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is reaping the harvest of international fiscal irresponsibility that we have been sowing since World War II. Wasteful oversea spending, together with a callous disregard for the protection of basic American industry, has depleted our gold reserves and destroyed the jobs of literally hundreds of thousands of our people.

Against this dark background, Mr. Speaker, I view with some misgiving the international conference of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to begin this month at Geneva, Switzerland. If our past experience with GATT can be any measure of what we can expect this year through our participation in the organization, American industry will be subjected again to an assault on our tariff structure. With ever-increasing unemployment and with mounting imports and a steady decline in our gold reserve the United States cannot withstand another round of decreased tariffs.

At this critical juncture in our economic history we must not, Mr. Speaker, place American industry at the mercy of the participating nations in GATT without some statutory safeguards.

I have, therefore, introduced a concurrent resolution which declares that it is the sense of this Congress that the United States shall grant no further reductions in our tariffs as a result of the deliberations that will begin this month when the parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade meet in Geneva. The enactment of my resolution or similar legislation should, if the American delegates to GATT follow the intent of the resolution, result in no further reductions in our tariff structure at the present time. The passage of the resolution will also give the Congress adequate time to make a thorough investigation of the serious harm being done the American economy through the ever-increasing flood of imports reaching our shores and an opportunity on the part of the Congress to enact corrective legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina has over 225,000 people alone employed in the textile industry. The existence of this industry, which is so basic to the well-being and security of the United States, is gravely threatened by mounting textile imports. In practically every district represented on the floor of this Congress one or more industries are suffering to the same, if not to a greater, degree as is the textile industry in my State. All of us, therefore, should support legislation to restore the economic vigor and stability of our Nation.

It is my sincere hope that my resolution will be enacted in order that the American delegates to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will have a clear understanding that this Congress favors the protection of American industry and does not sanction a further lowering of our tariffs.

CREATING THREE ADDITIONAL HOUSE SEATS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census advises me that, based upon the 1960 census, the new apportionment that must be made in the House of Representatives will result in gains in the delegations of 9 States and losses in those of 16 States. The Bureau informs me that the States of Maine, North Carolina, Kentucky, West Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas will lose one Representative each. The States of Arkansas, Massachusetts, and New York will lose two Representatives each; while the State of Pennsylvania will lose three Representatives.

The States of Arizona, Texas, Ohio, Michigan, Maryland, Hawaii, and New Jersey will gain one Representative by reason of the 1960 census. California, however, will gain eight Representatives, and Florida will gain four.

The reapportionment of House seats among the States as a result of the 1960 Census will become effective with the elections for the 88th Congress to be held in November 1962.

Mr. Speaker, the act of August 8, 1911, fixes the permanent membership of the House of Representatives at 435 seats. This number was reaffirmed by the act of June 18, 1929. The acts admitting the States of Alaska and Hawaii granted a temporary increase in House membership to 437 seats. The two additional seats, however, for Alaska and Hawaii, together with any additional representation to which these States might be entitled under the census of 1960, are to be absorbed as a result of the 1960 census reapportionment in the permanent membership of 435 seats.

It is apparent, therefore, that unless the permanent membership of the House of Representatives is increased certain States stand to lose representation in the 88th Congress as a direct result of the admission of the States of Alaska and Hawaii. The Bureau of the Census advises that Alaska will be entitled to one seat and Hawaii to two seats in the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, I believe will eliminate the loss of representation that certain States will suffer by the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. My measure, which is identical with a bill I introduced in the 86th Congress, provides for the increase in the permanent membership of the House of Representatives to 438 seats in the 88th Congress. By creating three additional permanent House seats my bill will provide for the three Representatives that Alaska and Hawaii will have in the 88th Congress as a result of the 1960 census reapportionment without causing certain States in the Union to lose representation.

My bill is in keeping with the historic pattern that has been followed in the past whenever new States have been admitted to the Union. Throughout our history the additional representation brought about by the admission of new States to the Union has been taken care of by the creation of new House seats.

It is interesting to note that under the reapportionment made necessary by the census of 1910, a total of 433 seats were allocated for the House. The law made provision, however, for one additional seat each for the States of New Mexico and Arizona, although these States did not actually enter the Union until 1912. The legislative history of the period, and the feeling throughout the country I might say at the time, was that the continental limits of the United States had been reached and that no further States would be admitted to the Union.

Mr. Speaker, the framers of our Constitution did not limit the total number of Senators and Representatives in the Congress. They wisely left the matter to future generations. While the Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators and at least one Representative, no limitation was placed on the total number of Senators and Representatives.

The Senate by constitutional mandate must increase its membership whenever a new State is admitted. It does not seem reasonable, therefore, that the House should remain static at 435 seats, regardless of additional representation made necessary by the admission of new States. It is all the more unreasonable to me to expect certain States of the Union to give up representation in the House by the admission of new States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the membership of the House of Representatives should be increased every time we have a reapportionment. My bill, of course, does not have this object as its purpose. It is reasonable to assume that we will have few, if any, additional States added to the American Union. There will be no need, therefore, to increase House membership in the future as a result of the admission of new States.

I feel that no State should be forced to lose representation by the admission of a new State. Such will be the case in the 88th Congress unless the House authorizes three additional permanent seats for the Representatives from Hawaii and Alaska under the reapportionment of the House that will be required by the census of 1960.

I feel that my bill is just and reasonable, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in preventing any State in the Union from losing representation through the admission of the two great States of Hawaii and Alaska.

FINANCING OF NURSING EDUCATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2445, a bill to provide for financing of nursing education.

Nationwide, there is already a substantial deficit of graduate nurses in relation to the need for their services. This deficit will inevitably increase unless means are found to enlarge the number and capacity of our schools of nursing. Sadly, there is no prospect of such enlargement as long as most of the schools are financed exclusively as part of the cost of hospital care. The need is dramatized by action Congress took last summer to provide more and better health care for aged people, which will necessarily increase greatly the demands on our nursing personnel.

Fortunately, there is no dearth of young women qualified for training as nurses. The basic problem is the financing of their education. The need for larger numbers of nurses, however, coincides with a troublesome rise in the cost of hospital care, and the hospital schools which train 85 percent of the graduate nurses cannot be expected to increase their enrollment unless a part of the financial burden can be lifted from their patients. The university degree granting schools, important though they are, obviously cannot alone meet what is basically a problem of numbers; we must look to all the institutions, public and private, that are or may be engaged in the training of nurses.

Both Federal and State Governments are concerned with the shortage of nurses, not only because of their interest in the health of the people, but also because governments employ perhaps a quarter of all the practicing nurses in the country.

Putting the various facts together, I think it altogether appropriate that a part of the cost of nurse education should be assumed, through the time-tested mechanism of grants-in-aid, by the Federal and State Governments acting together.

My bill represents no final judgment on the particulars of a program, and I invite suggestions for its improvement from whatever sources such suggestions may come, be they public or private organizations. Leadership on the part of the new administration in this field will be particularly welcome, of course. But I hope that we can act in this session of the Congress, for I am convinced that the problem is a pressing one that will only become more acute with each year that we delay.

TARGETS FOR U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there follows the text of "Targets for U.S. Economic Growth," a statement issued January 6, 1960, by the NPA steering committee, and a staff report by Gerhard Colm:

TARGETS FOR U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE EARLY SIXTIES

(By Gerhard Colm, with the assistance of Peter Wagner)

CHAPTER I. POTENTIAL AND ACTUAL PRODUCTION, 1955–60

Before appraising the potential economic development during the first half of the coming decade, it is instructive to look at the record of the past 5 or 6 years.

At first glance, increase in total production does not appear unimpressive. Total GNP, in 1960 prices, increased from about $448 billion in 1955 to a recent level of about $503 billion.[1] In relative terms, however, this is only a 2.6 percent rate of growth per year. The average annual increase in total production per capita of the population amounted to a mere 0.8 percent over this 5-year period.

Some increase has occurred in each sector of the economy during the 5-year period, as shown in table I.

[1] The annual rate of the first half of 1960 is used for comparison in order to avoid comparison between a high activity year 1955 with a partly slack year 1960.

TABLE I.—*Gross national product and major components, 1955–60,[1] in prices of 1st half of 1960*

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Gross national product	Personal consumption expenditures	Business plant and equipment outlays	Residential construction	Government purchases	
					Defense	Other
1955	447.6	281.6	46.7	21.3	46.5	43.3
1960	503.2	326.2	47.7	21.4	44.8	53.2
SHARE IN TOTAL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT [In percent]						
1955	100	62.9	10.4	4.8	10.4	9.7
1960	100	64.8	9.5	4.3	8.9	10.6
INCREASE PER ANNUM [In percent]						
1955–60 (1st half)	2.6	3.3	0.5	0.1	−0.8	4.7

[1] Figures for 1960 are those for the 1st half, expressed at annual rates.

The outlays for plant and equipment, residential construction, and for Government purchases as a whole, while increasing in absolute terms, showed small declines in their share of total production. This means that the greatest gains have been realized by personal consumption expenditures. The relatively strong position of consumption does not result from a structural change in favor of consumption but from the cyclical fact that during recessions consumption has been holding up better than business investment.

Thus two facts are clear: The Government sector (defense and nondefense), commonly believed to increase at the expense of private consumption and investment, while growing in absolute terms, actually declined relatively over the past 5 or 6 years. Second, investment in plant and equipment showed only a small rise in absolute terms. This is disappointing since economic progress depends on a rising level of investment expenditures. Business investments were apparently dampened in recent years because aggregate demand did not increase in proportion to the increase in capacities generated by the high level of investment during 1955–56. Excess capacities and a curtailment in business investments followed.

The pressure on prices of finished products resulting from renewed international and domestic competition has also restrained investment activity. Rising costs (including some costs of materials, labor costs in some industries and especially rising overhead unit costs because of low rates of operation) brought about a reduction in profits. Even though profits in absolute terms recovered a great deal after the 1958 recession, profit margins have been declining and have had an inhibiting effect on business investment decisions.

If unemployment could have been held down to 4 percent, the gross national product in 1960 would have amounted to at least $525 billion, instead of just over $500 billion actually achieved. We are faced with a shortfall in GNP of $25 billion or more. This is the result not only of the fact that unemployment has been running in excess of 6 percent recently but also that there has been a significant increase in involuntary part-time work, and underutilization of on-the-job personnel.

There is also considerable underemployment of industrial capacity. Even though we have no single agreed measure of industrial capacity and of the most desirable rate of its utilization, 15 percent to 20 percent idle capacity is most commonly estimated for the average of American industry in 1960.

It may be of interest to compare the U.S. rate of economic growth in recent years with that of other countries of the free world. (See table II.) We have included in the comparison only countries with little or limited inflation during these years. Countries with price rises of more than 4 percent annually have been excluded. Also excluded are all Iron Curtain countries because of their basically different methods for promoting and measuring economic growth.

TABLE II.—*Growth rates in real terms and price rise*

Country	Year	Average annual growth rate (in constant prices)	Average annual price rise
		Percent	*Percent*
United States	1953–59	2.4	2.3
Germany	1953–59	6.6	2.3
Japan	1953–59	6.3	1.6
Italy	1953–59	5.4	2.0
Switzerland	1953–59	4.9	1.0
Netherlands	1953–59	4.5	3.6
Sweden	1953–59	3.6	3.2
Portugal	1953–59	3.5	.8
India	1953–59	3.2	2.2
Canada	1953–59	3.2	1.6
Norway	1953–59	2.9	3.7
Denmark	1953–59	2.8	3.0
Belgium	1953–59	2.5	2.3
United Kingdom	1953–59	2.4	3.0

The United States and the United Kingdom are at the bottom of the list. It is noteworthy that prices in Japan, Germany, and Italy—countries with the fastest rates of growth—increased roughly in line with our own price level, while price increases in Switzerland were only slightly over one-half of ours during this period.

Conditions for economic growth differ from country to country—even if only countries of similar industrial structure are compared. Nevertheless, table II suggests the conclusion that the rate of progress under free democratic institutions can be greater than the rate we have achieved without drastic inflationary consequences during recent years. Considering the importance of technological developments for economic growth, it does not appear convincing that the United States must be near the bottom in her rate of economic advance. With policies more successful in combating frequent recessions and with public and private measures promoting productivity gains, a high rate of growth could have been achieved.

CHAPTER II. ALTERNATIVE GOALS FOR PRODUCTION

1. Organic and forced growth

What public and private needs can be met or will remain unsatisfied under alternative production targets? The answer to this question will permit a better informed discussion of the relative merits of aiming at a more rapid or less rapid rate of economic growth.

It is not enough, however, merely to examine the desirability and urgency of a more rapid increase in production. It is equally necessary to ascertain whether a target is within the range of our capacity to grow. This examination is complicated by the fact that the capacity to grow cannot be entirely determined by objective factors but a feasible rate of growth depends to a considerable extent on changes in private practices of business, labor, and other groups as well as on Government policies.

Policies in support of economic growth will be discussed in the next chapter. However, no meaningful goals of production can be proposed without determining at least in a general way what changes in current practices and policies are believed feasible.

In this respect we could distinguish: (a) "Drift" rate of growth that would take place without changes in present practices and policies; (b) "organic" growth which assumes some changes and further development in practices and policies emerging from existing economic and social traditions; and (c) "forced" growth, which requires drastic changes in economic and social institutions, practices, and policies.

It was shown in the first chapter that the United States experienced during the last five years a rate of economic growth of about 2.6 percent. A significantly higher rate of growth cannot be expected unless some private practices and public policies are changed. If we permit the economy to bump along from one recession to another, a long-range average growth rate of around 2.5 percent appears the best that can be expected. Chart I and table III present estimates of production consistent with a 2.5 percent rate of growth; they illustrate the consequences of unchanged practices and policies.

We also present estimates reflecting a higher long-range growth rate which we consider consistent with organic growth. When economic activities are recovering from a recession level, a faster rate of growth is feasible with the support of appropriate monetary and fiscal policy. But once a level of high employment has been restored a rate of growth of about 4.5 percent appears to be attainable with appropriate policies but without significant changes in our economic and social institutions. Nevertheless, sustaining such a rate of growth requires some significant changes in government policies and in business and labor practices. These include a more effective implementation of the Employment Act than we have had in the past; more rapid adoption of technological advances and scientific management; improvement in training and mobility of the work force; more effective policies to prevent the abuse of private economic power and to prevent price rises. The changes in public policies and private practices which may be needed to accomplish a long-range growth of 4½ percent will be discussed in the next chapter. Here it is only intended to emphasize that these targets are based on changes in practices and policies which are significant but do not represent a break with the spirit of our economic and social insititutions.

Forced growth may be needed and can be achieved if the international situation requires an extraordinary increase in the field of military and civilian defense; then a much greater production effort may be necessary. Under such conditions an annual increase in production of more than 5 percent would be needed and could be achieved. How long such an effort could be continued depends, however, on the sense of urgency and discipline of the people. In an emergency it may become necessary to prolong the workweek, to channel labor and material into the most urgent uses by substantial increases in tax rates and possibly by the adoption of manpower and materials controls. Under conditions of forced growth, price and wage controls also would be needed. These are policies which would mark at least a temporary break with the spirit of our traditional economic and social institutions. It may be questionable whether such policies could be pursued for a protracted period without making some of these changes actually irreversible.

There certainly will be controversy exactly where the line is to be drawn between organic and forced growth. Some policies have been adopted and are generally recognized as part of our economic and social system which a few decades ago were regarded as incompatible with the American tradition. The line between organic and forced growth will change with national attitudes toward the national and international tasks to be performed. Nevertheless, it is important in developing alternative goals of production to make at least a tentative distinction between policies which can be continued for a long period of time and those which appear feasible only under truly emergency conditions of limited duration.

2. Alternative paths from economic slack to high employment

The immediate task is to promote a vigorous rate of recovery which, once high employment has been reached, will then lead over into sustained economic growth. Chart I (not printed in RECORD) and table III demonstrate the difficulty of this task. We assume that there will be some further contraction at the beginning of the year 1961 until, partly as a result and partly in anticipation of an antirecession program the economy will turn toward recovery later in the year. Alternative I in the chart and table demonstrates the development which should take place if high employment (arbitrarily defined as compatible with 4 percent unemployment or less) should be achieved in the calendar year 1962. This would require an increase of no less than 11 percent in real total activity under our assumption. It does not appear realistic to count on achieving this objective, considering the time needed to effect an antirecession program.

TABLE III

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT IN 1960 PRICES

[In billions of dollars]

Year	I	II	III
1960	502	502	502
1961	510½	510½	510½
1962	567	549	523
1963	590½	590½	536
1964	615	615	549½
1965	640	640	563
ANNUAL RATE OF GROWTH			
[In percent]			
1960-61	1.7	1.7	1.7
1961-62	11.1	7.5	2.5
1962-63	4.1	7.5	2.5
1963-65	4.1	4.1	2.5

TABLE III—Continued

RATE OF EMPLOYMENT

[In percent [1]]

Year	I	II	III
1960	5.6	5.6	5.6
1961	7.2	7.2	7.2
1962	4.0	5.6	8.6
1963	4.0	4.0	10.1
1965	4.0	4.0	13.2

[1] At the end of 1960 our full-time unemployment rate was 6.3 percent. With a conservative allowance for involuntary part-time work the end of 1960 unemployment rate rises to 7.8 percent.

Alternative I: Restoration of full employment by 1962. Projected full-employment growth thereafter.

Alternative II: Gradual reemployment between 1961 and 1963. Projected full-employment growth thereafter.

Alternative III: Projected gross national product growth at recent rates. No change in level of employed labor force. Gross nation product growth equal to productivity increases.

Aiming at reducing unemployment to 4 percent or below in 1963 would require a rate of growth of 7.5 percent annually for a 2-year period. Remembering that other recent recovery periods brought 7 percent to 8 percent rates of growth, this does not appear as an overambitious minimum goal. (Alternative II in chart and table.)

However, continuation of the 2.5 percent rate of growth for the next few years would leave us with unemployment rising from 7 percent in 1961 to 10 percent and more in 1963 and following years (alternative III in chart and table) unless one assumes that the average workweek or productivity increases would be substantially reduced. A substantial reduction of the workweek within such a short time would run into serious difficulties because it would either require a reduction in weekly earnings or force prices up and further endanger the international competitiveness of American industry.

Assuming a development more similar to alternative II, it appears feasible that by 1965 the gross national product may reach $640 billion (in 1960 prices) or a gain of almost $140 billion above the 1960 level of activity. In case of a further drift as described by our alternative III we would not only have rising unemployment but also raise the gross national product to only $563 billion by 1965 or by $61 billion. On a per capita basis this would be an increase of only 3.6 percent over 5 years or 0.7 percent per year.

Increase in production for what?

We stated in the preceding section that a substantial increase in production is needed in order to provide employment opportunities for a rising labor force producing a growing output per manhour. In order to obtain and sustain full employment a substantially rising production or a substantial curtailment in the workweek are the only available alternatives. Generally, workers are not willing to accept wage reductions or forego wage increases for shorter hours. This indicates a stronger desire even among the higher paid workers to increase their standard of consumption in preference to increasing the leisure time. There is indeed great concern about the number of workers who are on involuntary part-time work. In addition, we still have a considerable number of families with incomes far below that of an average manual worker: 10 percent of American families still have money incomes below $2,000 per year. Thus, there are ample indications that most people are not yet near the saturation point of consumption. This applies not only to private consumption but with even greater force to public services. In normal times, the goal of wiping out the remnants of povery, providing full employment opportunities, and of raising the standard of living for a growing population would be a strong reason for emphasizing the desirability of economic growth. However, times are not normal. And there are additional reasons which make an adequate rate of growth in the United States not only desirable but imperative.

The international struggle in which we are engaged is fought on many fronts and with many means, which include demonstration of deterrent military power, scientific advances, educational efforts, assistance for underdeveloped countries, competition even in arts and sports. These obvious aspects of competitive coexistence require our ability to demonstrate to ourselves and the world that we are able to manage our economic and social problems in a satisfactory manner. Except for the extent of defense preparedness we should engage in none of these efforts merely because of competition with the Soviets. Each is justified on its own merits. However, in a period of competitive coexistence the Soviets will exploit weaknesses on any of these fronts for their own advantage. This makes it imperative to accomplish what otherwise would be desirable.

Progress in defense, education, assistance to underdeveloped countries and the other tasks will not be automatically achieved merely by stepping up the rate of growth. However, they can more easily be met if supported by an economy with a rising production. Therefore, what we regard as an adequate rate of growth for the economy of the United States is not determined by the rate of growth of the Soviet Union or any other country but by the increase in production needed to support the tasks which have to be performed.

With rising production it is possible to channel part of the increase into the tasks which need to be performed without taking resources away from present use. With a smaller increase in production these additional tasks can be performed only by curtailing the present use of our resources. This can be done but it leads to more resistance and tension. What is true of productive resources also applies to financial resources. With rising production, tax yields increase and permit the financing of additional programs without raising tax rates or resorting to inflationary financing. This can be demonstrated by computing the increase in tax yields which would result if the gross national product should reach the $640 billion which we assume to be a feasible objective for 1965. On that level of production and incomes Federal, State and local governments would have net receipts of about $170 billion, or about $40 billion more than in the calendar year 1959 (again in present prices). This assumes no major general change in tax rates (although possible revisions in the tax structure).

Now we ask, what additions to various Government programs would be feasible if Federal, State or local expenditures would be increased by the same amount as the prospective increase in receipts? Column 3 in table IV illustrates a way in which such an increase could be distributed among Government functions in which an increase appears most urgent. In this column only such increase in national security expenditures is provided as appears likely to take place if present programs are projected. The urgency of increases in education, research, health, and transportation is generally recognized. The largest relative increase is estimated for urban redevelopment. Conditions in both smaller towns and in the metropolitan areas are becoming more difficult and costly each year. Solving the city traffic problem is a task needed not only for making urban life again more attractive but also for reducing a serious drag on the productivity of the American economy as has been pointed out in a previous joint statement of

NPA. Progress on these various programs is needed as an essential support of economic growth.

We do not say that the progress reflected in the table is all that is needed for the coming 5 years; we only say that this is the progress which can be made without an increase in the general level of tax rates of Federal, State and local government. Column 5 of the same table projects an increase in defense expenditures of the size believed necessary by a number of experts. If a greater defense effort is needed it might be necessary to proceed more slowly with some other programs unless tax rates are substantially increased. The somewhat larger increase in Government expenditures projected in this case of increased defense programs would still lie within the range of what could be financed with approximately the present level of tax rates.

Finally, there is also the possibility that international developments may make some reduction in defense expenditures possible. In this case it would be possible to make more rapid progress with some of the high priority nondefense programs and possibly also to reduce tax rates and thereby permit a larger increase in private consumption.[2]

The need to move ahead with these public programs is widely acknowledged, but it may be asked why an increase in production by almost $140 billion should be required in order to add $38 or $45 billion to Government programs. Would not the same increase in Government programs be possible also if the increase in production would amount to only $61 billion as would occur under the 2.5 percent rate of growth? This would be possible. Indeed, it has been suggested that a substantial increase in Government programs would be possible even if aggregate production would not be increased at all. Considering the resources used for less essential purposes, all really urgent private and public needs could be met by the reallocation of resources and by eliminating less essential consumption. This would require, however, very substantial increases in tax rates.

TABLE IV.—*Federal, State, and local expenditures, actual and projected*

[Dollar figures in 1960 prices]

	1959 gross national product,[1] $488.5 billion		Projected 1965			
			Present defense program, $640 billion		High defense program, $658 billion	
	Billion dollars	Percent of gross national product	Billion dollars	Percent of gross national product	Billion dollars	Percent of gross national product
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
National security	47.6	9.8	51.9	8.1	67.8	10.3
Education	17.2	3.5	25.5	4.0	25.0	3.8
Health	3.7	.7	6.7	1.1	5.9	.9
Housing and urban redevelopment	.7	.1	3.2	.5	3.2	.5
Roads and highways	8.4	1.7	12.4	1.9	11.3	1.7
All other outlays for goods and services	21.2	4.5	30.4	4.7	28.3	4.3
Goods and services, total	98.8	20.3	130.1	20.3	141.5	21.5
Social insurance	16.2	3.3	23.0	3.5	19.1	2.9
Social assistance	3.2	.7	3.5	.5	3.0	.5
Veterans benefits	5.3	1.1	5.8	.9	5.3	.8
Other transfer payments	3.0	.7	1.1	.2	−.8	−.1
Net transfer payments	27.7	5.8	33.4	5.2	26.6	4.1
Net interest payments	7.0	1.4	7.7	1.2	10.1	1.5
Expenditure totals	133.5	27.5	171.2	26.7	178.2	27.1

[1] Several of the 1959 figures are estimates.

If we assume no increase in production by 1965 but an increase in Government expenditures of $38 billion the ratio of Government expenditures to the gross national product would rise from 27.5 percent in 1959 to 34 percent in 1965. In case of the 2.5 percent rate of growth this ratio would rise to 30.3 percent in 1965. Such increases in this ratio mean that tax rates have to be stepped up substantially above present levels or that large scale and presumably inflationary deficit financing would take place. If the GNP increases from about $500 billion to $640 billion, Government expenditures rising from $133 billion to $171 billion would amount to a slightly lower ratio to GNP (27.5 percent in 1959 and 26.7 percent in 1965). As tax revenues increase somewhat more than in proportion to the rise in GNP, some downward adjustments in tax rates might even become possible in spite of the substantial rise in Government expenditures without necessary resort to inflationary financing.

While in case of need some increase in tax rates should not be excluded from consideration it is obvious that financing additional programs out of rising tax yields is more preferable to financing them out of rising tax rates. Indeed, the only painless source of additional tax revenue is economic growth.

The estimated increase in Government expenditures of $38 billion consists of a $31 billion increase in Government outlays for goods and services. The balance is accounted for in transfer payments and interest which in accord with the official U.S. economic accounts are reflected as income and expenditures of the private sector.

Thus a projected increase in GNP of $138 billion and of Government goods and service purchases of $31 billion leaves $107 billion for an increase in private demand. On the basis of past relationships this may be divided between $84 billion for an increase in private consumption and $23 billion for domestic and foreign private gross investments. Private gross investments have been computed as the amount needed to support the posited rate of growth and to create the job opportunities needed for the growing labor force.

[2] See joint NPA statement on "Can the American Economy Adjust to Arms Reduction?" published in Looking Ahead, March 1960.

The increase in consumption would allow not only for the growth in population but also for an annual growth of more than 2½ percent per capita. In a critical situation which may continue possibly for a long time it is important that we not only make the necessary progress in public programs, but have in addition funds and resources available for productive investments, and allow for some continuing increase in consumer expenditures, both for a rising population and a rising level of living. Only if there is room for the latter, is it possible to have some wage rate increases without necessary inflationary consequences. With growing personal incomes and resources for increases in consumption it is possible for those at the bottom of the income pyramid to attain a decent standard of living and increase their productivity by better health and education without a more far-reaching policy of redistribution. In the process some resources may be spent on what some people would call frivolous consumption. It would certainly be desirable to eliminate some of the wasteful use of resources in our economy. Nevertheless, some doubtful use of resources might be tolerated if considered in the light of the social costs implied in a drastic policy of reallocation of resources and redistribution of incomes.

Before these projections can be accepted as feasible goals we have to demonstrate that such an increase in production can be promoted by policy measures which fall within our definition of measures compatible with organic growth.

CHAPTER III. GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN SUPPORT OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

1. Antirecession policies and economic growth

In this section we discuss the policies which will be needed to accomplish organic growth. It is not our purpose to lay out a complete program of Government policy measures that may be needed. Under the Employment Act, it is the duty of the President to transmit such a program to the Congress. The Council of Economic Advisors is designed to assist him in this task, as the Joint Economic Committee is designed to assist Congress in the legislative implementation of policy. The following paragraphs are merely intended as illustrations of the kind of governmental policies which would be needed to promote a rate of growth of about 4½ percent. In the next chapter, changes in practices of business, labor, and other private groups will be discussed.

To a very large extent a policy in support of growth is identical with a policy promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power to which the Government is obligated under the Employment Act of 1946. We have pointed out in the first chapter that the relatively low rate of growth of the recent past is to a large part explained by the frequent recessions. Even though each recession was of short duration it put a damper on economic growth. If the 1960–61 recession should be overcome quickly and if future recessionary tendencies should be restrained before they can develop fully, management and labor will be encouraged to adopt technological and managerial advances. Thus a serious obstacle to productivity gains and economic expansion will be reduced. It is likely that success in an antirecession policy in itself would result in a substantial rise in the rate of growth. Nevertheless, there are several ways in which an antirecession policy can move and there are methods which are particularly suitable if antirecession policy is at the same time designed to support economic growth. There are also policies specifically designed to support economic growth irrespective of any

recession. Before dealing with various policies in detail it may be useful to discuss two different approaches to the problem of economic growth.

2. Alternative policies in support of economic growth

Two completely different approaches to a policy in support of economic growth have gained considerable support. The first takes as a point of departure the fact that recessions are usually characterized by a drop in business investment while a rise in business investment and productive capacity is essential for economic growth. Strengthening incentives for business investment thereby becomes of strategic importance, both for counteracting recessions and for supporting economic growth. In this context, reference is made to the profit squeeze of recent years which we have mentioned in the first chapter as one of the factors contributing to the dampening of business expansion. Some policy advisers have pointed out, in addition, that business expansion depends not only on investment incentives but also on the availability of adequate funds. From this it follows in their view that policies which support an increase in individual or corporate saving also would support business investments and more rapid economic growth.

This approach has been criticized by those who point out that the most basic reason for slow business expansion is the fact that business capacity is only inadequately utilized. Underutilization of capital is attributed to the fact that aggregate demand has risen proportionately less than productive capacity. The remedy suggested is an increase in effective demand which can be accomplished either by monetary or fiscal measures or best by some combination of the two. In this second view, therefore, expanding demand and a high rate of operation are the most effective investment incentives. Thus, in contrast with the preceding recommendation a policy which would support saving at the cost of consumption would weaken effective demand and thereby add to the recessionary tendencies.

When the economy is in a slack and idle capacity persists it is essential, first, to promote growth in total demand and to stimulate a high rate of operation. When the recovery is underway it becomes important that available savings be utilized for additional investments so that a temporary recovery movement will develop into balanced and sustainable growth. Thus a comprehensive program should include both measures to expand aggregate demand and to provide additional incentives for expansion and modernization of plant and equipment with emphasis on the first measures in the earlier phases, on the second measures in the later phases of the program.

Balanced economic growth requires that markets and capacity expand in approximately equal proportion. The word "approximately" is important in this connection. At times the expansion in capacity will move ahead and demand must be adjusted to make full use of the production potential; at other times demand may be ahead and investment then needs to be promoted at the cost of a lesser increase in consumer demand.

3. The fiscal-monetary policy mix

If in the present international economic situation the interest rate in the United States for liquid and high-grade securities is substantialy below that prevailing in European capital markets an outflow of funds may be stimulated which threatens to add to the outflux of gold. This occurred when in the fall of 1960, the U.S. economy was slack and therefore interest rates were reduced while various European countries kept interest rates high to restrain a boom. Under such conditions general monetary policy cannot be used as effectively for combating a slackening of our economy at home as would be possible in the absence of balance-of-payment considerations. Even the more recent reduction in rates in several European countries has not fully eliminated the interest differential. Fiscal policy has to carry more of the burden when balance-of-payments considerations restrict the use of interest rates.

Fiscal policy can increase effective demand by raising public expenditures, reducing taxes, and modifying debt management (i.e., by issuing more securities suitable for commercial bank holdings and by making reserves available to commercial banks for purchasing such securities in preference to the issue of securities which would be placed outside the banks in competition with private mortgages and other private securities).

It has been argued that changes in expenditure programs often take too much time for preparation and that they usually cannot be stopped when the need for bolstering demand has disappeared. This argument has less validity in a situation in which expenditure programs are in preparation which have merits in their own right. In chapter II we have presented several examples of Government programs which need to be initiated or enlarged for their own sake. There is a double reason to do so promptly under conditions of a recession or slack. When full employment is being approached these programs are not intended to be stopped; they will continue, though possibly at a reduced pace. The main difference is that the method of financing of these additional programs should be adjusted to changing cyclical conditions.

When Government programs are initiated or stepped up during a recession a budget deficit is likely to occur. If Government securities have to be issued they should, during a recession, compete as little as possible with private issues. A planned deficit resulting from an active recovery program is likely to be smaller than a deficit that would result from the unintended impact of a recession on incomes and profits and thereby on tax yields as happened in the 1958 recession which produced a very large deficit in the fiscal year 1958–59.

It has been suggested sometimes that the Government has the choice between an active antirecession program, which will result in a budget deficit, and no such program, which then is often implied would not result in a deficit. In reality it is likely that over a few years a deficit resulting from inaction in a recession is larger than the deficit resulting from a successful antirecession program. Apart from economic and social reasons, strictly financial reasons also suggest early measures designed to combat a recession and to support economic growth. A deficit resulting from an increase in growth supporting programs or tax abatement is more effective in promoting expansion of economic activities than a deficit resulting from slipping tax yields. With a recovery and economic growth tax yields will rise and the deficit resulting from an active program will disappear or diminish.

A policy of sustained growth probably requires that some of the large capital outlays of the Government be financed by bond issues, if not at the Federal level then at the level of State and local government and government corporations and authorities. If for some capital outlays debt financing is to be continued during a period of high activity, securities should no longer be placed in the banking system but marketed in competition with private issues so that an inflationary impact will be prevented or reduced.

The same applies not only to programs directly financed by the Federal Government but also to those which are financed with the aid of Federal guaranties or insurance (e.g., for residential construction). Consideration might also be given to schemes by which the Federal Government could be authorized to buy securities issued by State or local governments or specially chartered authorities (e.g., for urban renewal projects). If we were living in a peaceful world, reduction in Federal tax rates might be considered as the most desirable device in support of recovery and growth. Under present conditions, however, the United States may be forced to increase national security expenditures at any time. In addition, in nondefense areas of public responsibility there exist serious deficiencies which suggest that judicious increases in Government programs deserve higher priority than a general tax reduction. Therefore a tax reduction should be considered in the light of the longer run budgetary needs and particularly the needs of State and local government.[3]

If an increase in high priority Government programs takes too long a time to serve as an effective support of recovery, tax reduction may have to be considered. Tax reduction is certainly preferable to an overhasty and wasteful increase in expenditure programs. However, such tax reduction should be only of a temporary nature. The personal income tax is the best vehicle for this purpose because through the payroll deductions and advance payments the tax reduction can promptly be made effective. Such temporary reduction should preferably be in the simplest form and should be separated from the much needed tax reforms which require a longer time for preparation and deliberation. Conceivably, Congress could consider and pass a bill for temporary tax reduction providing for the effective date of and reduction to be fixed by joint resolutions depending on economic conditions in accord with advice of the President and the Council of Economic Advisors and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.

4. Other policies in support of economic growth

Fiscal and monetary policies are of crucial importance for combating a slack in the economy and for supporting an increase in effective demand commensurate with the increase in productive capacity. However, these policies must be supplemented by other policies, specifically in support of economic growth and price stability.

We have discussed as one of the possibilities of fiscal policy the initiation or enlargement of high priority Government programs. To the extent that such programs are designated to bolster lagging demand their effectiveness depends on how promptly they result in an increase in employment and payrolls. That is what we call the spending effect of Government programs. There is, however, also a program effect which in the long run is more important for the support of economic growth. Here we are particularly concerned with those Government programs which directly or indirectly contribute to a sustained increase in production. Also a distinction should be made between tax reduction designed to add to available purchasing power and tax reduction designed to encourage improvements in management and technology.

Consideration might be given to the establishment of Government programs specifically designed to accelerate the application of research and development for industrial and commercial use. The fact that research and developmental outlays can be deducted as legitimate business expenses has already provided a powerful stimulus for the expansion of these activities. Furthermore, if a higher rate of productivity gains is found to be desirable, the tax laws should be examined in order to ascertain if some further encouragement should be given to re-

[3] See NPA Joint Statement, "Federal-State-Local Financial Relationships," January 1960.

place obsolete but not yet fully depreciated equipment by equipment of more advanced design. (Simply as an example, it might be considered that productive facilities could be written off as obsolete if taken out of use and sealed without requiring actual scrapping.) Health programs may cut into absenteeism and thereby may increase the active labor force. Also the abolition of the retirement test under old-age and survivors insurance might keep a large number of additional workers between the ages of 65 and 72 in full or part-time employment. There are many older workers who are able and desirous to continue full or part-time work but remain wholly or partly idle only because they do not want to lose benefit payments which are due to them. True, abolishing the retirement test would raise the costs of social insurance, but one has to weigh the additional financial costs against the gains in production. Several other countries provide for an increase in pensions for those workers who postpone their retirement. In any case, such changes in the social insurance legislation would make sense only if there is some assurance that the whole labor force can be effectively utilized in the years to come.

This question raises one of the crucial issues for any policy in support of economic growth. In the interest of economic growth and of international competitiveness rapid managerial and technological advances must be supported. Such advances necessarily result, however, in shifts in the location of factories and offices and also in shifts in the occupational requirements of the labor force. A special NPA joint study is dealing with the rise in chronic unemployment which is in part the result of the rapid changes in the character and methods of production. In that study policies are explored by which the establishment of new industries can be encouraged in areas in which existing industries are declining and also policies designed to promote a greater geographic and occupational mobility of labor. Any program which promotes technological development must also face up to the problem of technological unemployment and must include policies to deal with that problem. Such policies may include training programs, more effective employment services, encouragement of arrangements by which workers can take their private pension rights and possibly also seniority rights with them when changing employers. Furthermore, the unemployment insurance system requires modification to insure that it can provide more effective support for workers who have been unemployed for longer periods. Because such policies are discussed in the study referred to, they will not be covered in this report.

5. Policies in support of price stability

If the Government pursues a determined fiscal and monetary policy in support of economic growth, it becomes all the more important at the same time it be ready with measures designed to curb inflation. Most important in this respect are arrangements by which the financing of Government programs can be shifted promptly from methods which encourage price rises to methods which are more nearly noninflationary. A more energetic policy in combating recessions and in support of economic growth must be associated also with a more energetic anti-inflation policy. Every effort needs to be made to support adequate but not excessive increases in aggregate demand. This requires arrangements for better collaboration between the executive agencies and the Congress and also a close cooperation of the fiscal and monetary authorities in implementing the policies determined by the President and Congress. A policy of price stability is needed in support of economic growth also because expectation of continuing price rises tends to raise the interest rate on long-term loans. A creditor expecting a price rise will lend money on long term only if the interest rate rewards him for the risk that repayment may be made in dollars of reduced purchasing power.

However, price rises cannot be combated by fiscal and monetary measures alone. In recent years, it is true, international competition has imposed a very effective though not always painless ceiling on prices in some important industries. The effectiveness of that ceiling, in conjunction with rising costs, is in part responsible for the profit squeeze which has taken place in the recent past. Serious distortions in price relationships have developed as a consequence of the fact that prices in some industries are more sensitive to international competition than others. Since some prices and costs are not effectively controlled by domestic or international competition, market power, or cost-push inflation has played a role besides the so-called demand inflation.

It is our conviction that the American economy will have to face this problem irrespective of the exact rate of organic growth. Under conditions of large-scale unemployment and idle capacity it is likely that the downward pressure on costs and prices would really eliminate the problem of inflation. In contrast, under conditions of a forced growth the pressure for inflation would be so strong that price and wage controls would be needed. Under conditions between these extremes some market power or cost-push inflation is likely to occur irrespective of a somewhat higher or lower rate of unemployment or a somewhat higher or lower rate of growth. Price stabilization cannot be obtained by simply being satisfied with a little more unemployment or a somewhat lower rate of growth than would otherwise be desirable. Therefore it is imperative that effective policies be adopted to counteract market power or cost-push inflation.

Several recommendations have been made to counteract such tendencies and a combination of various measures is probably needed. In this connection, consideration should also be given to the proposal that price and wage analysis boards be set up which analyze pending price or wage increases in crucial industries in terms of their justification and their effect on economic growth and price stability. It would be up to the President to determine which industries are regarded as crucial. These industries would have to give notification of intended price increases and such wage demands, as in the opinion of the industry could not be granted without price increases. On the basis of the factual reports of the price and wage analysis boards the President could make a statement if he finds that an intended price or wage action is, in his opinion, in conflict with the public interest. Legislation has been proposed for authorizing such price and wage studies in specific industries. Perhaps legislation is needed to dramatize such measures and to ensure the cooperation of business and labor with the price and wage analysis boards. Nevertheless, pending such legislation it would be useful to experiment with such and similar methods by voluntary arrangements.

CHAPTER IV. PRIVATE PRACTICES IN SUPPORT OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Government policies for organic growth, within the framework of a free enterprise and free labor economy can be successful only if business and labor practices support the objectives of growth and stability. Such a system rests on dovetailing private and public operations.

1. In support of growth

It has been said that economic growth and economic stagnation reflect, in part, differences in the state of the people's mind. We can observe for example, two different reactions on the side of both management and labor to an increase in foreign competition. One reaction calls for higher tariffs and another calls for a determined effort to increase efficiency in production and distribution. We submit that the latter reaction is more conducive to economic growth.

Economic growth requires rising business investments adequate for an increased output at lower costs. One of the worst obstacles to sustained economic growth has been the cycle of a burst of investments, the development of excess capacity, a reduction of investments, until conditions were ripe for another cycle. In recent years a growing number of corporations have begun to plan their investment programs in the perspective of longer time periods. Every progress in this respect should be both in the interest of the corporations and in the interest of more steady and larger economic growth.

Also in many other respects, business management practices have not moved as swiftly as the advances in technological knowledge would permit. This applies to the adoption of technological and managerial improvements. By this we mean the introduction of actual technological and managerial innovations in contrast with inventions.

Labor in America has been more cooperative with management in advancing productivity than in some other industrial countries. Nevertheless, certain labor practices are serious obstacles to increasing productivity on the labor side. The concern with the technological replacement of labor is understandable when the increase in the opening up of new job opportunities is lagging behind the increase in labor supply. There is probably no other single factor which could contribute as much to removing obstacles on the side of management and labor to technological and managerial advances as the confidence that Government policies will supplement private expansion in providing growing markets and job opportunities. Greater labor mobility is an essential requirement of a dynamic economy. Moving from a job which has been abolished to another job often involves hardship and inconvenience. These will be taken in stride more willingly when the worker knows that there are job opportunities and that his company and if necessary the Government will assist him when the new job requires retraining and possibly relocation for him and his family.

The spectacular increase in agricultural productivity has contributed to economic growth because it has become possible to produce a rising farm output with a reduced farm labor force. There are still at least 2 million farmers or farmworkers who could transfer to other jobs without any loss of needed farm production, if other job opportunities are offered. With better transportation facilities and the settlement of industries in rural areas, nonfarm work of people living on farms may increase in importance. This factor will add to nonfarm production and, combined with the migration of farmers, will raise the level of income of the rural population. This too requires adaptability of farmers and the willingness to adjust to the requirements of a growing economy.

2. In support of stability

Government promotion of expanding markets and job opportunities may be regarded as an assurance by business and labor that they can use their market power for increasing prices and wages without paying the penalty of pricing themselevs out of the market. Government measures designed to prevent the abuse of private economic power can go some way toward limiting the threat of market power inflation. But such measures, essential as they are, will not assure

price stability unless management and labor use a great deal of self-restraint. It is not enough to expect greater self-restraint simply as a result of exhortation coming either from the President or private groups. We have already recommended a procedure by which price and wage decisions in critical industries would be exposed to public scrutiny. The main objective would be that management and labor are made conscious of the fact that their decisions affect not only their own corporation or their own members but also affect all groups in the population. Collective bargaining in our time is not realistic unless the public interest is represented at least as an invisible partner at the bargaining table.

The main obstacles to economic growth at present are inadequate market and profit expectations. Difficulties or high cost in financing are obstacles in particular instances, especially for smaller business enterprises. Once the economy is expanding more rapidly, more saving will be needed to finance private and Government outlays for investments in a noninflationary manner. An increase in saving will then become important for sustained noninflationary growth.

3. Changes in attitudes

We do not propose that corporations or unions should develop into philanthropic institutions. Corporations will continue to operate for profit, unions for improving the income and welfare of their members. However, as drivers of cars in pursuit of their own purposes must operate their vehicles so as not to harm other drivers or pedestrians, so management and labor must operate within a frame of reference determined by the public interest. As a good driving habit becomes second nature to a driver and the police interfere only in relatively rare cases of infringements, so successful economic operation depends on responsible business and labor practices, with regulations and controls only functioning as a last resort. There is perhaps no more urgent requirement for an economy of satisfactory growth and reasonable price stability than the development of such a sense of responsibility in business and labor.

It may be asking too much to expect business and labor to sift out all the practices which contribute to economic growth and stability from those which do not. The dividing line in particular situations is often very hard to find, particularly when those seeking it normally hear only one side of the question. Private organizations whose primary focus is on the public interest, therefore, have a special role to play. They should work more actively with representatives of management, labor, and agriculture in seeking a general understanding of the specific price and wage policies which are needed to assure the maintenance of a free economy that is fully employed at home and competitive abroad.

COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON TARGETS FOR U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH

I

The American economy is going through the fourth recession within a dozen years. Thus far the present slack has been mild. It is disquieting however, that unemployment even in phases of relatively high activity has been rising and is likely to become very serious unless a sharp and sustained upturn should soon be initiated. Frequent recessions have acted as a drag on economic growth. Thus we have been falling short of the production goals which we could have achieved if sustained and full use had been made of our human and material resources, and especially of the spectacular advances in technical and managerial knowledge. While resources remained unused, serious deficiencies in national security, education, health, urban renewal and other public programs have remained unmet. The standard of living has been rising for most people but not for all. Poverty still remains in the midst of plenty. The most urgent of our private and public needs could be met without serious sacrifices if potential increases in production were realized.

Unsatisfactory domestic economic developments also have failed to give the needed support to our foreign economic policy. Very embarrassing steps have been taken in attempts to reduce the balance-of-payment deficit. Rising costs of production, partly resulting from low rates of operation, partly from exercise of "market power" by business and labor,[1] have prevented us from obtaining the share in world markets and the export surplus which are needed in support of our international commitments. Realizing potential productivity gains at satisfactory rates of operation would permit cost reductions and at least moderate increases in wage rates.

We are not concerned with a statistical race of growth rates with the Soviet Union or any other country. But we are concerned with whether we can demonstrate to ourselves and the world that our political, social, and economic institutions can meet the challenge of our times. Speaking of a challenge is not a mere cliché. The new weapons technology has made old political concepts obsolete. Advances in medicine and hygiene are resulting in an increase in population never before experienced in the history of the human race. In many areas of the world the increase in population exceeds the increase in production. Geographic distances have shrunk through spectacular advances in transportation and communication. Methods of production, all over the globe, are being revolutionized. Nevertheless, the gulf in the standard of living between the industrially advanced countries and the less advanced countries is widening and the resentment in the underdeveloped areas is growing. The world is in turmoil and the turmoil is being exploited by communism.

We do not believe that we can solve these problems merely by promoting a higher rate of growth. We do believe, however, that an increased rate of growth is one of the essential conditions for a constructive approach to many of these problems. Economic growth makes productive resources available for meeting public and private needs without taking resources away from present use. It also results in higher tax yields to finance additional public tasks without the need to raise tax rates or engage in inflationary financing.

The report which we are submitting for public discussion is designed to explore what rate of economic growth would be needed to make some progress in meeting the national and international needs and appears as a realizable objective. The report also explores private and public policies which could aid in reaching such targets.

II

There is not any single rate of growth which is feasible. The rate of growth in part depends on the private and public policies which are adopted. And what policies can be adopted depends in turn on the sense of urgency which is felt by the people and their leaders. A policy of drift would probably result in low rates of growth which would not permit much progress in making up for the deficiencies unless resources are rechanneled at high social costs in terms of tension and disunity. A very high rate of growth (forced growth) again will imply high social costs in terms of substantial increases in taxes and measures of control. Such policies are necessary and justified under conditions of all-out mobilization, particularly for a limited period of time. Stepping up the present 2.5 percent rate of growth to about 4.5 percent (organic rate of growth) would require aggressive policies but not of the character of those needed for forced economic growth and would permit substantial progress toward meeting the most urgent private and public deficiencies. Unless international conditions require a drastic increase in national security programs, it is our view that American policy should aim at a sustained rate of growth of 4½ percent. It is our conviction that such a rate of growth can be attained and maintained with policies which are more aggressive than those pursued in the past but are compatible with American political and social institutions. While a policy of forced growth would entail strong inflationary pressures, a policy of organic growth is believed compatible with price stabilization. However, there are in our economy price-rising tendencies with which our policies need to deal regardless of the exact rate of growth which we will achieve.

The most effective policy in support of economic growth is one which mitigates if not prevents recessions. The mandate of the Employment Act of 1946 should be implemented more effectively than it has been in the past. Special provisions for overall planning and programing may be needed in the Executive Office of the President. We should have both an inventory of the tasks which need to be performed and also an examination of the potential and feasible increase in productive forces which can become available for performing these additional tasks. The attached report does make a modest contribution towards such an examination.

We recommend that the Government pursue those programs which merit highest priority consideration and then arrange their financing so as to promote expansion as long as an economic slack prevails and to combat inflation when demand threatens to approach the ceiling of manpower and facilities. In the area of national security prompt action could be taken on certain high priority programs. There are other programs which probably could be curtailed without serious loss in national security. However, curtailing obsolete or low priority programs requires time for careful examination. We believe the needed increases in high priority programs should not await completion of that examination even though it means that the total amount of obligations for national security purposes would increase in the meantime.

We also believe that programs should be expanded which will lend support to economic growth, particularly in the fields of education, health, housing, community facilities, and urban renewal.

Even with the stimulus of economic growth, unemployment—particularly persistent unemployment among certain age, racial, and occupational groups, and in depressed areas—will not soon be reduced to tolerable levels. Therefore, we also recommend strengthening of unemployment benefits and special measures for distressed areas.

Prompt adoption and initiation of such measures, combined with appropriate methods of financing, will help to achieve a desirable rate of growth. With a desirable rate of growth, there would be no question that we can afford the proposed expenditures program within the order of magnitude indicated in the attached report.

As long as the balance of payment situation limits the freedom of action on general monetary policy, more emphasis must be placed on specific credit measures and fiscal policies. If we were to rely on monetary

---

[1] Footnote by A. J. Hayes: It is well established that labor has little to say concerning the prices set by business. I take exception to the coupling of labor to business in regard to rising costs.

policy as a prime instrument for stimulating economic expansion, interest rates would have to be so drastically reduced that the substantially higher interest rates in foreign countries would be likely to attract liquid funds and aggravate the balance of payment problem. Though supporting the proposed budgetry measures, general monetary policy could not therefore be relied upon to take the lead in a policy of economic growth.

We cannot meet the challenge of the present day world without policies in support of greater productivity through technological and managerial advances. We are conscious that these same policies may aggravate special problems of chronic unemployment, which result from geographic shifts in production and especially from automation and other technological advances. Therefore, a policy in promotion of economic growth must be combined with private and public measures designed to mitigate the impact of advances on those who bear the brunt of needed adjustments. The National Planning Association is devoting a special study to the serious problem of chronic unemployment.[2]

We do not share the opinions that continued price rises are needed to achieve the rate of growth we have proposed as a target, nor that that rate of growth must inevitably generate inflationary pressures. As a matter of fact, general price and cost rises could tend to aggravate the balance of payments problem and militate against our commitments abroad. We believe that government, business, labor, and other private groups should give most serious attention to the problem of price stability. We believe that a combination of government policies and private cooperative endeavors will be needed to accomplish reasonable price stability under conditions of economic growth.

The attached report sets forth various proposals to achieve this objective.[3]

Members of the committee signing the statement: H. Christian Sonne, chairman, president, South Ridge Corp.; Frank Altschul, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co.; Solomon Barkin,[4] director of research, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL–CIO; Myron M. Cowen, Washington, D.C.; Clinton S. Golden, Ozona, Fla.; Albert J. Hayes,[4] international president, International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO; Leland Hazard, director-consultant, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; Donald R. Murphy, director editorial research, Wallace's Farmer; Charlton Ogburn, New York City; Clarence E. Pickett, honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.; Elmo Roper, Elmo Roper & Associates; Lauren K. Soth,[4] editor of the editorial pages, Des Moines Register and Tribune; Robert C. Tait, senior vice president, General Dynamics Corp.; Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Heathsville, Va.; Arnold S. Zander, international president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO.

[2] Footnote by Lauren K. Soth: Many people in rural areas are technologically unemployed or underemployed as the result of rapid advances in farm technology in recent years. The Federal rural development program should be expanded to help provide more off-farm employment, especially in the South. This could make a significant contribution to economic growth.

[3] Footnote by Solomon Barkin: Bold programs of public and private activity are urgently required to reestablish our full employment economy. Per capita national output has been stagnating and the volume of unemployment has been rising. With our work population increasing at an accelerated rate as the postwar population comes of work age, plans must be designed to provide them with productive and necessary employments to help the nation grow and discharge its responsibilities on the world scene. The needs in our public sector have been clear; no time can be spared to get them started. They should be supported by new enterprise and vitality in the private sector. A crash program of industrial and commercial development and application of the basic research and military applications accumulated during recent years is needed to create new products and markets and restore this country's competitive world advantage. A National Development Council could assure the widest and most intensive application of our technical knowledge to industry and commerce.

[4] See footnote in statement.

"GOLD DOLLAR WIDOW DIRECTIVE" PLACES HEAVY BURDEN ON SERVICE FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the directive of November 25, 1960, which, in compliance with President Eisenhower's orders, requires a reduction in the number of dependents of military personnel in foreign countries is of serious import, indeed. It places a heavy burden on service families and brings about a grave threat to morale in the armed services.

The intent of this directive is readily apparent. It seeks to curb the outflow of gold from our gold reserve at Fort Knox. This is a serious problem which must be solved. Nevertheless, it is disappointing that the President's directive seems to rest most heavily upon the dependents of members of our Armed Forces. There are other, more appropriate ways in which this outflow of gold can be curbed. In these troubled times military strength and effectiveness is of foremost consideration in establishing and performing foreign policy. There is the distinct possibility that our military effectiveness will be lessened because of lowered morale among our military personnel as a direct result of the "gold dollar widow directive."

The present policy of permitting dependents to accompany military personnel to oversea stations is, of course, an expensive one. Nevertheless, it is a policy which was established deliberately in order to maintain high morale among servicemen and their families and to give the best possible picture of America to the nations where our military personnel are stationed. It is my belief that the proposed separation of families will do more to decrease service attractiveness and hasten retirement of military personnel in whom thousands of dollars have been invested for training purposes than will any other single factor.

The Defense Department has formulated a plan for carrying out this policy but there still exist uncertainties. These will result in hardships to thousands of service families and problems will be encountered that they have not anticipated nor been informed about upon initiating careers in the Armed Forces. It has been announced that provisions will be made to accommodate hardship cases; however, this will necessitate the establishment of a special department to adjudicate cases and to recommend exceptions. Separations will become acutely prominent among the enlisted grades and this in turn will add to the already teeming number of responsibilities now so ably handled by the American Red Cross in their liaison relations between the military dependents separated from their sponsors when these are stricken by sickness or financial difficulties.

The President's surprise announcement on the recall of military dependents and the reduction in oversea expenditures for military requirements comes as a direct rebuttal of recent publicity encouraging Americans to study foreign languages, to travel abroad, and thereby to contribute to our good-neighbor policy.

It is claimed that this move by the administration to restrict dependent travel was made after giving careful consideration to the opinions of experts in the field and that to have postponed action until the incoming President had taken office would have endangered the economic status of the United States. This leads us to wonder—who were the experts consulted?—what is the long-term policy upon which the announcement was based?—and just what is the actual state of the U.S. economy? More importantly, what alternative policies were considered and rejected?

It appears to me that herein lies the real crux of the problem. Instead, in my opinion, there should have been a substantial reduction in foreign aid. Clearly, hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved without serious damage to the foreign aid program. I realize that much of our foreign aid program is in commodities, but over the years billions of actual dollars have been poured into the treasuries of other nations. This continues to be true.

American tourists spend approximately $2½ billion a year in oversea travel. As far as I can determine no effort has been made to reduce this outflow of American dollars. American industry is investing heavily overseas. One major automobile manufacturer is spending several hundred million dollars to purchase the stock of a British automobile company. These investments by American industry constitute a very substantial drainage upon the gold at Fort Knox. The President could have prohibited transactions in foreign exchange or transfers of credit or payment had the situation appeared to be serious enough. There are thousands of dependents of employees of other Government agencies abroad. This includes the State Department, ICA, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and others. It seems ill advised indeed to single out dependents of members of the Armed Forces and require that they make the only sacrifice necessary to prevent the outflow of dollars from the United States. Clearly, it is not good to separate wives and children from their husbands and fathers. Clearly, this act will negate legislative programs intended to encourage career personnel to remain in the service.

I am gravely concerned over having members of the military overseas for long periods of time without their dependents and I am confident it will continue to produce multitudinous morale problems. I believe it is apparent that this decision was made without complete consultation with the military experts and that had they been properly consulted, some alternative could have been found. I trust this will now be done.

CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last November I had occasion to visit some eight countries in Central and South America over a 2-week period. This visit was made as a member of the Naval Reserve group here on Capitol Hill. While the trip was performed essentially in my capacity as a Naval Reserve officer, no Member of Congress can visit any area of the world as important as Latin America today without trying to gain whatever general information he can about the countries and the peoples involved to assist him in the execution of his broader responsibilities as a Member of this House during these difficult and fast-moving days.

I also happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that a Member of this body who does make a visit abroad should report on this visit both to his constituents and to this House, so that any information or impressions he may have gained as a result of it can be passed along for whatever use or benefit they may have. Having already reported by means of my regular newsletter to the people of the 32d Congressional District of New York on this visit, I now take this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues some additional comments and conclusions based on this brief Latin American tour.

Of course I make no pretense, Mr. Speaker, of being any expert on Latin American affairs. I speak neither Spanish nor Portuguese, and in any event our visit lasted only 16 days. Yet even in this rather brief time I do think it possible to gain at least some general understanding of an area and of the problems of the people who live there. So it is, in this limited sense, Mr. Speaker, that I submit my report.

Our trip took us through both Central and South America. We flew a total of 12,300 miles and visited some eight countries: Mexico, Panama, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Surinam—Dutch Guiana, and Puerto Rico.

In each country we were briefed by American Embassy personnel and by American military assistance representatives. In addition we found ourselves invited to visit the House or Chamber of Deputies in most of the countries, and everywhere were received in most friendly fashion. In spite of all of the anti-American sentiment we had read about we encountered none of it.

As naval reservists we were especially fortunate to have an opportunity to participate in the final phase of one of the most remarkable international naval training operations I have ever witnessed. This was the so-called Operation Unidas conducted by Task Force 86 under the command of Rear Adm. Allen L. Reed, U.S. Navy. Admiral Reed and his ships had just completed a full swing around the South American Continent in the course of which they had been carrying out various antisubmarine warfare training exercises with the navies of a number of our South American neighbors. When our group arrived in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on November 25 we were just in time for the final critique of the last of these exercises, one that included naval forces from the United States, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. This was the first time, incidentally, that the navies of these three South American countries had ever operated with one another. Obviously a combined effort is most essential if we are to defend ourselves effectively against the Soviet submarine threat in the South Atlantic Ocean.

Admiral Reed deserves the highest praise for the success of this operation as well as for his own personal contribution to better inter-American understanding through his facility in the use of the Spanish language. May I add, too, Mr. Speaker, that I was favorably impressed with the command of the local language possessed by all of our naval and foreign service personnel stationed in the countries we visited.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the basic political problem in Latin America is economic—the wide disparity between the comparative few in most of these countries who have a very great deal and the vast majority who have almost nothing. Except for Argentina, Brazil, and to some extent Mexico, there is no real middle class in Latin America. In almost every city you can see on the one hand magnificent homes, ultra-modern office buildings and apartments, attractive hotels and shops; and yet almost alongside are also some of the most dismal shacks and squatter communities that can be seen anywhere in the world, with people living in them in the most primitive and unsanitary conditions.

It is this economic gap that constitutes the political challenge facing Latin America today and in so doing also poses such a very serious problem for us. Fidel Castro and his Communist overlords have been busily exploiting this economic gap. To those who have little but can see that somehow others have a whole lot more, the Communists promise a swift and easy prosperity. We know how false and hollow these Communist promises are, but those who have lived too long in grinding poverty and without education are scarcely apt to be so perceptive.

This same economic appeal also underlies the enthusiasm with which Fidelism, as it is referred to south of the border, has stirred up in so many of the plain people in other Latin American countries as well.

Obviously, we cannot permit Castro and the Communists to make any further gains in the Western Hemisphere. Our problem, then, is to assist those friendly governments and peoples who are still on our side and are still willing to listen to us in closing this economic gap by constitutional and legal means rapidly enough to stay ahead of the Communists who want to close it by explosive and violent means.

This is no easy task, nor is there any certain, positive remedy. And time is running out on us fast. We must act quickly and effectively to prevent Latin America from falling to the Communists. But what should we do? Can we save the situation simply by massive injections of foreign aid into the Latin American Continent? The 86th Congress authorized a half-billion-dollar aid program for Latin America, to be used for social development. No doubt more American dollars can be helpful. Indeed, one of the reasons, I am told, why we are experiencing a measure of anti-American feeling in many of these countries today is that in the distribution of our post-World War II foreign economic largesse, the major instrument of our foreign policy since 1946, we have largely overlooked them.

But there is a limit to what can be accomplished in Latin America, as well as elsewhere, with money alone. For one thing the gold outflow will certainly restrict the funds available to us for aid purposes this year, so that any additional funds channeled into Latin America would probably have to be provided at the expense of other areas of the world.

But even more important than this is the fact that what can be accomplished with these dollars depends to a very great extent on the degree to which these Latin American countries are willing to undertake serious and perhaps even painful steps to help themselves. Many countries, for example, have only rudimentary tax collection programs. In one country we visited, for example, the property owner was allowed to fix his own assessment. You can imagine how extensive tax returns would be under such conditions. Surely we cannot repeatedly call on the American taxpayer to dig further and further into his own pocket to help countries whose own governments are unwilling to impose correspondingly severe burden upon their own taxpayers.

Besides, there is the additional complication that whenever we propose to our Latin American friends that they make certain changes of this sort as a condition for receiving our help, we usually end up being accused of interfering in their "internal affairs."

So this, Mr. Speaker, is the dilemma we face. Yet fortunately there is one very bright spot on the horizon. Everywhere we went in Latin America we found a tremendous feeling of friendliness toward President-elect Kennedy, not only among those in official position but among individual citizens as well. Here we have a new and tremendous asset in our relations with Latin America which we must not dissipate or neglect. If the success of any aid program depends, as I have suggested, upon getting the governments of the countries con-

cerned to undertake some rather difficult belt-tightening measures of their own, then Mr. Kennedy's obviously very substantial prestige may well provide us with just the kind of lever we need to get such actions started. Perhaps the new administration can persuade our friends to extend themselves just a little bit more along these particular lines.

So much for the generalities.

Now for my recommendations:

First. We must channel a greater proportion of our foreign assistance funds into Latin American countries to be used to meet such urgent social needs as housing, roads, health, and education.

Second. At the same time we must continue to insist that the countries concerned take all reasonable steps to bear their own full share of the burden. In other words, we do need certain performance "strings" attached to our dollar aid. But how these strings can best be attached should be worked out in each particular case.

Third. We must make a much greater effort to see that surplus American food is distributed to needy families throughout South America, perhaps as one major condition for financial aid. Here, too, the political problem involved is substantial. Some Latin American leaders frankly do not welcome this form of aid. As one official expressed it to me rather bluntly, "If you feed them today they'll be hungry again tomorrow." But surely, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Latin America can be fed today and tomorrow and even the day after tomorrow and thereby can be kept from starvation or despair for even a year or two or three, aren't we postponing the day when the appeal of communism might take hold, and thus winning valuable time for the development of more permanent and self-supporting solutions to Latin American economic problems?

Fourth. We must increase sharply our information and cultural exchange programs in Latin America. Our group learned last month that the total money the United States has put into these programs for the whole of Latin America is less than what the Soviets are spending for just a single country. The Soviets are carrying out a vast propaganda program of their own in Latin America today. We found all sorts of Communist literature openly on sale in street bookstalls in Santiago, Chile, for example. I believe strongly we must increase not only our publications in Latin America, but our radio broadcasts, and our exchanges of personnel. One talented Chilean choral group, for example, which we were privileged to hear at the American Embassy in Santiago, could mean more in increased understanding between our countries than scores of official diplomatic contacts.

Fifth. I believe the administration should seriously consider calling a meeting of Latin American presidents to be held in Washington later this year. No doubt a personal visit by President Kennedy to Latin America would be the best way of dramatizing our new interest in this important area, and of solidifying Latin American support for us. But the President-elect cannot be expected to undertake such a visit now. Perhaps a suitable alternative would be to invite the presidents of the Latin American Republics to visit him here in Washington and then to follow this with a general tour of the country for them.

Sixth. At the same time I would recommend establishment of an Interparliamentary Conference for Latin America similar to those already in operation for Canada and the NATO countries. This device would supply us with an ideal basis for broader exchange of views between the legislative leaders of all the Western Hemisphere countries.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Latin America are looking forward to the inauguration of Mr. Kennedy with a great sense of expectation. They anticipate bold new courses of action for the Western Hemisphere. Such enthusiasm presents us with something of a challenge, because perhaps they are expecting too much and will be disappointed if miracles do not occur overnight. But their enthusiasm also represents an even greater opportunity for us to forge a more effective hemispheric solidarity and it is this new opportunity we must seize.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that our new administration will move quickly both to meet the challenge and to exploit the opportunity. But President Kennedy cannot do the job alone. He needs our support and cooperation in forging the legislative programs to meet these goals. We here in this House must not be found wanting when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point a copy of the newsletter on my Latin American trip which was issued to my constituents on December 29, 1960:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, SAMUEL S. STRATTON, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

DEAR FOLKS: I wanted to give you a brief report on my recent Naval Reserve tour of South America. I do this because South America—or Latin America as it is usually called south of the border—is certain to occupy a major share of our attention in the new Congress and the new administration.

From Walter Lippmann to Jane Russell: The Latin Americans are aware, of course, of all the interest suddenly being lavished on them from the north. As one paper noted with some perplexity, at the same time our Reserve group of 7 Congressmen was in Brazil, there were also 27 U.S. Governors, a large U.S. Navy task force, 1 U.S. Army band, Herald Tribune Columnist Walter Lippmann, and Jane Russell.

Itinerary: In all we visited eight Latin American countries—Mexico, Panama, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Surinam (Dutch Guiana), and Puerto Rico—and covered a total of 12,300 miles by air. En route we were briefed by local embassy and U.S. military assistance personnel, conferred with top Latin American defense leaders, and took part in the windup critique of the largest joint United States-Latin American naval training exercise ever conducted.

General observations: While each country has certain special problems of its own, there are certain comments that do apply to Latin America generally. For one thing, it's a most attractive and fascinating place. Yet it is also a region of stark and powerful contrasts. In Brasilia, for instance, you have some of the most impressive ultramodern architecture in the world; yet in Rio and Lima you find slums and squatter villages that are more appalling than anything you can find in Europe.

To have and have not: In fact this yawning gap between the relative few who have a whole lot, and the overwhelming majority who have almost nothing is the major political problem in Latin America. Except for Argentina, and to some extent Brazil, there just isn't any middle class. It's this sharp gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" that originally sparked the Castro revolution in Cuba. It's this same gap which seems to make the Communist line so alluring elsewhere in Latin America. Our job is to help friendly governments and peoples—in the little time that remains—to narrow this gap by constitutional and peaceful means rapidly enough so as to stay ahead of the Communists' effort to narrow it by revolutionary and explosive means.

More foreign aid? Perhaps to some extent this job can be done by channeling increased amounts of foreign aid funds into this backyard of ours which until now we have so largely neglected. But there are definite limits to what we can afford to spend, and besides, money is not the only answer. If our aid is to be really effective these countries have got to make a more strenuous effort to help themselves, tightening up and actually enforcing their own very rudimentary tax laws, for instance.

El Presidente Kennedy: But there's one bright spot in the picture, and that is the tremendous feeling of friendliness we found everywhere toward our new President-elect. If the success of any new Latin American aid program depends, as I believe it does, on our managing to get the Latin American countries to undertake some rather difficult belt-tightening measures of their own, then Mr. Kennedy's personal prestige south of the border may well furnish the new lever that will do the trick.

So much for generalities. Now for some thumbnail highlights of the eight countries we visited.

Mexico: The stablest, friendliest, and economically most advanced of the Latin American countries. Also headquarters for Communist attempts to penetrate the hemisphere. Mexicans occasionally say some unpleasant things about the United States, but they are Castro's closest neighbors, and they are souring on him fast.

Panama: The canal, an efficient, paternalistic, rather antiseptic 10-mile zone set in the middle of a tropical jungle—is the one and only issue here. Panamanians watch it from their own rusted tin-roof shacks just across the fence, and wish they owned it themselves. Conditions have eased since the anti-American riots a year ago, and I came away thinking maybe Ike was right after all in trying to smooth things over a bit by letting the Panamanian flag fly inside the zone.

Peru: Lima, the capital, is a beautiful, subtropical resort city. But right outside you run into those incredible shanty towns. Here live the Indians, descendants of the historic Incas who have come down out of the mountain in search of civilization and a better life. Peru needs U.S. funds to help build more housing projects and more roads.

Chile: A land of snowcapped mountains and Anaconda Copper. Downtown Santiago reminds you of New York. In fact former New York State Lieutenant Governor Poletti was in town with film star Leo Carillo the day we arrived promoting the 1964 New York World's Fair. Most Chileans appreciate our help in the recent earthquake, and the Chilean Congress couldn't have been more hospitable. But Communist literature is on sale more openly in street bookstalls in Santiago than in any other city we saw.

Argentina: Buenos Aires is the Paris of South America. Argentina has a middle class, but the Communists and the followers of the deposed dictator Peron are still active. Many of Peron's monuments are still visible, too, like the huge white hospital

without a single bed, operating table, or patient inside it. Steak is plentiful and cheap, but look out for the traffic. Buenos Aires has no stoplights, and the people often drive at night without headlights.

Brazil: Rio de Janiero is another city of contrasts—the glittering skyscraper resort hotels on the beach, and just back behind them the shacks and mud huts again. But the real thrill is Brasilia, the new ultramodern capital being carved out of the jungle hundreds of miles inland. Inflation is rough in Brazil but you can't help admiring the boldness and confidence of such a tremendous undertaking. Clearly the high point of our tour.

Surinam: We just touched down here briefly at the airport at Paramaribo. But from what little we could see the Dutch have a model colony here.

Puerto Rico: Our trip wound up with a reception by Governor Muñoz-Marín, fresh from a smashing reelection victory. Puerto Rico, though a part of the United States, has over the years, had much the same problems as we saw elsewhere. But she has begun to lick them. Operation Bootstrap definitely seems to be working.

JOHN F. STEVENS: VIEWS ON SECOND CANAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the Congress the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], on June 23, 1960, submitted to this body the final report of the board of consultants, Isthmian Canal studies, appointed in 1957, on a "Long Range Program for Isthmian Canal Transits," published as House Report No. 1960, 80th Congress.

While this report primarily concerns the problems of the Panama Canal it includes consideration of canals at other locations, of which the Nicaragua route, the historic rival of Panama, is the best known.

In delving into the background of the Nicaragua Canal, I have read an informative article, published in the April 1930 issue of Foreign Affairs by John F. Stevens, the first Chairman—1907—and Chief Engineer—1905 to 1907—of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which was charged with responsibility for the planning and construction of the Panama Canal.

In order that Members of the Congress and others concerned with isthmian questions may know the qualifications of Stevens, I wish to stress that he was chief engineer of the Panama Canal during its design period. His contributions for the project were momentous, gaining for him great fame as the basic architect of the Panama Canal. In addition to organizing the forces for construction and ordering the major part of the equipment, he was mainly responsible for the great decision for the high-level-lake and lock type canal and for the location of Gatun locks and dam, as well as for the layout of the spoil disposal transportation system.

A careful student, as well as well traveled observer, whose name is associated with many important works, his writings are featured by a degree of timelessness seldom encountered. Thus his views on the fundamentals of the Nicaragua Canal are just as applicable today as they were when published.

In order that the 1930 Stevens article on the Nicaragua project may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress and the Archives of the Government, and thus be made easily accessible to all concerned with isthmian problems, I quote the entire text:

[From Foreign Affairs, April 1930]

IS A SECOND CANAL NECESSARY?

(By John F. Stevens)

The ultimate transit capacity of the Panama Canal will not be reached in the next 75 years. This confident forecast is made with an assurance justified by a knowledge of its design, construction, and latent possibilities, as well as of its functioning during the 15 years since it was placed in service. It is a fact that the canal is not now being operated even to 50 percent of its present capacity.

Descriptions of the canal have often been published, but some details will be of interest even to readers who are not generally concerned with technicalities. The length of the canal from ocean to ocean is 50 miles. Its highest water elevation above mean sea level is 87 feet; in other words, that is the average lift and consequent descent which a ship must make in passing through. The elevation of the bottom of the lake channels is 40 feet. The minimum depth of water on the miter sills of the locks is 41 feet, and in the sea level sections is 40 feet. The narrowest parts of the canal are the locks, and throughout its entire length, excepting in the locks, there is ample room for ships to pass each other. The width of the channel through Galliard Cut is 300 feet, thus providing safe room for the meeting and passing of ships of any present or probable future beam.

There are double (or twin) locks in three steps at Gatun on the Atlantic side, double locks in two steps at Miraflores, and double locks in one step at Pedro Miguel on the Pacific side. The locks are 1,000 feet in length; the lock chambers have a usable length of 1,000 feet and a usable width of 110 feet, and by intermediate movable gates they can be divided into two sections of 650 and 350 feet, respectively, permitting lockages of small ships to be made with the minimum loss of water. The average time required for passing a ship through the locks is about 50 minutes, and the average time used in passing from ocean to ocean is about 8 hours.

As no occasion has as yet arisen which required the use of the locks to their maximum capacity for the entire 24 hours, one can only calculate the full-time capacity of the locks on the basis of shorter periods. A calculation of that sort indicates that 48 passages in 24 hours can safely be taken as an average. Incidentally, it may be noted that on one occasion 57 transits were successfully made in 1 day. This average, however, is based upon an assumed uniformly spaced time of arrival of ships desiring transit, which does not always occur. Making the necessary alowances, one may say that, to avoid peak delays, 32 transits per 24 hours can easily be made. Such peaks, however, are of infrequent occurrence, and an adjustment in tolls might be made in each particular case to compensate ships for delays.

A brief analysis of the actual movements of ships through the canal for the past few years will enable a fair judgment to be formed as to the truth or falsity of the oft-repeated and vociferous claims that traffic at Panama is increasing by "leaps and bounds" and is rapidly reaching the point of saturation.

The great increase in the number of transits through the canal between the years of 1919 and 1923 was largely caused by the readjustment of trade routes dislocated by the war, which readjustment required several years to accomplish and should, therefore, not be used in the determination of averages. During 1924 there were 26,994,710 tons of commercial traffic carried through the canal in 5,230 ships. During 1929 there were 30,663,000 tons of such traffic carried in 6,413 ships. The increases in a period of 6 years were not at a uniformly accelerating rate, as 1925 showed a substantial decrease in both tonnage and transits, and 1929 a slight decrease in the number of transits and a small increase in tonnage as compared with 1928.

The largest amount of tonnage passed in any one year was 30,663,006 in 1929. During the past 6 years—years during which our own and all worldwide trade has expanded at a record rate—the increase of tonnage through the canal has been only 3,668,296 tons, or 13.6 percent, an average increase of only 2.27 percent a year. In this connection we must remember that the true measure of the capacity of a canal is not the amount of tonnage, but the number of transits which it can regularly provide for in any given period. The increase in the number of transits during the 6-year period has been 1,183, or 22.6 percent, an average of only 3.8 percent a year. The monthly average during 1928 was 538; during 1929 it was 534. The daily average of commercial transits for 1929 was 17.57; for 1928 it was 17.60. There has been no great increase in the number of these transits for the past 3 years, the daily average being less than 17. It would appear, therefore, that the alleged "leaping and bounding" of traffic is purely imaginary.

Applying the same percentage of increase in the number of transits that has prevailed during the past 6 years to the coming years, in 6-year periods, it will be found that not until 1960 will the calculated limit of 48 daily transits be reached, and such a forecast assumes that the past phenomenal increase in general business will continue, which assumption is not a safe one. It also ignores the certainty that larger ships mean heavier loading, with a relative reduction in the number of transits per unit of cargo.

The increases in the number of transits during the period from 1920 to 1924 were almost wholly caused by the large number of oil tankers, and the slowing down in the rate of increase since then has been occasioned by the development of oilfields on the Atlantic coast; the product of these fields does not pass through the canal. Whether the lost oil traffic will ever return cannot safely be predicted; in any case, the hope of its return is an absolutely unsafe basis upon which to predicate an increase in the present rate of traffic. If it does come back the Panama Canal can take care of it.

Taking the entire number of transits, toll and free, for 1929, which were 7,029, a daily average of 19.26, we may note that even at infrequent peak occasions the present canal would be worked only to 60 percent of its calculated limit, and under usual conditions of arrivals of ships, only to 40 percent. Only at times when a lock is out of commission for the purpose of being reconditioned, which occurs every 4 years, is that particular lock (or rather, its double) operated for 24 hours; otherwise there has as yet been no occasion when press of traffic necessitated the operation of the canal or any part of it for more than 16 hours. Let me repeat, then, that the canal is not being operated up to 50 percent of its present capacity.

The Spooner Act, under which the canal was planned and constructed, directed that it should be of dimensions sufficiently large

to pass any ship then afloat, or any that might be reasonably expected in the future. The canal has already passed successfully and expeditiously the largest ship afloat, and only once has the limit of the locks been reached, when a U.S. plane carrier was passed through the locks with some inches to spare. As the inevitable tendency is to build everything larger, it is reasonably certain that larger ships, with increased width of beam, will appear and call for passage, but this demand can be met at Panama.

When the canal was planned provision was made for room to install an additional set of locks alongside the present double installation, making each group triple, instead of double as at present. The length of locks is practically unlimited, and it is certain that, mechanically, new locks can be built and operated to handle the larger ships. The apparently inexhaustible capacity and flexibility of electricity as a means of supplying power for mechanical purposes has made quite simple the solution of problems which in the past have handicapped our mechanical engineers.

The installation of the new locks, together with some mechanical improvements, would increase the capacity of the canal at least 75 percent. That places the date of saturation too far in the distant future for us to be warranted in making predictions or calculations.

It would even be practicable to install a fourth line of locks for the use of small vessels, but such a proposition, like that to change the present lock canal to one of a sea-level type, can be left for later generations to consider and deal with.

The cost of installing the triple locks has not been estimated, but a rough guess puts it at from seventy-five to one hundred million dollars. The length of time required for their construction would depend upon the urgency with which they were needed and also upon the size of the yearly appropriations which Congress might authorize. The work of installation ought to be complete when the daily average lockages (with the present facilities) reach an average of 32. Unless the lockages increase much faster than they have for the past few years, the work of installing the additional locks need not be initiated for years to come. It is safe to predict that the cost of the triple locks, including that of an additional water supply, would not be more than one-sixth the cost of a second canal, built elsewhere.

No occasion has yet arisen when the operation of the canal has been hampered or even threatened by lack of water for lockage purposes; but an unusually light rainfall during the wet season, followed by an abnormally long dry season, would probably bring the water supply too low to be comfortable. Plans for providing ample additional reserves of water were made before the canal was built. The storage capacity of a dam to be constructed at Alhajuela, some miles up the Chagres River from Gatun Lake, will so increase the available supply that fears of a shortage will be laid for practically all time to come. The cost of the dam, with its appurtenances such as highway, railway, hydroelectric generating plant, and housing, is estimated at $12,000,000 and the time necessary for its construction is put at 6 years, though this could probably be cut if urgency demanded and if congressional appropriations were forthcoming. Congress has already appropriated some funds for preliminary work, which is now in progress.

Meanwhile, in case of threatened shortage of water, the supply can be conserved by closing down the hydroelectric plant at Gatun Dam and using the diesel installation at Miraflores to generate electricity, Lake Gatun can safely be drawn down enough to augment the canal's water supply to the amount necessary. In fact, no anxiety need be entertained as to the water supply of the canal, and the situation is explained here for the reason that periodically reports go forth that a shortage of water is imminent at Panama. Such reports are as baseless as are those of traffic congestion.

A mass of reliable data could be given to substantiate the assertions as to the certain, safe, and working capacity of the Panama Canal. Plans, records, and statistics are available, and are public property. Any person accustomed to the use of ordinary business figures can investigate, and if he does so in an unbiased manner he can come to but one conclusion; namely, that the constantly recurring reports of congestion of traffic at the canal are without any foundation in fact. The canal's present yearly capacity is more than double the maximum tonnage which it has carried; and as its ultimate capacity is more than 100 million tons yearly it will—as far as human foresight can judge—be capable of handling all the traffic for 75 and possibly 100 years to come.

Compare the transit figures given with those for the three American Soo locks in use at the outlet of Lake Superior. These 3 locks during the open season of 1929 handled a total number of 19,793 vessels, or an average of 80 each day. They passed, during the 245 days they were in service 92,622,000 tons of cargo. Of course, many of these vessels were comparatively small, and it is equally true that the chief commodities carried—coal, iron ore, and grain—load heavily. At the same time, the locks were in operation but 67 percent of the year (instead of 100 percent, as at Panama) and it is claimed that they are not worked to their full capacity even while in service. They carry more tonnage in 8 months than crosses the North Atlantic in 12 months. They carry 50 percent more tonnage in 8 months than the total tonnage carried in 12 months by the Panama and Suez Canals combined. But with the installation of the triple locks, the Panama Canal will have a larger carrying capacity than has the present Soo Canal.

The general public visions the Panama Canal as a huge moneymaking machine; but considered as a strictly business undertaking, divested of theory and sentiment, it is not. The error in the public mind is occasioned by the fact that the figures given in Government reports do not tell the whole story and do not paint the picture as it really exists. The above statement rests solely upon a commercial basis, eliminating any theoretical money benefit which might accrue to the United States by reason of the canal being considered as an asset to the national defense of the country in time of war. In the minds of some it is a moot question whether in such an event, the canal would not be a weakness rather than an element of strength. But this is a question which cannot be settled by theory, but only by actual experience.

The Government allocated $113 million of the reported original total cost of the canal to national defense. There remains a capital investment, for purely commercial purposes, of $273 million. The annual interest charge on this sum, at 4 percent, is $10,920,000, which is not included in the liabilities as reported.

From the report of the Governor of the Canal Zone for the fiscal year 1929, we learn that the net (presumably the operating) profits of the canal, including those of its auxiliary appendages such as the Panama Railroad, were in round figures $20,162,000 (about 2 percent less than in 1928); but, states the report, "Considering the capital invested and accumulated interest on the investment, the present total capital liability is such that the canal is not as yet earning the annual interest charge at 4 percent, the current borrowing rate of the Treasury of the United States." This is not the whole story.

The United States paid Colombia $25 million as compensation for that country's claim of equity in the Canal Zone. It paid $25 million for the Virgin Islands, avowedly to secure another outpost to add to the security of the canal. By these two moves it has incurred a further capital charge of $50 million, with an annual interest charge of $2 million, which does not appear in the published reports of canal finances. Altogether, the omitted interest charges would reduce the reported profit of $20,162,000 to $7,242,000, or about 2.7 percent even on the $273 million of reported capital investment. On the whole this is a surprisingly good figure in view of the usual result of governmental business operations.

But there is some further figuring to be done. Since the opening of the canal, for example, many millions of dollars have been spent in improvements, equipment, etc., which are properly chargeable to capital account, and which are not included in that account as reported. If included, the percentage of profit would approach the vanishing point.

During 1927, moreover, there were quartered along the canal about 9,000 soldiers of our Regular Army, probably about the average yearly number; a contingent of our naval force was also present in the harbors and in the air service. These forces, aggregating a large personnel and millions of dollars of equipment, were there for no other purpose than the protection of the canal, excepting perhaps a few to meet contingencies which might arise in the Republic of Panama. The annual expense of maintaining this display of military and naval strength must be at least $20 million, which would change the apparent profit of $7,242,000 to a yearly deficit of $12,758,000. The annual interest charge at 4 percent on the $113 million allocated for national defense would be $4,520,000. If we now add this to the yearly deficit it reaches a figure above $17 million.

It may be argued that the forces in question are a part of our Regular Establishment, and as such must be maintained anyhow, but the fact remains that they are there because of the necessity of safeguarding our peaceful possession of the canal, and even if plans for universal disarmament prevail, the people of this country would never allow such a very vital and vulnerable organ of our economic body to remain unguarded from the attack of a possible enemy. Therefore, the expense must go on indefinitely, and the money which is spent in this way all comes out of the public pocketbook in the last analysis.

The annual interest charges upon the real cost of the canal, together with the expense of maintaining the Armed Forces for the past 15 years, would change the surplus of $117 million, as shown in Government reports, to a huge deficit at least equal in amount to the reported surplus resulting from the canal's operations for the 15 years past. But until business methods prevail in governmental bookkeeping, we shall probably go on deceiving ourselves in the good old way.

It is argued that the value of the canal as a factor in eliminating the necessity for, and consequent cost of, a large fleet in the Pacific Ocean should be placed as a credit to the canal finances. Perhaps so, but if the canal is such a factor in our national defense it is pertinent to inquire why the United States was allowed the same ratio as Great Britain at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments. Was the canal's value as a factor in naval power considered negligible at that historic conference?

Then there is the question as to what effect the canal has had in reducing the cost of transport in the United States between the coasts and the hinterlands of the two oceans. Vast sums are loosely stated to have been

saved the American people by the operation of the canal, but an analysis of this question would disclose that the ultimate consumers have not been the beneficiaries; the benefits have gone to the producer and the middleman. So far as the rates of the transcontinental railways are concerned, that is a matter entirely in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which can make any rates that it chooses, regardless of canal competition.

Considerable space has been given here to these financial features of the Panama Canal because the operation of a second canal would seriously and adversely affect the receipts of the present canal, besides probably creating a large yearly deficit for itself.

The administraiton of the business affairs of the canal, and its technical operation and maintenance, have been carried on by the Governors and staffs of the Canal Zone with a high degree of ability and efficiency, and reflect great credit upon the branch of the national service to which these officials belong. These men, who from their very duties are close students of the trend in volume and routing of seaborne traffic, are without exception emphatic in their judgment as to the capacity of the canal to meet all demands of transit that may be made upon it in the long future.

General Walker, former Governor, stated in 1927: "In my opinion the correct policy now is to proceed at once with the construction of the Alhajuela storage project, to watch the situation and commence the installation of the third locks when indications warrant, and to entirely dismiss the Nicaraguan Canal from consideration for a long time to come." And Colonel Burgess, the present Governor, stated as late as September 1929: "It seems a fairly safe prediction to estimate the growth of traffic as not over 10 million Panama Canal tons per decade, and to state that the third locks will be required in from 30 to 35 years." Again: "Since the ultimate capacity of the canal is over 112 million tons per year, it seems entirely safe to say that it can take care of all the demands of commerce to the end of this century."

If these officials, with their years of practical experience at the canal and their comprehensive and intelligent studies of the situation, cannot be trusted to give a correct opinion of the present and future capacity of the Panama Canal, then no one lives that can. The writer—who from his intimate connection with the planning and construction of the canal, and from his study of the weekly official detailed reports of the operations for years past believes that he has a fair degree of information as to the situation—heartily agrees with them.

Nevertheless, the call for a second canal to supplement the Panama Canal is loud and persistent. The major reason put forth in support of it is the allegation that the present canal will soon be unable to handle the traffic. Other reasons set forth are military, political, economic, and financial, together with some that are too farcical to mention.

The location selected by the proponents of a second canal is in Nicaragua. If such a canal is to be built, this is without doubt the correct place for it. The story of the efforts made for many years to promote a canal at Nicaragua—the investigations, surveys, plans, expenditures, voluminous reports, congressional actions and recommendations—is not relevant here. That it is practicable from a physical standpoint to build and operate in Nicaragua a canal designed to meet modern requirements cannot be gainsaid. As a commission of engineers under the authority and orders of Congress is now investigating that route, and as the final report of this commission cannot be expected for a long time, any comments made now as to characteristics, cost and time of completion of such a canal are obviously useless. However, some of the conditions which exist there—to which any plan must conform—are fairly well known.

Many people have the impression that a sea-level canal is what is projected at Nicaragua. Such a canal can probably be built there, but it has never been recommended by any competent authority, a lock type canal always being advocated (although the present commission may report otherwise). Lake Nicaragua at its present elevation has always been regarded as the key to the situation.

The eastern terminus of a Nicaraguan canal would be at Greytown (San Juan del Norte) on the Caribbean Sea and the western at Brito, near San Juan del Sud on the Pacific Ocean. The length of the canal would be about 185 miles, nearly 100 miles of it lying along the San Juan River, which is very crooked and would require modern canalization. Some 70 miles of Lake Nicaragua would be utilized, necessitating 20 miles of dredging in order to obtain the depth of water requisite for navigation. Then a cutting of some 15 miles through the Continental Divide would bring the canal to the Pacific Ocean. So far as reported, its alinement for many miles would be very tortuous; this would necessitate slow speeds and would be dangerous in night navigation.[1]

The elevation of the water of Lake Nicaragua is about 110 feet above mean sea level, or 23 feet more than that of Gatun Lake. Thus there would be required one more step of locks than at Panama. An extra step of locks would be necessary also at some point or points west of Lake Nicaragua. There is undoubtedly an ample supply of water for lockages to any reasonable number and at all seasons. There are no existing facilities to aid in the work of construction and so a railroad would have to be built through approximately 200 miles of tropical jungle swamps, where construction would be both expensive and long drawn out. At the Pacific end conditions are such that a harbor and terminus can be constructed at a reasonable expenditure of money and time. At the Caribbean end the conditions are particularly bad, but it is possible to construct and maintain the necessary facilities at a heavy expense. Such are the natural conditions. What the costs would be no one knows. It is safe to predict that to build a canal here, today, would cost in money, more—much more—than it cost to build the one at Panama. As to the time which would be required, one experienced engineer's guess now is as good as another's—possibly a minimum of 10 years.

Wild statements are put forth as to the vast amount of new business that would spring up almost overnight as the result of the operation of a canal at Nicaragua; but its proponents are singularly silent as to the nature of such business, where it would originate, and how and where it would move. Some local business would naturally develop in Nicaragua, but it necessarily would be comparatively small. A railroad costing possibly $25 million would develop as much local business as would a canal.

The records kept at Panama disclose that approximately 75 percent of the traffic through the canal moves to and fro between the Atlantic and the North Pacific, and undoubtedly some of this traffic would benefit by using a canal at Nicaragua. A theoretical calculation, using only the factor of comparative distances, indicates that ships in such traffic would save 2 days in their voyages. But this figure of the saving is overdrawn, for while the total distance is less, the time required to pass the additional locks, the slow speeds necessary to negotiate the poor alinement, together with the additional 135 miles of canal, would eliminate a large part of the assumed saving of time via Nicaragua. The time a ship would take to pass through a canal at Nicaragua has been variously estimated at from 1 to 1½ days; probably the latter time is more nearly correct. It would likely be five times as long as it is at Panama.

The remaining 25 percent of the traffic—including that portion passing to and fro between the Atlantic and ports on the west coast of South and Central America, the Orient, and the South Sea Islands—would move as it now does, through the Panama Canal whether a second canal were built or not. If the second canal is built, and if it takes over any part of the traffic first mentioned from Panama, that canal will lose part of its revenue but it will have to be maintained and operated just as it is today, thus increasing its present deficit and putting it deeper and deeper in the hole.

If a canal is built at Nicaragua, it will certainly have to be guarded by our Army and Navy in the same way that Panama is guarded. Sometimes the claim is made that a second canal would be an additional protection to the Nation in time of war. Any canal is vulnerable and might be put out of commission by an enemy. It seems reasonably safe to assert that as yet no adequate means has been found for defending the locks of a canal or ships in its waterways against attacks from the air. The absolute safety of no canal can be assured in time of war unless the enemy can be kept away from it, and this is a problem not yet solved. If one canal can be put out of commission so can two. It is difficult for a layman to comprehend how two danger spots located 400 miles apart could be of mutual assistance.

Some patriots aver that in order to impress other nations with our wealth and power we should build the second canal, whether it is needed for economic reasons or not. The United States does not need to resort to such practices. Other unthinking people have suggested that Lake Nicaragua would be a fine place to keep a part of our Navy. If we need a fleet at all (and we most assuredly do), it will not be kept in a place where it could be bottled up in time of need.

We are told that if we do not build the Nicaragua Canal some other nation will build it, or build one somewhere else. Possibly so, but when it is considered that commercial ships of all nations have the same unrestricted rights as have ours at Panama, at the same cost and under the same conditions, enabling them to compete on equal terms with us for the trade of the world, it is not easy to understand what policy would justify another nation in building a second canal at the expenditure of millions of dollars, incurring at the same time the certain antagonism of the United States; for the Monroe Doctrine would be sure to be invoked against any such project. Every nation can pass its warships through the canal in time of peace. And certainly our financial experience at Panama would not be an inducement for any nation to build an interoceanic canal as a means of profit. The foreign bogy is just another herring dragged across the trail to lure the traveler from the path to the real facts and the correct decisions.

[1] This brief description of the general features of the route of the proposed canal is taken from rather sketchy data, and the studies of the commission of engineers may modify it to some extent.

DEPRESSED AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent for this special order to bring to the attention

of the House a special report to the Kennedy task force on depressed areas prepared by the area aid committee of the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, Hazleton, Pa., based on a decade of experience in community rejuvenation. The members of this committee, all distinguished civic leaders of the city of Hazleton, are as follows: Attorney Louis G. Feldmann, chairman; Paul Cerula, Attorney Martin D. Cohn, Frederick W. Deisroth, Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, Victor C. Diehm, Frank E. Jedlicka, and Frank H. Walser.

I have worked with this community leadership—by the way, Hazleton is my hometown; I was born there, and so have a special interest in this community's welfare.

I have been in touch with the members of this committee off and on for several years on these problems, particularly in the last 30 days, and I have discussed with these gentlemen many of the matters touched upon in the report to which I refer.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being named by President-elect Kennedy as adviser to the Kennedy task force on depressed areas, which report was presented to Mr. Kennedy on the 28th day of December. And you know as well, I introduced in the House H.R. 5 and the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] introduced in the Senate, S. 1, a bill for the relief of the distressed areas, which was one phase of the task force report.

I have seen several other reports prepared by area aid committees from various parts of the country, but I am pleased to say that the Hazleton report is the equal over any and better than most.

It is our hope and prayer that many of the suggestions contained in this and similar reports and in the Kennedy task force report itself, can speedily be put into operation not only for the particular areas affected, but for the general national welfare.

The material I have referred to is as follows:

A SPECIAL REPORT TO THE KENNEDY TASK FORCE ON DEPRESSED AREAS

PREAMBLE

The suggestions contained in this report should be received in the spirit they are given. We understand the overall unemployment problem and shun provincialism. We have had a long and varied history in fighting unemployment in our area and have firsthand knowledge of what might help and what might not. We realize the answers are anything but simple.

Paramount in any plan should be the preservation of local initiative and responsibility. Local effort should be perpetuated rather than supplanted. Without this, all else would fail.

With full realization of the size of our bureaucratic monster in Washington, we feel that help should be channeled through existing agencies. The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Agency, for instance, is a model of efficiency and has been spectacularly successful.

No one State should achieve priority over another, nor one area over another. Pilot Federal operations in a single area would impose a most unfair penalty on other areas struggling toward the same goal.

Pirating industry with local or State funds closely skirts the borders of ethical conduct. Pirating industry with Federal funds is unthinkable and would be disastrous for the entire program. Conversely, unwanted restrictions could nullify all of our efforts.

These few thoughts will serve as a preamble to our specific suggestions. In general, we feel that the Federal Government cannot solve our problems for us, but it can help us solve our own.

STATEMENT OF NEEDS OF THE GREATER HAZLETON AREA REGARDING DISCOUNTING OF MORTGAGES

(By Can Do, Inc., one of the industrial development arms of the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce)

What is to be said in the following paragraphs will apply equally to any area anywhere in the United States which has the following conditions:

1. That it has raised money locally for the community share of industrial development costs.

2. That it is located in any area except the extremely large urban communities of the United States.

The Hazleton area has raised from its local citizens in three drives approximately $2,100,000 to be used for industrial development. The first was the Electric Autolite drive of 1947 which raised $650,000. The second was the Can Do drive of 1956 which raised approximately $750,000. And the third was the Can Do drive of 1959 to which there was approximately $850,000 paid or pledged.

The Can Do plan is based primarily on the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Act, which provides that the State will provide 30 percent of the cost of an industrial building at varying interest rates (depending on the rate charged by the community), providing that (1) financial institutions will finance 50 percent of the cost of the building and (2) the community will finance 20 percent of the cost of the building.

Can Do, Inc., proceeded on this basis to build buildings, and these were disposed of in varying ways:

1. By self-amortization leases containing options to purchase.

2. By old-fashioned land contracts.

3. By the use of first, second, and third mortgages.

In the first two plans, Can Do, Inc., gave to the banks in the Greater Hazleton area its first mortgage for 50 percent. It gave to the State of Pennsylvania (PIDA) its mortgage for 30 percent, and it retained a 20 percent in the building.

Under the lease plan, Can Do, Inc., originally gave its mortgage to the financial institutions for the 50 percent; its mortgage to PIDA for the second mortgage of 30 percent; and when the building was completed, gave to the industrial firm a deed in fee simple for the property. The industrial development firm, in turn, gave the banks its own first mortgage and bond. The deed contained a provision whereby the industrial firm took the deed, under and subject to, and agreeing to pay PIDA its second mortgage. (Pennsylvania law required this.)

Finally, the firm gave to Can Do, Inc., the firm's mortgage for Can Do, Inc.'s 20 percent. All mortgages were to be amortized over 15 to 20 years at varying interest rates, depending on the money market.

The following buildings have been constructed by Can Do, Inc., and HIDC at approximately the following amounts:

	Number employed	Cost of building	Bank loan	State loan	Can Do's interest in the building
General Foam Corp:					
Plant No. 1	[1] 200	$400,000	$200,000	$120,000	$80,000
Plant No. 2		475,000	237,500	142,500	95,000
Capitol Products Corp		425,000	212,500	127,500	85,000
Lewis Steel Products Corp	100	420,000	210,000	126,000	84,000
Highway Trailer Industries, Inc	600	1,210,000	605,000	363,000	242,000
New Moon Homes, Inc	170	400,000	200,000	120,000	80,000
Spaulding Bakeries, Inc	275	975,000	487,500	292,500	195,000
Foldes Industries, Inc	100	220,000	110,000	66,000	44,000
Lone Star Boat Co	100-300	922,500	461,250	276,750	[2] 184,500
Jack L. Honig, Inc	200	285,000	155,000		[3] 120,000

[1] Total.
[2] And HIDC financed.
[3] Only HIDC financed.

You will note that simple addition will show you that we have, therefore, built $5,732,500 worth of buildings.

It will also show that the financial institutions have invested in mortgages in these buildings $2,878,750.

It will show, too, that the State of Pennsylvania has invested in these buildings $1,634,250.

And it will also show that Can Do, Inc., and HIDC retain an interest either in fee or by mortgage by $1,209,500.

The following industries have come in during the last 4 years without financing: The Beryllium Corp., Hazleton Weaving Corp., and the Everon Corp.

Greater Hazleton now finds itself in this dilemma. In the Hazleton area we have 13 financial institutions. Banks are limited by law on their loans to any one person or company 10 percent of their capital and surplus, but not including their undivided profits; and the law is the same for both State and Federal banks. As a matter of practice, banks will not go over 60 percent in deposits of loans of all kinds; and, therefore, bank loans of the type described depend on other loans banks have; and this, of course, follows to some extent the market for money. Banks further have a dislike for industrial mortgages, particularly small banks; and some banks refuse to take very many, if any, industrial mortgages at all.

Ignoring all other factors and only considering the limit fixed by law of capital and surplus, the financial institutions in the Hazleton area are able to loan at a maximum $2,026,500. In order to secure further industrial financing it was necessary to have several industrial development corporations and finally have industry buy and place first mortgages in their name.

Thus, it can readily be seen that one of the greatest problems facing us today is not only getting industry, but also being able to get the money to finance industry. We have solicited our people; and despite the fact we are in what the Government calls "a chronic distressed area," we have raised fabulous sums of money. But this cannot go on indefinitely.

Our financial institutions have been very cooperative, but they are faced with the limits set forth, with the result that if it were not for the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, we would not have been able to even complete the Spaulding transaction.

What we have also purposely overlooked giving you is the fact that because of the impossibility of raising the banks' share of the money for a considerable period of time, we lost the expansion of Highway Trailer

Industries, Inc., which would have cost $1,250,000, for the simple reason we could not get together a bank loan of the necessary $625,000. They just did not have the capacity nor the money.

We must repeat—that without the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, the Northeastern Pennsylvania National Bank & Trust Co., and the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Hazleton, our Can Do program would have come to an end 24 months ago. Yet this is the program which has employed nearly 2,000 men directly and several thousand indirectly.

Now, the proposal of the Hazleton plan is this:

First, that the Government set up a corporation similar to Fannie Mae, with authority to buy, and relieve Can Do, Inc., of its liabilities on the bond and first mortgages held by banks given by Can Do, Inc., to the banks in which Can Do, Inc., is the mortgagor and banks are the mortgagees. These are participating mortgages in which a number of banks take part, and one bank is named as trustee. This would eliminate the problem of limitation of capital and surplus imposed by law and free money so that we might bring in other industries and expand existing industries.

Second, take care of self-imposed restrictions imposed by banks (many of these being limits imposed by bank examiners). This then would release dollars that banks might lend to Can Do, Inc., and other industrial development organizations.

Third, we would suggest that provision be made in the law that the present trustee continue his duties and collect money for the Government, and that present trustee's fee of one-quarter of 1 percent be paid from the funds collected.

The second part of the act should provide that the Government would be able to buy the interest of the industrial development organization in each of these buildings. This would then allow the industrial development organization to continue to rotate its funds, avoiding the necessity of going back to the people continuously for money. But it would have the advantage of forcing communities to participate if they are to get help. This money should be loaned to the community at a very nominal rate of interest, because one of the difficulties of present procedure is that there is not enough left over to pay interest on bonds or debentures or promises to pay, since some of the money is raised on promises to pay it back, although some are outright gifts.

These, then, are the highlights and important features of this bill. This would insure continued industrial development in any area which is willing to raise some money and could work out some kind of financing plan with either Federal or State aid, or even possibly just with their financial institutions.

What we propose is not something which will cost the Federal Government any extensive sum of money. If it is carefully administered without extensive redtape, it can be done very cheaply and with minimum loss to the Government. In fact, if it is well and intelligently administered, the Government can make a profit. This plan envisages nothing except the Government doing what we are unable to do ourselves—and that is finding a market for our mortgages and finding a means of releasing our community funds so that they may turn over again.

While this is called the Hazleton plan, it is so called only because we have had fabulous success so far; and we now deal in hard sound practice. We know some of our weaknesses and also know some of the weaknesses which will develop anywhere; therefore, we respectfully submit this plan to you.

LAND RECLAMATION

One of the major problems which chronically depressed areas have in common is the problem of land reclamation. Whether it be in the coal regions with its strippings and culm banks, former lumbering areas with their denuded forests, or urban areas with their blighted slums, this problem becomes a very tangible liability in attracting new people and new industries to the area. It is even a factor against the development of a tourist program.

Normally, the problem falls into four distinct divisions. They are as follows:

1. The problem of land defacement, strippings, culm banks, denuded areas.

2. The problem of recreation—no playgrounds or parks.

3. The problem of available utilities.

4. The problem of blighted slum areas.

Dealing with them individually, and in order of priority, we find them as follows:

1. Strippings, culm banks, denuded areas: Entrances to all of the major and smaller cities in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, lower Ohio and Indiana, Kentucky, and West Virginia are defaced with mammoth stripping holes, large waste banks or culm piles devoid of vegetation. To use our own example—in the city of Hazleton alone, we have 38 percent of our land area not being utilized. This is according to a survey made by Jack M. Kendree, planning consultant, urban renewal planners for the city of Hazleton. Of this 38 percent, most of the area is actual stripping or culm banks or land so near to these areas as to preclude the possibility of immediate usefulness. The problem is twofold: First, many times industries on tour in our area become immediately discouraged and disgusted with the unattractive appearance of the city before even seeing the more attractive residential districts; second, this is land which could have been used for industrial and commercial sites.

Our recommendation is as follows: The Federal Government, perhaps in cooperation with the State government, devise legislation which would condemn this land from those people who now own it, fill it, and restore it to its natural use where it can be planted and utilized for industries, commercial use, and even for residential development. This is A–1 on the priority list for all depressed areas.

2. Recreation and parks: Quoting from "A Community Attack on Chronic Unemployment," a case study by the Office of Area Development of the U.S. Department of Commerce, one of the problems in our Hazleton area is the lack of playgrounds and parks. This year, for the first time, we have purchased a recreation park, utilizing a group of citizens under the direction of the chamber of commerce. We were successful in acquiring 175 acres which has to be paid for over a period of 5 years. This is a natural wooded park. Here, the Federal Government on some matching basis with local participation on either a loan or a grant basis, could assist parks in their development. It might be possible that development could be in the form of utilities only, such as roads, sanitary disposal units, etc. This is something which should be studied very seriously by your Subcommittee on Depressed Areas. It certainly is a major asset in attracting new people to live in the area. Many industries have refused to locate in depressed areas because their people could not find proper recreational facilities.

3. Utilities: Extension of roads, water lines, and sewer lines has been a tremendous problem for the chronically depressed areas of northeastern Pennsylvania. Scranton, long a pioneer in industrial development, is rapidly running out of sites into which sewer and water can be extended. They have already gone into use of septic tank disposal problem for some of their factories. This is not a desirable situation. Many of their sites are undermined which prevents the drilling of wells.

In Hazleton, we have spent nearly $250,000 voluntarily raised funds on our own water system, sewer system, and the development of certain roads for our industrial park. This is money which could have been used to attract other industries by constructing buildings.

Our proposal is that the Federal Government investigate this utility problem; and possibly by means of an agency, similar to the REA, devise a local council plan which could ascertain the needs of chronically depressed areas. This agency could, through a cooperative venture, loan money over a long period of time for the extension of utilities, such as sewer and water, to industrial sites. This loan could be for a period of 50 years.

This is a problem common to many depressed area States, such as West Virginia, lower Ohio, and areas in Pennsylvania. Desirable industrial sites are at a premium today. There is no shortage of electrical power in our area. The Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. in our area has contributed substantially.

4. Blighted areas: Many of the urban areas of our smaller cities, as well as our larger cities, have become blighted through the decay of substandard housing, sometimes from third-class commercial encroachment, such as scrap yards, etc., which encourages this type of blight. Many of these areas are such that they could be developed for light industry or commercial warehousing.

It is our belief that this is one place where the Federal Government, through its urban renewal program, could step up assistance and, perhaps, do an overall study of the community itself. This, of course, would be participated in locally in some fashion. We would recommend a 10-percent participation. However, we feel that the Government would make such a study on its own and hire the consultant. Expediting the actual rebuilding of such an area for industrial or commercial development would remove the liability and create desirable industrial and light commercial sites.

HIGHWAYS

It is an undisputed historical fact that growth follows transportation. The converse of this axiom that the lack of transportation breeds economic decay, along with other factors that are dealt with elsewhere in this report, is illustrated in the anthracite coal regions of northeastern Pennsylvania. Despite the fact that the region lies athwart the shortest routes between the great metropolitan center of New York and the midwestern metropolitan centers of Cleveland and Chicago, there are no major waterways, no major trunkline railroads, and no modern highway facilities in this area connecting it with these metropolitan centers.

It is for this reason that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, shortly after the passage of the Highway Act of 1956, determined that U.S. Route 80, the limited access modern highway from the George Washington Bridge to Cleveland, Chicago, and thence to San Francisco, be constructed through the middle of the anthracite region; and that U.S. Route 81, traversing the area in a north-south direction and eventually connecting the St. Lawrence Seaway with the Gulf of Mexico, also be constructed through this region. It is to be noted that U.S. Route 80 will serve all but one of the depressed areas in Pennsylvania.

Notwithstanding the fact that the decisions for these general locations were made some 4 years ago, no construction has taken place which would result in any economic benefit to the region. A crash program of the construction of these two highways would have two immediate effects in that it would (1) infuse a substantial amount of money and provide considerable employment

in the faltering economy of the area, and (2) help overcome the single largest objection of new industries locating in this area—the lack of modern highway facilities.

It is, therefore, urged that the Federal Government, acting within the general structure of the Federal Highway Act of 1956, should lend the necessary funds to States having depressed areas for the very early construction of interstate roads, without interest, upon the specific understanding that (1) the highway departments apply the funds in areas of substantial unemployment, and (2) that the States receiving such funds could repay them over a period of 10 years from future 90 percent allocations from the trust fund set up under the 1956 act. It is evident that such a proposal would benefit practically every area of substantial unemployment, not only in Pennsylvania, but also certainly in such places as West Virginia where the problem of highway transportation is a serious deterrent to the development of new industry.

FEDERAL AID TO AIRPORTS

Industrially depressed areas need airport aid over and above that granted in the normal allocation of airports. Since communication is one of the vital factors of practically every industrially developed area, we propose that the Federal Government make a special allocation available over and above the air allocation for the development of airports in these areas. While this might be on a matching fund basis, it is our belief that in order to make it work, funds should be given with a smaller local and State participation; and, if possible, the part of the local communities should be deferred for a number of years so as not to overtax real estate and, thus, create another barrier to industrial development.

In addition, the establishment by the Federal Government of Reserve Air Units and National Guard Units at these fields could do two things: (1) provide another economic base for the community, and (2) possibly increase the Government's participation in the airport development.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY AND THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the many subjects which my studies of the Panama Canal have involved is that of the breadth of territorial seas. The recognized width of 3 nautical miles is a fundamental of international law developed over the centuries through experience and agreements among the great maritime nations and specifically affirmed in 1930 by the majority of nations at the Hague Codification Conference.

In recent years, certain countries have endeavored to bring about an extension of the 3-mile limit to 12 miles. This was dramatically illustrated on December 18, 1958, by a unilateral effort by the Republic of Panama. Aimed at extending Panamanian territorial waters so as to surround the Canal Zone and make it another Berlin, this endeavor was promptly protested by the United States and not recognized.

The dangers and complications of any such encirclement of the Canal Zone were discussed at length by me in addresses to the House on January 9 and February 25, 1959.

Notwithstanding the obvious relation of this attempted encirclement of the Panama Canal to the Communist-supported Afro-Asiatic drive for approval of a 12-mile limit at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in March 1960 at Geneva, Switzerland, the United States, Canadian, and British delegations to that Conference seemed willing to compromise in principle with the Bolshevist objective on the basis of a 6-mile limit—a move narrowly defeated by the single vote of Yemen.

Unfortunately, the press of the country did not present the territorial sea subject as it should have been presented, particularly with respect to our vital interests in strategic trade routes.

Among the routes that would be placed under territorial control by the 6-mile limit would be first, the Straits of Gibraltar; second, the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb; third, Strait of Malacca; and fourth, Tsugara Kaikyo between Hokkaido and Honshu in Japan, all with obvious implications affecting our security.

Fortunately, a realistic appraisal of the territorial sea width drive is presented in an article, "Communist Strategy and the High Seas," by George Winder in the December 1960 issue of American Opinion, the well-known magazine published by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont, Mass., and devoted to fundamental Americanism.

Because the article is highly illuminating, I include it as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD and commend it for study by those concerned with the subject of territorial sea width, especially the Departments of Defense and State, and congressional committees investigating subversive influences in the conduct of our foreign policy.

The article follows:

COMMUNIST STRATEGY AND THE HIGH SEAS

(By George Winder)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER lately said, "Communists do not look upon negotiations as we do, as an effort to reach an agreement. For them negotiations are simply an instrument of political warfare. For them a summit meeting is another battle in the struggle for the world."

If Senator GOLDWATER has taken note of a United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which took place at Geneva this spring, just when the attention of the West was concentrated on the preliminaries for a summit, he will have found much to confirm his statement in what happened at a meeting that was barely mentioned in the American press. He will have discovered that it was only by extraordinary good fortune that the Western negotiators at this meeting did not present Russia with a concession which would have been of inestimable use to her in times of war. In fact, the Communist power came within an ace of gaining the equivalent of a great naval victory without firing a shot.

This conference was called ostensibly to discuss certain fishing rights claimed by Iceland, but it had unseen depths where Russia angled for a very fat fish indeed. The real prize sought by Russia was the acceptance by the Conference of an Afro-Asian resolution that the strip of sea which is now looked upon as the territorial possession of all coastal states should, in future, be 12 miles wide instead of the now almost universally accepted width of 3 miles. This, said the Russians, would give certain new nations, which were dependent upon the resources of the sea, a much greater area in which to fish, undisturbed by competition from foreigners.

What Russia did not mention, however, and what the meeting as a whole seemed loath to discuss, was that the substitution of a 12-mile for a 3-mile limit would place no less than 19 important straits, which are now part of the high seas, under national jurisdiction. At present these straits have their central waters beyond the 3-mile limit of any country, and are therefore completely free to all shipping. If the Afro-Asian proposal had been carried, however, the whole of the waters of these straits would have become the territorial possessions of the states on either side and no ship could pass through them without permission.

It is true that the United Nations resolution says that ships should have the right of innocent passage through such waters, but this term has little meaning. It is well understood that ships while in territorial waters can be boarded and searched at the discretion of the sovereign, that restrictions can be placed on radio transmission, and any regulations concerning pilotage, safety and customs can be enforced. Even the bar in the lounge can be closed at will. Innocent passage can be accompanied by such restrictions and harassment that navigation would not be worth while, or even practicable—and all this without contravening what is, after all, merely an expression of opinion by the United Nations.

II

The shipping industries of the world almost unanimously agree that the breadth of territorial waters should be as narrow as possible in order to minimize the possibility of interference with ships on the high seas. At 3 miles a ship's officer standing on the bridge of most ships can see the shoreline. Charted landmarks, such as towers and church spires, are clearly visible. And at 3 miles ships can in most instances anchor in safety outside the limit, but at 6 miles the water is usually too deep.

Thus in times of peace the 3-mile limit has great advantages, but it is in time of war that a wider limit would become particularly disadvantageous and even dangerous to the Western nations, because international law requires that all territorial waters shall be closed to the ships of belligerent powers. This means that many important straits would be closed to the British and United States Navies, including, of course, convoys transporting munitions or soldiers. The international law, to be sure, would also apply to the Russian Navy, but this would affect it very little, for in any foreseeable contest, it is not likely to use these straits.

The American State Department must be aware of the imminent danger to the United States in any extension of territorial limits to either 6 or 12 miles, for it has received a report by the Association of American Geographers which states that although naval maneuvers entailing passage through territorial waters might not necessarily be prevented, if the territorial limit were extended, there would be a serious potential danger. In the face of international stress * * * the Western World could lose much. For example, U.S. warships steaming to quell trouble in a localized flareup of hostilities might be subjected to additional travel time, as much as 2 or 3 days, to avoid penetrating the territorial sea of a nonbelligerent state. Even hours can count heavily in critical incidents. Or there might be attempts to close off an area completely. It is probable that during a period of world tension, i.e., even before actual hostilities the right of innocent passage would be regarded by a neutral state as posing a threat to security, and as a result be denied.

This report also points out the increased distances a ship may have to travel merely by being required to keep an additional 9 miles from shore. A 12-mile limit would actually turn some 3 million square miles of sea, now perfectly free to the ships of all nations, into territorial waters which could be closed at will. In the event of war, these

waters would have to be closed to Western navies, even by friendly powers, for not to do so would be a breach of neutrality which could drag the offending nation into war. Exactly the same principles govern aircraft, which in time of war would be excluded from flying over the territorial waters no less than over the land of a neutral power.

With only a 6-mile limit the Straits of Gibraltar would become territorial waters. With Spain and Morocco neutral, this would create at least a barrier of hundreds of miles against aircraft entering the Mediterranean from the West. Or assume an entirely possible situation: Yugoslavia, for example, invades Italy; Great Britain and/or the United States support their ally against the Communist empire; other nations remain officially neutral. Under international law, Britain and the United States would have no way whatsoever, whether by sea or by air, to transport supplies and troops to Italy. This obvious consequence of a 6-mile limit must have been in mind of the Russians when they, under the pretext of giving increased fishing rights to certain small nations such as Iceland, supported the Afro-Asian resolution, which they had probably inspired in the first place.

III

Let us not get Iceland confused with the main issue. The idea that nations can by international agreement grant to one nation special rights in contiguous waters beyond the 3-mile limit for such purposes as fishing or undersea mining for minerals, without the actual extension of territorial power, has long been accepted. There was nothing to prevent the Conference at Geneva from giving Iceland special fishing rights over an additional 9 miles, if it so desired. In fact, as we shall see, such a concession of special fishing rights was part of a scheme that was almost adopted.

Exclusive fishing rights are one thing, territorial sovereignty quite another. In view of this, to put forward the Icelandic demand for fishing rights as a reason for increasing the territorial limits of all nations, was a remarkably brazen action on the part of those who moved the resolution. It failed, of course, with only the Afro-Asians and the Communists voting for it; but was it expected to succeed? Was its real purpose a hidden one? Did it really compel the United States to put forward her subsequent compromise resolution? Or was the resolution which the United States moved jointly with Canada merely another example of the Western nations' love of compromise, or, as Senator GOLDWATER would say, "appeasement"?

This joint resolution proposed a territorial limit of 6 miles plus exclusive fishing rights over another 6 miles, the latter to take effect after a period of 10 years. We are not here concerned wtih these extended fishing rights; all that interests us is the proposal to extend territorial limits from 3 to 6 miles, for if this had been accepted by the Conference, it would, in event of war, have greatly weakened the position of the Western Powers.

While it would not, of course, have been as disastrous as the Afro-Asian proposal, it would, nevertheless have placed at least six important straits, which are now perfectly free to shipping, under territorial control. According to the Association of American Geographers, these straits are:

1. Straits of Gibraltar. All ships passing through these straits would come under the jurisdiction of either Spain or Morocco. It would be the duty of these powers to block this western gate of the Mediterranean to all belligerent ships and aircraft. Failure to do so would be a breach of neutrality.

2. Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, entrance to the Red Sea, closing the approaches to Israel, United Arab Republic, Jordan, Sudan, Ethiopia and Yemen, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the southern entrance to the Suez Canal.

3. Straits of Malacca, between Malaya and the Indonesian island of Sumatra.

4. Gulf of Honduras, between Honduras and British Honduras in the approach to the coast of Guatemala.

5. Entrance to Brunei Bay on the northern coast of Borneo.

6. Tangara Kaikyo, between Hokkaido and Honshu, Japan.

IV

We do not yet know where the next war will take place, but we can imagine many circumstances in which the blocking of these straits would have very serious consequences on the navies and armies of America and Great Britain.

Of course, the Anglo-Americans could simply violate the neutrality of the countries to whom these straits would belong, but this would be a breach of a worldwide moral code to which they have long committed themselves and a repudiation of the basic principle of international law, the distinction between neutrality and belligerency.

When we consider all these facts, we must ask ourselves: Why did the United States and Canada jointly move, and Great Britain support, a resolution which, to put it mildly, would be so very inconvenient to the Western air and sea forces during times of war?

There can have been no doubt about the recognition of the 3-mile limit as a fundamental of the international law that has been built up over centuries by the experience and agreement of civilized nations. It was explicitly affirmed by the great majority of nations at the Hague Codification Conference of 1930. The last body to consider the question was the International Law Commission appointed by the United Nations a few years ago, in which the U.S. Government presented a long declaration which emphatically stated its opinion that "a codification of the international law applicable to the territorial sea must * * * incorporate * * * the 3-mile limit and record its unquestioned acceptance as a lawful limit." The British Government's declaration before the same body was no less positive and emphatic. The question, indeed, came up at all only because the long-established principle had been questioned by some of the less civilized or responsible nations.

Before the last war the few countries which did not officially acknowledge the 3-mile limit usually accepted it in practice. Even Russia allowed foreigners to fish to within 3 miles of her coast. Since the war, however, we have entered a period of retrogression in international morality, so much so that the very principle of the freedom of the seas is endangered.

Led by Argentina under General Perón, many South American nations have made the most extravagant claims to territorial waters. Peru, for example, claims 200 miles of the sea measured from her coast, and has actually arrested and heavily fined vessels which were peacefully hunting for whales many miles from land. Before the war these wholly unjustifiable acts would have been automatically condemned as piracy on the high seas. Fantastic claims have also been made, more or less seriously, by Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Tunis, South Korea, Communist China, and Indonesia. In comparison with these, the 12 miles claimed by Iceland, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Republic seem relatively modest—a mere 400 percent of existing rights.

V

The representatives of the United States and Great Britain at Geneva must have known of the emphatic statements made by their governments before the International Law Commission in favor of the 3-mile limit. They must have known of the general tendency of less responsible nations to play havoc with the freedom of the seas by seizing large tracts of the ocean. They must have known, or should have known, of the warning contained in the booklet issued by the Association of American Geographers. Yet they proposed a resolution that constituted a complete abandonment of the 3-mile limit which in times of war would gravely impair the military power of their own countries.

This complete abandonment of a position which international law had established, and which Americans and Britains a few years before had supported with irrefutable arguments, is almost beyond human understanding. It becomes even more mysterious when we consider the nature and constitution of the Conference on the Law of the Sea at which this reversal took place.

To begin with, this court—for we must call it that since it was entrusted with the interpretation of the rights of many established interests—consisted of the representatives of 88 nations, to many of which international law was an entirely novel conception. Many had neither merchant ships of any size nor fishing vessels, other than those used for inshore fishing. Some did not even possess a seacoast. Many—notably Peru, Indonesia, the Arab Republic, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Yemen—were amongst the worst offenders in the postwar extension of territorial claims over seas which for centuries had been free, or in arbitrary interference with navigation in complete defiance of all international law and custom. It could correctly be said that those who broke the law were sitting in judgment upon those who had kept it.

Although the vast majority of these 88 states had no fleets of trawlers fishing the high seas to consider, many of them had offshore fishermen who, with no immediate prospect of fishing the high seas, were pressure groups for a 12-mile limit which would give them an extended monopoly of the adjacent waters. This meant, of course, that although these nations sat in judgment on the law of the sea, they were certainly not free from bias and self-interest. To refer the law of the sea to such a body as this was, in reality, to abandon the rule of law altogether.

It is just possible that some will at this point say: "Well, what of it? You are creating a false analogy when you compare this conference with a court of law. It was not called to consider existing rights, but only to find out the wishes of the majority."

If this is so, the departure of the Conference from our traditional principles of justice is even greater than we supposed. Great nations over the centuries have built great merchant fleets on the assumption that the oceans' highways would forever remain free. The very prosperity of the Western World depends on the freedom of the seas. So does its security in wartime. By custom and usage the nations have acquired prescriptive rights to sail the seas without interference from coastal states, both in times of war and peace, so long as they remained outside a 3-mile limit. Some have built large fishing fleets to fish the very seas over which other nations now claim the right of exclusive possession. Are these prescriptive rights to be subjected now, without any consideration of international law, to the mere arbitrary will and interests or even the whims of the nations called together to sit in this strange conference?

Are politics, unhampered by accepted principles, to take the place of law, and is the power of great nations which have provided the world with many tons of merchant shipping to be equated with that of nations which do not possess a vessel of any kind? Was this conference to indulge in a strange form of power politics in which rights and customs did not count at all, but where the

power (expressed in a vote) of insignificant states in which slavery still exists carries the same weight as that of the United States, or Great Britain? Where the ambition of the owners of a few dhows could perhaps prevent a P. & O. liner from passing freely where it had passed for a hundred years? Where the tiny population of a barbarous tribe or squalid sheikdom has as much power as a 170 million Americans?

To allow such a conference to throw old established principles of Christian civilization into the melting pot, and to reshape them according to irreligious or alien ideas, is to place civilization at the mercy of the barbarians. What is to prevent such a motley crew from deciding, for a small bribe or mere spitefulness, to take the Panama Canal from the United States, or Hudson Bay from Canada?

VI

Whether this weird conference was intended to be a court of law or merely an arbitrary body subject to nothing but the will of a two-thirds majority, there are two other points to be considered. The first of these is that many of the nations present were governed by dictators who had given proof that they seldom respect law of any kind, and hold international law in particular contempt. Even more important, some countries officially had Communist governments, and a considerable number of others were obviously manipulated by the Communists or at least exposed to very strong pressures. The dominant purpose of these states was obviously to inflict as much damage as possible on the non-Communist world, particularly Great Britain and the United States. Under these circumstances the behavior of the American and Canadian representatives in jointly proposing a resolution which provided for a 6-mile territorial limit is as strange and unnatural as is the behavior of the British representative in supporting it. Is modern civilization bent on self-destruction?

The American delegate, Mr. Arthur H. Dean, made it clear that he knew that the resolution was not in the interests of his country, and that he approved it only to give embodiment to the desires of coastal states, especially the newer countries, who have desired to obtain exclusive fishing jurisdiction within 12 miles of their coast. In other words, the whole conception of the freedom of the seas was to be modified and all other maritime powers were to be sacrificed for no other reason than to appease a few petty nations who wanted monopoly fishing rights where they had never had them before and which, in any case, they were not entitled to possess, and which, furthermore, could have been granted without extending territorial limits.

The United Kingdom was represented by Her Majesty's Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Mr. John Hare, who also emphasized his country's sacrifices, although he probably did not comprehend their real extent. "Let no one think," he said, "that this does not involve a heavy sacrifice by the United Kingdom. It means abandoning the 3-mile territorial sea." But he urged the conference to deal with this economic, social, and humanitarian problem in the spirit of the United Nations Charter. His one object seemed to be to get a formal agreement out of the Conference, however detrimental to the West; for that, in his view, would mean that the Conference had succeeded. "The joint resolution," he said, "stands for the best chance of winning a majority." A great conception of Western civilization, which was of service to the whole world, was to be sacrificed for no other apparent reason than that a conference, made up chiefly of nations to which Western civilization was comparatively strange, might not adjourn without announcing an agreement.

VII

This brings us to another aspect of this strange surrender. Was a real agreement possible in any circumstances? Let us suppose that a resolution confirming the 3-mile limit had been passed by the Conference; would Iceland have accepted it? Would Peru and other countries with absurd claims of fifty or a hundred miles have observed even a 6-mile limit, if that had been decided upon by the Conference? Would Russia and the other Communist countries, who have consistently ignored international law and the customs of nations as well as their own treaties whenever they wished, have made an exception for a resolution by the pow-wow in Geneva?

But there are certain countries who respect international agreements and whose people tend to insist that any decision of a body set up by the United Nations should be blindly accepted; these, of course, are countries of the Western World. In them the propaganda value of the United Nations has incalculable force. To many of their people a decision announced by that mystic body becomes a moral imperative that must be obeyed at all costs. This being so, the West goes into all such conferences at a hopeless disadvantage. It can lose, but it cannot win. It must accept any decision which goes against it, while the Communists, their puppets, most of the dictatorships, and a number of democracies simply ignore any decision they do not like.

It is a sinister fact that before the Conference the people of the Western World were being conditioned by their newspapers for surrender. References to the conferences described those who supported the 3-mile limit as flogging a dead horse. No arguments were presented—just the deadly assumption that nobody now supported 3 miles. The facts that trade routes would be seriously affected by the change, and that the military power of the West would be greatly impaired, were never mentioned. There was only the fatuous notion that the world was changing and, therefore, everything, including territorial limits, must change also. That's progress.

Only one thing finally saved the Western Powers from the consequences of their own folly. Their proposed self-sacrifice was not enough to satisfy those who wanted a limit of 12 miles or more. The rules of the Conference called for a two-thirds majority, and the fateful resolution was lost by one vote. The other Western Powers followed their leaders like sheep and voted for the resolution, but the final result was 54 in favor and 28 against.

Those voting against the resolution were the 10 officially Communist states, and Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Venezuela, Iraq, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Republic, Burma, Guinea, India, Iceland, Indonesia, the Sudan, and Yemen. They were as foolish in refusing half what they asked as were the Western nations in making their offer. Yemen, or any of these states, however small, had the same voting power as the United States or Great Britain, but this was for once fortunate, for it was the single vote of an Arab slave state that saved the Western nations from the immolation they had prepared for themselves.

VIII

Today the only territorial limit which has, to quote an official declaration by the United States before it so mysteriously changed its mind, historical sanction and a record of acceptance in practice is the 3-mile limit. And until the United Nations intervenes again more disastrously, this will be recognized by the great civilized powers as the extent of territorial waters, and will be generally accepted in practice by the sheer power of tradition and custom by most of the rest of the world.

However, the question still remains: Why were the United States, Canada, and Great Britain so eager to please the Communists and Afro-Asian nations that they were willing to increase territorial sea limits from 3 to 6 miles? Did they think the freedom of so many waterways and their own strategic needs not worth defending? How many positions can we surrender one by one before they add up to defeat?

If the United States and Britain attend many more conferences such as this, the Communists may win the world without a battle.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal Aid Highway Program from its inception. From this vantage point I have been convinced that there is an enormous and important investigative job to be done and a thorough evaluation of policies adopted by the various State highway departments if the public interest is to be served by this multi-billion-dollar highway program. However, I have become equally convinced that this job will not and cannot be fully done by our present subcommittee which contains 13 Democrat members and only 6 Republicans.

As I have pointed out several times before in the RECORD, there has never been a select or special committee of the House, charged with investigating a particular field, where the minority members have so little representation regardless of which party controls the House. Such a politically constituted committee cannot command the broad confidence of the House and the public that its motives are beyond suspect. We are all sophisticated enough to recognize that there will be a minimum of political consideration in every committee and this is especially so where the majority party has more than a 2 to 1 majority on the committee.

Thus it is with this special subcommittee. There have been charges and countercharges of politics on both sides in the manner this committee has functioned to date; this was especially true in the period prior to the recent presidential election. But now that the election is over, I think and hope that politics will be submerged and that both parties, which contain men of good will, can unite against crooks, grafters, and incompetents who are bringing our vast Federal aid project into public disrepute. Accordingly, I have introduced a resolution to create a new, select, bipartisan committee of the House to complete the job which so far has not and could not be done during the short existence of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal Aid Highway Program. I include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1961, there is hereby established and created a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct investigations and studies of all aspects of and problems arising under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and to

determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided,* That the select committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall be composed of twelve members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, six from the majority party and six from the minority party, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Speaker, select a chairman from the members of the majority party and a vice chairman from the minority members, and adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the House. (b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. The select committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the House; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such attorneys, investigators, technical engineering, and other assistants and consultants who are qualified, experienced, and knowledgeable in roadbuilding and highway matters as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 5. For further purposes of this resolution (1) subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the select committee or any members designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member; (2) oaths to witnesses may be administered by the chairman of the select committee or any member thereof.

SEC. 6. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking evidence including sworn testimony.

SEC. 7. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed and shall be paid upon vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the select committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Speaker, in drafting this resolution, I have combined what I think are the best features of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The Senate select committee, called the "Labor Rackets Committee," investigated the extremely sensitive field of labor and management for 3 years and reflected credit upon the Senate and upon the Congress. Composed of four Democrats and four Republicans, even though the Republican strength in the Senate was considerably less than this ratio, this select committee, under the graceful chairmanship of Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, kept politics at an absolute minimum.

During these 3 years of investigation, all of the committee reports were unanimous except for two. Of these two reports, I notice that the only dissent in one was filled by a Democrat Senator and in the other the four Republican members signed one, and the four Democrat members issued two separate views on the same subject matter. This, I think, is a marvelous record and one which I am convinced can be duplicated in this equally sensitive area of Federal aid to highways.

You will notice that my resolution calls for a select committee composed of 12 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, 6 from each party. The number 12 is an arbitrary figure, to be sure, but I have chosen it with the thought that such committees will be more effective with a relatively small membership. You will further notice that the 12 members selected by the Speaker will select a chairman from the majority party and the vice chairman from the minority party. This, again, is a feature which I have taken from the resolution creating the Labor Rackets Committee and which, in my judgment and the judgment of many observers, operated to keep politics at a minimum.

Let me demonstrate how this can be so. The Democratic Party, in addition to controlling both Houses of the Congress, now controls the executive branch of the Government and is, therefore, responsible for administering the Highway Act of 1956. And, while it is true that prior to the last election our special subcommittee was, in a sense, investigating the shortcomings of a Republican administration, the shoe is now, or shortly will be, on the other foot. The possibility is not entirely remote, in my view, that the Republicans could capture control of the House and this committee in 1962. And, human nature being what it is, a Republican majority in control of the investigative machinery of the House theoretically could be more interested in tarring a Democratic administration than getting at the facts.

But, under my resolution and my hypothetical example, the Democratic Party would still retain an equal number of members on the select committee and, in addition, would have a vice chairman of its own, all of whom could act as a brake on any political excesses on the part of the Republicans. So, while in the short view the Democratic Party may be surrendering a few of its prerogatives, in the long-range view I think both parties and the public interest can be served if what I have described should come about.

There are other and equally cogent arguments to support my resolution which I hope will commend it to all Members of the House regardless of what party they belong to. I welcome their support for this resolution and, for further considerations, I refer them to a speech which I made on the floor of the House, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 14, pages 18775–18782. I also include this speech at this point in the RECORD:

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Speech of HON. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, August 31, 1960)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee of the Federal Aid Highway Program, of which I am a member, has been in existence for almost 1 year now. During this time, the staff of a dozen or so counsel and investigators, under the direction of the Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, has been combing the country for scandals in the multi-billion-dollar Interstate Highway System. While getting the crooks is important, and I am in favor of it, this is not the only thing this committee ought to be doing. Then, too, it should be noted that what our subcommittee has done to date would convince even a man from Mars that it has not borne out the charges yet, made in some of the press and some of the Democratic colleagues' press releases, that Democratic colleagues' press releases, that our exposés would make Teapot Dome seem like a child's game of marbles and would dwarf in comparison the sordid Dave Beck-Jimmy Hoffa episodes uncovered by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee of the Senate.

Thus far, we have held two hearings: one of them involving vertical bridge clearance and another dealing with fraud in Oklahoma, which case admittedly was not completely investigated. Also, it should be noted that just when it appeared that the subcommittee could get its teeth into a real meaty scandal involving alleged millions of dollars of right-of-way irregularities in the State of Massachusetts, the Chairman has unilaterally decided that there will be no more hearings until after the November election in order to keep any political considerations out of the probe.

Now this decision represented a complete reversal of the Chair's earlier position, for we Republican members of the subcommittee had been informed that there would be further hearings after the conventions of the two political parties but before the November elections.

What occurred between early May and June 20 that would account for this press release indicating a complete change from earlier positive assurance to the committee? I suggest a clue can be found in the Boston Traveler, dated May 13, 1960, which first broke the news that the Bureau of Public Roads had "uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in our appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program." Carried under the headline "U.S. Probes Appraisals for Massachusetts Roads," this story was front-page stuff in the Boston Traveler. I include, at this point in the RECORD, the article referred to above:

"[From the Boston Traveler of May 13, 1960]

"U.S. PROBES APPRAISALS FOR MASSACHUSETTS ROADS

"(By Tom W. Gerber)

"WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in overappraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

"And the Bureau has launched a two-pronged investigation of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works' land value estimates for rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways.

"Bureau cut off payments for land takings here

"Atop this, the Traveler learned today the Bureau in January cut off payments to the State for right-of-way land takings based on DPW appraisals.

"This action was taken pending exhaustive audit of each suspected overappraised land parcel in highway rights-of-way.

"A top source said the Bureau has made no payments to the State for acquiring rights-of-way since Federal funds were shut off 4 months ago.

"And it was learned Massachusetts is the only State in the Nation currently under this restriction.

"Under normal practice, the Bureau makes progress payments for acquiring needed highway rights-of-way without audit.

"This helps speed construction of the Nation's $37 billion, 41,000-mile highway program. Audits normally are conducted later.

"Engineer-appraiser-accountant teams from the Bureau's project examination division have been investigating the Massachusetts DPW's right-of-way land appraisals for several months.

"More than 100 suspected swollen appraisals are under scrutiny.

"And only last week, the Bureau hired the Washington, D.C., valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley, to doublecheck the Bureau's findings.

"This professional appraising firm often has worked under Government contract. It has been hired in the past by the Navy and the Army Corps of Engineers in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads.

"Three years ago, some of the evidence uncovered by this concern led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

"The Traveler learned three land parcels in eastern Massachusetts, valued by State-hired appraisers at about $100,000 each, only were worth between $30,000 and $40,000 in the opinion of Government appraisers.

"The Department of Justice here has been informed of these preliminary findings, the Traveler learned. It was reported 'watching' the investigation.

"Overpayments in two categories

"Bureau agents discovered what they considered to be overappraisals both in the costly Interstate Highway System and in the so-called primary, secondary, and urban programs in Massachusetts.

"The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the costs under the interstate program and splits the costs 50–50 with the State for primary, secondary, and urban projects.

"The Traveler learned the Bureau's systematic analysis of the State's right-of-way land appraisals done on a sample basis.

"Bureau agents, including former FBI men, are examining more than 10 percent of roughly 1,000 right-of-way land appraisals accomplished by the State last year.

"However, one source said the sampling included the three in the $100,000 bracket. He said the State's questionable appraisals generally appear to be between 25 to 50 percent too high according to Federal standards.

"Two separate sources told the Traveler many of the State's appraisals were 'unreasonable, unsupported, and erroneous.' Both sources used the same words.

"The investigation was touched off late last year when the State failed to provide satisfactory documentation for land appraisals required for highway rights-of-way.

"A Traveler source said it soon was 'obvious' much of the data in the State appraisals was erroneous.

"However, this source refused to rule out the possibility the bloated appraisals represented merely errors of judgment.

"But he pointed to the fact some estimated land values in the DPW appraisals failed to coincide with appraisals of similar nearby land.

"Professional probers costly to Government

"He also pointed to the fact the Bureau had hired the firm of professional appraisers 'at considerable cost to the Government.'

'He said this wouldn't be done unless 'substantial sums' were involved.

"It was reported the investigation had not yet reached the point where appraisers, property owners, and DPW employees were being questioned, with a view toward more drastic action by the Government.

"The Massachusetts DPW usually hires private appraisers to make land value estimates. They are paid from $500 to $1,000, depending on the scope of the appraisal job.

"If the land is believed to be worth more than $25,000, two appraisers are hired. For the most part, these appraisers are local real estate operators.

"Probe reported planned in two stages

"The investigation was reported to be planned in two stages.

"Now underway is the first stage to determine the basis for the suspected high appraisals.

"The second stage would be to make certain that none of the appraisals was set before the right-of-way land was examined.

"While the Bureau has shut off payments to the State for acquiring right-of-way land, construction progress payments still are being made.

"It was reported this part of the highway program in Massachusetts was not under unusual examination.

"In previous years, all Federal payments under the cooperative highway construction program were cut off in Indiana and Arizona when scandals racked their State highway departments.

"Di Natale aware of Federal probe

"State Public Works Commissioner Anthony N. Di Natale issued a statement Sunday suggesting he was aware of the Bureau double-barreled inquiry.

"He announced he would 'cull out and fire incompetents' hired by the DPW as property negotiators and appraisers on highway projects."

This subcommittee, authorized by the House to investigate irregularities in the Interstate System has proved to be a "most reluctant dragon" when Massachusetts is concerned. This alarming situation has been known by the subcommittee since January of 1960, when the Bureau of Public Roads first learned of it, cut off all payment on all Massachusetts Federal-aid projects, and began a vigorous investigation on its own initiative. And as noted above, it has been noted in the Boston press since May 13, 1960. Yet, even though the staff independently determined that there was substance to these allegations of a conspiracy to defraud the Government, this subcommittee had made no move to have the staff, assisted by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepare this case for hearing.

This inaction should be contrasted with the alacrity with which this subcommittee pounced upon some newspaper clippings exposing alleged irregularities in Tulsa, Okla., and which resulted in a series of hearings during the first week of May of this year. So eagerly was the Oklahoma matter pushed, that the grand jury evidence was presented in open hearings shortly after several contractors were indicted and even before they could be given a fair trial in a court of law. It is also interesting to note that the present Governor of Oklahoma, whose presence as a witness was demanded by me to explain why he had rewarded unfaithful State highway officials with increased pay and job security, was not called as a witness.

May came and went, and still there was little interest in Massachusetts. So did June and July. But in the words of a familiar song, "The days grow short as we reach September." On August 16, 1960, the Bureau of Public Roads, in a letter from Mr. Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner, referred the results of their investigations to the subcommittee and to the Department of Justice for its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate. This letter has been released to the press and reported in the Boston Traveler on August 17, 1960. I therefore include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

"[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 17, 1960]

"LETTER TO HOUSE UNIT DETAILS ROAD PROBE

"(Traveler Washington Bureau)

"WASHINGTON.—Following is the text of a letter transmitting reports on the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program from the Bureau of Public Roads to the House Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:

" 'Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,

" '*Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

" 'DEAR MR. BLATNIK: Reference is made to the review by this Bureau of certain appraisal practices in the State of Massachusetts which has been continuing since the beginning of this year and with certain aspects of which members of your staff are familiar. As a result of information that fee appraisers retained by the State of Massachusetts, in connection with Federal aid projects, were submitting inadequate or misleading information in appraisal reports to justify appraisals far in excess of true market value, the Project Examination Division of this Bureau in cooperation with your field offices undertook a special review in January of this year. In addition, at that time the Bureau required that no payments be made to Massachusetts reimbursing it for the cost of the acquisition of right-of-way on Federal-aid projects, except after final audit of such property involved.

" 'BUREAU CONTINUES SPECIAL REVIEW

" 'After several months of review, the Bureau retained the firm of Beasley & Beasley of Washington, D.C., to make new appraisals of certain selected projects in Massachusetts, including a primary Federal-aid project in Wakefield and an interstate project in Attleboro. At the same time the Bureau continued its own special review. The firm of Beasley & Beasley has now submitted its first reports containing its appraisals in Wakefield and the southerly part of the interstate project at Attleboro. Copies of these reports are forwarded herewith.

" 'An analytical and comparative review of these Beasley appraisals and those of independent fee appraisers retained by the State is now underway. This analysis to date reveals that certain fee appraisers retained by the State, by using misleading information and ignoring available data, placed values on selected properties far in excess of values that could be supported by available true market data. For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true land value. At the same time, the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values.

" 'CASES INVOLVE LARGE SUMS

" 'For the most part these selected cases involved extensive properties and large sums of money. The Bureau has made no payments in reimbursement to Massachusetts on any of these properties.

" 'A preliminary detailed analysis of these selected cases is now in our files and available to your committee. This analysis, together with other independent information which has come to the attention of this Bureau, support a conclusion that certain fee appraisers employed by the State have been subjected to pressures which comprised their independence. Such analysis and such other information have been and are being submitted to the Department of Justice for its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate.

"'If there is any further information on this subject which you desire, please do not hesitate to call us.

"'Sincerely yours,

"'ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,

"'*Commissioner of Public Roads.*'"

On August 17, 1960, the Boston Traveler carried an article written by its correspondent Tom W. Gerber, under such headlines as "Land Appraisals Boosted 300 P.C.," "Excesses Run Into Millions of Dollars," and "High State Official Is Under Suspicion," I ask that this article dated August 17, 1960, also be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as similar articles appearing in the Boston Herald, dated August 18, 1960, entitled "U.S. Pledges Complete Probe of Massachusetts Highway Land Cost"; in the Boston Traveler on August 18, 1960, entitled, "Massachusetts Highway Scandals Worst Yet"; in the Boston Herald dated August 19, 1960, entitled, "FBI To Probe State Scandal in Land Taking"; and in the Boston Traveler, dated August 19, 1960, entitled "GOP Demands Action in Massachusetts Roads Probe."

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 17, 1960]

"MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL

"(By Tom W. Gerber)

"WASHINGTON.—Excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program run into the millions of dollars, the Traveler learned today.

"A high State official is under suspicion in the racket, believed the largest yet in the Nation's $50 billion highway construction program.

"These facts came to light as the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads filed a preliminary report to Congress on a 3-month investigation of highway land takings in Massachusetts.

"The results of this inquiry and other data already have been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for 'any action * * * it may deem appropriate.'

"The preliminary investigation report was prepared by Beasley & Beasley, an independent Washington valuation engineering firm retained by the Bureau of Public Roads to look into the Massachusetts situation. Its inquiry is continuing.

"Three years ago, evidence uncovered by this firm in another BPR investigation led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

"The current report does not name the Massachusetts official under suspicion in the land appraisal racket.

"However, the Traveler learned the official and certain accomplices subjected highway right-of-way land appraisers employed by the State to 'presures which compromised their independence.'

"These appraisers were hired by the State, mostly last year, to set values on land the State would take for construction of Federal-aid highways.

"In some cases, their appraisals were up to 300 percent higher than detailed valuations determined by Beasley & Beasley. These cases involved extensive land tracts.

"Threats go with bloated appraisals

"The Traveler learned the bloated appraisals were submitted in some cases under threat of losing the State's business if the fee appraisers failed to comply.

"However, the Federal Government will not have to pay for these excessive land-taking costs.

"The BPR in January cut off payments to Massachusetts for highway right-of-way taking based on State department of public works appraisals.

"The Federal Government usually reimburses the State for 90 percent of the costs of land-taking and construction of the vast Interstate Highway System within the State.

"It also pays the State half the cost of land taking and construction under the so-called primary, secondary, and urban highway construction program.

"Most of these facts were contained in a Beasley & Beasley report forwarded by the BPR to the House Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

"Two thick volumes of investigation results and an accompanying letter were sent to the subcommittee that has been investigating reported abuses in the interstate highway program nationwide.

"The report dealt with alleged land appraisal excesses in Wakefield and part of an Interstate Highway 95 project in Attleboro and North Attleboro.

"Two additional volumes were expected to be sent to the subcommittee within a few days with additional details on the Attleboro-North Attleboro project.

"The valuation engineering firm, which previously has worked under contracts with the Army, the Navy, and the BPR, is expected to complete a study of the Gardner area next month.

"In addition to this study, the Bureau's project examination division has been investigating suspected land valuation excesses in Massachusetts since January, when Federal payments were halted.

"The Bureau's agents still are operating within the State.

"The letter transmitting the reports to Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, subcommittee chairman, told how some excess appraisals were devised.

"The letter said 'certain fee appraisers retained by the State' used misleading information and ignored available data that would have supported lower valuations.

"Thus, the letter said, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices for unimproved nearby land far in excess of true value.

"The letter continued:

"'At the same time the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values.'

"Thus, if there was a $30,000 house on a lot worth $10,000, the land alone would be appraised for $40,000 to justify an excessive valuation for a property to be taken in the vicinity.

"The Traveler learned the puffed valuations were on only a small percentage of the properties involved in land takings in the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro areas.

"The investigation showed land appraisals were reasonably accurate on smaller properties.

"Yet, the Traveler's sources said the excessive valuations would run into 'millions of dollars'—considerably more than originally suspected when the investigation first was undertaken.

"And the State already has paid for some land takings based on these overvaluations, the Traveler learned.

"But no Federal money has reached the hands either of the State official or the appraisers involved. The appraisers are paid fees based on their work.

"Normally, the Federal Government would reimburse the State half of the highway improvement cost under the primary secondary, and urban Federal highway program.

"The project in Wakefield, now in the construction stage, involved a widening of Route 128.

"It is a 3.3-mile stretch skirting Wakefield's northern boundary from North Avenue to the Saugus River, including the Lowell Street interchange.

"It originally was planned in 1956, designed in 1957, and authorized for acquisition in 1958 and 1959. The State filed its required declaration of land taking in August 1959.

"The Attleboro project on which the investigation still was incomplete, involved two stretches of interstate highway totaling 6.6 miles.

"The first part extended 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through industrial-commercial property to a point north of Thacher Street.

"The second stretch was 2.1 miles from just north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point north of Kelley Boulevard.

"Hundreds of land tracts are involved in the land-taking process that will clear the way for the new highways. The exact number still is undetermined as the investigation continues.

"The precise number of fee appraisers involved in the overvaluations also was undetermined. It was believed to be a comparatively small number.

"A Traveler source said some of the appraisers apparently worked actively with the State official while others were 'coerced.'

"Since Federal money didn't change hands, any official charges against these persons based on Justice Department investigation, probably would be something like conspiracy.

"Under State procedure, appraisals approved by the State department of public works are sent to a five-member real estate review board for review.

"However, this group meets only once weekly and lacks facilities for investigating the basis on which the submitted appraisals were determined."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 18, 1960]

"UNITED STATES PLEDGES COMPLETE PROBE OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY LAND COST

"(By Tom W. Gerber)

"WASHINGTON.—The chairman of a Federal highway investigating subcommittee Wednesday pledged a complete rundown on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal aid highway program.

"Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat of Minnesota) told the Herald his group was going to find out about U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' evidence that overvaluations totaled 'millions of dollars.'

"GOP member wants faster action

"BLATNIK, whose subcommittee was formed to watchdog the biggest construction undertaking in world history, said he hoped to send investigators to Massachusetts within a month.

"But the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, of Ohio), told the Herald the investigation should be started immediately.

"'There's no reason why the subcommittee staff should not conduct a complete investigation at this time,' SCHERER said.

"SCHERER, reached Wednesday night soon after his return from Cincinnati said the Massachusetts highway scandals were far worse than in Oklahoma.

"SCHERER said he expected to have a further statement on the Massachusetts highway scandals after he had studied BPR reports sent to the subcommittee.

"The subcommittee in May held hearings on the Oklahoma highway scandal. Evidence was developed on falsified reports, payments for work not done, death threats, and juggled claims.

"Meeting August 24

"BLATNIK said the subcommittee would discuss the evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program at an executive session August 24.

"The Minnesota Congressman said subcommittee experts would evaluate data obtained by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley and other

material in BPR files before investigators were sent to the Bay State.

"'I want to make this perfectly clear,' BLATNIK said. 'The situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown.

"However, he said hearings on highway right-of-way appraisals in Massachusetts certainly would not be held before Thanksgiving.

"BLATNIK said no hearings would be held until after the November elections.

"Politics charge feared

"'We could be accused of playing politics,' he said.

"But SCHERER disagreed. He noted the Beasley & Beasley reports and BPR-developed information already had been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for 'appropriate action.'

"'The committee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward,' he said.

"The BPR reports to the subcommittee and other information obtained by the Herald implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket.

"However, the official was not named in the reports.

"But it was learned he exerted 'pressures' on State-hired fee appraisers to 'compromise their independence,' in making true market value appraisals.

"Up 300 percent

"Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-appraisal racket while others were coerced by the threat of losing State business if they failed to cooperate, the Herald learned.

"Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent over subsequent appraisals by Beasley & Beasley, it was learned.

"The valuation engineering firm from Washington, D.C., was hired by the BPR in May to investigate and doublecheck information developed by the BPR's project examination division since January.

"That was when the Federal Government shut off land-taking reimbursements to the State under the Interstate Highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a full audit.

"The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion Interstate program and half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

"Two areas covered

"However, despite this 8-month holdback of Federal funds, the Herald learned the State already has paid for some of the land that was excessively appraised.

"The BPR report to the subcommittee, prepared by Beasley and Beasley, covered Federal-aid highway projects in two Massachusetts areas—Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro.

"The Wakefield project was a widening of Route 128 along a 3.3-mile stretch around the community's northern bulge. This is under the primary road program.

"The Attleboro-North Attleboro project was in two parts of proposed Interstate Route 95.

"No comparison

"The first stretched for 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through costly industrial and commercial property to a point near Thacher Street.

"The second was a 2.1-mile segment from north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point just north of Kelley Boulevard.

"However, the Beasley and Beasley reports of these projects contained only painstaking appraisal of each land parcel involved in the highway construction.

"There was no comparison with State appraisals.

"This was contained in other BPR data not sent to the subcommittee, but to which the subcommittee was given access.

"A Herald source said two additional volumes covering other land appraisals in the Attleboro area would be sent to the subcommittee of a later date.

"Many values upheld

"In addition, the Herald learned another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area also was under BPR and Beasley and Beasley review.

"Study and analysis of this area was expected to be ready next month.

"The Herald's source said hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch thick reports sent to the subcommittee. However, he said only 'a small percentage' of the appraisals received by Beasley and Beasley had been found to be valued excessively.

"Generally, he said, the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

"Nevertheless, the Herald was told authoritatively the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into 'millions of dollars.'

"At the outset of the investigation this spring, it was believed the overvaluations would range only in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

"How was it done

"In a letter transmitting the report to the subcommittee, Public Roads Commisisoner Ellis L. Armstrong told how fee appraisers justified excessive valuations.

"The letter to BLATNIK said State-hired appraisers used 'misleading information' and ignored 'available data' that might support a true valuation.

"'For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true value,' the letter said.

"And the Herald learned these appraisers sometimes ranged as far as several miles from the property they were supposed to be appraising to find more costly land they could cite to support an inflated appraisal.

"Up to lawyers

"The Herald's source emphasized the suspected appraisers and the State official involved never collected Federal funds. This money was shut off in January.

"However, intentional overappraisals submitted in expectation the State would be reimbursed with Federal funds possibly could be considered conspiracy.

"But this was up to the Justice Department to determine.

"Meanwhile, both the BPR and the Beasley and Beasley investigations continued."

"[From the Boston Traveler, August 18, 1960]

"MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL WORST YET

"(By Tom Gerber)

"WASHINGTON.—Preliminary evidence indicates the Massachusetts highway scandal is bigger than all six under congressional investigation in other States put together, an informed source said today.

"The source, which is close to the investigating subcommittee, would not name the other six States currently under probe.

"However, he said the Massachusetts situation also involved more money than scandals previously uncovered in Arizona, Indiana, and Oklahoma.

"The Executive Council today rejected a proposal to halt State land-damage payments during the Federal investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

"Councilor Augustus Means, sole Republican member, proposed the freeze and cast the only vote recorded in favor.

"He called attention to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads investigation of Massachusetts land appraisals in the Federal-aid highway program.

"'Something is apparently brewing in the Department of Public Works and the U.S. Government,' he said. 'This body should not continue to approve any more land damages until the matter is cleared up.'

"Councilor Joseph R. Crimins, one of seven Democrats voting against the motion, said a halt in payments would hurt small property owners whose homes had been taken for new highways.

"Democratic Councilor Patrick J. McDonough bitterly attacked Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts, and the Herald and Traveler.

"He said the newspaper's stories about the Federal investigation were 'phony and padded' for the benefit of SALTONSTALL.

"'SALTONSTALL will have all kinds of Federal men here to produce phony headlines,' he said.

"He told the council that similar Federal investigations are going on in every State of the Union. No single State is being singled out, he said.

"Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, Minnesota), chairman of the highway investigating subcommittee, said his group will make a complete rundown on evidence that excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program totaled millions of dollars.

"BLATNIK said he hoped to send subcommittee investigators to Massachusetts within a month.

"Asks probe right now

"But the ranking subcommittee's minority member, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio), suggested the investigation should begin immediately.

"In an exclusive story in yesterday's Traveler, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads reported it had evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program.

"The BPR report to the subcommittee covered Federal-aid highway projects in Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro. The report was prepared by Beasley and Beasley, a valuation firm from Washington, D.C.

"The report and other information obtained by the Traveler implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket. The official, however, was not identified by name.

"Pressures exerted

"But it was learned he exerted pressures on State-hired fee appraisers to compromise their independence in making true market value appraisals.

"Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-up appraisals, while others, it was learned, were coerced with threats of losing State business if they didn't cooperate.

"Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent higher than appraisals subsequently made by Beasley and Beasley, it was learned.

"The firm was hired by the BPR in May to probe into information developed by the Bureau's project examination division since January.

"During January, the Federal Government suspended land-taking reimbursements to the State under the interstate highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a complete audit.

"The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion interstate program. It pays half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

"BLATNIK told the Traveler his subcommittee will discuss the evidence of bloated

appraisals in Massachusetts at an executive session August 24.

"Subcommittee experts will evaluate it before investigators are sent into the State, he added:

"'I want to make this perfectly clear,' he said, 'the situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown.'

"But he surmised that hearings on the evidence would not be held before the November elections. Otherwise, he added, 'we could be accused of playing politics.'

"SCHERER disagreed, noting that the Beasley and Beasley reports already have been turned over to the U.S. Department of Justice for appropriate action. He said:

" 'The subcommittee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward.'

"In addition to the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro projects, the BPR also is reviewing another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area, it was learned.

"Study and analysis of this area is expected to be ready next month.

"Hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch thick reports sent to the subcommittee. But only a small percentage of the appraisals received by Beasley and Beasley had been found to be valued excessively, a source said.

"In general, he explained that the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

"Nevertheless, the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into millions of dollars, it was reported."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 19, 1960]

"FBI TO PROBE STATE SCANDAL IN LAND TAKING

"(By Paul Costello)

"The FBI will be called in within one week to investigate the alleged millions of dollars in excessive appraisals for rights-of-way in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program.

"The Herald learned Thursday night that the U.S. Justice Department has been kept informed of the preliminary investigation of large-scale land damage frauds by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and it has decided to call the FBI into the case.

"Three investigations

"The FBI inquiry will be conducted separately from the Bureau of Public Roads investigation and from the investigation being conducted by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley.

"All that remains to be completed before the FBI steps in is the filing of a formal request by the Justice Department and the completion by the Bureau of Public Roads of its final draft of the preliminary report based on its 7-month Massachusetts study.

"The BPR broke the scandal Wednesday in a letter to a special House subcommittee set up as a watchdog on the billion-dollar Federal-aid highway program throughout the Nation.

"The FBI entrance into the scandals comes on the heels of announcement Wednesday by subcommittee Chairman Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK that preliminary reports of BPR and Beasley & Beasley warranted a complete rundown on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

"BLATNIK said then that he hoped to send committee investigators into Massachusetts within a month.

"Turns over files

"However, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio), told the Herald that there was no reason why staff investigators shouldn't start on the case at once.

"The Bureau of Public Roads turned over its files in the case to the Justice Department Wednesday. The Justice Department, on the basis of BPR information, decided to call in the FBI.

"The evidence presented by the BPR showed that at least one high State official has been implicated in the right-of-way scandal.

"This official has not been identified pending submission of evidence to a Federal grand jury, but the Herald learned he exerted pressures on State-hired fee appraisers to compromise their independence, in making true market value appraisals.

"Beasley & Beasley, which was hired by the BPR in May to double check and develop evidence uncovered by BPR investigators since January, has reported some appraisals were inflated by as much as 300 percent.

"Started in January

"The BPR launched its review of the Massachusetts phase of the Federal highway program in January after shutting off land-taking reimbursements to the State as the result of reports of widespread abuses here.

"The Federal Government reimburses the States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion interstate program and pays 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

"The preliminary BPR report, which is the basis for the FBI being called in, covered Federal-aid projects in Wakefield along Route 128 and in the Attleboro-North Attleboro area on Interstate Route 95.

"The investigation by the FBI will be a brand new study. The BPR material will be used only to supply leads for FBI agents to follow.

"Under usual procedures the FBI would turn over the results of its investigation to the Justice Department, which then must decide whether to seek indictments before a Federal grand jury.

"Stormy session

"In a stormy session of the executive council on Beacon Hill yesterday Democratic councilors defended the department of public works and the Furcolo administration in the right-of-way scandal.

"The storm broke when the lone Republican on the council, Augustus G. Means of Essex, introduced a mild motion requesting that the council refrain from acting on pending land-taking cases until the Federal investigation has been completed.

"The council defeated the motion 7 to 1 and then approved 39 land-taking damage awards.

"Means, who reminded the councilors that 'it is this honorable body' that must in the last analysis pass on all land takings, said 'something is brewing in the department of public works * * * and I urgently request that we suspend action until it is apparent these land takings are in order.'

"Councilor Joseph Ray Crimmins (Democrat, Somerville), seconded Means' motion 'just to get this out in the open,' and then challenged Means to produce evidence of wrongdoing in the DPW.

"The strongest comments came from Councilor Patrick J. McDonough (Democrat, Boston), who charges the published stories out of Washington on the Massachusetts investigation are 'phony, padded stories for the benefit of one LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.' "

"[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 19, 1960]

"GOP DEMANDS ACTION IN MASSACUSETTS ROADS PROBE

"(By Tom W. Gerber)

"WASHINGTON.—Republican Members will seek a showdown Wednesday on their demand that a congressional subcommittee begin an immediate investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

"They will press their demand in an executive session of the House Highway Investigating Subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, Minnesota).

"Want to defer probe until after election

"BLATNIK and the other 12 Democratic members of the 19-man group want to put off any inquiry until after the November election. They don't want to embarrass the Massachusetts Democratic administration and thus indirectly Democratic presidential nominee Senator John F. Kennedy.

"Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio) is expected to lead the minority fight for an immediate inquiry.

"Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, Massachusetts) said the BPR's 'shocking charges * * * must be investigated to the fullest.'

" 'This, I am confident responsible Federal authorities will do,' he said.

" 'Personally, I know nothing more of this matter than what I have read in the newspapers. But to pass this matter off merely as election-year politics demonstrates careless disregard for the taxpayers' interest and public trust.'

"Although the subcommittee has not yet sent its investigators to Massachusetts, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is pressing ahead with its inquiry. Moreover, the FBI is expected to launch an independent investigation next week.

"The BPR investigation already has turned up evidence that Massachusetts appraisers inflated right-of-way land appraisals for Federal-aid highways by millions of dollars.

"The BPR turned over its preliminary files in the case to the Justice Department on Wednesday for 'appropriate action.' The Justice Department, in turn, decided to call in the FBI.

"High State official under suspicion

"A high State official is under suspicion, it was learned, of pressuring State-hired appraisers to 'compromise their independence' by inflating their estimates of land values.

"The independent appraisal firm of Beasley & Beasley, hired by the BPR to check the right-of-way properties, has indicated some values were ballooned by as much as 300 percent.

"The Federal Government reimburses States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion Interstate Highway program, and 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

"Since the BPR shut off reimbursements to Massachusetts last January, however, no Federal money has been paid out for the inflated appraisals.

"Federal courts nevertheless could prosecute participants in the inflated scheme for conspiracy to defraud."

And while the subcommittee is investigating these alleged right-of-way irregularities in the Bay State, I commend to its attention the possibility that there may be some liberties taken with the Federal purse in the awarding of contracts for consulting engineering work by the Massachusetts Public Works Department. I especially would like the subcommittee to investigate the possibility that these contracts may have been awarded on a political patronage basis to J. L. Hayden Associates and to Thomas Worcester, Inc., both Massachusetts firms. Of prime concern should be: Are any of these moneys and large funds being returned to the campaign coffers of the party faithful? The basis for my information and concern are some recent newspaper clippings from the crusading Boston Herald, which some good public-spirited citizen of the State of Massachusetts recently sent to me. Because some Members of the House do not read the Boston papers and because I want to be help-

ful to the chairman of my subcommittee, I request that the newspaper articles just mentioned also be printed at this point in my remarks. They are articles entitled: "Parkway Brochure Cost $46 Each," in the Boston Herald dated August 23, 1960; "'No Comment,' says Ricciardi," in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; "Thomas Worcester Charged With $180,784 Tax Evasion" in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; "Company Made Payments on Bogus Bills, Trial Told" in the Boston Herald on August 25, 1960; "$23,000 Brochure Job Sublet for About $5,000," in Boston Herald on August 25, 1960.

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

"PARKWAY BROCHURES COST $46 EACH

"(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

"The Furcolo administration paid $46 per copy for 500 "Commemorative Brochures" on the proposed President Adams Parkway, the Herald learned last night.

"Study still going on

"Some $23,000 of the taxpayers' money was shelled out to J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., one of the administration's pet consulting engineering firms, for preparing the 44-page, 9-inch by 12-inch brochure.

"The money was spent by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works at the suggestion of Governor Furcolo despite the fact that the Federal Government is spending $25,000 for a study of the feasibility of establishing such a parkway.

"Furcolo and his newly appointed commissioner of public works, Jack Ricciardi, announced last week that a parkway from Faneuil Hall, Boston, to Plymouth was being considered. The existing portions of the southeast expressway from Boston to Quincy as well as the Plymouth bypass would be incorporated in the new roadway that calls for construction between Quincy and Kingston, according to the Governor.

"Just why the souvenir booklet which is largely a collection of pictures and facts researched from various historical books and societies, was not put together by the DPW's regular staff of public relations consultants has not been explained.

"Ostensibly the brochure was prepared to help influence the Federal Government on the necessity of constructing another parkway through the south shore to Plymouth in addition to the expensive southeast expressway and Route 3A.

"More likely, according to one leading Democrat, the huge outlay was made to supply Governor Furcolo with some publicity aimed at garnering votes for him along the south shore in his bid to unseat Senator SALTONSTALL. The timing of the announcement during the current political campaign would seem to bear this out, especially since the brochure was prepared last winter.

"Most statehouse and Capitol Hill observers see little or no chance of an additional highway—which by the DPW's own conservative estimate would cost a staggering $76 million—being built by the State or Federal Government along the south shore in the foreseeable future.

"'If approved' clause

"That the State has no intention of spending a dime of its own for construction of the parkway is manifest from the tenor of the statements by Furcolo and Ricciardi when they launched the trial balloon about the road last week. Both officials qualified their statements about the proposed parkway with a handy 'if approved by the Federal Government' escape clause.

"The Federal officials who are studying the feasibility of establishing (not necessarily constructing) a President Adams parkway were in Boston the last week of July conferring with representatives of the Boston office of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State public works department."

"One official at the Bureau of Public Roads told the Herald he was sure the Federal Government would balk at constructing any great amount of new roadway for the parkway and would insist on using existing roads like Route 3A or the entire length of the Southeast Expressway when it is completed through Hingham, Norwell, Hanover, Pembroke, and Kingston to the Plymouth Bypass.

"He pointed out that a freeway to the western suburbs, as recommended in the 1948 master highway plan, would have to be built before the South Shore gets another new highway, especially if the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority is unable to finance extension of the turnpike from Weston to Boston.

"Started in 1959

"The firm which authored the expensive brochure is one of the up and coming professional engineering firms in Massachusetts. J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., doing business at 1340 Soldier's Field Road, Brighton, was incorporated on April 9, 1959.

"The firm's incorporation papers, on file at Secretary of State Joseph Ward's office, show that John L. Hayden of 14 Richland Road, Wellesley, is president and treasurer. Clerk is Philip A. Brancucci, lawyer, of 10 Arlington Street, Cambridge. The corporation's three directors are listed as Hayden, Brancucci and Alice P. Kavanaugh of 54 Kenmore Road, Medford.

"J. L. Hayden Associates is only one of four related firms whose president is Hayden and whose offices are at 1340 Soldier's Field Road. Other corporate papers on file at the State House reveal that Hayden is also president of Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc.; Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc.; and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co., Inc. This latter firm is known as Persco.

"All of these firms, with the exception of Persco, have been the recipients of several lucrative consulting engineering contracts from the Furcolo administration in recent years.

"Many contracts

"There are many consulting engineering firms doing business with the Department of Public Works which lets the vast majority of its engineering work out on contract to private firms on the grounds that the department does not have enough qualified engineers to handle the tremendous work load occasioned by the State's huge road program.

"A check of the DPW's contracts with these firms shows that the Hayden companies have been unusually successful in convincing State officials not only of the value of their work but also of the diversity of their capabilities.

"Following is a rundown of some of the Hayden firms' contracts with the DPW and its division of waterways:

"1. A $921,000 lump-sum contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Charles A. Maguire & Associates for consulting engineering work on the Inner Belt. The two firms presumably are splitting the work.

"2. An $878,000 contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., for consulting engineering on a portion of Interstate Route 195 which runs between the Rhode Island border at East Providence and New Bedford.

"Eighteen-million-dollar cost

"The firm's slice of this roadway is a segment between Fall River and Westport. Estimated construction cost of this piece of roadway is $18 million and the engineering fee granted H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc., amounts to 4.88 percent of this or $878,000. Through last May the firm had received a half million dollars for the work it had done to date. Although consulting engineering fees for highway construction jobs generally run about 4½ percent, the 4.88-percent fee to the Hayden concern is not unusual.

"3. A $225,000 consulting engineering fee for work on a $6 million construction segment of the same road, Interstate Route 195, between Seekonk and Swansea. This contract also involved H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc.

"4. A $148,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates for an extensive study of the State's highway needs as well as recommendations for a detailed program of future construction in Massachusetts. This presumably was the study that resulted in the billion-dollar-highway program that Furcolo unsuccessfully recommended to the legislature this year.

"5. An $84,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates to review and study for possible revision and rewriting the DPW's manuals, guides, and specifications.

"Waterways projects

"6. A contract between the division of waterways and J. L. Hayden Associates for consultant services on certain waterways projects. As of last January the Hayden firm was paid $8,811 for its work, principally survey work, on Quequechan River in the Fall River area where the river's channel was being relocated.

"Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co. were incorporated on April 7, 1955. Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., was incorporated April 30, 1957, while J. L. Hayden Associates was formed on April 9, 1959."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

"NO COMMENT, SAYS RICCIARDI

"State Public Works Commissioner Jack Ricciardi of Wellesley late yesterday gave a 'no comment' answer to State Auditor Thomas J. Buckley's 154-page report sharply criticizing the DPW.

"Ricciardi, a former deputy commissioner, said he had just received the bulky document and asked for time to study it.

"CONTRACTS CITED

"Buckley's report made mention of a deputy commissioner who received an average of $14,000 annually as a consultant for more than 2 years.

"It also singled out for criticism the granting by the DPW of 44 separate under-$1,000 contracts to a single painting contractor as a 'device to circumvent the laws.'

"It was pointed out that under State law only contracts of $1,000 or more require competitive bidding. The 44 contracts referred to in the audit of the highway division of the DPW were 'each for $125 less than the statutory limit of $1,000.'

"Buckley reported they went to one painting contractor for work confined to a single section of the East Boston Expressway.

"The report also criticized payment of $775,812 for corrective construction at the Roy C. Smith Bridge on the Southeast Expressway near the Neponset Interchange in Dorchester. The payment was made, the report said, despite a ruling from the attorney general that the contractor was at fault.

"Buckley also questioned the award of a lump sum contract for $84,000 for professional engineering services which should have been performed on a cost-plus basis; 'overruns' on construction projects due to consistent failure of preliminary plans to show either the terrain or the makeup of the area with any degree of accuracy; changes in a connecting roadway contract on a road in Philipston at a cost of $83,000 despite the attorney general's disapproval, and failure of leases for gas stations and restaurants to spell out responsibility for local real estate taxes.

"PAYMENTS HELD UP

"The Buckley report did not identify the deputy commissioner involved as a consultant, but Ricciardi readily admitted the State auditor had him in mind.

"The audit also charged the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has held up payments of $6,721,817 on land damage cases, pending the outcome of its probe into claims of overpayment for land taken for federally aided roads.

"The same Federal agency, the report said, has withheld approval of a bridge at Fall River due to a question concerning the safety of steel girders. The report says welding problems have arisen and that as a result the Bureau has not been billed for $655,396 for this project.

"Buckley's report contends that specifications for highway construction failed to properly identify the type of terrain. It said many examples were shown of ledge being found instead of earth and other variances.

"Because of the varying charges for removal of peat, earth, or rock, Buckley said the overrun charges on one contract in Methuen amounted to $76,000.

"The report also cited a Middleboro contract where overrun charges of $222,778 were made on one contract for gravel borrow alone. In the same contract, Buckley said the overrun for digging out peat came to $44,500.

"Review audit cited

"The State auditor also took issue with payment of $9,894.48 to a consultant for a review audit of one of Buckley's own audit reports on the department.

"Buckley pointed out that his previous criticism of leasing of parking lots without bids resulted in the DPW's cancellation of contracts and the advertising for bids.

"A comparison of the bids, he said, showed the high bids will amount to $70,578.60 annually, whereas the negotiated leases on the same lots amounted to $7,020 per year."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

"THOMAS WORCESTER CHARGED WITH $180,784 TAX EVASION

"Thomas Worcester, 63, president of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, went on trial before Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and a jury in U.S. district court yesterday charged with evading income taxes totaling $180,784.

"Worcester, of Putnam Street, Waltham, is charged with evading personal taxes totaling $74,582 for 1950, 1951, and 1952, also taxes of $106,202 allegedly owed by his firm for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. The Government alleges he filed false returns understating his own and the corporation's income.

"It is charged that his personal net income during the 3 years involved totaled $263,156 but that he reported only $112,162 in his returns.

"Also, that the company's net income for the years 1950 and 1951 amounted to $209,114, but that only $48,457 was listed in the returns.

"Assistant U.S. Attorney Norman A. Hubley, in his opening to the jury, said the Government would show that Worcester channeled large sums out of the firm and into his own hands. He said the funds were diverted to two other concerns through fictitious expense charges."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

"COMPANY MADE PAYMENTS ON BOGUS BILLS, TRIAL TOLD

"Philip W. Murphy, former comptroller of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, testified in U.S. district court yesterday that the company made large payments to another firm on the basis of "fictitious" bills and vouchers.

"Asked by Lewald the purpose of the Ross Turner concern, Murphy said, 'Mr. Worcester needed to have a considerable sum of money and the partnership was formed in order to bill the Worcester company for services, and the Worcester company in turn would make checks payable to Ross Turner & Co.'

"Murphy, a resident of East Bridgewater, was called as a Government witness at the trial of Thomas Worcester, head of the engineering and construction firm, on income tax evasion charges.

"Say $180,784 evaded

"Worcester, 63, is charged with evading taxes totaling $180,784 by filing false returns for himself and his firm. Included are personal taxes of $74,582 allegedly owed for 1950, 1951 and 1952, and $106,202 allegedly owed by Thomas Worcester, Inc., for 1950 and 1951. Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., is presiding at the jury trial.

"Murphy, under questioning by Assistant U.S. Attorney George H. Lewald, testified that payments totaling $105,240 were made by the Worcester company in 1949 to a newly organized firm called Ross Turner & Co., which had been set up in an office on State Street.

"The firm was a partnership whose members comprised Worcester, Murphy and two other employees of the Worcester firm. Murphy, who worked as comptroller directly under Worcester, said the payments were made purportedly for 'engineering services' rendered to the Worcester company by Ross Turner & Co., but that actually no services were made. The checks covering the payments, said Murphy, were signed by Worcester and himself."

"[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

"TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLAR BROCHURE JOB SUBLET FOR ABOUT $5,000

"(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

The consulting engineering firm which was handed a $23,000 contract for preparing 500 commemorative brochures on the proposed President Adams Parkway sublet the job to a Boston advertising agency, the Herald learned last night.

"Job turned over to ad agency

"J. L. Hayden Associates, which was paid $46 a copy for each of the brochures, turned the job over to Parsons, Friedmann & Central Advertising Agency of 69 Newbury Street almost immediately after signing the contract with former State Public Works Commissioner Anthony DiNatale.

"DiNatale quit his post as head of the DPW recently but was commissioner on December 8, 1959, when the agreement between the State and the Hayden firm was set up.

"Although mystery continued to shroud some aspects of the brochure, several developments were uncovered by the Herald.

"Here are the known facts in the strange case:

"Commissioner DiNatale and John L. Hayden of Wellesley who is president of J. L. Hayden Associates and two other firms which have been paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past year for consulting engineering work in a variety of DPW projects, including the updating of DPW manuals and publications, signed a contract December 8 providing for the parkway brochure.

"Shortly thereafter Hayden or one of his representatives called Robert Friedmann, treasurer and account executive of the advertising agency, and requested the agency to go to work immediately on the project.

"It is not clear whether Hayden made the call because his secretary reported that he had 'gone on vacation' and she 'didn't know when he would be back' when the Herald attempted to question him about the brochure.

"At any rate, the agency contacted Wintrop Printing & Offset Co. of 141 West Second Street, South Boston, and asked the firm to quote a price on the job.

"It was explained the job had to be done as fast as possible even if it involved overtime.

"The firm submitted a price somewhere in the vicinity of $2,000 and was given the job.

"Roy E. Orrall, an executive of the printing firm, said his company printed the brochure but referred all questions about it to Friedmann.

"Raymond E. Parsons of South Weymouth, president of the advertising agency, said he was not familiar with all of the details of the brochure.

"About $5,000

"He did say the total value of the job was 'about $5,000' and this included the printing of the brochures as well as the creative work the agency put into the preparation of the original copy.

"Parsons indicated he thought his agency was given the job because the firm had considerable experience in producing historical material. The famous folder on Boston's 'Freedom Trail,' was considered an outstanding guide on the city's historic sites, was prepared by his agency.

" 'I can say that we were entirely ethical,' Parsons said. 'We prepared the brochure at a price customary for such work. It was within the normal price range that any agency would have charged.'

"Parsons indicated that the total cost for the agency and printing company's efforts did not exceed $5,000.

"Several mysteries

"Several mysteries still remain in the strange case of the parkway brochure:

"1. Why did the Furcolo administration pay Hayden Associates $23,000 for a job that apparently was worth considerably less?

"2. Why the tremendous Christmas rush to complete the job 'as fast as possible.' even if it meant overtime? The brochure was not released to the press until last Friday, August 19—some 8 months after it was completed.

"3. Why do DPW records show that the work on the brochure was done between January 11, 1960, and February 3, 1960, when it now has been established that the work was jammed through in December 1959?

"4. Why was a professional engineering firm that was busy with a multitude of other Department of Public Works contracts chosen to do a brochure that was primarily a historic and scenic guide that was more properly the work of an advertising agency?"

"[From the Washington News, Aug. 23, 1960]

"HIGHWAY CHARGES FLY ON HILL

"Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican of Ohio, today charged a Democratic-controlled investigation committee is deliberately covering up a Massachusetts road-building scandal which is 'the granddaddy of them all.'

"Representative SCHERER, ranking minority member of the House Highway Investigating Committee, said the road building skullduggery being investigated by the committee 'looks like peanuts' compared with the Massachusetts situation.

"He flatly accused Committee Chairman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat of Minnesota, of arbitrarily deciding to stop 'all further hearings because the Massachusetts scandals had to be kept under cover until after the election.'

" 'He's a liar,' Representative BLATNIK retorted. 'We've been in touch with the Massachusetts situation all the time. There's no change in tune.' "

I do not know if the "political considerations," referred to by the Chair, means that to expose this Massachusetts matter prior to election would be embarrassing to some Democratic politicians in the Bay State who are offering their credentials to the voters this fall. Nor do I know if exposure would prove to be a Teapot Dome or another Hoffa-

Beck episode. But I find this forbearance is a remarkable thing under the circumstances and, I fear, it will serve no worthy cause other than to obscure the true facts which the public ought to know and to undermine public confidence in the objective of an important committee of Congress. Accordingly, I urge our subcommittee to move into Massachusetts forthwith and prepare this hearing as soon as possible, letting the chips fall where they may. This alleged scandal has been known since January and further delay cannot be justified on any ground other than narrow political expediency.

OTHER UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There are also other areas of our highway program which I have long urged in vain that our subcommittee investigate and inform the Congress. These areas raise the questions of whether congressional policies are sound and are being administered properly by both Federal and State officials. It may be that these matters are not as "glamorous" as exposing corruption and laying hold of some scandals whose perfidy is rightly aired before the bar of public scrutiny, but they are nonetheless important. Without being exhaustive, the following list of objectives ought to engage the attention of our forum:

1. The reevaluation of the provisions for extending the Interstate System beyond 40,000 miles; and, if this policy is sound, establishment of a standard to determine when and where such extension shall be made.

2. A reevaluation of the decision that the system shall serve both local needs and through traffic as well, together with some clarification of the policy vis-a-vis the location of interchanges.

3. A review and clarification of the policy regarding design standards relating to the use of multiple-lane highways as opposed to two-lane highways and design standards of interchanges.

4. Review and clarification of the policy regarding construction of the Interstate System between population centers, and connecting links into population centers.

5. Review and clarification of the policies regarding route locations as such decisions are related to the economic impact of the highways on the affected community.

6. Review and clarification of the policies relating to promotion of an integrated highway system and their implementation in the system's projects to date.

7. Reevaluation of the present policies relating to highway bridges over navigable waters with the view to developing different but adequate standards for bridge construction under the Federal Bridge Act.

8. Reevaluation of the policy providing for payment of the costs of relocation of utilities on highway right-of-way on to highway construction.

9. Clarification of reasons for the wide variation between the cost estimate of 1955, upon which the 1956 act was based, and the revised cost estimate submitted to Congress in 1958.

10. Investigation of the extent to which defense needs become the determining factor in route location and mileage.

Mr. Speaker, this entire highway program will be up for reappraisal by the Congress early in the next year. Unless some of these areas indicated above are explored, there simply will not be any record of facts and evidence which can form a solid foundation for the Congress to legislate upon or to base an informed examination of the present laws. If the new Congress is to raise some $13 billion in new revenue to help this Interstate System out of its financial dilemma, such inquiries as I have suggested must be answered. I would feel that I have failed to protect the best interests of all Americans, including my own constituents in the First District of Iowa, if I did not take this last opportunity in the waning days of this Congress to renew my demands, voiced on the floor of the House (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, pp. 11322–11325 and often in committee hearings, that these areas be timely explored. I sincerely hope that this can and will be done and that when the new Congress returns in January, we can have the benefit of such investigations.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman's complaint on the membership of the committee is not quite clear to me, although it may be very valid. I would point out to the gentleman that the ratio on many committees is 12 to 6. If I recall correctly there are quite a few committees in the House where the ratio is 2 to 1. The gentleman made reference to the political aspects of the Highway Committee but did not give any substantiation of it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I mentioned it.

Mr. BLATNIK. What political situation does the gentleman make reference to? He does not name anybody.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There are several instances of record, but I must confess I did not come prepared to argue this particular point. There are members on the gentleman's side and some on my side who I am sure agree with me on this point.

I should point out that the gentleman interrogating me is chairman of the committee of which I speak. I would remind him that the division of the committee membership is not 12 and 6, but it is 13 and 6. This is completely out of proportion, and I cite to the gentleman the record that has been made by this Congress. I refer the gentleman to two important committees, the Labor Rackets Committee and the Committee on Small Business. They are pretty well balanced.

Mr. BLATNIK. I made myself clear. The gentleman may have a valid point and I do not dispute his position, when he says that there ought to be a closer division on this committee than two to one. Certainly that is true of committees in some instances, and of subcommittees, but I again direct my question; what is political about the subcommittee? I must confess I feel a reference is being made to me as chairman of that committee last year, and I do not recall any charge being made that it was political. Will the gentleman state for the record something definite?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will be glad to cite the record of our own committee where I think the chairman himself had some comments about certain people playing politics. He may have been right. His accusation, of course, was made about people across the aisle.

Mr. BLATNIK. The chairman can speak for himself, and I will at a later time, but I am addressing myself to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am referring to the record.

Mr. BLATNIK. What is the gentleman's basis for the complaint that the gentleman makes about the committee being political?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I mentioned one charge about politics that was made, or at least suggested by the chairman. We find that in the committee report. I have not the record before me so I cannot give the gentleman the exact date and page of the report. That statement was made in which the chairman at least inferred that there was politics on our side.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is the gentleman who says there was politics. I do not remember saying so. But let the record show what politics this committee was playing. Tell us of our own experience any instance that would lead the gentleman to believe that politics was being played? That is a rather serious charge.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have very few representatives or employees on the committee studying these irregularities in connection with construction in various States. I have a feeling that maybe for political reasons you have not completed the studies and reports and investigations that ought to be made in some of the areas into which we have gone. I feel that we have not made as much progress as we should have. I recall one instance in the State of Florida where the newspapers have exposed the activities of a member of the highway commission down there. If a half or a third of those charges are true there is more money involved and more corruption involved and more disregard of the public interest in the activities of this one man than has been characteristic or true of all the investigations we have made so far. It can be said that due to the fact this man is a political appointee maybe it is because of politics that we have not made any more progress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Why does the gentleman say a second time that maybe it is because of politics? It is or it is not. The gentleman stated the committee was political minded. I am asking in all fairness that the story be told. Now, will the gentleman indicate instances that can be substantiated? His is a serious charge and a serious reflection on the committee, and I want a statement rather than innuendos. What has the committee done that the gentleman should tell me in the well of the House and in the official record of this body that the committee was politically motivated or politically bent? The gentleman complains only that the ratio of membership was not satisfactory.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I do, and it was motivated by politics.

Mr. BLATNIK. One illustration quoting what I said is not sufficient. Give me an example.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The Republicans had no chance to sit down with the majority Members and discuss any place the procedures and methods we were going to use in this investigation. We had no voice in selecting the employees of the committee. They were all selected by the majority.

Mr. BLATNIK. The majority always selects committee employees.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to remind the gentleman that this has not been true in the case of many other investigating committees of the Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is true of our parent committee, the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am speaking now of the special investigating committees that have been created by the Congress since the 80th Congress.

I placed in the RECORD a report of a study that I made on this question sometime last year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman give us one instance in which the committee played politics?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I said that you certainly did not recognize the Republicans when you went to set up the procedures on how you were going to proceed. We were not counseled on what States we were going into or what areas we were going into.

Mr. BLATNIK. Let the RECORD show that the committee never moves until an executive session is held and a full review made of the case and only at that point is the decision made by the members in executive session whether or not they feel that the findings warrant a public hearing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I recall in one instance I read in the newspapers we were going into a certain State before the executive committee had any hearings; at least, I was not notified of any executive committee meeting to be held on Florida, for instance. I read about that in the newspapers. I was not counseled. I did not know until I received a letter from a staff member, or possibly it was from the chairman himself just when we were going to have it.

Mr. BLATNIK. I received no complaint from the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Now, if you have complaints about not being consulted, bring them to him first and do not take the time and the expense of the House to air a complaint.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The minority leader is not here, but I think he can speak for himself. I have a feeling that he agrees substantially with what I have said and done and the statements I have made in regard to this. It is impossible for him because of weather conditions to be here today.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you give us one example of where the committee played politics or give us an indication, even a slight one, of any time where there was any politics played by the subcommittee?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have not proceeded with any hearings in the States where we started.

Mr. BLATNIK. In what State?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, we have not, according to your own statement. We postponed the hearings in Oklahoma.

Mr. BLATNIK. We did not postpone Oklahoma. We completed the Oklahoma case.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The RECORD does not show that, and I do not understand that to be the case. I understood we were going to come back, and the Governor of Oklahoma said he would come back.

Mr. BLATNIK. He stayed here all the time. He was never recalled. If it was necessary for him to appear, of course, he would have. Of course, all that occurred before he ever became Governor of Oklahoma, anyway. I am puzzled by the gentleman's observations.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I am puzzled, too.

Mr. BLATNIK. And I am puzzled by these peripheral statements and arguments that are being made by the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There is reason to believe that the public does not have and probably will not continue to have the type of confidence they ought to have in our committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. They will never have confidence in view of the irresponsible statements made here. No evidence has ever been brought or no illustrations have been brought to the attention of the House Members to justify those arguments.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I suppose the gentleman will take issue with any statement I make in that regard.

Mr. BLATNIK. I do not, but I just want the RECORD to show and I am pressing the gentleman to give me one example where politics was played. There may be other reasons, but you are saying politics were played.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think because we have not moved as fast as we should in certain directions.

Mr. BLATNIK. How many committees have moved as fast as they should? But is that political?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I interpret it as such in this case.

Mr. BLATNIK. And that is the only illustration the gentleman has to submit to substantiate his charges of political interference.

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY—JOHN BRENNAN, CHIEF OF BAYONNE, N.J., FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in Bayonne, N.J., on December 29, John Brennan, the chief of the Bayonne Fire Department performed a heroic act that went beyond the call of duty. In doing so, he made us pause to reflect just how dependent we all are on each other.

In the midst of a roaring oil fire that threatened the entire city already shaken by tank explosions he crawled through the flames to turn off the valve that was feeding the fire from an 18,000-gallon propane tank. In weighing the risk of the entire tank exploding and in disregarding the consequences, he saved the city from great tragedy.

His action was of heroic proportions for he gambled his life in order to save the lives of others. This is the greatest sacrifice within the capability of man.

It should create in all of us an awareness that each day our firemen and policemen accept this challenge as part of their daily life. It may be that for long periods of time most firemen or policemen are not required to accept such a challenge. But the fact is that all of them are ready to accept such a challenge upon accepting their position. We all take for granted their courage and their acceptance of bodily harm and injury in the interest of the public safety as much as we take for granted that they wear blue uniforms. Let us pause once in awhile when we see the service blue to thank our firemen and our policemen for doing so much for all of us for very little return. Chief Brennan's action typifies all firemen and all policemen—ready to defend us and ready to sacrifice their lives for us. The next time we are prone to criticize let us instead praise them for what we know—that our community is a better place to live because of them.

Let us understand them better and let us understand each other better. Not only will understanding make life more pleasant but it can only be through understanding that we can ever achieve peace.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the following editorials from the Bayonne Times, the Jersey Journal, and the Newark News paying tribute to Fire Chief Brennan, Bayonne firemen and to the many volunteers who participated in this great public service. These editorials are typical of the editorial comment throughout the country who commented on this heroic performance:

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Dec. 31, 1960]

DISASTER AVERTED

But for the efficient and heroic efforts of Bayonne's firemen, the conflagration Wednesday night amidst petroleum stocks and exploding gas tanks might have exceeded the Constellation disaster in terms of human lives lost.

Fortunately, as was not the case aboard the incompleted carrier, there was no conflict of command; no confusion in direction. The men under Fire Chief John Brennan, who risked his own life by crawling under volatile tanks to reach a cutoff valve, did their job with creditable precision.

As a result, the exploding inferno was confined to the yards. Nearby homes did not catch fire. No lives were lost.

Many of those who live in the potentially dangerous surroundings of Constable Hook have expressed their gratitude to the men who answered Bayonne's general alarm. Appreciation for their services is something firemen deserve but seldom hear.

HEROISM OF FIRE CHIEF MOVES EVERYONE BUT HIM

Fire Chief John T. Brennan didn't tell his six kids about his role in averting a major disaster when he went home to change clothes yesterday morning. He had just risked death by crawling between flames to

shut off the main valve of an 18,000-gallon propane gas tank that was feeding the fire and causing explosions of smaller gas cylinders at the Sun Gas Products Co.

He left home quickly, without sleep, to begin a long day of work and answering questions—from everybody, especially reporters—and coordinating cleanup and investigation tasks.

KIDS MOB HIM

When he got home at night, though, the kids knew about it—and so did everyone else who reads newspapers, watches television, or listens to the radio.

The youngsters, from 2 to 12, mobbed their daddy at the door to add their congratulations to the widespread plaudits he has received.

Commissioner John E. Januszewski gave the most dramatic thanks to the 38-year-old fire chief when he said, "If that tank had exploded, it would have been the end of Bayonne."

Reporters talking with Brennan yesterday wouldn't have known from the way he spoke that he had a played a hero's role.

He said that all his men faced death in the line of duty as they wet down five huge Bayonne Industries storage tanks scant yards away from the propane, each of the two-story tanks holding 1,680,000 gallons of fuel oil.

If one of those tanks had ruptured, the firemen would have been engulfed with blazing oil. The ensuing fire would have made the sky-piercing blaze at the propane yard look like a candle in a hurricane by comparison.

This morning, when asked how he felt the day after the excitement, Brennan, fire chief only since October 1, answered sleepily:

"I don't feel anything at all."

[From the Bayonne (N.J.) Times, Dec. 30, 1960]

THE DISASTER

Bayonne is entitled to be proud of the work done at the scene of the explosions and fire yesterday morning. The firemen were working under extremely perilous conditions, in cold and ice among inflammables they could only guess at the nature of. They didn't hesitate. Chief Brennan epitomized their spirit when he crawled into a dangerous spot to close a valve that was pouring out a volatile liquid, and when he closed the valve that part of the blaze was soon controlled. Elsewhere other firemen were doing everything that could be done. In the meantime volunteers were converging on the disaster areas, and they pitched in to help.

It does not just happen that the disaster was no worse. It could have been, certainly, if luck had been bad. But it was not good luck that the firemen and their volunteer assistants managed to protect tanks full of inflammables in the neighborhood, and labored to confine the fires with the skill that comes of knowing precisely what is to be done in a given situation. And it is not luck that the Elks and the Mackenzie Post and the Polish American Home were ready to take in the families cleared from the area. That was kindliness and willingness to do anything that might be useful. The Salvation Army was there; the Red Cross sent its volunteers in. Civil defense people were helping. What could have been an appalling disaster was held within limits, and it was skill combined with general willingness to help that did it.

The blasts serve as a reminder that we are in the middle of one of the most dangerous periods of the entire year for fires, traffic accidents, and casual mishaps. It is an excellent time to be careful at home, at work, traveling in between, and anywhere at all. The fire danger is acute because of the strain on heating plants; the traffic danger involves the usual holiday risks aggravated by the new snow on an ice base. And we've been warned. There have been enough fires in Bayonne in the last couple of weeks to last us for a long, long time.

[From the Jersey Journal, Jan. 4, 1961]

HUDSON HERO

Long overdue here is praise for John T. Brennan, the Bayonne fire chief who risked his life in last week's explosions and fire at a gas products company in the Constable Hook section.

Chief Brennan dashed into the heart of the fire to shut off a valve on an 18,000-gallon tank of propane which was feeding the blaze. Other firemen kept hoses trained on him, wetting him down as he made the dash and then crawled under the tank to turn the valve. But Chief Brennan did not ask one of his men to go; he did the job himself.

Chief Brennan joined the Bayonne Fire Department in 1943 and worked up through the ranks to his appointment as chief last September. At 38, he is the youngest fire chief the city has ever had.

When he was named chief, Brennan said he is not the kind to send any man into a fire where he would not first go himself. Last week he proved he meant what he said.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on January 23.

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. CONTE), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. CONTE), for 45 minutes, on January 23.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. CONTE), for 1 hour, on January 18.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. CONTE), for 30 minutes, on January 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN in two instances and to include a copy of a bill.

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include an address.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. DENT.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HERLONG.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. WALTER.

(At the request of Mr. CONTE and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in six instances.

Mr. POFF.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 18, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

283. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc.; transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

284. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Banks for the year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

285. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

286. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the final report of the highway cost allocation study, pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 387), as amended by section 2 of the act approved August 28, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

288. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

289. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend

title 10, United States Code, as relates to the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

290. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

291. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes,' approved August 11, 1950"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

292. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

293. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

295. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to section 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the sums, and balances, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

296. A letter from the Chairman, James Madison Memorial Commission, transmitting the interim report of the James Madison Memorial Commission, pursuant to Public Law 86-417; to the Committee on House Administration.

297. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

298. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled 'An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies' "; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to donate to certain Indian tribes some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

302. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1926"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

303. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1946, with relation to the importation of trademarked articles and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

305. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

306. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to confirm the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

307. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

308. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, pursuant to section 503, title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

309. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting correspondence concerning positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, pursuant to section 503 of title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

310. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, pursuant to section 503 of title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

311. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

312. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

313. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

314. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

315. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters"; to the Committee on Public Works.

316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantation, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 2691. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on pencils and pens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2692. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (college housing) to authorize loans to educational institutions for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, and improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 2693. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to make aid to dependent children available thereunder, even though both parents are still living in the home, in the case of children who are in need because of their parents' unemployment or other inability to provide financial support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2694. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for foster children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 2695. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2696. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2697. A bill to prohibit the Development Loan Fund from making loans to nations in default; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2698. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2699. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2700. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H.R. 2701. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retired pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from June 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2702. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 2703. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2704. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 2705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax reduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2706. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2707. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 2708. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2709. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported citrus fruits and shelled walnuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2710. A bill to amend section 5(B)4 of the Federal Alcoholic Administration Act, title 27, United States Code, section 205(b)(4); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2711. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2712. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 2713. A bill to establish a commission to study smalltown community problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2714. A bill to provide for the establishment of a poultry research laboratory in the Delmarva Peninsula area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2715. A bill designating the first Monday in Fire Prevention Week as National Firemen's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 2717. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2718. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 2720. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 2721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude capital gains and losses from the taxable income of taxpayers other than corporations and to separately tax the net capital gain of such taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 2722. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 2723. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2725. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2726. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2727. A bill to repeal part I of subchapter G of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H.R. 2728. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30 percent limitation of adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2729. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 2730. A bill to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2731. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in employments which expose employees to radioactive material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2732. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that the Secretaries of the uniformed services shall prescribe a reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings upon permanent change of station of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2733. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to provide for correction of defects and omissions in it relating to the regulation of arbitration, to provide for judicial review of questions of law arising in arbitration proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 2734. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 2735. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 2736. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2737. A bill to extend the application of the act of June 11, 1960, to authorize the leasing of certain Indian land in California,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 2738. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 2739. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2740. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2742. A bill to authorize an extension of the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors breakwater; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 2743. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 2744. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 2745. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to exempt employees of certain radio and television stations from the maximum hour provisions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2747. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2748. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to establish a new program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 2749. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities; and to permit for 1 year veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total to obtain disability income protection under national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 2750. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2751. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2752. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the signers for freedom stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 2753. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2754. A bill to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 2755. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a 3-year presumption of service connection for active tuberculous disease cases in peacetime; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend sections 4(a), 4(e), 7(e), and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, relating to rates and contracts of natural gas companies and the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to such companies, and relating to hearings and procedure in proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving natural gas matters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 2758. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance thereunder to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from service-connected disability incurred in wartime or as a direct result of active service during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2759. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 2760. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2763. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 75th anniversary of Temple University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2764. A bill for the establishment of the U.S. Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2765. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 2766. A bill to permit temporary free importation of articles imported solely for exhibition purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2767. A bill for the relief of certain defense-related company employees who performed services during 1953, 1954, and 1955 on a temporary duty basis in the area of Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., or Air Force Plant 42, Palmdale, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 2768. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2769. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 2770. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to strengthen and improve the child-welfare services program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend title B of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 2775. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 2777. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for Indians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2778. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the nonrecognition of gain on the sale of stock where there is reinvestment in stock providing additional capital for domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2781. A bill to amend sections 4(a), 4(e), 7(e), and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, relating to rates and contracts of natural gas companies and the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to such companies, and relating to hearings and procedure in proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving natural gas matters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2782. A bill to authorize the retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act, without reduction in annuity and regardless of age, of employees who have completed 40 years of services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2783. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 2784. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the signers for freedom stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2787. A bill to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2788. A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2790. A bill relating to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on obligations of educational institutions shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 2792. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for reinvestment of capital in a trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE:

H.R. 2794. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to include as creditable service certain service performed in Federal-State cooperative programs financed in whole or in part by Federal funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2795. A bill to establish a water resources commission for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2796. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 2797. A bill to establish the procedure for the determination of the economic justification of certain inland waterway improvement projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2798. A bill to repeal the commodities clause in part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 2801. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2802. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure by corporate officers, directors, and controlling stockholders of the compensation and other benefits derived by them as such, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for reconfirmation by the Senate of certain appointments made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the residence qualifications for voting for President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (by request):

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the reconstitution of the Supreme Court, so that such Court will consist of Justices from the highest appellate tribunals of one-third of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution designating the week of May 22–27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution designating the week of May 22–27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to residence requirements under State laws for voters for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution that the U.S. Mission to the United Nations shall take such steps as might be necessary to have each day's session in the United Nations opened with a prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Res. 107. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 108. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 109. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. Res. 110. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Res. 111. Resolution to establish a select committee to conduct investigations and studies relative to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 2803. A bill for the relief of Roberto Altamoreno Lopez, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Eric Rudolf Heggblad (also known as Erik Rudolf Haggblad); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 2805. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Casserly, his wife, Rosa Muller Casserly, and their minor child, Christopher Allen Dacks (also known as Christopher Allen Casserly); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Vagharshag O. Danielian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Rocco Mescia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Albert Charles Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Marion Manion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2810. A bill for the relief of Anton Sankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2811. A bill for the relief of Peter and Lucia Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2812. A bill for the relief of Milos Vujaklija; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 2813. A bill for the relief of Zu Kong Lien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 2814. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil and Edward G. Trousil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 2815. A bill for the relief of Miss Olinda Di Carlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 2816. A bill for the relief of CWO James M. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2817. A bill for the relief of John Hsueh-Ming Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2818. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Talusan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2819. A bill for the relief of Dr. Martino Maines Almogela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2820. A bill for the relief of Pedro Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2821. A bill for the relief of Fotios Koutras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 2822. A bill for the relief of Gregoire A. Kublin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 2823. A bill for the relief of Betty Sandra Fagann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2824. A bill for the relief of J. Ross Reed, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2825. A bill to provide clear title to certain real property of James L. Ralphs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2826. A bill to provide for the sale of certain desert lands to M. Penn Phillips; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2827. A bill for the relief of Hinshaw's Department Stores, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2828. A bill for the relief of Rose A. Fadel-Idriss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2829. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Mizuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2830. A bill for the relief of Gen Gay Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2831. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 2832. A bill for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Franziska Aloisia Fuchs, nee Tercka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2834. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stavros N. Nicolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2835. A bill for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 2836. A bill for the relief of C. Edwin Alley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 2837. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property owned by the United States to Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN by request:

H.R. 2838. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 2839. A bill for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 2840. A bill for the relief of William Tsun W. Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 2841. A bill for the relief of Aznife Achkhanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 2842. A bill for the relief of Cesare Nannizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 2843. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hermino Cabrera and his wife, Gloria A. Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2844. A bill for the relief of Lew Sang (also known as Loo Sung or Lou Yee) and Chin Ah May (also known as May Mark Chin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ramaben Chimanbhai Patel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 2846. A bill for the relief of Aurora Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2847. A bill for the relief of Warren H. Johnson and Aleta A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 2848. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Sandor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2849. A bill for the relief of Alda Palmerini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Miss Madeline A. Bushbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 2851. A bill for the relief of Miss Clare O'Halloran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 112. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 2676 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

34. By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Petition of citizens of Louisiana relative to charges against Judge J. Skelly Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. By Mr. STRATTON: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Gloversville expressing its opposition to any increase in rates for telephone services in upstate New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

36. Also, petition of 190 citizens of New York State, circulated by members of the freshman class of the Morris Central School of Morris, N.Y., urging the Congress to consider a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college and substituting the decision of the total electorate as expressed in the popular vote as the method of selecting the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to a redress of grievance and requesting that a bill of relief be introduced in his behalf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Gold Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, I introduced H.R. 2573 on the subject of gold, not only because of the magnitude of our balance-of-payments dilemma, but because of the need for increasing the domestic gold production of the United States, and the need of our gold miners for a fair chance to do just that.

Of vital concern to all Americans is the necessity of stemming the rapid outflow of gold from the United States. Since January 1, 1958, our gold supply has dwindled $3.7 billion from $22.9 billion on that date to $19.2 billion on July 1, 1960. During the same period foreign claims have increased from $14.9 billion to $18.5 billion, leaving only $0.7 billion of free gold. If this trend continues at such a rate our country will soon be in critical monetary trouble. In fact since the above figures were issued, our gold supply has dropped to $18 billion.

One reason for the decline in our gold stock is the virtual disappearance of gold production under the American flag, caused by the fact that the present price of gold of $35 per fine ounce fixed by law in 1934 is now the equivalent of only $15 in purchasing power as compared to the purchasing power of the dollar in 1939. This is approximately proportionate to the increase in the cost of mining for gold, and has created a situation which has driven most of our gold miners out of business.

Another factor is the imbalance between new production and sales by the Treasury for industrial, professional, and artistic use. This is illustrated by the following figures for calendar year 1959:

Issued by mint for industrial, professional, and artistic use	$82,403,755
U.S. new gold production	57,225,000
Imbalance in 1959	25,178,755

In addition $28,734,755 in bullion was issued by private refiners and dealers against which $22,875,510 was recovered in the form of scrap, some small portion of which was returned for monetary use, the exact figure not stated by the Treasury.

My bill is designed to do three things: First, stimulate new domestic production of gold by raising the price to be paid therefore to $70 per fine ounce; second, increase the income of gold producers without loss to the Government on resales to industry; third, induce dealers who supply gold for industrial, professional, and artistic use to shop abroad for such gold as they need over and above their recovery of gold derived from scrap. They would prefer to pay $50 or less per fine ounce, for example from foreign sources, than pay $70 per fine ounce from the U.S. Treasury. This would relieve the U.S. Treasury from having to part with any gold for such nonmonetary purposes and presumably enable retention of at least $82 million per year instead of issuing it for industrial uses, not counting the inflow of an increasing amount of newly mined gold. However, the Treasury would be standing by to supply gold to industry, upon request, at $70 per fine ounce.

All this would be accomplished without disturbing our international arrangements for settlement of trade balances and redemption of foreign dollar credits on the basis of $35 per fine ounce.

Although my bill would not constitute a major solution of the highly complex and serious gold problem, it would be a step in the right direction, besides giving a boost to our gold miners. Accordingly, in behalf of this legislation, I solicit the consideration and support of my colleagues in the Congress.

Major Laws or Provisions Expiring in 1961 and Other Deadline Dates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of chairmen of several committees, I enclose a memorandum on laws expiring in 1961, given to me by Jesse Laventhol, executive assistant of the Office of Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives.

Major laws or provisions expiring in 1961 and other deadline dates

Date	Expiring law or provision	Latest public law	Committee
Mar. 31	Extension of Sugar Act of 1948 fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers and giving President authority to readjust Cuba's quota.	86-592	Agriculture.
	Price support for milk and butterfat	86-799	Do.
	Authority of ICC to guarantee loans to railroads	85-625	Interstate.
	Deadline for report from Joint Committee on Internal Revenue on study of procurement and renegotiation policies under Renegotiation Act.	86-89	Ways and Means.
June 14	Authority of Secretary of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft	86-746	Interstate.
June 30	Authority for temporary $8 billion increase in national debt from $285 to $293 billion	86-564	Ways and Means.
	Corporate income tax rate of 52 percent and existing schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, autos, parts, etc.	86-564	Do.
	Authority for 1-cent increase in Federal gasoline tax (from 3 to 4 cents for 21 months) and parts of excise revenue, to finance highway program.	86-342	Public Works.
	Termination date for refund of certain sugar taxes	84-545	Agriculture.
	Airport Act authority for construction grants-in-aid to States	86-72	Interstate.
	Water Pollution Control Act	84-660	Public Works.
	Mutual Security Act	86-472	Foreign Affairs.
	School construction and operation aid in impacted areas as to children of persons who do not both reside and work on Federal property.	85-620	Education and Labor.
	Authorization of special milk program in nonprofit schools, child care centers, etc	85-478	Agriculture.
	Authority of SBA to charter small business investment companies	85-699	Banking and Currency.
	Authority of SBA to make loans to State and local development companies	85-699	Do.
	Authority for hospital construction loans under Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act	86-372	Do.
	Farm housing research program	86-372	Do.
	Refinancing loans for family-size farms under Bankhead-Jones Act	85-332	Agriculture.
	Authority for entry of certain aliens of nonquota status	85-253	Judiciary.
	Dual rate contract agreements in shipping industry	85-542	Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
	Suspension of duties on import of metal scrap	85-606	Ways and Means.
	Expiration date of Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	86-78	Interior and Insular Affairs.
July 1	Authorization for primary and secondary highway systems and extensions into urban areas	86-342	Public Works.
	Tax on general telephone services	86-564	Ways and Means.
	Reduction from 10 percent to 5 percent on transportation of persons	86-564	Do.
	Free importation of gifts from servicemen abroad	86-99	Do.
July 14	Authority to make supplementary advances on special livestock loans	86-516	Agriculture.
	Assessment and refund or credit under income tax treatment of dealer reserve income	86-459	Ways and Means.
Oct. 1	FHA home repair insurance, college construction, and community facilities loan programs	86-788	Banking and Currency.
	Public housing authorization; mortgage insurance for armed services housing and voluntary home mortgage programs.	86-372	Do.
Nov. 9	Termination of 2-year extension of Civil Rights Commission (carried in Mutual Security Appropriation Act)	86-383	Judiciary.
Dec. 31	Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure expire	86-287	Do.
	Mexican farm labor program	86-783	Agriculture.
	Authority to commit construction reserve funds under the Merchant Marine Act	86-237	Merchant Marine and Fishery.

Problems of the Aged: Our Foremost Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this week the eyes of the Nation are focused on the White House Conference on the Aging which is meeting here in Washington pursuant to a resolution of the 85th Congress. As a cosponsor of that resolution, I wish to extend a warm welcome to the more than 2,500 delegates who are gathered here today.

The task which confronts them is an enormously complex and challenging one, covering as it does the vast range of the pressing problems which beset our aged population. It is the anxious hope of everyone of us—legislator and citizen alike—that the Conference will result in sound guideposts and positive proposals for their ultimate solution.

The host of issues which faces the White House Conference, and ultimately this 87th Congress, range from financial security to housing, from employment discrimination to medical care. And perhaps the most pressing of these is the latter.

In my opinion, the results of the Conference may well be judged by the way in which they deal with the medical needs of our senior citizens.

Facing the delegates is the basic fact that despite the efforts of insurance companies to increase the number of health insurance policyholders among the aged population, it is clear that they are unable to provide the kind of insurance older people need at a price they can afford. A study recently released by the Public Health Service shows that while 74 percent of the people in the United States between the ages of 25 and 44 have hospital insurance, only 46 percent of those 65 and over are similarly insured. Even less—37 percent—have surgical insurance, and only 10 percent have doctor-visit insurance which provides protection against the costs of nonsurgical care, diagnostic examinations, and other physicians' services.

Both political parties have espoused the principle that the Federal Government should do something to assist in providing our older people with some protection against the costs of expensive medical care. They have, of course, disagreed on the method by which this should be done. We Democrats believe that a program of medical care for the aged should be established as part of our social security system. The approach of the Eisenhower administration to the problem, as expressed during the great debates between the two presidential candidates, is to provide benefits under a Federal grant-in-aid program administered by the States.

There are several distinct disadvantages to this latter approach. The overriding objection is that it would involve a means test, which would require everyone to declare that his income was below a stated amount before he would be eligible to receive benefits. I do not think it is necessary to subject people to this humiliation. This plan suffers from another weakness in that it would require every State to adopt a separate program and furnish State funds to provide for these benefits. The natural outcome of such a system would be a jungle of administrative complexities, a patchwork of benefits varying from State to State, and an additional burden on the already overburdened State treasuries.

Granting that the necessity exists for furnishing medical care for older people—and everyone concerned with the problem agrees that it does exist—the most effective, efficient, and socially desirable method of meeting it is through the established administrative framework of the social security system. Under this system a person will be able to provide for his medical care needs after retirement through regular payroll contributions made during his working years. The retired persons would thus be entitled to benefits without having to subject himself to the embarassment of meeting a means test.

These considerations are clearly recognized in the report of the New Jersey delegation to the White House Conference on the Aging—prepared by the Division of Aging of the New Jersey Department of State. After pointing out that 75 percent of New Jersey's population over 65 receive social security benefits, with an average monthly income of $62.33, the report concludes that first, most people aged 65 and over have incomes so low they cannot adequately meet their medical needs; second, when the medical needs of those covered by OASI are met, the largest part of the problem will have been solved; and third, the health insurance needs of the aging can best be met through appropriate changes in the old age and survivors insurance program with supplemental private or voluntary coverage as required to meet individual needs.

I urgently commend these conclusions to the other 49 State delegations which are meeting in Washington this week.

For the Relief of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York would be reimbursed more than $4.4 million for "unusual expenses" incurred during last fall's United Nations General Assembly session under the terms of a bill I introduced last Thursday, January 12, 1961.

The bill would amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 by adding a new section to authorize the Secretary of State to pay the expenses in a lump sum. The period involved is from September 19 to October 14 of last year when Nikita Khrushchev, Fidel Castro, and other heads of state were in New York acting as heads of foreign delegations to the United Nations.

The host city of New York should not, as a matter of commonsense and fair play, be forced to shoulder the full burden of these expenses. The city provided security in the area of the United Nations, guarded the several heads of state during their stay in this country, regulated huge crowds and assigned hundreds of policemen and others to control extremely unusual occurrences.

New York city officials have been pressing for a Federal payment to offset heavy losses during the stormy U.N. session last fall.

My bill sets the exact amount of reimbursement at $4,404,000, which was arrived at by figuring time and a half for the employees involved. I believe it is an equitable figure, and I hope I will have the support of my colleagues in the House for this bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. 2447

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287–287e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. The Secretary of State shall pay to the appropriate officals of the city of New York, State of New York, the sum of $4,404,000 as reimbursement to that city for the unusual expenses incurred by that city during the period September 19, 1960, to October 14, 1960, both dates inclusive, in providing police and other protection for the headquarters area of the United Nations, in protecting the heads of foreign governments and foreign delegations attending the United Nations, and in providing security and other services required by the presence of such heads of foreign governments and foreign delegations."

The 87th Congress Should Take Immediate Action on H.R. 591, Designed To Prohibit Unjust Discrimination in Employment Because of Age, Since Enactment of Such Legislation Has Been Urged for Years by the Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my efforts to cooperate with the Fraternal Order of Eagles in its campaign to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age, I have reintroduced the bill I had pending in the 86th Congress on the subject.

For the past several years the Fraternal Order of Eagles has been in the forefront of the effort to encourage employment for persons over 40 years of age under a national program titled "Jobs After 40."

Recently I was in contact with Mr. Arthur S. Ehrmann of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at which time I informed him of my intention to reintroduce the legislation sponsored by me in the 86th Congress. Mr. Ehrmann asserted that the Fraternal Order of Eagles is seeking legislation at both the State and National levels to combat the increasingly grave problem. He stated that "the Eagles are supporting bills in the various State legislatures seeking to add to the 11 States which already have on their books laws prohibiting job discrimination based solely on age."

It is my sincere hope that my bill H.R. 591 will receive early and favorable consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently at the age of 76, the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, the metropolitan archbishop of the Philadelphia See of the Byzantine Rite of the Ukrainian Catholic Church passed on. Apart from those Ukrainian Catholics living in New England, Archbishop Bohachevsky was the spiritual head of 300,000 Ukrainian Catholics in the United States. We may be sure that one of the archbishop's last thoughts—perhaps his last temporal meditation—concerned the present fate and the future of the great Ukraine country whence he, his ancestors and his spiritual flock derived. One of the so-called Soviet Socialist Republics, this mighty region of more than 170,000 square miles, with its ancient capital of Kiev, stretches from White Russia on the north to the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov on the south. Compared with the wretched Baltic States, the Ukraine, like the other 10 Soviet Republics, enjoys some autonomy; but that is not the same as pure, life-giving independence such as this country, too, once struggled to achieve. Today, the 41 million people of the Ukraine long for a restoration of the nationhood which they briefly enjoyed during the years 1918–20 before they were entangled in the vast and sinister "spider web" which stretches from the walls of the Kremlin to enmesh one-sixth of the surface of the earth.

In this country the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee has taken upon itself the task of keeping alive the ardent desire for independence of a politically enslaved people whose area, population, and wealth of natural resources could make them a great force for peace and stability in a troubled world. To this end, the committee has assumed the task of disseminating such information as can be smuggled beneath the Iron Curtain against the day when the bells of ancient churches, long since fallen into disuse, may, as did once our own tocsin of independence, "proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Baring—Right of the Blind To Organize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to speak briefly in behalf of my bill H.R. 1921 to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organization of the blind. I have previously introduced this bill along with many other Members in the past and I should like to emphasize, at this time, that I shall continue to press for its enactment.

The bill is brief and simple in language, but it would give every blind citizen their constitutional right to freely associate themselves without threat or fear and to express their views with regard to programs that closely affect their well-being and their opportunities.

I might say that, during the 85th Congress, the Subcommittee on Special Education devoted most of its time to the education bill, and it was only at the end of that session that they were able to offer brief hearings on H.R. 8609, which was then the number of my bill. Following discussions with Chairman CARL ELLIOTT, it was deemed expedient to reintroduce the bill during the 86th Congress in order to insure the committee's full consideration since they could not allocate sufficient time at the end of the 85th Congress to hear all those who requested the privilege of testifying for or against the bill.

In March 1959 the Subcommittee on Special Education did conduct hearings on H.R. 14, the new number of the right to organize bill, together with 60 similar bills, and at that time the committee did consider several other bills which would establish a commission designed to inquire into all services provided to blind persons. The committee's decision was to defer action on all blind bills and to conduct a special study into the needs of all disability groups. Exhaustive workshop studies consumed the balance of time so that the 86th Congress adjourned without taking action.

The 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution assure all American citizens the right to freely assemble and to join with others of their own choosing, to promote their goals and purposes, the right to speak freely on all matters which concern them, and the right to make known their views and their opinions to their representatives in government. I admit that our blind citizens do possess these rights, but as brought out in the hearings, as a matter of general practice, many of these rights have been denied a number of blind citizens. That is why I have introduced this bill. I am not going to elaborate on the situation in detail. I have read and seen more than adequate evidence to convince me that certain organizations for the blind have interfered with the rights of blind persons to join organizations of the blind and that administrators of programs for aid and rehabilitation of the blind have refused and continue to refuse to consult with representatives of the blind in the execution and administration of those programs which are intended solely to benefit blind persons.

Some blind people do have special needs that Congress has recognized but the administrators of the programs which have been established to provide these services have authority to evaluate such needs and to withhold the services that have been authorized by Congress. This is why my bill is essential to the welfare of every blind citizen. It is simply an enunciation of their constitutional rights, which provide, first, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the extent practicable, consult with representatives of organizations of the blind in the formulation, execution, and administration of programs of aid and rehabilitation of the blind and that he encourages State agencies receiving Federal funds for such programs to do likewise; second, it prohibits any official or employee of any program of aid or rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds are contributed to use the influence of his position to prevent any blind person from joining an organization of the blind.

I urge its support by every Member of Congress.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of United Lodge 174, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Altoona, Pa., October 15, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1960, United Lodge No. 174, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Altoona, Pa., celebrated its 75th anniversary with a banquet attended by over 700 persons.

Among the distinguished guests present was W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who congratulated the officers and members of lodge No. 174 on the growth in membership and for many accomplishments.

It was my privilege to address the banquet and my remarks follow:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF UNITED LODGE 174, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1960, AT JAFFA SHRINE TEMPLE, ALTOONA, PA.

It is a privilege and an honor for Mrs. Van Zandt and me to be invited to attend

this 75th anniversary banquet of Lodge No. 174, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

My joy is twofold, because being a former railroad employee here in Altoona I have known many of you all my life.

Then, too, many of you knew my grandfather and my father, for the name Van Zandt has always been identified with the railroad families of this area.

The occasion also gives me the opportunity not only to congratulate the officers and members of lodge No. 174 on the celebration of your diamond jubilee, but also to salute your peerless leader, President W. P. Kennedy, who before and since his election as president at your 1946 national convention has served you faithfully and well in various offices of trust.

Incidentally, on September 21 it was my honor, at the invitation of President Kennedy, to address the dinner meeting at Cornell University held in connection with the 3-day Educational Institute of Railway Labor Organizations sponsored by the five operating brotherhoods.

President Kennedy, who is regarded as one of the most highly respected labor leaders in the Nation, played an important part in the proceedings of the institute.

From a legislative standpoint, for many years, I have known your national legislative representative, Harry See, of Washington, D.C. Harry and I have conferred frequently during sessions of Congress on legislation affecting the railroads and their employees.

I can assure you that Harry See, together with your great president, Mr. W. P. Kennedy, form a fine legislative team, as evidenced by the respect and esteem in which they are held in congressional circles.

On the local scene, your officers, whom you have elected over the years to guide the destinies of lodge No. 174, have always been men of great integrity. The result has been that lodge No. 174 has reflected in a true and effective manner the ideals and objectives of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which for over 77 years has served its membership with fidelity and in a true spirit of helpfulness.

As members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, you enjoy the reputation and prestige that your brotherhood has earned in the field of organized labor.

You may well be proud of 75 years of affiliation with one of the most highly respected organizations of the labor movement.

Therefore, on the occasion of your diamond jubilee, it affords me great pleasure to extend to lodge No. 174 heartiest congratulations on this happy anniversary and best wishes for your continued growth and success.

Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the field of espionage which I feel deserves the early attention of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The limitation upon the application of existing espionage laws to acts committed either in the United States, on the high seas, or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States has prevented prosecution of acts of espionage committed against the United States in foreign countries. There is no justification for such a limitation. It is imperative that the laws of this Nation protect it from acts of espionage committed abroad as well as at home.

To give our criminal laws such extraterritorial effect is not novel. In the case of *United States* v. *Bowman* (260 U.S. 94), the Supreme Court held that citizens of the United States while in a foreign country were subject to penal laws enacted to protect the United States and its property. Crimes against the United States committed abroad are triable, under section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, in the district where the offender is found, or into which he is first brought.

Similar legislation has twice before passed the House of Representatives, but has failed for want of action by the other body. I am hopeful that the bill can be handled early enough this year to reach the other body well in advance of the date of adjournment.

Aid to Investment Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill designed to aid investment companies to police their own business.

This legislation, amending section 36 of the Investment Company Act, was enacted at the close of the last Congress as one of a number of amendments to that act. Unfortunately it proved impossible to bring the House and Senate bills to conference at that time. The problems of the investment companies are still to be dealt with.

This legislation, as I said in the debate on its passage last year, is intended to give the management of an investment company the power to put its own house in order. It permits the directors of such a company, after board action, to request any of its directors, officers, agents, or employees to furnish the board a detailed account of their personal dealings. If the person of whom such a request is made fails to comply within 30 days, the corporation is authorized to go to an appropriate court and seek an injunction restraining the person in question from continuing to function as an officer or director or controlling person, directly or indirectly, in the investment company field.

The need for this legislation is increasingly apparent. The new management of Investors Diversified Services, the underwriter and investment adviser for the largest group of investment companies in the world, managing some $3 billion in assets, has recently found evidence indicating the existence of violations of the Investment Company Act by the preceding management group. In spite of repeated requests from its successors, the old group has refused to make any voluntary disclosure to them of its personal dealings or transactions during its management tenure.

The SEC is now conducting an investigation of certain of these matters after receiving a complaint from the new management group alleging violations of the law, some carrying with them criminal penalties. Seventeen lawyers and accountants of the Commission's staff have been assigned to this task.

The Commission's order dealing with part of the information supplied it by the new group states that:

Members of the Commission's staff have received and reported information to the Commission which tends to show that:

A. Since January 1, 1950, certain of the directors, officers, affiliated persons and others in a control position with the above captioned companies, by reason of said relationships, caused the custodian banks of these companies to make and maintain deposits of funds in other specified banks, following which certain of such persons borrowed funds and obtained credits for the personal use and benefit of such persons from such specified banks.

The order further recites that:

The information reported to the Commission by members of its staff, as set forth in section II hereof, if true, tends to show possible violations of various sections of the statutes administered by the Commission.

Of these sections, section 49 of the Investment Company Act provides:

PENALTIES

SEC. 49. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this title or any rule, regulation, or order hereunder, or any person who willfully in any registration statement, application, report, account, record, or other document filed or transmitted pursuant to this title or the keeping of which is required pursuant to section 31(a) makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact necessary in order to prevent the statements made therein from being materially misleading in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; but no person shall be convicted under this section for the violation of any rule, regulation or order if he proves that he had no actual knowledge of such rule, regulation or order.

The proposed amendment would establish a simple and quick procedure in such circumstances, enabling an investment company management to secure the information it needs to determine that its members, agents, or employees have complied with the laws we have enacted for the control of investment companies and the securities business in general.

I should also like to point out to the House that the passage of this legislation will serve to alleviate some of the heavy enforcement burdens which the SEC now bears. As I mentioned earlier, the SEC has assigned some 17 people to one such case alone. If the parties themselves had the authority which this legislation grants, the SEC could employ those people on other matters. I believe that the procedure of resolving intracorporate matters as provided in the legislation is consistent with our philosophy of a minimum of Government interference in the internal operation of business enterprises.

The Van Zandt Bill, H.R. 273, Provides a Realistic and Long-Range Local-Federal-State Program for Area Redevelopment in Areas of Chronic Unemployment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch advocate of area redevelopment legislation it is gratifying to witness the renewed effort being made in this Congress to enact a bill designed to alleviate chronic unemployment in the depressed areas of the Nation.

Since 1954 I have consistently supported area redevelopment legislation and during that time on various occasions I sponsored bills on the subject. In addition to voting for the area redevelopment bill in the 86th Congress, I joined advocates of the legislation in the effort made to override the Presidential veto of S. 722. Therefore, it is my desire to emphasize that I am prepared during the 87th Congress to support any version of area redevelopment legislation when perfected and ready for a vote by the House.

Despite our efforts over the period from 1954 to 1960 to enact area redevelopment legislation the records show that so far we have accomplished nothing. Now with the opening of the 87th Congress the opportunity is again before us to discard the perennial bickering and the endless discussions that have occurred over the lack of progress in enacting area redevelopment legislation. As the record will show many area redevelopment bills have been introduced in the 87th Congress including my bill, H.R. 273 which I introduced on January 3, and which provides a local-Federal-State program of area redevelopment.

Because of the imperative need to alleviate chronic unemployment in some 30 States immediate approval of area redevelopment legislation is a must for this Congress. Like many other of my colleagues it is my desire that this important subject receives early and favorable consideration by Congress.

For the past several months I have devoted much thought and study to the various versions of area redevelopment legislation as introduced in Congress for the past several years. In this connection I conferred with members of the faculty of the School of Business Administration of the Pennsylvania State University as well as experts from Federal agencies and representatives of the public utilities, railroad, coal, and allied industries.

As a result of studying the scores of bills and the thousands of pages of testimony given at congressional hearings the past several years as well as analyzing reports on unemployment from a nationwide standpoint, it is evident that the areas of chronic unemployment are increasing and that immediate congressional action is required.

In my own congressional district in Pennsylvania there are two labor markets where the number of unemployed is over 11,000 representing 12.3 percent of the labor force. This unemployment is not of a seasonal nature because for the past several years due to the decline in the coal and railroad industries these areas in my congressional district have been certified by the U.S. Department of Labor as having substantial and persistent unemployment.

FEDERAL-STATE PROGRAM

In my conferences on area redevelopment, I have found that advocates of aid to depressed areas join me in agreeing that an effective program to aid these areas of chronic unemployment must be based upon a coordinated effort at all levels of government, namely, local, State, and Federal as well as at all levels of private enterprise.

My bill, H.R. 273, is based upon these basic facts. Instead of establishing large, new agencies in Washington to aid depressed areas my bill leaves it to the States and local communities to establish effective programs which will be suitable in solving their own special problems.

In short my bill, H.R. 273, is designed to establish an effective Federal-State program to aid at the community level in alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in nearly 100 areas of chronic unemployment.

A REALISTIC AND LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

H.R. 273 is an entirely new approach in the field of area redevelopment legislation since it provides for a Federal-State program administered by the State and not the Federal Government. My bill provides a realistic and long-range program that will prove effective in alleviating chronic unemployment in depressed areas. H.R. 273 would establish an area redevelopment program similar to Federal-State programs requiring the matching of funds now in operation for airports, sewage disposal plants, hospitals, highways, and so forth.

Under the provisions of H.R. 273 the Federal Government would assist the States to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development by enabling depressed areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies. Under the proposed Federal-State program new employment opportunities would be created by developing and expanding new and existing resources rather than by merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another.

STATE PLAN REQUIRED

States to be eligible to participate in the Federal-State program will be required to submit the State plan to the Secretary of Commerce. The plan must provide for financial participation by the State and must further provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the administration of the plan.

The opportunity must be provided under the State plan for a fair hearing before the State agency to appropriate representatives of areas of chronic unemployment or areas claiming to be economically depressed.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LOANS

Under the provisions of H.R. 273, assistance under the Federal-State program will include authorizing the State to purchase evidence of indebtedness and to make loans to aid in financing any project within an economically depressed area for the purchase or development of land and facilities including machinery and equipment in exceptional cases for small locally developed enterprises for local usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, including shell buildings, and for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings for industrial uses or for the purchase or development of recreational areas and other lands and facilities for tourist usage.

Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase of unemployment in the area of original location.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LOANS

Terms and conditions shall be developed in conformity with the State plan and extended only to applicants, both private and public, which have been approved for such assistance by the State agency.

Such assistance shall not exceed 90 percent and shall be on condition that other funds are available with at least 10 percent of such other funds being provided by the community or local area organization.

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

In addition to providing loans to aid in financing any project within an economically depressed area H.R. 273 also provides for loans for public facilities. It is provided that political subdivisions of the State may obtain loans with a 40-year maturity date to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage if the project will improve opportunities in such areas for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. Such projects would include water systems, building access roads, and so forth.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Another provision of H.R. 273 would provide vocational training or retraining of unemployed individuals in economically depressed areas to enable them to qualify specifically for new employment in such areas in industrial projects assisted under the State program.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance is also provided as an aid to depressed areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information or advice, which are obtainable from the State

government or the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment within such areas.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

It is further provided that the Secretary of Commerce shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various Federal departments and agencies with a list—as obtained from time to time from the State agency—containing names, addresses, and production capabilities of business firms which are located in economically depressed areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services.

Each such department or agency shall keep the Secretary of Commerce fully and currently informed with respect to any procurement transactions which it contemplates and which might be performed by firms in such areas. The Secretary shall obtain and publish semiannually a report from the various Federal departments on procurements actually entered into and performed in each of the areas eligible for assistance under the Federal-State program established by H.R. 273.

STATE REVOLVING FUND

The State plan must also provide for the establishment within the State treasury of a special redevelopment revolving fund from which loans will be made and in which loan payments will be deposited. Payment to States will be made quarterly in an amount equal to one-half of the total amounts expended during such quarter for planning and financing the economic redevelopment of depressed areas in the State.

COST OF H.R. 273

Since the cost of area redevelopment legislation has been of great importance in the effort made during the past 5 years to enact such legislation it is of interest to state that the Department of Commerce, on December 29, 1960, estimates that H.R. 273 will cost the Federal Government about $150 million for the first 5 years. Since the State revolving fund will be replenished by loan payments, the second 5-year period it is estimated will require a Federal contribution of $50 million or a total cost of $200 million over a 10-year period.

It is estimated by the Department of Commerce that the first year's cost by quarters would be as follows:

1st quarter	$500,000
2d quarter	2,500,000
3d quarter	10,000,000
4th quarter	12,000,000
Total first year	25,000,000

For the succeeding 4 years the estimated Federal cost would run as follows:

2d year	$30,000,000
3d year	40,000,000
4th year	30,000,000
5th year	25,000,000
Total cost for succeeding 4 years	125,000,000
Total Federal cost for the first 5 years	150,000,000

It is expected according to the estimate furnished by the Department of Commerce that over the next 5 years the program will average about $10 million a year in cost to the Federal Government.

Concluding its estimate of the Federal cost of the program, the Department of Commerce added:

If anything, the estimates for the first few years may be on the high side. Our estimates assume that the program will get underway fairly quickly. This may be optimistic since most of the States will have to prepare and pass enabling legislation. Furthermore many of the State budgets are made biennially, and this may introduce further delays.

SUPPORTING LEGISLATION TO H.R. 273

Supplementing H.R. 273, I also introduced on January 3, 1961, two other bills; namely, H.R. 274 and H.R. 275 in a three-pronged attack on chronic unemployment in economically depressed areas.

FAST TAX WRITEOFF

H.R. 274 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas. Through such a fast tax writeoff an incentive would be provided to locate industrial or commercial plants and facilities in economically depressed areas.

ALLOCATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

My other bill, H.R. 275, would amend title 10 of the United States Code to give authority to the President to provide for the allocation of defense contracts to areas certified by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial labor surplus.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, these three bills, H.R. 273, H.R. 274, and H.R. 275 if enacted into law will alleviate chronic unemployment in economically depressed areas thus serving as an effective means of solving such a distressing and monumental problem now faced by nearly 100 areas referred to as "pockets of chronic unemployment."

As previously stated I have been consistent in my support of area redevelopment legislation and have been in the forefront of the battle in previous Congresses since 1954 to secure its enactment. During the 86th Congress I served as cochairman on the bipartisan Committee on Area Redevelopment in the House of Representatives. Therefore, let me state again I shall support whatever version of the legislation that is perfected by congressional committees during this session of Congress and sent to the floor for a vote. I am hopeful, however, that my bills, H.R. 273, H.R. 274, and H.R. 275 will receive consideration in committee as I feel their provisions not only represent a new realistic and reasonable concept on area redevelopment legislation but they will aid greatly in solving the chronic unemployment problem in depressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that H.R. 273 which would establish a Federal-State program is a bill of great merit because it will permit the State to administer the program at the State and community level thereby reducing to a minimum Federal interference and placing the initiative for developing and executing an area redevelopment program where it belongs—at a State and local level.

Problems of the Aging Facing the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a substantial portion of Congress time in the next months will be spent in considering the problems which confront our aging population. These problems range from inadequate income to inadequate housing, from the high cost of medical care to discrimination in employment. They require immediate solution if the 16 million citizens over the age of 65 are indeed to face golden years ahead.

I wish to suggest a four-point "crash" program for prompt enactment by this Congress. In my opinion this represents the very minimum which we must do if we are to fulfill our responsibility to America's senior citizens.

The first three proposals I have in mind relate to changes in the social security program. Point 4 is the creation of a Bureau of Senior Citizens.

First and foremost, is an adequate medical care program financed through the social security system. I have already stated why I believe this is the only efficient, effective, and equitable approach to this crucial problem. For too many retired people major illness is a financial nightmare. Let us meet this issue promptly and without further delay.

Second, I suggest that the social security retirement age be lowered to age 60. I believe we should permit those who have contributed perhaps forty working years to retire early enough to enjoy their retirement, if they so desire.

Third, we should eliminate the so-called retirement test, which forces a social security recipient to lose a part or all of his benefits because he has the initiative and ambition to supplement his payments by working. Some of the harshness was taken out of the earnings limitation this last year, but still the basic provision—which denies many retired workers the benefits which they have earned through contributing to the social security system over many years of their working lives—remains. A policy which discourages people from continuing to contribute to our national production as long as they are willing and able to do so, has no place in our social security program.

During the last Congress some 100 Members of Congress, including myself, introduced legislation which would either eliminate the earnings limitation altogether, or change it so that older

workers could earn substantially more than the present amount without risking loss of benefits. This illustrates, I believe, the widespread sentiment that exists throughout the country for ending this kind of income discrimination against older people.

A bill to provide for the establishment of a central agency in the Federal Government to represent the interests of America's aged and aging population should result in some positive action. At the present time there is no single bureau authorized to coordinate the Federal activities in behalf of the elderly. During the last 2 years, the Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and Aging, under the chairmanship of Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, made an extensive study into the difficulties faced by our rapidly increasing aged population. The subcommittee recommended the establishment of an agency similar to the one provided for in the bill which I introduced. In its final report the subcommittee states:

> The aged of this Nation have been buffeted from agency to agency, from committee to council in a separatist, fragmented fashion. They are ready for and require a high level, congressionally created agency concerned with the interrelationship of their problems and speaking out for them.

The subcommittee stated further:

> The creation of a U.S. Office of the Aging will not automatically solve the problems of senior citizens. It should not be visualized as a substitute for action on such matters as financing medical care, increasing social security benefits, meeting the housing needs. It will, however, establish on a permanent basis an agency with authority to undertake positive action nationally and develop cooperative relations with States and local communities in programs for the aging.

The reasons for a Bureau of Senior Citizens in the Federal Establishment are clear and compelling. The increased life expectancy of the individual and the growth of our total population since the turn of the century have brought about drastic changes in the age structure of our society. The fastest growing segment of our population consists of persons 65 years of age and over. They numbered approximately 3 million in the year 1900. Their number presently exceeds 16 million, and is expected to reach 20 million by 1970.

Moreover, during the 20th century our national economy has moved from one based primarily upon agriculture to a highly developed industrial complex, which has brought us not only the blessings of a high standard of living, but also many new social problems. These problems have fallen with special severity upon certain segments of our population, particularly the elderly, who have suffered perhaps more than any other group from the effects of inflation. They have seen their fixed dollar incomes able to meet less and less of the necessities of life.

I recognize that the primary responsibility for assisting our elderly citizens lies with the States. At the same time I believe that each senior citizen has the right and the duty to exercise free choice and to make his own decisions in planning his future. The bill which I have introduced recognizes these facts; but it takes account as well of the need for an agency at the Federal level to help the States, and older people themselves, achieve their goals.

In our dynamic, fast-changing manner of living we should not lose sight of a truth expressed by Franklin Roosevelt, when he said:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

I have faith that this Congress and the new administration will meet this test of progress and will help our senior citizens to leave the ranks of those who have too little.

Contributions of American-Italians to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Christopher Columbus Society of Altoona, Pa., observed its 56th anniversary on October 9, 1960, and as the principal speaker for the occasion I delivered the following address:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN-ITALIANS TO THE UNITED STATES

(By Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the 56th anniversary dinner of the Christopher Columbus Society, October 9)

One of the things that makes our country great is the diversity of its population.

Our far-reaching experiment in the cooperation of almost every imaginable racial, national, and religious strain has resulted in a society unique in the history of man.

It is a society that is indivisible precisely because it is built by the contributions of many nationalities.

Many national groups came to our shores, either to flee from poverty or injustice and to start life anew in a promised land.

Their determination, ideals, and hard work have made America what it is today.

The variety of their cultures has served to provide vitality and strength to our material, spiritual, and cultural development.

In most cases the adjustment of the immigrant to the American way of life was not easy.

Although anxious to come to our land, migrants to our shores had to leave their homes and friends and they faced a new, often bewildering, way of life, an unknown language, and strange people.

Consequently, in spite of the opportunities and material benefits available in their adopted country, it was natural for them to look back with longing at times to familiar things and people in the lands of their birth.

In spite of this natural yearning for their homeland, they were nevertheless eager to become good Americans.

Proof of this desire can be seen in the accomplishments of the various national groups in our society.

Their hard work, skill, and inventive genius; their various cultural backgrounds, customs, and traditions, and their invigorating qualities of mind and temperament, have made America what it is today.

We are indebted to a great many nationalities, races, and religious creeds for their contributions.

We were the beneficiaries of their immigration to our shores.

We needed all their various gifts to aid in the construction and development of our great land.

All these national groups, which make up the greater part of our population, have greatly influenced the American way of life.

They are all an integral part of our Nation.

Therefore, we insist that these Americans never forget, in their efforts to become good citizens, their roots in other lands and cultures.

In fact, we urge them to cling to and to be proud to preserve the best of their heritage, for this serves to enrich our own culture.

Here in America most of us have learned that peoples of all nations are actually very much alike underneath despite the differences that may exist in customs and languages.

In most cases our traditional spirit of tolerance has aided these various foreign groups in their struggle to become Americanized.

Unfortunately, at times, some have not lived up to this spirit and have resented those who happened to arrive in our country later than others.

Some Americans have even been guilty of shameful injustices to certain minority groups.

Traditionally, America has been looked upon by the free world as the leader in the fight for freedom and justice for all peoples.

Consequently, it is the duty of all of us to constantly endeavor to prevent the spread of ill feeling toward national and other groups in our own society.

We know in our hearts that it is mere ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstanding that promotes these sentiments.

For if all of us search our minds we must conclude that human beings of all types will, if they live under similar conditions with the same opportunities for advancement, develop in much the same way.

I think it is particularly appropriate on this Columbus Day celebration before you as a group of Italian-American citizens that I demonstrate the proof of this statement by showing how the Italian immigrant and his children, with the opportunities available in our free society, have developed and prospered as well as any other American.

Most people are inclined to think of the Italian immigrant as new Americans.

Actually, however, they have played a large and continuous role throughout our history.

Columbus discovered America, another Italian gave her his name, still another planted the first English flag on our soil.

Many Italians settled in the Colonies between 1622–1776.

Official colonial records show that they were present in the earliest years of the settlement of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Rhode Island.

Perhaps the most famous of these was Philip Mazzei, who took an active role in our struggle for independence.

Thomas Jefferson, himself, stated that he used Mazzei's quotation, "All men are by nature created free and independent" while drafting the Declaration of Independence.

Early in our history, the artistic and musical contributions of the Italian immigrant was also an aid in adding vitality to our colonial culture.

President Jefferson encouraged Italian sculptors to come to our country to work on various public buildings in the Nation's Capital.

The most renowned of these was Constantine Brumidi, who spent over 30 years creating the murals in the rotunda of the Capitol.

In music, as early as 1757, we hear of John Palma conducting a concert in Philadelphia.

I have used these few examples to demonstrate how the Italian immigrant contributed to the growth of our infant Nation.

There was no question but that we quickly accepted them as Americans.

In fact, in many cases we urged them to come to our country, and we have ever since been thankful for the culture and talent which they provided to our young and expanding civilization.

The new Italian immigrants, however, who came in the 1880's found it a little more difficult to adjust to their new surroundings.

Many of them fled overpopulated and poorer regions of Italy and came to our promised land in search of a new life.

At first the majority of these immigrants would only qualify for the humblest type of labor.

In the short span of one generation, however, their progress was amazing.

Beneath their poverty lay much hidden talent which quickly was allowed to come to the surface once given the opportunity.

This quick adjustment to American life is evident in the field of sports.

Their accomplishments in boxing, baseball, and football have thrilled sports followers throughout our country.

In boxing many became world champions.

Names like Lou Ambers, Rocky Graziano, and Rocky Marciano, who retired as the undefeated heavyweight champion of the world, read like a Boxing Hall of Fame.

In baseball likewise their skill on the diamond brought many to prominence in the major leagues.

Tony Lazzeri, Frank Crosetti, Phil Rizzuto, Yogi Berra, and the DiMaggio brothers are only a few of those who were celebrated stars.

Who will ever forget how Joe DiMaggio, the graceful center fielder of the New York Yankees, aroused the interest of the baseball world when he established a new record by hitting in 56 consecutive games.

On the college gridiron as well, students talked of the exploits of such football stars as Carideo, Bertelli, Ameche and Tamburo.

In the musical and theatrical world also these new Italian immigrants achieved success.

Singers like Enrico Caruso, Mario Lanza, Frank Sinatra, and Perry Como—band leaders such as Guy Lombardo—and theatrical personalities such as Jimmy Durante, Jerry Colonna, Dean Martin and Lou Costello brought many moments of joy to people throughout the land.

As these athletes and artists were gaining fame because of their talents—other Italians were contributing to the growth of America in other ways.

In agriculture, industry, business, and the professions their contributions were instrumental in the political and economic growth of America.

As well as contributing to the growth of our country, Italian-Americans have always been ready to defend it in time of peril.

From the time of the Revolutionary War they have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Thousands have died for the land they all loved.

The dozens of Congressional Medals of Honor and Navy Crosses—the hundreds of Distinguished Service Crosses—and the thousands of Purple Hearts with which they have been honored—are testimony enough of their loyalty to their country.

During these few moments, I have attempted to show that variety in our cosmopolitan society has enriched America.

On this Columbus Day of 1960, I thought it appropriate to briefly outline what the Italian-Americans have contributed to this development.

We have seen that the injection of Italian traditions and heritage in our blood has aided in producing a strong America.

During these few moments, while discussing the contributions of Italian-Americans to America, I really have only scratched the surface.

It would take hours to give a true and accurate picture of their donations to our great Nation.

To me, however, their greatest single contribution was themselves.

Having to earn their citizenship in many cases the hard way, they often became better citizens than many who had citizenship handed to them at birth.

With determination and hard work Italian Americans have become solid pillars of communities throughout the United States.

They have amalgamated in the main stream of American life—and added their bit to the American scene—while retaining many of their own customs, but they have always been proud first of their positions as Americans.

The Changing Rules of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, despite my freshman status, I have acquired some knowledge of the history and traditions of the House of Representatives. I am, therefore, somewhat surprised at the arguments advanced by those who would have us believe, at least by implication, that there is something revolutionary about suggesting changes in our rules.

The truth is, of course, that the history of the structure and rules of the House of Representatives is also one of long evolution. There was once unlimited debate in this House; we know that is no longer the case. There was a general revision of the rules in 1860, and another in 1880. Drastic changes were again made in 1909 and in 1910.

There has always been a Committee on Rules in the House, we are told, but it was only a select committee with quite limited powers during the first 90 years of the Republic. The committee played so minor a role in the early days that no appointments were made to it in the 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, and 21st Congresses. Its powers were gradually enlarged by rulings and rules changes beginning in 1841 until by 1890 the committee had achieved a preeminent position in the House.

Whereupon the House began to adopt measures to curb those powers: The Calendar Wednesday rule, adopted in 1909; rule XI, paragraph 23, in 1924; the discharge rule in 1910, and amended in 1911, 1912, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1931, and 1935; and the 21-day rule, in effect in 1949 and 1950.

The rules of the House of Representatives should not be sacrosanct and unchangeable. Over the years our country has changed; our governmental structure has changed; the base of our democratic process has been enlarged.

Even the size of the Rules Committee has been changed at rather frequent intervals. In 1880, when it was made a standing committee after many years as a "select" committee, its membership was set at five. In 1910 it was increased to 11, in 1917 to 12 and in 1935 to 14. The present size of 12 was fixed in 1945.

The real mark of genius in our political system has been its flexibility in meeting new circumstances and situations. I am confident that the House of Representatives, mindful of its unique representative position in that system, will once more adapt itself so as to overcome the thwarting of majority rule.

Functional Discount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I again submit for consideration by this House a functional discount amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act. A bill of this nature was initially introduced by a number of my colleagues—Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, and Hon. HENRY S. REUSS—and myself at the 2d session of the 85th Congress. Extensive hearings on these bills were held before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on June 16 and 17, 1958.

As a result of the hearings thus held, it was my privilege to join again with my other colleagues in introducing revised bills on this subject, which took into account certain discrepancies disclosed in the original proposed legislation. The newly revised bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress and additional hearings were held before the same subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be a member, on June 25 and 26, 1959.

I do not at this time intend to labor the obvious. The merits of the legislation which I now sponsor have been spread upon the public record made at the before-mentioned hearings. The transcript of both hearings are available for anyone interested in a comprehensive analysis of the purport of our need for this legislation.

The Robinson-Patman Act was originally intended to prevent a manufacturer from setting a one price policy and forcing wholesalers to buy at the same price charged to favored direct buying retailers so as to be unable to sell to the small stores at prices which would enable these small stores to compete effectively with the privileged direct buying retailer.

This salutory provision of the Robinson-Patman Act has become a dead letter. It has never been used to prevent price discrimination. I feel it is high time to give force to this clause and put an end to the existing price discrimination. This is the intent of my functional

discount amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

A functional discount has been called an essential economic incentive to make it possible for the different economic classes of distribution to survive. It is the practice whereby a manufacturer charges a lower price to a wholesaler than he charges to a direct-buying retailer. It is ordinarily considered essential for a manufacturer to provide such differentials in price if he wishes to sell both to wholesaler and to retailer. Under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is universally agreed that a manufacturer who imposes functional price differentials is not discriminating in price since no injury to competition is occasioned by such price differentials. On the other hand, when a manufacturer does not impose such price differential, and sells to different classes of customers, he may and often does severely injure competition.

Where a manufacturer charges the same price to a wholesaler and a retailer, it is quite obvious that the wholesaler has to resell to his customers at a higher price than the price he pays the manufacturer. As a result the retailer who buys from the wholesaler pays a higher price for the same merchandise than the retailer who purchases directly from the manufacturer.

Since in most cases the retailer who buys from the wholesaler is not permitted or is unable to buy directly from the manufacturer, this means that, when the manufacturer establishes a one-price policy, and sells only to selected direct-buying retailers, he has discriminated in price against those retailers who are required to buy from the wholesaler. Unlike the differential created by granting functional discounts, the discrimination created by failing to grant functional discounts does effect competition since the retailer who cannot buy from the manufacturer must compete on unequal terms with the retailer who is permitted to buy directly. The indirect buyer is forced to pay more for merchandise and, even if his operating efficiencies are as great as the direct buyer's, his price to the consumer must necessarily be higher. Thus the effect of failing to grant a functional discount is to substantially lessen competition and tends to create a monopoly—practices specially proscribed by the very terms of the Robinson-Patman Act.

If there was one thing made abundantly clear by prior hearings on this subject, it is the uncontested and incontrovertible fact, duly acknowledged by the most adamant opponents of this proposed legislation, that a single price policy is, ipso facto, economic discrimination. Indeed, at the second series of hearings previously adverted to by me, a colloquy took place between the learned chief counsel to our subcommittee and the acting chief officer of the antitrust segment of the Department of Justice in the past administration. That latter individual, numbered among the prime opponents of the present legislation, nevertheless, in response to the chief counsel's question as to whether he would agree that "a manufacturer's single price policy results in economic discrimination" he answered and said, "Yes, I do," amplifying this remark by further stating, "I think it is possible if a manufacturer were to sell to wholesalers at the same price at which he sold to retailers directly that competed with retailers to whom the wholesaler sold, you would have economic discrimination in the sense of competitive consequences."

Thus even the most convinced opponents of this legislation must necessarily admit that the absence of this amendment gives rise to economic discrimination favoring the larger competitor against his less powerful rival. I take it to be the sense of this body that it does not countenance and cannot approve situations in which the small man is penalized merely because he is small and the large-scale businessman is given economic advantage merely because he is big. The simple purpose of the proposed amendment is to rectify this condition and to permit all retailers, whether large or small, to compete on an equal price footing.

Above all, let us search our consciences and weigh our collective sincerity in our protestations of concern for the preservation of that historic benchmark of our Nation—freedom of opportunity. Our Nation has, traditionally, merited the accolade of serving as the primary catalyst which has enabled those of the lower economic strata, including refugees from religious persecution and escapees from political apprehension, to discover the broad dimensions of America's freedom of opportunity for one and all to embark upon modest business careers—and, thus, emerge successfully or "go bust." There are many signs indicative of the fact that this unique distinction is fast on the wane.

When an aspiring individual is deprived of the opportunity to exercise his initiative to embark upon a business venture, he then, advertently or inadvertently, becomes a malcontent, and as such is easy prey for the propaganda of agitators: as a consequence, democracy suffers. When a number of well-intentioned individuals become the prey of malcontents, the fundamental institutions of democracy are placed in jeopardy. When, in a free democracy, an ever growing number of the youth become victims of delinquency and are pervaded by a sort of frustration and disillusion with the generally accepted conventions of society, and are blindly joining the ranks of beatniks or neatniks, to that extent, we are puncturing the ramparts of democracy and endangering all its estimable institutions.

It is implicit in the American way of life that every contender be assured a reasonably even chance before he is set loose on his own. The principles applicable in the realm of sportsmanship have been made pertinent to the realm of economics through the enactment of an array of statutes seeking to assure every striving entrepreneur an equal opportunity. In the list of such laws is the Robinson-Patman Act proscribing price discrimination.

This law has seen long and serviceable use in the cause of economic fair dealing. However, akin to a carefully designed structure or a faultlessly constructed garment, over a long period of time, weathering by the elements or wear and tear by usage sets in. A need arises for refurbishing and repair.

The proposed discount amendment is in the nature of repair and rehabilitation to an honored and long effective legal structure—the Robinson-Patman Act.

The discouragements and frustrations facing young people today in embarking upon new ventures is lent added weight by the fact that the cards are so stacked against them that, regardless of diligence and industry, the lack of equal economic opportunity raises hurdles and roadblocks with which they find it impossible to cope. This cause of discouragement and frustration, which sometimes even contributes to family discord and unhappiness has an economic basis in the present lack of equal opportunity. The proposed amendment is intended to provide the means by which the new entrepreneur may embark on his venture with an even chance of success, by providing that he will have available to him a means of acquiring his necessities of the trade at prices which will enable him to compete with his larger rival. I submit such a bill deserves the wholehearted support of all those interested in preserving and extending our economic way of life.

George Washington Carver Centennial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am honored to report that under previous authorization of the Congress as implemented by the Department of Interior, the George Washington Carver Monument was dedicated at Diamond, Mo., in Newton County of my district this past year. Mrs. Hall and I were privileged to attend the dedication ceremonies with over 1,300 in attendance. The junior Senator from Missouri, EDWARD V. LONG—then Lieutenant Governor of the State of Missouri—gave the dedicatory address. It was a gala occasion in the Ozarks.

Therefore, I was more than pleased this Monday past when a resolution was unanimously adopted on the floor of this House to establish a George Washington Carver Centennial Commission. My compliments to the distinguished majority leader and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. BEN JENSEN, who were largely responsible for this action. It is my sincere hope and desire that this Commission, as authorized by House Joint Resolution 110, will be passed in the Senate so that its functions can be implemented at the earliest practicable date.

The fine museum, the natural amphitheater in a grove of trees high up on an Ozark plateau, as well as the preserved original buildings of this great American, are adequate as a monument, but his contributions to humanity should be commemorated throughout the length and breadth of this land. George Washington Carver contributed to our educational foundations, to scientific research throughout this growing and expanding Nation, to good agricultural pursuits, and to the inner calm and conscience of a happy people in our Republic where individual man can still grow from obscurity to fame. Never before has it been more important to carry out efficiently and in the public interest memorialization of such an individual's characteristics and exploits, that have helped make this a great Nation.

I am happy that the Commission will be terminated automatically on completion of its objectives; and for the above and other valid reasons commend to this House, the Senate, and the administration the early enactment of this legislation.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as part of the observance of the 15th anniversary of the United Nations, the following address was delivered by me before the Clearfield (Pa.) Lions Club, October 17, 1960:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE CLEARFIELD LIONS CLUB, CLEARFIELD, PA., OCTOBER 17, 1960

The newspapers daily emphasize the fragile structure of world peace.

A review of the proceedings of the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly, which convened in New York September 22, confirms that fact.

In Germany, in southeast Asia, in Cuba, and in the seething continent of Africa, time bombs are ticking away that could explode with unforeseeable consequences.

The development of unprecedentedly destructive weapons and of unprecedentedly rapid means of delivery have made a neighborhood of the entire world in the short period of a decade and a half.

And the problems which these changed circumstances have created seem, at times, almost too vast and complex for human solution.

Certainly, mankind must seek to find new ways of resolving its disputes if we are to survive on this planet.

The old answers, the old diplomacy are no longer adequate. And we cannot rely on the slow, evolutionary methods of the past. The accelerating rush of events has plunged us into a new world.

We must develop new rules to live by, and new instruments to maintain these rules and we must do it fast if we want to live out our lives and if our children are to live out their lives.

One of the instruments that is being developed to cope with this new world is the United Nations. Little did the framers suspect, in 1945 when the United Nations Charter was drafted, what this organization would be called upon to do. And little did the framers realize, from the structure they agreed upon, how the organization would develop.

In the first place, they accepted the premise that there would be substantial agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on keeping the peace.

The United Nations was only a few months old when this hope had all but vanished.

Another premise was that China would develop into the major democratic nation of the East, and would be a stabilizing influence in international relations. Dashing these expectations, China had in a few short years become Communist and the question of its United Nations representation the cause of a major division in the organization.

Communist China at present is perhaps the only nation of importance which advocates war as an instrument of policy—in its case, of Communist policy.

The outrageous conduct at the 15th United Nations General Assembly of Premier Khrushchev of Russia, Fidel Castro, of Cuba, and Janos Kadar of Hungary, as they joined hands in an effort to destroy the United Nations reveals them to the world as arch hypocrites in their denunciation of colonialism and their efforts to displace Dag Hammarskjold as Secretary General of the United Nations.

None of the trio, or for that matter none of the other henchmen from behind the Iron Curtain, were ever elected as a result of free elections.

Yet they were appealing to small independent nations whose freedom is made possible by the United Nations to destroy that agency of international peace.

In denouncing colonialism and lecturing so-called neutral nations to aid in sabotaging the United Nations not one word came from Khrushchev's lips with respect to restoring independence to nations subjugated by Russia and which have lost every vestige of liberty and freedom.

These Iron Curtain countries robbed of freedom by Russia include Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Albania, each of which, if they dared rebel against Russian rule, would face the same fate of Hungary when it sought to break the shackles forged by the cruel monsters of Moscow.

In short, Khrushchev's appeal was in reality an invitation to the new member nations of the United Nations to place their necks in the Kremlin noose.

The spectacle of Khrushchev and his Red cronies posing as liberators of mankind insulted the intelligence of all civilized nations as did his table-pounding antics when various United Nations speakers opposed him and his gang of international thugs.

While the West succeeded in repulsing Khrushchev and his Communist stooges the growing membership of the United Nations is evidence that the West faces a great task in meeting the challenge of the Kremlin.

On October 8, by a vote of 34 to 42, with 22 nations not voting, the West headed by the United States defeated the Kremlin's attempt to oust Nationalist China from the United Nations and admit Red China.

The effort to replace Dag Hammarskjold with a Soviet-type three-man committee including a vetoing Communist would result in sounding the death knell of the United Nations.

It is gratifying that by a 70 to 0 vote the United Nations confirmed its confidence in Dag Hammarskjold. Yet the constantly increasing membership of the United Nations poses a threat to the West as evidenced by the scant eight-vote margin on October 8 that defeated the proposal to consider the admission of Red China.

Frankly, the next 12 months may well determine how the question is to be settled since 22 nations abstained from voting this year.

Indeed, perhaps only the strong leadership of the United States has enabled the United Nations to survive and to develop into the force for world peace that it is today.

Against Soviet and Chinese Communist aggressive designs the United States, in 1950, led many of the free nations in the United Nations fight against aggression in Korea.

Our steadfast support of this organization has made it a rallying point for most of the free nations of the world. It has become an indispensable instrument of free-world diplomacy and an indispensable bridge between the free and Soviet-dominated Communist worlds.

Without the United Nations, hopes for peace would be greatly diminished; and hopes for peace with freedom would suffer an even sharper decline.

I repeat, the United Nations of 1960 is vastly different from the United Nations of 1945. It has been adapted to meet rapidly changing conditions over the years.

For a better understanding of the present United Nations—this increasingly useful organization—I would like to describe three ways in which it is serving the cause of peace today, illustrated by specific examples.

1. The United Nations is promoting stability in new nations: Scores of new nations have emerged upon the international horizon since 1945. This year alone will see the birth of many new nations in Africa, and a consequent increase in the membership of the United Nations from 82 to close to 100. Most of these new countries are underdeveloped.

The majority of them, in reaction against historic white Western domination, are averse to following Western leadership.

Under these circumstances the United Nations is a natural instrument toward which these new countries, particularly in Africa, can turn for help and guidance.

One of the principal purposes of the United Nations is to protect the independence of its member states, and usually one of the first acts of a new nation is to seek the protection of U.N. membership.

Within the past months we have seen the United Nations emerge as a potent factor in Africa, where the explosive forces of independence threaten to create chaos and where weakness threatens to invite Communist subversion.

The present and future roles of the United Nations in Africa may well spell the difference between an Africa free to discover its own identity and its own interests, and an Africa caught in the dangerous currents of the cold war.

Specifically, we are witnessing from day to day the unprecedented role the United Nations is playing in the Congo, where freedom has meant descent into near anarchy.

Events in the Congo illustrate how the Soviet Union seeks to fill political vacuums and thus extend communism.

If the United Nations can maintain its position in the Congo and help the Congo become a stable and progressive country, free from outside domination, we will have witnessed a great and promising expansion of its usefulness.

The difficulties should not be minimized and it will be some time before we can tell whether the experiment will succeed.

But it should be given every chance to succeed that money or other United States support can provide, for the Congo may be the touchstone of the future of Africa, and indeed, of the United Nations and of world peace.

2. The United Nations provides buffers between quarreling nations: Often the purposes of peace are best served by drawing quarreling nations apart and erecting some kind of barrier between them. The United Nations is well equipped to perform this function. This is particularly true of its role in interposing itself between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Direct confrontations of power between the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, are extremely dangerous, for they carry with them the possibility of atomic world war.

When confrontations threaten to occur in vital strategic areas, the dangers are increased.

I would list two vital areas in which the United Nations has served as a neutralizing agency—as a buffer—as a way of preventing or diminishing Western and Soviet involvements threatening world peace: The Middle East and southeast Asia. The importance of the Middle East in world politics can scarcely be overestimated. This is indeed a pivotal area, a crossroads of the world, rich in oil and other resources, and the gateway to the African Continent.

It has been the scene of fiery international politics since the end of World War II, and its recurring crises have several times brought the world to the brink of war. Nowhere has the United Nations played a more useful part as a buffer and neutralizer.

In the Suez debacle of 1956, it created a United Nations emergency force to facilitate the withdrawal of the British and French from Egypt and to pacify the relations between Israel and Egypt.

The emergency force has remained on duty ever since and has recently provided valuable personnel experienced in the arts of international peacemaking to the United Nations force presently deployed in the Congo.

Again in 1958 events in the Middle East evoked screaming headlines in all of our papers.

Both the United States and Great Britain found it necessary to land troops in the area and the threat of Soviet involvement loomed large.

Once more the United Nations was called upon for help.

In an emergency special session of the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Secretary General was charged with creating the kind of stability in the region which would permit the withdrawal of the United States and British troops.

Largely through the negotiations at which he is so adept, the U.N. Secretary General was successful in reducing the tensions among the various Arab countries and thus permitting the withdrawal of Western troops.

The risks of great power confrontation were in this way reduced.

Southeast Asia is another region where Communist attempts at penetration create a danger to peace.

Recently North Vietnam, doubtless with the backing of Communist China if not the Soviet Union, was masterminding subversion and guerrilla activity in Laos aimed at bringing Laos into the Communist camp.

Lao authorities had more than a year ago entered into consultation with United Nations officials.

Last September the Government of Laos sent an urgent request to the United Nations for an emergency force to halt aggression.

Over an attempted Soviet veto, the United Nations Security Council sent a mission to Laos to investigate, and this was followed by a visit by the United Nations Secretary General.

All of these different initiatives have had the effect of establishing the United Nations as an active element in the stabilization of Laos and helping to keep it free, at least so far, from Communist domination.

Recent disturbances reveal that the situation in Laos is still touch and go. Southeast Asia remains a potentially explosive region.

But if the United Nations succeeds in the Congo, it may well take on a stronger role elsewhere and be used with increasing effectiveness to maintain the independence of its members in southeast Asia.

3. Finally, the United Nations, as a world forum, is used to clarify important world issues and offers a means of talking out disputes instead of fighting them out.

The United Nations provides a neutral forum in which all sides to controversies can have their say. This is in itself a useful function.

But, more than this, in the United Nations problems crucial to the survival of humanity are explored, and thus the way is made easier for future solutions. An example of this role has been the prolonged debate in the United Nations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the issue of surprise attack.

The development of the long-range missile has made devastating surprise attack, a vastly magnified Pearl Harbor, possible on the part of the Soviet Union.

This possibility vitally affects the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and, indeed, international politics in general.

The latest round of this portentous United Nations debate was precipitated by the downing of the American U–2 plane over the Soviet Union.

To put this incident in perspective, I would like to recall that as far back as 1955 at the summit conference of that year, President Eisenhower proposed an "open skies" plan which, if adopted, would have precluded the necessity for U–2 flights.

Here is an instance where violent disagreements have been aired but no solution has been found; of an endless dialogue which apparently reaches no conclusions.

But the fears and needs of both sides have been explored and a safety valve has been provided for tensions that at times have risen dangerously high.

Can we not hope that this debate will contribute to some solution in the future?

Indeed, if mankind is to survive, ways must be found to control the trembling balance of terror, any disturbance of which may mean all-out nuclear war.

I have listed only three of the many ways in which the United Nations contributes to world peace.

At this stage in history it is obvious that we could not do without such an organization. But what the United Nations has been made to do is much less than what it must be made to do, if we are to evolve a true community of mankind. And only in such evolution is there hope for permanent peace.

Statesmanlike Agreement Between Eastern Airlines and Aeronaves de Mexico Marks New Milestone in Progressive Relations Between the Two Countries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the complex and critical question of our country's ability to provide economic as well as military assistance to other nations who share our common struggle for the preservation of freedom in this tension-torn world has long been and continues to be of vital concern to our Government and to our people. The cost of our foreign aid program, including the interest on the money we have borrowed, is billions annually. This is a staggering burden for our citizens to bear. There is no question of their willingness to shoulder this and even heavier loads if they could be sure that their hard-earned money was being spent wisely and that it was accomplishing its objectives in a degree commensurate with the sacrifice called for on the part of each and every one of our citizens.

There have and always will be serious questions raised in this regard. It is natural and desirable that this should be so. The manner in which these tremendous sums are used are, in most cases, beyond the understanding of the individual who, in large or small measure, contributes a share.

At the same time, confused by the intricate, diplomatic maneuverings and by the unceasing barrage of conflicting propaganda, he naturally and properly tends to view the value of our Nation's contributions in terms of his own practical estimate of values in terms of his own experience and talents and abilities. This is basically expressed in the technical aid aspects of our foreign assistance program—the most promising, in many respects, of our abilities to contribute to the well-being, the growth, and the increasing strength of free world nations.

This we have done in substantial measure but certainly we should strive to do more. The principal obstacle to a fuller achievement of this essential aspect of our aid program lies primarily in the lack of means by which these talents and abilities can be recognized and productively put to work.

In this regard, I would like to bring to the attention of this House a recent agreement on cooperation concluded between one of our great airlines, Eastern Airlines, and Aeronaves de Mexico, the Government-owned national airline of our good neighbor to the South. As an expression of mutual devotion to a common cause, it is unique. Beyond that, however, it offers an encouraging example of the recognition, by farsighted business leaders of both countries, of the increasing importance of joining hands and efforts to help better achieve the common objectives of our friendly freedom-loving peoples.

To understand better the significance of this precedent-making forward stride in international relations at citizen, as contrasted with governmental, levels, a brief knowledge of the background will be interesting and enlightening. The history of our civil aviation relationship between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, which extends back for more than 31 years, has been marked with many areas of disagreement. Conflicts of interest between ambitious air carriers on both sides of the border have inevitably had a strong influence on policies pursued by the respective governments. Although the first commercial air service between the two Republics was instituted on

March 9, 1929, no bilateral agreement with respect to civil aviation was reached between the two countries until March of 1957.

The first attempt to negotiate a bilateral agreement was initiated in 1946. That endeavor failed. And successive endeavors similarly broke up on the rocks of Mexico's understandable concern over the ability of its air carriers to compete with the much stronger U.S. airlines. This situation was further complicated by the U.S. carrier participation in the ownership of Mexico's principal airline, through which was exercised a degree of influence over that carrier and inevitably over civil aviation policy on both sides of the border.

It was not until March 1957 that the first provisional agreement on civil aviation was successfully concluded between the United States and Mexico. That agreement expressed clear recognition of the mutual interests of each country in the benefits to be made available to the peoples of both countries through the establishment of reciprocal air services, designed to promote closer cultural and commercial ties between the neighboring Republics, toward the achievement of greater progress and mutual security for the friendly peoples of our two countries who share the same priceless heritage of freedom.

The enlightened principles enunciated in that agreement recognized the right of the air carriers of each country to a fair and equal opportunity to participate in the carriage of traffic between our neighboring countries and the mutual obligation of the airlines designated by each government for the performance of these reciprocal services, to contribute by providing the most advanced means of this new age of transportation to aid in achieving these important national objectives.

Representatives of our State Department and our Civil Aeronautics Board have recently and successfully negotiated with their counterparts in the Mexican Government a renewal of that agreement for 3 years, providing a stability in our civil aviation relationships which had never heretofore existed.

Implementation of the spirit as well as the letter of that agreement is now provided for in a unique agreement of understanding between Eastern Airlines and Aeronaves de Mexico, the airlines designated by their respective governments for the operation of the key New York-Mexico City nonstop air route. As an example of enlightened statesmanship on the part of aeronautical leadership in both countries, this agreement marks a new milestone in progressive relationships between the two countries. Unlike previous agreements in this field, the Eastern-Aeronaves agreement has no financial involvement by the U.S. carrier in the Mexican company or any influence or control upon the management of the Mexican carrier through stock ownership or otherwise. It goes further to insure that each company will maintain its complete independence of identification and action, will not hold itself out as being the agent for the other, and provides for separate functioning of its sales and other related operations.

On the other hand, however, it does provide that each company, within the territorial limits of its own country, will provide for the reciprocal carrier such facilities and service as each carrier, because of its own nationality, is best equipped to provide or render to the end that the services provided shall be the most advanced, the most efficient, and the most economical for the benefit of the public of both countries.

Unique also is the provision designed to enable Aeronaves de Mexico, Mexico's national airline, to advance into the jet air age with the same advantages held by carriers of other nationalities already equipped with the larger, faster, and more powerful American-built jets. To accommodate this, the U.S. carrier, Eastern Airlines, had made it possible for Aeronaves to secure from the Douglas Airplane Co., one of Eastern's new 115-passenger, 615 miles per hour DC 8–B jets equipped with the largest and the latest 16,800 pounds thrust J–75 engines, which airliner was originally scheduled for delivery to the U.S. carrier in November.

By the assignment of this priority in delivery to Aeronaves, Mexico's national airline was able to secure the finest jet aircraft in the world at least 16 months before they would otherwise be able to get deliveries with currently placed orders and to inaugurate service to the United States with this superior equipment a full year before it would otherwise have been possible.

To appreciate the importance of this aspect of the forward-looking interairline agreement, you need only know that the only jets now available on Mexican-flag airlines are aircraft of foreign manufacture and which are both smaller and slower than the products of U.S. industry. The difference in the capabilities of these foreign-built versus U.S.-built jets could force Mexico's airlines to accept a secondary role on the important international operations which are important to that country to establish in the coming years in competition with other proud and powerful international carriers who are already being equipped with the superior U.S. jets.

Further, to assist Mexico's aviation to stand on its own economic feet and to hold its head high in pride among the other carriers of the world, the U.S. air carrier is also training the Mexican airlines' personnel in Eastern's own advanced jet-training classes in Miami, is making available to the Mexican carrier the use of the costly ground equipment which otherwise the Mexican carrier would be required needlessly to duplicate, and in other ways is working in a true partnership of objectives.

This agreement of international cooperation between these two air carriers is indicative of what can be done in many, many areas of our international relationships. It is a splendid example of mutual foreign aid at the working level. It gives away nothing in terms of national resources. On the other hand, it contributes the priceless experience, accumulated under our private enterprise system, to assist others to acquire the know-how they need to utilize to the fullest in their own behalf the tremendous benefits of our superior technological advancements. The cause is not competitive with our interests or enterprise but, on the contrary, lies entirely in the area of providing needed practical help for an important job which, with all of our vast resources, we will never be capable of doing by ourselves.

Great credit is due to that great pioneer of air transportation in America, Captain Eddie Rickenbacker, chairman, and to Malcolm A. MacIntyre, the president of Eastern Airlines, who conceived and carried out this new approach to practical, international relationships with their counterparts in Mexico's national airline. Particularly credit is due, also, to the distinguished Secretary of Mexico's Department of Communications and Transports, Inc., Walter C. Buchanan, and to the members of our Civil Aeronautics Board whose clear understanding, technical knowledge and, above all, recognition of the tremendous importance of improved communications and transportation between the two countries in the cause of peace and progress are clearly expressed in formal approval of the practical program for achieving them which was devised by the progressive carriers of both nations.

Increasing the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have always taken the position that the House of Representatives should have an opportunity to work its will on legislation which has been reported by committees.

It has been my experience that adequate procedures exist under the present rules so that the Rules Committee cannot bottle up bills against the will of the majority of Members.

There are three principal methods available to break up any such roadblock. For example, the Speaker, if he desires to do so, may recognize any Member to bring up a bill by asking for suspension of the rules. In this case a two-thirds vote is required for approval.

Second, if the Rules Committee fails to grant a rule to a bill within 7 legislative days of a request by the legislative committee chairman having jurisdiction, supporters of the bill may move to force a rule from the committee.

They do this by introducing their own rule for debate on the bill, then filing a petition to discharge their rule from the Rules Committee.

Once a majority of Members sign the discharge petition a sponsor may call up the petition for floor consideration. The House then votes on whether to discharge the rule.

A third procedure is under Calendar Wednesday when on Wednesday of each week the Speaker can call upon the chairmen of House committees in alpha-

betical order. When called on, each chairman may call up for a vote any bill previously reported by his committee.

My position in opposition to the Speaker's plan to increase the membership of the House Rules Committee is based on several counts.

The precedent of a Speaker "packing" a House committee to carry out a President's program is dangerous. If this can be done to the Rules Committee it could be done to any other committee. What members each political party assigns to any committee is their own business, but enlarging a legislative committee is not dissimilar to enlarging the Supreme Court to impose "thought control."

My fear is not that a packed Rules Committee will report bills to carry out the Kennedy program. What I fear is a committee reporting these measures under gag rules. In other words, the majority of the House could thereby be forced to vote a bill up or down without an opportunity to amend or offer a substitute.

I have no quarrel with allowing legislation to be considered when it can be changed to comply with the majority views in floor action, but under closed rules which could be imposed by a stacked Rules Committee a minority view could be imposed. A take it or leave it situation would result. Many Members who had expressed support for programs would be forced to accept language and provisions to which they object, or otherwise vote against measures which they were committed by previous public statements to support.

Mr. Speaker, I am not purposing to hide behind any Rules Committee as to how I would vote. I am frankly against new, big spending measures. I am against creeping socialism and Federal control over matters that should properly be managed on the State and local level. But I strongly oppose setting up a precedent whereby my individual vote for moderation could be thwarted and a new frontier such as is included in the 1960 Democratic platform thrust down the throat of a reluctant majority of Congress.

I believe that opposing the packing of a legislative committee is the right thing to do. Therefore, I am voting against it.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 14, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 14, 1961.

The state of the Union message, President Eisenhower's last (read by the Clerk, not delivered in person), dominated a week lacking legislative activity. The House is still not organized into committees, awaiting the outcome of the Democrats' dissension over the Rules Committee. The President's message was a concise recapitulation of 8 years and reminds us there is still time to count our blessings instead of only downgrading ourselves for partisan aggrandizement. In counting our blessings, we can recognize: (1) 8 years of peace; (2) military strength second to none; (3) an economy where real income (in constant dollars) is up 15 percent (factory workers, 20 percent) over 1952; (4) a major tax cut in 1954; (5) a stable currency without the pre-1952 continuing inflation; (6) a successful labor reform effort, the Landrum-Griffin bill; (7) Government competition with private enterprise decreased by discontinuance of 2,000 commercial industrial installations operated directly by Government and curtailment of 550 others. Certainly these achievements, plus many others, belie the charges of some political campaigners that the United States has slipped, is second rate, stagnating, etc.

My criticisms of the President's message are these: (1) Basically, there is too great a reliance on, too great a faith in, the actions and accomplishments of the Federal Government. The recognition of human needs is not coincidental with Federal Government leadership, legislation, and spending. For example, the underlying intent of the 1946 Full Employment Act, on which is based the Federal Government's alleged responsibility for full employment, is fallacious. The Federal Government is not responsible for employment; (2) the social security program expansion is hardly praiseworthy in view of its actuarial imbalance and unsoundness; (3) aid to education under the National Defense Education Act is outside the role of Federal Government; (4) likewise unconstitutional are Federal functions in agriculture, welfare, urban renewal, and other Federal subsidy programs—so I hardly feel these endeavors are praiseworthy; (5) repeating the administration's avowed stand against recognition of Red China and to oppose admission of this belligerent and unrepentant nation into the United Nations is inconsistent with our recognition of Russia, the bandit leader in the world today. This suggests again the wisdom of withdrawing recognition of Russia. We should really be gearing ourselves for the showdown with communism. Instead, our policy seems to vacillate between confidence in peaceful coexistence to recognition that the Communists are out to bury us, one way or another. The United States and Russia are at war, and so it will be until one side wins. Our failure to recognize this fully and/or govern ourselves accordingly is my basic criticism of Government policy in this message as well as the years before 1952. We must, as a nation, really understand the intent and danger of communism.

The task forces reporting to President-elect Kennedy in recent days, have supported his campaign platform and promises by asking for increased spending in defense, space, public works, foreign aid, highway construction, urban renewal, transportation—all this in addition to the five-point, basic or urgent J.F.K. legislative program.

Our real legislative needs, as I see it, are these: (1) Balanced budget, debt reduction, tax cut; (2) Government out of business enterprise; (3) labor under antitrust; (4) U.S. sovereignty protected (Bricker amendment); (5) electoral college reform; (6) such other legislation needed to correct present legislation, resulting from a comprehensive review of the laws now in effect. Instead of a yearly mad rush to write new legislation increasing Federal Government participation, we should evaluate present law. We don't need more Federal law—we need better law. For example, in the field of taxation, to what degree do we really believe in the ability-to-pay tax principle—what percent from zero to total confiscation of property—and why? Then, let's reshape the law—not just add a few more deductions, exemptions, or change percentage points, up or down. Tax law like other laws have grown, like Topsy. As a result, we have a rickety structure, not really our intent, but a conglomerate hodgepodge of archaic laws.

The Rules Committee change is an inter-Democratic Party squabble. Once again the liberals will win within the party framework; once again the conservatives will be licked. Once again—or many times—some of the southern, self-styled conservatives will endeavor to cover up the triumph of liberalism (or radicalism) within their party by playing up the coalition. The coalition of Republicans and alleged southern conservatives does not exist for two reasons: (1) There are few Democrat conservatives left, judging by their voting records; and (2) there is no agreement or teamwork—any kinship in voting is accidental, not intentional. It is important that this misunderstanding of coalition voting not be perpetuated because it damages both the liberals and the conservatives by muddying the water. The people don't know what actually is being done. The real coalition, the only coalition, of northern and southern Democrats is responsible for the organization of the Congress around liberals (radicals). The result, of course, is to besmirch the efforts of both liberals and conservatives within the Democratic Party and screen from the view of all but the most discerning who are really in control and are responsible for the legislation considered and passed.

Operation Main Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2487, which will provide the economic stimulus so desperately needed by the small business sector of our Nation's economy. Frankly, I am overwhelmed by the instant favorable response to this measure from small businessmen and others, which indicates clearly to me the magnitude of the problem and the deep-seated desire of the people that a solution be found.

In recent years, it has become the fashion to discuss, study, and talk about problems of small business. The time for talk has clearly ended. In diagnosing the patient let us take care that the patient does not die while discussions proceed. We may differ on the cure, but we all agree that a cure must be found and that a significant beginning toward this goal must be made now.

We are all alarmed over mounting unemployment, increasing idle productive capacity, and widening pockets of depressed economic activity. I welcome President Kennedy's action in ordering an increase in the surplus food distribution program, but let us also take bold action to insure the creation of new jobs.

Today we find steel production at less than 50 percent of capacity; capital goods orders are steadily declining; and, most importantly, housing starts are off more than seasonally with inventory liquidation reaching disturbing proportions.

The tax adjustment provided by H.R. 2487, which would result in increased orders for stock and increased investment in modernization and expansion of facilities, could well be the needed counter-stimulant to our current economic ills. It will most assuredly provide long overdue relief to small and medium-size businesses in financing their growth and expansion.

It is my earnest hope that prompt favorable action will be taken by the Congress on H.R. 2487.

J.F.K. Must Put People in Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial from the Jeannette Journal—Mr. James Landis, editor—Jeannette, Pa., and my open letter to the editor:

J.F.K. MUST PUT PEOPLE IN JOBS

For some 5 years or so we've seen many articles for sale in America that were manufactured in foreign nations. At the same time we've read many times of X amount of money going to foreign nations.

For those same 5 or so years we've steadily seen people put out of work and kept permanently out of work because there were no jobs for them.

An examination of practically any imported article of merchandise, large or small, will reveal that it could have been manufactured here in America and thus put at least some of our people to work whose earnings, when spent, would have provided additional jobs here.

Back in our days in grade school we were told that our import duties laws were constructed so as to control imports by simply jacking up import duties and making the importation of foreign-made goods an unprofitable operation.

The import charges thus would make American manufacturing profitable and put people to work.

Why, oh why, we ask, hasn't official Washington seen to this matter instead of sending our tax money to foreign countries and setting them up in competitive businesses and putting people on relief?

We don't know why but we now demand that our new Kennedy administration act at once to get some sense into Government and put our people back into gainful employment.

OPEN LETTER TO THE JOURNAL

MR. JAMES LANDIS,
Editor, Jeannette Journal,
Jeannette, Pa.

DEAR JIM: I read your very fine editorial on Kennedy and jobs this week. You certainly put your finger on one of the most disastrous changes that has taken place in recent years.

I refer, of course, to the mistaken, misguided and misfortune of our so-called aid-and-trade policy.

For this Nation to be kidded into the belief that by building up our competition abroad is the road to peace and prosperity is a tragic and fatal mistake.

If the American people knew even one-tenth of the story on how American money has built up foreign production facilities for glass, rubber, cars, typewriters and on and on in every consumer item, there would be a housecleaning in Washington that would be more disastrous than a Kansas hurricane.

Frankly, when I started fighting against foreign aid grants for foreign industry, etc., I was almost alone in the House—now I've got many more helpers and getting more every day.

One example that has just come to my attention in a letter is from the Zippo Lighter people from Bradford, Pa. They told me that in less than 10 years the importation of lighters went from less than a half million a year to the astounding figure of 46 million lighters in 1959 from Japan, etc. This ought to burn up every fellow who has to apply for unemployment compensation.

Maybe I'm wrong, but between automation here, low wages abroad and failure to cut the retirement age for social security, the whole economic structure of our Nation is tumbling down. Every time we sell anything overseas, it's because they can't make or mine the product or it's at a cost over and above their costs. No nation on earth allows its market to be flooded with foreign-made goods at prices their own producers can't meet.

Much as I hate to admit it, the Russians have a system that's foolproof. They don't care how many items are imported into Russia, but the items can't be sold for less than the cost of production in Russia.

They gain a great reputation for being a free trade nation—no tariffs, etc., but they have a more effective protectionist deal than any other nation on earth.

Another little trick that will kick the American economy in the teeth is the latest report from London in that the new tariffs on aluminum in the European markets will practically kill all American exports to the area. This is really a sellout because the aluminum production of England is practically owned lock, stock, and barrel by American investors.

This is how it will work. We will have a tariff barrier against us in Europe, but the tariff wall here will be lowered or torn down so that our friends can ship into the United States.

Space doesn't permit the telling of the whole story, but enough to say that we will never get well buying retail and selling wholesale.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

First Annual Veterans Day Dinner, Philadelphia, Pa., November 11, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1960, the United Veterans Council of Philadelphia, Pa., comprised of the city's 21 veterans' organizations, sponsored their first annual Veterans Day dinner at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, at which time it was my privilege to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE FIRST ANNUAL VETERANS DAY DINNER, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

You have honored me by your invitation to come to Philadelphia—the cradle of liberty—to participate in this first annual Veterans Day dinner sponsored by the United Veterans Council of Philadelphia comprised of the city's 21 veterans organizations.

First let me congratulate the officers and members of the United Veterans Council for their foresight in bringing together the city's veteran organizations and establishing this annual event in tribute to our Nation's war veterans who are honored by a grateful Nation on Veterans Day, November 11.

Then, too, I commend the officers and members of the United Veterans Council for the honor bestowed on Old Glory through the pageant of flags and for the recognition given to each of Philadelphia's veterans organizations.

This twin tribute is indicative of the great admiration we veterans have for the flag of our country in war and in peace.

This is the 42d anniversary of Armistice Day, known annually since 1954 through an act of Congress as Veterans Day.

On this sixth anniversary of Veterans Day we are reminded that Armistice Day had a special meaning for World War I veterans who for years were joined by Spanish-American War veterans—in celebrating the momentous event of November 11, 1918, when the Germans laid down their arms thus bringing to an end World War I that cost us $78 billion and 330,000 casualties.

It is recalled that World War I was heralded as a "war to end all wars."

When we think of the First World War we are reminded that Webster defines the word "armistice" as "a brief cessation of hostilities."

We know, too, that for years following World War I we relied on our victory over German imperialism as ushering in an era of peace and tranquility for the family of nations.

Our hope of universal peace was short lived for within a period of 22 years—America was an armed camp preparing for World War II that saw the greatest blood bath in history—with America in a war that resulted in 409,000 men killed and a total of 1,050,000 casualties at a cost of $466 billion.

Following World War II our hope for world peace was rudely shattered when we found our Nation embroiled in the so-called police action in Korea that cost our Nation $121 billion and claimed in casualties 54,000 of the youth of our country.

Thus it may be seen that following World War II and the Korean war, Congress in 1954 acted in an appropriate manner when it discarded the term "Armistice Day" and recognized November 11 as Veterans Day.

The change was deemed as being more descriptive of a national holiday designed to commemorate the service rendered their country by the veterans of all wars in which this Nation has been involved.

Tonight, here in Philadelphia, we celebrate Veterans Day with an added tribute of respect and admiration for the United Veterans Council as sponsor of this first annual Veterans Day celebration.

This year, in addition to paying homage to our veteran population, November 11 has added significance because it marks the beginning of annual recognition of Veterans Day by this first annual Veterans Day dinner.

This annual dinner in celebration of Veterans Day is a fitting tribute to the memory of those of the area who in time of national emergency were found ready and willing to defend the security of their country—as they

marched under our national emblem on far-flung global battlefronts.

Many of our comrades made the supreme sacrifice.

Those of us who returned are now faced with the added responsibility in peacetime of further safeguarding our cherished principles of liberty and freedom which are now being challenged by the ruthless forces of atheistic world communism.

In paying honor on November 11 to those who defended our Nation in war, we are forced to recognize that the most dangerous threat here at home may well prove to be the apathy and indifference of thoughtless citizens who refuse to recognize the deadly threat of world communism.

It has been truly said that the infiltration of communism in the bloodstream of American life—as unfolded over the years—is traceable to the complacency of misguided Americans who refuse to become alarmed over the Red peril to the American form of government.

Frankly, we can lose this battle for the minds of men by default if we elect to pursue a listless attitude in regard to preserving and protecting the true concept of Americanism.

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer in a Veterans Day speech at Arlington National Cemetery in 1959 clearly defined the situation facing America when he warned that "citizen apathy" may well prove the downfall of our Nation.

May I digress at this point to state that two of Philadelphia's distinguished citizens—your honorable Mayor Richardson Dilworth and Mr. Albert M. Greenfield—are being honored this evening by being recipients of outstanding service awards for their civic consciousness.

They present by their lives the perfect antidote for citizen apathy by General Wedemeyer.

Continuing with the views expressed by General Wedemeyer, he said:

"One hears these days about civil rights and individual rights.

"However, inherent in those rights are definite responsibilities.

"Not the least of these," said General Wedemeyer, "is the continued and enthusiastic support of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen."

The general said it is primarily our fault if servicemen are not proud of the uniform they wear.

He asserted, "We share equally the shame when they are brainwashed by an unscrupulous enemy."

Continuing, General Wedemeyer said, "it is our responsibility that the men and women in the Armed Forces fully realize how grateful we are for their sacrifices and unstinted efforts to perpetuate our American heritage."

Finally, General Wedemeyer made a fervent plea that such organizations as the United Veterans Council of Philadelphia receive deserving recognition and public support when he stated, "We also have the responsibility of supporting the patriotic and civic organizations whose members or their representatives assemble annually at Arlington National Cemetery—and elsewhere in the country on Veterans Day."

Ladies and gentlemen, it behooves all America to take to heart the words of Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, especially when we realize the complacency that has engulfed the Nation in paying tribute to its defenders and to the Stars and Stripes under which they marched bravely in all wars in which this Nation was involved.

Today, November 11, 1960, it is shameful to note that flying the flag of our country is no longer a custom on national holidays such as Veterans Day.

Those of us who served in World War I recall with pride the honor and respect accorded Old Glory when in our youthful days it was a grand old American custom to "fling it afresh to the breeze" and say: "Three cheers for the red, white, and blue."

Let us hope that we can return to such a custom which was observed with patriotic pride by our parents and which they had hoped was a custom that posterity would observe.

The observance of Veterans Day provides a fine opportunity to examine the conscience of our Nation with respect to the appropriate observance of national holidays of a patriotic nature and for proper and due respect for the flag of our Nation.

During the recent 15th annual meeting of the United Nations—we had a closeup picture of world communism at work as revealed by the blustering tactics of Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

Surrounded by several puppets of Moscow from the Iron Curtain countries Khrushchev and his Red cronies spent their 3½ weeks in New York City in heaping ridicule and abuse on our Nation and its leaders.

Khrushchev, in an insulting and arrogant manner, defied the West in his efforts to scuttle the United Nations as an organization dedicated to seeking world peace.

He left for the Kremlin with his Red cohorts shouting insults and boasting of his future efforts to reduce the United Nations to the status of becoming a puppet of Moscow.

While the nations of the West discounted his boisterous conduct as being bluster and bluff the fact remains that his challenge cannot be ignored or lightly regarded.

At the present time, through the admission to the United Nations of many new nations, the growing membership provides a fertile soil for Kremlin arrogance and deceit in trying to sabotage the United Nations and make it a tool of the masters of the Kremlin.

With pressure for the admission of Red China increasing every year the West is being forcibly reminded that it cannot relax its vigilance lest its indifference result in the accomplishment of Soviet aims.

Veterans Day being reminiscent of our past wars is also an occasion to consider well the devastation to follow from a third world war fought with missiles and nuclear weapons.

The very thought of such a potential catastrophe is too awesome to contemplate and poses a challenge to national unity that demands careful and sober thought.

The history of America reveals that despite the various differences we may have among groups of citizens—many of which were exemplified in this week's election campaign—when the "smoke of battle" clears there emerges a united nation eager to "bury the hatchet" and get on with the task before us.

Premier Khrushchev, if he continues his diabolical efforts to "divide and conquer," will find that an aroused America is capable of the power of production never before equaled in history.

This was true in World War II and it will be repeated again if the madmen of the Kremlin exhaust our patience by some overt act that places our Nation in deadly peril.

Frankly, the answer to the menace of world communism is the age-old brand of militant Americanism.

We know that no foreign "ism" can survive in a community, State, or nation, that understands and practices true Americanism.

In our battle with the Red hordes of atheistic communism—we are not shadowboxing; no, we are "playing for keeps."

It is a "do or die" struggle with no twilight zone or middle course of action because America with her allies presents the only stumbling block in the path of Communist aggression.

When you realize that this is an all-out struggle against the Kremlin dagger pointed at the very heart of our Nation it is revolting to witness the parade of so-called Americans who, when accused of subversive activities, hide behind the fifth amendment and refuse to testify regarding their sordid conduct.

These phony Americans have given comfort and aid to the butchers of Budapest.

By their actions they betray our country and besmirch the memory of our valiant comrades; yes, America's sons, who offered their lives on the altar of freedom.

In the wake of the shameful conduct of such phony Americans it behooves us as citizens to cast off the cloak of apathy recognizing the undying truth that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Therefore, on this Veterans Day, 1960, let us take inventory of the benefits and blessings that divine providence has bestowed on our beloved country.

Let us examine our conscience, seeking an answer to the important question, "Am I discharging my obligations as an American citizen to the best of my ability?"

If we answer in the affirmative then by our words and deeds we reaffirm our allegiance to this Republic of the United States and to the American way of life.

Moreover, our minds, our hearts, and our hands, will be united with other loyal Americans throughout the world in holding high the banner of human dignity and liberty, and of justice, peace, and understanding, among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

This type of real Americanism is what our Nation needs today if it is to retain its prestige as the leader of all the free nations of the world and to serve as a beacon light in the deathless struggle for a just and lasting peace.

In conclusion let us never forget that the post headquarters of the various veterans organizations in every community is a citadel of patriotism and civic pride.

Yes, collectively they are mighty sentinels representing a vast network of grassroot voices.

These voices can be blended into a resounding chorus in support of the American way of life for which millions of our comrades gave their last, full measure of devotion.

Therefore, on this Veterans Day, 1960, let us honor their memory by rededicating ourselves to the task of preserving for posterity—unsullied and undefiled—the greatest nation of them all—the United States of America.

Federal Spending, Tax Rates, and Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my friend and distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and myself, I would like to call to the attention of the House the reintroduction of our companion bills, H. R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, to reform Federal tax rates and methods. These bills were originally introduced in the 86th Congress on January 21, 1959, and were reintroduced in the 87th Congress on January 6, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, for 4 years there has been before the Congress legislation to reform Federal tax rates to permit greater economic progress. Over roughly the same period, Federal spending has increased $11 billion, and retarded economic growth has emerged as the Nation's chronic problem. If the revenue consumed in the increased spending had been retained in the private economy through tax rate reform, we would already be moving into a new era of more rapid and sustainable economic growth.

The philosophy underlying the Federal tax system is as outmoded as the breadline. It was born in Europe out of misunderstanding of the meaning and promise of the industrial revolution, and in America was nourished into political acceptance in the doom and gloom of "maturity economics" in the 1930's. It is defeatist in concept and weighted against progress in practice.

If the present tax rates and methods did not exist, no contemporary authority would advocate such exactions on progress. The first responsibility of government is to correct its mistakes, not attempt to compensate for them.

We are told that the new Congress must enact a variety of legislation to deal with problems which are symptomatic instead of the cause of retarded economic growth. Every such legislative proposal which would add to the spending total, or otherwise compound the problem of inadequate growth, should be rejected. It is a time for statesmanship in the general public interest, not more of the patchwork, opportunistic politics which mar our national greatness.

In our joint statement of January 21, 1959, we said:

> Combined with men's energy, vision, and technological skill, capital is the source of all economic progress. Its beneficial effect starts with employment. The production of capital goods itself provides jobs. Then these goods are used to increase the productivity of existing jobs and to create new production and new jobs.
>
> Any tax method or rate which impedes the accumulation, use, or preservation of capital is a tax on human betterment and national strength. Our Federal tax structure must stand convicted of this fault.
>
> By use of capital-destroying tax rates and methods we have prevented our economy from achieving anything like its potential for progress. This means that we have fewer and less productive jobs than should be available. Our total production is far short of our national capability for progress and the standard of living of our people is correspondingly less than it should be. It also means that failure to effect fundamental reform of our tax structure quickly would put in jeopardy the industrial supremacy on which our national security depends.

The urgency which was then seen by too few is now apparent to many. From the nagging, increasingly serious problem of unemployment, and the related problem of distressed areas, through the increased effectiveness of foreign competition, to the twin problems of the adverse balance of international payments and the gold outflow, we see the handiwork of too much dependence on government, and too little reliance on the free economy.

America's gift to mankind is freedom. The constitutional design was to protect men in the exercise of their free rights and responsibilities, not to make them dependent on government direction, props, and handouts, nor to make them suffer under government-imposed restraints and handicaps. There is nothing in the art of all-pervasive government which has not been tried elsewhere. Only through practice of the art of freedom can America remain the torchbearer for human dignity and well-being in the world.

The tax philosophy which hamstrings America's economic progress is, like strong-arm government, an import. Its fitness for nations whose economies are semisocialized, cartelized, or subsidized is for them to decide. But it is totally incompatible with the rigorous competitiveness of our free economy. For a number of years after World War II, inflation blunted some of this competitiveness and thus made it easier to earn adequate profits. Even in that era, however, economic growth was not well balanced. The great strides made in basic industries and well-established companies were not matched by a free flow of new and mobile venture capital into new businesses providing new jobs and new products and services. Instead, the flow has been little more than a trickle compared with the potential under a moderate and reasonable tax rate structure.

Mr. Speaker, the slow and intermittent growth of recent years is proof that more Government programs and greater spending provides no offset for a capital-destroying tax structure. The finality of this proof is sometimes obscured because of the tendency of economists, private as well as public, to speak of increase in Government spending as a plus value in business activity. Such observations ignore both the cost, and the fact that total government spending—Federal, State, and local—already amounts to more than 30 percent of gross national product. If Government spending assured prosperity, we would have no problem of retarded economic growth.

Despite these facts, the Nation has been deluged over the past couple of years with high-sourding appeals for putting more of the people's income into government—called the public sector of the economy—and leaving less of their income for use in the private economy. Such thinking goes further than just putting the cart before the horse; it would strangle the animal. Whatever else might be said about the American scene since World War II, it is contrary to all reason to state that the needs of the people for government have been neglected. It is the needs of the people for a vigorous, dynamic, job-giving, strength-building private economy which have been neglected.

The greatness of our Nation is in peril and, with it, the strength and leadership which is the world's unifying force in containing the spread of communism. We cannot expect to continue to lead much beyond the time when we excel in economic vitality.

The world is capital-minded as never before. Whether it be slave capital behind the Iron Curtain, semisocialized capital in too many nations, or free capital in the most rapidly advancing nations, it is capital that underwrites all progress. It is long past the time when we can discount economic advance in the Soviet Union, and many other nations, at two, three, or more times our rate, as recovery from the holocaust of war. They are growing more rapidly because, through whatever means, they are developing and using more capital.

The irony of the situation is that, since World War II, the foremost consideration of our foreign economic policy has been the need for capital elsewhere. Tens of billions of dollars of foreign aid have been donated to build, directly or indirectly, capital supply and use in other nations. We would rebuild and expand the ramparts of all non-Communist nations except America. We have forgotten that we cannot long serve the interests of all mankind without first serving our own.

It is long past the time when we should have recognized that we need more capital for more growth just as does the rest of the world. We cannot afford a tax structure which converts job creating growth capital into current Government spending. Until Federal tax rates are reasonable and moderate, further increase in Federal spending will be at the expense of greater growth in the private economy.

Mr. Speaker, the details of our bills are given in the attached excerpt from our statement of January 21, 1959. The essential procedure of the legislation is to use the revenue gain from economic growth to reform the tax rates and methods which impede growth, thus assuring greater growth and more revenue. The revenue gain amounts to approximately $1 billion for each 1-percent increase in gross national product. The reforms involving major revenue effect are spread out over a 5-year period, with the result that the revenue effect in any one year would not be greater than $3½ billion, or the revenue increase which would come from a growth rate of 3½ percent.

The intent of the legislation is to give priority for use of the revenue gain to tax rate reform over any and all spending on new or old programs except that necessary for national security. Necessary increase in spending on some phases of the military program should be offset by economies in other phases of this program or by reduction elsewhere in the Federal budget. However, to safeguard against a return to deficit financing, the legislation provides a procedure for postponing the forward-scheduled income tax rate reductions in any year in which budget unbalance is threatened.

Assuming no postponements, at the end of 5 years the top rates of income and estate taxes would be reduced to 47 percent. In relation to the need for more capital for more growth, it is unfortunate that these rates cannot be brought down more rapidly, and to a lower level within the 5 years. The legislation thus is a modest, and not a drastic, program.

The goals of this legislation should be distinguished from other proposals designed to aid, prop, or stimulate the private economy. Our proposal is one for undoing what the Government should not have done in the first place and which, once done, should long since have been discontinued. The economy would not be stimulated, but released from tax brakes and drags which have no place in a free economy. Recently, a French economist stated:

> All economic progress is nothing, basically, except an incessant struggle between the call of the future and the defense of the past.

The present system of Federal tax rates and methods is a relic of uninformed and misguided thinking of the past. It is no more suited to the requirements of the present and the future than is the notion that our economy by the 1930's had reached a stage of permanent maturity. To defend the present system is to look backward, not forward.

We cannot move forward to new heights of prosperity, employment, economic growth, national strength, and international prestige by keeping our economy tied to a tax model which reflects all the defeatism of the past, and none of the promise of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the time is already late for action. We are off to a slow start in the critical decade of the 1960's. We dare not temporize further lest new commitments for Government spending again intervene and preempt the revenue gain from economic growth for years ahead. If we do not act now, we will invite further deterioration in our domestic economy and in our position of international prestige and leadership, instead of moving forward in the 1960's.

The joint statement follows:

EXCERPTS FROM JOINT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE A. S. HERLONG, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD H. BAKER, REPUBLICAN, OF TENNESSEE, ON JANUARY 21, 1959

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Starting with January 1, 1961, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated rates of individual tax, with the first bracket rate being reduced from 20 to 15 percent. With compression of the scale of graduation being the key to fundamental tax reform over the 5 years, the top individual rate would be brought down to 47 percent, from its present 91 percent. Specific examples of reductions in other statutory rates follow: $4,000 to $6,000 taxable income bracket, from 26 to 17 percent; $8,000 to $10,000 bracket, from 34 to 19 percent; $12,000 to $14,000 bracket, from 43 to 21 percent; $16,000 to $18,000 bracket, from 50 to 23 percent; and $20,000 to $22,000 bracket, from 56 to 25 percent. Appendix A shows the new rates for each year. Appendix B provides a means by which individual taxpayers can compute their tax liability at the end of the reduction period, as compared to present law.

The revenue effect of these reductions would be somewhat more than $2 billion annually, or upward of $11 billion over the 5-year period, out of a total revenue effect for the legislation as a whole of about $17 billion. Nearly 60 percent of this $11 billion revenue effect (tax saving to the individual) would fall in the taxable income brackets up to $6,000, as shown in appendix C; and 79 percent in the taxable brackets up to $18,000. Only 6 percent of the total would fall in the brackets above $50,000. Of course, the data for the lower brackets include tax savings on all income falling in such brackets, including that of taxpayers whose total income also places them in higher brackets. The table demonstrates the point, however, that there could be no further significant reductions in the lower brackets by foregoing part of the reductions in the middle and higher brackets.

The emphasis we place on compression of the graduated scale of individual tax rates reflects the fact that graduation is the worst saboteur of the economics of progress. While the most senseless and uneconomic rates are in the highest brackets, the steepest climb in graduation is through the middle and not the higher brackets. In fact, half of the total range of graduation (the 71 percentage points between the first rate of 20 percent and the top rate of 91 percent) is reached at the taxable income bracket beginning with $22,000, where the rate is 56 percent (basic rate of 20 percent, and graduated element of 36 percent).

The steeply graduated rates dull the incentives to earn higher income and to engage or invest in venturesome enterprises.

These rates drastically limit the accumulation of new capital in two ways. As income increases only a declining margin is available for saving. And, because of the impact on incentives, much less income is sought and realized in the middle through higher brackets than would be the case under moderate rates.

The high rates limit the investment potential even more than indicated by the immediate effect on capital accumulation. Savings of persons in the middle and higher income brackets are more likely to be invested in the risky or venturesome types of enterprise than are the savings of those with lower incomes. This likelihood would be greatly increased under moderate rates. Risk-taking investments always forerun opportunity for safer use of investment funds. Under sustained, higher level growth, which must be sparked and initially fueled by venture capital, there would be much greater accumulation and use of investment funds from all sources.

The limitation on total investment potential has its most severe effect as regards the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of small businesses once begun. Aside from the incentives to engage in business, or to make a business grow, the punitive tax rates make it impossible for the small business to secure venture capital from outside sources. The once prolific source of such capital, the successful person who was willing and able to invest in new enterprises, has been choked off by the punitive tax rates. When, under moderate tax rates, the successful are again able to accumulate substantial savings out of current income, we will find that they again will be interested in investing in such enterprises.

Moreover, even well-established businesses in the middle and larger size categories are often faced with an impossible problem of finding adequate new funds for expansion. All across the board, the steeply graduated rates of individual tax serve directly and indirectly to limit the accumulation of new capital funds so desperately needed to realize our Nation's potential for progress and security.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX, AND DEPRECIATION

Starting January 1, 1961, there would be five annual reductions of 1 percentage point each in the rates of corporate tax, and five annual reductions of 5 percent each in the maximum required length of property lives for depreciation on new plant and equipment as measured from an average of present experience.

The first three reductions in tax rates would apply to the normal corporate tax, bringing it down from 30 to 27 percent, and the last two reductions would apply to the surtax, bringing it down from 22 to 20 percent. The combined top rate would thus be reduced from 52 to 47 percent.

The revenue effect of the corporate rate reductions is estimated at $400 million annually, or a total of $2 billion over the 5 years.

The depreciation provisions, applied to new acquisition of business plant and equipment, would supplant Treasury determination of property lives under bulletin F by substituting six broad statutory classifications of depreciable property. In actual experience many taxpayers have used, with Revenue Service approval, shorter property lives than provided in bulletin F, and the aim in the legislation is to measure the reduction in lives from average actual experience.

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal allowances in early years under the sum-of-the-year's digits and double declining clining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 Revenue Code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

While the long-range effect of depreciation speedups is to defer and not eliminate tax liability, the short-to-medium-range effects are the same as that coming from any type of tax reform.

On the basis of rough data we have estimated the revenue effect of these depreciation changes at up to $600 million annually, or up to $3 billion over the 5-year period. It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of the tax savings would go to corporate taxpayers, and 25 percent to unincorporated business taxpayers.

Potentially corporate profits are a major source of new venture capital. The potential derives from two factors: First, profits retained within a corporation increase the stockholder's equity and hence are venture capital; and, second, people who own stocks could normally be expected to invest a large part of dividend income in new equities.

In recent years the first factor has been negated in large part because of the overstatement of corporate profits due to inflation. This results because depreciation charges are stated in dollars of original investment, instead of in dollars reflecting replacement cost. The difference, which is subject to the tax on profits, has to be made up out of retained profits in order to maintain intact the present value of investment. Only the remaining profits are available for net new investment in plant and facilities. This problem is aggravated by the required spread out of depreciation allowances over unrealistically long periods of time.

Under these conditions, it is understandable there would be advocacy of legislative action to compensate for the inflationary impact on profits by increasing depreciation allowances to reflect replacement instead of original cost. Such a procedure, however, would run counter to the purpose of our legislation, which is to stop inflation, not compensate for it. There are other reasons why it would not be feasible to incorporate a replacement cost formula; namely, the revenue effect would be so large as to prevent any contemporary reduction in corporate rates, as well as some of the reduction in individual rates contemplated in our bills; the tax reduction dollars involved would go entirely to established enterprises without improving the depreciation situation of enterprises still in the development and initial expansion phases; and it would leave unresolved and even aggravate the problem of excessive property lives.

On the other hand, reduction of property lives as provided in our legislation would contribute to forces for stopping inflation; can

Mr. Speaker, for 4 years there has been before the Congress legislation to reform Federal tax rates to permit greater economic progress. Over roughly the same period, Federal spending has increased $11 billion, and retarded economic growth has emerged as the Nation's chronic problem. If the revenue consumed in the increased spending had been retained in the private economy through tax rate reform, we would already be moving into a new era of more rapid and sustainable economic growth.

The philosophy underlying the Federal tax system is as outmoded as the breadline. It was born in Europe out of misunderstanding of the meaning and promise of the industrial revolution, and in America was nourished into political acceptance in the doom and gloom of "maturity economics" in the 1930's. It is defeatist in concept and weighted against progress in practice.

If the present tax rates and methods did not exist, no contemporary authority would advocate such exactions on progress. The first responsibility of government is to correct its mistakes, not attempt to compensate for them.

We are told that the new Congress must enact a variety of legislation to deal with problems which are symptomatic instead of the cause of retarded economic growth. Every such legislative proposal which would add to the spending total, or otherwise compound the problem of inadequate growth, should be rejected. It is a time for statesmanship in the general public interest, not more of the patchwork, opportunistic politics which mar our national greatness.

In our joint statement of January 21, 1959, we said:

> Combined with men's energy, vision, and technological skill, capital is the source of all economic progress. Its beneficial effect starts with employment. The production of capital goods itself provides jobs. Then these goods are used to increase the productivity of existing jobs and to create new production and new jobs.
>
> Any tax method or rate which impedes the accumulation, use, or preservation of capital is a tax on human betterment and national strength. Our Federal tax structure must stand convicted of this fault.
>
> By use of capital-destroying tax rates and methods we have prevented our economy from achieving anything like its potential for progress. This means that we have fewer and less productive jobs than should be available. Our total production is far short of our national capability for progress and the standard of living of our people is correspondingly less than it should be. It also means that failure to effect fundamental reform of our tax structure quickly would put in jeopardy the industrial supremacy on which our national security depends.

The urgency which was then seen by too few is now apparent to many. From the nagging, increasingly serious problem of unemployment, and the related problem of distressed areas, through the increased effectiveness of foreign competition, to the twin problems of the adverse balance of international payments and the gold outflow, we see the handiwork of too much dependence on government, and too little reliance on the free economy.

America's gift to mankind is freedom. The constitutional design was to protect men in the exercise of their free rights and responsibilities, not to make them dependent on government direction, props, and handouts, nor to make them suffer under government-imposed restraints and handicaps. There is nothing in the art of all-pervasive government which has not been tried elsewhere. Only through practice of the art of freedom can America remain the torchbearer for human dignity and well-being in the world.

The tax philosophy which hamstrings America's economic progress is, like strong-arm government, an import. Its fitness for nations whose economies are semisocialized, cartelized, or subsidized is for them to decide. But it is totally incompatible with the rigorous competitiveness of our free economy. For a number of years after World War II, inflation blunted some of this competitiveness and thus made it easier to earn adequate profits. Even in that era, however, economic growth was not well balanced. The great strides made in basic industries and well-established companies were not matched by a free flow of new and mobile venture capital into new businesses providing new jobs and new products and services. Instead, the flow has been little more than a trickle compared with the potential under a moderate and reasonable tax rate structure.

Mr. Speaker, the slow and intermittent growth of recent years is proof that more Government programs and greater spending provides no offset for a capital-destroying tax structure. The finality of this proof is sometimes obscured because of the tendency of economists, private as well as public, to speak of increase in Government spending as a plus value in business activity. Such observations ignore both the cost, and the fact that total government spending—Federal, State, and local—already amounts to more than 30 percent of gross national product. If Government spending assured prosperity, we would have no problem of retarded economic growth.

Despite these facts, the Nation has been deluged over the past couple of years with high-sounding appeals for putting more of the people's income into government—called the public sector of the economy—and leaving less of their income for use in the private economy. Such thinking goes further than just putting the cart before the horse; it would strangle the animal. Whatever else might be said about the American scene since World War II, it is contrary to all reason to state that the needs of the people for government have been neglected. It is the needs of the people for a vigorous, dynamic, job-giving, strength-building private economy which have been neglected.

The greatness of our Nation is in peril and, with it, the strength and leadership which is the world's unifying force in containing the spread of communism. We cannot expect to continue to lead much beyond the time when we excel in economic vitality.

The world is capital-minded as never before. Whether it be slave capital behind the Iron Curtain, semisocialized capital in too many nations, or free capital in the most rapidly advancing nations, it is capital that underwrites all progress. It is long past the time when we can discount economic advance in the Soviet Union, and many other nations, at two, three, or more times our rate, as recovery from the holocaust of war. They are growing more rapidly because, through whatever means, they are developing and using more capital.

The irony of the situation is that, since World War II, the foremost consideration of our foreign economic policy has been the need for capital elsewhere. Tens of billions of dollars of foreign aid have been donated to build, directly or indirectly, capital supply and use in other nations. We would rebuild and expand the ramparts of all non-Communist nations except America. We have forgotten that we cannot long serve the interests of all mankind without first serving our own.

It is long past the time when we should have recognized that we need more capital for more growth just as does the rest of the world. We cannot afford a tax structure which converts job creating growth capital into current Government spending. Until Federal tax rates are reasonable and moderate, further increase in Federal spending will be at the expense of greater growth in the private economy.

Mr. Speaker, the details of our bills are given in the attached excerpt from our statement of January 21, 1959. The essential procedure of the legislation is to use the revenue gain from economic growth to reform the tax rates and methods which impede growth, thus assuring greater growth and more revenue. The revenue gain amounts to approximately $1 billion for each 1-percent increase in gross national product. The reforms involving major revenue effect are spread out over a 5-year period, with the result that the revenue effect in any one year would not be greater than $3½ billion, or the revenue increase which would come from a growth rate of 3½ percent.

The intent of the legislation is to give priority for use of the revenue gain to tax rate reform over any and all spending on new or old programs except that necessary for national security. Necessary increase in spending on some phases of the military program should be offset by economies in other phases of this program or by reduction elsewhere in the Federal budget. However, to safeguard against a return to deficit financing, the legislation provides a procedure for postponing the forward-scheduled income tax rate reductions in any year in which budget unbalance is threatened.

Assuming no postponements, at the end of 5 years the top rates of income and estate taxes would be reduced to 47 percent. In relation to the need for more capital for more growth, it is unfortunate that these rates cannot be brought down more rapidly, and to a lower level within the 5 years. The legislation thus is a modest, and not a drastic, program.

The goals of this legislation should be distinguished from other proposals designed to aid, prop, or stimulate the private economy. Our proposal is one for undoing what the Government should not have done in the first place and which, once done, should long since have been discontinued. The economy would not be stimulated, but released from tax brakes and drags which have no place in a free economy. Recently, a French economist stated:

> All economic progress is nothing, basically, except an incessant struggle between the call of the future and the defense of the past.

The present system of Federal tax rates and methods is a relic of uninformed and misguided thinking of the past. It is no more suited to the requirements of the present and the future than is the notion that our economy by the 1930's had reached a stage of permanent maturity. To defend the present system is to look backward, not forward.

We cannot move forward to new heights of prosperity, employment, economic growth, national strength, and international prestige by keeping our economy tied to a tax model which reflects all the defeatism of the past, and none of the promise of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the time is already late for action. We are off to a slow start in the critical decade of the 1960's. We dare not temporize further lest new commitments for Government spending again intervene and preempt the revenue gain from economic growth for years ahead. If we do not act now, we will invite further deterioration in our domestic economy and in our position of international prestige and leadership, instead of moving forward in the 1960's.

The joint statement follows:

EXCERPTS FROM JOINT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE A. S. HERLONG, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD H. BAKER, REPUBLICAN, OF TENNESSEE, ON JANUARY 21, 1959

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Starting with January 1, 1961, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated rates of individual tax, with the first bracket rate being reduced from 20 to 15 percent. With compression of the scale of graduation being the key to fundamental tax reform over the 5 years, the top individual rate would be brought down to 47 percent, from its present 91 percent. Specific examples of reductions in other statutory rates follow: $4,000 to $6,000 taxable income bracket, from 26 to 17 percent; $8,000 to $10,000 bracket, from 34 to 19 percent; $12,000 to $14,000 bracket, from 43 to 21 percent; $16,000 to $18,000 bracket, from 50 to 23 percent; and $20,000 to $22,000 bracket, from 56 to 25 percent. Appendix A shows the new rates for each year. Appendix B provides a means by which individual taxpayers can compute their tax liability at the end of the reduction period, as compared to present law.

The revenue effect of these reductions would be somewhat more than $2 billion annually, or upward of $11 billion over the 5-year period, out of a total revenue effect for the legislation as a whole of about $17 billion. Nearly 60 percent of this $11 billion revenue effect (tax saving to the individual) would fall in the taxable income brackets up to $6,000, as shown in appendix C; and 79 percent in the taxable brackets up to $18,000. Only 6 percent of the total would fall in the brackets above $50,000. Of course, the data for the lower brackets include tax savings on all income falling in such brackets, including that of taxpayers whose total income also places them in higher brackets. The table demonstrates the point, however, that there could be no further significant reductions in the lower brackets by foregoing part of the reductions in the middle and higher brackets.

The emphasis we place on compression of the graduated scale of individual tax rates reflects the fact that graduation is the worst saboteur of the economics of progress. While the most senseless and uneconomic rates are in the highest brackets, the steepest climb in graduation is through the middle and not the higher brackets. In fact, half of the total range of graduation (the 71 percentage points between the first rate of 20 percent and the top rate of 91 percent) is reached at the taxable income bracket beginning with $22,000, where the rate is 56 percent (basic rate of 20 percent, and graduated element of 36 percent).

The steeply graduated rates dull the incentives to earn higher income and to engage or invest in venturesome enterprises.

These rates drastically limit the accumulation of new capital in two ways. As income increases only a declining margin is available for saving. And, because of the impact on incentives, much less income is sought and realized in the middle through higher brackets than would be the case under moderate rates.

The high rates limit the investment potential even more than indicated by the immediate effect on capital accumulation. Savings of persons in the middle and higher income brackets are more likely to be invested in the risky or venturesome types of enterprise than are the savings of those with lower incomes. This likelihood would be greatly increased under moderate rates. Risk-taking investments always forerun opportunity for safer use of investment funds. Under sustained, higher level growth, which must be sparked and initially fueled by venture capital, there would be much greater accumulation and use of investment funds from all sources.

The limitation on total investment potential has its most severe effect as regards the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of small businesses once begun. Aside from the incentives to engage in business, or to make a busines grow, the punitive tax rates make it impossible for the small business to secure venture capital from outside sources. The once prolific source of such capital, the successful person who was willing and able to invest in new enterprises, has been choked off by the punitive tax rates. When, under moderate tax rates, the successful are again able to accumulate substantial savings out of current income, we will find that they again will be interested in investing in such enterprises.

Moreover, even well-established businesses in the middle and larger size categories are often faced with an impossible problem of finding adequate new funds for expansion. All across the board, the steeply graduated rates of individual tax serve directly and indirectly to limit the accumulation of new capital funds so desperately needed to realize our Nation's potential for progress and security.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX, AND DEPRECIATION

Starting January 1, 1961, there would be five annual reductions of 1 percentage point each in the rates of corporate tax, and five annual reductions of 5 percent each in the maximum required length of property lives for depreciation on new plant and equipment as measured from an average of present experience.

The first three reductions in tax rates would apply to the normal corporate tax, bringing it down from 30 to 27 percent, and the last two reductions would apply to the surtax, bringing it down from 22 to 20 percent. The combined top rate would thus be reduced from 52 to 47 percent.

The revenue effect of the corporate rate reductions is estimated at $400 million annually, or a total of $2 billion over the 5 years.

The depreciation provisions, applied to new acquisition of business plant and equipment, would supplant Treasury determination of property lives under bulletin F by substituting six broad statutory classifications of depreciable property. In actual experience many taxpayers have used, with Revenue Service approval, shorter property lives than provided in bulletin F, and the aim in the legislation is to measure the reduction in lives from average actual experience.

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal allowances in early years under the sum-of-the-year's digits and double declining clining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 Revenue Code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

While the long-range effect of depreciation speedups is to defer and not eliminate tax liability, the short-to-medium-range effects are the same as that coming from any type of tax reform.

On the basis of rough data we have estimated the revenue effect of these depreciation changes at up to $600 million annually, or up to $3 billion over the 5-year period. It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of the tax savings would go to corporate taxpayers, and 25 percent to unincorporated business taxpayers.

Potentially corporate profits are a major source of new venture capital. The potential derives from two factors: First, profits retained within a corporation increase the stockholder's equity and hence are venture capital; and, second, people who own stocks could normally be expected to invest a large part of dividend income in new equities.

In recent years the first factor has been negated in large part because of the overstatement of corporate profits due to inflation. This results because depreciation charges are stated in dollars of original investment, instead of in dollars reflecting replacement cost. The difference, which is subject to the tax on profits, has to be made up out of retained profits in order to maintain intact the present value of investment. Only the remaining profits are available for net new investment in plant and facilities. This problem is aggravated by the required spread out of depreciation allowances over unrealistically long periods of time.

Under these conditions, it is understandable there would be advocacy of legislative action to compensate for the inflationary impact on profits by increasing depreciation allowances to reflect replacement instead of original cost. Such a procedure, however, would run counter to the purpose of our legislation, which is to stop inflation, not compensate for it. There are other reasons why it would not be feasible to incorporate a replacement cost formula; namely, the revenue effect would be so large as to prevent any contemporary reduction in corporate rates, as well as some of the reduction in individual rates contemplated in our bills; the tax reduction dollars involved would go entirely to established enterprises without improving the depreciation situation of enterprises still in the development and initial expansion phases; and it would leave unresolved and even aggravate the problem of excessive property lives.

On the other hand, reduction of property lives as provided in our legislation would contribute to forces for stopping inflation; can

be accommodated by foregoing a reduction of only 5 percentage points in the corporate tax; would benefit enterprises in accordance with the rate of new investment regardless of preceding development; and would constitute a major step toward a permanent solution to the problem of excessive property lives which otherwise could become intolerable under the rapid advance of technology. Moreover, as additional tax reduction opportunities open up, this procedure may be readily expanded to accomplish a total reduction of say 50 percent in property lives which would mean a doubling of depreciation allowance rates. As a final point, when this procedure brings property lives down to realistic levels, there would be eliminated one of the areas of persistent conflict between taxpayers and the Revenue Service involving tremendous time and cost on the part of both.

As regards the second factor mentioned above, stockholder reinvestment of dividend income is now largely prevented by the steeply climbing rates of individual tax. This situation would be greatly improved under the moderate individual rate scale provided in our bills.

THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX

In accordance with the precedent already established on the sale and repurchase of homes, our bills make statutory provision for tax free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another when the transactions are completed within the taxable year, and the investments sold have been held by the taxpayer for at least 6 months. The result would be a deferral of tax on long-term gains until such time as the taxpayer disinvests. We have included this application of the rollover principle in the legislation since the only possible justification for taxing at any time the proceeds from sale of a long-term investment is that the seller is disinvesting with the intention of using capital gains as income for consumption purposes.

Recognizing that consideration of this kind of procedure for prospective effectuation could result in an inflationary buyer's market for securities and other producing properties, as present owners held back from selling in the expectation of tax deferral on later sales, we have set the effective date for this provision as of January 1, 1961. Data are not available from which the revenue effect of this provision can be systematically calculated, but it could not be too large because of the exclusion of corporate transactions and also some other types of transactions, such as sale of timber-cutting rights as distinguished from the property itself, now classed as capital gains. The total revenue effect might go as high as $1 billion, but conceivably could be as low as half a billion dollars.

Whatever the revenue effect, there would be a complete offsetting increase in the availability of new capital. A tax on a capital gain from investment is a tax on capital, and the existing supply of capital is diminished by the amount of the tax. Capital so destroyed must be replaced by new capital accumulated out of current income, before there is a net addition to capital supply for new investment.

In addition to decreasing the existing supply of capital, the fact of a tax on capital gains serves to reduce the mobility of capital, since it defeats the investor's judgment where the reasons for transferring capital from one investment to another do not outweigh the tax consideration. Capital immobilized in this way is described as "locked in." The result is particularly serious as regards new and small business since, other things being equal, it restricts movements of funds from ownership in well-established business to more venturesome enterprises involving the prospect of greater return. Thus, the capital gains tax serves to compound the prohibitive barrier of the graduated individual tax to the starting and development of business.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Instead of establishing a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts, our bills would simply bring the top rate of estate tax down to 47 percent to coincide with the top rates of individual and corporate tax after 5 years, and consistent with the present relationship, reduce the top rate of gift tax to three-fourths of this figure, or 35.25 percent. All lower rates would be reduced in proportion. Thus, as set forth in appendix D, the estate tax rates would range by taxable brackets from 1.75 to 47 percent, compared with the present 3 to 77 percent, and the gift tax rates from 1.25 to 35.25 percent, compared with the present 2.25 to 57.75 percent.

These new rates would become effective on the day following enactment of the legislation. Because of the normal delay between the occurrence of death and payment of estate tax, the revenue effect of the legislation would not be significant in the first year. Thereafter, it is estimated the effect would be no more than $400 to $500 million annually.

Since a death or gift tax is a tax on capital, these are but modest reductions in destructive rates. As with the capital gains tax, the net reduction of capital through estate and gift taxes can only be restored by withdrawals from new savings out of current income.

The high rates have been championed as a means for breaking up and redistributing the wealth represented in large estates. To the extent of the tax, however, capital is destroyed and not redistributed. Actually, the high rates have resulted in transfer of the bulk of many large estates to tax-exempt trusts and foundations. Instead of dispersing ownership, such transfers have created a new kind of concentration which, unlike individual ownership, is self-perpetuating.

In its competitive free economy, operating under the protection of the antitrust laws, America does not face the social dangers of concentration of wealth which have plagued other less dynamic societies. The higher the rate of economic growth, the greater will be the diffusion of income and new wealth throughout the population.

Actually, exorbitant rates of estate and gift taxes are a major tax cause of the merger of family and other closely held businesses with larger concerns. They complete the blow initially dealt the formation and development of new businesses by the graduated income tax.

Forestry in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid address, "Forestry in the Space Age," by the Honorable ROBERT SIKES. This address was delivered at the Forest Farmers Cooperative annual meeting in Jacksonville, Fla., on March 11, 1960. Congressman SIKES is the beloved and able dean of the Florida congressional delegation, and I know that his address will be of great interest to us as we move forward this year to an even greater program for the development of our national forests. The address follows:

FORESTRY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida)

Mr. Chairman and fellow forest farmers, I was pleased when your secretary invited me to speak. He knows and so do most of you that forestry is a subject close to my heart. I welcome opportunities to talk on forestry. So often do I urge my colleagues in Congress to give favorable consideration to forestry items that they expect me at every hearing on forestry legislation and appropriation.

Before I explain why I have this interest in forestry please permit me to welcome you to this wonderful State of Florida and this great city of Jacksonville. I sincerely hope that every minute of your convention will be rewarding.

Here in Florida we have many important military installations including the famous Cape Canaveral operation and Eglin Field with its half million forested acres. The Air Force is doing a splendid job of managing Eglin Field's forest. At Cape Canaveral we are, as you know, making our Nation's major effort to conquer outer space. Both activities are important—forestry on the ground and advancement into space.

One of the reasons why I keep telling the Congress about forestry is that it is easy to forget it while we are struggling to establish our leadership in space.

I have heard that the most popular study in ancient times was astrology. Much of its popularity derived from the fact that scholars could lie on their backs and contemplate the heavens. It was their favorite escape from the problems of this earth. I don't mean to belittle our space efforts at all. We must do more. But we must also come to grips with the problems on the ground.

In 1957 Khrushchev told American reporters in Moscow he was declaring war upon us in the peaceful field of trade. He said that the threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production and that the Soviets are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of their system.

In considering this war on the economic front let us review what our two chief adversaries are doing in forestry. Communist China plans to reforest 190 million acres by 1965, an area larger than the State of Texas, to counteract the effects of centuries of progressive deforestation. During 1953–56, 25 million acres were planted to trees and bamboo, and in addition, a large network of shelterbelts has been established. The planting program is considered important because it will increase the future timber supply, decrease soil erosion, and help protect the huge investments in dams and irrigation works. In Russia, because of intensive development and improvement of logging equipment at several research stations, mechanization of logging has progressed rapidly and reached a high degree of efficiency, surpassing by far that of any European country. Shelterbelt plantings on a huge scale have been established successfully on the southern plains. Programs for the future stress the application of scientific and technical knowledge in all fields of forestry, logging, and wood utilization, and call for greater exploitation of the vast virgin forests of Siberia. The U.S.S.R., on its accessible forest area of about 2.5 billion acres, possesses nearly 65 percent of the world's softwood timber. Although the U.S.S.R. is still far behind the United States in the production of some forest products, such as plywood and woodpulp it has greatly increased output in others. In 1958, both the industrial wood cut and lumber production were greater than those of the

United States, and Russia has now become a major exporter of lumber.

I believe that the American way is far superior to any system Khrushchev has in mind. But we must prove it. We must outproduce the Communist nations on all fronts. We must surpass them in our forest management and in producing the forest products so urgently needed in peace and war. We can do it. We have the know-how and the energy. We have the good forest sites, the sunshine and rainfall. Fortunately the forest is a renewable resource. But we must make greater effort to renew it.

We need more research to show us how. But we know enough right now to do more intensive management. Most of you in this audience are big landowners and I congratulate you for the fine progress you are making on your own lands. According to the Timber Resources Review you, the large landowners, are, in general, practicing good forestry. Also our publicly owned forests—particularly the national forests are well managed.

At this point I would like to pay a tribute to my old friend, Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service. I wish I could have been here yesterday to hear him. I know you all enjoyed hearing him and I shall read his speech when it appears in the Forest Farmer magazine. Dr. McArdle is a career Government forester of more than 30 years of service. He is a scientist, administrator, and planner. During his leadership of the Forest Service forestry research has expanded and the use of the national forests has greatly increased. Dr. McArdle is an enthusiastic champion of the principle of multiple use management in the national forests.

A few decades ago the national forests were largely remote and inaccessible. Now the American people are flocking to the national forests and want more from them. Multiple use management is the most effective form of forest management yet devised in terms of producing maximum overall benefits from these public forest lands. Multiple use management calls for the fullest possible utilization of the renewable resources—timber, water, forage, wildlife, recreation—at a high level of continuing productivity, with resources, and uses combined in such a way that they are compatible. This concept of national forest management has been a tenet of the Forest Service since the days of Pinchot. Now in the days of McArdle—multiple use management becomes more important than ever before and promises greater returns in the future to the American people from our national forests.

The three forest units making up the Florida national forests offer a variety of recreation opportunities that is not duplicated elsewhere.

All three units are situated on relatively flat country with numerous ponds and cypress swamps on the Osceola; large, clear-flowing streams through subtropical palms, hardwoods, and pines on the Ocala; and interesting sinkholes on the Apalachicola. Picnicking, camping, swimming, and boating can be enjoyed year around, while fishing and hunting are popular in season. The most popular areas are Silver Lake (Apalachicola), Juniper Springs and Alexander Spring (Ocala), and Ocean Pond (Osceola).

Our Florida national forests last year sold 71 million board feet of timber for over a million dollars. This year I am told the supervisor expects to sell 76 million board feet and this should increase next year and in later years as the young stands reach merchantable size.

The Federal Forest Service maintains several important research units in Florida in cooperation with the Florida Forest Service. The Lake City Research Center is the headquarters for all Forest Service research in naval stores production. It has developed new turpentining methods which save the naval stores industry more than a million dollars each year. It is also pioneering the breeding of high-yielding naval stores pines for the future. Special attention is given to combining naval stores and timber production for highest profit per acre. Recently, research was started at Lake City on stimulation of seed crops in slash pine. A branch of the Lake City center is operated at Fort Myers. The Fort Myers branch specializes in the management of forest ranges and in seeding and planting pine on the extensive deforested areas in south Florida.

The new center at Marianna, in whose development I have been keenly interested, is devoted to research on methods for getting pine reestablished on the scrub oak sandhills which occupy large areas in western Florida. This research has clearly shown the excellent growth of pine that is possible on the sandhills if the scrub oak is completely removed. Until the removal techniques were developed, the scrub oak sandhills remained nonproductive of commercial timber for many decades. Now they are rapidly being converted to profitable pine forests to supply Florida's forest industries.

The Federal research program is actively supported by the Florida Legislature working through the Florida Forest Service. The State forest service also maintains a forest tree introduction project at Fort Myers in cooperation with the Forest Service branch station there. The State forest service and the Federal research centers have always operated in close harmony with each other. State Forester Coulter, a former research forester, serves as an adviser to the research centers at Lake City and Marianna.

Fire is still the No. 1 problem in southern forestry. My own State of Florida which has made marked progress still has 3.5 million acres unprotected on which there was a burn in 1958 of over 1 million acres; on 17 million acres of protected lands the burn was only 56,000 acres—three-tenths of 1 percent. Due also to the large unprotected area, Florida had the most fires and the biggest burn of any of the States in the South. There is little doubt but that additional funds would help Florida as well as other States to make more rapid progress toward their goals. State Forester Coulter, after a careful review of his organization and problems, estimates a need for about $6 million to protect the valuable forest resources in the State. His expenditures are about $3.5 million, a little more than half his need.

Another big job of importance to the South and to Florida is tree planting. The State foresters nationwide last year produced 945 million tree seedlings and transplants under the Federal-State cooperative program authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act and an additional 587 million plants under cooperative agreements in connection with the conservation reserve of the soil bank. This large output of planting stock by State forestry department nurseries to a large measure made possible the planting of more than 2 million acres of forest plantings.

Six States in this area planted more than 150,000 acres each. Georgia has the largest signup by far for tree planting under the conservation reserve which accounts in large measure for its record planting of 335,593 acres. Florida planted more acres in 1957 and 1958 than any other State and reported more than 200,000 acres planted again in 1959. A new State nursery has been developed at Punta Gorda to better serve planters in southern Florida. This nursery made its first shipment of trees in fiscal year 1959.

To provide technical forestry assistance the Florida Forest Service has 23 farm or service foresters—more than any other State except Virginia, New York, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The latest annual report showed that these foresters, employed by the State forester under a cooperative arrangement with U.S. Forest Service, in Florida assisted 2,855 woodland owners. While this is an impressive record of achievement it is only a fraction of the number of landowners who should be reached. We must remember that in Florida we have about 90,000 small private woodland ownerships. Of course, consulting foresters and the good neighborly foresters of industries are also helping some of our small woodland owners. We must all greatly increase our efforts, however, if we are to reach most of the small woodland owners.

In case I have given you a feeling of complacency by praising your good work on the large properties and by telling you that our national forests are in good hands please forgive me. This is no time for complacency. Here's why: more than half of our Nation's commercial forest land is in the hands of 4½ million small owners and few of these properties are managed anywhere near their capabilities.

Before leaving Washington I called the Forest Service and asked for a few statistics from the Timber Resources for America's Future. Len Barrett gave me the following:

1. In the 12 Southern States, Virginia to east Texas and Oklahoma, lie 40 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land and 45 percent of the national growth potential possible under practicable forest management. In these 12 States 91 percent of all forest land is in private ownership as compared to 81 percent in the North and 34 percent in the West. Thus to a substantial degree, the future timber supply of the Nation is in the hands of private landowners in the South.

2. Who are these private owners? Mostly they are small owners. Nearly 60 percent (57 percent) of all private forest land in the South is held in tracts of less than 500 acres and nearly three-fourths (73 percent) is held in tracts of less than 5,000 acres. Larger landowners and forest industries own about one-fourth (27 percent) of the private forest land. Forest problems then are primarily problems of the 1.8 million farmers and other individuals who own small forest tracts.

3. There has been talk recently about surplus timber growth in some areas of the South. Fears have been expressed that we will have timber running out of our ears or that we will have more timber than we can sell and prices will take a nosedive. Those of you who have studied our national timber situation know that these fears are unfounded. It is in the interest of the South and the Nation that we have this surplus growth. We will need it and we will need to accumulate surplus growth for a number of years. This is the only way we can build up our timber supplies to meet future demands that in 2000 will be double the current demand. Moreover, the West now dominates some segments of the market for wood products and this is being done largely through cutting of old growth of high quality. Within the next 40 to 50 years this old growth will no longer enjoy its present dominance. The South can take advantage of this improvement in competitive position if in the meantime it can build up the volume and quality of its timber inventory through accumulation of surplus growth.

This is the challenge that timber resources for America's future presents to us, gentlemen. This is a challenge to improve our timber management on all properties, small as well as large. In conclusion I would like to accept this challenge for the South and Florida. We can accept it—for we can do the job. We must do it quickly while we may yet have the time. With forestry in the space age we must close the gap in our economic race with Russia not only in missiles but also in our forest resources.

H.R. 3542

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the enormous increase in the cost of higher education during the past 15 years has created a condition which, in many instances, makes college attendance by qualified students economically impossible. These costs have increased to an extent that many tuition-free city and State higher educational institutions are contemplating the imposition of tuition charges for the first time.

In this era when educational attainment is, both from the point of view of the individual and that of our national security, of such overriding importance, we must take steps which will help to insure higher educational opportunity to all qualified individuals.

As we all know, especially those of us who have financed higher education for our children, the present tax laws do not make provision for a deduction of tuition and maintenance charges incurred by a taxpayer on behalf of a dependent. The law merely provides for a continuance of the normal $600 exemption while a dependent is a student supported by the taxpayer. Obviously, tuition and maintenance far exceed that small amount.

In an attempt to somewhat reduce the financial burden placed upon parents whose dependents are desirous of attaining a college education, I have today introduced H.R. 3542 which provides for a full deduction, for income tax purposes, of higher educational expenses incurred by a taxpayer in behalf of a dependent.

In the case of all tax deduction proposals we must look not only to the benefit afforded the taxpayer but also to the loss in revenue to the Treasury. Judged by these standards, I believe my bill strikes a balance between the two considerations. The exclusion of tuition paid to private elementary and secondary schools from the benefits of the legislation prevents a serious revenue loss permitting relief to be given in the area of the greatest need.

My bill would authorize the deduction of tuition and other fees, transportation costs and expenses of books, supplies, and equipment. The bill further provides for a deduction of food and lodging expenses. It is noteworthy that the food and lodging provision would permit a deduction even if the student resides at home with his family. This provision, I feel, will afford some measure of relief to taxpayers whose children attend college within their local community. Without this provision the legislation would favor those taxpayers whose dependents attend schools away from home.

The seriousness of this problem was pointed up last week when Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, representing the 18th Assembly District of Brooklyn, introduced a concurrent resolution in the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to enact legislation such as H.R. 3542.

To help make a college education economically feasible to every qualified student, it is my hope that H.R. 3542 will be favorably considered and enacted into law.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, as we bow in this quiet moment, dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm, we beseech Thee, our abiding faith in the deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand, instead of rock.

Make us alive and alert, we beseech Thee, to the spiritual values which underlie all the bitter struggle of these epic days.

In all our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions, if we find all except Thee, we have nothing but vanity, and our spirits remain still famished and athirst. To these, Thy servants, who in the ministry of public service have been called by their counsel to help lead the peoples of the earth in these perplexing days, give a right judgment in all things.

Grant them the sustaining grace both to will and to do the things which are good and acceptable in Thy sight.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, January 13, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the annual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending June 30, 1960. The report was prepared under the direction of the Coordinator of the mutual security program by the Department of State—including the International Cooperation Administrator—the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

At the turn of this decade we have seen change and political uncertainty in the developing areas which have caused us to strengthen our programs for economic and social development. We have had as our goal the promotion of peaceful change for millions of people in Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East who are seeking domestic tranquillity and a better way of life. We have responded to the hope of these millions for a decent future for themselves and their children through well-conceived programs of economic and technical assistance. Our friends and allies have shared this responsibility with us.

Our common safety has been of equal concern and it has been our purpose to unite the free people of the world in a sustained common defense against overt attack or suppression of liberty. We have maintained the strength of our alliances by reinforcing collective defense arrangements. In doing this we have again demonstrated that firmness in the face of threatened aggression is a dependable safeguard to peace.

The events of the past year once again emphasized the need for a strong and vigorous mutual security program. Urgent issues will continue to confront us as members of the international community and we must respond wisely through constructive action.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 10th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

AGREEMENT FOR MOST EFFECTIVE PATTERN OF NATO MILITARY DEFENSE STRENGTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which with the accompanying data, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

In December 1957 the heads of government of the nations members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization reached agreement in principle on the desirability of achieving the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques. In enunciating this agreement in principle the heads of government made it clear that this decision was the result of the fact that the Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, had left no doubt that the most modern and destructive weapons of all kinds were being introduced into the Soviet armed forces. The introduction of modern weapons into NATO forces should be no cause for concern on the part of other countries, since NATO is purely a defensive alliance.

It is our conviction and the conviction of our NATO allies that the introduction into NATO defenses of the most modern weapons available is essential in maintaining the strength necessary to the alliance. Any alliance depends in the last analysis upon the sense of shared mutual interests among its members, and by sharing with our allies certain training information we are demonstrating concretely our sense of partnership in NATO's defensive planning. Failure on our part to contribute to the improvement of the state of operational readiness of the forces of other members of NATO will only encourage the Soviet Union to believe that it can eventually succeed in its goal of destroying NATO's effectiveness.

To facilitate the necessary cooperation on our part, legislation amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was enacted by the Congress in 1958. Pursuant to that legislation agreements for cooperation were concluded with four of our NATO partners in May and June 1959. A similar agreement was also recently concluded with our NATO ally, the Republic of Italy. All of these agreements are designed to implement in important respects the agreed NATO program.

This agreement with the Government of Italy will enable the United States to cooperate effectively in mutual defense planning with Italy and in the training of Italian NATO forces in order that, if an attack on NATO should occur, Italian forces could, under the direction of the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe, effectively use nuclear weapons in their defense.

These agreements previously concluded and this Italian agreement represent only a portion of the work necessary for complete implementation of the decision taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in December 1957. I anticipate the conclusion of similar agreements for cooperation with certain other NATO nations as the alliance's defensive planning continues.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the agreement with the Government of Italy. I am also transmitting a copy of the Secretary of State's letter accompanying an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, a copy of a joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of this document, and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto setting forth my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget message which was read in the House on yesterday be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For President's message, see RECORD of January 16, 1961, pp. 734–760.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 107) exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 107) exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby authorized, to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTING OF EXPENSES INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds, by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law provides that within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year the chairman of each committee shall prepare a consolidated report and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee, under the terms of the law, is required to insert the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In accordance with the terms of these various laws, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the report submitted to the committee dated January 11, 1961, by the Joint Economic Committee.

Within the next 2 months many committees will be forwarding to the Senate Committee on Appropriations similar reports relating to their expenses. I will include these reports in the RECORD from time to time upon receipt by the committee, without the detailed legal references I have given today.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
January 11, 1961.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended by the members and staff of the Joint Economic Committee between January 1 and December 31, 1960.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
			Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency
J. K. Javits	France	Franc	167,772	341.11	53,415	108.49	16,800	34.17	26,310	53.41	264,297	537.18
Do	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	50-0-6	140.07	25-6-3	70.88	15-5-0	42.70	20-7-2	57.00	110-18-11	310.65
Total				481.18		179.37		76.87		110.41		847.83
J. W. Knowles	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	22-6-6	62.51	8-8-4	23.57	1-13-0	4.62	11-2-2	31.10	43-10-0	121.80
Do	Belgium	Franc	726	14.52	609	12.18	145	2.90	860	17.20	2,340	46.80
Do	Denmark	Kroner	158.70	22.97	119.70	17.32	4.50	0.65	67.10	9.71	350	50.65
Do	Sweden	do	77.40	15.01	54.18	10.51	6.15	1.19	47.00	9.18	184.73	35.89
Do	Netherlands	Guilder					4,187	1,101.85			4,187	1,101.85
Total				115.01		63.58		1,111.21		67.19		1,356.99
J. W. Lehman	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	21-14-2	60.78	13-18-6	38.99	4-9-4	12.51	6-18-0	19.32	47-0-0	131.60
Do	Belgium	Franc	1,196	23.92	418	8.36	200	4.00	456	9.12	2,270	45.40
Do	Denmark	Kroner	179	26.00	56	8.05			85	12.25	320	46.30
Do	Sweden	do	90	17.37	112	21.63	5	0.97	88	17.01	295	56.98
Do	Netherlands	Guilder					4,187	1,101.85			4,187	1,101.85
Total				128.07		77.03		1,119.33		57.70		1,382.13
Sar Levitan	Germany	Mark	135.00	32.14	328.50	78.21	4,737.28	1,127.93	31.00	7.38	5,231.78	1,245.66
Do	Italy	Lira	27,810	44.78	41,890	67.46	7,200	11.59	7,600	12.24	84,500	136.07
Total				76.92		145.67		1,139.52		19.62		1,381.73
Belle Notkin	France	Franc	32,775	66.89	31,850	65.00	14,700	30.00	21,560	44.00	100,885	205.89
Grand total				868.07		530.65		3,476.93		298.92		5,174.57

Recapitulation: Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent), total $5,174.57

(Signed) PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Friday, and that on Friday, after the transaction of any routine business and a quorum call, the Senate proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies; that at the conclusion of the ceremonies the Senate return to its Chamber, and that it then be in order to receive nominations from the President. While the Senate will stay in session to hear any debate of such nominations, no vote will be taken thereon on Friday. I also ask that when the Senate concludes its session on Friday, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Saturday, and that it then be in order to consider any nominations reported by committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SALARIES, EXPENSES, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 307, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, executive office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret copy of No. 1 of the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislation Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1961, December 31, there were assigned to the seat of government by the Air Force, 2,320 officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia Government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINAL REPORT OF THE HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the highway cost allocation study (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REVISION OF RESTRICTION ON THE CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS LAND FOR HISTORIC-MONUMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF DEFENSE LENDING

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF INDIAN DEBTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF IRRIGATION CHARGES OF CERTAIN NON-INDIAN LANDOWNERS OF WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a secretarial order canceling and adjusting irrigation charges of certain non-Indian landowners of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve the order (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO MINING LEASES ON TRIBAL INDIAN LANDS AND FEDERAL LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SALE OF INDIAN TIMBER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE PALA INDIAN RESERVATION, THE PAUMA INDIAN RESERVATION, AND CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PER DIEM PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVOCATION OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY FARM RESERVE ON THE LAC DU FLAMBEAU RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO EFFIGY MOUNDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, IOWA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENT OF OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY FOR CRUISES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS TO LAND THEIR CATCHES OF FISH IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF AUTOMOBILE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT TO GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency of its activities under the Federal Airport Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

IMMIGRATION VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing the issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, to transfer responsibility for determining the suitability of the home of the adopting parents for such orphans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF POWER TO GUAM TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN INTERSTATE COMPACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 2, 1889, RELATING TO REQUIREMENT THAT GRANTORS FURNISH ABSTRACTS, OFFICIAL CERTIFICATIONS, AND EVIDENCES OF TITLE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, of Charleston, S.C., relating to membership on the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the United Brick and Clay Workers of America, AFL–CIO, District Council No. 9, relative to a resolution adopted by that council, concerning the serious problem of cutthroat competition from foreign imports; to the Committee on Finance.

STANDARDIZING DRUGS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Tompkins County, N.Y., Medical Society, relating to the standardization of drugs.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARDIZING DRUGS—A RESOLUTION BY THE TOMPKINS COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

1. Whereas a Special National Academy of Sciences Committee advisory to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming, composed of Dr. C. Phillip Miller, Chairman, professor of medicine, University of Chicago; Dr. John H. Dingle, professor of preventive medicine, Western Reserve University; Dr. Maxwell Finland, associate professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School; Dr. Colin M. MacLeod, professor of medicine, New York University; Dr. Karl F. Meyer, Director Emeritus George Williams, Hooper Foundation, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco; Dr. John R. Paul, professor of preventive medicine, Yale University; Dr. Carl F. Schmidt, professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Wesley W. Spink, professor of medicine, University of Minnesota, has reviewed the policies and procedures of the Food and Drug Administration concerning the acceptance and certification of new drugs; and

2. Whereas this committee has recommended (a) that the Food and Drug Administration should be given statutory authority to require proof of the efficacy, as well as the safety, of all new drugs; (b) that the Food and Drug Administration be authorized to carry on continuous inspection of drug factories to guarantee compliance with quality standards before marketing, and (c) that several other procedures be instituted with the purpose of safeguarding the public health with regard to drug therapy; and

3. Whereas the Tompkins County Medical Society believes that these recommendations are sound and urgent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tompkins County Medical Society endorse these recommendations and urge the New York State Medical Society to recommend that the Congress of the United States adopt legislation to enact them into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING and Congressman JOHN TABER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant (S. Rept. No. 5); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print as a Senate Document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by Senate Resolution 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and Senate Resolution 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STUDY ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. KERR), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consulant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, 1960" — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 4)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, I submit a report entitled "Government Procurement, 1960," on lack of competition in military procurement and its impact on small business, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 432. A bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 433. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 434. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 436. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 437. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Verda Mae Jennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 440. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 3, 1956, with respect to the pay-

ment of annuities to the widows of judges of U.S. courts who died prior to the enactment of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron); and

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 443. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 444. A bill for the relief of Ok Hi Shin and Tae Soo Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 445. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to authorize the United States to intervene in certain school desegregation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 446. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

S. 447. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airmen's certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 448. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 449. A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 450. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 451. A bill to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Scanlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 454. A bill to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 455. A bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Concetta Casola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 457. A bill to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Chin Hee; and

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Melisarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; and

S. 462. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 463. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 464. A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of library facilities and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Pietro Realmuto; and

S. 466. A bill for the relief of Miss Hanako Konishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; and

S. 468. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 469. A bill to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 470. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes;

S. 471. A bill to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; and

S. 472. A bill to repeal the provision of law establishing 6-year terms of civil service commissioners; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 473. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal Employee Unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 474. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 475. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 476. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 477. A bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 478. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 479. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine:)

S. 480. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 481. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 482. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 483. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 484. A bill to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts attempting to desegregate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MORSE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 486. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 487. A bill to provide a new farm program for certain specified agricultural commodities under which American agriculture will be restored to a free enterprise basis; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 488. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, in order to prohibit export subsidy payments on certain products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 489. A bill for the relief of Dellarose J. Dowler;

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Cutter Laboratories; and

S. 491. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel P. Skamangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 492. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 493. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern administration and office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 494. A bill to provide the appointment of additional district judges for the northern, southern, and western districts of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 495. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Yun Fun Cheng Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 497. A bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr GRUENING):

S. 498. A bill to establish a water resources commission for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 499. A bill to modify conditions for reduced rate of contributions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 500. A bill to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. McGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 501. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 502. A bill to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 503. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution designating the week of May 22–27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

SPLIT SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) relating to split sessions of the Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF COUNTERFEIT DRUG TRAFFIC

Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 42) relating to an investigation of the counterfeit drug traffic, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUTLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

STUDY ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43) to provide for a study by the Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CERTAIN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. KERR), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45) to investigate matters relating to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE TO U.S. DELEGATION TO GATT, REGARDING TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 46) relating to the U.S. delegation to GATT to negotiate and bring about favorable conditions for the health of world trade generally, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See the above resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL, which appears under a separate heading.)

ELIMINATION OF REDUCTION BY EXECUTIVE ORDER OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress.

The bill is short, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 432) to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress, introduced by Mr. CURTIS was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution, whenever, after investigation, he shall find and declare that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest will be served thereby: *Provided*, That whenever the President issues an Executive order under the provisions of this Act, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such order is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such order: *Provided further*, That the continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain. As used in this section, the term "appropriation" includes an authorization to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

SEC. 2. Any appropriations or parts thereof eliminated under the authority of this Act shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and the same action shall be taken with respect to any amounts by which any appropriations or parts thereof may be reduced under the authority of this Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, 30 years is a relatively short time—yet when we look today at an array of talented youth in high places we know much can be accomplished in 30 years.

In the time of this Republic, 30 years represent one-sixth of our national span of life. Too—this is a short time, but our collective accomplishments in the fiscal affairs of this Nation present a much gloomier picture than does the array of individual success about us. To be frank, our record in fiscal matters is a bleak one.

True, we have encountered many grave situations in our generation. Recessions, depressions, wars and threats of wars have greatly expanded spending at the Federal level. This we all know, yet, in the prior 150 years this Nation has met, and risen above, other grave emergencies. There have been recessions, depressions, wars and threats of wars of another day. As I stated, they were met, the country moved ahead, and its bills were paid.

Concern over our national solvency is by no means only the concern of those Senators who have joined with me today in the introduction of a bill designed to improve fiscal procedures and effect Federal economies. It is by no means only a concern of those who deliberate in our National Legislature. It is the concern of all our citizens. Unless we face up to reality and make our best efforts now—it will be the concern of many future generations of this proud Nation.

There are times when I worry whether we have reached a degree of sophistication that denies reality. Has reason been shelved by many who believe we can spend more than we gather for most of these 30 years past and yet avoid a day of reckoning? If any of those are among us, I invite them to take another look at the debt, at its annual cost of service, and at the lack of any fixed policy toward its retirement.

I submit there is no single cure-all to the fiscal problem. The bill which we have introduced today, if enacted, will be an important step forward. It will provide a brake on profligate spending. It will be an important vehicle in pursuing our total objective of fiscal responsibility.

The retiring Budget Director, the very able Mr. Maurice O. Stans, had the following to say about an identical bill introduced in the last Congress:

> At the present time, general appropriation bills are usually enacted late in any session of the Congress. They provide funds for essential Government functions, and appropriations for a number of different departments and agencies are customarily included in each such bill. From time to time, such bills contain appropriations to which the President may object, or which he may regard as excessive. However, there is a traditional reluctance on the part of any President to veto such measures, notwithstanding his objections, because of the possible disruption of essential Government activities. A President is, therefore, as a matter of fact, compelled to approve officially that which he does not approve, in order to avoid striking down an entire bill with highly undesirable consequences. There is no present procedure—other than a veto of an entire bill—by which the President may formally and effectively bring to the attention of the Congress any objections which he may have to the action taken by the Congress on individual appropriation items and secure reconsideration of those items in the light of his views.
>
> It would be hoped that this bill would provide an effective procedure to overcome these difficulties. After making a finding that the elimination or reduction of certain appropriations would aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest would be served thereby, the Executive order providing for eliminating or reducing those appropriations would be submitted for consideration of the Congress before becoming effective. Thereafter, either House of Congress could, by a simple majority vote, prevent the President's proposed reductions from becoming effective. The proposed procedure would thus retain a high degree of congressional control over appropriation matters, while at the same time providing the President with an effective means of securing specific congressional consideration of his views on particular items.

The bill which I am introducing today has nothing to do with the veto or approval of a measure. It would vest in the President the power to reduce or to eliminate appropriations at any later time by Executive order. This proposal provides that the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce in whole or in part any appropriation made by Congress when, after investigation, he finds and declares that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt and that the public interest will be served thereby.

This proposal further provides that, when the President issues such an Executive order, he must do so while the Congress is in session and the order eliminating or reducing an appropriation shall not take effect for 60 days. It further provides that, if, during that 60-day period, either the House of Representatives or the Senate passes a resolution disapproving the Executive order, it shall not become effective.

In other words, the Congress does not lose its power over appropriations. The President can make his finding, and reduce or eliminate an appropriation, but either House, by a simple majority vote, can override his decision. In my opinion, this will have a sobering and salutary effect. If either House of Congress does override the President, it must do so in the face of the President's finding that they are upsetting the budget, adding to the public debt, and threatening the public interest.

As used in my bill, the term "appropriation" is a broad one which includes authority to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

Mr. President, in preparing this measure I have followed the general scheme of the Reorganization Act. It is a plan whereby we vest in the President the power to do certain things, but retain power in either House of the Congress to override such actions. I believe that the enactment of this measure will materially assist in balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and bringing about a long-hoped-for tax reduction.

Mr. President, by way of explanation, I might say something about section 2 of this proposal. It provides that any appropriation or part thereof eliminated in this manner shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury. I am aware that appropriated funds do not leave the Treasury until they are actually expended and that, therefore, this section may not be necessary. I might say that this section is placed in the bill at the suggestion of the drafting service. Its purpose is to make it clear that, once an appropriation is eliminated or reduced in this manner by Executive action, it cannot be restored by the Executive. The funds could only be restored by being reappropriated by Congress.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction. I submit an analysis of the bill, because it is very simple. The approach is extremely direct, and I believe it represents what I think can best be done in this field. The statement is not long, but I shall not trespass on the patience of the Senate; instead, I ask that the statement and a copy of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 433) to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1961."

PURPOSE OF ACT

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize Federal financial assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school classrooms.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. Any assistance rendered under provisions of this Act shall not relieve the States and local communities from the primary responsibility for financing the costs of public school facilities, including classrooms, or be a means by which any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise, directly or indirectly, any direction, supervision, or control over the policies, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, administration or operation of any school in any community receiving assistance under this Act except with respect to the conditions set forth in section 6.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. Amounts appropriated under the authorization of this section shall remain available until the first day of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made.

ALLOCATION TO STATES

SEC. 5. Within sixty days after the effective date of this Act, the Commissioner shall notify the Governor of each State of the amount of assistance to which such State is entitled, which shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate of amounts authorized in section 4 that the number of children under age fourteen in that State bears to the total number of children under age fourteen in the United States, as determined by the 1960 census.

REPORTS BY STATES

SEC. 6. Each State desiring assistance under the provisions of this Act shall—

(a) Within one year from the effective date of this Act, submit to the Commissioner for approval a report

(1) showing for each classroom construction project for which the State desires assistance

(A) the number of classrooms to be constructed by the project;

(B) its cost;

(C) the size and character of the community in which it is to be located;

(D) the reason or reasons why the classrooms could not be constructed without assistance under this Act;

(E) a description of any other school facilities constructed by or for the community receiving assistance during the ten years preceding the filing of the report, or under construction, the cost of each and the source and amount of the funds expended or financing in connection therewith;

(2) stating the manner in which the particular projects were selected by the State for assistance;

(3) certifying that

(A) the communities receiving assistance are those having the greatest need for classrooms and the least ability to finance their construction;

(B) procedures will be adopted for such fiscal controls as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of funds paid to the State under the provisions of this Act;

(C) assistance under the provisions of this Act will not exceed one-half the actual total cost of each classroom construction project;

(D) the assistance provided under this Act will be used only for the construction of classrooms;

(E) not more than 25 percent of the total funds obligated or expended for the construction of school facilities by each community receiving assistance will be used for the construction of school facilities other than classrooms for a period of 10 years from the date of the report unless any such assistance received by such a community shall be first repaid;

(F) the classrooms constructed with assistance provided by this Act will be available to all students as required by law; and

(4) stating the aggregate amount of assistance requested by the State (which shall not exceed the amount allocated to the State under the provisions of sec. 5) and requesting the portion of such amount expected to be expended prior to the end of the next Federal fiscal year.

(b) Annually after the report submitted as required by subsection 6(a), and at such other times as the Commissioner may direct, until the completion of all projects in that State, submit to the Commissioner for approval a report certifying—

(1) the progress of each classroom construction project;

(2) the funds disbursed in connection with each such project (including any assistance under this Act), stating the source of such funds and the amount of funds from each source;

(3) that not more than 25 percent of all funds obligated or expended by each community receiving assistance under the provisions of this Act for the construction of school facilities has been used for the construction of school facilities other than classrooms;

(4) the portion of the State's allocation expected to be expended prior to the end of the next Federal fiscal year (after deducting any amounts previously requested under the provisions of this act and remaining undisbursed) which shall constitute a request for such amount; and

(5) any other information reasonably requested by the Commissioner.

PAYMENT TO STATES

SEC. 7. The Commissioner shall pay to each State as it complies with the requirements of sections 6 (a) and (b) the portions of the financial assistance requested by such State in such reports, upon his approval of such reports, and such funds shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Commissioner may, upon reasonable grounds, refuse to approve any such report and any funds requested therein shall be deducted from the total

amount authorized in section 4 and from the allocation to such State.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) the term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(c) the term "assistance" means Federal financial assistance under the provisions of this act.

(d) the term "community receiving assistance" means the community served by the school system in which the classroom construction project is to be located.

(e) the term "school system" means a governmental authority which operates and directs public education in a city, county, township, or other local political subdivision of any State.

(f) the term "school facilities" means any buildings, furnishings, equipment, supplies, and land used or held by the school system.

(g) the term "classroom" means a school area used principally for instruction in subjects required for graduation, except that it shall include libraries. It shall not include any indoor athletic facilities or any special purpose rooms unless the subject to be principally taught in any such room is required for graduation.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

SCHOOL AID

I have described the school bill which I introduced as one to provide assistance for education, but not frills. It will require sacrifice. It is simple, direct and austere.

I should like to discuss now some of the principal provisions of the bill.

NEED

First there is the question of need. Section 2 says that the bill is to provide for assistance in constructing urgently needed public school classrooms. Not any school facility but only classrooms and then only where they are urgently needed.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTROL

It is my thesis that the States and local communities have the primary responsibility for education and it is not the intent of this bill to shift that responsibility to the Federal Government. Section 3 provides that this responsibility remains with the community and State.

Education should be a matter of local concern and local communities should have the full control over education in their areas. Therefore, section 3 provides expressly that no department, officer or agent of the Federal Government shall exercise, directly or indirectly, any direction, supervision or control over the administration, operation or course of instruction of any school in any community receiving assistance under the bill.

AMOUNT OF AID

The bill provides for $1 billion of aid, $250 million in each of the next 4 years. It further provides that amounts appropriated shall be available until the first day of the third fiscal year following the year for which the appropriation was made. The money is spaced out over a period of years because school construction programs are not conceived nor are schools built overnight.

AMOUNT OF AID TO EACH STATE

The bill provides a simple formula to determine the amount of aid each State gets. It is the same faction of the whole amount as the number of children under age 14 in that State is to the total number of children under age 14 in the United States and is determined by the 1960 census. There are no fancy quotients, "State school effort indexes," "national school effort indexes," or elaborate matching formula—just the number of children under age 14. I want to emphasize that the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 should not be the basis of an allocation because many of them will have finished school by the time the schools are built. On the other hand the schools will be used by the children who are under age 5 today, and they should be included in any determination of any aid. The test in the bill is simple, and a State can know the amount to which it is entitled almost immediately after the passage of the bill.

WHAT A STATE MUST DO TO RECEIVE AID

First, within a year from the effective date of the act it must formulate its program and submit a report on its needs to the Commissioner of Education. This report shall show the number of classrooms to be constructed, their cost, the size and character of the community, the reasons why the classrooms could not be constructed without assistance under the act, and a description of any other school facilities which the community has constructed within the past 10 years or has under construction and how they have been financed. This will let all the world know how a State has spent its own money, how it is spending its share of Federal assistance, and whether the projects are worthy. The report must also state how the particular projects were selected by the State for assistance and certify that the communities receiving the aid had the greatest need for classrooms and the least ability to finance their construction; that proper procedures will be adopted for the disbursement of the funds and that for the next 10 years not more than 25 percent of the total funds spent by the community for school facilities will be used for construction of facilities other than classrooms unless any Federal aid shall be first repaid. Thus a State which spends the bulk of its money in frills rather than no classrooms will not get Federal aid under this bill.

MATCHING FUNDS

Each State must promise that the Federal aid will not exceed one-half the total cost of each classroom construction project.

DISCRIMINATION

On the subject of discrimination I want to emphasize that this bill is a school construction bill not a civil rights bill. It is concerned with building classrooms and it leaves to other legislation to decide who shall use the classrooms. It does provide most emphatically, however, that the classrooms must be available to all students as required by law. It also provides that if a State certifies this to be the case and it is not, that the assistance provided by the bill may be cutoff.

PROGRESS REPORTS

While the projects are in process of construction, the bill provides for progress reports, so that all may know whether the State is keeping its part of the bargain.

If these or any other reports by the States show that the State is not keeping its part of the bargain or are not honest, or are misleading, the bill provides that the Federal assistance to the State may be cutoff or reduced.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I also want to point out that the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Pacific island areas share in this aid on the same basis as any State.

CLASSROOMS

Last, I want to point up what I mean by classrooms and why the aid is limited to classrooms. I believe that our youth should have a well-trained mind and a well-trained body. This means an emphasis on basic subjects and basic physical training. The frills are fine to have but the other things should come first, and must come first when the people of all the country are being taxed to help communities meet local problems. Thus the bill provides no aid for special purpose rooms used for frills and for such things as indoor swimming pools. If communities want them they can build them on their own, if they can afford them. The basic subjects for graduation and some outdoor exercise can be good for everyone. The bill provides aid for those and no further.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOCKS AND DAMS ON THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year the Army Engineers reported on a project for the improvement of the Illinois Waterway, for the expansion of locks and dams. However, the project did not eventuate, because of budget difficulties. Therefore, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize again this improvement; and I send the bill to the desk, together with a release I issued at the time and a copy of the engineers' report, and ask that the release and the report be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the report and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The report and statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

(S. Rept. No. 1524, 86th Cong., 2d sess., June 6, 1960)

ILLINOIS WATERWAY, ILL. AND IND.

Location: The Illinois Waterway provides a channel for barge navigation between the Mississippi River, 38 miles above St. Louis, and Lake Michigan at Chicago.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution adopted March 16, 1943; Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 24, 1958.

Existing project: Provides for nine locks and six dams; navigation channel 9 feet deep in the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers from the mouth of the Illinois River to Lockport, a distance of 291.1±miles upstream extension and branch channels 9 feet deep in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago River, Calumet-Sag Channel, Little Calumet River, Calumet River, and Grand Calumet River; and appurtenant improvements including bridge changes. The project is complete except for construction of two locks, one on Calumet River and the other on Grand Calumet River and improvements of the branch channel in the Grand Calumet River.

National problem: Commerce on the Illinois River has increased since the improved waterway to Chicago was opened from about 1.7 million tons in 1935 to 21.4 million tons in 1955. Most of the traffic

delays now occur at the locks because many tows require rearrangement to permit a single lockage and the larger tows must make a double lockage. The congestion at the locks resulting from these delays will be more critical as the traffic increases.

Recommended plan of improvement: Modification of existing project to provide for construction of supplemental locks, 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long, at the seven existing lock sites on the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers. (The first two locks estimated to be needed by 1968 and the last three by 1977.)

Estimated cost (price level of January 1957): All Federal, $114,652,000.

Project economics:

Annual charges	$4,594,300
Annual benefits, all transportation savings	22,320,000

Benefit-cost ratio: $4.9.

Local cooperation: Provided that prior to construction local interests agree that they will assume title to, and maintain and operate the new bridge across the lower approach to the Brandon Road lock when the bridge is placed in service.

Comments of State and Federal agencies:

Fish and Wildlife Service: No interest in project.

State of Illinois: Concurs in conclusions and recommendations.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: Notes that commerce on the waterway has increased at a rapid rate since 1935; however, it states that a projection of the past rate of growth is by no means certain. The Bureau of the Budget does not question the economic justification, but considers authorization 10 to 19 years in advance of the need is premature and accordingly urges that the report be regarded only as a study of future need, and that the estimates on commerce and average tons per lockage be brought up to date in a future report to Congress in 5 years.

Remarks: The committee held extensive hearings on this project. Opponents presented voluminous information on prospective future traffic that would move over the completed waterway. The committee has long pointed with pride to this project as an example of how traffic will develop over extensions of our inland waterway system. The existing project provides for a 9-foot navigation channel from the Mississippi River at Grafton, Ill., to Lake Michigan at Chicago, by use of seven locks 110 feet wide and 600 feet long, and by channel dredging. Commerce on this waterway has increased from 1.7 million tons in 1936 to 23.4 million tons in 1956. The commerce moves in large multiple-barge tows which require double locking through the existing locks. There are 13 principal cities along the waterway, all of which are highly industrialized and there are numerous water terminals along the route. The principal commodities moved on the waterway are coal, petroleum products, sand, gravel, grain, sulfur, and iron and steel products. The committee was advised that the practical capacity of the existing locks is 29.8 million tons annually. Supplemental locks 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long, at the seven existing locks on the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers are proposed. These supplemental locks would eliminate the multiple-lockage now required and would adequately care for the predicted traffic of 55 million tons annually by the year 2000.

The committee notes the exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio of 4.9 for this project. It also notes the comments of the Bureau of the Budget which questions the estimates of traffic growth, and that another report be submitted to Congress in 5 years. The committee believes the estimates on future commerce to be reasonable, and that such commerce will approach 30 million tons in a very few years. It is realized that it is a little early to determine the effects St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes traffic will have on commerce on the Illinois Waterway, but such effect might be considerable. The committee realizes that a large amount of planning must go into a project of this magnitude. Almost 2 years of the 5-year period the Bureau of the Budget referred to has elapsed. The committee sees no necessity of submitting another report in the near future. It recommends authorization of the project at this time, with planning carried forward at an early date, at which time the economic benefits of the project can be reviewed with a view to completion of the first two locks by 1968, when present estimates indicate they will be needed.

STATEMENT

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, Illinois, minority leader, today proposed an amendment to the House-passed River and Harbor and Flood Control bill to authorize the construction of 7 supplemental locks 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long on the Illinois waterway, Illinois and Indiana, at the following points:

Lockport, Brandon Road, Dreseen Island, Marseilles, Starved Rock, Peoria and La Grange at an estimated cost of $114,652,000. The bill as it passed the House did not include an item providing for authorization of the duplicate locks projects which have been approved by the chief of engineers and the board of engineers for rivers and harbors.

"The existing locks will have reached their maximum capacity to move the growing volume of commerce on the river based upon estimates which the engineers admit may be optimistic as far as capacity is concerned and unduly pessimistic as far as potential commerce is concerned," Senator DIRKSEN pointed out. "Governor Stratton has already concurred in the report for the State of Illinois."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have joined the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and other Senators in the introduction of several civil rights bills.

Substantial progress has been made during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, the greatest progress in 100 years. The occupant of the chair, the Vice President, by his influence in many cases by specification has helped immeasurably that progress.

I have joined in supporting bills, in which I have a strong interest. I introduce now an additional bill for myself, and the senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, which would specifically deal with the problem which is now before the country, and which has been before the country for a long time. That is the question of school desegregation, under the 14th amendment and the Brown case.

The bill which I introduce is similar in some respects to the bill I introduced in 1957 at the time of the debate on the civil rights bill. It did not receive many votes at that time, although it went to the immediate problem before the country in 1957.

Last year the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators joined me in introducing the bill I introduce today. Its purpose would authorize the Attorney General to intervene in school desegregation cases, in the name of the United States, and at the expense of the United States for those who are denied their rights in school desegregation cases.

That is the issue which is still before us. In 1957 I was troubled by the resistance to school desegregation cases in one place in my own State of Kentucky, which did not represent the true opinion of the people of my State. Today this resistance persists in some of the States of the South, and in other States. It is a crisis which we must meet. It is a constitutional question. It affects the breakdown of law and order. It is an ethical question. It tests the very validity of our democratic system.

The bill I introduce squarely meets these issues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 445) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to authorize the United States to intervene in certain school desegregation cases, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MCGEE] and myself, I introduce a bill to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act to March 31, 1965. The National Wool Act passed in 1954 has been an effort to bring stability to one of the great industries of the West and of the Nation. It was extended by the 86th Congress in 1958, to March 31, 1962.

It is highly desirable that this extension be made in the first session of this Congress. Not to do so would leave a very short time at the beginning of the second session when we would be faced with deciding under the pressure of the March 31 deadline. I, therefore, believe that an early introduction of the extension is most desirable. I know that there are many Senators with a great knowledge and interest in the wool industry. I request, therefore, Mr. President, that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until January 27 for the signatures of other Senators who may desire to join me in its introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be allowed to lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 454) to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1965, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE PUBLIC MUST PARTICIPATE IN OUR BATTLE AGAINST SMOG

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from time to time during my service in the Senate I have had occasion to discuss

the insidious and serious character of air pollution. It has been my privilege to sponsor a variety of proposals by which the Federal Government has entered the fight now going on in many sections of our Nation to obtain scientific data and to devise and apply controls necessary to assure our people of clean air.

Since the first participation was authorized in 1955, Federal agencies have taken on a primary responsibility of seeking basic information about the causes and effects of smog and other types of air pollution. It is gratifying, as President Eisenhower noted last week in his state of the Union message, that Federal activities in this field have been intensified.

One of the principal duties of the Federal Government is to provide leadership in efforts to abate air pollution. Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney, in making public a thought-provoking and challenging report of an advisory task group, just a little over a month ago stated:

> The problem of air pollution, like many challenges of our modern environment, can be resolved only by a balanced partnership among many agencies and interests.

In order that the Federal Government may better discharge its obligations in this field, I am introducing for the second time in less than a year a bill designed to strengthen the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Public Health Service in their key role of the antipollution campaign. I am gratified that once again my colleague from California and my two colleagues from Pennsylvania have done me the honor of joining as co-sponsors of this proposal, which this Senate approved last June 28 but which, I deeply regret, died in a committee of the other body with final adjournment. The need for this legislation is even more pressing than previously.

Although I believe the time is fast approaching when we should consider stepping up the level of expenditures in the air pollution field, I am content at the moment to seek only approval of the measure which passed this body at the last session. The bill would authorize the Surgeon General, either on his own initiative or on request from State or local governmental agencies concerned with the problem, to conduct public hearings on any aspect of air pollution deemed of general concern or of interstate character. Such authority is urgently requested by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and is in accordance with goals set forth by the President, which I feel confident the new administration will continue striving to reach.

Mr. President, in connection with these comments I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the communications received last year by the Committee on Public Works from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the General Services Administration in respect to this proposed legislation be set forth in full.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 29, 1960, for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 3108, a bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is identified with the draft bill transmitted with a letter to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on February 19, 1960.

The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the views expressed by the Secretary in his letter. The President, in his 1961 budget message, stated that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will make legislative recommendations to authorize greater Federal leadership in combating air pollution. The provisions of S. 3108 are designed to accomplish that objective.

Accordingly, I am authorized to advise you that enactment of S. 3108 would be in accord with the program of the President.

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE,
March 8, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of February 29, 1960, for a report on S. 3108, a bill to provide for public hearings on air-pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

S. 3108 is the same as the draft bill which we submitted to the President of the Senate on February 19, 1960. For the reasons stated in the letter transmitting the draft bill, we recommend enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

BERTHA ADKINS,
Acting Secretary.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of February 29, 1960, requested that your committee be furnished suggestions with reference to S. 3108, a bill, to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 3108 is, under certain conditions enumerated therein, to provide that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may call a public hearing on any problem of air pollution which may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or which may affect any community or communities in any State other than the State in which the matter causing or contributing to the pollution originates.

The measure also provides the necessary mechanics for conducting the hearings and reporting thereon, authorizes appropriations for each fiscal year such sum as may be necessary, and extends the Federal air pollution control law indefinitely by removing the present limitation of June 30, 1964.

General Services Administration is in accord with the objectives of the underlying legislation and favors its amendment as provided in S. 3108.

We are not in a position at this time to estimate the increase, if any, in the fiscal requirements of GSA which would result from enactment of the measure.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 455) to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS PLANTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with Federal legislation on the control and eradication of noxious weeds. I hold in my hand a letter I have received from Warren C. Teel, director of the Noxious Weeds Division of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture. In the letter, Mr. Teel discusses the need for this legislation. I also have before me a resolution on this subject which was adopted by the Weed Society of America. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, the resolution, and a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 457) to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of Agriculture or other proper agency of any State in which there is in effect a program for the control of noxious plants may enter upon any land in such State under the control or jurisdiction of a department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the permission of and in accordance with the program acceptable to the head of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and destroy by appropriate methods noxious plants growing on such land if—

(1) the same procedure required by the State program with respect to privately owned land has been followed; and

(2) the department, agency, or independent establishment involved has failed to comply with the requirements of such program.

SEC. 2. To the extent that funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act are available therefor, any State incurring expenses pursuant to the first section of this Act shall be reimbursed, upon presentation of an itemized account of such expenses, by the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government having control or jurisdiction of the land with respect to which such expenses were incurred.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the executive branch of the Federal Government such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. CARLSON are as follows:

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Topeka, Kans., January 13, 1961.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: You will recall my contact to you last summer pertaining to proposed Federal legislation on noxious-weed control. I believe Senate bill 861 passed the Senate on August 21, 1959, and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. However, there is a chance that the bill will need to be reintroduced in this session of Congress.

The matter of Federal legislation on noxious-weed prevention, control, and eradication was discussed at our North Central Weed Control Conference last month and the conference regulatory committee and conference officials once again approved the adoption of such legislation. I'm enclosing a copy of the original resolution passed by this organization.

During 1961 I am serving as chairman of the regulatory committee of the North Central Weed Control Conference and a member of the legislative committee of the Weed Society of America. It is in this capacity and as director of the Kansas noxious weeds division, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, that I am contacting you regarding this proposed legislation.

I will certainly appreciate your support and assistance in getting this piece of legislation reintroduced into the Senate and House for action in this session of Congress. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need further information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

WARREN C. TEEL,
Director, Noxious Weeds Division.

Whereas (1) the advancement in weed control through the use of better seed-cleaning methods, improved cultural practices and better herbicides makes the production of weed-free crops possible; and

2. The presence of weed seed in seed used for sowing purposes is a continuing source of dissemination; and

3. The presence of objectionable weed seeds in grain reduces its value and is an obstacle in the marketing of such grain; and

4. The screenings of grain containing weed seeds is a source of continued dissemination of such weeds; and

5. The presence of weeds in hay and forage crops reduces its value and is a continuing source of dissemination of such weeds; and

6. Lack of uniformity in the restrictions and requirements under Federal and State law reveals a lack of agreement on the problem of weed control and the most practical efforts to reduce it, which fact impairs the desirable progress which would seem possible with a coordinated approach: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there must be closer coordination of the many regulatory efforts to reduce the injury and waste caused by weeds and that this may be done through:

1. More uniformity in the noxious weed seed restrictions in the several State seed laws, at least on a regional basis consistent with soil, climate and agronomic practices, coupled with more educational efforts to encourage greater use of modern seed-cleaning equipment which permits the sowing of weed-free seed;

2. Adoption of a suggested uniform State weed law which is practical of enforcement and gives encouragement to farmers who endeavor to grow weed-free crops;

3. Adoption of a uniform State feed control law which restricts the dissemination of screenings and other feed materials containing weed seeds;

4. Restrictions against the importation of screenings containing weed seeds; and

5. Coordination of the Federal and State seed, feed, and weed laws and regulations; and be it

Resolved further, That the Weed Society of America serve as a coordinator urging each agency, association and organization involved to comply with the sense of this resolution and report at the next meeting of the society on the progress made.

ALLOWANCE OF LAWFUL EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES AS LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as legitimate business expense.

The Internal Revenue Service has interpreted the income tax laws so as to prevent labor unions, chambers of commerce, trade associations, professional groups and other such organizations from legitimately trying to influence legislation.

Every person who must make decisions on legislation has to obtain information from many sources. We have found that associations, whether they are made up of business interests, labor interests, manufacturers, farmers, doctors, or some other group, are invaluable sources of information. Legislators need to know the pros and cons from as many sources as possible. That is why we have always welcomed mail and advice from organizations, as well as individuals. Organizations present information which enables representatives to understand problems of various segments of the population and judge bills more intelligently.

This legislation will provide free speech for organizations. I earnestly hope that Congress this year will act to protect this vital right of Americans to get together and tell their story to their legislators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 467) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income, introduced by Mr. HARTKE was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing a $100 a month pension for World War I veterans.

When Congress approved the Veterans Pension Act of 1959, I emphasized that it was my belief that this did not relieve the Congress of the responsibility we have to make further improvements in the program.

World War I veterans never received benefits comparable to those given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. The ranks of the World War I veterans are decreasing each year. Many of them are now retired or will soon retire and are living on low and fixed incomes.

Most of these veterans are now in their sixties. Congress has received volumes and volumes of information on the difficulties which American citizens in their sixties are having. Many of them cannot afford adequate medical care. They cannot, for health reasons or because of age discrimination, become gainfully employed. They served our country at a time when there was no GI bill of rights. The benefits which they have received from the Government in no way measure up to the benefits which we have provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. They suffered as much during the First World War as other veterans. They were taken from their homes, their loved ones and their jobs. And what did we provide for them? No educational programs. No assistance in purchasing homes. None of the rights accorded other veterans.

I think that this country has done well in providing for the World War II and Korean veterans. I have benefited from the GI bill of rights and I am thankful. But I think that it is time, late as it may be, to provide some help for veterans who were excluded.

This is why I am introducing this bill. I earnestly hope that we will be able to consider this matter early and that favorable action will be taken this year to help this group of Americans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 468) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Country Life Commission. The purpose would be to evaluate, and make recommendations for meeting, the long-range challenges in agriculture.

Over the years, the agricultural picture in America has undergone far-reaching changes.

The technological revolution has had a dramatic impact on farm life and progress.

Economic and social conditions on the farm have changed tremendously.

A new relationship—too little understood—has developed between rural and urban citizens.

The farm economy itself has suffered from a dangerous and costly supply-demand imbalance.

The trend toward larger and larger farms, resulting in a migration of country folks to the city, has had a dramatic effect on country life.

The American farmer faces serious, unresolved problems in housing, health, long-hour-for-little-pay work schedules, resulting from new forces and influences affecting rural life.

The proposed Country Life Commission had an important forerunner in history. In 1908, President Teddy Roosevelt established such a commission. During the succeeding years, the findings of the Commission made an invaluable contribution to formulation of agricultural policy.

To cope more effectively with these and other challenges in farming, I am proposing the establishment of a Country Life Commission.

The Congress, I believe, should act early and favorably on this legislation.

To enable fellow Senators to join in cosponsoring the measure if they wish to do so, I request unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for a week.

In addition, I request unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 469) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. Because (1) economic changes are profoundly affecting all phases of human life and endeavor in country communities; (2) there is currently a need for greater awareness on the part of all people, their organizations, and their leadership concerning the interrelatedness of rural and urban forces shaping the country community; (3) rural organizations and leadership are in need of a critical and thoughtful appraisal of the forces shaping the country community; (4) in a time of great economic adjustment spokesmen for country people must be encouraged to safeguard the opportunity for full development of individual and local community initiative; and (5) there is a need for an approach to the changing country scene which will provide the Nation with a body of objective facts, thoughtful appraisal, and a value base to help its people make wise decisions in the area of country living, it is therefore determined to be necessary to establish a commission to develop this approach, advise and recommend with regard to problems, needs, probable courses of action, or other appropriate means which will help the Nation to act wisely in this time of unprecedented change in country community living.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act there is hereby established an independent commission to be known as the Commission on Country Life (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members, as follows:

(1) Nine members, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and shall be appointed by the President of the United States;

Three members appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than two of which shall be members of the same political party; and

(3) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not more than two of which shall be members of the same political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

(f) The members of the Commission shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from the membership of the Commission.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and in so doing shall—

(1) assemble the facts necessary to give a comprehensive picture with respect to the major trends affecting country community living;

(2) identify major gaps between the problems of country residents and the organized means to handle their problems;

(3) evaluate interrelatedness, and functions of the various institutions, agencies, and organizations serving country people;

(4) evaluate the impact of technological developments on living and ways of making a living in the country community;

(5) assess the impact of the changing composition of the country community population on economic goals and values; and

(6) develop a set of principles and guides to serve as a basis for approaches to improved country living in the years ahead.

(b) The Commission, not later than one year after the date on which the fifteenth member of the Commission is appointed, shall submit to the President and to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission shall also from time to time make other reports on the activities and studies of the Commission. Copies of reports of the Commission shall be distributed free to interested persons.

HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or each subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) All agencies, departments, and independent instrumentalities of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission, and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish all such information as requested by the Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member of such Commission, to any such member who is receiving other compensation from the United States, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(f) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe. The compensation paid to such Director under the provisions of this subsection shall not exceed the rate of $16,000 per annum.

HEADQUARTERS

SEC. 6. The Commission may establish and maintain its headquarters at whatever place within the United States that is determined by the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3(b) of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

RECOGNITION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE UNIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of this body to a bill which I introduced, in conjunction with the senior Senator from Minnesota, which I sincerely believe will have a highly beneficial effect on the future efficiency of the entire Federal establishment.

I do not think it is necessary to point out that the success of our entire governmental operation depends to a major extent on the morale and efficiency of the 2½ million civil service personnel who make up our employee force. And I want to stress particularly the fact that the future efficiency of our governmental operation depends on the caliber of people whom we are able to recruit into civil service careers.

Despite these indisputable facts, the personnel practices which presently exist in the Federal establishment are antiquated and oppressive to a point where

they lag at least a full half century behind the practices universally accepted in private industry.

The legislation which the Senator from Minnesota and I have jointly introduced will bring Government personnel policies and practices up to date so that in many important respects they will compare favorably with those in private industry.

I might add that this task has been neglected for far too long a time. Government is the largest employer in the country. Government is also the largest business in the world. We must therefore be competitive with other large employers and other large businesses if we expect to attract to Government—and to keep in Government—its proper share of the Nation's employment pool.

Certainly we are not offering to Government employees extravagant wage scales. Government employees are almost always a couple of years behind the cost-of-living index—particularly in the lowest grades. Even after the pay raise which we voted last year, the Federal employees are not in a particularly advantageous position. The long-awaited—and long delayed—report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics certainly proves this statement to be true.

The fringe benefits which we offer Government employees, while vastly improved over what they have been, still fall short of the benefits being offered in competitive private industry.

Government employees—quite rightly—are forbidden the right to strike. It is essential, of course, that this situation be maintained, but it does leave Federal employees almost completely dependent on the humanity, the liberalism, and the farsightedness of the Congress and of the President of the United States.

Up until now, their work conditions and their work procedures have depended pretty much on the attitudes of their department heads. At times these attitudes have been good. At far too many times, they have been wicked.

In any case, all policies governing work conditions and work procedures have flowed downward from top management to the employees. All labor-management decisions—whether they be good or whether they be bad—are thrust upon the employees without previous consultation and without previous device.

In cases where the policies have been good, this has resulted in a firm but benevolent paternalism. In cases where the policies have been bad, the result has been a kind of soul-killing despotism.

The legislation which the Senator from Minnesota and I have introduced will cure this antiquated procedure, which has stultified initiative among the rank-and-file employees and which has caused innumerable injustices over the years. It will also produce greater efficiency in the Government in that it will provide definite procedures by which management can avail itself of the vast pool of experience, brains, and ingenuity among the 2½ million dedicated civil service employees who make up our Federal employee force.

The legislation which we have introduced will do several important things—all of them beneficial to the employer and the employee and to the overall efficiency of the Federal establishment.

First of all, it will provide for a degree of recognition for the existing unions and associations of Federal employees. It will recognize officially the right of officers or representatives of such unions and associations to present grievances in behalf of their members, and it will forbid Government officials to attempt reprisal, discrimination, or intimidation as a result of such presentation of grievances.

The legislation will also make it mandatory for Government department heads to consult with the designated representatives of the unions and associations of Federal employees, and to listen to their views before promulgating regulations or policies affecting the working conditions or the work procedures in the field service.

This, Mr. President, makes great good sense. Most department heads, no matter how worthy they are, are unfamiliar with the specific conditions existing in the field service or in certain areas of the field service. It is impossible for them to know what effect their policies will have on personnel in the field. As a result, many policies which look excellent and, indeed foolproof on paper, turn out to be monstrosities when translated into human terms. Previous consultation with employee leaders would prevent such disasters.

Conversely, Mr. President, many wise policies fail because their purpose and effects have not been explained to the employees in advance. Since Government agencies do not have the apparatus by which they can effectively reach their farflung employees to explain proposed procedures, it will be extremely helpful to them if they make use of the unions and associations which do have such an apparatus.

And, of course, after three-quarters of a century, in which they have proved over and over again their dedication and effectiveness, the unions and associations of Federal employees are long overdue for the measure of recognition which this legislation provides.

The legislation also modernizes the obsolete procedures in Government for the arbitration and settlement of grievances.

It also provides for an entirely voluntary system for the collection of union and association dues.

This would be voluntary—dependent entirely on the wishes of the individual employee.

If this proposal seems startling at first glance, I would like to point out that we established the principle of a checkoff when we passed the Government Employees Life Insurance program in 1954. I would also like to point out that we reestablished this principle when we passed the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. To extend the idea of a checkoff to the collection of union and association dues would be merely to reaffirm our collective judgment in years past.

Mr. President, I shall not expatiate further on this proposed legislation except to reiterate my initial statement that it is long overdue. The personnel practices of Government for too many generations have been carried on under rules which would have seemed somewhat old-fashioned to our grandfathers. The welfare of 2½ million men and women has been controlled on a completely hit-or-miss basis without proper safeguards for the employees and without proper assurance of fair and decent treatment. This legislation will bring these policies and procedures up to date and make them compatible with the middle of the 20th century. It will make the Federal service far more attractive to those who are presently in it, and it will also make it far more attractive to those who are eligible to join it and make it a lifetime career.

I sincerely urge that the Members of this body give this legislation their earnest and wholehearted attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 473) to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is an honor to be joined as a cosponsor on the bill introduced today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Senator JOHNSTON, which would give to the entire Federal establishment, for the first time in history, a truly modern personnel program.

The personnel policies of the Federal Government, Mr. President, have their roots deeply embedded in the 19th century. From time to time we have placed some 20th century patches on the mid-Victorian structure of laws and regulations which govern the relationship between management and labor in Government, but we have never before attempted to modernize the basic structure itself.

Mr. President, since the U.S. Government is the largest single employer of manpower not only in the Nation, but in the entire world, I think it is imperative that we make of our Federal establishment a model employer in the modern mold and not permit it to remain an antiquated and arbitrary throwback to the autocratic practices which characterized the earliest and grimmest days of the industrial revolution.

If we are to enter into an era of New Frontiers, we must make those frontiers of enlightenment available to those who look to us for their livelihood and for the maintenance and improvement of the conditions under which they must earn that livelihood.

As we all know, Federal employees are denied the right to strike. But, just because Federal employees cannot strike against the Government, there is no reason why they should be denied certain other rights and privileges which are commonplace in the world of private industry and commerce.

The bill which we have introduced will grant certain rights and privileges which

are generally enjoyed by workers in private industry throughout America.

The legislation which we have introduced shall give to the representatives of Government employee unions and associations the legal and inalienable right to present grievances in behalf of their members without fear of reprisal, intimidation, or interference. It would also make it mandatory for Government department heads to confer with designated representatives of such unions and associations on all matters of policy affecting working conditions, work procedures, automation, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions and demotions, rates of pay, and reductions in force.

Our legislation goes further to insist that the views of such organization leaders should be sought before new policies affecting these areas should be promulgated or before existing policies should be modified.

The legislation which we have introduced provides for a complete overhaul and modernization of the grievance procedures of the Government which are reminiscent not so much of the 19th century as of the star chamber practices of 17th century England.

The legislation also provides for a voluntary check-off plan for the collection of union and association dues. I stress the word "voluntary."

As you know, Mr. President, we broke ground in this area when we approved the Federal employee life insurance law in 1954. We broke further ground when we approved the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. In both cases, our collective judgment proved eminently correct. I see no reason why we cannot now extend this practice to the collection of organization dues in the same way as the practice is observed in private industry.

The unions of Federal employees over the years have been a model and an inspiration for clean and progressive trade unionists throughout the United States and, indeed, throughout the free world. And yet, up until now, we have denied these 2½ million dedicated and devoted human beings basic rights which are part and parcel of trade union practices in every civilized nation on the face of the globe.

It is only common humanitarianism to grant these common rights to these highly uncommon and deserving people.

But, more than that, it is good business. Our approval of this legislation will result in a dramatic improvement in the overall morale of our Federal employee force. It will result in an overall improvement in efficiency. And it will make the Government service greatly more attractive to prospective recruits and insure us of an even higher caliber of Federal employee in the years to come.

If we are to continue to attract employees of equal ability and trustworthiness as those in private industry, we must compete with private industry, not only in regard to remuneration, but also in regard to conditions of work.

I feel strongly that the legislation we have introduced will accomplish this end, and at practically no additional cost to the Government. I earnestly direct your attention to this legislation, Mr. President, and I earnestly seek the sympathetic approval of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to have these remarks go in the RECORD. I am satisfied that, with the Senator's assistance in this body, we shall probably pass the bills in the Senate without much trouble.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to permit and encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by the self-employed of our Nation.

This bill will provide a system whereby the self-employed such as doctors, lawyers, farmers, accountants, architects, engineers, insurance agents, dentists, and so forth, can be covered under approved pension plans similar to those presently enjoyed by most corporation employees in our country. The intent of this legislation is to give equality of opportunity to the self-employed to set aside a portion of their income for their old age, in much the same manner as corporate employees now contribute to company operated pension plans.

In concept this is not new legislation. It has been many years in evolving to the present form in which this bill is drafted. However, the bill I am introducing today makes a number of important changes over the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee last year: First, it eliminates all proposed restrictions on corporate pension plans covering so-called owner-employees; second, it does not require a self-employed person to include his employees under the plan unless they are more than three in number, excluding part-time or seasonal employees; third, it modifies the severe limitations of the previous bill on the amount of contributions which can be made on behalf of owner-employees, that is, sole proprietors and partners having more than a 10-percent interest in the business; and, fourth, it bases the self-employed individual's contribution on the amount of his self-employment earnings rather than on his earned income from the business.

Other features of this new bill include the following:

First, where there are more than three employees and the plan covers any owner-employee, the employees' rights must be nonforfeitable for the plan to qualify.

Second. There is no "stepped up" contribution for persons over age 50 and no lifetime limit on contributions.

Third. Contributions to the plan in behalf of owner-employees may not exceed the greater of (a) $2,500 or 10 percent of self-employment earnings, whichever is the lesser, or (b) where there are more than three employees and the plan covers any owner-employee, the same ratio of contributions to compensation as applies to any employee.

Fourth. Partners having not more than a 10 percent interest in the business are in general affected by the same rules as true employees.

Fifth. The plan cannot have a waiting period for employee coverage of more than 3 years, instead of 5 years as under qualified pension plans generally.

Sixth. No benefits can be paid to an owner-employee under the plan before he reaches the age of 59½ years, except in case of disability, and must commence not later than age 70½.

Seventh. Retirement benefits payable to a self-employed will be taxed as ordinary income as and when received, except that (a) in lieu of capital gain treatment lump sum payments after age 59½—and after at least 5 years coverage—or on death or disability shall not be subject to tax greater than five times the increase in tax resulting from the inclusion in gross income of one-fifth of the distribution and (b) distributions of $2,500 or more prior to age 59½ shall be taxed at not less than 110 percent of the liability which would have resulted had the distribution been spread over the taxable year and the 4 prior years.

Eighth. Retirement funds can be invested with a bank as trustee or used to purchase retirement annuities from an insurance company. Alternatively, the bill permits the plan to provide for custodial accounts to be set up with a bank if the investment of the contributions and earnings is made solely in regulated investment company stock and also allows the employer to purchase and distribute to his employees a special form of nontransferable U.S. bond redeemable after age 59½ or disability and providing for the payment of interest only upon redemption. Investment can also be made in face-amount certificates.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH has introduced an identical bill in the House, where it has been given the same number, H.R. 10, as it had in the 86th Congress. Inasmuch as this measure does affect Federal revenue, it must first be considered by the House before the Senate can act upon it. However, the introduction of my bill today will give the Senate Finance Committee a chance to consider this measure at an early date along with other self-employed retirement bills introduced by other Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the American Bar Association has been one of the leading advocates in emphasizing the need for legislation to encourage voluntary pension plans for the self-employed. However, this bill has wide support among all self-employed, including the legal and medical professions, farm organizations and small business associations. In fact, I am informed that some 70 national associations have given their endorsement to the concept involved in the Keogh-Bennett bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 474) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans

by self-employed individuals, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this act may be cited as the "Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. QUALIFICATION OF PLANS.

Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (5) of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph and subsection (d)(5), the total compensation of an individual who is a self-employed individual (as defined in subsection (c)(2) is such individual's self-employment earnings (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) and the basic or regular rate of compensation of such an individual shall be determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, with respect to that portion of his self-employment earnings which bears the same ratio to his self-employment earnings as the basic or regular compensation of the employees (other than self-employed individuals) under the plan bears to the total compensation of such employees.";

(2) by adding at the end of the subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(7) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan of which such trust is a part provides that, upon its termination or upon complete discontinuance of contributions under the plan, the rights of all employees to benefits accrued to the date of such termination or discontinuance, to the extent then funded, or the amounts credited to the employees' accounts, are nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to benefits or contributions which, under provisions of the plan adopted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to preclude the discrimination prohibited by paragraph (4), may not be used for designated employees in the event of early termination of the plan.

"(8) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless, under the plan of which such trust is a part, the entire interest of each employee—

"(A) either will be distributed to him not later than his taxable year in which he attains the age of 70½ years, or, in the case of an employee other than an owner-employee (as defined in subsection (c)(4)), in which he retires, whichever is the later, or

"(B) will be distributed, commencing not later than such taxable year, (i) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, over the life of such employee or over the lives of such employee and his spouse, or (ii) in accordance with such regulations, over the life expectancy of such employee or over the life expectancy of such employee and his spouse.

"(9) A trust forming part of a pension plan shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan provides that forfeitures must not be applied to increase the benefits any employee would otherwise receive under the plan.

"(10) If—

"(A)(i) on one day in each quarter in the taxable year of the plan, an employer has more than 3 employees, or

"(ii) this paragraph applied at any prior time in respect of such plan, and

"(B) the plan provides for current or future contributions for any owner-employee, then the trust shall be a qualified trust under this section only if each employee having a period of employment of 3 years or more is included under the plan. For purposes of the preceding sentence, (i) the term 'employee' does not include any employee whose customary employment is for not more than 20 hours in any one week or is for not more than 5 months in any calendar year, nor does such term include an owner-employee, and (ii) in the case of a partner who is not an owner-employee, the period of time during which he has been such a partner shall be included in his period of employment.

"(11) If paragraph (10) does not apply, then the determination as to whether a trust is a qualified trust under this subsection shall be made—

"(A) in the case of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees who are not owner-employees, without reference to any portion of such plan which provides contributions or benefits for owner-employees, and

"(B) in the case of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for owner-employees, without reference to any portion of such plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees who are not owner-employees.

"(12) A trust forming part of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in subsection (c)(4)) shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if the requirements in subsection (d) are also met."; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (h) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) DEFINITIONS AND RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee' includes, for any taxable year, a self-employed individual.

"(2) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'self-employed individual' means an individual who has self-employment earnings (as defined in paragraph (3)) for the taxable year.

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS.—The term 'self-employment earnings' means net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) determined—

"(A) without regard to paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c),

"(B) in the case of any individual who is treated as an employee under section 3121(d)(3)(A), (C), or (D), without regard to paragraph (2) of section 1402(c), and

"(C) without regard to items which are not included in gross income for purpose of this chapter, and the deductions properly allocable to or chargeable against such items.

"(4) OWNER-EMPLOYEE.—The term 'owner-employee' means a self-employed individual who—

"(A) derives self-employment earnings from a trade or business carried on by him, or

"(B) in the case of a partnership, is a partner who owns more than 10 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

"(5) EMPLOYER.—In the case of a trade or business carried on by a self-employed individual, such individual shall be treated as his own employer. A partnership shall be treated as the employer of each partner who is an employee within the meaning of paragraph (1).

"(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION OF TRUSTS AND PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—A trust forming part of a pension or profit-sharing plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (a), the following requirements of this subsection are met by the trust and by the plan of which such trust is a part:

"(1) In the case of a trust which is created on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, or which was created before such date but is not exempt from tax under section 501(a) as an organization described in subsection (a) on the day before such date, the trustee is a bank but a person (including the employer) other than a bank may be granted, under the trust instrument, the power to control the investment of the trust funds either by directing investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges) or by disapproving proposed investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges). This paragraph shall not apply to a trust created or organized outside the United States before the date of the enactment of this subsection if, under section 402(c), it is treated as exempt from taxation under section 501(a) on the day before such date. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'bank' means—

"(A) a bank as defined in section 581,

"(B) a corporation which under the laws of the State of its incorporation is subject to supervision and examination by the commissioner of banking or other officer of such State in charge of the administration of the banking laws of such State, and

"(C) In the case of a trust created or organized outside the United States, a bank or trust company, wherever incorporated, exercising fiduciary powers and subject to supervision and examination by governmental authority.

"(2) Under the plan, no benefits may be paid to any owner-employee before he attains the age of 59½ years, except in the case of his becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(3) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the employees' rights to or derived from the contributions under the plan are nonforfeitable at the time the contributions are paid to or under the plan.

"(4) In the case of a profit-sharing plan, the plan provides a definite formula for determining the contributions to be made to the trust by the employer on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees).

"(5) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the plan does not permit the ratio of contributions by the employer for any owner-employee to such owner-employee's compensation to exceed the ratio of contributions by the employer for any employee (other than an owner-employee) to his compensation. For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) The term 'compensation' means total compensation, or basic or regular rate of compensation, whichever may be specified in the plan.

"(B) If—

"(i) of the contributions deductible under section 404, not more than one-third is deductible by reason of contributions by the employer for owner-employees, and

"(ii) taxes paid by the owner-employee under chapter 2 (relating to tax on self-employment income), and the taxes which would be payable under such chapter 2 by the owner-employee but for paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c), are taken into account as contributions by the employer for such owner-employee,

then taxes paid under section 3111 (relating to tax on employers) with respect to an employee may be taken into account as contributions by the employer for such employee under the plan.

"(6) The plan does not permit—

"(A) contributions to be made by the employer for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(B) in the case of a plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, the portion thereof)

which provides contributions or benefits only for owner-employees, contributions by or for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year; and

"(C) if a distribution under the plan is made to any employee and if any portion of such distribution is an amount described in section 72(m)(5)(A)(i) (whether or not section 72(m)(5) applies to such amount), contributions to be made on behalf of such employee for the 5 taxable years succeeding the taxable year in which such distribution is made.

"(7) Under the plan, if an owner-employee dies before his entire interest has been distributed to him, or if distribution has been commenced in accordance with subsection (a)(8)(B) to his surviving spouse and such surviving spouse dies before his entire interest has been distributed to her, his entire interest (or the remaining part of such interest if distribution thereof has commenced) will, within 5 years after his death (or the death of his surviving spouse), be distributed, or applied to the purchase of an immediate annuity for his beneficiary or beneficiaries (or the beneficiary or beneficiaries of his surviving spouse) which will be payable for the life of such beneficiary or beneficiaries (or for a term certain not extending beyond the life expectancy of such beneficiary or beneficiaries) and which will be immediately distributed to such beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"(8) Under the plan—

"(A) any contribution which is an excess contribution (as defined in subsection (e)(1)), together with the income attributable to such excess contribution, is (unless subsection (e)(2)(E) applies) to be repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution is made;

"(B) if for any taxable year the plan does not, by reason of subsection (e)(2)(A), meet (for purposes of section 404) the requirements of this subsection with respect to an owner-employee, the income for the taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under the plan is to be paid to such owner-employee; and

"(C) the entire interest of an owner-employee is to be repaid to him when required by the provisions of subsections (e)(2)(E).

"(9)(A) If the plan provides contributions or benefits for an owner-employee who controls, or for two or more owner-employees who together control, the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, and who also control as an owner-employee or as owner-employees one or more other trades or businesses, such plan and the plans (if any) established with respect to such other trades or businesses constitute a plan which meets the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4), and paragraph (10) or (11) (as the case may be), of subsection (a) with respect to the employees of all such trades or businesses (including the trade or business with respect to which the plan intended to qualify under this section is established).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be considered to control a trade or business if such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees together—

"(i) own the entire interest in an unincorporated trade or business, or

"(ii) in the case of a partnership, own more than 50 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be treated as owning any interest in a partnership which is owned, directly or indirectly, by a partnership which such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees, are considered to control within the meaning of the preceding sentence.

"(10) Under the plan, contributions by or for any owner-employee may be made only with respect to the self-employment earnings of such owner-employee derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established.

"(e) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) EXCESS CONTRIBUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'excess contribution' means—

"(A) if, in the taxable year, contributions are made under the plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, under the portion of the plan) only by or for owner-employees, the amount of any contribution made by or for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year; or

"(B) if subparagraph (A) does not apply—

"(i) the amount of any contribution made by the employer for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(ii) the amount of any contribution made by any owner-employee (as an employee) at a rate which exceeds the rate of contributions permitted to be made by employees other than owner-employees; and

"(iii) the amount of any contribution made under the plan by any owner-employee (as an employee) which exceeds the lesser of $2,500 or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings for such taxable year derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business (or trades and businesses) with respect to which the plan is established; and

"(C) the amount of any contribution made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year for which, under paragraph (2)(A) or (E), the plan does not (for purposes of section 404) meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee.

For purposes of this subsection, the amount of any contribution which is allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(2) EFFECT OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If an excess contribution (other than an excess contribution to which subparagraph (E) applies) is made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year, the plan with respect to which such excess contribution is made shall, except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), be considered, for purposes of section 404, as not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year and for all succeeding taxable years.

"(B) INCLUSION OF AMOUNTS IN GROSS INCOME OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For any taxable year for which any plan does not meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to an owner-employee by reason of subparagraph (A), the gross income of such owner-employee shall, for purposes of this chapter, include the amount of income for such taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under such plan.

"(C) REPAYMENT WITHIN PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year, if, on or before the close of the 6-month period beginning on the day on which the Secretary or his delegate sends notice (by certified or registered mail) to the person to whom such excess contribution was paid of the amount of such excess contribution, the amount of such excess contribution, and the income attributable thereto, is repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made. If the excess contribution is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1)(A) or (B)(i), or is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1)(C) with respect to which a deduction has been claimed under section 404, the notice required by the preceding sentence shall not be mailed prior to the time that the amount of the tax under this chapter of such owner-employee for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made has been finally determined.

"(D) REPAYMENT AFTER PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—If an excess contribution, together with the income attributable thereto, is not repaid within the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year beginning with the taxable year in which the person to whom such excess contribution was paid repays the amount of such excess contribution to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made, and pays to such owner-employee the amount of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee which, under subparagraph (B), has been included in the gross income of such owner-employee for any prior taxable year.

"(E) SPECIAL RULE IF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION WAS WILLFULLY MADE.—If an excess contribution made by or for an owner-employee is determined to have been willfully made, then—

"(i) subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), shall not apply with respect to such excess contribution;

"(ii) there shall be distributed to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was willfully made his entire interest in all plans with respect to which he is an owner-employee; and

"(iii) no plan shall, for purposes of section 404, be considered as meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year in which it is determined that such excess contribution was willfully made and for the 5 taxable years following such taxable year.

"(F) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—In any case in which subparagraph (A) applies, the period for assessing any deficiency arising by reason of—

"(i) the disallowance of any deduction under section 404 on account of a plan not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to the owner-employee by or for whom an excess contribution was made, or

"(ii) the inclusion, under subparagraph (B), in gross income of such owner-employee of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under a plan, for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made or for any succeeding taxable year shall not expire prior to one year after the close of the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C).

"(f) CERTAIN CUSTODIAL ACCOUNTS.—

"(1) TREATMENT AS QUALIFIED TRUST.—For purposes of this title, a custodial account shall be treated as a qualified trust under this section, if—

"(A) such custodial account would, except for the fact that it is not a trust, constitute a qualified trust under this section;

"(B) the custodian is a bank (as defined in section 581);

"(C) the investment of the contributions to such account, and of the earnings attributable thereto, is to be made solely in regulated investment company stock with respect to which an employee is the beneficial owner; and

"(D) the shareholder of record of any such stock is the custodian or its nominee.

"(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'regulated investment company' means a domestic corporation which—

"(A) is a regulated investment company within the meaning of section 851(a), and

"(B) issues only redeemable stock.

"(g) FACE-AMOUNT CERTIFICATES TREATED AS ANNUITIES.—For purposes of this section and sections 402, 403, and 404, the term 'annuity' includes a face-amount certificate, as defined in section 2(a)(15) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C., sec. 80a–2)."

SEC. 3. DEDUCTIBILITY OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANS.

(a) INCLUSION OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Section 404(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6)," in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, in the case of a plan described in paragraph (9 of this subsection, which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (3), and (4))"; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraphs:

"(8) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for self-employed individuals within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), for purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'employee' includes a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5);

"(B) the term 'self-employment earnings' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(3);

"(C) the contributions to such plan by or for a self-employed individual shall be considered to satisfy the conditions of section 162 or 212 to the extent that such contributions do not exceed the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established, and to the extent that such contributions are not allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance; and

"(D) any reference to compensation shall, in the case of a self-employed individual, be considered to be a reference to the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established.

"(9) PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees—

"(A) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees), as if such employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan;

"(B) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of owner-employees—

"(i) as if such owner-employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan, and

"(ii) without regard to paragraph (1)(D), the second and third sentences of paragraph (3), and the second sentence of paragraph (7); and

"(C) the amounts deductible under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7), with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee, shall not exceed the applicable limitation provided in subsection (e).

For purposes of this paragraph and subsections (e) and (f), the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4)."

(b) LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

"(e) SPECIAL LIMITATIONS FOR OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan included in subsection (a) (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees, the amounts deductible under subsection (a) in any taxable year with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(A) $2,500, or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, whichever is the lesser; or

"(B) if section 401(a)(10) applies, the maximum amount of contributions permitted on behalf of such owner-employee on the application of section 401(d)(5).

"(2) CONTRIBUTIONS MADE UNDER MORE THAN ONE PLAN.—

"(A) OVERALL LIMITATION.—In any taxable year in which amounts are deductible with respect to two or more plans (whether established with respect to the same trade or business or different trades or businesses) on behalf of an individual who is an owner-employee with respect to such plans, the aggregate amount deductible for such taxable year under such plans with respect to contributions on behalf of such owner-employee shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(i) $2,500, or

"(ii) the sum of the amounts so contributed under all such plans to the extent that, with respect to each such plan, the amount contributed does not exceed the amount described in paragraph (1)(B).

"(B) ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS DEDUCTIBLE.—In any case in which the amounts deductible under subsection (a) (with the application of the limitations of this subsection) with respect to contributions made by or for an owner-employee under two or more plans are, by reason of subparagraph (A), less than the amounts deductible under such subsection determined without regard to such subparagraph, the amount deductible under subsection (a) with respect to such contributions under each such plan shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) CONTRIBUTIONS ALLOCABLE TO INSURANCE PROTECTION.—For purposes of this subsection, contributions which are allocable (determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(f) CERTAIN LOAN REPAYMENTS CONSIDERED AS CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, any amount paid, directly or indirectly, by an owner-employee in repayment of any loan which under section 72(m)(4)(B) was treated as an amount received under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a) shall be treated as a contribution to which this section applies on behalf of such owner-employee to such trust or to or under such plan."

SEC. 4. TAXABILITY OF DISTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 72(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to employees' annuities) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (1).—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) if the employee died before any amount was received as an annuity under the contract, the words 'receivable by the employee' shall be read as 'receivable by a beneficiary of the employee'; and

"(B) any contribution made with respect to the contract while an individual is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) which is not allowed as a deduction under section 404 shall be treated as consideration for the contract contributed by the employee."

(b) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to annuities, etc.) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsections:

"(m) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEE ANNUITIES AND DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER EMPLOYEE PLANS.—

"(1) CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BEFORE ANNUITY STARTING DATE.—Any amounts received under an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract before the annuity starting date which are not received as an annuity (within the meaning of subsection (e)(2)) shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which received to the extent that—

"(A) such amounts, plus all amounts theretofore received under the contract and includible in gross income under this paragraph, do not exceed

"(B) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for the contract while the employee was an owner-employer (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) which were allowed as deductions under section 404 for the taxable year and all prior taxable years (not including any portion of such premiums or other consideration properly allocable, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance).

Any such amounts so received which are not includible in gross income under this paragraph shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (e).

"(2) COMPUTATION OF CONSIDERATION PAID BY THE EMPLOYEE.—In computing—

"(A) the aggregate amount of premiums or other consideration paid for the contract for purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A) (relating to the investment in the contract),

"(B) the consideration for the contract contributed by the employee for purposes of subsection (d)(1) (relating to employee's contributions recoverable in 3 years), and

"(C) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for purposes of subsection (e)(1)(B) (relating to certain amounts not received as an annuity),

any amount allowed as a deduction with respect to the contract under section 404 which was paid while the individual was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall be treated as consideration contributed by the employer, and there shall not be taken into account any portion of the premiums or other consideration for the contract paid while the individual was an owner-employee which is properly allocable (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his

delegate) to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance.

"(3) LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply to any life insurance contract—

"(i) purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(ii) purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) if the proceeds of such contract are payable directly or indirectly to a participant in such trust or to a beneficiary of such participant.

"(B) Any contributions to a plan described in subparagraph (A)(i) or a trust described in subparagraph (A)(ii) which is allowed as a deduction under section 404, and any income of a trust described in subparagraph (A)(ii), which is determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to have been applied to purchase the life insurance protection under a contract described in subparagraph (A), is includible in the gross income of the participant for the taxable year when so applied.

"(C) In the case of the death of an individual insured under a contract described in subparagraph (A), an amount equal to the cash surrender value of the contract immediately before the death of the insured shall be treated as a payment under such plan or a distribution by such trust, and the excess of the amount payable by reason of the death of the insured over such cash surrender value shall not be includible in gross income under this section and shall be treated as provided in section 101.

"(4) AMOUNTS CONSTRUCTIVELY RECEIVED.—

"(A) ASSIGNMENTS OR PLEDGES.—If during any taxable year an owner-employee assigns (or agrees to assign) or pledges (or agrees to pledge) any portion of his interest in a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or any portion of the value of a contract purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), such portion shall be treated as having been received by such owner-employee as a distribution from such trust or as an amount received under the contract.

"(B) LOANS ON CONTRACTS.—If during any taxable year, an owner-employee receives, directly or indirectly, any amount from any insurance company as a loan under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), and issued by such insurance company, such amount shall be treated as an amount received under the contract.

"(5) PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply—

"(i) to amounts (other than any amount received by an individual in his capacity as a policyholder of an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract which is in the nature of a dividend or similar distribution) which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) and which are received by an individual, who is, or has been, an owner-employee, before such individual attains the age of 59½ years, for any reason other than the individual's becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)), but only to the extent that such amounts are attributable to contributions paid on behalf of such individual (whether or not paid by him) while he was an owner-employee,

"(ii) to amounts which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) at any time by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee, or by the successor of such individual, but only to the extent that such amounts are determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to exceed the benefits provided for such individual under the plan formula, and

"(iii) to amounts which are received, by reason of the distribution under the provisions of section 401(e)(2)(E), by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee of his entire interest in all qualified trusts described in section 401(a) and in all plans described in section 403(a).

"(B) (i) If the aggregate of the amounts to which this paragraph applies received by any person in his taxable year equals or exceeds $2,500, the increase in his tax for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not be less than 110 percent of the aggregate increase in taxes, for the taxable year and the 4 immediately preceding taxable years, which would have resulted if such amounts had been included in such person's gross income ratably over such taxable years.

"(ii) If deductions have been allowed under section 404 for contributions paid on behalf of the individual while he is an owner-employee for a number of prior taxable years less than 4, clause (i) shall be applied by taking into account a number of taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which the amount was so received equal to such lesser number.

"(C) If subparagraph (B) does not apply to a person for the taxable year, the increase in tax of such person for the taxable year attributable to the amounts to which this paragraph applies shall be 110 percent of such increase (computed without regard to this subparagraph).

"(D) Subparagraph (A) (i) and (ii) of this paragraph shall not apply to any amount to which section 402(a)(2) or 403(a)(2) applies.

"(E) For special rules for computation of taxable income for taxable years to which this paragraph applies, see subsection (n)(3).

"(6) OWNER-EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4).

"(n) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CONTRIBUTIONS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—

"(A) DISTRIBUTIONS BY EMPLOYEES' TRUST.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this subsection shall apply to amounts distributed to a distributee, in the case of an employees' trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) if, the total distributions payable to the distributee with respect to an employee are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(B) ANNUITY PLANS.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this paragraph shall apply to amounts paid to a payee, in the case of an annuity plan described in section 403(a), if the total amounts payable to the payee with respect to an employee are paid to the payee within one taxable year of the payee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(C) LIMITATIONS AND EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall apply—

"(i) only with respect to so much of any distribution or payment to which (without regard to this subparagraph) subparagraph (A) or (B) applies as is attributable to contributions made by or for a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and

"(ii) if the recipient is the individual by or for whom such contributions were made, only if contributions which were allowed as a deduction under section 404 have been made by or for such individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) for 5 or more taxable years prior to the taxable year in which the total distributions payable or total amounts payable, as the case may be, are paid.

This subsection shall not apply to amounts described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) of subsection (m)(5) (but, in the case of amounts described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph, only to the extent that subsection (m)(5) applies to such amounts).

"(2) LIMITATION OF TAX.—In any case to which this subsection applies, the tax attributable to the amounts to which this subsection applies for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not be greater than 5 times the increase in tax which would result from the inclusion in gross income of the recipient of 20 percent of so much of the amount so received as is includible in gross income.

"(3) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—Notwithstanding section 63 (relating to definition of taxable income), for purposes only of computing the tax under this chapter attributable to amounts to which this subsection or subsection (m)(5) applies and which are includible in gross income, the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt (and for any other taxable year) involved in the computation under subsection (m)(5) shall be treated as being not less than the amount by which—

"(A) the aggregate of such amounts so includible in gross income, exceeds

"(B) the amount of the deductions allowed for such taxable year under section 151 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions).

In any case in which the preceding sentence results in an increase in taxable income for any taxable year, the resulting increase in the taxes imposed by section 1 or 3 for such taxable year shall not be reduced by any credit under part IV of subchapter A (other than section 31 thereof) which, but for this sentence, would be allowable."

(c) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to capital gains treatment for certain distributions) is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new sentence: "This paragraph shall not apply to distributions paid to any distributee to the extent such distributions are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' ANNUITY PAYMENTS.—Section 403(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxability of a beneficiary under a qualified annuity plan) is amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (2)(A)(i) "which meets the requirements of section 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in paragraph (1)";

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following new sentence: "This subparagraph shall not apply to amounts paid to any payee to the extent such amounts are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5)."

SEC. 5. PLANS FOR PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES BONDS.

(a) QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deferred compensation, etc.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS.—A plan of an employer for the purchase for and distribution to his employees or their beneficiaries of United States bonds described in subsection (b) shall constitute a qualified bond purchase plan under this section if—

"(1) the plan meets the requirements of section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, if applicable, the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (6)(B), and (8)); and

"(2) contributions under the plan are used solely to purchase for employees or their beneficiaries United States bonds described in subsection (b).

"(b) BONDS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—

"(1) CHARACTERISTICS OF BONDS.—This section shall apply only to a bond issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, which by its terms, or by regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such Act—

"(A) provides for payment of interest, or investment yield, only upon redemption;

"(B) may be purchased only in the name of an individual;

"(C) ceases to bear interest, or provide investment yield, not later than 5 years after the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased;

"(D) may be redeemed before the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased only if such individual—

"(i) has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(ii) has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)); and

"(E) is nontransferable.

"(2) MUST BE PURCHASED IN NAME OF EMPLOYEE.—This section shall apply to a bond described in paragraph (1) only if it is purchased in the name of the employee.

"(c) DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Contributions paid by an employer to or under a qualified bond purchase plan shall be deductible in an amount determined under section 404(a) in the same manner and to the same extent as if such contributions were made to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a).

"(d) TAXABILITY OF BENEFICIARY OF QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLAN.—

"(1) GROSS INCOME NOT TO INCLUDE BONDS AT TIME OF DISTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of a distributee of a bond described in subsection (b) under a qualified bond purchase plan, or from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), gross income does not include any amount attributable to the receipt of such bond. Upon redemption of such bond, the proceeds shall be subject to taxation under this chapter, but the provisions of section 72 (relating to annuities, etc.) and section 1232 (relating to bonds and other evidences of indebtedness) shall not apply.

"(2) BASIS.—The basis of any bond received by a distributee under a qualified bond purchase plan—

"(A) if such bond is distributed to an employee, or with respect to an employee, who at the time of purchase of the bond, was not a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions by the employee which were used to purchase the bond, and

"(B) if such bond is distributed to an individual, or with respect to an individual, who, at the time of purchase of the bond, was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions used to purchase the bond which were made by or for such individual and were not allowed as a deduction under subsection (c).

The basis of any bond described in subsection (b) received by a distributee from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT NOT TO APPLY TO BONDS DISTRIBUTED BY TRUSTS.—Section 402(a)(2) shall not apply to any bond described in subsection (b) distributed to any distributee and, for purposes of applying such section, any such bond distributed to any distributee and any such bond to the credit of any employee shall not be taken into account.

"(f) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual shall be the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5).

"(g) PROOF OF PURCHASE.—At the time of purchase of any bond to which this section applies, proof of such purchase shall be furnished in such form as will enable the purchaser, and the employee in whose name such bond is purchased, to comply with the provisions of this section.

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 405. Qualified bond purchase plans."

SEC. 6. PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.

Section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to prohibited transactions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) TRUSTS BENEFITING CERTAIN OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—In the case of a trust described in section 401(a) which is part of a plan providing contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) who control (within the meaning of section 401(d)(9)(B)), the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, the term 'prohibited transaction' also means any transaction in which such trust, directly or indirectly—

"(A) lends any part of the corpus or income of the trust to;

"(B) pays any compensation for personal services rendered to the trust to;

"(C) makes any part of its services available on a preferential basis to; or

"(D) acquires for the trust any property from, or sells any property to;

any person described in subsection (c) or to any such owner-employee, a member of the family (as defined in section 367(c)(4)) of any such owner-employee, or a corporation controlled by any such owner-employee through the ownership, directly or indirectly, of 50 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or 50 percent or more of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR LOANS.—For purposes of the application of paragraph (1)(A), the following rules shall apply with respect to a loan made before the date of the enactment of this subsection which would be a prohibited transaction if made in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961:

"(A) If any part of the loan is repayable prior to December 31, 1964, the renewal of such part of the loan for a period not extending beyond December 31, 1964, on the same terms, shall not be considered a prohibited transaction.

"(B) If the loan is repayable on demand, the continuation of the loan beyond December 31, 1964, shall be considered a prohibited transaction."

SEC. 7. OTHER SPECIAL RULES, TECHNICAL CHANGES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT.—Section 37(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of retirement income) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) pensions and annuities (including, in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), distributions by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a),"; and

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "and", and by adding after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) bonds described in section 405(b)(1) which are received under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a) or in a distribution from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or".

(b) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) PENSION, PROFIT-SHARING, ANNUITY, AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), the deductions allowed by section 404 and section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions made by or for such individual."

(c) DEATH BENEFITS.—Section 101(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1054 (relating to employees' death benefits) is amended—

(1) by striking out clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(ii) under an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a), or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AN EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall not be treated as an employee in the case of—

"(A) a pension or profit-sharing trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(B) an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a).

if such individual was included at any time under the plan as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) AMOUNTS RECEIVED THROUGH ACCIDENT OR HEALTH INSURANCE.—Section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-

employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), contributions made by or for such individual while he was such an individual to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or under a plan described in section 403(a), shall, to the extent attributable to contributions allowed as deductions under section 404, be treated as contributions by the employer which were not includible in the gross income of the employee."

(e) AMOUNTS RECEIVED UNDER ACCIDENT AND HEALTH PLANS.—Section 105 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amounts received under accident and health plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AS EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' does not include an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(f) NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION.—Section 172(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to nonbusiness deductions of taxpayers other than corporations) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) any deduction allowed under section 404 or section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions which are made on behalf of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall not be treated as attributable to the trade or business of such individual."

(g) CERTAIN LIFE INSURANCE RESERVES.—Section 805(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to pension plan reserves) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subparagraph (B) "meeting the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6) or" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in section 403(a), or plans meeting"; and

(2) by striking out "section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)," in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, in the case of a plan described in section 404(a)(9), which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (3), and (4)),"; and

(h) UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS ELECTING TO BE TAXED AS CORPORATIONS.—Section 1361(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) LIMITATION.—For purposes of sections 401(a) (relating to employees pension trusts, etc.) and 405 (relating to qualified bond purchase plans), a partner or proprietor of an unincorporated business enterprise as to which an election has been made under subsection (a) shall not be considered an employee other than as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(i) ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2039 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from the gross estate of annuities under certain trusts and plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (c)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, contributions or payments on behalf of the decedent while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in paragraph (1) or (2) shall be considered to be contributions or payments made by the decedent."

(j) GIFT TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2517 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gift tax in case of certain annuities under qualified plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, payments or contributions on behalf of an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be considered to be payments or contributions made by the employee."

(k) FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT.—Section 3306(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, is a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment, is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a);".

(l) WITHHOLDING OF INCOME TAX.—Section 3401(a)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan, which, at the time of such payment is a plan described in section 403(a); or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a)."

(m) INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information concerning transactions with other persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6047. INFORMATION RELATING TO CERTAIN TRUSTS AND ANNUITY AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS.

"(a) TRUSTEES AND INSURANCE COMPANIES.—The trustee of a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) to which contributions have been paid under a plan by or for any owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4)), and each insurance company which is the issuer of a contract purchased by such a trust, or purchased under a plan described in section 403(a), contributions for which have been paid by or for any owner-employee, shall file such returns (in such form and at such times), keep such records, make such identification of contracts and funds (and accounts within such funds), and supply such information, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(b) OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Every individual by or for whom contributions have been paid as an owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4))—

"(1) to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(2) to an insurance company under a plan described in section 403(a),

shall furnish the trustee or insurance company, as the case may be, such information at such times and in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by forms or regulations.

"(c) EMPLOYEES UNDER QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Every individual in whose name a bond described in section 405(b)(1) is purchased by his employer under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a), or by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), shall furnish—

"(1) to his employer or to such trust, and

"(2) to the Secretary (or to such person as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe),

such information as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For criminal penalty for furnishing fraudulent information, see section 7207."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6047. Information relating to certain trusts and annuity and bond plans."

(3) PENALTY.—Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any person required pursuant to section 6047(b) to furnish any information to any trust, any insurance company, his employer, or the Secretary who willfully furnishes any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE FORCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred by the police force of the city of New York during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. This bill is introduced on behalf of myself and my senior colleague, Senator JAVITS.

For several months now I have been actively interested in the efforts of the city of New York, and particularly of Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy, to have the Federal Government partially cover the tremendous costs involved in protecting Premier Khrushchev, Fidel Castro, and the several other Soviet puppet dictators, who were in New York last fall for the convening of the 15th annual United Nations General Assembly session.

President Eisenhower, the Budget Bureau, and the State Department have clearly recognized the justification for this request. Last Friday the President sent a message to the Congress calling for an authorization of $1,500,000 for this purpose.

I am delighted that the President has acted favorably on this matter. However, I personally do not feel that $1,500,000 is adequate remuneration for the significant services rendered by the police force and taxpayers of the city of New York. The bill which Senator

JAVITS and I introduce today calls for the payment of $2.936 million, which is the full cost, at straight-time rates, for the hours of the New York City policemen who worked so long and hard, under trying circumstances, to protect the visiting Communist dictators. This is approximately one-half of the full cost to the city. In a letter which I received on October 31 from Police Commissioner Kennedy, he states that the total cost to the city, at time and one-half rates, and including the costs of services and equipment, was $6,364,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the above-referred-to letter appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER,
CITY OF NEW YORK,
October 31, 1960.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: First, I want to repeat my thanks for your commendations of the police department during the recent emergency period of the United Nations General Assembly.

Knowing of your interest in exploring methods of compensating the city for the extraordinary police expenses incurred, I am taking the liberty of summarizing for your information a report completed today on the costs of overtime compensation and all other extra services and equipment. As you know, this department bore the primary responsibility for providing security in the United Nations area itself, protecting the visiting foreign representatives at their residences and in their travels throughout the city, and in controlling the crowds, demonstrations and other incidents arising from strong antagonisms towards some of the delegates attending the session.

The report indicates a total cost to the city as follows: $6,364,000, if overtime compensation is computed on the basis of time-and-a-half rates; $4,896,000, if overtime compensation is computed on the basis of regular salary rates.

These total sums consists of two main categories:

First, the amount attributable to compensation for overtime: $4,404,000 at time-and-a-half rates, or $2,936,000 at regular rates.

Second, the cost of equipment and personnel transferred, in the main, from regular police duties to special details relating directly to the United Nations General Assembly, and the cost of personnel whose normal vacations were suspended until after the emergency period, amounting in the aggregate to $1,960,000.

With respect to the first category, it should be pointed out that during the emergency special duty hours were in effect, requiring all members of the force to perform duties greatly in excess of the normal 42-hour week.

With regard to the second main category of $1,960,000, only a small portion of these costs were "extra" costs in the sense that they would not have been otherwise incurred; however, the equipment and personnel represented by these costs were diverted from their standard function of police protection throughout the city to the special function of protecting the United Nations and the individual security risks who were attending the General Assembly.

To recapitulate:

		At time-and-a-half rates	At regular rates
Overtime		$4,404,000	$2,936,000
Services and equipment:			
Cost of equipment	$91,000		
Cost of personnel diverted from regular duties	1,204,000		
Cost of suspended vacations	665,000		
		1,960,000	1,960,000
Total cost		6,364,000	4,896,000

I should like to draw your particular attention to the funds necessary to provide compensation for overtime hours of duty. Under considerations both of law and of good conscience, it is imperative that the members of the force be compensated for their overtime duty by financial means. In fairness to the people of the city it would not be proper to grant compensation by means of days off. The magnitude of the necessary vacations would strip the city of necessary police protection for months to come, thus seriously jeopardizing the safety of the community.

Please be assured that I deeply appreciate your interest in securing reimbursement for the city and compensation for the individual members of the force for their impressive services on an overtime schedule.

If any further information is desired, I of course am ready to provide it at any time.

Faithfully yours,
Steve,
STEPHEN P. KENNEDY,
Police Commissioner.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. William B. Macomber, Assistant Secretary of the State Department, dated October 27 and indicating the position of the Department on this matter, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1960.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I wish to refer to your inquiry concerning the cost to the city of New York of providing police protection to the members of delegations to the United Nations at the outset of the present session of the General Assembly.

The attendance at the 15th General Assembly of so many world leaders was unprecedented in the history of the United Nations. The Department recognizes that an additional financial burden was placed upon Commissioner Kennedy's department as a result of the task created by their presence in New York City. The Department recognizes also, and appreciates, the outstanding service rendered the Government and the people of the United States by Commissioner Kennedy and the members of the New York City Police Department.

At the present time, various areas within the Department are exploring ways and means of assisting the city of New York in defraying the additional cost of police services occasioned by the current session of the General Assembly. I am quite certain that means can be found to meet this Government's responsibilities in this unforeseen and unparalleled situation.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I very much hope that the appropriate committees of both the Senate and the House will act favorably on this bill. Our bill calls for the exact same amount of reimbursement to the city of New York that has been requested by Mayor Wagner. I think this is a fair and reasonable payment to the city under the circumstances here involved.

I recognize that a certain part of the responsibility for protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations, while in the city of New York, rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives great benefit from its being there. However, the extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances of last fall go far beyond the responsibility of the city. In part, this responsibility must be borne by our Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host to the United Nations.

Although these funds are badly needed by the city of New York, no amount of money in the world could repay the policemen of the city of New York for the fine way in which they carried out their duties in connection with the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. They certainly lived up to their reputation as New York's finest. They were away from their homes and families all hours of the day and night, rain or shine. They did an excellent job in averting the unpleasant incidents which were anticipated in response to the appearance of so many unpopular world figures in the great city of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill which we introduce at this time and a copy of a brief memo on the legislative justification for such a bill be included at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memo will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 475) to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,936,000 for payment to the city of New York. The said appropriation shall be considered an ex gratia payment to assist the city of New York to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government

during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations.

The memo presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

Subject: Reimbursement for expenses of New York City Police Department in re the recent U.N. session.

While there is no specific precedent to cover the unique situation brought about by the leaders of the Communist world attending en masse the recent U.N. session, there is no question that a definite moral obligation rests upon the Federal Government to reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary expenses incurred by its police department in providing protection for these leaders.

The agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, by section 16, imposes an obligation upon "appropriate American authorities" to provide police protection for the United Nations Headquarters District and its vicinity, and by section 25 provides that where such an obligation is imposed the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for its fulfillment.

The New York City Police Department, "an appropriate American authority," under the terms of the foregoing agreement (see *People v. Carcel*, 1956, 150 N.Y.S. 2d 436) having performed for the benefit of the American people as a whole and with commendable efficiency an ultimate obligation of the United States to protect the persons of these Communist leaders and to prevent any untoward incident connected with them that might mar our international relations, it is inherently just and fair that the Federal Government should reimburse the city for the extraordinary expenses so incurred.

That these expenses are extraordinary and so far in excess of expenses that might reasonably be considered rightful obligations of the city of New York incurred in connection with the visits of foreign dignitaries is evidenced by the letter of Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber to me, in which he states: "I am quite certain that means can be found to meet this Government's responsibilities in this unforeseen and unparalleled situation."

ESTABLISHMENT OF POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce a bill for establishment of a national seashore park on Point Reyes Peninsula, Marin County, Calif., as a part of the national park system.

The bill is the result of years of study by the National Park Service and by interested parties in California, including the able Congressman from the area, Representative CLEM MILLER, as well as Senator KUCHEL and myself. Representative MILLER is introducing identical legislation in the House.

Each of us has examined the proposals put forth by the National Park Service, and has discussed them with many local officials as well as authorities on park needs and legislation. The proposed Point Reyes National Seashore has been, to date, the subject of three favorable National Park Service studies and reports. Today's bill substantially embodies the proposal first recommended by the Park Service last April, at a public hearing conducted in Marin County by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Last August, this proposal was favorably recommended to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

We feel that this legislation is justified only on the bases of a strong showing that this is the most effective means of achieving highest and best use of the peninsula for present and future generations, that the area is of national significance, and that the proposal is consistent with advancement of local community and economic interests.

I believe that this bill, individually designed for this area, provides a workable framework for equitable harmonizing of the various National, State, county, local, and private interests involved in a project of this nature and magnitude.

We have tried to set this proposal against the perspective of history, the needs of the future, and the need to protect the interests of the local residents. Seashores suitable for family recreational uses and near large centers of population are a very limited part of our heritage today. We have seen what has happened in many of our Atlantic and Great Lakes States where developments of many kinds are often crowded together so as to destroy or bar public access to the very natural attractions which most people go to the seashore to enjoy.

We were impressed with the Park Service's 1957 preliminary report which described an immediate recreation potential of the first magnitude at Point Reyes:

> This relatively undeveloped region, from its 45 miles of seashore to forest-covered Inverness Ridge, a scant two miles away, provides a combination of scenic, recreation and biologic interests which can be found nowhere else in this country as near a large center of population. * * * The opportunity as a matter of good government for the people to preserve and enjoy this superlative seashore is unusual, if not unique.

Following this preliminary appraisal, we requested that funds be provided by the last Congress for a more detailed National Park Service land-use survey and economic feasibility study. This report is now published—"Proposed Point Reyes National Seashore Land Use Survey," Department of the Interior, 1960. The report confirms and, we believe, justifies the Park Service's belief that the area should be included within the national park system.

The natural character of Point Reyes Peninsula is compounded of many elements: ocean, beach, cliff, off-shore rock, bayshore, marsh, pond, dunes, open space, and forest, as well as unique geological features and plant and animal life, including marine, waterfowl, and upland game. To these natural features is added the additional ingredient of historical interest as the probable location of the first English landing—by Sir Francis Drake, in 1579—in what is now the United States.

The peninsula is located 30 to 35 miles north of San Francisco, the center of one of the fastest growing metropolitan regions in the fastest growing part of the Nation. A number of population studies tell us that the 13-county San Francisco Bay region alone, estimated to have a population of nearly 4½ million in 1959, is expected to grow to at least 7.2 million by 1980, and to nearly 11.7 million by the year 2000. In addition, more than 2½ million out-of-State tourists are expected to visit the bay region annually by 1980. Several already programed road construction improvements would speed access to the proposed park area.

The National Park Service estimates that the proposed park would attract about 2,350,000 days of visitor use annually by 1980. This would be more than visited Yosemite, Kings Canyon, Sequoia, and Lassen National Parks, combined, 5 years ago.

Under the development plan recommended by the Park Service, recreational activities would include a wider range than is permitted in national parks. These would include hiking, nature study, camping, golf, boating, sailing, fishing, riding, and cycling. Existing fishery operations could be expanded to furnish charter-boat service for deep-sea sport fishing. The southern half of the peninsula—considered the most scenic part—would become accessible to the public for the first time in more than a century.

Throughout our consideration of this proposal we have tried to keep at heart the sentiments of the present residents of the peninsula. It is essential that their legitimate interests be met. While the bill specifies exact proposed boundaries, final determination will of course be worked out by the Congress following the hearings on this legislation by the appropriate committees. The bill includes provisions which seem to us to afford reasonable protections to the residents and to the ranchers within the proposed ranching area.

In this connection, several features of the bill are worth special mention:

First. Of the total area of not more than 53,000 acres, not less than 20,000 would be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as a ranching area or pastoral zone in which private dairy and beef cattle ranching would continue under lease agreements.

Second. Owners of improved residential property, on which construction was begun before September 1, 1959, could, as a condition of sale to the Government, retain the right of use and occupancy for life, or for a term ending at the death of his spouse, or until his last surviving child reaches the age of 30, whichever is the latest.

Third. The Secretary could acquire property in the area by exchange of any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within California and adjacent States.

Fourth. The proposed boundaries leave expansion areas for residential and commercial growth of the established communities of Inverness and Bolinas.

The preliminary Park Service proposal and the Point Reyes bill introduced in the last Congress in 1959 provided for a smaller maximum acreage than the 53,000 provided for in this bill. Since 1959 the Park Service has completed its land-use plan and final report on the proposal. The report recommends that

the park should encompass approximately 53,000 acres. Virtually all the difference in acreage between the proposal embodied in today's bill and that of the earlier bill is represented by the proposed ranching area or pastoral zone, as distinguished from the public use zone.

In order to provide adequate facilities for the public, so as to permit reasonable use and enjoyment of the area, and to permit proper administration of it, the Park Service has had to consider the need for, and location of, campgrounds, picnic areas, roads, trails, and other developments. While certain ranch and other open lands not required for actual development purposes could continue in their present uses, it is considered necessary to have control over them.

We fully appreciate the firm desire of many owners to maintain fee title to their lands and their intentions to continue ranching. However, there is no assurance that they might not change their minds at a later date, or that increasing land values and taxes might not make it economically impossible to continue these operations. Without this control we might find ourselves with subdivisions, a manufacturing center, or other incompatible development in the middle of the park's beautiful natural setting. Such a situation would seriously impair public use and enjoyment of the area. The Park Service report states that about half of the existing dairy and beef cattle lands on the peninsula would continue operation under lease agreements covering lands within the proposed ranching zone.

The Park Service also recommends that the commercial fisheries at Point Reyes, the oyster beds and oyster cannery on Drakes Estero, and the two transpacific radio receiving stations continue in operation.

We are pleased to note that the economic survey made last year by the National Park Service, in cooperation with the University of California economists and other authorities—incorporated in "Proposed Point Reyes Seashore Land Use Survey," 1960—makes these points:

First. Removal of lands from the tax rolls in the event of national seashore establishment would not necessarily result in increased tax burdens to other property owners in Marin County;

Second. Any possible loss in tax revenues unquestionably would be more than compensated for in a short time by the various taxes paid by new and expanded facilities and services outside the proposed park area that would be essential to serve the visitors. A national seashore would serve for Marin County in the same role as industrial property, in that it would attract taxable commerce and facilities to serve visitors. Such expansion would add to the property, sales, gasoline, and other tax bases of the county, which has few industrial properties in proportion to residential properties, and thereby has a property-tax burden on households which is greater than for any other San Francisco Bay area county.

Third. The proximity of a national seashore park would help attract new commercial enterprises to the region, because they would find that the increased recreation advantages of Marin County would make it easier to hold skilled labor and professional forces, especially of the substantial types Marin County is trying to attract.

In summary, we strongly believe it is in the national interest to capitalize now on the few remaining clear opportunities to save our vanishing shoreline for public recreational use, particularly the very few still unspoiled and outstanding shoreline areas near large concentrations of population. By any standard, it seems to us and to most of the citizens and public leaders from whom we have heard that Point Reyes Peninsula presents such a clear opportunity.

The National Park Service first recommended, in 1935, consideration of this peninsula for a 53,000-acre national seashore recreation area. The author of the 1935 report considered it almost a miracle that this choice area, but 30 miles from the San Francisco metropolitan population of over a million persons, should still be virtually unknown. Today this is no longer the case. The peninsula is already the object of speculative interest on the part of a number of potential subdividers.

Time is of the essence. The public decision on the future of this beautiful island in time cannot be postponed much longer; the peninsula soon will be developed in one way or another.

Those who prevented purchase of Point Reyes and certain other proposed shoreline recreation areas in 1936 only succeeded in leaving the Nation diminished opportunity to accept a lesser program at an enormously increased cost.

It is our hope that this Congress will authorize establishment of this and other national seashores this year, so that we may begin to meet the public need in this field and so be better prepared for the future.

If we act sensibly and foresightedly now, while the opportunity remains, we shall have preserved for America and for California and for the people of Marin County a priceless heritage to be enjoyed many times over, not only by our generation, but also by those which follow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 476) to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED FIRST SECRETARY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 477) to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in his budget message President Eisenhower, for whom we have the deepest affection and respect, a great President who served our country and the whole free world so nobly during the past 8 years, said:

> I have given much personal study to the assistance the President needs in meeting the multitude of demands placed upon him in conducting and correlating all aspects of foreign, political, economic, social and military affairs. I have reached the conclusion that serious attention should be given to providing in the President's office an official ranking higher than Cabinet members, possibly with the title of First Secretary of the Government, to assist the President in consulting with the departments on the formulation of national security objectives, in coordinating international programs, and in representing the President at meetings with foreign officials above the rank of foreign minister and below the rank of head of state.

The subject matter of these recommendations was considered during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Governmental Policy Machinery of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the honor to be a member; and also follows the suggestion sponsored before us in those hearings by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York and other distinguished Americans.

Mr. President, the primary functions of the First Secretary, who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would include the coordination of national security and international affairs required by the cold war. The First Secretary would receive a salary of $35,000 annually—equivalent to the amount received by the Vice President and Justices of the Supreme Court—and would stand after the President pro tempore of the Senate in line of succession to the Presidency.

The bill I am introducing today is also a direct implementation of that part of the Republican platform plank on Government administration.

The Republican Convention unanimously endorsed the proposal that two top positions should be established to assist the President in, first, the entire field of national security and international affairs; and second, governmental planning and management, particularly in domestic affairs. The post of First Secretary would carry out the first of those two suggestions. In addition, my bill would implement the proposal included in the Nixon-Rockefeller agreement of July 23, 1960, for the creation of a post to assist the President in the whole area of national security and international affairs.

The First Secretary of the Government would be the No. 1 aid to the President and be responsible to him for the effective coordination of U.S. activities in the cold war.

Prompt consideration of this plan should receive top priority by the Congress and the new administration.

The months of intensive hearings by the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of which I am a member included much testimony by men of both parties who served in the highest policy-making appointive posts and under different Presidents. Many stressed in the

most persuasive terms the urgent need for a super-Cabinet official who can help direct and coordinate concerning national security and international affairs policy once it has been set by the President.

Under the terms of my bill, the First Secretary would be a member of the National Security Council and could preside at these meetings should the President so direct. His staff could include four employees each eligible to receive a maximum of $19,000 per annum, and two additional officers appointed by the President to assist the First Secretary. On a protocol basis a First Secretary also could relieve the President of at least some of his appearances, ranking as he would with other prime ministers.

Although we may be aware of the enormous dangers and the tremendous challenges which confront us on almost every front, foreign and domestic, few of us can conceive of the extreme pressures or the awesome complexity of the problems which daily come to the desk of the President. As Governor Rockefeller pointed out in his testimony before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, the President must play many roles. He is Chief of State, Chief Executive, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, constitutionally responsible for conducting foreign policy, and head of his political party. More than 50 departments and agencies of Government report directly to the President and those involved in the national security field have a total annual budget of almost $50 billion. This, in turn, has led to the creation of scores of interdepartmental and interagency committees—160 exist in the field of international affairs alone. In addition, there are 18 independent agencies, many more boards and commissions—4 Government agencies and 6 international financial organizations are concerned with foreign economic aid.

My bill provides that the First Secretary may serve as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. In a sense, this chairmanship is a high command post in U.S. foreign economic policy for the Council is responsible for U.S. activities in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Monetary Fund.

Decisionmaking as President Eisenhower has properly emphasized, is properly a function of the Presidency. However, the outstanding contributions which are made regularly by Cabinet officers, the Vice President, and other top level advisers in the efficient and imaginative conduct of Government cannot be discounted. The creation of the post of First Secretary is meant to contribute to this process by vesting the coordinating responsibility for activities related to our very survival in an official able to carry multidepartmental authority without encroaching on what must be recognized as the final authority and the constitutional powers of the President.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I are today introducing a civil rights package of seven bills in order to implement the major fields of civil rights legislation contained in the 1960 platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. I emphasize that these measures are bipartisan sponsored. In each case the sponsors differed slightly in respect to different bills. In some I am the principal sponsor; in others the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is, together with other of our colleagues.

The seven bills in the package would—

First. Authorize the Attorney General to bring key civil actions for the protection of civil rights, and to permit him to intervene in similar cases brought by private individuals—this proposal is similar to the part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which was stricken in the Senate. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Second. Provide technical and financial assistance to State and local school districts seeking to desegregate. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT and SMITH of Maine.

Third. Establish a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, similar to proposals repeatedly recommended by President Eisenhower to the Congress. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HART, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Fourth. Extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission—due to expire in September 1951—for an indefinite period. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HART, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Fifth. Establish as sufficient proof of literacy for voting purposes the completion of the sixth grade in school, thus eliminating the use of such tests to deny the right to vote on racial and similar grounds. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Sixth. Make unlawful deprivations of rights under the 14th amendment, such as the right to a fair trial. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Seventh. Eliminate by statute the poll tax or any other property qualifications as a legal requirement for voters. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

I send those bills to the desk for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills referred to by Mr. JAVITS were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 478. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 479. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 480. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 481. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 482. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 483. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 484. A bill to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts attempting to desegregate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr President, I have a brief statement prepared by Senator KEATING and myself.

The absence of civil rights from the reported list of legislation labeled top priority by the new Democratic administration is a glaring omission. The new recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its report "Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education," plus the dramatic events involving school desegregation in New Orleans underline emphatically the need for additional civil rights laws. The

opponents of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision will not be convinced that the country demands compliance with the law unless Congress shows its determination to act. The announced intention of the new administration to exercise Executive action to end discriminatory practices in such areas as education, housing, employment and voting is fine as far as it goes but is not adequate to the job and will not remedy the legislative gaps which exist.

Finally I wish to say for myself that I think there is no escaping this responsibility by President-elect Kennedy. Whatever may be said about his alleged deferral of interference in the rules fight with respect to the filibuster, the same cannot be said about these measures, and I deeply feel that civil rights in this country will not be adequately enforced if only the Executive acts, any more than they were adequately enforced when only the Supreme Court acted.

We must have Congress involved, and that is the fundamental objective of my colleague, myself and the colleagues who have joined with us on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to join in sponsoring and cosponsoring these civil rights measures with my colleague from New York and other Senators.

These bills outline a minimum program for legislative action in this field. I must candidly say that in some respects they are only a pale reflection of the promises made to the American people by both parties during the campaign. However, last Wednesday's action on attempts to amend rule XXII suggested the wisdom of a cautious approach to this subject, and these proposals have been shaped accordingly.

I would be delighted to discover that sentiment on this issue has been misjudged. I have no doubt that much more could reasonably be done to protect civil rights than is proposed in these bills. Indeed, I now have under study a number of proposals which may be needed to promote a fuller realization of all the principles of our Constitution.

This is a great and wonderful land, and every American can take immense pride in the achievements of our Nation. But only a blind man could fail to see that much remains to be done to remove the last vestige of lawless and wasteful discrimination from the American scene. We have made steady progress in the past, but overwhelming problems still confront us in our goal of equal protection for all Americans.

These bills, if enacted, would take us a step closer to these goals, but they are no panacea.

Of all the bills, the most important at this time is the bill to continue the Civil Rights Commission on an indefinite basis. This outstanding Commission will expire this year unless we act. The present bill is drawn to avoid the necessity and hazards of a biennial battle for its preservation. Congress could still terminate the Commission any time it desired, but in the interim, it could carry on its important work without facing periodic harassment and peril. The Commission, made up of dedicated men from all sections of the country, has given us a wealth of information and insight into this field. It would be foolish to risk its expiration before it has completed the many tasks which have been barely undertaken.

Another of our bills would abolish any use of literacy tests as a device for discriminating against qualified citizens attempting to exercise the right to vote. This is based on the extensive investigations of this subject by the Civil Rights Commission, which disclosed that individually administered literacy tests were being misused by election officials in some areas on a large scale to unfairly disenfranchise Negro voters.

I do not argue with the requirement of literacy for voting—but the present unscrupulous resort to such tests as a pretext for racial discrimination compels this kind of protective legislation. The bill would simply provide that anyone who has completed the sixth primary grade in an accredited school is not incompetent shall not be subjected to a phony literacy examination.

We are also proposing the elimination of poll taxes or other property taxes as a qualification for voting. The payment of a fee for the privilege of voting is abhorrent to our democratic spirit and I know that there is overwhelming sentiment for abolition of any such requirements. I hope that we will not permit a dispute over whether this should be done by statute or constitutional amendment prevent our taking action to eliminate poll taxes by one method or another.

Another bill would give the Attorney General authority to institute civil injunctive suits under certain conditions in all cases involving denial of equal protection of the law and not just voting cases. The language of this title is modeled after part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as it was recommended by the administration and passed by the House of Representatives. I believe that events since then have demonstrated the error which the Senate made in striking part III from that legislation. The absence of such authority has proven to be a severe handicap in school cases and has placed an intolerable burden on poor private citizens forced to finance and prosecute their own cases. It is certainly high time we remedied this situation.

Two of our bills contain the provisions of the 1959 Civil Rights Act proposed by President Eisenhower which were deleted during Senate consideration of the measure. They relate respectively to technical and financial assistance to State and local school districts attempting to desegregate their schools and to the grant of statutory authority to the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

One important change in the technical assistance bill would permit grants directly to local school agencies in States which have not made any efforts to comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. These proposals were the subject of extensive hearings and debate during the last session of Congress, and I will, therefore, not dwell upon them at this time except to stress their continued importance.

Our final bill would be designed to make fully effective the guarantees of due process under the 14th amendment to the Constitution. The Supreme Court in *U.S.* v. *Williams* (341 U.S. 70 (1951)), interpreted the present civil rights statutes, title 18, United States Code, sections 241 and 242, as being inapplicable to 14th amendment rights. This bill would overcome the impact of that decision, and give added meaning to the hallowed concept of due process expressed in the Constitution.

Mr. President, last Wednesday's action—deferring, if not defeating, a change in Senate rule XXII—in my opinion will make it virtually impossible to consider these proposals in a normal, deliberative manner. The threat of a filibuster automatically arises whenever legislation is proposed in the field of civil rights—and we may as well face that fact.

That situation increases the difficulty, but it in no way diminishes the importance of action in this field. Those of us in favor of continuing the advance of human freedom will simply have to work more diligently and maybe more astutely to succeed. We are disheartened, but we are by no means vanquished.

Mr. President, these are the first civil rights bills introduced this session. I expect that there will be others and there should be because much remains to be done in this field. Let us not delude the American people into thinking that bold Executive action can solve these problems. The President cannot abolish poll taxes, or eliminate discriminatory literacy tests. He cannot extend the Civil Rights Commission or provide financial and technical assistance to the States to help them carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. And he cannot direct the institution of equal protection or 14th amendment suits without legislative authority. Nor can he give the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity statutory powers. Of course, there are problems which the President can help resolve without additional legislation. But in the areas covered by these bills, nothing can substitute for the legislation which is needed. This was clearly recognized not so long ago during the 1960 conventions and campaign. I do not believe the American people are going to be misled by any strategy of delay and expediency now that the elections are over.

We intend to continue to utilize every appropriate opportunity to press for action in this field until at least a measure of the solemn promises we have made to the American people are redeemed.

Mr. President, I send to the desk bills to extend the Civil Rights Commission, to provide technical and financial assistance to the school districts attempting to desegregate, and to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent that the texts of the bills and the names of the

cosponsors be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 478, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. LONG OF HAWAII, MR. MOSS, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that the requirement that a poll tax or other tax be paid, or that any property qualification be met, as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and elections for said national officers, an abridgment of the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, a tax on such rights and privileges, an obstruction of the operations of the Federal Government, and an impairment of the republican form of government.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental authority or any subdivision thereof, or for any person, whether or not acting on behalf of any State, municipality, other governmental authority or subdivision thereof, to levy, collect, or require the payment of any poll tax or other tax or to impose a property qualification as a prerequisite for registering to vote or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, elector for President or Vice President, or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or otherwise to interfere with or prevent any person from registering to vote or voting in any such election by reason of such person's failure or refusal to pay or assume the obligation of paying any poll tax or other such tax or meeting any property qualification. Any such levy, collection, or requirement, and any such tax or property qualification, shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

S. 479, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. DOUGLAS, MR. FONG, MR. HART, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a commission to be known as the "Commisison on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts", hereinafter referred to as the Commission.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall consist of fifteen members appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President. The Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be designated by the President.

(b) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve the Commission without additional compensation. Members of the Commission who are not officers or employees of the United States shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(c) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered to be service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall make investigations, studies, and surveys, and shall conduct such hearings, as may be necessary or appropriate in the discharge of its duties under this Act.

(b) To implement the policy of the United States Government to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of persons in the performance of contracts or subcontracts to provide the Government with goods or services, the Commission shall make recommendations to the President and to Government contracting agencies with respect to the preparation, revision, execution, and enforcement of contract provisions relating to such nondiscrimination in employment.

(c) The Government agencies contracting for goods or services to be furnished the Government shall perform such duties as may be requested of them by the President to cooperate with the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall also encourage, by the development and distribution of pertinent information and by other appropriate means, the furtherance of educational programs by employer, labor, civic, educational, religious, and other nongovernmental groups in order to eliminate discrimination in employment.

(e) The Commission is authorized to establish and maintain cooperative relationships with agencies of State and local governments, as well as with nongovernmental bodies, to assist in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. The Commission may employ such personnel as may be required for the effective performance of its duties.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall render to the President annual reports for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 481, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining orders, or other order.

"(b) Whenever an action has been commended in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law."

S. 480, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. DOUGLAS, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. MOSS, MR. SCOTT AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress, assembled, That (a) the Congress finds that the right to vote is fundamental to free, democratic government and that it continues to be the responsibility of all Federal Government to secure and protect this right against all unreasonable and arbitrary restrictions.

(b) The Congress further finds that the right to vote of many persons has been subjected to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on account of race or color; that tests of literacy have been used extensively as a device for arbitrarily and unreasonably denying the right to vote to otherwise qualified persons on account of race or color; and that laws presently in effect are inadequate to assure that all qualified persons shall enjoy this essential right without discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) The Congress further finds that illiteracy is rapidly disappearing in the United States; that the quality of elementary education furnished by the Nation's schools is of high caliber; that persons completing six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate; that a literate electorate can be assured by affording the right to vote to any otherwise qualified person who has completed six grades of education; and that any test of literacy that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades of education is arbitrary and unreasonable.

(d) The Congress, therefore, further finds and declares that the enactment of this Act is necessary to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution, particularly those contained in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. by eliminating or preventing arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the franchise which occur through the denial of the right to vote to persons with at least six grades of education and which exist in order to effectuate denials of the right to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such elections, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and without subjection to any arbitrary or unreasonable test, standard, or practice with respect to literacy; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding. 'Arbitrary or unreasonable test, standard, or practice with respect to literacy' shall mean any requirement designed to determine literacy, comprehension, intelligence, or other test of education, knowledge, or understanding, in the case of any citizen who has not been adjudged an incompetent who has completed the sixth primary grade in a school accredited by any State or by the District of Columbia."

S. 482, INTRODUCED BY MR. KEATING (for himself, MR. JAVITS, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. LONG OF HAWAII, Mr. SCOTT, AND Mrs. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the fourteenth amendment, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1509. Deprivation of rights under the 14th amendment

"Whoever willfully injures, oppresses, threatens or intimidates any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any procedural right secured to such person by the 14th amendment to the Constitution by virtue of his custody under State authority or of criminal proceedings against such person under such authority, or on account of such person having exercised such right; or willfully hinders or prevents any person from exercising or enjoying such right; or

"Whoever willfully injures, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any person acting by or under the authority of any State in the exercise of his duty to accord any other person due process of law as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution; or willfully hinders or prevents any person acting by or under the authority of any State from exercising such duty—

"Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both:

"Provided, if injury to any person results, the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 10 years, or both:

"Provided further, if death to any person results, the punishment shall be imprisonment for any term of years or for life, but the court may impose the death penalty if the jury so recommends."

APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL JUVENILE COURT JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

It is with great pleasure that I can announce that joining as cosponsors of this bill are the same Senators who are presently members of your committee and who approved this measure 2 years ago when it cleared your Committee on the District of Columbia. They are my distinguished colleagues and friends, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], who was chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill 2 years ago; the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

This is not new legislation. An identical bill was approved by the Senate almost 2 years ago but it failed to clear the Congress because others apparently felt a solution required more than additional judges. Almost 3 years ago the Senate passed legislation authorizing one additional judge for the juvenile court. It likewise failed to clear the Congress.

Mr. President, I cannot be forceful enough in classifying the present situation in the judicial handling of wayward juveniles in the District of Columbia as a tragic calamity. Testimony before a Senate committee last summer showed a total of 1,667 cases were awaiting hearing, an increase of 300 cases compared to the backlog the court had 6 months before.

On January 1, 1961, the court backlog had reached more than 2,200 cases, a 14-percent increase in 3 months. That backlog today is increasing at a rate of more than 100 cases per month.

Testimony has shown that in too many cases 6 months to 1 year are required from the time a juvenile comes to the attention of law-enforcement officers until the court hears the case. Too often the youngsters are back out on the streets, with the opportunity of having further difficulties with the law, before they have even appeared before the court on their first infraction.

This is a shameful situation. It cannot, by its very nature, instill respect by our boys and girls for the law or for our court system.

I am not wedded to any concept that all the juvenile court needs is more judges. I am firmly convinced the court should have more judicial manpower. However, if a three-judge court is not the entire answer, then we must get at least some answer. It may well be that some additional relief is desirable, that the juvenile court more properly should be a direct arm of the District's general judicial system with more centralized authority, or that jurisdictional and administrative changes are desirable.

Today, with the case backlog increasing at least 100 per month, the boys and girls, the mothers and fathers, and each and every citizen of this great city are the big losers. Our youth must be saved from going down the juvenile delinquency path with all the tools at our command. The youngsters and their parents alike must be given the proper service and guidance they deserve from their Government.

Your committee desired to go into all aspects of the juvenile court problem and a staff study is presently in progress looking to this end.

One thing is certain. The juvenile court backlog has increased steadily the last 2 years. The court cannot solve the problem itself. The Congress must provide assistance, whatever form that may be.

With Washington, D.C., increasingly becoming the city the world looks to as a showcase, our juvenile court system must measure up to assist the children of today become better citizens of tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 486) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Senators MORSE, HARTKE, BEALL, and PROUTY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia and my colleagues on that committee in the introduction of a bill to alleviate the congestion of the juvenile court calendar through authorizing the appointment of additional juvenile judges.

This measure, or one accomplishing the objective of reducing the backlog of cases in the juvenile court, ought to be enacted early in this session. Relief in this critical area is long overdue. As of September 30, 1960, according to published statistics, there were 533 juvenile cases and 1,361 adult cases awaiting judicial action. This is a court backlog of 1,894 cases. The statistics for the period October 1 through December 30, 1960, have not yet been released, but I am informed that at least another 117 juvenile and at least another 189 adult cases will be added to the existing arrears, when the December 30, 1960, report is published. The addition of at least 306 cases in a 3-month period—this is a 14-percent increase in backlog—makes it increasingly clear to me that remedial action on the part of the Congress must be taken, and soon.

It is true that in one sense the backlog figure represents many cases previously heard upon which some action has already been taken but which have been scheduled for additional hearings. Given the nature of the court, this will occur, but I make the point that each such case, necessarily, will take the time of the court and will prevent another case from having an initial hearing.

It is essential that the court be freed of a part of the human pressure of work to be done, if it is to give to the boys and girls appearing before it the best service. We must not forget that many of the children dealt with by the court are dependency cases, neglected children, and orphan children. To these we owe a special duty of prompt and adequate care.

Mr. President, the Washington community is understandably deeply interested in this problem, and rightly so. I am encouraged by this interest, whose latest manifestation is the half hour program devoted to the juvenile court crisis which will be presented on WTOP at 8 p.m. tonight on channel 9. I urge Senators whose schedules will permit to view this program in order to obtain an

understanding of the problem. I am especially happy to recommend this program to the Senate since one of the major participants in it will be my chairman, the senior Senator from Nevada. Senator BIBLE brings to this subject, as to so many others relating to the District, his informed judgment and practical legislative sagacity. In this fight to remedy an almost intolerable condition he will find a strong ally in me and in our good friends and stanch colleagues on the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an announcement published by WTOP–TV entitled "Juvenile Court Practice To Be Investigated in Half-Hour Editorial Program January 17 on WTOP–TV."

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE COURT CRISIS TO BE INVESTIGATED IN HALF-HOUR EDITORIAL PROGRAM JANUARY 17 ON WTOP–TV

A special half hour program, "A WTOP Editorial: The Juvenile Court Crisis" will be presented Tuesday, January 17, at 8–8:30 p.m. on channel 9, George F. Hartford, vice president and general manager for WTOP–TV, announced today. The program is being produced under the supervision of the WTOP editorial board.

WTOP Newsman Jack Jurey will narrate the program. Jurey is regularly the spokesman for the station on its daily editorial.

The program investigates the need for an additional judge in the District of Columbia Juvenile Court. At the present time there is only one juvenile court judge. Bills are pending in the U.S. Congress to increase the number of judges to three. These bills have been blocked in recent sessions of Congress by a subcommittee of the House District Committee. The editorial takes the position that the need for increasing the number of judges is critical.

Judge Orman Ketcham, the juvenile court judge for the District of Columbia, is interviewed on the program. Many other statements by prominent Washington officials and civic leaders are also seen on the program. These include Robert E. McLaughlin, President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners; Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, until recently chief judge of the District of Columbia Judicial Court Circuit; and Senator Alan Bible, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate District Committee.

This is the second in a continuing series of special WTOP editorials exploring in depth some major national and local problems and expressing the station's view on those problems. The first special editorial was presented on October 27; it dealt with the problem of slot machines in Charles County, Md.

Film for "A WTOP Editorial: The Juvenile Court Crisis" was made by WTOP–TV cameraman Hal Saylor. The program will be directed by William Linden.

"Father Knows Best," usually seen Tuesday at 8–8:30 p.m., will be preempted one time only for this special program.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES FOR TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appointment of three additional district judges for Texas, one each in the northern, southern, and western districts of the State. These judges are very badly needed to handle the large volume of litigation in those districts. As capable as the present judges are, the volume of work has increased to such a degree that long delays in bringing cases to trial have resulted, to the detriment of the judicial process.

I am hopeful that those concerned will find it possible to take speedy action on this matter. The bar of Texas has been vitally interested in this improvement for some time, and I feel confident its members are virtually unanimous in approving such an expansion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 494) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern, southern, and western districts of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO LOANS TO FARMERS AND RANCHERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify and consolidate the existing authority for loans made to farmers and ranchers by the Farmers Home Administration. I ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk through the close of business January 20 for cosponsorship and that it be set out in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk through the close of business on January 20, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

The bill (S. 497) to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this bill is a refinement of legislation which I first introduced in 1956. A similar bill, sponsored by Congressman COOLEY, was approved by the House on June 20, 1960, as H.R. 11761. Unfortunately that bill was still under consideration in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when we adjourned.

The need for the bill is clear and concurred in by the current administration and by all farm groups. To my knowledge there is no opposition to the idea of this legislation.

Very briefly it should be explained that title I of the bill would replace the existing authority for real estate improvement loans now handled under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; soil and water conservation loans now processed under authority of the act of August 28, 1937; and loans for the construction and repair of farm dwellings now authorized under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Title II of the bill provides simplified authority for farm operating loans similar to that now provided by title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Title III of the bill authorizes emergency loans now authorized by Public Law 38 of the 81st Congress. Procedures would be simplified but loans would be made for the same purposes as those in titles I and II.

In general, the loans would be authorized for family type farms only, except those made under title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The ceiling of indebtedness for any farmer or rancher would be $10,000 except that 10 percent of the amount appropriated might be utilized for loans in excess of that ceiling under titles I and II. Title III provides a limit on the outstanding indebtedness for emergency loans of $50,000.

The bill also provides simple and modern authorization for administration under title IV. It would also authorize a revolving fund into which would be funneled all existing liabilities and assets. However, loans could be made only in such amounts as authorized through the annual appropriations process, thus retaining complete control by the Congress and the appropriate committees.

This new bill would retain the county committee for local operation of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. President, in conclusion, during the past 6 years I have presented various bills to the Congress and to the committees of the Congress. It has been the policy of the Congress to provide a Farm Credit Administration for our farmers. Because of the fact that the original act has now been amended some 30 times, it requires 1,200 pages of regulations to interpret the laws. Even the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture, to say nothing of a Philadelphia lawyer, say frankly that they find it almost impossible in some instances to interpret the conflicting laws and the conflicting regulations.

We are spending the money for a Farm Home Administration, not only for emergency credits, but ordinary credit to farmers who cannot get it from banks, cooperatives, or other sources. We are spending the money. Why should we not finally awake and pass a bill which is streamlined, which codifies all preexisting legislation on this subject, and which would make the farm credit laws of the country meaningful, and make credit speedy and certain for those who need it?

No one who has lived in a farming community, as I have, and who has seen that community stricken by unusual circumstances, as I saw the Great Plains area stricken from 1952 to 1957, can forget the specter of farmers lining up for a block and a half down the street from the farm credit office in order to obtain loans to tide them through. This is a spectacle which we should not tolerate, and we will not tolerate it.

This bill will go a long way toward stopping the confusion which is caused by the present situation with respect to the complexity of laws. We are going to spend the money. I certainly am for

the program. But let us make it meaningful. Let us make it efficient, and let us make it certain.

The bill (S. 497), introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961."

(b) The Congress finds that the statutory authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary," for making and insuring loans to farmers and ranchers should be revised and consolidated to avoid multiplicity of loan types and to provide for more effective credit services primarily for family-type farms.

TITLE I—REAL ESTATE LOANS

SEC. 101. The Secretary is authorized to make and insure loans to farmers and ranchers in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who (1) are citizens of the United States of America, (2) have a farm background and recent farming experience which the Secretary determines is sufficient to assure reasonable prospects of success in the proposed farming operations, (3) are or will become owner-operators of not larger than family-type farms for each family and, in the case of farm purchase loans, will derive their principal income from farming, and (4) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 102. Loans may be made or insured under this title for acquiring, enlarging, or improving farms, including farm buildings, land and water development, use, and conservation, refinancing existing indebtedness, and for loan closing costs. For the purpose of loans only to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace farm dwellings and other farm buildings in order to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing and adequate farm buildings, the term "farm" shall include a parcel or parcels of land which is used for agricultural production and operated as a single unit which produces or is capable of producing agricultural commodities for sale or for home use of a gross annual value of not less than $400 in 1944, as determined by the Secretary. In making or insuring loans for farm purchase, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married or have dependent families and, wherever practicable, to persons who are able to make initial downpayments, or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary successfully to carry on farming operations.

SEC. 103. The Secretary shall make or insure no loan under this title (1) for the purpose of acquiring or enlarging any farm which has a value as acquired, enlarged, and improved in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units in the county, as determined by the Secretary from time to time, or (2) to any individual which would cause (a) the unpaid indebtedness against the farm at the time the loan is made to exceed 90 per centum of the normal value of the farm, or (b) the loan to exceed the amount certified by the county committee, whichever is less. In determining the normal value of the farm, the Secretary shall consider appraisals made by competent appraisers under rules established by the Secretary. Such appraisals shall take into consideration both the normal agricultural value and the normal market value of the farm.

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit and public or quasi-public agencies, for the purpose of providing facilities for soil and water conservation, development, use, and drainage primarily for serving farmers, ranchers, farm laborers, and rural residents. No such loan shall be made which would cause the association's unpaid principal indebtedness to the Secretary under this title and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, to exceed $500,000 at any one time: *Provided, however,* That no initial loan under this section shall exceed $350,000.

(b) The service provided or made available through any such association shall not be curtailed or limited by inclusion of the area served by such association within the boundaries of any municipal corporation or other public body, or by the granting of any private franchise for similar service, within such area during the term of such loan; nor shall the happening of any such event be the basis of requiring such association to secure any franchise, license, or permit as a condition to continuing to serve the area served by the association at the time of the occurrence of such event.

SEC. 105. The period for repayment of loans under this title shall not exceed forty years. The Secretary shall from time to time establish the interest rate or rates at which loans for various purposes will be made or insured, taking into consideration the prevailing private and cooperative interest rates for loans for similar terms and purposes but for insured loans not in excess of 6 per centum per annum and for direct loans under this title not in excess of 5 per centum per annum. The borrower shall pay such fees and other charges as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 106. Loans under this title may be insured by the Secretary, aggregating not more than $150,000,000 in any one year, whenever funds are advanced or a loan is purchased by a lender other than the United States. In connection with insurance of loans, the Secretary—

(a) is authorized to make agreements with respect to the servicing of loans insured hereunder and to purchase such loans on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than five years from the date of the note; and

(b) shall retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate determined by the Secretary equivalent to not less than 1 per centum per annum on the principal balance of the loan unpaid from time to time.

Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this title shall be an obligation supported by the full faith and credit of the United States and incontestable except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder has actual knowledge.

SEC. 107. (a) The fund established pursuant to section 11(a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, shall hereafter be called the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund and is hereinafter in this title referred to as the "fund." The fund shall remain available as a revolving fund for the discharge of the obligations of the Secretary under agreements insuring loans under this title and loans and mortgages insured under prior authority.

(b) Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States. The Secretary may purchase with money in the fund any notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining money for the fund.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds necessary for discharging obligations under this section and for authorized expenditures out of the fund. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the notes issued by the Secretary under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) Notes and security acquired by the Secretary in connection with loans insured under this title shall become a part of the fund. Notes may be held in the fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold by the Secretary with or without agreements for insurance thereof at the balance due thereon, or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine from time to time. All net proceeds from such collections, including sales of notes or property, shall be deposited in and become a part of the fund.

(e) The Secretary shall deposit in the fund such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations as he determines to be an appropriate insurance charge and the remainder of such charge shall be available for compensating lenders and others for loan servicing or for administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration to be transferred annually and become merged with any appropriation for administrative expenses.

(f) The Secretary may utilize the fund—

(1) to make loans which could be insured under this title whenever the Secretary has reasonable assurances that they can be sold without undue delay, and may sell and insure such loans. The aggregate of the principal of such loans made and not disposed of shall not exceed $10,000,000 at any one time;

(2) to pay the interest to which the holder of the note is entitled on loans heretofore or hereafter insured accruing between the date of any prepayments made by the borrower and the date of transmittal of any such prepayments to the lender. In the discretion of the Secretary, prepayments other than final payments need not be remitted to the holder until the due date of the annual installment;

(3) to pay to the holder of the notes any defaulted installment or, upon assignment of the note to the Secretary at the Secretary's request, the entire balance due on the loan;

(4) to purchase notes in accordance with agreements previously entered into; and

(5) to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, expenses necessary to make fiscal adjustments in connection with the application and transmittal of collections and other expenses and advances authorized in section 405(a) in connection with insured loans.

SEC. 108. The Secretary shall take as security for the obligations entered into in connection with loans first or second mortgages on farms with respect to which such loans are made and such other security as the Secretary may require, and for obligations in connection with loans to associations under section 104, shall take liens on

the facility or such other security as he may determine to be necessary. Such security instruments shall constitute liens running to the United States notwithstanding the fact that the notes may be held by lenders other than the United States.

TITLE II—OPERATING LOANS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to make or participate in loans to farmers and ranchers in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who (1) are citizens of the United States of America, (2) have a farm background and recent farming experience which the Secretary determines is sufficient to assure reasonable prospects of success in the proposed farming operation, (3) are or will become operators of not larger than family-type farms, and (4) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 202. Loans may be made under this title for (1) paying costs incident to reorganizing the farming system for more profitable operation, (2) purchasing livestock, poultry and farm equipment, (3) purchasing feed, seed, fertilizer, insecticides, and farm supplies and to meet other essential farm operating expenses including cash rent, (4) financing land and water development, use, and conservation, (5) refinancing existing indebtedness, (6) other farm needs including but not limited to family subsistence, and (7) for loan closing costs.

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall make no loan under this title to any individual (1) which would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any one time for loans made under this title and under section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to exceed $30,000: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 per centum of the sums made available for loans under this title may be used for loans which would cause such indebtedness of any borrower under said Acts to exceed $10,000, (2) for the purchasing or leasing of land other than for cash rent, or for carrying on any land leasing or land purchasing program, or (3) in excess of an amount certified by the county committee.

SEC. 204. The Secretary shall make all loans under this title at an interest rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum, upon the full personal liability of the borrower and upon such security as the Secretary may prescribe. Such loans shall be payable in not more than seven years and no such loans shall be made to any person who has been continuously indebted for loans under this title or under section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or both, for the immediately preceding ten years.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY LOANS

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary may designate any area in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as an emergency area if he finds (1) that there exists in such area a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met for temporary periods of time by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary is authorized to make under title II or to make or insure under title I of this Act or any other Act of Congress), at reasonable rates and on terms and conditions which farmers and ranchers could be expected to meet under the circumstances; and (2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster or severe production losses.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make or participate in loans in any such area to established farmers or ranchers who are citizens of the United States of America and to private corporations or partnerships engaged primarily in farming or ranching provided they (1) have experience and resources necessary to assure a reasonable prospect for successful operation with the assistance of such loan, and (2) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 302. Loans may be made under this title for any of the purposes authorized for loans under titles I or II of this Act.

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall make no loan under this title to any individual, corporation, or partnership (1) which would cause the borrower's unpaid principal indebtedness for loans made under this title to exceed $50,000, or (2) in excess of an amount certified by the county committee, whichever is less.

SEC. 304. The Secretary shall make all direct loans under this title at the same rate of interest established for a loan for similar purposes under titles I and II of this Act, repayable at such times as the Secretary may determine, taking into account the purpose of the loan and the nature and effect of the emergency, but not later than provided for loans for similar purposes under titles I and II of this Act, and upon the full personal liability and available security of the farmer or rancher, or, in the case of corporations or partnerships, upon the full liability and available security of the corporation or partnership and of each person holding as much as 10 per centum of the stock or other interest in the corporation or partnership.

SEC. 305. The Secretary may make additional loans without regard to the designation of emergency areas under section 301(a) or the $50,000 limit in section 303, to persons or corporations who are indebted to the Secretary for loans under the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, or the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, to the extent necessary to permit the orderly repayment or liquidation of said prior indebtedness.

SEC. 306. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1148a) (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund"), for carrying out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 307. (a) All sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of loans made under the provisions of this title or under the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, or the Act of August 31, 1954, and from the liquidation of any other assets acquired with money from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund shall be added to and become a part of the fund.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund such additional sums as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. For the purposes of this Act and for the administration of assets under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, as amended, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, and the powers and duties of the Secretary under any other Act authorizing agricultural credit, the Secretary may assign and transfer such powers, duties, and assets to the Farmers Home Administration, to be headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, who shall receive basic compensation as provided by law for that office.

The Secretary may—

(a) administer his powers and duties through such national, area, State, or local offices and employees in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as he determines to be necessary and may authorize an office to serve the area composed of two or more States if he determines that the volume of business in the area is not sufficient to justify separate State offices;

(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, territory, or political subdivision;

(c) within the limits of appropriations made therefor, make necessary expenditures for rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, purchase and exchange of supplies and equipment, purchase or hire of passenger vehicles, printing and binding without regard to the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 111), and such other facilities and services as he may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this Act;

(d) acquire land and interest therein without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(e) compromise, adjust, or reduce claims and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into or administered by the Farmers Home Administration under any of its programs, as circumstances may require: *Provided, however,* That—

(1) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims of $15,000 or more must be effected by reference to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of section 3469 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 194);

(2) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be based on the value of the security and a determination by the Secretary of the debtor's reasonable ability to pay considering his other assets and income at the time of the action and with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of such adjustment or reduction;

(3) releases from personal liability may also be made with or without payment of any consideration at the time of adjustment of claims against—

(A) borrowers who have transferred the security property to approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding secured indebtedness;

(B) borrowers who have transferred the security property to approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of the secured indebtedness equal to the current market value of the security property or transferred the security property to the Secretary;

(C) borrowers who have transferred the security property to other than approved applicants under agreements assuming the full amount of or that portion of the secured indebtedness equal to the current market value of the security property on terms not to exceed five annual installments with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate determined by the Secretary; and

(D) borrowers who transfer security property under items (B) and (C) above for amounts less than the indebtedness secured thereby may be released from personal liability only on a determination by the Secretary that each such borrower has no reasonable debt-paying ability considering his assets and income at the time of the transfer and the county committee certifies that the borrower has cooperated in good faith, used due diligence to maintain the security property against loss, and has otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to his loan to the best of his ability.

(4) no compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be made upon terms more

favorable than recommended by the appropriate county committee utilized pursuant to section 402 of this Act; and

(5) any claim which has been due and payable for five years or more, and where the debtor has no assets or no apparent future debt-paying ability from which the claim could be collected, or is deceased and has left no estate, or has been absent from his last known address for a period of at least five years, has no known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, may be charged off or released by the Secretary upon a report and favorable recommendation of the county committee and of the employee of the Administration having charge of the claim, and any claim involving a principal balance of $150 or less may be charged off or released whenever it appears to the Secretary that further collection efforts would be ineffectual or likely to prove uneconomical; and

(6) partial releases and subordination of mortgages may be granted either where the secured indebtedness remaining after the transaction will be adequately secured or the security interest of the Government will not be adversely affected, and the transaction and use of proceeds will further the purposes for which the loan was made, improve the borrower's debt-paying ability, permit payments on indebtedness owed to or insured by the Secretary, or permit payment of reasonable costs and expenses incident to the transaction, including taxes incident to or resulting from the transaction which the borrower is unable to pay from other sources.

(f) collect all claims and obligations arising or administered under this Act, or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into or administered pursuant to this Act and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction. All legal work arising out of such claims and obligations, including, but not limited to, the prosecution and defense of all litigation, is authorized to be performed, as determined by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, through the Department of Justice, by attorneys of the Office of General Council of the Department of Agriculture, or by local counsel.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to appoint in each county or area in which activities are carried on under this Act, a county committee composed of three individuals residing in the county or area, at least two of whom at the time of appointment shall be farmers deriving the principal part of their income from farming. Committee appointments shall be for a term of three years except that the first appointments for any new committee shall be for one-, two-, and three-year periods, respectively, so as to provide continuity of committee membership. The Secretary may appoint alternate committeemen. The members of the committee and their alternates shall be removable for cause by the Secretary.

(b) The rates of compensation, the number of days per month each member may be paid, and the amount to be allowed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses, shall be determined and paid by the Secretary.

(c) The committee shall meet on the call of the chairman elected by the committee or on the call of such other person as the Secretary may designate. Two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of the committees and their duties, furnish forms and equipment necessary, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he finds may be required by any committee.

SEC. 403. In connection with loans made or insured under this Act, the Secretary shall require—

(a) the applicant to certify in writing that the applicant is unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance his actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near his community.

(b) except for loans under section 104, the county committee to certify in writing that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements for the loan and has the character, industry, and ability to carry out the proposed farming operations, and will, in the opinion of the committee, honestly endeavor to carry out his undertakings and obligations; and for loans under section 104, the Secretary shall require the recommendation of the county committee as to the making or insuring of the loan.

(c) an agreement by the borrower that if at any time it shall appear to the Secretary that the borrower may be able to obtain a loan from a production credit association, a Federal land bank, or other responsible cooperative or private credit source, at reasonable rates and terms for loans for similar purposes and periods of time pervailing in the area, the borrower will, upon request by the Secretary, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Secretary or the insured lender, or both, and to pay for any stock necessary to be purchased in a cooperative lending agency in connection with such loan;

(d) such provision for supervision of the borrower's operations as the Secretary shall deem necessary to achieve the objectives of the loan and protect the interests of the United States; and

(e) the applications of veterans for loans under title I or II of this Act to be given preference over similar applications of nonveterans on file in any county or area office at the same time. Veterans as used herein shall mean persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation or during the Korean conflict and who were discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 404. All property subject to a lien held by the United States or the title to which is acquired or held by the Secretary under this Act other than property used for administrative purposes, shall be subject to taxation by State, territory, district, and local political subdivisions in the same manner and to the same extent as other property is taxed: *Provided, however,* That no tax shall be imposed or collected on or with respect to any instrument if the tax is based on—

(1) the value of any notes or mortgages or other lien instruments held by or transferred to the Secretary;

(2) any notes or lien instruments administered under this Act which are made, assigned, or held by a person otherwise liable for such tax; or

(3) the value of any property conveyed or transferred to the Secretary,

whether as a tax on the instrument, the privilege of conveying or transferring or the recordation thereof; nor shall the failure to pay or collect any such tax be a ground for refusal to record or file such instruments, or for failure to impart notice, or prevent the enforcement of its provisions in any State or Federal court.

SEC. 405. (a) The Secretary is authorized and empowered to make advances, without regard to any loan or total indebtedness limitation, to preserve and protect the security for or the lien or priority of the lien securing any loan or other indebtedness owing to, insured by, or acquired by the Secretary under this Act or under any other programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration; to bid for and purchase at any execution, foreclosure, or other sale or otherwise to acquire property upon which the United States has a lien by reason of a judgment or execution arising from, or which is pledged, mortgaged, conveyed, attached, or levied upon to secure the payment of, any such indebtedness whether or not such property is subject to other liens; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; and to sell, manage, or otherwise dispose of such property as hereinafter provided.

(b) Real property administered under the provisions of this act may be operated or leased by the Secretary for such period or periods as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the Government's investment therein.

(c) The Secretary may determine whether real property administered under this Act is suitable for disposition for purposes consistent with section 102 of this Act to persons eligible for assistance under title I of this Act. Any property which the Secretary determines to be suitable for such purposes shall, whenever practicable, be sold by the Secretary as expeditiously as possible to such eligible persons in a manner consistent with the provisions of title I hereof. Real property which is not determined suitable for sale to such eligible persons or which has not been purchased by such persons within a period of three years from the date of acquisition, shall be sold by the Secretary after public notice at public sale and, if no acceptable bid is received then by negotiated sale, at the best price obtainable for cash or on secured credit without regard to the laws governing the disposition of excess or surplus property of the United States. The terms of such sale shall require an initial downpayment of at least 20 per centum, and the remainder of the sales price payable in not more than five annual installments with interest on unpaid balance at the rate determined by the Secretary. Any conveyances under this Act shall include all of the interest of the United States including mineral rights.

(d) With respect to any real property administered under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to grant or sell easements or rights-of-way for roads, utilities, and other appurtenances not inconsistent with the public interest. With respect to any rights-of-way over land on which the United States has a lien administered under this Act, the Secretary may release said lien upon payment to the United States of adequate consideration, and the interest of the United States arising under any such lien may be acquired for highway purposes by any State or political subdivision thereof in condemnation proceedings under State law by service by certified mail upon the U.S. attorney for the district, the State Director of the Farmers Home Administration for the State in which the farm is located, and the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall not be required to appear, answer, or respond to any notice or writ sooner than ninety days from the time such notice or writ is returnable or purports to be effective, and the taking or vesting of title to the interest of the United States shall not become final under any proceeding, order, or decree until adequate compensation and damages have been finally determined and paid to the United States or into the registry of the court.

SEC. 406. No officer, attorney, or other employee of the Secretary shall, directly or indirectly, be the beneficiary of or receive any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration for or in connection with any transaction or business under this Act other than such salary, fee, or other compensation as he may receive as such officer, attorney, or employee. No member of a county committee shall knowingly make or join in making any certification with respect to a loan to purchase any land in which he or any person related to him within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity has or may acquire any interest or with respect to any applicant related

to him within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity. Any persons violating any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

SEC. 407. The Secretary may provide voluntary debt adjustment assistance between farmers and their creditors and may cooperate with State, territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment, and may give credit counseling.

SEC. 408. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this Act and for the administration of assets transferred to the Farmers Home Administration.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds in such amounts as the Congress may approve from time to time for making direct loans under this Act. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(c) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund known as the "Farmers Home Administration Revolving Fund" (hereinafter in this section called the "revolving fund"). The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund established by section 107 of this Act, or the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund established by section 306 of this Act, the assets and liabilities thereof or the Secretary's authority with respect thereto.

There are hereby transferred to the revolving fund the unexpended balances of any appropriation, the sums heretofore borrowed, and the claims, notes, mortgages, property and receipts acquired and now held by the Secretary, including any claims, notes, mortgages, or property held by the Secretary on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury which were made, arose, collected or are being administered under this Act or under the following Acts or parts thereof (hereinafter in this section referred to as "said Acts"): (1) titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, including any amounts transferred from collections for loan insurance charges or other charges for administrative expenses; (2) the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, as amended, excluding the assets of the State rural rehabilitation corporations but including any sums received from the accounts of said corporations for administrative expenses; (3) the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, including any amounts transferred from collections for loan insurance charges or other charges for administrative expenses; (4) title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; (5) the item "Loans to farmers—1948 flood damage" in the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1038); (6) the item "Loans to farmers—property damages" in the Act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 82); (7) the sales and development accounts in the water conservation and utilization projects (53 Stat. 685, 719, as amended and supplemented by 16 U.S.C. 590y, z1–10); (8) the Act of September 6, 1950; and (9) the Act of July 11, 1956.

There shall be deposited in the revolving fund all appropriations hereafter made, any sums borrowed under existing or future authorizations for the purposes of said Acts or this Act, all notes, mortgages, claims, and property hereafter acquired and held by the Secretary, the proceeds from the use and sale of any such property, all collections of principal and interest, and any other receipts under said Acts or under this Act.

The Secretary may sell and assign any notes and mortgages in the revolving fund with the consent of the borrower or without such consent when the borrower has failed to comply with his agreement to refinance the indebtedness at the request of the Secretary. Such loans may be sold at the balance due thereon or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine from time to time.

The notes of the Secretary issued to the Secretary of the Treasury under said Acts or this Act and all other liabilities against the appropriations or assets transferred to or deposited in the revolving fund shall be liabilities of the revolving fund and all other obligations against such appropriations or assets shall be obligations of the revolving fund.

The unexpended balances of any appropriation or authorizations transferred to and all sums deposited in the revolving fund shall remain available to the Secretary until expended (1) for loans under title I of this Act not to exceed the total unobligated balances of the sums appropriated or made available for loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Act of August 28, 1937, and not to exceed the amount apportioned by the Budget Bureau for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year 1961, for loans under title II of this Act not to exceed the unobligated balances of sums appropriated or made available for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for administrative expenses under this Act not to exceed the appropriation for administrative expense, for the fiscal year current when this Act becomes effective; (2) for the purposes of this Act in such further annual amounts as Congress in Appropriation Acts may from time to time determine; and (3) for interest on and repayments on notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided, however,* That collections on sales and development accounts in water conservation and utilization projects shall be transferred to and deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Subject to the foregoing limitations, collections deposited in the fund may be utilized in lieu of, or partially in lieu of, issuing additional notes to the Secretary of the Treasury under said Acts or under this Act.

(d) At least 25 per centum of the sums authorized in any fiscal year for direct loans to be made by the Secretary under title I of this Act shall be allocated equitably among the several States and territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 409. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations, prescribe the terms and conditions for making or insuring loans, security instruments and agreements, except as otherwise specified herein, and make such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 410. (a) References to any provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, title V of the Housing Act of 1949 or the Act of August 28, 1937, superseded by any provision of this Act shall be construed as referring to the appropriate provision of this Act. Titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, except the authorization contained in section 511 thereof, the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, are hereby repealed effective 120 days after enactment, or such earlier date as the provisions of this Act are made effective by the Secretary's regulations. The foregoing provisions shall not have the effect of repealing the amendments to section 24, chapter 6 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, section 35 of chapter III of the Act approved June 19, 1934 (D.C. Code, title 35, section 535) enacted by section 15 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and by section 10(f) of the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended.

(b) The repeal of any provision of law by this Act shall not—

(1) affect the validity of any action taken or obligation entered into pursuant to the authority of any of said Acts, or

(2) prejudice the application of any person with respect to receiving assistance under the provisions of this Act, solely because such person is obligated to the Secretary under authorization contained in any such repealed provision.

(c) If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 411. Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended by the following new section 35:

"SEC. 35. The provisions of this title shall extend to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In case of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the term 'county' as used in this title shall be deemed synonymous with the territory thereof, or any subdivision thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, and payments under section 33 of this title shall be made to the Governor or to the fiscal agent of such subdivision."

WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska. A similar version of this bill passed the Senate during the 86th Congress, 1st session, on September 10, 1959.

This bill, Mr. President, would create a study commission patterned after other commissions which have been of great assistance to the executive department, the Congress and to such regions as New England and the Southeastern and Southwestern parts of the United States.

The Alaska Water Resources Commission, to be created by this bill, would be the principal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local plans for developing water and related land resources in Alaska. It would recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for collection of information and for the planning and construction of needed projects. The Commission would conduct studies of water resources problems and prepare and submit to the President

a comprehensive development plan. The members of the Commission would be appointed by the President, four of whom would be nominated by the Governor of Alaska.

Mr. President, Alaska has a great need for this Commission, and for the information and rational analysis of our resources which this Commission would provide. With such a commission, Alaskans will be working with Federal officials to realize the creative potential of Alaska's great glaciers, lakes and rivers in such areas as navigation, power, recreation, irrigation, and fisheries.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is an expression of the desire of Alaskans to participate in the thoughtful and careful study processes which will make possible an ever greater contribution by Alaska to the well-being of the Nation, and which will insure that governmental efforts to develop rivers, ports, and drainage basins in Alaska on a comprehensive basis will be preceded by sound research by knowledgeable persons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 498) to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR CERTAIN FREE OR TOLL ROADS ON INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on the Interstate System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill may be printed in the RECORD after these remarks, followed by the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the announcement and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 500) to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on the Interstate System, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be the policy of the Federal Government to equitably reimburse a State for free or toll highways on the Interstate System within its boundaries, the construction of which has been completed or partially completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which was either in actual construction, or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, if such highway or partially completed section thereof meets the standards required for the Interstate System.

SEC. 2. If an existing free or toll highway or partially completed section of highway which is located upon the Interstate System and included in the report submitted to Congress under section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) (House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress), is believed to measure up to the standards of construction adopted under section 108(i) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, a State may request of the Secretary of Commerce that it receive reimbursement for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such reimbursement subject to the conditions of this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall first determine whether or not the highway, or partially completed section of highway, meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to section 4 hereof, the amount of reimbursement to which the State is entitled based on the cost of such highway, less depreciation and the total amount of any Federal funds used in the construction of such highway. In each such determination for a toll highway, the Secretary shall also exclude from the cost of the highway the cost of financing thereof and the cost of any toll plazas, toll collection facilities, and any other facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation.

SEC. 3. Any State entitled to reimbursement under this Act, whether for a toll or a free highway or a partially completed section of highway, shall use the funds so reimbursed, first, for construction of projects on free highways which connect with the Interstate System and enhance the utility of such system; and then, if there be any funds remaining after completion of such projects, on any Federal-aid system, subject to the condition that all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to a State under Federal-aid highway legislation for the current fiscal year have been expended within the meaning of said legislation. Whenever a State constructs such projects with funds received as a result of a reimbursement under this Act, all procedures and steps shall be taken in the same manner as though such funds had been apportioned under Federal-aid highway legislation: *Provided,* That State matching funds shall not be required: *And provided further,* That the funds received as a result of a reimbursement under this section shall constitute the total Federal share of any project upon which such funds are expended. The State shall obligate the amounts to which it is entitled to be reimbursed under this section prior to July 1, 1976, and any portion of such amount not so obligated shall lapse. No State shall be permitted to obligate in any one fiscal year more than 10 percent of the amount to which it is entitled to be reimbursed under this section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce shall establish such rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 17.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH urged the 87th Congress today to reimburse the States for free and toll highways taken by the Federal Government for incorporation into the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

"It is time that this debt of the Federal Government to the States was paid," the Connecticut Senator said, in announcing he is reintroducing a reimbursement bill. "This Congress must come to grips with the problem of financing completion of the Interstate System, and the Federal Government's indebtedness to the States must not be overlooked."

Senator BUSH said that all of the 48 mainland States have highways which would be eligible for reimbursement under the terms of his bill. In Connecticut a total of 143.6 miles of highway on the Interstate System, including 89 miles of the Connecticut Turnpike, would qualify.

"The Federal Government owes Connecticut about $300 million for the mileage it has taken for the Interstate System," he said. "Under the terms of my bill, we would be able to use these funds for construction of highways connecting with interstate routes, including North-South roads urgently needed by communities in the interior of our State."

Senator BUSH's bill would—

1. Declare it to be the policy of the Federal Government to reimburse equitably the States for acceptable highways, free or toll, which have been incorporated into the Interstate System.

2. Authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide reimbursement, upon request of a State, if he determines such highways meet interstate standards. The amount of reimbursement would be limited to the cost of the highway, less depreciation and the total amount of Federal funds used in its construction. In the case of toll highways, the reimbursement would be further reduced by deductions for the cost of all auxiliary features needed for its toll operation.

3. Require the States to use the funds for construction of projects on highways which connect with the Interstate System and enhance its utility and, after completion of such projects, on any Federal-aid system. No State matching funds would be required.

Senator BUSH said it was equally important to recognize what the bill would not do—

"1. It would not give any State so-called windfall because if the State had not had the initiative to construct the highway, the Federal Government would have had to finance its construction with 90 percent Federal funds under the terms of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

"2. It would not violate the prohibition against use of Federal funds on toll highways because any funds reimbursed would have to be spent on highways which are toll free."

Senator BUSH said that the total cost of reimbursement has been estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads at approximately $4.2 billion.

"In order to avoid an excessive addition to the normal flow of Federal highway funds in any single year," he said, "the bill provides that a State shall have until July 1, 1976, to obligate reimbursed funds to its credit, with a proviso that no more than 10 percent of the total credit may be obligated in any one fiscal year."

Senator BUSH said the bill was intended to implement the reimbursement proposals of the so-called Clay committee, whose recommendations led to the Highway Act of 1956.

"Although many Members of Congress fought hard for the Clay committee's principle of reimbursement when the 1956 act was under consideration," he recalled, "a decision was postponed at that time. The act merely contains a declaration that it was the intent of Congress to determine whether or not reimbursement should be made to the States for highways, toll or free, which had been completed, or put under construction on the Interstate System between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957.

"The 87th Congress should now make that determination, and fairness and justice require that reimbursement be granted. Otherwise, severe penalties will be imposed against the very States which, prior to enactment of the 1956 act, had made the most progress in modernizing the Interstate System within their borders."

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED FEDERAL PERSONNEL BY BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, toward the close of the last session, I introduced a bill in the hope that the subject it treats of would receive attention and study, to the degree that interested parties would be prepared to testify early in this session on such a bill.

The purpose of this bill is to help effect a fuller use of mature and experienced professional manpower, here in the District of Columbia, without having the plan cost the Federal or the District Government any higher expenditures.

I am now introducing this bill again. I hope it will receive early consideration. The plan it proposes is a simple one; one which I hope will be of help to both the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

It provides that any person who is retired from the Federal Government service, may, if he has all the qualifications required by the Board of Education of Washington, D.C., be appointed to teach in Washington's public schools, and draw his Federal retirement pay as well. The bill further provides as a complementary provision, that any professional employee of the Board of Education may on his retirement accept a position in the Federal Government, and continue to draw his earned retirement pay. Such a plan is both practical and just.

At present, any teacher who is retired under the laws of any State in the Union may accept a position in the Federal Government, for which he may be qualified, and any person, retired under the Federal employees' retirement law may accept a position in any school system in the United States, for which he may be qualified, except in the District of Columbia.

Some years ago we passed a bill making retired teachers eligible for service as substitutes in the schools of Washington, without having such appointment in any way impair their pension. The proposal in this bill simply extends the principle of the earlier bill, now a law.

A number of qualified Federal workers are interested in doing a few years teaching, after having had a period of service in the Federal Government and similarly a number of teachers are interested in rounding out their careers with a few years in Government service.

The bill involves no additional costs to either the Federal Government or the Washington public schools, and is so far as I have heard not controversial. As it would be of some help in recruiting much-needed professional manpower, and as no additional cost is involved, I hope we may give early favorable consideration to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 502) to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any former employee of the Federal Government who has been retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the Board, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

SEC. 2. Any former employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who shall have been retired under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved April 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the said Civil Service Commission, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, as amended.

SPLIT SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I submit today, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution proposing that the annual sessions of Congress be split, with the first part being in the period of January to August and the second being November to January. In the even-numbered years, the second part would be 15 days later because of the November election.

This is the same proposal that I made in 1959 with Senate Concurrent Resolution 77.

The purpose of the resolution is clear. Year after year we see sessions going late into August, September, or October—and we see tempers frayed, mental fatigue, and exhaustion, and minds on such matters as election campaigns. The overall result is that we legislate in such periods under conditions that are not conducive for clear minds and stable emotions.

I think that the wisdom of this proposal that I made in 1959 was proved in 1960 when we had the August session after the national conventions. The frustration and confusion was evident to almost everyone.

There is another aspect of this matter. Under the present system many congressional families are broken up for as much as 6 months of the year. With school recessing in June, many of the wives and children go back home while the Members must remain here in Washington. Then when the mothers and children return to Washington in September when school starts again, the chances are that the Members have left Washington to go back home to their constituency—often not to return to Washington until January.

Under the schedule I propose, the families would be kept together instead of being divided so much of the year. It would be a schedule keyed more to the school year schedule. If most of us will examine the annual schedule of Americans, we will see that most families key their schedule to the school schedule.

Of course, it is to be recognized that a session starting in mid-November in the even-numbered years would result in a lame duck session. While there are objections to this, I believe the objectionable features of the present system are much greater and involve far greater risks militating against performing the function of legislating under the best circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for annual adjournments of Congress, submitted by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 132. (a) Effective with the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, in each even-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 15, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 15 in that year, or the following Monday if November 15 falls on Saturday or Sunday; and in each odd-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 1, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 1 in that year, or the following Monday if November 1 falls on Saturday or Sunday.

"(b) The consent of the respective Houses is hereby given to an adjournment of the other for the period specified in subsection (a)."

INVESTIGATION OF COUNTERFEIT DRUG TRAFFIC

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I submit a resolution providing for a complete and thorough investigation of the counterfeit drug traffic in the United States.

This traffic is a multi-million-dollar racket, a flourishing trade in fake and diluted drugs stamped with the counterfeit trademarks of reputable firms. A conservative estimate has placed the annual turnover at $50 million, but some observers have placed the yearly value of these fake and dangerous drugs at $150 million.

The recent discovery of counterfeit drugs here in Washington, D.C., and in Baltimore are but a few examples of a vicious practice spreading throughout the United States. Mr. President, we cannot allow unscrupulous men to pile up profits at the expense of the health of our citizens.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, while an excellent piece of legislation, cannot possibly cover every one of the possible violations and evasive techniques which have come into being within the last few years.

Counterfeit drugs constitute an obvious danger to patients. Furthermore, traffic in such drugs places a heavy burden on thousands of honest, conscientious druggists and pharmacists who must compete with the callous few in the drug profession who place their own financial well-being above the interest of their customers.

At present, the only basis upon which action can now be taken against counterfeit drugs per se is that of mislabeling and then only when the mislabeled drugs have been introduced into interstate commerce. It has been suggested that a statute aimed directly at the manufacture of counterfeit drugs would have a tremendous impact upon those few whose greed places sick and ill people in mortal danger daily.

To date there have been no recorded tragedies resulting from counterfeit drugs. But customers may not be so fortunate with the next batch of falsely marked and illegally produced drugs. It is up to the Congress to insure that there is no "next batch."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following excellent article entitled "A New Program To Protect You From Counterfeit Drugs," in the January 15, 1961, edition of Parade Magazine printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 42), submitted by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER), was received, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the health and welfare of the people of the United States demand full utilization of the vast technical advances in the development of new drugs; and

Whereas the effectiveness and safety of drugs are dependent upon the maintenance of the highest standards in manufacture and prescription; and

Whereas there is definite evidence of a growing traffic in counterfeit drugs manufactured in many instances without regard to prescribed standards and under wantonly unsanitary conditions; and

Whereas the continued traffic in such counterfeit drugs constitutes an increasingly serious menace to the health and welfare of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized under Sections 134A and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine the extent of the traffic in counterfeit drugs in the United States and to recommend to the Senate such legislative or other action as in the opinion of the Committee is necessary to be taken to assure the health and welfare of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall report their findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but no later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which will not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

The article presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

[From Parade, Jan. 15, 1961]

A NEW PROGRAM TO PROTECT YOU AGAINST COUNTERFEIT DRUGS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A new offensive has been launched to stamp out the vicious—and flourishing—traffic in counterfeit drugs. Generated within the drug industry itself, the program promises new safeguards against a multi-million-dollar racket that now threatens the health of every American.

On October 23, 1960, Parade first warned that nationally-known drugs and medicines are faked in filthy basements and garrets at vast profits to quacks who make them. Since then, the Food and Drug Administration has said that the production of so-called zombies is not declining but growing. Deputy Commissioner John L. Harvey declares:

"An FDA survey now going on indicates that drug counterfeiting may be on the increase. Retail druggists have been warned to insist on sealed manufacturers' packaging and to be on the alert for suspicious drug marketing practices which may suggest that the drugs involved are counterfeit. This is a serious threat to the public health."

But out of the national outrage that followed Parade's article has come a plan to strike back.

The District of Columbia Pharmaceutical Association, anxious to purge an honorable profession of its shady operators, conferred with Parade about the problem. As a result, the National Committee Against Counterfeit Drugs was organized. And a local pilot project was set up, which, it is hoped, will be the model for a nationwide campaign against drug faking.

Pharmacists will sign a pledge of ethical practice and agree to forfeit a $10,000 bond if, knowingly, that pledge is broken. Those who sign will be issued blue-and-white seals as a symbol of the purity of their pharmacies.

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

The danger of contaminated drugs is obvious. Not so obvious are the dangers of dilution and substitution. A doctor orders a certain treatment. The patient buys the prescribed drug but gets a zombie. It may contain no harmful ingredients; it may simply be a diluted imitation. Naturally, the patient won't respond properly. It may be weeks before the doctor discovers, if he ever does, what has happened. In the meantime, the disease may progress unchecked, until the patient is beyond cure.

It would be bad enough if this shameful trade were a hole-in-the-wall business. But Parade's investigation revealed that the counterfeiters literally are flooding the country with zombies.

Parade found three basic reasons why the trade flourishes:

The Food and Drug Administration has been understaffed and apathetic;

Some States do not require drugmakers to be licensed, allowing counterfeiters to operate after they have been chased out of other States;

Reputable manufacturers and pharmacists have been wary of exposing the racket, fearing that customers would be frightened away from legitimate drugs. Leading pharmaceutical manufacturers have spent millions of dollars every year in research to perfect, develop, and control new drugs.

Parade's exposé brought in letters of praise by every mail. Honest pharmacists across the Nation wrote bitterly of what they called a disgrace to our profession. The National Wholesale Druggists' Association ordered the article reprinted and sent 20,000 copies to its members from coast to coast. The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association declared: "We certainly want to compliment you on this effort to make the public aware of what apparently is a growing threat in the field of health care."

"Many innocent pharmacies could be taken by such nefarious peddlers," wrote Sol S. Turnoff, of the Pennsylvania State Board of Pharmacy. "The decent and honest pharmacists thank you."

REACHING THE PUBLIC

"You have made a real contribution to consumer education," Leavitt C. Parsons, publisher of the Apothecary, a trade magazine for druggists in New England, declared. "So much of this vital information has appeared only in the technical-trade papers. I feel very strongly on the need of educating the general public."

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, citing the Parade article, declared hopefully: "This publicity may result in considerable pressure on legislators to do something." The Michigan State Pharmaceutical Association commented: "The public should be encouraged to place their confidence in reputable pharmacists as they would in reputable physicians. The pharmacist, in turn, should respect his role in the physician-pharmacist-patient relationship and dispense only drugs of high quality purchased from reputable companies. The Parade feature emphasizes what the results can be when one loses sight of the importance of providing only high-qualify, lifesaving drugs."

But the letters and telegrams from the public were the most heart rending. They told of savings squandered on phony drugs—from sawdust-filled "vitamin" pills to fake "wonder drugs" made of chalk, flour, and other fillers—all sold at fancy prices. They told of dear ones who may have suffered months of needless illness, who might even have died, because of quack medications. Most letters simply sought help in identifying counterfeit drugs. Doctors also raged against the prevalent practice of filling their prescriptions with substitutes.

The District of Columbia Pharmaceutical Association, however, was not content merely to express alarm and indignation. Harold Elwyn, of Western Pharmacy, called an informal meeting of the District of Columbia pharmacists at his home and urged that something be done. His specific plan for a joint pharmacy committee to safeguard public health was rejected. But officers of the Association called upon Parade to discuss the problem.

Charles N. Grubb, president; Eileen Brooks, executive secretary, and Frank Stoutenburgh, publicity director, met with Washington correspondent Jack Anderson, who directed Parade's investigation. Out of the meeting came a proposal to issue special seals to Washington druggists who would pledge themselves to fight counterfeiting. By resolution of the executive board, the association adopted the drug seal program at a meeting November 27.

The issuing of seals and recording of pledges in Washington will be the responsibility of the National Committee Against Counterfeit Drugs. A three-man committee was set up, consisting of Anderson, Warren Woods, prominent Washington attorney in no way connected with the drug industry, and Walter Mancuso, president-elect of the Pharmaceutical Association, who was selected by the pharmacists as their representative. Since the committee is a public-spirited, nonprofit organization, all three will serve voluntarily without fee.

The "pledge of ethical practice" seal will be issued, beginning today, to those Washington pharmacists willing to pledge never to deal knowingly in counterfeit drugs.

Any $10,000 forfeits collected will go to a scholarship fund for the training of pharmacists.

Certain drug manufacturers have expressed willingness to help the committee by providing shoppers, investigators and testing facilities to police the program. Committee investigators will spot-shop drugstores. Any complaint that a pharmacist is violating his "pledge of ethical practice" seal will be thoroughly investigated. Serious evidence of counterfeiting will be turned over to authorities for prosecution. Should the authorities fail to take what the committee considers to be satisfactory action, however, the committee will reserve the right to file civil suit and present evidence in court to collect the $10,000 forfeiture.

BLOWING THE WHISTLE

The response to the seal program has already been vastly encouraging. Local civic leaders in Washington are giving wholehearted support. Leading newsmen, radio and TV stars have agreed to promote and publicize the anti-counterfeit drive. Among them are WRC's Patty Cavin, WWDC's Steve Allison, WTOP's Mark Evans, and WMAL's Jerry Strong and Del Malkie. O. Roy Chalk, owner of the D.C. Transit Co., also has agreed to display the seal in every bus and streetcar so customers will know what to look for when they buy drugs.

To kill the bootleg drug racket will require tougher State and Federal laws, perhaps tougher policing and penalties. Until that day comes, pill purchasers should be on their guard.

"We've started the ball rolling," says Washington pharmacist Stoutenburgh of the seal program. "Now we are hoping the rest of the Nation will join up and stamp out once and for all this vicious practice."

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent months of the economic problems the United States now faces in the conduct of her world trade. Growing imports of many items formerly supplied by our country to the rest of the world, the increased ability of foreign countries to supply one another with needed items, and the change in the trade position of nations once devastated by war, have placed in new focus the coming negotiation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

New developments in the control of international trade place a difficult burden on our negotiators. Quotas which frequently exclude our products from other nations even though tariffs may be low, currency restrictions which discriminate against U.S. dollars and the products they will purchase, and Government restrictions on import and export licenses all fall under this category. Although they are not directly a part of the tariff negotiations, they have an important bearing on the outcome of this conference. I, therefore, feel that the United States should take the use of these restrictions into full consideration in its negotiations to achieve genuine reciprocity.

Industry in New England and in fact throughout the whole country looks forward to growing exports and an equalization of its opportunity to compete with the imports now entering our country from nations which are in the position of purchasing increasing amounts of our products.

Considering the evolution in the whole character of international trade, I hope that the Senate may see fit to support increased efforts on the part of our negotiators. I believe that under these circumstances the Senate can helpfully state its views on the negotiations shortly to commence under GATT. I wish to present a resolution which I have discussed with State Department officials and also with representatives of New England industry which I hope can serve as a vehicle for such an expression of the sense of the Senate.

I therefore file for appropriate reference a resolution calling for the U.S. delegation to GATT to negotiate vigorously in these areas so as to benefit our exporters and assist in bringing about favorable conditions for the health of world trade generally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 46), submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Trade Agreements Committee on May 28, 1960, announced the intention of the United States to participate in international tariff negotiations, listing United States import articles to be considered for possible tariff concessions; and

Whereas in such negotiations the United States delegation will be authorized to offer tariff concessions on certain articles; and

Whereas to counter the unfavorable balance of payments now being experienced by the United States, every effort must be made to stimulate United States exports and improve the United States balance of trade position; and

Whereas to counter unemployment in certain distressed areas of the United States every effort must be made to stimulate domestic manufacturing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States delegation to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should be instructed to use its authority to the fullest extent practicable to offer and seek concessions in the manner best designed to obtain from other countries participating in these negotiations maximum reduction in their tariffs and liberalization of their quotas and other restrictions for the benefit of United States exporters consistent with the achievement of the goal of genuine reciprocity in our tariff and trade agreements with foreign nations.

TREATIES RELATING TO WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). On behalf of the majority leader, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 87th Congress, 1st session, a treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington January 17, 1961; Executive D, 87th Congress, 1st session, the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960; Executive E, 87th Congress, 1st session, a copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, signed at Paris on December 14, 1960; and Executive F, 87th Congress, 1st session, the texts of amendments to article 10(a)(2) and 13, of the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, held at Geneva from April 1 to 28, 1959, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the treaty, the second agreement, a copy of the convention, and the texts of amendments, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The messages from the President are as follows:

EXECUTIVE C, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington January 17, 1961, together with a report of the Secretary of State.

The treaty is an important step toward achieving optimum development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin as a whole from which the United States and Canada will each receive benefits materially larger than either could obtain independently.

The United States will secure a large block of power at low cost, substantial flood control benefits, and additional incidental benefits for irrigation, navigation, pollution abatement, and other uses resulting from controlled storage. Canada will also receive a large block of power at a low cost, as well as flood control and other benefits resulting from the control of water flow.

The treaty envisages the construction, in the Columbia River Basin in Canada within a 9-year period, of reservoirs providing 15.5 million acre-feet of storage. The treaty also clears the way for construction by the United States, at its option, of the Libby project on the Kootenai River in northern Montana, which was authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1950. The reservoir area for this project extends 42 miles into the Canadian province of British Columbia.

The flood control and power benefits resulting from the treaty will be realized at a much earlier date and at a cost materially less than would be the case were they to be provided exclusively through projects in the United States.

The developments brought about under the treaty will be of great significance for their human values as well as for the material gains they will provide.

The flood control objectives of the United States for the lower Columbia River in Oregon and Washington which have been a pressing need for many years will be brought to substantial realization within a span of less than a decade. The Libby project will resolve the critical flood control problem in the Bonners Ferry area in Idaho. Removal of

the hazard of periodic floods will pay incalculable dividends in the saving of human life and the avoidance of suffering, as well as through economic improvement in areas heretofore subject to recurring flood damage.

The initial power benefits realizable in the United States from Canadian storage under the treaty are comparable to another Grand Coulee Dam, the largest hydroelectric project now in operation in the United States. The Libby clearance presents the opportunity to gain an additional block of power substantially greater than the output of Bonneville Dam. The total initial result is a gain to the United States of over 1,686,000 kilowatts of low-cost prime power.

Over the longer term, this large block of storage will make more valuable the existing projects in the Columbia River Basin, representing an investment of some $3.5 billion, by accelerating the time at which their full potential can be realized. The large blocks of power that will result will be a tremendous asset in fostering the Nation's economic growth and in augmenting our national resources.

Due to the location of the storage, there will be no interference with the cycle for salmon and other anadromous fish which constitute such an important economic and recreational asset for the people of the Pacific Northwest.

To provide flood control and power benefits equivalent to those provided by the Canadian storage as of 1970 entirely from projects in the United States would require an investment in the United States of about $710 million (including the cost of necessary additional transmission facilities) over this decade. To realize the treaty benefits, on the other hand, the costs in the United States over the next 10 years are estimated at not over $150 million. Between 1970 and 1985 an additional estimated $268 million of U.S. expenditures will be required. Most of this added expenditure will go to install additional generating facilities in the United States to take full advantage of the Canadian storage. In all, the total capital outlay in the United States by reason of the treaty (exclusive of the cost of the Libby project) is estimated at about $418 million.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the treaty which should not be considered from the aspect of economic benefit alone but also as a further demonstration of the spirit of cooperation and mutual accommodation which has traditionally characterized relationships between Canada and the United States of America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Treaty concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin.)

EXECUTIVE D, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding certain matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960.

There is transmitted also for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the agreement.

By providing for validation of certain East German dollar bonds as to which there are guarantors or substantial assets of the issuer in the Federal Republic of Germany, the agreement will permit payments to be made to the U.S. holders of such bonds. I recommend that the Senate take favorable action with respect to the agreement.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Agreement.)

EXECUTIVE E, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, together with copies of two protocols relating thereto, signed at Paris on December 14, 1960, by representatives of the United States of America, Canada, and the 18 member countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

The convention reflects the broad area of mutual interest among the major industrialized nations of the North Atlantic area. It represents a historic step toward closer economic cooperation among them. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will forge a strong new link between Western Europe and North America, and will provide the means to intensify economic consultation and cooperation to meet the new challenges facing the member countries.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with copies of two protocols relating thereto.)

EXECUTIVE F, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to approval of amendments to articles 10(a)(2) and 13 of the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, I transmit herewith the texts of those amendments as embodied in resolutions adopted at the Third Congress of the Organization, held at Geneva, from April 1 to 28, 1959. The amendment to article 10(a)(2) eliminates an inconsistency between the English and French language versions of the text with respect to voting on membership. The amendment to article 13 increases the membership of the Executive Committee of the Organization. The U.S. delegation to the Third Congress voted for the resolutions.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the amendments.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Amendment of article 10(a)(2), resolution 1 (Cg-III). 3. Amendment of article 13, resolution 2 (Cg-III).)

ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for some time I have been very much concerned with the effect of the present electoral college system of electing our President and Vice President, in distorting the relative effect of the votes of our citizens, depending upon the State in which they live and other factors which have no substantial place in the election of our Chief Executive. I have come to the conclusion that the most effective way to deal with this problem is to amend the Constitution in order to eliminate the electoral college provisions and to provide for the election of our President and Vice President by popular vote.

It is of particular interest to me that a joint resolution to this effect has been introduced by the majority leader, since both he and I announced our interest in such legislation soon after election day, when the closeness of the balloting again called the incongruity of the present system to the attention of all Americans. The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has kindly consented to my joining as a cosponsor of his measure to this effect. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a co-sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 23 at the time of its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND WHITE FLEET BILLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to two bills which I introduced last week—S. 404 which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps, and S. 324 which would authorize establishment of a White Fleet for purposes of providing aid to people of other lands suffering from natural disasters.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ARCHIBALD COX, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SOLICITOR-GENERAL-DESIGNATE, AND BYRON R. WHITE, OF COLORADO, DEPUTY ATTORNEY-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 18, 1961, at 10:30 a.m.,

in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, Solicitor-General-designate, and on Byron R. White, of Colorado, Deputy Attorney-General-designate.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold public hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, January 18 and 19 on S. 1, S. 6, and S. 9, and any other bills which may be before the subcommittee relating to area redevelopment. We shall begin at 10 a.m. on Wednesday.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Milton P. Semer, counsel, Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered by him entitled "Public Education in a Democracy," at dedication of the Lexington High School, Lexington, Va., November 6, 1960.

AMBASSADOR DOUGLAS MacARTHUR II

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a recent issue of the New York Times carried a story from Tokyo, by Robert Trumbull, on the expected departure of Ambassador Douglas MacArthur 2d from that city. The occasion ought not to pass without recognition of the outstanding services which Mr. MacArthur has rendered his country during the past few years.

It is all too easy to overlook these services, because of the riots last summer in Tokyo, which were the result of many factors. The fact is that Ambassador MacArthur has headed our entire official mission to Japan during a most critical transitional period. During this period we have moved from the vestiges of war and occupation to a sound footing of peaceful cooperation in Japanese-United States relations. Mutually beneficial trade has flourished; American personnel in Japan and, hence, costs, have been sharply reduced. And a new pattern of cooperation in defense is replacing the former one-sided dependency of Japan on the military power of the United States.

These achievements are due in great part to the distinguished and dedicated service of Douglas MacArthur 2d. He has led, as it is proper for an Ambassador to lead, all the various United States agencies and departments which are represented in the official mission in Tokyo. He has led them firmly and judiciously as a coordinated group. His work has been outstanding, both in this connection and in his personal relations with the leaders of the Japanese government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the story in the New York Times previously mentioned.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AND JAPAN ENTER NEW ERA; THEIR MAJOR ISSUES ARE SETTLED—MacARTHUR ENDING TERM AS ENVOY AFTER HELPING BRING FORMER OCCUPIED LAND TO FOOTING OF EQUALITY AS ALLY

(By Robert Trumbull)

TOKYO, January 6.—With the expected departure soon of Ambassador Douglas MacArthur 2d as a new administration takes office in Washington, the United States will close a critical phase in its postwar relations with Japan.

The era of the second MacArthur here has brought relations between Tokyo and Washington to a new footing of equality after 15 years of Japanese subordination. The first MacArthur here was the occupation commander, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Ambassador's uncle.

The envoy's accomplishments were somewhat obscured by the riotous demonstrations against the new United States-Japanese mutual security treaty last May and June. The demonstrations forced the cancellation of President Eisenhower's scheduled visit here. Since then, the political party that adopted the treaty has been returned to power in the Diet (Parliament).

NO PROBLEMS OUTSTANDING

Premier Hayato Ikeda, assuming the direction of the Government as the leftist-led clamor subsided, declared significantly that no outstanding problems remained between Tokyo and Washington. This statement, which no Japanese leader could have made before, really denoted the end of the postwar transitional period in American-Japanese relations.

Developments followed a distinct progression from outright occupation, during which the Japanese political, economic and social systems underwent a thorough reform along democratic lines. Relations went through a period of economic and political dependency and into a third phase marked by the acute dissatisfaction of an emergent nation over what it considered to be restrictions upon its sovereignty.

Through protracted, negotiations, with Ambassador MacArthur handling United States policies, the Japanese grievances were resolved or ameliorated.

Near the outset of Mr. MacArthur's tenure in the Embassy, Japanese suspicions in one important area of relations with the United States decision to let local courts try Sp3c William C. Girard, accused of shooting and killing a Japanese woman on a firing range in an action outside the line of duty.

More than Specialist Girard's fate was involved here. The case had brought into question the good faith of the United States in interpreting the agreement on criminal jurisdiction over American personnel. The Embassy's action was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. The soldier was given a suspended sentence and removed from Japan.

SERVICE PERSONNEL CUT

Heeding a Japanese plea, the United States halved its number of combat personnel in Japan to about 50,000, forming an inconspicuous element in the population.

In response to Japan's complaint that the U.S. forces were needlessly hanging onto many land areas and buildings sequestered during the occupation, hundreds of these facilities were turned back to Japanese use.

In the new security treaty, the annual assessment on Japan to support American troops on her soil was dropped.

Another complaint was stilled when the United States expedited the parole of the last of the Japanese war criminals held in Sugamo Prison by any of the Allied nations. The Japanese had contended that their continued incarceration inflicted a "living stigma" on Japan for war guilt long since expiated.

Washington refused for security reasons to return the Bonin Islands but Congress ameliorated this grievance by voting $6 million compensation for Japanese residents of the islands who are prevented from returning to their homes.

THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO. WHITE PAPER SERIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co., recognizing the urgent need for presenting to the public extraordinary national and international occurrences in the form of effective television documentaries, has developed a unique series known as NBC white paper.

The NBC news and public affairs department, in organizing these programs successfully, has made painstaking efforts to research, analyze, and collate the actual facts surrounding such unusual events as the U-2 affair, and the sit-in strikes, which affect the lives of every citizen in our community.

NBC news and public affairs prepared this white paper series not only to capture and hold the interest of the vast television audience from coast to coast, but, more importantly, to stimulate and activate public awareness and to create in the public a greater consciousness toward the safeguarding of the American way of life.

In view of the growing necessity for our people to understand fully these responsibilities as citizens both at home and abroad in the challenging crises of our times, the National Broadcasting Co., through its white paper series, has fulfilled its true role as a communications medium. It is NBC's hope that this kind of programing will help our Nation continually realize and appraise our ideals, and also, in this way, create and promote among our people an increased alertness to our national goals and our cherished democratic institutions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that the National Broadcasting Co. is to be highly commended for its successful efforts to originate and present programs of such unique national importance as the NBC white paper series.

SOUTH DAKOTA ARGUS-LEADER ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the inauguration of a new President close at hand, I think it is fitting to bring to the attention of my colleagues five essays

which have been written on inaugurations of the past.

The five essays have been selected as the most outstanding in competition conducted by the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, South Dakota's largest daily newspaper, the publisher of which is John A. Kennedy. The writers of these highly interesting and informative articles will arrive in our Nation's Capital Wednesday, as guests of the Argus-Leader, for the Presidential inauguration.

Each of the writers is a high school student; and I can well imagine the thrill it will be for them as they attend this inspiring demonstration of our great democracy as the transition is made from one Chief of State to another. In view of the research and study the winning students have made, I expect that this trip to Washington will be a most fitting climax to what most certainly has been a keenly whetted interest in our Government.

Before placing the essays in the RECORD, I want to extend my congratulations to the student-writers on this outstanding recognition of their fine work. The Argus-Leader essay winners are:

Melody Gilbride, of Sioux Falls,
Burdell Peterson, of Flandreau.
James W. Conklin, of Aberdeen.
Vicki Barnett, of Sioux Falls.
Linda Nelson, of Vermillion.

Mr. President, I request permission that the articles be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Melody Gilbride)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Precedent was broken here today on this the 20th day of January in 1941.

A tradition, steeped in history since the Presidency of George Washington was washed out as Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath which made him the first third term President in American history.

Amid the circumstances of war in Europe, the Democratic Convention in 1940 nominated Franklin Roosevelt for a third term.

Roosevelt said he had accepted because the country needed every citizen and it was up to the electorate to say whether or not he had made the right choice in running again.

His opponent was Wendell Willkie, an old Bryan Democrat turned Republican, who hammered hard at Roosevelt's domestic policies but who refused to let himself get pushed into an attack on the President's foreign policies.

Today dawned crystal clear and just enough snap in the air to make people hurry a little to keep warm. The people had been waiting since early morning for this event.

Roosevelt's third inauguration went smoothly, and gracefully, just as his brief sermon-like speech had gone. Only twice did events slip from schedule; once when the President's Scottie, Falla, tried to accompany his master to the Capitol; and again when the clerk of the Supreme Court, Charles E. Cropley, suffered an attack of butterfingers with the Roosevelt family's heavy 200-year-old Bible.

This afternoon, President Roosevelt stood before the White House and reviewed the Nation's armed and civilian forces in the traditional inaugural parade. Well coated against the brisk, crisp breezes from the northwest, the President smiled and waved as the marchers strode past.

About midway through there was a lull. The paraders disappeared in the distance. From far up the avenue a dull rumble was heard. It grew louder. The President, near-sighted, groped for his glasses. Fitting them on his nose he saw units of light tanks approaching in clouds of blue exhaust. After them came medium tanks, motorcycle troops, armored combat cars at 20, 30, and 40 miles per hour. The crowds around the President cheered.

For in the thunder of those mechanized forces they heard the beating of the wave of America's future.

Could Roosevelt have wondered of his future?

Aided to the reviewing stand by his son James, the President did not look as robust as he did 8 years ago.

This inauguration has many interesting factors. Roosevelt is the first person to serve three terms. The people apparently wanted him to guide America for another 4 years. The world is in danger of war and many feel he can keep America out of war. The people have placed an unmeasurable amount of trust in him.

He is a heartwarming man, full of courage, and an unselfish person. He appears to be an inspiration to the people of America. He had kept their chins off the ground and spirits high.

Now this history-breaking event is in the hands of history.

What will it say of Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Where will it place him in American history?

Handicapped by a crippling disease, he has made bold moves in his previous 8 years. Does today's Inaugural Day signal more bold moves? Can he steer America on the path of peace or will he be forced to drape on his stooped shoulders the mantle of Commander in Chief of America's Armed Forces?

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Burdell Peterson)

When Andrew Jackson assumed office on March 4, 1829, it was with the simplicity of a Hebrew prophet. Jackson was the first President who was not descended from an old and aristocratic family. He was a typical frontiersman, from west of the mountains, and he was idolized by his backwoods followers. They poured into Washington from 500 miles around to share in his triumph. They seemed to think that he had rescued the country from some terrible danger.

The more cultured and conservative easterners watched with apprehension as the West crowded into Washington to celebrate.

Inauguration morning was ushered in by a salute of 13 guns.

By 10 o'clock on this sunny, springlike day, Pennsylvania Avenue was crowded with splendid carriages, old carts, wagons, people in finery, and people in rags. The frontiersmen wore coonskin caps and buckskin jackets, spat accurately, swore eloquently, and sang loudly the praises of Old Hickory. Half the men wore their trousers tucked in their boots and others wore pistols at their sides. So popular was Old Hickory, the newly elected President, that horsemen clopped by with hickory bark bridles, hickory stirrups, and hickory sticks. Women wore necklaces of hickory nuts and carried hickory brooms.

Among the spectators was Francis Scott Key who remarked of the mighty crowd, "It is beautiful, it is sublime." Another spectator said, "A monstrous crowd of people is in the city. I never saw anything like it before."

Jackson walked up unpaved Pennsylvania Avenue from the Indian Queen Hotel with his head uncovered "as a servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people of the United States." At about 12 a rending shout announced the presence of the general upon the eastern portico, which, from its elevation, rendered the ceremony extremely conspicuous and imposing. Order being reclaimed, the oath was administered by John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Then another shout went up from the multitude. After a dignified bow, the President commenced his short address. His manner was simple and emphatic. The only sign of nervousness was the trembling of his hands. His voice was low but distinct and audible at a considerable distance. He promised economy, the payment of the national debt, the protection of States rights, and a tariff for national industries.

The address being finished, another acclamation rent the air. There was now a general rush among the foremost to reach the President's hand.

When the ceremony at the Capitol ended, the crowd of Jackson's admirers—10,000 strong—followed him to the White House pleading for jobs all along the way. High and low, old and young, black and white pushed into the White House grounds and forced their way into the spacious mansion through all the doors and windows. No plans had been made to provide police for the reception. No one ever dreamed that the rabble would dare to attend.

In their eagerness to be served with refreshments, men in muddy boots leaped on satin-covered chairs, overturned tables, broke china and glassware, and pulled draperies from their hangings. Later, Jackson himself was glad to escape through a window and return to the Indian Queen Hotel. Peace was not restored in the White House until tubs of spiked orange punch had been placed around on the lawn to lure the mob out of doors. Even then there was still fighting going on inside the White House. Women as well as men had bloody noses. When it was all over, the White House looked as though it had been through a tornado. The damage to glassware, furniture, rugs, and draperies totaled several thousands dollars.

The election had been a great victory for Jackson as he received 178 electoral votes to 83 for Adams. It is recorded of the rough and ready Andrew Jackson that, before his nomination for the Presidency, he made an impulsive remark that he was not such a fool as to think he was fit for President. He could lead a body of men in a rough way but he wasn't the man for President.

However, he won the Presidency and entered the White House proud, yet grieving, for his wife had recently died from a heart attack.

So ended the "people's day" in honor of the "people's President."

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION

(By James W. Conklin)

No President of the United States has ever approached the office with so much private misgiving and public acclamation as did George Washington in 1789. There was no campaign for Washington, and his immense popularity was due to his primary role in winning the war that made the Presidency possible; a role that could never be duplicated by his successors. This acclamation is a prime factor in making this inauguration, the first Presidential inauguration under the new Constitution, the most interesting.

Washington alone was trusted both by the conservatives and by the democratic leaders. All agreed that under Washington the new Government might work. This faith that everyone had in Washington has never been equaled, and is another factor in making this inauguration interesting. The fact

that Washington was elected President by unanimous choice of the electors is another illustration of the people's faith in him.

Governor Morris, in urging Washington to accept the Presidency said, "Your cool, steady temper is indispensably necessary to give firm and manly tone to the new Government."

Washington was prevailed upon to turn his back once more upon the private life for which he longed. He was weary of public service, and honestly believed that he was not capable of the great task before him.

Never has a President had such a great, triumphal march to the Capitol as did Washington. From beginning to end his procession would have honored a Roman conqueror. In every village the people from the farm and workshop crowded the streets to watch for his carriage, and the ringing of bells and firing of guns marked his coming and going. At Baltimore, a cavalcade of citizens escorted him, and cannons roared a welcome. At the Pennsylvania line, Governor Mifflin, with soldiers and citizens, gathered to greet him. In the midst of a troop of cavalry, he rode into Philadelphia, beneath triumphal arches, for a day of public rejoicing and festivity. As he passed under one arch, a concealed mechanism lowered a wreath on his head. At Trenton there was sunshine, and arch of triumph, and young girls walking before him throwing flowers in his path. Songs of praise and gratitude were sung. The committees of Congress met him at Elizabethtown Point, and here he went on board a barge and was rowed to the city of New York, the temporary Capitol. A long procession of barges swept after him with music and song, while ships in the harbor fired salutes in his honor. When he reached the landing, he was accompanied by Governor Clinton to his house.

Thursday, April 30, was Inauguration Day. At 9 o'clock every church bell began a salute to the occasion. Washington dressed himself in a dark brown American-made suit, white silk stockings and silver shoe buckles; he was later to fasten on a dress sword in a steel scabbard. By the time the official procession reached his door at noon, he was ready to enter his coach, which was cream-colored, and of an elaborate design. The Washington coat of arms was on its sides, decorated with a scroll depicting the four seasons.

Between lines of cheering watchers, the parade proceeded to the new Federal statehouse on Wall Street. Washington went to the balcony and bowed to the cheering crowds. Then came the moment for which the whole Nation had waited. Washington repeated the oath of office after Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, and reverently added, "So help me God." He bent forward and kissed the Bible. Livingston turned to the railing and proclaimed in a ringing voice, "Long live George Washington, President of the United States."

There was cheering from the crowd below and the roar of a 13-gun salute. Washington stood bowing for a minute or two, then went into the Senate Chamber and read his inaugural speech. When it was over, he proceeded to St. Paul's Chapel to attend services. That concluded the ceremonies.

Therefore, Washington's inauguration is the most interesting because of the following: It was the first; it received a tremendous public acclamation; Washington's election was due to the unanimous choice of the electors in spite of the fact that he wanted to return to private life; his inauguration had a pageantry which has never been attained since; his inaugural established a precedent for subsequent inaugurations; and last, but certainly not least, due to Washington's inaugural and devoted service to the new Nation, it remained the United States of America.

THE MOST INTERESTING PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Vicki Barnett)

The time is March 4, 1829. The place is the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C. The occasion is the inauguration of the seventh President of the United States, Andrew Jackson.

The south side of the Capitol is literally alive with the cheering, swarming crowds, who stand ready to receive their hero, "Old Hickory." The enthusiastic group bears no distinction of color, wealth, social level, or ability. The great new West, with its frontiersmen and pioneers, seems to be the predominantly represented section of the country. (Jackson himself is a typical native son of the unadulterated frontier, and truly represents the mass mind of the West.) Scattered among the pioneers are Jacksonian hunters and backwoods farmers from the South, whom Jackson has led to glory. The hickory emblem, symbolic of General Jackson, is in evidence everywhere. Hickory canes and staffs are carried by the men. Women are wearing bonnets trimmed with hickory leaves, and necklaces composed of hickory nuts fancifully painted. There is obviously an atmosphere of triumph hovering over the crowd as the cheering and singing grows louder; the people really seem to think that the country has been saved from some great danger.

Now the general and his small bodyguard are approaching on foot. Unlike his predecessors, Monroe and Adams, Jackson has no parade or military outfit with him to announce his arrival. Impeded by the huge throngs, Jackson's procession moves at snail pace. Even from a great distance, Jackson can be discerned from those who accompany him, for he is the only one who is hatless, thereby giving the impression that he wishes to be a servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people.

Entering the portico, the general advances to the table where he is to recite his oath of office. He is wearing two pair of spectacles; one for reading and one for looking. While one is in use, the other is pushed up on his forehead. Piercing shouts rend the air as the new President steps up to the rostrum to give his inaugural address. In words of simplicity, again appealing to the common people, Jackson touches on matters which are not too gravely important. In fact, as yet, no one really knows his political views, for this election was won solely on personal popularity.

Concluding his speech, President Jackson, amid the singing and shouting of his ardent admirers, mounts a fine, white horse and proceeds to make the short trek to the White House, where a gigantic feast has been prepared. The barrier which had been built up between President Jackson and the citizens because of scandalous rumors concerning his wife, Rachel, has now been broken down; therefore, the gates of the White House are flung open, allowing everyone present to attend the inaugural reception. Once more, Mr. Jackson demonstrates that he is a "man of the people."

Inevitably, mobs get out of hand, and this one is certainly no exception. Within the great white mansion, upholstered furniture is being trampled, many ornate decorations, pieces of costly china, and fine crystal glassware are being smashed. In their eagerness to shake the hand of their hero, the mobbing people have jammed President Jackson against the wall, to the serious peril of his ribs. Finally, friends help him to escape through a back entry.

The building being stuffed, Negro servants are bringing out buckets of punch and salvers of cake. Much food and drink is being wasted. In an effort to get inside the people have blocked the doorways so that those wishing to come out have to climb through windows and drop six feet or more to the ground. Everywhere, women are fainting; men are quarreling and badly bruising each other's faces.

Undoubtedly, to some, this demonstration represents only the intrinsic dangers of mob rule. But to others, including myself, the incidents occurring on March 4, 1829, directly symbolize the entrance of the true democratic spirit into American Government. For even though democracy has been the United States recognized form of government since the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, democracy, as we now think of it did not come into existence overnight. Countless hardships were endured, battles were fought and won, the pangs of numerous depressions were felt, and drastic changes were made before the United States finally became a full-fledged democratic nation. The inauguration of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency was one of these drastic changes which represented a victory for democracy. Consequently, I believe that it was the most interesting Presidential inauguration in American history.

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN HISTORY

(By Linda Nelson)

"He is one of us" was the cry of the people when Andrew Jackson was elected to the highest office in the land. And rightly so, for Jackson was a product of the people. He was born in a frontier community in South Carolina, the son of poor Irish immigrants. With only a scanty education, Jackson became a lawyer. Later he went on to become a successful Indian fighter and army general. And in 1828, Andrew Jackson was elected to the U.S. Presidency.

Figuratively, Jackson came into Washington on the shoulders of the mob. The city was filled to capacity with Jackson supporters during the inauguration. Daniel Webster described the tremendous multitude in this manner: "I have never seen such a crowd before. Persons have come 500 miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country has been rescued from some dreadful danger."

Prior to the inauguration Jackson stayed temporarily at Gadsby's Tavern, located across the river in Alexandria. The hostel was overrun with the President-elect's friends, swarming about the rooms and shaking hands with their idol.

March 4, 1829, dawned as an overcast day; but as Andrew Jackson left Gadsby's and walked to the Capitol, the sun broke through the clouds. At an early hour Pennsylvania Avenue had been lined with Jackson's friends, and he was impeded by the crowds thronging about him. As he proceeded, he could be seen from a distance since he alone was not wearing a hat. He was the servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people. Jackson was wearing a black suit and a black cravat. An English woman noted: "He wore his gray hair carelessly but not ungracefully arranged, and in spite of his harsh gaunt features looked like a gentleman and a soldier."

John Q. Adams, the well-educated, highly polished outgoing President, nurtured a great contempt for the new President. He had refused to ride in the inaugural parade with Jackson and had taken leave of Washington before the inauguration.

At noon Andrew Jackson delivered his inaugural address and was sworn into office by John Marshall. The grounds and steps of the Capitol were covered with Congressmen, Army officers, foreign ministers, and ladies dressed in the varying hues of fashionable colors. It was a most beautiful and inspiring scene.

After the ceremonies the new President rode to the White House with the entire mob on his heels. The Presidential home had never seen such a sight. Because of the defaming of the mansion in the eyes of the aristocrats, Jackson's critics nicknamed the home the "White House" because it no longer seemed like a mansion but merely a whitewashed house.

At the inaugural reception, according to the Justice Story, "The reign of the king mob seemed triumphant," and the White House was overrun by "crowds of all sorts of people, from the highest and most polished down to the most vulgar and gross in the Nation." The aristocrats looked on the noisy rabble with horror and disgust.

Half the men wore coonskin caps, had their trousers tucked into their bootlegs, and carried pistols openly in their belts. In their muddy boots they clumsily tramped over precious damask chairs, and carelessly knocked bric-a-brac off the walls while stampeding for refreshments. Women fainted; men had bloody noses; and to add to the confusion, no police had been placed on duty. To relieve the White House of the tumultuous crowd, punch was hauled outside; and the noisy festivities were continued on the front lawn.

During the gaieties friends had to form a blockade around Jackson to protect him from overzealous well wishers. Finally, Jackson crawled from a back window and retreated to Gadsby's to escape the din which shook the Capital all night long.

Andrew Jackson's hour of triumph, however, was marred with sadness by the death of his devoted wife, Rachel. She lived to see her husband elected but died before he moved into the White House. Rachel was arrayed for burial in the same white satin dress which she had planned to wear to her husband's inauguration. Jackson entered the White House, a lonely and shattered man.

Andrew Jackson's inauguration went down in history as a grand and hilarious spectacle; but amid the celebration and confusion, one important ideal was brought forth. The people at the inauguration realized that Jackson was the President of the people of the United States. He was one of them.

PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE TO REDUCE NUMBER OF ARMED SERVICES DEPENDENTS STATIONED ABROAD AND TO CONSERVE DOLLAR EXCHANGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the estimated effects in Japan of the Presidential directive to reduce the number of dependents of armed services personnel who are serving abroad and to conserve dollar exchange. I believe the directive should be modified in the interest of improving the morale of our Armed Forces. I also believe that the reasons underlying the issuance of the order should be reexamined; and I take this position for the following reasons:

I have made an investigation, primarily from the Navy viewpoint, although my observations apply equally to the Army and to the Air Force.

The Navy intends to implement the reduction in the number of dependents stationed abroad first, by sending some officers and men home early, with their families; second, by encouraging single men to extend the length of their service; third, by sending out replacements without their families, the number of dependents stationed abroad to be reduced 50–70 percent; fourth, by applying the reduced percentage impartially through all ranks and enlisted grades. Army and Air Force plans are similar.

Numerous ships and staffs are homeported in Japan. This practice makes it possible to keep more active ships in the 7th Fleet. For this reason, preference has been recommended for the dependents of officers and men attached to these ships. If carried out, this will mean that very few personnel stationed ashore will have families with them. The problem of choosing the select few is essentially insoluble. Morale is sure to drop, and serious losses of career people will result.

Navy men are marrying Japanese women at the rate of about 1,100 per year. So far these newly acquired dependents are exempted from the quotas, although future action is unpredictable. The injustice of this action to U.S. wives is readily apparent.

The number of marriages to Japanese women will increase. So will the informal liaisons with these women, already a serious moral and morale problem, especially when U.S. personnel are married and have families in the States.

At present, in all services, about 50 percent of our people live in private rentals in the Japanese community. These men and their families are a major factor in the people-to-people program. As the dependents decrease in number, all of them, with few exceptions, will be concentrated—perhaps "segregated" is more accurate—in military posts. There may be many more "Ugly Americans."

The purchase of Japanese and other foreign goods for resale in our Navy exchanges has been stopped. Upward of 100,000 people in Japan, mostly in small business, have been concerned with the manufacture of goods for sale in the stores operated by the services. The owners are caught with goods in inventory amounting to several millions of dollars. Unfortunately, these goods in many cases are not salable to Japanese, and there is no established U.S. market for them.

The profits from these sales have gone to welfare and recreation funds, and amount to about 35 percent of all profits. With our base stores denied as outlets, these goods will be sold in the towns outside our gates. Prices will be higher, and quality uncertain. No profit will be generated for welfare, and more dollars will be spent.

Considerable latitude has been given in the expenditure of appropriated funds. Ship's stores afloat are still permitted to purchase foreign merchandise for resale to embarked personnel within certain restrictions. Purchase of Japanese goods and services by purchasing activities will be affected to only a small degree, since exceptions are provided if the price differential is greater than 25 percent, or if the purchase is under $1,000, or if the commodity is perishable. Within the exceptions granted, I expect that the economical repair of ships and airplanes in Japan will continue. I consider this program to be the most important expenditure of U.S. dollars in Japan in terms of value received and in supporting 7th Fleet operations in the western Pacific.

This order will result in some reduction of dollars spent overseas. But more dollars will have to be appropriated to the military, if our present strength overseas is maintained, in order to pay for greatly increased travel costs, inasmuch as single men and married men without dependents will be shifted approximately every 12 months, and for the purchase of higher priced goods and services in the United States.

In Okinawa there are to be no restrictions on the number of dependents stationed there or on sales in the stores. But the Navy has, as housing assets there, a total of 31 condemned Quonsets; and private rentals are scarce and very expensive.

This is a gloomy but, I fear, an accurate appraisal. If we are to continue to honor our worldwide commitments we must deploy military personnel overseas to support them. These personnel should be reasonably well paid and well housed. They cannot be expected to remain in the services, loyal and effective, if they are required by the United States to leave their families at home.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that this country—the wealthiest nation ever known—should have, from time to time, to go through the pains of periodic economic readjustments which bring unemployment and other economic and personal suffering to large sections of the country.

My own State of Wisconsin has several depressed areas, and I feel it is urgent that their plight be given immediate attention.

In the continued struggle between American democracy and Soviet communism, one of the major questions is which of the two systems will better be able to satisfy the needs of the people and to provide continued security to labor, to management, to small business, to the retired persons, and to all other segments of our economy. We cannot afford to fail winning this contest with communism.

Recently, I received from the Ashland County Civic Club, in Wisconsin, a resolution expressing the concern of the club over the problems of foreign competition through the importation of foreign ore, steel, and wood products.

I should like to read this resolution in the RECORD.

Whereas the importation of foreign ore, steel, and wood products has seriously retarded the economy of our whole area, and caused the closing of many of our plants, and curtailed the operation of our existing mines and retarded progress in opening new mines, causing a serious unemployment problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ashland County Civic Club in special meeting assembled, do respectfully request the national Congress to pass regulations curtailing such imports and as far as possible make Federal funds available for opening of potential sources of new employment in these depressed areas.

Also that a copy of this resolution be sent to the State legislature and to the Governors

of the three States who are facing this same problem, namely, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, with instructions that we collectively request the Congress to pass legislation to remedy this situation.

ASHLAND COUNTY CIVIC CLUB,
HERMAN PATITZ, *President.*
GERALD J. SCHRANFUGEL, *Secretary.*

On this occasion, I wish to stress that our domestic problems are numerous, immediate, and overwhelming. In fact, we may very well need to develop our own domestic point 4 program to cope with these problems. Now that many of our foreign friends have gotten on their own feet, a domestic aid program is doubly appropriate.

Certainly there is national justification for our overseas aid programs. But we cannot forever go on helping Europe, Asia, and Africa, when there are slums in our midst, when there are pockets of industrial unemployment in the Eastern United States and even in my own State of Wisconsin. We have spent great fortunes on foreign aid. Now the time has come for us to establish a domestic program for aid to our own needy areas.

I hope Congress and the administration will study this problem carefully and will act in order to prevent greater economic suffering and in order to prevent more serious disruptions in our economy.

NAVAL RADIO STATION AT CUTLER, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, during the last week of 1960 I made a tour of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps establishments in my home State of Maine. I had visited most of the establishments many times before, but this was my first coordinated, overall tour of the Maine bases.

I was greatly encouraged with what I found. Our service personnel are doing a dedicated and truly wonderful job for the defense and security of our country. I am very proud of the manner in which the people of Maine are cooperating with them.

In this tour I visited the naval radio station at Cutler, Maine, for the first time. It was a fascinating experience that defies imagination; the station is truly one of the wonders of the world.

This vitally important naval installation will beam radio waves and communications to all corners of the world and to sea depths never accomplished before. It will be the hub of the worldwide communication system for the greatest defense weapon we have, the Polaris missile nuclear submarine.

So fantastic is the naval radio station at Cutler, Maine, that I wish all Members of this body could visit it. I guarantee that it will be well worth their time and will be a most gratifying and interesting experience for them.

I wish to express high commendation for the commander of the naval radio station, Comdr. J. J. Zammit, and his staff, for the very excellent performance they have given, and to the Continental Electronics Co. Together they have performed a rare achievement—the completion of the construction of the station a year ahead of the scheduled time. This is unheard of in Defense Establishment construction.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine, perspective analysis of our economic structure today, written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's press, and I refer particularly to the Washington Post.

The burden of Mr. Lippmann's analysis suggests we must concern ourselves deeply not only with the rate of our economic growth, an economic growth consistent with our own population explosion and the needs attendant on it, but, likewise, with the question of economic needs, not alone of consumption by purchasers but of productivity and consumption on the national level and in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the able article by Walter Lippmann be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1961]

THE TWO POSITIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In his last message on the state of the Union and the budget President Eisenhower, as was his constitutional duty, has stated his own views about economic policy. They differ importantly from those of the incoming Kennedy administration, and they point to certain basic issues which will now be much discussed. As it happens, there is available for the discussion not only Mr. Kennedy's campaign speeches but the report of Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, which was made public about 10 days ago.

As between the Eisenhower and the Kennedy positions on the recession, the budget, and the state of the economy, there are two main points of difference. The one is about the current recession. The other is about the general condition of the American economy since about 1955 when it has been shaped by the Eisenhower-Humphrey-Anderson policies.

On the recession, President Eisenhower expresses an unqualified optimism that the recession will soon cure itself and that consequently we shall have a small budgetary surplus by June 30 next. The Samuelson report to Mr. Kennedy rejects the idea that we can count on the recession curing itself quickly. The report calls for some immediate but moderate measures to reflate the economy—something in the order of three to five billions of expenditures above the Eisenhower level. But these suggestions are followed by a warning that the recession may grow worse—that unemployment, which is now about 6 percent of the labor force, may rise to seven and a half percent, which is the peak for the postwar era. Should this happen, the Kennedy administration is advised to prepare for still stronger measures of reflation, including perhaps a temporary cut in taxes.

As of now no one can tell whether the stronger measures will be necessary. But there is good reason to disbelieve in the Eisenhower optimism about the recession, that it will quickly cure itself. There is an ominous and pertinent precedent for this disbelief. In early 1958, when the second of the Eisenhower recessions was underway, the President predicted a small budgetary surplus for fiscal 1959, just as he is now predicting a small surplus for 1961 and a larger surplus for 1962. But in fact, because of the recession, the 1959 budgetary year ended with a deficit of $12 billion, the largest deficit ever in time of peace. After that, we must look with caution and skepticism at optimistic predictions that all will right itself quickly, and that nothing is needed except words of confidence and hope.

The difference between Eisenhower and Kennedy on the current recession is, however, not nearly so important as their differing views on the general condition of the economy.

President Eisenhower says in the message on the state of the Union that "the expanding American economy passed the half-trillion-dollar mark in gross national product early in 1960. The Nation's output of goods and services is now nearly 25 percent higher than in 1952."

While the figures are true, the impression of strong growth, which they are meant to convey, is misleading. For they leave out of the picture the fact that since 1952 the population of the continental United States has grown by something like 25 million persons.

In the years 1955–60—when the consequences of the Korean war were over and the Eisenhower-Humphrey-Anderson economic policies were operating—our gross national product increased from $448 billion to about $503 billion. (This is the President's "half trillion.") These figures mean a rate of growth of 2.6 percent per year, which is among the very slowest of the advanced industrial nations of the world. Worse still, measured against the increase of the population, these figures mean that the annual production per capita has increased by something less than 1 percent.

This sluggish rate of growth is at the root of many of our domestic and of our foreign problems. The Samuelson report to Kennedy says "Had our economy progressed since 1956—not at the dramatic sprint of the Western European and the Japanese economies or at the rush of the controlled totalitarian systems, but simply at the modest pace made possible by our labor force and productivity trends—we could have expected 1961 to bring a gross national product some 10 percent above the $500 billion level we are now experiencing." This would mean, says the report, that we would be producing about $50 billion more per year, and that at the present rate of taxes this would produce a budget surplus of $10 billion.

Those who say that without inflation or regimentation our rate of growth cannot be increased above the Eisenhower level should ponder what it means to say this. It means that we can no longer achieve the rate of growth which we have achieved for over a century. It means that, as compared with all our economic competitors, not to speak of the Soviet Union, we have become—though we are still the biggest of the lot—sluggish and slow to develop. Must we accept this view of ourselves? Would it not be a good thing to be a little less optimistic about the recession which stares us in the face and to have a little more confidence in the American future?

But this is not all. The Kennedy administration will be concerned not only with the rate of growth but with the kind of growth.

President Eisenhower's convictions on this point were put forward most explicitly by the Chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Saulnier, who once testified in 1949, "As I understand an economy its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers." Then he went to to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being committed to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

The results show that if this was the right goal, the Eisenhower administration has reached it. Between 1955 and the first half of 1960, personal consumption expenditure increased at the rate of 3.3 percent per year, whereas the whole economy grew by only 2.6 percent. This is not the character of a sound and prudent society—that, when subjected to an historic challenge, when faced with an explosive growth of population and its concentration in great cities, personal consumer expenditure grow faster than expenditures for productive investment or for the national defense.

BUDGETING CONFIDENCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on another subject, I call attention to an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Budgeting Confidence." This is an extremely able analysis of budgeting problems in the transition from one administration to the next. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETING CONFIDENCE

President Eisenhower's final budget makes the best of assorted uncertainties and leaves for President-elect Kennedy the hard but probably necessary job of throwing the books into the red for this year and next. Deficit financing of some Federal needs would be a thoroughly justified move against recession, if the consensus of expert economic judgment is correct. It will probably be necessary, in any case, to meet the minimal defense and domestic needs that have been shortchanged in the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. Eisenhower appears to have chosen the most optimistic of several economic forecasts put before him in relying, for revenue estimation purposes, upon a growth in total output from $503 billion last year to between $510 and $515 billion in 1961. This prognosis assumes that the economy has now merely leveled off and will head upward by late winter, more or less on its own. But a more detailed examination of production figures indicates that the country is, indeed, in a decline and that the end is not in sight barring some strong Federal action to compensate for the slump in private investment.

Again, putting the best face on matters, Treasury Secretary Anderson prefers to believe that the decline in inventory purchasing reflects business confidence in stable prices. Budget Director Stans, complementing this observation, suggests that a few words of "confidence" from the new administration would do more than billions in spending to keep things steady. There is no denying that confidence is of central importance in the functioning of the American economy, but it is not something that can be pulled out of the air by Presidential incantation.

The confidence that the American people need must be grounded upon a certitude that the Government in Washington is aware of and responsive to national needs. Thus prompt action to extend and improve unemployment benefits, beyond any measures proposed by Mr. Eisenhower, would generate confidence. The early acceleration of needed highway, urban renewal and other public works programs, most of which in many communities lag far behind requirements, would stimulate confidence.

More adequate funding of certain military research and development programs essential to restoring and maintaining American influence would add to confidence. Some basic tax reforms to stimulate private investment and perhaps a temporary tax cut would encourage confidence. But the mere proclamation, "all's well," which is the thesis of the Eisenhower 1962 financial program, is not enough.

Mr. Kennedy is wise, we think, to plan on making his changes in the budget bit by bit as he and his associates have a chance to analyze the weak spots and to formulate the best ways to strengthen them. This will make it a little harder for the public to follow the development of the Kennedy program as contrasted with the proposals of Mr. Eisenhower, but even without a change in administration the budget is altered many times during a year by changes both in revenue estimates and in spending expectations.

It would be helpful if the new Budget Director, particularly in this year of transition, could provide monthly budget reviews in place of the half-yearly revisions which are customary. The summaries compiled by congressional committees during the year are never all-inclusive, and there is no central place where a good cumulative accounting of executive branch proposals and legislative actions is always and readily available.

Mr. Eisenhower reiterates in his final message the philosophy of public spending that has blinded both of his administrations to the economic challenge which confronts this country. That philosophy is that private disposition of earnings by individuals is inherently sounder and wiser and better for the Nation than public allocation of the fruits of industry. Thus the smaller the Federal budget in proportion to gross national product, the better for the country. In his 8 years, Mr. Eisenhower has indeed succeeded in pushing downward, however slightly, the proportionate level of Federal expenditure, and in this cold statistic he takes great pride.

But during those 8 years American military primacy has been seriously challenged, the Federal Government has failed to keep pace with State and local efforts to meet problems in education, health, and welfare, and despite a general private affluence, deep pockets of poverty and human misery persist throughout the land. Private, individual decisions will not bring the remedies that are needed, and a prejudice against public action in meeting these needs has no place in the budgeting of American economic effort.

The first task for the new administration is to remove this senseless shackle and permit the realistic statement of priority public needs. Until this is done, Congress will be unlikely to respond with the equally necessary realism on the Federal revenue structure.

REHABILITATION NEEDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an article in the New York Times of January 15, written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, gives a full report on the recommendations of the section on rehabilitation at the recent White House Conference on the Aging.

I believe these recommendations merit the careful attention of all those who are concerned about the welfare of disabled people, their families, and the social costs of disability. As Dr. Rusk points out:

The recommendations of the White House Conference, if followed, not only would change the course and tempo of the present program of rehabilitation of the aged, but would make possible new lives of dignity for a considerable segment of our population.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rusk's fine article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHABILITATION NEEDS—FIRST WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE REPORTS ON REQUIREMENTS OF ELDERLY INDIGENT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—More than 3,000 interested experts and citizens in the field of the aging have been meeting this week in Washington at the first White House conference on this subject.

The program was obviously a complicated one, because of the breadth of the problem, which ranges from leisure time activity to medical care. Ten work groups and 20 sections met in 8 Washington hotels.

Unfortunately, the controversy over method of payment for medical care for the aged has obscured the other important problems considered at the conference, and many of the most significant findings of the week were left unreported.

Throughout the conference, there was tremendous interest in rehabilitation and the vital role it plays in the health and well-being of the elderly.

The final report of the section on rehabilitation is quoted in its entirety, because it is believed that those interested in rehabilitation and the problems of the aged will be eager to know the recommendations of the White House conference for an action program.

"THE ONLY HOPE

"Rehabilitation is the only hope for those afflicted with and disabled by chronic or degenerative conditions until such time as specific means are found to prevent and cure them. The rehabilitation program must be dynamic and total, designed to meet the physical, emotional, social, and vocational needs of the chronically ill and disabled.

"Only a fraction of those needing these services can secure them, due to lack of facilities, personnel, financial resources and knowledge as to the opportunities available through such dynamic rehabilitation. In an effort to meet these deficiencies and promote understanding the following recommendations are offered by the Section on Rehabilitation:

"Vocational rehabilitation services must be improved and expanded so that older disabled persons may obtain or regain their ability to work and secure suitable employment.

"This requires staff increases; greater public understanding of career opportunities in rehabilitation; additional funds specifically allocated for the vocational rehabilitation of the aging; creation of more job opportunities for qualified older workers; continued exploration of methodology for maximum utilization of the work skills of beneficiaries receiving social security disability benefits; the enactment of Federal grant-in-aid legislation to help communities establish rehabilitation workshops meeting acceptable standards to provide diagnostic and therapeutic services and terminal employment for those not capable of competitive work.

"Such workshops should be eligible to secure Federal surplus property on the same basis as schools and hospitals.

"TEACHERS NEEDED

"Qualified teachers must be provided and well structured units concerned with the teaching of rehabilitation principles need to be established or expanded in schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and in departments of psychology, education and other related disciplines, both on the graduate and undergraduate level.

"Hospitals and rehabilitation centers should have adequate outpatient and inpatient facilities for the rehabilitation of the aging. Rehabilitation services could well be a condition of accreditation for hospitals, particularly those with approved internship training programs.

"Facilities offering long-term care should be required to have minimum rehabilitation services to be licensed or otherwise approved. Staff training programs should be available. The fee structure should be such as to encourage the provision of rehabilitation services. These facilities should be encouraged to affiliate with organized and approved training programs for the improvement of their nonprofessional staff. Persons with practical knowledge may serve a useful purpose to supplement the services of professional workers.

"EVALUATION STRESSED

"Geriatric rehabilitation must begin with the first professional exposure and persistently continue in the institution or institutions to which the patient is subsequently admitted. Prompt and comprehensive rehabilitation evaluation must be made at the earliest possible time to determine the patient's future.

"Admission of emotionally disturbed older people to psychiatric institutions should be preceded by a thorough evaluation by qualified medical personnel.

"A Federal grant-in-aid program should be established to help States develop programs designed to inculcate rehabilitation practices in governmental, nonprofit, and proprietary institutions providing long-term services to handicapped older people. This would involve research, demonstration, and training of personnel.

"Communities should develop additional supporting services and facilities such as home care programs, homemaker services, day hospitals, patient clubs, halfway houses, foster homes, and preventive clinics for well older people. Careful attention to the training of the aging in the use of prosthetic and self-care devices would enable many of them to lead more independent lives.

"State councils of representatives of public agencies concerned with rehabilitation services to seriously handicapped older people should be established. Local councils should be organized also to serve as centers for public information, referral, and planning services.

"Public assistance agencies should be given the financial resources to implement the provisions of their laws for self-help and self-care to include persons who are not recipients of public assistance. They should strengthen the rehabilitation concept in their medical care program. State rehabilitation agencies should utilize existing authority to provide more rehabilitation services to older people. Arbitrary age limits, where they exist, should be removed. Public health agencies should be more adequately financed in order to allow them to assume a greater responsibility in the field of rehabilitation and related services.

"Voluntary and health insurance plans should provide inpatient as well as outpatient coverage for rehabilitation services in hospitals and in rehabilitation centers.

"As one means of strengthening rehabilitation efforts, consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Institute of Rehabilitation.

"Research should be encouraged to identify administrative and organizational patterns through which rehabilitation services can be provided effectively for older people. In this and other fields voluntary effort must be encouraged at all levels and individual community initiative emphasized. Churches, schools, libraries, and other public and private institutions should be alert to the needs of older handicapped people within the scope of their own activities. There should be a Federal grant-in-aid program to help communities establish rehabilitation facilities as well as workshops.

"To promote the well-being of persons suffering visual loss and maintain their integration as members of society there are available a considerable array of valid processes. These consist of two major kinds: (1) Means of sight preservation and restoration, including visual aids and (2) means of self-management as blind individuals.

"THE TALENTS NEEDED

"For the first of these the combined talents of medicine, optometry, and social work require special facilities and training under the aegis of properly constituted public health programs.

"For the second, resources of rehabilitation are required, particularly skills in self-management as developed in rehabilitation for the blind, as well as the liberal use of such motivation measures as reader and guide service.

"Pragmatically sanctioned treatment and care as developed in various existing programs for the blind can be serviceable to the aged population, if expanded. There is need to learn more about the true function of work, leisure, and recreation in the lives of aging persons with vision loss.

"There is both ignorance and complacency with respect to the serious problems presented by hearing loss among the aging. There is great need, therefore, to point up the problems of the hard of hearing and the deaf and to stimulate public concern.

"CASE FINDING SYSTEM

"We need to establish a system for case finding in both urban and rural areas and to promote the training of professional and technical personnel. Hearing aids and training in their use should be provided as needed. We need also to devise special plans for job placement and job maintenance for our older people with hearing impairments.

"Appropriate safety provisions for these older individuals with hearing loss should be incorporated in housing planning. Deaf persons requiring institutional care should be provided appropriate accommodations in institutions serving the aged.

"Several million of our older citizens are dependent on others for meeting the normal demands of daily living. They cannot travel, feed themselves, dress, communicate adequately, or move about without aid. If they were provided modern rehabilitation services, many could once again learn to live their lives in independence and with greater dignity. Some could return to work.

"The benefits from rehabilitation services would extend not only to these disabled persons alone, but to their families and to society as a whole. A Federal grant-in-aid program should be established to provide the rehabilitation services they need that would lead to independent living."

The recommendations of the White House conference, if followed, not only would change the course and tempo of the present program of rehabilitation of the aged, but would make possible new lives of dignity for a considerable segment of our population.

REPORTS OF POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my hometown paper, the Lexington Gazette, one of the oldest weeklies of continuous publication in the Nation, reprinted in its issue of January 11, 1961, the following news item from its issue of January 8, 1836:

From the report of the Postmaster General, it appears that the post routes during the year ending June 30, covered over 112,754 miles. In daily and less frequent trips, the mails were carried on these routes about 25,869,486 miles. The number of post offices was 10,770, the gross revenue for the year was $2,993,556.66 and expenses $2,757,350.08 leaving a balance in favor of the Department of $236,206.58. Mr. Kendall appears to manage this extensive concern with more ability than his predecessor.

That substantial surplus which the Postmaster General reported for the end of the previous fiscal year 125 years ago is in pleasing contrast to the deficit of $888 million which the Postmaster General is expected to report at the end of the current fiscal year.

NATIONAL CHILD EVANGELISM WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the week of February 25 to March 6, 1961, has been designated as "National Child Evangelism Week" throughout the United States and Canada.

Special services will be held in churches and other places during the week to alert the people of the United States and Canada to the need for Bible teaching to children.

During this week special proclamations will be issued by Governors of States, mayors of municipalities and other governing bodies.

National Child Evangelism Fellowship, Inc., sponsors of National Child Evangelism Week, has issued the following report:

Report of Child Evangelism Fellowship accomplishments for 1 year, Sept. 1, 1959–Aug. 31, 1960

Total number children's home Bible classes (Good News Clubs)	8,495
Total number children contacted in these classes	279,578
Total number children contacted in these classes not in Sunday school	25,479
Total number children starting Sunday school as a result of these contacts	4,351
Total number children reached in school classes (other than above)	83,982
Total number children contacted in summer 5-day clubs	74,042
Total number children contacted in rallies	62,051
Total number children contacted in vacation Bible schools	27,170
Total number children contacted in other ways (fairs, hospitals, trailer courts, detention homes, playgrounds, etc.)	108,112
Total children contacted in all phases of this work	634,935
Total number volunteer teachers, helpers and hostesses	13,515
Total number of children personally dealt with and making decisions for Christ	107,043

This is a very conservative report as several different States did not make reports for several months.

Child Evangelism Fellowship serves the church by channeling into the Sunday school the children contacted in the home Bible classes; giving the church contact with families who do not attend church; giving specialized training to Sunday school teachers and church workers; and making available the best in visual aids, Bible lessons, and teaching materials.

I trust that this program, sponsored by the National Child Evangelism Fellowship, will receive the approval and active support of church organizations throughout the country.

THE EISENHOWER REGIME—A FRANK APPRAISAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in a few days President Eisenhower will be concluding his 8 years of service as President of the United States.

As a Kansan and one who made two trips to Paris to urge Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to return to the United States and become the Republican candidate for the Presidency, I am proud of the fact that he retires from office with the good will of the American people.

During his administration there have been outstanding achievements in both the international and domestic fields. His ability as a Chief Executive to work with Congress is notable in the fact that there has been less bickering between the White House and Capitol Hill than with respect to any previous administrations.

One of the criticisms which might be made against President Eisenhower is the fact that he was not partisan enough. He was truly a statesman, and politics was laid aside in the interests of all of our people.

During the past few days Congress has received his last two messages to the Nation and to the Congress; namely, his message on the state of the Union and his budget message.

For 8 years our Nation has been at peace, but during this period military preparation has been underway which gives us the deterrent power to defend ourselves on any part of the globe.

The life ambition of the President—soldier-statesman that he is—is to bring about a solution of our tense world problems so that citizens everywhere may live in security and peace. Great progress has been made in this field, but there is much more to be done.

In the domestic field notable gains have been made in civil rights, social security, and welfare. When he assumed the Presidency, the purchasing power of the dollar had suffered greatly through inflation. It was through his tireless efforts that the inflationary trends were arrested. Family income increased by more than 15 percent and the laborer's wages went up 20 percent.

History will, in my opinion, record the fact that no President ever left the White House with stronger support among the people than President Eisenhower. There is no doubt in my mind that had he desired to serve another term and had there not been a constitutional prohibition against a third term, he would have been elected overwhelmingly.

One of President Eisenhower's close friends for many years, Roy Roberts, editor of the Kansas City Star, wrote an article entitled "The Eisenhower Regime—A Frank Appraisal," which appeared in the Kansas City Star January 15, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER REGIME—A FRANK APPRAISAL

We're entirely too close to the man and the events to make a fully objective evaluation of the Eisenhower era. Time and history will write the final story.

But, as an era ends and an era begins, there are bound to be many contemporary appraisals. It would be fascinating, a couple of decades hence, to tune in on history's evaluation of these swift-paced years. We have our hunch about them, and a definite belief that history will substantiate it. We suspect that time will ultimately find President Dwight D. Eisenhower a niche much higher in our national annals than today's intellectuals and pundits seem willing to give him.

We believe that history's judgment will be based primarily on one phase of the Eisenhower record that has been largely overlooked. Certainly Dwight Eisenhower will not be given accolades as one of the most brilliant or imaginative of Presidents. But few men in the decades of the Republic have so captured the hearts, the trust, and the faith of the people. More important, this general turned President has retained the deep affection of his countrymen practically undiminished to the end.

In short, it will be Ike the man whom history will remember and evaluate. The impact of his personality on the world, the great drama of one individual working unceasingly for peace, will form the basis for time's judgment. These qualities will overshadow the specific measurements of success and failure.

The Ike legend will grow. For history possesses, in the retiring Presidents, one of those rare individuals who are taken completely into the hearts of the people. Who can say that a man and his purpose in life cannot have an impact greater than can be measured by his specific deeds?

General Eisenhower entered the White House with the aura and glamour of a war hero. The remembered reputation of the battlefield soon faded. Ike, the man of good will, honesty, and peace, began to emerge. His era draws to a close now, but the affections of his fellow Americans remain. Even in the politically charged atmosphere of the late campaign, predominantly Democratic cities such as Chicago and New York staged tremendous demonstrations, almost impromptu, for the President. Not for political love but for the man himself.

It was pretty generally admitted even by his opponents and critics that had Dwight Eisenhower been running again in 1960, there would have been another Eisenhower landslide. The Democratic opposition handled the Chief Executive gingerly until the closing weeks of the campaign when no holds were barred. The Democratic attitude was, we believe, simply a practical and political recognition of the popular feeling toward Ike the man.

Perhaps more important in the story of our times is the fact that the Eisenhower appeal proved to be a highly exportable commodity. Consider the savage, sometimes humiliating propaganda onslaughts by Nikita Khrushchev and the Communists in the closing months of the Eisenhower era. Nothing that ruthless men could say or do effectively diminished the worldwide reputation of Dwight D. Eisenhower as a leader for peace.

We think of the millions who greeted him on his dramatic journeys to other lands, of the crowds in the streets of Karachi or New Delhi or in countless other spots around the globe. We think of the old ideas—the American ideas—of peace and justice and freedom that he made new for the masses of the nations. We think of the cheering multitudes and the hand-drawn sign of a little Turkish boy that said: "Ike Like We."

And here, perhaps, we have achievement that will provide history its most pointed judgment. Before the world Dwight D. Eisenhower stood as the symbol of peace and good will. In Moscow, in Peiping, and elsewhere others have sought to tarnish the image. But we have no doubt that the symbol of peace and good will has been transferred in a large degree to the United States itself. The intangible something that Dwight Eisenhower possesses made people trust him. History must consider the fact, even though Ike will never be judged as the most profound or brilliant of world leaders.

In evaluating any President and his record, you have to examine three aspects of his White House years:

His world leadership.

His national leadership.

His party leadership.

The biggest single problem confronting Mr. Eisenhower in his 8 years at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue was the problem of war and peace. To be sure, the Communist advance was, in those 8 years, virtually halted from a geographical point of view. But unquestionably, the world picture darkened in the later years. No one disputes that gloomy fact and history will so record it.

Yet everything is comparative. During the previous administration, the world saw the forces of communism advance menacingly. More than a fourth of the world's population, in continental China, disappeared behind the impenetrable curtain of communism.

In 1961, as President Eisenhower prepares to leave office, the Reds have a foothold in Cuba right on the doorstep of our continent. Nevertheless, it is a fair judgment to say that the actual loss to communism during his administration has been small compared to the free world's losses in the preceeding years.

There is another fact that alters today's judgments and which history cannot avoid. As President, Mr. Eisenhower faced more than just the sinister thrust of communism. His years watched the spreading spark of world revolution, of striving nationalism. Around the globe, and especially in Africa, new nations have taken their place in the sun. The have-nots have sought the status of the haves. And the underdeveloped new nations in particular have offered fine waters for the Communists to fish in.

Man's desire for freedom and for self-determination has started one of the great movements of history. The world leaders of all nations have been forced to cope with that movement. Keep that in mind as you study the overall Eisenhower record. And, considering the many forces and tensions of today, one fact at the moment stands out: We have had 8 years without the start of a new war even though we have been perilously close to the brink several times.

We recall the early Eisenhower days when it looked as though the Indo-China affair was about to create another Korea. Within the administration itself and in the diplomatic circles there were tremendous pressures for armed American intervention.

After sleepless nights, spent pacing the floor of his White House quarters, the warrior-President made the decision for peace, not war.

History in time may note how curious it is that this devotion to peace should have predominated throughout the regime of a great war hero who became President.

From a practical point of view, there were two definite periods of Eisenhower foreign policy. The first was dominated by the vigorous, uncompromising Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. In the second period, President Eisenhower himself took personal command.

We suspect that historians may wage their fiercest debates over two major foreign policy decisions. Both, oddly enough, involved the simple question of honesty.

Secretary Dulles was ill when the first major decision, in the Suez crisis, was made. France, England, and Israel had moved on Egypt. The United States had been urging the United Nations to condemn the aggression of Communist Russia in bloody Hungary. What was the United States to do when its own allies—wisely or unwisely—put themselves in a similar position before the world?

Dwight Eisenhower took the position that the United States had to be honest with the world. And that it must insist that the rules of world conduct apply to our allies as well as our foes.

For a time, it looked as though the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would break wide open and that our tight ties to Europe would be destroyed. But NATO and our friendships with Europe survived. In time even closer bonds were forged.

The second decision that will fascinate history was the President's personal handling of the U–2 affair. It wasn't cricket, it wasn't even logical under the rules of international conduct, to admit such an incident. When spying of any sort is mentioned, a nation speaks with diplomatic white lies. Everyone knows it.

But Ike amazed the world. Candidly, he admitted what the United States had done. That decision started the chain reaction that rocked the Nation and destroyed the last faint hopes of a successful summit. Whatever history's appraisal of this action by Dwight Eisenhower, this much we know: It was entirely typical of the man.

So the United States, under Mr. Eisenhower, has passed through a period of world leadership in which the tensions have been increased, not lessened. The tide of nationalism has moved relentlessly. But Europe made an amazing economic comeback in this period. There was no retreat from Berlin although there was no settlement.

And under a man of peace, the United States has had 8 years of peace—though peace that has been admittedly uneasy. That man of peace has been most effective as his country's good will ambassador to the millions.

Let's look now at Dwight Eisenhower as a national leader. The record has been unspectacular but sound. And it must be considered in the light of the forces that are altering history as we watch it.

We need to consider, for example, the expanding population of the Nation. We cannot afford to underestimate automation as the creator of the second industrial revolution through which we are living. In the late fifties the United States for the first time in the postwar era sensed the challenge of other nations to its role as chief exporter to the world.

Science dominated the life of the Nation as never before. Man reached, for the first time, into the distant cosmos and the short-lived atomic age suddenly became the space age. Great questions of public policy were posed—on the size of Government, on inflation and its dangers, on the proper level of Federal activity.

In the domestic field, we are convinced that Mr. Eisenhower's greatest achievement was the establishment of a national sense of fiscal responsibility. The forces of inflation were not checked altogether. But Ike put on the brakes emphatically. Again we have a dramatic comparison. President Eisenhower's years followed a period in which the dollar had been drastically eroded.

We recall a conversation several months ago with a man who has played a large part in the Government through several administrations.

Never in his experience, he remarked, had he known a President who arrived in Washington with so little knowledge of money, inflation, and fiscal problems. Literally, Mr. Eisenhower had had no experience in these matters. He was a soldier, not an economist.

But there was an almost unbelievable evolution in the President's knowledge. He did his homework, assiduously. In time, our friend added, Dwight Eisenhower came to understand the fiscal and monetary forces of our times possibly better than any other President.

He grasped the meaning of inflation as it affected the entire Nation, and particularly those who live on pensions and fixed incomes. He understood the potential and actual trends of the cost-of-living figures. He understood these matters and he was ready to fight.

Here, we think, was Ike's biggest single domestic contribution. To be sure, the administration departs with the Nation in a condition of mild recession. But, by and large, the Eisenhower years have been characterized by prosperity and boom.

And here's a thought for the future: The public may look back on the last 8 years as much rosier than they now seem. We say this in spite of the three recessions. To be sure, unemployment has remained disturbingly high. But in 1960 more Americans had jobs than ever before. And this fact must be considered in the light of that awesome force of automation.

So the sound dollar was the object of an Eisenhower crusade. We think the overall results have been apparent. The anti-inflation crusade was coupled with the Eisenhower distaste for big government. Long ago Ike concluded that the people could spend the money better and more wisely. It wasn't always a politically popular concept. But the President never retreated from his firm belief that America was built by the creative genius of private initiative. He held firmly to the view that the Federal Government should never intervene except when individuals and the lower levels of government couldn't do the necessary jobs.

There have been many paradoxes in the Eisenhower domestic record. Critics—especially labor spokesmen—always referred to him as the "businessman's President." Yet more antitrust cases were filed and prosecuted during his 8 years than in practically all the previous history of the Government.

Labor leaders never accepted Dwight Eisenhower. Yet there is no question he received a bigger share of union members' votes than any Republican in several decades. And under a supposedly "anti-labor" President, labor and the working man made greater advances than ever before.

The President has opposed the basic conception of the welfare state. Yet in his 8 years, there were as many advances in social legislation as in any previous period.

Another paradox. His Agriculture Secretary, Ezra Taft Benson, refused to play politics with the farm problem. The administration came in for more abuse on its farm program than on any other subject. Yet the Eisenhower administration poured out more billions to help the farmers—many times more—than did any previous administration.

There are, of course, a number of mileposts in the story of the Eisenhower era that will mark off the path of history. Mr. Eisenhower was the President who signed the bill creating the first U.S. Government agency concerned largely with outer space, the sun, and the stars. He witnessed the admission of the 49th and 50th States into the Union. But we would venture a guess on two particular accomplishments that figured not at all in the last campaign. They stand as monuments to the Eisenhower years:

The construction and opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The dream of decades became reality.

The establishment of the great interstate highway program that is building today the magnificent expressways of tomorrow.

The domestic record of the last 8 years was highlighted by the Supreme Court decision on school integration. And President Eisenhower signed the first civil rights law enacted since the days of reconstruction.

On civil rights as on other issues the position of Dwight Eisenhower was essentially the position of moderation. He did not move as aggressively for drastic enforcement measures as many persons demanded. Conversely, in the opinion of the South he went much too far. The President believed that in this trying period of change in a Nation's way of life, moderation was essential.

Sum it up, then: As a national leader, Dwight Eisenhower gave the people sound government dominated by his own philosophy of the middle-of-the-road. For the most part, we believe, the people had faith in their government and the man who guided it.

As a party leader, Mr. Eisenhower was probably at his weakest. This much should be said before considering the political Eisenhower, however: Ike couldn't be a strong partisan. He served his country and his party with the philosophy that what was best for the Nation was to be found in the middle of the political road, neither to the far left nor far right. Mr. Eisenhower moved down the center. And it is only realistic to admit that some leaders of his own party found this fact disturbing.

In a sense, Dwight Eisenhower just wasn't cut out to be a politician. But his friendly smile and his winning ways captured the crowds. The orthodox techniques of politicking were nearly always beyond his understanding. Yet the Nation saw him win two elections by landslide margins. And most observers agree that he could have won a third except for the third-term amendment. Yet here is a highly significant paradox: Mr. Eisenhower did not succeed in building his party to the point where it, too, could win.

Mr. Eisenhower won by huge margins. But his party controlled both Houses of Congress only in the first 2 of his 8 years. President Eisenhower faced three successive opposition Congresses. And the success with which he dealt with them suggests something about Ike the man.

For indeed, he worked easily with the Democratic leadership in the last 6 years. Not being an extreme partisan, it was relatively easy for him to carry on more or less bipartisan government throughout most of his administration.

Certainly the congressional leaders of the Democratic Party deserve some credit for the success of divided government. Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House and LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate majority leader, fully recognized Mr. Eisenhower's firm hold on the people. They respected the President. They were willing to work with him.

And then there is the footnote of political history to the Eisenhower years. For three successive elections, the Republican Party had been soundly defeated in its efforts to win Congress. Yet when the national chips were down in 1960, Mr. Eisenhower's Democratic successor was able to win only by the closest of margins. Much of the election hinged on the Eisenhower record. But for the Republicans, the effective magic of the Eisenhower personality was lost.

So another era draws to a close, the era covering 8 portentious postwar years. Another President has written his record and left his stamp on his country and on the

world. Within a few days the Eisenhower years will be the property of history, for the final judgment and evaluation of time.

Dwight David Eisenhower leaves the White House with a tribute received by few men—the devotion of scores of millions at home and around the world.

EVEN LIPPMANN IS SUBJECT TO HUMAN ERROR

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] placed in the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the newspapers this morning.

I always approach a column by Walter Lippmann with the same reverence with which I approach a Socratic dialogue. His wisdom is a unique national resource.

However, even Walter Lippmann is human, and I think this morning he falls into error.

I agree with his basic argument that we should gear our economy to growth rather than consumption. However, I believe Walter Lippmann makes an error in two ways. First, he identifies the Samuelson report with the position of President-elect Kennedy. The Samuelson recommendations were simply task force recommendations, and they have in no sense been agreed to by President-elect Kennedy. The President-elect has not committed himself to them in any sense. I earnestly hope he will not do so.

In the second place, Lippmann compares the Samuelson recommendation as the Kennedy approach, with the Eisenhower budget, the Eisenhower approach. He writes that the Eisenhower budget may be unrealistic in implicitly predicting that the country is coming out of the recession.

In the Lippmann view the Samuelson task force makes the more realistic prediction that the recession may continue and deepen. It therefore prescribes as a first step an increase in spending of $3 to $5 billion. The Samuelson committee recommends a second step to be taken, if necessary, of a moderate tax cut.

Lippmann argues, in part, that the Eisenhower prediction may have less validity in view of the Eisenhower failure in 1958 to predict a recession that turned an estimated 1959 fiscal year surplus into a whopping deficit of more than $12 billion.

But, Mr. President, the great lesson from that 1959 deficit is not that the estimate was wrong and therefore prevented wise and appropriate Federal action. The lesson is that in spite of this error, in spite of no deliberate, planned increased spending, in spite of no tax cut, the Federal Government did have a gigantic deficit of more than $12 billion which automatically contributed to the recovery from the recession.

Mr. President, unless one argues that the $12 billion was not big enough—and no one to my knowledge argues that—it seems to me the conclusion logically follows that additional spending or tax cutting in the 1958–59 period would have been in error.

The great lesson of the 1958–59 recession in my mind is that automatic stabilizers make the Samuelson approach of increasing spending or cutting taxes in anticipation of a recession both unwise and unnecessary.

Mr. President, it is very fortunate that this is so. The state of economic forecasting is so primitive that any administration that bases its taxing and spending on economic predictions is going to be in trouble. Budget forecasters, Federal Reserve economists, and the finest academic economic experts alike have a record of being wrong at least as often as they have been right.

Second, any administration which expands or contracts public spending in periodic response to economic predictions is bound to operate wastefully.

This is not to say the Government should be heartlessly inactive in the face of recession. It is to say that we should improve and sharpen our built-in stabilizers, such as unemployment compensation and depressed areas legislation. We should, of course, provide those public services which are necessary, and we should do so promptly. But we should not contract or expand, speed up or slow down spending or taxing in response to the erratic predictions of economic forecasting.

I earnestly hope that President-elect Kennedy, as well as Walter Lippmann, will recognize the distinction.

TELEVISION'S ROLE IN DEMOCRATIC PROCESS SHOWN BY NBC'S "U–2 AFFAIR"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how to hammer into the minds and hearts of American citizens the significance of immensely important historical developments is a central problem of a democracy. It is a truism that this great democracy can move little faster than public opinion permits it to move. It is no exaggeration to say that our future as a nation depends on our ability to reach the American citizen's understanding, to hold his attention, to touch his heart. How brilliantly television can do this was demonstrated by the recent NBC television White Paper entitled "The U–2 Affair."

Those who saw this broadcast were able to witness a recreation of the high drama of this extraordinary episode. They were also presented with a careful discussion of our Government's actions during the course of the crisis. The program concluded with a pointed analysis of what had gone wrong, including suggestions on how similar mistakes might be avoided in the future.

To paraphrase one of the newsmen quoted in this program, NBC has here grasped a piece of history by the tail. In the years to come Francis Gary Powers' fateful U–2 flight will be dismissed and analyzed by chroniclers of our time. An excellent summary of what really happened will be available to these future historians in this NBC program. But the great point of television is that it literally can change history. And programs of this kind can do exactly this. History can be changed because our American public opinion can be informed and thereby transformed into an instrument of national wisdom in the future. National decisionmakers—Presidents, Cabinet officers, Senators can act far more constructively and wisely because there is much greater public awareness and understanding.

Narrated by Chet Huntley, this program was written and produced by Al Wasserman and Arthur Barron. Irving Gitlin was the executive producer, and the sponsor was Timex, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the script of the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U–2 AFFAIR

(Narrator: Chet Huntley)

(Broadcast Tuesday, November 29, 1960)

CHET HUNTLEY. Almost 6 months have passed since the day of the U–2 flight and the crisis it created. But a crisis should not be filed and forgotten in a nation's archives simply because it is in the past. Now that the passions and partisanship of an election year have subsided—and because we feel that the consequences of this crisis are still unfolding and the lessons to be learned are still significant—NBC news has decided to retell and reexamine the story of that fateful flight of May 1 and the events that flowed from it.

If the story can properly be said to begin anywhere, it is with the superb airplane itself and the men who built it. This is a U–2, filmed by NBC with special permission at the place of its birth, the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. in Burbank, Calif.

Here is the man who designed it, Lockheed vice president, Kelly Johnson.

KELLY JOHNSON. Back in 1953 and 1954, we were studying ways and means of making fighter airplanes like the F–104 go higher and further than they did at that time. As we went further and further into these studies it soon became apparent that it would take an entirely new kind of aircraft to do the job that we wanted done.

From this came the U–2. We made a wing that had a very long span—over 80 feet. The wing had to carry the whole weight of the aircraft and still be very, very light. It had to be designed not only to hold a great amount of fuel, but it was designed so the wingtip acted as part of the landing gear.

On the takeoff, we invented what we called the pogo landing gears. These stick into sockets in the wing, and rest on the ground and keep the airplane level on takeoff.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the design of the U-2 presented unusual problems, so too did flying it. The pilot of a U-2 must spend an hour-and-a-half before takeoff relaxing and breathing pure oxygen in order to prepare himself for high altitude conditions.

His helmet is airtight and sealed to his body by a cork ring; he can, therefore, neither eat nor drink before * * * or during a flight. A long flight may keep the pilot sealed up for more than 8 hours.

After such a voyage, he will emerge hungry and thirsty from his cramped cockpit, his skin chafed and raw from the tight fitting suit and helmet. The plane he flies will range as high as 90,000 feet—17 miles above the earth—far above the operating ceiling of any other jet * * * and during the 8 hours it can stay aloft, the U-2 will half fly, half glide for nearly 4,000 miles.

It was evident from the start that the U-2 would be an invaluable airplane. It was—and is—employed by the Air Force and other agencies for high altitude scientific research. More recently, the Air Force has been using the planes to observe missiles in flight and to track missile nose cones on the way down.

But, to the civilian Central Intelligence Agency, the U–2's ability to fly higher and

farther than any interceptor aircraft made it a superb spy. With dark paint and a special reconnaissance equipment, the unmarked plane the Russians came to call the black lady of espionage systematically probed the borders and penetrated deep behind the iron curtain for nearly 4 years.

A crash landing at a glider strip near Tokyo in 1959 provided the most dramatic breach in the secrecy surrounding the espionage activities of the U-2. These pictures were made before the area could be cordoned off by U.S. security guards.

Over the years other hints of the black ladies' secret missions came to the surface, first in a British flight magazine, then in reports of a mysterious crash that killed Lockheed test pilot Robert Seiker, then in other newspapers and aviation magazines including Russian ones. In 1958–59 the newspaper Soviet Aviation attacked the espionage flights, the men behind them, and the planes they flew.

POWERS' MOTHER. Ever since Francis was just a little boy he was interested in airplanes, and made model planes. And always said he wanted to become a pilot. So he, after so long a time, he made a pilot.

Well, I wanted the boy to do what he thought best. Because it was his life. And I was kind of scared, though, as I was afraid of planes, the dangers of them. Anything that goes up has to come down. So that's the reason I was kind of afraid for him, afraid he would crash, sometime, and maybe kill himself.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In August 1956, Francis Powers arrived at Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, an American installation on a flat, bleak, plain 10 miles from the town of Adana. It is a normal Air Force base with one exception. Isolated in a trailer camp at its western end is the top secret 10–10 reconnaissance detachment, which conducted U–2 overflights. Francis Powers and his wife moved into trailer T–1356, where, in common with seven other civilian pilots and their families they lived in mystery and seclusion for nearly 4 years, aloof from the rest of the base. On Thursday, April 27, 1960, a transport plane flew Powers and other members of the 10–10 detachment from Incirlik to the Pakistani Air Base at Peshawar. Then, when conditions were right, Powers would begin a 3,300 mile voyage across the Soviet Union, his equipment continuously monitoring its industry and defenses. If all went well, he would touch down at Bodo, Norway, 8 hours after takeoff.

And so, early on Sunday morning on the first of May 1960, Francis Powers lifted off from Pakistan. Most of the Western World was still in darkness and, as he crossed into Soviet territory, dawn was just breaking in Moscow.

In a few hours, the May Day parade was scheduled to begin, an annual display dedicated to the glorification of the Communist regime. Already the city was being prepared for the great event.

As Powers continued his flight, it was still the night of April 30 in the United States of America.

In Washington, D.C., at midnight, it was time for the daily ritual of shutting down the city's landmarks.

At the White House, guards kept watch over an empty building. The President was away for the weekend at his Gettysburg farmhouse.

At the State Department, a few lights were burning late. A summit conference—the first in 5 years—was scheduled to begin in Paris in 2 weeks, and there were preparations to make.

In one section of the city there was considerable activity.

The Sunday papers had just come off the presses and were being readied for delivery. Whatever news was to occupy attention that morning was already frozen in type and bound in wire. And of all those who would soon be casually scanning the morning papers, in Washington, and in Moscow, no one was aware that a news story that would shake the world was being born in the wreckage of an American plane, down 1,200 miles inside the Soviet Union.

The circumstances surrounding the downing the U–2 are still largely a mystery. American intelligence sources have communicated a version of what happened to several reporters, among them, Robert Holtz, editor of the authoritative Aviation Week magazine.

Mr. HOLTZ. Our Government knew that Powers was in trouble almost from the moment that it first occurred. This is because we have a rather extensive network of monitoring Soviet communications, and they also have a similar network with which they monitor ours.

This is an example of what we got from listening to the Russians. This incident took place about 2 years ago.

Sound: Russian fighter pilot conversation.

The Russian fighter pilots are moving in to attack. Here is the official translation of their conversation at this point:

"The target is a four-engine transport—roger; 201, I am attacking the target; the target is burning; there is a hit; the target is banking; it is going toward the fence. Open fire. 218, are you attacking? Yes, yes. The tail assembly is falling off the target. I will finish him off, boys. I will finish him off on the run. The target is falling, yes. Form up—go home."

During Powers' flight across Russia our monitoring system was functioning and gained a great deal of useful information. From conversation of the Russian radar crews it was evident that Powers' flight was expected and it was tracked almost from the moment he crossed the Afghan border. From conversations of fighter pilots and air defense installations it was evident that they set up relays of supersonic fighters in an attempt to shoot him down. As Powers neared Sverdlovsk, he reported a flameout in his jet engine and began to descend to the altitude at which it was possible to start this engine in the air. The last communication with Powers was about 40,000 feet. When Powers came down in the Soviet Union, our Government knew the following facts: The fact that the plane had come down in the area of Sverdlovsk; the fact that it had been forced down by a mechanical failure, not shot down by a rocket at 70,000 feet as the Soviets later claimed. What our Government did not know was whether the pilot was still alive and what the condition of the aircraft was when it hit the ground.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Powers' plane had crashed in a field near the city of Sverdlovsk, some 900 miles east of Moscow. According to the Russians, the pilot had parachuted down and had been taken into custody by several local citizens. They described how they disarmed him, gave him a drink of water and a cigarette, and drove him to the local rural Soviet, where he was turned over to security police.

In Moscow, it was 8:53 a.m. at the time of the crash. The streets outside Red Square were already crowded with spectators waiting for the May Day parade to begin.

As the Russian high command walked out of the Kremlin to take their places at the reviewing stand, they were probably still unaware of what had happened.

Among those in Red Square watching the events of that morning was NBC News correspondent, Joe Michaels.

Mr. MICHAELS. Exactly at 10 a.m., as always, the May Day ceremony officially began. The first part of the parade was the military section. I watched the mobile units going by to see if there was anything new. There wasn't. Most of the time, I kept my eye on the reviewing stand. From a reporter's point of view this is the most likely place to pick up anything of interest. And at about 10:45—three-quarters of an hour after the parade began—I did notice something most unusual. An excited Marshal Vershinin, the head of the Soviet Air Force, arrived late. He entered at the rear of the reviewing stand, went up to Khrushchev, and whispered something in his ear. Of course it's only a guess, but I am inclined to believe that this was the moment Khrushchev found out that the U–2 was down.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the manner in which Khrushchev learned the news is open to speculation, so is the manner in which our own key officials learned. According to Powers' testimony, his destination was to have been the NATO Airbase at Bodo, Norway, a small fishing town at the edge of the Arctic Circle. The plane was due at 7 a.m., Washington time on May 1. When it failed to arrive, this information must have been communicated to the headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency in Washington. In any event, by noon, 5 hours after the plane was due, it is known that word had already spread among a group of top Washington officials.

At CIA, under whose direction the overflights were conducted, Director Allen Dulles had been advised.

At the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Gates knew about it.

At NASA—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—which operated the scientific weather flight program of the U–2's, Director Keith Glennan and Deputy Director Lawrence Dryden also knew.

And at the Department of State, Under Secretary Douglas Dillon had been informed. What they did not know was that in Moscow, as the May Day festivities continued into the night, Francis Gary Powers, the pilot of the U–2 was alive and already confined in a cell somewhere behind the forbidding walls of Lubyanka prison.

That same night of May 1, in Washington, our Government began to take action. To tell us about it NBC News State Department correspondent, Frank Bourgholtzer.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. I've been told by persons whom I believe that there was a meeting not long after the word was received that the U–2 was missing. This was a meeting at a relatively low level of those persons who normally meet to discuss such intelligence problems.

At this meeting a rather routine decision was made to go ahead and put out a cover story; that is to say, a story that would cover for the record the fact that the plane was missing without revealing anything of its true mission.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This is Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, a former specialist in intelligence and military affairs analyst for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. PHILLIPS. From an intelligence point of view, the original cover story seemed to be particularly inept. One gets the impression, and I believe it's a true one, that it had been in the files for a long time. And when the U–2 came down, it was just yanked out of the files and issued.

A cover story has certain requirements. It must be credible. It must be a story that can be maintained; and it should not have too much detail. Anything that's missing in a cover story can be taken care of by saying the matter is being investigated.

The most striking thing was the failure to consider, in the cover story issued, the possibility that the pilot might be alive and the airplane might be intact.

Mr. HUNTLEY. As the events of the week of May 1 were to demonstrate, the story that was issued to cover the disappearance of the U–2 failed to serve its purpose. This failure was not immediately apparent.

The days following May 1 were quiet ones, and the cover story first began to come

to the surface on Tuesday, May 3, in Istanbul, Turkey.

On May 3, Istanbul was a city under martial law, the atmosphere heavy with tension. Turkish students were rioting in protest over the stern police policies of Premier Menderes and his ruling party. Although the government was still in control, it's downfall was only a few weeks off.

At the Municipal Palace in Istanbul, troops stood guard while, inside, a meeting of the NATO countries was taking place. Attending, was Secretary of State Christian Herter and a number of his top aids in the State Department. Among those covering the developments of the day was a Turkish reporter.

Mr. GOREN. I'm Zeyyat Goren, United Press International Bureau Manager for Turkey. It was a Tuesday morning, May 3. I was writing a story on the NATO Council meeting and the anti-Menderes demonstrations. A stringer of mine called me. He said he heard a story about an American plane missing—somewhere in eastern Turkey—from Incirlik Airbase at Adana. After I got the tip, I called Incirlik Airbase and talked to the information sergeant, who gave me the details of the story.

The sergeant said the story is true. The plane is missing since 2 days. And the last they have heard from the pilot, he has trouble with his oxygen supplies somewhere over Van Lake area—which, he added, is near to the Persian border. Of course, being a native of Turkey, I know Van Lake area is also near to the Russian border, which was the angle of my story—though I didn't know that day that this story will come such a big story.

BILL FOX. I'm Bill Fox, day cable editor for United Press International in New York. I was on duty on May 3 when we received a dispatch from Istanbul, Turkey, about 8 o'clock in the morning reporting that a U.S. Air Force plane, a U–2, was reported missing somewhere in the rugged mountains of eastern Turkey in the area of Lake Van, which is near the Soviet border. I have here the original dispatch which we received by radio teletype from London. Of course, at the time I didn't know what a U–2 was, nor did I realize that we had a piece of history by the tail. But, the fact that an American airplane was missing in the general area of the Soviet border, I felt was newsworthy. Consequently, I rewrote the story, adding some information that another American plane had been downed in the same general area about a year previously. I checked it with the foreign editor and sent it to the news desk. From there it was put on our transcontinental A wire for simultaneous dispatch to all UPI subscribers throughout North America.

The text of our story went like this: A single engine U.S. Air Force plane with one man aboard was missing today near the Soviet border in the rugged mountains of southeastern Turkey. The plane was one of two that took off Sunday morning from Incirlik Airbase near Adana on a weather reconnaissance mission. One plane returned but the pilot of the missing craft reported that his oxygen equipment was out of order. Three C–54 planes from Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya under the command of Maj. Harry E. Hayes, of Clarksville, Tex., were combing the area in search of the missing plane, but thus far without success.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The cover story appeared in print on the morning of May 4. At the time, it was so unimportant that only a handful of papers across the country carried it—and only one, the Washington Post and Times Herald ran it on the front page—a small story that was eliminated in later editions to make room for a baseball headline.

In Washington, on Wednesday, May 4, there was not much to be found in the way of news.

In the morning, the President had breakfast with a number of Republican Congressmen, then chatted with them on the steps of the White House.

Later in the morning, he signed an important wheat agreement with India, and in the afternoon played a round of golf.

In New York, Mayor Wagner presided at the opening of a tulip display. Spring was on its way.

And in Paris, workmen were busy tidying up the Elysee Palace for a summit conference that would never be held.

All in all, it was a quiet day, May 4—the last such day the world would know for some time to come.

Moscow, Thursday, May 5.—NBC News Correspondent Joe Michaels again reporting.

Mr. MICHAELS. On Thursday morning, May 5, I was present in the hall of the great Kremlin palace as the supreme Soviet began its 3-day meeting. First on the agenda was a speech by Premier Khrushchev. At 10 a.m. Khrushchev began his 3½-hour address. Most of it dealt with such matters at tax reform, wages, prices, currency change, and so forth. But toward the end, he suddenly introduced a new theme.

To a stunned and startled audience, Khrushchev announced that an American U–2 spy plane had been shot down in the Soviet Union. He did not specify where, and he did not indicate the fate of the pilot. He went on to warn those countries harboring U.S. bases that they were playing with fire and promised a stern protest to the United States and to the United Nations. But he added, "I do not doubt President Eisenhower's sincere desire for peace. Reason must guide us."

Mr. HUNTLEY. With Khrushchev's speech, the U–2 affair had become a full-blown crisis. The world was waiting for our Government to respond, and respond we did—during a 2-day period of chaos.

NBC News State Department Correspondent Frank Bourgholtzer, and White House correspondent, Ray Scherer, were following the story as it developed.

Mr. SCHERER. At the time the U–2 incident broke into the headlines, events were moving so rapidly and we were all so close to the story that none of us could really follow its ramifications. Now, with the passage of time, certain things have become clarified.

We know, for example, that following the National Security Council meeting on May 5, the President called together a small group to discuss how to handle the situation. Two decisions emerged from this meeting: One, to continue with the cover story that had already been planted; and two, that any statement by this Government on the situation would come only from the State Department. This latter decision was not implemented. In a recent discussion with Jim Hagerty, Frank Bourgholtzer and I questioned him about that.

Mr. SCHERER. Now after you saw us on that Thursday morning and told us that the President had asked for a full investigation, you referred us to NASA and to the State Department for further information.

Mr. HAGERTY. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Now I went over from the White House to NASA upon hearing your word they would have a statement. They seemed to know nothing about it. They weren't prepared to make a statement. But they did make one later. Why was the time—

Mr. HAGERTY. Ray, I don't know. I can't answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you in on the framing of their statement?

Mr. HAGERTY. No, I was not.

Mr. SCHERER. Just to establish a further point, did the men at NASA, and did the men in the State Department involved in the cover story know it was a cover story, or were they simply agents?

Mr. HAGERTY. That I cannot answer. I do not know.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. On the morning of May the 5th I was at the State Department. We were waiting with more than normal curiosity for Link White's daily briefing. He came out to see us at 12:45 and he read the following statement:

Mr. WHITE. The Department has been informed by NASA that, as announced May 3, an unarmed plane—a U–2 weather research plane based at Adana, Turkey, piloted by a civilian, has been missing since May 1. During the flight of this plane, the pilot reported difficulty with his oxygen equipment. Mr. Khrushchev has announced that a U.S. plane has been shot down over the U.S.S.R. on that date. It may be that this was the missing plane. It is entirely possible that having failure in the oxygen equipment, which could result in the pilot losing consciousness, the plane continued on automatic pilot for a considerable distance and accidently violated Soviet airspace. The United States is taking this matter up with the Soviet Government, with particular reference to the fate of the pilot.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Thinking back to the answers Link White gave to the many questions we later posed it is perfectly clear that he had not been informed of any decision to make the State Department the sole spokesman about the U–2. When reporters pressed him for details, he volunteered the information that "infinitely more detail" was being given out at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. SCHERER. At 12:15 on May 5, as soon as the Hagerty news conference was over, I followed his suggestion, ran from the White House across Lafayette Park to NASA. I was the first reporter to arrive. I said, "I have come for the statement." And they said, "What statement?" I said, "The statement that Jim Hagerty said that you were going to put out." Well that seemed to confuse them. They didn't know anything about any such statement. They finally took me in to see Walt Bonney, the Information Chief. He didn't know anything about it either. There was a lot of conferring and some more confusion. Other reporters arrived. Well, I finally left and I had the impression that there wouldn't be any statement. But at 1:30 p.m., Bonney did release a statement that attempted to answer the questions reporters had been asking him.

Mr. BONNEY. Now, if the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane, from the last reported position, would be impossible to determine.

Mr. SCHERER. The Bonney statement went considerably beyond that of the State Department. For instance, there were details about the supposed U–2 flight plan, how many U–2's we had, where they were stationed, and so forth. The statement was so detailed that it raised almost as many questions as it answered. For example, Bonney contended that the U–2 had taken off from Incirlik Airbase in Turkey at 8 a.m. local time. This was considerably later than the time announced in Khrushchev's speech, and reporters were quick to notice the discrepancy.

Mr. HUNTLEY. One more incident occurred in Washington on that confusing May 5th which is worth noting. Late in the afternoon, a telegram was received from Ambassador Thompson, in Moscow, advising the State Department of the possibility that Powers might be alive. Despite this warning, on the following day we still seemed curiously unaware of the full potentialities of the situation.

On the morning of Friday, May 6, President Eisenhower attended a union industrial exhibit. Reporter Charles Roberts of Newsweek magazine, was there.

Mr. ROBERTS. On Friday, May 6, I was standing just 2 feet from President Eisen-

hower when he gave his first public reaction to the U–2 incident. At a union industry show in the Washington Armory, talking to George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, he remarked that he was going to give a hydrojet boat to Khrushchev on his trip to Russia. Then, he added the phrase, "If I go." Up until then the White House had refused to comment on the U–2 incident or acknowledge in any that it had disturbed our relations with the Soviet Union. After the show, around noon on Friday, Ike climbed into his helicopter, outside the armory, and flew to Gettysburg where, that afternoon, he played a round of golf. Some of us were surprised that he flew to Gettysburg in time of crisis—but the White House has always insisted that with modern communications the President can run the Government from his Gettysburg farmhouse as well as he can from the White House.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Later that same afternoon, Secretary of State Herter returned from abroad. Despite the crisis, it would still be 2 days before he and the President were to see one another.

And at the State Department, in his press conference that day, held in a setting similar to this, it was evident that Lincoln White had still not be advised to exercise caution. In response to questioning by reporters, he said, "It is ridiculous to say we are trying to kid the world about this."

Later, he added, "There was absolutely no—N–O—no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet airspace and there has never been."

Saturday morning, May 7, for Nikita Khrushchev, a day of triumph.

Once the applause of the Supreme Soviet quieted down, Khrushchev revealed a secret that he had been keeping almost a week. He displayed photographs, which he said were taken from the captured U–2, and announced that the pilot was alive and had confessed. Then he said, of the Americans, "When they learn that the pilot is alive, they will have to think of something else, and they will."

Khrushchev's announcement had blown our cover story to pieces. Newsweek correspondent, Charles Roberts, continues with his report of developments in Gettysburg that day.

Mr. ROBERTS. Early Saturday morning, May 7, a number of reporters, including myself, came up to Gettysburg to cover late developments.

White House News Secretary James Hagerty had promised us a story that morning, and we thought it would relate in some way to the U–2. At 9:36, while the President was out playing golf, we sat down with Hagerty at a makeshift pressroom at the Gettysburg Hotel. To our astonishment, the story he promised concerned nuclear testing.

He announced that the United States was prepared to resume nuclear testing as soon as possible—as he put it. The tests were to be for the purpose of improving means of detecting underground blasts—a step toward policing a nuclear test ban. But we were still surprised that the Government would put out an announcement, while it was under fire for aerial spying, that might be interpreted as a new cold war maneuver. Hagerty still refused to discuss the U–2 incident. He said he had informed the President of Khrushchev's latest speech, but that he would have no comment. Any reaction, he said, would have to come from the State Department. Meantime, Ike had been on the golf course since 9:05. He finished his round at 11:28—score unreported. Then, he returned to the farmhouse, where he spent the remainder of the day. During that day, at the State Department in Washington, a crucial meeting was held to work out an answer to Khrushchev's latest speech. The President did not attend that meeting, but Hagerty informed us that Ike was in contact with Secretary of State Herter by phone during the day. Late in the afternoon, a statement was read to the President by phone—and he approved it without change. At 6 p.m., Lincoln White of the State Department read that statement to newsmen.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Only the previous day, Lincoln White had said, "There was absolutely no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet airspace and there never has been." Now he was stating something different.

Mr. WHITE. As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President it has been established that insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned, there was no authorization for any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev. Nevertheless it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U–2 plane.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This one statement, agreed upon at a hastily convened meeting, represented a historic decision—our Government was, in effect, admitting that we had previously lied, and that we had committed espionage—admissions no nation had ever made before.

QUESTION. How will this incident affect the United States, do you think?

YOUTH. I feel that it will give the Americans a black eye all over Europe.

MAN 1. My feeling is that the country did the right thing in sending these planes over—or this plane over. Because we have to keep abreast of the Russians, as far as the information is concerned.

MAN 2. I think that if we fly over Russian territory, we take the chance of being shot down because of engaging in espionage—the same as we would do to them if they flew over our territory.

MAN 3. I think that we ought to sink one of those submarines that have been spying off Cape Canaveral.

WOMAN. Well, I don't think we should admit it. Yes. Yes. Never mind what the pilot said. We have a right to protect ourselves.

MAN 4. Thinking it over, I think the State Department has really erred in the whole thing. They got a mixup there. They don't seem to be coordinated. The one doesn't know what the other is doing.

Question. What do you think about it?

WOMAN 2. Well, I can only say what we were told in church yesterday. We should pray for that boy. He needs it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On Wednesday, May 11, President Eisenhower answered the one major question that remained: Who had authorized the flights?

President EISENHOWER. Our deterrent must never be placed in jeopardy. The safety of the whole free world demands this. As the Secretary of State pointed out in his recent statement, ever since the beginning of my administration I have issued directives to gather, in every feasible way, the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for defense.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The President himself had assumed responsibility for authorizing the program of intelligence flights. We have learned that CIA Director, Allen Dulles, had offered to serve as the traditional scapegoat and to resign. However, this is not the course the President chose. This avowal of responsibility by a head of state for intelligence activities was unprecedented in the history of international relations. It is a decision that has been the subject of considerable debate. Here are the views of the chairman of the Senate committee that investigated the U–2 affair—Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT—and of the President's Press Secretary, James Hagerty.

There is a great deal of puzzlement in my own mind of people that say why did the President or the Government of the United States take responsibility. Well now this is something new that has been added to my world. If you gentlemen are spies, and I am not, and you get caught, I can say I never heard of you, or saw you before. But if you strap a U–2 to your back, it is a little difficult, to say the least, not to admit and assume responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The President need never have avowed or disavowed is the point I make. He should have taken the position of silence in this matter and left the—uh, if anyone had to take responsibility, it should have been the head of the intelligence.

Uh, it should have to depend on circumstances as to who avowed or disavowed anything but it shouldn't have been the President who as I say embodies the whole sovereignty and dignity of the whole American people. I think personally this was perhaps the most serious fault in this whole operation, this whole incident.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Coupled with the President's assuming responsibility for the U–2 flights, was our attempt to justify our right to engage in them.

Mr. HAGERTY. As the President himself at a press conference and in speeches said, when a closed society makes threats against our very welfare, it is up to us to find out everything we can about such a closed society, whether they are preparing for war, whether they are building up, and also the determination of the members of the Government that there will never be another Pearl Harbor if they have anything to do about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think one of the most serious things to, uh, growing out of this, was our endeavor, on the part of our people, to justify uh, this—these flights. Uh, to say you need something such as intelligence in international relations certainly is no justification for it. But in the position the President took he was in fact asserting the right to do this and not the need. They could understand the need. They understand that espionage goes on within certain areas all the time. But they never take full responsibility for it. The head of state does not. I think that it's responsible to believe that this avowal put Mr. Khrushchev in the position where he could not proceed to treat with the man who at the same time is asserting the right to violate the sovereignty of his country, in this case, the U.S.S.R.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Following our avowal of the U–2 flights, one more significant question was raised during the week preceding the summit conference—the question of whether the flights would be continued. As the week began this became a source of apparently deliberate confusion.

Mr. SCHERER. On Monday morning May 9, the New York Times carried a story saying, "It was learned that the President had ordered cessation of all flights over or near the borders of the U.S.S.R." Well, later that morning, at Jim Hagerty's news conference, we asked him whether the flights had been canceled. He said that the President had not canceled the flights. When asked whether they had been canceled by any order other than the President, Jim answered, "I know of no such orders." Well the impression we were left with was that despite the events of the last few days, the U–2 flights were still going on. This impression was reinforced by a statement of Secretary of State Herter, which was released by Lincoln White the same afternoon.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Although the administration had denied that it intended to imply that the flights would continue, this was the inference that was drawn by most observers. All these events led to an atmosphere of increasing tension as the summit conference approached.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In the Soviet Union, Khrushchev toured an exhibit that opened in

Gorki Park. Here in a hall customarily devoted to the pastime of chess, the Russians had put on display remnants of the plane, its equipment, and the pilot's personal effects.

Later, in an impromptu press conference, Khrushchev reacted violently to what he termed our threat to continue the flights. He canceled his invitation to President Eisenhower for a visit to the Soviet Union that had been planned for the following month.

And in Washington, as administration leaders explained their decision to Congress, the beginning of a major controversy, involving both this country and its allies, was already apparent.

CHESTER BOWLES. We have certainly lost ground. Major elements in our Government have been caught telling blatant falsehoods to the world, to ourselves, to each other, and to congressional committees. We have not told the truth. We have taken grave risks on the very eve of a great and important international conference. And we put the President in a position of not knowing who keeps store.

BARRY GOLDWATER. We have nothing to gain by going to the summit. We have nothing to negotiate at the summit. And about all we can do is to add dignity to this last beastly act of the Soviets. And I hope the President decides not to go. How can you negotiate with murderers? How can you negotiate with people who have shot down numbers of our planes? How do you negotiate with people who tell lies and who do not fulfill their solemn obligations? I don't think you can gain anything by going to the summit with these types of people. I think we ought to realize, in this country, that we're in a cold war and we better be in this war to win it—and start acting like it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The former Foreign Minister of Canada.

Mr. PEARSON. It was pretty stupid, on the part of the United States, if I may say so, for getting itself in a position, before the summit conference, that the Soviets could exploit an incident of this kind.

In other words, I don't think they've handled the matter very well. As long as the cold war goes on, governments are going to collect intelligence, legally or illegally, and the Russians are at the forefront of that parade. But if you do this kind of thing—collect intelligence—you should do it intelligently.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On Saturday, May 14, President Eisenhower left the White House by helicopter to board the plane that would take him to Paris. The trip that was to have been the capstone of his career was already foredoomed to a failure that he, least of all, would have wanted. As James Reston had written in the New York Times, "The tragedy of President Eisenhower in the spy-plane case is that he and his colleagues have created almost all the things he feared the most. He wanted to reduce international tensions and he has increased it. He wanted to strengthen the alliance and he has weakened it. He glorified teamwork and morality, and got lies and administrative chaos. Everything he was noted for—caution, patience, leadership, military skill, and even good luck—suddenly eluded him precisely at the moment he needed them the most. What happened after the President's arrival has become part of the folklore of history. The conference that was to be held at the Elysee Palace was never formally convened. After bitterly attacking the President of the United States, Premier Khrushchev stalked out of the first preliminary meeting. And before returning to Moscow he began what has since become an all-too-familiar pattern of public performances."

The Russians now exploited to the fullest the propaganda advantage we had given them with the U–2. Whether the incident was chiefly responsible for the summit failure is still being debated; but it did provide ammunition for the Russians as they intensified cold war pressures throughout the world. Fear of Russian rockets in the months following the summit made American bases the object of an increasing number of protest demonstrations.

The United States found itself embarrassingly on the defensive—and in the riots against the Japanese-American Security Treaty, even high United States officials were caught in the storm.

Mr. SCHERER. Jim, by way of taking a longer look at this whole U–2 incident, now that the dust has settled somewhat, how do you think the United States came out of it?

Mr. HAGERTY. Well, I think they came out very well. I think that basically the argument of an open society versus a closed society has been very well brought to the fore, has been brought to the attention of the peoples of the world. I think that is an oversea reaction. I think domestically the reaction of the American people quite frankly was "It was too bad we got caught, but we are glad we were doing it." That is the way I would sum it up.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Do you, looking back, think that if you had it to do over again, you might have done anything in some different fashion?

Mr. HAGERTY. No, with the exception that I think everybody admits, of the failure of the cover story. But outside of that, no.

Mr. SCHERER. As you look back on this U–2 incident, who was in charge of our side of the thing as it developed—issuing of statements, coordination of policy, the whole aspect?

Mr. HAGERTY. Well, I just can't answer that, Ray, I am sorry.

Mr. SCHERER. Having had this experience, and now speaking with the benefit of hindsight, what lessons emerged from this for the future?

Mr. HAGERTY. Don't get caught.

Mr. HUNTLEY. At the hearings held by the Fulbright committee, the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, was also asked what lessons could be learned from the U–2 affair. His answer was "Not to have accidents." We leave it to the American public to decide whether "Don't get caught" and "Not to have accidents" are the only lessons to be learned from U–2.

What you have seen in the past hour is an attempt at a historical evaluation of a most controversial subject, including opposing viewpoints on the matter. Over 30 responsible reporters who covered this story as it unfolded contributed to this effort. There are certain conclusions that may reasonably be drawn from the facts examined in this report.

1. The cover story was inadequate to its mission. It was hastily released, excessive in detail and failed to take account of the possibility that Powers might be alive.

2. As the U–2 crisis developed, there was a serious lack of coordination among the governmental agencies involved, which resulted in conflicting and damaging statements to the world.

3. By avowing that intelligence flights, an act unprecedented in the history of nations, our Government suffered the consequences of having been caught in public misstatements.

4. Nobody expects the United States, or any other nation to stop intelligence activities, but by justifying the U–2 flights and implying they would continue, we materially affected the summit conference. If Khrushchev intended to wreck the conference beforehand, we gave him a readymade excuse, If he intended to negotiate, we made it difficult for him to do so.

5. Throughout the whole U–2 affair, we suffered from the fact that there was apparently no one official or agency to direct our total response to this crisis.

This is not a matter for the history books, but vitally affects our ability to survive as a nation. There will be other crises that the new administration, and succeeding administrations, will have to face. In the world as it is today, we cannot afford another U–2 affair. Good night.

VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, because of the paramount importance of urban transportation in the economic and social welfare of the Nation, I wish to place in the RECORD in one convenient place a number of diverse and penetrating papers and statements on this subject.

One of the best broad-scale statements on urban transportation that it has been my pleasure to read was prepared in October last year by Mr. Luther Gulick, president of the Institute of Public Administration in New York. I will not attempt to summarize his article except to say that it delves into such important questions as the function of urban transportation, the qualitative distinction between transportation within an urban area and transportation between urban areas, the causes and consequences of the urban transportation crisis, the effect of public and private decisions on urban transportation, and the relationship of land-use development to transportation.

This last point is one that is emphasized in a number of these papers and one to which I spoke at length in a statement January 11 of this year at the time of introduction of S. 345, on urban mass transportation. Without comprehensive planning for our entire urban areas, our decisions and efforts in transportation will be poorly based and may ultimately be in vain for failure to control land-use developments once the transportation networks have been established.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gulick's "Observations on Urban Transportation" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

(By Luther Gulick)

This paper discusses urban transportation policy from the point of view of the urban public administrator and researcher. This will best focus what the author has to say on certain aspects of the economics of urban transportation, putting them in a framework of policy development and planning.

The discussion is built around the following four topics:

1. What makes the modern urban area?
2. What is the function of urban transportation?
3. Why are we concerned with urban transportation as a problem today?
4. Economic considerations and the decision process.

I. WHY THE MODERN URBAN AREA?

If you scattered the 32 black and white pieces of a chess set out over a room, and then assumed that the various pieces had strong reasons for conferring, or working, or dealing with each other, you would have a simple picture of the forces that create urban centers, and of their transportation problem.

The first response to the wide scatteration of the chess men would be the effort of certain pieces to get together. For some reasons, the bishops might want to be close together; as might the knights, or the pawns. For other purposes one queen would want to be surrounded by the knights, and a bishop would certainly want to shepherd the black pawns. The kings would move with their castles; and the knights, after occasional forays, would return to their kings. And the only way that all of these kaleidoscopic desires and needs could be met easily would be by assembling all of these pieces in the closest possible compass which still permits changes in their interrelations from time to time. Packing them in a box does not give the answer, because the pieces must always have the chance for further movement.

This illustrates the bipolar force that creates the modern urban center.

The whole purpose is to reduce the space that separates man, without freezing the relationships, so that contact and communication may be easy and varied at will.

We cut down the space by crowding together in a restricted geographic area. This is the urban region.

The fact is, the human being is a social animal, as Aristotle observed over 2,000 years ago, and is by nature a teamworker. He can't do much by himself alone. But there are apparently few limits to what he can accomplish working with others. For this reason there is no limit either to the need, the desire, or the economic advantages of getting human activities close together in a fluid teamwork matrix.

But crowding makes problems for human beings, problems of health, and sanitation, and comfort, and aggression. Crowding also puts a physical block in the way of easy communication except with the fellow "with his elbow in your eye." Yet easy communication with the various people one may select at will is the very purpose of urban concentration. Thus crowding itself can defeat the basic function of the city.

As a result, we have three adjustments to human crowding. The first is to make crowding livable by controls, services, and amenities. The second is to make crowding less necessary by creating methods of human communication which do not require immediate physical propinquity, such as the telephone, radio, and TV. The third is by speeding and mechanizing circulation, so that people may work together on the same job, or exchange goods with other than their direct neighbors, without significant expense or loss of time. This, of course, is what we call the transportation system.

Each of the approaches—crowding together, communications, and transportation—makes its contribution, and each has its limitations and costs.

Crowding

Crowding humans together in a narrow geographic space is the first and most direct method of obliterating space. But it soon begins to defeat itself as people and activities get so close and piled up that they cannot move easily on their various and changing errands. The costs of living also mount as sanitary and other considerations pile on their requirements. And, while human beings are sociable, and like to be together at times, they also like to be alone and quiet, and they hate other people's dirt and noise and invasion of their privacy. Crowding together thus has serious drawbacks.

Cities have from the earliest times done a great deal to gain the benefits of close association and at the same time to mitigate the unhealthy and undesirable effects of crowding by planning, zoning, sanitary, health, police, fire and other services, by prohibiting acts which deprive others, and by making a place for the special architectural instruments of close association.

Communication devices

The mechanical and electrical aids to communication have also made an incalculable contribution. Think of the talk and visits that are saved by the newspaper, the steps and meetings that are saved by the telephone, the congregating and going to and fro that are saved by radio and TV. The extraordinary progress, the increased dependability, and the magic of modern communication, which we now take for granted, have gone a long way to wipe out space for a certain range of human contacts. The time loss involved is virtually nothing, and the unit costs of modern communication are minimal.

The only drawback in substituting mechanical and electronic communication for direct personal communication is the range and accuracy of the sensory impacts which are thus conveyed. This is partly a matter of our limited vocabulary and instrumentation and partly a matter of unreflected subtile combinations. In other words, in spite of extraordinary progress over the past two decades, especially the combination of direct sound and sight, there are still important gaps and distortions. No communication system is sufficiently hi-fi to reflect the more subtile human relationships and activities or to treat all situations with equal impartiality. The communication system can obliterate space for a certain limited range of habitual sounds, images, facts, decisions. But it cannot obliterate space for the direct physical factors and for certain intangible psychic values. Therefore where there is a required feedback between the physical and the sensory, and vice versa, this will be lost from any indirect intercommunication process.

While this may not be too important in the humdrum relations of life, it is important in the most significant human relations, particularly those relating to leadership, the processes of social agreement and decision, habit changes, invention, creative work situations, the deeper education, artistic creation and enjoyment, and the highest contributions of mind, spirit, friendship, and sacrifice. Even with the progress that still lies ahead, the electronic devices will never catch up with the full multidimensional physical and spiritual reality of human personality, because, after all, man will use and thus continuously rise above and beyond the machines, however beautiful and clever they may be.

As a result of these inherent limitations of mechanical and electronic communications, we must conclude that such devices cannot take the place of massive urbanization. For some essential purposes we will always need densely packed human concentrations.

II. THE FUNCTION OF URBAN TRANSPORTATION

This makes the third method of adjusting our life to urban crowding, namely, the transportation and circulation system, basic to civilization. The function of this system is to overcome space as a barrier without destroying space as a channel of free and changing contact.

By physical transportation we make it possible to reach across space and bring together persons, things and persons, and things. Everything that is used in this process is part of the comprehensive circulation and transportation system.

Under this definition, sidewalks, elevators, escalators, hoists, loaders, pipelines, tubes, wires, conveyor cables and belts, pushcarts, and even sewers, are just as much a part of the total transportation system as are streets, freeways, bridges, railroads, tunnels, canals, subways and elevateds, buses, private cars and trucks, airways and airfields, garages, terminals and port facilities, and all the equipment that uses these facilities and their rights-of-way. Too often, we seem to overlook the vast intermeshed complexity of the total mechanical and institutional structure man has evolved over the centuries to master space.

The great advantage of good physical transportation as a method of overcoming space is that you really bring persons and things together. You do squeeze out the intervening space while preserving the freedom to move and to establish new contacts. When physically brought together human beings can work together, communicate, bargain, argue, compromise, and agree, as though they were direct neighbors. But instead of having 10 neighbors, a man can have a thousand neighbors, or a hundred thousand, or a million, with all the added choices and teamwork possibilities afforded by this wider horizon. Goods can be seen and exchanged, raw materials can be processed, components assembled, and commodities handed over and consumed.

The great disadvantage of transportation is that physical movement of people and things takes time, consumes scarce resources and can destroy not only the space, which we are seeking to master, but also the freedom of further movement, which we must preserve. And this is where our problem of urban transportation begins.

Transportation—Internal and external

I am convinced that it is useful to recognize two major categories of transportation in each major urban concentration. These are, first, the external transportation which ties the city to the rest of the Nation and the world; and second, the internal system of circulation and movement.

Of course, the two are related where they meet, and neither can be fully effective without the other. But when it comes to thinking about the internal circulatory needs of an urban area, and doing something about them, I think it will be agreed that we need to divide the external and the internal to clarify the situation. When we do this, we can immediately relate the rail commuter problem not to the national railroads, but to the local circulatory system; and we can think more intelligently also about the local impacts of the interstate highways.

The function of the exurban transportation system is to tie the urban areas to each other and to their rural and resource hinterland. The function of the urban circulatory system is quite different. It is to capture the advantages of compounded human crowding, thus extending infinitely the probability of fruitful contacts and creative teamwork, while at the same time preserving the maximum freedom of choice in shifting these contacts.

This defintion places the emphasis on human beings rather than on the transportation of commodities. This, I think, is appropriate.

Urban concentrations are human, not material, except incidentally. It follows that our first problem today within the urban areas is therefore human contacts and human circulation. As we have seen, human, face-to-face contact is now the only real reason for the modern city. Unless we have to crowd people together for their own advantage, we don't need to bring them together at all. This fact has been obscured by past history when defense, trade, great distances, power, labor, and limited transport and communication were compelling.

Henry Fagin has recently called attention to the relation of transportation and the division of labor. In this he is, of course, quite right. But the important thing here is not the movement of the material components, but the human phenomenon of specialization and the related social structure of cooperating specialists and of interrelated external economies.

The movement of food and goods is important, yes essential, for the urban concentration and, furthermore, this physical

movement of commodities can seriously interfere with the required human circulation. Therefore we cannot omit goods movement within the urban area from our consideration of the total system, but we must always recognize that our prime consideration is the people.

I venture to emphasize this point because we can take any major self-contained manufacturing process out of the urban areas without too much difficulty along with the minute division of labor, as some social planners have already suggested. This can be done with little loss and much gain for the individual establishment and its routine employees. Each such enterprise, within its own walls and the surrounding dependent community, is an integrated, rationalized and closed economic and social system, with its designed internal and external transportation. It is not, and cannot be a fluid teamwork matrix.

This freedom of choice can only be provided in the open social and economic lack-of-fixed-structure of an urban area with its infinite pluralism.

It is the function of the system of circulation and transportation to make this kind of fluid human life fully viable, in the vast urban movement.

III. WHY ARE WE CONCERNED WITH URBAN TRANSPORTATION TODAY?

We are concerned with urban transportation today because the ecological equilibrium between human concentration and the internal urban circulation system established over the past century has now been thrown out of kilter.

This came about suddenly because of an extraordinary combination of circumstances after World War II. These include a phenomenal growth of our population, the formation of millions of new families, the lack of acceptable city housing, the artificial stimulation of suburban housing, a marked change in income distribution, universal ownership of automobiles, cultural suburbanization, the spread of hard roads, electricity and telephones, and then the scatteration of retail outlets and employment opportunities.

The combined effect of these developments on urban transportation has been catastrophic. The major impacts are these:

The people have scattered out into the country as to their living arrangements, though they want to continue to work for city corporations, shops, factories, and in city professions and trades. This creates a scattered urban population outside the city and reduces population and density in town, except for the economically handicapped.

Because of scattered homes, these people start to work in their private cars and prefer to finish their trip without changing. This increases road traffic but cuts mass transportation.

Many factories, needing more space, have moved out because space is available and cheaper outside, and because they can now get labor, coming in their own cars, and handle their goods by truck. This cuts employment in town.

Shops and shopping centers have also developed in the suburban region, depending on auto and truck transport. This cuts trips to town and business in town.

Professional and service trades follow the population which commands buying power, and travel to their work by private car.

Fine new highways have been built in the suburbs along with throughways, bridges, and other conveniences for automobile traffic, and garages and parking lots are being provided in town.

Automobiles have been improved and endowed with heightened status appeal.

Mass transportation within the urban center has lost business, lost income, reduced service, failed to modernize, and has generally lacked imagination and an understanding of what is happening.

All of this has taken place at the same time that we were going over onto a 5-day, 40-hour week—with no business for common carriers on Saturday and Sunday, and heightened peak loads each workday. Radio and TV improvements have also revolutionized entertainment in the home.

As a result, the urban circulation system, evolved for totally different conditions, cannot now perform its twin responsibilities. It can get people and things together, but it cannot do so without inordinate time delays, nor can it preserve the freedom of movement and contact we require.

In other words, the basic function of the urban concentration is now threatened by the breakdown of the internal circulation system. This is the first reason for our concern with urban transportation.

The second reason is that we all recognize, almost instinctively, that we are now blundering into solutions of urban transportation problems, without really knowing what we are doing, or what the results will be. We suspect that some of the things we are now doing relate only to superficial symptoms, and may even make matters worse in the end.

Our third reason for deep concern is because we know that nothing will set the pattern of the future for any town so irrevocably as the major outlines of the transportation system which is now adopted and installed. The sequence of land development in a metropolitan area under present conditions appears to exhibit six clear steps.

First, the extension and marked improvement of all-season, limited access passenger and goods highways.

Second, the development of land, thus made accessible, with suburban housing, both high and middle income, and the proliferation of shopping centers, factories, and warehouses.

Third, the extension of electricity, telephone, and other utilities in pace with, or just ahead of, development.

Fourth, the establishment of local services and service trades, along with spotty location of lower income housing, partly by conversion and partly by new construction.

Fifth, a frantic and not too successful effort to catch up with required governmental services, especially sewers, schools, water supplies, paving of secondary roads, and the development of parking. Policing, fire protection, education, health, welfare, and recreation are equally involved.

Sixth, as the secondary roads are built and the services extended, more land is rendered "ripe for development" and the cycle repeats itself.

This sequential spiraling cycle is not entirely new. It happened when streetcars were introduced, and again when rapid transit arrived. Our current cycle is based on the ubiquitous ownership of automobiles and trucks, and triggers initially a less dense but far broader pattern of settlement.

This initial situation now gives us highly desirable suburban opportunities. This may, however, be a transitional delight, destined to deteriorate sharply as the land fills in, the highways become congested and slow, the golf clubs vanish, the open spaces disappear, the governmental facilities continue to lag behind the needs of the developing population, taxes rise, the value of land climbs out of the reach of the middle-income class for single houses, and the nodal centers begin to build high-rise structures, including apartments, to increase the earning power of the land. When this happens, highways which were a joy for the first settlers, will be a headache for the third wave of settlers, and the costs of added throughways will be prohibitive. We shall then have suburban slums which do not have the power to save themselves, and an urban concentration which cannot be sustained because of the collapse of circulation. It is not a pleasant prospect.

There was a time when transportation was designed to meet the need for movement generated by land uses. This is not our situation today. As John T. Howard says in the October Traffic Quarterly, "Over the long run, the relation reverses 'tself. Future locations of land-uses largely result now from the circulation system and its impact."

This fact justifies America's great concern today with urban transportation and its problems.

Land uses and urban efficiency for the future rest directly upon, and will be limited by the circulation and transportation framework we now design and install. Under modern conditions those who lay out the urban circulation system determine the geographic pattern of our future civilization.

IV. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS AND THE DECISION PROCESS

In modernizing the urban circulation system we must obviously be controlled by the basic urban function, namely to increase the opportunity for human contacts and at the same time to preserve freedom of movement. This involves an economy both of time and cost. This cost factor is highly important.

Other urban regions, with their cities and suburbs, are eternally in competition not only with each other, but with other sections of the world as well. If a city has a wasteful transportation system, the inhabitants of the town will, in the end, have to accept a lower net income and fewer things that they desire, than if they enjoyed an economical transportation system. Transportation is surely an area in which the "iniquities of the fathers will be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations," as the Good Book says.

There is not much a city can do about the efficiency of its external transportation ties, since these are determined by the natural advantages of the city and by the national and international transportation system. The great differences between cities which have equally good locations will thus arise from their own internal transportation systems, their own docks and terminals, their flow of internal traffic, the efficiency of their pattern of arrangement, and the time costs involved in meeting the circulation requirements of the individual urban community.

The pattern of a city has a great influence on the economy of its internal transportation system. You can imagine a city of 2 million arranged on an oblong island as follows: first factories, then business and stores, then low rent housing, and finally high rent housing. Compare the transportation of such a city with one arranged; factories, low rent housing, business, and then high rent housing. Merely by interchanging two use districts, as in the second arrangement, you might cut the community transportation bill by 25 percent. Between the least economical arrangement of these four traffic generating factors and the most economical there is a mathematical difference in man-miles of commuter travel of 67.2 percent. While this is an imaginary model, and things are never so clear cut, variations of this problem exist in every city. Only recently Washington, D.C., found that it was laying out a new transit system assuming that many people would live in the Northwest of town and work in the Southeast, commuting at peak hours through the heart of the business center; and Baltimore found that a proposed industrial district would permanently involve unnecessarily high transportation costs.

When uneconomic costs of this sort are deliberately built into a community, they cannot fail to have a long and permanent effect on its economy.

Origin and destination studies

In recent years millions of dollars have been spent on origin and destination studies. Some lay committees have been led to believe that the transportation system of the future should be designed to fit a straight line projection of present origin and destination linkages. Even some engineers bow down and worship before the idol of origin and destination because it gives them a comfortable religion, a substitute for real planning and thought.

Every origin and destination study is a picture of the past. It is powerfully determined by the existing inadequate and irrational traffic linkages. It is usually a picture of what we want to get away from, not what we want.

When the origin and destination ratios are extended into the future all we are doing is saying "this is how bad things will be if we do nothing to guide our urban development."

I am all for sampling origin and destination studies, especially to develop trends and interrelations, but let us stand ready to start with the future and work back, not with the past and extend this into the future. In the process, we will be in a better position to guide traffic-generating land uses, to modify the circulation system, to create new transportation facilities, to establish individual economic incentives, and thus to mold the future demand lines to give us a more convenient and economical set of linkages in place of the fantastic costs that will be incurred if we proceed under the high priests of origin and destination. No one can see very far into the future when on his knees, burning incense and bowing down to origin and destination.

The great decisions

It is thus appropriate to inquire into how we are now making our major decisions as to the future transportation and circulation systems of our fast developing urban concentrations.

It is now clear that the great decisions, those which will mold the urban communities of the future for generations to come, are being made in four clearly distinct theaters:

The first is at the Federal and State level, largely in connection with the new limited access through highways. Also involved are airports (Federal), interstate commerce controls over rails, water, and trucking (Federal), harbor and navigational maintenance (Federal), and slum clearance, urban renewal, and public housing (Federal, State, and local).

The second theater of decision relates to the flow of individual trips made by people and goods from hour to hour, and day to day. These decisions are almost entirely individual and personal. Each trip decision is made by the individual user to suit his individual convenience and pocketbook. The grand decision in this theater is the accumulated sum total of all these private acts.

The third area of decision relates to the governmental allocation of scarce resources locally, including the determination of how much land within the urban region shall be devoted to exclusive rights-of-way, to terminals, and to vehicle storage.

The fourth area of decision comprises the decisions, public and private, which set the general character and volume of urban circulation needs and demands, by determining or guiding the traffic-generating land uses.

Let us examine each of these areas of decision to see what the controlling forces are, and where they will get us in building for the future.

The top level of decisions

The top level of decisions, those relating in the main to the exurban transportation system, are made by the Federal Government and by the States, chiefly now through the massive new interstate highway program. This was undertaken for national defense, the prevention of tragic and costly accidents, and the modernization of the obsolete intercity highway system.[1] The Federal interest in airways and airports, railways, and water commerce are similarly limited to the external commerce of the urban areas, though several congressional committees have recently become involved in urban commuter problems. However, Connery and Leach, after a comprehensive review of present Federal impacts on the urban areas observed that "As the Federal Government has become involved, it has proceeded on an ad hoc basis, its many parts moving independently most of the time without any attempt at coordination."[2]

Thus at the top level, the decisions are made individually, program by program, with only incidental attention to the interrelations of the Federal, State, and local activities. Furthermore, it is inevitable that these decisions are concerned with the exurban aspects, not with the internal circulation of people and goods.

The user decisions

The next level of decisions come from the user. These decisions are a continuous, highly visible and vigorous force. They operate all the time. People and goods must move.

What determines these decisions? The personal convenience and direct cost to the user of each individual trip or shipment. This phenomenon of arriving at an economic answer by taking the result produced by millions of free individual decisions is known as the market. It would be a wonderful way of finding what kind of a transportation system a city needs, provided (a) you have a free market, (b) a community could freely experiment with a system, discard it and try another, and (c) the charge for each individual service reflects the true costs.

But the fact is you cannot meet these conditions at any point. The market is not free, transportation tends to be a monopoly, each type in its own sphere. Once a major type of transportation is laid out, little can be done about it for 50 years or more. The user cannot shop around, he must select from among the modes of movement provided. He cannot experiment and test, he must take what there is, including the equipment furnished, however obsolete.

But the real problem comes on pricing. There is hardly a mode of urban transportation in connection with which the trip user knows what the trip really costs him, or the community of which he is a part. Some rates are higher than are economically required, while others are distinctly lower. In my town, the man who crosses the Triborough Bridge helps pay for the Coliseum, the Holland Tunnel user helps finance the Narrows Bridge and docks in Brooklyn, the man who takes the helicopter from one airport to another gets a Federal subsidy (probably out of his income taxes) of $3 for each $1 he pays, the New Haven Railroads commuter is subsidized out of freight rates and the pockets of the stockholders, the subway rider comes over a right-of-way furnished by the real estate taxpayer, to the tune of about $100 a million a year, and many a man drives his private car free, over a bridge paid for by local real estate taxes, and stores his car all day, tying up 25 percent of a street capacity, all for not more than the cost of his gasoline, a third of which is taxes collected by the State and the Nation.

It is thus an understatement to say that urban transportation is not in the free economy. It is in an area of "managed prices," some of which are loaded and some of which are heavily subsidized. It is difficult to find a single transportation service with reference to which the charges for service reflect the true cost. If you know of any, I should like to hear about it.

This chaotic situation is, however, not the result of any thought-out plan or policy. It has arisen almost by accident, deeply affected by shifting waves of historical development and public opinion.

Rail versus private car

The point at which the free market price breaks down most conspicuously is when the user compares the cost of riding on a railroad with the cost to him of driving his personal automobile.

The railroad owns its vehicles and its exclusive right of way, its terminals, and its storage yards. The auto owner owns his car but drives over public streets, uses the streets for loading and unloading, and, though he may have a carport at home, stores his car in town, where land is really valuable, on the street, if he can find any space and is not ruled off by the cops. As a result, the public land in most city streets has now been given over to private car storage and terminals to the extent of 25 to 50 percent of its capacity during business hours.

The railroad was once a vicious monopoly and still carries the burden of heavy real estate and other taxes. The motorist, in contrast, pays a nominal license and fuel taxes, which fall far short of direct governmental outlays for his benefit and control, though these taxes are gradually rising. He does pay tolls on a few new facilities and for a small part of his parking.

Economics of fixed charges

Another major difference as between the private auto and all other methods of public transportation arises from the economics of fixed charges.

Where the user owns the vehicle he must, of course, carry the burden of depreciation, insurance, and operating costs. There is no escape. Of these costs, only the operating costs rise or fall with the per trip use of the vehicle; most of the other costs run on whether the vehicle is used or not. This economic law applies to all owners, be they railroads, bus companies, taxis, or private auto owners. Therefore, when a railroad or bus company fixes its fares, it, being the owner of the vehicle, must apportion a part of the depreciation and the insurance to each trip. But the private automobile owner, when he figures his trip cost, is in a completely different position. As owner, his costs go on whether he uses his car or not. Therefore, the added cost to him of the contemplated trip excludes depreciation and insurance, and includes only the fuel and oil (and tolls or parking, perhaps) for the trip. While this computation may be slightly affected by marginal factors, these are more than made up for most men by the use of the car for recreation and family errands. Of course, most private owners keep no accounts, and know nothing about the economic analysis I have just sketched. All they know is that the only cost to them of driving to town is the gasoline because the car is just sitting there anyway. Thus the practical man and the theorist come out at the same place.

From the analysis, it follows that the decisions made by individuals as to modes of travel, trip by trip, though thoroughly rational and economical for them at the time, are made with a grossly distorted picture of true costs, particularly as to depreciation, insurance, rights-of-way, terminals, and storage. These happen to be the major part of the total true cost, and they happen to involve the private use of community resources, a matter of overriding public concern.

---

[1] "A Ten Year National Highway Program," report to the President, the President's Advisory Committee, Lucius D. Clay, Chairman. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington (January 1955).

[2] Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," Harvard University Press, 1960, p. 61.

User charges

Charges to the user for special transportation services are becoming more and more significant, especially in and around the eastern urban areas and in the Middle West. Such charges are generally applied only to new facilities, and are politically justified by the greatly improved service rendered by a new tunnel, bridge, throughway, or parking garage. Some of these facilities run a profit from the start, while others operate "in the red" for many years.

Without these charges many of the most spectacular motor transport improvements could not have been undertaken because of the lack of State and local financial resources, borrowing powers, and willingness to go ahead.

Lyle C. Fitch, New York's city administrator, has called attention to another economic effect of these user charges. When a price is attached to the individual trip, this will of itself exclude from the facility those who feel that the service is not worth the cost to them for the trip or service in question. This automatically persuades the user, of his own free will, not to use a bridge, a throughway, a tunnel, a public garage or parking space, unless there is an economic reason for doing so. If a service is not thus rationed on an economic basis, it will automatically be rationed by queueing and congestion, which thus gives the service to the person whose time is least valuable to him, and presumably to the economy.

It has also been pointed out that this resort to the market has a political benefit as well. When tolls are charged, those who use the facility are voting with their dimes and quarters, thus expressing their continuing need for the service. This is surely a more accurate way of determining the required levels of service than holding public hearings and asking for legislative votes.

The automatic economic rationing is also more acceptable to the public than any method of sorting out and restricting the frivolous users by administrative devices, as we did during the war. In peacetime, it is doubtful if the public will readily accept such administrative rationing. In contrast, no one resists the economic rationing, except when it is applied to a service long free or underpriced.

It must be noted, however, that pricing a service does not decide in advance what will be required. This advance decision must always be a political decision, however much it is based on prior engineering and fiscal analysis. But the psychology of measuring the need for the service, the effective benefit, over against the service charges which will be paid, has its own economic value.

In view of these compelling facts as to user decisions we must conclude that the transportation and circulation system of an urban area cannot be determined or designed by the market, the user, or the extension of O & D studies. The user will always pick and choose to suit his own preference and economic need, but the framework of choices given him must be set up by public action.

Governmental allocation of land

A crucial decision as to its transportation system in any urban area is this: How much of our total land must we dedicate to circulation?

This is a question of urban design and is like the same problem faced in the design of a factory, a theater, a school, or an office building.

We cannot go at the problem in precisely the same way, however, because an American cit, is not a controlled social and economic structure, and we don't want it to be. Under our definition of a city as a place for free and easy, unregimented contacts, we cannot have, and do not want, a structure rigorously controlled to the same degree as a building by a fixed architectural blueprint. When we plan and design a city, or additions to a city, we must not reach beyond the elements of the framework lest we intrude upon the free flow of contacts. But to preserve this very freedom, we have now found it necessary to apply to the use of land space the same kind of social limitation which we place on other human conduct in order to maximize the free opportunities of all by limiting the unsocial acts of the few. This is a difficult but necessary social decision, because private land use in an urban area affects not only the immediate neighbors, but also the whole area through its proportionate effect on the total circulation system.

One aspect of theater design is much like the design problem of the city. In a theater, the revenue comes from the seats. The more seats, the more revenue; and the more space we put into the aisles, the less floor space we have for seats. The same problem arises, with some variations, in the city. Our city community income also arises from the "seats," that is, the land put to economic use. If we put half of the land, or more, into the circulation and transportation system, what will this do to the economic life of the community?

If we put the entire land surface into parking lots and concrete, we know the answer. Where in between should each urban community reach its best balance? If a city finds its raison d'etre in facilitating human association, what happens when you gouge a Panama Canal for private automobiles through the middle of the town and then introduce yawning parking lots and sterile high-rise garages into the business district?

If the workers in modern office buildings all went to work in their private cars, we would require not less than 75 percent of the total downtown land area for throughways and streets, and for each office building the size of the Empire State Building we would need for its employees alone two garages of equal size to store their cars during the hours they are at work.

Some cities will want it that way. They will have a predominantly private auto circulation system, and they will have an economic community in which business itself and professional life are also atomized. This has many attractive features. But for other cities, particularly those with important executive, managerial, financial, interdependent professional, multiple-idea exchanging, and non-self-sufficient little economies, a different kind of urban concentration will be required. In such cities no large space separators can be permitted, and land must be conserved and arranged for the maximum face-to-face contacts.

The decisions as to the proportion of urban land to be assigned to transportation, and to what kind, is made by the local government, with an assist from State and Federal agencies when it comes to the through highways and some other modes of movement. The difficulty is that the local governmental decisions are not now made as part of a general plan, but only as each separate facility is designed and constructed by each local governmental unit, be it city, county, or town. As a result, nobody knows where any regional circulation system is headed, or where it will end up. Until recently, in my city, the only overall circulation plan has been that of a private planning group of good citizens drawn up 35 years ago, and this paid little attention to rail commuters. A half dozen separate official agencies have built this or that subway extension, bridge, tunnel, throughway, parkway, street, ferry system, or garage. Someone else regulates parking lots, and another department entirely installs parking meters and decrees one-way streets. And nobody, but nobody, has worried about the commuter railroads, until they began to fold.

Urban land is terrifically valuable for the community. It cannot be squandered away thoughtlessly, a little here and a little there.

From now on, no land should be allocated in any city to any part of the circulation and transportation services, public or private, without competent, impartial professional examination and comparison with a general idea of what the city is for, and a cross check with an official comprehensive circulation plan or program.

This is not something that can be done in pieces, nor by separate squabbling authorities, nor by private agencies, however competent. It is a job for a responsible and well-staffed instrument of State and local government. And it must be done on a comprehensive basis with the broad goals continuously in mind.

Land use planning and control

The fourth theater of decision as to the circulation and transportation system of an urban area is found in its street system and its local zoning controls. These are determined by the local municipal government when it lays out and improves streets, accepts the platting of private land, adopts and enforces its zoning controls, locates public open spaces and facilities, and approves mass transportation franchises or routes. These are city planning and legislative acts, though generally undertaken under executive and technical guidance.

Fortunately, we are beginning to recognize that each kind and intensity of urban land use tends to generate a known amount and kind of traffic. As a result, any city which is really determined to solve its traffic problem in the next generation can do so by zoning its land uses now and, at the same time, designing its major comprehensive transportation system so that the land-use pattern and the circulation system will be in reasonable balance. Such a system will have built into it a series of economic persuaders and controls to keep things in line, and it will be continually under planned modification to meet changing conditions. This solution cannot be achieved all at once, but it can be evolved, once a community firmly and irrevocably decides to work its way out of its present mess. This kind of decision must involve a firm commitment by the business, banking, labor, civic, educational, entertainment, and political leaders of a community. It is not something that a few well-intentioned people can bring about by stealth. It can only come as the result of a strong community commitment and sustained administration. But it will surely be worth the effort.

Obstacles to action

There are many obstacles to action along this line which we cannot take time to explore here. The fundamental problem is the fragmentation of the metropolitan area into scores, or hundreds, of local governmental authorities. As a result, there is frequently no concept of land-use allocation or zoning control in the fastest growing fringe of the urban area. In these areas there is no effort to plan for a balanced residential, industrial, and retail development, except to get while the getting is good, or inconsistently to preserve the old town. Nobody is thinking about a balance between land uses and the circulation system of the entire social and economic area of which the given town is an inseparable part. Each little fringe community and each central city is going its own way. The ultimate penalty for this kind of thoughtless and selfish development will be very high, both for the towns and for the entire urban region.

Other economic considerations

There is no thought of covering all of the economic considerations affecting transportation in this brief paper. Economies and diseconomies of scale are involved, though

our knowledge in this field is fragmentary, and most decisions are being made without the benefit of rational analysis. Perhaps these decisions can be looked at as experimental and thus subject to revision after trial. This approach is not fundamentally unscientific, though it is wasteful, especially where the experiment is irreversible for generations to come, as with the establishment of the circulation system.

The effect of the circulation and transportation system on land values throughout the metropolitan area is a further matter for analysis. Robert Murray Haig demonstrated over a generation ago that a perfect, frictionless, urban transportation system would equalize the site value of land throughout the area, by making land at the center no more desirable or income producing than any other land, even out to the farthest suburbs. This equalizing effect on land values from improving the circulation system is dramatically evident in the transfer today of city residential and shopping values into the country. The same centrifugal effect is seen with the service trades. But when it comes to the highest quality commodities and services, and to the higher levels of managerial, idea-exchanging, creative, and other required face-to-face contacts, may not the demand be for aggregation per se? If so, the best possible circulation system will favor concentration by facilitating confluence from a wider base. This would then create higher peak land values at such a center. In the city of New York one can see both of these forces, the one centrifugal, the other centripetal operating simultaneously. The identification of the functions which gain by flying out, and those which gain by pressing in, and their mutual interrelations in the metropolitan complex, is still inadequately understood.

Another basic economic and political problem of the urban area is posed by the development of insulated and favored suburban enclaves. Such quality suburbs do have higher incomes, more tax resources per child in school, for example, and may capture a good industry to help carry the load, while the neighboring suburb may have only the burdens, and the old, central cities have the renewal problem to keep them busy while some of their taxable values are sliding away. The economist recognizes in this situation the basic question of the redistribution of income, both within the public and within the private sectors, and as between the two. The resulting disparities and imbalance are both economic and political, and will lead to fundamental changes in our tax systems and the reallocation of now local governmental powers and services. The administrator and planner cannot overlook this redistribution problem even though the major adjustments will be made at the higher levels of our national social philosophy and politics. After all, the local governments are still the major retail outlets under our system for distributing social income.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, I want to urge on you as engineers, six lines of thought:

1. Wherever you have a chance to influence the situation, insist that a big city shall approach any one of its major traffic, transportation, or parking and terminal problems as an integral part of its total circulation philosophy and system. We must have the comprehensive approach, even if this requires more studies, more cooperation, and more delay. Those who rush into breaking this or that individual traffic bottleneck from now on, will only break their own, or that of the city for whom they work.

2. No big city can now plan, or design, or finance its internal circulation system without incorporating into these processes the broader metropolitan area of which it is now a part. Our city lines were established when the pattern of the streetcar and horse-drawn vehicles dominated the scene. The geographic area to be covered today in dealing with internal circulation must be greatly extended. This is a technological as well as a political requirement. For these broader studies, and operations, and financing, we shall need new broader jurisdictions, with built-in cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities. This has been decided for us by the way the American people want to live and work, now that they have small, flexible individual units of fast locomotion.

3. We must expect quite different answers to the traffic and transportation problem in each of the major cities and their surrounding areas. These will depend on the shape, functions and past history, and the future mission, of each urban area. Make no mistake, cities can't do much to change their basic place in the world or the Nation, but they can lose out by falling down on the transportation job, and letting somebody else fall heir to their natural birthright. Internal circulation is a major factor in this picture. For most cities, transportation may be the critical determinant of that city's future arrangement, efficiency, and livability. It therefore becomes essential to develop our comprehensive transportation planning on the basis of solid economic and social understandings and community decisions to proceed. Nothing but disaster will come from putting the monomaniacs in control, be they rail, rubber, monorail, helicopter, conveyor belt, or other enthusiasts. What we now need is the designed circulation function, relating land and rights-of-way and modes of movement and communication, fused in an evolving economic and social structure which recognizes human needs as paramount.

4. The circulation system, the process of getting about, uses a great deal of time and consumes a great amount of manpower and material. These can become a serious drag on the income of any community and can injure its competitive economic situation in the world, or the arrangement can become a real community asset. We must therefore seek to make circulation easy and inexpensive, to mold the growth of the community to avoid unnecessary cross hauls and long linkages, and to create a transportation system and a pattern of land use which are complementary and in balance, inducing for each movement a mode which is appropriate and economical.

5. The selection of the best mode of individual urban movement must be left to the individual user. As a practical matter, however, the user can select only from among the available modes, and makes his decision to suit his own convenience and pocketbook. Without advance community decision as to the general circulation system, the free decisions of individuals end up in inordinately expensive chaos, as we now know. It is therefore imperative that the community shall decide and provide the general outlines of a rational, comprehensive circulation and transportation system. When this has been done and land uses and density are controlled accordingly, the community can rely on the free choices of individuals, and can depend on economic persuaders rather than police controls, to achieve an efficient, economic, and smooth flowing total system. People will do the right and sensible thing when given a chance.

6. Finally, I plead with you to insist that any new or modified circulation and transportation system you can help to design and install will function effectively for the future only as the load on that system is held within reasonable balance by land use control. As engineers you know better than anyone else that this is true. You have the duty, therefore, to make this point over and over, every time you have anything to do with urban transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, next I would like to call attention to an address by Mr. Donald C. Wagner, managing director of the city of Philadelphia, to the annual conference of the American Municipal Association, held in New York City in November last year.

Mr. Wagner also emphasizes the need for the development of a general comprehensive plan, preferably for the entire metropolitan area, after which there must follow a comprehensive transportation plan in much more detail and depth. It is for this latter type of planning, particularly mass transportation planning, that S. 345 is designed to assist with matching funds to State and local governments. Mr. Wagner raises an important point when he states that—

If the city makes the region's plan unilaterally, it is likely to be unrealistic and almost sure to meet with opposition from other parts of the region.

It was my thought, in introducing S. 345, that comprehensive, areawide mass transportation planning is so badly needed that we cannot wait for the formation in every case of bodies with areawide representation to undertake such planning. But the bill does require the administration to give planning grants to those bodies best qualified to plan for the area as a whole and to make a continuing contribution to the fulfillment of the plans. Also he is directed to encourage the participation and cooperation of other interested municipalities in the formulation of the plans so as to insure maximum communitywide support for them.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Wagner's talk on "Solving Traffic Congestion in Large Cities" be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLVING TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN LARGE CITIES

I must in all frankness admit my own inadequacy in handling this subject. We have not yet solved our traffic congestion in Philadelphia despite all of the effort we have put into it. I am sure that many of you have done and are doing tremendously important and interesting things in coping with this problem in your cities.

In this group of cities of over a quarter million in population we have one thing in common. Each of our cities is the core city of a larger and very important metropolitan area. Many of our cities lost population from 1950 to 1960, yet the population of the total metropolitan area has increased tremendously. The cities that have not lost population are those which encompass or have annexed vast areas and large portions of the metropolitan area are within their boundaries. The growth of these metropolitan areas is expected to continue significantly certainly for another decade or two and therefore the importance of circulation in, through, and around the core city must be recognized. With the inevitable growth in population will come a corresponding growth in the use of that product for which Detroit is famous, and many of the increased numbers of automobile trips will be in and through our cities. It is our belief that the centers of our cities can and must be maintained in their vitality and attractiveness so

that the entire area recognizes it as the throbbing heart giving life and purpose to the region.

I assume that each of us has done what now seems elementary: (1) developed to the maximum one-way street patterns of movement; (2) restricted or prohibited onstreet parking or stopping during peak hours; (3) developed truck routes bypassing congestion; (4) required loading and unloading to be done off peak or off street; (5) reversed flows for morning and evening peak; (6) performing our own public works and utility reconstruction at night; (7) provided modern traffic signal control so synchronized as to keep traffic flowing; (8) generous use of channelizing and street lane marking to avoid physical conflict; and many others.

Not so elementary, but gaining in use and importance are such things as lanes reserved for buses during peak hours, underground streets for loading and unloading operations and servicing buildings, streets reserved for mass transit, and pedestrian malls bypassed by all vehicular traffic.

I will attempt to survey what seems to me to be some of the basic steps that any city of a quarter million or more people must take in order to meet the needs of transportation of people and goods and at the same time avoid traffic strangulation. Perhaps I can bring you some of the understanding that I have been able to get from State highway departments as one of your representatives on the joint AMA–AASHO Committee on Highways, from participation in the Sagamore conference and from what has been reported to me on the Connecticut general conference and the more recent Woods Hole seminars on transportation.

First, every one of us should have a comprehensive development plan for our city and, preferably, for our metropolitan area. Since Philadelphia's plan has just been published this year, I feel this statement can be made in good grace. It took us 8 years to complete this plan, and it is being changed already; but, nonetheless, we do have a plan for all of the city which includes land use, transportation, economic development, recreation, parks, and facilities for all types of institutions, both public and private. Unfortunately, this plan is limited by the city's boundaries, although forecasts of regional economic and population growth were taken into account.

It seems clear to us that the region itself somehow must set its basic goals on a broad range of public and private facilities and objectives; otherwise, transportation cannot be brought in balance with the needs of the citizenry. Those of you who have been concerned with this task know how difficult it is to make a valid long-range plan. It is even more difficult when the city attempts to do this jointly with the other government units that make up the region. And if the city makes the region's plan unilaterally, it is likely to be unrealistic and almost sure to meet with opposition from other parts of the region.

Our own comprehensive plan was preceded by a transportation study in which forecasts of economic growth and population distribution became the basis for a recommended program of improvements to the transportation system so as best to serve a strong central city and a spreading region. These recommendations were published in the spring of 1956 by the city's urban traffic and transportation board as "Plan and Program, 1955." This publication was adopted as the city's "bible" of transportation policy, allowing separate projects to be shaped toward our long-range goals and the major findings were embodied in the comprehensive plan.

After the comprehensive plan, of course, should come the transportation plan in very much more detail and depth. In Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Washington such major transportation plans either have been completed very recently or, in the case of Pittsburgh, are well on the way. We have a year and a half to go to the completion of our own major transportation plan which is being done by the Penn-Jersey transportation study for the Philadelphia-Camden-Trenton region. This study is perhaps unique in its field for two reasons: (a) it includes Philadelphia and eight counties in two States, and (b) the governing board consists principally of governmental generalists, rather than just highway people, although most of the money comes from highway user taxes, State and Federal. The 500 or more people now employed on this study will turn out a regional plan for transportation which we believe even our suburban counties of the opposite political party will agree has the right objectives for the region.

Many, if not all, of the objectives for solving traffic congestion can be accomplished on a do-it-yourself basis. The National Committee on Urban Transportation, recently dissolved, put forth a series of manuals showing how this can be done at home, using local talent as an ongoing part of government. AMA, through staff assistance, is encouraging cities to make such studies themselves. You, your city manager, or your city traffic engineer certainly should be familiar with these manuals and should be accumulating the data which they indicate will be helpful, not only for a major transportation plan, but for the ordinary operation of your city's transportation system.

If you are in a very large city such as Philadelphia, you're going to find a whole gamut of short-range plans to be necessary. Perhaps the array which Philadelphia has instigated will give you some indication of the complexity of this problem: (a) About the same time that the urban traffic and transportation board was giving a comprehensive look at the transportation policies facing the city and outlining how they could be brought into balance, the transit situation was being studied in more depth by the department of public property and its consulting engineers, and they came out with a plan for the surface transit system which was very helpful as we negotiated with the transit operators on the abandonment of surface rail routes and their conversion to bus routes; (b) the city's department of streets, through their consultants, did a comprehensive study on the utilization of the surface street system in our central business district. This led to the development of a completely interconnected electronic signal system with measuring devices to vary the signal timing automatically for a very large area at a cost of over a million dollars. Even this has not proved able to carry the burden which the automobile has put on our very narrow streets, many of them only 50 feet wide with 26-foot cartways, but it is typical of the study in depth which we think is necessary in order to reach reasonable decisions in the transportation field; (c) in parking we have utilized short-range plans, particularly in the center city where we have had a comprehensive analysis of the parking needs of our central business district related to the numbers of people which we expect to bring in by automobiles. Frankly, we never solve transportation congestion; we merely ameliorate it or move the congestion from one spot to another because, as I indicated at the outset, the great growth in population and automobiles is so far ahead of anything that can be done within the physical framework of an existing city that a full solution is impossible.

Often not even the short-range plans can be completed before a municipality must do something. It is needless for me to tell you this for, as administrators, you all know that decisions have to be reached before all the facts are available. You draw the best conclusions you can and move ahead. We have the same kind of difficulties in Philadelphia, but we try to do a fair job of studying projects before they are instituted. We have literally dozens of substantial transportation projects in various stages—plans and reports on the shelf, others which have been put into operation wholly or in part, and others which are underway. And the city traffic engineer makes literally hundreds of studies every year to find solutions to major or minor irritants. The location of a traffic signal (or nonlocation) takes a great deal of staff time, as you well know.

Our commuter railroad improvement program has been a major effort which has attracted considerable attention throughout the region and perhaps in the Nation. Beginning just 2 years ago, in October 1958, the city began supporting improved service at reduced fares on 2 of the 15 or so railroad commuter lines serving the region. Great increases in ridership resulted. In September 1959 it was possible to add a third line with increased service and reduced fares. Service improvement included not only more frequent trains, filling in gaps in the schedules, but also the provision of transit rides at roughly half the going rate of 22 cents cash or 20 cents by token. This permits a person to ride a bus in the outskirts of the city to a railroad station and come by train to the center of the city for as low a fare as 40 cents. And just a month ago, three additional lines, making a total of six, were put into this program. One of these goes up into the far northeast where it has been necessary to add two zones above the standard 30-cent fare. We are anxiously watching to see if these lines show a significant increase in ridership, which has been as high as 400 percent over previous years on the most lightly patronized line. I could talk the whole time on what this program is, how it is operated, and how successful it has been. But if you have interest in it, perhaps we could give you more specifics in terms of your interest at the question session. Our purpose is to keep in use not only the commuter rail facilities we have but to improve them and extend their use, and at the same time keep our rapid transit lines running as near to capacity as we can.

We believe in the tremendous value of expressways and we urge their construction just as speedily as possible, but we do have high-quality commuter railroad and rapid transit systems which are here now and operating. The investment of Federal and State funds in our modest expressway program—and it is modest compared to other cities in this Nation—will not provide enough funds to build a complete system for four decades, and it seems impossible to speed the rate of investment very much. We, therefore, believe it unwise to risk losing an existing railroad and rapid transit system which is doing so much by carrying the peak-hour loads to the central business district. This will permit our limited highway funds to be applied to facilities which have a much greater offpeak to peak ratio and, therefore, return far greater benefits to the region.

We have a whole gamut of parking projects, including a few major central-city garages. Here we are attempting to attract private capital to build the structures while the city is providing the land on a lease basis, and we have two dozen smaller lots in suburban business districts to provide more adequate parking space in these important areas. We have not yet found it possible to provide residential parking because we do not find people willing to pay the cost. Yet Philadelphia, built to very high density with no off-street parking space in many areas, desperately needs such parking in residential areas, particularly along arterial streets. We have longingly looked at the Milwaukee parking tax and have for some

time concluded that the tax is the only possible way we have of raising sufficient funds to get cars off the street in areas where there are no garages.

We have related our transportation plans to our redevelopment plans in every redevelopment area. Even though we build to fairly high density in redevelopment projects, fortunately we find that car ownership is a little below normal and we do not greatly overload the parking spaces provided. It has not been possible, within the Federal framework or rules, to provide as much parking as we would like to in these major redevelopment projects. Finally, the city does have an arterial street system which is perhaps even more important than the expressway system. We have not yet carried through the comprehensive studies which we think are necessary to determine just how our limited funds shall be spent on this system. Nonetheless, the city traffic engineers, the street commissioner and the whole administration have drawn value judgments on which projects are the most important and many arterial streets are being improved in our 6-year capital program. Unfortunately, we get practically no assistance from the State highway department in this area compared to the amounts paid by Philadelphians to support the highway department. This, too, is an old story to this group. Nonetheless, all of us must work, at both the State and Federal levels, to make certain that adequate sums of money are available to do the things that the central cities cannot do alone. This must include equitable sharing of highway funds, and finally, support for mass transit facilities where they are more economical for the public than highways alone, certainly from the Federal Government and possibly from the State government.

In conclusion, we believe a balanced transportation system can contribute greatly to solving traffic congestion not only in Philadelphia, but in any large city. Balanced, in our view, means a conscious decision by the government to make available to the public the best kinds of transportation at the lowest cost. We believe that highways cannot do the job alone and that we will not have enough money to support them in heavily built-up urban areas unless we take advantage of the economies of mass transportation. In some cities in our group, buses, properly handled, may be able to move the masses of people without congesting traffic; in others rail rapid transit and railroad commuter lines on their own right-of-way or in subways are the best means of hauling large numbers of people at peak hours. Each city should make its choice after thorough study. This is not a problem which will solve itself. It must be faced with a boldly planned program and money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a third speech of particular interest to those studying the unique phenomenon known as the New York metropolitan region, was given by Mr. Ernest Erber, a member of the New York Regional Plan Association and Passaic Valley Citizens Planning Association, to the Business Forum at Fairleigh Dickenson University, on November 15, 1960.

This statement well illustrates the extent to which urban transportation has become an almost insoluble problem in the New York-New Jersey area. It is worth considering the fact that only a mere 9 percent of the commuters in the nine counties of North Jersey actually commute into New York. The other 91 percent are busy struggling to and from work within the north Jersey area itself.

This fact demonstrates the magnitude of the problem facing us, and, I should think, provides the rest of the urban areas across the country with adequate warning of what is to come unless prompt and bold attention is given to land use and transportation developments, particularly to the potentials of modern mass transportation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Erber's statement on "Transportation in Metropolitan Northern New Jersey" be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY

(By Ernest Erber)

It is most appropriate that students of business administration engaged in a study of industry be concerned with transportation, for it has always been the lifeblood of commerce—whether in the age of the camel caravan or the age of the jetplane.

My talk cannot possibly encompass transportation everywhere and in all its phases. I wish to cover that aspect of which I have knowledge from professional experience. This is passenger transportation by both public and private conveyance in the metropolitan counties of northern New Jersey, namely Bergen, Passaic, Hudson, Essex, Morris, Union, Middlesex, Somerset, and Monmouth. These counties form a continuous complex of urban and suburban development that is more populous than any city in the Nation except New York and more populous than any metropolitan region outside of the New York region, except for the Chicago or Los Angeles regions.

It is therefore apparent that even after my self-imposed limitation to transportation of persons in north Jersey, the subject matter remains rather imposing; far too vast and complex for exhaustive treatment within the confines of a single lecture, even if I were equipped with the knowledge to cover it comprehensively. I will not attempt, therefore, to make this presentation a definitive paper on the subject.

The problem of traveling in our New York-New Jersey region has been very much in evidence on the front pages of the metropolitan press in these past few years. We have read about commuter trains that have stopped running; about State subsidies to railroads; about huge expressway construction programs; about schemes for new technological innovations such as monorail; about the Port of New York Authority's alleged failure to carry out its responsibility; about pending Federal legislation; about a State transportation study just getting underway which will spend over $3 million to seek a solution.

Incidentally, the $3 million are held to be insufficient to do a thorough job by some people who know this field. If this staggers your sense of proportion, it will be stabilized again when I tell you that $3 million will build less than one-half mile of the proposed Essex Freeway. When we are engaged in programs that spend $7 million per mile of highway and when we hear of rapid transit proposals that exceed $1 billion, the $3 million study just getting underway sounds like small change.

You can realize from this that we are talking about something that is big—I would guess that it sounds big even to students of business administration. You will understand, therefore, why I shun the role of the encyclopedic authority on every phase of this problem and speak here tonight in the humble role of the practitioner in city planning who seeks to convey to you a distillation of his observations and experiences gained in a dozen years of professional work in north Jersey.

I have another reason for not undertaking an encyclopedic review of this subject. Such an effort at complete coverage of the subject within a single lecture would, of necessity, be confined to a reading of topical headings and subheadings in a comprehensive outline. Such a syllabus is proper for a complete course of study of this subject. However, as a visiting lecturer bringing some specialized knowledge to bear, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to deal with the subject in such a manner as to make a contribution to a better understanding of some phase of it not just for my listeners, but also for those in positions of responsibility who must make the decisions that shape public policy in the field of transportation. If my effort here tonight results in placing some phases of the transportation problem into sharper focus, I shall consider myself fully compensated for the effort made.

To put into sharper focus any phase of this complex problem is to make a distinct contribution to its solution. For I contend that the failure to make more progress in improving transportation in north Jersey stems, largely, from misconceptions of the nature of the problem especially the fallacy of oversimplification. I wish to illustrate this contention with several examples.

There is a widely held view—and, unfortunately, one held in positions of influence, that the crux of north Jersey's transportation problem is to transport the New Jersey resident to his Manhattan job swiftly, comfortably and economically. I do not deny for one moment that this is a commendable objective, nor that its solution should have a claim upon our intellectual and financial resources. However, I deny that this is the crux of the problem, and I contend that its solution will represent only a relatively minor contribution to the overall problem of the balanced development of metropolitan northern New Jersey.

I contend that this is not the crux of the problem because the typical New Jersey breadwinner earns his living on this side of the Hudson River. In the nine metropolitan counties of North Jersey, 91 percent of those gainfully employed work in New Jersey. Only 9 percent cross the river daily to work in Manhattan. I do not belittle the importance of providing transportation for this 9 percent without a strain upon their time, pocketbooks or nerves. But if the transportation problem of the 91 percent remains unimproved, North Jersey will still represent a disorderly transportation jungle. (If any of you have to fight your way down Route 17 in the morning or evening rush hours, you will know what I mean when I say that its jungle nature is apparent from the fact that the law of the fang and the claw holds sway.)

I attach importance to clarifying this misconception about the New York-bound Jerseyite as the crux of the problem, mainly because it is a misconception and, as with all misconceptions, it obscures an appreciation and understanding of the true nature of the problem. By the same token it postpones a coming to grips with the real problem. I have introduced this reference to the 9 percent and the 91 percent as an example of a misconception that I hope to correct. I will have more to say on this aspect of the problem later on in my remarks when I shall try to spell out what I deem to be the real problem.

However, while dealing with misconceptions that need dispelling, I wish to turn to another one that has come to be widely held and has contributed greatly to disorienting those seeking answers to our transportation problem. This is the oversimplified view that everything was fine until people deserted public transportation for private cars. This

is alleged to have caused the financial ruin of public transportation companies and the congestion on our highways which necessitates vast public expenditures for road building. It is easy to understand why so many people—including many who speak out publicly on this subject and thereby mold public opinion—should hold this oversimplified, and basically fallacious, view of how we got into our transportation crisis. This view is almost inevitable for anyone who has sat behind the wheel of his car inching his way down to the Lincoln Tunnel in bumper-to-bumper traffic. On occasions like that, one cannot escape the conclusion that about everyone in New Jersey who owns a car (and that is just about everybody) is trying to drive it to Manhattan. From experiences like this are born the sage advice that the transportation problem would be solved if we could only get people to leave their cars at home and use public transportation. (I wish to comment, parenthetically, that I suspect that most such sage advisers really mean to say that if everyone else used public transit, they would have no delays in taking their car through the tunnel.)

However, the statistics show that the use of the private automobile for the trip to New York could not be the sole, nor even the main, cause of financial difficulties for public transportation, and more specifically, railroads. The metropolitan rapid transit commission study of December 1957 showed that some 383,000 persons crossed the Hudson River from New Jersey to New York on a typical working day in 1955. Of these, 263,000 were destined for Manhattan. Of these, 135,000 traveled to Manhattan between 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. and can be presumed to have consisted mainly of commuters bound for a Manhattan job. Of these only 16,000, or about 12 percent, traveled by car. Of these, only 6,000 went by car during the peak hour of morning travel, namely between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m., when the bulk of the white-collar workers are en route to work. If these 6,000 were lured away from their cars and added to the 76,000 fellow Jerseyites who were using trains and buses during this peak hour, it would hardly constitute a financial windfall for the common carriers, though it would have the wholesome effect of unclogging bridges and tunnels for use by buses and trucks.

Why do I attach so much importance to dispelling these misconceptions of what constitutes north Jersey's transportation problem? I do it because while public attention is riveted on the Manhattan-bound Jerseyite, and more particularly in trying to get 6,000 of them to leave their car at home, there are 32,810 residents of Union County trying to fight their way through morning traffic to jobs in Essex County, and 22,066 residents of Essex County trying to fight their way to jobs in Hudson County, and 23,117 residents of Hudson County trying to fight their way into Bergen County, and 27,669 Bergen residents trying to squeeze across an insufficient number of inadequate bridges over the Passaic River to jobs in Passaic County. They are among those who compose the 91 percent of the gainfully employed Jerseyites who work in New Jersey. It is my contention that a study of this problem will bring us closer to the crux of the crisis of transportation in north Jersey.

I say this without the slightest emotional attachment to the interests of New Jersey vis-a-vis the rest of the metropolitan region. I say it coldbloodedly and objectively from my concept of the New York region as a whole, which concept I base in large part upon the economic and population data presented in the monumental Harvard studies sponsored by the Regional Plan Association and published in nine volumes, the last of which was released on Monday. I believe that implicit in this data, and explicit in large measure in the analysis by Dr. Raymond Vernon and his associates, is a concept of the emergent metropolitan region considerably at variance with that which still persists as the public's image and, alas, the false basis for many public policy decisions.

However, before I leave the matter of the erroneous concentration of attention on the 9-percent-Manhattan-bound commuters, I wish to comment on one phase of the trans-Hudson problem. In a public address at a recent conference, the dean of one of our schools of architecture decried the double-decking of the George Washington Bridge as an example of the folly of building additional facilities to make New York accessible by automobile. He advanced the oft-repeated advice that the money spent on automotive tunnels and bridges would be used more wisely if used to construct rapid transit. I am an ardent advocate of rapid transit—into Manhattan, into Newark, into Paterson, into Elizabeth; wherever it is economically feasible to build it. But I am also aware of its limitations. Unless our entire pattern of living undergoes a change, rapid transit, at best, can answer only our workaday travel needs. I rather doubt that Americans will ever leave the car at home and take public transportation on pleasure jaunts, especially on the weekend when they head for the wide-open spaces with the family or just on a Sunday trip to visit Aunt Tilly, whether she lives in Canarsie or Morristown. It is, therefore, symptomatic and not accidental that the day on which the greatest number of autos crossed the George Washington Bridge was on Mother's Day. A swift and comfortable ride on a modern transit facility from Far Hills or Scarsdale to a Manhattan job is a desirable objective. However, it must also be weighed against the need for adequate facilities to permit that percent of New Yorkers who own cars and whose tax moneys help to pay for highway construction, to leave their city through uncongested exits and enjoy the beaches, State parks and, generally, the countryside. I have interjected this reply to the dean of architecture at this point for two reasons. One is to give evidence that my concern is for the region as a whole and that I have as much concern for the transportation needs of the Brooklynite who wishes to take his family to Palisades Interstate Park as I have for the resident of Kearny who works at the Ford motor plant in Mahwah. My second reason is to combat another misconception that obscures an understanding of our transportation. It cannot be rapid transit or highways. We need both and they should be planned to supplement each other.

Now that I have wielded my lance in combat with what I consider to be several of the hoary and pernicious misconceptions that obscure an understanding of the transportation problem in metropolitan north Jersey—and if any believe that these misconceptions are mere windmills and not real dragons, they must still convince me—I shall turn my thoughts to comments on the nature of the problem as I see it. If some of you are thinking that this is where I should have begun the lecture, you will have to attribute my choice of sequence to an inbred querulousness and contentionousness in the face of what I interpret as error, especially error that is widespread and espoused in high places. That is why I am an inveterate and, I fear, incorrigible member of that tribe of Americans known as letter-to-the-editor writers. However, I hope that you have noted that while I was speaking critically of what I consider to be misconceptions, I was, by the same token, simultaneously advancing some of my own positive conceptions of the problem, especially with reference to the 91 percent of the gainfully employed Jerseyites who work in Jersey, and with reference to the intercounty commuting that takes place in New Jersey, and with the need to find a more substantial explanation for the financial difficulties of the common carrier, and with the need to plan public and private transportation facilities as complementary, and not to the exclusion of the one or the other. I will now expand upon these concepts within the context of my description of the metropolitan region and its Jersey sector as I see them emerging from the 15-year period of transition since World War II.

The biggest news in the population field in recent months has been the relative decrease in the central cities—and an absolute loss of population in many—and the spectacular increase of population in most of the standard metropolitan areas. Preliminary figures released by the Census Bureau indicate that approximately 61.3 percent of the Nation's population, or some 108.9 million persons, is contained in the 189 standard metropolitan statistical areas defined by the Bureau prior to the census. Some 80 percent of the total population increase of 26.4 million occurred in the standard metropolitan statistical areas, with the suburban sectors receiving about two-thirds of the total increase.

As a result of these spectacular population changes America is at last discovering the metropolitan region. When we turn our attention to our New York region and begin examining its internal geography, we quickly realize that—as in most everything else—New York is different. If not different in any other respect, than certainly in size. The New York region is not simply one of many. It is in a class by itself. It is a superregion.

One need but roll off the vital statistics to see how far it is set apart from those regions closest to it in size: nearly 7,000 square miles, some 16 million people, 7 million jobs, 22 counties, etc. From Morristown to Hempstead, and from Suffern to Danbury to Red Bank, it is one continuous urban and suburban complex. As is true in so many areas of investigation of various phenomena—both natural and social—in which quantitative differences often translate themselves into qualitative differences, so in the case of New York as a superregion we find that it is also different qualitatively. One of these qualitative differences is the fact that large portions of the New York region have a degree of socioeconomic self-sufficiency beyond that found in any other region. This could not be different in view of (1) the vast area of the New York region; (2) the divisions within it created by waterways; and (3) the existence of old, central cities of the size of Newark, Jersey City, Elizabeth, Paterson, Bridgeport, Yonkers, etc.

Of the various portions of the New York region, that having the greatest degee of self-sufficiency is the New Jersey portion. This is a vast urban complex in its own right. Existing by itself, North Jersey would be a major American metropolis, the fourth largest region in the Nation. Its nine counties contain 2,268 square miles (one-third of the region), 4½ million people (one-fourth of the region), and 1¾ million jobs (one-fourth of the jobs in the region).

In referring to population growth above, I stated that two-thirds of the population growth of the metropolitan area has taken place in the suburbs. I used "suburbs" with the loose construction with which we use the term in referring to areas outside of the central city. For purposes other than such a ready reference to these areas, the term "suburb" is very misleading and its use creates a mental image of the region which is in conflict with the facts as revealed in the Harvard study. All of the 4½ million persons living in the Jersey sector of the New York region can hardly be said to be living in the suburbs, if this word is used with any exactitude of meaning.

The dictionary tells us that a suburb is "a place adjacent to a city" or "outlying residential districts." The latter could hardly apply to Hoboken—nor to the place of residence of millions of Jerseyites which, if not as urban as Manhattan, are certainly no less urban than Brooklyn, the Bronx, or Queens. It is, therefore, apparent that we must dig below the superficial concept of central city and its suburbs if we are to understand the nature of the New York region and, especially, its Jersey sector.

The physical characteristics of any region—or of a community, for that matter—take shape in response to two factors: (1) the economic and population drives which spur a relentless research for the most advantageous location for industrial, commercial, residential, and other land uses under the impact of changing technology, and (2) the impact of these drives upon, and accommodation to, the existing structures, installations and facilities, both public and private, as these exist at a given moment as a product of all previous historical development. In this sense the north Jersey of today and tomorrow is being shaped between the hammer of economic and population change and the anvil of north Jersey's existing physical plant as the heritage from its past. This is why I can stand on a street corner within 5 minutes' walk from my home in Radburn (itself a suburban community of the 1920's), and see as adjacent land uses a shopping center, complete with a branch bank and a city-type delicatessen; an industrial park, giving employment to over 5,000; an apartment house project containing hundreds of families; and a truck farm with a goat nibbling grass on the front lawn. This is an extreme example, but it is by no means unique. This is symbolic of Jersey as it looks today—the successive overlayering and interlarding of more intensive urban development upon previous less intensive suburban and rural forms. However, the new urban forms are not a facsimile of the central city. When National Biscuit moves its plant from 14th Street in Manhattan to Fair Lawn, the plant undergoes a physical transformation to suit modern architectural design and modern technology, to adapt to less expensive and more ample land, including extensive landscaping, and to provide the large parking areas required by a large auto-borne working force. When Bambergers or Gimbels appears in Parasmus it is likewise in mid-twentieth century garb and spatially situated to accommodate the auto-borne shopper. When a 10-story elevator apartment building goes up in Clifton it is located at the junction of a State highway and the Garden State Parkway (though, incidentally, a few truck farms can still be seen from its upper floors). This successive overlayering results in a change—with a typical old central cities like Passaic or Hoboken at one extreme and typical new Los Angeles-type of auto-age communities like Clifton, Wayne, or Paramus at the other extreme.

A landscape dominated by a National Biscuit plant, by Gimbels, and by a 10-story apartment building—this is not suburbia. This is urbia—but urbia of a new type. This is the low density, land-devouring urban growth of the automobile age. This is Los Angeles superimposed upon the central city-suburban-rural pattern that was north Jersey 25 years ago. Then we had Newark and Paterson and Elizabeth and New Brunswick as typical central cities with an industrial base. Then we had Montclair, Glen Ridge, Ridgewood, and Englewood as typical on-rail, upper income suburbs. Then we had Paramus and Wayne, and the Caldwells as rural areas. Today these previous community forms live on, with varying degrees of survival. In the old cities it is blight, slums and urban renewal. In the old suburbs estates are being subdivided and big old houses are being converted. In the old rural areas the plow is yielding to the bulldozer.

What shall we call this—the new New Jersey that is taking shape? A suburb of New York? Hardly. A collection of separate cities? Hardly, when they are really so interdependent economically. (A man may live in Clifton, work in Jersey City and shop in Newark or Paramus.) There is no easy categorizing of north Jersey. It is sui generis, a thing unto itself—at least for the time being and until a clearer socioeconomic-physical form takes shape.

I wish at this time to introduce a postulate which is widely accepted in the planning profession. This is that transportation is basically determined by land-use patterns, but that the relationship is a reciprocal one and that transportation, in responding to needs created by land use, can foster new land development.

Based on this postulate, we can say that what has happened in New Jersey is that the automobile and the highway answered the transportation needs of scattered, growing communities—whether cities, towns, or hamlets—and, in providing the answer, set in motion entirely new patterns of urban growth tailored to private automotive transportation.

The result is this city of north Jersey, with its 4½ million people, spread over nine counties. Can we make it a city in fact? I do not refer to a city as a single political entity. I refer to a city as an urban development that caters to all of man's needs—physical and intellectual. Can north Jersey become an urban home for its millions and prove livable? Can it become fully civilized in the sense of combining physical convenience with intellectual and esthetic stimulation? Fortunately, north Jersey can always rely, to some extent, upon Manhattan which will remain the cultural center of the Nation. Nor is there a need to duplicate that which only such a center can provide. However, to the extent that every modern urban complex should satisfy man's hunger for physical comfort and mental stimulation, north Jersey can succeed only if it is served by a modern transportation system. Can the addition of highways and the multiplication of travel lanes provide such a system? Is such a transportation system based upon the private automobile compatible with an urban environment that is livable, enjoyable, and intellectually enriching?

This, then, I hold to be the crux of north Jersey's transportation problem. I do not know the answer, certainly not the whole answer. However, it is up to you, as an important segment of our citizenry—I hope tomorrow's captains of industry—to understand this problem and make your contribution to finding the answer in the arena of public discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Next I should like to call attention to a memorandum prepared by Mr. William B. Saunders, a Washington, D.C., transportation consultant, who raises some basic questions on urban transportation to which I would hope the Federal Government would devote considerable research effort, along with other kinds of research authorized by S. 345.

Also there is a memorandum on the cost-benefit concept in urban transportation planning, together with some of the factors that should be evaluated in such studies. The bill, S. 345, gives a great deal of emphasis to these all-important studies. It authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make studies on the model procedures that might be used in cost-benefit studies. It encourages these studies to be undertaken as a part of comprehensive mass transportation planning by State and local governments. And it authorizes the Administrator to undertake them in connection with funds granted for pilot demonstration projects.

Mr. President, I ask that this statement by Mr. Saunders be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON COMMUTATION

Many people think of the commuter problem as confined to a handful of our largest cities. However, it casts a shadow over all large cities as they continue to grow. Therefore, the treatment of today's major problems will have an impact on solutions to be applied in later years elsewhere. Likewise, planning activities now going on in the various cities will unquestionably be influenced by what is done now.

There can be no real cure without a knowledge of what caused the disease. Cities are congested by automobiles because people prefer them. Transit companies suffer declining patronage and service deteriorates, with resulting further declines in traffic volume. There are two basic questions to evaluate:

(a) Why do people prefer autos?

(b) Even if better for the individual, should the continued shift be encouraged from a public policy standpoint?

Like it or not, we have to face the fact that the individual's preference is affected with a public interest if only because government provides the highways and collects taxes. In its simplest form, the fact is that when we build bigger and better roads to attract automobiles, inevitably we affect the tax revenues of cities, the earnings of private transit companies, the congestion-exasperation index of the downtown driver, and the number of traffic policemen hired. This is all created initially by government decisions.

We must decide where the net benefits lie. Does the whole community—city and transit company and driver and business taxpayer and consumer—spend more for less one way than the other? If the overall costs versus benefits suggest continued encouragement of the private car, we should not be shoring up transit but rather providing for an orderly decline of the central city.

The automobile has made possible the suburb and the distant commuter. The scatter of population is the key to the lost traffic density on the commuter lines—rail and bus. People start from the edges of a wide circle and move into a narrow center. Good, frequent transit service at the edges (anything even remotely like the convenience of the private car) cannot possibly be provided at a profit to the transit company because of the light traffic on most of the run. But, from a public point of view, less total money might be spent even if buses did go in and out of town or in and out of concentration points with light loads.

Providing new highways to the central city and downtown parking lots means money spent by one set of political jurisdictions. The private car owner lives in the "bedroom" area and pays taxes there—but he works in the central city, which has the primary responsibility for providing the buses and police to keep him moving. Thus, a key fact which hinders solutions is the matter of jurisdiction. What practical steps can be taken to bring the workroom and the bedroom governments together (a) financially and (b) administratively?

If the problem is seen as one involving the best use of total resources, we can ask whether any existing agency is in a position

to deal with the problem. Thus, even the far-flung New York Port Authority is not equipped to solve all the New York area's problems—even if it wanted to. True, it could take over the transit companies and absorb their deficits out of tunnel tolls and other activities. But it has no voice in the planning or location of highways or other facilities. How could it give leadership and direction to a local program of encouraging people to drive only as far as a suburban parking lot? How can the costs be fairly apportioned among the big and little beneficiaries of reduced congestion? These are some of the practical considerations which must be faced.

We may see a short run or a long run solution here. For the short run, a city or area authority can merely absorb the deficits of existing transit facilities. For the long run, total urban area planning must be considered—including the nature and location of highways and other public facilities.

THE COST-BENEFIT CONCEPT AS APPLIED TO URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Our cities need a fresh look at their transportation problems and policies if they are to survive on a healthy basis. Two features of life today must be included in that look. The first is a recognition of the economic togetherness of communities in each area. The second is the vital need for looking at total transportation rather than only one mode.

The key to effective planning of urban transportation lies in creating public understanding of these points. As a result of the traditional segregation of mass transportation from highway programs, the net impact of total transportation plans is often obscure, even to community leaders.

There is now a glimmering of recognition, for example, that highway construction brings many social benefits, but that it also produces social costs through the loss of taxable real estate. We must ask the same kinds of questions about all public and private transportation policies. Ultimately, the community must face a basic economic question—how can the total burden be minimized.

The tragedy is that the central cities everywhere are being strangled by their own efforts to give the people what they want, without regard to total net cost. This comes about in part because people say that highways are congested and therefore we need more highways—particularly since we have a Federal-aid program in this field.

In a total transportation system approach, we must measure the relative costs and benefits which would accrue to the community from alternative public policies designed to meet present and prospective demands for transportation.

In its simplest form, one might visualize two extreme alternatives. The choice might be shown as between relying exclusively on private automobiles to meet demand for metropolitan movement versus relying entirely on public transportation (rail and bus) to meet the given demand.

In reality, of course, the number of choices is much greater than this, with the best practical alternative being some combination between the extremes. It is helpful, however, to think of the problem in its simplest form for convenience of description.

The important points to be evaluated in considering any proposed alternative are shown in the attached table.

If we ask questions about these items and assign a money value for each, it will soon be clear what the relative advantages are of various transportation plans. Such analysis would help to show the public why it is not sufficient merely to add new highway approaches to the metropolitan core. It would possibly show that total taxes might be lowered in both the bedroom sector as well as in the office sector of the metropolitan area by a better coordinated transportation system.

This subject is so important as to warrant some prompt pilot study treatment. I do not think any of our cities have ever really done this job as it should be done. It is a real challenge to government and community leaders alike. But the rewards to the Nation from a successful approach are immeasurable.

Transportation plan evaluation summary

	(1) All private automobile	(2) All transit (bus and/or rail)	(3) Mixed system
What will be the effect of each system on—			
(a) Public expenditures for highway construction			
(b) Public expenditures for highway maintenance			
(c) Public receipts from user charges			
(d) Public or private expenditure for off-street parking			
(e) Public or private expenditures for transit equipment and facilities			
(f) Revenues of public carriers			
(g) Operating costs of public carriers			
(h) Costs of private automobiles—			
for operation			
for capital investment			
for user charges			
(i) Business activity (and construction)—			
in core area			
in suburban area			
(j) Tax base and revenue—			
in core area			
in suburban area			
(k) Convenience to individual rider—			
in value of time in transit			
in accident and insurance costs			
(l) Community service requirements—			
for police			
for traffic control			
for other			
(m) Economic development—land values, employment, income, etc			
(n) Other			

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Finally, I was privileged just last week on January 12, to address the downtown developments committee of the National Retail Merchants Association at their 50th annual convention in New York City. Joining with me in discussing urban mass transportation were Mr. Dwight Palmer, New Jersey's State highway commissioner; Mr. Walter Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and Mr. Herbert Harper, president of Public Service Coordinated Transport in New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask that the statements of these gentlemen be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES IN URBAN AREAS

(By Dwight R. G. Palmer, New Jersey State highway commissioner, at the 50th Annual Convention, National Retail Merchants Association, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, Jan. 12, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when Mr. Pasqual Guerrieri asked if I would come to New York City to visit with a group of his associates in the business and civic life of this city on certain aspects of adequate transit facilities, I readily accepted his invitation that I might convey to you what I feel is industry's and business' real opportunity in our today's economy.

There are, in my opinion, few organizations other than your own that have a better understanding of how much the vitality of downtown areas depends on adequate public transportation. It is organizations such as your Downtown Development Committee of the National Retail Merchants Association, through its membership and its members' affiliation with other civic and business groups that can do much to spell success or failure for programs initiated by governmental agencies. It seems to me that no organization could be more concerned than is yours with the decline of central cities, particularly as centers of retail trade; also of the flight to the suburbs of thousands of middle income families precipitating the springing up of suburban shopping centers by the dozen changing all of your retail marketing patterns. Those of you who have maintained your ties with the central cities have seen develop the imbalance in social structure with the loss of numerous families to the suburbs—an imbalance that reduces city income on the one hand while increasing costs of education, protection and welfare on the other.

Narrowing our attentions to transportation and the congestion that we have grown to associate with our motorized age, you have asked me to discuss the "Role of State Government in Providing Adequate Mass Transit Facilities in Urban Areas." All of us are conscious of the problem that we face in keeping alive our public transportation network. The problem that we have in New Jersey has been with us for many years and presently is extremely critical—particularly with the suburban railroads.

We came across a statement that took our interest—a public official said:

"If the railway department could be relieved of providing all passenger services an acceptable balance between its revenues and working expenditures would be realized. * * * There has been allowed to develop a position of uneconomic competition between bus and rail services although one mode of transportation would be sufficient to cater for the traffic offering from each suburb. The only solution to this problem is the coordination of rail and bus operations withing the city."

This is a familiar tune—it is being sung in most of our metropolitan areas but this statement was made by the Treasurer of the State of Queensland, Australia, in introducing his budget to Parliament for the new fiscal year.

Also a white paper on the Nationalized Railway System in England emphasized the losses being incurred and made a plea for coordinated transit.

Maybe we can take some comfort from the realization that our problem in transportation is not unlike that being experienced in every corner of our globe. Although our problem is a common one, the solution is not. Returning to Australia for a moment we find one extreme—the State Government of New South Wales, for instance, provides a state-owned and operated rail transit system from the city of Sydney—a complete system being provided by the State for its urban area. At the other extreme, in this country, the States have, in general, limited participation to that of exercising regulation over private transportation companies. Last June however, landmark action was taken in New Jersey when our Gov. Robert B. Meyner signed into law a measure enabling the State to actively participate in the private transportation effort and share with rail carriers a part of the problem of providing rail service essential in the public interest. To our knowledge New Jersey was the first State to recognize such responsibility.

The decision to face the transportation problem head on was influenced by New Jersey's strategic location between the metropolitan complexes centered on New York City to the north and Philadelphia to the south. These major cities along with Newark, Jersey City, Elizabeth, Trenton, Paterson, Camden, and Atlantic City have left practically no municipality in the State immune from developing a commuter population. A look at some of the commuter patterns that have developed since the last war emphasizes the nearly statewide nature of the problem. There are, for instance, 500 people who board trains at Point Pleasant day after day, and ride for 2 hours or more, traveling at least 65 miles, for 8 hours work at their office, retracing the same journey in the evening. Another 700 commute daily from Trenton to Newark and New York and even with only one train to ride, some 80 daily passengers make an 80-mile trip from the Cape May area to Philadelphia in the winter season—in the summer the number of Philadelphia-Cape May commuters may triple. The laurels for distant commuting, however, must go to those 250 Pennsylvanians who travel the 90 miles from Philadelphia to New York every day and pay the railroad $67.90 each month for the privilege. For many of these hardy souls their commutation also involves a subway, bus, or rail trip at one or both ends of the through trip. These 20th century pioneers have disregarded natural geographical barriers and man-made political divisions in exercising their right to work and live where they choose. They have exhibited great tenacity of purpose in meeting their individual travel needs. They crisscross the State from border to border—from every direction. Combined with the great masses of intermediate and short haul rail commuters, their number is so great that the difficulties they face with ever shrinking railroad service are such that they cannot be ignored by the State. Without the rails our citizens would of necessity have to move over the highways in private cars or auto buses. New Jersey's traffic density already is 5½ times the national average; 3 times that of Pennsylvania and 3¾ times the density on New York State highways. Twenty-four billion automobile miles were traveled last year—it is forecast that in the next 15 years this mileage will double to 48 billion. New Jersey has the dubious honor of being the most densely populated State of the Union and the population is increasing—up 25 percent in a decade and all studies indicate the upward trend will not only continue but increase.

Currently the rails are transporting about 100,000 of our citizens between home and office during morning and evening rush periods, the periods when our major highway arteries are already clogged with vehicles. Should the rails suddenly fail to provide this service, the conditions on our highways, bridges, and tunnels would become chaotic. Incidentally they are bad enough right now. The alternative to continuing rail service lies in greatly expanding our highway program, with most of the expansion taking place in the urbanized areas where the cost of land is prohibitively high and where communities can no longer tolerate a continual loss of ratables as would be required to develop a transportation network relying solely on automobiles and buses. The results of an overemphasis on one form of transportation has not proved satisfactory in any of our metropolitan areas; we are hopeful that our leaders will profit by the experiences of others and develop a public transportation network that will make maximum use of all forms of transportation—a system that will coordinate rail, bus, highway, and parking facilities for maximum efficiency; a system that will eliminate parallel, duplicating rail and bus lines; a system whereby one mode of transport will complement, not compete, with another, and that all such planning will take into consideration slum clearance and overall land use.

We will be the first to admit that it is easy to speak of integrated transit or coordinated systems—it is still another matter to bring them about. To gain time for such accomplishments and to assure our citizens that they would have continuity of rail service we placed rail carriers under contracts with the State to provide a tabulated schedule of service at established rates. For this first year, 1960–61, $6 million was recommended as an amount sufficient to accomplish our objectives. Although the legislation did not compel railroads to participate in the program, we have about 95 percent of our daily railroad patrons riding in trains that are under contract with the State. Payments to the five carriers total nearly one-half million dollars per month. Our contracts required operation of additional trains on certain routes and required instituting or restoring the sale of reduced rate, round-trip tickets for travel at other than commuter rush periods. We expect the contract program will continue for several more years. During this period we expect other recommendations made in our report to Gov. Robert B. Meyner and the legislature last spring, to be accomplished—namely, serious interest in the H & M by the port authority; rerouting the Jersey Central service to Newark providing direct rail service to the State's largest city from one of its most densely populated corridors and combining the Jersey Shore service of the Jersey Central and the Pennsylvania in one carrier, presently provided by both operating the trains through to Penn Station, Manhattan. This is the nucleus of the State program to date. Looking to the future and beyond the projects just mentioned, the goal is to effect improvements that will permit the suburban railroads to operate without State assistance; to substitute rapid transit for certain railroad service and to develop the integrated transport network previously described. The State recognizes that developing adequate mass transit is a matter that transcends municipal, county and even State borders—that it can only be solved by an agency whose jurisdiction extends geographically over the area encompassed by the problem.

A little out of context but, nevertheless, in the field of transportation, the following I clipped from a periodical:

"The president of a famous railroad rode in a drawing room on one of his own trains recently and was horrified to spend the night in a bed which was infested with bedbugs. The next day he dictated a blistering letter to the man in charge of such complaints. But, to see what would happen, he used a different name and letterhead. Three days later a reply came back from the railroad. It was three pages long, single spaced. It offered the most sincere apologies and shared his horror at such a thing. The complaint manager said that such a thing has never before happened on that railroad, and he didn't understand how it could have happened, etc. He begged the traveler's forgiveness and assured him that steps were being taken to prevent such a thing from ever happening again. The railroad president was pleased with the long, seemingly personal letter until he turned the page and found that the writer's secretary had by mistake also sent along his original letter of complaint. On it the complaint manager had scrawled, 'send this s.o.b. the bedbug letter'."

There is a trend today toward establishing special districts or authorities to cope with special problems as they arise. According to the New York Committee for Economic Development there are now 3,200 special districts in metropolitan areas and the number grows every year. In Los Angeles a transportation district has been created that covers an area one-half the size of the State of New Jersey; in Miami a federation of localities has been created to better contend with areawide public matters including transportation; in Cleveland the first attempt to consolidate a number of areawide functions under the county government was rejected at the polls as were similar efforts in Buffalo, Toledo, and St. Louis—the trend toward change is established however, and each year will see local governments being adapted to enable them to carry out more efficiently public responsibilities which are clearly metropolitan in scope. Resistance to change in municipal relationships is expected—the role of the State should be to lead the way through law and constitutional changes that will permit formulation of governmental structures with greater capacity to meet the complex problems of a society that each year is more urbanized in character.

Pending such changes it is certainly a State function to identify responsibilities that rest with the municipalities in the joint effort to preserve and improve mass transport for our citizens. There is general agreement that the economy of many of our suburban communities is sustained by virtue of its rail service, yet few have taken municipal action contributing to the continuance of this service. This is partly due to a failure to understand what its responsibilities are. There is one allied service essential to successful railroad operation that should, in my opinion, become a municipal function—the acquisition and operation of passenger stations and parking areas at the stations. Railroads in New Jersey are disposing of parking areas at an increasing rate. Problems relating to policing the areas—to reserve the space for railroad patrons—and the tax burden, are cited as reasons for selling the land or leasing it to concessionaires. In many instances the carriers have given municipalities first option to acquire or lease parking space before otherwise disposing of it.

A valuable contribution toward solving the rail problem would result if each village or city would take over the station and establish parking facilities.

Space for a ticket agent could be leased back to the railroad including in the terms of the agreement the hours the office would be open. The city of Red Bank in Monmouth County, N.J., has gone a step further—this city is striving to finance a new modern station at a location with larger parking areas and more convenient automobile access.

In summary I might point out that we are not only studying the passenger patterns via rail and the movement of people—their travel habits—their parking needs and their origin and destination, but the movement

of goods—the waterfront handling of goods, that is, the facilities and personnel engaged in this activity.

Under Gov. Robert B. Meyner's inspiration and direction we have taken more than a mere bite of the cherry. Our progress to date apparently is heartening to the carriers, the informed thinking public and those of us intimately engaged in this venture. With the support and active interest of organizations such as the National Retail Merchants Association we can, with due application and nominal sums of money, in due season deliver the finished product, I hope. We are a society that is on the move—we daily look for new frontiers. It is your and my opportunity to promote this development and to find the ways and means to intelligently direct this movement of people and of goods.

You have been good to listen so patiently to this review of our transportation problem. As I sign off I salute you on the occasion of your 50th anniversary and wish you all, the best of everything for 1961.

THE ROLE OF THE SUBURBAN RAILROAD IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES IN URBAN AREAS

(Remarks by W. W. Patchell, vice president of special services, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at the 50th Annual Convention of the National Retail Merchants' Association, Jan. 12, 1961)

The National Retail Merchants' Association is to be congratulated upon having a downtown development committee, which is actively looking at the future.

Future Government policies with respect to passenger transportation are most important, especially for mass transportation and, particularly, as distinguished between the suburban railroads, transit systems, and bus lines. As suburban development continues, the movement of people during the rush hours will increase. The real question facing the public is whether it will continue to utilize the present investments in railroad rights-of-way and facilities, to move these great volumes of people, or whether we will continue to waste millions by further expanding the development of superhighways, to move these peak hour volumes either by private automobile or bus.

However, to understand the problem, it is first necessary to realize that the suburban rail services developed from the local passenger service which was operated to serve local communities and feed the through railroad passenger services. As population expanded, a need arose to move people to and from work each morning and evening.

In those days, the rails were able to handle this movement without any appreciable increase in cost. Therefore, the so-called commutation rates were established on an additive basis, which was never fully compensatory. It was like your 1 cent sales.

Today, the original function of the suburban rail services—that of serving the through passenger business—has disappeared. These trains are left with the 1 cent sale business, which cannot produce sufficient revenue to make these services self-sustaining. The impact of this 1 cent sale bargain is even more evident when you realize that, although the unit cost of railroad wages and supplies has increased almost 300 percent, railroad basic coach fares are today only 20 percent higher than they were 40 years ago.

The capacity of each mode of travel should determine its role in urban transportation. On this chart, you can see how the capacity of one railroad track compares with one lane of buses or private automobiles. Note that the rail lines have the capacity to handle 20 times the volume of people as automobiles. This is computed at a rate of one and one-half people per automobile, even though the average automobile in metropolitan areas carries only 1.1 or 1.2 people. The rail lines also have the capacity to handle about seven times the capacity of buses operating on an exclusive express lane highway. Eventually, expressway traffic must be fed into and from access ramps, so that the ramp congestion will further affect this comparative capacity. I do not mean to discredit the bus. Each mode of transport has an area in which it can serve most efficiently, but buses just do not have the capacity to move vast volumes of people. This is like comparing the mass movement of materials on a conveyor system with handling materials on individual push trucks.

The essentiality of mass transportation has been well demonstrated by the Congress Street Expressway in Chicago. This expressway has four lanes in each direction, with two tracks of the Chicago Transit Authority in the middle. Soon after the expressway was built and opened, it was loaded to capacity. Today, the rush hour congestion on it is almost intolerable and it is impossible to get more cars on and off the expressway without additional entrances and exits. But the more entrances and exits there are, the greater the congestion and the less expressway capacity you have. Private automobiles and buses are moving a peak of only 7,650 people per hour. Contrasted with this, one track of the rail line is moving 12,350 people per hour, and this is only about 25 percent of its capacity.

In other words, the rail line could take on three times its present load. If abandoned, seven additional expressway lanes would have to be constructed to provide sufficient highway lanes for automobiles to carry the present load, or two more lanes exclusively for buses. And to provide the present peak capacity of this rail line would require at least 20 additional expressway lanes in each direction if everyone went by automobile, or 7 additional bus lanes if everyone were forced into buses. And remember, more lanes mean more entrances and exits and more delay.

Another quality desired of urban transportation is reliability. Some of you recall the severe snowstorm which struck the eastern seaboard just a month ago today. Many areas were grateful for suburban railroads, which proved the reliability of rail systems by continuing to function, even under such adverse conditions. I must say that operations were far from perfect, especially because the snowbirds, many of whom had not traveled by rail for years, deserted highway transportation and crowded onto the trains. Nonetheless, the railroads proved their ability to carry people to work and to shop at your stores in all kinds of weather.

Urban mobility, or the ease with which people can get between home and your stores, is an essential asset for the success of your business and for the economic vitality of your community. Actually, it is the lifeblood of your business. If it doesn't flow, your business does not live. Suburban rail transportation is an essential factor in urban mobility, especially where large volumes of people must be carried—a further reason why your community needs these reliable, all-weather rail systems.

Another attribute of a suburban railroad is its ability to carry large volumes of people at the lowest total cost to the community as a whole—in other words, to the citizens and businesses that pay the taxes. We made a study in the Philadelphia area of what would be involved if the expansion of the highway system were continued, in an attempt to take over just the passenger load being carried by the Pennsylvania Railroad's suburban services. It would cost $611 million for additional facilities to do this job by highway. Yet the cost to the public to provide for the continuation of this rail service would be only $4 million a year, to cover the Pennsylvania's present losses on this service. Certainly, it is not economical to spend $611 million, or even half of that amount, when the same purpose can be accomplished by having the public spend only $4 million annually to purchase a needed service.

This problem is repeated in every metropolitan area, where it is costing the public up to $40 and $45 million a mile to build superhighways which consume much valuable land, reduce tax ratables, and carry only a fraction of the number of people which rail systems can handle.

However, there is a much greater problem to be faced than just the question of cost. It is the impracticality of attempting to do this job with highways alone. The highway traffic engineer of Los Angeles, the chief engineer of New York's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and my good friend, Dwight Palmer, here, have all stated that highways are not the sole answer to carrying the peakload. Even the Port of New York Authority recognized this fact and stated that, even with their newly expanded bus terminal, they would still need the existing suburban railroad lines to carry the peak-hour loads.

The reason these highway authorities state that highways are not the sole answer to carrying the peakloads is easily demonstrated. A 10-percent reduction in the mass transit volume of a city will produce a 42-percent increase in auto travel. A 20-percent reduction will produce an 84-percent increase, and a 24-percent reduction will produce a 100-percent increase. These are not railroad calculations, but were prepared by the city of Philadelphia.

Not only is it impossible to solve this problem with highways, but it is cheaper for the citizens and the community to buy the insurance of the suburban rail lines to move peakloads of the individual between his residence and place of business, because:

1. Each railroad track can handle as many people per hour as 20 lanes of superhighways in the manner in which people are now moving.

2. Sufficient highways cannot be built; there is not the money to build them or the room to put them.

3. As soon as highways are built, the peakloads immediately begin to congest them.

4. A constant increase of automobiles cannot be moved into the downtown areas because of lack of access for the peakloads and room for automobile storage.

5. Expansion of the highway program into the downtown area would further destroy the important tax base.

Another problem facing our cities is that of proper land use. If you rely entirely upon automobile transportation as a means of access to your store, you know that you need three times as much parking area as you have floor space in your store. This problem is especially acute downtown, where land is valuable. As population increases, land becomes more scarce in every part of the metropolitan area. Our land must be preserved and used most wisely. The more land you devote to parking spaces, the more your stores are dispersed, and the more you lose compactness and convenience.

Los Angeles is an example. Today, two-thirds of the land in downtown Los Angeles is devoted to highways, streets, and parking spaces. This means that less space is left to do business. The compactness of the center core, so essential for the economic vitality of the area and your business, has been seriously affected.

Rail systems have the capacity to carry large volumes of people in a short period of time to your stores. They can provide efficient downtown distribution of these people by using frequent station stops, where justified and desirable.

I know that all of you, as businessmen, are not only interested in increasing the volume of your business, but also in reducing ex-

penses and increasing the value of your property. Experience has proved that the use of rail systems to serve your store areas can save money for you, your customers and the community as a whole. When your customers travel by rail, they preserve street space for movement of your delivery vehicles and save you and themselves valuable time and money by reducing street congestion, which would otherwise become even more intolerable than it is today.

The community saves money, by avoiding the need for tremendous expenditures for new highway facilities and their operation and maintenance. Also, by using rail systems, the community avoids the demolition of vast tax ratables necessary to carry the same volume of people by highways. Just visualize your own hometown and what your tax bills would be if even one-half of the off-street land area had to be used for parking.

Some areas have already recognized the importance of using rail systems to preserve tax ratables and permit proper land use. Toronto, Canada, is a good example. Seven years ago Toronto built its first subway system. The subway encouraged redevelopment and new development along its entire route, and property along the subway has become more valuable. Values have increased as much as 79 percent and 93 percent in two of the subdivisions immediately adjacent to the subway. Rather than destroying downtown property values, the construction of this rail line has virtually paid for itself because of the resulting increase of about $5½ million annually in city tax revenues. Further, it is estimated that the subway is keeping 10,000 automobiles from further congesting the streets every business day. With such favorable experience, Toronto is now expanding its rail subway system, at a cost of $220 million.

Each mode of transportation has a significant role to play in this job and should be used to its best advantage. The automobile is essential for mobility in the sparsely populated suburban areas. It is a most inefficient tool when used to carry large volumes of people en masse. Where volume is sufficient to support its use, the bus is far more efficient than the automobile and serves as an excellent feeder to rail systems. However, the bus has to cope with the same traffic congestion confronting automobiles on our urban streets and highways.

The most efficient tool for carrying large volumes of people at peakloads with speed and reliability is the rail system, and there has been increasing recognition of the essentiality of the suburban railroads. However, there are problems. The problem for the railroads, however, is not technological, but financial. Faced with continuing expenditures by the public for highway facilities which help to put the railroads out of the through passenger business, the railroads can no longer subsidize the community. Yet the community cannot afford to be without these suburban rail services.

In order to preserve the communities and to save money for them and their citizens, the suburban rail services, where they exist, must be preserved.

Local conditions will require different local solutions. All areas need highways, but where existing rail facilities can be used or reclaimed for suburban rail service it would be sheer folly to discard them. Of course, it will be fine to provide, eventually, the most modern equipment and operating controls, but remember that the first problem is to arouse government to its responsibility to preserve these services. The time remaining to accomplish this is very, very short.

As merchants and businessmen who have a financial interest in this problem and in the economic vitality of your community, your time for action is now.

The Role of the Surface Transit Company in Providing Adequate Mass Transit Facilities in Urban Areas

(Remarks of Herbert E. Harper, president, Public Service Coordinated Transport, at the downtown development session, National Retail Merchants Association, 50th annual convention, January 12, 1961, 2:30 p.m.)

In the earlier years of the 20th century people who lived in row houses and tenements of American cities were within walking distance of places of employment, shopping, worship, entertainment, or close to a transportation service.

More recently many city people have moved to new areas situated outside city limits. Whole new regions, composed of many separate communities, have sprung up which, together with the mother city, now comprise a new metropolitan area. The growth of those metropolitan centers has been fantastic. In 1,900 core cities of 50,000 or more persons, with adjoining areas, contained only one-third of the national population; today the figure is almost two-thirds. You may recall that the 1960 census, compared with that for 1950, showed that many large cities suffered a loss in population, while the metropolitan areas of which the cities are a part showed substantial growth. The majority of people in a metropolitan region still live in the central city, but by 1975 it is forecast that 60 percent of the metropolitan residents will be living in communities outside the central cities. The great desire for suburban living is creating many problems that must be solved if the cities with their business areas are to prosper.

Most of my comments will be directed to the problem of providing adequate mass transit facilities in urban areas. I do so recognizing that the many other smaller business areas and scattered shopping centers that serve the new suburban markets have transportation problems of their own.

Public transportation, to win acceptance of the public, must move people quickly, conveniently, and at reasonable rates of fare. All forms of surface transportation, whether on rail or highway, are a part of the solution.

Railroad commuter service

Railroad commuter services, designed to carry great numbers of people to and from the urban centers, are experiencing heavy operating losses because costs are being pyramided by limited use—about 20 hours per week—of passenger equipment, stations, and portions of rights of way. The relatively well patronized commuter railroad service should be preserved as long as justified by such patronage even though that service may require financial aid similar to that provided by the Meyner-Palmer (New Jersey) plan of relief for railroads. Conversely, poorly patronized rail service should be discontinued in the interest of helping to preserve essential service.

Rail rapid transit

Relatively few American cities today have rail rapid transit—Boston has it; Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, and Toronto, Canada—and those services are losing money. Public Service operates a short subway-open cut rail line known as Newark City Subway and that, too, is a losing proposition. Rail rapid transit for other cities has been studied and recommendations submitted, but the story is the same—high construction and operating costs produce estimated losses. The equation to be solved by the large metropolitan areas is a simple one—how many dollars, and from what sources, would be justified to obtain the advantages of rail rapid transit service?

The automobile

Then we have the ever popular automobile—costly to use, a waster of space, limited in carrying capacity and with an average use of only 30 percent of that capacity. The faults of the automobile, however, are overshadowed by the advantages of convenience, availability at zero headway, speed, and pride of ownership. Forecasters predict that the per capita use of the automobile will continue to increase annually and that continuously increased facilities will be required for its accommodation. It may be that the appetite of the automobile for space never will be satisfied even though autoists appear willing to pay for the use of facilities that make driving faster, safer, and more convenient.

The popularity of the automobile has forced major improvements in traffic control and given impetus to betterments in street and highway construction. Experts concede, however, that the automobile alone cannot solve a city's transportation problem.

Motorbus

The modern motorbus, of all forms of public surface transportation, comes closest to equaling the flexibility, availability, and convenience of the private automobile. The introduction of air suspension and air conditioning, among other things, has made the motorbus attractive to increasing numbers of people. City transit, starting with the horse-drawn omnibus, improved by the horsecar, the cable car, the electric streetcar, and finally by the modern large capacity motorbus, always has made the most productive use of street space. The motorbus in large measure has replaced electric streetcars and been substituted for lightly patronized railroad service.

New Jersey bus operations

I will use my remaining time to give you a composite of bus transit operations in New Jersey and the part played by my company, Public Service Coordinated Transport. Those operations are representative of good surface transit generally found in the larger urban areas of the United States.

Relatively few people realize the degree to which industry, commerce, residents and others depend on bus transit for local and suburban transportation. Buses do the whole transit job in New Jersey, except for the Newark City subway, the only remaining electric car line in the State. The 1,500,000 passengers carried on regular lines on an average weekday represent 25 percent of the State's population (estimated 1960 New Jersey census).

Bus service in the State's 21 counties is the most important single segment in New Jersey's passenger transportation industry. A total of 496 appropriately authorized carriers use 4,346 motorbuses. Special, contract and chartered service is furnished by 147 other operators having a combined total of 980 buses. The industry's employment figure exceeds 11,000 persons.

Bus service—Newark

The city of Newark, New Jersey's largest city, has one of the finest and most complete bus transportation systems in the country. A total of 85 lines serve the city with almost 1,100 buses that operate over 13,000 bus trips daily to, from and within the city. More than 400,000 passengers are transported each weekday, and that figure, by way of comparison, almost equals the 1960 census population of the city of Newark. Public Service Transport operates 69 of the lines, the remaining 16 lines being operated by other companies.

The widespread network of 85 lines reaches all sections of Newark and extends to suburban points and other cities such as Perth Amboy, New Brunswick, Plainfield, Netcong,

Paterson, Hackensack, Jersey City (all in New Jersey) and New York City.

The importance of Newark's bus system to the retail merchant best can be visualized by the 133,000 automobiles that would be required to transport the average weekday load of 400,000 passengers. The cessation of all that bus service even for a day or two would be catastrophic. A number of unfortunate transit strikes have served to emphasize that point, the last such strike having occurred in Boston last August.

LINCOLN TUNNEL PARK-RIDE

My comment about bus operations in New Jersey would not be complete without reference to one of the most successful park-ride operations in the East, between the Lincoln Tunnel parking lot in North Bergen, N.J., and the port authority bus terminal, near Times Square, New York City. Persons may park their cars at the parking lot and ride to the port authority bus terminal by express bus, in 14 minutes, and return for the sum of $1. The advantage to the motorist readily is apparent as he saves tunnel toll each way as well as a parking fee in central Manhattan of $1.50 upwards for all-day parking.

The operation is conducted 6 days a week, and a daily high of 1,945 cars parked was reached on the 24th of last March. A weekly high was attained in the period November 14–19 when 10,354 cars were parked.

The parking lot was constructed on unused land under the approach highway to the Lincoln Tunnel and is owned by the Port of New York Authority. Public Service Transport operates the lot and the park-ride service on a contract basis.

PROBLEMS—BUS INDUSTRY

The bus industry, in common with all other passenger transportation services, today is confronted with the problem of maintaining operations on a profitable basis at fare rates that are generally acceptable to the public.

The inflationary economic trend experienced since the end of World War II has raised substantially labor, material, bus equipment, and construction costs. As an example, the cost of providing a single seat in a city-type bus was $338 in 1945, $505 in 1958, and $557 in the new city-type buses delivered in 1960.

The bus industry, of necessity, has practiced economy in all phases of its operation and quickly has taken advantage of technological improvements in bus equipment, automation, work procedures, and building design. The industry has met changing trends in passenger traffic, made extensions of lines where necessary, and inaugurated new services in growing industrial, commercial, and residential areas of New Jersey.

The enigma of traffic congestion is of great concern to the transit industry. While the construction of expressways, parkways, and freeways has afforded substantial relief, too little attention has been given to less spectacular but effective measures that, if adopted, would mean much to the maintenance of good headways on services operated within cities having heavy volumes of traffic. Some of those measures already taken by the city of Newark, and by some other cities in the Nation, are—the enforcement of parking regulations; the establishment of one-way streets; exclusive lanes for buses; the banning of parking on heavily traveled arteries, particularly during the morning and evening rush hours; elimination of certain left-hand turns; and the proper timing of traffic signals.

TRANSIT AND THE MERCHANT

As members of the National Retail Merchants Association you have a real self-interest in the preservation and improvement of transit because you must depend on transit to bring downtown a substantial percentage of your customers. Further, transit is used by most people who work in the central business area and those people constitute a sizable portion of each downtown store's patronage.

The question naturally arises as to what the downtown merchant can do to help transit. The merchant can help in many ways. First, he must recognize the importance of transit to his business and encourage transit's efforts to improve operating conditions in the downtown area. He can advocate the advantages of using transit by word of mouth, store newspaper advertisements and through news releases of the local merchants' association. The local transit company will be glad to help in those efforts. The merchant should favor all plans to widen and improve main thoroughfares and back reasonable traffic regulations pertaining to parking, no parking, traffic light timing, bans on left-hand turns, the purposes of which are to speed the movement of traffic generally including bus transit.

The retail merchant should consider extending to the transit-shop patron the same treatment on refunds as that extended to park-shop customers. In other words, pay all or a part of the fare of transit patrons similar to the refunding of all or a part of the parking fees to automobile customers. An alternative for the merchant would be to encourage park-ride undertakings and then to support them by contributing toward the park-ride charge.

The merchant should favor tax relief for transit, especially when needed to help keep transit fares at the point of acceptability to the public. He also should encourage the placing of most auto parking facilities at the fringe of the central business district so that traffic congestion might be lessened in the central business area.

CONCLUSIONS

The merchants should continue to strive, as I know they have in the past, to make the central business district more attractive by modernizing and glamorizing their places of business, and then making those places more accessible by insisting that all traffic regulations be uniformly enforced, and that all essential physical improvements be effected in the city's street system.

Transit is meeting a real need in furnishing safe, convenient, fast and economical service, and offers the autoist the greatest inducement to use public transportation.

I am certain that the bus industry, with the continued sympathetic cooperation of the merchants it serves, city governments, legislatures and regulatory agencies, will meet successfully the challenge of the urban areas in the future.

EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the last Congress established a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii. Initial funds from the Federal Government became available only in November 1960. However, since the State of Hawaii had already appropriated money to assist in the creation of this bold plan to create mutual understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the western Pacific, no time was lost in starting out. The first students are already in residence. The first buildings will soon be going up.

A progress report covering the initial few months of operation was recently issued by the University of Hawaii, which is operating the East-West Center under contract with the Department of State. It tells of the first students to report to the center—from India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Korea—and the number of scholarship applications which are being considered.

The detailed report is too lengthy to reproduce in the RECORD. However, I believe that the Members of Congress will obtain a great deal of useful information from certain excerpts from the report of Mr. Murray Turnbull, interim director of the East-West Center, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. MURRAY TURNBULL

The establishment of the East-West Center was authorized by chapter 7 of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 which was signed into law on May 14. Subsequently on August 31 the Congress appropriated the sum of $10 million to provide for the first year of the operation of the center. This appropriation was based upon extensive plans for the organization and operation of the center prepared by the University of Hawaii and a committee appointed by the Governor and approved by the Department of State. These plans were incorporated as a part of an agreement between the university and the Department of State vesting responsibility for the administration of the center in the university and including documents describing the organization and operation of the center in some detail. This was signed by President Laurence Snyder on October 21, 1960, and placed in effect as of October 25. As a consequence the center became an official and integral part of the university, and its various institutes and divisions were placed in operation.

The first installment of funds for the first fiscal year was received by the university on November 8, 1960, in the amount of $1,124,918. This sum is intended to provide for scholarships, grants, and operational costs until March 31, 1961, at which time a second allocation is due, to be followed in the future by quarterly payments. The sum of $9,693,000 has been requested for the year of operation beginning July 1, 1961. It should be noted that the State of Hawaii has also appropriated $756,000 for the construction of a dormitory, $124,094 to provide for certain operational and administrative costs for the present fiscal year, and is making available 21 acres of land on its university campus valued currently at about $2,740,000. It is also providing its other university resources of faculty and staff, laboratories, classrooms, and libraries, plus various other resources in the State government and the community at large for the development of the center.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Beginning with the establishment of the center and the International College at the end of October and henceforth all foreign students will apply for admission to and be accepted by and into the International College as unclassified students. This college, acting as an administrative agent, will provide for screening and processing of scholarships through a trained admissions staff and academic screening committees, and for academic counseling until each student is qualified for admission to one of the degree-granting academic colleges or to the graduate school. This arrangement will provide for the application of customary programs and standards for degrees, yet allow for flexibility in planning nondegree courses of study for individual students, assuring special tutoring or counseling where needed. All applications will be processed through academic departments, although some students will receive grants for special studies not falling within degree programs or leading to specific degrees. Until a permanent admissions staff can be formed and a perma-

nent screening system adopted, a subcommittee of the advisory committee has been serving to screen applications after review by departments.

U.S. educational commissions and Embassy cultural affairs officers abroad have cooperated extensively and with commendable speed and effort in publicizing the first available grants and in screening students preliminary to the submission of applications, final selection resting with the university. In one country more than 400 students have applied for February admission, and in another over 700 have been screened. Although the center will proceed further to establish its own screening and selection procedures, wherever feasible, it could not have awarded any scholarships thus far without this assistance.

Applications received, by countries, up to December 15, 1960:

Australia	1
Burma	0
Cambodia	1
Ceylon	1
Hong Kong	4
India	29
Indonesia	2
Japan	22
Korea	4
Malaya	1
Laos	4
Nepal	3
New Zealand	0
Pakistan	3
Philippines	29
Singapore	2
Taiwan	49
Thailand	12
Vietnam	0
United States	14
Formosa	1
Fiji Islands	1
Total	183

Allocations of scholarships by fields of study for the first 375 students have been made as follows (these will include all scholarships offered for February 1961 and for the academic year beginning in September 1961):

AREAS OF STUDY FOR FIRST 300 ASIAN STUDENTS

Undergraduate: Total of 30 in all areas of study.

Graduate: Total of 270.

Agricultural economics	4
Animal science	8
Anthropology	4
Art	4
Business administration and economics	25
Botany	10
Chemistry and biochemistry	15
Drama and theater	4
Entomology	8
English	5
English as a 2d language	20
Education	34
Engineering (civil probably)	5
Far East studies	4
Geography	4
Genetics	10
Government and public administration	15
History	5
Mathematics	5
Meteorology	5
Microbiology	6
Nutrition	4
Philosophy	5
Physics	5
Public health	5
Psychology	5
Soil science	12
Sociology	5
Social work	5
Speech	
Tropical crop science	12
Zoology	8

AREAS OF STUDY FOR FIRST 75 AMERICAN STUDENTS

Undergraduate: Total of 25 primarily in Asian studies program and language and area studies.

Graduate: Total of 50.

Far Eastern studies: 15; China, 5, Japan, 5, Korea, 5.

Oversea operations program: 15.

Far Eastern history: Four.

Far Eastern art: Four.

Geography: Four.

Government (comparative and international relations): Four.

Pacific islands studies: Two.

Philosophy (Eastern or comparative): Two.

(Minor adjustments in all of these figures are to be expected.)

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Seven architectural and engineering firms are presently working on plans for East-West facilities. In addition to these firms, a consultant electrical engineer and a landscape architect have been working in the area of their specialties on this project.

An entirely new corporation has been formed under the name of East-West Center Associates, Ltd., for the purpose of carrying out the complete design assignment for East-West facilities. Principals of this firm include I. M. Pei & Associates, architects, New York City, N.Y.; McAuliffe, Young & Associates, architects, Honolulu, and Law & Wilson, engineers, Honolulu.

The structures and facilities to be designed under stage I of this contract consist of the administration-food service building, the theater-auditorium, a high-rise dormitory housing 480 students, a low-rise dormitory housing 120 students, and a transient facility which will initially provide quarters for 72 transients plus 48 apartments for visiting scholars. At a later stage, these apartments will be converted to transient use, making the transient capacity of this building 120 persons.

In addition to the structures listed above, the stage I facilities include a laboratory-classroom building. This building, to house the department of zoology and entomology will be located across McCarthy Mall from Bilger Hall and connect to the Life Science-Health Research Institute Building, also under design, on each of four floors.

The administration-food service building, the theater auditorium, and the high-rise dormitory are now in the cost estimate stage prior to approval of final studies of preliminary plans.

The low-rise dormitory, transient quarters, and laboratory-classroom building are being developed by the associates for review on December 23.

The present schedule calls for the complete design assignment, including working drawings, specifications, and cost estimates, to be ready for advertising for bids on May 10, 1961.

This will permit awarding of bids for construction contracts for all stage I facilities prior to July 1, 1961, and completion of construction for occupancy in August 1962.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES

The center has recently extracted and published from its plan for organization and operation the following principles:

A. The center should have as its primary objective the increase and development of mutual understanding between the peoples of the countries of the Pacific area. The term "interchange" in the title of the center should carry the greatest possible weight and be of the utmost significance in the formulation and carrying out of basic policies and operations.

B. The center should have as a parallel objective the betterment of American relationships with foreign peoples. This objective should be understood as consistent with and, in fact, dependent upon the first objective.

C. The center should encourage and solicit, indeed, make paramount, the fullest mutual cooperation and participation of foreign countries and institutions, as well as mainland American universities and other institutions, in fulfilling its objectives.

D. Plans for the organization and operation of the center should be flexible enough to be adaptable to multiple, diverse, and changing needs of the countries, students, and senior scholars and leaders involved.

E. The center should actively seek, at home and abroad, foundation and private financial support for its programs and enterprises, along with assistance from existing governmental agencies and legislation. The ultimate aim should be to reduce special Government support and increase support from nongovernmental organizations.

F. All awards, grants, and expenditures made through, for, or on behalf of the center should be devised to acknowledge and develop the highest standards of intellectual achievement and community service in the course of human welfare.

G. The center should seek to fulfill its objectives through two different kinds of people—first, young men and women who are potential leaders in their own communities; and, second, men and women of established reputation and achievement.

H. Grants to individuals should be made to men and women of promise and ability who may be expected to make or are making a significant contribution to life in their own countries. Such people from abroad should be selected on the understanding that they will return to their own countries upon completion of studies or other assignments pertaining to the operation of the center.

I. Expenditures for conferences, research, and other special programs of the center should be planned to promote and facilitate the free passage of information and ideas, and should be based on the acknowledgments of mutual capacity and potential of participating individuals and countries.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT L. McDERMOTT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to Albert L. McDermott, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, who has done a remarkably effective job in serving our great friend, the Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell, whom so many of us wish more success in the days ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the letter written by Secretary Mitchell, in acknowledging Mr. McDermott's resignation, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1961.

Mr. ALBERT L. MCDERMOTT,
Special Assistant to the Secretary,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: It is with regret that I accede to your personal desires and accept your letter of resignation, to be effective on January 6, 1961.

You may take great pride in the accomplishments achieved during the almost 7 years that you have served as my special assistant with the responsibility for maintaining liaison between the Department of Labor and the Congress. Your skill, discretion and knowledge greatly enhanced the efforts of the Department in assisting the Congress in the enactment of important legislation

which has truly benefited the wage earners of our Nation.

You have my very best wishes for success as you return to the practice of law in the District of Columbia, and I hope that our paths will cross frequently in the future.

Cordially yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the legislative liaison officer of a Federal agency is the key for us Members to a cordial and cooperative working arrangement with that agency in our many dealings therewith. One of the most competent individuals in the present administration who has served for some years in that capacity is Albert L. McDermott, who has handled such work with the Congress for the Department of Labor. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has announced that Mr. McDermott has resigned to resume the private practice of law. My best wishes for his continued success go with him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with appreciation that I join in this tribute to Al McDermott, special assistant to Secretary Mitchell for congressional relations. Al has served with great distinction for 6 years. He has expertly facilitated relationships between Members of the Congress and the Secretary of Labor. In my own case, Al has willingly and eagerly assisted me and members of my staff in preparing materials and memorandums on legislation affecting the interests of working men and women throughout New York State and our Nation.

Secretary Mitchell has done a better job than any other Secretary of Labor in developing a sound and harmonious understanding between labor leaders and representatives of management during the past 7 years in which he has served as Secretary of Labor. Al McDermott has been of great assistance to the Secretary in this work, and it is with pleasure that I join in the comments made on the fine work which has been done.

GIFT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Before morning business is closed, the Chair would like to make an announcement with regard to a gift the Chair would like to leave for the Senate on this occasion, when he is presiding for the last time over this body.

One of the problems of a Presiding Officer is to time equitably Senators who wish to speak under the 3-minute rule. For example, earlier today we had a case in point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair forbear, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? If so, Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair, before the quorum call began, was making a statement which he would like to conclude at this time.

This is the last time the present occupant of the chair will be privileged to preside over this body. He has been trying to think of some gift he could leave to the Senate that would be useful and also appropriate.

One of the major problems the Presiding Officer has, as the Chair has learned, is to enforce the so-called 3-minute rule in the morning hour equitably as to all Senators. We had, for example, an instance this morning where a question was raised as to whether a Senator had exceeded the 3 minutes. The Chair has noted the intention of Senators on both sides to enforce that rule more stringently in the future than it has been in the past, when we have, for reasons we all understand, allowed considerable leeway to Senators exceeding the 3 minutes.

The Chair noted that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] suggested on the Senate floor recently that it might be well to have on the Presiding Officer's desk an hourglass such as was the case in the senate, as he said, in ancient Greek parliaments.

Of course, an hourglass would not serve the purpose we are attempting to achieve, unless it were a sandglass that ran for 3 minutes. Consequently, the Chair has explored the situation and has found it is possible for him to purchase a 3-minute glass, which will be given to the Senate, and which Presiding Officers, in their discretion, will be able to use to keep time equitably, so that no Senator on either side of the aisle will question whether the Presiding Officer has cut him short when he has to rap the gavel and end his tenure on the floor. As a matter of fact, the Chair is leaving not only one 3-minute glass, but two, because Senators may not use the full 3 minutes. When that happens, the other glass can be brought into play to indicate the end of the 3 minutes, so that every Senator will have a full opportunity to have his full 3 minutes without interruption by the Chair or by another Senator.

With this gift, the Chair feels he will have left to the Senate a device which will help to maintain orderly procedure and which will assure that, whoever sits in this chair, be he from one side of the aisle or the other, a question will never be raised as to whether he can tell the time of day.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished occupant of the chair manifests a very practical instinct and indicates that he has some familiarity with the technique of the kitchen. It never occurred to me that there ought to be two 3-minute glasses, but I can see the wisdom of it, because one cannot very well upend the hourglass and get the desired result. And, really, when a speech begins in the morning hour, there must be one glass in operation, and then, if the 3-minute period is not consumed, there must be another available. So I trust the distinguished Vice President will find this instrument will enable us more efficaciously to enforce and monitor the 3-minute rule.

I do not know whether the 3-minute rule originally was designed to be consonant with what it takes to get the right consistency in eggs; but, in any event, it is a 3-minute period, and these glasses are made for the purpose the Vice President has stated.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished occupant of the chair could make such a useful gift; but, since this is going to be his last day in the chair, there are a number of sentiments I want to utter, and in so doing, I think I speak for my colleagues who constitute the leadership on this side who are at the White House today for a luncheon for the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada.

First, Mr. President, before you leave, let me salute you as a man. Never in your public service have you forgotten that the important thing in life is never to lose the human attributes that make a man. I am reminded that in an English church is an epitaph which reads:

Here lies Peter Bacon.
Born a man.
And died a grocer.

Mr. Vice President, you always retain the attributes of the individual. And what a heartwarming experience it was to go through the Capitol with you on occasions when we marched to the House and to hear, "Howdy, Mr. Vice President." "Hi, Dick." That is really a great tribute to you.

Second, may I say you have been one of the most distinguished Vice Presidents of this country. If I needed anything to verify that statement, what happened on November 8 was an ample demonstration as to the trust and confidence of our people in the way you have conducted the public business as the Vice President of the United States. No Vice President in the whole history of this Republic has taken a more active part in the formulations of policies and affairs of the country than have you. No Vice President has been designated to greater responsibilities in the executive branch than have you.

So we salute you, not only as a man: We salute you as a great Vice President and a great public official.

We also salute you as the Presiding Officer of this great deliberative body. Always have your rulings been fair. Always have they been impartial. Always have they been so knowledgeable, and based upon the rules of this body. I can think of no greater tribute—and I think I am correct in saying this—than that never in the 8 years in which you have presided over the deliberations of the U.S. Senate—never once—has one of your rulings been reversed on appeal. I can think of no greater testimony to the fairness, to the knowledge, to the capacity, and to the judicial approach you have taken to your responsibilities as the Presiding Officer of this body.

Now, Mr. President, there will be for you a respite for a time. You will not be too deeply beset with the prolixities and the vagaries of rule XXII; and, if you are, you will not be called upon to pass judgment.

I have an idea—and I say it modestly—that probably Pat will be the speaker in your household, even as the good ladies are the speakers in all households, so when rule XXII comes up for discussion in the family menage it will not be you but the speaker of your great household, Pat, who will pass on the matter.

You will not be beset, I take it, with parliamentary inquiries and points of order, except as they may relate to the children and what they do from time to time.

So, as you put aside the mantle of your responsibility as the Vice President of the United States and as the Presiding Officer of this body, may you enjoy a thorough rest, a thorough respite from the public business, with the understanding that your interest will be an intense and continuing one, because we expect to see you often in the course of our pursuit of the public business.

So, Mr. Vice President, I say for my colleagues, hail and farewell.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I believe this will be the last time we shall have an opportunity—certainly for at least the next 4 years—to address you as Mr. President. That there may be a repetition of this opportunity goes without saying, so far as the opinion of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned.

I believe this is the first time in the history of the Senate it will become possible for the Presiding Officer to lift a glass within these sacred confines, and this glass will be lifted for the betterment of and for the common welfare of all Senators. While it may not prove as refreshing as other glasses lifted in other places on other occasions, it at least will be a timely reminder that each of us really does not have as much wisdom to impart as he thinks he does, and that the other 99 Members of this body are impatiently awaiting their opportunity to enlighten the people of America with their sound judgment, their wise observations, and their keen wit.

Mr. President, it is said that time and tide wait for no man. It will now be demonstrated that while time does not wait for any man, every Senator must wait, after the sands of the glass have expired for him, at least on that occasion.

We have heard the phrase, "time and the river." I think it is a good thing that we have decided the river of oratory shall be dammed—and I use the word in the respectful and proper sense—from place to place by the interception of this reminder.

Mr. President, all of us wish for you the best of everything in life. We say to you, with sadness and with fondness, and we say to your wife, Pat, that always in our lifetimes the influence which has been brought to bear by your leadership will be with us. We hope that leadership and that inspiration will continue. We believe it will. We wish for you much joy, much serenity and much pleasure in such future duties as you may choose to assume.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to join my minority leader and all the others of my colleagues in expressing my appreciation for your service as Presiding Officer of this body. I think you have brought it to a very appropriate climax today, because for the first time over many, many years you have found a way to resolve the problem of cloture. You have given us the cloture device to which all Members of the Senate can agree, which does not require complicated legislation, which has the advantages of being automatic and of being simple. I think in so doing you have made a tremendous contribution to our future success.

No man can leave an office, I think, with greater satisfaction than to know that he has left something behind him which will improve and increase the efficiency of an organization he has served, as you have served us, so well and faithfully.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I accept and concur in every fine thing which has been said about our Vice President. I wish to thank him personally for his service in this body and to the Nation as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, for his fairness, his kindness, and his consideration.

It would take a long speech—it would take many speeches—to enumerate the high points only in the career of our distinguished Vice President. That I shall not attempt to do. I have no fears concerning the verdict of history concerning our Vice President.

Our Vice President is very much loved by the people I represent. He has visited in the State of Nebraska many times. He has personal friends there. He has old college chums there. It was not surprising that in the recent election 62.4 percent of the vote cast for President in that State was cast for our beloved Vice President, RICHARD NIXON.

That is not an isolated sectional verdict, I will say. As the Senate proceeds with its business this year there will be more Senators here who represent States which voted for RICHARD NIXON for President than there will be Senators who represent States which voted otherwise.

Of course, we abide by the results of the election. I will say, however, that our distinguished Vice President has followers and friends who are legion in number—more than he can realize. We wish for him and his fine family every good thing from this moment on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in extending our very best wishes to you and to Pat and to your gracious young daughters, who, as a family, have worked so hard and have helped you to dignify and to fulfill so ably the Office of Vice President of the United States. As you depart into private life I know of no greater tribute that can be paid to you as our Vice President than to say that our country and the world at large are better places in which to live as the result of your distinguished service, and we in the U.S. Senate are better men and women for having had the opportunity of knowing you and Pat.

Good luck and best wishes, but not farewell.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, our distinguished Vice President has said and done many things which will have a lasting impact upon the Senate of the United States. At times he has cajoled, cheered, advised, and praised various Members of this body. We shall, all politics aside, miss his strong hand, his good judgment, and his fine leadership.

The Vice President has today taken an action which perhaps will have a lasting and strong effect upon the Senate. He has given us the perfect recipe for instant oratory: Allow to simmer for 3 minutes and then turn off. The minuteman gave us freedom. May the "3-minute man" help us to preserve it.

Time will mow us down by the instrument which the Vice President has presented to us, but it is inescapable that winds may blow, come and go, but sand is sand, time is time, and that is that. Three minutes are three minutes, and what is presented to us is a very constructive gift which I know we shall all cherish and appreciate.

This gift of time is made particularly significant when one considers how well the giver has exemplified, in his lifetime, the golden uses to which time may be put. What the Vice President has done he has done surpassingly well. He has reached great heights because his outstanding qualities of intellect, of courage, and of leadership have lifted him to those heights. And surely, the magnificent and gracious manner with which he recently accepted defeat represents, in a very true sense, a victory of the human spirit, and a lesson to all of us that the real test of greatness lies not only in the way a man wins but also in the way he loses.

Mr. Vice President, as you give up the office which you have held with such dignity and ability, it is the heartfelt wish of the junior Senator from New York that you and your entire family will have great happiness, and that you will continue to make significant contributions to the welfare of your Nation, as you have in such a unique manner during the years you have served as Vice President of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Vice President, speaking from the majority side of the aisle, I should like to say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair that it is to his great credit that many Senators on this side of the aisle have come to know him, to appreciate him, to respect him, and to have great affection for him.

I wish to remind him that when he came to the Senate in 1950 he was assigned office space and on the same floor and in the same corridor in which the junior Senator from New Mexico had an office. I had many pleasant opportunities to discuss then with the distinguished occupant of the Chair, his activities in the past, and his plans for the future, and also to see the responsibility with which he undertook his first work.

To one who has come to know an individual so well, television can bring some very interesting and perhaps strange thrills. I wish to assure the Vice President that even though I had a

greater interest in another political convention, I received a deep thrill when he was brought to the platform and joined his hands with the able President of the United States in their salute to the convention. The team of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon swept the country. We have seen the Vice President in the intervening years grow substantially in his position. I have been many times impressed with the fact that the young Senator who came from the House of Representatives in 1950 bears very little resemblance to the seasoned statesman who sits in the chair of the Presiding Officer of the Senate at this time. We have all been proud of his growth during the past 8 years.

Mr. President, I would not wish to close without saying that while Mrs. Nixon is a wonderfully fine wife and mother, I take particular pride in the way in which she has conducted herself as head of the Senate ladies.

I speak not only from the standpoint of what my own wife tells me, but also from what other wives comment as they leave meetings and as we meet them in other places.

Mrs. Nixon has been a wonderfully fine presiding officer — democratic, friendly, and kindly to all. I wish to speak a word of commendation for her as well as for the able Presiding Officer in the Senate, and say to him that I know the Senators on the Democratic side wish for him and his fine family the very best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Vice President, I came to the House of Representatives when the Vice President came there in 1947, a veteran, fresh from the wars, with something of the same desire to serve further. However, we had served previously—I as a staff officer, the Vice President in an active role in the Navy, and others in capacities more or less heroic. We all came to the one conclusion that men had suffered too much, and that we must do our utmost to alleviate all suffering.

I have been a long-time admirer and friend of the Vice President through all the days since then, and perhaps the greatest tribute I can pay to the Vice President of the United States is to say that I am proud of his friendship after all these arduous years of struggle and turmoil, of agreement and of difference.

The Vice President's service to our Nation and to our country and to the free world would be underestimated if some of the historic highlights of his service were not mentioned, even if briefly, today. I think that his so-called good will visits, which showed America to the people of the world in the person of one of its most distinguished young men, will have repercussions for decades. I have heard the Vice President described as epitomizing those descriptions, too, in his automobile trip through Warsaw, with the emotion, the tears, and the flowers which commemorated that occasion. I think I know something about the European mind from my own antecedents. It does not forget for generations, and that kind of impression may well prove, years from now, a live and fresh rallying cry to people who will yet get their freedom, though it seems dim indeed to us today.

Then we recall the Vice President's story to us all of his experiences in Caracas, which also had a historic significance because it showed how close to us a problem could have arisen. The event was a deep experience of regret and shame to the people of Latin America, one which will be remembered for decades, and may some day result in a far more substantial practice of democratic ideals and free institutions there because it happened, than otherwise.

Finally, some very tasteful and somewhat humorous observations have been made by my colleague about the 3-minute rule, and the Vice President's tasteful contribution to the enforcement of that rule.

I prefer to speak of the historic service of the Vice President in his ruling that the Senate has control over its rules under the Constitution of the United States. This may prove to be the most single historic act that the Vice President has performed in his incumbency that is directly related to his office and not peripheral in its responsibility at all. This subject remains one of the great problems of the country. I think we shall solve it. If we do so, I believe the Vice President can take enormous satisfaction from the fact that he laid the foundation for its solution.

To you, Mr. Vice President, who have shown us an example of not only a great public man but also a great family man, to Pat and the children, every good wish in life. The happy days are just beginning. All health and success to you.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Vice President, my colleagues have touched less completely than any of them would have wished upon your service to the Nation—and it is a very great service—and upon the unique and very special job you have performed as Vice President in every capacity. I shall not, therefore, labor that subject, except to note that it alone would have been more than sufficient reason for all of us to heap our accolades upon you at this time.

The Senator from New York has just mentioned a subject upon which I had intended to dwell, one of many incidents in your distinguished career as Presiding Officer over this body. Perhaps your ruling will prove to be the most important, historic, and the most lasting of your contributions in that regard. But your whole conduct has been that of a distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, and for this conduct we thank you.

I should like to add a word about the Vice President's able leadership of the party of which we are both members. The leadership has been on the forward-looking side. It has been on the side which understands that a great American party must represent all the people and that it has a tremendous obligation for progress, as well as a proper obligation for restraint and responsible conduct. For this we thank you.

But of course most of all—and this is what we feel most strongly—we appreciate the friendship, the personal understanding, and the warm relationship we have enjoyed with you during our service, some of us in the House, and all of us in the Senate, most recently as you presided over the Senate.

Our good wishes to you and to your wife and to your family go without saying. We express our good wishes with less sadness because we know that from time to time you will be around here, and we will have much pleasure in seeing you. Good luck.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I did not want to let the opportunity pass by without expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. Vice President, for the outstanding service you have rendered to this body.

I was sworn into the Senate on November 29, 1950. According to the records, the Vice President was sworn into the Senate on December 5, 1950, in the 82d Congress. Therefore, our service in this body has been pretty much together, although in different capacities during some part of the time.

It has been a great privilege and pleasure to work with you, Mr. Vice President, and a great pleasure to have known you, not only as the Presiding Officer with your great ability and great fairness, but personally. One of the majority colleagues came walking along a few moments ago and he said to me: "Among all the Presiding Officers I have ever served under, I never questioned the fairness of the present occupant of the chair." That is a compliment which, coming from the other side, is worthy of note, and I am sure the feeling is shared by all the Members of the Senate.

I have been proud, too, of the splendid good will ambassador you have been for our Nation. As a matter of fact, wherever you and your good wife have traveled, you have left nothing but good will. You have implanted among the peoples of other nations a character and life that exemplify the true America. Sometimes the pictures foreign people get of our country are not very good. That is largely because many who carry those pictures to foreign lands leave a poor image of this country. That is not the kind of image you left overseas.

Mr. President, you have rendered great service in these fields. We will miss you. As has been suggested, you will of course, come back and will be around here with us. Wherever you and your good wife, Pat, go, we all wish you the best of everything. Godspeed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to join my distinguished colleagues in the statements they have been making about our distinguished Vice President. I merely wish to add, as one of the youngest Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, that you, Mr. Vice President, have provided the young members of our party, as well as the young voters of the country, with great inspiration. You have demonstrated that there is a high place in the leadership, not only of one's party, but also of one's country; that there is that place for the younger as well as the older citizens of this country.

For this reason, in addition to the great many reasons advanced by my col-

leagues, we thank you, and we wish you the very best.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the remarks they are making about the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, our Vice President, who, after 8 fruitful years, is on the verge of leaving the Senate.

I understand that some reference has been made to 3-minute glasses this morning. I assure the distinguished Vice President that he will not need one to keep me within the 3-minute limit. At the same time I want him to know that I appreciate the graciousness, the courtesy, the understanding, and the tolerance he has shown during the 8 years he has graced the chair which he new occupies.

I will admit that I have not always been in accord with his rulings, especially those that are advisory, but I do recognize that the chair has been occupied by one who believes in the dignity of the Senate and in the dignity of the office which he has had the honor and privilege to occupy for so long a period of time.

I do not believe this is a hail and farewell meeting for the Vice President. I am sure I speak on behalf of all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I say that we are deeply appreciative of the many courtesies he has extended to us, and also for the graciousness and understanding and tolerance that he has consistently shown.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last week I had an opportunity to speak about the Vice President on the occasion of his birthday. What I would say now would be in reiteration to a great extent of what I said on that occasion.

When we consider that in the short space of 15 years the Vice President, although still a young man, has been elected to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, has served as Vice President for 8 years, has been chosen by his party to be its candidate for President, and received almost half the votes of the people in this country for the Presidency, we have testimony which speaks more eloquently than anything I can say, of the deep respect and confidence in which he is held by the people of the United States.

We are proud of him for the campaign he made for the Presidency of the United States; and for the sense of responsibility to his country, which he maintained during the campaign—and when the campaign was over, by his understanding and respect for the American system, the glory which makes it stand out more than any other free system; the glory that ours is a free system which continues whatever the result of the election may be.

The Vice President has broken new ground in the Senate by his rulings, made with integrity and with great courage, and yet with profound respect for the Senate's character. I doubt if the extent of his rulings and their significance for the years to come is as yet widely understood and appreciated by peoples to whom they will mean much.

I speak of his work for world understanding and peace. Wherever he traveled throughout the world, he represented our country's best and deepest purposes. When I say represented our country, I cannot say more.

Two years ago I was in London at the time of the dedication of the chapel in St. Paul's Cathedral to American servicemen who lost their lives during the second great war.

I stood in St. Paul's that day, with pride and emotion when the Vice President of the United States walked down the aisle of that great cathedral as the representative of the United States in the moving ceremony.

I believe it was the Vice President's first visit to England in his official capacity. Before he came to London, many articles appeared in the newspapers speculating, inquiring about the Vice President of the United States.

He spoke several times in London; he was seen, heard; he talked to all types of people. And then the newspapers wrote of his integrity, ability, the intellectual capacity, and the service of the Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President and his wife have again symbolized the promise and opportunity our country affords to young men and women of capacity, integrity and patriotism. They have given devoted and patriotic service to country.

This is not a day to say, "Hail and Farewell." I remember the lines from Gilbert and Sullivan which go something like this:

> The privilege and the pleasure
> That we treasure beyond measure
> Is the satisfying feeling
> That our duty has been done.

They do not speak the philosophy of the Vice President. I know that his duty to his country will never be done. We bid him goodbye knowing this to be true.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the members of the house of NIXON prepare to exemplify the great American song, "California, Here We Come," I should like to be among those extending the wish of good fortune and good cheer to Pat and DICK and their two charming daughters.

It has been my unusual good fortune to be very closely associated with the Vice President through most of his public career. We served together as Members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through some pretty hectic and exciting days.

We served together as members of the Senate Investigating Committee, through another significant and important era of American history.

I was privileged to be among those campaigning for him in a significant campaign out in California between Mrs. Douglas and DICK NIXON. I have enjoyed every minute of my close association with the Vice President. It has been a challenge to work with him.

DICK NIXON has never lost an election in South Dakota. He has always carried every contest, whether in a convention or in a fall election.

I know that he has served his country well as a messenger of good will abroad and as an advocate of good sense here at home; and I know that as he goes to California we will hear much in the future about this very energetic and patriotic young American.

I think it might well be said of him, as Churchill said, that this is not the beginning of the end. Perhaps today is the end of the beginning, because he starts out once again as a private citizen with a vast reservoir of knowledge about American public affairs and world affairs in general.

I am sure the country will hear more in the form of words of counsel and suggestions as he brings into focus his experienced opinions on the various problems of our time.

I think DICK NIXON has demonstrated that he is a great gladiator in contest. He accepts defeat with dignity. After all, that is the American philosophy. After the voters have spoken, we unite behind the victor.

I congratulate DICK NIXON on a great career of 14 years in public life in Washington. He had a useful and constructive career in private life and in military service prior to that time.

I assure him that Mrs. Mundt and I are among those wishing for him and his family the best of everything in years to come.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I join other Senators this afternoon in paying my heartfelt respects to our distinguished Vice President, and conveying my sincere regards in connection with his departure within the next day or so from his official duties as Vice President of the United States.

As is the case with other Senators who have spoken, I have known RICHARD NIXON for a number of years. I have known him and worked with him in various capacities. I think the record is abundantly clear that no man in public life, either in this generation or in any past generation, has possessed a higher degree of devotion to public service and to his fellow man, or a higher degree of zeal for service, than has the Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

In some ways, one period in the American political system is coming to a close, and another one is beginning. Eight years ago when you, sir, became Vice President of the United States, we were in one of the major wars that have beset the United States throughout its history. We saw that war brought to a close, and we saw carried to a successful conclusion the arduous task of the reestablishment of economic and political stability in this country, as differentiated from wartime politicial and economic situations.

During those 8 years we have witnessed great progress in our country. We have seen perhaps the greatest consistent period of reliable prosperity this country has ever known. We have seen great confidence in the United States sustained, and in my opinion advanced, not only here, but throughout the world. We have seen a record of accomplishment that may never be equaled.

But, Mr. President, the greatest thing I recall in these years of association with you has been your great cordiality and your willingness to assist and cooperate.

That applies not alone to those of your party, but those of both political parties. No man can successfully point his finger at you and say that you ever deceived him in any way, or that you ever failed to do anything but give him the fullest and most honest cooperation in any matter touching you and him.

We have a special pride and a special proprietary interest in you, Mr. President, because of your service in Iowa during World War II. All one has to do is to go to Ottumwa, Iowa, and talk with any man or woman on the street, or in any home. They speak with pride about knowing you and Mrs. Nixon. They recall with nostalgia the days you spent there. Not only have you always been welcome in Iowa, but you have visited us too infrequently for our own satisfaction, although you have favored us with repeated visits.

In your recent political campaign, which was the culmination of many years of some of the most extensive and effective preparation for further political life that any man has ever had, and perhaps the most anyone has ever had in the history of this country, you conducted yourself with the highest degree of verity and truth and strength of argument.

At no time did you indulge in any demagogic programs or campaigns. You talked facts and figures, and expressed interest in the American people and the American system. I think the American people overwhelmingly appreciate that particular trait.

I shall always remember that campaign as one of vigor; and although your party and mine did not prevail, I remember the campaign with a considerable degree of satisfaction which comes from the fact that in the last analysis your programs and the ones which I supported and which other Republicans supported were honorably, fairly, and decently presented to the American people in the truest traditions of our political life.

I have just completed a swing around Latin America; I left on November 14. At that time the outcome of the total vote in the election was still uncertain. When I left, the difference between the total popular votes received by each candidate was approximately 175,000, out of 68 million-plus votes. In a number of Latin American countries I found great concern about the closeness of the vote; and as the margin decreased until, before I returned, it was approximately 112,000, in the various countries I was repeatedly asked by nationals of great importance in their countries, "What are you Republicans going to do with so close a vote?" Of course my answer was, "We will abide by what the majority of the people of the United States say." After the first inquiry had given me the key, I said to each of those persons, "What would you do if you had an election that close in your country?" Almost invariably the answer they gave was, "We would have a revolution." I took that opportunity to refer to the American principle which you, Mr. President, so magnificently expressed on the day of the official canvass of the electoral college at the joint session of the Congress. As you so magnificently said on that day, I tried to impress on those persons the fact that we in this country believe we have arrived at the most fundamental of all self-governing principles; namely, to accept with grace and dignity the will of the majority of the people.

Mr. President, not in the nature of a requiem at your departure, but because I intend it in the nature of one of the greatest tributes I can pay, I say that no man has ever met, accepted, and surmounted defeat when he sought election to the highest office in the land, with greater grace or greater devotion to the true principle of rule by the majority in a free society than you yourself, sir. To me, that is one of the greatest tributes that could be paid you.

The magnificence with which you have met the vicissitudes of that campaign, of the election, and of the postelection days, is something I shall always remember; and it will inspire me and, I know, all others in the United States.

To you and Mrs. Nixon and your children, Mrs. Hickenlooper and I extend our best wishes; and we wish you all of the best things in life during the years to come.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, not upon the occasion of the ending of his public service, but, rather, upon the occasion of almost the end of his service while presiding over the U.S. Senate. I believe that too few persons in the country realize that successful participation in the Government, not only by the President and the Vice President, but by anyone in public office, is the result of a studied circumscribing of emotions and baser motives and the achievement of objectiveness which, in the truest sense, marks a real public servant and, in the truest sense, marks a statesman.

In this respect I could enumerate many things which demonstrate the applicability of that statement to the Vice President, the President of the Senate. For example, I think of the situation which existed when the Vice President was called upon to rule for the first time upon the responsibility and the opportunity of the Senate to make its own rules when it met at the beginning of a new Congress. It would have been easy for the Vice President to have ruled otherwise than as he did rule on that occasion, and there were many pressures to do it. There were many persons who would have liked to see him rule otherwise. In view of the fact that even by then it was fairly obvious that the Vice President might well be a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, it would have been easy for him to have curried favor with certain sections of the country by making a ruling other than the one he did make. I was happy and privileged to take part in the debate in the Senate at the time when the ruling was made; and I believe it is to the eternal credit of the Vice President that, regardless of political considerations and, I know, without emotion, but strictly in reliance upon his own ability as a lawyer, he made a study of the rules and of the Constitution and of the history of the Senate and, on that basis, made the ruling that at the beginning of a Congress the Senate can make its own rules. In doing so, I must say that I believe he was completely correct.

Let me also say, Mr. President, that following the recent election, all of us—even though of course we reserve the right to criticize—will support the new President and the new Vice President in the same way that every President and every Vice President of our country must be supported, in the interest of our national welfare. But following that election, which was won by so small a margin, the Vice President must have a great glow of warmth in his heart from the realization that almost 50 percent—only an infinitesimal number less than that—of the people of the country supported him and supported the doctrines and the ideals of government which he has so ably espoused.

And I am particularly happy, of course, that the people of my own State overwhelmingly—I repeat, overwhelmingly—supported the Vice President in that election and the ideas and the concept of the future of this country which he so ably expressed during the campaign. In all this, of course, his lovely wife, Pat, has had a great part; and I would be remiss if I did not express, for Mrs. Allott and myself, the deep affection we have for her as well as for the Vice President, and the very great job she has done—and it has been a great job—as the wife of the Vice President of the United States.

Then I think, if I may say so, Mr. Vice President, that it is a wonderful thing that a man like yourself still stands today as a part of the American tradition and the American ideal that high office and great leadership can be attained regardless of the state of a man's birth, or his religion, or the place of his birth. So long as we have people who, like yourself, are of modest means, as you have been all your life, who can attain such high office, I think we can look forward with hope that the boys and girls of America will cherish this American tradition and ideal.

I speak, lastly, of courage. The present occupant has brought the office of the Vice-Presidency up to its present great prestige—a level of prestige not previously accorded this position. I cannot forget that, from the time he entered the Senate, and, yes, even before, when he was the spearhead of the effort to uncover one of the foulest infiltrations of our Government that ever took place, the Vice President has been the subject of vitriolic, and many times vicious, attacks by his opponents in this country. Through all of this, he has shown the same courage, the same objectiveness, the same unwillingness to resort to the kind of emotional involvement that has occasionally overtaken his opponents.

And I cannot forget the courage he showed as our ambassador, not the official ambassador, but the representative of this country as Vice President. If people could have heard, as I heard, his report on the situation in Caracas and

his visit to South America, they could have only asked themselves this question: "Could I, under the same circumstances, have displayed the same courage the Vice President and his wife displayed at that time?" No man could have answered that question in the affirmative, because no man could have been subject to greater provocation or danger and remained so composed.

So today, for all practical purposes, ends one phase of the Vice President's life. None of us can see into the future, neither the Vice President, nor I, nor any of us present on the floor, nor anyone except the all-pervading Deity. I hope that in the years to come we can see a constant enhancement and enlargement and enrichment of the Vice President's public service, and feel certain that we will.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], would have you especially note their concurrence in these tributes, since they are unavoidably detained.

Mr. President, second, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit their tributes for inclusion in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these tributes be assembled and published as a Senate document, notwithstanding the existing rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I sat in the Senate for the last 8 years and listened occasionally to tributes paid both our living friends and those who have departed, I could not help but feel that they sounded something like a wake. I feel a great sadness in my heart at your leaving this body and leaving the high office that you hold; but, as I think about it, there are many things we Americans can be happy about in the 8 years you have served the country as Vice President and have served this body as its President.

Instead of sounding sad about your leaving—which I am—I should like to enumerate some of the things we ought to be happy about. I might say, facetiously, that the people of Arizona are happy that one who lived in Arizona has been Vice President, and that he has been the best Vice President this country has ever had. I think Arizonians are happy to see what its waters can do for a man who lives in California.

Now I speak more as an American citizen than as a Senator: I am very proud and happy of the way you served our country in time of war. I am very proud of the way in which you served our country as you traveled around in the many, many countries, representing America and the American people and American ideals. This is to my mind one of the few times that this objective has been so completely accomplished and with such conspicuous success.

I am very happy, as an American, that you had the courage to seek to ferret out Communists in our Government. I only wish your example of courage had been followed more completely and more fully by others who followed in your footsteps.

I am very happy, as an American, for the example you have been, because I happen to have four children and two grandchildren. I am happy to be able to say that this office of Vice-Presidency has been filled by such a competent man, who measures up to every definition of that word.

And, Mr. President, I think we are all happy that your wife, Pat, showed such good judgment in marrying you, because we have looked upon you, in the office of the Vice-Presidency, as what we call an ideal, if not almost perfect, American family. I would use the word "perfect," but, being a father, I know that is rather hard to achieve in a family. But I think Pat deserves almost as much credit as you do for the conspicuous success you have had in your public life. And to her and to your family I think all Americans show a great respect and a great deal of respect for having been as you are.

Finally, I am very happy to have had your friendship through the years, and that I have had the opportunity to display my friendship to you; and I shall look forward in the years ahead, to the retention of your friendship and the opportunities from time to time to show my friendship and my respect for an American for whom I have great admiration.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Vice President, as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, is presenting the Senate with 3-minute glasses, the Senator from New Hampshire will show his appreciation by confining his remarks well within the limit.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to participate in these tributes without injecting a slightly personal note. You will remember, Mr. President, it was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to hold up his hand and to take his oath of office as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives 14 years ago on the same day that you entered that body. It was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to serve with you in that session of Congress. It was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to serve with you and a group of freshman Representatives in Congress who met week by week to compare notes and to improve their own viewpoints together.

So, as I rise this afternoon, I think of that personal relationship and some of the memories which come to me of the years that you have served—particularly the earlier years. I recall very well—and I shall never forget—the afternoon in the House of Representatives when you, Mr. President, rose to make your report on the so-called Alger Hiss case to the House of Representatives. I shall never forget your opening words, that the United States of America, this country, cannot afford another Hiss case. I recall how unimpassioned, how careful, how fair, how analytical was that report. I went out of the House of Representatives that afternoon saying to a friend, "That man will be heard from in future years."

I remember that a group of Representatives gathered together at the close of the 80th Congress, which was our freshman term, to talk about the record made by each new Representative. Of course, everyone in the group secretly felt he had made the best record, but actually the composite opinion of the group was that RICHARD NIXON of California was perhaps the most promising of all the young men who entered public life in that Congress.

As the years unfolded it was my privilege to serve with you in the House of Representatives, as it was later my privilege to serve under you as the Presiding Officer in the Senate, to know you as Vice President of the United States, and to work for you as my candidate for President of the United States.

I do not think of your career as a succession of achievements, as a calling of the roll of the positions you have held, the responsibilities you have met and the duties you have discharged.

I think, rather, of the qualities of mind and of heart which have impressed themselves upon all who know you. The first of those qualities, of which I always think, is that you have impressed me, and I think you have impressed all who know you well, as a precision thinker. I have never known you to, in the colloquialism of my good old New England State of New Hampshire, "Go off half-cocked." I have never known you to utter a hasty, ill-considered, unfortunate word. I have watched you go through many delicate missions abroad. I have watched you handle yourself through two Presidential illnesses without one single major misstep in all those years. From the time I first heard you address the House on the Hiss case through all these years, in every capacity, you have exhibited the same restraint and never yielded to the temptation of being sensational or demagogic. I for one rejoice in the fact that while many wished you to resort to these devices in the recent campaign, you steadfastly remained yourself to the end. Such intellectual honesty, in the long run, cannot fail.

I think of you first as a precision thinker. We need such men. That attribute must not be lost to leadership in this country.

I think of you second because of the personal relationship I have been privileged to have with you through the past 14 years. I think of you in a way more and more Americans, I think, are coming to think of you, particularly in these later days, though they did not think of you always in this way in times past—as a warm, affectionate personality. That same sincere devotion you have exhibited to your family you have for your friends and you have for all with whom you come in contact. We who have known you know these things.

I do not even take the time to think about your achievements, the offices you have held, the trips you have taken, and the speeches you have made. I think,

rather, of what you are. Like the Senator from Arizona, I feel this is not an unhappy occasion, even though you are leaving this Chamber in which you have served so well.

Those who know you believe the things you possess, the qualities you have, and the abilities you have demonstrated, are so valuable that they cannot long remain in disuse. We expect and believe we shall be associated with you again.

In closing, on that rather warm human note, I should like to use a paraphrase of words of Fielding:

God bless you, RICHARD NIXON, may you live a thousand years—
To guide us on our pathway through this weary vale of tears,
And may we live a thousand, too, a thousand less one day,
For we would not want to be on earth the day you pass away.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in congratulating Vice President NIXON upon his record during the 8 years he has presided over the U.S. Senate. He has been fair, and he has been clear in his rulings. He has been friendly and helpful to the individual Members of this body. He has not hesitated to cast his vote to break a tie when he was required to do so.

As an individual, he retires from his present post with a thoughtful understanding of our national and international problems, which are complicated and difficult. He has done much to better international relations with our friends in other countries, and he has proved himself, with Mrs. Nixon's help, a worthy, courageous, and intelligent representative of the United States in areas of the world which are not so friendly to us or our way of life. On domestic questions, he has proved himself a sound public official.

On the many occasions when he has spoken briefly at a dinner, his remarks have been apt, humorous, and yet appreciative of the amenities of the gathering.

Now he leaves us as the Presiding Officer of this body, but will continue as a friend and helpful counsellor in the days to come. I am certain that DICK NIXON and his wife, Pat, have many happy and useful years ahead of them. I am sure we will hear of him often and favorably in the days to come.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the history of the administration of Dwight Eisenhower is finally and completely chronicled, it will tell of a unique and dedicated public service, quite unparalleled in the Nation's history, which was rendered during all those years by the Vice President of the United States, my fellow Californian, RICHARD NIXON.

Today, for the last time, the Vice President presided over the proceedings in the Senate. During all the time that he has been the second highest officer in the country, those who have served with him in this Chamber, regardless of their political persuasion, have saluted him as an able and honorable Presiding Officer, skilled in parliamentary law, fair in his decisions, and honest in the opinions which he has rendered.

The other day, on the occasion of his birthday anniversary, I recalled what I thought was a remarkably clear, cogent, able, and courageous opinion which the Vice President had previously uttered with respect to the constitutional rights of a majority of the Senate in each Congress to determine the rules by which the public business in this Chamber might be transacted. This opinion, I believe, will be one of the milestones in the career which Vice President RICHARD NIXON has made for himself in this Chamber.

But far more than the success and the reputation which he achieved here in the Senate Chamber are those far-flung responsibilities given to him by his Chief, each of which he discharged with distinction to his Government and to the American people.

The Vice President was placed in charge of the governmental Committee on Fair Employment Practices; and there, in company with a group of outstanding Americans, attempted to make, and did make, progress in the fair and equal treatment of our people who are employed under contracts awarded with governmental tax dollars in the defense industry and otherwise.

Across the street, at the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court, is the eloquent phrase "Equal justice under law." In the deliberation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices, and in the leadership which Vice President NIXON provided for that committee's activities, substantial progress was made toward equal treatment under law, one of the basic American dreams.

Our people, too, will remember him as he represented the people of the United States abroad. Vice President NIXON traveled in many climes during the past 8 years.

They will recall that, at the direction of his Chief, representing the Government of the United States, he stood unflinching in the face of mob violence in Venezuela. They will recall him as the symbol of American freedom when the Polish people strew the highways with garlands of flowers as he proceeded to go through the streets of that beleaguered country and traveled among its gallant people.

All in all, the Vice President of the United States, as he and his wife and two daughters leave the District of Columbia to return to the State which I have the honor to represent in part, his native State of California, will take with him real satisfaction and inward pride in the manner in which he has discharged the multitude of official chores, both legislative and executive, which were given to him in the great years through which our country and the world have now passed.

He and his family will take away with them something more than mere recollections and a sense of pride. They will take with them the respect and affection of Members of the Senate, of those in government who have worked with him, in both political parties, and quite regardless whether they have disagreed with him from time to time. The Nixons will take with them the respect of all who have known them here at the seat of Government and all across the land.

In the last campaign the Vice President of the United States was the nominee of my party for Chief Executive of our country. He conducted a campaign honorably. He conducted it well. Almost half our citizens supported him. Since last November his public utterances have been accepted by the American people as an attempt—and I think I may say a successful attempt—to weld us all together into one strong, American Nation.

The other day, when the Congress met in joint session in response to the constitutional provision with respect to the counting of the electoral votes, I thought the Vice President of the United States, in his comments on that occasion, demonstrated what is at the bottom of the American dream—a dream which we, no matter what our race or creed, no matter whence our forebears sprang, can realize. We are Americans together, as he said so well, united by an unflinching zeal to retain the liberty which we have, and to accept the responsibility which is ours, to lead the world toward freedom and a just peace, and away from slavery.

In the words he used the other day, he was vigorously applauded by all in the Congress who sat and listened to him as fellow citizens.

I am glad to say on this occasion, Mr. President, as Vice President NIXON returns home, he takes with him good wishes and Godspeed from all of us.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in associating myself with the remarks previously made in regard to Vice President NIXON, I wish to say that it is a matter of deep personal regret to me that the Vice President is very shortly to take leave of us.

I have listened with great interest and sympathy to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and I share the great feeling of affection and respect that he has voiced regarding DICK NIXON.

Vice President NIXON has been, I believe, the most tireless and self-sacrificing worker for the Republican Party in the last 8 years, at least; and I say this because during that period I have been closely associated with him.

He has come to Connecticut whenever we wished him to do so, to help our party; and he has made a wonderful impression there. His popularity in my State has increased with every trip he has made there; and people in the press and people in other walks of life in Connecticut who were opposed to him have come to respect him greatly.

I believe that no campaigner for the Republican Party has been more greatly respected and, I may say, even feared by the other party than DICK NIXON. Of course, that situation has placed him under fierce attack. However, when confronted with such attacks, he has always faced them forthrightly, with iron nerve, and he has been undaunted and undiminished in his efforts to accomplish what he set out to accomplish for our party.

Vice President NIXON has been a great leader.

The Vice President has also been a great loser, as all of us have observed

during the last few weeks. He is what I call a great sportsman, too, because he has taken his defeat in the manner in which great sportsmen do take defeat—without rancor, but with good will for all—not only all who worked for him, but even those who were responsible for his defeat. This has increased enormously our admiration of him.

Finally, Mr. President, I would observe in regard to Mrs. Nixon that her friendship has been one of the friendships which Mrs. Bush has enjoyed to the utmost in the past 8 years. They have been great friends, and I know I speak for Mrs. Bush—and I am glad to do it—when I say that a very sad parting will take place when Pat Nixon leaves Washington. She has, of course, endeared herself to all of us who have had the privilege of knowing her, and we shall miss her very much indeed.

I know that the Senate wives, over which she presided by virtue of being the wife of the Vice President, have formed a very deep affection for her, and that is true not only of the Republican women but also of the Democratic women. Last spring, when the group broke up, extremely fine tributes were paid to Pat Nixon, and the most glowing one was made by the wife of a Democratic Senator—a tribute which was accompanied by a gift symbolic of their deep affection for Pat Nixon.

So, Mr. President, rather sadly, although I am glad to have this opportunity to speak, I pay my affectionate respects to the Nixons. I state without qualification my great pride in our friendship and my great regard for this great politician, this great statesman, and this great servant of the American people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unable to be here, because of illness. He asked me to read the following:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

We are going to miss Vice President NIXON. During his campaign his first stop was at Indianapolis and our Hoosier State immediately climbed aboard his bandwagon.

RICHARD M. NIXON has served our country well with dignity and sincerity. The service he has given as Vice President is unparalleled in the history of our Nation.

I hope his experience and knowledge will be available to our country for many, many years to come.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying my respects to the Vice President, our Presiding Officer.

I can remember, as some of my other colleagues can, receiving the oath of office in the House of Representatives at the same time the Vice President received his. I shall always remember with pleasure and with pride the many years that I was associated in the House with him.

I feel at this time possibly a deeper loss, as the Presiding Officer concludes his many years of service in this body, for I, as a new Member of the Senate, am losing the opportunity to once again be associated with a man for whom I hold the highest respect and deepest admiration.

Despite the outcome of the recent election, the Vice President is well aware of the legion of friends that he has in my State of Delaware. Our people have always looked with anticipation on his many visits, and I am sure they feel as my colleague from Iowa expressed it—his visits were all too infrequent.

I shall, too, add finally, that I do not believe that this is "hail and farewell." I would rather believe that it is only "auf wiedersehen."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as a codicil to this testament of tribute and affection, I simply say "Godspeed."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INHERITED BURDEN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this week, 3 days hence, the will of the people, expressed in the election of last November, will take effect. John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be inaugurated as President of the United States, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON as Vice President. This week tens of thousands of Americans will converge on the National Capital to attend the inaugural ceremonies and to cheer the new leadership. Tens of millions will watch the ceremony over television and listen to it by radio.

For the first time in some years, the executive and legislative branches will be under the guidance of the same political party—a condition, I believe, which should and will tend to more effective functioning of our Government. The transition from the executive administration of one party to that of another has been accomplished with unprecedented smoothness and effectiveness, and with a gratifying tolerance and good feeling both on the part of the outgoing and incoming officialdom. A great deal of credit for the efficiency of this transition belongs to Clark Clifford, to whom this task has been entrusted by President-elect Kennedy. But it is also due to the thoughtful courtesy, kindliness, good nature, and good will of the outgoing and incoming national leaders, and worthy of a special salute, the good sportsmanship of Vice President NIXON. Their gallant performance is a tribute not only to them but to the American system.

This subject was admirably discussed by that outstandingly wise commentator, James Reston, in Sunday's New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REASSURING CIVILITY OF THE TRANSITION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—The changing of the guard in Washington has been achieved with more civility and commonsense this time than ever in living memory.

There has been less friction and less personal bitterness, despite the closeness of the election, than anybody expected, and this says a great deal for the essential unity of the American people and the stability of their political institutions.

In no truly democratic country in the world is there such a sharp contrast between the lives of the defeated and the lives of the victorious. In victory, RICHARD NIXON is the leader not only of the Nation but of the whole free world; in defeat, he is a lawyer outside Los Angeles.

It is a cruel system; maybe not as cruel as in Russia, where a man who loses power may lose his head, or in Latin America, where the defeated candidate often loses his homeland; but it is cruel enough to bruise men's souls and debase their reason.

If this has happened this time, however, it is certainly not apparent. President Eisenhower has been a model of courtesy and generosity. Vice President NIXON has slipped into the shadows with dignity and even good humor. And Senator Kennedy has moved with great sensitivity to bind up the wounds of the campaign.

THE HUMAN COURTESIES

It is not only that the practical obligations of the transition have been met. The files of the old administration have, of course, been opened to the new, but the spirit of the whole thing has been admirable in every one of the departments, and the new Cabinet has been treated on Capitol Hill with elaborate courtesy.

Kennedy has not only avoided extreme partisanship or ideological alinement in picking his Cabinet but has paid attention to those important human details which make disappointment tolerable.

He called on Mr. NIXON. He paid his respects to Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Hoover. He reassured the financial community and the business community by inviting Douglas Dillon and Robert McNamara into his Cabinet, and he filled the sub-Cabinet posts with distinguished men regardless of their political affiliations.

As a result, an interesting thing has happened. The mail reaching the capital now is full of letters from Republicans testifying that they feel much better about Kennedy's victory today than they did two months ago, and the President-elect is thus approaching Inauguration Day with a larger margin of support than when he was elected.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

There are of course, differences between the parties, particularly on the state of the Union. The Republicans are saying that we have made great progress in the last eight years and the Democrats are saying that we are in terrible shape, and of course both are right

The confusion lies in definition of progress. In his last state of the Union message this week, President Eisenhower defined progress in terms of a catalog of improvements over what we had before.

Thus, he cited the phenomenal rise in the productivity of the Nation with more guns and butter, and more people employed at higher wages and with more Social Security than ever before.

The Democrats do not challenge these facts, but they have a different definition of progress. When they talk of our decline,

they are speaking relatively, not about where we are now in relation to where we were internally eight years ago, but where we stand in relation to our external problems.

Herbert Spencer defined "progress" as an increase of a man's adaptation to his environment. George Bernard Shaw observed that there were five main directions in which a civilization could go wrong: By being overwhelmed as a result of falling out of date in its economics, its politics, its science, its education, and its religion.

This is what Kennedy is talking about. He is not saying we have not improved in many ways, but that improvement is not necessarily progress in Spencer's terms, that we have improved but not enough to adapt to our revolutionary environment.

Nevertheless, even this argument between the parties is proceeding now without rancor. We may not know where we are or where we're going, but we're on our way, and at least for the moment, nobody in Washington is very mad at anybody else.

Mr. GRUENING. However, Mr. President, there is a basic fact—indeed a series of basic facts—connected with the change of administration that needs to be called to the attention of the American people.

That fact is that the Kennedy administration inherits a very grave situation—or series of situations—from the Eisenhower administration.

This fact is not generally known or appreciated by the American people.

It is not generally known or appreciated for several reasons. In the recent Presidential campaign, Vice President NIXON campaigned on the optimistic theme that all was well.

Domestically, he insisted, there would be no recession.

Abroad, he declared repeatedly, the prestige of the United States was never higher—the prestige of our totalitarian opponents never lower. In short, everything was on the up and up both at home and abroad.

Likewise, President Eisenhower, in his farewell state of the Union message, naturally stressed the favorable aspects of his 8-year administration, highlighted what he believed had been its accomplishments, and minimized the adverse factors.

So, for these and other reasons, the American people are not aware of what a heavy burden President Kennedy will inherit when he takes office on January 20.

What are the facts?

Domestically, the Nation is going into a serious recession. It may become a depression, although the difference between a recession and a depression may be one of degree—or semantics. The fact is that unemployment has reached its highest peak since 1940, and the trend is far more unemployment.

The dollar is in peril, and the belated efforts of the Eisenhower administration to stop the outflow of gold testify to that fact.

Abroad, the free world is confronted with grave crises in southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa, all legacies of what has been done, or not done, by the outgoing administration.

Let us look at the state of the Nation's economy—the home front.

To my knowledge, no one has ever thought of the U.S. News & World Report as a magazine displaying preference for the Democratic Party. However, it is thorough and exhaustive in its discussion of economic problems, national and foreign, and its newsgrams are generally perceptive and accurate. Hence, its statements that John F. Kennedy "is walking right into a recession," that "business is getting worse, not better," that unemployment is rising, and that industry's output "will be running 7 percent below a year earlier," may be taken as a fair estimate of what our President-elect faces. It is indeed a gloomy picture.

I ask unanimous consent that the newsgram from U.S. News & World Report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSGRAM

John F. Kennedy, walking right into the middle of a recession, is to face this situation on January 20:

Business will be getting worse, not better. Unemployment will be above 5½ million, and rising. Steel mills will be operating at barely half of capacity. Output of industry will be running roughly 7 percent below a year earlier. Factory orders will be lagging.

Some bright spots will be showing through. People's incomes, in total, will be high. Retail trade will be good—not booming, probably, but good. Reports on Christmas trade, coming out in January, will mark up a new high.

The recession, as recessions go, will be mild overall, yet painful for many. Recovery, when Kennedy takes over, still will be months away.

That's to be the first problem the new President will have to face.

Kennedy, at the outset, will be limited in what he can do about it. The new administration, trying to deal with a business slump at home, will be caught by troubles of the U.S. dollar abroad.

The dilemma will be this: Raise Federal spending sharply to give business a lift, and the budget will be thrown for a loop. That could mean further damage to the dollar's standing in other countries. Cut taxes, and it's the same story—a budget out of whack, meaning more trouble for the dollar. Cut interest rates to encourage spending of borrowed money, and more capital flows out of the United States to seek higher returns abroad. That would hurt.

Besides, it's Congress that has the last word on big scale spending or tax cuts. Action there takes time. Federal Reserve Board holds the power over interest rates, and FRB doesn't have to take orders from the White House.

It would be a mistake to expect any sudden magic from a new administration.

The recession, in other words, will run about the same course as if there were no change in Washington. Speedup in defense contracts will continue. That has started under Eisenhower, and will help. Some other programs may be pushed a bit faster. Kennedy's main proposals to Congress, however, will be mostly longer range, with limited effect on the current recession.

The timetable for business now looks about like this:

Christmas, 1960: Business good in the stores, yet far below expectations in most lines. Increases over a year ago showing up mainly in sales of autos, which were in short supply last Christmas season.

First quarter, 1961: Business sagging. Profits down. Production slipping further. More layoffs, unemployment climbing.

Second quarter, 1961: Troubles continuing. Output down. Unemployment still high. However, first signs possibly appearing to suggest a pickup.

Third quarter, 1961: Recovery starting. Production picking up. Profits rising strongly. Rehiring in many lines, but unemployment still a problem.

Fourth quarter, 1961: Better times again. Production continuing to rise. Profits good. Employment up, unemployment down moderately.

Unemployment will be the continuing headache. Kennedy's program, in large part, will be related to that problem. Congress, worried about it, will be receptive to ideas on how to open up more jobs.

All that, however, and nearly everything else Kennedy wants to do, will be conditioned by what the budget will stand. Here is the problem:

This year, the year to end in mid-1961—tax receipts are down, mainly because of a drop in corporate profits. Instead of the surplus of $1.1 billion predicted officially in September, there is to be a small deficit.

Next year, starting in mid-1961—revenues will decline further. That will result from the profit squeeze of the current recession. Spending will go up by roughly $1.6 billion, even without any costly new programs. Result: a deficit of $5 to $6 billion. Higher spending or lower taxes would widen the gap.

Kennedy, thus, is not likely to rush in with a whole hatful of high-priced ideas, as many expected. Tax cuts are unlikely any time soon. If anything, he will be inclined to seek more revenue—mainly by closing tax loopholes.

Mr. GRUENING. More contemporary confirmation comes from an Associated Press article taken from last Friday's Washington Star, revealing that total unemployed in December had risen half a million, the highest figure in 20 years, and that a worsening of this situation may be expected.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, with its headlines, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS UP HALF MILLION, TOTAL BIGGEST SINCE 1940—UNEMPLOYMENT RATE HITS 6.8 PERCENT; EXPERT SEES FURTHER INCREASE AHEAD

(By the Associated Press)

Unemployment rose by a half million in December to 4,540,000—highest December total since 1940.

Employment declined by 1,173,000 to 66,009,000.

Announcing these figures today, the Labor Department also reported that the rate of unemployment to the total work force rose from 6.3 percent in November to 6.8 percent. This is the highest December rate since 1940. The percentages are seasonally adjusted.

Seymour Wolfbein, Labor Department manpower expert, said that the idle total is going up further this winter.

Mr. Wolfbein said that if the seasonally adjusted 6.8 percent idle rate remains unchanged the unemployed total will increase by 1 million to 5½ million during January.

USUALLY BETTER IN SPRING

On this same basis of assuming only seasonal factors, without continued worsening of factory employment, Mr. Wolfbein said that the prospective idle totals will be 5.6 million in February, 5.4 million in March, and 4.9

million in April. The spring season generally brings improvement because the warmer weather permits construction and other outdoor work.

An indication of how unemployment has mounted since the mid-December date, when the 4.5 million December unemployment was recorded, can be seen in unemployment compensation claims.

These increased by 600,000 from December 10 to December 31, and reached an all-time record December total of approximately 3 million.

December usually brings some decline in employment and increase in unemployment, but officials said that this year the changes were considerably more than seasonal.

JOBLESS INCREASE TRIPLES

For example, the half-million December unemployment increase is about triple the increase that would be regarded as normal for the month. The drop in employment also was extraseasonal.

For the first time in a year, the employment total was smaller than the corresponding total a year ago.

The number of persons idle for 15 weeks or longer—the long-term unemployed—remained at approximately 1 million for the third straight month. Nearly half of these workers have been unable to find work for 27 weeks or longer—a half year.

The unemployment rate for married men reached 5.1 percent in December compared with 3.6 percent a year earlier, a significant change because of family responsibilities.

ELECTION WORKERS OUT

Compared with a year ago, unemployment is up almost 1 million.

About 700,000 farmworkers left jobs in December because of winter weather, as expected. Also, about 250,000 workers temporarily employed in fall election duties lost their jobs.

Helping to offset this was the usual expansion of 570,000 in holiday trade employment and a 300,000 holiday period increase in the postal work force. There was an unusually sharp decline of 300,000 in construction activity. This was due in part to heavy snows.

The storms were blamed in part, also, for a drop in the average workweek to 38.8 hours. A rise in hourly earnings to $2.32 offset the work-time decline, so that average weekly earnings of the factory worker remained at $90.02 in December.

FACTORY JOBS ARE CORE

Mr. Wolfbein said that, outside of the expected seasonal changes, a continued decline in factory employment is the core of the unemployment problem. Factory employment dropped sharply in December, by almost 300,000 jobs.

Mr. Wolfbein said that unemployment compensation claims show that the idle problem is worst in six big States: Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, Michigan, New York, and Illinois. These six States account for close to two-thirds of the increase in idle payment claims during 1960.

Mr. GRUENING. Statistics are impressive and, in this case, depressing, but the words "unemployed" or "out of work," or "no jobs available" signify personal tragedies to husbands, wives, mothers, and fathers—and children.

What the present deepening recession means, in human terms, is revealed in a story in last Sunday's Washington Post, which discloses that hunger is now stalking the land, and right here in the Capital of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post headed "Mommy Don't Eat Most of Time," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MOMMY DON'T EAT MOST OF TIME"—UNEMPLOYED LIVE FROM DAY TO DAY ON CABBAGE, BEANS, GIFTS, AND HOPE

(By Wendell P. Bradley)

Mrs. Robert Curry didn't eat breakfast last week, and she hasn't eaten lunch since November, when her husband lost his job.

"It's easy once you get used to it," she said. She has always had something for dinner—fried potatoes and bean soup one night; cabbage, perhaps, the next.

"Just cabbage?" she was asked.

"Just cabbage," she said.

When visitors called on Mrs. Curry last Thursday she turned to her 10-year-old son.

"Bob," she said, "would you go upstairs and get the light bulb?"

When Bob returned with the bulb—the only one in the house—she put it in the table lamp in the livingroom and invited her callers to sit down. As she talked, four of the five Curry children played on the floor and in and out of her lap.

The Currys are a statistic, one of the 4.5 million unemployed in this country. One can talk to quite a number of statistics in a 3-hour driving radius of Washington—construction laborers in the District who worked 2 months last year, shivering steelworkers in the unemployment lines of Baltimore, who cannot buy milk for their children, aircraft workers in Hagerstown (where the Currys live), whose unemployment payments ran out 8 months ago.

Mrs. Curry was asked if her children eat three meals a day.

"The ones that go to school do," she said. "The smaller ones at home get their breakfast and maybe a slice of bread with jelly at noon. So far we've managed to get milk for the kids every day—enough for their breakfast cereal."

"Mommy don't eat most of the time," Belinda, 9, said, looking up from the floor.

She said it the way she might have said, "Sally got a new doll," or the way her brother, Bob, interrupted a few minutes later with this bit of information: "I got a quarter from some men once and bought some ice cream for us all. Mommy didn't want any."

Neither Bob nor Belinda seemed to know why. And it was just as an isolated fact again when Belinda said: "I don't think Mommy will manage to give us quarters for our lunch anymore."

"I've always managed so far," Mrs. Curry said. "Somehow I've always managed to have quarters for the kids to take to school every day."

She went on:

"This was the worst Christmas the children ever had. They got a dart game from the Salvation Army and Bob bought the boys a friction airplane for 88 cents."

Bob interrupted, "Mom, I got a box of cookies and an eraser."

"I'd forgotten," Mrs. Curry said.

"We used to get plenty of toys," Bob said. "I hoped I'd get a tire and an inner tube for Christmas, but I didn't."

"I know a boy," he continued, "and he and his little brother didn't get anything for Christmas."

"Why didn't they, Bob?"

Bob shrugged his shoulders. "I don't know," he said.

"Their father's unemployed," Mrs. Curry said.

The Currys are better off than many former Fairchild workers. They still receive unemployment benefits of $43 a week.

NEIGHBOR'S PLIGHT

Jim Wilson, who lives a few blocks away, has no money, no food in the house, no prospect of a job, but he has plenty of bills.

"I called a feller Monday in Washington about a painting job," Jim said. "He said, 'Call next Wednesday.' I said, 'Man, I don't have money to call. It's 55 cents.' "

Wilson was laid off by Fairchild 2 years ago. He has worked a total of 7 months since. He is 33 years old and has four children.

"Everywhere you go there's no one to help. I went over to welfare. They said you've got to be disabled. I said, 'My God, what can I do? I can work, I'm dying for work. But there isn't any work.'

"I even went to a loan company. I wanted $100 to pay $50 on the rent and $50 on the car."

Wilson can't sell his car because his only trade, except for Fairchild where he worked 9 years, is painting. His only work in the past 2 years was in the District.

Hunting for jobs around Hagerstown, where more than 15 percent of the labor force is unemployed, is like looking for a needle in the proverbial haystack. The men gang up, in search of work, chip in for gas, and drive to Baltimore, Washington, and Virginia.

Sometimes it means they have to skimp on the tub of coal or the few gallons of oil they buy daily to heat their homes. Usually the trips are fruitless.

PROBLEMS AT 62

"I've gone here and there but at my age you're too young for your old age benefits and you're almost too old for a job," Russell K. Heefner said. Heefner is 62 and was laid off last June after 18½ years at Fairchild.

"I've been through one depression but that one was easier," he said. "You could forage for wood for the old stove and beans were 5 cents a can and a big loaf of bread was a dime. Now you go to the store with $5 and you don't get anything really.

"And you've got to pay the gas and the electricity. I'd turn off the electricity and use oil for light but I've got to have it for the furnace. I hate to think what's going to happen when my unemployment runs out."

It runs out next month.

Heefner and his wife, who appears cheerful in spite of their troubles, live in a neat little bungalow in a new subdivision outside of Hagerstown. Their payments on the bungalow are $54 a month. They will lose it unless something turns up.

HOW JOBLESS ARE PAID

In Baltimore, a man with a sign on his back reading "Checks Cashed Free. Hot and Cold Drinks. Stan's Corner," walks up and down beside the lines of unemployed men and women outside the Employment Security Building. A relief official calls out: "One o'clock line on the left. One-thirty line on the right."

The unemployed are let into the building 75 at a time. The wait to receive their checks is usually an hour.

(The economists call Baltimore's unemployment cyclical—the result of a downturn in the business cycle which has forced cuts in steel production at Sparrows Point. Hagerstown's unemployment is called chronic, because Hagerstown, situated in depressed western Maryland, has suffered from it for many years. Washington's unemployment, on the other hand, is the mildest kind, seasonal, caused primarily by the weather's slowdown of building activity.)

"Ha," William J. Elmore, 34, said when he was asked about Christmas. "I ain't worked 5 days since last summer. Toys? I can't buy my kids milk."

Elmore has five children. He gets a $43 unemployment check from the State and $18.65 supplemental unemployment check from Bethlehem Steel where he has worked for 10 years. Since 1958 he has been laid off for longer periods than he has worked, he said.

"The rent's overdue. Everything is overdue. I got loans on top of loans," he said.

"People think I don't want to pay. I want to pay but I don't have the money. I buy food until the money runs out and I pay bills until the money runs out. The kids get about two meals a day. Potatoes and rice."

OWES ON LOANS

Elmore said he borrowed about $600 from two loan companies. On one loan, he owes $212; on the other, about $190. He owes the grocery store $55. He hasn't had a Christmas tree for 3 years.

Elmore says he's better off than some of his friends. He knows steelworkers who were terminated, not told to stay home, as he was, until work picks up. This is based on seniority.

Where do the terminated steelworkers go for work? "There are no jobs around Baltimore, that I know," Elmore said. "More people are out of work there than are working."

It is not so bad if a jobless man has only one child. Not so bad financially, that is.

"What's unemployment like? It's having fights with the old lady," Edward Gramuth, 26, said. "I get up in the morning and watch TV, eat—you gotta eat—and watch TV. Or maybe play cards with the wife half the day.

"Like today. I'll get home, wash the clothes and maybe help with the baby. It gets on your nerves if you're used to working.

"When you come home from your job you don't feel like just watching TV, you feel like going out somewhere. I'd take the wife out.

"I lost my car when I got laid off, but otherwise I'm getting along pretty well."

Gramuth has been a steelworker 7 years. He looked all over Baltimore for a job, but work there is so scarce, he said, that employment offices are reluctant even to take applications.

CONSTRUCTION WORKERS HIT

In Washington the construction trades are the hardest hit. Building stopped December 11 when the snow came. It is only slowly starting again. But even before the snow, work was slack. Only 3,000 of the 4,500 members of the Building Laborers' local here worked steadily in 1960.

Wayland McManus, 52, of 1302 Park Road NW., worked 2 months in the past 12. He supported two sisters and two nieces on approximately $1,500. Seventy dollars a month went for rent and all the rest for food. Clothes came from welfare agencies and emergencies were met by "this man, he's from my hometown. He'll give me a couple of dollars," McManus said.

Thomas C. Brooks, 47, of 1524 Constitution Avenue NE., a laborer, worked 3 months at $20 a day last year. He has six children. He had to send two of them to his in-laws in North Carolina. They live on a farm and mail food to him every once in a while.

"My house is bought and paid for, thank the Lord," Brooks said. "Most of what I make goes for food and electricity and gas. I haven't made enough even to have my TV fixed so the kids can't look at it.

"I feed 'em three meals a day, but most of the time it's beans and rice. Sometimes when I'm working I give 'em some vegetables. They're not hungry.

"I eat out most of the time to leave the food for them. I get a bowl of beans and cornbread for 26 cents at noontime. I can make it on that.

"I feel all right. Not tired. Just sick, kind of, from worrying—thinking all the time about where to get some money."

On weekends, Brooks goes out to Burning Tree. He makes a few dollars caddying.

Mr. GRUENING. Another crisis facing the Kennedy administration, as it takes up the reins of office, is our ever-dwindling gold supplies. This, too, has been a situation which has been developing over the years. The Eisenhower administration gave no indication of taking intelligently planned action in the years past to meet the worsening situation. It barely mentioned the growing crisis—and took no practical steps to alleviate the situation until the elections were over. Now these drastic measures come late.

An editorial in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "Plugging a Gold Leak," refers to the latest of these measures, but as the editorial states—

It does not solve the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLUGGING A GOLD LEAK

President Eisenhower has wisely moved to plug a potentially serious leak in our gold supplies by prohibiting the purchase abroad of gold by Americans and American enterprises, and by prohibiting their ownership of gold abroad after May 31. Such a ban might have been justified long ago simply on the ground of equity, since ownership or purchase of gold in this country, except for dental, jewelry, and similar purposes, has been prohibited since 1933. But it was obviously the continuing drain on our gold stocks rather than any considerations of equity which prompted the President's move.

Behind this move are insistent reports that wealthy Americans, fearful of the dollar's future, have been a major element in stimulating the demand for gold on the London gold exchange and elsewhere. Obviously foreigners who have seen Americans thus engaged in a flight from the dollar have been encouraged to do likewise. If this were permitted to go on, the danger was posed of a real world crisis of confidence in the dollar, one having no relationship to the economic realities but important nevertheless.

But whatever help this latest move provides for easing pressure on the dollar, it does not solve the problem behind the outward gold flow: Our adverse balance of payments. Long continued, this adverse balance and continued gold loss could force the most drastic measures, up to and including exchange control, despite all the unfortunate impact such control would have upon normal economic relations with other countries.

The need is obviously for bold leadership early in the new administration to correct the fundamental factors behind the situation. A drive to step up exports, a really energetic campaign to bring foreign tourists here, and an effort to attract more foreign investment in this country are among the steps that need to be taken. Beyond these specific areas, there is need for a broad educational campaign to make our population understand the stake that every one of us has in correcting the present imbalance of our foreign accounts. We hope President-elect Kennedy has this problem high on his agenda of matters that need attending to very soon after he takes office next Friday.

Mr. GRUENING. As for the foreign situation—there are grave crises in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

In Laos, into which the outgoing administration has poured hundreds of millions of dollars, Columnist Joseph Alsop refers to its status as "desperately grave," and that "the truth is that this remote situation now shows all signs of getting wholly out of control," and, he adds, "it has been a sorry story."

Life magazine, of the Luce publications, gives that sorry story in detail. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Mess in Laos," by Stanley Karnow, Time-Life bureau chief in Hong Kong, and the leading story in this week's issue of Time, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MESS IN LAOS

(By Stanley Karnow)

BANGKOK.—The land of the million elephants, as Laos is historically known; is an antique, sleepy country whose people want little more than to be left alone in their paradise of poppy fields and gilded temples. But this week the Lao were once more incongruously, dramatically, perhaps tragically projected onto the international stage and the United States with them.

After 5 years of effort and an expenditure of $300 million in aid, we are identified in Laos with an artless government and an ineffective local army incapable of waging war or making peace. Our allies in SEATO (the eight-nation Southeast Asia Treaty Organization convened to cope with the crisis) are basically at odds with us over our handling of the situation there. "Dollar for dollar," a U.S. Asian expert summed it up, "it is about as bad a bargain as international aid money has yet bought."

Should American foot soldiers have to fight "another Korea" in Laos it would be on the worst possible terrain. Landlocked Laos is a rugged region of dense jungle, practically no communications or navigable rivers, few roads, a handful of simple airstrips, a land where no skirmish is decisive and no war is really won. And should we attempt a peace settlement, there will be the tough opposition of the Soviets, who have wormed their way into a strong bargaining position, as well as continuing pressure from surrounding Communist countries.

If the aircraft carriers are now underway and U.S. Marines are in readiness, this is only the latest and most dramatic in a series of stopgap measures to prop up a policy in Laos that has consistently failed. Ironically, the unattractive dilemma in which we now find ourselves is to a great degree of our own making.

In Laos U.S. money has been wasted, squandered and mismanaged by both Americans and Lao. But the real loss comes from Washington's insistence—often against the appraisals of U.S. diplomats on the scene—on trying to fit Laos into a broad strategic military picture, creating and inflexibly following goals and aims which the backward, imponderable little country could not possibly have achieved.

From the very beginning of U.S. responsibility in Laos in January 1955 there was a spirit of urgency. Americans still remembered Korea. The French had just lost Indochina. The cocky Chinese and Vietnamese Communists, fresh from the unhappy Geneva Conference, seemed poised to move again. To the Secretary of State—John Foster Dulles—Laos was a crucial link in a chain of defense the United States was trying to forge for southeast Asia.

In the policy discussions in Washington the Dulles view prevailed over the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who wanted a small flexible force of 12,000 to 15,000 men. Dulles won authorization for a Lao army of nearly twice that size—to be supported by the United States. Laos would become "a bulwark against communism."

And so the trouble began. To feed, equip, and pay the army—at one of the highest pay scales in Asia, the United States started flooding the country with money and consumer goods to generate local currency. Underwriting practically all the Lao budget, the U.S. Treasury deposited dollars in American banks to support new currency printed by the Lao treasury.

To try to absorb the enormous pile of new money, we established a big import program whereby local businessmen could buy foreign merchandise with U.S. dollars, bring it in and sell it for Lao money. They could then get more dollars to import more goods. All this was too rich for a simple economy to absorb safely. It was also too much of a temptation for almost every well-placed Lao to resist. Politicians, princes, burghers went on a spree of illegal money-making, allowing of course for intermittent pauses to protest their devotion to anti-communism and thus keep the U.S. cash coming in.

Unhappily American aid officials apparently expended no great energy to find out whether the merchandise authorized for import was suitable for the country, or even to check whether merchandise given import licenses was actually brought into the country. "There was," recalls Haynes Miller, a former U.S. aid investigator in Laos, "an almost fairy-tale implausibility" about the result. Lao businessmen were buying and selling import licenses, arranging for phony documents, purchasing goods under the American aid program and selling them in Bangkok (Thailand) as they were unloaded from ships. Despite the fact that Lao spin and weave their minimal apparel in every village, import licenses for textiles in 1955 and 1956 ran to more than $4.5 million.

Though the country has only a few miles of road, about $1.3 million worth of automobiles were licensed for import during the same period. Lao importers, faking invoices and conniving with local officials, often got the United States to put out sums sometimes three times the real price paid.

AMERICANS AND THE FAST BUCK

In one operation a Laos businessman with proper U.S. connections got authorization to import German-made generators, actually bought up U.S. Army surplus equipment and made a fast $147,000 profit—cash—through the courtesy of Uncle Sam. Other imports listed included such unlikely items as: 37 tons of toothpaste, and 4½ tons of feather dusters.

Not all Americans in Laos were immune to the local kind of search for the fast buck. Among many U.S.-sponsored projects was road maintenance and construction. And by 1956 it looked as if one American construction company was getting favored treatment from U.S. officials. It was receiving money and equipment but there were doubts not only about how the contracts were arranged, but if they were being properly fulfilled.

U.S. investigator Miller, concurring with the assessment of the U.N., economic adviser to the Lao Government, began to air his suspicions of corruption and inefficiency. He was advised by superiors to discontinue his poking around. When he persisted he was removed from the mission. At the same time a top U.S. official was writing home to Washington fine reports about roadwork and construction. "For the first time American aid is producing something visible of major importance."

A congressional committee, after investigating the affair, saw fit to call down the U.S. authorities in Laos who were ultimately responsibile for "railroading" Miller home. Another official in Laos—Public Works Officer Edward T. McNamara—admitted receiving $12,000 in cash and stocks from the company.

To such reports of bungling and inefficiency in Laos, American officials involved have an almost automatic response: "Well," they shrug, "it hasn't gone Communist, has it?"

That common consolation is not only lame, but largely inaccurate. On maps lining walls of Washington offices, Laos can of course be counted as a country in the free world. But the reality of Laos is different.

The capital and a few towns, isolated from each other by poor communications, are in government hands. Some areas are controlled by nominally pro-Western civil or military commanders who, like Chinese warlords, unpredictably shift their allegiance as the winds of power change.

Probably the largest part of the countryside belongs, in a very loose sense of the word, to the pro-Communist Pathet Lao. They do not govern it in any juridical manner. But from a few unadorned and well-hidden bases, they can roam freely over jungle trails and hills.

These Pathet Lao partisans—there are probably only some 4,000 of them—have no magic charms and they spout few Marxist slogans. They are not especially liked even by the independent back country people. But they take advantage of discontent among tribal minorities. And to many remote rice farmers and mountain tribesmen ignorant of the very existence of the State of Laos, these guerrillas are the only outside authority ever seen. There are huge regions of the country in which no official of the U.S.-supported government has ever set foot. "It's not fair to say the government lost the countryside," a Lao explained to me. "They never had it to lose."

TRUCKS BUT NO ROADS

The United States might have had the countryside—and held it—had we learned the basic lesson which the Pathet Lao and other Communist-style guerrillas know so well. To work in a country like Laos you must adapt to the terrain, make contact with and develop the local rural population. Instead the U.S. emergency aid program called for a large army to assure internal security and provide initial resistance in case of invasion. That army got U.S. equipment—most of it unsuited to Laos: armored cars, jeeps and trucks which rusted in parking lots for lack of roads; artillery designed to cannonade fixed targets but no answer to flushing out small, mobile, elusive Pathet Lao guerrillas in the jungle.

Outside of Vientiane one day last month in the fighting between Captain Kongle's forces and General Phoumi's men, I encountered a howitzer battery firing away toward the north without any forward observers. "Enemy is out there somewhere," explained a Lao officer.

Virtually the only effective combat units in the Lao Army are the two battalions of paratroopers—and these are now opposing each other. The rest of the army's 29,000 men are service troops, headquarters personnel and assorted garrison defenders who may shoot back, if assaulted. By a Lao yardstick, these soldiers are well-paid citizens. In a country where the per capita income is roughly $50 or less per year, an army private earns more than $130 annually plus food. Officers' wages range from $800 to $3,000 yearly, with extras that might include a house and car.

With the bulk of the American money going for the support of this large, ineffective, overpaid army, hardly organized for combat, little assistance ever got out into the countryside. Yet a little economic help to the rural population can be as effective a military weapon as a rifle, and much more effective than a tank.

Finally in 1957 there was some recognition that the villages had been neglected. But like most U.S. measures taken in Laos, the cure was a fast, stopgap plan, provoked largely by fear that the Communists would win local by-elections. It was called Operation Booster Shot. For some $3 million, work was begun on simple irrigation ditches, flood control dams, school repairs and other small but practical projects.

The short span of the program did not, of course, prevent some Communist success at the polls. But even in those few months, as the new U.S. Ambassador was able to report, Booster had a greater impact on Laos than any other aid program. Its cost was only a drop in the bucket—since aid to Laos by then totaled $135 million. But Washington did not, apparently, enter into any searching reappraisal of the old policy. The idea for a dynamic village aid scheme died away.

Last year the total capital earmarked for rural projects was $2.5 million. This was less than the salaries of the Americans working on them. But the growing insecurity throughout the country had by that time spread so far that neither the rural projects nor a newly planned $8.6 million road-building program ever got started. After sitting idle for months, American technicians were evacuated from Laos last week, sourly grumbling the old theme—too little and too late.

But that was not really the trouble. The United States came to Laos early and spent more per capita in aid than in almost any country in the world. Yet the United States, flexible and pragmatic at home, is often program-bound and inflexible abroad; and in Laos we showed an overriding concern for grand strategy. There was often total impatience with practical details, details which were necessary for the most elementary efforts at developing sound economic growth and political unity.

Primitive countries like Laos cannot be expected overnight to make responsible decisions, demonstrate sincere allegiance, behave like real nations or react to standard programs designed for rational modern economies. They must go through basic steps first. Putting them through such steps is a huge enterprise even for the strongest ally, and hard even without the chronic Communist danger.

In Laos the United States barely tried this basic approach. It was easier to pour in money, pay the semblance of a national army, encourage politicians who would sound sympathetic and—as emergencies inevitably succeeded one another—try a convenient tactic to get by them.

Even before Captain Kongle's coup last August sent Laos into a roil of new crises, U.S. hopes to preserve independence and integrity in Laos were not much closer to achievement than they had been back in 1955, when we started. On the level of international politics our margin to maneuver has been narrowed almost to a choice between an inconclusive kind of war and an unsatisfactory kind of peace.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if Laos goes, all southeastern Asia is in imminent danger of following and likewise going behind the Iron Curtain. This is among the crises which the Kennedy administration inherits.

In the Western Hemisphere, the Monroe Doctrine, which has stood firmly for nearly a century and a half, has been breached for the first time, and right at our door—in Cuba.

Not only has our nearest island neighbor, Cuba, gone behind the Iron Curtain, not only has the free world lost Cuba, but on the very eve of the change of administration the situation has deteriorated beyond precedent; for the Eisenhower administration, not content with turning over this most serious problem to its successor as it had been, felt obliged to sever diplomatic relations with Cuba

and create a situation without precedent or parallel in our relations with our Latin American neighbors.

Moreover, Cuba is not an isolated example of Communist penetration in Latin America. Foci of Communist infiltration exist widespread throughout the Western Hemisphere among the nations to the south of us, whom, until recent years, we could count upon as our friends, and supporters of the principles of freedom.

Eight and one-half years ago, when the administration that moved into the White House in 1953 was campaigning to achieve that end, it used as one of its slogans that it was necessary to clean up "the mess in Washington." This time, the mess is not in Washington. It is far more widespread. It extends to the fields of unemployment all over the Nation and to the grave crises abroad. The American people should realize what a terrific burden, what a terrific legacy, faces our gallant new President.

WHERE DOES CHESTER BOWLES STAND ON RED CHINA?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly be called upon to advice and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of State. If confirmed, he will have a key role in the determination and execution of the foreign policy of the U.S. Government.

Therefore, I believe I have an obligation to present the principal reasons for my concern over his appointment, and to raise some of the points which I feel must be fully and frankly answered by Mr. Bowles before his nomination is acted upon by the Senate.

Let me say at the outset that I have no personal animosity toward Mr. Bowles. He has a distinguished record of public service, as OPA Administrator, as Ambassador to India, as Governor of Connecticut, and as a Member of Congress. He is an able and articulate spokesman for the things in which he believes, and I have found many statements in his public speeches with which I entirely agree.

However, his attitude toward Communist China raises grave and serious questions in my mind—questions which must be clearly resolved before I could conscientiously vote for his confirmation.

This issue is not a minor one. Communist China is the most populous nation on the face of the earth, but the importance of our policy toward its government is not measured by that country's size alone. Our attitude toward Red China is a crucial element in our relations with virtually all of the nations of Asia.

Where does Chester Bowles stand with respect to Red China?

First, Mr. Bowles has expressed himself in opposition to diplomatic recognition of Communist China at this time. In a speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on October 21, 1960, he said:

> In developing more realistic policies in regard to east Asia, we can avoid some emotional debates by viewing the question of recognizing the Peiping government for what it is; a diplomatic dead end street.
>
> Unless we agreed to recognize his jurisdiction over "the province of Taiwan," Mao Tse-tung would refuse under present circumstances to recognize our recognition of him. Since our commitment to the independence and defense of Taiwan is irrevocable, the question is not negotiable.

Second, Mr. Bowles has opposed Communist China's admission into the United Nations. The Democratic platform of 1960, for which he was responsible as chairman of the platform committee, says:

> We reaffirm our pledge of determined opposition to the present admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

For these two forthright statements Mr. Bowles should be commended, and if they stood alone, without being weakened or diluted by other utterances, my concern over his appointment would be greatly lessened.

Most Americans believe, and believe fervently, I think, that opposition to recognition of Red China and to admission of Red China into the United Nations are bedrock foundations of our policy. Mr. Bowles apparently does not, for he described them as "a posture and not a policy" in an address to the United Press Conference of Editors and Publishers in Washington, September 9, 1960. Here are his words:

> In regard to Communist China, one thing at least is clear; her growing strength and aggressive nature will impel us to have a policy toward her in the decade of the sixties. Even though we will continue to oppose recognition and United Nations membership for the Peiping government, such attitudes are a posture and not a policy. Of various issues from news coverage to arms control, a new administration will have to take positive measures to cope with the China problem.

What does Mr. Bowles mean by "a posture and not a policy"? What kind of "positive measures to cope with the China problem" will he advocate as Under Secretary of State?

He may have already given us some hints about this in an article entitled "The China Problem Reconsidered," which he wrote for the April 1960, issue of Foreign Affairs. Here is what he said then:

> Only when we start to move off dead center in east Asia, beginning with the creation and implementation of imaginative policies based on the reality of two Chinas, will we start to exert a constructive influence on the shape of events to come.

Exactly what does Mr. Bowles mean by "the reality of two Chinas"? For a long time the phrase "two-China policy" has had a distinct meaning—recognition of Communist China as the ruler of the Chinese mainland and Nationalist China as the ruler of Formosa only. It would appear that while Mr. Bowles asserts, no doubt sincerely, that he is opposed to the immediate formal recognition of the two Chinas, he believes in the acceptance of their reality. The difference between acceptance and recognition is very slight. I submit that the first would be only a prelude to the second.

Perhaps this is not what Mr. Bowles has in mind. Perhaps I do not clearly understand what he means by "the reality of two Chinas", but we had better find out what he means before his nomination is confirmed as Under Secretary of State. If by "reality of two Chinas" he does not mean the acceptance and ultimate recognition of two Chinas, then what does he mean?

If his use of the words "two Chinas" does mean what we know as the two-China policy, then he should not be confirmed as American Under Secretary of State.

In my opinion acceptance of the two-China policy is not only unworkable, but it would be disastrous for the United States and for the free world.

It would have to be forced on both the Republic of China and Communist China. Both are violently opposed to it.

It would be regarded as a betrayal not only by Nationalist China but by other free nations, particularly those under the shadow of Red China.

The whole series of free world alliances which are key elements in our own defense would be weakened by such evidence that we would ignore or turn our back on a stanch friend.

No small nation anywhere in the world dependent on our support would feel they could ever trust us again. What do Senators think would be the reaction in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, South Vietnam, and Pakistan?

Would the reaction of Korea be shared by West Germany? Both of these countries are tested allies of the United States, and both are divided. A two-China policy would imply U.S. approval for two Germanys and two Koreas.

In short, it would weaken our strength and our moral leadership throughout the world.

In addition, Mr. Bowles, as I have noted above, has called for "positive measures to cope with the China problem" and for "the creation and implementation of imaginative policies."

There can be no quarrel with those concepts. Our policies should all be imaginative and positive—so long as they are not soft and gullible.

Our policies will be tested, not just for their imagination, but for how well they stack up against the dull and often brutal facts.

We should not forget, as Cardinal Cushing recently reminded us, that the Chinese Communist Government "in no way represents the will or aspirations of the Chinese people. It came to power by force and deceit, and continues to hold power by force. Today, after 10 years, less than 2 percent of the people belong to the Chinese Communist Party. It has maintained control by constant purges and the liquidation of at least 18 million Chinese. It has subjugated 600 million people, but it has not won their hearts."

The Communist Chinese Government continues to hold five Americans in prison on trumped-up and ridiculous charges. They include Catholic Bishop James E. Walsh, of Cumberland, Md., serving a 20-year sentence for espionage.

The Red Chinese Government still refuses to give any accounting for the 389

American servicemen missing from the Korean war, some of whom were known to have been alive in Communist hands at one time.

They have callously refused to take any steps on these matters. Moreover, they have used them, and every other possible pretext, as the excuse to make demands on our Government which are nothing short of blackmail and extortion.

Negotiation over news coverage is a case in point. The State Department long ago agreed to validate the passports of U.S. newsmen for travel in Communist China, but the Chinese have refused to issue visas. Negotiations, conducted by the U.S. and Red Chinese Ambassadors to Poland, have foundered over the Communist demand that newsmen be admitted to China only on the understanding that their visits are designed to promote the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Formosa.

U.S. concessions to Communist China at this time, under the present circumstances, could only involve the abject payment of blackmail demands—something no self-respecting government could agree to.

Perhaps new and imaginative policies can find a way around the dilemma—and secure the release of the five American prisoners, for instance, without the stigma of having knuckled under to extortion. But I want it clearly understood that I am unalterably opposed to any softening or weakening of our attitude toward Communist China, unless that government purges itself of its crimes by positive acts, not intimations or promises of future conduct, and by acts that are not predicated on concessions by us. All the world would regard such softening as a sign of weakness and irresolution; and these are fatal attributes for any Nation which hopes to meet the Communist challenge.

Mr. Bowles will have the opportunity during his forthcoming appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to clarify his position. Perhaps he will be able to end all doubt on these important issues. Indeed, I hope so, for this is not a partisan matter, but an issue of vital importance to our national security. However, I must say that, for me, it will require some very firm and clear-cut commitments on his part. It is hard for me to believe that anything but a softening and faltering in our policy toward Red China can result from the appointment of a man who talks as Mr. Bowles has been talking.

Mr. Bowles' concern over the long range trend of developments in East Asia is commendable, and I am not questioning his sincerity in advocating changes in our policies for Communist China. Indeed, I am not questioning his sincerity in respect to any subject.

We should be constantly testing our policies to be as certain as we can be that they serve our purposes—that they advance the cause of peace, justice, and human liberty.

In conclusion, let me quote the words of the late John Foster Dulles:

> There are occasions when others, and not we, should provide the change. Nothing could be more dangerous than for the United States to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not quickly or readily change, then it is we who must change to meet them.

FORT WORTH LEGION POST VOTES FOR REFORMS IN ELECTION LAWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Department of Texas, urging a number of badly needed election law reforms on both the State and Federal level.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOTHWELL-KANE POST NO. 21, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS

Whereas we have associated ourselves together for God and country and are dedicated to the proposition that right shall be the master of might; and

Whereas the energies of the National American Legion, the State American Legion and the 12th district of the American Legion have been devoted in 1960 to a major register-and-vote campaign, and

Whereas participation in our Government should be encouraged rather than discouraged; and

Whereas it is essential that every vote be counted fairly and honestly, and that the sanctity of the ballot be preserved so that we, the people, shall have confidence in our elected officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21 of the American Legion in its regular meeting at the veterans memorial on the 8th day of December 1960, That all political parties, the National Congress, the Texas Legislature, all veterans, all public officials and all citizens interested in good government give earnest consideration to the following recommendations for improving our American and Texas election procedures:

First. Replace the electoral college with a provision for election of the President and Vice President by popular vote. Second consideration is also recommended for the Gossett-Lodge plan for splitting the electoral vote of each State in accordance with the percentage of popular vote.

Second. Establish in Texas a permanent registration system for voters, and thereby replace the annual poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Third. Move the voter registration deadline from January 31 to 1 month prior to the first primary.

Fourth. Permit registration for national elections during a 2-week period ending 1 month before general election, and reduce residence requirements for national elections.

Fifth. Shorten the span time between election and inauguration, by providing for inauguration in the first week in January and by delaying the general election to the first Saturday in December.

Sixth Hold the presidential nominating conventions the last 2 weeks in September, in order to shorten the presidential campaign period.

Seventh. Hold the Texas party conventions the second week in September.

Eighth. Hold the first primary in Texas the first week in August, with the second primary following in the first week in September.

Ninth. Establish a joint primary election system in which both Democratic and Republican Parties participate, wherein the voter requests the ballot of the party of his choice, with such primaries to be financed by the States or the counties rather than by the candidates.

Tenth. Provide for reasonable filing fees for public office so as not to deter good men from entering public service.

Eleventh. Encourage the two-party system by basing the number of delegates to party conventions on the number of votes cast for each party's nominee for President, and restore order to conventions by reducing the number of delegates permitted on the floor; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the next 12th District convention for its approval; and that copies of this resolution be provided to all Texas Senators and Congressmen, to all members of the Texas Legislature, to the national Legion commander, to the State Legion commander, to all district commanders, to the Texas Legion News, to the American Legion magazine, and to all local news media.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. One point of the resolution calls for abolition of the poll tax in Texas. During the last session I joined in cosponsorship of a bill aimed at abolishing poll taxes in Federal elections, and I should be glad to support this proposed State action for abolition of the poll tax.

While I would want to give additional study to some of the reforms suggested in this resolution, I find myself in agreement with several of the proposed reforms and urge the resolution to the attention of the Congress.

In his letter accompanying the resolution, Post Commander Bill Wills informed me:

> The post members have asked me to send the resolution to you and to express the feelings that caused its adoption. We believe each of the recommendations has merit and we urge you to give careful consideration to all of them. If you are persuaded by one or more of these ideas, we urge that you take the leadership in securing legislative approval for them.
>
> We believe it is fundamentally important that we encourage everyone to take an active interest in government. We are convinced that it is essential for each citizen to have the utmost confidence in democratic processes and in the men who he helps elect to office. The members of our post are certain that enactment of the recommendations contained in the resolution will accomplish these ends.

Another point calls for a change in the electoral college.

Another calls for the establishment of a joint primary system, in which both Democratic and Republican Parties participate, wherein the voter requests a ballot for the party of his choice, such primaries to be financed by the State and counties, rather than by candidates. Under our present system, such campaigns are financed by the candidates, and only those of considerable means can afford it.

The tenth point provides for reasonable filing fees for public office so as not to deter good men from entering public service. In our State 5 percent of the first year's salary is required as a filing fee.

There are a number of other good provisions recommended in this resolution. I should like to give additional study to some of the proposed reforms. Some of them require further study. The resolution shows a far-reaching study by the Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21, of the American Legion, Department of Texas.

COTTON PARITY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have never taken a sectional view of the farm problem and the farm price-support program. The various basic commodities supported by marketing loans have different problems which arise at different times.

This year cotton is confronted with a specific situation which demands the attention of the new Secretary of Agriculture at an early date and, if necessary, also the attention of the Congress.

I urge the new Secretary to give his full support and assistance to a program that will hold the loan support value for cotton to at least 75 percent of parity.

This would mean about 1½ to 2 cents a pound above the 70-percent minimum permitted by law for 1961.

Let me refresh the memory of the Senate on the legislative history of the farm bill and the statements made by the Senate floor manager when the farm bill was up for consideration in 1958.

At that time we clearly committed ourselves, as a matter of legislative policy, to a loan support price in the neighborhood of 30 cents a pound for Middling 1-inch cotton in 1961.

If 70 percent of parity goes into effect, combined with the new formula substituting average-of-the-crop staple length for Middling ⅞-inch cotton, farmers would receive approximately 28 to 28½ cents a pound for Middling 1-inch cotton.

This two-way cut in the price-support loan is too drastic. Such a sharp drop in 1 year would create undue hardships throughout our cotton industry.

I consider the promises made during the 1958 consideration of the farm bill to be a clear mandate for a price of at least 30½ cents a pound for Middling inch cotton in 1961.

I am convinced that improvements in the supply and demand situation now apparent in the cotton industry fully justify a price support loan at 75 percent of parity.

I remind the new Secretary and I advise the Senate that no new change in law is necessary to make this price adjustment, because the 1958 law clearly gives the Secretary of Agriculture full discretion to act and to set the loan support price for 1961 at 75 percent of parity, instead of the minimum permitted, 70 percent.

This question should be faced promptly by the new Secretary of Agriculture. If not, then early legislation should be enacted; and I stand ready to introduce the necessary legislation on this vital matter. I hope that other Members of the Senate who are interested in this problem will express an active interest therein, and I urge them to call this matter to the special attention of the Secretary.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the second report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, issued last November, contains a number of recommendations for State and Federal action to improve the conditions of migratory workers.

Legislation regarding migratory workers will be before this session of the Congress, and I believe Members will find this report of interest and value as they prepare to take such legislative action.

I believe that the recommendations generally are good. In my opinion, too great a burden is placed upon the States and too much responsibility is imposed upon them in dealing with problems which are essentially national in character. Nevertheless, the recommendations, when taken altogether, are good and deserve the consideration of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a part of the news release announcing the report, along with a summary of the Committee recommendations, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release and the summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The second report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, issued today by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, says that the lives of most migratory farmworkers are characterized by lack of adequate employment, low wages, poor housing, lack of education, lack of health and welfare services, and in some cases, unsafe vehicles for transportation.

The Committee report was released simultaneously with President Eisenhower's announcement that he has signed an Executive order formalizing the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. Secretary Mitchell is chairman of the Committee, other members are: Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Norman Mason, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor has two main objectives: (1) Bringing about improved conditions for migratory workers needed under the existing patterns of agricultural production; and (2) reducing the need for workers to migrate by stabilizing agricultural employment.

Most Committee efforts thus far have been directed toward the resolving of contemporary problems. Decent camp housing, safe transportation, adequate education and health services, extension of labor laws to agricultural workers, and greater employment opportunities are matters of immediate concern to the migrant and those interested in his welfare.

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor believes that over the Nation modest progress has been made toward reaching the first objective. The Committee is cognizant of the many problems involved, and of the interlocking interests and responsibilities at all levels of Government and industry. The process of bringing to fruition needed legislative and other measures is time consuming and challenging to both Federal and State authorities.

Nevertheless, there has been progress. Five years ago, migratory agricultural workers were not covered by old-age and survivors and disability insurance. Today they are. Two years ago there were no regulations governing the interstate transportation of migratory workers. Today, such regulations exist. Twenty-one States have formed migratory labor committees since the establishment of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. There has been improvement in the housing for migrants, and programs such as the annual worker plan have helped provide more continuous employment for migrants.

Much remains to be accomplished, however, before the job is completed. Outlined below are various areas which lend themselves most appropriately to State action, and to which the attention of State authorities is sincerely invited. Areas of Federal responsibility are similarly outlined for emphasis and for future action by the President's Committee and related Federal departments.

State responsibility: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends action by the States in the following areas:

1. Extension of State workmen's compensation laws to agricultural workers.
2. Creation of State safety regulations for the transportation of agricultural workers.
3. Extension of State child-labor legislation to hired agricultural workers.
4. Adoption and enforcement of housing regulations which apply to seasonal farm-labor housing in those States that do not already have such regulations.
5. Reimbursement to local school boards for education of migrant children.
6. Reimbursement of funds to local health agencies to assist them in extending public health services to migrant workers and their families.
7. Provision for adult education classes for migrants, including vocational education.
8. Extension of child-welfare services, including day-care facilities, to migrant children.
9. Elimination of residence requirements in all State health, education, rehabilitation, and welfare programs.
10. Employer education on worker training, employer-employee relationships, and community relations.

(NOTE.—As has been mentioned in this report, Federal-State studies on the possible extension of unemployment insurance to agriculture are now in progress. Recommendations in this field will be based on the results of these studies.)

Federal responsibilities: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends action by the Federal Government in the following areas:

1. The passage of crew leader registration legislation to protect migrants from the unscrupulous practices of some crew leaders and labor contractors.
2. Adequate staffing of the Interstate Commerce Commission to insure proper enforcement of the regulations governing the interstate transportation of migratory workers in privately owned trucks and buses.
3. More positive leadership and guidance of State extension programs for education and service to migrants.
4. Continuing review of all foreign labor import programs to make certain that the importation of foreign workers does not have an adverse effect on the employment opportunities, wages, and working conditions of domestic farm workers.
5. Elimination of residence requirements as a condition for receipt of Federal funds.
6. Continued and strengthened emphasis and encouragement of action to assure the provision of needed health services to migrant families and adequate housing whether that housing is in camps, isolated units, or farms, or fringe areas of towns.

AGRICULTURAL INCOME EQUALIZATION ACT OF 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this 87th Congress has a mandate to devise and enact a new national farm program. If its efforts are to result in a realistic and effective plan, it must face up to four fundamental facts.

The first is that the only justification for a farm program is to increase farm income.

The second is that farm program dollars which do not go directly into the pockets of the farmers are wasted.

The third is that to be workable, a farm program must restore to the farmer the responsibility for marketing what he grows.

And the fourth is that to be successful, a farm program must be correlated with the entire economy and serve the best interests of both farmers and consumers.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that none of the election-year solutions to our grave agricultural problems proposed last year takes all of those factors into account. None of the campaign ideas put forward envisions the bold, front-door approach which the farm crisis demands.

All of the fancy formulas and high-sounding schemes for saving the Nation's agricultural economy are worth less than the paper on which they are written unless they have as their basis the solution of this country's No. 1 economic ill—farm income which is less than one-third that earned in other phases of the national economy.

If all that was required to achieve that solution was the mere expenditure of tax dollars, then Ezra Taft Benson would have gone down in history as the savior of American agriculture. Under his direction, the Department of Agriculture spent more during the last 8 years than during all the previous 90 years of its existence, combined. Yet, despite all his spending, Mr. Benson distinguished himself only by reducing farm income by 24 percent and forcing more than 5 million persons to leave the farms of America.

We know from experience, Mr. President, that programs which seek to solve farm problems by reducing acreage and prices result only in creating vicious cycles of surplus and depression and in placing an intolerable burden on the taxpayers of the country, without helping the farmers.

All of the variations of farm programs which have been tried to date have suffered from the same fatal flaw; that is, they all put the U.S. Government in the business of buying, transporting, storing and selling farm commodities and, consequently, have piled up the $9 billion agricultural surplus with which the taxpayers are stuck. I know the theory has been that the Government only makes loans on the security of unsold crops, but the result has been that the Government has been left with the farmers' mistakes and, in trying to get rid of them, has disrupted the Nation's agricultural economy to the point of disaster.

It is to be hoped, Mr. President, that Congress will profit from the sad experience of the past and, taking heed of the lessons it teaches, will step ahead instead of backward in working out a permanent solution to our agricultural problems.

Mr. President, I have given long and serious study to this subject. And, as I have stated previously before the Senate, I am convinced that the only way in which the desired solution can be achieved is through discarding the present patchwork of discredited farm laws and taking a fresh start which will get away from the compounded failures and stereotyped concepts of the past. I am further convinced that such a program must have three coequal objectives: First, to let the farmer farm; second, to guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income; and, third, to place American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

It was to those objectives that I addressed the Talmadge farm plan which I introduced during both the 85th and 86th Congresses and which I rise today to reintroduce in a revised and perfected form.

Stated simply, Mr. President, my bill would free the Nation's economy of the expensive and ineffectual farm laws which have caused the present disastrous agricultural depression, and restore American agriculture to a free-enterprise basis, bolstered by a system of compensatory payments limited to domestically consumed basic commodities.

It would eliminate all acreage controls and government loans and, instead, assign to each farmer a domestic production quota. Expressed in terms of pounds, bushels, bales, and other appropriate units of measurement, that quota would be the same percentage of the previous year's national consumption of basic commodities as the farmer's average annual production bears to the total national average production.

The farmer would market what he produced and would be guaranteed the difference between the price he received for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity. He would have to submit a bill of sale to qualify for his support payment, and no farmer would be allowed to receive more than $12,500 in Government payments in any one year.

Payments also would be prohibited to contract farmers and to farmers whose families have total nonfarm incomes of more than $5,000 a year.

To quality for inclusion in the program, a farmer would have to agree to place a specified portion of his land over 30 acres—but not exceeding 20 percent of his total acreage—into conservation practices without compensation.

Commodities covered by the program would be corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and the various classes of wheat. Tobacco would continue under its present program and would not be affected.

It has been argued that under such a plan the farmer would plant himself into the ground. I do not accept that thesis, because, I believe farmers are good businessmen who will not plant crops they cannot sell 2 years in a row. However, out of an abundance of caution, I have provided in my revised bill authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to impose marketing quotas whenever it appears that market prices are about to fall below 75 percent of parity in the case of peanuts, corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, or butterfat; 60 percent of parity in the case of each of the various classes of wheat; and 55 percent of parity in the case of cotton or rice.

Another feature of the bill I am introducing today is the four-step program for disposing of the $9-billion-plus agricultural surplus which Mr. Benson has accumulated.

The first step would be to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from acquiring further stocks of commodities covered by the act.

The second step would be to have the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Security Council make a determination as to the amount of the surplus which should be set aside and preserved as a strategic reserve.

The third step would be to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend specific legislation for prompt disposition of as much as possible of the surplus through normal trade channels.

The fourth—and, by far, the one offering the most promise—would be to absorb the remainder of the surplus in the farm program itself.

The first three steps are self-explanatory, and the fourth would be accomplished in this way:

Any farmer so electing could, by agreeing to put into conservation practices without payment the amount of land on which he would grow his domestic production quota, receive from the Secretary of Agriculture a negotiable certificate entitling him to sell the equivalent of his quota from surplus stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

No compensatory payments would be paid on such sales as the participating farmers would have, in effect, received such payments in eliminating the cost of growing their shares of the domestic market.

Under such an arrangement existing commodities would be substituted unit for unit for assigned quotas which would assure against disruption of normal trade channels. In addition, farmers electing the option would still be free to grow on land not thus committed to conservation practices as much of any commodity as they might desire to attempt to sell on the world market.

Another feature of the new version of the Talmadge farm plan is that it places upon the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility for sending to Congress each year a detailed report setting forth both the short- and long-range objectives of the Department of Agriculture and specific legislative recommendations for achieving them.

The cost of the Talmadge farm plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the covered basic commodities, but in any event it would be considerably less than that of the present program. It would likely vary between $2 and $3 billion, and agricultural experts of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have estimated its potential saving to the taxpayer at between $2 and $3 billion a year.

While costing less, it ultimately would put perhaps as much as $1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that might seem, it would

be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program would be considerably reduced. For instance, one of the costs which would be greatly reduced and eventually ended would be the billion dollars a year now being spent to handle surplus agricultural commodities.

Furthermore, whatever its ultimate cost might prove to be, the Talmadge farm plan would assure that every farm program dollar went into the pockets of the farmers of America, which decidedly is not the case at the present time.

Even more important than the financial considerations are the intangible advantages to be derived from a free enterprise farm program bolstered by compensatory payments.

Such an approach is extremely simple and would take the redtape out of the farm program.

Such an approach would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

Such an approach would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise, where it belongs.

Such an approach would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income and restore agriculture to a free-enterprise, competitive base.

Such an approach would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

Such an approach would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices.

Such an approach would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would take the realistic view that the only justification for a farm program is to increase the income of farmers and would seek to do that by going in the front, instead of the back, door.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start which would release agriculture from the bonds of past mistakes and relieve the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws.

My proposal has been loudly criticized by both those who want no farm program at all and those who want even more stringent controls than we already have. Mr. Benson, for example, saw fit to call the Talmadge farm plan a long step toward a fully socialized agriculture and maintained it joined the issue of Government control versus freedom.

To the former assertion, I would reply that Mr. Benson either is totally ignorant of the provisions of the Talmadge farm plan or he was looking in the mirror at his own mess of a program when he coined his description.

To the latter claim I would say that it is true that the issue has been joined but that the roles are the reverse of what he would have them be.

My recollection of elementary economics is that socialism is synonymous with nationalization or government ownership and control.

Now, I ask, Mr. President, would American agriculture be more nationalized under my plan whereby the farmer could plant what he pleases and be held responsible for selling what he grows, or under the present plan whereby the Government tells the farmer how much he can grow and then buys, stores, transports and sells it for him?

My knowledge of the present farm program which stems from my own experience as a farmer operating under it is that its basis is drastic and ever-constricting acreage controls.

Now, I ask, Mr. President, would the American farmer have more freedom under my plan whereby the farmer would be free to decide for himself what and how much he would grow, or under the present plan whereby the Government puts strict limits on his planting and subjects him to stiff penalties for failing to comply with them?

I think the answers to those questions are obvious.

There have been some who have sought to label my proposal a "Brannan plan."

Such a label is not supported by the facts of the matter.

The only point of similarity between the Talmadge and the Brannan plans is the compensatory payment idea, and, if it is the intent of critics to equate that feature of my proposal with the Brannan plan, then by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Seaton plan and, yes, even the Benson plan.

That is true because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to producers of metals and growers of wool and sugar.

While I am enough of an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrat to believe that we would all be better off if our entire economy were freed and allowed to seek its own level, I am also, by the same token, enough of a realist to know that with virtually every other segment of the Nation's economy protected by law, the farmer cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national income.

If the farmer is to share in the general prosperity of the rest of the country—if he is to own an automobile, send his children to school, and give his family a reasonable standard of living—it is essential that a new farm program be devised which will give him that assurance.

The American standard of living is the highest in the world and to deny the American farmer legislative protection in the enjoyment of it would amount to putting him into direct competition with farmers in countries where living standards are minute fractions of our own and to make of him a virtual peon in a land of plenty.

The sands of history are littered with the wrecks of civilizations and nations which perished as the result of dissipating and destroying their independent farming populations.

The vitality of any people stems from the soil, and it is an inexorable law of nature that it withers and dies when its roots are transplanted to a wholly urban culture.

The worst fate which could befall our country would be for urban Americans to lose sight of the fact that their present and their future are dependent upon the maintenance of a vital and progressive agriculture.

The day we allow ourselves to be deceived into believing that the American farmer is an economic liability will be the day which marks the beginning of the end of our great Nation.

Americans must look beyond their own personal interests and recognize the great truth uttered by Daniel Webster when he declared:

> Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization.

That is why, Mr. President, we must look to our farms as the only source of a posterity which cherishes its freedom and is dedicated to its preservation.

That is why, Mr. President, we must do whatever is necessary to sustain our farms as the roots of our great American civilization.

That is why, Mr. President, it is imperative that this Congress act soon and decisively to write and enact a workable and productive farm program which will assure for all time to come that those roots will continue to nourish and replenish the life's blood of our Nation.

It is in the hope, therefore, Mr. President, that my ideas can make some contribution toward those deliberations that I herewith introduce my bill and ask unanimous consent that it be read twice, appropriately referred, and that the text of it printed in the RECORD at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 487) to provide a new farm program for certain specified agricultural commodities under which American agriculture will be restored to a free-enterprise basis, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1961".

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to afford to the farmers of the United States legislative protection and assistance equivalent to that received by

other segments of the national economy. It is recognized that previous farm legislation has failed to achieve that end, and that a policy of reduced acreage and reduced prices leads only to reducing farm income to a disastrous level. Therefore, it is the purpose of Congress, in enacting the program provided for in this Act, to free the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws and to restore American agriculture to a free enterprise basis bolstered by a system of compensatory payments. The objectives of Congress is so doing are (1) to let the farmer farm, (2) guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income, and (3) place American agricultural commodities back on the world market at competitive prices.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION QUOTA

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall proclaim each year a domestic consumption quota for corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat, respectively. Such quota shall be proclaimed in terms of pounds, in the case of peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat; bushels, in the case of corn, oats, barley, rye, and each class of wheat; and bales, in the case of cotton.

(b) The domestic consumption quota for any year for cotton, peanuts, rice, and each class of wheat shall be the average annual amount of such commodity consumed domestically during the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the domestic consumption quota is proclaimed for any such commodity. The domestic consumption quota for any year for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, and rye shall be the amount of such commodity sold domestically during the year immediately preceding the year in which such quota is proclaimed. The domestic consumption quota for any year for fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat shall be the domestic civilian disappearance for food from commercial sources during the year immediately preceding the year in which such quota is proclaimed. The Secretary shall proclaim the domestic consumption quota for any year for any specified commodity in the calendar year immediately preceding the marketing year for which such quota is proclaimed.

ASSIGNMENT AND DETERMINATION OF FARM DOMESTIC PRODUCTION QUOTAS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall assign each year, after the effective date of this Act, to every eligible farm on which is produced one or more of the specified commodities a domestic production quota for each such commodity. The domestic production quota for any such farm with respect to any such commodity shall be determined by the Secretary in terms of pounds, in the case of peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat; bushels in the case of corn, oats, barley, rye, and each class of wheat; and bales, in the case of cotton.

(b) (1) Any farm in order to be eligible to receive a domestic production quota for cotton, peanuts, or rice must have received an acreage allotment under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for such commodity during the twelve months prior to the enactment of this Act. Any farm in order to be eligible to receive a domestic production quota for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat must have produced such commodity for sale during any two or more of the five years immediately prior to the enactment of this Act.

(2) No farm shall be assigned a domestic production quota for any specified commodity unless the owner or operator of such farm contracts with the Secretary (A) to devote to soil conserving practices, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, without payment, a percentage of the tillable acreage of the farm in excess of thirty acres which corresponds to the percentage of the total tillable acreage of all farms not needed (as determined by the Secretary) for the production for sale of such commodity sufficient to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed in the case of any farm for any one commodity 20 per centum of the total tillable acreage of such farm in excess of thirty acres, (B) to comply with such marketing regulations governing such commodity produced on such farm as the Secretary may prescribe pursuant to section 7, and (C) to comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may from time to time prescribe with respect to production quotas and compensatory payments made under this Act.

(c) (1) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for cotton, peanuts, and rice shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity for such year (as proclaimed by the Secretary) as the average production from the acreage allotment for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average annual production from the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such period.

(2) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for any class of wheat shall be an amount of such class of wheat which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such class of wheat as the estimated average annual acreage seeded on such farm to such class of wheat in 1952 and 1953 multiplied by the average yield per acre of such farm for such class of wheat bears to the national average annual acreage seeded to such class of wheat in 1952 and 1953 multiplied by the national average yield per acre for such class of wheat. For the purposes of this section "average yield" means the annual average yield per acre for the seven highest yielding years of the ten-year period 1951 to 1960, inclusive.

(3) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, and rye shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity as the average production for commercial sale of such commodity for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average national production of such commodity for commercial sale for such period.

(4) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity as the average production of such commodity for domestic civilian food sales for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average national production of such commodity for domestic civilian food sales for such period.

(d) The Secretary shall withhold from the domestic consumption quota, proclaimed pursuant to section 3, in any year for any specified commodity an amount of such quota not to exceed 3 per centum for use in making domestic production quotas available to new farms and to increase farm production quotas in hardship cases. From any such amount withheld, the Secretary shall make available farm domestic production quotas to farms ineligible for quotas under subsection (c) of this section, and may increase farm domestic production quotas in hardship cases. The Secretary shall prescribe requirements of eligibility for new farms and for hardship cases and shall assign farm domestic quotas to new farms and increase quotas in hardship cases on as equitable a basis as possible.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) Any producer whose farm has been assigned a domestic production quota pursuant to section 4 for any specified commodity shall receive compensatory payments for such quota as provided in this section.

(b) The Secretary shall pay to any such producer, with respect to any such commodity produced on his farm within such quota, the amount, if any, by which the parity price for such commodity (for the year in which such commodity is sold by him) exceeds the national average market price for such commodity (for the year in which such commodity is sold by him).

(c) No producer shall be paid a compensatory payment except upon presentation by him of a receipt of sale of the commodity produced by him. He may receive compensatory payment upon any portion of his quota for which a receipt of sale is submitted. In no event shall any producer be paid an amount in excess of $12,500 in compensatory payments for any one year.

(d) Compensatory payments shall be made in such manner and at such times as the Secretary shall prescribe, and receipts of sale required under this section shall be in such form and contain such information as he shall prescribe.

(e) No producer shall be paid a compensatory payment on any commodity for any year under the provisions of this Act if such producer during such year—

(1) marketed any specified commodity produced on his farm in violation of any marketing agreement regulation for such commodity prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 7;

(2) had a total income, together with any member or members of his dependent family, from off-farm sources in an amount greater than $5,000 during the preceding year;

(3) entered into a contract with a prospective purchaser for any specified commodity produced on such producer's farm for which payments are provided by this Act under which the prospective purchaser contributed in any manner to the financing of all or any part of the costs of producing such commodity;

(4) failed to devote a percentage of his acreage to soil conserving practices pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b)(2); or

(5) violated the provisions of any regulation issued by the Secretary under this Act.

PAYMENT IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Any producer eligible for a farm domestic production quota for any specified commodity for any year may elect pursuant to the provisions of this section not to plant such quota for such commodity for such year and receive a certificate issued by the Secretary which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in agricultural commodities owned by the United States. No person shall be paid a compensatory payment on any commodity delivered by the Commodity Credit Corporation in redemption of any certificate issued under the provisions of this section.

(b) In order to be eligible for a certificate as provided in subsection (a), such producer shall agree to devote to soil conserving practices, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, such portion (as determined by the Secretary) of his tillable acreage as would have been utilized for the production of his quota for such commodity for such year. Such portion shall be in addition to any acreage he would have been required to devote to soil conserving practices in order to be eligible for compensatory payments on such commodity under this Act.

(c) Any producer who withholds any commodity from production pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be entitled to receive, upon presentation to the Commodity Credit Corporation of the certificate issued to him, an amount of such commodity equal to (or equivalent in value to) the amount of such commodity the producer would have normally produced, as determined by the Secretary, had such producer planted his farm production quota to such commodity. A certificate may be issued only for the same kind of commodity withheld from production by the producer to whom such certificate is issued and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not in redeeming any certificate deliver any commodity other than the commodity for which such certificate was issued.

(d) Certificates issued pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be freely transferable and each certificate shall indicate on its face (1) the amount of the commodity, expressed in appropriate units of measure, for which such certificate may be redeemed, and (2) the minimum dollar value of the commodity for which such certificate was issued. The dollar value indicated on any such certificate shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the market price, at the time such certificate is issued, of the average class, grade, or staple, as the case may be, of the commodity (for which such certificate was issued) produced by the producer to whom such certificate was issued in the last year in which such commodity was produced by him. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payment in cash for any certificate issued under the provisions of this section.

(e) Any certificate issued pursuant to the provisions of this section may be redeemed by the holder thereof at the warehouse or storage facility of the Commodity Credit Corporation nearest such holder, unless the Secretary indicates that the commodities of such warehouse or storage facility are not available for such purpose. No transportation costs shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the transportation of any commodity after such commodity has been delivered in redemption of a certificate at the warehouse or storage facility of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(f) The Secretary shall have authority to discontinue or suspend temporarily the right of producers to an election under this section with respect to any or all commodities at any time he determines the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are insufficient to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EMERGENCY MARKETING REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. As an emergency safeguard to prevent the price of any specified commodity from dropping to a level which would overload the domestic or world market and prevent producers from receiving a reasonable price for such commodity on the open market, the Secretary is authorized and directed to effectuate such marketing regulations for any marketing year with respect to any specified commodity as he determines necessary in order to maintain the national average price received by farmers for such commodity during such marketing year at not less than the following percentage of the parity price for such commodities: (1) in the case of peanuts, corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat, 75 per centum, (2) in the case of each class of wheat, 60 per centum, and (3) in the case of cotton and rice, 55 per centum.

APPLICABILITY

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall apply to farms in the several States and territories, and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

PUBLICATION AND NOTICE OF FARM DOMESTIC PRODUCTION QUOTAS

SEC. 9. All domestic production quotas assigned to farms in a county or other local administrative area shall, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be made and kept freely available for public inspection in such county or other local administrative area. Notice of the farm domestic production quota assigned to a farm shall be mailed to the owner or operator of such farm.

REVIEW OF ASSIGNED QUOTAS

SEC. 10. (a) Any farmer who is dissatisfied with the farm production quota established for his farm may, within fifteen days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 9, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary. Unless application for review is made within such period, the original determination of the farm domestic production quota shall be final.

(b) The members of the review committee shall receive as compensation for their services the same per diem as that received by the members of the committee utilized for the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. The members of the review committee shall not be entitled to receive compensation for more than thirty days in any one year.

INSTITUTE OF PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 11. If the producer is dissatisfied with the determination of the review committee, he may, within fifteen days after a notice of such determination is mailed to him by registered mail, file suit against the review board as defendant in the United States district court, or institute proceedings for review in any court of record of the State having general jurisdiction, sitting in the county or the district in which his farm is located, for the purpose of obtaining a review of such determination. Bond shall be given in an amount and with surety satisfaction to the court to secure the United States for the cost of the proceeding. The bill of complaint in such proceeding may be served by delivering a copy thereof to any one of the members of the review committee. Thereupon the review committee shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination complained of was made, toegther with its findings of fact.

COURT REVIEW

SEC. 12. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and the finding of fact by the review committee, if supported by the evidence, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there was reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the review committee, the court may direct such additional evidence to be taken before the review committee in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The review committee may modify its findings of fact or its determination by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file with the court such modified findings or determination, which findings of fact shall be conclusive. At the earliest convenient time, the court, in term time or vacation, shall hear and determine the case upon the original record of the hearing before the review committee, and upon such record as supplemented, if supplemented, by further hearing before the review committee pursuant to direction of the court. The court shall affirm the review committee's determination, or modified determination, if the court determines that the same is in accordance with the law. If the court determines that such determination or modified determination is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceeding to the review committee with direction either to make such determination as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the court's opinion, the law requires.

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS AND EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION

SEC. 13. The commencement of judicial proceedings under this Act shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the review committee's determination. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the jurisdiction conferred by this Act to review the legal validity of a determination made by a review committee pursuant to this Act shall be exclusive. No court of the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction to pass upon the legal validity of any such determination except in a proceeding under this Act.

NO EFFECT ON OTHER QUOTAS

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding any increase of any farm as a result of review of the determination thereof under this Act, the domestic production quota for other farms shall not be affected.

REPEALS; EFFECT ON SOIL BANK

SEC. 15. (a) All provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price support shall be ineffective with respect to any specified commodity after the effective date of this Act, except that any right, claim, or action which accrued under any such provisions prior to such effective date shall not be affected.

(b) The provisions of section 114 of the Soil Bank Act, relating to compliance with acreage allotments for any specified commodity, shall be ineffective after the effective date of this Act. Except with respect to compliance with acreage allotment requirements nothing in this Act shall be construed as altering the terms of any contract entered into under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act.

MILK MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 16. Milk orders established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act shall be reviewed and may be amended to take into account the payments made pursuant to this Act and the purposes of this Act to improve farm family income in relation to the criteria provided in this Act.

RULES AND REGULATIONS; PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall include in such regulations acceptable marketing practices for the disposition of the specified commodities for which compensatory payments are to be paid.

(c) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to this section for the purpose of obtaining a compensatory payment or a certificate issued under the provisions of section 6 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or one year in jail, or both.

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe rules and regulations providing for the cancellations of the production quota assigned any farm in the event the owner or operator of such farm is guilty of violating any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL, COUNTY, AND STATE COMMITTEES

SEC. 18. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall utilize the local,

county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 19. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 20. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not after the effective date of this Act acquire any additional stocks of specified commodities.

(b) The Secretary shall, in conjunction with the National Security Council, make a determination as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the kinds and quantities of agricultural stocks owned by the United States that are needed for purposes of a strategic reserve to protect this country against shortage of such stocks in the event of a national emergency.

(c) The Secretary shall, immediately after such determination has been made, submit to the Congress specific recommendations for legislation necessary to provide for the prompt disposition, by such means as would not adversely affect normal trade channels, of any agricultural stocks owned by the United States in excess of those needed for strategic reserve purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHORT AND LONG RANGE LEGISLATION

SEC. 21. The Secretary of Agriculture, with the advice and assistance of other appropriate officials and agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government, shall prepare and submit to Congress at the beginning of each session of Congress a detailed report setting forth both the short and long range objectives of the Department of Agriculture with reference to achieving and maintaining prosperity and living standards for the agricultural economy equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation, and shall submit specific recommendations for legislation and appropriations required to achieve such objectives.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 22. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on December 31, 1961, except that the Secretary may by proclamation make such provisions effective with respect to any specified commodity prior to such date if he finds that such action will effectuate the policy and purposes of this Act as declared in section 2. In the event the provisions of this Act are effected with respect to any such commodity prior to December 31, 1961, the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended shall, as prescribed in section 15(a), become ineffective with respect to any such commodity as of the date the Secretary proclaims the provisions of this Act effective with respect to such commodity.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 23. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) The term "specified commodities" shall mean corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, grain sorghum, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat, respectively;

(3) The term "fluid milk" shall mean whole milk sold by producers in fluid form which is sold to the ultimate consumer as whole milk in fluid form;

(4) The term "manufacturing milk" shall mean all whole milk sold by producers in fluid form for use in the manufacture of the products of milk;

(5) The term "butterfat" shall mean all butterfat sold by producers in the form of fluid cream.

(6) The term "parity price" shall mean parity price as such term was defined in section 301(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, prior to the effective date of this Act; and

(7) The term "producer" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, or estate.

(b) As used in this Act the term "cotton" shall not include extra long staple cotton as described in section 347(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD H. REES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for the first time in 24 years, a new Congress has opened without having as one of its Members my very good friend and coworker Edward H. Rees, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas.

Ed was a good legislator, a fighter for the principles in which he believed, and a sincere public servant, one devoted and dedicated to the cause of good government.

Legislation proposed and sponsored by him in the interest and welfare of our Federal civil service employees will stand as a mark of his leadership and his statesmanship.

There have been many good editorials written about Ed Rees. One of the best I have seen is the one written by E. C. Hallbeck, the very able president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, AFL–CIO. It appears in the January issue of the Union Postal Clerk.

I ask unanimous consent this editorial be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD H. REES

When the 87th Congress convenes, a number of our friends will be among the missing, some retiring of their own choice and some having been defeated in their bids for reelection. Among the former is the kindly Edward H. Rees, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas for 24 years, from 1937 to 1960, inclusive. During his entire period of service Mr. Rees was a member of a committee that had much to do with the welfare of Government employees; first, as a member of the House Committee on Civil Service and, following the Reorganization Act which combined that committee with the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service where he had the honor of serving as the first chairman.

To list all of the beneficial measures that have been enacted for postal and Federal employees during Ed Rees' service on the committee would in itself be quite a job; but perhaps some faint idea of the magnitude of the task can be realized by recalling that at the time he came to Congress the substitutes' hourly rate was 65 cents, regardless of how long they subbed, and a regular clerk received a wage of $1,700 to $2,100 per annum. Postal employees had 10 days sick leave and 15 days annual leave each year, regardless of service; and the average employee with 30 years of service at age 65 received $1,200 per annum upon retirement, with no provision for his widow or dependents. Substitutes received neither sick nor annual leave. There was no such thing as life insurance, hospital and surgical benefits, or other fringe benefits.

Ed Rees played a conspicuous part in the effort to enact all of the legislation that brought about the conditions we enjoy today; and while it would not be entirely correct to say that he voted for every single bill in our interest during all of those years, it would be entirely proper to say that he supported most of them and where his views differed from ours, it was a difference of degree rather than principle. It is also proper to recall that Mr. Rees was chairman of the committee when the Congress enacted what, up until this year, was the largest single salary increase ever granted to postal employees, as well as the most far-reaching and advanced retirement measure ever to become law.

For all of these we are grateful, but we are also grateful for his kindly and friendly counsel; for his patience and fairness; and for his unfailing devotion to the cause of good government. We are personally grateful for his many unobstrusive acts of kindness. Ed Rees could disagree without being disagreeable. He could oppose without becoming petty or vindictive. We salute him for these sterling qualities.

We wish for Ed and Mrs. Rees a long, healthy, and happy life, filled with all of the blessings that life may bestow. Of him we say—Well done, thou good and faithful soldier.

MR. LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the New York Times there appeared an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, a columnist of the New York Times, criticizing—and I think it would be accurate to say castigating—some of us who led the fight on the floor of the Senate in the not too distant past against the confirmation of Mr. Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. In the article Mr. Krock, as is so frequently typical of hasty journalistic writing, and particularly typical of his column, demonstrated once again that he had not done his bookwork. He has taken an obiter dictum passage out of the recent Supreme Court decision on the infamous Dixon-Yates case and has sought to use it to sustain his fallacious conclusion that Mr. Strauss knew little about the Dixon-Yates contract. If he had done his bookwork, he would have known the fact was completely to the contrary.

In the course of his column Mr. Krock stated:

> However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau know of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston, it is significant, we think, that: * * * no one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

May I say most respectfully that the question as to Strauss' knowledge of the Dixon-Yates contract was not at issue before the Supreme Court. Had it been at issue, then I am satisfied that Chief Justice Warren would have made a more

careful examination of the record before he wrote the language that is now contained in his obiter dictum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Krock, published this morning in the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OBITER DICTUM OF SOME ANTIQUARIAN INTEREST

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Shortly after midnight, June 19, 1959, the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46 declined to confirm President Eisenhower's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss of Virginia to be Secretary of Commerce. Many of the Senators who voted to reject, including the majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, gave no reason for participating in an action by which the President of the United States has only on eight occasions been overruled in his Cabinet selections.

Senator Kennedy generalized the rejection as a disagreeable job done in the national interest. But others of the 49 explained they voted against Strauss' confirmation because, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, he had been active in behalf of negotiating the Dixon-Yates contract.

As sometimes before when the Senate has sought more popular ground on which to base an action dominated by partisan politics and/or personal vendetta, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, had provided it. Senators McGee and O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, had already done some effective scouting in the area. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, had previously made it clear to some Democrats who were disposed to vote for Strauss that he would take rejection as an endorsement of his position in the longstanding controversy between him and the AEC chairman. And news reporters had found a strong impression in the Democratic cloakroom that a vote against Strauss would be far from displeasing to majority leader JOHNSON, who eventually also voted to reject the nomination.

Then rose Senator MORSE to say as follows: "I do not deny that Mr. Strauss is probably a very intelligent man * * *. I do not think he is disloyal to our country and our form of government. (Strauss had been accused of obstructing the right of Congress to be given executive information within its constitutional sphere.) * * * I do not find that Mr. Strauss has used his powers or office, or will use them, to enrich himself * * *. There is no indication of his personal conflict of interest."

"But," he continued, "the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, has given the Senate a carefully documented account of the Dixon-Yates scandal and the role Mr. Strauss played in its negotiation, * * * [and] in his effort to foist this illegal contract upon the country Mr. Strauss was an enemy of the American people."

Last week the Supreme Court decided, 6 to 3, that this contract between the Government and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (the Dixon-Yates combine) was indeed illegal and therefore unenforcible. Chief Justice Warren, for the Court, upheld the Department of Justice's claim to this effect, on the ground that the role of Adolphe E. Wenzell as a Budget Bureau consultant in the negotiation of the contract, while retaining his connection with and pay from the First Boston Corp., violated the conflict-of-interest statute. The Chief Justice held it to be irrelevant that the Budget Bureau sought and encouraged Wenzell's participation with full knowledge of his dual role. And he rejected a Court of Claims award, made on the basis of this knowledge, to the M.V.G. Co. of about $1.9 million for costs it had incurred in preparations to execute the Government-signed contract.

However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau knew of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston," it is significant, we think, that—

No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

It is also significant, though now of mere antiquarian interest to anyone but the victim of the charge made by MORSE and other Democrats as a principal reason for rejecting Strauss, that in this period he was Chairman of that very AEC in which no one knew of the duality of Wenzell and which had been reluctant at all times to negotiate the contract. But it is characteristic of politics, and therefore not at all significant, that no Senator who made the charge against Strauss of "an effort to foist this illegal contract on the country" has taken any notice whatever of the finding to the exact contrary by the entire Supreme Court, dissenters included.

Mr. MORSE. So Mr. Krock this morning, seizing upon the obiter dictum of Chief Justice Warren's decision, seeks to give the American people the impression that those of us in the Senate, when it was an issue as to whether Mr. Strauss had knowledge of Wenzell's conduct, were in error in the criticisms we made of Mr. Strauss during the confirmation hearing.

By way of introduction to my reply to Mr. Krock, I wish to repeat that Mr. Strauss knew of Wenzell's conflict of interest conduct in connection with the contract, and that after he knew of it, he continued to support and defend the contract.

I now take the time to prove it from the record.

When a journalist of Mr. Krock's alleged standing is guilty of the misleading representation that he makes in his column this morning, it is important that he be answered, and that the facts be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. Arthur Krock makes about as poor a case in defense of his friend, Lewis Strauss, as it is possible to make. He makes it only by ignoring most of the facts regarding Strauss and his involvement in the Dixon-Yates contract.

As I have pointed out, the reference in the Supreme Court opinion to the Atomic Energy Commission and the conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates contract is just what the headline on Mr. Krock's column calls it—an obiter dictum. In law, an obiter dictum is an incidental remark or opinion of the judge which does not bear on the outcome of the case. Had the knowledge by the AEC and by Commissioner Strauss of conflict of interest in the negotiation of the contract been a controlling fact in the case, the Court would undoubtedly have gone further than it did into the testimony and the record on this point.

When the Senate was required under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution to look into the qualifications of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, this was a very important point. It was a point which was at issue. It was one on which the consent to the appointment would largely turn. Therefore, Senators had to look at the record of our own hearings, investigations, and inquiries put to Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract.

FINDINGS OF ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

These are some of the statements made under oath on which the Senate had to judge Mr. Strauss and his role in the Dixon-Yates contract:

First. In testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in July 1955, Adolphe Wenzell stated that he first met with Lewis Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract on January 18, 1954. That was not December, but the first month of the year 1954—January 18, 1954. The sworn testimony in the official record of the Senate reads as follows:

Senator KEFAUVER. Did you go into the Atomic Energy Commission representing the Bureau of the Budget or the First Boston Corp.?

Mr. WENZELL. At that time I considered my work entirely as a representative of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEEFFE. Did you tell Admiral Strauss you were a representative of the budget, a consultant of Mr. Hughes?

Mr. WENZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. Let's get that straight. I didn't understand the import of your question. You explained to Admiral Strauss that you were there as a consultant of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. WENZELL. The appointment having been made by the Bureau of Budget; yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. And you talked with him as a consultant?

Mr. WENZELL. I did; yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Wenzell, you said a few minutes ago that Admiral Strauss knew who you were, knew that you were a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget. You were down there several times, subsequently; were you not?

Mr. WENZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. He certainly knew who you were, didn't he?

Mr. WENZELL. I told him so at the beginning.

Yet before the same Senate subcommittee, Mr. Strauss testified that he knew Mr. Wenzell as a representative of the First Boston Corp.

Mr. President, let us never forget the controlling fact in this whole issue of conflict of interest as involved in the Dixon-Yates case. That was the activity of Mr. Wenzell as an official of the First Boston Corp. while he was also representing the Bureau of the Budget of the Federal Government. There is no question that his dual role was known by many of his associates in the Budget Bureau, including the Director.

So we have Mr. Strauss' testimony as follows:

Mr. STRAUSS. I have no recollection of Mr. Wenzell's status that is in conflict with my then belief that he represented his firm, the

First Boston Corp., advising all present at the conference on the availability and cost of financing.

A second indication that some people at the AEC knew of Wenzell in more than one role was also brought out by the Antitrust Subcommittee. In 1954 serious questions were raised about the contract. Wenzell himself testified that he had qualms about his dual role, and had been advised by his firm's attorney to resign from his job as consultant to the Budget Bureau. The matter was discussed with the Director of the Budget Bureau, who felt that Wenzell was unduly concerned.

One of the shocking things about this case is that this was not a case of oversight. This was a case of full and complete knowledge on the part of the Federal Government's officials in the Eisenhower administration. This was a case of where even the Bureau of the Budget discussed this point of conflict of interest. So it is impossible for the Eisenhower administration to try to gloss over this notorious example of what I consider to be shocking political corruption within its record, along with the others that I discussed the other day in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate.

President Eisenhower then directed the Budget Bureau and the AEC to prepare a chronology of negotiations on the contract and it was published on August 21, 1954. Neither Wenzell nor Paul Miller, vice president and assistant vice president, respectively, of the First Boston Corp., was mentioned as having participated in the contract negotiations.

That is the incident to which I referred the other day in my speech, when I pointed out that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] had called for a list of the individuals involved in the negotiations in regard to this matter. When the list was submitted, it was interesting to note that Wenzell's name was not on the list.

It has always been my opinion—and I think it was shared by the Senator from Tennessee, and I said so at the time, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—that the Bureau of the Budget thought it could get by with the omission.

When Senator KEFAUVER challenged the omission, the lame excuse of the Bureau of the Budget was that it was an oversight.

But Richard W. Cook, Deputy General Manager of the AEC, had prepared three or four drafts, all of which subsequently were destroyed. He was aided in their preparation by his predecessor, Walter Williams. The original drafts of both Cook and Williams had included the names of Wenzell and Miller.

At the suggestion of William F. McCandless, of the Budget Bureau, the AEC agreed to drop them from the list of participants.

Let me say, for the benefit of Mr. Krock, that he should have done his bookwork before he wrote this uncalled for and misrepresenting column this morning. The testimony on this episode appears on pages 697 through 711 of the Antitrust Subcommittee hearings.

In considering whether to give or withhold its consent to the appointment of Mr. Stennis to a Cabinet post, the Senate had to give full consideration to this question of how much Mr. Strauss and the AEC knew of the conflict of interest and what action they took regarding it; the Supreme Court did not have the responsibility of determining that question of fact. It was not at issue before the Supreme Court, may I say for the benefit of Mr. Krock, who is not a lawyer, but who should not be writing on legal subjects such as this without having the benefit of counsel from a lawyer before he becomes guilty of the gross misrepresentations that were contained in his column this morning.

As to Mr. Strauss' efforts to "foist this illegal contract upon the country," the record is equally clear. Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, spoke at length in the Senate on the possibility of conflict of interest in the negotiation of the Dixon-Yates contract on February 18, 1955. On June 27, the Antitrust Subcommittee opened its hearings. On June 28, the Atomic Energy Commission passed a resolution reaffirming the contract and its necessity. It was not until November of that year that it was finally terminated. Subsequently the Dixon-Yates combine filed suit in the Court of Claims for its "out-of-pocket" costs; the Justice Department countered that the Government was not liable because the contract had been illegally negotiated.

Yet up to the very moment of the Senate vote in 1959, Lewis Strauss continued to defend the contract. This was his testimony to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee on April 30, 1959:

The CHAIRMAN. And you, then, as Chairman, had looked over the contract and, as I understand it, you approved the contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. Yes; I thought it was a good contract and I still do, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my next question I was going to ask you. In view of subsequent events, do you think that contract still is a good contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. It has been terminated, but it was to provide power——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I understand that, but I am asking your opinion: Do you still think it was a good contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. I did and do; and it would have cost the people a great deal less than the plant that is now going to cost, which is not yet complete.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the point of my question—I think we could argue that point back and forth—but what I wanted on the record is: If the Dixon-Yates contract, as approved by the Commission on that date, were before you now, you would approve of it?

Mr. STRAUSS. Well, that is a very "iffy" question.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it isn't "iffy."

Mr. STRAUSS. I think it is, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the same contract.

Mr. STRAUSS. If the circumstances were the same I would approve it; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you still think it is a good contract? You just said that you did, and were going to give your reasons.

Senator BUTLER. As of that time.

Mr. STRAUSS. As of that time, under those circumstances, I thought it was a good contract. I think its provisions were fair; I think as a matter of fact they were more than fair to the Government of the United States. And today we could not get the money for such a figure, anything like such a figure; and I doubt whether we would ever be able to get any companies to agree to the limitations on earnings which these companies at that time were willing to agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any opinion about the contract now, if it were up now?

Mr. STRAUSS. If it were up now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRAUSS. I would think it would be a good contract.

I repeat, when the final question was put to him, as to whether or not, at the very time he was testifying, and on the basis of the facts which had been brought out, he thought it was a good contract, his answer was:

I would think it would be a good contract.

In short, what the U.S. Supreme Court considered was the question of the legality and enforceability of the contract; what the Senate considered were the qualifications of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. I think both bodies rendered the proper verdict on the basis of the applicable facts.

For the benefit of Mr. Krock, let me repeat again today, as I did in my speech when I opposed confirmation of Mr. Strauss' nomination, that the record showed—and I have repeated the record today—that Strauss knew of the Wenzell connection with the First Boston Corporation; while he was also representing the Budget Bureau, and notwithstanding Wenzell's connection with the First Boston Corporation, and notwithstanding the fact that he also served as a staff member of the Bureau of the Budget, participating in the preparation and negotiation of the contract, Mr. Strauss approved the contract. Not even his friends, like Mr. Krock, can get him off that hook of misconduct.

In my judgment there was a failure on his part to perform the services which the American taxpayers have the right to expect of any public official.

I voted against confirmation of his nomination, and I shall always be proud of my vote against his confirmation, because I am satisfied that upon the record he showed that he was not fit to serve as Secretary of Commerce, and in my opinion he was justifiably rejected for the position.

FOREST ACCESS ROADS—THE KEY TO WISE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF OUR FEDERAL FORESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today on behalf of myself and Senators MAGNUSON, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, ENGLE, GRUENING, JACKSON, MCGEE, METCALF, MOSS, NEUBERGER, CARROLL, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and HICKEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act as it relates to forest development roads and trails.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 501) to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

MORSE for himself and other Senators was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I explain the bill, I should like to pay high tribute and commendation to an associate of mine of many years in the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The senior Senator from Washington and I have worked together and stood shoulder to shoulder for many years in our endeavors to secure congressional approval of an expanded so-called access road program.

We have met with some success, as the record will show, but at no time, in my judgment, has the Congress ever approved an adequate program for saving the American taxpayers many millions of dollars which would be saved to them if the Federal Government kept itself in a position so that it could harvest its timber without suffering the great losses it suffers each year from fire, disease, and windstorms.

As I have said so many times, we are dealing with a crop. Trees are a crop; and trees must be harvested at the point when it is time to harvest them if we are to save not only the great waste of a particular tree, but the great waste of surrounding timber. If diseased timber is allowed to stand, if blown-down timber, which becomes a fire hazard, is allowed to remain blown down, and is not cleared out, of course, the healthy surrounding timber is in danger.

So once again I raise my voice in the Senate in support of a forest access roads bill. I am satisfied that it is a sound bill from the standpoint of our Nation's economy. It will return to the Treasury of the United States many times its cost, making it possible for us to harvest timber which otherwise would be lost. The proceeds will go into the Treasury of the United States, to the great benefit of the American taxpayers.

Last year, when the Senate Committee on Public Works reported the highway bill, it indicated that studies would go forward and hearings would be held with respect to forest development roads. We introduce this bill on behalf of wise conservation and management of our forests and in order to place before the Senate Committee on Public Works the proper legislative vehicle with which to achieve these objectives.

The subject of forest access roads is one to which I have devoted a great deal of effort since I first came to the Senate. The following are some of the major measures I sponsored or cosponsored with my colleagues in the Senate on behalf of a greatly expanded program of Federal forest access roads:

Senate bill 800, of the 80th Congress. This bill sought to authorize $25 million for access road construction. It passed the Senate in May 1947.

Senate Joint Resolution 126, of the 80th Congress, which called for annual appropriations of $25 million for the construction of access roads and trails in our national forests.

Senate Joint Resolution 196, of the 80th Congress. This proposed the authorization of $30 million annually for the access road program of our Federal forests.

Senate Joint Resolution 24, of the 81st Congress, which passed the Senate in August 1949. It would have authorized annual appropriations of $30 million for Federal forest access roads.

Senate Joint Resolution 32, of the 82d Congress, and Senate Joint Resolution 86, of the 83d Congress. These resolutions would also have authorized $30 million annually for the program of our Federal forest access roads.

Senate bill 3420, of the 84th Congress. This bill called for a 12-year program of forest access road construction. It proposed fund authorizations ranging from $32 million for the first year to a maximum of $50 million a year for the final 10 years.

Senate bill 1136, of the 85th Congress, which called for a 12-year access road program, ranging from an initial $32 million up to $50 million per annum for the last 9 years.

Senate bill 2240, of the 86th Congress, cosponsored by a number of Senators. It proposed appropriations of $40 million for the fiscal year 1961 and $50 million for the fiscal year 1962, for the development of forest roads and trails in our national forests.

Those of us in the Senate who have sponsored forest access roads bills have made substantial progress in raising authorization levels. I say with considerable regret that for the past 8 years there has been strong administration opposition to any important increase in these authorizations. Despite the opposition, we have moved forward; but the rate has been less than that needed.

In 1959 the Secretary of Agriculture submitted a program for the national forests, which specifically called for $720 million in appropriated funds to be spent over the next 12 years for forest roads—an average of $60 million a year. It is a curious fact that both before and after the announcement of the program for the national forests, there has been consistent opposition from the Eisenhower administration to increases in these road authorizations.

Our bill proposes that by fiscal year 1963 we move to the authorization level which has been suggested, but not supported, by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, our bill asks the Public Works Committee to re-do the section of the 1960 Highway Act which provided $35 million for the fiscal year 1962 and $40 million for the fiscal year 1963, and to provide $45 million for 1962 and $60 million for 1963. The well-supported justification is a part of this program for the national forests. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the message of March 24, 1959, from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President of the Senate be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my speech.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROADS AND TRAILS

The road and trail system which serves the national forest lands is a complex of highways and access roads and trails under various ownerships and jurisdictions. This transportation system is vital to the multiple use of all the resources of the national forest system.

For administrative purposes, the road and trail facilities are grouped into a forest highway system and a forest development road and trail system. All these facilities benefit the national forests. There are now 24,400 miles for forest highways, 149,700 miles of forest development roads, and 112,200 miles of trails. When fully installed, there will be about 70,000 miles of forest highways, 542,000 miles of access roads, and the trail network will be reduced to about 80,000 miles.

The forest highway program is administered by the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. The forest highways are, therefore, not included in the program herein outlined.

An adequate system of roads and trails is essential to proper management of forest lands. The presence or lack of access roads has a direct and controlling influence on many phases of forest management, such as the volume of timber that can be marketed; the size, duration, and distribution of sales within working circles; the level of salvage cutting; protection of national forest resources from fire, insects, and disease; and recreational and forage use.

Financial losses occur every year to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber now inaccessible but in need of harvesting, and to promptly and completely salvage losses resulting from fire, windstorms, insects, and diseases. As the road and trail system is expanded the revenue to the Government increases, primarily through expanded timber sales. Timber access roads for the national forest system are investments which will pay their own way over a period of years.

The long-range objective is to have and maintain a system of roads and trails to service the national forests adequately at the levels needed to meet expected demands. Such a system will not only make that possible, but will at the same time enhance the value of the timber and other resources being utilized.

Construction of about 392,600 miles of new roads and 6,000 miles of new trails will ultimately be needed, along with reconstruction of about 112,600 miles of roads and 11,300 miles of trails. Also about 41,400 miles of existing trails will be replaced by construction of new roads.

In the short-term period the program proposals are—

1. Complete construction and reconstruction of about 90,000 miles of access roads and 8,000 miles of trails. This constitutes about 19 percent of roads and trails included in the long-range objectives. Approximately half of the value of the work on timber access roads planned for this period will be constructed by national forest timber purchasers, but paid for by the Government through adjustment of stumpage prices.

2. Provide maintenance to full standards on the 261,900 miles of existing development roads and trails and on 58,000 miles of new construction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other sections are designed to give us the means whereby we may proceed with implementation of the program for the national forests. They will provide a policy guide for an adequate system of forest development roads and trails.

They will enable us to acquire roads and road rights-of-way needed in the development and management of lands administered by the Forest Service, and will authorize the granting of road rights-of-way over Forest Service lands. Of particular importance in these respects is the proposed new section 205 to title 23c, United States Code. The new section would have three subsections.

Subsection (a) would permit the Secretary of Agriculture, under rules and regulations promulgated by him, and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to provide for the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails within and near lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications to permit maximum economy. It would authorize this to be done either, first, directly, with appropriated funds; second, by requirements of purchasers of timber or other products from the lands when roads are needed in their removal; third, by cooperation; or fourth, by a combination of these. This subsection would also authorize the Secretary to require the payment of fees for the use and maintenance of such roads and trails in accordance with regulations promulgated by him.

In situations where it is in the public interest, usually where timber purchasers need to haul over a common road, the Secretary would be authorized to require deposits from the purchasers of timber or other products from Forest Service lands, for the maintenance or construction by the Forest Service of roads used by purchasers under their contracts.

Subsection (a) would also make it possible for the Secretary to advertise and sell timber at gross stumpage or unit rates which would include amortization rates for roads to be constructed by the purchaser. Also included would be: Appropriate provisions for retention by the purchaser-builder of amounts equal to road amortization rates until the value of the road construction is amortized; a provision for refunding of amounts needed to liquidate unamortized balances, and authority to adjust the road amortization rates from time to time. This would permit true amortization of road construction values, and would protect both the Government and the purchasers.

Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary:

First. To grant easements for roads across Forest Service lands.

Second. To enter into agreements for the exchange of hauling rights or rights-of-way with those who own, control, or use lands intermingled with Forest Service lands. Where mutual need for access exists, the Secretary, notwithstanding other provisions of law, would be authorized to condition the granting of any permission or right to cross Forest Service lands upon the granting to the United States of rights or permission to cross the non-Federal lands to the extent the Secretary deems necessary.

Where the rights or permission granted to the United States under such circumstances are determined by the Secretary to be of greater value than those granted to the person seeking the permission or rights to cross Forest Service lands, the Secretary could make arrangements to reimburse the owner for the difference. Such arrangements could include payment by the Secretary with appropriated funds or provision for such compensation through requirements of purchasers of timber or other products from Forest Service lands who would need to use the road, or payment of fees by other persons using such roads.

Section (b)2 is intended to assure that the Secretary need not grant a permit to cross national forest land to one who refuses to permit the Forest Service to cross its lands. The expectation is that the prevailing situation will be one where agreements will be reached amicably.

In applying subsection (b)2, in a situation where the landowner and the Forest Service cannot reach agreement in time to meet an urgent need for public access, the Secretary may exercise two options. If the Secretary concludes that no agreement on price or condition is in sight, he can condemn a road, utilizing the authority in subsection (a), and pay for the road in accordance with subsections (a) and (c).

The Secretary could permit all persons to utilize forest roads and, to the extent proper, could recapture the share of the cost of the road attributable to non-Federal products, through the application of use fees. He would not be required to grant any rights for the construction of a parallel or duplicating road system to serve private timber unless it would be deemed to be in the public interest.

When negotiations over road use are underway, and are difficult and complex, there is always the question of whether in some way the private party may be shut off from road use pending a final solution. The language of this bill is broad enough to give the Secretary power to provide for temporary joint road use for a reasonable period until a final agreement could be reached.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Secretary to deposit into a special account, to be available for the purpose for which deposited, fees paid by purchasers or other users of roads, to cover deferred payments to the Government's grantor. Special accounts could also be authorized for deposits required of purchasers of national forest products for road construction or maintenance. Provision is included for expending such deposits for work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or in areas which, in the aggregate, are determined to cover a single work unit on the combined areas. In this connection, the Government may use estimates based on a cost analysis of the type of work to be done to determine the cost to the United States of performing the work. Provision is also included for unexpended balances, upon accomplishment of the purposes for which deposited, to be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded to the depositor.

Mr. President, the substantive provisions of our bill were finally approved by the outgoing administration last year, but no action was taken for a number of reasons. One of the foremost was the strong opposition expressed by the larger timber interests to the provision dealing with the inability of the Forest Service to market its overripe timber.

Today there are over 56 billion board-feet of national forest timber in the five States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho to which the Forest Service has not obtained access and to which access must be secured across private lands. This volume of timber is equal to the annual allowable cut from the national forests for 8 years. The total volume for which access is needed exceeds the total use of public and privately cut timber for this entire Nation for 1 year. This is a measure of the magnitude of the situation.

POSITION OF LARGE TIMBER OPERATORS

May I say, Mr. President, that I am well aware of the longstanding opposition of many of the big timber concerns of this country to prevent the Federal Government from having access to its own Federal timberlands across the property of private timber companies. The result of this course of action on the part of the big timber companies has not been in the public interest. The result of this selfish attitude on the part of the big timber companies of this country has cost the American taxpayers, over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars in losses in Federal forests.

It is a view of mine, well recognized in American jurisprudence, that no one has the right to use his private property in a manner that does damage to the public interest where there is a great public concern involved. Therefore, I have always taken the position that if the big timber operators are not willing to cooperate voluntarily in regard to this road access problem, then it is the clear duty of the Government, acting in behalf of all the taxpayers of this country, to take the necessary legal steps to require access, over private property, to Federal forests. And it is the clear obligation, as I have been heard to say before, of the Congress to see to it that the legislative power is carried out in order to compel the big timber operators of this country, if necessary, to make available access across private timberlands—of course, Mr. President, with appropriate compensation paid for such use of private property.

Mr. President, I am very much concerned about this problem in the Pacific Northwest, because I offer this bill today not only to protect the titleholders of the American Federal forests, which are the taxpayers of this country, but also because the bill could really be considered an emergency bill to help meet part of the need of an economically distressed area of the United States. I wish Senators from areas of the United States where unemployment has not yet reached disastrous proportions would just call at my office and look over the volumes of mail I am getting each day these days from the State of Oregon, dealing with the matter of a distressed area, because Oregon today is a distressed area. We have not had such unemployment in our State during the last

20 years. Thousands and thousands and thousands of wage earners are out of jobs, and they are not seasonal workers.

As was pointed out in my office this morning by a delegation that waited upon me in regard to the disastrous unemployment situation that confronts the State of Oregon, many of those now unemployed in the Pacific Northwest—and I speak only with knowledge of Oregon, but they assured me it was also true of Washington and Idaho—have not been out of work for a score of years.

They are craftsmen; they are men from the skilled trades. The terrific slump in the lumber market has resulted in the closing of a great many lumber mills in the State of Oregon, and the placing of many more on part-time shifts.

Of course, merely opening up the timber is not going to solve the unemployment problem, unless there is a corollary adopted with it. It will have to be supplemented, of course, with a construction program that will result in the building of homes, schoolhouses, and public works, so sorely needed in our country.

That will help put men and women back to work. That will help to start the cycle which is needed to expand the economy and to bring to an end the serious unemployment situation in this particular depressed area.

I am in a position so that I can speak on this matter, because in recent years I have urged relief on the economic front for areas of the country which were depressed at a time when my State was not. The RECORD is replete with speeches I have made over the years in support, for example, of the two Senators from Pennsylvania, of the two Senators from West Virginia, and of the two Senators from Michigan, only to mention three of the depressed areas of the United States of recent years which have needed assistance from the Federal Government, which the Republican administration denied them through the President's veto of the depressed areas bill.

Mr. President, my own State is now hard hit, and I am going to do whatever I can, seeking to start my work on the problem in the speech today, to see to it that the President of the United States who will take office next Friday is made fully aware of the shocking economic situation which confronts the people of the Pacific Northwest.

NEED FOR ACTION UNDER EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

In 1946 I was one of the sponsors and supporters of the Murray full employment bill. For the most part it has been a "dead letter" on the statute books ever since it was passed.

I say to President-elect Kennedy that when he takes the solemn oath on January 20 he will assume also, in my judgment, a solemn responsibility to see to it that the Federal Government lives up to what I consider to be a great moral and economic obligation to the people of our country who live in distressed areas. I think the Full Employment Act of 1946 is sound, both in political and economic philosophy. It is the obligation of a free government, existing under our constitutional form, to see to it that it does for its people what needs to be done in order to do justice and economic equity to them.

Mr. President, this Government cannot stand by and, in effect, throw up its hands in what might be interpreted as an exhibition of a do-nothing, despairing attitude, with increasing tens of thousands of people going out of work week by week.

As this administration comes to its end, it comes to its end with rising unemployment, with economic depression in various economic pockets in this country, the like of which we have not had for many years in the United States.

The new Kennedy administration will be confronted with a great challenge, which is to live up to what some of us have argued for many times in the Senate, ever since we passed the Full Employment Act of 1946, which is that when these deplorable economic conditions exist it is the duty of the Government to step in and to take the action necessary to see to it that men and women are put to work.

In fact, I happen to think that the perpetuation of our economic system is dependent upon the Government meeting such obligations, because if we let such adverse conditions continue unchecked, Mr. President, we will find ourselves in the depth of a nationwide depression, and the people then will have a right to say to legislators and to executives, "You have betrayed your trust to the American people, and we will act accordingly."

Mr. President, with respect to the national forests created from the public domain, the Forest Service has proceeded on the basis that whenever private timber companies sought to build roads across the national forests to remove timber from private lands, they had that right. The only conditions which could be attached were technical, relating to protection of Government property. The result was an anomalous situation: The private companies could not be required to grant the United States the right to use the road, but the Forest Service had to let such companies use its roads. The result has been unsatisfactory. Private timber companies whose holdings are intermingled with the Government's have, on occasion, constructed roads and removed their timber while the Government timber stood rotting.

Our bill intends to achieve a degree of mutuality which does not now exist for all the national forest lands.

On the eastern national forests acquired under the Weeks law there is no statutory right of ingress and egress. If a private landowner blocks the Government in getting to its timber, the Government does not have to give access to that private party.

On the O. & C. lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management there is also a provision for reciprocal access. I think this is a sound policy and I believe the problem deserves early solution.

CONSERVATION NEEDS ARE PARAMOUNT

The Chief of the Forest Service said in testimony in 1956:

The national forests are under permanent administration for the use and benefit of the citizens of the United States. Permanent management and permanent use require permanent access.

I think this sums up very neatly the heart of the only method by which true multiple-use resource management can be achieved. I have dwelt heavily on timber, but I should point out that these roads serve equally and well all the varied uses of the national forests. Even those who wish to travel the solitude of the wilderness need a road to reach the place that takes them up into the high country and its pristine beauty.

The pressures which today exist upon our wilderness areas for diminution of their size and for permitting extensive timbering will be eased and even erased if we will but construct the needed roads in the commercial timber-growing sections of our public forests.

The key to a whole host of improvements in management and protection can be found in the development of adequate roads.

When I make this argument for access roads I am also making an argument for the expansion of recreational facilities available to the American people. Let us not forget that the recreational use of our great wilderness areas—the great forested areas of the West, the areas where rivers still run through primeval forests—is one of the great sources of income for the States of the West.

For all these reasons it is my hope that this bill will meet with the general approval of all who are dedicated to true conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that he had hoped to be present today when I introduced the bill, so that he could give support to the bill and to the position I have taken. However, as Senators know from the press reports, the Senator from Washington was called to Florida to confer with the President-elect and could not be present today.

So far as the bill is concerned, I speak for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and he urges that the bill receive early consideration by the committee to which it is referred.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 501

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 205 a new section, as follows:

"§ 205A. System of forest development roads and trails.

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) is authorized and directed under rules and regulations to be promulgated by him to provide a system of forest development roads and trails in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum long-term economy in the development and management of all the resources on lands administered by the Forest Service. Forest development roads and trails may be constructed, reconstructed, and maintained, and such roads and trails or rights-of-way therefor may be acquired by purchase, exchange, or condemnation, by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, by requirements on For-

est Service contractors, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, by requiring the payment of fees for the use and maintenance of roads and trails, by cooperation with public or private agencies or persons, or by a combination of these methods. The regulations of the Secretary shall provide that no fees for the use and maintenance of roads and trails shall be required for (1) the hauling of products produced from a farm or ranch within or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service on which the owner or operator resides, or (2) in the case of other products if the quantity hauled is minor, or (3) if he determines that the interest of the United States does not require such payment.

"(b) The Secretary is also authorized to—

"(1) grant easements for specified periods of time or otherwise in, upon, across, and over lands administered by the Forest Service for rights-of-way for roads upon such terms and conditions as he may deem are in the public interest; and

"(2) enter into agreements to exchange hauling rights or rights-of-way and easements for roads with those who own, control, or use lands intermingled with or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service and where mutual needs for access exist and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to condition the grant of any right-of-way or permission to cross Forest Service lands upon the granting to the United States of rights or permission to cross lands owned, controlled, or used by the applicant to the extent the Secretary deems necessary and to make or receive reasonable compensation for such rights or permission: *Provided*, That no such condition shall be imposed upon persons residing within or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service seeking rights of ingress and egress to their homes.

"(c) Fees paid for the use of any road as to which the agreement under which the United States obtained its rights provides for delayed payments may be placed in a special account to pay the vendor and fees paid to cover the maintenance of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided*, That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further*, That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded."

(b) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "205. Forest development roads and trails." a new item as follows:

"205A. System of forest development roads and trails."

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 205 and 205A of title 23, United States Code, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for forest development roads and trails to and on the national forests the following sums: $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

WILLIAM BIRRELL FRANKE, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the impending departure of Secretary of the Navy, William Birrell Franke, recalls to us all the laudable service this distinguished gentleman has offered to his country. Mr. Franke has devoted almost a decade of leadership to our Nation's Defense Establishment, during which he served in the positions of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of the Navy, and, most recently, he occupied the honored office of Secretary of the Navy.

Secretary Franke brought to each of these high positions a valued fund of experience, ability, acumen, and integrity. The record clearly demonstrates how well he has acquitted himself in meeting the weighty responsibilities with which he has been charged. He has provided decisive and inspiring leadership to our country's fine Naval and Marine Corps Establishment. He has guided the Navy and Marine Corps in an era of rapid technological advancement.

His sound counsel and direction have aided the Navy Department wisely to plot its course in the nuclear and space age. It is due in considerable measure to the Secretary's wise appreciation of these accelerated advancements that the eminently successful Polaris missile has come to early fruition.

Mr. Franke's unstinted and willing cooperation with the Members of Congress has greatly assisted us in our assigned task of providing, and watching over the affairs of our fine Navy and Marine Corps. When Mr. Franke leaves the office in which he served so well he will leave behind an example of devotion and capability.

I know also these brief remarks in respect to the Secretary are deserved and should also include praise for his highly capable assistants, Messrs. Bantz, Jackson, Milne, and Wakelin, all of whom have worked hard to build our Navy to its present high standard.

We congratulate Secretary Franke for the years of service he has given his country.

DAVID HAMIL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Colorado takes a deep pride in her native sons and daughters who, in recent years, have served so well and faithfully in responsible Federal positions. All have acquitted themselves with dignity and honor. No breath of scandal has brushed a single one. Their departments and agencies—and the Nation—are the better for the work they have done. Some are leaving in the next few days; others stay.

One who comes particularly to mind is David Hamil, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I have known Dave Hamil for many years. I have known him as a hardheaded, aggressive rancher; a man who built a large ranch out of nothing; a legislator of consummate skill and ability; and as a square shooting businessman. In his direction of the REA, he has retained all of these qualities and brought to the REA a new sense of progress. He has brought to himself a deep sense of gratitude from all the members of the REA for his faithful and efficient administration, as well as for his fair administration of that agency.

ANDREW J. MAIR

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of those men who has done much to help the farmer try to solve some of his ills has been Andrew J. Mair, who worked so effectively as Deputy Administrator for Operations of the Commodity Stabilization Service, and as a vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Those who dealt with Andy Mair constantly told me that his guidance and willing work brought a real sense of direction to these two operations. I am happy to report that this career civil servant is not being lost to the Government but that he has been transferred to The Hague as an agricultural attaché.

ROLLIN D. BARNARD

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, back in 1953 Postmaster General Summerfield conducted a nationwide talent hunt for a vigorous, experienced young man to head the Real Estate Division of the Post Office Department. He chose Rollin D. Barnard of Denver. In nearly 8 years, that choice has proven one of the wisest of this administration, and Mr. Barnard has risen to Deputy Assistant Postmaster General and then Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Facilities. As such he has overseen the millions of dollars worth of vehicles, buildings, and supplies for the entire Department.

Under his guidance, 5,400 new post office buildings have been constructed and 27 major, modern mail-handling facilities, many of them by private capital on a lease arrangement which has saved the Government many dollars and kept them on local tax rolls. Mr. Barnard currently is supervising the new supply management and modern warehousing programs of the Post Office and the conversion of the awkward, costly fleet of specially built vehicles to a less expensive fleet of standard design trucks. For all this, he was deservedly given the highest honor a postal employee can receive, the Department's Distinguished Service Award.

ELMER BENNETT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for another Colorado story, one can go back to the days of World War II when a young Greeley attorney came to serve in Washington. He stayed, moved up through the ranks of civil service, spent a period as legislative assistant to the late, great Senator Eugene D. Millikin, and today, after service at the top of his chosen profession as Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, is Under Secretary of the Interior. He is Elmer F. Bennett.

In his position as Solicitor and Under Secretary, the West owes him a real vote of thanks for his assiduousness, his studiousness, and his conscientiousness with which he has applied his great ability. These abilities have been repeatedly testified to, not only by members of his own party, but also by Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle.

FRED SEATON, GEORGE ABBOTT, AND PHILIP J. MULLIN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, of course I cannot discuss the Department of the Interior without mentioning the outstanding work of Secretary Fred A. Seaton, whose second home, at least, is Colorado. For his great devotion to the West and to all of us who reside there a great endless debt is owed. Without his devotion to the West and without his understanding of the problems of our great arid and semiarid areas of the West, we would not have made the progress we have. We would not have made the great progress in reclamation which, despite the campaign speeches, we have made during the last 8 years.

Another one of these gentlemen to whom we owe a great tribute is Assistant Secretary George Abbott; also Mr. Philip J. Mullin, my former administrative assistant and now Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. Mullin, of course is a Coloradan, but the others have worked so closely with us in the West, those of us in Colorado especially, that we feel almost as if we could claim them for our own.

THEODORE F. STEVENS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, another of the brilliant young men with whom I have enjoyed working is Ted Stevens, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Although he is returning to Alaska, in whose statehood fight he was so prominently involved, we will remember him as the only person in history who was able to convince a Colorado girl that Alaska was the place to live.

I hope that the country will see more of him in public service.

JAMES T. PYLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of those most respected by the aviation industry for his work with the former Civil Aeronautics Authority and now as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is James T. Pyle of Denver. Much of the credit for the rapidity with which the FAA is solving the complex, dangerous problems of the air age is due to Jim Pyle's love of his work, and his understanding of it and his ability to move forward in the very complex system which is necessary to govern our air transportation.

ROBERT S. McCOLLUM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, another Coloradan who has served with distinction on a highly specialized program is Robert S. McCollum, former Deputy Administrator in charge of the Department of State's Office of Refugee Affairs.

Thousands of anguished persons seeking a new way of life in freedom were aided by Mr. McCollum, who is now serving as vice chancellor of the University of Denver. His great idealism and his very great business ability and practical organization ability which he possesses have made a great success of the program. This will be attested by thousands who are now able to live in peace and happiness in this country, and who formerly knew only starvation and travail.

JOYCE BOVIK PEYTON AND ERNEST J. EATON

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Congress would be remiss in its appreciation if it did not recall at times such as this those who have served so well as liaison officers between the executive and the legislative. One outstanding characteristic of these men and women has been a friendly willingness to obtain information, to seek methods of solving problems and to keep us posted on developments in their fields.

Two Coloradans come to mind here: One is Joyce Bovik Peyton of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mrs. Peyton brought to her work a practiced understanding of politics and a background of government study which made her one of the most effective liaison officers.

The other is Ernest J. Eaton, staff assistant at Department of the Interior. Here is a young man also steeped in the science of government as well as its practice and perhaps the best tribute to Mr. Eaton and his work is the high and warm regard in which he is held by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

ELIOT RICHARDSON AND ALBERT McDERMOTT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, of course, there were many from outside Colorado who served honorably and well in the difficult task of coordinating the work of the executive and legislative branches of this Government. All of us who served on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee remember particularly the solid assistance given us by Eliot Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Albert McDermott, Assistant to Secretary Mitchell of the Department of Labor. I understand that Al is returning to the practice of the law here in the District of Columbia. All of my colleagues who have been exposed to his friendly and intelligent manner will join me, I feel certain, in wishing him well.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Friday, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, January 20, 1961, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1961:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for reappointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the temporary disability retired list to the permanent grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Donald L. Campbell, effective October 7, 1960, with date of rank June 15, 1960.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commander

Kenneth A. MacDonald.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Raymond L. Speer.
Jack W. Kinney, Jr.

To be ensigns

Victor R. Smith	Guy H. Fisher, Jr.
Ralph J. Land	John W. Bricker
Thomas M. Monaghan	Marvin G. Lane
Francis D. Moran	Robert C. McGuffee, Jr.
Robert A. Zimmer	Robert E. Lushene

ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell O16684, U.S. Army, in the rank of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Lowman Decker, O18549, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447, for appointment as Assistant the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hall McCaw, O38722, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton O18417, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, O18478, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, U.S. Army.

Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, U.S. Army.

Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, O18330, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Juan Cesar Cordero, O222751, Army National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Russell Boyt, O266555, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Anthony Long, O274572, Army National Guard of the United States.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

To be major generals

Col. Paul Milton Booth, O327750, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Arthur Young Lloyd, O253763, Army National Guard of the United States.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Ashley, Alvie O., O89690.
Beavers, Guy M., O89177.
Braa, Emery W., O89184.
Callahan, Donald J., O89794.
Collier John F., O89442.
Holmes, James R., O89340.
Hopkins, James R., O91277.
Hubbard, Robert V., O90101.
Incremona, Richard S., O76256.
Jackson, Raymond F., O89227.
Luisi, Gerard H., O89248.
Martin, Bruce A., O89251.
Orr, Gerald W., O89365.
Price, Robert D., O89277.
Rambo, James E., O89280.
Renzi, Eugene C., O89584.
Taylor, Thomas W., O89150.
Walker, Prosper N., O89633.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Gillespie, Ronald L., O89490.
Jones, Donn C., O89229.
Stavish, Peter J., O88958.
Vann, Lawrence K., O89304.
Wilburn, James H., O89010.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be colonel

Sanderson, Harold Rennie, O42076.

To be lieutenant colonel

Miller, Samuel Theodore, O31377.

To be major (chaplain)

McLeod, Walter Grey, O60748.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, and 3292:

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Turrou, Edward Arnold (Adjutant General's Corps), O48222.

To be captain

Mittenthal, Lothrop (Medical Service Corps), O83844.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Williams, Edwin Hugh (Infantry), O87970.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Hembree, Calvin Still (Ordnance Corps), O91267.

Riordan, Michael William, Jr. (Signal Corps), O83442.

To be second lieutenant

Smith, Edward Charles, Jr. (Medical Service Corps), O84275.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Beuke, Henry Albert, O1844798.
Hartley, C. W., Jr., O1636013.
Kesler, Mac Purcell, O2026784.
Long, Louis Ernest, O1010478.
Mewha, John, O1014061.
O'Meara, William Frederick, O1646470.
Ortiz-Moreno, Orlando, O934461.
Petrik, Vernon Frank, O935286.
Sciortino, John Charles, O1684015.
Tharp, Charles Dean, O538228.

To be captains

Aaron, Jerome, O1036920.
Barton, Wade Goldsmith, Jr., O1913425.
Burhoe, John Merchant, O1112596.
Cassella, Arthur Colin, O1937016.
Dietsch, Richard Koehler, O4015531.
Ewing, Amos Dickson, O540749.
Ferris, Gordon Frank, O1891916.
Fleet, Robert Gordon, O954335.
Gearin, Cornelius Joseph, Jr., O1935342.
Gecoma, Richard Montgomery, O2021020.
Gilbert, Robert Lee, O1889907.
Golden, Robert Kenneth, O2263695.
Grzybowski, Conrad John, O1925709.
Haney, Leslie Dolin, O968432.
Jacoby, Richard Allen, O1876876.
Jones, Robert B., O1879684.
Kane, Francis John, O550498.
Kees, William George, O2203037.
Kizirian, John, O2263617.
Klugh, James Richard, O4012172.
Lair, Donald Earl, O4005112.
Lang, Bobby Ray, O1341885.
LeVasseur, Thomas Joseph, Jr., O2209934.
Lowery, Rolla Wilbert, O4019423.
Marder, Everett Joseph, O4006155.
Maxin, Stuart Elwood, O1925349.
Mead, Chester Robert, O953890.
Papajohn, Carroll, O4005341.
Paris, Kenneth Gail, O4005600.
Pate, John Horace, O1881958.
Phillips, William Daniel, O1879782.
Porter, Edward JeDon, O2206684.
Reinhart, William Jennings, Jr., O1891441.
Smith, Lloyd David, O2210103.
Sorenson, Ted Osborne, O1924578.
Stanfield, John Thomas, O2014628.
Steenborg, George Andrew, O1702304.
Stoessner, Richard Leonard, O4006259.
Sugiyama, Shigeki James, O1341720.
Thompson, Glen David, O2030536.
Trexler, Tommy Park, O2014531.
Vass, Marshall Bowie, O960303.
Watson, Robert William, O1883745.
Wetzel, Lewis Arthur, O1888231.
Woods, Chester Arthur, O2263233.

To be first lieutenants

Alliason, John Richard, O4010029.
Aschliman, Edward LeRoy, O5503255.
Barker, Rex Nelson, O4049505.
Beach, Ernest Ervin, O5302582.
Bell, James Claude, Jr., O4059302.
Berry, Tommie Joe, O5504308.
Bligh, Thomas Francis, Jr., O4058781.
Brown, Lee David, O4057879.
Bryant, Richard Lewis, O4034774.
Casey, Franklin James, O4060899.
Cochran, John Robert, O4028987.
Cook, John Jerome, O1886623.
Coyne, Robert Alan, O4031130.
Easterling, Ned Harve, Jr., O4072094.
Eshelman, John Everett, O4031133.
Fancher, Louis Clay, Jr., O5405013.
Frost, Henry Randall, O4074810.
Gilbertson, James Sylvester, O4031227.
Gonsalves, Robert Francis, O1923131.
Goodall, Billy Rhea, O4042977.
Gordon, Charles Lee, O4071650.
Graney, Donald Caryl, O4050288.
Gray, Frank McKay, Jr., O4063409.
Grubbs, William Francis, II, O4070715.
Harper, Oscar Ray, O4032877.
Hattersley, James Garland, O4010934.
Hawkins, Douglas Keith, O2264530.
Hedgcock, Robert Eugene, O4069470.
Heverly, Charles Irwin, Jr., O2291969.
Hightower, Loyal Glenn, Jr., O4044836.
Howard, James Wallace, O4059944.
Hull, Michael Harold, O4070454.
Hutto, Azel James, Jr., O4058748.
Karr, Don Everett, O4047930.
Kemp, Donald Thomas, O4024456.
Kincheloe, Carl Eldridge, O4062710.
Knauss, David Schelly, O4038956.
Lally, Michael Joseph, Jr., O4019656.
Leach, Robert Alan, O4047833.
Lee, James Robert, O2287917.
Leuer, Kenneth Charles, O4059707.
Little, Robert Eugene, O4059322.
Lollis, James Albert, O4074515.
Lomax, Rhoss Cook, Jr., O4049102.
Lott, Kirby Joe, O1934522.
MacLean, Bruce Donaldson, O4085678.
Maxwell, George Michael, Jr., O4085580.
May, Elmer Clarence, O4060981.
McClain, Charles Snyder, O5301537.
McConnell, Richard Marvin, O4024911.
McVeigh, Andrew Jackson, III, O4010980.
Medina-Goveo, Efrain, O4028567.
Morgan, Robert Daniel, O4051562.
Morris, Ellis Rowe, O5300299.
Morris, Robert William, O2210607.
Nagel, Joseph Leo, O4071712.
Nakamura, Leslie Katsumi, O4040120.
Nuckolls, Donald Ray, O4026883.
Parker, Charles Elmer, Jr., O5302644.
Perkins, George Roy, O4026309.
Rhodes, Roy Phil, O4024790.
Richardson, James Ottie, O4025865.
Rowlands, David Latimer, O4077158.
Ryan, William Jerome, O4041871.
Sanford, Jackie Willard, O4030758.
Santilli, Joseph Francis, Jr., O2275652.
Schwartz, James Loren, O4029836.
Serra, Robert Roger, O4038896.
Sinclair, Allen Blanding, O4053200.
Skinner, Gary Nolan, Sr., O1878012.
Solley, Lee Roy, O5405113.
Sorensen, Martin Peter, O4084224.
Stuart, Theodore Mortimer, O4032609.
Thiede, Alfred John, O5502337.
Todd, Rouse Jefferson, O4025123.
Tomes, Paul John, O4048577.
Trail, Carl Francis, O4040275.
Turner, Donald Eugene, O1923566.
Valverde, Robert Arturo, O4037779.
Verry, Horace Daniel, O4067088.
Vincent, Charles James, O5203130.
Wallace, William Clarkton, O4063474.
Warren, Wilford Neil, O4030961.
Williams, Lewis Eugene, O4006701.

To be second lieutenants

Alston, Norman Wayne, O5404880.
Alves, Robert George, O5704419.
Anderson, Thomas Warren, O5405395.
Apruzzese, Vincent Albert, O5000402.
Arwood, Thomas Blodgett, O5305426.
Beard, Charles Thomas, O5401653.

Beasley, Rodney Sid, O5304548.
Bennett, John Samuel, Jr., O5307976.
Blanchard, Robert Dewitt, O5403506.
Blatter, Erwin Walter, II, O4010663.
Bliss, Richard Aaron, O5506285.
Boyd, Thomas Gerald, O5402234.
Bray, Robert Francis, O5508873.
Bretsch, Kenneth Philip, O5306169.
Cain, Morton George, O5505436.
Calise, Gaetano George, Jr., O5007020.
Conklin, Robert Elliott, O5206121.
Cortelli, Richard Joseph, O5305005.
Cox, Ronald Dale, O5400960.
Craig, Norton Warwick, II, O5212063.
Davenport, Robert Leonard, O5702558.
Davis, Charles Leon, Jr., O2300433.
Dearman, Charles Sylvester, O5405509.
Dougherty, George James, O4085068.
Downing, Peter Sharron, O5405400.
Dunn, Ralph Bryan, Jr., O5402199.
Dvorak, Ernest Joseph, O5505050.
Fenton, Charles Richard, O5702070.
Ferrari, Robert Glen, O5702026.
Fisher, Thomas Paul, O5508954.
Fitzsimmons, John Edward, O5505864.
Gauntner, Donald Eugene, O5200327.
Gray, Josef Elmer, O5701931.
Grier, Edward George, Jr., O5704392.
Hadjis, John, O5203486.
Harrington, George Stephen, Jr., O4086019.
Healey, Roger, Jr., O5001447.
Herr, Edward Larue, O5207072.
Heuver, Robert Garret, O5704469.
Hicks, Arthur Joseph, Jr., O5403338.
Hooker, George Alwyn, O5307086.
Hunter, Victor Delano, O5302530.
Jaffe, Stephen George, O5004206.
Johnson, Michael Dennis, O5702316.
Johnson, William Morris, O5304824.
Jones, William Jennings, Jr., O5307357.
Kenworthy, John Howard, O4026438.
Kesterson, Charles Robert, O5206282.
Keszler, Lawrence William, O5509788.
Kilgore, Jack Eldon, O5205516.
Kimball, William Dorrance, O5304467.
Koury, Edward Norman, RA12574180.
Leach, James Edmund, O5504312.
Lee, David Weeks, O5510095.
Lennon, John Cale, O5305079.
Lewis, Homer, Jr., O5305052.
Liddle, Jack Wilson, O5209544.
Ludgewait, Herbert Harris, O5002277.
Lynch, Thomas Henry, Jr., O5508641.
Matthis, Earl Newell, O5209034.
Mauk, Gerald Francis, O5702009.
McCrary, Richard Francis, O5507051.
Meadows, Kenneth Doyle, O4074414.
Mitchell, Radcliff Golder, Jr., O5001093.
Mosley, Howard Robert, O5307377.
Myers, William Madison, O5505419.
Nee, John Richard, O5402476.
O'Hara, Thomas Charles, O5703867.
Osborne, James Cecil, O5202787.
Outlaw, James Franklin, Jr., RO14682002.
Parker, Purvis Lamar, O5304494.
Parman, Donald Wade, O5701790.
Patrick, Horace Beverly, O5205513.
Reed, David Bruce, III, O5308268.
Reid, Thomas Frederick, O5205237.
Riggs, Gary Anderson, O5205398.
Riley, Frank Joseph, O5405489.
Rogers, James Harvey, O5402881.
Roeder, Helmut Adolf Gunther, O5405614.
Shalikashvili, John Malchase David, O5405424.
Skeins, Harry, Jr., ER52374054.
Smith, Curtis Sneed, O5210276.
Smith, John Ray, O5307802.
Smith, Stanley Leroy, Jr., O5204116.
Southworth, James Vincent, O2298670.
Sowell, Mark Sanford, Jr., O5305100.
Sproul, Hugh Bell, III, O2296617.
Stallings, Jimmie Lee, O5404993.
Stewart, Alexander Gordon, O5702809.
Sullivan, Gordon Russell, O5006850.
Swain, Richard Capron, O4085544.
Talkington, Thomas Eugene, O5702910.
Terry, Robert Lee, O4058242.
Thompson, Wesley Winthrop, Jr., O5309106.
Tipton, Carl William, O5402968.
Waldack, Albert Charles, O5502304.
Welch, Jerry Floyd, O5510485.
West, Donald Randolph, O5400863.
Zachary, James Lee, O5307166.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel, Chaplain

Pawlowicz, Theodore Charles, O481318.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Kilby, Ralph Allen, O2303736.
Mayer, William Erwin, O2302308.
Schurter, Lonis Leon.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Benson, Valborg Matilda, J100169.
Werner, Janet Louise, J100079.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Ganow, Marie Bertha, N901473.
Houle, Alice Therese, N901236.
Johnston, Jane Helen, N900043.
Lynch, Betty Jane, N774378.

To be captains, Chaplain

Boggs, James Russell, O1878491.
Helton, Clinton, O1873294.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Cutcher, James Lawrence, O4073768.
DeLeo, Norman Joseph, O5500488.
Leonardo, Raymond Camillo, O5202583.
Shimoda, Larry Minoru, O5500311.
Von Gruenigen, James Albert, O5301084.
Williford, John Will, O5301210.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Hawley, Richard Springer, O2104221.
Sanders, Richard Durrett, O974380.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bedynek, Julius Ludwig, Jr., O5701451.
Bergmanis, Juris, O4043938.
Gregory, Kelly Gentry, O2282901.
Hill, Jay Murray, O1880355.
Johnson, Lewis Allen, O4077985.
Lavenson, George Stanley, Jr., O2283897.
Leighton, Henry Alexander, O2211803.
Linnemann, Roger Edward, O2279361.
Logan, Donald James, O2283893.
Ormand, John William, Jr., O2302284.
Redd, Henry Jefferson, Jr., O2284664.
Siemsen, Arnold William, O4073840.
Sowell, John Michael, O4011664.
Walker, Jackson Kyle, O2283901.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Ikeda, George, O2271710.
Johnson, Aaron Basil, O2102829.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Barnwell, Shireley Mae, L1020637.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hyde, Patricia Louise, M3067.
Pause, Barbara Edwina, M3078.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Coble, Patricia Irene, N2294702.
Greene, Patricia Ann, N805742.
Jagiello, Helen Dolores, N902475.
Jaskoski, Margaret Lucille, N902370.
Robertson, Joyce Alice, N901288.
Thomas, Nevaida, N902727.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Mills, Charlie Smith, O1856096.
Phillips, Major Hunter, Jr., O2297357.
Tolbert, Carl Edwin, O1942271.
Weathers, Clifford Thurston, O2295260.
Wetherell, Sterling Alan, O2294446.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Hann, John Robert, O2295829.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Beutter, Robert Charles, O5502479.
Butler, Richard Ward, O4077283.
Davis, Thomas Hugh, O2291957.
Dudzik, Joseph Anthony, Jr., O2298724.
Gehler, Robert Ray, O5512121.
Groshong, W. Ronald, O5702770.
Gullage, James Truett, O5309284.
Kirshman, Norman Harold, O2298692.
Lively, Floyd Robert, O5506548.
McNealy, Richard Kinney, O2298051.
Mittelstaedt, Robert Noble, O2298695.
Mounts, James Addison, Jr., O4002673.
O'Brien, Thomas Patrick, Jr., O5207697.
O'Kelley, Richard Dale, O5502551.
Passamaneck, David Joel, O2298780.
Patrick, Robert Franklin, O5701746.
Roberts, Norman Leslie, O5703905.
Schiesser, Charles William, O2298714.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

Kalivoda, Andrew Joseph, O4052840.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Burris, Norman Leroy, O4032307.
Pulcini, Dino Joseph, O4064869.
Stevenson, Wilbert Charles, O4049293.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Eddy, Gerald Arthur, O5701429.
Kinnamon, Kenneth Ellis, O2297988.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Cooper, Alice Eugenia, L2294020.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Dorman, Joyce Rose Marie, N5407137.
Miles, Marcia Elaine, N2293782.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arkinson, Thomas Eugene.
Dillie, Charles William, Jr., BR13689995.
Dubiel, Joseph, Jr., O4085507.
Graham, Richard William, O2299093.
Houston, William Eddie, O5212037.
Hubbard, James Arthur, O5204717.
Lamport, James Earle, O2297118.
Martinka, Gerald Rudolph, O5504021.
Murray, Robert Eugene, O2297343.
Norris, Jimmy Richard, O2297119.
Redman, David Elmer, O5401527.
Summary, James John, O2300222.
Thomas, Donald Wayne, O2300454.
Travis, Edward Ernest, O2298306.
Wergeland, David Andrew, O2300532.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

McCord, Patricia Ann, L2298792.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Christianson, Lloyd Duane, O5512454.
Hall, Joseph Andrew.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Besemer, Ellsworth Albert.
Bird, William Wirt, Jr.
Chen, William Shao-Chang.
Connell, Thomas Richard, Jr., O5705725.
Coseo, David Paul, O5311183.
Craig, John Davis.
Curcio, Anthony James, Jr., O5213423.
DeSantis, Edward, O5008245.
Dreska, John Paul.
Earle, Robert Ray.
Finnerty, Robert John.
Gallagher, Donald Michael.
Harris, Benny Ronney Sanford.
Hendrick, Thomas Gould, III, O5410462.
Hill, Wilmer Darden, O5311106.
Javorka, Frank Henry, O5410478.
Kemp, Robert Francis.
Korbel, John Robert.
Laird, Kenneth Wayne, O5705018.

Leatherwood, Thomas Lewis, Jr., O5410393.
Lind, Alan David, O5704989.
Mallette, Alfred John.
Martinez, Arthur Caulfield.
McCord, Chancey Kelly, O5213328.
McGruder, Kenneth Byron.
McNeil, William Dean.
Myers, Nathan Joseph.
Olsen, Kenneth Jay.
Owen, Dean Mallory, O5705746.
Peterson, Robert Dale.
Phelps, Arland Eugene.
Pratt, Joseph.
Sheffer, Ronald Gene.
Stubblefield, Joel Richard, O5410264.
Summers, Bruce Gregory, O5705175.
Tang, Douglas Brayton, O5512905.
Taylor, Edwin Fitz-Gerald.
Turnbull, John Gordon.
Ulrich, Carl Edward, Jr., O5705537.
Werner, David Ross, O5410490.
White, Douglas Raeburn, O5213800.
Wolfver, Jimmy Wayne.

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Gilbert W. Melcher, Gulf Shores, Ala., in place of Frank Wenzel, removed.

COLORADO

Charles E. Casper, Campo, Colo., in place of B. M. Wells, retired.

IDAHO

Wayne J. Roos, Sandpoint, Idaho, in place of D. P. Woodard, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eleanor M. Smith, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

INDIANA

A. Wayne Kellams, Edinburg, Ind., in place of R. K. Auxier, retired.

KANSAS

Leonard Y. Craig, Mulvane, Kans., in place of G. E. Smysor, retired.
Marion E. Keely, Rock, Kans., in place of E. E. Kunkle, retired.
Thurman A. Kelly, Towanda, Kans., in place of La Vera Wheeler, retired.

KENTUCKY

Dan R. Cabell, New Castle, Ky., in place of E. L. Bailey, retired.

MARYLAND

Marion E. Hopkins, Nanjemoy, Md., in place of M. C. Ward, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John A. MacIver, Monterey, Mass., in place of A. P. Phillips, removed.

MICHIGAN

Charles W. Fairchild, Frankfort, Mich., in place of R. E. Peterson, deceased.
Robert L. Selby, Sturgis, Mich., in place of J. E. Luttmann, deceased.
Mildred H. Seaman, Sumner, Mich., in place of A. W. Bond, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Albert V. Nelson, Austin, Minn., in place of Elmer Requa, deceased.
Harold A. Randen, Nicollet, Minn., in place of W. H. Gronholz, Jr., transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Ray Bonds, Booneville, Miss., in place of F. J. Fugitt, retired.

MISSOURI

Charles W. Glass, Baring, Mo., in place of J. W. Costello, retired.
Byron D. Montgomery, Slater, Mo., in place of H. B. Brown, retired.

NEBRASKA

Earl W. Weber, Creston, Nebr., in place of G. H. Summers, retired.
Donald D. Smith, Douglas, Nebr., in place of D. G. Hendricks, retired.

NEW YORK

Robert E. Wallace, Castile, N.Y., in place of Martin Carey, retired.
Dorothy L. Varley, Thomson, N.Y., in place of G. E. Varley, retired.

OHIO

Alberta M. Edwards, Kipton, Ohio, in place of B. R. Waite, deceased.

OREGON

Norman B. Hess, Roseburg, Oreg., in place of C. W. Carstens, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry H. Greenfield, Coatesville, Pa., in place of C. H. Conner, retired.
George M. Brunner, Cranesville, Pa., in place of M. H. Thrasher, retired.
Billy D. Pomeroy, East Springfield, Pa., in place of M. G. Spencer, retired.
Charles K. Bantley, Windber, Pa., in place of C. W. Baumgardner, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Maurice D. Putnam, Artesian, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Heinricks, retired.
Hobart H. Gates, Custer, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Himebaugh, retired.

TEXAS

R. Donal Ray, Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

VIRGINIA

Eva B. Toner, Claremont, Va., in place of Rudolph Shiffer, deceased.
Robert T. Gillette, Courtland, Va., in place of B. A. Williams, Jr., resigned.
Brenda S. Holt, Rockville, Va., in place of R. S. Johnson, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Raymond J. West, Blaine, Wash., in place of W. V. Cowderoy, deceased.
Dorothy D. Eldridge, Fox Island, Wash., in place of C. R. Bowyer, retired.
Paul C. Alvestad, Gig Harbor, Wash., in place of T. W. Tait, retired.
Albert A. Novick, Kelso, Wash., in place of S. M. Lord, retired.
John B. Walli, Lacrosse, Wash., in place of C. E. Shaver, resigned.
Aaron B. Green, Monroe, Wash., in place of C. H. Currie, retired.
Ida M. Femling, Riverside, Wash., in place of A. J. Dickinson, retired.
Merl T. Benton, Rockport, Wash., in place of E. V. Pressentin, retired.
Robert N. Prante, Satsop, Wash., in place of R. H. Hughes, retired.
Florence C. Blaisdell, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., in place of L. E. Metzler, transferred.
Richard H. Usher, Sumner, Wash., in place of W. L. Barnard, retired.
Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.
Samuel R. Campbell, Tieton, Wash., in place of A. R. Schooler, retired.
Gaines B. Seefeldt, Toppenish, Wash., in place of P. D. Wilson, retired.
John W. Rice, Valley, Wash., in place of A. J. Diedrich, retired.
Orville K. Allen, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Glennon, James B., Jr.	Wilkinson, Andrew M.
Carneal, Wyatt B., Jr.	Dalton, Honore G.
Walsh, Walter R.	Aldridge, Frederick S.
O'Connor, Thomas J.	Glickert, Robert W.
Johnson, Richard S.	Russell, Gerald F.
Spritzen, Roland J.	Currin, Ralph H.
Lattimer, Hubert C.	West, Fraser E.
Popper, Harry S., Jr.	Vick, Kirby B.
Doyle, Edward J.	Schlesinger, Francis R.
Helmer, Wilbur R.	Ingle, Shelton C.
Sawyer, Webb D.	Sherman, Donald W.
Jewson, Winston E.	Olson, Merlin R.
Kisgen, James T.	Smith, Robert E., Jr.
Moore, George E.	Miller, Roy D.
Oliver, William P., Jr.	Bonner, William R.
Williams, Maxie R.	Clarke, Harry D.
Pratt, Harry D.	Elliott, Benton H.
Dobson, Charles E., Jr.	Norton, William R.
Harris, Arnold W.	Kurdziel, Edward G.
Reid, Leonard D.	Blackwell, John O.
Cokin, Milton G.	Myers, Reginald R.
Wertman, Howard E.	Leffers, James
Altman, Sidney J.	Martin, Glen E.
Buzhardt, Harry O.	Trompeter, Joseph D.
Feeley, James A., Jr.	Atkin, Ernest G., Jr.
McDaniel, James T.	Miller, Norman A., Jr.
Keller, Robert P.	Andre, Paul L., Jr.
Stapp, Donald H.	Smith, Sherman A.
Armstrong, Alan J.	McGlothlin, Joe H., Jr.
Lahue, Foster C.	Baker, Robert R.
Padley, John J.	Yunck, Michael R.
Porter, Frank R., Jr.	Quilty, Joseph F., Jr.
Campbell, Albert W.	McElhany, Boyd C., Jr.
Mee, Fenton J.	
Pratt, Spencer H.	Moran, Arthur M.
Arsenault, Albert	Moore, Jack R.
Farrelly, Robert B.	Morrison, Jack W.
Vogel, Frank H., Jr.	Flaherty, Robert F.
Clark, James H.	Scott, Jack C.
West, Robley E.	Shuman, Perry L.
Gorman, John E.	Abblitt, William E.
King, John H., Jr.	Eisele, Harold A.
Bangert, Douglas A.	Long, Herbert H.
Bronleewe, Thomas G., Jr.	Whitten, Robert T.
	McMahon, John P.
Ireland, Julius W.	White, Robert O.
Howatt, William J.	Love, James W.
Burnett, John R.	Holdzkom, Lincoln N.
Randall, David S.	Widdecke, Charles F.
Winstead, Edwin G.	Andruska, Bruno J.
Esterline, William C.	Early, Cleland E.
Marsh, William H.	Burgoyne, William R., Jr.
Blackwell, James R.	
Dulacki, Leo J.	Wilson, Louis H., Jr.
Daughtry, George W. E.	Flake, William L.
	Gottschalk, Vincent J.
Hammond, Bruce B.	Gilliland, George A.
Nelson, Stanley J.	Mitchell, Bryan B.
Brickley, John H.	Wojcik, Thaddeus P.
Griffin, David R.	McLaughlin, John N.
Ryffel, George G.	Holmes, Fenwicke W.
Hammond, Robert C., Jr.	Haltom, Winfield S., Jr.
Coss, Francis K.	Treleaven, Lewis F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Aufmann, Richard N.	Shapiro, Vernon W.
Westmoreland, William T., Jr.	McMullen, Francis A.
	Shelly, Kermit H.
Mulroney, Peter J.	Gehri, Donald J.
Walker, Charles E.	Bonner, Joel E., Jr.
Greene, Thomas N.	Nuess, Robert H.
Jones, Jack R.	Phillips, William T.
Earl, Quentin V.	Barker, Edward L.
Rudenauer, Francis X.	Smith, Nathan R.
Ing, Herbert E., Jr.	Breen, Richard R.
Heier, William D.	Olson, Virgil D.
De Long, Phillip C.	Reed, Godfrey H.
Harper, Edwin A.	Knapp, Raymond E., Jr.
Reber, John J.	
MacLean, William G., Jr.	Mitchell, Robert H.
	Hurst, Thomas C.
Lewis, Ralph H.	Parran, Thomas, Jr.
Hughes, Frederick E.	Lengel, Dwain L.
Coffey, John F.	Salvaggio, Marshall
Fry, William F.	Hilliard, Robert C.
Mesko, John	Johnston, Oscar B.
Castagna, Anthony J.	Noel, Paul A., Jr.
Einum, James R.	Rickabaugh, David D.
Averill, Gerald P.	Horne, Thomas M.
Soupios, Alfred V.	Maeger, Henry G.
McCreery, Russell E.	McClure, Grover C., Jr.
Sherbondy, Arthur L.	Bowers, Marion B.
Faser, Karl E.	Schnettler, Edward L.
Haffey, Eugene H.	Hunter, Ovis D.
Keagy, Lowell T.	Merrick, Herbert R., Jr.
Sedgwick, Robert R.	

Wortman, Harry D.
Hedahl, Everet A.
Stauffer, James E.
Cole, Glenn O.
MacNeil, John A.
Fisher, Don H.
Brewster, David A., Sr.
Hill, Harold S.
Penn, Lloyd S.
Matheson, Bruce J.
McCaleb, Edwin H., III
Walley, James M.
Scherer, John H.
Hanthorn, Jack E.
Cervell, Joseph G.
James, Albert E.
Fuss, Paul
Shute, James J.
Padalino, Mauro J.
Horst, Henry W.
Miller, Lester
Carlson, Alfred G.
Herrick, Donald L.
Atkinson, Albert B.
Bennison, William H.
Kindred, Lawrence E.
Koetsch, Julius F.
Young, James P., Jr.
Lownds, David E.
Lo Prete, Joseph E.
Cornwell, Charles E.
Antley, William E., Jr.
Williams, Albert L.
Taylor, Summerfield M., Jr.
Autry, Robert L.
Sheppard, Frank J.
Wall, Ray B.
Gingher, Harold R.
Kersey, Robert W.
Augeri, Rosario J.
Rotter, Francis F.
Halbert, Wallace M.
Foster, Hardy E.
Moore, Walter
Radics, Emil J.
Pittman, Howard T.
Wilcox, Wilbur D.
Reifel, Horace C.
King, George W.
McDowell, Dean N.
Kleager, Frank C.
MacDonnell, Dermott H.
Cook, Edward
Mehaffey, Harold N.
Johnson, Victor M.
Ross, George O.
Beasley, Clarence B.
Frey, Leroy T.
Nelson, Kenneth B.
Guy, Charles B.
Winchester, Eugene H.
Legan, Stanley F.
Morgan, Henry H.
Saxon, Thomas J., Jr.
Roxier, William R.
Jones, Mark
Peebles, Robert R.
Holt, William R.
Schmidt, George C., Jr.
Pearson, John A.
Davis, Raymond N.
Stubbs, Robert S., II
Tuma, James W.
Read, Benjamin S.
Quint, Frederick A.
Canton, John S.
Giddens, Richard M.
Hall, Reverdy M.
Fris, Edward S.
Persinger, Harry D., Jr.
Dillow, Rex O.
Baird, Robert
Lang, Frank C.
McNiel, Monroe E.
Rieder, Glenn L.
Moos, Kenneth L.
Williams, Walter L.
Earney, William R.
Sturdevan, Garth K.
Melby, William E.
Ord, James B., Jr.
Keown, Lyman E.
McKiever, Charles F.
Kerr, William A.
Harney, John B.
Wegley, Don E.
Veigel, Lester E.
Cresap, Charles C.
Corley, Clarence E., Jr.
Kleber, Victor A., Jr.
Whitescarver, Kenneth T., Jr.
Glenn, John H., Jr.
Johnson, Earl W.
Marker, Rolland E.
Swenson, Lester V.
Lynch, Robert J., Jr.
Armstrong, Victor A.
LaMar, Robert L.
Mosca, Herbert P., Jr.
Humphreys, Zaphney O.
Lewis, George F.
Mack, William E.
Bryant, George M.
Emils, Arnold L.
Soderberg, Ralph A.
Fredrick, Charles D.
Harper, James A.
Lindell, Carl W.
Burnam, Thomas J.
Nowadnick, William R.
Ross, Thomas J.
Barnett, John E.
Troy, Harland E.
Bjorson, Richard A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Martin, Virgil R.
*Shenaut, Donald L.
*Roscoe Anthony J.
*Miears, William D.
*Hudock, John C.
*Nolte, William L.
Metz, Adam A.
Adams, Paul
Parham, Bill L.
Pines, Gerald L.
Goare, Henry G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Miller, William T.
*Stahlstrom, Harry A.
*Booker, Jesse V.
*Moore, Harry R.
*Peevey, Nathan B., Jr.
*Crapo, William M., Jr.
*Gibson, John A., Jr.
*Doxey, Donald T.
*Stanfield, James C.
*Ronald, Robert C.
*Leland, Harry E., Jr.
*McPartlin, Charles E., Jr.
*Limberg, Robert D.
*Blankenship, Clifford P.
*Cotton, James T.
*Sumerlin, Earl B., Jr.
*Lavoy, John H.
*Ciampa, Emilius R., Jr.
*Seibert, Kenneth D.
*Blakely, James A., Jr.
*Gallo, James A., Jr.
*Page, Leslie L.
*Riley, David
*Barney, Irvin J.
*Poppe, Elery G.
*Hickey, Thomas R. Jr.
*Waltz, Herbert R.
*Doty, William C., Jr.
*Kositch, Alexander
*Whitaker, James L.
*Carlock, Robert O.
*Morel, Oscar J.
*Daze, Louis R.
*Gentry, Tolbert T.
*Hopkins, Donald S.
*Dimond, Neil
*Shook, Frank A., Jr.
*Lauer, Stewart R.
*Crew, Charles E.
*Hall, Harold K.
*Aynes, James P.
*Bauman, George F.
*Doherty, John J.
*Redmond, Walter L.
*Stingley, Elmo J.
*Long, Edwin B.
*Mackel, Edward H.
*Brandon, Lawrence H.
*Pippin, Franklin N.
*Prestridge, John G.
*Barber, Billy H.
*Kapsch, Joseph R.
*Fox, James G.
*Stirling, Harold H., Jr.
*Dupre, Paul J.
*Gallagher, Burnett R.
*Young, Frank R.
*Reece, Josef I.
*Davis, Stanley
*James, William C., Jr.
*Stephenson, Lyle S.
*Ostby, John L.
*Yerkes, Robert W.
*Victor, James E., Jr.
*Knauf, Robert C.
*McRobert, Perry P.
*Turner, Byron C.
*Watson, Paul B., Jr.
*Allen, Robert L.
*Rupp, George R.
*Bell, Robert T.
*Gourley, Norman W.
*Cloud, Guy M.
*Biehl, William, Jr.
*Mayer, Henry
*Cordes, Alfred M.
*Canan, Christopher M.
*Lewis, Edward L., Jr.
*Campbell, Charles I., Jr.
*Jefferson, James M., Jr.
*Shields, Robert F.
*Ruffner, Paul M.
*Rinehart, James H.
*Dove, Charles E.
*Healy, Robert M.
*Smith, Leland R.
*Lillie, James L., Jr.
*Sanders, Roger M.
*Callen, George W.
*Traynor, William L.
*Taylor, Richard M.
*Magon, Walter E.
Malcolm, Joseph W., Jr.
Holcombe, James V.
Perry, Jack E.
Garrotto, Alfred F.
Schroeder, Charles L.
Davis, Dellwyn L.
Morrison, William R.
Dunlap, Jack
Cox, Lewis J.
Bennett, Eugene N.
Russell, Marvin R.
Gocke, Charles E.
Farrell, William
Webster, William J.
Woodard, Richard M.
Curtis, Oliver W.
Baker, Robert W.
Browning, Richard C.
Dochterman, Lloyd B., Jr.
Risner, Albert H.
Schoner, Albert C.
Hohl, Robert W.
Schriver, Richard J.
Bauer, Richard A.
Kelley, John P.
Lindley, Dean W.
Bledsoe, Willmar M.
Woods, Laurence H.
Jarrett, Clyde R.
Watts, Frederic T., Jr.
Klingman, Robert R.
Reier, Gordon R.
Fitzgerald, Austin C.
McMullen, Robert A.
Barber, Neil E.
Smith, Mercer R.
Skeath, Marvin A., Jr.
Perrin, John S.
Petro, George E.
Martin, Samuel F.
Briganti, Emilio
Semb, Allen R.
Jobe, Harrel K.
Huntington, Kenneth E.
Helstrom, Roland S.
Horner, Bill E.
Walker, Edward H.
Johnson, James D., Jr.
Davis, Philip A.
Ward, Dale L.
Mouzakis, George E.
Wilson, Alexander
Redalen, Dwain L.
Michael, Richard L., Jr.
Bortz, William H., Jr.
Lucas, William R.
Waldrop, Otis R.
Wade, Robert
Gallentine, Owen V.
Seminoff, Nicholas M.
Luther, James W.
Phillips, Allen L.
Deasy, Rex A.
Austin, Marshall S.
Weidner, James M.
Norton, Lawrence C.
Johnson, Thirl D.
Poor, Ernest E.
Hill, Arthur T.
Knocke, Jack K.
Davis, George L., Jr.
Quay, John E., Jr.
Graham, Paul G.
Remington, Edgar F.
Collins, Ted H.
Slay, Robert D.
Fellingham, Richard J.
Clary, Matthew A., Jr.
Laspada, John F.
Barrineau, William E.
Kellogg, Wilbur C., Jr.
Mariades, James P.
Cooper, Milton B.
Holzbauer, Joseph F.
Fallon, Eugene B.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel; subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Kleberger, Doris V.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Seward, Robert F.
Smith, Vincent J.
O'Connor, Alfred L., Jr.
Watson, Royce W.
McKamy, Donald I.
Lemmons, Ray T.
Kroodsma, Gordon A.
Hickman, Edwin L., Jr.
Nelson, Arthur A., Jr.
Hart, Lawrence P.
Beat, Nolan J.
Fassino, Anton N.
Bekins, Robert Q., Jr.
Watson, Warren C.
Busick, Clarence J.
Selleck, Lawrence M., Jr.
Lee, Harry
McPherson, Gordon D.
Vonhorn, Charles S.
Stott, Harry D.
Read, John L.
Anderson, Howard A., Jr.
Matheson, Kenneth A.
Fulton, Floyd K., Jr.
Smith, George H.
Thompson, Roger B.
Cunningham, John D.
Beckett, William H.
Heflin, Bruce A.
Head, Ralph M.
Beal, Samuel G.
Alford, Bennett W.
Nahow, Theodore
Ferguson, Howard, Jr.
Cook, Bertram E., Jr.
Schmid, Clarence H.
Christopher, Willard N.
Ksycewski, Casimir C.
Boulware, John C.
Evans, Robert C.
Argo, Hugh D.
Dauphine, George M.
Kelly, Joseph J.
MacCormack, William H.
Vaught, Francis W.
Locke, William R.
McGowan, Louis J.
Weber, William E.
Reese, Robert V.
Kirk, Walter C.
Johnstone, John H.
Harris, William D.
Evans, Harold W., Jr.
Anderson, Hermann L.
Allen, James F.
Ball, Robert E.
Tunnell, Robert J., Jr.
Rowlett, Guy W.
Lindall, Albin L., Jr.
Byrum, Paul B.
Brandel, Ralph E.
Ladutko, John
Sanzo, James
Hail, Leslie R.
McGlynn, Raymond J.
Vandalsem, Robert R.
Settle, Ray W.
Green, Carleton M.
Gibson, George E., Jr.
Dunphy, James C.
Clyde, Denton P.
Thompson, John S.
Dillon, James W.
Kelly, Walter C.
Boudreaux, Donald L.
Gray, Harold Z.
Pechar, George
Sinclair, Robert B.
Janiszewski, George
Hall, Clifford D.
Doty, Duane J.
Penley, Virgil R.
Reeder, James H.
Hoch, Kurt L.
Rowe, Edward J.
Murphy, John J.
Nichols, Robert L.
Haynes, Albert B., Jr.
Ingram, Alfred L. V.
Allen, Warren H.
De Barr, John R.
Dunbar, Michael J.
Kirchmann, Charles S.
Frazier, Louis S., Jr.
Probst, Arthur E.
Roberts, James F.
Burch, Carrol B.
Moore, William L.
Sanders, Paul E.
O'Donnell, Andrew W.
Baar, Stuart P., Jr.
Kramek, Stanley E.
Bland, Kenneth R.
Jones, Barney D.
Glover, William R.
Webb, James O.
Mehlinger, Marion F.
Burnett, Loren E.
Hill, Malcolm A.
Sheehan, Charles I.
Rossi, Robert J.
Ettenborough, Robert B.
Shea, William E.
Mann, Clyde R.
Metcalfe, Robert B.
Coffeen, Albert E.
Nelson, William L.
Hershey, Gilbert R.
Hamilton, Ralph H., Jr.
Donahue, William F., Jr.
Shelby, Alfred C., Jr.
Pommerenk, Albert C.
Colella, Roland L.
Fisher, Sidney
Toups, Thaddeus J.
Weaver, Charles A.
Slenning, Bradford N.
Bonds, William E.
Wadsworth, Thomas B.
Snyder, Billy H.
Anderson, George B.
Hampton, Everett
Browne, Gordon S., Jr.
Sears, Redford D.
Webb, Marshall A., Jr.
Soper, James B.
Daskalakis, John A.
Skotnicki, Anthony J.
Reep, Maurice A.
Michaux, Alexander L., Jr.
Gore, Willis L.
Hoskins, Robert E.
See, Charles M.
Hendrickson, Arvil B.
Hunter, Glenn R.
Wagenhoffer, Martin T.
Wann, Charles M., Jr.
Shuford, Robert L.
Usher, Edward G.
Doering, John H., Jr.

Dayvault, Nevin E.
Croyle, Fred K.
Metzger, Theodore E.
Domina, Walter E.
Fox, Jean T.
Jones, Aubrey T.
Harpe, Lilburn L.
Bailey, Edward A.
Rumble, Gerould M., Jr.
Platt, Robert M.
Burke, Thomas W.
Weber, Raymond J.
Pates, Bruce A., Jr.
Bain, Herbert J.
Bell, Van D., Jr.
Groome, Roland C.
Barrett, James B.
Cunard, Earl M., Jr.
Franzman, Freddie L.
Lauck, John H.
Landrigan, James M.
Eddy, Samuel L., Jr.
Schwartz, John L.
Kelly, William D.
Novak, Anthony
Raphael, Milton L.
Kurth, Harold R., Jr.
Camporini, Edward E.
Costanza, Frank V.
Moritz, Andrew B.
Whitehurst, Kenneth
Girard, David D.
Crowley, John F.
Allen, Robert B.
Anthony, William S.
Roberts, Clyde R.
Frazier, Arthur C.
Rogal, Edward R.
Cox, Samuel A., Jr.
Mitchell, Weldon R.
Priddy, James R.
Davis, David A.
Park, Charles E.
White, James H.
Dittmar, Robert W.
Pavlicin, George A.
French, Harry D.
Alexander, Leland G.
Thomas, Alfred I.
Herndon, Wilber N.
Unger, William T.
May, William L., Jr.
Robinson, Eddie L.
Eberhart, John W.
Scott, Louis B.
Riggs, Thomas W.
Herald, Charles D.
Cuneo, John E.
Cooley, Richard A.
Sullivan, Arthur J.
Harris, Leroy C., Jr.
Adair, Harold F.
Hill, Franklin A.
Wilkerson, Herbert L.
Kluckman, Wilson A.
Stone, Earnest H., Jr.
Crispen, Richard W.
Walker, Emerson A.
Ziegler, Paul E.
Leeseberg, Phillip K.
Weizenegger, James A.
Johnson, Corbin J.
Chapman, Fred D.
Kearns, Timothy J.
Timme, William G.
Brierton, Thomas J., Jr.
Taylor, William W.
Mills, Dan L.
Terry, John M., Jr.
Nixon, Dalbro R., Jr.
Chambers, George G., Jr.
Pickett, Philip G.
Little, Eldon L., Jr.
Defenbaugh, Neil F.
Whitehead, Arthur T.
Schening, Richard J.
Harper, Esmond E.
Coppins, Frank B.
Primrose, Richard A.
Davis, Robert L.
Broome, Norris C.
Misiewicz, John
Campbell, Frederick H.
House, Arthur E., Jr.
Hewlett, Marvin M.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Hilgart, Valeria F.
*Baker, Constance

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

King, James P.
Slee, Don J.
Jones, Vernon E.
Fontenot, Karl J., Jr.
Saul, Jacque L.
Cottom, John W.
De Schuytner, Victor R.
Bird, James H., Jr.
Lewis, Robert W.
Trescott, Eugene H.
Green, Austin H.
Andrews, John W.
White, Michael E.
Hodges, Ervin E.
Turner, Frank P.
Barlow, Glen H.
Bates, William H.
Hollis, John S.
Deprima, Joseph
Weise, William
Hyland, Richard L.
Case, Richard A.
Altman, George F.
Thomas, Spencer F.
Christopherson, James W.
Borjesson, Stanley G.
Hofstetter, Robert E.
Field, Wells L., III
Huerlimann, Ernest A., Jr.
Lavigne, Arthur W. D.
Graham, Edward T., Jr.
Mc Lane, Donald C., Jr.
Steinberg, Melvin J.
Jones, Robert I.
Johnston, Paul M.
McBrayer, William L.
Dorman, John F.
Munson, James D.
Thompson, Alva F., Jr.
Davis, Jack W.
Gale, John R.
Wynn, Neal B.
Bucher, William E.
Snyder, Theodore O.
Mickle, Don A.
Andrus, Kermit W.
Drovedahl, Robert
O'Brien, John A.
Kuci, Richard A.
Harris, John B.
Hargadine, Walter W.
O'Brien, William J.
Grunwald, Harry H., Jr.
Penny, James R.
Kelly, Thomas J.
Wallace, Charles F.
Hagaman, Harry T.
Duffield, Daniel M., Jr.
Irion, John W., Jr.
Benton, William D.
Karker, Floyd A., Jr.
McCarthy, Eugene C.
Johnson, Frederick S.
Cheatham, Ernest C., Jr.
Pickett, Bayard S.
McGlone, Vincent P.
Radtke, Paul G.
Batchelder, Sydney H., Jr.
Angelo, Leon N.
Hunter, Maurice
Thomas, William J.
Tolnay, John J.
Chesla, Edward J., Jr.
Lee, Thomas I.
Reddick, Cleveland N. F., Jr.
Witt, Lewis C.
Cornwall, Gerald B.
Lynch, Ronald J.
Fitzgerald, Edward F.
Whalley, Albert
Phillips, John
Jones, Joseph F.
Conlon, James F.
Scoppa, Joseph, Jr.
Snyder, Louis G.
Powell, Rollin R., Jr.
Whelan, William L.
Kramer, William K.
Walker, Dallas R.
McEwan, Frederick J.
Gravel, Marcus J.
Hippler, Rollin E.
Corliss, Gregory A.
Balogh, Howard G.
O'Donnell, Harold F.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Cox, John V.
Johnson, Floyd J., Jr.
Moeller, Richard L.
Fibich, Michael J., Jr.
Moser, Charles F.
Gillis, James E.
Bogg, Charles F.
Cox, Stanley D.
Peck, Kenneth D.
Petersen, Frank E.
Valentine, Herbert J.
Green, Billy R.
Payne, Norman E., Jr.
Ihli, Leo J.
Brown, Carroll E.
Couch, Wallace M.
Kendrick, Harold L.
Wickman, George A.
Swayne, Robert W.
White, Robert E.
Smith, Conway J.
Gregerson, Johnny O.
Rice, Wesley H.
Coates, Franklin W.
Stark, Robert W.
Austgen, Donald R.
Weber, John E., Jr.
Clark, Frank A.
Morris, Wilbur J.
Pierson, Earl F., Jr.
Gillum, Donald E.
Quick, Daniel J.
Catt, Jack R.
Miller, Robert B.
Goodson, George O., Jr.
Goar, John W.
Van Den Elzen, James R.
Miller, Hubert E.
Higgins, James H.
Hahn, Billy H.
Harkey, Herbert J., Jr.
Mushett, Howard F.
Kinniburgh, John A.
Nesbit, Charles L.
Parker, John K.
Bicknell, Ralph L.
Romine, Richard E.
Harlan, Gale
Peterson, Burdette H.
McCauley, Bertram W.
Shaklee, Harold G.
Heesch, Robert W.
McDonald, Richard C.
Fry, Raymond S.
Kirkpatrick, Richard H.
Galloway, Jack J.
Dittmann, Wayne R.
Boyd, Clarence A., Jr.
Baker, William H.
Farris, William E.
Love, Ernold G.
Garrett, Elmer T., Jr
Hossli, Carl C.
Morrin, Wardell C.
Wilson, Billy E.
Fish, Thomas E.
Cuppy, Will C., Jr.
Beach, Andrew D.
Ward, George W.
La Porte, Alphonse A., Jr.
Ford, Daniel J.
Roberts, Richard T.
Henley, Robert J.
Fink, Arden L.
Dean, Roland H.
Berthoud, Kenneth H., Jr.
Ruete, Alfred W., Jr.
Cohn, William A.
Drescher, Herbert W.
Casey, Francis M.
Lawendowski, John J.
Went, Joseph J.
Hafey, Robert J., Jr.
Field, Harold J., Jr.
Kelly, David A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Adamczuk, Russell W.
*Weiler, Frank V.
*Collins, Garrett L.
*Houder, Charles H., Jr.
*Rapp, John T.
*Schneider, Lawrence A.
*Ullom, Thomas H.
*Bruce, Frank H., Jr.
O'Neal, Robert P.
Ultsch, Harold E.
Evans, William T.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*O'Bymachow, Joseph P.
*Holben, David S.
*Wheeler, Thomas M.
*Graeff, Edward W.
*Gaffney, Jack A.
*Schafer, John B.
*Winberg, James M.
*Grimes, Billy M.
*Rogers, John A., II
*Capwell, George L., Jr
*Nussel, Arthur H.
*Lary, Ralph L., Jr.
*Kahler, Billy J.
*Cleveland, Robert E.
*Oldham, John S.
*McInroe, Jimmy B.
Armstrong, Stephen A.
Shockley, Gordon E.
Morris, John B.
Reeves, Michael P.
Dane, Donald W.
Lottman, William J.
Davis, William C.
Miller, James A.
Shaver, Glenn J., Jr.
Blackburn, George M.
Gagen, John A.
Tinsley, Dale L.
McCarthy, Donald J.
Llewellyn, Perry T.
Jahn, James D.
Smyth, George W., Jr.
Nelson, Marvin R.
Ruthven, Colin J.
Cathcart, Donald E.
Ausley, Wilbur H.
Adams, Richard J.
Anderson, Ira C.
Watson, Jac D.
Merritt, Gene R.
Thompson, Jerry R.
Hill, Lorenza H., Jr.
James, Gerald D.
Lively, Charles M.
Brown, Richard H.
Eddy, John L.
Spaulding, Dorsey L.
Lee, Peter B.
Gurtner, James F.
Kerce, Herbert M.
Correll, William R., Jr.
Wallace, Lorin C., Jr.
Rule, Julius M., III
Caylor, David A.
Burns, Mervyn J.
Miller, Ralph D.
Yates, Charles E.
Ellis, Gerald L.
Kirby, Donald E.
Pitt, Albert
Caldas, John J., Jr.
Tunget, Everett L.
Silva, Lionel V.
Ficere, William G., Jr.
McCarty, James A.
Murch, David H.
Wilson, Dwayne E. T.
Loe, Gerald E.
Strand, Gordon D.
Ramsey, David A.
Hohman, Richard B.
Freeman, Robert A.
Hatch, William W.
Heiser, Karl R.
Houle, Frederick J., Jr.
Bjork, Wayne V.
Ludlow, James L.
Broad, Robert O., Jr.
Walsh, Robert L.
Hatch, Donald J.
Smith, Norman H.
Allen, Francis R.
Ragsdale, James E., Jr.
Schuyler, John A.
Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr.
Kent, William L.
Kennedy, Clifford A.
Earls, Kenneth W.
Conway, Thomas F.
Carr, Donald S.
Bailey, David B.
Difiore, Harold J.
Poronto, Earle G.
Pritchett, Louis C.
Kitchens, Kenneth E.
Cloutier, Paul N.
Taylor, Charles W.
Voigt, Wilson A.
Kazmierczak, Robert B.
Kachauskas, Carl W.
Rhodes, James L.
Adams, Richard O.
Leo, Pasquale
Wessel, William C., Jr.
Seay, Donald R.
Robinson, Lucien C.
McCoart, James J., Jr.
Lougheed, Thomas P.
Marquette, Eugene O., III
Lee, Howard V.
Wilde, Hugh L.
Hanly, Alfred S.
Fullerton, Edward R.
Harding, William W., Jr.
Vreeland, Norman H.
Price, William G.
Parker, John B.
Sfreddo, Robert L.
Combs, Loyal D.
Byram, Joseph C., Jr.
Tharp, John J.
Douglas, Richard T.
Lutes, Morris W.
Johns, David D.
Page, Dorsie D., Jr.
Fennell, Harris J.
Johnson, Robert C.
Monroe, Jack J., Jr.
Livingston, Henry S.
Huston, Ralph S.
Owen, Ronald L.
Hunt, Harry A., Jr.
Finn, Robert C.
Memmer, George V.
Schumacher, James A.
Walker, Edwin H., IV
Hampton, Charles T.
Carrier, John H.
Schoon, John E.
Williams, Donald E.
McManus, William J.
Keenan, John M.
Preble, Lee A.
Coykendall, John M.
Donovan, John B., Jr.
Clark, George
Finlon, Arthur P.
Cameron, Dougal A., III
Throm, Robert B.
Brooks, Donald D.
Edwards, Fred L., Jr.
McKenna, William E., Jr.
Nice, Lloyd B.
Taylor, George H., III
Trader, Everett P., Jr.
Crudup, Dempsey B.
Kropp, Ronald G.
Slider, William P.
Corbett, Roy G.
Reed, Ralph L.
Johnson, Lester E.
James, Perry L.
Hunt, Theodore E.
McGrady, Garnett
Cody, Joseph F., Jr.
Hicks, Jimmie A.
Park, Ralph K.
Kropinack, Robert C.
Skelton, Richard J.
Larimer, Neil M., II
Jasper, Norman J., Jr.
Gonzales, Cyril E.
Splean, Roger A.
Johnson, Gunnar A.
Sinclair, Duan K., Jr.
White, Craig A.
Blair, Lynde D.
Turner, Terry
Shortt, Harry R.
McKellar, Charles W. F.
Glaser, Ronald R.
Reilly, James K.
Schultz, Jack T.
Eskam, John A.
Taylor, Richard B.
Martin, Delbert M.
Spooner, Richard T.
Reese, John A., Jr.
Zeterberg, David P.
Soesbe, Keith E.
Hatfield, Charles D.
Carroll, John E., Jr.
Vogel, Peter J.
Sullivan, Michael P.
Bode, Donald H.

Hornsby, Malcolm T., Jr.
Erickson, Bernon R.
Edens, Allen R.
Carroll, Edward P.
Russell, Eugene B.
Noll, Richard A.
Abraham, Louis R.
Smith, Robert W.
Carlton, John D.
Hey, John M.
Musilli, John A.
Cronin, Timothy J., Jr.
Rackham, Robert N.
Strain, Walter L.
Franklin, Ray M.
Bowlin, Jerry T.
Regan, Frank C., Jr.
Mulrooney, Michael J.
Williams, James P.
Adams, Thomas G.
Morgan, Harvey J.
Lundberg, Darwin D.
Spaete, Robert P.
Kartchner, Orville R.
Van Gorder, Jan H.
Hamilton, George S.
Kostesky, Raymond M.
Sasso, Louis G.
Knight, Frank P.
Landis, John L.
Brandt, Loren A.
Cone, Fred J.
Meeth, John C., Jr.
Edgar, Thomas R.
Dunn, Ronald E.
Nichols, Donald L.
Varney, Richard S.
Toben, Theodore J., Jr.
Ogden, Don J.
Porter, Charles R.
Baker, George A., III
Poorman, Gary L.
Burns, Jackie D.
Barnard, William H.
Sanders, Joe P.
Moe, Frederick J.
MacFarlane, John L.
Moore, Robert S.
Hanna, Don K.
Burke, John J., Jr.
O'Toole, Patrick E.
Searle, Henry L.
Gulick, Roy M., Jr.
Angle, Harold L.
Franklin, Carroll R.
Ledin, Jerry W.
Bateman, John H.
Tully, Thomas J.
Porter, Robert R.
Carbonar, Vincent A.
Shank, Paul J., Jr.
Raines, Henry R.
Smallman, John
Adamo, Nicholas J.
Crone, Forrest W.
Ryan, Edward F.
Barnes, Harry F.
Van Leeuwen, Neil R.
Friske, John D.
Yezzi, Richard C.
Swenson, Carter P.
Rice, James F.
O'Brien, Robert L.
Carney, Robert T.
Doerner, William C.
Chapman, Harlan P.
McDavid, James E., III
Chambers, Dwight L.
Frank, Armin H.
Winoski, Walter M.
Stannard, Robert A.
Egan, John J.
Lethin, Ronald R.
Becker, Raymond A.
Holmes, Lee B.
Murtland, James B., III
Smith, William D.
Marren, Harry T.
Morris, George S.
Bailey, Carlos T.
Stauffer, Robert M.
Orio, Carl D.
Townley, Edward F., Jr.
Albans, Constantine
Loring, Arthur P., Jr.
Whaley, William M.
Facklam, Arnold W., Jr.
Peterson, Robert L.
Kenworthy, Richard J.
Dailey, John R.
Dwyer, Robert H.
Phillips, Reed, Jr.
Moriarty, Neil F.
Wynn, Anthony M.
Sargeant, Robert A.
Rychlik, Robert W.
Szafranski, Leonard J., Jr.
Vernay, Vincent A.
Schneider, John F.
Ferdinand, Warren A.
Roach, James L.
Hager, George F., Jr.
Beck, Peter S.
Braun, Richard G.
Miller, Neil P.
Johnson, Bruce W.
Reilly, William J., Jr.
Taylor, Theodore W.
Fazekas, Alex E.
Cobb, Charles S., III
Carolan, Frederick A.
Luedke, Bruce D.
Wills, Wayne M.
Baggett, Robert L.
Formanek, Robert L.
Looney, Edmund P., Jr.
Schaet, Donald E.
Fredericks, Ronald D.
Svec, M. Ronald
Deibler, Harold J.
Stein, Michael E.
Palmore, Carroll A.
Seals, Charles J., Jr.
Monson, Charles L., Jr.
Harman, John R.
Houston, Thomas C.
Hart, Milledge A., III
Gillespie, Thomas E., Jr.
Dettle, Christian J.
Lynch, Thomas K.
Ryan, Thomas J.
Wuertz, Joseph B.
Lynn, Chester V., Jr.
Jaczko, Eugene S., Jr.
Becerra, Rafael A., Jr.
Swab, James E.
Ford, Pat D.
Hopkins, John I.
Dowling, Edmund H.
Lynch, Bruce G.
Martin, Joel A.
Weinerth, Stuart L., Jr.
Rohloff, Carl A.
Leva, Russell E.
Knettles, Charles E.
Norman, Ronald E.
Evans, John S.
Reinke, Milton A.
Stith, Edward E.
Lee, Alex
Milligan, Robert F.
Herlihy, Horace F.
Boyd, Edward H.
Thompson, Jack C.
Millington, Seth F.
Thompson, Milton S.
Mulcahy, Robert D.
Schmidt, James M.
Clark, Dale H.
Townsend, James B.
Dolson, Thomas C.
Treichler, Donald R.
Maeser, Earl S.
Beckman, Norbert J.
Felker, James E.
Wilkerson, Melvin V., Jr.
Brower, George H.
Cannon, Charles E.
Gazzaniga, Donald A.
Powers, Robert A.
Wildprett, William R.
Solomonson, Carl, Jr.
Barner, George B., Jr.
Andrews, William D.
Dubac, Carl H.
Motherway, Robert T.
Eikenbery, Terry L.
Palmer, John K.
Slough, Phillip G.
Krauss, Walter J., Jr.
Shigley, Richard T.
Mavretic, Josephus L.
Jastrzemski, Walter M.
Rourke, William B., Jr.
Frasier, Joseph A., III
Brokaw, James C.
Shillinglaw, James S.
Henry, John W., Jr.
Henry, Richard T.
Lewis, Franklin J.
Klingensmith, Cloyd H.
Lynch, Jarvis D., Jr.
McGrath, Daniel R.
O'Brien, Richard J.
Whitton, Frank H.
Douglas, Donald M.
O'Shea, Cornelius J., Jr.
Brown, Robert S., Jr.
Perry, Clarence R.
Smith, James W.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donohoe, Katherine M.
Gulbransen, Jerry G.
Leonard, Betty L.
Connors, Anna M.
Hoskin, Patricia A.
Mink, Shirley L.
Hernandez, Manuela
Auldridge, Carolyn J.
Quisenberry, Delores J.
Primeau, Elaine E.
Rivera, Cuevas S.
Farman, Elsa L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abney, Robert D.
Adams, Dale H.
Adams, Hubert J., Jr.
Aiken, Thomas H.
Albright, Howard E.
Alexander, Charles R.
Alexander, John R.
Alexander, Richard H.
Alexander, Robert B.
Allen, James R.
Alley, Rodney H.
Allinder, Myrl W., Jr.
Alogna, John M.
Amick, Lewie E., Jr.
Andre, Joseph S.
Andersen, Donald E.
Anderson, John W.
Anderson, Leland G.
Anderson, Leon L.
Anthony, Anthony A.
Anthis, Bobby G.
Arnold, Curtis G.
Austin, Randall W.
Auten, Don E.
Ayers, James W.
Bailey, Gene E.
Baker, Charles W.
Baker, Horace W.
Baldwin, William S.
Barney, Dale G.
Barrett, Charles S., III
Bartol, Henry J.
Bauer, William D.
Beckwith, William H.
Behme, James E.
Bergen, Daniel F.
Bigler, James C., Jr.
Black, Robert M.
Blackington, R. C., Jr.
Bohr, Harper L., Jr.
Boman, Bruce B.
Bonthrow, William J.
Booth, Francis D.
Bossert, John M.
Bosworth, Gerald G.
Boudreaux, Sidney J., Jr.
Bowles, Ray W.
Bowman, Donald G.
Bown, Rodney L.
Brackman, James T., II
Breitenbach, Roy G.
Brennan, William F.
Brickett, Charles M.
Brill, Arthur P., Jr.
Brill, Newton C.
Brinegar, Richard L.
Brock, David A.
Brown, Charles J.
Brown, Larry K.
Brown, Richard H.
Browne, Edward R.
Bryan, Jonathan R.
Bucknam, Howard V.
Buerk, Gerald S.
Burke, John P.
Burleson, Eugene B., Jr.
Buss, Richard H.
Butchart, Edward W.
Butler, Frank H.
Byrnes, Robert E., III
Cady, Thomas C.
Campanella, Francis B.
Capek, Richard C.
Carlton, Richard L.
Carswell, Donn A.
Cartwright, David L.
Carty, John J.
Cassidy, Myles D.
Caswell, Russell J.
Caton, James R.
Chambliss, John C.
Chappel, John F.
Chase, William E.
Clark, Robert L.
Clay, John P.
Clinton, James R.
Cobb, Jerry L.
Cockell, Robert C.
Cohan, Leon, Jr.
Collins, Carl G.
Collins, Larry M.
Collins, Patrick G.
Collison, Walter N., Jr.
Cook, Ernest T., Jr.
Cooper, Harlan C., Jr.
Cooper, Jerome G.
Cooper, Matthew T.
Cooper, Samuel W.
Copeland, Joseph D.
Corn, Charles P.
Cox, Frank J., Jr.
Crabtree, Robert G.
Criger, Frank R.
Crubbs, Wendell O.
Cullen, Robert F.
Culver, Richard O., Jr.
Cunningham, Dennis M.
Cunningham, Francis J., III
Curd, James H. R.
Cuthrell, Donald W., Jr.
Czerwinski, John L.
Dalberg, James E.
Damuth, Don R.
Daniels, Clifton
Davis, Charles E., III
Davis, Charles W.
Davis, Ronald W.
Davis, William G.
Day, Bernard C.
Dean, Alan J.
Dean, Bennett R.
Deatrick, George B.
DeBrine, Richard A.
Deegan, Gene A.
DeMartino, Pasquale W.
Dennis, Charles H.
Dominquez, Marino T.
Donnelly, John L.
Donnelly, Walter A., Jr.
Dougherty, Paul K.
Doughty, Clifford C.
Douse, George H.
Driscoll, Eugene J., Jr.
Drury, Michael C.
Dube, Marcel J.
Dulaney, Richard L.
Dusek, Lowell M.
Dwyre, Michael D.
Dyer, Calvin R.
Dyer, Paul W.
Ebanks, William J., Jr.
Edwards, Elgin C.
Elofson, Rodger H.
Embry, John P. J.
Evans, Robert V.
Featherston, Robert K.
Felix, William D.
Ferguson, Robert A.
Ferguson, William C., III
Floyd, William C.
Foster, Edward B.
Foster, Roger G.
Fraser, Thomas J., Jr.
Fredricks, William B.
French, Leighton H.
Friedland, Alan S.
Garant, Philias R.
Garcia, Robert E.
Gardner, Benjamin W.
Garner, John T.
Gelpi, Gerard T.
Gilligan, Adrian
Ging, Edward D.
Giordano, Joseph F.
Gleason, Michael N.
Gleason, Richard E.
Gleim, Earl C.
Goldberg, Marvin A.
Goode, Kenneth N.
Gordon, Richard H.
Granger, James H.
Gratto, Joseph M.
Green, John M., Jr.
Greene, Robert W.
Hafner, Bron D.
Haibleib, John A.
Hale, Harold W.
Hale, William H., Jr.
Hanley, Michael J.
Hanson, Richard A.
Hanthorn, Russell L.
Hardgrove, William R.
Harnden, Milton D.
Harper, Hugh J.
Harris, John E.
Harvey, Alan N.
Hatton, George A., Jr.
Haws, William E., Jr.
Hayward, Benjamin N., Jr.
Hemingway, John W.
Henry, James W.
Himmerich, Robert T.
Hocevar, Francis A.
Hodge, Gene D.
Hofland, Robert M.
Hogaboom, Pieter L.
Horne, George R., II
House, David W.
House, Edward L., Jr.
Houseman, William B.
Hudson, Jerry E.
Huffman, Donald R.
Huff, Edwin L.
Huffcut, William H., II
Hulme, Michael E.
Hurley, Robert B.
Iles, Jacob E.
Iliff, Warren J.
Imbus, Robert J., Jr.
Irish, Jerry A.
Isherwood, Geoffrey B.
James, Joseph L.
James, Ronald K.
Jenkins, Jerry H.
Jespersen, Robert R.
Judkins, Paul G.
Kaapu, Kekoa D.
Kammeier, Frederick A.
Kandra, Myron J.
Kazalunas, John
Keane, Michael F., Jr.
Keating, Daniel J., Jr.
Keith, Charles R.
Kelly, Daniel A.
Kelley, Philip S., Jr.
Kerr, Richard A.
Keshian, Richard
Kester, Robert L.
Kieselbach, Philip J.
Kirkham, James H.
Klinkenberg, Arnold L.
Knapper, Roger E.
Knight, James R.
Knowles, Robert C., Jr.
Krebs, John F.
Kreicker, Graham H.
Kretschmar, Ernest T.
Kulp, James E.
Kynion, Kaye M.
Lakes, Jack B.
Lammerding, Richard L.
Landy, Barry A.
Lanigan, John D.
Larsen, Raymond E.
Larson, Richard D.
Lawe, Richard C.
Lawler, Traugott F.
Leary, Daniel F., III
Lee, William F.
Lemmons, Jimmy B.
Lengauer, George T., Jr.
Letscher, Martin G.
Lewis, Sherman R., Jr.
Lindseth, Clarence D.
Little, John C., III
Longdon, Alexander P., Jr.
Losack, Joseph P.
Lovell, John H., II
Luft, Robert S.
Lummis, Charles D.
MacCarthy, Alan W., Jr.
Mackin, Patrick M.
MacWay, Malcolm L.
Magee, James T., Jr.
Maguire, Robert J.
Mahoney, John M.
Ma Keever, Harrison A.
Maley, Frederic W.
Maloy, Kevin A.

Manazir, Charles H.
Martin, Edgar C.
Martin, Warren L.
Massey, Gerald J.
Maxwell, John A.
Mayberry, William B.
Mayers, Kenneth E.
McCabe, John G.
McCormick, Ralph C.
McElroy, Theodore R.
McFadden, Jack D.
McGuire, James S.
McIntyre, Melvin
McKinney, Ronald D.
McKittrick, Robert O.
McLaughlin, George D., Jr.
McNally, Paul F.
McNelly, John F.
McNutt, Kenneth A.
Mead, Charles P., Jr.
Means, Henry N., III
Meissner, Howard W.
Merriss, William D.
Milleman, Sherwood E.
Miller, Anthony D.
Miller, Richard A.
Miluski, Joseph J.
Mixson, Miles E.
Molineaux, Joseph F., Jr.
Molsbee, Neil
Mooney, William A.
Moore, Royal N., Jr.
Morris, Paul D.
Mosher, David K.
Mulcahy, Thomas J.
Mulkern, Thomas R., Jr.
Mulkey, Jesse G.
Murdick, Perry H., III
Murphy, John R.
Nappi, Louis T.
Naugle, Donald G.
Navadel, George D.
Newman, Gale L.
Nichols, Charles H., Jr.
Nicol, Alton E.
Nielsen, Bruce S.
Noble, Robert E.
Notine, Daniel M.
Nugent, Wallace R.
Oakley, Cledith E.
O'Brien, Joseph J.
O'Hayre, John J., Jr.
Olson, Reid H.
Ondrick, Robert M.
Oravits, Joseph J.
Ovelgonne, Walter E.
Overmyer, Robert F.
Paige, Reid B.
Parks, Hugh L., III
Pastrell, Darrell K.
Patrick, Jimmy L.
Payton, Luther L., Jr.
Pederson, Richard J.
Peterson, David B.
Phenegar, Wesley R., Jr.
Pierce, Jerry S.
Polk, Larry J.
Polyak, George R.
Poore, Horace
Pope, Ernie T.
Power, Thomas J.
Powell, Donald A.
Pratt, Thomas M., III
Prewitt, Robert C.
Quanrud, Richard B.
Radcliffe, Eugene T.
Raines, Richard C.
Ramsay, Charles J.
Rasavage, John R.
Ratzlaff, James W.
Rausch, Robert C.
Reczek, Gerald F.
Reed, Robert W.
Reeves, Thomas L.
Regan, Charles D.
Reynolds, Richard C.
Rhinesmith, Gary B.
Rivella, Hermon J.
Roberson, John C.
Robinson, Donald M.
Rodewald, William O.
Rodwell, Roy O.
Roman, Donald J.
Rosenberg, Joseph F.
Roudebush, Tom
Rountree, Lee C.
Rushing, Clifton L., Jr
Russo, Anthony R.
Russell, Francis P., Jr.
Rutledge, Bobby G.
Salmon, Michael D.
Scamehorn, Richard C.
Schenck, Kennell I., Jr.
Schermerhorn, Dale W.
Schmidt, John E.
Seaver, Robert L.
Seymour, Kenneth F.
Shannahan, John K.
Shaw, Phillip E.
Shroyer, David K., Jr.
Shropshire, Jack C.
Silvear, Thomas A.
Silver, Tommy J.
Simon, Clyde C.
Simon, Francis
Simpson, Fred D., Jr.
Simpson, James F.
Simpson, Patrick S.
Sinnott, William T.
Sisley, Frederick E.
Smaldone, Ronald A.
Smith, Ellis F.
Smith, Robert E.
Smyth, Thomas J.
Sotsky, George R.
Spangler, John F.
Spence, Jack R.
Sperry, Charles B.
Sprick, Doyle R.
Steffen, Allan J.
Stehr, Paul W.
Stevens, John D.
Stevenson, Samuel H.
Stewart, Douglas K.
Stewart, Douglas P.
Stoffey, Robert E.
Stoloski, William J.
Stremic, Anthony W.
Studer, Edward A.
Stumpf, Thomas A.
Sudmeyer, Paul T.
Suedekum, Norman F.
Sutherland, Arthur A., Jr.
Sutton, Robert A.
Swenson, Wayne R.
Taylor, Bruce C.
Taylor, Franklin D.
Taylor, Richard H.
Tebow, William J.
Telford, Jacque W.
Thames, Samuel E.
Thien, Robert L.
Thomas, Willard Y.
Thomas, William L.
Thompson, Amos D., Jr.
Thompson, Charles B.
Tiffany, Russell B.
Tilton, Richard C.
Tinker, Alan
Toelle, Alan D.
Toler, Albert E.
Toth, James E.
Tucker, G. B.
Turner, James D.
Uram, Edward T.
VanAntwerp, William M., Jr.
VanNiman, John H.
VanTassel, Gerry L.
Vasko, George E.
Vaughn, Clovis S.
Vindich, Joseph G.
Volz, Carl W.
Vorreyer, Richard W.
Vowell, David E.
Wakefield, Robert H.
Wallace, Harry R.
Wall, Melvin N.
Walsh, Gerald E.
Walters, Warren S.
Wanner, Sanford B.
Ward, Charles L.
Warfield, Harry R.
Warnicke, Edward A.
Washington, Joel
Wasik, Henry J.
Weir, Charles J.
Wells, Jack W.
Wells, Raymond
Weltin, William L.
Welzant, Charles M.
Werner, Robert G.
Wescott, William F.
Westphal, Paul E., Jr.
West, Herman B., Jr.
Whipple, Oliver M.
Whittlesey, Joseph T.
Whiting, Edward R.
Wier, David A.
Williams, Walter L., Jr.
Willmarth, John M.
Wilson, David R.
Wilson, Robert B.
Wogan, Christopher M.
Woodward, Robert L.
Wood, Howard C.
Wright, Ronald W.
Yenerall, Grant L.
Yon, Dandridge H.
York, Geoffrey A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Billy W.
Albright, Donald A.
Aleksic, Water P.
Alexander, Joseph H.
Ammons, Kenneth L.
Anderson, Clifford H.
Anderson, Gary H.
Anderson, Jesse E., Jr.
Anderson, John E.
Atkins, George W. P., Jr.
Babbie, Earl R.
Bacon, James N.
Baier, James F.
Baig, Mirza M.
Bailey, Alfred D.
Bailey, Edward R.
Baker, Robert L.
Balash, Steve R., Jr.
Bane, Ronald E.
Barnhill, Dwight D.
Bartel, James A.
Bartnick, Stanley J.
*Bartunek, Jack F.
Bass, Murray, Jr.
Bastian, Dean L.
*Bauknight, Harry L.
Baxter, Thomas W.
Beck, Duane C.
Bechler, William R.
Bennett, Allan L.
*Bergbauer, Daniel M.
Bertrand, Horace A., Jr.
Besch, Edwin W.
Bethea, William D.
Betz, Thomas R.
Bierman, Edward O.
Bikakis, Charles N.
Bilyeu, Byron L.
Bivens, Alfred H.
Bland, Richard P. L.
Blythe, Ralph A., Jr.
Bogard, Bobby D.
Boller, Lawrence J.
Boone, Fredrick E.
Boston, John C., Jr.
Bower, James W.
*Bowersox, Robert L.
Bowlby, Samuel W.
Bowman, James H.
Bradbury, Donald L.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Braun, Robert A.
Britell, Claudius J.
Broadwell, Donald N.
Bronson, James V.
Brown, John H.
Brown, Robert J.
*Bryan, Charles G.
Burgess, Richard S.
Burke, Francis M.
Burkley, George W.
Burns, Charles W.
Burns, James P., III
*Burns, John R., Jr.
Burton, Lou L., Jr.
Buske, Kenneth R.
Byers, Larry E.
Carlson, Robert A.
Carroll, Thomas J.
Cassel, Louis A.
Cathell, Peter H.
Cauley, Bernard J.
Cazares, Alfred F., Jr.
*Cheney, Oakley W., Jr.
Clark, Francis S.
Clawson, Roger L.
Clements, Richard F.
Cochran, Bruce A.
Coll, Vincent S.
Collins, William
Conklin, Raymond C.
Conrad, Frederick A.
Copeland, Randolph G.
Core, George E.
Costa, Keith A.
Coulter, Robert S.
Cox, Donald C.
*Cox, Frank O., Jr.
*Crain, John D.
Crampton, James H.
Culver, John L.
Curley, Michael H.
Curry, John E.
Cutcomb, David H.
*Daniel, Ray A.
Darrow, Donnie L.
Davis, Brian P.
Derbes, David G.
Desautels, Ernest J.
Deshler, George O.
Dickerson, Michael G.
Dickson, Bonneau H., Jr.
Diffee, Gerald L.
Diffen, Ray I.
Dilweg, Gary T.
Dixon, Edward E.
Dobak, John D.
*Dods, Walter K.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Dominguez, Michael E. P.
*Doughtie, Nath C.
Douthit, Nathan C.
Dunn, Theodore R.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Dvorak, David S.
Eggleston, George D.
Eirich, Donald G.
Elgin, Arthur C., Jr.
Elpers, David J.
Elrod, McLowery
Ennis, Berlis F.
Enochs, George H.
Eppinger, Edward A.
Erb, Louis F.
Farnsworth, Charles E.
Fehnel, Richard A.
Feitel, Joseph Y., Jr.
Filson, John R.
*Findlay, Raymond F., Jr.
Fisher, Roy E., Jr.
Flessner, Matthew
Forbes, Philip A.
Foster, Karl A.
Fox, Raymond F.
Friedl, Richard C.
Friend, Gerald E.
Friis, David J.
Fuqua, Beverly B.
Gamer, Peter P.
Gann, Robert B.
Gardner, Phillip E.
Garriott, John W.
Gatz, Frederic L.
Gay, Charles B., Jr.
Gaynor, Paul B.
Georgia, Daniel C.
Germer, Henry A., Jr.
Gibbons, Joel W., III
Gibbs, Joseph W., III
Gilbert, Jan R.
Gill, John P.
Gleim, Earl C.
Glover, Douglas
Goodwyn, George W., Jr.
Gorman, Merle W.
Gosnell, Harold C., Jr.
*Greene, Robert W.
Grant, Herbert A., Jr.
Griffin, Wayne G.
Hahn, Warren G.
Hale, Lynn A.
*Hamilton, Robert E.
Handrahan, Robert G.
Hanrahan, James G.
Hanson, Chester E.
Harlan, Robert R.
*Harrer, Dean R.
Harris, Henry W., Jr.
Harris, Richard I.
Harter, Gary D.
Hastings, Barclay
Hatfield, Maynard A.
Hawley, George T.
Hayes, Frank S.
Heil, Thomas C., Jr.
Heinisch, Roger P.
*Henry, Billy E.
Hildebrandt, Earl W.
Hitchcock, Gene R.
Hofmann, David H.
Holman, Robert S.
Hopkins, Harvard V., Jr.
Howe, David T.
Hracho, Eugene E.
*Hudson, Donald R.
Huggin, Gerald C.
Hughes, Richard W.
Hungerford, Ed V., III
Hutton, Lajon R.
Ingebretsen, Carl R.
Jackson, Clifford A.
Jerbasi, John T.
*Johnson, Gene C.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, Richard A.
Jolley, Hugh S.
Jones, Kenneth N.
Kaster, Stephen H.
Kealey, James A.
Kelley, Reginald C., Jr.
Kelly, Gordon L.
Kemp, Steven J.
Kerr, James A., Jr.
Kerrigan, Richard T.
Kew, Robert J.
Keys, William M.
King, Dennis G.
Kirkpatrick, Joe J.
Kisner, Ned B.
*Kitto, Clyde W.
Knepp, Donald R.
Koenig, Donald M.
Kolbe, Frank P., Jr.
Koontz, Robert P.
Koppang, James D.
Kowalski, Thomas J.
Kraft, Daniel J.
Kreider, James W.
Lamb, Donald L.
Land, Edward J., Jr.
Landes, Burrell H., Jr.
Lantz, Conrad W.
*Larson, Gary M.
Larson, Kenneth P.
Lashlee, Hugh W.
Lee, Vincent R.
Lefeve, David A.
Leggett, James
*Lemay, Ralph E., Jr.
*Lewin, Lawrence S.
*Libkie, Frederick A.
Lindquist, Terry K.
Little, Thomas F.
Lohmeier, Donald L.
*Long, Jules H., Jr.
*Losik, Francis A.
Lowe, James W., Jr.
Luther, Lawrence A.
Lutheran, Joseph A.
Lyman, Donald O.
Lynch, Charles L.
Lytle, William J.
Marshall, Robert D.
Martin, Lawrence G.
Martin, William R.
Massey, Tom E.
May, James S.
Mayers, David, Jr.
McAfee, Ernest W., Jr.
McCain, Charles M.
McCallum, William J.
McClanahan, Garrett W.
*McColl, David K., II
McInteer, Robert C.
McIntyre, William A., III
McKee, Samuel K., III
McKenney, David M.
McLaughlin, Paul A.
McLaurin, Robert L., Jr.
*McNamara, Jack D.
Meck, Robert S.
Meeks, Clarence I., III
Mehl, Spencer P.
Meissner, Howard W.
Metzler, Harry R.
Mickey, Robert B.
Miller, Allen H.
Miller, Dan G.
Mills, James D.
Mitchell, Larry G.
Moore, James L.
Moore, Lawrence R.
Moran, Thomas J.
Morgan, Robert F.
*Mosser, George E.
Mueller, Gerald R.
Murphy, Richard J.
Myers, Oran L.
Nestande, Bruce K.
Newbern, Jay A.
Nolen, Thomas A.
O'Connell, Maurice C.
O'Laughlin, Larry L.
Oliver, Troy R., Jr.
Olson, Joseph C., III
Oots, Samuel E.
Orr, Alan L.
Oxenreider, Lynn F.
*Peet, Christopher
Pegler, Richard N.
Perrin, Richard K.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Pierce, James L.
Pieri, Francis L., Jr.
Presley, Olen D.
Preston, Raymond G.
Prue, David B.
Pruiett, Denis I.
Puaa, En Sue Pung
Puckett, Scott C.

Pynchon, George E.
Quinlan, David A.
Rader, Russell W.
Reagan, Ronald E.
Reams, William H.
Reimer, John H., Jr.
Richardson, Tom V.
Rippelmeyer, Karl
Roark, Richard D.
Robinson, George K., Jr.
Robinson, Lance R.
Roche, William A.
Rogers, Torrence W.
Ross, George C.
Ross, James M.
Ross, Robert A.
Ruyle, James B.
Sadler, Kenneth R.
Sale, Charles L.
Sammis, Norman W.
Sampson, Charles W.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Sawyer, Carl R., Jr.
Sawyer, John F.
Seaman, Lawrence E., Jr.
Seay, Olen A., Jr.
Schulster, James T.
Shaver, Wayne E.
Shaver, William C.
Shaw, Walter C.
Shea, James R.
Silva, Lionel M.
Sirois, Benoit J. L.
*Sledge, John W., Jr.
Smith, Gid B.
Smith, James M.
*Smith, Stanley R.
Smith, Vincent M.
Smolenski, Robert J.
Sneed, Richard C.
Snook, Howard M.
Sohm, Jacque E.
Solak, Thomas J.
Solomon, John E., Jr.
Somerville, Gary J.
Spence, Wesley F.
Spevetz, Louis M.
Spolyar, Robert J.
Stacy, Richard M.
Stanton, Donald R.
Steele, James L.
Stefansson, David R.
Stensland, William C.
Stewart, James J.
Stiegman, Donald L.
Strand, Robert H.
Strickland, Anthony R.
Stuart, Phil E.
Sullivan, Harold D.
Sutton, Edward N.
Sweetser, Warren E., III
Swetman, Roderick E.
Szweda, Edward H., Jr.
Taylor, Lawrence A.
Tener, Frederick S., Jr.
Tenney, Joseph R.
Terpak, John B., Jr.
Thomas, Hagar E., Jr.
Thomas, James N.
Thomas, Richard E.
Thompson, Allan
Thompson, James G.
Thompson, Richard K.
Todd, Gary E.
Todd, Harry G.
*Todd, James H.
Todd, John H.
Troutman, Howard P.
Tschida, Rudolph G.
Tull, Martin N.
Tumlinson, James H., III
Tunberg, Karl A.
Turbeville, Bobby G.
Turner, Carlon N.
Uzzelle, George H., III
Vaughan, Jean P. C.
Wallace, Arthur L., Jr.
Wallace, Richard F.
Ward, Sanford D.
Watson, Jack H., Jr.
Watson, John R.
Webster, Steven S.
Weren, Arthur D.
Werner, Evan C.
Whitaker, Allen P.
White, Richard
Whitfield, Howard M.
Wickens, Justin H.
Wilkins, George M.
Williams, Edward B.
Williams, Paul R.
Winston, Herbert T.
*Winter, Richard D.
Wood, Herbert H.
Wright, Floyd K., Jr.
*Yarmy, Richard L.
Young, Gordon K.
Young, Harry C., Jr.
Abele, William R.
Andrews, Donald W.
Brown, Mark T.
Cole, Bobby F.
Comstock, John S.
Connelly, Edmund J., Jr.
Cooper, Gary J.
Driskell, James M.
Dowling, Richard D.
Driver, Robert J., Jr.
Fanning, David E.
Fricker, Jerrell T.
Gallery, Vincent R.
Gentry, Harry R.
Grega, Ronald R.
Jessen, Thomas F.
Johnson, Warren H.
King, Paul F.
Lilley, Melton G.
Marino, Gaetano
Marshall, John C.
Mayers, Joseph C.
McIver, Werner W.
Nardo, Joseph F.
Pope, James H.
Price, Ronald K.
Rhodes, William M.
Rowley, William B.
Sewell, Welton C.
Smith, George W. G., Jr.
Sole, Joseph A.
Stoner, Donald L.
Whittingham, David
Wright, William E.
*Worley, Jerry W.
*Farrington, Francis X.
*Redelman, Roger L.
*Sullivan, James V.
Bioser, Jan R.
*McGraw, Clifford L., Jr.
Graham, Wallace A.
Gazares, Alford F., Jr.
Hollon, Jack A.
Hungerford, Ed V., III
Kromminga, Lynn R.
Link, David A.
Mead, Richard J.
Reitz, Harry J., Jr.
Riblet, William B.
Roberts, Lloyd A.
Raper, Donald L.
Tidwell, Clark H.
Wallace, Robert D.
*Bailey, Richard W.
*Metscher, Walter H.
*Baradat, Armand J.
*Boyd, Granberry D., III
*Hansen, Allen G.
*Reilly, James E.
*Souders, James P.
Steiner, Kenneth J.
Martin, William R.
Bowman, James H.
Collins, William
Costa, Keith A.
Cox, Donald C.
Curley, Michael H.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Foster, Karl A.
Friedl, Richard C.
Friend, Gerald E.
Hopkins, Howard V.
Lantz, Conard W.
Morgan, Robert F.
Mueller, Gerald R.
Turner, Carlon N.
Wallace, Richard F.
Young, Harry C., Jr.
Atkins, James W.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Snodgrass, Clyde R.
Baker, Robert L.
Kerr, James A., Jr.
McCain, Charles M.
Mills, James D.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Whitfield, Howard M.
Chambless, Edward L.
Meeks, Clarence I.
Core, George E.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Pate, Hugh P.
Van Wert, Paul J., Jr.
Cates, George L.
Babwell, Charles H.
Brooks, Carl E.
Beattie, Richard I., Jr.
Brooks, Robert C.
Buethe, Frank A.
Coleman, Roland W.
Davis, Arthur G., Jr.
Dunn, Bernard
Gacusana, Jose M.
Gresham, James W.
Gruhler, Jean A., Jr.
Hardiman, David W.
Kane, Thomas F.
Long, Edward D.
McCreedy, Edwin J.
Mitchell, Robert W., Jr.
Monette, Roland E.
Pearce, Frank G.
Ray, Revedy C., III
Rivers, John F.
Rose, Allen J.
Shirley, Jerry C.
Smith, Richard P.
Spivey, Bayliss L., Jr.
Taylor, Kenneth T.
Weede, Richard D.
Zappone, Francis L., Jr.
D'Avolio, Gerald D.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Black, Lois J.
Carlson, Carol J.
Carroll, Nancy A.
Rick, Nancy J.
Roberts, Roberta N.
Schlechert, Dolores A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gibbon, Edward E.
Wightman, Gene F.
Adams, Robert K.
Sweetser, William B.
Schroder, Henry H.
Allen, Arnold V.
Amos, William H.
Harper, John A.
Edwards, George T.
Overby, Richard C.
Embrey, Almon D.
Scarborough, John A.
Roberson, Frank R.
Gidlewski, Aloysius C.
Fields, Clifford J.
Arnold, Kenneth G.
Rains, Novis I.
Lloyd, Paul V.
Lynch, Walker R.
Goen, Sargent
Norris, Edward S.
Taylor, Thomas G.
Edmondson, William B.
Beard, John B.
Jensen, Kermit R.
Lewis, Raymond E.
Smith, Edward O.
Clement, Joseph E.
Honeycutt, Paul F.
Sketoe, Clayton D.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Buss, Herbert F.
Shirley, Joe D.
Herriotts, Charles I.
McGrath, Cletus P.
Yost, Russell W.
Rozycki, Edmund V.
Boreman, Gilbert H.
Edwards, Robin R.
Virden, Robert W.
Denyer, Samuel A., Jr.
Arthur, Robert O.
Dancy, John P.
Albert, Robert H.
Osimo, Mario C.
Woods, George D.
Skinner, Ned S.
Okonek, Mark V.
Morgan, Lloyd H.
Arnold, Daniel W.
Jones, James F. A.
Girouard, Eli
Hathaway, John A.
Pryor, Charley L., Jr.
Adams, Joseph B.
Brisbois, Donald J.
Wyzykowski, Joseph A.
Jordan, Robert H.
Harris, Jerry W.
Morris, Floyd L.
Zam, Frank S.
Parker, Norman E.
Hodge, William K.
Boudreaux, Robert M.
Pierce, Julius B.
Stutts, Commodore
Hawbecker, Donald L.
Greene, Robert B.
Lamonte, Stanley W.
Harnage, Floyd E.
Nicholson, Edsel W.
Zimba, John P.
Perkins, Burton O.
Riebe, Kenneth W. B.
Duncan, David N.
Harvey, Leonard R.
Greenspan, Leo
Engelhardt, Harold H.
Nault, Charles R.
Martin, Robert E.
Nelson, George B., Jr.
Dick, Boyd W.
Gandy, Austin O.
Kennedy, Clarence E.
Arsenault, Robert W.
Wright, Ira L., Jr.
Thatenhurst, King D., Sr.
Meek, Wendell A.
Tusa, Joe N.
Burke, Richard M.
Miller, Nicholas J., Jr.
Graef, Ralph E.
Deatrick, Curtis L.
Seymour, Dwight W.
Wilson, Warren L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Meyer, William A.
Johansen, Carl, Jr.
Johns, Fred E.
Clabaugh, John W., Jr.
Kozlowski, John
Morris, Frank B.
Powell, Lester E.
Miller, Martin A.
Berry, Norman
Bennett, Joseph L., Jr.
Gomb, Francis F.
Nix, Casey R.
Wilterding, Ashton C.
Elder, James O.
Brown, Robert H.
Harris, James R.
Richards, Irving S.
Russell, Robert A.
Nilsen, Donald A.
Kennedy, Raymond G.
McMillan, William W., Jr.
Reagan, Kenneth H.
Holzinger, Bernard E.
Flaherty, William C.
Tobin, Frank T.
Kulak, Raymond
Black, John R.
Chandler, James D.
Webb, John H., Jr.
Chaput, Roger U.
Taylor, Jack R.
Mann, Horace L.
Huff, Robert R.
Wynant, Neil E.
Olesak, Andrew M.
Walls, George O.
Condon, Raymond W.
Slater, Robert T.
Cushman, Robert L.
Bowen, Myron J.
Capozzoli, John A., Jr.
Cain, John T.
Voorhees, John D.
Griggs, Clarence F., Jr.
Ivey, Billy D.
Kozain, Lawrence E.
Kilborn, Charles R.
Tucker, Willie R. M.
Smith, Darrel H.
Smith, Vernon E.
Pope, Hal E.
Olsen, Thomas R.
Wilder, Raymond C.
Hunt, Robert T.
Norris, William B.
Gentry, Edwin S.
Gordon, John B.
Garrett, Stanley E.
Brown, Elroy L.
Durfee, Norman E.
Pluger, Edwin A.
Wuerth, Milton R.
Dugan, Arthur E.
Massarotti, Dante A.
Munt, Dean J., Jr.
Haydock, Eugene S.
McNamara, William
Waller, Henry J.
Bailey, Graydon L.
Woodson, Duane L.
Hammons, William V., Jr.
Main, Stanley W.
Keller, Robert P.
Crenshaw, John O.
Stergiou, Chris G.
Karrer, Joseph J.
McGrory, John F.
Jones, James W.
Peterson, James H.
Gracey, Koyle D., Jr.
Kerr, Richard A.
Hadley, John A.
Thacher, Robert M.
Connell, James J.
Groom, Robert W.
Freeman, Elaine G.

*Indicates ad interim appointments.

NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Acker, Guilford D.
Adams, David G., Jr.
Alexander, James T., Jr.
*Allen, Roger H.
Allendorfer, Harry C., Jr.
*Allman, John C.
Andrews, Frank A.
Armstrong, Parker B.
Arthur, William A.
Ashcraft, Robert L.
Ashley, James M., Jr.
Augenblick, Richard G.
*Azab, John C.
Bachhuber, Joseph A.
*Bailey, Max P., Jr.
Balis, Theodore L.
Barker, Jonathan A.
Barnhardt, Eugene C., III
*Belcher, Roy S., Jr.
Bennett, Walter F. V.
Bergin, Daniel E., Jr.
Betzel, Albert F.
Betzer, William E.
*Bill, Wells R., Jr.
Binion, Vernon E.
Bishop, Charles B.
Black, Robert G.
Blair, Alfred F.
Blanchard, Frank M.
Boe, Nils W.
Bradshaw, Harold G.
Brango, Nicholas
Brink, John D.
Britner, George F., Jr.
Brown, Galen C.
Brown, Garrison
Brown, Kenneth B.
Bryan, David, Jr.
Buck, Richard H.
Buhrer, Gordon C.
*Bunting, Curtis W.
Bunting, Davis E.
Butts, John "L", Jr.
Cain, James B.
*Cantlon, Clifton E.
Carmody, Martin D.
Carter, Robert R.
Carver, William E.
Cason, Arthur C., Jr.
Caton, Clifford E.
*Celustka, Robert J.
*Chick, Lewis W.

Clarke, Jared E., III
Clarke, Robert A.
*Clifford, John K.
Cole, Philip P.
Conger, James W.
Conner, Andrew B., Jr.
Cook, James L., Jr.
Corkran, Richard L., Jr.
Craig, Russell F.
*Cramer, Donald S.
*Craven, William H., Jr.
Crawford, John W., Jr.
Creed, Donald L.
*Dahlstrom, Vincent A.
Davis, John B., Jr.
*Davis, Lewis E., Jr.
des Granges, Maino
Devine, Richard O.
Dickerson, Vincent M.
Dietz, Willard D.
Dillard, Chester L.
Doner, Landis E.
Dowd, Robert A.
Doyle, Judson C.
Dubyk, William
Duncan, Max C.
Dupre, Marcy M., III
Durand, Paul H.
*Dye, Philip G.
Early, Leo W.
Eastman, Robert S.
Eggeman, Benjamin R., Jr.
Elliott, Ralph E., Jr.
Erb, Leonard
Erwin, Virgil A., Jr.
*Evans, Jack L.
Fair, John W.
Farrell, Eugene H.
Farrell, William F., Jr.
Fichman, Herbert T.
Fink, Christian
Fitzpatrick, Edward G.
Flynn, Russell F.
Forrer, Samuel W.
Forrest, Gaylord T.
Fox, John P., Jr.
Fraser, Leroy B., Jr.
Friedman, Malcolm C.
Froude, Robert S.
Gallin, Alvin L.
Garrett, Wallace H., Jr.
*Garver, Donald L.
Gates, Robert L.
*Gibbons, John P.
*Ginn, Wilbur N., Jr.
*Gladding, Everett B.
Gockel, Bernard N.
*Grainger, Charles H.
Greeley, George R.
Green, David H.
Green, Laurence B.
*Greenlee, Pleas E., Jr.
*Griffin, Charles D.
Grimes, Alton B.
Gulledge, Kenneth E.
Gutting, John P.
Haffey, John J., Jr.
Halpin, Paul D.
Halvorson, George G.
Hamilton, Arthur G., Jr.
*Hankey, John R.
Hanson, Eugene R.
Harbert, Thomas C., Jr.
*Harris, John S.
Hartley, Gordon E.
Harwood, Robert H., Jr.
Haszard, Harry A.
Helme, Charles F., Jr.
Heronemus, William E.
Hill, John C., II
Hinchey, John J.
Hinkamp, Maddox N. P.
Holley, Edward B., Jr.
Holloway, James L., III
Holmes, Donald T.
Hoof, Wayne
Hopley, Eric E.
Hosey, William B.
Howell, Wiley B.
Howerton, Wilfred M.
Hunt, Robert J.
Hurst, William J.
*Hutchinson, John L.
Hyde, Richard W.
James, Jack M.
Jennings, Lewis B.
Jernigan, William A., Jr.
*Johnson, Ace
Johnston, Juel D.
Jones, Bennie W., Jr.
Jones, Samuel G.
Kane, John D. H., Jr.
Kelly, William W.
*Kendrick, David C.
*Keys, James E.
Kinne, Francis E.
Kintner, Edwin E.
Knight, Francis S.
Knight, Robert C.
*Kohler, Karl B.
Kolakowski, Roman
Krantz, William F.
Kurtz, William R.
Lacy, Paul L., Jr.
*Lahodney, William J., Jr.
Lape, Wade W.
*Laurich, James A.
Law, John T.
Lee, Chester M.
*Lee, Florn L.
Lemmon, Robert "H"
Lindbeck, John A.
Lowentrout, Jack L.
Lumpkin, Pickett
Maddex, John W.
Mahler, George H., III
Malone, Eugene I.
*Mansueto, Edmund J.
Margolf, Edgar L.
Marocchi, John L.
Maupin, Owen L.
McCarty, Lindsay C.
*McDowell, William R., Jr.
*McKee, Craig
McMahon, John L., Jr.
McNeal, Horace P.
McNees, Richard B.
McWethy, Robert D.
Meacher, Leo
Meier, Louis L., Jr.
Milano, Louis L.
Miller, Frank E.
Miller, Ward S.
Mills, Richard H.
Mills, Robert G.
Momsen, Charles B., Jr.
*Montgomery, John A., Jr.
Montgomery, William M.
Moore, Michael U.
Moran, William J.
Morin, George F.
Morrow, William B.
Mottern, Robert E.
Mullen, Arthur C.
Munk, Maximilian W.
Murph, John W.
*Murphy, Pleasant L.
Myers, Robert I.
Nash, Norman C.
Nasworthy, George F.
Neff, John L.
*Neill, Dugald T.
Newton, William L.
*Norton, Mohl C., Jr.
Nyburg, Willard L.
O'Brien, Frank H.
O'Bryant, William T.
Oliver, Frederick W.
O'Neal, Justin A.
Osborn, James B.
Payne, Charles N., Jr.
Peddicord, Gerald E.
Pellett, William H.
Peterson, Robert F.
Peto, David C.
*Piper, Max A.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
*Pitts, Raymond L.
Poage, Robert B.
Porter, Rufus C., Jr.
Price, Walter W., Jr.
*Price, William M.
Pugh, Paul E.
Pugh, William M., II
Rasmussen, Jonathan Q.
Rawls, William A.
Rawson, Arthur F., Jr.
Reck, Floyd F.
Reed, Dale C.
Reed, Roy E.
Rees, Joseph R.
Rice, Harold E.
Ricketts, Colin J.
Rizza, Joseph P.
Robie, William A.
Robison, Roy J.
Romanick, Frank M.
Rosenberg, Edwin M.
Rowan, John J.
Ruehrmund, Paul L., Jr.
*Runk, Theodore W.
Rusch, William J., Jr.
*Russell, Charles E.
Ruth, Lloyd D.
Sands, Pierre N.
*Savadkin, Lawrence
Savage, Jimmie E.
Saylor, Philip G.
Scarborough, Frank G.
Schremp, James F.
Schroeder, Charles J.
Seitz, Eugene W.
Sewall, Richard M.
Shaw, Claude B.
Sheppard, Charles P.
*Sherman, Vining A.
Shireman, Richard H. Jr.
Sigley, Claredon H.
Simmons, Kendall W.
Simmons, William E.
Sims, William E.
*Sisley, William R.
Slater, Mervin O.
Small, James D.
Smith, Armistead B., Jr.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, James W.
*Smith, Leroy P.
Smith, Paul B.
Smith, Peter S.
*Soli, Orlan A.
Sorenson, Harry E.
Sparks, Robert R.
Spiegel, William D.
Squires, Lewis W.
Stecher, Lewis J., Jr.
Stokes, Griffith P.
Stone, Howard L., Jr.
Stough, Ben H., Jr.
Strane, John R.
Suerstedt, Henry, Jr.
Sweitzer, Henry B.
Tabor, Travis O., III
*Tallman, Humphrey L.
Tanner, Charles S.
Thienes, Robert L.
Thompson, Harley F.
*Thompson, Robert A.
Timmes, Francis X.
Tully, Joseph M., Jr.
Turner, Carol A.
Turner, Thomas
*Tuttle, John E.
Vincent, Manuel C.
Vita, Harold E.
Voris, Roy M.
Vose, William F.
*Walkinshaw, David J.
Wall, Charles B., Jr.
Warren, Harry S.
Weber, William G.
Weidlein, Leopold
*Weissenborn, Donald E.
Werner, William R.
Whited, Ciro N. V., Jr.
Whitney, Alden W.
*Wilbur, Charles C.
Wilhite, Drewery R.
*Williams, Joe W., Jr.
Williams, Thomas H.
Willis, William P., Jr.
Winslow, Edward H.
*Wirth, Hubert P.
Woods, Mark W.
Woodson, Walter B., Jr.
*Woosley, David G.
Young, Charles M.
Zigler, Frederick W.
Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Brown, Loy T.
Custis, Donald L.
Davis, Harold A.
Fuller, Frank D.
Lebherz, Thomas B.
Lee, James H., Jr.
MacPherson, Roderick F. C.
McKane, Andrew, III
Muehe, Charles C.
Santina, Henry
Tratar, Anton A., Jr.
Zarriello, Jerry J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Winston L.
*Anderson, Niels H.
Anderson, Scott K.
*Angelopoulos, John C.
Bjorlo, Lloyd S.
*Botkin, Dwight M.
Coiner, John S.
Corrick, James A., Jr.
*Crane, Frank E., Jr.
*Ellis, Robert L.
Graham, Jack L.
Hennessy, James L. F.
*Ironmonger, Richard
McNeill, Dan C.
*Meilandt, Ralph L.
*O'Toole, Charles W.
Power, Richard T.
*Redavid, Louis R.
Richardson, William C.
Smith, John D.
Zerfoss, Allen B.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Brooks, William E., Jr.
*Buckingham, Herbert W.
Craven, John H.
Ingvoldstad, Orlando, Jr.
Markley, John H.
McManus, Hugh T.
Menges, Harold F.
Noce, William S.
Tubbs, Joseph J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bamberg, Edward C.
Frate, Lawrence P.
Moeller, Griswold L.
Smisek, Joseph J.
Underhill, Edward G.
*Urquhart, James B., Jr.
*Young, James C.

DENTAL CORPS

Bucher, John F.
*Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
*Castner, David V., Jr.
Hunley, Theodore R.
Kailer, Charles E.
Koch, John A.
McNett, Roy C.
*Parks, Clyde R.
Scofield, Henry H., Jr.
Small, Ernest W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Floyd, Thomas M., Jr.
White, Erwin W.

NURSE CORPS

Burk, Alberta

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Absher, George W., Jr.
*Acton, Thomas E.
Acton, William D.
Adams, Allan M., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, Lynn "W"
*Adkisson, Hubert K.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
*Ales, George A.
*Alexander, Robert J.
*Alford, Ralph M.
Althoff, William B.
*Altz, Leroy V., Jr.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
*Andrews, Lyman L., Jr.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Atkinson, Edward C.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Aulick, Donald M.
Ayers, George "L", Jr.
Babbitt, Franklin G.
Bachert, John O.
Bailey, Gordon W.
Bailey, John B.
Bailey, John D.
Bailey, Keith E.
Baker, Robert J.
*Baker, Royal W.
Bakle, George F.
Baldwin, Lawrence C.
Ball, Edwin L.
Barlow, John P.
Barnes, Robert O.
Barnum, Ralph L.
*Barton, George E.
Bathel, Leonard F.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
*Beaubouef, James A.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bennett, William O.
Bent, Jack
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bergner, Robert B.
Bergs, Robert A.
Bettis, Alfred M.
Beutler, Albert G.
Bischof, William W.
Blackwelder, Buren L.
*Blade, Dale O.
Blades, Jehu L.
*Blaisdell, Robert J.
Blake, John S.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boniface, John G.
*Bono, Vernon C.
Booker, Thomas F.
Borgerding, Howard A.
*Boutin, Alfred V.
*Boutte, Lester H.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Bradberry, Gordon D.
*Bradbury, Albert W.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branton, Richard C.
Bremer, Woodson P.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
*Broughton, Walter T., II
Brown, Ian F.
*Brown, John W.
*Brown, Joseph W., Jr.
Brown, Keith F.
*Brownlee, Robert E., Jr.
Brozo, John G.
*Brtek, Frank C.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burns, William L.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, Lester H.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Caldwell, Jack
Camp, Herbert E.
Cannon, Herbert "B"
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Carneghi, Albert J.
*Carpenter, Edward L.
Carr, Howard W.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Carroll, Thomas F.
Carter, Jack L.
*Carter, Kenneth
Castillo, Edmund L.

*Chandler, Lowell D.
*Charles, John M.
Christensen, Morris A.
Christy, Douglas G.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James H.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clausen, Paul K.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Clifton, Autry W.
Coble, Reid E.
Codemo, Joseph E.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M.
Collins, John T.
*Collister, Louis J.
Condren, John F.
*Conger, Elton V.
Connelley, Ernest C., Jr.
*Cook, Harry W.
*Cook, Herbert B.
Cooke, Edward W.
Cooley, Homer K., Jr.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Crangle, Eugene V.
Cranton, Jack H.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Robert E.
*Creider, Anthony S.
Cronander, James H.
*Cronenwett, Wilson R.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crozier, Francis J.
*Crumbaugh, Fred R., Jr.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
*Curtis, Donald P.
Cushing, Leonard W.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
*Custer, Prentice J.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Deacon, William, III
Decker, Edward A.
*Deems, Eugene F.
Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
DeMayo, John J., Jr.
DeMent, Henry F.
*Denkler, William A.
Dente, Eugene
Dick, Kenneth S.
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
DiMatteo, Dominic J.
Dise, Robert L.
*Dodge, James D.
*Dolan, William R., Jr.
Doles, Thomas K.
*Donovan, Gerard M.
Doss, Robert F.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis J. J.
*Doyle, James T.
Doyle, Philip P.
Duberg, Carl N.
DuBiel, Robert A.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dugger, John A.
*Dulhagen, John J.
Duncan, Robert C.
*Dunlap, Billy F.
Dunning, Richard A.
Durbin, Stephen F.
*Durtche, Carl, Jr.
Dutra, John E.
Duvall, Richard A.
Eagan, Bryan R.
*Earnhardt, Elmer H.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
*Edelman, Sydney
*Edmondson, George H.
*Ellenbrand, Ralph E.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
*Elmles, George
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
*Ennis, Wilbur J.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Enyart, John W.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, Jack R.
Evans, James G.
*Everhart, Charles D.
Exum, John D.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Fagan, Philip J.
Fahrney, Robert H.
Farrington, Richard S.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
*Faulkner, Stuart T.
Fay, Robert J.
*Feher, Melvin A.
Felsman, Jack L.
*Ferguson, William P.
Ferrante, John M.
Field, Francis E.
*Fife, Milton E.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Carl S.
Fitzgerel, John H.
Flack, Roby E.
Fluhart, James H.
Folensbee, Albert H.
Folop, Albert A.
*Forbis, Roy E.
*Forgy, William J.
Forsyth, William D.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Fridge, Herbert E.
*Friedman, Robert
Fries, William D.
Fromknecht, George W.
Furland, Frederick W.
Gaehler, Alfred H.
Gainer, Richard D.
Gaither, Donald
*Gallagher, John J.
Galt, Robert W.
Gano, Hubert D.
Gately, Donald E.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gaul, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gavett, Theodore C.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
*Gawthrop, Wilson R.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Giedt, John G.
Gilles, Donald A.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Gilmour, Robert, Jr.
*Giorgis, Albert S.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Gordon, Jack G.
Gortney, William M.
Gossman, Thomas J.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Gray, Robert J.
*Greene, Ernest "G"
Greene, Joseph M.
*Gregonis, Joseph P.
*Griffin, Shade W.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Grojean, Charles D.
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullette, John G.
Haak, Frank S., Jr.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
*Hallman, Robert E.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hambley, Louis C.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hansen, John E.
Hansen, Theodore W.
Hanson, Donald J.
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harper, George A.
Harris, William F.
Harris, William C.
Hart, Robert R.
Haselton, Frederick R., Jr.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Heberling, Donald A.
Hefferman, James M.
*Heiderer, Robert
Hemler, Frank T.
Henderson, Jerome E.
*Herman, Richard D.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heuer, Edward H.
Hicken, Frederick J.
Higgins, Robert T.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
*Hilton, David E.
Hinchcliff, Lester G., Jr.
*Hodge, Ervin "F"
Hoeller, Warren J.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holland, David B.
*Holt, Albert T.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Howard, George D.
Howard, William D.
Hubbard, Edward R.
*Huckaby, Donnie W.
*Hudson, George D.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hugus, James E.
Hume, David M.
Hutches, Robert S.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jalbert, Llewellyn E.
*Jenks, Edwin R.
*Jester, Jack A.
Johnson, Charles E., Jr.
Johnson, Charles M., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R.
*Johnson, Gerald
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Keith V.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, Edward G.
*Jones, Harvey B.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Robert F.
*Jones, Robert S.
*Joslin, Harold E.
Joy, Harmon R.
Junod, Louis L.
Kallies, Richard H.
*Karr, Kenneth R.
Karr, Walter G., Jr.
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Kelley, Albert J.
Kelly, George R.
Kelly, James J.
Kelly, Leslie D., Jr.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kent, John "L"
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kidd, Robert A.
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimmons, George W.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
King, Herbert T.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kirklighter, James F., Jr.
Klug, George J.
*Knick, Victor R.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Ladosz, John W.
Lambert, Carl R.
Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
*Langland, Robert G.
*Lanzit, Jerome R.
Last, Frank J., Jr.
Laughlin, George W.
Lavelle, Francis M.
*Laws, Walter T.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leighton, David T.
*Lenson, Robert H., Jr.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levi, Burna D., Jr.
Lewis, George H.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindsay, John R.
Linville, James C.
Lippincott, Lincoln H., Jr.
Long, David A.
*Longlev, Thomas B.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
*Lucas, Burke D., Jr.
*Luedtke, Wilbert C.
Lund, Howard R.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
Mackintosh, Robert C.
*MacMillan, Harold R.
Macon, Glen G.
Maginnis, Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Malnerich, Joseph N.
Malone, Walter J.
March, James D.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
*Masterman, Howard W.
*Masuen, Francis N.
*Maulden, Hoyt P.
Maupin, Elwin C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
*McAndrew, Richard J.
McCall, Robert E.
McCandless, Arlin R.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McCormick, Gordon H.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
*McFarland, Earle T.
McGovern, William
McGrath, Herman G., Jr.
McKenzie, Robert P.
*McVicker, Robert J.
*Mead, Robert W.
Meek, Orville M., Jr.
*Meints, Alvin L.
*Melin, Kenneth L.
Metschel, John J.
Metzger, Daniel T.
Metzger, Robert L.
Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
*Midgett, Maxton M.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miles, Warren H.
*Miller, George M.
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
*Miller, Lawrence L.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Millsaps, Lewis M.
Minton, Don R.
*Montgomery, Marvin D.
Monthan, George R.
*Moore, James D.
Moore, James A.
*Moore, Robert A.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moran, Thomas L.
*Morgan, Henry S., Jr.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Morris, James W.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
*Moses, Carl W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Mulholland, William P.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murphy, Francis J.
*Murphy, John L.
*Murray, Walter F.
Musial, Fred A.
Nasipak, Valentin
Nasset, Lawrence O.
Nevins, John D.
Newbern, Robert O.
*Newman, Augustus, Jr.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Norin, Robert A.
Norton, James C.
Nott, Hugh G.
Nugent, Corliss R.
*Nutt, Thomas A., Jr.
*O'Brien, Edward F., Jr.
*Odom, James E., Jr.
Offtermatt, Wilbur F.
*Ogier, Herbert L., Jr.
Ohsiek, Robert R.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
*O'Shaughnessy, James D.
*Ostrom, Ellsworth M., Jr.
Overn, John A.
*Packer, Francis A., Jr.
*Padis, Alexander A.
Page, Robert A.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Parker, Edwin J.
*Parker, George A.
Parnell, James M.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Parry, Loren C.
Pavis, George P.
Pearson, Douglas C.
Pearson, Francis E., III
*Pell, Isaac N., Jr.
Penny, Harmon C.
Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.
Peters, Bernard
Phelps, Henry E.
Phillips, Chester G.
*Phillips, Richard B.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plummer, Philip F.
Plunkett, Roy D.
*Polansky, Lewis J.
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Powers, Horace S.
*Price, Arthur W., Jr.
Putnam, Earl B.
*Quarton, Thomas J.
*Quelland, Obed R.
*Rasko, Robert V.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Charles E.
Ray, Troy G.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Redgrave, DeWitt C., III
*Reed, Irvin W.
Reiff, Glenn A.
*Reilly, Joseph L., Jr.
Reinhart, Leonard J.
Renn, John E.
Richey, Chesley W.
*Richison, Warren C.
*Risley, Clayton E., Jr.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Rock, Clifford "T"
Roemer, Robert F.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
*Rooney, Frederick T.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
*Rossi, Edward C.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
*Rule, John F.
*Rumburg, William H. Jr.
Russ, John, E., Jr.
Russel, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
*Sadler, Robert J.
Sailors, Benjamin G.
Sandeford, William H.
Sanderson, James R.
*Sante, Robert D.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Saylor, Beverly
*Scarborough, Harry C., Jr.
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schaffer, Donald R.
Scheuhing, Robert E.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schlemmer, George S.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schneider, Frank J.
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seargeant, John A.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seiwert, Ray W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
*Seymour, Earl P.
Shafer, Elroy J.
*Shaffer, James B.
Shane, Elbert B.

Sharp, Wallace E.
Sheil, James E.
Shepard, Everett G., Jr.
Sherfy, John B., Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Short, Merton D.
Shreve, Andrew K.
Sickel, John A.
Simon, Harold W
Simpson, William E.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Skoog, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
*Smith, Gerald W.
*Smith, Horace G., Jr.
Smith, Hugh W.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
*Smithey, Thurman E.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, Macon S.
*Sodke, Henry E., Jr.
Spencer, Paul E.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stanley, Earl W.
Staveley, Ernest
*St. Clair, Robert H., Jr.
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
*Stewart, Clell
*Stickles, Robert B.
Still, Raymond G.
*St. Jerne, Paul
Stose, John F.
*Stout, Burke W.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sullenger, Charles R.
*Sullivan, Joseph E.
Sullivan, William P.
*Swigart, Robert E.
*Tallent, Carson R.
Taylor, John L.
Tesh, Charles P.
*Thigpen, Francis Y.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
*Thomas, Alfred J.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thompson, Max E.
Thompson, Robert D.
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tisdale, Robert S.
*Tonkovic, Andrew A.
*Tranter, Thomas L.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Tribble, Robert J.
Trott, Robert J.
Tull, John L. D.
*Tull, Robert
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turley, Miles D. J.
*Turnbull, William O.
Tuttle, John S.
Tyler, Robert E.
Ufer, Alfred L.
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Valentine, Andrew J.
VanTrain, William A., Jr.
VanWinkle, Oscar L.
Vardy, Richard S.
*Vaught, William J.
Veling, George M.
Viele, John W.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
*Walker, Robert G.
Walsh, John A.
*Warfield, John B.
*Warrick, Frank W.
Wash, John L.
Watt, Jesse R.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter C.
*Webb, Charles W.
*Webb, George J.
Webster, Daniel A.
Weidner, Robert E.
Weigel, John J.
Weirich, James E.
Welander, Robert O.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wessinger, William D.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheeler, William L.
*Wheless, John C.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ray B.
*White, Robert E.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
*Wiggins, James R.
Wilcox, Burr C.
Wilder, James H.
*Wilkins, James C., Jr.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, "D" Hunt
Williams, Paul H.
Williamson, Robert, II
Willis, Charles H.
Willson, Lawrence E., Jr.
*Wilmarth, Eugene M.
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Richard H.
*Wilson, Ronald O.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
*Winton, Matthew J.
*Wise, John H.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, John M.
*Wood, Ellis L.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
*Work, David D.
Wyman, Charles L.
Yarbrough, Charles F.
Yarbrough, Herbert A.
*Youmans, Laurens W., Jr.
Young, William B.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Bass, Robert E.
*Beer, David C.
Buechel, Donald R.
*Cruft, George E.
Drips, Robert C.
Dunn, Seldon C.
Durden, Charles S., Jr.
Greene, Lynne T.
*Hayes, William E.
*Kaufman, Paul
Long, James A.
Neptune, Edgar M., Jr.
Noer, Harold R.
Palmer, Robert H., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Richardson, Fred W.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Steen, Frank G.
Wilber, Martin C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armlin, James F.
Bain, Louis E.
Baird, Richard S.
Baker, William R.
*Barger, Conrad A.
*Beckham, John J.
Bevill, Andrew F.
*Boswell, Harold
Brown, Emlin N., Jr.
*Burrus, Elgie L.
Chance, Carl
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Conover, Donald T.
Corley, James O.
*Daniel, Charles, Jr.
*Darrow, Robert W. H.
Dester, John M.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Elkins, Robert H.
*Elmore, John W.
*Fink, William W., Jr.
*Fitchett, George L.
Forrest, James E.
Gillis, Charles L.
Goolsby, Loyd
Gralla, Eugene
Haley, Robert S.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Haslett, Robert H.
Henderson, Robyn H.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Hughes, Thomas W., Jr.
*Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
*Kelleher, John C.
Knight, Richard H.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
Leclert, Arthur C.
Lewis, Raymond O.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
*Martin, James R.
*McDugald, Jesse
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
Moore, Vincent P., Jr.
Nickson, Roy E.
Olson, Robert S.
Peffley, John F.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rinetti, Edward J.
*Roche, Francis
*Rodgers, Wallace F.
Schar, Kenneth A.
*Simpson, James F.
Small, Joseph T.
Spargo, Robert A.
*Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
Statia, William W.
Stewart, Robert W.
Surran, Charles R.
Tinney, Richard T.
Tongren, Hale N.
Uskievich, Byron
*Wilson, Wilbur A. G.
Wingo, Rodney K.
Woolard, Kenneth A.
Wright, William D.
Yearick, William A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Brenneman, Marshall E.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Deal, Robert L.
Dennis, Arthur W.
*Emerson, James E.
Hayes, Henry H.
Herrmann, Theodore C.
Hopkins, Ralph W.
Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
*Keeley, John A.
Lavin, Henry T.
*Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
*Pigott, Charles S.
*Power, Bashford S.
Power, Joseph G.
*Radcliffe, Robert W.
*Ray, Milton U.
Sullivan, Mark
*Trower, Ross H.
Vincer, John D.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, John C.
Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Bartlett, Robert B.
*Bixby, Paul
*Blevins, "W" "J"
Brantner, William B.
Burton, George W.
*Cunning, David P.
*Daggett, Robert E.
Dennis, Johnnie C.
Diehl, Charles E.
*Divoll, Richard L.
Doyle, Paul J., Jr.
*Eding, Lawrence H.
Farley, Robert J.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
*Gault, Alan C.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
*Hansen, Bernard L.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Heuston, Robert H.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Klingenmeier, Russell J., Jr.
LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
More, David C.
*Oldham, Herron
O'Neill, Lawrence F.
Patrick, Donald A.
*Patrick, Jason M.
Peacock, Francis B.
*Pollard, Andrew M.
*Reese, William R., Jr.
Saunders, Edward M.
Seitz, Carl R.
Snow, Arthur W.
Souder, Charles L.
Spangler, William S.
Stiffler, Lloyd E., Jr.
VanLeer, Blake W.
Vaughan, James H., Jr.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Yount, George R.
Zirzow, Charles F.

DENTAL CORPS

*Carlson, Theodore E.
Counsell, Lee A.
Dunn, John J.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Holmes, Corey H.
Mahoney, Jack D.
Samuels, Homer S.
*Scribner, James H.
Stephenson, Thomas D.
Taber, Donald S.
Timberlake, Robert W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Anderson, William F.
Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
*Bowman, Clarence W.
*Boyd, Thomas A., Jr.
*Brooks, Euris J.
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
*Carson, Ralph
Chapman, William H.
Civiello, Harold J.
Clauss, Edward L.
*Coggburn, Manfred W.
*Eastman, Robert W.
*Essman, Frederick B.
Ethridge, John W.
*Frazier, Florence M.
*Guidry, Joseph A.
*Hollis, Thomas L.
Hunt, Bernhard H.
Kelly, Joseph A.
*Kinder, James W.
*King, Arthur N.
*LeBleu, Harry W.
*Longest, Nova
*Manley, Woodrow C.
*Martorano, Joseph J.
*Mayberry, Frank L.
*McLellan, David J.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moore, Daniel D.
*Ottie, Frederick O.
Parker, James H.
*Pedersen, Arthur S.
*Pellarin, Victor L.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
*Raybourn, Byron C.
*Sabbag, George J.
*Shepherd, William H.
*Sinclair, Harry E.
Smith, Forbes H.
Sontag, Frank B.
Sorger, Frank J.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
*Tunks, Omar A.
*Wade, Daryle A.

NURSE CORPS

Brown, Mary J.
Scheips, Edna M.
Smoker, Sue E.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Abelein, Herman C.
*Adams, Joseph A.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Aldern, Donald D.
Allen, James A.
Allen, John B.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
*Alsager, Richard H.
Alvis, John G.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, Lyle C.
*Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Paul L.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J., III
Andrew, Neil H.
Angier, Donald L.
Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Antar, Albert
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Armstrong, John E.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Ashmore, Jackie K.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Augustine, William F.
Aus, Charles A.
Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Austin, James M.
Averitt, Gordon F.
Babbitt, James A., Jr.
*Bachtold, James R.
Bacon, James A.
Baggett, Talmadge S.
Bailey, Gilliam M.
Bain, Robert
Baker, James E., Jr.
Baker, James G.
Baker, Richard L.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ballew, Richard F., Jr.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
*Barker, Harold D.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, Philip A.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrow, Robert W.
Bartholomew, John L.
Bartz, Donald P.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Bauer, Edward C.
Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stanley L.
Beck, Stuart M.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Bell, Gerald R.
Benton, Hugh A.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bergman, Daniel
Bibby, Lowe H., III
Bickel, William B.
Bigenho, Roy M.
*Bippus, Henry
Birdsong, Harold S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bish, Arthur A.
Blackwell, Bishop B.
Blasi, Richard R.
*Boakes, William H.
Boone, Robert R.
Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
Bouknight, Foy H.
Bowen, Albert S., III
Bowen, Jack W.
*Bowers, Thomas L.
Bowling, William H.
Brady, Allen C.
Brainard, Donald R.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Branch, Alvin D.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bres, John H.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridgham, Russell B.
Briggs, Douglas W.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brodie, Robert, III
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Brown, Bruce W.
*Brown, Peter G.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryant, William R.
Buck, John A.
*Buck, Robert A.

Buffkin, John W., Jr.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burke, William J.
Burke, William F.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
Burrows, Herbert J.
Burton, Herbert O.
Busch, Roland G.
Bush, Charles L.
Butts, John L.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Calhoun, William P.
Callahan, Earle R.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Carden, Marshall B., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
*Carlson, Burford A.
Carlson, George R.
Carpenter, Walter H.
Carraway, Terry F.
Carter, Edward W., III
Caskey, Donald L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Cauffman, Charles E.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Chandler, Hamilton A.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, Howard M. Jr.
Charnas, Steve C.
Chereskin, Howard
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Childers, Donald J.
Childs, John T.
Childs, Richard V.
Christensen, Earl D.
Christenson, Donald A.
*Church, George A.
Church, John H.
*Clarke, John R.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
*Clemens, Robert F.
Coale, William A.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Cole, William F., Jr.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Robert S.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condon, Edward J.
Cone, Henry S., Jr.
Conlon, Frank S.
Cook, Carroll T.
Cooney, David M.
Cooper, Carleton R.
Corley, James W.
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotter, Charles L.
*Coulson, Eugene R.
Councell, Thomas S.
*Courtney, Robert A.
Crandall, Hal R.
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Criner, James E.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Crosby, Russell U.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Currie, Edgar I.
Dallaire, Richard P.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
*Dame, Harold E.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
Davey, Richard B.
Davis, Edward W.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Ralph H., Jr.
Davis, William J.
Decook, David W.
Defelice, Edward A.
Degnan, Francis J.
Dellinger, Donald B.
Derby, George K.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
*Dewing, Jay N.
DeWitt, Duane D.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dievendorff, Frank
Dill, Charles M.
*Dillahunty, Benjamin P.
Dittmar, Louis C.
*Dix, Robert D.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
*Dodd, Charles A.
Dodd, Robert L.
Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, Burton L., Jr.
Donnelly, John D.
Downs, Leslie R.
Duffy, Charles G., Jr.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dumont, Sidney P., Jr.
*Dunaway, Gene T.
Dungan, John D.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Earl, William C.
Easterling, Crawford A.
Eckert, Richard H.
*Eckhout, Wilmot S.
Eckstein, John R.
Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, Chester C.
*Ehleringer, Henry G.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
*Ellis, James L.
Ellis, Richard M.
*Ellison, David J.
Englehart, Harry J.
*Erhart, James W.
Erkelens, Clarence
*Estabrook, Robert K.
Estes, Dana, II
*Estes, Leland F.
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, Dorrance O.
Evans, George J.
Evans, LaVerne E.
Fagan, Edward J.
Farrell, John R.
Farren, Merritt C.
*Feit, Harry H., Jr.
*Feldman, Harry G.
Fenton, Robert E.
Fiore, Harold J.
Fite, Albert B.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fleming, Michael J. J.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Forrester, James E.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foster, William F.
Fox, Kenneth
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Frei, Donald P.
Fremd, Harry L.
French, Jack T.
*Freund, Charles G.
Friedman, Arthur C.
Friend, Joseph F.
Frost, William L.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
*Furey, Francis D.
Gaches, John W.
Gale, Robert D.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Lawrence E.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gallegos, Prudenso S.
Gamber, Harold W.
Gardner, Richard C.
Gardner, Richmond
Garner, Charles H.
Garrett, Bernard H.
Garrett, Charles I., Jr.
Garrett, Everett C.
Gearhart, Norman R.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Gibson, Charles L.
Gilbertson, John E.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Gillcrist, Paul T.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
*Gnos, Kenneth R.
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
*Goodwin, George E.
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Art W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
*Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Grady, Edward L., Jr.
Graf, Harry R.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grayson, William R.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, John N.
Green, Richard W.
Green, Robert E.
Gregg, Robert F.
*Griffin, Jack R.
Grozier, Roy E.
Guffey, Elton E.
Guion, Joseph E.
Haack, Donald E.
Hackett, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Hall, Harrell W.
Hall, Thomas D.
Hall, Timothy K.
Halleck, William L.
Hallett, Edward R.
Hamilton, John W.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hansen, Merle C.
Harber, Russell L.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Harnden, Charles G.
Harper, Lorren G.
Harris, Elvin R.
*Harshbarger, John F.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Stephen L.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Hartigan, Richard B.
*Hartley, Jack H.
Harvey, William T.
*Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
Hausler, Carl O.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Robert W.
*Hayes, Winston R.
Hayman, Robert B.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Head, John L.
Hedges, Corky J. W.
*Heigl, John T., Jr.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herbert, Thomas J.
Herbig, Henry F.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Herrin, Holden R.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Highleyman, Searle F.
*Hill, Howard A.
*Hill, James C.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hinsen, Kenneth L.
Hobbs, James "B"
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hofmockel, John L.
Hogan, Francis W.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., II
Holine, Leif A.
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holt, Robert E.
Honey, Arthur C., Jr.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopper, Richard S.
Hossfeld, James F.
Hounihan, John C.
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
*Hubbs, Donald R.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Humphries, George P.
Hunt, Albert M.
Hurd, Russell E.
Husbands, Joseph M.
Ingram, Billy G.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Bobby R.
Inman, Richard P.
Irby, Charles R.
*Irish, George E.
Irwin, Wayne R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jacks, Robert G.
*Jaeger, Adolphus F.
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jeffries, Rollin E., Jr.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jennings, John S.
Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Darl W.
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Joseph J.
*Johnson, Richard C.
*Johnston, Frederick B.
Johnstone, Richard A.
Joiner, Orrin
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Jubb, Donald E.
Kalakowski, Joseph E.
*Katz, Martin
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keeney, David J.
Keihner, James K.
Kelly, Lawrence J.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelly, Ellis G.
Kemble, John R.
Kennedy, Nevin, III
Kephart, Robert D.
Kerr, Robert G.
Kertz, Jacob D.
Kilmer, Donald A.
Kimball, William A.
King, Cecil
King, William R.
*Kingery, Samuel G.
Kinnaird, Martin J.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Kirchner, David P.
Kirk, John J.
Klabo, Richard T.
Klett, George J.
Knutson, Donald W.
Koch, Richard A.
Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Kosonen, Charles G.
Kozel, William J.
Kramer, Robert P.
Kubel, Samuel R.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Lacy, James E.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Larson, Charles D.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leach, Everett N.
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
Leibold, William R.
*Leis, Alfred C.
Lentz, Charles M.
Leppin, William F., Jr.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Lewallen, John D.
Lewis, Charles B.
Lewis, James R.
Liberato, Frank A.
Libey, John D.
Lilienfeld, Joe J.
Lindsay, John D.
*Lipchak, Edward A.
Liston, John M.
Little, James G.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Longhi, William J.
Love, Henry H., Jr.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
Luskin, Arthur G.
MacAulay, Angus
MacAuley, George W.
MacFie, Richard B.
Mack, Robert P.
Madden, Raymond A.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Malone, Roy W.
*Marangiello, Daniel A.
Marin, William T.
Marr, William F.
*Martin, Calvin W.
*Martin, William K.
Martin, William R.
Mattioni, Biasco
Maxwell, Daryl O.
Maxwell, Leslie J.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
Mazzolini, John A.
McAlister, George C.
*McAnulty, David J.
McBain, Robert F.
McBurney, William J.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCoy, Robert B.
McCrary, Dewey W.
McCumber, Harold E.
McDonald, Robert P.
McDonnel, Harold A.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McFadden, Albert J., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGlone, Lawrence H.
McGrath, Harold A.
McGuire, Eugene J.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKee, Samuel T.
McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McLaughlin, Dean N.
McLemore, Albert S.
McLoughlin, James
McMurray, William C.
McNally, John H.
*McNerney, James F.
McQuestion, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Mehl, James P.
Melim, Robert D.
Mench, Leland E.
Merchant, Paul G.
Merritt, Glen C.
*Metcalf, Joseph, III
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, James P.
Miller, Robert L.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
*Mitchell, Joe C.
Mitchell, John R. C.
Moffitt, Russel L.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moore, Larry E.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
Morgan, James E.
Moriarty, Peter M.
Morin, Richard J.
Morris, Howard L.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrow, Charles D.
Mow, Douglas F.
Moyer, Donald R.
Mueller, George E.
Mullen, Roger F.
Mullin, James
Munro, Ernest A.
Muros, Ralph L.
*Murray, Douglas V.
Muto, Charles J.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Neild, Arthur W.
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
*Nelson, Harry J., Jr.
Neustel, Arthur D.
Nevius, William B.
*Newlund, Robert L.
Nix, Henry B.
North, Sylvester F.
Nunneley, John K.
Nunneley, James K.
Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Leo F.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
O'Hara, Jack F.
Ohls, Karl E.
Oldfield, Charles B., III
Oliphant, Don "L"
Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
Olson, Willard R.
Orem, John B., Jr.
O'Riley, Vernon E.
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Owens, Robert L.
Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
Paddock, Charles O.

Padgett, James P.
*Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Paisley, Harrison B.
*Palau, Henry S.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Parks, John T.
Parks, William W.
Parthemer, Lloyd L.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
*Patterson, William W., Jr.
Patterson, Jerry C.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Pentony, John F.
*Perry, Roger E., Jr.
Pescott, Robert
Peters, Robert E.
Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.
Peterson, Richard E.
*Pette, Donald C.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Peugh, Everett R.
Pfeiff, Robert L.
*Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, Harry E.
*Phillips, Lawrence E.
Phillips, William R.
Pinkerton, Roy "T"
Pinning, Joseph E.
Piraino, Daniel
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Pittman, Jack R.
Pogue, David W.
Pototsky, William J.
Powell, John J.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Prescott, Richard J.
Proctor, Sumner M., Jr.
Prosser, Walter R.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
*Radja, James E.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, David G.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Rapp, Fred L.
Ray, Thermon L.
Ray, Thomas B.
Read, Garlin R.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Redfield, John M.
Redman, James R.
Reed, Robert K.
Regan, William B.
Reid, Albert R.
Remsen, "T" Schenck
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Richardson, Robert L.
Richardson, Richard H.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Robbins, Allan W.
Roberts, Robert T.
Roberts, Robert
Robertson, Douglas B.
*Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Robert B.
*Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerred R.
Rogers, James O.
Rohde, Robert D.
Root, John B., Jr.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Rubey, William A.
Rubin, Arnold J.
*Rubins, Frederick K.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Rue, Harland J., II
Rueff, Eugene C.
Ruggiero, Michael E.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
*Russ, Jack E.
Rutherford, Ralph B.
Rylee, James E.
Salin, Robert S.
Sandberg, William G.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saul, Elmer L.
Sayers, Clay S.
*Saylor, Eugene H.
*Schaber, Rolph E.
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schulte, Richard J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schutz, Walter J.
Schwartz, Sheldon O.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Self, William H. C.
Semeraro, Angelo P.
Seward, John A., Jr.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Shaver, Frank T.
Shearer, Peter S.
Sheely, Donald M.
*Sheffield, Hughie D.
Sherman, Peter W.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shutty, Michael S.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
Simcox, James G.
Simmons, Kenneth J.
Simmons, Robert R.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Skube, Edward A.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smellie, Rex D.
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Douglas J.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Stanford A.
Smith, William F.
Smyth, James M.
Sobieski, Leonard J.
Sollinger, David A.
Solterer, Carl F.
Soracco, David L.
Spencer, John R.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Howard C.
Stader, John F.
Stafford, Richard M.
Staheli, Gerald D.
Stallings, Alfred K.
Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
Stanley, Gregory W.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Richard M.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
Steckbauer, Theodore C.
Stein, George D., Jr.
Stenke, George
Stephan, Robert A.
Stephenson, Donald L.
Stevens, Ralph H.
Stewart, Gene R.
Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Stewart, Thomas P.
Still, Donald A.
Stine, Leon L., Jr.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
St. Marie, Joseph
Stocklmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Storm, John S.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stratmann, Charles I.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strohm, James J.
Stromski, Alexander S.
Stubbs, Robert C.
Stump, John M.
Sullivan, Edward T.
Sundstrom, Alex L.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Surovik, George A.
Swank, Donald E.
Swart, Robert L., Jr.
Szymanski, Andrew G.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Francis C.
Tennison, Lonnie D.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Preston G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, William S.
Thomson, William O.
Thornburg, Thomas H.
Tillotson, Ted K.
Tillson, John G.
*Timoney, Gerald P.
*Tinkham, John A.
*Tobias, Ralph W.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
*Tomb, Paul D.
Tomsky, Jackson M.
Townsend, "G" "E"
Traub, Charles, III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Trens, Mike J.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
*Troter, Thomas K.
Trout, Thomas W.
*Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Turnbull, James R.
Turner, Keith S.
Tuzo, Paul B., III
Uehlinger, John C.
Uhrig, William R.
Ulen, Victor A.
*Utterback, Paul W.
Vahsen, George M.
Vail, Harold W.
Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Vandermolen, Dale R.
VanDeweghe, Raymond
VanHook, Gordon R.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
VonChristierson, William W.
Vrieze, Edwin H., III
Wadsworth, Francis L.
*Wales, John R.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Ware, Owen H.
Warner, Brooks F.
*Wartman, Albert C., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Wassell, James W.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Waterhouse, Charles N.
Watson, Peter J.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Weeks, Robert H.
Wehner, William A.
Weisheit, Burton A.
Welch, Bernard W.
Welch, Clyde R.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wells, William H.
Wenzel, Robert F.
West, Floyd P.
Wettroth, John R.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Maurice G.
White, Steven A.
Whiteleather, Charles H., Jr.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
*Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whyte, Kent E.
*Wigent, Richard A.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wildauer, Paul A.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, John T.
Williams, John D.
Williams, Ross N.
*Williams, Robert L.
Williamson, Donald A.
Willis, Francis R.
Willson, Donald M.
*Wilson, Clarence E.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
*Wilson, William W.
Winberg, William, III
*Winfrey, Harvey M. Jr.
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wood, Lewis I.
Wood, Stephen C.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Wooden, Neal R.
Worden, Dwight G.
Wright, Merritt R.
Wylie, David C.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yeager, George E.
Yearous, Glenn W.
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Robert A.
*Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to chief warrant officer, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W–3

Ace, Robert F.
Ayres, Gordon K.
Gilmore, Francis L.
Harkins, Billy M.
James, William B.
Kay, James R.
Keesling, Norman O.
Mitchell, William J.
Norris, Francis C., Jr.
Pangle, Jacob W.
Petersen, James C.
Quinlan, Charles M.

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W–4

Alexander, Silas R.
Baker, Millard T.
Belcoe, Melbert V.
Borgens, John
Byrd, Raymond R.
Cannon, Jesse D.
Carleton, Jack E. L.
Castelli, Ramon P.
Christiansen, Arnold M.
Clooney, William T.
Covington, John R.
Crouch, Kenneth L.
Dingess, Naaman
Doud, Robert H.
Dunnigan, George J.
Egger, Wayne I.
Foster, Orlon C.
Goerner, Ralph T., Jr.
Good, Adolph
Hall, Jimmie C.
Hanson, Harley C.
Hardin, Jasper S.
Harris, Robert S.
Hayes, Jack E.
Hewitt, Albert L.
Hicks, Jeptha B.
Holdgrafer, Ambrose H.
Holmes, Herbert M.
Hunter, Clifford D.
Kasprzak, Edward G.
Locker, John C.
Mauldin, William L.
Maxwell, Frank L.
Mayle, Arthur E.
Miller, Claude W.
Mulkins, Blair D.
Mumford, Lloyd K.
McGinley, James P., Jr.
McKamey, Robert W.
McKim, Mark E.
O'Leary, Robert P.
Smith, Paul J.
Snyder, David W.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Tinnell, Eldridge G.
Turnipseed, Mike W.
Tye, Litton E.
Wilson, Reid
Wolf, Kenneth R.
Woods, Norman G.
Young, Leroy
Zatorski, John F.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Harrison, Elizabeth S.
Truitt, Beatrice M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Barton, Margaret E.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Arenth, Rosemary D.
Barteau, Celia L.
Gore, Mary A.
Kraff, Lorraine
Linderman, Mary J.
Lloyd, Rebecca A.
McKee, Fran
Safford, Charlotte L.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adsit, Carol A.
Baker, Roberta R.
Barker, Cathryn J.
Burch, Mary J.
Burman, Rita M.
Chapman, Barbara R.
Cheatham, Nonna E.
Davies, Alice L.
Driver, Mary L.
Glover, Elizabeth B.
Grantham, Diana B.
Green, Jeannette E.
Hess, Carleen R.
Higgins, Maria S.
Jackson, Virginia E.
Miller, Sarah L.
Moore, Ida R.
Pea, Mary E.
Rogers, Elaine R.
Skoff, Jordine C.
Vogler, Velma R.
Williams, Barbara M.
Wilson, Margaret A.

Paul Wohl, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Lloyd R. Evans, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Alden, Robert F.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
Brown, Thomas W.
Compton, William H.
Cox, Duane A.
DeNoon, Norman L.

Doe, Burdell F.
Frederick, Keith J.
Gales, George M.
Geraldson, Elmer L.
Gray, Fred, III
Hickman, Thomas W.
Keller, Joseph A.
Kerman, William O.
Louis, David R., Jr.
Masson, Robert H.
McCauley, George K.
Murdoch, Thomas M.
Seidel, Melvin L.
Simmons, James L.
Tarkowski, Donald C.
Thomas, John D.
Vaiana, James C.
Wilson, Claude D., Jr.
Wolfe, Philip W.
Young, Wayne G.

SUPPLY CORPS

Basley, Raymond C.
Brown, Alan S.
Davis, John R.
Doddridge, Benjamin F.
Gavin, Victor M.
Govig, Melvin E.
Tyree, David M., Jr.
Weller, Thomas C., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Podbielski, Victor

NURSE CORPS

Calloway, Emily F.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

LINE

To be captains

Adams, John P.
Allen, Hartsel D.
Alley, Charles J.
Anderson, Elmer D.
Anderson, Herbert H.
Anderson, Roy G.
Andrews, Burton H.
Andrews, Clyde C.
Andrews, Thomas L., Jr.
Auman, Forrester C.
Bacon, Schuyler W.
Badger, Heber J.
Baker, Carl S.
Balaban, Stephen F.
Ball, George G.
Ball, George C., Jr.
Ball, Thomas J.
Bangs, Louis L.
Barackman, Bruce MacD.
Barnhart, Robert E.
Bassett, Henry B.
Baughan, Robert L., Jr.
Bauser, Edward J.
Baxter, Robert J.
Beardall, John R., Jr.
Beauchamp, Ernest M.
Bellis, Charles A.
Bennett, John E.
Benton, Burgin "L"
Bienvenu, Roland G.
Bikle, Burton L.
Bjornson, Gordon B.
Blandin, Victor A.
Borden, Paul F.
Bowell, John H.
Bowen, John S.
Boyle, John E., Jr.
Bradway, William S., Jr.
Brandt, George E., Jr.
Brines, George R.
Brinn, Rufus T.
Brittin, Burdick H.
Brooks, Sidney
Brown, Gordon J.
Brownlow, Paul J.
Bryan, William C.
Buell, Thomas C.
Bunn, Giles F., Jr.
Burbage, Charles L.
Burley, Thomas G., Jr.
Burnett, Louis R.
Byrnside, Benjamin C., Jr.
Cagle, Malcolm W.
Calland, Robert W.
Camera, John A.
Campbell, Donald C.
Cappello, Henry J.
Carlisle, Geoffrey E.
Carlson, Ralph B.
Carmichael, Carl
Carney, Gerald F.
Carpenter, William M.
Carr, Charles H.
Carter, William D.
Chalmers, Norman E.
Chandler, Ralph S.
Charbonnet, Pierre N., Jr.
Christiansen, Arnold R.
Clark, Asa A., III
Clark, Cecil
Clark, Robert B.
Clinton, Jack W.
Coats, Robert C.
Cocowitch, Harry M.
Collingwood, John F.
Combs, Paul C.
Compton, Oliver D.
Compton, Raymond F.
Cone, Davis
Connolly, John M., Jr.
Cook, George C.
Cook, Ralph E.
Cooper, Damon W.
Cooper, James S.
Corcoran, William J.
Corneliussen, Steven T.
Costagliola, Francesco
Cowart, Andrew H.
Cox, Harry C.
Coyle, James J.
Cramp, Kenneth W.
Crawford, Joseph W., Jr.
Crockett, David S.
Crommelin, Quentin C.
Cross, William H.
Crowe, John W.
Cuccias, Francis P.
Cunnare, Francis H.
Daly, George W.
Damon, Arthur H., Jr.
Daniels, Lowell P.
Darby, Lowel E.
Darrah, Charles A.
Davenport, John B.
Davidson, James J.
Davis, Bernard W.
Davis, Maxey B.
Davol, Charles D., Jr.
Delano, Victor
Denegre, Thomas B., Jr.
Dertien, Donald A.
De Venter, Willard W.
Dinneen, John H.
Doherty, John C.
Dolan, John H.
Donahue, John C., II
Donahue, Philip M.
Dorrington, Joseph F.
Douglas, George M.
Dowdell, James S.
Drain, Dan T.
Drake, James P.
Dresser, Kenneth R.
Dreyer, Oscar F.
Drum, Henry W.
Duke, John M., Jr.
Dupzyk, Robert R.
Earnest, Albert K.
Eason, Van V., Jr.
Easterling, Henry McC.
Ebright, Myrton T.
Edelstein, Sam E., Jr.
Eder, Willard E.
Edwards, Frank G.
Edwards, Frederick L., Jr.
Eggen, Arnold W.
Elliott, August W., Jr.
Elliott, James B., Jr.
Englander, Felix L.
Engle, Aubrey D.
English, Elbert H., Jr.
Erdmann, Robert F.
Ereckson, Henry J., Jr.
Evers, Adelbert R.
Fairchild, Dale E.
Fears, Charles L.
Felter, John F.
Field, Henry C., Jr.
Fleet, John P.
Floyd, Joe H.
Flynn, David R.
Foltz, Gayle C.
Fonvielle, Charles D., Jr.
Foster, Edward L.
Foster, Richard E.
Foster, William McA.
Frazier, Walter J.
Freitag, Robert F.
French, Dana P.
Gaddis, Walter D.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
Garrett, Ned
Garvey, Richard S.
Gee, Roy P.
Gerry, Duane J.
Gibbs, Harry B.
Glassman, David E.
Gooch, Floyd W., Jr.
Gooding, Robert C.
Gordon, Archer R.
Gorman, Frederick E.
Grabowsky, Leon
Gray, Paul N.
Griber, Peter A. M.
Griffing, Charles W.
Gruber, Richard D.
Guillory, Troy T.
Gundlach, William
Gustaferro, Joseph F.
Guy, Robert S.
Hackett, James E., Jr.
Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
Hagerman, George M.
Hailey, Robert
Hall, Harvey W., Jr.
Haller, Morris E.
Harding, William T.
Hardy, Lewis R., Jr.
Harrell, Robert B.
Harris, Raymond M.
Harrison, Edward W.
Harrold, Clay
Hart, Clarence M.
Hatch, William N.
Hawes, George M.
Hayler, Robert W., Jr.
Hennessey, Thomas V.
Hickman, Howard H., Jr.
Higgins, Edward M.
Hildreth, James B.
Hill, Raymond E.
Hirshfeld, Ross R.
Hirst, William B., Jr.
Hitchcock, John H.
Hodson, Norman D.
Hoffberg, Howard J.
Hokr, Joseph E.
Holm, Stanley R.
Holmes, John L., Jr.
Holmes, Paul L.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Hopkins, Lewis A.
Horner, Thomas L.
Houghton, James C.
Houser, William D.
Howard, Seth T.
Huey, Enders P.
Hunt, Edward R.
Iarrobino, John H.
Ireland, James M.
Issitt, Donald K.
Ivison, Sterling H., Jr.
Jackson, Clifton E.
Jackson, David H.
Jackson, Harry A.
Jackson, Wyman N.
James, Daniel V.
Jamison, James P.
Jeffery, Robert E.
Johns, Ruben L.
Johnson, Edward B., Jr.
Jones, Joseph M.
Jones, Stuart C.
Jones, William W.
Kalin, Morris I.
Keegan, John P.
Keehn, Robert H.
Kelly, Charles B.
Kennedy, John E.
Kenner, Jack L.
Kern, Donald H.
Kidd, Isaac C., Jr.
Kiefer, Edwin H.
Kilner, John S., Jr.
King, Ira M.
King, Jerome H., Jr.
Kiracofe, Warren C.
Kittler, Fred W.
Kittrell, James R.
Klingaman, Leon C.
Knoche, Ernest J.
Knowlton, Negus W.
Kobey, Albert L., Jr.
Koenigsberger, Charles, Jr.
Kooy, Herman P.
Kosciusko, Henry M.
Kotsch, William J.
Kroger, Bruce G.
Laforest, Thomas J.
Lane, Stanley H.
Lange, Robert V.
Lanterman, William S., Jr.
LaRocque, Gene R.
LaRoe, Edward T.
Larson, Lewis E., Jr.
Lauff, Bernard J.
Leahy, Harold G.
Lee, Norman I., Jr.
Lee, Robert E., Jr.
Leidel, John S.
Lemos, William E.
Lewis, Allen L.
Lewiston, William A.
Lienhard, Bernard A.
Lilly, Percy A., Jr.
Lloyd, Frederic M., III
Lockett, Lawrence S.
Long, Andrew W., Jr.
Lowe, Grady H.
Luce, William T.
Luehman, Earl A.
Lungren, Arthur E.
Lynch, James P.
Lynn, Joseph
Lyon, Hugh P.
McGregor, Stephen H., Jr.
Macklin, Robert D.
MacMillan, Oscar D.
Macri, Guiseppi
Maddocks, William J.
Marquardt, Richard C.
Marshall, James M.
Marzetta, Dante R.
Mason, Frank V.
Mathew, Robert H., Jr.
Matton, William G., Jr
Maxwell, Frederick W., Jr.
Mayer, Lucas B.
Mayher, John R.
McCormick, Thomas E., Jr.
McDevitt, Joseph B.
McDonald, Maxwell "D"
McEntire, Paul W.
McIntosh, David M.
McKee, John R.
McLaughlin, Bernard
McNulty, Willard J.
McQuown, Wymard "B", Jr.
Meadors, William W.
Medley, Russel "C"
Melson, Lewis B.
Menge, Robert F.
Merill, David A.
Messer, John G.
Micheel, Vernon L.
Middleton, Roderic O.
Mildahn, Elwood C.
Miller, Ashton C., Jr.
Miller, Edward G.
Miller, Gerald E.
Miller, Jack A.
Miller, Robert N.
Milota, Robert F.
Minor, Gerald E.
Minton, Robert B.
Mishan, John E.
Mohl, Edgar V.
Moitoret, Victor A.
Molitor, Francis R.
Moore, Howard N.
Moriarty, Thomas J.
Morrison, George S.
Morrissey, Jack L.
Morton, Albert O.
Muckenthaler, Charles P., Jr.
Murphy, Frank McL.
Murphy, Walter P., Jr.
Myers, Fredrick R.
Neese, William G.
Nelms, Kenneth S.
Nelson, Charles E.
Nelson, John B.
Neman, Sol
Newland, John R.
Newsom, John W.
Nichols, Keith G.
Nicholson, William M.
Norrington, William E., Jr.
Norton, Marvin D., Jr.
Norvell, Forrest H., Jr.
Oliver, Ray E.
Oliver, William B.
Olson, Donald K.
O'Neil, Vernon P.
O'Neill, Harold J.
Orme, Samuel T.
Osborne, Manley C.
Osterhoudt, Raymond S.
Ousey, Walter M.
Owen, William D., Jr.
Palmer, Grant A., Jr.
Parisian, Richard W.
Parker, Elwin A.
Parris, Arthur
Paulin, William B.
Pease, Forrest A.
Pendergrass, James T.
Penfold, Jack R.
Pennoyer, Frederick W., III
Pittman, William R.
Plate, Douglas C.
Plemons, Arnold G.
Pollard, Eric W.
Porter, Ebenezer F.
Potter, James A., III
Poulsen, Harold N.
Prince, Mortimer J.
Pugh, Harry M.
Quigley, Donald F.
Quinn, Charles S., Jr.
Rahill, Gerald W.
Rau, Robert E.
Rawlings, Grover L.
Ray, Alan
Rayburn, Joseph H., Jr.
Redmayne, Richard B.
Reeves, Gerald McG.
Reidy, John J., Jr.
Reitz, Spencer
Rex, Daniel F.
Ricks, Robert B.
Rifenburgh, Edward G.
Riley, George B.
Ring, Eli D.
Roberts, Francis R.
Rodin, Harry C.
Rodman, William B., IV
Rood, George H.
Rowen, William H.
Rowney, James V.
Rubel, David M.
Ruder, Frederick J.
Ruefle, William J.
Rush, Charles W., Jr.
Russell, Allard G.
Sallenger, Asbury H.
Salyer, Herbert L., Jr.
Salzer, Robert S.
Sanborn, Francis R.
Sandor, Edward A.
Sanger, Frank M., Jr.
Santry, Jere J., Jr.
Satterfield, Loys M.
Savage, Lowell C.
Saveker, David R.
Scapa, Jacob
Schaible, Theodore C.
Scherrer, Carl L.
Schley, John B.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Schweer, William W.
Seith, William
Sessums, Walter M.
Shallenberg, Lowell W.
Sharratt, George S. H., Jr.
Shaw-Corthorn, George
Shear, Harold E.
Shelton, Samuel M.
Shew, James E.
Shockey, William H.
Showers, Donald M.
Shropshire, Paul H., Jr
Shults, Roy G.
Shutt, Richard G.
Siefert, Jerry R.
Silberstein, Howard J.
Simmons, Kenneth G.
Sims, John H.
Sisk, Hoke M.
Smalzel, Charles W.
Smith, Carl M.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Smith, Coleman H.
Smith, Thomas P., Jr.
Smits, Cornelius J., Jr.
Sorensen, Robert E.
Sotos, George P.
Southard, Pemberton
Spencer, John C.
Spitler, Joseph C.
Spore, Burns W.
Stanziano, Arthur J.
Staring, Merlin H.
Starkey, Robert C.

Steen, Kenneth
Sterling, Stoughton, Jr.
Stetson, Thomas H.
Steuckert, Julius F.
Stevens, Paul F., Jr.
Stevens, Wynne A., Jr.
Stone, Frank B.
Stonecipher, Elmer T.
Strieter, Robert M.
Strum, Charles G.
Styer, Charles W., Jr.
Svendsen, Edward C.
Swacker, Stewart W.
Swain, Dean H.
Swayne, Charles B.
Sweatt, Robert A.
Sweeny, James B., Jr.
Sweeny, John
Swenson, Winford A.
Talbot, Wallace L., Jr.
Tappan, Benjamin
Tebo, Kenneth M.
Tenanty, Joseph R.
Terrill, Ralph "B"
Terry, John H.
Thomas, Willis L.
Thompson, Joseph E., Jr.
Thomson, James R.
Thro, John B.
Todd, Forrest A.
Towle, Barnaby L.
Trauger, Robert J.
Traynor, Laurence G.
Tripp, Jack H.
Trudeau, Russell F.
Turner, Thomas A.
Tvedt, Joseph A.
Vail, Powell P., Jr.
Vanderburg, Elden R.
Venne, Antoine W., Jr.
Walkinshaw, David J.
Wallace, John G.
Warns, James T.
Watson, John M.
Wayne, John B.
Weary, Neil S.
Weatherwax, John C.
Welch, David F.
Werth, James M.
Weschler, Thomas R.
Westervelt, John D.
Whatton, James E.
Wheeler, Joseph C., Jr.
Whitaker, Malcolm W., Jr.
Whitman, William A.
Weir, John P.
Williams, Clyde A.
Williams, Robert E.
Windsor, Robert W., Jr.
Witten, Charles H.
Wittmann, Narvin O.
Wolfe, Malcolm E.
Wood, Albert H.
Wood, Harry W.
Worcester, Benjamin F., II
Wright, Clarence C.
Wright, Richard M.
Wyse, Frederick C., Jr.
Zimmerman, Milton A.
Zirkle, Joseph C., Jr.
Zurcher, Clarence J.

To be commanders

Adams, Benjamin W.
Adams, Ollie B.
Adamson, Robert E., Jr.
Ahrens, Alfred H.
Ainsworth, Herbert S.
Ajemian, Baret V.
Aldrich, James H.
Alexander, William H., II
Allen, Raymond W.
Almy, Charles B.
Amick, William C., Jr.
Anderson, Kenneth L.
Apple, Robert E.
Arbo, Paul E.
Arnold, Ernest S.
Arnold, Julian, Jr.
Asbury, David A.
Ashcroft, Jerome L., Jr.
Awtrey, Robert K., Jr.
Ayers, Arnold W.
Bach, Sverre O.
Bacheler, Theodore F.
Bacon, Americus V. H., Jr.
Bagby, Robert G.
Bagley, David H.
Baldwin, Lorenzo W., Jr.
Barber, Lester W.
Barbour, Henry S.
Barker, Arthur, Jr.
Barnes, George J.
Barrett, Frank O., Jr.
Barrow, William B., Jr.
Bartles, William H.
Bartlett, Albert J.
Bartlett, Richard C., Jr.
Barton, Francis D.
Bass, Kenneth L.
Bates, Sheldon "S"
Battson, Arthur LaG., Jr.
Baumann, Edward W.
Baumberger, Harold E.
Bedsole, Donald S.
Behrens, William W., Jr.
Bennett, George O.
Bennett, William L., Jr.
Benson, LaRoyd E.
Bergstedt, William C.
Berkstresser, Charles G.
Berree, Norman R.
Biche, Robert C.
Bicknell, John R.
Biddle, Edward
Biewer, Francis N.
Bird, Robert A.
Blaine, Ralph R.
Blakeman, James McN.
Blalack, Russell E.
Blockwick, Thomas N.
Bogan, Lewis F.
Bohan, Norman C.
Bonnett, Ira W.
Boose, William R.
Boscole, Robert A.
Bothwell, Robert L.
Bouldin, Jack F.
Boyes, Jon L.
Brady, Thomas J.
Breeden, George B.
Bristow, Robert I.
Brittingham, Stanley H.
Broadbent, Harvey, Jr.
Brock, Clarence C., Jr.
Brock, Marvin A.
Brooks, Daniel P.
Brooks, David M.
Brosnahan, James J.
Brouner, Albert M.
Brown, Thomas H.
Bryan, John I., Jr.
Buescher, Joseph H.
Burk, Raymond W.
Burlin, Charles W., Jr.
Burnell, Robert M.
Burnham, Fletcher H.
Butcher, Cecil O.
Butler, Hugh D.
Butler, William C.
Butt, Cyrus H.
Cabell, John B.
Caldwell, Harry H.
Cameron, Alan R.
Campbell, Charles B., Jr.
Campbell, Norman F.
Campbell, William C.
Capriotti, Anthony T., Jr.
Carlson, William S.
Carpenter, Albert P.
Carr, Robert T.
Carruth, Vincent DeP. D.
Carson, Albert C.
Casey, Martin M., Jr.
Casey, William C.
Cassani, Vincent L., Jr.
Castle, Hal C.
Catha, William H.
Cauble, Lawrence M.
Cavanaugh, Robert B.
Chadwick, Walter D.
Chandler, Alfred W., Jr.
Chapman, Tyrus C.
Chapman, William C.
Christman, Thomas J.
Clapp, Atlee F.
Clapp, Clarence M.
Clark, Gilbert L.
Clark, Morris Y.
Clift, Frank W., III
Colopy, Robert E.
Coogan, Robert P.
Cook, Creighton W.
Cook, Robert H.
Cook, William C.
Cooney, Lawrence F., Jr.
Cooper, Thomas H., III
Cornwall, Ernest S., Jr.
Cowdrey, Roy B.
Cox, Donald V.
Craig, Allan H.
Cramer, Shannon D., Jr.
Crandall, Charles N., Jr.
Crawford, Arthur G.
Creamer, John J.
Croft, Alfred R., Jr.
Cron, Robert H.
Crowder, Jonathan J.
Cruise, William H., Jr.
Crutchfield, Paul W., Jr.
Cryan, John J.
Cummings, Harry A.
Cummings, John N.
Cummins, Lawrence D.
Curts, Robert I.
Cutler, Henry O.
Dankworth, Theodore P.
Dannettell, Ralph, Jr.
Davidson, Edward A.
Davis, Donald C.
Davis, John F.
Davis, Robert J., Jr.
Dawson, Howard W.
Deal, Ronald A., Jr.
DeBuhr, Calvin H.
DeBuhr, Claude N.
DeHuff, David
DeLaMater, Stephen T. Jr.
De Largy, John M.
Dennis, Reyburn H., Jr.
DePrez, Richard J.
Dersam, Harold G.
DeWachter, Alphonse E.
Dillard, Thornwell M.
Dixon, Walter J., Jr.
Donaldson, John S.
Donnelly, Grant L.
Donnelly, William E., Jr.
Donovan, John F.
Dormer, Robert L.
Draper, Murray E.
Driscoll, John F.
Dumas, Glenn I.
Duncan, Derwood D.
Duncan, Gordon
Dunning, Harvey K.
Dusek, Charles C.
Dyar, Joseph E., Jr.
Eaton, Russell S., Jr.
Eimstad, Henry A.
Eldridge, Edgar A.
Elliott, Michael M.
Ely, Charles S., Jr.
Emig, Alvin F.
Engen, Donald D.
Engle, Raymond K.
Etter, William P.
Evans, Nicholas A.
Ewing, Harold T.
Fairbanks, John W.
Faubion, Richard D.
Fields, Louis B.
Filiatrault, Alfred C., Jr.
Fitton, Cyrus F.
Fitzpatrick, Wayne N.
Flanagan, William R.
Flannery, William J.
Flory, Edwin B.
Foltz, Ralph E.
Ford, Albert T.
Ford, Raymond E.
Foreman, Robert P.
Forsberg, Francis C.
Foss, Newton P.
Foster, William G.
Fowler, Richard E., Jr.
Frame, Ralph W., Jr.
Fritz, Charles W.
From, John L., Jr.
Furnas, Wendell J.
Gaibler, Richard
Gaiennie, George W.
Gallatin, Robert E.
Gaskin, Edward R.
Gear, Bud B.
Gibson, Richard H.
Gibson, Robert C.
Gibson, William C.
Gilliland, Theodore McE.
Gleason, Wesley A.
Glendinning, Bruce E.
Glenn, Hardy
Godfrey, Jack E.
Godman, Robert
Goodwin, John T.
Gorman, Henry
Goudie, Gene
Grace, Joseph A., II
Graning, Leonard G.
Grant, William W., Jr.
Greer, Howard E.
Grimes, Harold J.
Grosser, John F.
Grosskopf, Homer L., Jr.
Gummerson, Kenneth C.
Gustafson, Boyd E.
Gustafson, Robert B.
Hall, Francis H. S.
Halstrom, Paul R.
Hammett, Wayne E.
Hancotte, John J., Jr.
Hanecak, Richard G.
Hanssen, Henry R.
Harkins, John A.
Hartle, Maurice C.
Harwell, Payton O.
Havenstein, Paul L.
Hay, Lorin W.
Hayden, Charles H.
Heald, Joseph F.
Heard, Jack F.
Heg, James E.
Heiler, Frederick J.
Heintz, John W.
Henderson, David W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Hendrick, William J.
Hennessey, Charles A., Jr.
Herlong, Daniel W.
Herrick, Harvey S.
Herrick, John J.
Herron, Adam A., Jr.
Hickle, Robert E.
Hickman, Charles R.
Hile, William H., Jr.
Hill, Clarence A., Jr.
Hill, Russel S.
Hiller, Harold W.
Hills, Stetson P.
Hipp, Ernest C., Jr.
Hogan, Horace C., Jr.
Hoke, Leonard A., Jr.
Holbrook, James L.
Holloway, Ernest W.
Hollyfield, Ernest E., Jr.
Holmes, Audley W.
Holt, McHenry H.
Holter, Ralph K.
Homyak, James A.
Honour, Walter W.
Hooper, John H.
Horn, Dean A.
Horton, William G.
Howard, Leo T.
Howell, Jay S.
Hulten, Albert P.
Hutzel, Robert G.
Huxford, Richard W.
Ingram, James D.
Jackson, Ralph F.
Jacques, Donald J.
Jakubowski, Thaddeus J.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jennings, Carl R.
Jennings, Joe C.
Jennings, Major J.
Johnson, Charles R.
Johnson, Clarence R.
Johnson, David A.
Jones, George B.
Jonson, Russell M.
Joslin, Charles L., Jr.
Kane, John C., Jr.
Keller, Robert M.
Kelley, Edmond L.
Kendall, Jack D.
Kendall, Robert J.
Kenny, James P.
King, Benjamin B., Jr.
King, Randolph W.
Kingston, George W.
Kiser, William P.
Kitt, Robert B.
Kleffner, Frank P.
Klein, Theodore G.
Knotts, Sanford L.
Knull, William H., Jr.
Kubicki, Edward
Kunberger, George A.
Lambert, Glenn E.
Landon, James B.
Landry, Adelard F.
Lane, Gene L.
Laney, Jack S.
Lawrence, Emmett B.
Lee, Alan S.
Lee, Kent L.
Lendenmann, Werner, Jr.
Levitt, Ben B.
Lewellen, Robert S.
Lieber, James C.
Lindberg, Donald S.
Linnekin, Richard B.
Little, John C.
Locklin, William H.
Long, Robert L. J.
Loomis, Robert J.
Lovell, Frederick A., Jr.
Lowe, Harry C.
Lowry, James J.
Lupia, Archy L.
Mackey, Clarence E.
MacLeod, Alan R., Jr.
Madden, James J.
Mahoney, George H.
Major, Arthur
Mallick, Edgar E.
Manship, Herbert K.
Markey, Francis H.
Martin, Walter F.
Mays, Dixie J., Jr.
McCabe, Donald C.
McCauley, James E.
McClane, Joseph L., Jr.
McDonald, Robert R.
McElroy, John B.
McHugh, Lee T.
McKinney, Andrew T.
McKinney, Clyde B.
McKinney, John B.
McMahon, Richard E.
McNeela, John P.
McVey, William J.
Mellin, Richard G.
Merrill, Ralph F.
Meshier, Charles W.
Methvin, James R., Jr.
Meyer, Herman E.
Miehe, Frederick W., Jr.
Millar, Donald B.
Miller, Charles L.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Jack N.
Miller, Kermit M. E.
Miller, Paul, Jr.
Miller, Rupert S.
Minard, Robert K., Jr.
Monson, Donald W.
Montgomery, George P., Jr.
Moore, Bobbie P.
Moore, Richard S.
Moore, Walter R., Jr.
Moran, George F.
Morris, Robert L.
Mowell, Lawrence V.
Moyer, Eugene H.
Muller, Ragnwald
Muller, Walter E.
Munnikhuysen, Douglas Y.
Munson, John R.
Murphy, Daniel J.
Musial, Joseph S.
Myers, Lawrence St. C.
Naczkowski, Bruno R.
Napier, Edward D.
Neal, Raymond G.
Netting, Robert W.
Nicholas, Philip W.
Niemann, William E.
O'Bryan, George R.
O'Leary, Arthur, C., Jr.
Olive, Robert C.
Olsen, Clifford E.
Osgood, Arthur H.
Pabarcus, John P.
Panther, Richard D.
Paolucci, Dominic A.
Patch, Arthur E.
Patrick, Urey W., Jr.
Patterson, Joseph, Jr.
Patterson, Donald G.
Payne, William E., Jr.
Pearce, Robert N.
Peery, George G., Jr.
Pelletier, Albe J., Jr.
Pennington, Jack H.
Perry, Joe R.
Perry, John E.
Perry, Oliver H., Jr.
Peterson, John E.
Pettitt, Robert B.
Pierre, Emile E., Jr.
Ploss, Richard L.
Poindexter, John T.
Pope, Albert J.
Porterfield, Floyd R.
Potolicchio, Rodney A.
Pressler, William J., Jr.
Prigmore, William B.
Proctor, Erman O.

Prosser, John M.
Ramay, Wayne P.
Rath, Elmer R.
Reeves, Carl G.
Reynolds, Ernest E., Jr.
Rhees, Thomas R.
Rice, James L., Jr.
Rice, Theodore C.
Rich, Clarence E.
Riediger, John R.
Rienstra, Dan "J", Jr.
Riker, Alden S.
Rinesmith, Robert D.
Roberts, John W.
Robinson, Irving A.
Rosania, Hugh J.
Rosemont, Robert K.
Rozier, Charles P.
Rush, Philip J.
Russillo, Alfred G.
Ryzow, Richard A.
Sadler, Stuart T.
Salsig, Edgar B.
Sanders, Nelson W.
Saxon, John S.
Schettino, Frank G.
Schlierf, Gerhard W.
Schmidt, Charles K.
Scholz, Walter E.
Schubert, Russell C.
Scott, Maylon T.
Seeger, Billy F.
Seiler, Aubrey R.
Shead, Theodore M.
Sherman, John O., Jr.
Sherwood, Wilbur G.
Shields, Robert A.
Sims, Coleman W.
Sink, Robert E.
Siple, William L.
Skidmore, Ellis D.
Slawson, Harry F.
Slaymaker, Basil D.
Smiegocki, Robert
Smith, Allen M.
Smith, Augustine W.
Smith, Charles B.
Smith, Leon I., Jr.
Smith, Nicholas J., III
Smith, Richard F.
Snyder, Edwin K.
Snyder, Harry E.
Solsson, Thomas J.
Sonntag, Frank H.
Sparger, John
Spell, Billie C.
Stafford, Carlos B.
Standard, Roy E.
Stanko, John
Stephens, Franklin T.
Stetson, John B.
Stevens, James H., Jr.
Stickles, Albert L., II
Stock, Edward J.
Stockton, Jackson A.
Stokes, Charles R.
Stout, Fred E., Jr.
Stribling, John W., Jr.
Stuart, Jack C.
Stubel, Alvin T.
Sullivan, Richard P.
Sundt, Robert K.
Surface, Wayne D.
Swift, Charles S.
Talley, George C., Jr.
Tamburello, Gaspare B.
Terrill, Scott E., Jr.
Thatcher, Roland C., Jr.
Thomaides, Thomas G.
Thomas, Alvin
Thomas, Charles M., Jr.
Thomas, Robert B.
Thomson, Fred R.
Thorington, Harry S.
Thornbury, Joe W.
Thornell, Enos
Thornhill, Henry E., Jr.
Tingle, Jack E.
Tisdale, Charles H., Jr.
Torbert, John H.
Townes, Herbert L., Jr.
Trautmann, John R.
Trottier, Albert R.
Truxler, Walter A.
Tucker, Charles E., Jr.
Tucker, Charles R.
Tyler, Claude L.
Upshaw, William W.
Vales, Robert F.
Van Acker, Albert
Van Blake, Benjamin J.
Vaughn, Allen A.
Vito, Albert H., Jr.
Wacker, William J.
Wakeland, William R.
Walsh, Thomas W. F.
Walters, Hilmon E., Jr.
Walton, Nelson C.
Wanner, Vance R.
Ward, John G.
Watkins, George C.
Watson, George W.
Webster, David A.
Wendorf, Edward G.
Wentworth, Ralph S., Jr.
Whidden, Wynn V.
White, Willett E.
Whitlock, Duane L.
Wiegard, John A.
Wiemer, Leo G. D., Jr.
Wilde, Norman W. W.
Williams, Clement G.
Williams, Henis J.
Williams, Martin T., Jr.
Wish, James R.
Wohler, Jack L.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wooten, Robert J.
Wrocklage, George M.
Wulf, Robert A.
Yates, Earl P.
Yeich, Lloyd G.
Youman, Harold R., Jr.
Young, Robert J.
Young, Robert J., Jr.
Zaborski, Leonard W.
Zaiser, Warren E.

To be lieutenant commanders

Abraham, Sigmund, Jr.
Abrahamson, Paul E.
Ackiss, James H.
Adams, Clayton R.
Adams, Frank M.
Adelman, Joseph L.
Aeschbach, Warren E.
Aicklen, William J., Jr.
Akins, Joseph W., Jr.
Alberta, Edward T.
Alexander, Charles S., Jr.
Allen, Floyd J.
Allen, Henry L., Jr.
Allen, James B.
Allen, James R.
Ambrose, Robert W.
Amme, Richard D.
Anderson, Arland T.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, John M.
Anderson, Richard W.
Ansel, David D.
Appert, Edward P.
Applebach, Richard O.
Apthorp, Grant B.
Arguelles, John R.
Ashford, Robert "L"
Askew, George V.
Athow, Robert F.
Atkinson, Roy C.
Austin, William H., Jr.
Ayres, James E.
Babineau, Francis E.
Bach, Nicholas R.
Bacon, Francis W., Jr.
Bade, Robert B.
Baekey, Richard A.
Baer, Joseph, Jr.
Bagwell, Wallace B.
Bailey, Daniel L.
Bailey, Emera S.
Bain, John R.
Baker, William F., Jr.
Balfe, John McK.
Bangham, James P.
Banks, Daniel L., Jr.
Barber, Albertus V., Jr.
Barfield, Charlie H.
Barley, Cecil E.
Barnard, Ralph E.
Barnes, Alan F.
Barnes, Dowdell A., Jr.
Barondes, Earl De R.
Barr, James H.
Barr, Robert McK., Jr.
Barry, James H.
Barry, William
Barteluce, John J.
Bass, Richard W., Jr.
Bassett, William E.
Baughman, Fred H.
Bauman, Robert W.
Baxter, James A.
Beane, Edward R.
Bebb, Kenneth N.
Beck, Bartlette A., Jr.
Beck, William, Jr.
Becken, Bradford A.
Becker, Terrill F.
Begley, Robert E.
Bell, John H.
Bell, Miller L., Jr.
Bell, Roy M.
Benson, Harry L.
Berend, John J.
Berglund, Burton E.
Bernier, Raymond R.
Bernstein, Fred J.
Betts, Martin B.
Beyer, Henry J.
Bialy, Benedict B.
Bihr, Richard A.
Bird, Comer H., Jr.
Bird, George B., Jr.
Bird, Gerald T.
Bivin, Homer R.
Blackburn, Edwin R.
Blair, Richard E.
Blank, Carl A.
Blevins, William D.
Bliesener, Arthur B.
Blixt, Melvin D.
Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
Blumberg, David H.
Bodnar, Andrew J.
Boger, Clarence E.
Bolling, Robert L.
Bond, John C., Jr.
Bornhop, Rodney E.
Bott, Alan R.
Bouwman, Fredric G.
Bowden, John L., Jr.
Bowdey, Floyd D.
Bowen, Edwin E.
Bowen, James W.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowers, Richard L.
Boyack, Maurice R.
Brabant, Robert J.
Bradshaw, Ray H.
Brady, Charles G., Jr.
Brandenburg, George I.
Breen, Thomas J., Jr.
Brenner, Thomas B.
Brewer, William E., Jr.
Bridges, Jack H.
Bridwell, Samuel L.
Briggs, Winston D.
Brittain, Thomas B., Jr.
Brogan, Arnold H.
Bromley, Frederick B.
Brooke, Rupert
Brooks, Wharton H., Jr.
Brower, Robert C.
Brown, Bryan B., Jr.
Brown, Floyd H.
Brown, Lofton C.
Brown, Louis F., Jr.
Brown, Thomas D.
Bruce, John C.
Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbaugh, Dale C.
Bryan, George H., Jr.
Buck, Maurice D.
Buffington, Richard B.
Burkart, John C.
Burke, Edwin J.
Burke, James A.
Burkett, Alva D.
Bush, Philip R.
Bush, Ward A.
Byington, Ward G.
Caine, Arthur D.
Callaway, John D., Jr.
Campbell, Richard D.
Cantrell, Charles E., Jr.
Carey, Edmond J.
Carlin, James
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carman, Warren E.
Carpenter, Harold L.
Carroll, Kent J.
Casserly, Christopher J.
Causey, Charles W., Jr.
Chadwick, Daniel
Chamberlain, Raymond E., Jr.
Chandler, Donald E.
Chapman, James H.
Chattleton, William D.
Cheek, Glen R.
Chelgren, John L.
Christensen, Jack A.
Christensen, Donald W.
Christiansen, Edward F.
Christoph, Karl J., Jr.
Christopher, Frank J.
Chuilli, Ernest J.
Cislo, Louis
Clark, Carroll D.
Clay, Harold S.
Clement, Marwood R., Jr.
Clement, Robert R.
Clemente, Angelo E.
Clifford, William F., Jr.
Cloonan, Fred M.
Clubb, Reginald D.
Cocke, Edgar M.
Coe, Arthur S.
Coggins, Jack C.
Cole, Kenneth J.
Cole, Russell W.
Collins, Robert M.
Collis, James E.
Colonna, Harry W.
Colot, Peter
Colquhoun, Richard G.
Condon, Vernon W.
Conn, Robert H.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Cooke, Robert S.
Copenhaver, James B., Jr.
Coppedge, John O.
Corley, Frank W., Jr.
Cort, Walter W., Jr.
Costanzo, Carl J.
Cover, John H.
Craig, Neil
Crane, John W., Jr.
Craven, Phillip R.
Crawford, Bentley B.
Creasman, Jesse C.
Crockett, Charles B., Jr.
Cross, William E.
Crowe, William J., Jr.
Crowley, Herbert D.
Crownover, Miller T.
Cummings, Charles W.
Cummings, Donald E.
Cummings, Edward M., Jr.
Cummins, Peter P.
Curtin, Lawrence J.
Dadisman, Richard "A"
Dahlby, Philip C.
Dale, Robert L.
Dallas, Charles MacD.
Dallmann, Paul H.
Darby, Keith C.
Darcy, Robert T.
Davenport, Thomas T.
Davidson, Alan N.
Davidson, James B.
Davidson, John D.
Davies, James W.
Davies, Robert
Davis, Cabell S., Jr.
Davis, Ray E.
Davis, Theodore F.
Davis, William G.
Dawson, John P.
DeBaets, Donald J.
DeBaets, Ronald M.
De Chow, Claude E.
DeCicco, John M.
Dedman, Tyler F.
Deffenbaugh, Robert M.
de Ganahl, James A.
Degler, Forrest R., Jr.
Denkler, John M.
Denton, Jeremiah A., Jr.
Dermody, Richard J.
De Werd, Theodore J.
Dibble, Henry M.
Dickey, John L.
Dickieson, Robert W.
Dickson, Richard "D"
Diffendorfer, Jarl J.
Dillon, John M.
Dobyns, Robert E.
Doe, Willard C.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Donaldson, Charles E., III
Dorman, "R" "H"
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
Douglass, Walter M.
Drabent, Eugene A.
Drago, Jack V.
Drake, John F.
Draz, David I.
Duckett, John P.
Dudley, Calvin C.
Durden, Walter D.
Durkin, Michael F.
Dyer, John C.
Early, Paul J.
Edelson, Burton, I.
Edwards, George D., Jr.
Edwards, Harold L.
Eidson, George V.
Ekas, Claude P., Jr.
Ekelund, Kenneth O., Jr.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Elefante, Frank L.
Elliott, Edward C.
Elliott, Hollie H., Jr.
Ellis, Joseph M.
Ellis, Samuel S.
Elmer, Joseph S.
Elwood, Claire R.
Endebrock, Robert E.
English, James G., Jr.
Enright, John P.
Enright, Robert E.
Estelman, Herman J.
Etcher, Robert W.
Evans, Jack E.
Evans, Joseph D.
Evans, William
Ewing, John R.
Ewing, Paul C.
Falter, Gilbert A., Jr.
Fargo, Robert R.
Farley, James E.
Farris, Frederick A.
Farris, George W.
Farshing, Donald D., Jr.
Faulkner, Doc G., Jr.
Fay, Lawrence J.
Fenn, Richard W.
Ferris, Wilbur G.
Ferry, Reginald V.
Finneran, John G.
Fischer, David W.
Fisher, John H.
Fiske, Clarence O.
Fitch, Robert A.
Fitchko, George W., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Paul F.
Fletcher, Gene C.
Flock, Loren W.
Forehand, Wendell C.
Fortson, Thomas E.
Fossum, Theodor T.
Foster, William L.
Franz, Donald A.
Freeland, Harold H.
Freeman, James
Fritz, Ernest S.
Fry, John C.
Fuller, Jack D.
Fuller, Richard, Jr.
Gallagher, Joseph
Gallagher, Cornelius R.
Garbee, Edwin T.
Gardiner, Richard S.
Gardner, James S.
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.
Garner, Alan S.
Garvin, Wilbur C.
Gary, Stanley P.
Gatts, William H.
Gauntt, Wesley R.
Gay, William W.
Gaynier, James R.
Geary, John T.
Geary, Joseph R.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Geel, Alan J.
Geiger, Robert K.
George, Robert McL.
Georgen, William M.
Gibson, George W.
Gideon, Robert A., Jr.
Gilliland, Frank
Gilmore, Russell G.
Gokey, Noah W., III
Goldstein, David A.
Gorder, Charles F.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gower, Harry T., Jr.
Gower, Robert F.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Grause, Jerome E.
Gravely, Samuel L., Jr.
Graves, Robert F., Jr.
Gray, Leland T., Jr.
Greene, Wallace A.
Greig, Joseph E.
Gresham, John I.
Griffin, Harry J.
Griffin, James W.
Grimes, William E.
Gross, James R.
Grove, George S.
Groves, Thomas E.
Grubbs, Harmon C.
Guertin, Louis H.
Gygax, Rex
Hahn, George C.
Hahnfeld, Arnold A.
Haizlip, John W., Jr.

Hale, Robert F.
Hall, Carl, Jr.
Hall, Donald M.
Hall, James F.
Hallam, Orval K.
Hallett, Oliver S.
Hamilton, Joe
Hamilton, Robert M.
Hancock, David L.
Hann, William
Hanna, Donald L.
Hanson, Edgar G.
Harbottle, Lyman W.
Hare, Guy C.
Hargarten, Robert W.
Hargrave, Seth E.
Harkins, William D.
Harper, John R.
Harris, Jack H.
Harris, William L., Jr.
Harris, William H.
Hart, Harry S.
Hartman, Willard R.
Hathway, Donald LaM.
Hattersley, Julian
Haugen, Edward S.
Haupt, Richard W.
Hawvermale, Joseph R.
Hayes, James W., Jr.
Haynes, William E.
Hays, Seymore T., Jr.
Hazelwood, James M.
Heckert, Nelson E.
Hedbawny, Edward J.
Hedrick, George F., Jr.
Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
Helms, Louis L.
Helton, William A.
Hemmer, Edgar H.
Henderson, James R.
Hendrick, Donald J., Jr.
Henry, Eugene M.
Henry, George L.
Herrick, Carl H.
Herzog, James H.
Hess, John A.
Hickman, Wilbur M.
High, John R.
Highsmith, Frederick L.
Hill, Edward C.
Hill, Elmer R., Jr.
Hill, John W.
Hinden, Harry J.
Hinds, Charles D.
Hinkle, William L.
Hintz, Warren S.
Hoffmann, Henry A.
Hoffmann, Roy F.
Holden, William P.
Hollyer, Richard S.
Holmes, Robert T.
Hoover, John R.
Hornbrook, James M.
Houck, Donald P.
Hough, William L.
Howard, Donnell
Howard, John N.
Howard, Raymond B.
Hoyman, William C.
Hubka, Verne R.
Hubler, Vernon R.
Huddle, Norman P.
Hudner, Thomas J., Jr.
Huling, Harold E.
Hunter, Jack S.
Hunter, Perry F., III
Irving, Robert
Jackson, Lee S., Jr.
Jackson, Thomas E.
Jacobs, Richard "B"
Jahant, John W.
Jameson, James N.
Jandebeur, Harold E.
Jenkins, Merlin P.
Jennings, Verne "H", Jr.
Jermann, Donald R.
Jesse, Harold W.
Jester, Malvern H. L.
Jewett, Frederick F., II
Jex, Donald R.
Johnson, Arnol, Jr.
Johnson, Benjamin T.
Johnson, Francis A.
Johnson, John D., Jr.
Johnson, Lester F., Jr.
Johnson, Philip W.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Walter F.
Johnston, John W.
Johnston, Richard C.
Johnstone, Frank L.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jones, William M.
Jordan, Glenn D.
Kaetzel, Robert H.
Kaffer, Gerald H., Jr.
Kane, Howard F.
Karlowicz, Mitchell J.
Karnagel, Donald T.
Kauzlarich, Frank P.
Kearney, Stuart D.
Kearny, James D.
Keegan, Earl W., Jr.
Keen, Timothy J.
Keith, Francis L.
Keith, James
Keller, William F., Jr.
Kellersberger, Donald C.
Kelso, Quinten A.
Kennedy, Clarence L.
Keough, Raymond F.
King, Harry W.
King, John W., Jr.
King, Ogden D., Jr.
King, William L., Jr.
Kinser, Ralph H., Jr.
Kirchner, Paul H.
Kirk, George G. E.
Kirkpatrick, James
Kiser, Charles A.
Klein, Melvin E.
Kleist, Roy F.
Klingberg, Franklin N.
Kluger, Raymond P.
Knowles, Cline H., Jr.
Knutson, Albert E.
Koch, Don R.
Kochis, Peter C.
Koehler, Robert H.
Koenig, William H.
Kolar, Robert P.
Kolda, Frank C.
Korb, Frank J.
Kosiba, Richard E.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Koster, Edwin R.
Kosman, Robert J.
Krauthamer, Richard J.
Krejcarek, Donald J.
Kreutz, Arthur R.
Kruzich, Andrew F.
Kubiszewski, Robert J.
Kwart, Philip
Kwitkoski, Walter J.
La Haye, James D.
Lakey, Keith G.
Lambertson, Tomme J.
Land, Nathaniel B.
Lang, Hugh E.
Langford, John D.
Larcombe, Howard N., Jr.
Larkin, George M., Jr.
Larsen, Bertrand "O"
Larsen, Norman E.
Laskowski, Walter E.
Lauver, George I.
Lawson, Kent W.
Lawton, Lawrence W.
Layman, William H.
Layser, Richard G.
Leach, David C., Jr.
Lebiedz, Edward F.
Leddick, Roth S.
Lee, Earl B.
Lee, Robert E.
Lehnig, Ernest P.
Lember, David B.
Lenihan, Jeremiah E.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Lewis, Harold L.
Lewis, John C.
Lewis, William S.
Lewison, Walter R.
Lindgren, George B.
Long, Douglas L.
Longo, Charles R.
Lott, Jesse P.
Lovett, Vincent D.
Lowans, Warren H.
Lowell, Percival D., Jr.
LuBien, William J.
Luoma, Walter R.
Lurker, Elmer R.
Lynch, Leslie "O"
Lynch, Robert E.
Lyon, Henry J.
Macomber, Mark M.
Macon, Benjamin H.
Mac Onie, Robert T.
Magee, William C.
Maige, George N.
Maley, Leonard
Manganaro, Francis F.
Maragos, George
March, George P.
Marckesano, Louis A.
Marsh, Paul E., Jr.
Martin, Barney
Martin, Claude F., Jr.
Martin, Don McC.
Martin, Frederick V.
Martin, James W.
Martin, Reginald E., Jr.
Martin, Samuel A.
Marvin, Stephen D.
Mathews, John M.
Matthews, Howard L., Jr.
Matthews, Pierce Y., Jr.
Matula, Valentin G.
Maurer, Richard C., Jr.
Mawhiney, William T.
Maxwell, Robert A.
Mayer, Donald R.
Maynard, Allison L.
McAdams, John W., Jr.
McArdle, Robert P.
McBratney, Thomas R.
McCarthy, John E.
McConnell, John H., Jr.
McCord, Wayne S.
McCracken, William H.
McDaniel, Charles B.
McDaniel, William O.
McDonald, Carlton A. K.
McDonald, Nathan F.
McDonald, Wesley L.
McDonald, William M.
McElwain, Richard S.
McGill, John C., Jr.
McGowan, James V.
McGrath, John J., Jr.
McIlroy, Edward E.
McKenzie, Joseph F.
McKenzie, William W., Jr.
McLaughlin, Norman H.
McMahon, James P.
McNary, Johnnie W.
McPadden, Gordon E.
McVey, Don C.
Measel, James G.
Meginniss, Walter M.
Meisenheimer, John L.
Melander, Vincent E.
Merritt, John A., III
Midgette, Oliver F.
Miears, Roy R.
Miles, Bernard L.
Miller, William O.
Mitchell, Eugene B.
Mitchell, Frank A.
Mitchell, John E.
Mone, James V.
Mooney, Rodney T.
Morgan, Clifford L.
Morgan, Daniel
Morgan, Newton H.
Morgiewicz, Daniel J.
Moriarty, Norbert L.
Morris, John R.
Morris, Marion E.
Morris, Max K.
Morrison, Edward B.
Morrison, Wilbur M.
Moss, James L.
Mossburg, Darrell L.
Mulligan, Eugene W., III
Muncie, Maurice O.
Munnikhuysen, Henry F.
Murline, Robert A. H.
Murphy, James J.
Murray, Kenneth A.
Murray, Richard D.
Murray, Stuart G.
Murrill, Robert L.
Mussetto, Bruno
Napior, Arthur D.
Navarrette, Claude, Jr.
Nealon, William G.
Nelson, Clifford
Netherland, Roger M.
Newcomb, Robert C.
Newkirk, Kenneth H.
Nienberg, Robert J.
Nimitz, Charles E. C.
Nivison, William
Nockold, Louis W.
Noll, Robert C.
Nordberg, Delbert W.
Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Nourse, James A.
Nowers, William E.
Nuss, Jerry J.
O'Brien, Billie E.
O'Callaghan, Edmund W.
O'Connell, Thomas A.
Oddo, Phillip W.
Odgers, Ralph E.
O'Donnell, William F.
Ogden, Samuel B., Jr.
O'Grady, John P.
Ohme, Henry P.
Olds, Corwin A.
O'Leary, Stephen J., Jr.
Olmsted, Paul S.
Olson, Delbert A.
Olson, Raoul M.
Olson, Richard A.
Olson, Robert C.
Opitz, Albert G.
Orbeton, Maurice C., Jr.
Osmer, James W., Jr.
Ostertag, Carl J., Jr.
Ostlund, Eugene W.
Packer, Duncan
Paddock, Richard A.
Palmer, Frederick F.
Palmer, George B., III
Parks, William L., Jr.
Patch, Donald R.
Pavelle, John J., Jr.
Pearson, George R. MacK.
Peebles, George C., Jr.
Pehrsson, Pehr H.
Peniston, Robert "C"
Pentinmaki, Walfred N.
Peoples, George F.
Perdue, Uley F.
Perry, Dale S.
Perry, William J.
Peterson, John P.
Peterson, William S.
Pettee, Warren E.
Pfundstein, Thomas D.
Phillips, Alva L., Jr.
Phillips, Kenneth E.
Phillips, Merrill L.
Pickens, Jackson R.
Pickert, Aloysius J., Jr.
Pitz, Otto G., Jr.
Pline, Joseph E.
Pollard, Robert D.
Pomeroy, Leslie K., Jr.
Pope, John E.
Porter, William W.
Powell, James A.
Powell, Robert A.
Prassinos, George
Presgrove, Charles K.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Prichard, Reuben P., Jr.
Prum, Bruce E.
Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
Puckett, Howard M.
Pugh, James McK.
Pullen, Boyd McG., Jr.
Radtke, Robert N.
Rae, William C., Jr.
Raftery, John J.
Ragsdale, Duncan E.
Ragsdale, Homer C., Jr.
Rank, Cyrus "A"
Rappenecker, James C.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ratliff, John "H"
Rauch, Charles F., Jr.
Rawson, Charles E.
Readdy, Francis J.
Reams, Benton E.
Reardon, Francis P.
Rectanus, Earl F.
Reese, Donald H.
Regan, William F.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
Reilly, David R.
Reilly, Jeremiah D., Jr.
Reinschmidt, Warren S.
Renz, Louis T.
Rex, James F.
Reynolds, Milton L.
Rezny, Ivan F.
Rich, Harold G.
Richards, John P. M., II
Riehl, Julian W., Jr.
Rigot, William L.
Riley, Daniel P.
Riley, Edward E.
Rivers, Lee R. P.
Robertson, William D., Jr.
Roche, Robert F.
Rockcastle, Charles H.
Rodgers, Hollis "T"
Roe, Charles R.
Rogers, William Healy
Rogers, William Henry
Rohrer, Leonard V.
Rollins, Henry G., Jr.
Romatowski, Louis A., Jr.
Rose, Charles J.
Rose, Vernon D., Jr.
Ross, Claude M.
Ross, Royal R., Jr.
Ross, Seymour N.
Roth, Emil S.
Rouse, Jerome A.
Ruoti, Anthony
Rusche, Alvin E.
Rush, William A.
Russell, Paul E.
Russell, Wallace L.
Russell, William M.
Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Ryder, Donald F.
Ryder, Everett G.
Sanders, Herman J.
Sanders, James E.
Sanders, Wilton T., Jr.
Saubers, Maurice D.
Saul, James O.
Sayre, George A.
Scappini, Mimo L.
Schaefer, William M.
Schafer, John B.
Schloer, Eric G.
Schmoller, James R.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
Schoonover, Ned W.
Schou, Aage J.
Schuknecht, Arnold R.
Schuler, Foster R.
Scott, Robert L.
Scudder, Harold
Seckinger, Neil V.
Seger, Josef McG.
Seidel, George H.
Seli, Carl H.
Sellman, Edmund W.
Sharahan, John J., Jr.
Sharpe, Owen B.
Shaver, William McC.
Shaw, Fletcher H.
Shelton, John P.
Shepard, Philip B.
Sheppard, James C.
Sheridan, Martin J.
Sherman, Harold N.
Shinn, William G.
Shuey, Charles M.
Shugart, Kenneth L., Jr.
Simkins, William A.
Simmons, John A., Jr.
Simone, William B.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisson, Jonathan A.
Sisson, Luther B.
Slonim, Charles E.
Smith, Bertram C.
Smith, Deming W.
Smith, George K.
Smith, Harold A.
Smith, Howard G.
Smith, James D.
Smith, John C.
Smith, John A.
Smith, Lloyd H.
Smith, Ralph F.
Smith, Robert S.
Smith, Robert H., Jr.
Smith, Robert P.
Smith, Stuart S.
Smith, Wade "K", Jr.
Smith, Wellington P.
Smith, Winfield S.
Snead, Leonard A.
Snure, Robert O.
Snyder, Francis M.
Songer, Jack R.
Soper, Malvern E.
Spahr, Arthur G.
Spangenberg, Walter, Jr.
Spann, Willis L.
Sparkman, Homer A., Jr.
Spencer, William A.
Spoon, Donald D.
Stahl, Douglas
Stanley, Hilton L.
Stark, Richard J.
Stensrud, John D.
Stevens, Jack M.
Stilwell, Edward P.
St. Louis, Joseph A.
Stockdale, James B.

Stone, Francis K.
Stone, John F.
Stone, Robert S.
Stone, Troy E.
Stratmann, William C.
Straton, Andrew C.
Strickler, Robert W.
Strobel, James W.
Strong, George T.
Strong, James T.
Stufflebeam, Jack M.
Sullivan, Elmer D.
Sullivan, John F.
Sup, George C.
Sutcliffe, George H.
Sutliff, Kermit R.
Sweeder, Stanley E.
Sylvia, Henry J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Tarpey, John F.
Taylor, Cecil O.
Taylor, David J.
Taylor, Robert H.
Teasley, William A., Jr
Tell, William M.
Terrass, Milford S.
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Thayer, Wirt C.
Thomas, Edward W.
Thomas, Lon C.
Thomas, Paul B.
Thomas, Ralph L., Jr.
Thompson, Elmer N.
Thompson, William F.
Thomson, Neil W.
Thornton, John L.
Thummel, Gerald F.
Thurtell, Frank A.
Timidaiski, James T.
Timm, Fred C.
Titcomb, Edmund B.
Tobin, Daniel P.
Toohill, Donald L.
Toole, Wycliffe D., Jr.
Tripp, Jack L.
Trout, Roscoe L.
Tucker, Ralph McM.
Tuel, Merritt D.
Turner, John C.
Turner, John S.
Ulbricht, Frederick W.
Ulm, Robert B.
Updike, Archie J.
Urban, Henry, Jr.
Urbanczyk, Louis T., Jr.
Usina, Joseph D.
Vaa, Norman A.
Van Atta, Bruce W.
Van Sickle, John R.
Van Tol, John
Van Tuyl, Andrew J., Jr.
Vermilya, Jay "J"
Vermilya, Robert S.
Viney, Irwin J.
Vollmer, Cecil R.
Von Gerichten, Robert L.
von Schrader, Chandle R. L.
Vose, Frederic H. E.
Voves, Martin C.
Waits, Jack E.
Walker, Grant J.
Walker, Grover "C.", Jr.
Waller, William, Jr.
Warde, William A.
Warriner, Victor G.
Warring, Leo B.
Waterman, Jack "E"
Waters, Lowell W.
Watkins, Robert W.
Watt, Gale V.
Weaver, John K.
Weber, Kent J.
Weidman, William K.
Welch, Paul R.
Wellings, Timothy F., Jr.
Wells, Donald M.
Wells, John T.
Wells, John W.
Wellsman, Howard C.
Wenger, Donald B.
Wente, David A.
Wenzel, Harold F.
White, Bernard C.
Whitegiver, Robert B., II
Whittaker, Gordon S.
Whyte, Herbert E.
Wicks, William F.
Wiggins, Bryan D.
Wilda, Gerald L.
Willett, Charles F.
Williams, Buck D., Jr.
Williams, Bernard P., Jr.
Williams, Glenn E.
Williams, Hexter A.
Williams, Joseph L., Jr.
Williams, John G., Jr.
Williams, James S.
Williamson, Robert C.
Wilson, Joseph H., Jr.
Wilson, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wilson, Robert D.
Winslett, Ernest R.
Witkowski, Eugene F.
Wood, Edward G.
Wood, Eugene E.
Wood, William D., Jr.
Woodard, David A.
Woodburn, Edwin C.
Woods, Kenneth
Woods, William L., Jr.
Working, Patrick L.
Wysocki, Walter J.
Yates, Andrew J.
Yates, William K.
Yeatman, Richard P.
Young, Austin V.
Young, Grant C.
Young, Laurence R.
Yuengling, Douglas J.
Zebrowski, Walter T.
Zelov, Randolph D.
Zenni, Martin "M"
Zent, John L.
Zumwalt, Marvin W.

To be lieutenants

Ables, Aubrey E.
Ager, Snowden C.
Agnew, Dwight M., Jr.
Albee, Thomas L., Jr.
Alberts, Richard P.
Alecxih, Peter C.
Allen, George W.
Allen, John S.
Alvarado, Ramon C.
Ammann, Robert E.
Ammerman, Clell N.
Amoruso, Alfred P.
Anderson, Eugene G.
Anderson, Falvie B., Jr.
Anderson, Giles B.
Anderson, Joseph F.
Anderson, Stephen P.
Anderson, Thomas F.
Anderson, Walter S.
Anderson, William P.
Anthony, Morris D.
Artz, Robert C.
Ascherbeck, Gene W.
Ascherfeld, Theodore F., Jr.
Ashby, Donald R.
Asman, Robert K.
Atherton, Raymond
Atkinson, Gerald L.
Atwood, Henry C., Jr.
Aumick, William A.
Austin, James W.
Austin, Robert C.
Aut, Warren E.
Avery, Billy J.
Bailey, Gail R.
Baird, Thomas L.
Baker, Walter F.
Ballow, Lawrence D.
Banfield, Thomas V., II
Barker, George D.
Barker, William St. G.
Barlow, James D.
Bascom, Paul P.
Basford, Michael G.
Bassett, Bradley A.
Baty, Frank O.
Bauman, James R.
Baumgardner, John F.
Baxter, George L., Jr.
Bayne, John P.
Beavert, Alfred F.
Beck, John L.
Beck, Walter R.
Beck, William H.
Beckmann, Archibald B., Jr.
Beckwith, Gilbert H.
Beeson, Robert "O"
Beisel, Gerald W.
Belay, William J.
Bell, James F.
Bennett, Donald C.
Bennett, Phillip L.
Berg, Robert L.
Berger, Ronald A.
Berkhimer, Frank R.
Bernardin, Peter A.
Berthe, Charles J., Jr.
Bibb, Benjamin O.
Bidelspach, Richard L.
Biederman, Robert D.
Biggar, William
Billerbeck, Henry G.
Bilyeu, Roland C.
Bissel, Norman H.
Blackwell, Jack L., Jr.
Blaes, Richard W.
Blaine, Thomas E.
Bock, "E" James
Boland, Bruce R.
Booth, Joseph K.
Bordone, Richard P.
Botshon, Morton
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowling, Charles R.
Boylson, Michael E.
Brackin, John D.
Bradshaw, Frederick L.
Brame, Frank A., III
Brammeier, Charles L.
Brandau, James F.
Brandon, Horace W.
Bravence, John, Jr.
Brennan, John S.
Briner, Robert R.
Brooks, Dennis L.
Broughton, James A.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Christopher H.
Brown, Malcolm C.
Brown, Richard B.
Brown, Robert C., Jr.
Brown, Robert H.
Brown, Thomas F., III
Browning, Robert B.
Bruley, Kenneth C.
Brunell, James I.
Buc, Gerald G.
Buchanan, Edward O.
Buchholz, Philip P.
Buckley, John E.
Bull, Norman S.
Bullman, Howard L.
Bunce, Bayne R.
Burger, Francis J., III
Burgert, Reginald D.
Burke, Robert M.
Burkhardt, Lawrence, III
Burnett, Richard W.
Burnett, William McK.
Burnham, Don E.
Burns, Richard F.
Burrow, Billy McC.
Burrows, Hubbard F., Jr.
Burtis, Evenson M.
Bush, Carl D.
Butler, William S.
Byington, Melville R., Jr.
Byrd, Mark W.
Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Cabot, Alan S.
Cade, John W.
Caldwell, Charles B.
Caldwell, Hamlin A., Jr.
Campbell, Donald S., Jr.
Campbell, John D.
Campbell, John F.
Campbell, John L.
Candoo, Charles G.
Cane, Guy
Cane, John W.
Cann, William A.
Canter, Howard R.
Cantwell, Richard B.
Carlson, Don P.
Carson, Louis F., Jr.
Carter, Gerald M., Jr.
Case, Robert W.
Casimes, Theodore C.
Cavicke, Richard J.
Cazares, Ralph B.
Chamberlain, James L.
Chambers, Dudley S.
Charlton, John W.
Cheney, Donald A.
Chidley, Ralph E.
Chisholm, George E., II
Cisson, Arthur
Clark, Charles F., Jr.
Clark, Richard G.
Cleaver, Stephen
Clemens, Paul E.
Clifford, Donald J.
Clopton, Claude A.
Coakley, Walter J., Jr.
Coe, Raymond P.
Colbus, Louis
Cole, Thomas T., Jr.
Coleman, Herman F.
Collier, Byron H.
Collins, Ferdinand I., Jr.
Collins, Robert M.
Collins, William D.
Colvin, William P.
Colwell, Lawrence S.
Conaughton, Robert G.
Conboy, Thomas W.
Conklin, Robert B.
Conner, Lawrence O.
Connolly, Paul P.
Conrad, Glenn T., Jr.
Cook, Russell A.
Cooley, Charles H.
Coor, Lawrence W.
Copeland, Edward C.
Coppess, Robert Y.
Corey, Stuart M.
Corkhill, Thomas M.
Cornell, Gordon C.
Cornell, Robert L.
Cotton, Alfred S.
Courtney, Charles H.
Couillard, James P.
Cowan, Daniel R.
Cowan, Stuart M.
Coward, Alton A., Jr.
Crabtree, Donald G.
Crane, Herbert C.
Crane, Robert D.
Crawford, Roderick P.
Crawford, Robert E.
Crawford, William T.
Crayton, Render
Crider, James A.
Croom, William H., Jr.
Crosby, Frederick P.
Crosson, Harry E.
Crotteau, Roger D.
Cryer, John P.
Cummings, Joseph D.
Cunningham, Marshall E.
Currier, Richard A.
Curtis, Fred M.
Curtis, John G., Jr.
Curtis, Robert E.
Cutchen, Paul O.
Czaja, Bernard F.
Daigneault, Joseph J., Jr.
Daleke, Richard A.
Dalla Mura, Bart M., Jr.
Daly, Paul S.
Damico, Richard J.
Damon, Terry A.
Dana, John B.
Dancer, Jerry D.
Daubenspeck, Richard E.
Davis, Ralph G.
Davis, Ramsey L., Jr.
Davis, Richard C.
Davis, Richard H.
Dawson, Edward H., Jr.
Deam, Norman A.
Dean, Herbert J.
De Boer, Jack "G"
DeHart, William
Deibert, Bernard N.
Delaney, John R.
DeLoach, John W.
Demmin, Lester F.
Dennison, William E.
Derendinger, George L.
Desseyn, Maurice H.
Deuel, Jamieson K.
DeVito, Vincent H.
DeVries, Edgar L.
DiCarlo, Vincent A.
Dickson, George K.
Diehm, William C., III
Diley, Lewis E.
Dillon, Alfred J.
Dillon, John F.
Dilweg, John C.
DiPace, Joseph V.
Dobbs, William D.
Doheny, Vincent
Doney, Robert G.
Donnell, Joseph S., III
Donnelly, Richard F.
Donnelly, Verne G.
Donovan, Daniel E.
Donovan, Philip C.
Dougherty, John E., Jr.
Downing, Thomas P.
Downs, James R.
Dozier, George W., Jr.
Drayton, Henry E., Jr.
Drenkard, Carl C.
Drumheller, Maxley W.
DuBois, Arthur N.
DuBois, George
Ducat, Julian A.
Du Charme, George W.
Dugan, Francis V.
Dugan, Richard F., Jr.
Duke, Robert J.
Dulke, Sylvester M.
Dunn, Alvan N.
Dunn, John F.
Dunning, James A.
Dupree, Richard E.
Durocher, Stephen F.
Dworsky, Alan J.
Easterling, Letson E.
Easton, Ervin R.
Easton, Peter B.
Eckerle, Charles R., Jr.
Edgren, Donald H.
Eels, William R., Jr.
Ehl, James W.
Eidsmoe, Norman E.
Elam, David L.
Elder, Ralph C.
Elliott, Donal W.
Emerson, John R.
Engelfried, Donald W.
Eriksson, Roger V.
Eubanks, Paul D.
Evans, Edwin D.
Evans, Thomas G.
Everett, Lauren R.
Evosevich, John N.
Evrard, William E.
Ewall, Thomas H.
Faddis, James W.
Fagan, Fredric G.
Faron, John F.
Farwell, Warren E.
Fech, Duane V.
Fell, Roy T.
Felling, Thomas A.
Felter, John F.
Ferguson, David E.
Fiedler, Peter B., Jr.
Fields, James E.
Fields, William B.
Fillerup, Raymond McD.
Fink, Jerome I.
Fitzgerald, Michael J.
Fitzsimmons, Robert J., Jr.
Flaherty, Robert M.
Fletcher, John G.
Fletcher, William B., III
Florin, Donald E.
Foard, Wyatte F., Jr.
Foley, Paul R.
Folta, Daniel A.
Fonda, Raymond C.
Forbes, Donald L.
Ford, Daniel R.
Forsyth, James P.
Foster, Clifton G., Jr.
Fox, Henry J., IV
Francke, Robert L.
Frazier, John D.
Frecker, David A.
Frentress, Bowheart "H", Jr.
Frick, Walter B.
Friddle, Frank R., Jr.
Fryberger, Elbert L., Jr.
Frye, Thomas A. W.
Gadberry, Roy K.
Gadolin, Ronald
Gallagher, William R.
Galli, William L.
Gallotta, Albert A., Jr.
Gardner, Bennett
Garlitz, Jerry E.
Gaskill, Richard T.
Gates, Fred H., II
Gatlin, Edwin F.
Gay, David E.
Geary, Jack E.
Gehring, Donald H.
Geronime, Eugene L.
Gholson, Daniel H. L.
Gideon, William C., Jr.
Gillham, Richard D.
Gilliamsen, Donald A.
Gilmore, Joseph M.
Glade, Gerald L.
Glanville, John T., Jr.
Gleim, James M.
Glover, Albert K., Jr.
Glover, Dennis C.
Glovier, Harold A., Jr.
Glunt, David L., Jr.
Gonzalez, Alfred H.
Good, Robert C.
Gordon, Arva F.
Gore, James R.
Graham, Robert F.
Graham, Sidney R.
Grammer, William R.
Grantman, Roger H.

Gray, Basil F., Jr.
Greene, Charles R., Jr.
Greenlaw, William C.
Greenlee, John W.
Greer, William E., III
Greisen, Bernard R.
Grider, Billy F.
Griffiths, Rodney D.
Grobey, John H.
Grose, Robert H.
Grothe, Henry J.
Grunwell, James G.
Guidry, Rodney R.
Gunn, Max C., Jr.
Gunter, Jack R.
Hager, Charles F.
Haggard, Marion Z.
Haggerty, Stewart V.
Hagmann, Albert P.
Hahn, Edward W., Jr.
Hall, Frank S.
Hall, Harry L.
Hall, Howard L.
Hall, John V.
Halladay, Maurice E.
Halladay, Norman E.
Halle, "S" Portland, III
Halloran, John W.
Hamel, Louis H., III
Hamelrath, Walter F.
Hamilton, Clyde E.
Hamlin, Andrew L.
Hamlin, George A., Jr.
Hampe, Barry F.
Hamrick, Franklin G.
Hanigan, Marvin F.
Hankins, Elton E.
Hanson, John I.
Happersett, Paul F.
Hargrave, William W., Jr.
Hargrove, John Q., III
Harms, Stanley J.
Harper, George T., Jr.
Harrell, Max A.
Harris, James C.
Harris, Neil A.
Harrison, Stuart E.
Hart, Robert L.
Hartman, Gerald A.
Harvey, Donald L.
Hatfield, Robert L.
Haverfield, Benjamin F.
Havicon, John W.
Hawkins, Cecil "B", Jr.
Hay, James C.
Hayes, Francis X.
Hayes, James C.
Hazlett, Frederick W.
Helfrich, William P.
Hellinger, Richard L.
Helm, George N., Jr.
Helms, Raymond E., Jr.
Hendrickson, Claude F., Jr.
Hendry, James D.
Henifin, Edward E.
Henson, George M.
Herberger, Albert J.
Herndon, Franklin C., Jr.
Herr, Arthur L., Jr.
Herren, Thomas C.
Herzer, Oscar A.
Hessman, James D.
Heydon, Robert M.
Heyl, William E.
Heyward, Irvine K., IV
Hickey, Edward J., Jr.
Hicklin, William C., III
Higgins, John F.
Higgins, Richard G.
Hilder, Leonard O., Jr.
Hinkle, David R.
Hobbs, Allen, Jr.
Hocker, Walter B.
Hogan, Edward J., Jr.
Hogan, George C.
Hogan, Thomas W., Jr.
Holder, Howard E.
Holderness, Robert T., Jr.
Holland, John C., Jr.
Hollenbach, Richard G.
Hollingsworth, Robert L.
Hollingworth, Roy M.
Holloman, William D.
Holman, Robert A., Jr.
Holmes, Richard B.
Holt, Henry C., IV
Hooper, Benjamin F.
Hope, Herbert A., Jr.
Hopper, Thomas M.
Horn, Charles E.
Horner, John, Jr.
Horowitz, Charles L.
Hosepian, Edward S.
Hovey, Gale K.
Howatt, Gerald J.
Howe, John E.
Howells, David A.
Hryskanich, Paul L.
Hubbard, Henry L.
Hudgins, Thomas B.
Hudome, Harry J., III
Huffer, Maurice W.
Hull, Fred A.
Hume, George A.
Hume, Kenneth E.
Humphrey, Morris L.
Hunter, Charles B.
Hunter, William G.
Hunter, William J.
Hurt, Jonathan S.
Hussey, William T.
Huttinger, Theodore
Hyman, Arnold J.
Ike, Robert C.
Iosue, Philip F.
Ireland, Blair
Jackson, Robert S.
Jauregui, Stephen, Jr.
Jenkins, Gaston J.
Jensen, Carl T.
Jobe, Gordon A.
Jobe, James E.
Johnson, Billie D.
Johnson, David E.
Johnson, Edward D.
Johnson, George P.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnston, Fox H.
Johnston, Fred W., Jr.
Joiner, Francis A.
Jolliff, James V.
Jones, Carroll S.
Jones, James F.
Jones, Jerry D.
Jones, Robert F., Jr.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Robert L.
Jones, William O.
Jongewaard, Larry L.
Jordan, Stephen W.
Joy, James A.
Juergens, John G.
Jurkowski, Joseph A.
Kaiser, Gilbert J.
Kaltenborn, James C.
Kavanagh, Robert G.
Kearns, William A., Jr.
Keating, John D.
Keele, Wayne, Jr.
Keely, Leroy B.
Keene, Glenn F.
Keene, Thomas J.
Keener, John I.
Keery, Jerry L.
Keith, Clyde R.
Keith, Harold S.
Keith, John D.
Kellaway, Peter W.
Kelleher, Thomas A., Jr.
Kellogg, Edward S., III
Kelly, Richmond K., Jr.
Kennedy, Jack M.
Kent, James F., Jr.
Kiehl, Richard L.
Kilty, Lawrence R.
King, Edward L.
King, Richard B.
Kingsley, Stephen S.
Kinley, Frederic H. M.
Kinne, Loren H.
Kinney, Eugene P.
Kieffel, Walter H.
Klein, Verle W.
Kline, Arlington N.
Klusmann, Charles F.
Knapp, Franklin P.
Kneisl, John F.
Knepler, James L.
Knies, George C., Jr.
Knight, Cecil F.
Kohloff, Donald A.
Kohoutek, James G.
Kois, John R.
Kollmorgen, Frederick J.
Kopacka, William F.
Kother, Charles G.
Kowalskey, Zygmont J., Jr.
Kracha, John K.
Krahn, Chris
Kraus, Kenneth E.
Kraus, Walter S.
Krisciunas, John P.
Kruger, David S.
Krumwiede, Jerold L.
Kugler, Valarius E.
Kujawski, Theodore D
Kunkler, Hilary G.
Kurth, Ronald J.
Lacy, Robert G.
LaGasse, Richard H.
Lambert, Walker W.
Lamore, James F.
Land, Elwood W., Jr.
Lane, William J.
Langelier, Wilfred E., Jr.
Langford, George R.
Langrind, Roy G.
Langston, Thomas J.
Larson, Ralph S.
Lawless, Spencer C.
Lawson, Thomas J.
Learned, Charles W., Jr.
LeClerc, Raymond P.
Lee, Melvin R.
Leedom, Clair E., Jr.
Legett, Thomas R.
Lehman, George W.
Lehr, Ronald F.
Lehto, Robert K.
Leibel, Robert J.
Lenardi, Donald M.
Leonard, John D., Jr.
Leslie, Richard
Lewis, David E.
Lewis, Jesse W., Jr.
Lewis, Martin E.
Lietzan, Ernest W., Jr.
Limroth, David F.
Lindsay, Thomas L.
Lissy, Ernest I.
Livingstone, Philip N.
Loeffler, William H.
Lotze, Herbert E., Jr.
Lucken, Frank E
Lukenbach, Max D.
Lunday, John W., III
Lutz, William R.
Lyding, John F.
Lynch, Will T.
Lynn, John C.
Lyons, Philip
MacAdam, William F.
Mack, John
Mack, Robert E.
Maddox, Iven J.
Manheimer, Donald Z.
Maratea, Ronald "M"
Markel, Douglas S.
Marshall, Brendan P.
Marshall, John Taylor, Jr.
Marshall, John Thomas, Jr.
Marshall, Norman G.
Martin, Edward H.
Martin, James F.
Martineau, Roger J.
Martini, Richard A.
Mason, Ralph A., Jr.
Mason, Ralph S.
Massey, Roger A., Jr.
Master, Carl L., Jr.
Masterson, Kleber S., Jr.
Mathews, Donald R.
Mathis, Harry L., II
Matthews, Paul C., Jr.
Mauer, Tommy L.
Maxwell, John A.
McAdoo, William C.
McArdle, Stephen J., Jr.
McBride, Earl P.
McCaffree, Burnham C., Jr.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McCarthy, Paul F., Jr.
McCarthy, Richard J.
McClellan, Billy L.
McClellan, Parker W.
McClenahan, Richard M.
McClure, Clark A.
McConnell, Cyrus, Jr.
McCracken, John L.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCullough, John A.
McDermott, John J.
McDevitt, Ronald F.
McGonagill, Eber C.
McGown, William A., Jr.
McGuiness, Donald A.
McIntyre, James G.
McKay, Robert W.
McKean, Francis E.
McKee, George R., Jr.
McKenzie, James A., Jr.
McKinlay, Archibald, Jr.
McKinnon, George H.
McKinster, James W.
McKnight, Kent A.
McMahill, Gary A.
McMillin, George W.
McNamara, William L.
McNenny, Patrick "J" S.
Melton, Arthur W.
Melville, Noel
Merkle, George W.
Merritt, Robert L.
Mester, Richard L.
Meyer, Donald J.
Michaels, John R.
Millen, Thomas H.
Miller, Bruce J.
Miller, Bryce N.
Miller, George E.
Miller, Raleigh B., Jr.
Miller, Robert R.
Miller, Russell C.
Miller, Theodore W.
Mitchell, Donald F.
Mitchell, James C.
Mobley, Arthur S.
Mode, Paul J.
Monaghan, James J., Jr.
Montgomery, Kenneth
Montross, Robert W.
Moody, Frank L.
Mook, Joe
Moore, Byron O.
Moore, Hugh A.
Moore, John R.
Moore, Percy J.
Moore, Thomas W.
Morano, Anthony
Moredock, William J.
Morisette, Clement J.
Morris, Charles H.
Morris, James I.
Mortimer, Edward H., III
Morton, Robert R.
Morton, Theodore E.
Moss, David P.
Moss, Jack L.
Motes, Thomas L.
Moye, William B., Jr.
Mudgett, Francis S.
Mudgett, Richard L.
Multer, Richard P.
Mulvany, George M.
Mundt, Werner F.
Murphy, Arthur D.
Murphy, Richard G.
Murray, Thomas F.
Musgrave, "R" "F"
Myers, Lowell R.
Myers, Richard C.
Nagel, Harold A., Jr.
Narowetz, Bruce A.
Nash, Owen W.
Needham, Donald E.
Neel, William M.
Neel, William C.
Nelles, Merice T.
Nelson, Jesse R.
Nelson, Lawrence R.
Newton, John E.
Niemela, George R.
Nightingale, Billy R.
Nix, Walter C.
Noblit, Charles LaR.
Noll, Rolf F.
Noren, Rees E.
Norris, Frederick J., Jr.
Nott, Edward C., Jr.
Nyland, Walter L.
Oaksmith, David E., Jr.
Oberg, Chester R.
O'Brien, John T.
O'Connell, Robert L.
O'Connell, Richard M.
O'Connell, William J.
O'Dea, Paul F.
O'Dell, Jerry T.
Offrell, David W.
Oldmixon, William J.
Oleson, David E.
Olsen, Charles F.
Olsen, Jerome J.
Olsen, Robert M.
O'Malia, Robert J.
O'Malley, David E.
O'Neill, Norbert W.
Ormond, George, Jr.
Orsik, Walter A.
Orsino, Leo A.
Ortmann, Dean A.
O'Shaughnessy, Robert J.
Oslun, William J.
Ostergren, James E.
O'Sullivan, Richard C.
O'Toole, Arthur L., Jr.
Otto, Robert O.
Padrta, Jerry C.
Paganelli, John E.
Palmer, David J.
Parks, Richard E.
Parsons, David E.
Pasztalaniec, Matthew F.
Paterson, Dale R.
Patrick, Julian C.
Patten, Robert S.
Patterson, William Van H.
Patterson, Lee R.
Paulson, Allan G.
Pearl, Harlan R.
Pedigo, Robert E.
Peery, William K.
Perault, David J.
Perkins, Jack C.
Peters, Deane G.
Petersen, Gordon S.
Peterson, Alfred A.
Peterson, Mell A., Jr.
Pettigrew, Joseph H.
Peugh, Dighton
Pfarrer, Charles P., Jr.
Phillips, Paul E.
Philpot, Marvin L.
Phoenix, David "A"
Pierce, Robert K.
Pietrowski, Joseph L.
Pikell, Joseph V.
Pippin, William E.
Pitcher, William E.
Pitfield, David C.
Pitts, David T.
Pitts, David B.
Platner, Fredric W.
Plesur, Jack J.
Polini, Eugene T., Jr.
Pollack, Harold I.
Polsin, Robert W.
Pope, John W. R., Jr.
Poreda, Charles P.
Post, George W.
Post, Jerome
Potosnak, Joseph E.
Potts, Bill H.
Premo, Melvin C.
Price, Carroll R.
Priestley, Joseph R.
Primeau, Don G.
Prosser, Rudolph J.
Pugliano, Ralph J.
Pullen, Luther D.
Puopolo, Michael J.
Purtell, Joseph M.
Quartly, Alexander H. W.
Quillin, Thomas E.
Rademacher, John W.
Raiter, Richard F.
Ramos, Steve LaC.
Ramzy, James R.
Raper, Albert D.
Raunig, David R.
Raysin, Paul E.
Read, Richard R.
Reardon, John R.
Reasonover, Roger L., Jr.
Reese, Franklin W., III
Register, Marvin O.
Reid, John A.
Reinhardt, Jerry B.
Reisinger, John E.
Renninger, Willard H.
Reynolds, James V.
Reynolds, Marvin D.
Rhodes, Thomas B.
Rice, Alan H.
Rice, Donald K.
Richards, Walter E.
Richardson, William C.
Richter, Ronald P.
Rickly, James M.
Riegel, Robert W.
Riendeau, Gerald L.
Ritchie, John K.
Rivers, John B.
Robbins, Paul H.
Robertson, Robert R., Jr.
Robey, George R., Jr.
Robinson, Duane A.
Robinson, William N.
Rockefeller, Harry C., Jr.
Roderick, Daniel W.
Rodriguez, William P.
Roe, Donald W., Jr.
Rogers, Robert B.
Rogers, Thomas D.
Rork, John K.
Rose, Charles C., Jr.

Rose, James S.
Roth, Conrad W.
Rowland, Charles M., Jr.
Ruggles, Kenneth W.
Rumelhart, Max R.
Rupp, Jimmie L.
Russell, Kenneth B.
Ryan, Albert
Ryan, James W.
Ryan, John N.
Ryan, Roger P.
Ryman, Gerald M.
Sabol, Ernest J., Jr.
Salmon, Robert L.
Salva, Fedor R., Jr.
Samonds, John P.
Samples, Loy C.
Sandoval, Silvano F.
Sangster, Robert A.
Sapp, Charles S.
Sawyer, Kenneth R.
Scheurich, Thomas E.
Schibel, Robert L.
Schlemmer, Robert M.
Schlenzig, Robert E.
Schmidt, Gilbert E.
Schoeckert, Robert D.
Schoeffel, Peter VanR.
Schoonover, Charles D.
Schroats, Richard P.
Schultz, Earl E.
Schuppert, Vincent J.
Schuster, Gustave P.
Schwaebe, Charles F.
Scott, Robert W.
Sedlak, Richard K.
Seifert, James R.
Seifert, Robert J.
Seigenthaler, Thomas U.
Selby, Paul F.
Selgrath, James J.
Sellers, John W.
Sesler, Ralph M.
Sewell, Robert L.
Shafer, Don M.
Shanaghan, John J.
Shannon, Edward R.
Shaughnessy, Francis M.
Shearer, Oliver V., Jr.
Shearer, Thomas D.
Sheehan, Robert K.
Sheldon, George E., Jr.
Shelly, Ronald G.
Shewchuk, William M.
Shields, Robert G.
Shimek, Paul, Jr.
Shinholser, Charles E.
Shirley, Milford E.
Shrader, Ebert F.
Shuey, Robert L.
Shultz, Donald E., Jr.
Shumaker, Lawrence A.
Shuman, Edwin A., III
Simia, Richard
Sinwell, Raymond J.
Sisson, Thomas U., Jr.
Siverly, Paul L.
Skarlatos, Paul
Skillen, Robert L.
Slattery, Francis A.
Smidt, Robert L.
Smith, Albert L.
Smith, Allen, III
Smith, Chester R.
Smith, David G.
Smith, Donald P.
Smith, Edward R.
Smith, "H" "O"
Smith, Irvin L.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Leighton D.
Smith, Ralph R.
Smith, Stewart C.
Smith, Walter S.
Sneed, William Y.
Snider, Lloyd H.
Snyder, Edward C., Jr.
Snyder, Sherman R.
Snyder, Virgil C.
Soczek, William
Soderholm, Richard C.
Soltys, Mitchel S.
Sommers, Carl "W", II
Sorenson, Curtis A.
Sottak, Edward J.
Southwick, Charles E.
Spear, John R.
Speirer, Paul E., Jr.
Spencer, Russell E.
Springston, William A.
Spurrier, William W.
Stacy, John O.
Stallworth, Lewis A., III
Stamm, Ernest A.
Starbuck, Thomas H.
Stechmann, Donald H.
Steel, Charles E.
Steele, Francis X.
Steele, Ted C., Jr.
Stefferud, David R.
Steffes, Herbert J.
Steinman, Alfred D., Jr.
Stelter, Frederick C., III
Sterling, Kenneth L.
Stevenson, LeeRoy J.
Stevenson, Donald W.
Stevenson, Peter K.
Stevenson, George L.
Stickling, William R.
Stickney, Harold "L"
Stilwell, Charles H., Jr.
Stock, Merlyn L.
Stoddart, Ronald L.
Stoffel, Michael J.
Stone, Jack W., Jr.
Stone, Robert A.
Stone, Ronald P.
Stoner, Thomas M.
Storck, Bernard F.
Storm, Carroll F.
Storms, James G., III
Stovall, John C.
Strasler, Herbert J.
Stroop, Paul D., Jr.
Strum, Gerard M., Jr.
Stuebben, Richard W., Jr.
Sullivan, John G.
Sullivan, Martin J.
Sullivan, Richard M., Jr.
Sullivan, Russell J.
Sutherland, Terence B.
Sutherland, William P.
Sweeney, John H., III
Sweet, Harry J.
Swenson, Nils A.
Switzer, Anton R.
Switzer, Robert J.
Tanner, Charles N.
Tanner, John P.
Tate, Charles E.
Tate, John F.
Taylor, Arthur C.
Taylor, Harold A., Jr.
Taylor, James D.
Test, Richard "Z"
Thalman, Robert H.
Thayer, Albert J.
Thomas, Benjamin A.
Thompson, Emil S., Jr.
Thompson, James C.
Thompson, Richard L.
Thompson, Richard G.
Thornton, Ray O.
Thrailkill, Chester, Jr.
Thudium, Wayne E.
Thunman, Nils R.
Tibbetts, Herbert E.
Tisdale, Albin A.
Tise, Donald G.
Tolg, Robert G., Jr.
Tom, Joseph
Tondora, Joseph E.
Townley, John L.
Tracy, George W., II
Trask, Ace F.
Treagy, Paul E., Jr.
Trenham, Herbert D.
Trevors, George A.
Trone, Dennis R.
Truman, Ernest W., Jr.
Trygsland, Arnold L.
Tucker, Eli L., Jr.
Tucker, Thomas A.
Tully, William R., Jr.
Turner, Ralph A., Jr.
Ulmer, Donald M.
Ulrich, Charles H.
Vainosky, Thomas M.
VanAntwerp, Richard D.
Vandewater, George L., Jr.
Van Dien, Casper R.
Van Dusen, Harold L.
Van Dyke, Willard H., Jr.
Varhalla, Michael R.
Vatidis, Christopher R.
Vaughan, Evan J., Jr.
Vaughan, Robert R.
Veatch, Philip A.
Vellom, Lee S.
Vernam, Claude C.
Villar, Emmanuel J.
Vogelberger, Peter J., Jr.
VonPerbandt, Louis K.
Vreeland, James M.
Wack, Charles G.
Walck, Claude W.
Walker, Benny R.
Walker, Charles
Walker, Jack O.
Walker, Raymond H., Jr.
Wallace, Dallas L.
Wallace, James D.
Wallace, Richard M.
Wallen, Millard L., Jr.
Walsh, Don
Walsh, Harvey T., Jr.
Walsh, Joseph A., Jr.
Walter, Howard J.
Ward, Charles W. D., Jr.
Ward, Conrad J.
Ward, Hugh P.
Ward, John H.
Warnke, James F.
Warthen, Ronald R.
Watkins, Howard B., Jr.
Watson, George, Jr.
Watson, Robert "M"
Watson, Thomas C., Jr.
Watson, Thomas P.
Watson, Thomas H.
Webb, Haven N.
Webb, James E.
Webb, John B.
Weed, John W.
Weir, Jack T.
Weitz, Paul J., Jr.
Welborn, William P.
Welcome, Allan T.
Wells, John E.
Wells, Peter M.
Welsh, Vincent F.
Wensman, Linus B.
Werness, Maurice H.
Wessel, James E.
West, Denton W.
West, Donald A.
Weston, Gustav R.
Wetzel, James F.
Wetzel, Weslie W.
Whalen, Joseph D.
Whaley, Daniel E., Jr.
Wheeler, Charles G.
Whitaker, James E.
White, Donald J.
White, Irvin L.
White, Raymond L.
White, Robert C.
White, William A.
Wickwire, George A., Jr.
Wiecking, Kenneth D.
Wight, Roy R.
Wigley, William W.
Wildberger, August M.
Wildman, John B.
Wilfert, Eugene N.
Wilford, Donald McK.
Will, John M., Jr.
Williams, Edward O'N.
Williams, John O., Jr.
Williams, Ronel J. D.
Willis, Arthur A., Jr.
Willis, James S., Jr.
Willmeroth, Earl R.
Wilmer, Robert R.
Wilson, David P.
Wilson, David G.
Wilson, Hugh P.
Wilson, William R.
Winchester, Warren H.
Winkowski, John R.
Winn, Velmer A. J.
Winton, Fred "B", Jr.
Wintriss, George V.
Wisniewski, Sylvester S.
Withers, Fred J.
Witthoft, Ronald D.
Wood, David E.
Wood, Fred L.
Wood, Leon G., Jr.
Wood, Noel T.
Wooden, Bruce J.
Woods, Carl J.
Woodward, John L.
Woollard, Edwin F.
Woolway, David J.
Wright, James R.
Wright, Murray H.
Wright, Robert R.
Wright, Ronald A.
Wyckoff, Peter B.
Yarger, Ernest F.
Yarger, Luther D.
Yarwood, John O.
Yates, James L., Jr.
Yenowine, George H.
Yonke, William D.
Young, Harold L.
Young, James E.
Young, Milton E.
Youngblood, Newton C.
Zable, Joseph J.
Zapalac, Robert E.
Zelones, Vincent L.
Zettle, Harold
Zidbeck, William E.
Zimmerman, Robert V.
Zuilkoski, Ronald R.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

Anthony, Lynn E.
Ash, Henry T.
Baisch, Bruce F.
Baker, Howard A.
Benson, Victor G.
Brown, Carleton J.
Brown, Robert H.
Burkle, Joseph S.
Connor, Richard B.
Deas, Thomas C.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Dineen, James R.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Draper, Arthur J.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Egan, John T., Jr.
Esswein, John G.
Fisichella, Rosario A.
Fleck, Robert L.
Fraser, William E.
Geib, Philip O.
Helgerson, Arthur A.
Hering, Alexander C.
Holmes, Alden V.
Honsik, Cyril J.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.
Howard, John W.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
Kelley, Kenneth J.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Lewis, Garner L.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Loeffler, Robert A.
Mackie, Robert W.
Martin, Richard J.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Nauman, Richard D.
Nordstrom, Harry C.
Ricketson, George M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Charles E.
Rush, Anthony P.
Schlang, Henry A.
Semmens, James P.
Spicher, Robert W.
Stevenson, Roger
Valusek, Fred A.
VanPetten, George T.

To be commanders

Bamberg, Paul G.
Brannon, Leland C.
Broaddus, Carl A., Jr.
Burke, Francis W.
Doolan, Paul D.
Drake, Robert M.
Edwards, Donald W.
Flynn, John W.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Golbranson, Frank L.
Hubbard, Hampton
Kent, Donald C.
Peckinpaugh, Robert O.
Peters, Earl R.
Sanborn, Neal D.
Sebrechts, Paul H.
Stark, James E.
Trier, William C.
Troy, John W.

To be lieutenant commanders

Allison, Mack E., Jr.
Azeris, Harijs T.
Babalis, William J.
Barnwell, Frank M.
Britton, Joseph H.
Burkhart, Vernon A.
Clarke, Pauline E.
Cooley, Norman V., Jr.
Frew, Mable A.
Gordon, John J.
Hamilton, Warren W., Jr.
Hyams, Vincent J.
Jacoby, William J., Jr.
Lucas, William E.
Lynch, Mary T.
Maughon, James S.
McDonough, Robert C.
Miller, Charles H.
Murphy, James J.
Musgrave, Max E.
O'Connell, Patrick F.
Parkinson, Leonard S. C.
Rossi, Joseph G.
Stephens, David L.
Turchi, Giuseppe
Wilson, David Q.
Winter, William R.
Wood, Matthew W.

To be lieutenants

Aaron, Benjamin L.
Akers, Richard E.
Austin, Frederick L., Jr.
Avery, Gordon B.
Avitabile, Stanton H.
Axe, Paul W., Jr.
Bailey, David W.
Baker, James P.
Baker, William P.
Barrett, Warren M.
Bartlett, Eugene F.
Bartlett, William A.
Bauer, William F.
Baxter, John C.
Beaty, Harry N.
Becker, Matthew K.
Beckman, William R.
Belevetz, David R.
Bemiller, Carl R.
Berry, Juanedd
Billingsley, Frank S.
Bird, Harry H., Jr.
Black, Maurice W.
Black, Robert C.
Blair, Sidney M.
Blais, Bernard R.
Block, Robert C.
Bloom, Joseph D.
Brackett, John W., Jr.
Brandon, Ralph F.
Brock, Richard R. H.
Bromley, Jess W.
Brooks, Robert T., Jr.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Stuart L.
Bucko, Matthew I., Jr.
Busch, Frederick M.
Calhoun, William M.
Cannard, Ralph J.
Castro, Joseph R.
Caulfield, Francis J., Jr.
Cavanagh, James J.
Cavin, William J., Jr.
Cerny, Matthew J., Jr.
Ching, Charles C.
Clark, Samuel S.
Collier, James C. P., Jr.
Coniff, Robert F.
Conkey, George A.
Connolly, Jul? T.
Cook, Roger C.
Cooper, Conrad L.
Cowen, Malcolm L.
Cunningham, John E., Jr.
Cutcher, Robert I.
Dalco, John C.
Day, John R., Jr.
DeBolt, William L.
Dewhirst, Milton C.
Dill, Donald M.
Diorio, Neil G.
Dolan, Robert G.
Dooley, Robert T.
Drum, David E.
Ducker, David E.
Duncan, Elmore E.

Erie, Norman A.
Evans, Robley D.
Farmer, Billy G.
Fieldson, Thomas L.
Fisch, James M.
Fitzgibbon, Carney, Jr.
Flack, James V., Jr.
Flynn, Peter A.
Freeman, Edward E.
Fuller, Dee L.
Gansa, Alexander N.
Garrison, Robert C., Jr.
Gibbs, John B.
Gill, Kenneth A., Jr.
Goddard, James E., Jr.
Goff, Terry H.
Goller, Vernon L.
Goodman, Maxwell W.
Gragg, Donald M.
Griffin, John P.
Halleen, Wayne I.
Hart, Daniel A.
Hazel, John R.
Hedges, Harold H., III
Hendra, Alan K.
Herring, John H.
Hodge, Warren W.
Hoffman, Donald E.
Hoke, Bob
Holderman, Henry L.
Holmboe, Arthur H.
Hopwood, Herbert G., Jr.
Hughes, Philip C.
Ickler, John L.
Jack, George A.
Jones, Frederic G.
Kelley, Donald L.
Kelley, William S., Jr.
Kennedy, Billy D.
Kern, John D.
Klein, Garner F.
Kostinas, John E.
Kyger, Kent
Lang, Jesse E.
Langsjoen, Ralph J.
Larcom, Gordon D., Jr.
Larson, James A.
Lawlor, Peter P., Jr.
Lawton, George M.
Learey, Kenneth L.
Levin, Howard A.
Levy, Jerome
Lewis, Jay F., II
Lockwood, Richard A.
Long, Virginia A.
Lovecchio, Francis A.
MacDonald, Rodney I.
MacLennan, John C.
Magi, Martin
Martin, George F., Jr.
Mathews, George W., Jr.
McGillis, Thomas J.
McGowan, Edward M., Jr.
McGrory, Thomas P.
McIntyre, James A. A.
McMicken, William H.
Merchant, Raymond J., Jr.
Meyer, Melvin B.
Miewald, John R.
Miranda, Mario C.
Mitchell, George H., Jr.
Moll, Francis K., Jr.
Morgan, Robert I.
Mullins, Wallace R.
Mullins, William J., Jr.
Neal, Royden W.
Neel, Samuel N.
Norton, Richard H.
O'Brien, Bernard E.
Ochs, Charles W.
Oden, George W.
O'Halloran, Patrick S.
O'Lane, John M.
O'Leary, Jay F.
Olson, Robert L.
Page, Larry K.
Palumbo, Ralph R.
Parker, Nelson H., III
Payne, Charles F., Jr.
Payne, Milton L.
Perkins, Robert H.
Pettengill, Howard W., Jr.
Phillips, Darwin D.
Pollard, Harry S. Jr.
Puk, John A.
Pulicicchio, Louis U.
Rack, Robert V.
Ragsdale, Julian L.
Randall, Glenn H.
Reckenthaler, Karl J.
Redick, Lloyd F.
Richardson, Charles R.
Rigsby, Robert E.
Rish, Berkley L.
Roberts, Donald M.
Robl, Robert J.
Roe, Jack M.
Rogers, Donald R.
Rogers, Jerry R.
Rohren, Donald W.
Roof, Roger S.
Rudolph, Samuel F., Jr.
Rumbel, Harold E.
Russotto, Joseph A.
Sargent, Charles R.
Scavo, Vincent J.
Schumacher, William H.
Scott, Augustus B.
Sharpe, Richard G.
Shaskey, Robert E.
Shaw, Spencer W.
Shepard, Barclay M.
Sincox, Francis J., Jr.
Slemmons, Daniel H.
Smith, Ray M.
Smith, Royal A.
Snyder, Harry D.
Stout, Bill D.
Stout, Bob E.
Swartz, Philip K., Jr.
Szojchet, Alvin
Taylor, Thomas E.
Thomas, Lawrence E.
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, Richard A.
Thompson, Robert E.
Thorne, Lawrence G.
Tobey, Raymond E.
Tully, John G., Jr.
Tupper, James R.
Ungersma, John A.
Vaught, Richard L.
Viola, Francis V., III
Walklett, William D.
Walter, Eugene P.
Wander, Harry J.
Weir, Gordon J., Jr.
West, William F.
Wheeler, Jock R.
Willard, Donald E., Jr.
Willcutts, Harrison D.
Wilson, Wayne R., Jr.
Wilson, William J.
Wright, Irving V.
Youngs, Luther A., III

SUPPLY CORPS

To be captains

Allen, John P.
Arrighi, Norman L.
Arst, Norton J.
Balch, Richard S.
Ball, Stuart M.
Beyer, Kenneth M.
Bloxom, Elliott
Bonnell, Graham C.
Bradley, Rex A.
Brogan, James M.
Cain, Thomas C., Jr.
Campbell, Robert R.
Cartee, James W.
Christensen, Don C.
Clark, Grover V.
Clark, Robert L., Jr.
Cone, Daniel G.
Cooley, Hollis W.
Custer, John D.
Daray, Jack L., Jr.
Dollard, John T.
Edwards, Robert B.
Evans, Philip W.
Everett, Robert J.
Foster, George S., Jr.
Fowler, Marion V.
Freeborn, Stanley B., Jr.
Gay, William W., Jr.
Graham, John W.
Gregg, William B.
Harrison, Frederick D.
Harvey, James E., Jr.
Helsel, Rolland A.
Henry, George, Jr.
Hirst, John W.
Hobgood, William W.
Howard, Joseph L.
Hughes, William V.
Jepson, Francis E.
Jones, Richard M.
Kahao, Martin J. B.
Knight, Charles L.
La Barre, Carl A.
Lindsay, Peter M.
Linscott, Henry D., Jr.
Lyles, Arromanus C., Jr.
Lynch, James J.
Lyness, Douglas H.
Lyon, Frederick A.
Malloy, John M.
Mann, Arthur W., Jr.
McCarten, George C., Jr.
McCreery, Bernard L.
McCrone, Andrew M.
Peterson, George W., Jr.
Purvis, Theodore B., Jr.
Quinn, Joseph P.
Rainey, Benajah L.
Rieseberg, Robert W.
Rieve, Roland
Roberts, Leo W.
Ross, William H.
Sharp, Evert R.
Shea, Leonard E.
Smith, Bert
Smith, Stuart H.
Spore, James S.
Stern, Theodore S.
Sullivan, John D.
Tobias, Robert H.
Van Der Maaten, Robert R.
Voegeli, George L.
Williams, Richard A.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Zimet, Stanford F.

To be commanders

Barrett, Henry T.
Bayer, John F.
Becker, Charles
Duke, Edwin L.
Fernald, Joseph A.
Garbak, Albert C.
Gardiner, Charles V.
Gaver, Harry L.
Harrington, Bernard C.
Ireland, Charles W.
Jaxtheimer, John C.
Johnson, Herbert L.
Lachicotte, Albert S., Jr.
Leary, Raymond F.
Maas, William C.
Marshall, John C.
McFadden, John P.
McMorries, Edwin E.
Meyer, William H., Jr.
Miller, James
Milliren, Howard C.
Mosolf, Lewis E.
Olson, George E., Jr.
Papageorge, Andrew J.
Paulsen, William N.
Penebaker, George W.
Quarles, Palmer A., Jr.
Randolph, Robert R.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Reilly, Frank J., Jr.
Rubel, Robert L.
Sanders, Roy N.
Schoggen, Joe G.
Scott, Leroy M.
Sheen, Raymond H.
Siembt, LaVerne L.
Slover, Jay A.
Standish, John C.
Sullivan, Raymond S.
Van Pelt, James C.
Wade, Aredus B., Jr.
Washburn, Dale W.
Windsor, James M.

To be lieutenant commanders

Abrams, Bernard
Allan, Richard T.
Armstrong, William S.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Bandish, Bernard J.
Bateman, Roger I., Jr.
Baumgardner, James M.
Bigham, Robert G., Jr.
Brennan, Jack M.
Brown, Lowell E.
Buben, George
Burgess, Frederick C.
Butler, Arthur G., Jr.
Carlson, John C.
Case, George O.
Charette, Author E.
Cheshure, Joseph H.
Chupalio, Anthony F.
Cohen, John F.
Coon, LeRoy E.
Crouch, Perry B.
Daniels, Hoyle H., II
Day, Robert D.
Dellinger, Charley P.
Depew, Robert W.
De Santo, James V.
Dietz, Howard M.
Donnelly, Joseph A.
Downey, James G.
Evans, Stuart J.
Ferris, Robert H.
Fisk, Calvin W.
Fjelsta, John E.
Fowler, George O., Jr.
Fronke, Robert E.
Fry, Roy A., Jr.
Gaetz, Edward F., Jr.
Gaschen, Fredrick S.
Haines, Donald R.
Hanson, Frank L.
Harris, Melvin W.
Hart, Billy W.
Hatch, James C.
Hatton, Roy E.
Heitmeyer, Richard C.
Hency, Max E.
Hillard, Herbert S., Jr.
Hobkirk, Carl M.
Holfield, Arthur W., Jr.
Holt, Robert O.
Honsinger, Jack E.
Horngren, Earl W.
Hughes, Lowell T.
Huntress, James F.
Hutchison, Marvin S.
Johnson, John T.
Johnson, Karl A.
Johnson, Richard D.
Johnson, Warren B.
Jones, John F.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kash, William B.
Keenan, Joseph I.
Keller, Bruce W.
Kellogg, Dean L.
Kennedy, Patrick F.
Knight, Reed H.
Knipple, John D.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J.
Kramp, Henry F.
Lake, Donald H.
Laning, George H.
Lindsey, Bob R.
Longmire, Billy R.
Luck, William E.
Marshall, John F.
Martin, Donald V.
Marx, James H.
Maurstad, Alfred S.
Maxon, Ivan B.
McBroom, William M.
McKenna, James E.
Morlan, Robert M.
Murauskas, William A.
Murray, Paul T.
Nash, William T.
Newton, Ernest C.
Nunn, Enoch W.
O'Connor, Thomas J.
Oller, William M.
Orr, Raymond J.
Orrill, Donald P.
Owen, Frank T., Jr.
Pate, Walter T., Jr.
Pillar, Samuel A.
Pistner, Robert G.
Pluto, Raymond J.
Podrouzek, William J.
Polk, Donald E.
Polk, Robert B.
Pope, George S., Jr.
Prehn, John L., Jr.
Primm, Jules R.
Raney, William O.
Rebentisch, Joseph A., Jr.
Riley, George D., Jr.
Roberts, Maynard R.
Ronayne, William D.
Ross, Joel E.
Rossi, Louis P.
Schultz, Jackson L.
Shepard, John C.
Sloan, Waldo D., Jr.
Smith, Carlton B.
Smith, William C.
Starbody, John L.
Thayer, Ernest C.
Thomason, Vernon D.
Thompson, Edwin H.
Thompson, Robert W.
Tice, "J" Philip
Tippin, Jesse R.
Truax, Ernest L., Jr.
Turnage, Robert E.
Tylman, Frank J.
Urban, John S.
Van Osdol, Robert C.
Varney, William G.
Vogel, Robert E.
Vogel, William J.
Waldron, William S.
Walker, Hinton C.
Waller, Thomas C., Jr.
Wasko, Andrew J.
Welch, Gordon E.
Weyrauch, Gerald H.
Wilsie, Roger M.
Wilson, Robert M.

To be lieutenants

Anderson, Richard A.
Anglim, Matthew E., Jr.
Armitage, James H.
Awalt, Richard E.
Babcock, Barry B.
Baglioni, Francis X.
Bartholomew, Charles W.
Bechtelheimer, Robert R.
Bennett, Richard B.
Blackshaw, Joseph R.
Bodart, Cletus W.
Brewin, Robert L.
Brooks, John E.
Brotherton, Curtis W.
Burr, William E.
Byers, Austin L.
Casselberry, Lynn W., Jr.
Caverly, Michael K.
Chapman, Charles B., III
Christenson, Richard D.
Clark, Shelby Van N. T.
Cocking, Rollin J.
Cook, Gerald W.
Cornelius, Jack M.
Cotton, Robert E.
Cronk, Philip W.
Delleney, Jimmie S.
Dollard, Paul A.
Dusenberry, Frank J.
Farrell, James G.
Fekula, Theodore V.
Ferraro, Niel P.
Flood, Peter A.
Fuka, Otto J., Jr.
Graessle, Philip G.
Grise, Norman W., Jr.
Hall, Robert A.
Hanly, Joseph B.
Harkin, James W.
Harless, Charles A.
Harrigan, Thomas F., Jr.
Hawkins, Charles A.
Hensley, Frank M.
Hochmuth, Alvin E., Jr.
Hollowell, Samuel T., Jr.
Horrigan, John W., Jr.
Jesser, Arthur D.
Johnson, Millard J.
Kela, Frederick H.
Klaren, John C.
Kurowski, Raymond J.
Lanphere, Robert J.
Lawrence, Robert W.
LeBlanc, George J., Jr.
LeBlanc, Merrill M.
Lewis, Brian K.
Mantlo, Glendon R.
McCarthy, Leonard D.
McCurdy, Bruce D.
Moore, James W.
Nelson, Alfred B.
Nolan, Frank R.
O'Connor, Robert W.
Ostrom, Lester E.
Parent, Elias A., Jr.
Partridge, John D.
Peek, Luther W.
Peterson, Kenneth A.
Pottinger, Ian G.
Prutzman, William L.
Read, Farra L., Jr.
Ribble, Marland S.
Rice, Harold A.
Richards, Walter T.
Riordan, William H.

Rolfe, James A.
Rose, Rufus E., Jr.
Ross, Howard "T", Jr.
Roth, Richard J.
Sanders, John R.
Savage, William H., Jr.
Sellers, Robert D.
Sevier, Moses T.
Shipley, Maynard K.
Shultz, William E.
Smith, Jay R., Jr.
Springer, Donald F.
Sterner, Norman G.
Stevenson, Ray H.
Strange, Geoffrey G.
Tillery, Preston J.
Topping, James F.
VanValkenburg, Max W.
Velotas, Bill M.
Wagner, John E.
Walker, Edward K., Jr.
Warneke, Grover C.
Weiss, Armand B.
White, Jack A.
Williams, Walter L.
Wilson, Kenneth B.
Wohl, Paul
Young, Robert H.
Zeberlein, George V.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be captains

Albrecht, Herbert C. W.
McComas, Robert F.
Michaels, Emmett T.
Moorman, Julian P., Jr.
Reaves, James E.
Ricker, Richard W.
Salyer, Oswald B.
Schnurr, Herman J.
Stephenson, Marion O.
Weise, John W.
Wright, George A.

To be commanders

Bonner, Robert A.
Cassady, Kermit R.
O'Neill, John J.
Sodt, William G.

To be lieutenant commanders

Agnew, James F.
Arnold, Charles L.
Below, Ralph W.
Connolly, Homer T.
Detrick, Wayne N.
Dunn, Edward J.
Goodman, Garson
Jackson, Raymond E.
Kensta, Felix L.
Lineberger, Ernest R.
Long, Bradford W.
McCarthy, Eugene W.
McDonnell, James T.
Paulson, George I.
Smith, Vincent M.
Sundt, Valery E.
Ward, Leo D.
Williams, Bruce H.
Wootten, Thomas J.

To be lieutenants

Baxter, Roy A.
Bliss, Donald
Brudzynski, Peter F.
Dozier, John W.
Gallagher, Bartholomew T.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Hilferty, Thomas J.
Hinderer, George M.
Jones, Stephen N.
Laurenzano, Roch M.
Lemieux, Ernest S.
Maritato, Victor J.
Meschke, David L.
Milosek, William J.
O'Gorman, Charles F.
Regan, James P.
Seegers, Leonard O.
Snyder, Marvin E., Jr.
Urbano, Francis J.
Vernon, Clarence A.
Walsh, Ronald J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be captains

Allegrone, Charles
Barnett, Thomas E.
Clampet, William T.
Cocke, Thomas P.
Cooke, Frederick A. F.
Culp, Dennis K.
Gill, Samuel C., Jr.
Johnson, Henry J.
Maley, William T., Jr.
McFarland, Wilburn J., Jr.
McLellon, Waldron M.
Merdinger, Charles J.
Neumann, Arthur C.
Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.
Raymond, John M., Jr.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Smith, Spencer R.
Sparks, Robert E.
Stevens, Harry, Jr.
Thomas, Robert E., Jr.

To be commanders

Barnes, George W., Jr.
Burke, John L.
Clarke, John F.
Gibbons, Earl F.
Graves, Lenson W.
Griffiths, William H., Jr.
Hayen, Charles L.
Loeffler, Harry H., Jr.
Minwegen, Arthur P.
Pyles, LaVern, Jr.
Reno, James N.
Roloff, Jerome W.

To be lieutenant commanders

Alberts, Carl D.
Andrews, James D.
Barron, William W.
Bothwell, John R.
Burch, Bobby F.
Butler, Charles W.
Cahill, Harold P., Jr.
Cochran, Joseph DeV.
Curione, Charles
Dewey, Elliot A.
Dunn, Robert H. P.
Ellis, Darl A.
Feinman, David M.
Gentry, William W.
Hoskins, Dalton
Jortberg, Robert F.
LeDoux, John C.
Lennox, Frederick E.
Marron, James P.
Merrill, Bergen S., Jr.
Miller, Robert H.
Nuss, Edward S.
Perkins, Anson C.
Pickett, Eugene L.
Puddicombe, Robert W.
Rumble, James D.
Russell, William F., Jr.
Sears, Kenneth P.
Shockey, Dan N.
Simonson, Nelson C.
Smith, Donald E.
Stacey, Ernest R.
Timberlake, Lewis G.
Wallace, Billy C.
Williams, Richard C.
Williams, Thomas C.
Wilson, William D.

To be lieutenants

Andersen, Charles P.
Auerbach, Ralph W., Jr.
Barry, Richard P.
Berdan, Maurice R.
Block, Norman G.
Brooks, Kenneth D.
Brown, George H.
Bruch, Charles G.
Burger, Henry K.
Collins, James R.
Eager, Walter J., Jr.
Edson, Theodore M.
Gans, George M., Jr.
George, Roscoe D., Jr.
Gibboney, Lloyd H.
Hanlon, Mark Z., Jr.
Hathaway, David B.
Hauck, John W.
Jones, John P., Jr.
Moger, Jack B.
Moore, Fred, Jr.
Morton, Donald A.
Nicholls, William H., Jr.
Nystedt, Russell P.
Oscarson, Edward R.
Petzrick, Paul A.
Pitman, James B., Jr.
Randall, Robert R.
Sherrod, Henry C., Jr.
Smila, William W.
Socha, Albert R., Jr.
Stedman, Ralph S., Jr.
Sweeney, John C.
Sylva, John P., Jr.
Taglienti, Gene S.
Toliver, Jack M.
Tombarge, John W.
Urish, Daniel W.
Wile, Dorwin B.
Williams, Jesse R.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
DoBronte, Frank
Enke, Loren F.
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Hillis, Walter G.
Lyon, Harvey W.
Mueller, Ray B.
Rhobotham, Frank B.
Stowell, Ralph H.

To be commanders

Bassett, Donald R.
Benson, Lambert A.
Besbekos, George A.
Calton, Melvin L.
Gossom, John N.
Marmarose, Frank A.
Peachey, James B.
Pentecost, John W.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Ulrich, George, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Austin, Robert E.
Bartosh, Andrew J.
Brown, Edward H.
Dennis, Harry J., Jr.
Duggan, Norman E.
Elliott, Robert W., Jr.
Enger, Theodore C.
Finnegan, Frederick J.
Hembre, Lloyd E.
Johnson, "C" Paul, Jr.
Knoedler, David J.
Leupold, Robert J.
Mann, William H.
Myrio, Donny A.
Penick, Edward C.
Rau, Charles F.
Sachs, Samuel J.
Schweitzer, John R.
Wilkens, Carl H., Jr.
Zeigler, Paul E.

To be lieutenants

Abate, Edwin G.
Adams, Robert C.
Allman, Daryl M.
Altman, Richard S.
Amato, Angelo E.
Arnold, Charles T.
Barley, Martin A.
Beesley, Charles V.
Begin, Raymond J.
Biron, George A.
Bitter, Norman C.
Boeke, Peter R.
Bryson, William F.
Burch, Meredith S.
Burke, Joseph H.
Casper, James A.
Castronovo, Sam
Cavalaris, Constantine J.
Chesser, Victor L.
Clynes, James T.
Corio, Russell L.
Corsello, Robert W.
Creedon, Robert L.
Desenfants, John A.
Earle, Lewis S.
Eid, Clark N.
Eppolito, John S.
Garrett, Fred A.
Gentry, Jesse T.
Hall, Donald B.
Heppler, Rosco Z.
Hill, Ronald K.
Hillenbrand, Ronald E.
Hodges, Albert P., Jr.
Howe, Robert E.
Hublou, Roland A.
Huettner, Robert E.
Johnson, Ronald H.
Joy, Edwin D., Jr.
Joyner, Charles D., Jr.
Koutouzakis, Henry P.
Leonard, Walter P.
Lessig, John F.
Love, Charles J.
Nable, Raymond D.
Novark, Bruce W.
Penners, Don A.
Perrere, Donald J.
Pinkerton, Robert J.
Pirie, George D.
Richter, Henry E., Jr.
Selby, Vernice B.
Seo, Kenji
Smith, Preston L.
Smith, Vonnie B.
Stallworth, Henry A.
Stocker, Ralph R.
Swaim, Bobby L.
Swenson, James D.
Tanner, Robert L.
Taylor, Carl N.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thompson, Ferris P.
Toolson, James R.
Verunac, James J.
Walters, Ray A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be captains

Holway, Richard T.
Timberlake, Claude V., Jr.

To be commanders

Beretta, John J.
Burgess, Benjamin F., Jr.
Ferber, Charles W.
Jachowski, Leo A., Jr.
Lester, William F.
McReynolds, Paul M.

To be lieutenant commanders

Combs, Norris K.
Flaherty, Edward M.
Noble, Howard F., Jr.

To be lieutenants

Barrett, Neil K.
Beyer, Charles E.
Brandon, Daniel A.
Brannon, Joe F.
Brownlow, Wilfred J., Jr.
Carpenter, Arden R.
Curto, James C.
Davies, John A.
Dennis, "J" "M"
Devine, Leonard F.
Dietch, Michael M.
Dunbar, Edward S.
Gallaher, Robert E.
Gilbert, Richard S.
Goon, Melvin H.
Hartley, Robert L., Jr.
Holston, Charles A.
Janson, Harold J.
Johnston, James F.
Keesee, Robert C.
Kramer, Stanley H.
Lamb, Jean L.
Long, William L.
McComb, Gordon S.
Miller, Earl F., II
Miller, Harry P.
Morris, Carlton R.
Myers, John D.
O'Connor, William F.
Oleson, Russell H.
Oswald, Charles A.
Reed, John R.
Richardson, James W.
Riser, Ellis W.
Sanborn, Warren R.
Schaffner, Leslie J.
Sloan, Marshall
Smout, Jay C.
Talley, Russel L.
Tatum, Raymond B.
Van Buskirk, Floyd W.
Woodham, James T.

NURSE CORPS

To be captains

Erickson, Ruth A.
Todd, "C" Edwina

To be commanders

Arnold, June E.
Aycock, Martha O.
Becker, Dorothy C.
Benson, Wilma M.
Bulshefski, Veronica M.
Gresko, Mary

To be lieutenant commanders

Bierma, Margery G.
Bridge, Velia C.
Dixon, Nora L.
Eastin, Virginia A.
Houghton, Arline D.
Humphrey, Ruth M.
Hutchens, Juanita F.
Javins, Betty J.
Johnson, June G.
Kahle, Helen D.
Lane, Ira L.
Lariviere, Margaret
O'Barto, Waldena
Palmer, Mildred F.
Papp, Gizella
Perry, Bessie M.
Philipone, Anna
Revis, Marjorie J.
Tollinger, Norma T.
Voth, Rita B.
Vought, Esther J.

To be lieutenants

Davis, Kathryn A.
Emter, Dorothy M.
Fudala, Adeline R.
Greene, Jane S.
Halle, Shirley W.
Hardcastle, Jeraldine N.
Jones, Mary L.
Kelly, Therese M.
Ludwig, Margaret M.
Max, Helen R.
Moriarty, Mary M.
Murphy, Veronica M.
Nagy, Bettye G.
Orr, Wanda S.
Pearce, Martha V.
Pickering, Julia E.
Proto, Theresa M.
Sauer, Mary A.
Spence, Laura D.
Sullivan, Patricia A.
Walker, Helen J.
Warren, Marjorie E.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James L. Adams
*William R. Aiman
*Michael D. Allen
*Norman A. Anderson
*William W. Anderson
*Terry B. Applegate
*Andre B. Ashley
*Conrad C. Bahr
*William F. Bealer, Jr.
*Reginald E. Bean
*Don M. Betterton

*Timothy L. Blakely
*Jerry K. Brown
*Joseph E. Callahan
*Robert B. Carl
*Dana A. Coe
*John C. Conant
*Steven E. Conner
*Ronald P. Cordes
*Robert G. Costello
*Paul W. Crumlish
*Donald P. Doherty
*Hal J. Drez
*Jack E. Duffy
*John W. Ehrmantraut
*John G. Fabie
*David D. Fagerland
*James M. Ferguson
*Dennis A. Fitzgerald
*Val Gerstenschlager
*George D. Gibbs, Jr.
*Clark E. Goebel
*Bobby F. Green
*Frederick T. Grexton
*John B. Hallmark
*Robert R. Hansen
*Benjamin F. Hehn III
*Hugh C. Henderson
*Frederick H. Hohnbaum
*Stephen J. Johnson
*Herbert W. Jones
*Glynn Q. Lane, Jr.
*Gerald W. Langkammerer
*Thomas S. Lattomus
*Dennis F. Leigh
*William L. Lewis
*Jack W. Lillis
*John G. Lukey
*William P. McCarthy
*James M. McCornock
*Wyatt H. McGee
*Robert L. Madden
*Ted W. Martens
*Dickie R. Matthes
*Stephen A. Moore
*Frank H. Murphy
*Edward M. Neumann
*Donald R. Nielsen
*Dudley G. Oakes
*Thomas H. O'Hara
*Robert C. Ohland
*David B. Osburn
*Larry G. Ostertag
*Julian I. Palmore III
*Richard V. Parish
*Richard J. Pryce
*Edwin O. Rhodes
*Ray "E" Riesgo
*Michael B. Sanson
*Frederick M. Scheinholtz
*Charles R. Schlegelmilch
*Larry C. Schooley
*George L. Schueppert
*Wendell D. Seif
*Don S. Slack
*Ronald A. Smith
*Charles F. Stephan
*George R. Syring
*Robert G. Syring
*John A. Tharp
*David L. Thomas
*Bruce T. Venner
*Thomas B. Ward
*David R. Wyatt

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Fred B. Benson III
*Ralph L. Chappell
*Douglas J. Lary
*James W. Lunn
*Daniel R. Mays
*David B. Turner

*John G. Lukey (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) are being nominated for both line and Staff Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William A. Berry
*William L. Harvey
*Robert S. Hindes
*Robert J. Jodan
*Jon B. Kasner
*Gary R. Kilday
*James C. Loblaw
*Joel F. Newgen
*John W. Nolan
*Guy E. Pahud
*"J" Dick Pensyl
*Ronald J. Perkocha
*James D. Potter, Jr.
*Allan B. Rogers
*Jerry C. Seyb
*Alan B. Smith
*Frederick G. Van-Koughnet
*Douglas M. Webb

*Milton D. Davis (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Stuart Ragland, Jr. (civilian college graduate), to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Richard R. Anderson
*Robert F. Kirk
*Sverre J. Oftedal, Jr.
*Nicholas W. Schmitz
*Jonas Sode

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Donald W. Hopping
*George F. Humbert, Jr.
*Herbert G. Lockhart, Jr.
*James F. O'Neill
*Joseph P. O'Riordan
*Carlos Villafana-Justicia
*Lowell T. York

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Laurence I. Alpert
*Gaspar W. Anastasi
*George F. Brumback
*Eugene J. Colangelo
*Jack M. Roe
*James F. Savage, Jr.
*James L. Shumaker
*Jennings B. Smalley, Jr.
*John D. Tolmie
*Herbert A. Urweider

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Emidio J. Collevecchio
*Ollie V. Hall, Jr.
*Robert D. Haymore
*Stanley E. Pepek

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Angelo R. Chiarenza
*Ralph J. DiClementi

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*George W. Ackley, Jr.
*Richard S. Altman
*David L. Gaston
*Frank H. Kellner
*William D. Kimmel, Jr.
*Samuel S. Lusk
*Rudolph G. McCranie
*Steve Montgomery
*Dorsey J. Moore
*Edward M. Osetek
*Nicholas Passodelis
*George D. Pirie
*Ellsworth H. Plump
*Paul J. Reisman
*Vernice B. Selby
*"O" "L" Shoemaker
*George A. Stanton, Jr.
*Norman H. Tracy, Jr.
*David L. Winegar

*William H. Bromann, Jr., U.S. Navy officer, to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Charles E. Langton, Jr., U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Charles V. Gordon, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Eugene R. Forsht, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, aviation maintenance, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*James H. Bergstrom, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line-running mates are so promoted, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Howard J. Alfandre
Donald O. Alford
Herbert F. Allshouse
Robert L. Altman
Richard F. Ambur
John R. Anderson
Robert L. Anderson
Schales L. Atkinson
Ernest Atlas
Marshall E. Atwell
Emil J. Bardana, Jr.
Harry J. Barr
Delano W. Bolter
Robert S. Borden
Eugene M. Brandt
William L. Brannon, Jr.
Willard A. Bredenberg
Lawrence Brettschneider
Jack R. Brewer
John W. Brown
Woody G. Burrow
Stephen T. Bush
George E. Byers, Jr.
Thomas R. Byrd
Marvin G. Caldwell
Richard E. Cannon
Edward F. Cantow
Anthony S. Casimir
Frederick F. Castrow II
David W. Chapman
Ronald L. Christ
Bartley G. Cilento
Harold L. Compton
Douglas R. Cordray
Charles L. Cotten
John C. Council, Jr.
Judson L. Crow
Larry E. Cummins
Ernest P. D'Angelo, Jr.
David R. Davis II
Gerald N. Davis
William E. Deignan
Benjamin G. W. Dew
Michael A. Donlan
James F. Donovan
James P. Drinkard
Neil P. Dubner
Donald F. Duff
Robert R. Duhamel
Julius E. Dunn, Jr.
Ronald C. Erbs
Thomas A. Farrell
William J. Farrell
Robert A. Feeney
Edward J. Finnerty
Darrell E. Fisher
Robert B. Fitzgerald
Peter A. Fleming
Charles D. Fogg
Michael F. Fornes
Frederick J. Frensilli
Arnold M. Frucht
Hugh S. Gallagher
John W. Garden
Donald M. Garland
Edward J. Garvin
Michael L. Gay
William Gee
Gerald F. Geiger
Benjamin F. Gibbs, Jr.
John C. Gibson
Edward C. Gilbert
Andrew M. Giovannini
Joseph G. Gregonis
Paul A. Guiles
Charles H. Hale III
John C. Hall
David J. Hand
Charles A. Hanna
Sigvard T. Hansen, Jr.
Robert S. Harlin
Randall L. Harrington
Dan W. Hibner
John H. Hoertz
Richard M. Hofmann
Hilmon D. Holley, Jr.
John E. Hoye
Royal C. Hudson, Jr.
Robert S. Janicki
Edward M. Jewusiak
Ernest J. Johnson
Walter T. Johnson
William W. Johnson
Edward M. Jones
George R. Jones
Robert W. Joyce, Jr.
Harry I. Katz
Frederic R. Keifer
Cyril F. Kellett, Jr.
John C. Kelly
Harry G. Kennedy, Jr.
Carl P. Kessler
Stephen H. King
Jimmie H. Knight
Marvin M. Krieps, Jr.
Randall A. Langston
Ronald G. Latimer
John C. Leadbeater
Frederick M. Lee
John C. Leissring
Ronald J. Lentz
Lawrence J. Macatee
Robert P. Majors, Jr.
William A. Martin
Sid "P" Mauk
"L" "B" McDaniels
James C. McGlamory
John F. McGrail
Samuel McQueen
David M. McRae
John R. McTammany
James C. Meador, Jr.
Russell W. Melton
Richard M. Monihan
James M. Moorefield, Jr.
Andrew Moreland
James D. Morgan
Thomas J. Murnane
Philip B. Nedelman
Carmine F. Nicholas
Robert D. Nichols
Surl L. Nielsen
Joseph E. O'Donnell
Patrick E. O'Hara
Ronald K. Ohslund
James A. Olsen
Crockett H. Page
Dominick N. Pasquale, Jr.
Joseph Patlovich
Elliott Perlin
Gordon W. Philip
Michael J. Pickering
Robert L. Piscatelli
Harry Porter, Jr.
Raymond L. Portu
Curtis G. Power, Jr.
Pablo P. Prietto
John R. Pulskamp
Kenneth D. Rashid
Ralph E. Reed
James S. Robison
Donald K. Roeder
Albert K. Rogers
Thomas P. Rooney
John B. Runnels
Burton A. Sandok
Richard F. Schillaci
Wilbur L. Secrist
Allen R. Shade
William C. Silberman
Wendell L. Skinner
Michael D. Smalkin
Thomas K. Smith
James L. Snyder
Frederick A. Spencer
Harlan D. Sponaugle
William W. Spore
Kevin C. Stanton
Stanley "D" Stier
David R. Stoop
Fred J. Stucker
Robert J. Swan
Ronald F. Swanger
Stanley J. Swierzewski, Jr.
Harry R. Tate
Fredric S. Taylor
James Z. Taylor
Richard L. Tenney
William C. Thacker
Robert L. Thompson
William F. Thompson
George B. Tipton
Gary M. Tolley
Kenneth W. Travis
William E. VanBuren
Robert L. Vance
John A. Vaughan
Frederick S. Vines
Christian E. vonDoepp
James Vorosmarti, Jr.
Don J. Wagoner
William H. Wanger
Robert S. West
Florent F. Westfall, Jr.

Cecil E. Wilson
Joseph T. Wilson, Jr.
Joseph H. Winston
David L. Wishart
Joseph L. Yon, Jr.
Gary W. Zelles

The following-named warrant officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenants

*Lindo E. Agosti
*Robert R. Baker
*Herbert W. Colt
*Joseph G. Dicarlo
*Robert H. Doud
*Ralph T. Goerner, Jr.
*Albert R. Hartgrove
*John A. Hughes, Jr.
*David A. Johnson
*William P. Johnson, Jr.
*Elmer D. Jungblut
*Arthur C. Lembeck
*James B. Lisenbee
*Jack E. Macklin
*Clarence B. Mohler
*Earl L. Nelsen
*Henry J. Niepsey
*James J. Olson
*William B. Pitzer
*Joseph R. Renard
*George J. Risko
*Henry J. Spangler
*William R. Stanberry
*Fred C. Ulmer, Jr.
*James W. Wilson

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

*Walter H. Clayton
*William J. Coats
*James R. Demo
*David J. Egan
*Harry R. Fallers, Jr.
*Eugene F. Meitl

To be ensigns

Arthur P. Brugman
*Clarence A. Dains
*Carl E. Erickson
*Ruddle L. Grice
*Don C. Harrison, Jr.
*Lee C. Jones
*Robert R. Kenion
*Melton L. Martin
*Robert F. Moran
*George E. Smith, Jr.
*James C. Thompson
*Charles E. Tiller

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Robert E. Anglin
*Max O. Baird
*James C. Bounds
*William R. Cole
*William P. Craft, Jr.
*Ralph J. Crocker
*Arthur B. Day
*Joseph G. Deiter
*Eugene E. Doty
*Oscar L. English
*Wilfred C. Gagne
*William H. Garing
*George W. Gilbert
*Etsel T. Guest
*James C. Hammock
*George R. Holt
*Alphonse B. Holtel
*Tom A. Lewis
*John H. Makinen
*Robert L. Marshall
*Arthur E. Mayle
*William C. McWhirter
*William P. Mesler
*Thomas H. Moss, Jr.
*Selby B. Riggs
*Luverne E. Vannieuwenhuise
*Aaron L. Wells
*Louis E. Wood

OPERATIONS

*Stewart G. Barbour
*John A. Woolley

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*Everett R. Bacon
*Kenneth A. Ballew
*Frederick F. Bennis
*Donald Blue
*Harvey H. Carpenter
*Robert F. Comstock
*Samuel Cox, Jr.
*Victor L. Ebersole
*Johann P. Feldscher
*Paul H. Fox
*John W. Hall
*Stanley J. Haydon
*Robert L. Jenkins
*Ted J. Lawrence
*Harold P. Lesh
*Edgar E. Lewis
*William A. Lewis
*Fredric C. Magee
*Edward M. Martin
*Wallace G. Murphy
*Walter S. Nickerson, Jr.
*Bernard B. Padget
*Roy E. Parker
*Oscar Peace
*Robert L. Petersen
*Charles S. Russell
*Rudolph J. Schuller
*Alfred Sokolowski
*Harold L. Still
*Thomas I. Suggs
*Henry E. Tullock
*Hubert R. Wendell
*Coleman L. White

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*William A. Berger, Jr.
*Harry D. Christensen
*John R. Clark
*John D. Hancock
*Cecil M. Harrison
*John R. Heckler
*William E. Long
*James D. Manning
*Frank B. Miller
*Eugene R. Thompson

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*David J. Andrews
*Leonard L. Auclair
*Raymond F. Foster
*Carroll E. Kinkel
*William C. Merrill
*Henry H. Merritt, Jr.
*John H. Pinning
*George R. Stark

ADMINISTRATION

*Robert E. Balcom
*John Borgens
*Donald J. Bovill
*Martin B. Bruns
*Paul R. Buck
*Edward T. Currie
*Charles H. Greene
*Leland L. Harris
*Grover C. Hinds, Jr.
*John E. Kehoe
*Charles J. Langello
*George A. Lundblade
*Rexford E. Means
*Richard D. Nagle, Jr.
*Frederick T. Pascucci
*Samuel C. Red
*Robert G. Rubenacker
*John F. Phelan
*Earl E. Smith
*Stephen C. Stamos
*Glenn E. Tripp
*Willie E. Tyrone
*Bruce F. Vorce
*Andy N. Whitwell
*Emory H. Wilson

ENGINEERING

*John A. Arnesen
*Samuel F. Bateman
*John L. Booth
*William L. Bovee
*Hugh H. Bush
*Russell C. Cammer
*Rufus R. Cannon
*Frederick P. Cerwonka
*Harry W. Clay
*Gene L. Cleven
*John R. Deboer
*Robert R. Dexter
*Richard M. Edwards
*William L. Edwards
*Oscar W. Ellis
*Elmer F. Falkenbach
*Harry Ferro
*Jack A. Garwood
*Russell W. Golding
*Harrison H. Green, Jr.
*Leroy R. Hagey, Jr.
*Perry E. Hanneman
*Harold J. Heath
*Benjamin O. Hemus, Jr.
*Ralph W. Holte
*Frederick B. Kauper
*Max A. Kenyon
*Andrew Logie
*Herman W. McCabe
*Rudolph Klecky
*Mitchell C. Kunkel
*John C. Locker
*Robert N. Long
*John J. Mastalski
*Robert Mayer
*Irwin R. McLain
*Robert C. Miller, Jr.
*Herschel H. Moore
*Orange J. Moore, Jr.
*Edward O. Neathammer
*Argonne F. Oliver
*Ivan Paulson
*Mack H. Phillips
*James D. Price
*Charles C. Ramet
*Joseph V. Ramsey
*Walter E. Reece
*Jay W. Rider
*Walter D. Robinson
*Carl Roller
*Walstein M. Rouse
*Howard L. Selden
*Henry J. Shotter
*Elliott B. Simpson
*Charles K. Sparrow
*Jesse G. Speer
*Garner Stephens
*Joseph A. Sumskis
*Malcolm E. Townsend
*Charles H. Vervalin
*Arthur C. VonBehren
*Andrew P. Weber
*Harry J. Wonderland
*Steven T. Zakrzewski
*Alfred P. Zaluski

HULL

*Cyrus E Alleman, Jr.
*Jesse D. Cannon
*Lawrence G. Engle
*Joseph O. Frazee
*William N. Garrett
*Earl Hendry
*David C. Holley
*Donzel B. Quinton
*Harold Tweed
*Bernard F. York

ELECTRICIAN

*Carl F. Allen
*Stanley C. Brown
*Chester L. Burns, Jr.
*John H. Dehnbostel
*Andrew Dranchak
*Everett R. Feldt
*Iver O. Hanson
*Andrew T. Malleck
*Emmett S. Mayne
*Charles A. Miles
*Walter L. Philips
*"J" "B" Sorrells
*Clarence D. Spencer
*Frederick M. Spinney
*Alexander C. Trouland, III
*Arthur K. Ullrich

ELECTRONICS

*Norbud L. Beck
*Norman K. Berry
*Dennis N. Bryant
*Jerome W. Christensen
*Chester C. Culp, Jr.
*John J. Furey
*Harold H. Gressman
*William O. Harper
*Louie E. Havens
*Jack E. Hayes
*Henry L. Jarvis
*Raymond D. Kester
*John R. King
*Robert E. Lafe
*Walter D. Laughlin
*John W. Magill
*Lawrence E. McGovern
*Don F. Noakes
*Warren M. Page
*Clarence Poland, Jr.
*Leverett E. Russell
*Albert O. Rustad
*Robert N. Schappacher
*George C. Tyler

CRYPTOLOGY

*Richard M. Allen
*William A. Cleveland
*Robert E. Curtin
*Lois Davidson
*Elmer H. Frantz, Jr.
*Irving W. Goss
*Douglas W. Harold
*Harold N. Harris
*Wilbur Hayes
*Charles K. Lindahl
*Andrew N. Michael
*Rexford G. Parr
*John M. Quesenberry
*Raymond A. Rundle
*Claude A. Sowada
*Earl W. Stewart
*William H. Tremblay
*Owen Unterberger
*Julian P. Wilder
*Douglas A. Williams

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Jack E. L. Carleton
*Omer T. Culwell
*Manuel D. Hardman
*Roland J. Koch
*James D. Maloney
*Jack W. Spurling

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Morrow J. Allen
*William D. Christopher
*Cecil P. Free
*Donald R. Lawson
*John G. Morford
*Bernard Singer
*Richard K. Thomas

AEROLOGY

*Walter W. Babic
*George F. Bule, Jr.
*Clyde L. Margeson
*Lama D. McCleskey, Jr.
*Ralph A. Wright

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Larry G. Barr
*Henry J. Beck
*Carl M. Berglund
*James D. Bradfield
*William R. Cantrell
*William C. Davis
*Morton N. Frey
*Vincent L. Hall
*Jackson L. Harris
*Floyd O. Holder
*Henry F. Holman
*Albert J. Leimer
*James O. Lence
*Theodore B. Levieux
*Howard A. MacDonald
*Fred H. Matthiesen, Jr.
*James F. McGregor
*Horace P. Mallory
*Franklin B. Owen
*Wallace B. Richards
*Grover C. Smelley
*Werner W. Thomas
*Alpine D. Weaver
*Richard E. Ziegler

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Clifton R. Beckett
*Roy E. Blood
*Rosairo A. Caltabiano
*James H. Cooney
*John A. Debell
*Robert E. Forster
*William J. Gamble
*Chester A. Guerry
*George A. Hoffman
*Homer C. Lucas
*Robert W. McKamey
*Lawrence J. McMackin
*Henry L. Moore
*Glen G. Rasmussen
*George A. Regan
*Leonard S. Shope
*Alex M. Sills
*Clarence E. Sutherland

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*Arthur T. Bennett
*Reid L. Bronson
*Francis H. Cohan
*Herman D. Coots
*Gorden H. Crawford
*Eugene C. Foerster
*James R. Goggin
*Edward H. Gibson
*Leo A. Goodman
*David A. Hathaway
*John E. Haygood
*Keith B. Hill
*William B. Hocutt
*Karl H. Kester
*Guy M. Larmore
*John E. Linder
*Alvin A. Littrell
*William E. Lundberg
*Charles F. O'Connell, Jr.
*John E. Price
*Maurice D. Price
*Robert W. Robida
*Roland M. Roy
*Edward N. Rutledge
*William C. Stead
*Merle E. Strunk
*Henry O. Thomas
*Litton E. Tye
*Harold S. Wicker
*Melvin E. Wyland
*Chester J. Youtkus

SUPPLY CORPS

*Donald L. Alford
*James F. Anderson
*Walter F. Ashe
*Stephen L. Boudreau
*William J. Butler, Jr.
*Meral J. Cathcart
*Charles J. Collins
*Louis P. Colston
*Jefferson B. Couch
*John R. Covington
*Wilimont E. Egan
*Ernest J. Facto
*Francis V. Filipowicz
*Donald W. Floyd
*Normand E. Forcier
*Warren O. Freiwald
*Raymond E. Glatz
*David G. Gordon
*Ray J. Gordon
*Milford K. Greenway
*Otto A. Grunwald, Jr.
*Wilbert R. Harpool
*Floyd A. Hawkins
*Isadore A. Herbst
*William E. James
*Joseph R. Joyce
*John G. Kearney
*Harold D. Kellogg
*Harry T. Kelly
*William C. Kersten
*Joseph V. Kossler
*Dale E. Leeper
*John J. McHugh
*John J. Michura
*James L. O'Connell
*Ralph S. Osborn
*Walter A. Pannek
*Melvin F. Pickel
*Byron Reynolds
*Herschel E. Robinson
*Jerome D. Samelson
*James C. Sergent
*Ernest H. Smith
*Edward S. Stammer
*William Stearns
*Harold L. Stewart, Jr.

*Robert S. Stone
*Jack Teague
*Willis M. Tefft
*Howard L. Toms
*Johnnie H. Vinson
*Claude H. Waters
*Samuel A. White
*Hugo C. Wondergem
*Lavern C. Zilla

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Herman W. Filbry
*Ralph K. Jones
*Martin L. Sowle
*Ernest A. Sidney
*Franklin M. Solina
*Victor Young
*Milton W. Zeitzmann

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Buford B. Akridge
*Bryan L. Auwen
*Harold G. Bender
*William R. Blades
*Robert B. Companion
*Wilburn C. Finch
*Albert Francescone
*William C. Haney
*George E. Head
*Alfred E. Manson
*Joshua T. S. Johnston
*Grady F. Mesimer, Jr.
*Earl C. Price
*James F. Rankin
*Jack L. Reckler
*Roger C. Smallwood
*George W. Stewart, Jr.
*Charles E. Stith
*Louis M. Tew

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*Gene L. Bieber
*Bernard F. Brislenn
*Noah R. Carder
*John A. Cole, Jr.
*Charles F. Driscoll
*Willis A. Gunnels
*Clarence G. Hager, Jr.
*Robert C. Harding
*Donald G. Hauser
*Lendo G. Renegar
*Johnnie W. Scott
*Leroy P. Selberg
*Carl L. Snyder
*George B. Steere
*Theodore Theodorides
*Austin C. Tilghman
*Henry E. Vongenk, Jr.
*Donald M. Waymire

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*James C. Armstrong
*Jack L. Bell
*Burnett W. Carter
*Harold W. Echternach
*William Geil
*Richard P. Holland
*Russell J. Jensen
*David F. Katusha
*Walter D. Ousts, Jr.
*Oscar H. Schmidt
*Clyde E. Slaughter

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*John W. Koerber
*John O'Brien
*Thomas H. Roberts

ADMINISTRATION

*Edward J. Baydowicz
*Eugene F. Burke
*Alexander D. Cameron
*Ralph W. Cavin
*Harold D. Christie
*Charles A. Clemmons, Jr.
*John T. Dilley
*Milton S. Doane
*Charles W. Everstine
*Melvin C. Freeman
*Charles W. A. Furlow
*James E. Garner, Jr.
*Robert C. Harreschou
*Herbert E. Huntley
*William B. Hutchison
*Leland L. Lydick
*Harold H. Merrill
*Arthur R. Murphy
*Floyd T. Samms
*Robert A. Strouts
*John W. Willis
*Bernard D. Woody
*Paul L. Woollard
*Theodore S. Zagorski

BANDMASTER

*Preston H. Turner

ENGINEERING

*Vincent Bayer
*Thomas R. Block
*Carl A. Bowlby
*Herbert P. Burkhart
*John N. Burton, Jr.
*Lawrence Brown
*Albert C. Cacioppo
*William C. Credille
*Joseph G. Dauber
*John P. Desposito
*Harold W. Dundore
*Harold E. Finsterwald
*James W. Flow
*Ernest O. Graves, Jr.
*Philip V. Hansen
*James R. Harris
*Joel R. Harris
*William O. Jones
*Elmer A. Ledbetter
*Harry G. Lewis
*Russel J. Lukey
*Thomas F. Marr
*Robert C. Mars
*Francis J. Minnock
*Glenn L. Minteer
*Bradford O. Mosher
*Bob J. Nolan
*Alex M. Nunnery, Jr.
*Alexander G. Patykula
*Lonnie R. Redwine, Jr.
*Gerard A. Sobieck
*David E. Taylor
*Beldon H. Trigg
*Bordeau J. Vassar
*"A" "D" Wall
*John M. Wilkerson
*Clifford H. Wood
*Fulton R. Wynn
*Curtis G. Zimmerman

HULL

*Robert F. Erni
*William C. Powell

ELECTRICIANS

*Carl O. Bialock, Jr.
*Benjamin C. Hibbs
*Jack M. Hutchison, Jr.
*Richard Kennedy
*Frederick F. Poyner

ELECTRONICS

*Allen D. Boyes
*Frederick W. Carnes
*Frank T. Chambers
*Wayne E. Conner
*Walter F. Corliss
*Arthur G. Crawford
*Maxie R. Cunningham
*James E. Dean
*Jack H. Dillich
*Arthur W. George
*Jack Hamer
*Roy P. Henderson
*Harley J. Higgins
*Willard D. Inman
*Virgil M. Klotzner
*Ralph R. Leight
*Eugene O. Loomis
*Onofrio Mammelli
*Chester A. Murphy
*John C. Phillips
*Charles D. Ransdell
*Chester J. Skjod
*Marvin H. Suttmann
*Merle E. Tree
*Emil J. Welk, Jr.

CRYPTOLOGY

*Dee Adkins
*Robert D. Arnold
*Robert C. Beverly
*Gordon I. Bower
*Raymond G. Boyer
*William T. Browne
*John F. Cain
*Charles B. Campbell
*Eugene Clark
*Paul W. Cooper
*Robert G. Creed
*Edward S. Custer
*Robert B. Depeyster
*Robert E. Dowd
*Thomas D. Eigen
*James S. Erven
*Robert R. Farrell
*Martin R. Fisher
*Harry R. Fuller, Jr.
*James K. Gordon
*William D. Hawley
*Floyd H. Heindl
*Orville C. Hinz
*Ephraim O. Jacques
*Richard S. Katzenberger
*Walter H. Keasler
*Edwin S. King
*Ralph M. Paul
*Marion L. Piper, Jr.
*Walter A. Rau
*Richard V. Richards
*William J. Sprich
*John R. Urquhart, Jr.
*Harry W. Weiss
*John M. Wolfe

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Henry J. Bouchard
*Walter L. Broyles
*Robert M. Hylton
*William L. Kurtz
*Paul E. Montgomery
*Frank A. Shelton
*James A. Thomas

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Charles W. Clark
*William J. Collins
*Richard R. Conger
*Harold R. Conklin
*Keith G. Riley
*Moo T. Soohoo
*Walter L. White
*Mack Wright

AEROLOGY

*Robert E. Bass
*Frank L. Jones
*Francis J. McGayhey

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Judson M. Brodie, Jr.
*William J. Uber

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Henry T. Baker
*Joffre P. Baker
*Robert A. Begg
*Robert E. Biggs
*Richard E. Brandt
*Everett R. Buck
*Jack W. Chase
*Harold R. Cowden
*Wilson H. Crone, Jr.
*Robert M. Donaldson
*Richard W. Dristy
*Charles C. Finch
*Paul A. Hair
*Clarence H. Harris
*Alexander H. Hilliard
*Theodore A. Johnson
*Walter Kachuck
*John F. Kralemann
*Mack S. Lanham
*Victor McCauley
*Lee O. Parks, Jr.
*Lyman N. Price
*William P. Roberson
*William K. Snow
*Raymond E. Strong, Jr.
*George L. Thompson
*Frank M. Turner
*David L. Walsh
*Albert G. Wickham
*John H. Wieting
*John A. Willett, Jr.
*Robert M. Worster

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*John O. Butterbaugh
*Royal B. Deland
*Russell W. Harper, Jr.
*William G. Hepburn
*Wesley I. Laroza, Jr.
*Harvey L. Pace, Jr.
*Leroy Peoples

SUPPLY CORPS

*Thomas E. Brooker
*Joe F. Buice
*Donald D. Conquest
*Richard M. Davis
*Robert B. Gage
*Raymond W. Hughes
*Leon A. Jackson
*Donald J. Johnson
*Raymond F. Kasch
*Dwayne E. Kauffman
*Quinton L. McElyea
*Billy L. McLeod
*Leo L. Monroe
*Henry J. Poltack
*John A. Rausch
*Duane T. Riplog
*Charles M. Shorrock
*Everett C. Smith
*Gerald H. Young

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Edward H. Bissen
*Melvin H. Harper
*David E. Landers
*Levon M. Majure
*George A. Marts
*Winfred C. Mathers
*George Moss
*Richard A. Nelson
*Charles L. Neugent
*George L. Sporhase
*John R. Stinson
*Willie C. Wall

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Douglas A. Belson
*Robert P. Bishop
*Joe L. Bradshaw
*Willie E. Haley
*Charles P. Helms
*Edward A. Lancaster
*William E. Marckfeld
*James S. Marshall
*Joseph A. Minton
*Peter Orlovich
*Frederick W. Reynolds, Jr.
*Edwin M. Rohr
*Joseph Welenc

OPERATIONS

*James T. Bartleson
*Donald H. Brown
*Edward D. Cowles
*John R. Giglio
*John F. Gilhuly
*Sidney E. Manning
*Charles W. Misuna
*Paul F. Noland
*Gerard H. Wirth

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*James C. Bladh
*Frederick W. Lawrence

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*Raymond H. Harper
*Walter R. McMeins
*Russell F. VanCuran

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*Walter W. Bissing
*Robert A. Dube
*Donald R. Hitchcock
*Michael M. Orbovich

ADMINISTRATION

*James L. Barrett
*Donald F. Boehnke
*Granvel L. Harrison
*Billie F. Lindsey
*Charles J. Maloney
*Thomas F. McNamara, Jr.
*William E. Pink
*Raymond A. Remillard
*Robert E. Rhodes
*Wyatt F. Straughn
*James M. Thompson

ENGINEERING

*Kenneth W. Fritsche
*John G. Grienenberger
*Jack M. Howard
*John L. Hughey
*Thomas V. Keener
*John J. Sharp
*Hamilton R. Sullivan

HULL

*Jack G. Bell

ELECTRICIAN

*Charles J. Wilkinson
*Joseph G. Zimmerman

ELECTRONICS

*Leo F. Carr
*Francis L. Cummings
*Ralph E. Evans
*John C. Ferrell
*Eugene M. Hall
*Stanley P. Lopes
*Glenn H. Mitchell
*Richard J. Nowatzki
*Richard W. Poole
*Thomas C. Reppert
*Obil J. Webb, Jr.

CRYPTOLOGY

*Wallace L. Bolczak
*Russell A. Davis
*William E. Denton
*Baxter D. Green, Jr.
*John B. King
*Daniel L. Mendel, Jr.
*John P. Morse
*Richard J. Winston

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Middleton Eason
*Otis G. Kight
*Kenneth E. Rogers

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Oscar W. Arsenault
*William S. Juby, Jr.

AEROLOGY

*Glen N. Drummond, Jr.
*Durward B. Holden

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*James A. Correll
*"J" "L" McClain
*Leslie H. Ovre
*Charles Vedral, Jr.
*Thomas O. Williams, Jr.

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*William F. Bradshaw
*Michael A. Columbo, Jr.
*John W. Kiss
*Willis R. Plummer
*Harry S. Richard
*David N. Smith
*Robert W. Stickelberger

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*James A. Bates
*Clifton H. Blank
*William F. Broderick
*Henry C. Butler
*John L. Chambers, Sr.
*Elmer A. Chipparoni
*Robert D. Duff
*John A. Edwards
*William W. Eggleston
*Leon E. Eichenlaub
*Sylvester Q. Grounds
*William W. Haycock
*Norman J. Howerton
*Milton T. Hurst
*Richard S. Liss
*Raymond C. Martin, Jr.
*Lester S. Owenby
*Berchman E. Rogero, Jr.
*Robert J. Surber
*Villard C. Sledge
*John W. Witten
*James C. Zapalac

SUPPLY CORPS

*Darry V. Baca
*Emory E. Bolton
*Clifford N. Brinkerhoff
*Marion H. Cox
*James G. Keller
*Charles I. T. McDowell
*Robert E. Naughton
*William E. Smith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Merrill M. Cooper
*William M. Ivie, Jr.
*Theodore S. Myers
*Herbert E. Stangl

MARINE CORPS

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Franklin H. Baker
Frederic C. Barber
Richard I. Beattie, Jr.
Jack W. Becker
Robert C. Brooks
Robert T. Bruner
Frank A. Buethe
Keith E. Carlson
Roland W. Coleman
Wayne F. Coulter
Arthur G. Davis, Jr.
Thomas R. Dove
Bernard Dunn
Charles S. Forbes
Jose M. Gacusana
James W. Gresham
Jean A. Gruhler, Jr.
David W. Hardiman
Thomas F. Kane
Gregory W. Lee
Edward D. Long
Albert F. Lucas, Jr.
Edwin J. McCreedy
Robert W. Mitchell, Jr.
Roland E. Monette
Robert L. Padgett
Frank G. Pearce
William K. Poston, Jr.
Revedy C. Ray III
John F. Rivers
Allen J. Rose
Jerry C. Shirley
Troy T. Shirley
Richard P. Smith
Bayliss L. Spivey, Jr.
Robert B. Starke, Jr.
Kenneth T. Taylor
William R. Warren
Richard D. Weede
Francis L. Zappone, Jr.

The following named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Peter E. Byrne

The following named (meritorious noncomissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*McLowery Elrod
*Arthur L. Houston, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers, Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James D. Care
Theodore L. Gatchel

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers, Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John O. Ahlquist
Robert C. Atchley
Robert A. Atkins
George F. Barbour
Harold T. Barraclough
Robert C. Barrier
Edwin Bean, Jr.
Frank A. Bendrick
Francis B. Brady
Philip O. Brady
Ronald F. Calta
Robert C. Cavin
Glenn S. Chambers
Jack A. Chapman
John W. Chowen
Ernest L. Cody, Jr.
Terence P. Connell
John E. Conrad, Jr.
Richard L. Costa
Jerome J. Crowley III
Roderic S. Daley
Marcel F. Dastugue III
Albert S. Daughtridge, Jr.
Peter G. Demetriades
Brinton N. Devilling
Ronald S. Dobies
James R. Doyle
James C. East
Walter J. Egger
Thomas H. Eubanks, Jr.
Peter Eustratiades
James W. Fagan
Ken Falkenberg
Thomas P. Fidelle
Jon T. Flint
Noret E. Flood, Jr.
John F. Follett
Bruce A. Fosnocht
Harley J. Francis, Jr.
James H. French
Dennis O. Gallagher
Dayne G. Gardner
James W. Garner
Terrance A. Gibbons
Julian H. Gignilliat
George K. Gill
Theodore A. Gleason
Ronald K. Golemon
David J. Gore
Allan A. Gorski
Benjamin W. Greene, Jr.
William R. Greenwood
Edgar H. Grubb
James G. Grunwaldt
John P. Halvorsen
John S. Hamlon
Glen L. Hampton
*Charles F. Harbison
Andrew D. Harris
Ernest A. Harris
John R. Hassler
Garner R. Hastings
Frank W. Hathcock
Roger C. Heigel
Kim F. Heller
Frederic P. Henderson, Jr.
Gordon E. Hendricks, Jr.
John D. Hess
Thomas E. Hewitt
John L. Hoerner
Claude M. Holifield, Jr.
Alwin G. Holland, Jr.
Sanders H. B. Hook
Robert A. Hopper
Charles T. Huckelbery
William C. Hunter
Edmund J. Irvine, Jr.
Harry E. Jennings, Jr.
Gerald W. Johnson
Philip L. Johnson
Richard E. Johnson
Newell M. Jones
Robert N. Kaff
Jon D. Keady
Francis T. Keough
William J. Kitchen
Ronald W. Kleiboeker
Eugene P. Kummeth
Rex M. Lasley
Walter J. Lawson
Martin J. Lenzini
Denton Lotz
John F. Luebben
Dennis E. Lunde
Robert S. Lynch
Hugh A. MacMullian III
Walter S. Mahle
Terrance B. Maloney
David M. Marchand
Joe A. Mauldin
Lynn B. Mayhan
William R. McAdams
Anthony J. McCarthy
Frederick A. McCaughn
John A. McDonald
James G. McDonough
John D. McGehe
George M. McGill
James H. McGinnis, Jr.
James P. McHenry
Robert A. McIndoe
Thomas K. McKeown
Colin A. P. McNease
Robert S. Miecznikowski
Michael J. Mullen
William F. Murphy, Jr.
Robert C. Nickel
Roy L. Nolen III
Jay R. Norman
Larry R. Ogle
Edward S. O'Keefe, Jr.
David R. Parker
Richard Parker
*Hugh P. Pate
Alva E. Peet, Jr.
Ronald E. Pettis
Fred A. Phelps
Jerry A. Philpott
Charles W. Porterfield
John R. Puckett
Charles C. Post
Herbert R. Quarles, Jr.
Jon N. Rachford
Bruce M. Rahm
George R. Rea
Peter M. Reber
Robert L. Rentto
Charles S. Robb II
Clifford E. Roberson
Frank W. Robert
Dayton L. Robinson, Jr.
John W. Robison
Richard W. Roll
Mike Roulier
William P. Rounds
James A. Saunders, Jr.
Donald L. Sayer
Delbert L. Schulzke
Alexander D. Segars, Jr.
Karl J. Seitz, Jr.
Jack T. Seymour
William C. Sharp
Charles H. Shelton
Lundie L. Sherretz
Wade B. Shrivalle, Jr.
Samuel R. Sims
Willard E. Slack
Todd M. Sloan
Frank W. Smith
Paul J. Smith, Jr.
Phillip R. Smith
Claude K. Snow
Denman T. Snow
Alexander J. Sobieski, Jr.
Frank R. Soderstrom
John A. Speicher
Robert E. Steward
Alan C. Stone
Eric R. Straumanis
Thomas C. Terrell
Francis A. Thomas
Sidney E. Thomas
Orville M. Thompson
Raymond S. Thompson III
Bruce D. Thoreson
John J. Toman
William E. Tripp, Jr.
Larry W. Trowbridge
Paul A. Vanderberg
Robert M. Varn
Robert L. Ventrees
Benny D. Wagner
John F. Walker III
David A. Warman
Robert F. Weaver, Jr.
Frederick L. Webber
Thomas A. White
Robert N. Whitesel
Walter H. Whitley
Frederick J. Wiele
Daniel B. Williams
John A. Williams
Duane A. Wills
Willis A. Wilson, Jr.
Benjamin T. Windham
Wilton K. Witzgall

*Indicates ad interim appointment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Public Education in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the recess of the 86th Congress, I had the honor to deliver the principal address at the dedication of the new high school in my home town of Lexington, Va. I paid tribute on that occasion to Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who brought to reality Jefferson's dream of a broad public school system to enlighten the people on their duties and obligations as free citizens in our representative democracy.

Were Ruffner or Jefferson alive today, they, I am sure, would want our public school system also to enlighten our children to the dangers our civilization faces from the godless ideology of communism, which already has enslaved roughly half the world's people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks I made at the Lexington High School dedication on November 6, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the dedication of the Lexington High School, Lexington, Va., November 6, 1960)

The determination of our colonial ancestors to be free gave birth to a new nation dedicated to constitutional liberty. The cur-

rent threat of an alien, anti-God ideology to our liberty makes our choice next Tuesday of a national leader a momentous one, emphasizing the political wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, who said, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it away from them, but to inform their discretion by education." The vital need of public education in a democracy was recognized by a Lexington man—Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who may properly be called the father of our present public-school system. That fact gives added pleasure to the privilege of joining with you in the dedication today of this new and splendid Lexington High School.

Lexington and Rockbridge County have been marked by their interest in education ever since they were settled in the middle of the 18th century.

Washington and Lee University had its origins in Augusta Academy, which was founded in 1749 in the adjoining county of Augusta; and in Liberty Hall, which was established in 1776 near Timber Ridge and moved to Mulberry Hill near Lexington in 1782. In 1796, Liberty Hall Academy received from George Washington the shares of stock in the James River Co. given him by the State, which he declined to accept for his own personal use, just as he had declined to receive any pay during the Revolution. The institution was soon named Washington Academy, and in 1813 it became Washington College. Washington and Lee University, like its neighbor in Lexington, the Virginia Military Institute, has had a long and honored history.

One of the most distinguished graduates of Washington College was Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who received from that college the bachelor of arts degree in 1842 and the master of arts degree in 1844. His father, incidentally, had been first a professor and then president of the college. Dr. Ruffner studied at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, and at Princeton. He was for 2 years chaplain and a student at the University of Virginia. From 1851 to 1870, Dr. Ruffner served as a preacher, in Philadelphia and in Virginia, and engaged in farming.

On March 2, 1870, Dr. Ruffner, on the basis of recommendations from Robert E. Lee and other prominent friends, became the first superintendent of public instruction of Virginia, a position created in the Virginia Constitution of 1870. He served in this position until 1882. In 1884 he was appointed the first president of the first Virginia normal school at Farmville. He served there until 1887, when he retired to Lexington and lived here until his death in 1908.

Dr. Ruffner's task as the first superintendent of public instruction of Virginia was a major undertaking. Nothing like it had ever been tried in Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson, in his proposed code of Virginia laws in 1776, devised a broad school system, with education available for all children in the early grades, secondary education for those children capable of benefiting from it, and colleges and a university for those who were qualified for advanced academic education. This proposal was never enacted. The Virginia school laws of 1796 and 1846 were permissive only; no counties established schools under the 1796 law, and only nine counties did so under the 1846 law. Except for the literary fund, established in 1810 for the support of free schools, and the University of Virginia founded in 1819, public education in Virginia, as distinguished from private academies and private colleges, consisted in 1870 largely of a few endowed elementary schools and a few neighborhood old field schools.

Within a month of his appointment, Dr. Ruffner submitted a report recommending a plan for the introduction of the public free school system. He drafted a bill embodying this proposal with the aid and advice of Prof. Jonathan B. Minor, of the University of Virginia. The bill, S.B. 150, was introduced by Col. Edmund Pendleton, representing Botetourt, Roanoke, Craig, and Giles Counties. Colonel Pendleton and Maj. Henderson M. Bell, who represented Augusta County, steered the bill through the two houses without weakening amendments. The bill became law on July 11, 1870.

Dr. Ruffner and the board of education then had to appoint about 1,400 county superintendents and district school trustees. The county superintendents had to take a census of school population, determine the number and location of schools, provide school accommodations, and appoint teachers. The first schools were opened in November. By the end of the school year, there were more than 2,900 schools, more than 3,000 teachers, and about 130,000 pupils.

Dr. Ruffner, in his report for 1876, recognized that statistics showed only quantity. They could not show the quality of education. He knew that the tremendous quantitative growth of the Virginia school system was only important if and to the extent that it provided good education. His principal concern was the merit and quality of the education provided.

Dr. Ruffner's reports show his understanding of the value of public education and its importance in a democracy. He shared the views of our former superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, who in a brilliant speech last month on "Education for Citizenship," said of the importance of education in a democracy: "This establishes a major responsibility for our educational system at all levels, and particularly in those studies that involve an understanding of the basic principles underlying our form of government and our economic way of life."

Public education is important in a democracy for many reasons. Democracy is based upon a belief in the dignity and rights of the individual. This belief necessarily leads to the belief that each individual should have a full opportunity to develop his abilities. Free public education is the only way to give this opportunity to all.

Our Biblical traditions are the source of our belief in the dignity and the rights of the individual. Our constitutional government and our free enterprise system spring from this same belief. These Biblical traditions and a deep concern for education were brought by the early settlers of Rockbridge County and Lexington from Scotland. Like the earliest settlers at Jamestown and the earliest settlers of New England, their first concern was a church, the next a school, to advance learning and perpetuate it for posterity. They did not want their children or their neighbors' children to grow up unable to read the Bible.

In a democracy, government represents the will of the people. This is so in a simple democracy like a Greek city state, or in a carefully contrived and delicately balanced democracy like ours, where the will of the people is expressed through their various representatives in the several branches of the State and Federal Governments. In either case, it is an axiom, as Jefferson wrote to Washington, that the people, whose will is to be carried out, must be informed and educated. "Such a responsibility," said Dr. Paschall, "recognizes that American destiny is already being molded in the classroom. The hope or the disillusionment; the glory or the despair; the statesman or the demagog; the patriot or the traitor; the sunshine of a republican form of government or the blackness of authoritarianism—are all there in potential."

The early settlers of Rockbridge County and Lexington knew the religious and ethical basis for public education. They knew the philosophic need for public education in a democracy. While primarily seeking religious freedom, those Scotch-Irish and Pennsylvania Dutch pioneers also knew that public education is essential to the fullest development of the economy of an area or a nation.

That fact was fully recognized by Dr. Ruffner when he said in 1870: "No money expended in public affairs brings back a larger or surer return of prosperity than the money expended in the education of the people."

In 1957, a legislative commission submitted a report to Governor Stanley and to the general assembly on ways to promote industrial development in Virginia. "Of all the normal functions of State and local governments," the commission said, "that may affect and influence industrial development favorably, or unfavorably, none is more important than education at both the secondary and college levels."

In 1959, the committee on education of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce made a study of education in Virginia. This showed a close relationship between educational and economic levels. The board of directors of the chamber were told that "It's just plain cash register arithmetic that more business at more profit can be done where more people are better educated."

Dr. Ruffner's reports contain many interesting discussions of the problems he faced and the principles he followed. I want to mention a few of these which are particularly relevant to our present situation, and to the new Lexington High School.

In creating and establishing the public school system in Virginia, Dr. Ruffner said he was guided by what he called "the established doctrine of liberal government, that power should be distributed, and should always be kept as near to the people as is consistent with the end to be subserved." The Rockbridge County School Board and the Lexington Town School Board have worked hard to reach a cooperative arrangement to build and operate this new high school, to serve the town of Lexington and the Buffalo, Kerrs' Creek, and central districts of the county. This kind of cooperation could not be compelled by law from Richmond. It could not be compelled by law from Washington. It could only grow out of the kind of local responsibility and interest that was advocated by Dr. Ruffner.

Dr. Ruffner knew the disadvantages of very small schools. "The community which divides its patronage among many disconnected little schools," he said in 1872, "is needlessly butchering the education of its children, and that, too, at double the cost of a good system."

Dr. Ruffner was speaking primarily of the one-room, one-teacher school. In the last 10 years, the Rockbridge County School Board has eliminated all of its one-, two-, and three-room elementary schools. It has built five new modern elementary schools, and expanded several others.

The disadvantages of the high school, too small to provide a satisfactory curriculum or satisfactory facilities, were pointed out by Dr. Conant, of Harvard, in 1959 in his report on "The American High School Today" and by the Spong Commission in its 1960 report to Governor Almond and the general assembly.

The new Lexington High School shows the benefits of increased size. Fifty-four units are offered by the new school, compared with 40½ offered last year. New courses in vocational agriculture, distributive education, and foreign languages are being offered, and the eighth grade program has expanded. There are now 25 teachers, compared to 17 last year. It is easy to see how these changes have improved the quality of education offered.

Dr. Ruffner was also aware of the problem of the comprehensive high school. Like Jefferson when he was drafting his 1776 bill, Dr. Ruffner knew that providing an equal opportunity for each student to get the education best suited to him did not mean giving every student the same education. "Is a true educational course," Dr. Ruffner asked in 1876, "one and the same for the boy who breaks off at the second book of Caesar to go to the plow or the plane, and the boy who goes on through college into law or theology?" Dr. Conant and the Spong Commission also were aware that the comprehensive high school must be capable of handling students with different needs and interests.

This new high school now offers a full college preparatory course with 25 units in such academic subjects as mathematics, science, Latin and French. It also offers vocational programs in 5 different fields, with a total of 21 units in those fields.

Dr. Ruffner's reports emphasize the importance of teachers and teaching. "School laws, taxes, officers, buildings, apparatus, books, grading," he said in 1872, "are all in vain without good teachers."

Dr. Ruffner instituted examinations for teachers. He set up teachers' institutes. He was responsible for the creation of the first State normal school at Farmville. I have no doubt that Dr. Ruffner would have approved the recommendations of the Spong Commission report for regular and advanced teacher training. The staff of the Lexington High School, I am sure, will take full advantage of the many opportunities for advanced training, such as the summer institutes in science and mathematics under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation, and the summer institutes in foreign languages under the National Defense Education Act.

Dr. Ruffner's emphasis on the importance of the teacher and those immediately in charge of education makes it appropriate to consider how fortunate Lexington has been in this respect. In 1897, only 3 years after the first public high school in Lexington had opened in what is now the Ruffner Elementary School building, Mr. Harrington Waddell, an honor graduate of Washington and Lee University and a charter member of the Washington and Lee Phi Beta Kappa Chapter, became the supervising principal of the Lexington public schools. Mr. Waddell served in this position until 1943, 46 years of constructive and effective leadership. During this period under his leadership and in subsequent years under the leadership of able and dedicated successors, the schools of Lexington and Rockbridge County have moved forward to provide increasingly effective education for their students.

Rockbridge County and the town of Lexington are reaching the final stages in a 10-year, $3½ million program of school improvement. This program has made it possible to improve the teaching in the elementary schools and in the new high schools.

These efforts make it clear that the people of Lexington and of Rockbridge County are still moved by the same deep concern for education which the first settlers of the area, and Thomas Jefferson, Robert E. Lee, and Dr. Ruffner all felt.

May the dedication of this new school building be characterized by a grateful acknowledgment of our indebtedness to school leaders of the past and a determination to carry forward their work in the spirit of George Washington, who said in his Farewell Address:

"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

But this, my friends, is not enough. We have here in Lexington a priceless heritage handed down to us from God-fearing progenitors who has grasped the true meaning of education.

Our knowledge of the physical sciences has outstripped our knowledge of the social sciences and no one can with confidence predict that there will never be an all-out nuclear war. The sum of the matter is this: America may well face annihilation unless, in heart and purpose, we turn back to the fountainhead of all learning—the Father of Light who illuminated the understanding of our ancestors. In the immortal Book, taught in all of their schools, it is written:

"Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding"; for "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom. Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Deuteronomy 8: 11: *Beware that thou forget not the Lord Thy God.*

Almighty God, upon whom we lean for strength and unto whom we look for hope, may we earnestly devote ourselves to the task of bringing unto all mankind the blessings of the more abundant life.

Grant that, living in an expanding universe, we may find our hearts enlarging with a greater concern for the welfare of humanity and a longing to help men and nations cultivate a friendly and fraternal relationship.

Show us how we may give consolation and courage to all who are tempted to surrender to futility, feeling that they are the victims of a conspiracy of wicked and untoward circumstances.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 16, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

PROCEEDINGS ON FRIDAY NEXT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Friday next. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11 o'clock Friday morning. In order to go out on the official platform, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket, it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

So if you expect to be in the procession and get a seat on the platform, it will be wise for you to be in the Chamber at 11 a.m. on next Friday.

The Chair further announces that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will act as Speaker pro tempore on next Friday.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 17, 1961.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12 o'clock meridian on January 17, 1961, and said to contain the message of the President of the United States with reference to the agreement with the Government of Italy, negotiated pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

AGREEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT OF ITALY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

In December 1957 the heads of government of the nations members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization reached agreement in principle on the desirability of achieving the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive

strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques. In enunciating this agreement in principle the heads of government made it clear that this decision was the result of the fact that the Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, had left no doubt that the most modern and destructive weapons of all kinds were being introduced into the Soviet armed forces. The introduction of modern weapons into NATO forces should be no cause for concern on the part of other countries, since NATO is purely a defensive alliance.

It is our conviction and the conviction of our NATO allies that the introduction into NATO defenses of the most modern weapons available is essential in maintaining the strength necessary to the alliance. Any alliance depends in the last analysis upon the sense of shared mutual interests among its members, and by sharing with our allies certain training information we are demonstrating concretely our sense of partnership in NATO's defensive planning. Failure on our part to contribute to the improvement of the state of operational readiness of the forces of other members of NATO will only encourage the Soviet Union to believe that it can eventually succeed in its goal of destroying NATO's effectiveness.

To facilitate the necessary cooperation on our part, legislation amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was enacted by the Congress in 1958. Pursuant to that legislation, agreements for cooperation were concluded with four of our NATO partners in May and June 1959. A similar agreement was also recently concluded with our NATO ally, the Republic of Italy. All of these agreements are designed to implement, in important respects, the agreed NATO program.

This agreement with the Government of Italy will enable the United States to cooperate effectively in mutual defense planning with Italy and in the training of Italian NATO forces in order that, if an attack on NATO should occur, Italian forces could, under the direction of the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe, effectively use nuclear weapons in their defense.

These agreements previously concluded and this Italian agreement represent only a portion of the work necessary for complete implementation of the decision taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in December 1957. I anticipate the conclusion of similar agreements for cooperation with certain other NATO nations as the alliance's defensive planning continues.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the agreement with the Government of Italy. I am also transmitting a copy of the Secretary of State's letter accompanying an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, a copy of a joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of this document and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto setting forth my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the annual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending June 30, 1960. The report was prepared under the direction of the coordinator of the mutual security program by the Department of State (including the International Cooperation Administration), the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

At the turn of this decade we have seen change and political uncertainty in the developing areas which have caused us to strengthen our programs for economic and social development. We have had as our goal the promotion of peaceful change for millions of people in Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East who are seeking domestic tranquillity and a better way of life. We have responded to the hope of these millions for a decent future for themselves and their children through well-conceived programs of economic and technical assistance. Our friends and allies have shared this responsibility with us.

Our common safety has been of equal concern and it has been our purpose to unite the free people of the world in a sustained common defense against overt attack or suppression of liberty. We have maintained the strength of our alliances by reinforcing collective defense arrangements. In doing this we have again demonstrated that firmness in the face of threatened aggression is a dependable safeguard to peace.

The events of the past year once again emphasized the need for a strong and vigorous mutual security program. Urgent issues will continue to confront us as members of the international community and we must respond wisely through constructive action.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the fourth semiannual report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period April 1, 1960, through September 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1961.*

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 57)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 10th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 28)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 18, 1961.

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, who, in turn, have had the assistance of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters discussed. Pursuant to the requirements of the Employment Act, the report summarizes the economic developments of the year and the policy actions taken to promote balanced growth of the economy, appraises the economic outlook, and puts forward a number of legislative proposals designed to help achieve the purposes of the act. The report also reviews the performance of the economy under the Employment Act, and particularly during the period of this administration, and discusses policies for the future in the light of this experience.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

As the year 1960 came to a close, the Nation was producing goods and services at an annual rate of $503.5 billion, the same as in the third quarter of the year, though slightly less than in the second quarter. For the year as a whole, the total output of our economy, in dollars of constant buying power, was 2.6 percent greater than in 1959.

Production and employment declined in the latter part of 1960, and unemployment rose, owing in large measure to an inventory adjustment. In the first quarter, inventories were being built up at an annual rate of $11.4 billion, but in the fourth quarter they were being reduced at an annual rate of $4 billion. It is encouraging, however, that the declines in production and income were moderate. And it is especially important that final demands for goods and services—that is, the sum of the Nation's expenditures except those resulting in inventory change—rose without interruption during the year and in the final quarter reached the level of $507.5 billion.

The achievement of a reasonable equilibrium in the Nation's international transactions continued to be a goal of our policies in 1960. The overall deficit in the U.S. balance of payments last year remained close to that in each of the 2 preceding years, but the structure of the deficit changed markedly. Short-term capital outflows accelerated, mainly in response to a widening of the margin by which interest rates abroad exceeded those in this country. But the deficit on all other transactions diminished greatly, as a result of a rapid rise in exports.

The underlying strength of our economy, manifested in final demand for goods and services, is a distinctly favorable element in appraising the economic outlook. So, also, is the fact that economic conditions today are free of maladjustments and imbalances which, to be corrected, would require prolonged contraction. Businessmen and consumers have kept their use of credit within reasonable limits, and speculative excesses have been generally avoided. Inflationary pressure has been restrained. While this may have affected inventory policies and, perhaps, other demands for goods and services, it has helped to prepare a solid foundation for a resumption of sustainable growth. Because action to maintain balance and to consolidate gains was taken in good time, we can look forward, provided public and private policies are favorable, to a period of sound economic growth from a firm base.

The Federal policies needed to promote balanced growth can, to a considerable extent, be applied under existing administrative authority. But there are certain areas in which legislative action is needed.

First, funds appropriated by the Congress for the fiscal year 1962 should be held within the limits of expected revenues. A budget conforming to this standard has been presented to the Congress. It makes certain suggestions for revenues to cover projected expenditures, including necessary extensions of taxes that would otherwise terminate or be reduced on July 1, 1961; an increase in the highway fuel tax to 4½ cents per gallon, to supply needed funds in the highway trust fund; the rescinding by the Congress of action taken in 1959 which would divert funds from the general fund of the Treasury for road construction; and a rate increase to place the postal system on a self-supporting basis.

Second, Congress should give the Secretary of the Treasury authority to raise funds in the long-term capital market when, in his judgment, this is in the public interest, even if the cost of the funds is above 4¼ percent. The existing ceiling remains an important impediment to the Treasury's flexibility in achieving significant debt lengthening.

Third, as I have pointed out to the Congress each year since 1955, legislation is needed to enable the Federal Government to give constructive assistance to areas where there is high and persistent unemployment. The character of the legislation needed is described in the Economic Report, and an administration proposal drafted to meet the standards indicated has been placed before the Congress.

Fourth, legislative needs in the areas of health, education, and welfare, antitrust enforcement, long-term agricultural adjustment, unemployment compensation, and housing and community development are outlined in the report. These are also described in the budget message.

Finally, I recommend again that Congress amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of national economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power now stated in the act. The amendment proposed is limited to a change in the language of the act's declaration of policy and would accomplish its aim without placing restrictions on the effective operation of economic markets. It would strengthen the Employment Act which, as the Economic Report shows, has been a useful statute under which our citizens have made notable further advances in their welfare.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I am transmitting herewith the third annual report on the Nation's activities in the fields of aeronautics and space.

As this report testifies, 1960 witnessed a vast expansion of man's knowledge of the earth's atmosphere and of the limitless regions of space beyond. The Vanguard, Explorer, and Pioneer spacecraft have added substantially to our knowledge of the earth's environment and of the sun-earth relationship. Experiments with Projects Echo and Courier, Tiros I and II, and Transit I and II have shown the promise of spacecraft application in the fields of communications, meteorology, and navigation. Among the outstanding accomplishments in technology were a series of successful recoveries from orbit of capsules from the Discoverer satellites and the increasing degree of reliability in stabilizing these satellites in the required orbits.

Significant advances were made in the manned space flight program and in the preparation of a small fleet of powerful launch vehicles to carry out a wide variety of space missions.

Underlying the Nation's aeronautics and space programs was a strong basic and applied research effort which resulted in constantly broadening scientific and technological horizons. Finally, the entire effort has been drawn together in a long-range program of space exploration which offers every promise that in the years to come benefits for all mankind will be extensive.

Summarized within this report are contributions of Federal agencies participating in the space effort.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1961.*

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK ERTEL CARLYLE

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within less than 2 years, I come to the well of the House to announce the passing of a former Member of this body from the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina, which I now have the honor to represent.

I am indeed sorry to announce to the House the passing of Frank Ertel Carlyle, who served in this body from 1949 through 1957, or from the 81st through the 84th Congresses. He died early Sunday morning, October 2, 1960, at his home in Lumberton, N.C. While Mr. Carlyle suffered for several years from a circulatory ailment, he had been active in the practice of law and participated in the activities of his city and county until his passing.

Mr. Carlyle was born in Lumberton in 1897, and spent his life there except for the time he served in the U.S. Navy in World War I and attended college. He began the practice of law in Lumberton in 1921.

The former Representative and Miss Lois Godwin Caldwell, also of Lumberton, were married May 19, 1927. To this union was born a daughter, Mrs. Doran Berry, who with her mother survive.

Mr. Carlyle had been chairman of the Robeson County Democratic Executive Committee and was appointed district solicitor for the ninth North Carolina ju-

dicial district. He was elected solicitor in 1938, and reelected in 1942 and again in 1946. He was in every sense of the word an able, vigorous, and fearless prosecutor of the laws and the rights of our citizenship. He was president of the Ninth North Carolina Judicial District Bar Association, commander of the Lumberton Post of the American Legion, member of the 40 and 8 Society, Phi Delta Theta, Methodist Church, a 32d degree Mason, and an Elk.

Mr. Carlyle was an able lawyer and a Christian gentleman. He endeared himself to all who knew him. Regardless of the time, place, or circumstances he was always kind and courteous, and had a word of encouragement for his friends. He was faithful to duty, laboring hard and long for the welfare of the people of his district, State, and Nation.

Frank Ertel Carlyle was a devoted public servant and a fine American. I am sure my colleagues will want to join me in extending deepest sympathy to members of the Carlyle family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that all Members may be granted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, on the life and character of the late Mr. Carlyle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM B. FRANKE, A GREAT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday there comes to an end the term in office of the present Secretary of the Navy, Hon. William B. Franke. As one who has had the honor to serve as a member of the Armed Services Committee of this body, and also as a member of the Naval Reserve, I have had a number of opportunities in the past 2 years to observe Mr. Franke's services to the Navy and to the country, and I would not want this occasion to pass without our pausing briefly to pay tribute to the job which Bill Franke has done for his Nation and to commend and congratulate him for all his services.

In his quiet but highly efficient and effective way, Secretary Franke has been a tireless and outspoken advocate of the naval service and of the unique contribution to our overall national defense which naval forces can uniquely make. Although not originally a sailor himself, he quickly won the confidence and respect of the uniformed members of the naval service, and he leaves office on Friday after 2 years as Secretary and another year as Under Secretary, with a profound grasp of those principles of strategy and defense which must be as clearly understood by the civilian heads of our armed services as they are by the uniformed members if our defense is to be genuinely strong and our Nation is to remain free.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Franke comes from my home State of New York, and he is, in fact, a neighbor of mine, having been born and raised in the city of Troy. In addition to that, his lovely lady, Mrs. Franke, is a native of my home city of Schenectady, and I regard both of them sentimentally, if not strictly legally, as constituents of mine.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, at the ceremonies held at the Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn., on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the first utilization of nuclear power in our naval fleet—an occasion at which Vice Admiral Rickover, the father of our nuclear Navy, was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal—Mr. Franke was introduced by Vice Admiral Grenfell as having been referred to by Adm. Arleigh Burke as the greatest Secretary of the Navy in our history.

This accolade by the Nation's No. 1 uniformed sailor, a man not often given to superlatives, is eloquent testimony of the job which Mr. Franke has done for the Navy. I know he will leave the Government service on Friday with the thanks and best wishes of all of us who have the Nation's defense and security at heart, and we can all be proud that this great New Yorker, at a difficult time in history, has steered the ship of our Naval Establishment so successfully through difficult waters to a new and ever greater place of responsibility in the posture of our national defense.

WEST VIRGINIA IS GETTING SHORTCHANGED: I

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a news release from the Department of Defense dated January 16, 1961, listing new military construction projects for which authorization is being requested. The new construction projects to be authorized include 358 named installations in 50 States and the District of Columbia and in certain foreign areas. The total amount for new construction in the United States is $654,490,000—or an average of roughly $13 million per State.

West Virginia, with the highest unemployment rate in the Nation and the highest percentage of its citizens having participated in the Korean conflict, nevertheless is allocated only a paltry $262,000 in these requests. This ranks 48th in the Nation—almost at the bottom of the list. West Virginia ranks 30th in the Nation according to the 1960 census.

Certainly at a time when considerable attention is being given to improving the economic status of distressed areas it simply makes no sense to shortchange the State of West Virginia in this way. We in West Virginia ask for no special favors. We in West Virginia ask for no handouts. We ask for no revision of military planning to give some artificial advantage to our State. All we ask for is an even break in the allocation of installations, particularly at a time when military construction might provide the necessary impetus toward economic recovery.

Each of the States bordering on West Virginia have been allocated amounts for new military construction, in proportion to population, far beyond what has been authorized for West Virginia. Consider these figures, Mr. Speaker:

State	1960 population	New military construction authorization requested by Department of Defense, Jan. 16, 1961
Pennsylvania	11,319,366	$7,298,000
Maryland	3,100,689	19,964,000
Virginia	3,966,949	12,269,000
Ohio	9,706,397	7,157,000
Kentucky	3,038,156	1,279,000
West Virginia	1,860,421	262,000

The State of Pennsylvania may have a population six times as large as West Virginia, but Pennsylvania's new military construction request totals 28 times as much as West Virginia's.

The State of Maryland, with a population of somewhat less than twice that of West Virginia, is provided with a new military construction request of over 75 times the amount provided for West Virginia.

The State of Virginia, with about twice the population of West Virginia, emerges with a new military construction request of nearly 50 times that of West Virginia.

The State of Ohio, with 5 times the population of West Virginia, has a new military construction request of over 25 times that of West Virginia.

The State of Kentucky, with a population a little over 1½ times that of West Virginia, has a new military construction request nearly 5 times as large as that of West Virginia.

What is true of the States bordering West Virginia is even more true throughout the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the incoming administration, awake and alive to the needs of the people of West Virginia, will check this constant shortchanging of our State.

SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution that will reduce the social security retirement age for men to 62 and for women to 60, and also to increase the monthly payments by $35.

I know there is some question as to whether it is desirable policy for the Government to encourage early retirement when man's lifespan is ever lengthening. But I understand only about half of the women eligible for retirement at 62 chose to retire when the 1956 amendment was adopted. The important part of my bill is that it provides for voluntary retirement at the lower age. No man or woman will be required to retire. The choice will be his or hers. I am sure many, even maybe a majority, would prefer to continue working. But my bill would pave the way for those who do want to retire and who should retire. There are many who are not physically able to continue working at that age, yet they are not disabled to the extent that they can qualify for disability benefits. My amendment would permit these persons to retire and make room for younger workers.

Why not make it possible for those who, perhaps due to adverse reasons beyond their control, wish to receive at an earlier age that which they have earned?

By increasing the monthly benefits by $35 for all, we are not only helping the people who need it most to meet everyday living costs, but we would also give our economy a shot in the arm.

Our country is faced with a great unemployment problem, and we cannot deny that automation is here to stay which constitutes a growing problem with which we will have to deal more and more in terms of unemployment. Further, these people who would benefit from the increase will spend it on needed living costs—which means more food, clothing, and so forth—and not increased savings accounts.

I cannot overemphasize the need for such legislation, and urge my colleagues to consider it at an early date.

DISPOSAL OF AIR FORCE PLANT NO. 60 AT ADRIAN, MICH.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I introduced legislation to require the General Services Administration to dispose of Air Force Plant No. 60 at Adrian, Mich., in such fashion as to provide the maximum of community benefits.

I have introduced two bills.

The first would amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that in the disposal of surplus real property consideration shall be given to the impact of such disposal upon the community in which such property is located.

The second is in the nature of special legislation and would authorize the disposal of Air Force Plant No. 60 at Adrian, Mich., to a person, firm, or corporation which will continue manufacturing operations therein.

The aluminum extrusion plant at Adrian was built during World War II and contributed to the Nation's defense through manufacture of aluminum products, primarily for military aircraft.

Throughout my service in the House of Representatives I have been called upon to assist the community in protecting its interests, including payments in lieu of taxes, with respect to this Government-owned industrial facility. The current problem involves the manner in which the General Services Administration as custodian of this plant sells or otherwise disposes of it and the effect of such disposal upon the community. Dismantlement and discontinuance of the plant as a unit of production would be a serious blow to the entire community and the State of Michigan.

I asked Administrator Floete January 4, 1961, to see that the aluminum extrusion plant at Adrian was disposed of in such a way as to avoid these disastrous consequences. That letter was signed by the entire Michigan delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike.

In conversations with GSA officials having responsibilities in connection with the disposal of this plant, I have urged that all efforts be made to continue this facility as a source of employment. During these discussions it has been pointed out that nothing in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 requires, directs, or even authorizes GSA to consider the effect on a community of the terms and manner in which it disposes of federally owned property. My bills will correct that deficiency.

I see no justice in the fact that the Federal Government due to a pressing Federal need can call on a community like Adrian to fill that need, require it to adjust itself to a Federal activity and then when that need has ceased to exist, to find itself devastated by Federal action taken in total disregard of the economic health of the community.

This legislation is of great urgency and requires immediate action.

The text of the two bills follows:

H.R. 2913

A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that in the disposal of surplus real property consideration shall be given to the impact of such disposal upon the community in which such property is located

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484) is amended by inserting immediately after "Government" the following: "and, in the case of real property, to the community in which such property is located."

H.R. 2914

A bill to authorize the disposal of Air Force Plant No. 60 at Adrian, Michigan, to a person, firm, or corporation which will continue manufacturing operations therein

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the disposal of Air Force Plant No. 60 at Adrian, Michigan, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, if he determines that the disposal thereof to the highest responsible bidder would have an adverse effect upon employment in the surrounding community, to dispose of such plant by negotiation to a person, firm, or corporation which furnishes him satisfactory assurances that he will continue manufacturing operations at such plant. Sales authorized by this Act shall, to the extent not inconsistent with this Act, be conducted in conformity with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; shall be publicized to the extent consistent with the value of the property; shall be subject to such competition as is feasible; shall be at a price which reflects the estimated fair market value of the property; and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary in the interest of the United States.

OVERHAUL AND REPAIR OF SUBMARINES AT PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this date I have introduced a bill to provide for full overhaul and repair capability for nuclear-powered and conventional submarines at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard in Pennsylvania.

With the Navy's growing fleet of nuclear submarines and the gradual retirement of the conventional submarine, the day is not far distant when the number of conventional submarines in the Navy will not warrant the continuation of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and Submarine Base unless it is fully equipped to handle nuclear-powered submarines in addition to its present capability with regard to conventional submarines.

At the present time, it is estimated that 900 men at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard are engaged daily in connection with maintenance and repair work on conventional submarines. This effort represents an annual expenditure of approximately $14 million. Therefore, with the nuclear-powered submarine destined to replace the conventional submarine within the next few days, these 900 jobs and the annual expenditure of $14 million could be placed in jeopardy.

We are all familiar with what is happening to skilled manpower at the Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D.C., where thousands of jobs are being abolished.

According to available information, the Navy's experience at other naval yards indicates that from 2 to 3 years is necessary from the time the funds become available until the conversion job is complete. Therefore, it could be 3 years before the submarine base at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard could be converted to the point that it could provide full overhaul and repair capability for nuclear-powered and conventional submarines. It is estimated that the cost of conversion will range from $2 to $4

million, and will not only apply to the facilities and equipment but will include training of personnel.

It is common knowledge that the life of a submarine is about 20 years and a great percentage of our conventional submarines is either overage or approaching that point. While it costs 1½ times as much to construct nuclear-powered submarines as it does the conventional type submarine, almost the same manpower is needed to overhaul and repair a nuclear-powered submarine. Here again time will be needed to train the necessary personnel.

Since nuclear-powered submarines require a greater depth of water than the conventional type, some work will be necessary such as dredging, and so forth, in the waters adjacent to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. However, according to information furnished, no work will be required on the main channel leading from the Atlantic Ocean to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. It will take time to dredge the area in the vicinity of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. There, time is of the essence in preparing the Philadelphia Submarine Base for dual capacity in maintaining and repairing both nuclear-powered and conventional submarines.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not permitted to reveal classified information, I can say it will not be too many years hence when the conventional type submarines in our Navy will be but a few. Therefore, if the Philadelphia Submarine Base with its 900 employees and an annual expenditure of $14 million are to be preserved, Congress should take immediate action on my bill, keeping in mind that the economic effects of closing such a facility would further complicate our growing unemployment problem in the State of Pennsylvania.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride that I take this occasion to pay tribute to the 34th President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I know that Americans everywhere and countless millions of friends from throughout the world join in the well wishes to our beloved President whose formal career will soon come to an end, when at noon, January 20, Mr. Eisenhower steps down from office, turning the reins of government over to President-elect Kennedy.

In my opinion, President Eisenhower possesses in abundance those virtues which through the ages have distinguished men of great character. Issues involving the fate of the world have hung upon his decisions. Yet he has made those decisions with courage and confidence. The immense power which Dwight Eisenhower commanded as a General and as a President never changed the essential humility of his nature.

On many occasions when cries went out for hasty action, President Eisenhower stayed his hand until he knew that the right hour had come. Only a master diplomat could have reconciled the tangle of conflicting loyalties, ambitions, and prejudices with which he has had to deal with in our faction-torn world. He has demonstrated firmness. He has demonstrated imagination and resourcefulness, his fairness, his honesty, and his practical nature.

His expressed views are those of a man who has pondered long and deeply on the historic significance of representative government in these United States. He has sought to preserve and enlarge the freedoms which are embodied in the word "America."

The tremendous universal popularity which has been President Eisenhower's has in no way given him a false set of values. Throughout his distinguished career of service to the public he has remained factually, firmly, and clearly a man of the people.

His election in 1952 and again in 1956 was fortunate, indeed, for America and for the world.

When Dwight Eisenhower arrived in Chicago for the Republican nominating convention in 1952, one of the first things he said was this:

> What we need, first, in America today is a well-understood objective. This is no time to zig and zag around the universe, first here and then there, in answer to someone else's initiative.

He sustained in his conduct of foreign affairs the victory he won in Chicago in 1952. Since the signing of the Korean armistice in 1953, our country has been at peace. The Eisenhower administration deepened its party's experience in serving the American people.

Our Government's influences over the economy of our Nation have been manipulated with skill and Mr. Eisenhower's record in dealing with stubborn postwar inflationary troubles has been noteworthy.

He sought to cut back the Federal Government's intervention in business and industry and to minimize interference with State and municipal government. He always remembered the importance of the individuals who might be in the midst of a problem. He conscientiously tried to limit the power of the Federal Government in its relations with the States.

After 20 years of one party government, President Eisenhower restored a new, healthy balance to American political life. He placed great emphasis on unifying the country. He brought new heights to the institution of the Presidency and to the concept of executive teamwork.

To America's moral standards, President Eisenhower brought new strength. He constantly warned his fellow citizens that the strength our Government wields must come from a community of informed, responsible, free people, aware of their own strength and given a clear path by Government to apply that strength.

I am certain President Eisenhower's dedication to the pursuit of peace for his country and the world will be recorded in history as exemplary. It is appropriate that we remember his words, spoken in December 1959, as follows:

> We have found that peace does not come just because the guns are still. We have to work for peace. We have to work with our hearts, with our substance, with our hands. We have to work all the time to maintain peace and to make it more secure. This cannot be done by any one man, by any one nation. We must all work together.

I salute a great man and a great President. To Dwight Eisenhower and his family I wish the peace and contentment he has sought so earnestly to bring to the world.

L. QUINCY MUMFORD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last year, when I took the House floor to pay tribute to David Chambers Mearns who had completed 40 years of service to the Library of Congress, I pointed out that, based on my experience, I have noted that the people who use the services of the Government tend to take our Government personnel too much for granted. Too often we accept as a matter of course the services we require to carry on the necessary business of Government and all too often we who have the privilege to serve as representatives of the people forget that our own accomplishments are only made possible by the hard labor of many others. I also pointed out that I, like you, have used the Library of Congress often and that I have become very impressed with work of the Library and especially the work of those who work in the legislative reference section of the Library.

In the preparation of the dissertation I gave on David Mearns, I became so enthused about the service of this great institution that I began immediately to collect material with a view of preparing a paper on the history, activities and influence of the Library of Congress which is an interesting and worthwhile story that I felt needed to be told and better understood with the hope that some day I would find time to elaborate on the work and service of the Library of Congress.

I am prepared to do that today.

First, however, I want to yield to a distinguished Member of this House who I am sure has some feelings on this matter that correspond to my own. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, Mr. OMAR BURLESON.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], very much for yielding to me at this time to permit me to express views which I am sure are similar to those which he has prepared on this great institution, the Library of Congress.

I should like to commend the gentleman for his continuing and intelligent interest in this matter over the years.

As this 1st session of the 87th Congress opens, our colleagues should be reminded—although those who have previously served in this House will need no reminder—of a great congressional institution run by dedicated people.

It has been my pleasure for a number of years to serve as chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, alternating with my distinguished Senate colleague who has just retired, Theodore Francis Green. Thus I am in a position to appreciate not only the fine services of the Library, from which all of us benefit, but also the large and complex problems with which Dr. Mumford is dealing so wisely.

The Library, though not as old as the Congress itself, is a venerable institution. Established in 1800, when the seat of the National Government was moved to Washington, D.C., it was designed at first to serve only the needs of Congress. But, over the years, Congress has extended its functions until now it serves not only Members and committees of Congress, but the entire Government, other libraries throughout the country, the world of scholarship, and the general public. It is, in effect, the national library of the United States. That it is in the legislative branch is entirely fitting, for, historically, its first duty is to serve the Nation through the Congress, which must have the finest possible library to supply it with the expert and impartial information essential for enlightened legislation.

Although appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Librarian of Congress is an official of the legislative branch, responsible to the Congress through the Joint Committee on the Library, the Committee on House Administration, and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

For almost a century, Librarians of Congress have traditionally served through changes in the national administration. For example, Ainsworth Rand Spofford served for 33 years—1864–97. He was succeeded by John Russell Young, who died in office. Herbert Putnam, who was appointed in 1899, held the position for 40 years. Archibald MacLeish, who succeeded Dr. Putnam in 1939, resigned in 1944 to become Assistant Secretary of State. He was succeeded by Luther Harris Evans, who resigned effective July 1, 1953, to become Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. His successor and our present Librarian, Dr. Mumford, took office on September 1, 1954.

The wisdom of maintaining the integrity of this office is self-evident; the Library must be, and is, administered in a nonpartisan, nonpolitical fashion, with emphasis on high standards of professional and scholarly excellence. Furthermore, the history of the Library shows that, although each Librarian has made his own unique contribution, great accomplishments have come during the administrations of those Librarians who have remained at their post for a number of years, for it takes time to satisfy long-standing needs and to consolidate gains in a national institution like the Library of Congress, which does not stand alone but is at the heart of this country's library system.

You may not all know our Librarian, Dr. Mumford, but you will. He customarily invites new Members to visit the Library to learn about the services and facilities. I hope you will go to see at firsthand what the institution is and does.

A North Carolinian by birth, Dr. Mumford, the 11th Librarian in the Library's 160-year history, was educated at Duke University. He did postgraduate work there and at Columbia University, from which he received his degree in library service. After a distinguished career in two of the largest library systems in the country—those of the New York Public Library and of the Cleveland Public Library, of which he was director from 1950 to 1954—he was chosen to be Librarian of Congress by the President from a small select list of professional librarians submitted by the American Library Association.

No stranger to Washington or the Library of Congress, Dr. Mumford had, at the request of Librarian MacLeish, been granted leave of absence from the New York Public Library in 1940–41 to organize the Processing Department of the Library of Congress and to serve for a year as its Director. This is the Department in the Library that is responsible for the complex of operations necessary in acquiring materials from all over the world and cataloging and otherwise preparing them for use. In his 1941 annual report, MacLeish said that Mumford had "effected a minor—perhaps a major—miracle in the Processing Department."

Notable progress has certainly been made in the Library in the past 6 years. This has come about through the partnership between the Library and its parent body, the Congress, the cooperation of other libraries, the interest of scholarship, and the work of a dedicated staff.

The collections of the Library have been augmented until today they consist of nearly 39 million items, among them some 12 million books and pamphlets on every subject and in a multitude of languages. These comprehensive collections are necessary to serve the needs of Congress, as well as of the Federal agencies and of scholarship. For Thomas Jefferson, whose private library was purchased by Congress in 1815 to replace the original Library of Congress that was destroyed in the War of 1812, spoke truly, and probably more prophetically than even he imagined, when he said: "There is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer."

A research library has to grow, as we in Congress recognize, or it quickly becomes antiquarian rather than utilitarian. But today so much is published that even the largest libraries must be selective. To insure that materials needed were obtained and that the Library's acquisition efforts were neither dissipated nor misdirected, one of the first things Dr. Mumford did was to examine and redefine the institution's acquisition policies. During his administration, exchange relations, through which invaluable research materials are obtained without expenditure of book-purchase funds, have been expanded by the thousands. When Dr. Mumford took office, the Library had only three exchange agreements with institutions in the Soviet Union; it now has more than 300. And today the Library has a worldwide network of almost 20,000 exchange agreements with governmental agencies, universities, and other research institutions, which bring in over half a million items a year. The Librarian has also persuaded us to increase his book-purchase funds not only to meet rising costs but to permit, among other things, the buying of foreign periodicals not available through exchange.

The Library's collections, its unique research tools, and its expert staff combine to constitute one of the major assets of the Congress. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 designated the Legislative Reference Service, one of the six departments of the Library, as the main information and research arm of the Congress, but LRS could not serve us as it does without the backing and the assistance of the entire Library. The increasing importance of the work done for us by LRS and other units of the Library is attested by the fact that our requests for information, for books, and for analytical studies have about doubled in the last 6 years. In the fiscal year 1954, the Library responded to 69,000 congressional requests, while in the past fiscal year it answered 123,000 inquiries.

The Library has been responsive to the developing requirements of research. It has, with direct appropriations, transferred funds, and foundation support, strengthened the collections in new areas of research, exploited them in various ways, and created the administrative machinery necessary to make them effective for both official and private use. For example, the Law Library has been strengthened by the establishment of a Near East and North African Law Division, by the augmentation of the Far Eastern Law Division, and by the addition to the European Law Division of specialists in the law of the Iron Curtain countries. In the Reference Department, the Slavic and Central European Division has been enlarged, and the scholarly community has been quickly informed of new materials relating to these areas that are available in the Library of Congress and in other large research libraries by the publication of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions and the monthly East European Accessions Index. During the past 5 to 6 years, the number of publications from these Iron Curtain countries covered by these two indexes has about tripled—from 22,620 to 64,330. An Africana Section has been created to give attention to the collections in this area and to provide expert reference assistance. The Science and Technology Division has been expanded to meet the demands for service on the Library's incomparable 1,500,000-volume

collection of scientific and technical materials. During the past fiscal year, this Division, in addition to its other reference work for Congress, Federal agencies, and scholars, prepared some 12,300 abstracts of scientific and technical literature in foreign languages, and in the last 2 years other divisions of the Library prepared more than 85,000 abstracts of information in such literature.

The humanist, the social scientist, often feels like the forgotten man in these days of emphasis on science and technology, but the Library of Congress, long a center for humanistic research, has not neglected this area. I can mention only a few projects, recently completed or in progress: the monumental publication, "A Guide to the Study of the United States"; the refilming from perishable paper prints of the historically important early motion pictures received as copyright deposits; the microfilming of the 23 groups of Presidential papers—from those of Washington to those of Coolidge—that are in the Library and the publication of indexes to them, which will make these significant materials more widely available for research; and the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, which will provide a guide to the manuscript resources of the country just as its prototype, the National Union Catalog, does to books important for research.

Because of lack of space the Library has not been able recently to provide all the studyroom facilities some scholars would like to have. We counsel patience. Although the space situation had been deteriorating for some time, it was Dr. Mumford who made an organized attack on the problem. As you know, Congress, in the last session, authorized plans and specifications for a new building which will be adequate, the Library hopes, to provide space for individual and group research, as well as for increasing collections and new facilities for their use.

In the past 2 years funds were granted for keeping some additional reading rooms open on a 7-day-a-week basis and for providing additional hours of service on books in the stacks. This has been a great help to readers and has resulted in increased use of the collections for research.

The Library card-distribution service, whereby catalog cards, prepared by the Library of Congress and cooperating libraries, are printed and sold to libraries throughout the country, has been improved and expanded by the Librarian. The increasing value of this service is evidenced by the fact that sales of cards and technical publications have doubled during his years in office (from $1,063,000 in fiscal 1954 to $2,171,284 in fiscal 1960) and these receipts go into the U.S. Treasury, making this service self-supporting. The National Union Catalog is now published in book form at no cost to the Government. And other projects of special interest to libraries, such as new editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification and of the Union List of Serials have also been undertaken by the Library.

Under Dr. Mumford's administration, the national library service for the blind, administered by the Library of Congress through 30 other cooperating libraries, has been greatly improved and extended, and fundamental research now in progress may revolutionize this service.

A significant series of studies looking toward the revision of the copyright law, which has remained substantially unchanged since 1909, has been completed within the past year and the studies are now being published as committee prints by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

For decades the legal profession has been seeking a satisfactory book classification system for legal literature. During the last 2 years, renewed efforts have been made in this direction through the Library of Congress with the cooperation of the American Association of Law Libraries and various bar groups, and agreement has been reached on the structure of such a system within the last few months.

Upon becoming Librarian, Dr. Mumford was instructed by Congress to undertake the "codification, simplification, and completion of the statutes relating to the Library." This has been done, and the draft codification, which should give the Library a broader charter than it has heretofore had, has been referred to the appropriate committees.

In its national library role, the Library of Congress has continued its cooperation with libraries and library associations in this country, with other national libraries, and with international library, educational, and cultural organizations. It has also greatly expanded its program for the indoctrination and training of foreigners who come to the United States on educational exchange or foundation grants. Last year almost a thousand such persons from all over the world, including 300 librarians, spent various periods in the Library and were given special attention.

President-elect Kennedy, in the Saturday Review of October 29, 1960, referred to the Library of Congress as "perhaps the world's greatest repository of culture," and he noted that the Federal Government "acts as art patron to only one person"—the consultant in poetry in English in the Library of Congress. I am sure he encompassed within culture, the collections and services as well as the Library's activities in the special field of the arts.

Even before the establishment of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board in 1925, and certainly since then, the Library has encouraged the arts, especially through the use of gift and trust funds. Since 1954, the Library's trust funds have been nearly doubled—from $2,625,232 to $4,463,121. The Library presents concerts and literary programs and commissions musical compositions. And the world of literature and scholarship is happy to serve it in honorary advisory capacities. Robert Frost, that great poetic voice of America, is, for example, the Library's very active honorary consultant in the humanities.

Dr. Mumford would be the last to claim that all these activities, which add distinction to the legislative branch and luster to the Library, originated with him. Nor would he have us believe that all the Library's problems have been solved. On the contrary, in his quietly tactful way, he keeps reminding us—lest we feel overgenerous in making appropriations or become too complacent—that, despite the progress that has been made, there are other problems requiring fiscal support that need attention. He and the Library's officers realize, for example, that the documentation in any field has become so massive that new methods of controlling it, of retrieving the information, must be found. Mechanical equipment has been introduced in the Library in a number of administrative and other processes, and presently there are three firms engaged in systems engineering and the manufacture of electronic equipment making surveys of the Library's operations with the view to further applications. These surveys pointed to several possibilities for data-processing approaches but stressed the need for further study of the Library's operations in relation to mechanization, for additional systems work, for the development by the industry of more sophisticated machines and, finally, for tests to prove economic feasibility. I understand that there is foundation interest in financing a comprehensive study of this kind using the Library of Congress as the focus for the investigation and having it direct and coordinate the study.

We should be grateful that we have such a forward-looking Librarian. All the outside surveys have noted, however, the complexity of the Library's operations and that action in one area will inevitably affect action in another—not only in the Library of Congress but possibly in the entire library world. It is a chain reaction that once started would be difficult to reverse.

One of Dr. Mumford's greatest accomplishments is an intangible one, but it is nevertheless really important. It is his contribution to the fine spirit of understanding that exists between the Library and the Congress. Last spring the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations, with members of both parties joining in, praised Dr. Mumford in terms so effusive that they must have overwhelmed that modest man. But they expressed, I am sure, what most of us on both sides of the House feel: Dr. Mumford, "you and your people have done a wonderful job."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to assure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] that he does indeed speak for both parties on this cardinal matter of the Library of Congress and its demonstrably competent and dedicated Librarian, L. Quincy Mumford. I do indeed concur most heartily with the warm approval and interesting appraisal he has just given the House on the eminence the Library has so long enjoyed as the foremost institution of its kind in the world. The Library is, as he pointed out so ably, a vital and enormously dependable servant of both branches of the Congress of the United States. It is in addition the devoted servant of the executive branch and of the judiciary. It is a respected repository of source material for scholarship at home and abroad, and a collaborative topflight assistant and aid to men of letters in all fields, to a degree

that has won the Library of Congress understandable approbation the world over. Its influence, through service, to the writers and thinkers, the intellectuals and statesmen of this era and the past, has earned for American culture the respect of an informed and influential mankind.

There is not a Member of this House, of either party and from anywhere in our 50 States, who is not, from inherently patriotic motives, a friend of the Library of Congress. Looking at the record of the Library which has been so carefully studied, and so well summarized by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration, we can see how inescapable it is that if one is the friend of the Library of Congress, one must also at the same time, in the light of this magnificent record, be a friend and admirer of the present Librarian.

What makes the Library itself, and in particular our present Librarian, so wholly satisfactory to the Congress in its legislative function, to the agencies of government in the executive branch, and to the country at large, is that Dr. Mumford and the remarkable institution he directs, maintain themselves in a nonpolitical position of utter impartiality and objectivity. The Librarian's service, and the service of the Library, in accordance with long and nobly maintained tradition, have never been subject to any influences except those of the highest professional excellence in the interests of the whole of American culture.

This is why my message, in unreserved support of the position just taken by Chairman BURLESON—who has also often served as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library—centers on the indispensable meaningfulness to the Library of Congress of upholding the principle of continuity in the position of the Librarian. Here is an area that—as the chairman and I are right now demonstrating—can be an avenue of amity between the two parties. Here, in this helpful discussion about the Library of Congress, we find ground for mutual courtesy and sincere and wholehearted concord. Thus at the very outset of the deliberations of the 87th Congress, the Library of Congress and its tested and worthy Librarian, Dr. Mumford, afford an opportunity for harmony, accord, and mutual good will.

This is a gesture of respect and political good manners to which I, for one, feel especially indebted to Mr. BURLESON. Thus it may be said that even here, a mere discussion about the Library of Congress, helps to elevate the level of our deliberations. And, again so far as I am concerned, it does this without in any way inhibiting us in the future, in contending against each other over political issues that divide us. The two opposing parties, with equal love for our country, may engage in hot and even rancorous debate over problems to which their approach is different. But on the subject of the Library of Congress and the importance of unbroken tenure for its incumbent chief, we cannot in the light of history, tradition, and the written record, find ourselves in any state of disagreement.

The Library of Congress is not a policymaking institution.

It is a service institution.

Its heart of hearts is, objectivity, impartiality, integrity, and scholarship.

It certainly does not tell or suggest to the Congress of the United States, the executive branch, the judiciary, or any of the autonomous agencies of Government, what to do or how to do it.

It is not an adviser.

It deliberately and by careful design keeps itself strictly free from exercising political influence of any issues before the country, directly or indirectly, and it has no pressures to exert. In fact the Library of Congress—especially under the present leadership—prides itself on these devoutly maintained disciplines.

Neither the Library of Congress nor its Librarian pretends to constitute a so-called brain trust in the sense that brain trusts are alleged to originate or guide or direct or politically influence or channel legislative, or executive, or judicial, or agency decision. Thus, however vital and exhaustive its services to all branches of Government—especially the Congress—and however substantive its contribution to American culture and learning generally, the Library of Congress and the Librarian do not operate in the areas of political and policy contention.

The Library of Congress, under the direction of the pertinent congressional committees, of course, has policies that govern its own internal administration. But on political issues its policy is to have no policy.

Its policy has always been and is now free of political inclinations or bias.

Its sole aim is to offer to its powerful clients—the people in the Government and without the Government of the United States—nothing but the truths of the past and the present. It provides the research in depth, the statistics, the impartial data. It is this basic and indispensable material that correctly informs legislation and decision. It is because of the manifold and burdensome and continuous performance, the skill of its presentation and the analysis that clarifies it, that the Library and the librarianship itself must be regarded, so to speak, as an institution and an office, apart.

It is with the profoundest satisfaction—agreeing with the implications of what Chairman BURLESON has said—that those of us who know the facts and have studied the history and the present record of the Library, can say that L. Quincy Mumford is a top-drawer executive in the very front rank of his profession.

Great libraries—dating back probably to the ancient library at Alexandria—have been very complex institutions calling for special skills and training of a high order. But they were never more complex, and in certain aspects of their development, more revolutionary, than they are today. Of these libraries in our time, the most complex of them all, and certainly the most heavily burdened, is the Library of Congress. It is common knowledge that the Library of Congress, without a shadow of a doubt, is the greatest library anywhere today. It may safely be said that it is the greatest of all time. Since this Library is the creature of the Congress this ought to be noted with a certain pride.

The chief administrator of an institution with such a complex of functions and services is inadequate to the task if his eminence bears no relation to librarianship and is predicated on scholarship alone, or on national or even world distinction in some special field of the arts. Today, thanks to the leadership and influence of the Library of Congress, library techniques and administration have achieved the stature of a highly professional science. They are so regarded in our universities and in the professional world. Indeed, if I may plagiarize a familiar phrase, right now library science stands at the doorstep of a new frontier of its own—the hope that electronics, that data-processing and information-retrieval machines—those subtle and cunning devices for ready mechanical reference—may, before long, revolutionize library service.

The greatest library of all time, the Library of Congress—to make the fullest use of this new frontier for itself, for us, for the library world, and the world of scholarship—must have at its head a universally acknowledged professional librarian, exactly and ideally represented in the present incumbent.

It is a fact imbedded in the history of this phase of our Nation that the Librarian, in the foremost position of his profession in the country, does not come and go with changing administrations. He is, on the contrary, as tradition has fixed him, a continuing and responsible officer of Government. As much as any individual can possibly be, by virtue of his office, he is the custodian of American culture. Our most solemn papers and the immortal written instruments of our freedom rest largely in his custody. He and his associates preserve and make available these precious materials, these testaments out of which our history is evaluated and reevaluated by the greatest minds and the ablest historians and biographers that our people and other peoples produce.

Here is an institution that goes back more than 160 years, almost to our very beginnings. For me, and for so many of us, the national treasure is not bullion buried deep in Kentucky's Fort Knox. Rather it is this reservoir of culture and learning—a storehouse whose treasure is more valuable. Rather it is this central source of library science and service that feeds library progress and library learning to the whole network of libraries everywhere in our 50 States. This is a service that, while major to our own libraries in the United States, has a beneficent cultural influence on libraries all over the world. The cataloging number and data given on a card by our Library of Congress to describe a book and its author become the identifying information for cards like it in thousands of libraries all over the land.

This is official, this is vital, this is uniform. And, as is so often pointed out, this card service is self-supporting.

The card-distribution system is a relatively modern phase of the operations of the Library of Congress. But its philosophy of service, improved and expanded under the present leadership, goes back to the Librarians and their dedicated technicians of earlier days.

For this is the Library that is adulated as "The Acropolis of America" and "The Citadel of Liberty." It has been called "The Fortress of Freedom." We, of course, for the most part, are content to call it simply the Library of Congress. This is the Library whose collections have grown from the contents of 11 hair trunks and a map case to a point where they now crowd more than 250 miles of steel shelving, 30 million items, 12 million books and pamphlets. And these shelves are ranged in the two largest buildings in the world constructed for such a purpose. This is the Library that has sustained the lively interest of 34 Presidents of the United States. This is the Library that has served 81 Congresses and, to an increasing degree, the rest of the Government and the world of learning and the arts.

Yet—and this is the burden of my argument—this is the Library that over this period of more than 160 years has been directed by only 11 men. Three of these Librarians of Congress held office for a total of 105 years. This is the Library that has grown, in a very real sense, as the United States has grown. Here is, as fully as may be, the story of our national progress—cultural, intellectual, scientific. This is the Library whose galleries are visited by kings and queens, heads of state, 4–H Clubs, the newly naturalized, the rich and the poor, the mighty and the humble, the great and the near-great. Its influence in presenting the United States to the peoples of the world in the best light are subtle and deep, profound and overwhelming, and brilliantly effective in counteracting a world image of so-called "Ugly Americans." And all this, up to this very hour, has been achieved, not by a constant succession of one Librarian and then another and then still another; rather, it has been achieved by—I repeat—only 11 men, and—again I repeat—3 of these held office for a total of 105 years.

This is what I mean by tradition.

This is the Library that the Congress has created.

This is the Library that—although it operates under the aegis of the legislative branch—serves as the national library as well.

The Library of Congress had distinguished antecedents. When the first Congress convened in New York's City Hall, its Members were given access to the resources of a fellow tenant, the New York Society Library. Later, when it met in Philadelphia, the Library Company put its books at the disposal of the Congress. A library, as we see, even then was regarded as basic to the democratic process and indispensable to the legislative method. At long last, in the administration of John Adams, in 1800 when the seat of government was moved to Washington, the Congress was determined to have a library of its own. On April 24, 1800, with the approving signature of the President, the Library that is the subject of our discussion today became an institution-in-being. The Clerks of the House of Representatives were our earliest librarians.

The Library's first tragedy came on April 24, 1814. Then some uninvited English guests, in uniform, conceived and executed a notion to burn the Yankee House of Parliament. Destruction was essentially complete, but, to replace its lost library, Congress acquired Thomas Jefferson's library. This both changed the character of the Library and fixed its future development. Until then it had been largely concentered on works of precedent dealing with politics, government, law. Now the Library became encyclopedic in the sweep and range of its materials. In fact Members of Congress at that time called it: "The substratum of a great national library." And today this is what the Library of Congress—precisely—has become: A great national library.

Moreover, with the Jeffersonian acquisitions, the Library's resources were doubled and a full-time Librarian was appointed.

Then there was the conflagration of Christmas Eve, 1851. This was the occasion when it was alleged that the fire hose was "rendered unfreezable by means of whisky." But despite the efficacy of the whisky, more than two-thirds of the Library's contents were destroyed. Like other Presidents, before and after him, President Lincoln made frequent use of the Library. We have a record of his borrowings. And it was Lincoln who appointed the great Librarian of the 19th century, Ainsworth Rand Spofford, who held the post for 33 years, through a considerable succession of other Presidents. Librarian Spofford loved books, enriched the collections, and proved a successful and productive Librarian whose methods and manner of progress were consonant with the nature of the times. In the case of Spofford, continuity in office meant, with the wholehearted cooperation of Congress, an effective deposit clause in the copyright law. It meant the transfer of the fine scientific library of the Smithsonian Institution to the Library of Congress. It meant for the Library the role of beneficiary in international exchange agreements. It also meant the acquisition of the Library's first great research collection—the famous Peter Force Collection of Americana. It meant a separate building for the Library of Congress.

Thus the story of the Library of Congress proceeded, through good times and bad, from crowded quarters to more ample quarters, which in time became crowded.

Another outstanding Librarian of Congress was, of course, Herbert Putnam. He, too, like the present incumbent, was a professional librarian. Also like the present incumbent, he had the endorsement of the American Library Association, of which each served as president. Just as the present incumbent won distinction in the New York and Cleveland public libraries, so Putnam distinguished himself by his direction of the public libraries of Minneapolis and Boston. Putnam was an innovator. To him, as to today's Librarian, it was manifest that the Library of Congress must be the leader in the national network of libraries. Under Putnam's direction and the force of his great administrative ability, tremendous technical strides were made and the Library of Congress assumed a new place of eminence, nationally and internationally. A national library service for the blind was instituted. The Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, which receives endowments, was established. Mrs. Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge and Mrs. Gertrude Clarke Whittall made munificent gifts to the Library. The plant underwent considerable expansion, and, when Librarian Putnam had been for 40 unbroken years Librarian of Congress, the annex to the Library opened its doors. Librarian Putnam's slogan for the Library "universal in scope, national in service," may be said to be the prevailing and implemented motto today.

My own opinion is that the present Librarian is in the line of the great tradition of Librarians of Congress. A native of North Carolina with a brilliant, honor-winning record as a student, he took office as Librarian of Congress on September 1, 1954. At the time of his appointment, the Washington Post said of him that he—I quote—"seems to be ideally qualified for the great office by attributes of mind and experience. This is obviously a merit selection and deserves the warmest public approbation. The Library of Congress is, in respect of the number of volumes it embraces"—I am still quoting—"the world's greatest library today. It ranks among the great libraries of the world by every other standard as well and holds a preeminent place among American cultural and educational institutions. Keeping it free from politics and placing it under the expert and scholarly direction of a professional librarian constitutes an expression to the world of the respect which Americans have for this place of learning."

This ends the quotation from the Washington Post.

If the question is asked: What has Librarian Mumford done? The answer is a voluminous one, crowded with details of achievement in library administration, and rich in results after the manner of his great predecessors, Spofford and Putnam. May it not honestly be said that Dr. Mumford has won the confidence of Congress as expressed in and outside committee rooms. The record in incontrovertible statistics proves how he has increased the Library's stature through improved services to the House and the Senate. This amplification and modernization and increasing efficiency extends to the services that other branches of the Government have received. The Library under this leadership has become more and more an aid to

scholars and the public and to other libraries, as the facts of the record testify. Librarian Mumford has tested the applicability of discoveries and inventions to the solution of library problems. With relatively limited, but extremely skilled personnel, the Library of Congress, under this Librarian, has given to the brilliant work of his predecessors added efficiency and even greater dimension. Librarian Mumford has brought important increments to the Library's resources. He has participated actively in the work of many public bodies, such as the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center. He is the chairman of the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, whose major project is a definitive history of the Supreme Court of the United States. Librarian Mumford, is in a word, a statesman at the head of our statemen's workshop.

The Library of Congress had had created within its establishment, even before the Mumford era, the Legislative Reference Service. Here outstandingly is an arm of the Congress itself and a vital need magnificently supplied for the legislative process on the Federal level. Dr. Ernest Griffith, its former Director, over the years, gave it expansion, leadership, vitality and greatly increased performance. The present Director with the wholehearted and consultative support of the Librarian, and his guidance, is wrestling cheerfully and effectively with the constantly greater workload of this live and productive branch of the Library. For me and for many of my colleagues the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress is an almost indispensable saver of a legislator's valuable time. It is a provider of information and background and precise and up-to-the-minute data and research that give to a legislator's work material that is the very meat and bone of his function as a maker of the laws.

This is work that supplements the work of one's own staff and of the excellent staffs of the committees. The Legislative Reference Service product is rich in a high quality of expertise. It is often produced against harrowing deadlines for immediate and emergency use. It is research and data not only out of the past, it is research on the immediate present. It is vitally needed information on an endless variety of legislative subjects from the Congo and Cuba to the gold outflow and depressed areas, and unemployment, and so on. The acute importance and value of the Legislative Reference Service is one of the major facets of the Library of Congress. Aware of its significance, the Librarian has given it his support and inspirational leadership.

All this exhaustive background research is done with an unobtrusive scholarly anonymity and selflessness. This is work that not only speeds up the legislative process but lends it character and authenticity. It is this diligence and freedom from publicity, the kind of labor of love that is natural to genuine scholarship, which the present chief of the Library has increasingly inculcated in his people. More service and less notice have been one of the hallmarks of his administration.

The Congress created the Library of Congress and saw it through its tragedies and its triumphs until today it is, in fact, the national Library of the United States, one of the great cultural institutions of the world. The Congress now—as always—administers it. The Library holds a special place in the hearts of all the people and all the branches of government. But the Congress has by law and by choice made the Library its very special concern, and the province of its protection and its affection. The Congress, in my judgment, is pleased with the progress the Library is making and the high dedication that motivates it as well as its director, Dr. Mumford. The Congress of the United States, I feel confident, therefore, will never let the great institution down, or fail it in its present efforts to distinguish itself as a symbol of our country's devotion to the dignity of man, to academic and intellectual freedom, and to our profound cultural values.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from Iowa has performed a great service in calling the attention of the House and the country to the facilities that the Library of Congress possesses and also to the history, the background and the personnel of that great institution. I am personally constantly amazed by the extent of the facilities and the assets that the Library of Congress possesses.

I find also that not only in the work of the congressional office to which the gentleman has referred, but also in my own personal reading for my personal enjoyment, these assets make a tremendous educational contribution.

I found one other use of the Library that I think the Members of the Congress might be interested in, and that is the availability of surplus books in the Library which are made available at regular intervals and which Members of Congress may obtain and send out to libraries in their own respective districts where the libraries may not be in a financial position to purchase desired books generally.

So, I again congratulate the gentleman for calling this great national institution to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman very much, and I am glad that he pointed out the fact that library books are available there for distribution to various libraries in the United States. Many districts throughout the United States have had the opportunity to enrich the libraries in their own communities. It is a very fine and worthwhile service, and I am happy that the gentleman has called this to our attention.

NO FURTHER TARIFF CONCESSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the United States will begin negotiations this month in Geneva, Switzerland, within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If our past experience with GATT is any indication of what we may expect to result from our participation this year in these negotiations, I am afraid the United States is in for another round of tariff concessions.

The prospect of a further reduction in our already weak tariff structure is disturbing to those of us in the Congress who have been working for the protection of American industry and the jobs of our people. It is also alarming to those of us who have watched our gold reserves vanish and unemployment take a sharp rise in the country.

It is sheer folly on the part of our Government, Mr. Speaker, to expect our country to continue to lower our tariffs, engage in tremendous foreign aid giveaway programs, and yet have full employment and a stable economy at home. The time has come when the Congress must take action to protect the jobs of our people and restore the confidence of the world in our dollar.

In view of our precarious economic situation at home and abroad, I have introduced a concurrent resolution, Mr. Speaker, which I hope will have the support of my colleagues in the House. My resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that no further concessions will be made this year by our representatives participating in GATT.

Our representatives to GATT must take no action to further weaken our economy through lowering our tariffs. It is imperative, therefore, that the Congress be placed on record as not in favor of further tariff concessions.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREST ACCESS ROADS TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently discussed in this body the great importance of forest access roads to true multiple-purpose resource management. The Department of Agriculture has itself acknowledged the need for a more realistic program in this field in its proposed program for the national forests. In recent years, however, the administration has failed to implement its own good plans with requests for adequate funds. I note for example that, although the program for the national forests anticipates an average annual expenditure of $60 million on forest roads and trails, last year's budget request was for only $30 million and in the budget sent to us this week, the request is for only $35 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is past the time when we can afford to short change this vital

program in such a manner. We need to make possible a more adequate use of the people's timber resources on a true sustained-yield basis. Access roads are essential to that goal and I have today introduced a measure which I believe represents another long overdue step in the direction of resource management for all the people. Such management means that timber, for example, is harvested in accordance with sound conservation practices, that both small and large timber operators have an equitable opportunity to bid on timber sales, and that all citizens have reasonable access to the national forests for recreational purposes. More adequate access roads will directly benefit the taxpayer, the recreationist, and the small timber operator. They will benefit the taxpayer in a number of ways. The current policy of depending largely on timber buyers to build their own access roads is, in the long run, more expensive to the taxpayer and freezes out small operators who are not in a position to build their own roads. Such a policy runs the cost of the roads up and the revenues from the timber down. It frequently leaves the rest of the public without adequate access to their national forests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that there is currently over 56 billion board feet of national forest timber in the five States of California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington to which the Forest Service has not obtained access. This volume of timber is equal to the annual allowable cut from the national forests for 8 years. Thus, a more adequate program of access roads and of attaining access to national forest land across private land will make possible the regular harvesting of billions of board feet of timber which is now in danger of rotting where it stands.

The bill which I have introduced has two major aspects. First, it will provide for a regular program of forest development roads as a part of the Highway Act. This includes the provision of the necessary authority for regularizing on an equitable basis access to national forest land across private land where the two are intermingled. Second, my bill calls for authorization of $45 million for forest roads and trails in fiscal year 1962 and for an increase in this authorization to $60 million in fiscal year 1963. Thus, in 2 years we will have placed the authorizations for this program back on the schedule called for by the program for the national forests.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that adequate access roads are a key to improved management of our timber resources. I hope that my colleagues will give the bill I have introduced careful consideration. As I have so often pointed out, wise investment in our natural resources pays great dividends to the taxpayers and the economy. This is particularly true of our investment in more adequate forest development roads.

EQUALIZATION OF TAXATION OF BANKING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which is identical to the measure introduced by my colleague from the majority side [Mr. HARRISON] seeking to equalize the tax disparity that exists between competing banking institutions.

The need for greater tax income is certainly evident at this time in our Nation's history. We are engaged in a global struggle which is imposing a heavy burden on our resources, both physical and monetary. However, I would like to call attention especially to the second purpose of the bill. In addition to providing increased revenue, this proposal will remove the discriminatory application of the Federal income tax law between commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks. Certainly something must be done when, over an 8-year period, commercial banks paid in Federal income taxes 35 percent of their net profits after interest payments, while during the same period member savings and loan associations and insured mutual savings banks paid about 1½ percent of their net profits in Federal income taxes, after deduction of interest and dividends. Congress expected to collect reasonable taxes when it made these institutions subject to the corporate tax rate in 1951.

Because of the special provisions in the law, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks pay only negligible amounts to the Treasury. But commercial banks pay sizable taxes on income. This situation arises because of the difference in tax treatment permitted savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks for reserves for bad debts. These institutions are permitted to make additions to bad debt reserves with such additions deducted before arriving at taxable income. The deductions, moreover, are subject to a maximum limitation so generous as to make the income tax law inapplicable in most cases.

Repeal of the present law governing tax-free additions to bad debt reserves by savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks is not intended to establish the same formula or method of computation now used for commercial banks. It does intend that these institutions operate according to the same rules with respect to the establishment of such reserves; namely, a bad debt reserve based upon a Treasury determination as is used in connection with other businesses.

I, too, wish to emphasize that Congress should not enact oppressive or punitive legislation with respect to mutual institutions. Their record in the savings and mortgage fields is outstanding, and their future performance should not be limited. My bill, however, would not hinder the progress and service of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. It only proposes to close that loophole which allows mutual institutions to attain almost all of its reserve growth on a tax-free basis. There simply is no justification for continuing the difference in tax treatment which gives one segment of the financial industry an unfair advantage over another.

We must recognize that savings and loans no longer represent the small savers. More small savers do their saving in commercial banks than in savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. As of December 1959, the average savings account on deposit in commercial banks was estimated to be approximately $1,000 as compared with an average share account of $2,072 in savings and loan associations and an average savings account of $1,567 in mutual savings banks.

Nor are mutual institutions still the special purpose, nonprofitmaking, fully cooperative limited membership organizations they used to be. Today they are big business directly competitive with commercial banks. Tax revision of the type envisaged in this bill would go a long way toward removing the burdensome handicap under which commercial banks now operate.

The proposed legislation represents a continuing interest on my part in this matter of tax equality. In the 86th Congress I introduced a bill with similar aims but one that took a different approach. Objections were raised to this approach and they were, to some extent, valid. I believe that the present bill removes many of these objections, and perhaps might meet with the approval of some of those who opposed the original measure.

When business growth results artificially, from tax advantages, it tends to prevent the Nation's financial system from allocating credit, and the real resources that credit can command, in an optimum manner. In a perfectly competitive credit market in which all financial intermediaries operate on an equal footing, funds will be channeled from savers to investors in accordance with their economic needs. But when certain lending institutions are accorded a favored status, in whatever manner, then the particular types of loans and investments they make are also favored at the expense of other users of credit.

Commercial banking closely touches nearly all sectors of the economy. If its operations are unduly hampered and its relative position is forcibly restricted by tax disadvantages neither the banks themselves nor the financial system in general nor the economy as a whole will be able to function with maximum efficiency.

"THE EISENHOWER YEARS" BY PAUL MARTIN

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to

call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article with respect to our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, which was written by Mr. Paul Martin, the Washington Bureau Chief of the Gannett News Service. I compliment Mr. Martin on a job well done and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this most deserving and interesting tribute to a great soldier, statesman, President and world leader. The article, as it appeared in the January 11 issue of the Niagara Falls Gazette, follows:

THE EISENHOWER YEARS—IKE LEAVES THE PRESIDENCY WITH POPULARITY AT PEAK

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower is leaving office as the most beloved President, at the end of his term, of any who has served during the 20th century.

This may seem paradoxical in view of the fact that Mr. Eisenhower was supposed to be the first victim of the no-third-term amendment to the Constitution adopted in 1951.

Many politicians assumed that since he could not run again—and everyone knew it—he would lose control over the Government, and his personal popularity would decline as he neared the end of his days in the White House.

Nothing of the sort has occurred.

The Gallup poll shows that for the eighth consecutive year the President rates first with the American people as the "most admired man" in the world.

If he had been eligible to run again last year, and if he had so desired, it seems apparent that Mr. Eisenhower would have been reelected President by an overwhelming vote against any opponent.

In this respect, Soviet Premier Khrushchev is grievously in error when he says that the 1960 election was a repudiation of the President, or the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of strength and firmness in dealing with international communism.

The public seems to recognize that Mr. Eisenhower—as the late Senator Taft once expressed it—is "a man of genuine good will."

Throughout his public career, he has never indulged in name calling, back biting, or petty faultfinding. Above all, he has refused to play off one social class or religion against another for partisan political advantage.

A very human man, he responds to the name of Ike, and feels no loss of dignity in so doing. Though he has a quick temper in private, he has never let it show in public.

He has tried conscientiously to be the President of all Americans. Instinctively, he seems to carry deep within him a profound feeling of the purpose and destiny of the Republic.

The 70-year-old soldier-statesman has, by the caprice of history, been the leader of the Nation and free world confederation at a time when America was in its ascendancy in world affairs.

Loking back over his 8 years in the White House, President Eisenhower believes that he has provided quiet and effective leadership, without political showmanship or demagoguery.

He regarded his election in 1952 as a mandate to halt the trend toward collectivism under the New Deal. He has tried to conduct an administration based on facts and reason, rather than emotion.

There have been disappointments, of course, and things which he would do differently, if he had it to do over again.

In foreign affairs he had hoped when he took office to be able to do more before the end of his term toward securing a sound and stable world peace, based on freedom and justice.

On the homefront, he regrets that he was unable to solve the farm problem, although he did much to remove the shackles of bureaucratic controls from American agriculture, and get away from the old rigid parity price formula.

He would use U.S. marshals, instead of Federal troops with bayonets, at Little Rock. He has been somewhat disappointed in the performance of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court.

The President was hurt by the Sherman Adams affair. He considers the death of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles a tragedy. Congress showed its meanest streak, in his estimation, when the Senate refused to confirm Adm. Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

He was right, the President knows now, in standing up to Congress against pump-priming spending measures in the 1958 business recession. The Nation came out of it quickly, without artificial stimulation.

In broad perspective, the Eisenhower years have been a time of great economic, scientific, and social progress throughout the world, with many new nations emerging to independence and a higher standard of living.

After 20 years of unremitting crisis under the Roosevelt-Truman New Deal, Mr. Eisenhower believes that he has given the American people an opportunity to enjoy the good things of life, with ever-increasing prosperity, but without war or authoritarian Government controls.

The President cannot see into the future, any more than you or I. He does not know exactly how and when the conflict between freedom and atheistic, Marxist totalitarianism may eventually be resolved.

But of this much he is certain: Dictators are foredoomed to failure by history and the aspirations of mankind. It is only a matter of time before they all go the way of Alexander, Genghis Khan, Napoleon, Hitler, and Mussolini.

Mr. Eisenhower is leaving to his successor a number of trouble spots around the world—Cuba, Laos, the Congo. But he also inherited many difficult situations, including some of perhaps greater magnitude.

When the Republicans came to power in 1953, the Nation was bogged down in the seemingly pointless Korean War, with 142,500 American casualties including 34,000 dead.

The Truman administration was under fire for tax scandals and corruption in Government. The Supreme Court had just declared President Truman's seizure of the steel mills to be unconstitutional.

The diabolical nature and insidious extent of the Communist conspiracy, penetrating into the U.S. Government, was becoming shockingly clear to the American people.

In 2 successive years, Congress had imposed the highest tax rates in history. Wartime controls still shackled a large segment of the national economy, while inflation gnawed away at earnings and savings.

The situation which President-elect Kennedy inherits today is considerably different from 1953, or 1933. There is no shooting war anywhere in which American troops are engaged. There is no great depression.

Inflation has been checked, prices stabilized. Despite a mild recession, the economy is operating on new high ground. The gross national product in 1960 topped the magic $500 billion mark for the first time. The average American family earns $1,000 a year more today than it did in 1952.

President Eisenhower is proud of the fight he conducted to prevent inflation and protect the purchasing power of the American dollar.

Whereas the BLS consumer price index went up 48 percent under former President Truman, it has risen only 11 percent in 8 Eisenhower years.

The value of the dollar, which dropped by 25 cents in 8 years under Truman, has gone down only 5 cents during the Eisenhower regime.

The President believes that, by his stand for economy in Government, he has blocked New Deal type spending bills proposed by Democrats in Congress which would have added $17 to $20 billion a year to the taxpayers' burden.

He takes satisfaction in knowing that no official of his administration has ever been accused of any criminal act, although several have been involved in conflict of interest cases.

There has been a notable lack of labor strife since Eisenhower has been President. This is in contrast to the violent Communist-led sitdown strikes of the 1930's, and crippling industrywide postwar strikes under Truman.

As a military leader, General Eisenhower is particularly proud and confident of America's defense program. There has been a veritable technological revolution in weaponry during the last 8 years.

Starting from scratch in 1954, tremendous advances have been made in big missiles including the Atlas, Titan, Polaris, Thor, Jupiter, and Minuteman.

There has been a complete conversion in the air from old propeller-type B–36 bombers to modern, jet, supersonic planes, each one capable of carrying more destructive power than all of the TNT used in World War II.

The Sino-Soviet bloc is ringed by free world land, sea, and air bases, while U.S. high altitude reconnaissance planes were able to penetrate Soviet air defenses with impunity for 4 years.

Instead of public alarm over Russian sputniks as in 1957, American satellite launchings have become so commonplace that they hardly ever get on page 1 in today's newspapers.

Some very real crises have occurred during the Eisenhower administration when the Nation was closer to war than the public generally recognized, but there were none of the manufactured crises which Roosevelt and Truman used to stampede legislation through Congress.

A show of force, as the landing of U.S. Marines in Lebanon, or firm and positive diplomacy, as in the case of the British-French-Israeli invasion of Suez, prevented dangerous foreign situations from developing into catastrophe.

The calendar of dramatic events includes Iran, Iraq, Guatemala, Tibet, Laos, Berlin, the Hungarian freedom uprising, and two efforts by Red China to reduce Quemoy and Matsu as a prelude to an invasion of Formosa.

In almost every instance, the final result has gone in favor of the free world, and against the Communists. Some uncommitted nations, formerly "neutral in favor of Russia," are coming our way, such as India.

The President feels there has been too much tendency in the past to play up the successes of our enemies, and to underestimate our own solid and substantial achievements.

He hopes that he has inspired Americans to discover within themselves greater pride and more self-confidence in facing the new problems that lie ahead.

Mr. Eisenhower is leaving the White House in the same manner that he took the oath of office in 1953—with a prayer on his lips.

Seeking divine guidance, with faith in ourselves and the courage to do right, this beloved President has unbounded confidence in the future of America.

SUMNER G. WHITTIER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it would take much more time than I have been allotted and far greater eloquence than I possess to pay a full measure of tribute to Sumner G. Whittier, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

On January 20, he leaves his post on the high council of the Federal Government. The same day the American people welcome a new President and a new administration. All thoughts will revolve around the new. All eyes will turn to the future. All minds and hearts will wonder what lies ahead.

It is a basic American trait to face tomorrow. But it is a basic fact of life that tomorrow is shaped by yesterday. The past is the future, roughhewn. Much of what lies ahead for the Nation's 22 million ex-servicemen has already been created by those who labored long and hard in the field of veterans' affairs.

Sumner Whittier was such a dedicated worker.

During his tenure as Administrator, the vast agency rose in stature and pulsed with a sense of urgency. Its operations became widely noted for efficiency, expeditious service, and sympathetic understanding for our former fighting men and the loved ones they left behind.

Millions of Americans, and especially VA's 170,000 devoted public servants, took pride in the increased productivity that grew out of improved internal management. They took pride in the increased bed capacity of VA hospitals, the lifesaving fruits of VA medical research, the modernized pension system which gives greatest assistance to those in greatest need, the new and improved VA hospitals that will rise under the 12-year $900 million construction program.

Yes, the future is shaped by the past—even though the past is often only dimly remembered. President Eisenhower realized this when in accepting Mr. Whittier's resignation he wrote:

> You will continue to see the fruits of your labors in the coming decades.

And then he paid him this tribute:

> As you return to private life, you carry with you my best wishes for your future health and happiness and my deep appreciation for a job well done.

To the simple nobility of our towering 34th President, may I be permitted to add my small voice, and say of Sumner Whittier:

He worked no one longer or harder than himself to make his personal credo the mission of the vast agency. What was that credo? Simply, the words of Abraham Lincoln.

> To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.

The record of VA accomplishments under Mr. Whittier's leadership speaks eloquently of his success.

To Sumner Whittier, whom I was privileged to serve as Deputy Administrator for almost 2 years, I say "well done."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

The past 8 years have been marked with improvement in programs for the veterans of the United States and these programs have been administered for all veterans with sympathetic understanding. Also, during these years there has been a large number of substantial improvements in organization and management.

During these years the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, responsible for one of the largest agencies of Government, advised the President on veterans' affairs and, more than any other prior Administrator, participated in Cabinet meetings when matters affecting veterans' affairs were discussed.

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OF THE AGENCY

President Eisenhower, early in his administration, directed that the Veterans' Administration be drastically reorganized. A successful businessman, Mr. Harvey V. Higley, was appointed Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. He brought to his task long and successful experience in business methods and organization, and applied this experience to the VA. Under his direction this agency, with a budget of more than $5 billion a year, went through a major reorganization with resulting economies and improvement in service.

With Mr. Higley's return to private life in 1957, the President appointed Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, then Chief Insurance Director, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under his direction progress has continued in the VA with particular emphasis on sound personnel and management practices.

In 1953, the Veterans' Administration employed about 163,000 people. Under the leadership of the two men appointed as Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, this number has been reduced to about 153,000 although employment in the expanding hospital system increased around 6,000.

In the headquarters of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., employment was cut 50 percent.

A work measurement system which has become a model for other agencies and has created a great deal of interest in private business where the measurement and management of a large volume of paper work is a growing problem, has been installed in the regional offices of the VA. Productivity increased 20 percent in these offices, where compensation, pension, and vocational rehabilitation programs among others, are handled, and employment was reduced 30 percent while workload declined only 17 percent.

An organization was established for auditing the internal management of the agency. This Internal Audit Service, divorced entirely from any organizational involvement, objectively evaluates the effectiveness of management throughout the agency and recommends improvements where they are needed.

A broad career development plan has been installed. This involves improving performance on the job, developing a reservoir of personnel available for greater responsibility, and assisting personnel in increasing management skills.

Automatic data processing equipment and methods have been applied to the insurance program which is the second largest ordinary life insurance operation in the United States. This was not easily accomplished nor quickly done. The annual cost of servicing a policy was reduced from $5.67 in fiscal year 1953 to $3.88 in fiscal year 1960. The number of people employed has been cut from 10,300 in fiscal year 1953 to 3,800 in fiscal year 1960 while efficiency of service to policyholders has almost doubled.

In the management of the insurance trust funds a new investment formula was negotiated with the Treasury which allows the agency a higher return on the policyholders' money with increased earnings and increased dividends.

The processing of benefit payments involving checks to 4.6 million veterans and dependents monthly is being converted to automatic data processing methods and centralized in one location at Chicago, Ill. This conversion will result in considerable savings and reflect the application of advanced business principles to this phase of VA operations. Not only is the Veterans' Administration involved but also the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department. The ultimate result will benefit the Nation in terms of tax dollars saved, and veterans and their dependents in terms of improvements in service rendered.

Improved management has not been limited to the insurance and regional office activities but extends also into hospital administration. Work standards are being developed in nonprofessional areas and a pilot hospital has been established in which to develop new and improved procedures and in which new techniques and machinery will be tested for application in all VA hospitals.

A chartroom where the status of any particular program can be determined at a glance has been established in the Administrator's office. This room serves as a basis of control for the VA's nationwide net of hospitals and offices. In addition, the magnitude of the problems the VA faces in the future are also charted and can be related quickly to the current situation so that both long term and current problems are considered when a decision has to be made.

A comprehensive and specific statement of policy, emphasizing the requirement of sympathetic understanding in all dealings with veterans, was developed for the guidance of the agency in the short term and in the long stretches of the decades ahead.

Great strides have been made in humanizing the agency's correspondence with veterans, their dependents, and the general public.

MEDICAL PROGRAM OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In 1959 the President approved an authorized capacity of 125,000 hospital beds for the VA. Within the framework of this new policy, the Administrator was granted authorization to modify the use of beds or hospitals from one type to another in keeping with advances in medical treatment and shifts in the veteran population. This was the first time that a President had given an Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the freedom to manage and direct the hospital bed program based on the needs of veterans.

In the past 8 years the bed capacity of VA hospitals has increased 14 percent, from 105,000 to about 120,000. The number of veterans hospitalized on any 1 day in a VA hospital has increased about 16 percent.

Thirteen new VA hospitals were opened between fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1960. A 12-year $900 million program has been developed and approved to modernize the VA hospital system. The first $75 million increment of this 12-year program was included in the fiscal year 1961 budget.

Racial segregation of patients in VA hospitals has been eliminated completely.

Medical research in the Veterans' Administration has expanded tremendously. In 1953 only $5,106,000 was devoted to medical research in the VA. In 1960 over $18 million

was being used to support further advances in the study of the cause, cure, and prevention of the dreaded diseases such as cancer, heart, etc.

One of the dramatic results of medical research may be seen in the number of VA hospital beds needed for tuberculous patients. The number of tuberculous patients increased steadily following World War II to the point where an average of 16,987 beds were needed for tuberculous patients in fiscal year 1954. Thereafter as the result of medical advances, in which the Veterans' Administration made a major contribution, the number of beds needed for such patients declined to an average of 9,967 in fiscal year 1960. On February 28, 1953, the number of TB patients awaiting admission to VA hospitals was over 2,600. Today, a TB patient can be admitted immediately.

Large-scale cooperative studies and the application of the new drugs in mental illness has resulted in a steady rise in the turnover rate of psychiatric patients in VA hospitals. The yearly turnover rate for new patients has increased from 66 percent in 1955 to 78 percent in 1960. During the past year the VA was able to admit to its hospitals more than 41,000 psychiatric patients.

The team approach to the management of the varied problems of amputees was given great impetus during the past several years. Some 81 orthopedic and prosthetic appliance clinic teams have been established by VA in selected field stations, usually consisting of an orthopedic surgeon as chief of the team, a psychiatrist, a therapist, a prosthetist, and a prosthetic specialist. Other specialists join the team as needed by the particular problems of an amputee. As a direct result of this pioneering effort, thousands of amputee veteran problem cases have been resolved. Of great significance to the disabled population of the Nation is the establishment of over 200 clinic teams patterned after the VA model in civilian rehabilitation groups in 39 States and the District of Columbia.

The VA inherited a system of soldiers homes from a predecessor agency. There are about 18,000 former soldiers resident in these homes today. While a planned living program was developed about 5 years ago, care continued to be primarily custodial. There is now under development in the Veterans Administration a new concept which, for the lack of a better term, may be called a restoration and rehabilitation center. The restoration center is to serve as a link between the hospital and the community. When the former soldier has received maximum hospital benefits, it is contemplated that he will be placed in a restoration center for a period of training and recuperation. He will then return to his home. If his physical condition is such as to prevent that, every effort will be made to find him a foster home, a nursing home, or some suitable facility in his home community where he may be near his relatives and friends. A pilot restoration center is planned for 1961.

The significance of the foregoing is obvious when it is realized that the aging of the veteran population already presents grave problems. In the future there will be an increasing number of veterans in this group of persons aged 65 or over. Thirty years from now about two-thirds of the males in this age group will be veterans. Many of these, if provided with proper rehabilitation services and assistance, could again become self-dependent. Hence, the new program which is designed to alleviate this problem before it reaches unmanageable proportions.

A NEW PENSION LAW

In 1960 the pension system was modernized to correct some abuses in the old system and to relate the pension more closely to the need of the individual. This was the first major revision in the pension system since 1933. Under the old system if the veteran pensioner earned even $1 more than the maximum amount set by law he received nothing at all in pension. If he earned $1 less than the maximum income limitation he received his whole pension. Earned income, and not other assets, was the only money taken into account in determining eligibility. Under the new modernized system a graduated scale of payments was established which is more equitable for all and which gives the greatest aid to those in the greatest need.

Under the new pension law widows of veterans of World War II and the Korean war were made eligible for pension on the same basis as widows of veterans of World War I. This change provided immediate benefits for thousands of widows of World War II veterans.

COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

Compensation is the term used to describe payments made for disabilities incurred or aggravated during war service.

During the past 8 years compensation payments have increased materially to the disabled. Payments have been increased by 30 percent for those 100 percent disabled and 16 percent for those 50 percent disabled. The widows of the men who died in service or as the result of wounds and diseases suffered in service have received 16 percent increases. In the prior administration the Consumer Price Index increased 25.6 percent while payments to war disabled veterans and their widows increased only 0.6 percent. The comparable Consumer Price Index increase during the present administration is 9.2 percent.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

In the past 8 years the VA has been particularly concerned with finding job opportunities for the handicapped. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was appointed chairman of an ad hoc committee to the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped to promote the redesign of the entrance ways to permit easy access for the handicapped in wheelchairs and leg braces. A publication of this committee on this subject has created widespread interest among architects, builders, and others.

Specialists within the Veterans' Administration have, during these years, published studies on (1) the occupations of epileptic veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, (2) occupations of blinded veterans, and (3) occupations of paraplegic veterans. These publications are being used by other Government agencies, colleges, and many foreign nations as a means of telling employers that what is important is what the man can do and not what he can't do.

In fiscal year 1960 the VA employed 1,249 disabled persons or more than 28 percent of all such disabled people employed by the Government during that year.

THE PROBLEM OF THE AGING VETERAN

The full range of the problems of aging and the aged is receiving careful study. In 1958 a division was established in the Veterans' Administration for medical research in aging. Its aims are to develop effective clinical and institutional approaches to meet the developing problems associated with the aging veteran population.

Not only the physical changes which complicate life for the elderly veterans, but social and economic problems as well are the subjects of intensive research. VA's efforts are coordinated with those of other agencies of Federal and local governments through participation in preparation for the White House Conference on Aging. Notable among VA's contributions to this Conference is a comprehensive study of the economic problems of aging veterans.

This recently published study points up rather dramatically the need for planning now the kind of program which will be required in the future. The number of veterans reaching age 65 peaks in 1961 and drops off to a very low point in 1967 followed by increasingly large numbers until another peak in 1990. Health facilities, income maintenance programs, and social services must be geared to these peaks and valleys of the future if they are to be effective in terms not only of veterans but of the Nation.

VETERANS BECOME HOMEOWNERS

During the past 8 years the Veterans' Administration through its loan guarantee program underwrote 2,740,000 loans to veterans for homes. This program has not only served as a stimulus to the economy but as a stabilizing influence to the society by assisting these millions of veterans to acquire property and a stake in a community.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Census Bureau reported in 1958: "The average head of the household is better educated than ever before. He now has 10.4 years of schooling compared with 9 years in 1950—an advance largely attributed to educational benefits given veterans of World War II and the Korean war."

In all, approximately 2,780,000 veterans have received training since 1953. Ninety-nine thousand more have required vocational rehabilitation because of disabilities incurred in wartime. More than 217,000 have trained in engineering. Another 77,000 have trained in medicine and related fields. Some 52,000 have trained in the physical and natural sciences. More than 860,000 have trained in the skilled trades.

In 1956 legislation was enacted providing educational assistance to orphans of war veterans. Since then a total of 19,000 war orphans have taken advantage of this act in order to better equip themselves to compete in modern society.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

President Eisenhower appointed a commission under the direction of a distinguished soldier and former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Omar Bradley, to study the programs of the Veterans' Administration. This Commission recognized in 1956 the need for planning veterans' programs well in advance.

This concept has been implemented by the establishment of a special unit with the primary mission of planning for the future. The establishment of this planning organization should result in a sound approach to the matters of veterans' affairs in the future.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 24.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 24.

Mr. ULLMAN, today, for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL, for 1 hour, on January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. JOELSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 20, 1961, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

317. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed new obligational authority in the amount of $1,474,000 for fiscal year 1960 and $1,692,786,594 for fiscal year 1961 for various agencies and $9,065,119 for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1961. In addition, other proposals not increasing new obligational authority are made for the appropriation of $21,944,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under previously granted contract authority, for transfers between appropriations in the amount of $257,928,000, and limitations amounting to $455,436,100 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

318. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterns of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 61st National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Detroit, Mich., August 21–26, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

319. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

320. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 21st Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

321. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the 1960 soil bank conservation reserve program, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

322. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508)"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

323. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

324. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

325. A letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting a detailed summary of negotiations to date with the Tribal Councils of the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Sioux Indian Tribes relating to the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, pursuant to Senate Report No. 1203, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

326. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Tribes and their members and the effect from the construction and operation of the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project, pursuant to Senate Report No. 1203, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

327. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

328. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

329. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to the mints and assay offices"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

330. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

331. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the 15th semiannual report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between July 1, 1960, and December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 85–536; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

332. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

333. A letter from the President of the Board of Comissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

334. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

335. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide equal pay without discrimination on account of sex in interstate employment"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

336. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

337. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and first assistant physician of the hospital, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

338. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a list containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in their employ as of June 30, 1960, and cases heard and/or decided by the Board, also a financial report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

339. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

340. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled "A bill to assist in meeting the costs of professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

341. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

342. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

343. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

344. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

345. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 13th semiannual report of its activities as of December 31, 1960, pursuant to 62 Stat. 1240; 50 U.S.C. App. 2001–2016, as amended and 64 Stat. 12; 22 U.S.C. 1621–1627, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

346. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

347. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

348. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus

Property Act of 1944, as amended"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

349. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

350. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its various units to perform their functions more efficiently and effectively by providing them with certain administrative authority, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

351. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority thereunder; require manufacturers of new drugs to keep records of, and make reports on, clinical experience and other relevant data bearing on the permissibility of such drugs; require that drugs be prepared or packed under adequate controls to insure proper identity, strength, purity, and quality, and otherwise insure their compliance with the act; and extend to all antibiotics the certification provisions of the act now limited to certain antibiotics"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

352. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

353. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

354. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

355. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

356. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and others for the purpose of providing for coordinated planning for the development of the Nation's water and related land resources through the establishment of water resources commissions"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

357. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 6(e) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting determinations relating to the 1962 and 1963 construction payments due the United States from the Bostwick Irrigation District, Nebraska, and Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, Kansas, Missouri River Basin project, pursuant to Public Law 86-308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 30(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C., sec. 187a), to prevent the undesirable division of oil and gas leaseholds"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C., secs. 351-355, 357-360), and the act of September 22, 1922 (c. 400, 42 Stat. 1012; 43 U.S.C., sec. 356), and to require that entrymen of lands in Nevada under the desert land act be resident citizens of Nevada"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913) with respect to the leasing of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting part II of the report entitled "Project Twenty-Twelve," the Bureau of Land Management's long-range plan for the administration, management, and development of the Nation's vital public land resources through the year 2012; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

366. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report of the Commission on Civil Rights, pursuant to Public Law 85-315, on equal protection of the laws in public higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

368. A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the U.S.A., transmitting the report of activities and statement of receipts and expenditures for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 564, 76th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

369. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting the audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, and certain other reports, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to revise section 3054, title 18 of the United States Code, concerning the enforcement of certain provisions of such Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

371. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to include officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

372. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

373. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

374. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

375. A letter from Ross, McCord, Ice & Miller, Indianapolis, Ind., transmitting audit and annual report of the Board for Fundamental Education for the year 1959, pursuant to section 14(b), Public Law No. 507, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

376. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U.S.C. 155(c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

377. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

378. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons, pursuant to section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

379. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

380. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

381. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

382. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services

of experts and consultants"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

383. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report regarding positions in grade GS–18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

384. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a copy of recommendations on financing the Civil Service Retirement System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

385. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

386. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

387. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

388. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act to consolidate the reporting of wages by employers for income tax withholding and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

389. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to improve tax administration by providing for extension of the use of identifying numbers"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

390. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2852. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2853. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2854. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2855. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2856. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2857. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2858. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2859. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2860. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2861. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2862. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 2863. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 2864. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2865. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2866. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 2867. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2868. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2869. A bill to assure to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States full and equal privileges with respect to public conveyances and places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, amusement, assemblage, and institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2870. A bill to secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 2871. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $50 per month of an individual's earned income shall be disregarded in determining his need for old-age assistance under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES (by request):

H.R. 2872. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain $10 per $1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2873. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit service-connected disabled veterans of service after April 25, 1951, who obtained national service life insurance under section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to obtain the $10 per $1,000 disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2874. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2875. A bill to authorize a comprehensive program for the maintenance of a healthy mining industry in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2876. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 2877. A bill to authorize the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to approve a financial contribution for civil defense purposes to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities which will provide new employment opportunities

in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2879. A bill to amend sections 4083, 4032, and 6416 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain sales of gasoline for nonfuel purposes from tax and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2880. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2882. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the rates of peacetime disability and death compensation shall be the same as the rates for wartime disability and death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 2885. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as "the signers for freedom stamps," honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 2886. A bill to authorize the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to approve a financial contribution for civil defense purposes to the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent increases in Federal income taxes as the result of tax-relief measures enacted by State and political subdivisions for the relief of railroad corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2888. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and disability insurance benefits by $35 a month (and other monthly benefits proportionately), and to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2889. A bill to provide that three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate shall be members of the American Battle Monuments Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize a decrease in the premium charged for the insurance of mortgages under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 (or $3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2892. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 2893. A bill to provide that where a claim or demand against the United States is duly allowed by legal authority without reduction to judgment, but an offset is claimed by the United States for a debt alleged to be due the United States, if such alleged debt is subsequently found to have been not due the United States, or due in a lesser amount than the offset, the amounts found not to have been due the United States in offset shall bear interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2894. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 2895. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 2896. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2897. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the signers for freedom stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 2898. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.R. 2899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, with respect to the taxation of banks, savings and loan associations, and other institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 2900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, with respect to the taxation of banks, savings and loan associations, and other institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2902. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act in order to amend the definition of the term "United States"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to permit patent holders to bring civil actions against Government contractors who infringe their patents while carrying out Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2904. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2906. A bill to assist in meeting the costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place in grade 18 of the general schedule the position of hearing examiners of the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 2908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that income derived by a nonprofit hospital, medical center, or medical research organization from the lease of its facilities or equipment shall be exempt from tax if it is used exclusively for the treatment of charity patients; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 2909. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 2910. A bill to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2911. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2912. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to improve veterans' benefits for female members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps, who served overseas during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 2913. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that in the disposal of surplus real property consideration shall be given to the impact of such disposal upon the community in which such property is located; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2914. A bill to authorize the disposal of Air Force plant No. 60 at Adrian, Mich., to a person, firm, or corporation which will continue manufacturing operations therein; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 2915. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 2916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 2917. A bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, to transfer responsibility for determining the suitability of the home of the adopting parents for such orphans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 2918. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2919. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 2920. A bill to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission, to provide for more effective research programs designed to expand markets for agricultural and forestry products, to reduce surpluses, to increase farm income, and to benefit consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 2921. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2922. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2923. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2924. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2925. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, pertaining to isolated tracts, to extend its provisions to public sales; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 2926. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2927. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2928. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations, shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2929. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the Navy rations statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2932. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2933. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the U.S. courts of appeals and to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2934. A bill to require that all agreements and understandings respecting the importation of foreign goods, entered into with foreign countries or their citizens, shall be reduced to writing and made public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2935. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2936. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 758), to integrate the Judge Advocate's promotion list with that of the Army to restore lost seniority and grade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2938. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2939. A bill to provide that the Department of Defense shall enter into contracts for air transportation with air carriers as defined by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2940. A bill to exempt Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers from the provisions of the Economy Act of 1932 for the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, on the same basis as members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and National Guard of the Army, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2941. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that service of a veteran in any campaign or expedition involving armed conflict shall be considered wartime service for the purposes of all laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that combat and wartime overseas veterans shall have priority in obtaining admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2946. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 2947. A bill to assist in alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically depressed areas through the establishment of a program of loans and grants and the provision of a secondary market for industrial mortgages covering property in those areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2948. A bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2949. A bill to determine the desirability of deepening the channel crossing St. George Island and Apalachicola Bay, Fla., and extending the jetties; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2950. A bill to determine the desirability of providing a channel at Two-Mile Settlement and Creek near Apalachicola, Fla., to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2951. A bill to determine the desirability of dredging the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

My Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2952. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of California to the City of Needles; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2953. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2954. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to payment of Philippine pensioners; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2956. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the signers for freedom stamps, honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2957. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic

pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2958. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 2959. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 2961. A bill to provide for full overhaul and repair capability for nuclear powered and conventional submarines at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to make unlawful the willful destruction or injury of goods moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2963. A bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission; to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 2964. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2965. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 175th anniversary of the birth of Dr. Jesse Torrey; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating the week of June 4 to 10, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Committee on Rail Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution designating the week of May 22 to 27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Res. 113. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 114. Resolution favoring an international agreement for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 115. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 116. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 2966. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sergio Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2967. A bill for the relief of Susana S. Reyes, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 2968. A bill for the relief of Sale Kurg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 2969. A bill for the relief of Gene H. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Theodore S. Zoupanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 2971. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Amada, Sister Mary Camino, Sister Mary Clara, Sister Mary Gloria, Sister Mary Cecilia, Sister Mary Juana, Sister Mary San Pedro, and Sister Mary Nieves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 2973. A bill for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2974. A bill for the relief of Costas Forakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 2975. A bill for the relief of Jean Hsu Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2976. A bill for the relief of Gustaf A. Lawson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2977. A bill for the relief of Kyoko Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2978. A bill for the relief of Rosa and Rita Quattrocchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2979. A bill for the relief of Maloney Bros. Nursery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2980. A bill for the relief of Khatchadour T. Tchoupdjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2981. A bill for the relief of Fernando Rocha Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2982. A bill for the relief of Sue Sau Him and Chow Wo Ho, also known as Chow Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2983. A bill for the relief of Konstantin P. Veliskakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 2984. A bill for the relief of Manfull Dairy Farm, Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 2985. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lydia Brill Misroch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2986. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isgouhie Agopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2987. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virjini Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2988. A bill for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 2989. A bill for the relief of Paciencia Ilagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2990. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 2991. A bill for the relief of Joseph Maz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2992. A bill for the relief of Maria Marcella Tang and Maria de Fatima Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2993. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Paul Bernstein against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 2994. A bill to provide for the enrollment of Della O. Adams, nee Tipton, as a member of the Creek Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 2995. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl F. Brzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2996. A bill for the relief of Dr. Malempati Madhusudana Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2997. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grazia L. Scarfalloto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Frank Ernest Gifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Lea Min Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H.R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Jagat Kumar Kaul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3002. A bill for the relief of William F. Sample; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Mervin L. Cotterell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Julia S. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 3005. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Yen Male; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Alberto Luciano (Rocchi) Rosasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 3009. A bill for the relief of John J. Russell and Emma J. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Wintford Jesse Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni A. Seckiner and Selma Seckiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

38. By Mr. LOSER: Petition of Hon. Jodie Aldridge of Nashville, Tenn., proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Fraternal Order of Eagles that such inequalities, as now administered under social security, be adjusted so that survivors benefits be identical for survivor whether it be husband or wife who dies first; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Marvin J. Sonosky, attorney for the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an interim report of the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, pursuant to Senate Report No. 1203, 86th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

41. Also, petition of Marvin J. Sonosky, attorney for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an interim report of the Crow Creek Tribe of South Dakota, pursuant to Senate Report No. 1203, 86th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1961

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1961, will mark the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Many Americans of Ukrainian descent in this country will be celebrating this anniversary in a fitting and solemn manner.

The Ukrainian people always have been loyal allies with us in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. They have suffered persecution and enslavement by Communist Russia and they fully understand the danger of Communist imperialism to the peace and future of the world.

Never before was this day as important to all freedom loving people as it is today when the danger of the spreading of Communist tyranny threatens the peace and security of the world. On this day we join in paying tribute to the gallant Ukrainian people who fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence and who never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation despite the fact that in 1920, Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshaling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, express our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

It is earnestly to be hoped that there may be restored to the Ukrainian people and to all enslaved nations, the blessings of freedom and liberty.

The Problem of the Effect of Foreign-Made Commodities on the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, many American industries suffer economically from the competition of foreign-made commodities made by laborers who work under unfavorable conditions at inadequate wages.

Yet we cannot baldly exclude foreign-made goods, since it is in the best interest of American foreign policy to maintain trade relations with nations in Asia and Africa, thereby preventing them from concluding trade treaties with Red China and Soviet Russia, and from thus coming within the Communist sphere of influence. We must also remember that we are not economically self-sufficient, and we export more than we import.

It is further in the best interest of American foreign policy to demonstrate to the working people of the world that the American worker lives under the best conditions in the world, and that the American people do not wish to purchase goods made for their consumption by the exploitation of foreign labor, even though Red China and Soviet Russia have no such compunctions.

If comparative labor costs could somehow be more fairly equalized, I believe that American industry would be willing to compete freely with foreign industries in the marketplaces of America and of the world.

I have, therefore, introduced a resolution in the House authorizing and directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the practicability of the formulation of a Labor Standards Schedule for specific industries in specific foreign nations whose goods enter the United States toward the end that a system of a sliding scale of tariffs may be ultimately adopted whereby the foreign industries having the most favorable conditions for labor pay the lowest tariffs, and the foreign industries having the least favorable conditions for labor pay the highest tariffs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Father of all men, who bringeth forth righteousness as the light, and judgment as the noonday, our souls wait upon Thee; our expectation is from Thee.

In the present crisis confronting our Nation give us the determination and the courage to choose the hard, rather than the soft and easy, way and the resolution to deny ourselves of any bauble in the realm of mere things robbing us of spiritual riches, which, lacking, we are moral paupers.

This day may the new President, chosen by the people, be indeed by his own dedication ordained of Thee, as, standing, by the open Bible, in the presence of the whole world, he assumes the awesome challenge of leading this Nation in history's gravest hour.

Purge us from conceptions too narrow as freemen. As citizens of this free land, make us big enough and good enough to be worthy of our heritage, as in Thy presence on this Inaugural Day we individually register our vow to guard the freedom purchased for us at great cost and to defend the Republic from all enemies at home and abroad, "I solemnly swear."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, January 17, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 28)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1961.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, who, in turn, have had the assistance of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters discussed. Pursuant to the requirements of the Employment Act, the report summarizes the economic developments of the year and the policy actions taken to promote balanced growth of the economy, appraises the economic outlook, and puts forward a number of legislative proposals designed to help achieve the purposes of the act. The report also reviews the performance of the economy under the Employment Act, and particularly during the period of this administration, and discusses policies for the future in the light of this experience.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

As the year 1960 came to a close, the Nation was producing goods and services at an annual rate of $503.5 billion, the same as in the third quarter of the year, though slightly less than in the second quarter. For the year as a whole, the total output of our economy, in dollars of constant buying power, was 2.6 percent greater than in 1959.

Production and employment declined in the latter part of 1960, and unemployment rose, owing in large measure to an inventory adjustment. In the first quarter, inventories were being built up at an annual rate of $11.4 billion, but in the fourth quarter they were being reduced at an annual rate of $4 billion. It is encouraging, however, that the declines in production and income were moderate. And it is especially important that final demands for goods and services—that is, the sum of the Nation's expenditures except those resulting in inventory change—rose without interruption during the year and in the final quarter reached the level of $507.5 billion.

The achievement of a reasonable equilibrium in the Nation's international transactions continued to be a goal of our policies in 1960. The overall deficit in the U.S. balance of payments last year remained close to that in each of the 2 preceding years, but the structure of the deficit changed markedly. Short-term capital outflows accelerated, mainly in response to a widening of the margin by which interest rates abroad exceeded those in this country. But the deficit on all other transactions diminished greatly as a result of a rapid rise in exports.

The underlying strength of our economy, manifested in final demand for goods and services, is a distinctly favorable element in appraising the economic outlook. So, also, is the fact that economic conditions today are free of maladjustments and imbalances which, to be corrected, would require prolonged contraction. Businessmen and consumers have kept their use of credit within reasonable limits, and speculative excesses have been generally avoided. Inflationary pressure has been restrained. While this may have affected inventory policies and, perhaps, other demands for goods and services, it has helped to prepare a solid foundation for a resumption of sustainable growth. Because action to maintain balance and to consolidate gains was taken in good time, we can look forward, provided public and private policies are favorable, to a period of sound economic growth from a firm base.

The Federal policies needed to promote balanced growth can, to a considerable extent, be applied under existing administrative authority. But there are certain areas in which legislative action is needed.

First, funds appropriated by the Congress for the fiscal year 1962 should be held within the limits of expected revenues. A budget conforming to this standard has been presented to the Congress. It makes certain suggestions for revenues to cover projected expenditures, including necessary extensions of taxes that would otherwise terminate or be reduced on July 1, 1961; an increase in the highway fuel tax to 4½ cents per gallon, to supply needed funds in the highway trust fund; the rescinding by the Congress of action taken in 1959 which would divert funds from the general fund of the Treasury for road construction; and a rate increase to place the postal system on a self-supporting basis.

Second, Congress should give the Secretary of the Treasury authority to raise funds in the long-term capital market when, in his judgment, this is in the public interest, even if the cost of the funds is above 4¼ percent. The existing ceiling remains an important impediment to the Treasury's flexibility in achieving significant debt lengthening.

Third, as I have pointed out to the Congress each year since 1955, legislation is needed to enable the Federal Government to give constructive assistance to areas where there is high and persistent unemployment. The character of the legislation needed is described in the Economic Report, and an administration proposal drafted to meet the standards indicated has been placed before the Congress.

Fourth, legislative needs in the areas of health, education, and welfare, antitrust enforcement, long-term agricultural adjustment, unemployment compensation, and housing and community development are outlined in the report. These are also described in the budget message.

Finally, I recommend again that Congress amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of national economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power now stated in the act. The amendment proposed is limited to a change in the language of the act's declaration of policy and would accomplish its aim without placing restrictions on the effective operation of economic markets. It would strengthen the Employment Act which, as the Economic Report shows, has been a useful statute under which our citizens have made notable further advances in their welfare.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Semiannual Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period April 1, 1960, through September 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1961.*

REPORT ON U.S. AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I am transmitting herewith the third annual report on the Nation's activities in the fields of aeronautics and space.

As this report testifies, 1960 witnessed a vast expansion of man's knowledge of the earth's atmosphere and of the limitless regions of space beyond. The Vanguard, Explorer, and Pioneer spacecraft have added substantially to our knowledge of the Earth's environment and of the Sun-Earth relationship. Experiments with Projects Echo and Courier, Tiros I and II, and Transit I and II have shown the promise of spacecraft application in the fields of communications, meteorology, and navigation. Among the outstanding accomplishments in technology were a series of successful recoveries from orbit of capsules from the Discoverer satellites and the increasing degree of reliability in stabilizing these satellites in the required orbits.

Significant advances were made in the manned space flight program and in the preparation of a small fleet of powerful launch vehicles to carry out a wide variety of space missions.

Underlying the Nation's aeronautics and space programs was a strong basic and applied research effort which resulted in constantly broadening scientific and technological horizons. Finally, the entire effort has been drawn together in a long-range program of space exploration which offers every promise that in the years to come benefits for all mankind will be extensive.

Summarized within this report are contributions of Federal agencies participating in the space effort.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1961.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ABSENCE OF A SENATOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I announce the unavoidable absence of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is detained by transportation difficulties in New York.

APPOINTMENT OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce his reappointment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OF THE AGREEMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization, signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TERMINATION OF EXISTENCE OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chief Commissioner and members of the Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the United Brick & Clay Workers of America, AFL–CIO, relating to tariff and trade, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 47) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961 to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 48. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 1 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the rembursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $178,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $300,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 50. Resolution to investigate problems connected with the flow of escapees and refugees.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 51. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961 to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 52. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necesary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 53. Resolution to investigate constitutional rights:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $26,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 55. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 56. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the Federal judicial system with special reference to (1) the organization, jurisdiction, and venue of the lower Federal courts; (2) the selection, appointment, tenure, and duties of the judges of such courts; and (3) the status of such system under the separation of powers doctrine as one of the three coordinate branches of the Government, with a view to determining the legislative or other measures, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency and improve the operation of such system.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 57. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 58. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 59. Resolution to study amendments to the Constitution of the United States:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $32,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 60. Resolution to examine the Trading With the Enemy Act:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gojko D. Stula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; and

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Wilbur R. Dameron, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 507. A bill to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF TRAVEL OF COMMUNISTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1961, the name of Mr. BUTLER was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 229) to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) on January 9, 1961.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 13, 1961, the names of Senators BUSH, LONG of Missouri, SCHOEPPEL, and PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 378) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property; and the names of Senators BUSH, LONG of Missouri, and SCHOEPPEL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 379) to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws; which bills were introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on January 13, 1961.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 407) for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, introduced on January 13, lie on the desk for an additional week, so that other Senators may join in cosponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Press release by him entitled "WILEY Lauds Record of Eisenhower Leadership," January 20, 1961.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to state that it is the intention to have a quorum call at between 11:15 and 11:30. At the conclusion of the quorum call, the Senate will proceed to the east front of the Capitol, for the inaugural ceremonies. At the conclusion of the ceremonies, the Senate will return to its Chamber, to receive nominations from the President.

TRIBUTE TO EZRA TAFT BENSON

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, today, as the Senate of the United States moves forward with the confirmation of Cabinet officers of the incoming administration, I want to pay a special tribute to an outgoing member of the Cabinet—Ezra Taft Benson, who served as Secretary of Agriculture throughout the entire administration of President Eisenhower.

Except for James Wilson, of Iowa, who was Secretary of Agriculture from 1897 through 1913, Mr. Benson has occupied this post for a longer period than any other man in the 20th century. It is my own belief that none of Mr. Benson's predecessors served the Government and the Nation's agriculture with a higher sense of duty or with greater credit than has this purposeful and dedicated man from Utah. As he returns to full-time service as a leader of his church, he goes with the best wishes and the sincere thanks of millions of his fellow citizens.

Ezra Benson will be remembered not only for his contributions to American agricultural progress, but, more importantly, as a symbol of integrity and as a citizen who fervently believes in his country and its destiny. He has eloquently expressed his convictions in these words:

> It is my firm belief that the God of Heaven raised up the Founding Fathers and inspired them to establish the Constitution of this land. This is a part of my religious faith. To me this is not just another nation. It is a great and glorious nation with a divine mission to perform for liberty-loving people everywhere. Therefore, our continuing great challenge is to keep America strong—strong economically, socially, and, above all, spiritually. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

Ezra Benson is one of the most intensely patriotic men it has ever been my good fortune to meet. Nevertheless, he was subjected through the years to a crossfire of charges and accusations such as few men in public life have had to face. His more extreme critics within the Democratic ranks charged him with plotting the liquidation of the family farm. Even the problems which arose from drought and flood were wrapped around Ezra Benson's neck.

It became fashionable in some areas for Democratic candidates to run against Benson. This was virtually their entire platform and campaign. They seemed to think it unimportant to proclaim what they were for; just being against

Benson was supposed to be enough to get a man elected.

Somehow, it did not work out that way. A considerable number of candidates who believed that an anti-Benson campaign speech was good for a free ticket to Washington are still waiting at the station back home. And about an equal number, who believed that Benson baiting would insure their reelection, got their free tickets all right, but they were one-way tickets from Washington back to their home districts.

In the 1960 elections, the Republican Party put on its greatest display of strength in the agricultural heartland of America, the area which supposedly had been forfeited to the opposition because of Ezra Benson's policies. To those who still persist in arguing that the election returns failed to prove that Mr. Benson has been basically right, I say that the recent elections showed, at least, that the farm people of America believe the agricultural programs advocated by the Democratic Party are wrong.

Godspeed, Ezra. You have earned the Nation's thanks for a job well done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by Secretary Benson, summarizing American agricultural progress in the last 8 years, together with several representative editorial comments on Mr. Benson's stewardship.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON

In 3 days I will relinquish this office. It is appropriate, therefore, to set forth certain facts about agriculture today as benchmarks from which all of us in the future may appraise the record.

It has always been this administration's position that the management of our farms and ranches is best left in the hands of farmers and ranchers themselves. Local, State, and Federal governments can and should provide sound help but farmers must be free to control their own operations and permit price to play its traditional role in directing production and consumption.

We have, therefore, tried to move steadily in the direction of more freedom for farmers to farm and toward economically sounder Government programs for agriculture based on research, education, and the expansion of markets.

Here are some of the benchmarks in this January 1961:

Four-fifths of agriculture is free of Government production controls and only 5 of some 250 commodities produced commercially are still subject to such controls.

The latest index of prices received by farmers (December 1960) is 5 percent higher than December 1959; even higher than December 1954, when price supports for basic crops were still at 90 percent of parity.

Fifteen of the twenty-one commodities under price support are selling at, or above, their support levels. Example: Soybeans, the fifth largest crop in dollar volume, were over 40 cents per bushel above support levels last week.

Only 12 commodities are currently in Government inventory; 10 items in inventory in 1953 are no longer in Government storage.

Despite record crops in 1958, 1959, and 1960, Government surplus holdings are less now than in November 1959—their alltime peak. Whereas the surplus grew $4.6 billion in 1953 and 1954, only $3 billion has been added in the past 6 years under policies and programs of this administration which began taking effect on a limited basis with the 1955 crop year.

Since January 1, 1953, CCC has moved out approximately $22 billion worth of Government-owned farm commodities with dollar sales comprising 55 percent of the total.

The new cotton program has regained lost markets and has raised domestic consumption and increased exports to a 1959–60 marketing total of 7.2 million bales (second highest in 27 years) and a 1960–61 total estimated at more than 6 million bales.

Farmers voted corn free of controls in 1958. Under more realistic price supports, corn has been moving into consumption at a rate 9 percent ahead of a year ago.

Tobacco prices in 1960 were exceeded only by the record 1959 level and disappearance was such that producers of some types of leaf may be entitled to increases in their 1961 allotment under an improved program which repealed the outmoded rigid 90 percent of parity supports.

Dairy product sales and income under adjusted price supports are at an alltime high.

Commodities subject to no price support are currently in a strong price position with a favorable outlook. Examples: Choice steers at Chicago last week were $27.28. Stockers and feeders at Kansas City were $24.21. Barrows and gilts at Chicago were $17.31.

Exports of all farm commodities are at new record highs with $4.8 billion in sales during the 1960 calendar year, making our 8-year total $30.4 billion, of which 68 percent was sold for dollars.

The parity ratio dropped 17 points in the 23 months prior to this administration's taking office. Farm income is still handicapped by the production-cost squeeze but has improved in 1960 and the outlook for 1961 is generally favorable.

Farmers' costs increased 133 percent from 1939 to 1952 and have increased only 4 percent in the past 8 years.

This Nation's first organized attempt at helping low-income farmers improve their economic status in life, through the rural development program, is now functioning in 39 States.

Our greatest problem is wheat where constructive legislation is still needed.

While I have emphasized here some of the more controversial aspects of agriculture, it is not my intention to minimize the great effort put forth by this administration in other areas to which I have pointed with pride many times. These include the extensive progress made in the fields of research, education, watershed development, conservation, forestry, credit and market development.

Much more needs to be done to improve farm income stability and assist marginal-area farm families, but this administration has, with the help of Congress, charted a course that spells a bright future for American agriculture.

Our farmers are the most efficient in the world. They deserve our unstinting praise and constructive help through economically sound programs which lead to less Government and less politics in farming.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1961]

HUMILITY ON THE FRONTIER

There was a refreshing humility about Orville Freeman's testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee. Appearing as President-elect Kennedy's nominee for the "hot seat" of Secretary of Agriculture, the former Governor of Minnesota chose to accentuate the negative with reference to his qualifications. "I do not present myself as an expert on agriculture," he said, almost in protest at the suggestion that he might be a Moses who could lead the way to better things down on the farms. "I do not claim to have all the answers."

If this sounds like strange talk from one of the New Frontiersmen, who were displaying no such diffidence prior to November 8 about their capacity to solve all sorts of national problems, it has some of the virtues of candor and realism. In a way, there has been no shortage of "experts" on agriculture, particularly among congressional Democrats who have specialized for the past 8 years in criticizing Republican Secretary Ezra Benson and blocking every administration effort to apply a reasonable amount of sane economics to a problem that has been part of the American politico-economic scene for the past quarter of a century. It is, in fact, ironic that it should have been a "farm veteran" among the lawmakers, Democratic Chairman ELLENDER of the Senate committee, who expressed the wistful hope that city-bred Mr. Freeman might turn into a Moses with the wisdom needed to show the way.

It is quite possible, of course, that if the farm politicians in and out of Congress had allowed Mr. Benson to show the way there would be less of a problem for Mr. Freeman to inherit. Basically, the departing Secretary favored more dependence on the nonpolitical laws of supply and demand, and less dependence upon a mish-mash of Government programs that have had an end result of helping the big corporation farms more than the smaller ones. The result, of course, has been to pile up surpluses in key crops (notably wheat) and to add billions to the expenditure side of the Federal budget. Indeed, with a Secretary less purposeful and courageous than Mr. Benson things might have become worse than they are and the farm States themselves paid him perhaps the finest tribute in their near-unanimous refusal to vote Democratic on November 8. As he leaves Washington, Mr. Benson has no need to offer excuses or apologies. As a charitable man, he undoubtedly wishes his successor good luck, and no doubt Mr. Freeman will need it.

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Sun]

A MAN MISUNDERSTOOD

Ezra Taft Benson probably is the most misunderstood public servant in the incumbent administration. If he'd been an ordinary man, Benson wouldn't be in office today.

During his tenure as Secretary of Agriculture, he has had to enforce laws he believed unsound. He has had to administer a program of waste and extravagance which he was unable to get Congress to change.

His was the inheritance of an agricultural mess that belongs to both Republicans and Democrats.

When a vexed electorate protested about subsidies, price supports, and surplus storage costs, Benson shouldered the blame that rightly wasn't his. Thinking persons, however, reason differently.

When Benson returns to Utah, this Nation will lose the services of an American who was not afraid to think straight in a world of political confusion. This, in brief, is the Benson story.

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) State News]

BENSON'S ACHIEVEMENT

President-elect John F. Kennedy has picked the young, liberal ex-Governor of Minnesota, Orville Freeman, to be his Secretary of Agriculture.

Word around Washington, according to some of the top political writers, is that Freeman was a compromise candidate for the job. Front runners were Fred V. Heinkel,

of Missouri, and Representative George McGovern, of South Dakota. When factions supporting Heinkel and McGovern came to a deadlock, Kennedy turned to Freeman.

The Minnesotan will have a big pair of shoes to fill as he follows in the footsteps of Ezra Benson. No one has brought more integrity, more soundness of thought and more patience with adversity to the agriculture Cabinet post than has Benson. Beset on all sides by cries for more Federal control of agriculture and deserted by many members of his own party, Benson bore the yoke of unpopularity with dignity and poise.

He consistently pointed out that a government storage bin was not a market for America's farmers. He resisted with all his strength the efforts by powerful factions to socialize agriculture.

The proof of Benson's wisdom can be best judged by the position in which he leaves American agriculture as he retires from his office. According to recent surveys, of all the American industries which compete on the international level today, agriculture is best equipped to hold its own. It is a healthy, vibrant industry.

Benson's philosophy and his belief in a free and unfettered agriculture will make him one of history's great Cabinet members.

[From the Poultry Tribune, December 1960]

THANK YOU, MR. BENSON

Before a new Secretary of Agriculture is named by the new administration, we would like to pause for a moment, take off our hat, and say "thank you" to Ezra Taft Benson, who has served as Secretary of Agriculture for the past 8 years.

The task of being Secretary of Agriculture is a big one. The adjustments taking place in American agriculture only have made his job more difficult.

Benson has withstood the bombardment of his critics without becoming bitter. One former USDA official said, "Benson has had the fortitude to do what everyone else knew was the right thing to do."

In 1952 when Benson was given recognition as a great agricultural leader at the Wisconsin Farm and Home Week, he said:

"Farmers will do well to encourage others to realize that you cannot build character or courage by taking away man's initiative and independence through the paternalistic efforts of an overgenerous government. Farmers must face the eternal truth that you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do and should do for themselves."

When the furor of the current election is over, Ezra Taft Benson will emerge as one of the great agricultural statesmen of all times.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 19, 1960]

YOU DID A GOOD JOB, MR. BENSON

Whether they agreed with his ideas or not, few persons have ever doubted the sincerity, honesty, courage, and dedication of Ezra Taft Benson, the retiring Secretary of Agriculture. We have believed in Mr. Benson, have felt that his hope of getting Government out of agriculture as much as possible was the right thing to do. We have applauded his efforts to reduce the high parity payments that stimulated overproduction and added to the vast Government agricultural surplus paid for with the taxpayers' money.

We doubt that Mr. Benson will receive very many pats on the back as he leaves office and a new Secretary of Agriculture takes over. Certainly the farm mess is still a mess, despite his best efforts. But we think Mr. Benson deserves appreciation, and we thank him for the thankless job he did.

We were impressed with the talk Secretary Benson made recently before a Washington audience, and we believe some of the points he made bear repetition.

To remain free, Secretary Benson said, we must stand firmly for sound money and against inflation; we must stand for economy and conservation and against waste. We must stand for the private competitive market and against Government interference. We must stand for local self-government and against Central Government intervention; for private ownership and against Government ownership and control of the means of production and distribution; for individual liberty and against coercion; for national security.

If this address was indeed the swan song of a brave and honorable and greatly misunderstood man, it deserves to be remembered, and we should like to quote a few paragraphs, as follows:

"Gentlemen, I love this Nation. It is my firm belief that the God of heaven raised up the Founding Fathers and inspired them to establish the Constitution of this land. This is part of my religious faith. To me this is not just another Nation. It is a great and glorious nation with a divine mission to perform for liberty-loving people everywhere.

"Therefore, our continuing great challenge is to keep America strong—strong economically, socially, and, above all, spiritually. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation."

Ezra Taft Benson may not go down in history as our greatest Secretary of Agriculture. But nobody ever tried harder.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 9, 1961]

EXPORTS UNDER BENSON

It happened to Mr. Dulles and it certainly would be ironic if it now happened to Mr. Benson. During his time as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles took some of the toughest and most sustained criticism of any public man in modern times. But the tide turned. His errors are of course not forgotten but his virtues, including his not inconsiderable wisdom have gained wider acknowledgement. Now Mr. Benson is about to leave office with the Eisenhower administration. And a surprising burst of commentary points out that farm income is really not so bad, that farm prices are more realistic and that farm exports are rising month by month.

It may be that part of this turnabout on the Benson policies comes from sudden recognition of how little there is to take their place. When the President-elect and the Secretary of Agriculture-designate met with a dozen or more farm lobby leaders at New York last week the only accomplishment seems to have been a new awareness of how far the various farm groups were apart. A schedule of subsequent conferences is announced but what has always been true seems just as true now: that the outlook is less for sweeping new farm legislation than for a patching up here and toning down there of what will continue to be the essential Benson program—itself essentially the Henry Wallace program of 1938.

One force pushing in this direction is the recovery of farm exports mentioned above. In 1953 American exports of foodstuffs alone were at the rate of $143 million a month, not including shipments under the mutual security program. The figure had risen to a monthly $208 million 4 years later. In September of this year with Mr. Benson coming to the end of his term a little bloody but quite unbowed, foodstuff exports were running at the roughly comparable rate of $242 million a month.

The Secretary of Agriculture has argued all the time that the thing to do was to get farm prices down off their support stilts and back in better relation to the market. The foreign export figures—though a certain amount of export subsidy is involved—show American farm prices progressively more compatible with world market demand. Such a demonstration will at least slow congressional drives to alter the Benson policies in any basic way.

[From the Kansas City Times, Dec. 17, 1960]

SECRETARY BENSON WROTE CAREER AS GLOBAL SALESMAN

In 8 controversial years as Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson gave unceasing efforts to selling products of United States farms. He did everything in his power to prevent piling huge surpluses in bins.

The Secretary has traveled all over the world, searching for markets, seeking better understandings between our Nation and others, ironing out kinks that have acted as barriers to trade. His most recent trip, from which he has just recently returned, was to Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand.

The last 5 years our exports of agricultural commodities have been setting new records. Exports for this year may set a new high at $4,600 million, exceeding the previous peak of $4,500 million in 1957. The outlook now is for this trade to continue into 1961.

MARKETS DEVELOPED

The Department of Agriculture now has attachés in most of the nations of the world. They work as salesmen for America. They work both for the Government and with private industry in developing markets.

The fact that surplus piles still exist in this country is evidence that our exports have not been sufficient to move all this country has produced. These troublesome surpluses also probably have overshadowed the effort to move great quantities of our produce into consumption. But, without such effort, the surpluses would have been much greater.

COMPETITION

From the beginning, Secretary Benson has insisted that a Government storage bin is not a legitimate market for products from the farm. He has maintained that for agriculture or any other industry in this country to prosper, it must meet competition the world over in price, quality and salesmanship. Always he emphasized salesmanship.

It may be that the new administration can improve on the efforts made by Secretary Benson. But we doubt that it would choose to repeal the policy.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Dec. 17, 1960]

BENSON KEPT HIS WORD

This newspaper frankly believes that outgoing Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson will go down in history as one of the most able men to serve in that most difficult office. Certainly he is one of the most principled.

While it is possible to criticize the mechanics of the soil bank and other programs launched during his administration, we believe most fairminded people will acknowledge that Benson's basic ideas are sound. Human nature being what it is, it may be that he was trying to accomplish the impossible.

Looking back over the past 8 years and the changes in Federal farm laws that Benson has managed to bring about, we can see the sincerity of the man when he said, back in 1952, that he does not believe price fixing and control of farm production are sound. Benson has stuck to this position throughout his term in office.

Secretary Benson also has some sound advice for the new Kennedy administration. He predicted that Congress will block any attempt to put on new controls. He stated

unequivocally that he thought his campaign to get the Government out of agriculture had been sound.

Benson also said—and perhaps this is borne out by the November election returns—that his farm program is sound and the overwhelming majority of farmers know it. Kennedy, it will be recalled, did not carry the so-called farm vote.

Federal control over any aspect of our national life is easy to legislate but the trend toward socialization is not so easy to reverse.

Secretary Benson deserves a big thank you from harassed American taxpayers for making the big effort on their behalf.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Dec. 13, 1960]

UNSWERVING INTEGRITY

The honor paid retiring Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson by the Saddle and Sirloin Club at the Chicago stockyards is gratifying to friends and admirers of the intrepid Utahan.

Mr. Benson was paid tribute by the distinguished livestockmen's group for "his unswerving integrity of purpose and principles." Albert K. Mitchell, New Mexico rancher and chairman of the International Livestock Exposition, presided.

The anomalousness of the occasion most likely was not lost on Mr. Benson, who for nearly 8 years has received mostly brickbats for earnestly trying to solve the country's almost insoluble farm problem. In one respect the honor was a bit of an anticlimax because the Secretary was indirectly honored last November 8 when the farm States, which were supposed to blame him for their troubles, registered no discernible protest against his party.

The significance of the Saddle and Sirloin tribute was peculiarly notable at this time. In addition to the national efforts to persuade him to abandon his free enterprise ideas about farming, Mr. Benson has been under the heaviest kind of pressure in his own region and State over programs to salvage mountain watersheds which have been in various stages of deterioration for about a century. Mr. Benson stood up to these and other pressures.

We echo the tribute paid him by Saddle and Sirloin.

[From the Sheboygan Falls (Wis.) News, Jan. 10, 1961]

A TOP PRIORITY PROBLEM

President-elect Kennedy has announced that one of the top priority problems he will tackle is the so-called farm problem, stating that one of the first to receive aid will be the poor depressed farmers.

This is indeed a noble goal. Unfortunately, it is something the majority of farmers neither need nor want. In fact, today the brightest spot in our entire economy is agriculture.

It is on the soundest basis that it has been in some years with a solid recovery from the slump of 2 years ago. But unless the new administration quickly takes measures to bolster other areas of our sagging economy, the farmer can expect his income to slump.

Nobody knows better than the farmer that most families can easily slice off a quart of milk per week, a pound of meat, or a can of vegetables and still be a long way from starving or malnutrition. In short, our present farm economy depends to a large extent on the kind of income that allows consumers to buy those tasty little extras.

This means that if we are to avoid those surpluses of 3 or 4 percent which so seriously depress prices, more jobs are needed in chronic areas of unemployment.

While many may not agree, farmers can largely thank Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson for the rosy outlook today. Despite murderous political pressure which would have crushed a weaker man, Benson had the backbone to stick with his policies.

The result has been that only wheat and corn are serious national problems. And these two products were the only two that Congress refused to let Benson apply his own policies to.

Congress, in spite of all of Benson's pleas, continues to believe that the right thing to do is to pay farmers to grow a crop already in surplus and one that is not needed. Benson opposed all such programs and favored getting the Government out of farming as rapidly as possible. Yet, he never advocated leaving the farm to sink or swim without any Government program to make the changeover a smooth transition.

He has raised foreign purchases of American agricultural products to the highest level in U.S. history. His trips abroad, often condemned by his enemies in Congress as wasteful, combined selling with good will and have produced results no other Secretary of Agriculture can boast of.

This has left the Kennedy administration with a solid foundation on which to build and increase our agricultural exports. This the President-elect has indicated he will do, so that at least this portion of the Benson program will not be lost.

We believe that when history is written, Mr. Benson will go down in the books as one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture our country has produced in this century.

When he assumes office Mr. Kennedy will do well to review the history of Benson's goals and achievements. We are sure he will find many economic problems greater than the farm problem today.

We believe that in his talk at Oshkosh last week Thomas J. Anderson, publisher and president of Farm and Ranch magazine, expressed the views of many farmers.

In summing up these views we quote an editorial Anderson wrote in the January issue of his magazine:

"The farmer needs an end to labor racketeering, but unionization of farming. The farmer needs lower prices for the things he buys, not artificially higher prices for his Government controlled production. The farmer needs a balanced budget, not more millions of dollars spent on a sprawling Government bureaucracy from which he may get no visible benefits. The farmer needs less nonfarmer subsidies, not more farmer subsidies. The farmer needs the right to produce, not more curbs; more markets, not less—and less government, not more."

[From the Lethbridge (Canada) Herald]

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

President-elect Kennedy has named Orville Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, as Secretary of Agriculture in the Democratic Government. Agriculture is of more concern to Canadians than any other department in the U.S. Government. Not only are Canadians faced with almost the same problems as U.S. agriculture but every policy and action of the U.S. Department will have some influence upon Canadian agriculture.

Ezra Taft Benson was a familiar person, in places such as Alberta a fairly frequent visitor. Mr. Benson was in fact regarded as a close relative by Albertans. He does have relatives here. In personality he is a friendly, sincere, down-to-earth type of man who really appealed to one as a good neighbor. There were frequent and strong demands from farm sections in the United States that President Eisenhower dismiss Benson. Eisenhower appeared to take little notice of the clamor. He apparently placed considerable faith in Benson and realized that anyone would be confronted with an insoluble problem as Secretary of Agriculture.

Benson inherited a farm situation which was the result of the 20-year agricultural program of Roosevelt and Truman. Franklin Roosevelt and his Cabinet began a program of control, subsidy, and protection for the American farmer in an honest effort to assist agriculture which was seriously suffering. The program became a Frankenstein. By the time Benson took over there was nothing he could do but go along with the system, while trying in any way possible to bring economic reason and businesslike operation back to agriculture. The U.S. agricultural program was so out of balance that in 1959 the Department of Agriculture spent more than what had been the budget for all departments of the Government only a few years before. Benson fought for a free farm policy, as few controls, subsidies, and artificiality as possible. He wanted to return farmers to their old independence and free enterprise system. That Benson did not succeed was not due to lack of honest, sincere, and dedicated effort.

Freeman will inherit many of the same problems which faced Benson, and they will be just as difficult to deal with. In Benson, Canada's farmers had a sympathetic friend with a high international moral standard. It is hoped the same will be found in the new U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

[From the Michigan Farmer, Jan. 7, 1961]

DEDICATED AMERICAN

Politics can be cruel. We're thinking of Ezra Taft Benson who ends 8 years of service as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture this coming January 20. Inheriting complexing problems that defied solution because of political influence and interference, he became one of the most controversial men in the Eisenhower administration. Political enemies heaped abuse and blame upon him for failures of farm legislation passed by Congress to satisfy all of the people. Political friends were often slow and not too numerous in coming to his defense. Yet Mr. Benson did not sway from his honest purpose of trying to work out a sound answer to the farm problem that would be of greatest benefit to most of this country and its people, even though politics continued to prevent such an answer from going into effect. No doubt he got considerable satisfaction from results throughout the agricultural Middle West in the recent national election.

One might not always agree with Mr. Benson's ideas, but you never questioned his sincerity and honesty of purpose. Our contacts with him left no doubt in our mind that he was a dedicated public servant, which we have not found too common in the Nation's Capital. He steps down from that high office with the respect and admiration of friends and enemies alike. We hope his successor will tackle the job with as much concern and earnest desire to serve well the people of America. We would ask as much of other public officials throughout our land.

ABC'S "CAST THE FIRST STONE" DESCRIBES PREJUDICE IN NORTHERN UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, television smashes into the public consciousness as no other media can. When it wishes to touch the public heart and mind by the millions, there is nothing, and has been nothing, like it. Television's capacity to heighten understanding of controversial social issues was strikingly illustrated recently by the ABC network program "Cast the First Stone." This program explored the subject of prejudice and discrimination in the Northern United States. The program ranged from coast to coast, above the

Mason-Dixon line, and cataloged the dislikes, hatreds, biases, and prejudices in the Nation.

Many kinds of prejudice were dramatized with skill, insight, and compassion. The program exposed the point system which operates in one community to exclude Jews and Negroes from homeownership. It recorded the views of America's first citizens, the Indians, frequently the victims of discrimination. It described the bitter hatred of an anti-Semitic, self-styled Nazi trying to organize followers in the East.

During the program, the narrator, John Daly, commented:

While the whole world ponders the problem of racial discrimination in the Southern United States, it is not generally realized that prejudice is a widespread actuality in this country outside the South. Yet experts estimate that 9 out of 10 Americans are guilty of prejudice, including many who are victims of it.

"Cast the First Stone" was produced by Walter Peters, and was directed by Marshal Diskin, with editorial supervision by Walter Peters. It was sponsored by the Bell & Howell Co. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CAST THE FIRST STONE," SEPTEMBER 27, 1960, ABC–TV

Mr. DALY. In darkness prejudice is born, the father is ignorance—the mother, fear—the child, a life misshapened by hate. In our times, mankind condemns violence and hate but there is in most of us a vestige of the savage past and ironically, most of us, hating, has been hated in return. Great nationality groups, fleeing persecution and poverty, found here among us, a new dream of the promised land. Newly arrived here on our shores, they found and still find they are the lowly, the despised, and the unwanted. The wonder of this Nation is that its new freedom, its overnew frontiers, and its bright confidence have always, in time, raised these, the tired, the poor, the huddled masses to dignity and a new estate.

Our shame and theirs must that they in turn have made of those who followed after, the lowly, the despised, and the unwanted. For some, dignity, a new estate, and too often the illusion of superiority are won only after bitter struggle in this neverending conflict. Through the years, have marched the legions of every race, creed, and color—Chinese, Catholic, Irish, Jew, Italian, Free-thinker, Poles, Latin American, and out of the bondage of slavery, the Negro. For the Negro, the struggle has been the hardest, the issue clearest drawn. The white South, the historic battleground for the American Negro has heard strident and accusing from every other corner of the Nation the cry, "shame, shame." That there is prejudice and discrimination in the South is beyond question, but in full measure, north of the Mason-Dixon line its ugly shadow lies across city and countryside. It is here that subterfuge and expedience, for instance, have built the new ghettos. The faces of prejudice are many. Some few transparently ugly—first piously denied. Its forms are sometimes flagrant, most often subtle, its sound on some occasions—muted; on others, raucous, as in the strangulating rage of a George Rockwell, a new American Nazi.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The Communist conspiracy is organizing the colored people of the world all over the earth against the white people for the benefit of the Jews. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I pledge you my life and every man here pledges his life, I pledge you my life that we will save America and we will save the white race.

Mr. DALY. Chicago—Carl Sandburg's stormy, husky, brawling city of big shoulders. Somewhere in its streets, prejudice, raucous, angry and anonymous—real but unwilling to show its face.

The SPEAKER. This used to be a nice neighborhood; niggers have taken over now though. We got this Catholic mayor, see, and he wants their votes. Not only the jigs either, some of those Jews up on the north side, they're just as bad. Try to get a tip out of them and it's like they've got fishhooks in their pockets. Gee, I don't know what has happened to this city, the jigs are really taking over here. Probably have one as mayor next time.

Mr. DALY. Into Chicago in recent years, as in most cities of the North, a vast migration from the South. Hundreds of thousands of Negroes pouring into the cities as did the Poles, the Italians, and Irish before them. The Midwest marketplace was bursting at the seams and they came to fill the needs of the expanding city, to find a better life. In the Windy City, they found what Chicago's Urban League directors describes as the most segregated large city in the Nation. Mr. William Berry.

Mr. BERRY. This business of living in ghettos the way we do here, vast black ghettos, for instance now we are on the periphery of the Nation's largest ghetto, we call it the Central South Side Ghetto. It's 8½ miles long and about 3 miles wide with bulges in places and more people live in it than the total population of Buffalo or Columbus, Ohio. They live in concentrated areas. Our schools, because of their geographic situation are segregated, so we have more segregated schools in this one ghetto than they have schools in Little Rock.

Not because of the edict of the school boards but by edict of those who control and manipulate the areas where people may live. This pattern of segregation reflects in all kinds of ways and we see it, too, in job opportunities. Here it's very serious and the most favorable of the surveys and estimates that have been made in terms of the earnings of Negroes in Chicago as compared to the earnings of whites have indicated that Negroes earn about 70 percent of the amount of money of their white brothers and they also pay more for rent because they are fenced in and do not have access to the free housing market. They also are preyed upon by unscrupulous retailers who seem to like to go into the Negro ghetto where they sell shoddy merchandise and very often use questionable credit practices—so here are a group of people who earn one-third less money, pay more for their rent and pay more for everything. This is what we call a color tax: the extra amount of money Negroes pay in the city of Chicago for the privilege of being nonwhite. We also have cases of interracial violence very often when a Negro is able to find a home to purchase or rent outside the prescribed Negro district and then very often there are crowds that gather and harass him, destroy his property, break windows, and in some cases, there are damages to the person as well as to the property. In the past, we have had many of these. Of course, you know that in order to have any racial violence of any significance, there are two things that are always required to be present. The prerequisites of interracial violence of any serious nature are segregation and good weather, so that we have these instances more often in summer than we do in winter. See, even fools won't fight in the rain or when it's cold.

Mr. DALY. On the periphery of Mr. Berry's ghetto, the quiet middle class neighborhoods and parks that once were the domain of the early European immigrant. Generations of Germans and Italians, Poles, and Jews, lived in these neighborhoods, each group with its own customs and then the inevitable explosion. The Negroes, hemmed in, resentful, demanded living room, and living includes recreation. This summer, at Grand Crossing in South Chicago, living room meant a previously all white swimming pool. The whites, hostile to change, instinctively fearful of the loss of status, reacted sharply. The Negroes, insisting on change, returned each day. At times, stalemate, an empty silence, the broken glass on the bottom, mute evidence of the conflict. Both sides speak uncertainly but frankly to ABC reporter, Walter Peters.

WHITE YOUTH. We used to play ball in the summer and all that, and go through the park, with no trouble at all but now, you walk through the park you are liable to get a spear in your back or something, always bothering you.

Mr. PETERS. Who's going to throw the spear?

WHITE YOUTH. The niggers.

NEGRO YOUTH. I was walking with my girl, it was down here on 77th and Evans, and three white fellows drove by in the car and they slowed down and they called, "niggers," we didn't pay any attention to it and then they called it again and we looked around. They said bring that nigger here, you know. We just walked on and some of my fellows were coming down the street and I guess they saw it and they just moved on. We didn't have any trouble with them since.

Mr. PETERS. What is the big problem here at Grand Crossing?

SECOND WHITE YOUTH. It seems to be over at the swimming pool, on who's going to get it.

Mr. PETERS. What do you mean by that?

SECOND WHITE YOUTH. Well, the white people around here, they don't like to see the pool go to the Negroes and the Negroes want to come in, which is their right to come in, and that's the whole problem, sir.

Mr. PETERS. I see and how do you feel about it, Harry?

HARRY. Well, I feel myself, I like to see people enjoy themselves and this is America and people have their rights but still I don't like to see it because people do think things about other people and I don't like to see the pool go to the Negro people that much because—now don't get me wrong, there are some people that are very nice in that race but like I said before, it's just the way things are. I mean like, eh, now, people over there by the pool, they make a big crack, you know, about what race you are, you know. I don't like that too much, you know.

Mr. PETERS. What kind of cracks, can you tell me about it?

HARRY. Well, like they call you white trash, you know, you walk into a pool and someone will make some crack and say "look at that white trash walking in" and you can't say anything, I mean, you are in no position to say anything right back to them after they say that to you. That's about the whole thing.

Mr. PETERS. Well, what about the white kids, what do they do?

Mr. HARRY. Well, they've done the equal part of it too. They'll walk in and they'll say, too, "look at that thing standing over there." No, they don't make cracks like that.

Mr. PETERS. Well, what kind of cracks, tell me about it.

Mr. HARRY. Well, like some people will be standing on the corner, some white boys and there'll be a colored fellow walking by with his girl and someone will say, "look at that, two little apes."

Mr. PETERS. You think that you might be able to learn to get along together?

Mr. HARRY. In time I think we will. I think in good time the white people will get to learn to live with Negro people but right

now, I don't think it will work out, I mean you just can't put two groups of people in one spot and expect them to live but as far as my feelings toward the Negroes, I have nothing against them myself, it's just little things that make people mad and then they grow. The more you think about it, the madder you get. That's, eh, but as far as the pool myself, well, I'd like to see it stay white because, I mean, I've been living around here and I like to see things stay the way it is and I don't want anything to be changed, I just want everything to be smooth and perfect which can't be either but that's my whole opinion of everything.

SECOND NEGRO YOUTH. The major problem I think is the acceptance of the whites, the whites accepting the Negroes, it's an ethnic thing, as far as I can see. It's based more on tradition rather than personal hatreds.

They feel that they have been in this area a long time and it is something they would wish to hold on to and they feel that it's the threat of it being taken away from them and moving into a strange area and leaving all of their strongholds, it's the anxiety that causes the prejudices, I imagine. The problem of the kids wanting to go into the park areas, to use the park to swim and the kids say, well this has been our area, this is ours and rightfully so, they believe that this is ours and the other Negro kids come in and say, well this park is public, why can't we use it? And they rightfully believe so that this is a public park and they should be able to use the facilities not thinking that they are taking something which has been traditionally the white's over a period of time.

Mr. PETERS. And has this caused much friction?

SECOND NEGRO YOUTH. Fortunately, there have been some minor incidents but none of major consequences. There has never been a wholesale race riot as in the Trumbull Park area. The kids seem to work it out among themselves and kids on the East Side of Cottage Groove being the white kids say, well we will have to give it up anyway because we are surrounded by three-fourths colored. The majority is Negro now so therefore they don't feel as though they have a leg to fight on. There have been minor scrimmages where three or four colored kids would get caught in the park and a group of white kids would jump on them and the same thing takes place if four or five Negroes caught two or three white boys in the park. And when the odds are usually even, both groups will stand back and call each other names and then take off.

Mr. DALY. At the nearby Church of St. Francis de Paula, Father Thomas McKugo.

Mr. PETERS. How does the church feel about the Negroes moving into the neighborhood?

FATHER. The church has the same doctrine that it has always had. The church would like people now to look at this doctrine and see how it's to be applied in changing conditions, to realize that the Negroes have, many of them have come to a status where now they fit into a neighborhood like this. Those that do fit into a neighborhood like this, they belong here just as much as anyone else.

Mr. DALY. Humor among America's Negroes is pointed and sharp-edged. One saying, for instance is, "in the South you can come close but don't get too high—in the North, you can get as high as you like but don't come too close." It is wry humor, born out of adversity but today it is apt to be edged with bitterness. There is an increasing ferment, a rising militancy among Negroes not only in the South where the recent sit-ins have had such a shattering impact, but in the North, where the Negro is increasingly articulate about social and economic as well as legal equality. At one end of the spectrum is hate, born of hate, the black supremacy of Elijah Mohammed, a religious opportunist, who has fired an estimated quarter of a million Negroes with a hatred for the whites. This is the fanatic, less virulent but as emphatic as a Chicago housewife, Mrs. Gladys Woods.

Mrs. WOODS. Well, I'm afraid it's because of the way the white man is treating me. I think that I am an American citizen and I am entitled to anything that anyone else is and I don't think we should have to wait a hundred years where we should have had it long ago, along with everyone else.

Mr. DALY. At Robert's Night Club, the humor of Dick Gregory is immediate and edged.

Mr. GREGORY. Thank you so very much, ladies and gentlemen. I want you to remember one thing, you must laugh real quick because I don't have too much time, I have to leave here this morning and go down to North Carolina and sit in the restaurants [laughter]. I mean it's like it's not funny. I have a kid brother who has been in North Carolina sitting in a restaurant for 3 months, he's so sure he is not going to get waited on, he don't even take no money with him [laughter]. Wouldn't it be funny if they served him? [laughter]. And they broke [laughter]. But this is where it is. Most people say, "come up North, don't worry about racial problems," that's a lie. I had better advantages back home on the farm than I have had up here. Shucks! You sit on the corner 3 hours, waiting on a bus and wondering where you are going to sit—back home, we know where we are going to sit [laughter].

This is the way it is. Twenty-four hours a day, we've got these little touchy problems. I see about 3 months ago they passed a bill saying all my folks back home can vote and the Governors of the Southern States gave them all a ball-point pen and some waxpaper and said, "try writing over this butter." [Laughter]. You got problems.

Mr. DALY. Chicago's Provident Hospital was organized by and for Negroes. General practitioner, staff physician, Dr. Arthur Falls, says it had to be.

Dr. FALLS. I think that I have to say very frankly that there is a great deal of bigotry and hatred in the medical profession. The crux of the situation really is the matter of appointment of staff physicians because most patients come into a hospital through their doctor and by the simple expedient of not allowing colored doctors on the staffs, the hospitals automatically bar many colored patients but they also bar colored patients who are the patients of white physicians by warning the white doctor that he either is not to bring any colored patients in or, that he is to bring in only a limited number.

Mr. PETERS. How would you compare Chicago's discriminatory policies, although they are not official certainly, as against those in the South?

Dr. FALLS. Well, the situation here is worse than in some places in the South. It's equal to some places in the South, it's the worst of any northern city.

Mr. PETERS. In the medical field?

Dr. FALLS. In the medical field. I'm speaking purely of the medical field.

Mr. DALY. The ferment among Negroes is nationwide and among Negro leaders it is reasoned and often bluntly honest. It was in Los Angeles with Attorney Lauren Miller.

Mr. PETERS. What about Negro people themselves; isn't there much prejudice within Negro groups?

Mr. MILLER. You mean as between Negroes?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I think that that is a very rapidly passing phenomenon. In the old days, the lighter skinned Negroes enjoyed tremendous advantages, had its roots in slavery, as a matter of fact. They were relatives of the master. They worked in the big house as the phrase goes. They had scorn and contempt for the fieldhands who were apt to be the darker people, so between these two groups there grew up this cleavage. Now, increasingly that is being dropped and is being done away with. I don't hear as much of it any more. But as a boy, I think I recognized there was a good deal of prejudice between groups.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Miller, what about yourself, are you prejudiced?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I suspect that I am. I would like to say this, to draw a little distinction between prejudice and discrimination—discrimination is the translation of prejudice into an overt act. Now, I try not to be discriminatory, but when I search my soul, I think that I can admit that I have some prejudices.

Mr. PETERS. Can you tell us in what way you are prejudiced?

Mr. MILLER. I shall try to. It crops out in all sorts of odd little ways. If I saw two fighters in a ring, for example, right now, naturally I would be in favor of the Negro fighter. If I saw an automobile accident, I would shade my testimony, I'm afraid—this is a bad thing for a lawyer to say—but I'm afraid I'd shade it in favor of the Negro and so, as I say, I search my soul, I find these telltale indications that I make judgments on the basis of race which I ought not to make.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Miller, are you prejudice against any particular nationality?

Mr. MILLER. Well, when I think about it, I think that I have to confess to harboring some prejudice against Polish people. This has a sort of historical background. Poles lived in large aggregations in cities such as Chicago and Detroit. They were constantly in conflict with the Negro community, trying to hedge it in. If you will recall the Detroit war riots, that was action on behalf of the Polish people to keep Negroes out of public housing projects. There were similar troubles in Buffalo, N.Y., between Poles and Negroes and I—I have formed a judgment which I ought not to form on a group basis against Poles because of this kind of conflict. I think I understand it. I think that here is a group of people from Europe themselves pushed around, eager enough and happy enough to find a scapegoat, but, of course, that's no excuse for me making a scapegoat of the Poles in my turn.

Mr. PETERS. Are you prejudice against Poles as individuals?

Mr. MILLER. No, not as individuals, you see. If I meet an individual, I don't think of him as Pole. When I think of Polish prejudice, I just think of the Poles as I think people think of the Negroes or the Jews or the Catholics.

Mr. PETERS. I'd like to ask you, Mr. Miller, how do you feel when someone insults you by calling you a nigger?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I think that I feel indignant. Oddly enough, you see, this direct appellation doesn't occur very much any more. That is, people may have a lapse and speak of niggers, but I can't remember, I'm trying to think of when I heard one person call an individual by that term and I simply can't remember, it has been so long ago. There's a change coming over the country, now, and in most of the larger cities Negroes are free to go to restaurants, to hotels, to places of public accommodation and I think, too, that there is a subtle distinction being made these days between middle-class white-collar Negroes and working-class Negroes. The white-collar middle-class Negro is apt to be pretty well served, the guy at the bottom of the heap who still has a pretty tough time—you go into a city, you can go to a first-class hotel, but the poor guy who wants to go to a third- or fourth-class hotel, still finds himself discriminated against.

Mr. PETERS. How do you feel, sir, or how have you felt, when in the past someone has refused you service in a restaurant?

Mr. MILLER. This, I suppose, is the most difficult of human feelings to illuminate.

The utter frustration that you feel, the utter sense of rejection that you feel, the sense that you feel that there's nothing that you can do to overcome it—you are the despised, the outcast, and you have an utter feeling of loneliness. You are utterly alone. The whole world is against you. This is about the best I can describe it, if you can get a picture of it from that.

Mr. DALY. Prejudice, as we have noted, has many faces. Religious or ethnic groups, alien to the dominant culture, still feel the razor's edge of discrimination. It is more subtle but still there in the upper echelons of business, industry and finance, in hundreds of exclusive resorts and residential communities, from coast to coast. One such community is Grosse Pointe, Mich.

Grosse Pointe lies immediately east of Detroit, next to Lake St. Clair. Along its tree-lined drives are the homes of the financial and social elite. Life in Grosse Pointe is quiet, genteel, and discreet. Or was, until earlier this year, when the skies were rent and the community found its secret, the screening system, exposed. The result was a shock and chagrin that swept the community, with the shock waves reverberating from the gulf coast to the swanky yacht club on Lake St. Clair. The more so, because a letter from a descendant of a signer of the Declaration of Independence and a crusading newspaper, the Grosse Pointe Press, had triggered the exposure. Here, a few miles from Grosse Pointe, in a quiet residential area of Detroit, spacious and manicured, the substance of what had been exposed is spelled out in the simple narrative of one of the rejected, Dr. Paul Lowinger.

Dr. LOWINGER. The point system was developed in 1945 by the Grosse Pointe Property Owners Association in order to screen out Jews, Italians, Polish people and people from southern Europe. If you are Jewish, you are required to have 85 points, if you are Italian 65 points or thereabout, and if you are Polish 55 points. I might mention that Negroes and orientals are not screened at all in the point system. The way it works is even more pernicious than the description that I have given. A detective with a 10th grade education is employed to investigate these people and he rates them on education, background and so on. The questionnaire, for instance, gives 20 points if you are with a prominent company and hold a high position but only 5 points if you have a good education. It also rates you on such things as the degree of swarthiness, meaning the color of your skin, the accent with which you speak and the number of children you have. It has never been clear to me whether it was desirable to have a small or large number of children but many of us feel that's a personal matter.

Mr. PETERS. How did they stop you from buying a home in Grosse Pointe?

Dr. LOWINGER. It happened by their telling me that I could not buy it because I was Jewish. When I pointed out to them that I had a signed agreement from the realtor and from the owner of the house, they pointed out to me in a threatening fashion that my family, including the child that I had then, would not be happy living in that community. I felt it best at that point to withdraw from the agreement and seek a home in another section.

Mr. DALY. Now, to meet Mrs. Lowinger.

Dr. LOWINGER. This is my wife, Mrs. Lowinger.

Mrs. LOWINGER. How do you do.

Mr. PETERS. How do you do, Mrs. Lowinger. Mrs. Lowinger, how do you feel about the Grosse Pointe point system?

Mrs. LOWINGER. I think it's pernicious, it's just very humiliating for the people who are exposed to it. I am sure no one would be exposed to it if they knew it existed. We certainly wouldn't have been. I don't know if we were screened really, I think we were just rejected.

Mr. PETERS. And if you were screened, what would they have found?

Mrs. LOWINGER. I can't imagine. I can imagine that they would have found that I was Protestant, my husband was Jewish, and that we had both had higher educations. You know, he has an M.D., I have a M.F.A. and that, I don't think that either of us is really swarthy, that seems to be one of the points that they feel was very important not to be. I don't know, but the whole thing was so revolting, I wouldn't even want to be involved in it, you know, I mean, I don't even like to think how we would be if we were screened. It's really not important.

Mr. PETERS. That's something you wouldn't do to others.

Mrs. LOWINGER. No; I certainly wouldn't. I admit that I may like some people better than others but if they want to buy a house, I feel that that's their business.

Mr. DALY. Not all of the residents in Grosse Pointe were in sympathy with the screening system, including Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Brown who would have been the Lowingers' neighbors.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. and Mrs. Brown, would you have liked the Lowingers for your neighbors?

Mr. BROWN. Well, certainly as far as we know, we would have. The man is a professional man, a well-trained man, very interesting background and I am sure we would have gotten along very well.

Mrs. BROWN. Well, from our brief acquaintance with Dr. and Mrs. Lowinger, we feel quite robbed that they can't be our neighbors. Now the people who bought the house they tried to buy are truthfully wonderful neighbors and friendly and we wouldn't trade them for anyone but we are sad that somewhere in our immediate community, people like Dr. and Mrs. Lowinger and their children aren't here for us to know and for our children to get acquainted with and grow up with.

Mr. DALY. Another Grosse Pointe resident, Dr. Douglas Sargant, a psychiatrist, thinks out loud of the motives and psychology underlying the system.

Dr. SARGANT. Well, any system like the Grosse Pointe point system which allegedly has as its goal to select superior neighbors for an area is a very wonderful system if it could do that. I'd love to live in a community of superior people. The only trouble is that this system is bound to fail because it starts from a false premise.

I think really that the motivation for any screening system of this kind is to inflate the feeling of superiority of the people already living there and I can't conceive how anyone who had a deep, lasting permanent sense of security and satisfaction within himself would need any screening system of this kind. I think it must simply be a sign of insecurity.

Mr. DALY. In the wake of the initial disclosure and resultant furor, the point system, with an official nudge by State officials was dropped, but not before the Reverend Arnold D. Johnson of the Grosse Pointe Congregational Church charged that Jesus Christ himself would not have been admitted to this community.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the first place, he was a Jew and Jews required more points than most other people in order to get into the community. Certainly we can well imagine that his complexion was swarthy and again, this would mitigate against his entrance. His education, while we would not call him an uneducated man at all, certainly was not formal, that is, he had no college degree from an Ivy League school. His occupation is not one of those that are rated very high. He was a sometime carpenter and an itinerant preacher. And so in the final analysis, it would seem that the real victims of prejudice are not those against whom the prejudice and discrimination is directed, but rather against those who are prejudice, for in seeking to have an exclusive neighborhood, to keep it just as they would want it, unchanged, with only what they would call their own kind in it, they soon find that they have excluded God from their lives, and this I think, is the worst punishment that anyone could be asked to endure.

Mr. DALY. This was once all Sioux country, a land of hills and plains, of buffalo and plenty—then, the white man came. Thus the voice of a Sioux chief revives the shame we all must share in the treatment of the Indian. The first American is still the poorest of any racial minority, with the shortest span of life. The romance of the western aside, the Indian has lost in the past 70 years 90 million acres of prime land to the white man. At the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, a once mighty nation of Sioux warrior hunters live in a stunting poverty, bitterly edged by the white man's prejudice. At a meeting of the Sioux tribal council, an old man's sense of injustice brings him to his feet.

OLD MAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the council body, ladies and gentlemen, we are confronted with a serious question. I have always hated the word "discrimination." We as a minority group, when you are discriminated against, they violate two of the precious things that's guaranteed you by our United States, that is, your constitutional rights and civil rights. As I have said, I don't like the word "discrimination." We council body here, if our people are discriminated against, the only way to fight that is by collective and unity. In other words, when I say that, I want you to remember this: That a man gains virtue by merits, not of color. And another philosophy that I strongly believe in is this: It's no disgrace to be born the color you are but I think it's a disgrace to have "Little Rocks" in your heads. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DALY. Another one speaks in Sioux.

On July 2, there was a case of police brutality off the reservation in Gordon, Nebr. I saw an Indian boy, Red Horse, beaten to his knees with police blackjacks. The police claimed he was drunk, but he was just standing on the sidewalk waiting for a friend. They were just angry because an Indian talked back to them. It has happened before and it will happen again.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say about this that Indians are not treated right. I have a son, a seven son and I lost one in World War II and I have one, Charlie Givens, he was in Korea, Japan during the war and peace was signed. He was one day he was drunk, I guess, he came back to my house and just then the police came in and they said, "come on, Charlie, let's go." So I told him to go, so he went and he handcuffed him and he knocked him down in front of me. So I told him, I said, "get your gun and shoot him and be done with it." And he said, "goddam you, you take care of him." That's what he said to me.

WOMAN SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, my name is Zona Bad Bear, I'm a representative from the Wounded Knee district. Discrimination is a terrible word but we have it, in the surrounding towns outside the reservation our boys are discriminated. In the towns, if they have just a can of beer or two, they are thrown in jail, just for no reason at all. And when you go to town the next morning, you see our Indian boys sweeping the streets of Bushville. You never see a white man in the bunch. These are some of the things that happen and I should know, because one of the boys, happens to be my own son.

Mr. DALY. All but one this Saturday are Sioux. The charge against all, warranted or not, the usual—too much to drink. The cadenced march of the brooms cleans the streets but the bitterness between white and

Indian dirties the community. Now the sheriff, Wendell Mills.

Mr. MILLS. We have quite a problem with the Indians' drinking. As prisoners, they are good workers. Many of these fellows are repeaters and they have been picked up, after a payday or a Government check and seems like many times within two hours after they get some money, they are drunk. We could pick up many times more than there are here. If we picked up all that we should we wouldn't have room in the courthouse, let alone the jail to keep them all.

Mr. DALY. A few Indians, a few, do get drunk, a relief usually borne of boredom and frustration. On the reservation, there is little future. The land is poor and there is no money for improvement. Off the reservation, because of his shyness and contempt for our competitive system, he runs a poor race for status and wealth. The result, is a timeless existence marked by the simplicities of birth and death. One of the rituals for one Indian father returning home in the evening is a trip to the pump. Henry Black Elk, Jr., once left the reservation. He came back after leaving an arm in Europe, fighting for a Government President Eisenhower has called un-Christian-like in its treatment of the Indians. His children love him. He is quiet, patient with them, and proud.

BLACK ELK. Back in the 1870's and 1880's, the Federal Government made treaties and agreements with the Sioux Nation in which it was agreed that the Sioux people would be provided with health, education, welfare, and other services as long as the grass shall grow and the river shall flow. But, it seems that the grass has stopped growing and the river has stopped flowing. In spite of this, because of our love of our land and our children, the Indian will prevail.

Life is simple but good on the Pine Ridge Reservation. Our children play, they love the pleasures although they are simple, but in their later years they will be coming into contact with discrimination. How can one tell these children so that they will be prepared to meet that situation? How can one prepare these children for that day? How can one prepare a child to meet the day when he would learn that pride in being an Indian is not shared by the outside world? I don't know. I just don't know.

Mr. DALY. The American Indians are the oldest in point of residence in these United States, the newest to come to citizenship are the Puerto Ricans. It is another irony of this study that the American Indian and the Puerto Rican constitute minorities upon whom the hand of prejudice lies heavy and persistent. It is a happy fact, however, that other minorities, notably the Japanese American and the Mexican American, are test to the will to and the possibility of a brighter tomorrow. For the Puerto Rican, that tomorrow is now only a bright hope.

Here most Puerto Ricans join the polyglot of the Nation's oldest ghetto, Harlem, now a waystation for an estimated 700,000 of its kind. For the fairer skinned, the exodus from the ghetto, once English is learned and new skills acquired, is not too difficult. For those of darker pigmentation, there are the same color barriers that still hem in the Harlem Negro. There is more for the Puerto Rican to contend with in his new home than the hazards of a strange tongue or the hostility of an alien land. Slum landlords, aware of the dire poverty left behind in Puerto Rico, crowd huge families into one or two rooms at exorbitant rents. As with Negroes in Chicago, the Puerto Rican may note bitterly that he pays a tax for the privilege of being of his race. This woman pays $31 a week for two rooms, sharing two beds with her mother and six children. For work, there is the pushcart in the garment industry or a task usually ensuring anonymity at the bottom of the ladder. But there is hope. It is enunciated by one of their leaders, Herman Badillo.

Mr. BADILLO. The Puerto Rican people have got to recognize that the best way to fight prejudice is to ignore it and that they have to do their share in order to overcome this thing. They must recognize that when they come to this country they have got to become full-time citizens. They have got to learn the language. They have got to learn the ways of the country and they have got to be ready to participate fully in the community life of this country.

Mr. DALY. In Los Angeles, the story of a fanatic hate against the Japanese American dissipated in less than 15 years. During the war, thousands were stripped of their possessions and thrown into American detention camps, orstracized and despised. Today, a dramatic change, reported by the President of the Japanese American Citizen's League, Mr. Frank Chuman.

Mr. CHUMAN. I say that the future of the Japanese American in California is very favorable. Although there are some areas of discrimination in housing, I think that they will become less and less. In the field of employment, it is becoming more and more broader, it is becoming to the place where the Japanese people are getting into better jobs, they are being more acceptable on their technical skills and I think that in time, they will be more and more recognized for their managerial capacity and I am sure that they will get into places of higher responsibility.

Mr. DALY. Also on the west coast a vast improvement in the lot of hundreds of thousands of Mexican Americans who have known discrimination for generations. The man who speaks for them is the first Mexican American to serve on the Los Angeles City Council in more than 100 years, Mr. Edward Roybal.

Mr. ROYBAL. I think that the future is quite bright. We know a few years ago, when we first got out of the service, we as Mexican Americans were quite proud of the fact that we received 37 percent of the Congressional Medals that were given out by our country and we felt it, at that time that we were, had to make some progress and we started making progress gradually and as we look at the picture today and analyze those things that happened during the last 15 to 17 years, we find that progress has been made gradually but that as 15 years go by in the future and even more, that the progress multiply.

For example, I think that we have now more professional people in the field than we ever had before. Up to 1945, we only had 11 M.D.'s that had Spanish names in Los Angeles County. You look at the directory today, you will find that M.D.'s are all over. You will also find that we have more pharmacists, we have more engineers, we have more educators and as you go into the various schools and colleges today, you will find Spanish speaking names and this was not so before 1945. So I think that it is a bright future. We as Mexican Americans take the position that we are Americans first, that we are entitled to all of the benefits that any American gets under the Constitution, we want no more, we want no less, and I think that the future in both respects is excellent.

Mr. DALY. At universities throughout the country classes in human relations to help in the fight against prejudice. At the University of Detroit, the president, the Very Reverend Celestin Steiner.

Mr. STEINER. But if I have learned anything in years just in terms of time and also the opportunities I have had, it is this one thing that is more important than anything else in the world, on God's earth, is understanding among God's children and this is regardless of race, color, or religious faith and so on.

Mr. DALY. At Jewitt City, Conn., a gathering of young people at a Baptist camp hear of how rumor breeds hate, from a guest, Rabbi Arthur Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT. This game is called rumor clinic. I will show you a picture and you are to look at the picture.

Mr. DALY. The game: one person studies the picture, relates his impression to the second and so on. Through subconscious distortions that razor is usually switched from the hand of the white man to that of the Negro.

In police departments across the Nation, officers are going back to school, learning that as guardians of the law, they must not be prejudicial nor discriminatory. At the police academy in Detroit the instructor is Inspector Leroy Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. The very security of the democratic way of life resides in effective safeguards against the loosening of racial, religious, and nationalistic hatreds. It follows then that you police officers must be ever alert against the irrational and emotional incitement of race haters and religious bigots.

Mr. DALY. There is prejudice abroad in the land unbearable at times for those who are forced to bear it but there is optimism and hope.

Mr. BERRY. We are entering in Chicago and probably in the Nation the most dynamic decade for interracial improvement that the Nation has ever known. I look for the sixties to be real good. I know they are going to be good in Chicago. I know that we are going to make more progress in the next 10 years here than we have in the last 50, interracially speaking, and I think that the same is going to be true the Nation over.

Mr. MILLER. I would say that there is hope here and I think that one of the most important things for a human being is hope. The hope that he can break out of the discrimination, the hope that his children will see the end of them, the hope that he himself can become a first-class citizen as the phrase goes.

Mr. DALY. In our Declaration of Independence with its emphasis on equality, the foundation of a way of life was laid. It is just as valid today as it was then, in a sense, even more so. The world today lives in the thunder of an insistent drumming demand for equality, sounded as never before. There are practical arguments that should persuade us to honor our birthrights: One, a Presidential committee, for instance, estimates that discrimination costs $30 billion a year in wasted manpower, morale and production. Two, on the world scene it is clear that all hope for decency and the rights of man depend on the achievement of a firm enduring partnership between the free and the newly free nations of Africa and Asia. Three, each day now, we all live in the shadow of the divisive influence of the issue of religion, thrown into the national elections by the unthinking and the bigoted. Yes, there are practical arguments against prejudice and discrimination but its elimination is in the heart and the mind of man. Let us, then, each with the courage to be honest, look into our own hearts and minds and only he that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last Tuesday Vice President NIXON exercised for the last time his constitutional duty of presiding over the Senate of the United States. I should not want the occasion to pass without paying my respects to him for his faithful, dedicated, and inspiring service to the Senate, and to the entire Nation, as well.

Eight years ago, I first had the privilege of meeting Vice President NIXON. I

was then Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii. My first impressions—and I am happy to say these were lasting impressions—were of a friendly, sincere, straightforward, dynamic, modest, intelligent young American, one who wore with proper humility the mantle of leadership.

Since coming to the Senate in August 1959, it has been my pleasure to work closely, from time to time, with Vice President NIXON; and my firsthand observations served to reinforce my original admiration of him. A man of intense convictions, yet neither opinionated nor prejudiced, DICK NIXON has given the office of Vice President new dimensions and new stature, not only in the eyes of his countrymen, but also in the eyes of peoples around the globe.

A tribute to his remarkable ability is the fact that, after 8 years in the Vice Presidency, that office no longer is regarded as "the most insignificant office that ever the invention of man contrived or his imagination conceived," as John Adams termed it. DICK NIXON has made the post of Vice President a useful instrument of government, the better to serve his country's needs at home and abroad. The trail he has blazed will make the task of the new administration easier, I am sure.

DICK NIXON's swift rise to places of high trust and responsibility is a modern-day American success story in the finest tradition. What adds luster to it is that, throughout, he has remained unpretentious, unassuming, unbigoted, and—above all—unafraid.

Whether on the Pacific front, in the uniform of his country, or on the home front, in the face of unkind and vicious attack, DICK NIXON has shown uncommon valor.

In matters of diplomacy, he won widespread admiration for his courage, when faced with belligerent communism and militant demonstrations.

In matters of politics, he demonstrated rare courage, always fighting for what he believes is right, regardless of the consequences for him.

For all these many reasons, the Republican Party was proud to name DICK NIXON as our presidential nominee in the last election. We are proud of the hard, clean campaign he conducted, in which he discussed the issues, and avoided personalities. Having worked very hard in his behalf, traveling more than 24,000 miles, and making more than 100 speeches and joining the Vice President for several days of his campaign, I must admit that I felt keenly disappointed in his defeat. I must say I was proud—and I know that all who voted for Mr. NIXON are proud—of the way he took his defeat—graciously accepting the will of the majority, slim though it was, and promptly moving to heal any wounds that might have divided our country. It is easy to be magnanimous in victory, but it takes a real champion to be elegant and gracious in defeat.

By his inspiring example, our Vice President unquestionably raised the prestige of the United States in a world where in too many countries the minority refuses to accept peaceably the will of the majority, but, instead, instigates strife, violence, and turmoil. For his unifying influence, all of us—regardless of party—can say, as we say in Hawaii, "mahalo"—thanks.

With such devoted and dedicated service as Vice President and as a Member of Congress, DICK NIXON has richly earned for himself a place on the roster of America's finest statesmen.

Now he begins a new chapter in what has already been a full and exciting life. In behalf of the people of Hawaii, I wish to extend our very best wishes for good health, good fortune, and happiness for him and for his charming and beloved wife, Pat, and their lovely children. May their blessings be many, and may those blessings multiply through the years to come. We prefer not to say "goodby" to the Nixons, as they depart from Washington for California. We would rather say "aloha" from all Hawaii to our new neighbors in the Golden State.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it has been said truly that graciousness in defeat provides an unfailing measure of a man's character.

Vice President NIXON's remarks before a joint session of the Congress on the occasion of the official announcement of the victory of his political opponent will, I believe, live long beyond the span of its author's life. "In our campaigns," he said, "no matter how hard fought they may be, no matter how close the election may turn out to be, those who lose accept the verdict, and support those who win."

No man could be more gracious in defeat.

The deep understanding and respect for the American tradition, the kindness and humility revealed by RICHARD NIXON's words and manner on that occasion, came as no surprise to those who have known him, worked with him, and admired his tireless industry, his incisive mind and his unfailing courtesy and consideration to all.

As naval officer, as Representative in Congress of his district, as U.S. Senator, as Vice President of the United States, RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON contributed generously of himself to advance the well-being of the American people and their Government.

Those contributions have not ended, for the United States can ill afford not to continue utilizing such a valuable resource.

His absence from the councils of Government in Washington will, it is to be hoped, be only temporary.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, 14 years ago you and I and many others together took our first oath of office as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. You will recall that we were a part of a very large class of Republican freshman Congressmen. It had been many years since such a large group of new Republican faces showed up on Capitol Hill. I am sorry that at no time since have we had so many new Republicans.

Some of our colleagues who came with us still serve with distinction in the House. Five of us today hold Republican seats in the Senate. Others left the Congress and were elected as Governors of their respective States, and still others have held important posts in the Eisenhower administration both at home and abroad. Even though a goodly number met with political misfortune, we constituted a group of which the Republican Party could justly be proud.

Early in that Congress you were recognized as a man who would go far in the affairs of our country and in the Republican Party. It was apparent that you had the qualities of leadership because of your intelligence, your energy, your comprehension of the Communist threat and your broad grasp of international problems. You were the only freshman Republican selected to serve on the important Herter committee, which contributed so much to the important part our country played in the rehabilitation of Western Europe.

I remember well sitting next to you on the House Committee on Labor and Education during the turbulent 81st Congress. The wise counsel which you brought to bear on the complex problems and the leadership which you gave to the committee were invaluable in restraining the extreme positions which were advocated by many Members. Those of us who came to know you in the early days of your congressional service and were favored with your friendship were not surprised that you went to the top and became Vice President of the United States and received the nomination of your party for the highest office in the land.

I have always treasured our friendship, and I know that it will continue through the years. You have my best wishes in whatever you undertake. I am sure that I echo the sentiments of tens of millions of Americans when I say that for DICK and Pat "the best is yet to be."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it hardly seems like 8 years since you were elected Vice President of the United States and became the Presiding Officer of the Senate. The years have gone by all too swiftly. It is with deep regret and a sense of sadness that we look upon your leaving.

I doubt if any Vice President has ever won greater respect from Members of this body than you. You have conducted the affairs of this important office in a dignified, fair, and honorable way. The fact that every ruling you have made during this 8 years has been sustained by the Senate is a great tribute in itself.

You have won great distinction in all of the important assignments given to you by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. These assignments have carried you to every part of the world, where you conferred with leaders of, I believe, more than 60 nations. No Vice President in our history has had more responsibility placed upon him than you. Pat and you have conducted yourselves in such a manner as to bring lasting credit to the people of this Nation. You are a wonderful team and have become known and loved by people everywhere.

Mr. Vice President, you have been a good winner as a candidate for Congress, the U.S. Senate, and twice for the high office of Vice President of the United

States. It is easy to be a good winner but much harder to be a good loser. I can think of no greater loss that could come to any person than in losing the election for President of the United States, and by the narrowest of margins. I am sure that people everywhere love and respect you even more because of the calm, dignified, and gracious way you have conducted yourself. You and Pat have endeared yourselves to people everywhere in a way that will long be remembered. Good luck to you in everything you undertake in the years to come, and may our paths often cross.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present to hear the tributes which were paid to you by Members of this body Tuesday, as I was attending a luncheon given at the White House by the President in honor of the Prime Minister of Canada, who earlier that day signed an important treaty between the United States and Canada for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin.

I have read the comments made by my colleagues in the farewell testimonial to your skill and your dedication in discharging your duties as Vice President during the past 8 years. I join most heartily in these tributes which should compensate you partially for the defeat you experienced recently in your quest for the Presidency. You have achieved an outstanding record of 14 years of service in the National Capital, and the record will show you have never faltered in facing the responsibilities confronting you as a Representative, as a Senator, and as the Vice President.

Like other Americans who have been outstanding in the service of our country, you have been criticized at times by those who believed you have been too aggressive in resisting Communist infiltration and in your advocacy and support of Republican principles and policies. However, it is noteworthy that you have commanded the respect of your colleagues because you have exemplified the highest degree of true American courage and perseverance.

In your extensive travels throughout the world you have dignified the position of the Vice Presidency, and with the help of your charming wife you have materially enhanced the prestige of the United States in many countries of the world. Your family has exemplified the American way of life and has endeared itself to everyone.

It was a pleasure for me to support you at the Republican National Convention for the nomination and to give you my wholehearted support throughout the campaign. Naturally I am extremely happy that Idaho overwhelmingly supported you along with many other States in the Rocky Mountain area which have given you well-deserved credit and proper recognition of your fine public service.

It is my ardent hope that as you leave the Vice Presidency you will maintain an aggressive interest in the affairs of the Republican Party and help to reestablish it as the majority party. It is my sincere wish that the confidence expressed in your leadership by millions of Americans will inspire you to even greater achievements in the future.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, within a few hours we shall stand on the steps of the new east front of the Capitol to witness the inauguration of a new President and Vice President. It is just a matter of historical accident, I suppose, that the new steps and the new front were provided mainly through the persistence and zeal of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of the House of Representatives, and that the same SAM RAYBURN will administer the oath of office to his fellow Texan, LYNDON JOHNSON, who has served so notably as the majority leader of this body.

In witnessing the inauguration ceremonies, Mr. President, I shall be the proud representative of my great State of Kansas, which, within the next week will begin celebrating its centennial year. In so doing, I shall try especially to stand in for those citizens of Kansas, who, by their votes, declared the Democratic candidates to be their choices for President and Vice President.

Now, however, it is my privilege to speak for the far larger number of Kansans who voted their deeply felt desire that DICK NIXON be President. The Kansas majority for DICK NIXON, almost 200,000, was greater than the nationwide popular majority of the Democratic candidates. That Kansas majority resoundingly proclaimed the respect and affection which our Vice President commands in my State.

Such respect and affection have been earned. They have been earned by clear statement of principle and steadfast adherence to principle, by quiet industry in the performance of both constitutional duties and assigned tasks, and by unobtrusive but thorough preparation to take on the full responsibility of the Presidency should fate so desire.

During the 8 years that Vice President NIXON has presided over the Senate, we have seen him grow in wisdom and in understanding. We have noted his ready grasp of the intricately interlocked problems of our own economy and the world at large. We have felt reassured by his ability to pierce through to the nub of nettlesome issues and to offer practical solutions for troublesome problems.

Towering above all, however, has been Vice President NIXON'S belief in and dedicated service to the ideal of democracy. He holds a serene confidence in the ultimate wisdom of an informed people. He freely accords to his political adversaries the right to dissent—even the right to be wrong. He recognizes that leaders can lead only where the people will follow, and that there are distractions along the way. Finally, he knows that the events of a year are but pinpoints in the panorama of time and that in the political world, tomorrow is almost here.

We shall see more of DICK NIXON in the years ahead. He has not yet made his full contribution. Meanwhile, he has our best wishes and our affectionate farewell.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Tuesday I regrettably did not have an opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the great Vice Presidents of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON.

At that time, I was attending a meeting at the White House for the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker.

However, I now welcome the opportunity to join all Americans in paying homage to the Vice President for a job well done.

As Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON has brought new esteem and distinction to the second highest office in our land.

His outstanding conduct and service, too, drew to himself new recognition and esteem for the worthy way in which he performed his duties as Vice President—and as President of the U.S. Senate.

Although still a young man, his remarkable career also includes a record of fine public service as a Member of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

Traveling in Moscow, Poland, and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, as well as around the world, DICK—time after time—demonstrated outstanding great courage, good judgment, real personal capability and integrity, in coping with difficult and sometimes dangerous situations. For such service he deserves the plaudits and deep gratitude of our people.

During the recent election, DICK missed by a "hair's breadth" winning the Presidency of the United States—with almost one-half of the voters expressing their confidence in his leadership in these troubled times.

In accepting the will of the majority with grace and dignity—a principle fundamental to self-governing people—however, DICK again displayed adherence to high statesmanlike standards of conduct in public service.

In facing the future, DICK NIXON can go forward with the satisfaction of a job well done in the Vice Presidency, and with confidence in his ability to succeed in both private and public life.

The inherent capabilities—good judgment, cool perspective, and high integrity—which have marked his career, equip him well for whatever lies ahead.

Happily, we have not—I am confident—heard the last of this fine, spirited, friendly, warm-hearted young man in America's public life. The years ahead, I believe, will open new opportunities for him to further serve his country—as he has done so well in the past, in peace and in war.

In these endeavors, I personally wish for him and his wonderful family, their just, well-deserved share of success, happiness, and all the other good things of life.

SUPPORT FOR NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, an hour from now a former colleague of ours will have become President of the United States.

The letters I receive ask the question, "What are we going to do?" My questioners ask in all seriousness, "What are we going to do?"

The answer is that our hopes, our prayers and our support go to the new President, Mr. Kennedy. His job will be, as someone has said, more significant than that of Lincoln because the world has been made so small by man's ingenuity. Whereas Cuba is 75 miles away, Russia is as near because of the intercontinental missile.

Mr. President, in these closing hours of the old administration, as one who senses that ahead are challenging problems which must be met head on, I say that we Americans—that is what we are first; not Democrats or Republicans—will back the new administration 100 percent in its solution of the problems that challenge our freedom and our way of life.

PLIGHT OF THE 19 MILLION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is an appropriate day to call attention to the plight of the 19 million Americans who did not have an opportunity to express themselves in the election of the man today being inaugurated as the 35th President of the United States.

According to figures of the American Heritage Foundation, 8 million Americans were ineligible to vote because they recently moved and thus could not meet State and local residence requirements. Six hundred thousand Americans live in the District of Columbia and cannot vote. Five million are sick or hospitalized. Some 2,600,000 are business travelers unable to obtain absentee ballots. Another 800,000 are classified as illiterate, but many are actually literate American Negroes who are denied the right to vote.

This is not "sour grapes." We have elected our new President, and I and all Americans—politics aside—wish him well.

But I am concerned, Mr. President, in the next 4 years. The Congress and the respective State and local legislative bodies must do something about the 19 million.

Among the several most pressing electoral reforms, few are as important as seeing to it that every deserving American citizen has the right to vote for the President and Vice President of these 50 States.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an extremely competent research report for me on the background and various attempts to do something about residence requirements for voting. I have studied this report with the greatest interest. It contains much extremely useful information. Although it is somewhat long, I believe it is of great value. I intend at a later time to call it to the attention of the Senate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent editorial, entitled "Lets Not Penalize Mobility," which recently appeared in Life magazine.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel that this is an appropriate time to briefly reflect about a number of the major election reforms which have been discussed in recent weeks. There is a tendency for our Nation and, in fact, for all nations to put aside problems when interest in them diminishes. We must not let this happen with regard to the many steps which must be taken by the Federal Government and by the States to improve and modernize our election procedures.

My time is limited today. I shall therefore just list several of the election reforms which I think should be seriously considered by the Congress this year.

First. The electoral college system should be abolished or, at the very least, radically reformed. I am a cosponsor of a bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader which would get rid of the electoral college system altogether.

Second. I agree with the many Americans who feel that campaigns should be shorter. This might be accomplished by the two major parties in scheduling the dates of their nominating conventions.

Third, Another is to provide 2 days for voting for the President and Vice President.

Fourth. An investigation should be made of the timing and manner of reporting election returns and the overall impact of television and the mass media during presidential campaigns. The role of the great debates of 1960 should also be carefully studied.

Fifth. President Eisenhower has advanced the interesting suggestion that the election and inauguration be held earlier so that the President will have an opportunity to recruit and work out with his team well before the Congress convenes.

Sixth. Consideration should be given both to the length of time and the financing of the interim period between the election and inauguration of a new President and Vice President.

Seventh. An intriguing suggestion which has been called to my attention and which I think is worthy of serious consideration is that the candidates for President and Vice President receiving the second highest number of votes be rewarded with nonvoting seats in the Senate for 4 years.

Mr. President, this by no means exhausts the list. But, it does pretty well exhaust my allotted time this morning.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Life magazine]

LET'S NOT PENALIZE MOBILITY

Of the 30-odd-million adult U.S. citizens who will have failed to vote in this election, the great majority have no good excuse and are unworthy of their franchise. But a hefty minority of at least 7 million were prevented from voting by unjust and obsolete residence requirements. Just for having moved too recently to a new county or State, they were put in the same class with idiots, felons, paupers, illiterates, and other ineligibles. The number of Americans thus disfranchised has been steadily increasing as business grows more mobile and employees move from plant to plant or job to job across State lines. It has now reached the dimensions of a serious national injustice.

The Federal Government could help a little by drawing up a model mobility ballot and urging uniform provisions on the States, much as it did in the case of the soldier vote during World War II. But residence requirements are a State function and only the States can enfranchise those 7 million nonvoters. Most States require from 6 months to 2 years' residence for voting purposes, though they make you take out a driver's license after 30 days and slap property taxes on you the moment you acquire any. In fact it is possible to owe two States at once taxes on the same estate, though you can also live all your life in the United States without being eligible to vote anywhere.

Three States have already changed their laws for the benefit of new residents. They are Wisconsin, Ohio, and California, and they will let you vote after only 54 days' residence or less provided you give them documentary evidence that you were a registered voter where you came from. Because this evidence is sometimes hard to get, the reform enfranchised only a few thousand voters in those three States this year. What is needed now is for all 50 States to adopt a more or less common residence statute and give each other full reciprocity and prompt service in exchanging registration records.

This was a leading topic at the meeting of the National Association of Secretaries of State in New York City last summer, but it takes a real torchbearer in each State to get the reform on the books. The Secretary of New York State, Caroline Simon, is one of the few who plans to have a bill ready for the legislature's next session. We urge the 40-odd others to get out their torch and light it. Otherwise by the 1964 election there will probably be 10 million unfairly disfranchised nonvoters, and their wholly justified resentment will be a lot more audible than it is now.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHRISTIAN HERTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the advent of the new administration, a gentleman who has served his country faithfully and well as Secretary of State is leaving office.

I should not want this occasion to pass without noting that Mr. Christian Herter, whom the Senate confirmed by unanimous vote as Secretary of State, has warranted that expression of confidence in every way. His tenure of office as the first officer of the Cabinet has been marked by courage, steadfastness, wisdom, fairness, and dedication.

As he returns to private life after several decades of almost continuous public service, I know that the Senate joins with me in this expression of gratitude and respect and in the wish that he will continue to serve this Nation in other public pursuits for many years to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by C. L. Sulzberger, which appeared in the New York Times, January 18, 1961, and which summarizes the work of Mr. Herter as Secretary of State, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAREWELL TO A MOST GALLANT GENTLEMAN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, January 17.—Chris Herter is neither the best nor the worst Secretary of State in American history but he may well be the most gallant. His courtesy, courage, and impeccably gentle manner will be missed on the strident international scene.

For 21 months newsreels and photographs familiarized the world with Herter's tall but

cruelly bent figure, stooped over steel, half-crutch supports, climbing into airplanes, entering conference rooms, a smile upon his handsome, tautly drawn features. The reason these are tautly drawn is the pain that lies behind them.

For years Herter has been afflicted with an advancing arthritic condition. This immutably contracts his great frame and compacts the nerves within it. But that torture, day and night, is never mentioned by him, nor has it been permitted to interfere with arduous diplomatic duties.

Unlike many men who suffer less, he hasn't allowed suffering to provoke impatience in human relationships. He has been at least as ready as younger, healthier colleagues to shoulder more than his share of work, to master his responsibilities.

Herter has served his fellow citizens 38 years—16 in Massachusetts and the rest in Washington. But on the whole, despite much knowledge and experience in foreign affairs, he had little fortune at the State Department.

For more than 3 years he was Under Secretary for Foster Dulles. Yet there was, in fact, no real No. 2. Dulles insisted with egocentricity and acrobatic talent on running the entire show himself.

Dulles had novel ideas on administering American foreign policy and these were suited only to his own indomitably energetic personality. From the start he sought simultaneously to be a traditional Secretary of State and a traveling Presidential agent in the manner of Colonel House or Harry Hopkins. He carried policy in his briefcase. He made decisions in midair. He planned and executed national attitudes on a peripatetic basis and molded the Department to suit this extraordinary method of operation.

THE INHERITED SYSTEM

As a result, Herter was never given the entire trust that should have been his as right-hand man and often Acting Secretary. And, when Dulles died, Herter inherited a system which was abnormal for anyone save his predecessor. He was additionally handicapped by President Eisenhower's perceptible hesitation in initially reposing confidence in him.

Nevertheless, with quiet composure, Herter assumed the role so inauspiciously handed to him. He secured the affection of those who worked with him and he righted some of the more grievous personnel wrongs permitted by Dulles during McCarthyism's heyday. He persuaded Charles E. Bohlen, our principal Soviet expert—exiled by Dulles to Manila and then thinking of retirement—to return to Washington as a leading adviser.

The new Secretary, laboring from the start in Dulles' great shadow, tried to reassure his foreign colleagues. Perhaps because of the difficult circumstances in which he assumed office, he was unable to assert the brand of leadership asserted by Dulles. President Eisenhower himself, approaching the end of his second term, found that when Dulles was gone he wanted to take a greater personal hand in foreign policy.

Nor was Herter able to devise and develop approaches of his own. He seemed the executor of someone else's testament. Thirteen months ago he called for a new, dynamic, 10-year plan for NATO. But it was too late; the Eisenhower administration was on the way out and all the allies knew it. They wanted new, dynamic plans only from its successor, for only these have political meaning.

The bad luck Dulles had so often artfully dodged descended on Herter's stooped shoulders. The U–2 incident torpedoed his one meaningful chance of negotiation. Explosions shook Korea, Turkey, the Congo. Bitter violence wrecked the project of a friendly Presidential visit to Japan. Herter fell heir to situations that in the end produced their own sad denouements. And these sad denouements will belong to his record in history's eyes.

With his customary thoughtfulness, Herter has done everything conceivable to ease the transition of authority to the younger, fitter Dean Rusk. He will now retire to travel, read, and write his memoirs—which will undoubtedly be too kind to those he mentions. A brave, human man, Chris Herter's departure is marked with sympathy.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. GATES, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it used to be that the position of Secretary of State was the most difficult and onerous in this Government. I suspect that that of Secretary of Defense now lays at least equal claim to that distinction. It is an enormous responsibility to preside over the Department which alone absorbs well over half of every tax dollar supplied by the people of the United States. It is an enormous responsibility to weigh the requirements of the various branches of the military service in the light of the total needs of the Nation for defense. It takes great courage and knowledge to be able to say "no" in these matters as well as "go ahead." All of these responsibilities and many others have fallen on Thomas S. Gates, Jr., as Secretary of Defense. Mr. Gates has been a hard-working Secretary who has immersed himself fully in the incredibly complex problems of that Department. Largely as a result of his initiative, his courage, and his persistence, we have begun to see some light on these problems. He has run the largest and most complex department of the Government in an outstanding fashion for the past 21 months. In leaving office at this time, he carries with him the respect and gratitude of the Senate for a job of public service well done.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRED SEATON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the occasion of the changeover in administration, I should like to note for the RECORD the exceptional services of Mr. Fred Seaton as Secretary of the Interior. Those of us who represent Western States are especially sensitive to the work of the Department of the Interior.

I want the RECORD to show, therefore, that as one Senator from that region I am deeply appreciative of the farsighted and impartial manner in which Mr. Seaton has administered the affairs of the Department of the Interior. In the case of Montana, he was most helpful to the congressional delegation in advancing Yellowtail, Libby, and East Bench and in many other undertakings which fall within the jurisdiction of Interior and are of particular interest to the State. But beyond these particular interests, the retiring Secretary of the Interior leaves an outstanding record because he has advanced on a broad front the principle that the great natural resources of the Nation constitute a trust which must be developed not only in the interests of the people of the living generation but of the generations yet to come.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a former colleague of mine in the House of Representatives, who is also a retired major general of the Marine Corps, was recently cited by President Eisenhower for his outstanding work as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

This man, Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Melvin Joseph Maas, is a symbol of the motto of the handicapped—"It's ability, not disability, that counts." Despite his own multiple physical afflictions Melvin Maas has served his Nation with great courage and dedication. I ask unanimous consent that a White House release covering his citation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

On behalf of President Eisenhower, Gerald D. Morgan, the Deputy Assistant to the President, today presented the following citation to Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMC, retired, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicaped, at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, where General Maas is recuperating from an illness:

"CITATION

"Maj. Gen. Melvin Joseph Maas (U.S. Marine Corps, retired), has served the people of the United States in peace and war with vigor, ability and devotion.

"As a Congressman, as a marine in both World Wars, as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Melvin Maas has become an example of inspired citizenship to all Americans.

"Total blindness and diverse physical afflictions have not been able to stop him in his prosecution of good works. He is a symbol of the proud motto of the handicapped—"It's ability, not disability, that counts." In him the physically handicapped have a brave and effective champion.

"For his lifelong dedication to the service of the American people; for his outstanding leadership of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; and for his courage in action over and beyond the call of duty, it is most fitting that Melvin Maas receive the grateful recognition of his countrymen.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

THE OUTSTANDING YANKEE LADY IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year, on September 6, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune an article on an outstanding lady who, born in this country, has immersed her life, through marriage and a zeal for service, in the Republic of Peru. The article, by Miss Grace Halsell, tells the story of Mrs. Miriam Kropp de Beltran, the wife of Peru's Prime Minister, Pedro Beltran. As the wife of this outstanding Latin American statesman and as editor of Peru's leading newspaper, La Prensa, Mrs. Beltran has made a great contribution to the progress which Peru has undergone in recent years in the direction of stable political democracy and the economic well-being of its citizens.

Mrs. Beltran's tireless efforts are directed and dedicated solely to Peru's welfare. Yet, in an indirect sense, her work has served the larger interests of inter-Americanism. Her life is a personification of the practice of that ideal of the Western Hemisphere, that ideal in which Americans of all parts of the hemisphere work shoulder to shoulder, for the benefit of the hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTSTANDING YANKEE LADY IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Grace Halsell)

LIMA, PERU.—A slender, green-eyed, attractive native of San Francisco, Miriam Kropp de Beltran, has carved such a unique place for herself here that today she is the most outstanding North American woman living in South America.

She is a quiet, behind-the-scenes manager. She speaks softly. But her voice carries influence, and more and more it is being heard here.

When her husband, Pedro Beltran, was named Prime Minister a little more than a year ago, she took over as boss of La Prensa, Peru's leading newspaper.

"She had no actual knowledge of running a newspaper, but a higher form of knowledge, called intuitive intellect," one editorial writer comments.

Instinctively, she knows good copy—and bad. One of the first of her many innovations was a woman's page, the first Lima had seen. "When I took around the page proofs, she immediately spotted an error I had overlooked," recalls Society Chief Ernesto Ramon Blanes. "When I asked in amazement how she always saw the errors first, she recalled, 'My father said I could see the hole before I saw the doughnut.'"

A graduate of the University of Stanford, she came to Lima in 1943, as economic analyst with the U.S. Embassy. In this year, she met Pedro Beltran, rich, brilliant, a member of one of Peru's well-known families, and a bachelor.

When he was sent to Washington as Peruvian Ambassador, she was in Lima. When he returned to Peru, she was back in the States. Their courtship (7 years) mostly was long distance. In 1950 he flew to San Francisco, where she was living. They were married there.

Returning to Peru, she moved to their hacienda Montalvan (former home of the liberator O'Higgins), 100 miles south of Lima in the Canate Valley.

She learned the tragedy of Peru's excesses: on the coast, arid as Arabia, there is not enough water; in the jungle, there is too much rainfall; and in the sierras, there is a desolate windswept mountaintop plain, where Indians chew coca and live no better than the sheep they guard.

Peru—as large as Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland together—has 10 million people, and, for the majority, a wage of $1 a day is good pay.

Mrs. Beltran believes, with her husband, that help should be given the "hopeless" ones, else there will be a revolution.

In her first years as Beltran's wife he ran the newspaper and she stayed behind the scenes, putting her two houses in order. Besides the hacienda, they have a downtown home, one of the loveliest in Peru.

She is an excellent hostess and, with a card-catalog file, she sees that dinner guests always have different companions with whom to converse and, moreover, she never serves the same meal twice to the same guest.

Her discipline is physical and mental: slender, she has not gained weight in a country where there are at least 100 typical dishes, all of them fattening. She is a trained ballet dancer. Mentally, she likes difficult problems, such as mastering all the rules of a language.

She rises at 6 a.m., reads La Prensa and the opposition papers, marking them all with short comments for the attention of newsmen. "She keeps us alert," they admit. A devout Catholic, she goes to mass every day. And, most unusual in this land where those in social circles leave the menial tasks to a vast array of inexpensive servants, she takes her baskets to Mercado Central, where the poorest people go to get the cheapest vegetables, and does the family shopping for a week.

Her quiet, soft-spoken ways belie her steel will, which the top general in Peru found stronger than his own.

After a revolution in Arequipa, when Gen. Manuel Odria came to power, Beltran criticized his economic policies. Odria imprisoned him and proceeded to install a censor in La Prensa.

Mrs. Beltran, in the absence of her husband, took charge at the newspaper. "No," she told General Odria. "There will never be a censor in La Prensa."

Rather than comply with his orders, she stopped the presses. After a few weeks, the general was forced to permit La Prensa to resume publication and Beltran was released.

(Odria, out of office and out of Peru for 4 years, may run for the Presidency again in 1962. Beltran also may be a candidate at that time.)

After Odria, Manuel Prado became President. When the La Prensa barrage started in his direction, he summoned Beltran, announcing: "You seem to know so much about running a government, I want you to run this one." He offered the title of Prime Minister.

After his acceptance, Mrs. Beltran became her husband's chief adviser on a multitude of problems. Her knowledge of Peru—she has traveled extensively—and of all Beltran's plans and projects became her power.

Yet if there has been much praise—in Washington circles he is considered one of the finest statesmen in Latin America—there has been slander, envy, and sharp attacks. One opposition editor insisted on a duel. For more than a year Mrs. Beltran has driven herself relentlessly, though she suffers from the humid climate of Lima.

In June she flew to San Francisco, accompanied by the Prime Minister, for minor surgery and a general rest.

She is expected to return to Lima in a matter of weeks and resume her activities as chairman of the board at La Prensa, the Prime Minister's personal secretary, and manager of the Beltran homes.

The popularity and influence of Miriam Kropp de Beltran in a country such as Peru, where the woman's role has always been bound by feudal customs, hinges on the fact that she has kept her North American characteristics—drive, spirit, initiative, spontaneity. But she always puts her husband's life first. This has enabled Peruvians to accept her completely—while she maintains her own individuality.

Everyone recalls the time of the national holidays a year ago, just after her husband had been named Prime Minister. "Te Deum" ceremonies are conducted with full protocol and are perhaps the most solemn of any governmental proceedings. The President, all Ministers, Senators, and Deputies at 10 a.m. appear in full dress, with swallowtail jackets and tophats. They march from the Governor's palace to the cathedral.

All the dignitaries were on hand, but no one had seen Mrs. Beltran. At the door of the cathedral, she was spotted, in low heels, a simple suit, a camera slung around her neck, looking like some coed tourist enraptured by all the foreign proceedings.

On seeing this remarkable woman, the President of the Republic broke file and, forgetting pomp and circumstance, spontaneously gave a warm "abrazos," the Latin greeting with arms around the shoulders.

This is indeed a measure of her acceptance in a land where she has won a reputation for both her steel and her velvet ways.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances and the approaching hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate will now, as a body, proceed to the inaugural.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND VICE PRESIDENT

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m. the Senate, headed by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF], the Secretary of the Senate (Mr. Felton M. Johnston), and the Sergeant at Arms (Mr. Joseph C. Duke), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the spaces assigned to them on the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The Members of the House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker pro tempore, Hon. CARL VINSON, and the Clerk of the House (Mr. Ralph R. Roberts), had preceded the Senate to the platform, and taken the spaces assigned to them on the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The Governors of the States were escorted by Mr. Emery L. Frazier to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, with their aides, were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The diplomatic corps were escorted by Mr. Jessop I. McDonnell to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members-of-the-Cabinet-designate of the President-elect were escorted to the places assigned to them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, preceded by its Marshal, T. Perry Lippitt,

its Clerk, James R. Browning, and Mr. Gordon F. Harrison, clerk and counsel of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, were escorted to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, were escorted to the inaugural platform by J. Mark Trice, Secretary for the Minority, Senator Bridges, and Representative Halleck, members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements. The President and Vice President were seated immediately to the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

Mrs. John F. Kennedy and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

The President-elect of the United States, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, and the Vice-President-elect of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, were escorted to the inaugural platform by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Arrangements, consisting of Senator Sparkman, chairman; Senator Hayden, and Senator Bridges, and Speaker Rayburn, Representative McCormack, and Representative Halleck, and accompanied by the Secretary of the Senate, Felton M. Johnston.

Former President Harry S. Truman was escorted to the place assigned to him on the platform.

Former Vice President Henry A. Wallace was escorted to the place assigned to him on the platform.

PLAYING OF "AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Mr. President-elect, distinguished guests and fellow citizens of this great representative Republic, we are here today to inaugurate the 35th President of this Union of free peoples.

It is my high honor to begin this event by presenting the U.S. Marine Band, under the direction of Lt. Col. Albert F. Schoepper, which will play a special arrangement of a song we cherish—"America the Beautiful."

(The U.S. Marine Band played a special arrangement of "America the Beautiful.")

INVOCATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the audience now rise as His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing pronounces the invocation.

His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, Mass., offered the following invocation:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

In this year of Our Lord, 1961, we ask Thee, O Almighty God, to enlighten us.

That we may know, as men, our personal responsibilities.

That we may know, as Americans, our political, social, and humanitarian responsibilities.

That we may know, as citizens of the world, our global responsibilities to ourselves and our fellow men.

That we may know, as children of God, our responsibilities to the Father of mankind.

Enlighten us, O Lord, that we may know how to combine all of these responsibilities into a continuing principle of responsibility.

Enlighten us that we may know how to put this principle of responsibility into daily practice both in ideal and action—in these troubled but hopeful times.

In this year of Our Lord, 1961, we beseech Thee, O Almighty God, to strengthen our resolve.

To enlarge our vision of the common good.

To implement with personal sacrifice the objectives of our national purpose.

To revere in every man that divine spark which makes him our brother—that human spark which can make him our friend—and that personal spark which makes him himself.

To learn to ask ourselves sincerely in every community effort, not what we can get out of it, but what we can put into it.

To defend my right to be myself; to defend my neighbor's right to be himself, and to defend America's duty to respect the rights of all men.

Strengthen our resolve, O Lord, to transform this recognition of others into a principle of cooperation.

Inspire us to practice this principle of cooperation both in ideal and action—in these most dangerous, but soul-stretching, times.

On this 20th day of January—1,961 years after the birth of Christ—on the occasion of the inauguration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President of the United States of America, do Thou, O Almighty God, give him, his Cabinet, the Congress, and courts of the United States—and all of us—the grace—

To perform with full personal responsibility our duties as freemen.

To perform in full cooperation our duties as American citizens.

To perform with complete vigilance our duty to prevent the spread of totalitarian terror everywhere.

To perform with religious fervor our duty to teach, implement, and create true freedom as a way of life at home and abroad—for true freedom underlies human dignity and is a holy state of life.

O Loving Creator, ever active, ever calm, give us the grace to realize that we are made to be holy according to Thy image and likeness, for to be holy is to be godlike.

Give us the vision to realize that in Thy plan we have a self-sacrificing part to play in completing an unfinished universe, for to sacrifice is to conquer.

Give us the strength to further Thy creation by our responsible and dedicated work, for to labor is to pray.

Give us the charity to further Thy creation by our brotherly cooperation, for to care is to love.

Finally, O Lord of men and nations, through confidence in Thee, let men take hope in what is being done in this Capital City for our Nation, in this hour, in this month of January in the year 1961.

Let hearts everywhere be lifted, and let anxieties be dispelled as new hands, in the vigor and vision of youth, grasp the wheel of the Ship of State. Put Thy hands in his hands, put Thy spirit in his heart, put Thy justice and peace, the work of justice, in all his programs, and let this land, and all lands, move forward under Thy guidance, through his leadership and with our cooperation, to new frontiers for the welfare of our Nation and all nations in peace, progress, and prosperity. Amen.

SOLO

Mr. SPARKMAN. And now Miss Marian Anderson will sing our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner," accompanied by the U.S. Marine Band.

(Miss Marian Anderson sang two stanzas of "The Star-Spangled Banner.")

PRAYER

Mr. SPARKMAN. His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos will now lead us in prayer:

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and all-merciful Lord, by whom all powers and authorities are ordained;

Who taught us that rulers are ministers of God to us for all that is good;

Who demandest of us that we offer supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgiving for all who are in authority:

Hear us, O Lord, for unto Thee do we bow submissively, inclining our heads and entreating Thy mercy upon Thy faithful servant, our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. Save Thy people, O Lord, and bless Thine heritage.

Visit Thy world with compassion and bounties.

Exalt the prestige of our country and the office of our President, and send down upon him Thy rich mercies.

Preserve his life and multiply his days with health and wisdom.

Grant unto him progress in all virtues.

Guard him within the realm of Thy grace and gird him with the armor of faith, prudence, and high morale.

Sanctify his soul and illumine his mind by Thy Holy Spirit.

Let a host of heavenly angels be his constant guardians, so that, guided and guarded thusly by Thee, he may attain his noble goals.

Finally, O Lord, bless the tenure of his office, so that he may be victorious in all his struggles against evil, violence, injustice, and threats of war.

May he emerge always in glory, for Thou hast said: "Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world."

For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, administered to the Vice-President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated as follows:

I, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, solemnly swear that I will support and defend

the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

PRAYER

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Reverend Dr. John Barclay will now lead us in prayer.

Rev. Dr. John Barclay offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pause again to acknowledge that in Thy presence we are living and moving and in Thee alone we have our being.

We are thankful for the great and good men raised up by Thee to lead us in the past. Bless these leaders of recent decades, still with us, who have led us through these tumultuous times, to live out their years with the consciousness of the admiration and appreciation of a grateful people.

We thank Thee for our country, for the manner in which Thou didst lead our fathers to establish this Nation in which all men have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Help us to so unite duties and rights that there may develop in all our people a new maturity that will continually produce life more abundant, liberty more responsible, and spiritual satisfactions more abiding.

Our Father, we pray for the Congress and the courts and all public servants, that there may come from their deep dedication and high patriotism a new inspiration for all Americans.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the two men whom we have elected to lead us, who today assume the almost unbearable responsibilities of their exalted offices. We thank Thee for their high intelligence and their characters made great by hard work and devoted services to their country in war and in peace. Bless them with vigorous health, great strength, and courageous boldness to lead our Nation out into a new era and into a new frontier. Help them to lead us to return to the virtues of our fathers; industry, honesty, and frugality. Under their leadership may we recapture the faith of our fathers and their spiritual optimism that problems are soluble, that what ought to be can be, that neighborly potential is inherent in mankind.

Our Father, we pray Thou wilt bless LYNDON B. JOHNSON and add Thy strength to his strength as he continues to lead men of divergent views to reconcile their differences in the interest of the common good of our Nation and of all mankind. Add Thy wisdom, grace, and power to his great abilities, and may his willingness to serve bring strength and help to the President.

May the beauty, understanding, and spiritual support of his family continue to bless his life all his years.

We pray, our Father, for John F. Kennedy as he assumes the heavy burden of great leadership in these ominous times. Bless his family that in all the turmoil of his public life they may be for him an oasis of quiet peace and rest.

When he faces great and solemn hours of decision, decisions upon which may hang the fate of all mankind, when he must ascend the lonely pinnacle, help him then to know that he is not alone; that Thou art with him to guide him in making decisions of wisdom and righteousness for his Nation and the whole world.

May the magnitude of his leadership inspire tens of millions of Americans into a dedicated involvement in their country's progress. And may peace crown his years.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

POEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now I have the honor to present one of America's most distinguished poets, Mr. Robert Frost, who will present an original composition.

Mr. Frost thereupon recited a poem entitled "The Gift Outright," preceded by an introductory dedication.

The dedication and poem are as follows:

Summoning artists to participate
In the august occasions of the State
Seems something for us all to celebrate.
This day is for my cause a day of days,
And his be poetry's old-fashioned praise
Who was the first to think of such a thing.
This tribute verse to be his own I bring
Is about the new order of the ages
That in the Latin of the founding sages
God nodded his approval of as good.
So much those sages knew and understood
(The mighty four of them were Washington,
John Adams, Jefferson, and Madison).
So much they saw as consecrated seers
They must have seen how in two hundred years
They would bring down the world about our ears
By the example of our Declaration.
It made the least tribe want to be a nation.
New order of the ages did they say?
The newest thing in which they led the way
Is in our very papers of the day.
Colonial had been the thing to be
As long as the great issue was to see
Which country'd be the one to dominate
By character, by tongue, and native trait
What Christopher Columbus first had found.
The French, the Spanish, and the Dutch were downed,
They all were counted out: The deeds were done:
Elizabeth the First and England won.
Of what had been for centuries the trend
This turned out the beginning of the end.
My verse purports to be the guiding chart
To the o'erturning it was ours to start
And in it have no unimportant part.
The turbulence we're in the middle of
Is something we can hardly help but love.
Some poor fool has been saying in his heart
Glory is out of date in live and art.
Our venture in revolution and outlawry
Has justified itself in freedom's story
Right down to now in glory upon glory.
I sometimes think that all we ask is glory.

THE GIFT OUTRIGHT

The land was ours before we were the land's.
She was our land more than a hundred years
Before we were her people. She was ours
In Massachusetts, in Virginia,
But we were England's, still colonials,
Possessing what we still were unpossessed by,
Possessed by what we now no more possessed.
Something we were withholding left us weak
Until we found out that it was ourselves
We were withholding from our land of living
And forthwith found salvation in surrender.
Such as we were we gave ourselves outright
(The deed of gift was many deeds of war)
To the land vaguely realizing westward,
But still unstoried, artless, unenhanced,
Such as she was, such as she will become.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

President KENNEDY. Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning—signifying renewal, as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world. [Applause.]

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our words that one form of colonial con-

trol shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside. [Applause.]

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house. [Applause.]

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate. [Applause.]

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations. [Applause.]

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin. [Applause.]

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in, and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort? [Applause.]

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. [Applause.] I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country. [Applause.]

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man. [Applause.]

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own. [Applause.]

BENEDICTION

Mr. SPARKMAN. The benediction will now be pronounced by Rabbi Dr. Nelson Glueck.

Rabbi Glueck pronounced the following benediction:

We turn to Thee, O God, in deepest gratitude on this exalting day of reaffirmation of our Nation's ideals and unity, and of personal avowal of sacred obligation by our President, in Thy name.

Mayest Thou, O God, to whom alone belong the dominion and the power, be his stay and support in the fulfillment of his awesome trust, to insure the unfettered implementation of the spirit and letter of our Constitution for all the inhabitants of our land, to provide them in law and in fact equal opportunities of learning and labor and well-being, to safeguard the physical and moral integrity of our beloved Commonwealth, founded on faith in Thee.

O Thou, who art the source of all life, quicken his heart always with the awareness of Thy presence, and especially in the lonely moments of fateful decisions which may be his to make for us and our world.

Guard and guide him in Thy loving kindness, that through his leadership hunger may be stilled, hurts healed, hope sustained, the weak and the worn assisted, human dignity and decency upheld, the blight of war and the specter of annihilation banished, and peace in freedom prevail among all Thy children everywhere, with none to make them afraid.

In profound humility, O God, we pray that Thy blessing may rest upon our President and all associated with him in our Government, which we the people have set in authority, upon everyone and everything dear and precious to him and us, as we repeat the ever new words of the ancient prayer in sacred writ:

יברכך ״ וישמרך:

May the Lord bless thee and keep thee,

יאר ״ פניו אליך ויחנך:

May the Lord cause His countenance to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee,

ישא ״ פניו אליך וישם לך שלום:

May the Lord lift up His countenance unto thee and grant thee peace.

At 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the President and Vice President of the United States, escorted by the Joint Committee on Arrangements, retired from the platform, followed by the Senate and House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other distinguished guests who had been invited to witness the ceremony.

Following the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies, the Senate reassembled at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m., when it was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does any Senator desire recognition at this time before the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is recognized to ask for a recess?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I intend to request a recess subject to the call of the Chair, unless some other Senator wishes to speak at this time. Following the recess, nominations will be submitted to the Senate. There will be no action on them at that time. No yea-and-nay vote is contemplated today on any of the nominations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator give us some idea how long he thinks the recess will last?

Mr. McCARTHY. It will last at least as long as the duration of the luncheon. I assume it will be approximately an hour and a half.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it contemplated that when the nominations are presented to the Senate, the committee reports on the nominations will be presented with them?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that will depend upon the action of the chairmen of the committees which held the hearings.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] might wish to comment on that subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that heretofore when nominations were submitted—in fact in 1953—all reports were on our desks before Senators went to the inaugural platform for the swearing-in ceremonies. We certainly should have reports submitted today on the nominations that are to be submitted today, because if it is contemplated that only the nominations will be presented today and the reports will be submitted tomorrow, I serve notice on the majority leader that the Senate will do no voting tomorrow, because those reports should be in our hands in time to be read; and they cannot be read and the nominations voted upon at the same time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been informed that the reports on all the nominations will be available tomorrow morning by 10 o'clock. I believe that they will be available then.

Mr. MORSE. Is it contemplated that the reports will be handed to us tomorrow morning and that we will then be expected to vote on the nominations?

Mr. McCARTHY. They will be available to all Senators by 10 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. I am a pretty fast reader, but not that fast. I respectfully suggest that we ought to have some time to read the reports. If they are not submitted until tomorrow, I do not believe we should have any votes on the nominations tomorrow, and I will do my best to see that there will not be.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to notify the Senate that we have before us at this time, and hope for consideration tomorrow, 11 nominations from the President of the United States—of 10 members of the Cabinet and the nomination of Adlai Stevenson as U.S. representative to the United Nations. It is my understanding that there is a desire on the part of some Senators that the reports of the committee and possibly copies of the hearings be placed on the desks of Senators this afternoon.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say further that I would hope that all the committee chairmen would be notified so that at the time of the resuming of our session this afternoon we will have on the desks all the pertinent material requested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to inquire if there would be a morning hour tomorrow beginning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was our intention to try to get through with as many nominations as possible. I would express the hope that if the nominations did not meet with too much opposition we could finish with the nominations and then have a morning hour or general discussion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the majority leader have any plans for other nominations which have been made by the President on which hearings have been held by committees?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge all we have before us are the nominations for the Cabinet and the nomination for U.S. Representative to the United Nations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are no plans at the present time to receive other nominations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are plans, but I assume that other nominations will be sent to the Senate tomorrow. However, if we are to observe the 1-day rule, it will mean that those nominations will go over from Saturday until Monday.

The purpose of the session this afternoon is to proceed to the filling of the top positions, if that may be done.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume from the answer to my last question that the leadership plans to have a session on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, because I think that at that time the Senate will have the other nominations to consider; and the sooner we fill out the President's official family, the better it will be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement just entered into, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until tomorrow, Saturday, January 21, 1961, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate (from President Dwight D. Eisenhower) January 20, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Parker T. Hart, of Illinois.
Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine.
Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Woodruff Wallner, of New Hampshire.
Ivan B. White, of Washington.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

K. William Jeffers
Donald W. Moncevicz

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Clyde O. Brindley	Lucy D. Ozarin
Arthur R. Dahlgren	Paul S. Parrino
Lynn L. Fulkerson	Carl I. Pirkle
Edwin M. Lerner, II	Celia W. Tabor
Glen W. McDonald	Joseph F. Wilson
Thomas E. O'Brien	

To be surgeons

Marguerite L. Candler	Samuel M. Fox, III
Jane G. Eichlepp	D. Wells Goodrich

Kehl Markley, III — Sam Silbergeld
Warren A. Rasmussen — Martha R. Wilson
Franz W. Rosa

To be senior assistant surgeons

W. King Engel
John R. Gill, Jr.
W. Paul Glezen

To be senior dental surgeons

William J. Pennoyer — James F. Scott
Francis W. Pomije — Sidney J. Winter
Stewart H. Rowberry

To be senior sanitary engineers

Aleck Alexander — Arthur H. Johnson
John H. Burgess — Carl A. Lindstrom
Daniel W. Evans — Paul P. Maier
Clyde F. Fehn — Bernard E. Saltzman
Archie B. Freeman — James D. Williams
Murray A. Getz

To be sanitary engineers

Albert G. Friend — Everett L. Mac Leman
Guy L. Hubbs — Gordon G. Robeck
William N. Long

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Gerard L. Eugene

To be senior scientists

Floyd O. Atchley — George W. Lones
Morris Goldman — Charles S. Richards
Melvin E. Griffith — Harry A. Saroff
Charles R. Joyce — John C. Wagner

To be scientist

Byron L. Harriman

To be senior assistant scientist

Joseph M. Dutler, Jr.

To be sanitarians

George A. Amundson — Leroy S. Houser
C. Bradley Bridges — Wilfred H. Johnson
Robert B. Carson — Harvey B. Morlan
Warren S. Dobson — Donald K. Summers
Harold E. Thompson, Jr.

To be nurse officers

Eileen M. Coviello — Mary F. Luvisi
Mary A. Ivanko — E. Josephine Strachan
Margaret E. Lamson — Elizabeth Walker
Maud P. Larssen

To be dietitians

Genevievo L. Casalaspro — Eileen M. Reid
Geraldine M. Piper — Anna O. Reimer
Jean M. Pope — Jeanne L. Tillotson

To be therapist

Vida J. Niebuhr

To be health services officers

John R. Barry — Barbara A. Murphy
Jason N. Calhoun — Shirley H. Owen
Marjorie E. Cantoni — Philip P. Simon
Jessie P. Dowling — Evelyn Walker
Margaret E. Heap — Ellen J. Walsh
Dorothy A. Huskey — Emma M. Wiest
George Landsman — Jeanne E. Wright

To be senior assistant health services officer

Gloria M. Russo

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Lawrence I. Carnes

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

John A. Eckert

III. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant dental surgeons

George R. McGuire
George N. Newton

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Robert L. Elder
John A. Eure
Paul J. Traina

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Joseph F. Toomey

To be senior scientist

Herbert T. Dalmat

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Rowland D. Eastwood, June Lake, Calif., in place of G. A. Deininger, retired.

Jesse B. Thompson, Lindsay, Calif., in place of E. M. Bandy, retired.

COLORADO

Otto A. Walter, Allenspark, Colo., in place of J. A. Jensen, retired.

Lane L. Hackett, Bristol, Colo., in place of H. L. Elmore, resigned.

Lucille R. Lavelett, Monument, Colo., in place of W. W. Carrothers, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Edward W. Gray, Riverton, Conn., in place of E. G. Jordan, deceased.

GEORGIA

Earl H. Shepard, Richmond Hill, Ga., in place of E. R. Gregory, retired.

ILLINOIS

Gordon C. Wormley, Oswego, Ill., in place of G. C. Bartholomew, resigned.

Adele V. Hildebrand, Sandoval, Ill., in place of M. M. Hawley, retired.

Harold B. Trigg, Tamaroa, Ill., in place of J. E. Lee, removed.

INDIANA

Leo E. Schuette, Dillsboro, Ind., in place of G. C. Gerster, retired.

Max R. Booth, Hamilton, Ind., in place of T. R. Teegardin, retired.

Frederick E. Prickett, Rome City, Ind., in place of T. J. Conley, deceased.

KANSAS

Harold F. Wiley, Basehor, Kans., in place of J. D. Grisham, retired.

Raymond Williams, Jr., Easton, Kans., in place of B. M. Stafford, retired.

Robert B. Miller, Everest, Kans., in place of H. J. Kuckelman, retired.

Albert Yoxall, Woodston, Kans., in place of F. C. McNutt, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Victor B. LaCombe, Carp Lake, Mich., in place of G. R. Athearn, retired.

MINNESOTA

Hubert A. Ruschmeier, Plato, Minn., in place of H. B. Roth, retired.

MISSOURI

Carl L. Lovekamp, Queen City, Mo., in place of R. B. Sloop, transferred.

MONTANA

Kenneth J. Bruce, Glasgow, Mont., in place of E. B. Pease, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lee F. Beatty, Conover, N.C., in place of C. M. Schell, retired.

Alfred R. McCord, Shelby, N.C., in place of R. M. Laughridge, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold E. Nelson, Manvel, N. Dak., in place of O. M. Sproule, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

J. Lynn McPherson, Clearfield, Pa., in place of A. R. Hinkle, retired.

James F. Acker, Venango, Pa., in place of George Acker, retired.

Richard G. Hoy, Williamsburg, Pa., in place of J. G. Butler, resigned.

TEXAS

Edith L. Hale, Orla, Tex., in place of W. H. Olds, retired.

William C. Copeland, Purdon, Tex., in place of A. W. Mosley, transferred.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Holden, Orfordville, Wis., in place of H. V. Holden, retired.

Executive nominations received by the Senate (from President John F. Kennedy) January 20, 1961:

UNITED NATIONS

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert S. McNamara, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

J. Edward Day, of California, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Stewart Lee Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Luther H. Hodges, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1961

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. VINSON.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words of the psalmist which were quoted by Prime Minister Winston Churchill when he addressed the Senate on December 26, 1941:

Psalm 112: 7: *He shall not be afraid of evil tidings; his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we earnestly beseech Thee that John F. Kennedy and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, at this noon hour, will take the oath of office, as the President and Vice President of these United States, may give to their high vocation the accents of mandate and mission, of devotion and trust.

Grant that they may be richly endowed with the blessings of wisdom and understanding, of vision and insight, of faith and courage, which will make their

leadership equal to the heaviest responsibilities and the most glorious opportunities.

Inspire them to daily seek and accept the Master's overtures of companionship and counsel in the noble adventure of building a social order which marches in step with the eternal wisdom and ordained will of God.

We pray that as our beloved country reaches out to new and loftier fields of endeavor and achievement, it may be the goal of all our aspirations and labors to glorify Thy great and holy name and to bring together in amity and good will the members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 18, 1961, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 18, 1961.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Arizona my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of Arizona.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

JANUARY 18, 1961.

Hon. PAUL FANNIN,
Governor of the State of Arizona, State Capitol, Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR GOVERNOR FANNIN: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of Arizona.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce to the House that we will leave here in a body to go out on the official platform for the inaugural ceremony. In order to get on the platform it will be necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The seats to be occupied by the Senate and the House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair also desires to state that, pursuant to House Resolution 106, on the conclusion of the ceremonies on the East front of the Capitol, the House will stand adjourned until noon on Monday next.

The Speaker pro tempore, preceded by the Clerk, will head the procession, and the Members of the House will form in double column following them.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker and the Clerk, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 106, stood in adjournment until Monday, January 23, 1961.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

391. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

392. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

393. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing a violation involving an overobligation as of July 31, 1960, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

394. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice of proposed disposition of nickel-cobalt-copper calcines and matte held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

395. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice of proposed disposition of nonspecification nickel and cobalt held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

396. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995)"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

397. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

398. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the period July 1 through December 31, 1960, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

399. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which presents a study under the Defense Production Act of competitive factors in the purchase of petroleum for defense uses, pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

400. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide greater flexibility in the organization of the Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

401. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act, authorizing grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, providing for Federal guarantee of loans for construction of group practice medical or dental care facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

402. A letter from the Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of activities of the Commission and a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

403. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

404. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

405. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration within the provisions of the United States Code relating to assaults upon, and homicides of, certain officers and employees of the United States as constituting a crime"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

406. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of positions placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 under provisions of law other than section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503 of title V of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and direct the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

408. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the direct loan program for Korean conflict veterans and provide an earlier termination date for the World War II loan guarantee and direct loan programs"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

409. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting drafts of a six-bill crime-elimi-

nating program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

410. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of several aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

411. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens under the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 3012. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3013. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service of females sworn in as members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that rules and regulations be made to require that the percentage of immigrants to the United States from any country will be reduced in the same ratio that the immigrants from that country participate in crimes in this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of American Samoa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation of American Samoa to Peter T. Coleman for his efforts as Governor of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HAGEN of California introduced a bill (H.R. 3014) for the relief of Dinka Maria Hraste, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

42. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the department commander, the American Legion, Department of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to giving wholehearted support to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower and the U.S. Government regarding rupture of diplomatic relations with Castro's Cuban regime of government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

43. Also petition of James M. Cochrane, Sr., and others, Lawton, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting legislation providing a national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Record of Eisenhower Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release in respect to the record of the Eisenhower leadership.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY LAUDS RECORD OF EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, senior Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today lauded Eisenhower's record of leadership as a unique, outstanding contribution to human progress and to a better climate of world peace.

"Dwight D. Eisenhower—as President for 8 years preceded by nearly 40 years of military service—has made a great contribution to progress and security of our country," Senator WILEY said.

"The annals of history—I am confident—will also evaluate his role as a world leader as a most significant contribution to human progress, nationally and internationally, and to peace.

"As soldier, statesman, emissary of peace, outstanding citizen—Mr. Eisenhower leaves the White House enriched with the love, respect, esteem, not only of his fellow countrymen, but of millions of people around the globe.

"Wearing the emblem of peace, he, in his travels, evoked almost universally, enthusiastic, heartfelt expressions of affection, trust and admiration, not only for himself but also for our country. Never before in history has a good will ambassador so aroused the best hopes of humanity, reflected in the echoing of 'I like Ike' in many languages and lands around the world.

"Under Eisenhower's leadership, the record of accomplishment extends too deeply into the complex of domestic and world affairs—and too far into the future as his words, deeds, and policies live long after his absence from the Presidency—to be fairly reflected, even sketchily, in a farewell tribute.

"Nevertheless, there are highlights, which, I believe, deserve a synopsis-like reference—even if inadequate—as the President leaves the White House.

"These include the following:

"(1) The economy: At home, the domestic economy has surged to new heights in employment—over 67 million—and output of goods and services, valued at around $503 billion. More of our people lived better, enjoying more of the good things of life, than ever before in history.

"(2) Conquest of space: Upon almost no foundation for space exploration—in effect, starting from scratch—the Eisenhower administration created—within 8 years—an awe-inspiring missile-satellite-space probe program of great sophistication and complexity. The feat—in my judgment—represents one of the most significant triumphs of human ingenuity—utilizing the tools of science and technology—in our history.

"(3) Defense: A jet-nuclear-missile-space defense has been strengthened progressively to serve as an effective deterrent to military attack by a powerful and fast-growing enemy, communism.

"(4) Strengthening our world alliances: Under the Eisenhower administration, the free world alliances were strengthened and membership extended to more nations, thus serving as a stronger, more effective bulwark against the expansionist aims of communism.

"(5) Human progress: Expanding programs of human, military and economic assistance to less-developed nations, were carried out successfully, even though such programs were not always popular—to improve life for a great many people; and diminish the targets for Communist penetration.

"(6) U.N., best hope for peace: Under Ike's administration, strong U.S. support for the United Nations—today's best hope for establishing law and order in the world—at times spelled failure—not success—for expansionist efforts of communism.

"The record of accomplishment under the Eisenhower administration, of course, reads on and on into world affairs and the lives of millions of people.

"Paramount among the President's goals has been the attainment of world climate conducive to peace among men and nations. Unfortunately, critics are now erroneously concluding that, since a lasting peace was not attained, this represents a failure of Eisenhower policies and programs.

"However, this does not reflect a realistic evaluation of world affairs.

"Today, there are many conflicting forces and influences in the world. The most antagonistic are grouped into the Communist and non-Communist camps.

"For the most part, these are too powerful—and too far apart in viewpoint—for us to realistically expect a vanishing of points of conflict, the establishment of a benevolent climate of nonantagonism, and a meshing of these forces into a common cause for human progress.

"Realistically, the best that can be attained—in the foreseeable future—is the strengthening of machinery, such as the United Nations, to encourage: The settlement of differences among countries by negotiations; respect for order and law in the world; recognition of human dignity and rights of nations to seek, and attain, their self-determined destinies.

"To these more realistic goals, the Eisenhower administration has made a great, constructive contribution—one of which the President can be justly proud.

"Accompanying his devotion to world peace, President Eisenhower has strongly and resolutely adhered to the conviction that the United States—while meeting its obligation of free world leadership—must remain strong economically, as well as militarily, morally, and spiritually. Time after time—he has admonished us to maintain a good

balance of commonsense and perspective in pursuing, as traditional, our high ideals. The theme is best expressed in his farewell message to the American people.

"The President said—and I quote: '* * * there is a great need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy; balance between cost and hoped-for advantage; balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the Nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.'

"As our beloved President leaves the highest office in our land—after almost half a century of great devoted service to our country, there go with him best wishes, not only of our own people, but of millions of citizens around the globe; prayers for his personal happiness and well-being; and the great hope for the opening of new doors of opportunity through which he will be able to bring his great prestige, love and respect—well deserved—to further serve our country in the future," Senator WILEY concluded.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1961

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON.

Rev. John Barclay, D.D., minister, Central Christian Church, Austin, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pause to acknowledge Thy presence, and thank Thee for it. And since no sparrow falls without Thy knowledge, surely no nation can rise without Thy help.

We ask Thy help, guidance, and blessing upon this great body of national leaders, with one of their own now its President. Out of backgrounds of great experiences may they have developed such intelligent good will toward each other and toward the whole Nation and the world that matters of great importance may be done with due dispatch. And may they be inspired by a great, universal upsurge of spiritual and political expectancy in our land.

We thank Thee that our Nation was built on the principle of no caste but character. We are grateful for the way in which this principle has worked out across two centuries to give us a true fluidity which permits true ability to be recognized, elected to places of great trust, and used for the common good.

May new harmony and a cooperative spirit in Government in all its branches, give us a new spiritual power thrust to a more stable and secure world. And may a new sense of dedication come to all our elected officials.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, January 20, 1961, was dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday I stated, for the information of the Senate, that today there would not be a morning hour until after the conclusion of the action of the Senate on the nominations pending. However, after talking with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to request that there now be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, and I also ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention to request, at the conclusion of the morning hour, a quorum call; and on the completion of that call, it is the intention to have the Senate go into executive session, to consider Cabinet nominations.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and submitted a report (No. 6) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the complete reorganization of the entire postal rate structure, (b) the establishment of better service to the public, and (c) the operation of the postal establishment with greater efficiency and economy;

(2) the operation of the Federal employees' group life insurance and health benefits programs to establish their effectiveness and determine the extent of their financial stability; and

(3) the establishment of guidelines to fix boundaries for keeping positions in the career service and for identifying those which clearly should be filled without regard to civil service procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 508. A bill for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman; and

S. 509. A bill for the relief of M. C. Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 510. A bill for the relief of Jordan Tomicic (Giordano Tomicich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Ruben N. and Dorothy A. Bergendoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 512. A bill to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 513. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Acadia* owned by Robert J. Davis of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 514. A bill to increase the amount of goods in transit allowed for visitors to the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Jonas Archiquette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 516. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 517. A bill to amend the laws relating to mortgage insurance, urban renewal, State limitation, and relocation payments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 518. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 with respect to the amount of loans permitted to be made in any State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JOHNSTON, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS TO APPEAR BEFORE DISTRICT COURT FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA AS WITNESSES AND PRODUCE CERTAIN DOCUMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 63) authorizing certain members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida as witnesses and produce certain documents; which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. At the request of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added as a cosponsor to two bills introduced, one introduced as a civil rights package by myself and my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and a number of other Senators. They are S. 479, to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and S. 483, to indefinitely extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin may be added as a cosponsor.

IMPROVEMENT OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO LOANS TO FARMERS AND RANCHERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1961, the names of Senators CARLSON, YOUNG of North Dakota, and BENNETT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 497) to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT on January 17, 1961.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I ask that he be granted leave from the Senate for the next few days because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time let me extend my congratulations to the Vice President, who is now presiding for the first time, and to say that I am extremely happy to see him occupying the chair; and I express the hope that in the years ahead he will have good luck and good fortune, which will be of great benefit and great value to the country as a whole.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is a great honor and privilege, as one of the representatives in this Chamber of the State of Texas, to be here on the first day when a fellow Texan is presiding as Vice President.

The State of Texas now has had the privilege of being the home of two Vice Presidents of this great Nation, the Honorable John Nance Garner, and the present occupant of the chair, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I feel that all the people of Texas are honored by the present distinguished occupant of the chair.

I wish to say that I made a special effort to be here at this time, to see this session of the Senate presided over for the first time by a fellow Texan who made such an outstanding record as majority leader of his party in the Senate, the only Texan ever to be the majority leader of the Senate, and the youngest majority leader in the history of the Senate. We are proud of the distinguished record the Vice President has made and is making at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me concur in the generous sentiments which have been expressed with respect to the distinguished occupant of the chair. Having served here in the opposite chair when our distinguished Presiding Officer conducted the affairs of this body as the majority leader, I have fond recollections of our intimate relationship; and I know that he will preside with distinction, will add prestige and honor to this body, and will acquit himself as a loyal son of the greatest unfrozen State in the Union should.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, it is my great privilege to rise this morning to offer an expression of gratitude that some time ago, when it became my pleasure to serve for a short time in this body, it was with the distinguished occupant of the chair as the then majority leader of the Senate. At that time I expressed my gratitude for his able assistance.

It is now with somewhat the same gratitude that I am privileged again to serve in the Senate and, because of the great confidence and trust that the people of this country have put in the present occupant of the chair, to have him preside over the Senate as our great Vice President.

Mr. President, it is my hope that I may continue to have the privilege of representing our great State and may continue to have the good counsel and advice of the distinguished occupant of the chair. I wish to say in the presence of all our colleagues that we of Texas are extremely grateful for the privilege of providing our Nation with so distinguished a son.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, let me express my sincere congratulations to the distinguished Vice President. We look forward with a great deal of pleasure to his service in this body in his new role.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in wishing the new Vice President, our Presiding Officer, the very best of luck. I am confident that in presiding over our proceedings he will be fair and objective in his rulings, both to the majority and the minority, when their members seek recognition.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, although I must admit frankly that I was not instrumental in the election of our present Presiding Officer to his present office, I am quite sure he realizes my great admiration and affection for him personally, my congratulations to him in his new office, and my assurance to him that he may expect the same heartfelt

cooperation he has always given me in our relationships in the years past. I wish for him a very successful tour of activities, and I know that all of us join in extending him our congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in extending congratulations and best wishes to the Vice President. We have been closely associated in the past, because both of us come from the great Middle West. I have always enjoyed working with the Vice President, and I extend to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I am not in a position to claim any credit for the great victory of the distinguished Senator from Texas, but I join in congratulating him, and I do so heartily. I am glad we shall have in the chair a man who has demonstrated his fairness to us on the Senate floor for so long and so ably as has LYNDON JOHNSON.

I have an affiliation with Texas, as my friend the Vice President knows, because of my son, who lives there, and for that reason, and knowing the admiration the people there hold for the Vice President, I am especially happy to join in congratulating him today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I could not let pass this outpouring of congratulations to the Vice President from this side of the aisle without participating in them. I, too, congratulate the Vice President on the position he has attained, even though it removes him as a participant in the debates which may take place in this Chamber from now on.

I intend to support the Vice President when he is right, and I know he intends to, and probably will, be right most of the time. I will say, however, that I would not take the outpouring of congratulations as being completely indicative of support from this side of the aisle for all of the planks in the Vice President's platform.

In any event, we wish him well in his new position, and I, for one, intend to cooperate with him to the best of my ability.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a very junior Member of this body, I wish to join in imparting congratulations to the new occupant of the chair. As he knows, he caused me a little discomfort in the recent unpleasantness known as the 1960 campaign in upstate New York. He well remembers the incidents which took place up there. He also knows that the junior Senator from New York has had a very strong bond of affection for the present occupant of the chair in the past, which I am sure will continue in the ensuing 4 years.

The junior Senator from New York has been the recipient of many kindnesses and fair and considerate treatment from the present occupant of the chair, for which he expresses appreciation.

I know all of us in this body are proud to see a former Member of this body in the Presiding Officer's chair, and we are proud of the fine qualities of character and leadership which have again and again been evidenced by the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, me, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I offer you my hearty congratulations. You, Mr. President, are a friend of every Member of the Senate. We respect you. We respect you as an American. We respect you as an able member of the Democratic Party. We respect you as a statesman, Mr. President. And the fact that on occasion we, on this side of the aisle, will disagree with your political philosophy has nothing to do with the sentiments we feel for you in our hearts; and we bid you Godspeed as you embark on this new chapter in your career.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I would not want the opening day of the new administration to go by without expressing congratulations on behalf of the people of Oklahoma, a State that has the privilege, and sometimes the peril, of bordering on the north side of Texas. Sometimes we feel that Texans consider us citizens of outer Texas. However, I do wish to express my appreciation of the opportunity to serve with the present distinguished occupant of the chair when he was a leading Member of the House, a Senator, the Senate minority leader, the Senate majority leader, and now as the Vice President.

Although we have frequently had differences of opinion on some issues, his great sense of fairness, his great drive, and his consideration in seeing that all voices were heard and all viewpoints expressed, I think will guard for us for the next 4 years, or the next 8 years, under the guiding hand of the distinguished Vice President who now occupies the chair.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, before the inauguration, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

> In these closing hours of the old administration as one who senses that ahead are challenging problems which must be met head on, I say that we Americans—that is what we are first; not Democrats or Republicans—will back the new administration 100 percent in its solution of the problems that challenge our freedom and our way of life.

You, sir, are a part of the team that is to meet head on, with us, the challenges that will arise.

As I sat here this morning, it was quite a change for me to be looking up into your face, because I used to see you sitting in the chair which the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] now occupies, and I got more acquainted with the back of your head than with your face. [Laughter.]

However, what I wish to compliment you on is that, as the leader of the majority, you performed a fine job. When I was asked about it, I said that I had been here for 22 years, and I had never seen one who occupied the leadership on either side of the aisle who had demonstrated the efficiency and the ability to get things done that characterized you. Besides, you were always friendly through your persistency.

Now, sir, what this world needs is people who will get things done. I understand that your task is not simply that of presiding over this body of Senators; your responsibility has been extended so that it reaches around the world, as it were, in its scope. You will have great opportunity for good—for building a better world.

I wish to join with Senators in wishing you, first, good health. I know you have the ability. I know you have the character. But you need good health. I trust, sir, that in the years which lie ahead you are going to find that what most of us have appreciated is a true joy, that of doing good and giving to the leadership of this world and of this Nation what President Kennedy mentioned yesterday.

We hope that with health will come that joy and sense of accomplishment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there are no two States in the Union which have more in common than the great States of Delaware and Texas. For nearly a century and three-quarters Delaware has been known as the next to the smallest State in the Union. Upon the admission of the State of Alaska Texas joined that distinguished role, as being the next to the largest State.

As a representative of one of those "next to" States, I extend best wishes and congratulations to the Vice President from next to the smallest State.

TRIBUTES TO VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the tributes to Richard M. Nixon for the dedicated service that he gave his Nation as Vice President of the United States for 8 years.

No person ever served more faithfully. No person ever served more efficiently. No person ever gave as much meaning to the position of Vice President as did Richard M. Nixon.

In his return to private life, I wish for him the success that he deserves and the success that I am confident he will attain. I am equally sure that he will return to a public role in the near future.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, after 14 years of service to his country as Congressman, Senator, and Vice President, Richard Nixon is retiring to private life, at least temporarily.

His devotion to his country, and the work he has performed, have been extolled by others whose command of the English language is far better than mine.

I wish, therefore, to speak of another side of Dick Nixon's character, namely, his understanding of people.

In the midst of the problems of state, Mr. President, I have never known Dick Nixon to feel too important or to be too busy to pass the time of day with the people who work in this Capitol.

He has learned to know them as friends, to sympathize with their troubles, and to hope for their successes.

Whenever we have had visitors from home with whom we have met the Vice President in the corridors he has always been glad to meet them and to talk with them in a friendly manner and understandable language.

To paraphrase Kipling, he has demonstrated that he "can talk with crowds

and keep his virtue, or walk with kings—nor lose his common touch."

Finally, Mr. President, Dick Nixon has been solicitous for those around him. When it became apparent that he had lost the election by a hair's breadth, one of his great concerns was for the men and women of his staff. He has done everything possible to make sure that they have not been left stranded by his temporary retirement from official life.

Richard Nixon's ability to keep the common touch, whether in the presence of royalty or in the corridors of this Capitol, marks the caliber of the man.

So, Mr. President, I join my colleagues in wishing our retiring Vice President and his gracious wife, Pat Nixon, a long life in usefulness and happiness in whatever field they may travel together.

COMMENTS OF MRS. DOROTHY E. ROBERTS ON INAUGURATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of Maine's foremost journalists and citizens, Mrs. Dorothy E. Roberts, publisher of the Lincoln County News, has sent me a telegram which makes a great deal of sense. I invite the very close attention and consideration of the Senate to it. It states:

DAMARISCOTTA, MAINE,
January 20, 1961.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a voter I suggest that a bill be introduced in Congress providing for the protection of our leaders. At no time shall those involved in an inaugural be subjected—the President, Vice President, or any other officials—to the rigors of weather. There must be another way. We are after all, intelligent human beings; then protocol is necessary unless it endangers our leaders.

DOROTHY E. ROBERTS.

I am sure that those of us who attended the inaugural ceremony, whether we be of the Congress or of the press, can surely appreciate the observations Mrs. Roberts has made.

THE 137TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF STONEWALL JACKSON—CENTENNIAL OF WAR BETWEEN THE STATES IS COMMEMORATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as the Members of this body—as well as most Americans—are aware, this is the year of our commemoration of the centennial of the War Between the States. This tragic conflict, from which we still bear the scars, continues to maintain a firm hold upon the imagination and stirs strong emotions in the hearts of many.

Though there is no conflict in history which has been subjected to more historical analysis and interpretation, we still find such diversity of opinion that it can be referred to as the "needless war" and the "irrepressible conflict" by equally eminent authorities. On one point, however, there seems to be virtual unanimity of belief: This was one of the few wars in history that really settled a question. It tested the capacity of democracy to endure, and it created a true nation from the welter of conflicting political, cultural, and philosophic loyalties.

It is due, therefore, to this genuine sense of national unity that we can now set aside the former rivalries and extend tribute as a nation to the heroes of both sides. For this reason I draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that today is the 137th anniversary of the birth of one of the men who achieved true greatness in that dreadful conflict.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, known to his men and to posterity as Stonewall, was born on January 21, 1824, in the western region of Virginia, in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., where today lie buried in the Jackson Historical Cemetery the physical remains of his great-grandmother, his father, and a younger sister.

There was little in the early life of this obscure mathematics teacher of the Virginia Military Institute that would have forecast his rise to eminence. Yet he was not only one of the greatest of American military geniuses acknowledged as such by his contemporaries and by history. He also achieved an equal greatness in personal character.

Thus, as we enter again a moment of severe national trial, and as we commemorate later this year the battle at which Stonewall won his name, we must look beyond the cause he served to the man himself. Therein I believe we may read a lesson for all Americans who honor devotion to duty, fidelity of purpose, and unselfish dedication to the common good. For these were the ideals which found one of their purest forms of expression in the life of Stonewall Jackson.

"GOOD NIGHT, MR. PRESIDENT"—POEM BY MISS MATTIE RICHARDS TYLER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Miss Mattie Richards Tyler, past president of the District of Columbia Branch, League of American Pen Women, Inc., a stanch admirer of President Eisenhower throughout the years he has been in the White House, penned a poem entitled "Goodnight, Mr. President," immediately following the President's farewell address on Tuesday night.

The poem appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 19, 1961.

I am sure countless Americans would enjoy reading it and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOODNIGHT, MR. PRESIDENT

Goodnight, our President! Goodnight, Godspeed!
And thank you for your dedicated life,
For always putting first our country's need,
For leading us to victory thru strife.
We cannot gage the sacrifice you made,
Nor even sense the burdens that you bore
In either war or peace, as time's keen blade
Was carving out your name forevermore.
But we can stand in grateful proud salute
Remembering the service that you gave—
A golden record years cannot refute,
A march of honor long beyond the grave.
Goodnight, our President, a well-earned rest,
To you who wore five stars upon your breast.

—*Mattie R. Tyler.*

CONTROL OF WATER RUNOFF AND PRESERVATION OF SOIL—RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas has an outstanding program for the control of water runoff and the preservation of our soil.

The Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts held its annual meeting in Topeka in November of last year and adopted resolutions urging Congress and the Kansas Legislature to take some definite action in order to speed up the work, not only in our State but in the Nation.

Kansas has 46 applications for assistance under Public Law 566, 13 applications covering well over a million acres await priority assignment.

This is some indication of the progress that is being made in our State.

As evidence of the progress that is being made in our State, I call attention to the fact that the project known as Thompsonville was the first Public Law 566 project completed in Kansas and it was the 10th in the United States.

Everyone must agree that our No. 1 problem in Kansas is to keep the water back where it falls. The future growth and development of our State will be determined largely by the amount of water we can conserve for beneficial use.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions adopted by the State association of soil conservation districts be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

Be it resolved, That this convention wishes to thank the Topeka Chamber of Commerce, the Shawnee County SCD board of supervisors and office personnel for their cooperation in making this convention an outstanding success. Also the ministers and speakers.

Be it resolved, That this convention wishes to thank Morrie A. Bolline and his soil conservation service for the fine help they have given us in the past year and offer our services if we can be of any help to them.

We also wish to thank the exhibitors for their fine contribution of exhibits to the success of the convention.

Be it resolved, That we wish to express to the newspapers of Kansas, the TV stations, and the radio stations, our thanks for their cooperation in spreading the news of soil and water conservation.

Be it resolved, That the Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts commend both the Soil Conservation Service and agriculture conservation program service for their continuing effort to simplify operating procedures in assisting cooperators in the installation of conservation practice.

Be it resolved, That the watershed program is essential to development of economic resources of our State. We, therefore, oppose new authorization for dams to be built by the Corps of Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation where such authorization would imperil the opportunity to progress under Public Law 566.

Be it resolved, That we request the Kansas Legislature to consider amendments to the Kansas Watershed District law to:

1. Provide for the annexation of cities, by referendum to extant watershed districts.

2. Provide suitable means for the dissolution of districts.

3. In the event of Public Law 566 assistance (a) provide sufficient information, including cost estimates, in the general plan of the watershed, to enable the watershed district board of directors to formulate the financial policy to be used in the operation of the watershed, and (b) eliminate the provisions of section 24–1216 calling for publication of resolution approving each specific project, right of petition, and election.

Whereas of the 46 applications for assistance under Public Law 566, filed in Kansas, 13 applications covering well over a million acres await priority assignment (which is usually made when means of planning can be anticipated): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Legislature be urged to appropriate to the State soil conservation committee a sum of $180,000 to be used to further the completion of watershed plans, necessary to secure authorization for completing of watershed projects.

Whereas present indications are that 12 watershed work plans, involving more than 1 million acres, involving about $20 million of Federal cost, will be seeking Federal authorization for operations in the next year. Our representatives and senators be informed of the pending needs for Kansas watersheds and urge their support for additional funds for the watershed program: Be it

Resolved, That Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts is opposed to any amendment of Public Law 566 permitting the assumption of the contracting obligation of local sponsors by an agency of the Federal Government.

KASCD favors extension of the principles embodied in the Great Plains conservation program to the watershed program.

Be it resolved, That the State highway department and local county engineers and commissioners cooperating with soil conservation districts be commended for their efforts in cooperating with projects that can involve both roads and soil conservation projects. We urge other counties and townships to cooperate on such projects.

Be it resolved, That each soil conservation district interview elected Representatives and Senators and find out how they stand on soil and water conservation. This information be sent to the president of the State association and this information put in a newsletter to the supervisors.

Be it resolved, That each soil conservation district board of supervisors make an effort to meet with the ministers and teachers of their district and tell the story of conservation so that they will help us reach more people in the State of Kansas and the soil conservation districts still offer scholarships to teachers.

Be it resolved, That this convention requests the Governor to put in his budget request for 1962, the amount of $157,500 for the use of soil conservation districts. This amount to be divided equally among the 105 districts in Kansas.

Federal: As Congress does appropriate the funds to operate the Soil Conservation Service and as the demand for technical help to serve the soil conservation districts in Kansas is greater than can be supplied by the Soil Conservation Service, due to the limitations of the conservation operation budget.

It is resolved, That Congress increase the conservation operation budget to the Soil Conservation Service in order to provide the county soil conservation districts in Kansas more technical help. It is further resolved to facilitate an efficiency in the handling of SCS and ACP budgetary matters that the 5 percent ACP transfer funds be eliminated altogether and that this differential of money be made a direct transfer of Federal appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service; that a request be made to the State legislative council to make a concerted study of the problems of the business of soil conservation in Kansas, and in particular, to better help understand the problems of the county soil conservation districts, both financially and operational; to study all phases of soil treatment and make long term projections of future needs as to help solve the time lag problem of getting the job done; to study what other State governments are doing with similar problems; and to make formulative suggestions in the form of recommendations to the State soil conservation committee, to the Kansas Legislature, and to the Governor.

County: It was resolved that chapter 2, section 1907B of the 1957 supplement to the soil conservation district law, which provides for county commissioners to grant clerical assistance to supervisors in the county soil conservation districts, be amended to read that the board of county commissioners may from time to time at their discretion and upon request of the county supervisors furnish to the county district a sufficient amount of money to hire needed technical help and/or to defray the general operative expenses of the county district. That it should also provide and authorize the board of county commissioners to levy up to one-half mill of total tangible tax per annum to cover such an appropriation of money if such action is necessary. That any and all employee or employees coming under this type of county fund appropriation be responsible administratively to the county soil conservation district and/or to the county commissioners.

Be it resolved, That the county ASC committees process and administer the payment of cost shares for practices completed under the Great Plains conservation program contracts after certification by SCS designated technicians.

Be it resolved, That the Kansas Great Plains Action Committee call a meeting of all agricultural agencies from a State level and other interested groups to develop a plan of action to increase active participation at all levels of the Great Plains conservation program.

THE LATE DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the United States and mankind everywhere suffered an extreme loss on January 18 when Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, only 34 years old, died of cancer in a New York hospital. Dr. Tom Dooley, as he was known, was a famed humanitarian who set up hospitals to combat disease in the jungles of Laos.

Dr. Dooley was born in St. Louis, Mo., on January 17, 1927. He attended St. Louis University High School and after a tour in the Navy returned to St. Louis University School of Medicine where he received his doctor of medicine degree in March 1953. One year later after he had again joined the Navy, Dr. Dooley gained international fame as the only medical officer to care for some 2,000 northern Vietnamese refugees. The problem of feeding and providing sanitary facilities for such a large number are described by the doctor in his book, "Deliver Us From Evil."

That same year Dr. Dooley was transferred to the port city of Haiphong. In the 8 months that he served in that city before it fell to the Communist Viet Minh, Dr. Dooley's camps cared for more than 600,000 refugees.

In 1956 Dr. Dooley resigned from the Navy to establish a small private medical mobile unit which he took with him to Laos. This private medical unit was known as Medico and, according to Life magazine, it would never have succeeded without Dr. Dooley as "the sparkplug and chief asset."

In summing up the achievements of Dr. Tom Dooley I would like to repeat the words of my distinguished colleague, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, when he said in part in 1956:

> If the United States had abroad more ambassadors like Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, I think it not only would be better off, but would be better understood in the countries which are underdeveloped and which need understanding at this time.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 43 years ago tomorrow, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people gained their freedom by proclaiming independence from czarist Russia and by establishing the Ukrainian Republic. The foundation of the democratic Ukrainian Republic was the culmination of a long struggle that began in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were first brought under the autocratic Russian regime. But the joys of freedom were short lived in the new Republic. Late in 1920 Communist forces invaded that fair land. And for the last 41 years the heel of Communist tyranny has lain heavy over the freedom-loving peoples of the Ukraine.

As one of the cosponsors of the captive nations resolution, I recognized that the Ukraine was among those captive nations enslaved by the force of Soviet arms alone against the wishes of the inhabitants of the Ukrainian nation. This resolution was a vivid reminder to the whole world of the infamy of Soviet imperialism.

But despite four decades of hardships and privations and of indescribable misery, the spirit of hope and freedom is not dead in the Ukraine. It is my fervent hope that the dreams of Ukrainians the world over can someday be realized. In memory of this anniversary of past independence and in sorrow and grief for the freedom that was only too brief, I offer this tribute to Ukrainians everywhere. On this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, I extend my warm and wholehearted sympathy and my very best wishes to a fine and courageous people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session, in order to proceed to the consideration of nominations sent to this body by the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[Ex. No. 1]

Aiken	Fong	Monroney
Allott	Fulbright	Morse
Anderson	Goldwater	Morton
Bartlett	Gore	Moss
Bennett	Gruening	Mundt
Bible	Hart	Muskie
Blakley	Hayden	Neuberger
Bogga	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Hickey	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cannon	Javits	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston	Scott
Carroll	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	
Ervin	Miller	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent in the State because of a death.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate certain nominations received from the President of the United States and asks the clerk to read them.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Dean Rusk, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert S. McNamara, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney General.

J. Edward Day, of California, to be Postmaster General.

Stewart Lee Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Luther H. Hodges, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Labor.

Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has some remarks to make on certain nominations. It is my further understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] likewise has a statement to make. The distinguished minority leader has been trying to establish contact with the Senator from New Hampshire. So we express the hope that these two Senators and other Senators who wish to speak on any of these nominations will be allowed that privilege before the vote is taken.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in considering the nominations for Cabinet posts and various subcabinet positions, several observations are in order:

First, some of the men named are outstanding.

Second, others are what might be termed "satisfactory" appointments.

But, third, there are others that leave plenty of room for doubt.

In fact, there could be, and are, deep reservations about some of them.

In one case, for example, a man who will handle a multibillion dollar budget apparently has no experience in this field.

However, the Constitution does not give the Senate the power of appointment. Our responsibility is to advise and consent. Therefore, as this principle might be understood, it is not a question of whether or not the President nominates a man whom I would nominate, or whom other Senators would nominate.

It should be noted for the record that some members of the majority party may not agree with my understanding of this principle.

For example, Senators will recall the summary rejection of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, a man of high character and qualifications, who was nominated by the President of the United States for Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

Again for the record, it is recalled that the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, who now seeks the Senate's advice and consent on his own nominations, voted against Admiral Strauss, and against the principle I have just outlined.

But apart from constitutional law, and notwithstanding the fact that the Democratic majority turned thumbs down on Admiral Strauss on very shaky grounds, the President's choices should not be limited beyond the following bounds:

One, is the nominee a loyal American?

Two, is he a man of good character?

Three, is he free from conflicts of interest?

Four, in the judgment of a Senator and based on a Senator's own conscience and individual decision, does the nominee hold views that are, or are not, compatible to the interests of this country?

Mr. President, it may be that even at this late hour many members of my party have not fully made up their minds to vote for or against some of these nominations. But if we vote to confirm some of them, or all of them, it does not mean that the party of which I am a member necessarily approves of the nominees from the standpoint of their experience, capabilities, their views, and their probable performance. It merely means that, as a matter of principle, we are upholding the theory of the advise and consent clause of the Constitution as we understand it.

Unless there is conclusive evidence to the contrary, the President, of course, should be given the benefit of any doubt.

But should his judgment later prove to be faulty, the official must, and will, be called to account.

And the President himself must bear the responsibility.

Those are some of my theories on the matter of confirmation of some of the principal posts in this Nation, and the basis of my understanding of the advice-and-consent clause.

NOMINATION OF DEAN RUSK TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination of Mr. Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State? The Chair hears none. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate, but I wish to say one word about the nominee, since the position of Secretary of State is one of the most important positions in our Government today. The committee held a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Rusk. He was subjected to considerable questioning, and I thought he answered the questions very satisfactorily. I believe he is an eminently qualified man by education and experience. I believe the Senate and the people of this country can rest assured that the affairs of the Department over which he will preside are in competent and worthy hands, and there is no need for any worriment on the part of anyone as to his nomination. I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination of Dean Rusk as Secretary of State.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am very happy to support the nomination of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State. I trust the nomination will be approved by the Senate without any dissenting votes.

I knew Dean Rusk when he was in the State Department a few years ago; and to the best of my knowledge he performed excellent and conscientious service at that time. I have confidence that he will continue to give equally loyal and efficient service as head of the Department in which he once worked. It gives me great pleasure to join the Senator

from Arkansas in supporting the nomination of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to endorse every word that the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and other members of the committee have just said about the nomination of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State.

I believe the new President of the United States has nominated a truly great team of statesmen to represent us in our foreign policy in the trying years immediately ahead, with Dean Rusk as Secretary of State, Adlai Stevenson as head of our delegation at the United Nations, Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of State, Mr. Williams in charge of African affairs, and Mr. Harriman as Ambassador at Large, so to speak. I think we have cause for great rejoicing in respect to the great decisions our new President has made in selecting the officers who will have charge of American foreign policy. I know very well that the President of the United States had the benefit of the advice and sage counsel of the Vice President of the United States. I take this opportunity to commend both of these great leaders of our Government in these excellent nominations in respect to our foreign policy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dean Rusk, a New Yorker, is a friend of mine of many years' standing. I have one other bit of testimony which might interest the Senate. He has worked very closely with me and with others, especially in the private economic center with respect to the work of NATO, in which we have participated together as far as the NATO parliamentarians are concerned.

I believe he has one advantage to commend him to the country which should be noted. We all know that the foreign policy of our Nation, especially at a time of such critical danger, is heavily rooted in bipartisanship. I know of few men who are as well equipped as Dean Rusk to carry on the foreign policy in a spirit of consultation, and in a spirit of getting the best of the ideas and suggestions of all Americans, including all of us in the Congress, whatever may be our party designation.

Dean Rusk has one other gift, and I have seen him exercise it many times. He knows how to make an amalgam of ideas so it is not merely a potpourri or hash, but is a coordinated policy of drawing freely and judiciously upon the views of men of differing views. I think this is a nomination which rises far above party, as indeed it should, in respect of the office which is being discussed. It happens that I have had these personal experiences with Dean Rusk. I think he will serve our country and the free world superbly well in this critically important job. Like my distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] I hope the Senate will approve the nomination without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I, too, wish to say a word about Dean Rusk, who is a New Yorker. He is a personal friend of mine. I served with him in the Army. He performed brilliantly there. He is a man who is full of good ideas. He was a most valuable staff officer for that reason. Certainly, new and imaginative ideas are always necessary in the Department of State. I look forward to brilliant service by him in the Department of State, and commend Dean Rusk to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I am delighted to see come before the Senate for confirmation the appointment of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State. I believe that every Senator who heard Dean Rusk's statements and his answers to questions put to him by members of the Foreign Relations Committee must have been impressed with the type of performance that we expect to have while he holds the high office of Secretary of State.

I have had the privilege of knowing Dean Rusk for a good many years. In 1950 I had the privilege of serving in the United Nations. Dean Rusk, functioning in the capacity of Assistant Secretary of State at that time, was very closely connected with the United Nations work. He was one of our principal advisers.

While we were formulating the Japanese Peace Treaty and seeking its approval I had a great deal of experience with him. As every Senator knows, the consummation of that treaty was a difficult job to execute. The work was led by the late John Foster Dulles, who had been commissioned by former President Truman to formulate the Japanese Peace Treaty. Dean Rusk at that time was Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. I was chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. I had occasion to work closely with him in the formulation of the treaty, and later I worked with him in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference at San Francisco.

I became impressed with the man, with his capacity, and with his way of getting things done. I think we will have a great Secretary of State. I hope the Senate will vote to give overwhelming approval to his nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Dean Rusk as Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS DILLON TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. Douglas Dillon has had long experience in many positions in Government. He has served as our Ambassador to France, as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, as Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and as Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Dillon was interrogated very fully by the members of the Committee on Finance. He made a very favorable impression upon the committee, and he received the unanimous vote of the committee in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. I hope the Senate will approve his nomination.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it was my privilege as a member of the Committee on Finance to hear the testimony Mr. Dillon gave in connection with his nomination as Secretary of the Treasury, as well as the other testimony.

I believe that Mr. Dillon's experience well qualifies him for his position, both at home and abroad, in financial circles. In my judgment he will be a great asset to our Government in the critical time in which we find ourselves with reference to international economics, and with reference to the unfavorable balance of payments in our international trade, with its resulting drain of our gold reserves. In my judgment Mr. Dillon will be an able Secretary of the Treasury for this administration in all aspects of the work of his department, especially in connection with those relating to the subjects to which I have referred.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish very briefly to say that I fully concur in the views expressed by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in stating the qualifications of Mr. Douglas Dillon as Secretary of the Treasury. It has been my privilege to know Mr. Dillon over a long period of time, commencing some years before he became connected with the Department of State. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have heard his testimony on a number of occasions, primarily on the mutual security program, which at one time he headed.

The new Secretary of the Treasury in the years to come will face, in my opinion, one of the most difficult tasks any Secretary of the Treasury has confronted in recent years. When I was informed that he would be appointed, I told him that he would face a difficult condition, and an almost impossible one, unless the new President would give priority to a stable dollar. Mr. Dillon told me that the new President had promised to do that.

On next Monday, or when next we meet after today, following the morning hour, when I am recognized, I shall discuss the budgetary problems which confront this Nation, especially with respect to the terrific drain upon the diminishing gold supply we are now experiencing, coupled, as it is, with the speculation that is taking place on the London Exchange in the supply of gold.

I am glad to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Dillion's nomination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as a new member of the Committee on Fi-

nance, I was pleased to vote in committee to confirm the nomination of Douglas Dillon. Of course, I had observed his work for a number of years when he was Under Secretary of State, and also when he was Ambassador to France. Mr. Dillon brings to his new position a wide and profound understanding of our international relations. One of the best aspects of his appointment is that it brings into the Treasury someone who is acutely aware of international relations, and who understands them. I think that is altogether appropriate. In the past there has been too much compartmentalization of our policy, with the Secretary of the Treasury looking only to his comparatively limited field relating to financial matters, ignoring the implications of the Department's policies in our international relations.

Therefore, the appointment of Mr. Dillon is an extremely fortunate one. By his experience and knowledge of international relations, political relations, economic relations, and financial matters, Mr. Dillon will make an excellent Secretary of the Treasury.

I hope the Senate will confirm his nomination.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the country and the new administration are fortunate that Douglas Dillon has agreed to serve as Secretary of the Treasury and to accept the responsibilities and burdens that go with that high office. I know it was a difficult decision, in view of the political overtones involved.

I am glad that he has accepted. I am sure that I echo the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

I happened to be an officer in the State Department during the time that Mr. Dillon served as Ambassador to France. Those were difficult years. In the termination of the Korean war we were daily in consultation with our allies, including France. Then came the Indochina situation in which France had the primary interest. Those were trying weeks and months, and throughout that time Douglas Dillon was of great help to President Eisenhower as our Ambassador in Paris. He was our Ambassador to France during the strenuous and trying times of the Suez crisis in 1956. Later he returned to the Department of State, and since then has rendered distinguished service there. During his duty in Paris I believe that one of the reasons he was so successful was that his charming and gracious lady, Phillis Dillon was with him. She made a place for herself in Paris and was, indeed, as effective as he in fostering the cordiality and effectiveness of relations between the United States and France.

I wish him well in his new undertaking. Again I say that we are indeed fortunate in the appointment of Douglas Dillon.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear the remarks of the able Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Republican National Committee, in speaking in favor of the approval of the appointment, and the acceptance of it by Mr. Dillon, because, as he has pointed out, this was a very difficult decision for him to make because of the politics involved.

I feel that Mr. Dillon brings to this office at a very critical time unusual personal equipment. Our problems today are worldwide problems, and Mr. Dillon brings to the Treasury a personality who knows the world and who is favorably known throughout the world.

It is no doubt for that reason that President Kennedy persuaded him to take the position of Secretary of the Treasury; offered him the position, is, perhaps, the better way to put it. I am very glad that Mr. Dillon accepted the offer. I have high hopes for his giving that office a successful administration, because he has the requisite equipment and experience, covering many years, and particularly the last 8 years, qualifying him to be a successful Secretary of the Treasury, under difficult conditions.

There has been some political criticism that Mr. Dillon should not have accepted the position because to do so would be to help to pull chestnuts out of the fire for the Democrats. My observation on that point is that the chestnuts are also ours. A great many of them are ours. If Mr. Dillon can pull them out of the fire, he will be pulling them out for everyone, not merely for the Democrats.

I believe that if Mr. Dillon becomes the successful Secretary of the Treasury which I expect him to be, he will reflect credit not only on the President who appointed him, but also on his own party, which he has served well for many years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Connecticut alluded to some adverse political repercussions as a result of the appointment of and also the acceptance by Mr. Dillon.

First, I feel certain that, contrary to some of the reports which have appeared in the press, his nomination had the approval of the former President of the United States, because he cleared the proposal with President Eisenhower.

Second, there is precedent for such a nomination, because in 1940 the incumbent President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, appointed Frank Knox, of Chicago, the publisher of the Chicago Daily News, to the position of Secretary of the Navy, and Henry L. Stimson to the office of Secretary of War. So there is precedent for reaching over into the other party.

I might say that I believe this nomination is a tribute to the fact that there is some talent and some brilliance in the Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not greatly concerned about any political implications that may be present in the nomination of Mr. Douglas Dillon to this highly important post in our Government at one of the most critical times in the history of our Nation.

I am impressed with his tremendous background in the field of finance. I have been most impressed by his willingness to continue to recognize our important domestic economic problems, even when he was serving as one of the top officials in the Department of State, which too frequently takes but small note of our domestic economic situation.

In his frequent appearances before the Committee on Appropriations, I have found Mr. Dillon to be most conversant with our domestic situation financially. He has been most anxious about the preservation of our financial solvency and just as deeply concerned from that standpoint as any other public servant who has appeared before our committee.

I should like to mention two particular fields in which he has impressed me greatly along the lines I have mentioned. First, in his appearances in behalf of the Development Loan Fund, which is an important adjunct of the mutual assistance program, he has shown always an understanding that if we can lend to other nations on any kind of reasonable basis, that course is sounder from the standpoint of protecting our own economy and our own people than to grant or to give.

Second—and this point especially I should like to have appear in the RECORD—he has been more helpful than any other leading member of the Department of State in trying to assist the producers of perishable fruits and those who, from the perishable fruits, produce dried, canned, and concentrated fruits and juices, in the retaking or regaining of foreign markets which we had before World War II, but which we have had great difficulty in retaking since that time.

Mr. Dillon has been a most helpful member of the State Department in assisting the great fruit-producing regions of the Nation—of the west coast, of the Southeast, of Virginia, of New York, and the other areas which are such heavy producers of apples, citrus, prunes, raisins, and other fruits. He has been the most helpful member of the State Department in trying to help the United States regain its access to foreign markets which want our products, but have not been able to get them because of troubles in the very field of exchange and finance with which he will have so much to do in his new post.

I strongly approve the selection of Mr. Dillon. I hope the Senate will overwhelmingly approve his nomination.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, certainly it is not strange that the senior Senator from New Jersey should rise to approve the nomination of Douglas Dillon as Secretary of the Treasury. What has been said about him is altogether true. The reason why he appeals so strongly to everyone with whom he comes in contact is due to a very simple combination which, unfortunately, is not found generally in public figures. First is his tremendously broad vision and understanding of world problems in the large. But coupled with that—and there things do not always, unfortunately, go together—is his understanding also of the facts, of the implications, of the particular moves and their relationship, not only to the world scene, but also to individuals in this country who are affected by the moves in international and national affairs.

The reason why this combination exists in Doug Dillon is, of course, his

broad experience and his wide knowledge gained in academic fields, gained in practical, private life, gained in a long period of public service, plus, most important, the fact that he works at his job and always has done so. He does not rely on generalities handed to him by someone else. He gets down to the facts of every situation and knows what he is doing.

In addition to my own personal gratification at the continued recognition of a warm personal friend, I am pledged, as a representative from the great State of New Jersey, by the recognition given to a native son. I congratulate the President of the United States in the selection of a man who, better than any others I can think of, will perform his tasks as Secretary of the Treasury in the most effective way for the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not add to what has been said by other Senators about Douglas Dillon when I speak of his exceptional background, experience, great capacity for work, and broad abilities—attributes which fit him uniquely for the office of Secretary of the Treasury.

I have known Douglas Dillon for 8 years. In addition to the attributes of which I have spoken, he has the necessary quality of a great public servant and statesman—a devotion to country which leads him to serve our country, and particularly at a time when grave problems confront the Nation.

It is a tribute to the man that when he was asked by President Kennedy to accept this nomination he knew his duty. His duty was to serve our country. He accepted the nomination, the country approves him, and he will succeed as Secretary of the Treasury for the country as he has in the other offices he has held.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with other Senators in their very high commendation of the nomination of Douglas Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I had the privilege of serving as delegates to the Bogotá Conference in September under the very brilliant and able leadership of Mr. Dillon, who was then Under Secretary of State. I wish all my other colleagues in the Senate had had the opportunity to see the brilliant performance of Mr. Dillon in Bogotá, at a conference that was very critical. If so, they, too, would have shared the viewpoint that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I expressed to each other on that occasion, namely, that he made us exceedingly proud to be Americans. At the Conference there was great concern about what the outcome would be, because our relationships with Latin America had been deteriorating for so long a time. I wish to say that that Conference was probably the best one on Latin American and inter-American affairs in which we have ever engaged, and most of the credit for it goes to the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon.

When I returned from the Conference, in September, I said that in case my party were to win the election on November 8, I hoped the new Democratic President would see to it that that brilliant Under Secretary of State would be kept in the public service.

It is true that at that time I was thinking of him in connection with foreign affairs, and it is true that my suggestion was made in regard to an appointment in the State Department. But, Mr. President, he is equally qualified to serve the new administration as Secretary of the Treasury.

I wish particularly to express the nonpartisan aspect of the appointment. I have heard it said by partisans in both political parties that from a partisan standpoint the appointment is a mistake. I completely disagree with that point of view. In my judgment, when a President of the United States has the solemn responsibility of nominating those to serve in high positions in our Government, we should recognize that he has the duty to select those whom he believes are the best ones to perform that service. And if he finds, when he comes to make a selection for service in a post as critical as this one, that the man he would like to select for that service belongs to the opposition party, I believe he should appoint him, regardless of any political overtones.

I heartily approve this appointment because I know Douglas Dillon well enough, and the record will show that when he first appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee and when at that time I had an opportunity to observe his brilliant mind at work, I then made a somewhat lengthy statement, for the record, of my appreciation of the opportunity to see so brilliant a mind functioning in behalf of all the American people, regardless of political alinement. Mr. President, I feel the same way about his appointment to be Secretary of the Treasury.

I close these remarks by saying that Mr. Dillon is a living example, in my judgment, of an undeniable fact which should never be forgotten in connection with the administration of government; namely, that there is no substitute for brains in the public service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the distinguished chairman of our committee in endorsing the appointment of Mr. Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury. The nomination received the unanimous approval of our committee. I believe that fact was due to the forthright answers Mr. Dillon gave to certain questions. For example, he emphasized that he believed in the complete and continued independence of the Federal Reserve System. He emphasized that under no circumstances should the executive branch or the Secretary of the Treasury try to dictate the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. That was a very important statement in the light of some earlier statements that had been made during the recent campaign. Likewise he said he believed it very important that the stability of the U.S. dollar be maintained, and as an important part of that objective he insisted that our Government continue to live within its income. I heartily endorse that statement. He emphasized that it is most important to balance the budget. Mr. Dillon made it clear that, if necessary, he would ask the Congress to raise the ceiling on the interest rates on long-term Government bonds, as has been requested by the previous Secretary of the Treasury. It was a serious mistake when Congress last year rejected this proposal.

So I am very glad that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle now recognize, even though somewhat belatedly, the importance of that sound position; and I hope that that next request for the removal of this ceiling on interest rates will be supported by all Members of the Senate. It is most significant that the Senate is today confirming as Secretary of the Treasury a man who takes such a strong position in defending and supporting the sound monetary policies of the Eisenhower administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas Dillon to be Secretary of the Treasury? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Douglas Dillon as Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. M'NAMARA TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert S. McNamara to be Secretary of Defense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot deliver any lengthy testimonial about the characteristics of Mr. McNamara, based on personal knowledge, because I did not have the privilege of meeting him until after President Kennedy had selected him for this very important post. However, over the past several weeks I have had an opportunity to be with Mr. McNamara on a number of occasions, and I must say that I have been most favorably impressed with his ability and with his dedicated approach to the vast responsibilities that will be his as Secretary of Defense. He has an active and retentive mind and a prodigious capacity for work.

When Mr. McNamara was before the committee, I asked him how long he intended to serve in this position. I was advised that he intended to serve for as long as President Kennedy wished him to serve.

Mr. President, in view of some of the statements which heretofore have emanated from the executive branch of the Government, intended to halter the high echelons of the commissioned personnel from giving very frank and unvarnished views to the Congress on matters affecting the Defense Department, I asked Mr. McNamara whether he believed that the congressional committees and the Congress, in the discharge of their constitutional responsibilities for the national defense, should be permitted to

get the frank, unbiased, and uninfluenced views of our Chiefs of Staff and their commissioned personnel, when considering defense matters. He assured the committee that he felt the Congress should have unrestrained information from the commissioned officers in the Department. I am confident that there will be no intimidation—direct or indirect—of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, during the period in which he serves as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I have very high hopes in regard to Mr. McNamara's services in the Department of Defense. Indeed, I believe, and am firmly convinced, that he will make an outstanding Secretary of Defense.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for their action on this nomination. I think there is a very delicate and very difficult problem when a distinguished nominee, such as Mr. McNamara, comes before a Senate committee when a conflict of interest is involved. It was particularly difficult in this case, because the nominee has made perhaps the greatest sacrifice that anyone has made in such a connection in a long time. I thought the matter was handled with great tact and good sense and complete compliance with the law, thanks to the diligence and the wisdom of these two Senators; and I wish to commend them for their attitude. This is not to say that I necessarily approve of the law as drafted. But it is now the law. Such laws can be applied and sometimes have been applied, by the Senate, at least in some respects in a discriminatory way. In this case both these Senators deserve our highest commendation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his comment. The interpretations of the statute with respect to conflicts that have been followed by the Senate Committee on Armed Services have been quite drastic; indeed, in many cases have been quite harsh.

I do not think a different rule should be applied to one individual than is applied to another. Mr. McNamara told the committee he would do everything necessary to meet the requirements. We in the committee wrestled for some time with the matter, and we decided we could not apply one rule to a man who had come from the presidency of General Motors and another to one who had come from the presidency of Ford Motor Co., even though they might be appointed by Presidents of different parties. We felt that, whether the rule was harsh or whether it was in the public interest, exactly the same standards must apply.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is true that in passing judgment on the qualifications of a Secretary of Defense, the Armed Services Committee handles that subject; but the money used to carry on its functions comes from money made available to him, and I happen to be Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles $41 billion for defense.

I saw Mr. McNamara. I had not met him before. I have full confidence that he will do the right thing for this Nation's security with the dollars provided by the Congress of the United States. I have great confidence in him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. McNamara before his appointment, but I have read of his record as an individual and how he has conducted his life. I had quite a number of questions of him in my private office, and I also listened to his testimony before the committee. I am confident he will make an excellent Secretary of Defense who will take the opportunity, when it is necessary, to have a civilian lead the Department of Defense, and who will consult with the officials of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, get the best military advice, and then make his own decision as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. McNamara made a fine appearance before our committee. He also showed great self-sacrifice and a great public spirit in divesting himself of those securities which he owned which could result in a conflict in his decisions and in his responsibilities as Secretary of Defense.

I am glad to join the chairman of the committee in recommending confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McNamara as Secretary of Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Robert S. McNamara as Secretary of Defense?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney General.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to state that we held hearings on the nomination of Mr. Kennedy to be Attorney General. It was the unanimous judgment of that committee, of those members present that his nomination be confirmed.

Mr. President, Mr. Kennedy, as most Members of the Senate know, has a fine legal mind, he is sincere, his personal life is clean; and it is the judgment of the committee that he is qualified in every respect for this appointment.

Bob Kennedy is possessed of the intelligence, the educational background, and the training and experience to make a most able and capable Attorney General. For an Attorney General, legal experience acquired in Government service is of equal importance, if not more so, than that acquired by a lawyer in the private practice of law.

He has had broad and practical experience in many phases of Government service. I do not think there is any man who has ever worked as counsel for a committee of the Congress who has done a more outstanding job than Robert Kennedy. And no man has worked harder at his jobs than has Robert Kennedy. He was never given an assignment that he did not fulfill with credit above and beyond the call of duty.

Questions were asked in the hearings about a possible conflict of interest. He testified that he had divested himself of all his personal holdings of which he could divest himself. These holdings were converted into United States, State, and municipal bonds. There are three trusts, in which he has a small interest, which were set up by his father many years ago. In these trusts he cannot appoint the trustee and has no control over how the money is invested. From a financial standpoint his situation presents not even the slightest question of conflict of interest.

Mr. Kennedy is a man of unimpeachable integrity and, in my judgment, is qualified in every respect to be an outstanding Attorney General of the United States. I hope the Senate will vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not think any lengthy statement from me on this nomination is necessary. I do not know that I need to say anything in behalf of this nominee, because he is so well known to all of us. His record is one with which we are all familiar, and which I am sure we all approve.

But, I do wish, while his confirmation is before us, to make some brief comments for the RECORD. Mr. President, I believe I know this nominee personally as well as any one of my colleagues of the Senate, and possibly I know him much better than most Senators. I have had 7 years of the most intimate professional and official relationships with him when, while as chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, and later as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, he served in the most responsible position as chief counsel of these major investigating committees. Thus, during those years of intense labor and arduous duties I observed him—his vigor, his skill, and his courage—under almost every circumstance which would serve as a test of his ability and of his qualities. I can say to Senators without any reservations whatsoever that as chief counsel of those committees—particularly of the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations—he did a magnificent job of supervising and directing the staff, and performed a service which was outstanding.

Mr. President, the assignments given to the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, its functions and its duties, were the most tedious, delicate, difficult, and possibly the most dangerous of any assignments ever committed to a committee of the Congress of the United States. It took real mettle, stamina, quality, intellect, and courage on the part of the chief counsel to meet and to discharge the important responsibilities which were incumbent upon him in that capacity.

As an organizer, coordinator, supervisor, and director, the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy demonstrated beyond question superb qualities both of administration and of executive leadership. And I may add, he demonstrated professional ability which convinced me beyond all doubt that he is capable of making a great Attorney General.

Mr. President, I know—I assert without the slightest doubt or reservation—that Robert Kennedy is possessed of unusual wisdom, judgment, and powers of discretion; and that his vigor, courage, and intellect, in my opinion, are unexcelled. He can be, and I believe he will be, a great asset to the new administration, and he can be, and he will be, a great public servant. I hope his nomination will be unanimously confirmed by this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas in what he has said about the Honorable Robert Kennedy, whose nomination to be Attorney General is now before the Senate for confirmation.

Robert Kennedy is a man of great integrity, of great ability, of great courage, and of great dedication. I think he has been tried in the fire and found not wanting. His record as the chief counsel of the committees enumerated by the Senator from Arkansas certainly, to us in this body, brings home the man's outstanding characteristics and his great abilities. I join with the Senator from Arkansas, who perhaps knows him more closely and better than any other Member of this body, in urging that we approve the nomination of Robert Kennedy to be Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as one who served on the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and also upon the select committee which studied the labor-management field, I had the privilege of sitting beside the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the chief counsel of those committees, Robert F. Kennedy. As a result of my experience on those committees and my observation of the very fine and devoted work which Robert F. Kennedy did as their chief counsel, I wish to associate myself in full measure with the statements made by the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the two committees.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy to be Attorney General of the United States.

It is difficult to do this in the face of the words of such a man as the senior Senator from Arknasas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in particular and the words of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who have spoken, for whom I have a high degree of respect, not only individually but also because of their professional attainments.

However, Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligation to my constituents and I would be remiss in my obligation to myself if I did not point out, in a few words, how I feel about this, and record my vote, whether it be the only one or not, in opposition to the appointment.

First of all, Mr. President, I agree generally with the criteria and the standards which were enunciated by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] a few minutes ago. In the 6 years I have been in the Senate I have seen many of my colleagues across the aisle advise and consent to nominations by then President Eisenhower, with respect to some of which, I am sure, they were not enthused. I do not take my position on the pending nomination simply because I lack enthusiasm.

I do not do this because Robert Kennedy is an extremely young man, because I can remember, as a young lawyer, having all of these charges regarding youth thrown at me also at that time.

I do not oppose the nomination on the basis of nepotism, although I would say that nepotism is not confined solely to those who give relatives positions and thus enhance their financial position in the world. From the record this young man appears to be a man of rather considerable wealth, which is a fact of common knowledge, I believe; so that question does not arise.

So far as the question of nepotism is concerned, although this would not cause me to cast my vote against the nomination, the mere closeness of the association of the President and the Attorney General may come to vex them and perhaps to vex the country in times to come and to destroy some of the objectivity which should exist in such a situation.

I have read the transcript of the hearing very carefully. I now wish to read into the RECORD a few parts of that transcript which I think are very pertinent. The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], our minority leader, read into the RECORD a quotation from the New York Times of December 20, which I think is the gist of this issue:

> If Robert Kennedy was one of the outstanding lawyers of the country, a preeminent legal philosopher, a noted prosecutor or legal officer at Federal or State level, the situation would be different, but his experience as counsel to the McClellan committee, notably successful as he is, is surely insufficient to warrant his present appointment.

With that quotation I agree completely.

Later in the hearing the minority leader asked the nominee certain questions about his experience, and after eliciting the information that he did his undergraduate work at Harvard, he also elicited the information that he graduated from the Virginia School of Law in 1951, that he had had service in the U.S. Navy, and that he was for a short time correspondent for the Boston Post. The Senator from Illinois then said:

> Senator DIRKSEN. You then took the bar examination and passed the bar of the State of Massachusetts, and unless there was some hiatus there, you then came back to Washington and for a period of 7 months you were in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. I traveled around the world with President Kennedy at that time, 1951, and then I came to work in the Department of Justice, I believe, in September of 1951.
>
> I left in May of 1952, I believe, around then.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN. So, roughly, you did have about 7 months of service?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN. Let me ask this question:
>
> After you were admitted to the bar, did you ever open a law office or did you ever associate yourself with any law firm?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. I have always been interested in working for the Government. I have always been interested in the Government, and after I graduated from law school, after I took this trip, I went to work for the Government immediately.
>
> I have worked for the Government ever since.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN. And then a corollary question:
>
> Did you ever actively practice law in any State court of record?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. I did not.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN. Did you ever practice law in any Federal court?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. No.
>
> I handled some cases before grand juries for the Department of Justice, Senator.

Those cases were referred to in a later statement of the nominee as certain cases before the grand jury in the city of New York, I believe.

He later enumerated his experiences in the various committees of the Senate and the House, and then said:

> I then participated in a—I wrote a book on the work of that committee and then I participated in a political campaign, and now I am here.

Later in the hearing the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] brought up, I think very properly, the question as to whether or not the main emphasis in the selection of Attorney General would be upon the legal ability or upon the administrative ability of the nominee. The Senator from Illinois said:

> There is this historical point, however, that I did want to make because it has received so much emphasis in the letters and in the telegrams that have come from the country, and for that reason I thought it ought to be clarified as a part of the record.

Preceding that statement he had said:

> Now, there are other questions, of course, on law enforcement, advising the President, any conflict of interest that might intervene with respect to the enforcement of the Antitrust Acts.

As we read the transcript of the hearing we find what constitutes preparation for this particular position. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who spoke a few moments ago, stated among other things on page 10 of the hearings, referring to the preceding Attorney General—

Then he practiced law in the District of Columbia for 2 years, which would make a total in the practice of law of about 8 years, which is quite a limited period of time.

With this statement I will wholeheartedly agree. The Senator from North Carolina said further:

I can't imagine a man becoming a legal authority in 8 years of law practice.

With this statement I wholeheartedly agree.

Numerous other statements were made during the hearing which indicate that this young man—capable, ambitious, driving as he may be—has not had sufficient background in the practice of law overall to qualify him for this position.

For example, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was questioning him about some of the trusts in which he was involved, with which, I must say, I find no criticism. These trusts were created many years ago. Mr. Robert Kennedy has no control over them, according to the record. He receives the income from them, and that is all.

Apparently when the committee hearings started, at least, he did not even know what the corpus in the trusts was, so one could hardly point the finger of suspicion at him on that account. He apparently was withholding himself from them, and that attitude is fine. But he was asked by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] as follows:

Senator KEATING. So that of the assets in them, all of you have an equitable interest?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Senator KEATING. And an undivided equitable interest?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know quite how it is split. I know it is broken down between all of us.

That statement indicates that the nominee himself was not even aware of the nature of an undivided interest—a subject which I believe almost every student of a law school learns shortly after he gets into law school.

I refer now to page 29 of the hearings, at which point the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] was questioning the witness. He asked him these questions:

Senator HRUSKA. But just to confirm what experience you have had, I would like to ask you this:

You were first in the Department of Justice and you were there assigned to the Internal Security Division. Was that your first assignment?

Mr. KENNEDY. That was when I first joined the Department of Justice, Senator.

Senator HRUSKA. And how long did you serve in that section?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think probably 2 or 3 months.

Senator HRUSKA. And it was then that you went over into the Criminal Division?

Mr. KENNNEDY. I went to the Criminal Division in this special unit that was set up at that time.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, now, bearing in mind that in your position as Attorney General, it will be necessary for you to pronounce judgment upon litigation in its various stages all the way from authorizing the institution of a lawsuit to its settlement, or to its appeal, I should like to ask you now:

Have you ever tried a case, a jury case, or an equity, before a judge?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have not.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you ever chosen a jury or written a trial brief or prepared a set of instructions for a trial in court?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have not. I think I made that clear, Senator.

Mr. President, so that no one will think that I am taking advantage of the situation in respect of the nominee, I state that he goes into a considerable statement of his experience, and I ask unanimous consent that the first part of page 30 of the hearings down to where Senator HRUSKA resumes may be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. KENNEDY. I have not. I think I made that clear, Senator.

I decided at quite a young age that I would dedicate or work for the Government, and I think I have made that quite clear.

I have been working for the Government. In my estimation I think that I have had invaluable experience.

The connections that I have had with various members of the committee, the direct relationship I had with the Department of Justice for a long period of time when I was counsel of that committee, with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons of which you are particularly interested, all of these matters, with Mr. Bennett, with Mr. Hoover, with Mr. Anslinger, I have had a great deal of experience in that field.

There is other experience that I have not had.

There is no question about that, and part of it you are developing, but, remember, Oliver Wendell Holmes said after he had been on the Court for a number of years, looked back and examined his cases, he said he was shocked at the fact that he had had so little experience in the broad purview of the law.

So I do not think, no matter what you do, to practice law all your life, that you are going to have experience in all phases of the law and in all phases of experience.

I would not have been given up 1 year of experience that I have had over the period since I graduated from law school, I would not give up 1 year to have sacrificed that experience for experience in practicing law in Boston or wherever it might be.

I think that I have gained invaluable experience, Senator.

I am young and I can't make up for the fact that I have only had 10 years out from school. But I think that what I have done or what experience I have had in those 10 years will be of tremendous help and make a tremendous difference in this new position that I am——

Mr. ALLOTT. Then the Senator from Nebraska stated in conclusion:

So I just wanted to reiterate, and you have emphasized for me, in fact, the idea that you have not only done any of those things in civil practice, but you have, as I understand it, never negotiated a settlement, for example, of a litigated civil case for damages or the breach of a contract or tort case.

Mr. KENNEDY. I doubt if I am going to be doing that as Attorney General.

Senator HRUSKA. I think you will, sir. I think you will. The law requires that the Attorney General pass upon any of the litigated cases wherein the Government is receiving or can receive, as a result of that case, more than $100,000, or if it is paying out more than $50,000, the law requires that the Attorney General make that decision. So you will be passing, and that is one of the reasons for my asking this question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I would prefer to finish my statement, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have just one question to ask.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is quoting Senator DIRKSEN and Senator HRUSKA. Would it also be correct to say that they voted to confirm the nomination?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why does not the Senator put all the hearings in the RECORD, instead of a piece here, a line there, or a sentence here, to be absolutely fair?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will answer the Senator's question. The record is wide open to the Senator, and he knows that. If he wishes to do so, he can put the whole hearing testimony in the RECORD, and I will not object. However I will——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire hearings be placed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator refuse to yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I refuse to yield for that purpose. I will answer questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. As I have said, it is not my intention to conceal the record in any sense in connection with the nomination. I certainly will not object to anyone inserting in the RECORD any portion of the hearings that he may wish to insert. I went outside of my own case and inserted, a moment ago, that part of the justification which Mr. Kennedy felt he had to have in order to bolster his own case.

I shall be very brief, Mr. President. Why do I feel this way? There is an old saying that the law is a jealous mistress. She is. I do not believe that anyone can qualify himself as a lawyer by being counsel for a committee in the Federal Government, unless it is one of those very peculiar situations, of which I have never heard, which would broaden and enhance that man's experience far beyond the counselship for any committee that I have ever known would do.

I believe that the private practice of law causes a respect for the law, a deep and abiding respect, when a man has to study it, when he has to advise his clients, when he has to stand upon the results of his own advice, and when his own future success or failure depends upon that advice and his own abilities and skills at the law.

When there are thousands of lawyers who, upon the record, are far, far more experienced than the nominee—and I do not confine these remarks to Republicans or Democrats—and if anyone reads those records, they will agree with me—I cannot in conscience vote to sustain the nomination. If he had any of the background which a lawyer thinks of in terms of having the qualifications of a lawyer, or if he had ever commenced a lawsuit, for example, it would be a different situation. I believe the only reference that he made in the testimony to that kind of situation is an experience before the grand jury in New York, which is nothing but a very limited segment of the practice of law.

For that reason—and I have tried to make my remarks on a dignified basis, upon the basis that I do not believe he is as qualified as many thousands of other lawyers in the country today to hold the position—I must cast my vote against him. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but I will ask for a division, in order to have a record of at least myself and others, if there are any, who may join me in this, to show who wishes to support me and who does not.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not yield at this time. In conclusion I should like to say that I wholeheartedly support the position that the President has the right to name his Cabinet. In this case I believe he has not chosen by a full degree a man who is qualified in the law, and I must therefore vote against the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was 171 years ago last September that President George Washington nominated Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, to be the first Attorney General of the United States. When he did so he picked one of the great lawyers of the colonial period.

It occurred to me that the first President set a precedent in selecting a great lawyer for the job as the General Counsel of the Government of the United States. That precedent has been consistently followed from that day on.

One need but look at the list of Attorneys General to note the outstanding people who have served in that capacity.

Under Andrew Jackson there was Roger B. Taney, who from the High Bench made history in this country, and also when he served as Attorney General.

William N. Evarts, who served under Andrew Johnson.

Judson Harmon, who served under Grover Cleveland.

Philander C. Knox, who served under William McKinley.

George W. Wickersham, who served under William Howard Taft.

James Clark McReynolds, who served under Woodrow Wilson, and who later went to the High Court.

Thomas Watt Gregory, who served under Woodrow Wilson.

Harlan F. Stone, who went to the High Court.

John G. Sargent. Robert H. Jackson. Tom C. Clark. There are others.

I have avoided Republican names deliberately, as a matter of fact, only to show that no matter what party was in power, always the emphasis was upon scholarly attainment and philosophical outlook and the legal competence of the man who became the Attorney General of the United States.

I trust I am not a slave to tradition, but I know it is written in the Book: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set."

I like to confirm that I believe that that is valid, and that is the reason for the examination that I conducted of the nominee in the hearing of the Judiciary Committee.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, I voted for him in the Committee on the Judiciary, and I propose to vote for him today—and for a reason. However, I simply spell out this theme because I felt that the Attorney General ought to be a legal scholar. I felt he ought to have some competence. He must advise the President not only on domestic problems, but on international problems, as well. There are specific duties, under the law, which he must perform in giving advice; and I should assume that they require that kind of competence which comes from practice over the years.

I am a lawyer. I am a member of the Illinois bar. I am a member of the District of Columbia bar. I am a member of the American Bar Association. However, I never fancied myself as a great lawyer—and I do not say that with my tongue in my cheek, either, as a matter of fact. But I think I know a great lawyer when I see one. So I disclaim that I am a great lawyer.

Nevertheless, I made this point for a reason in the committee, and I reemphasize it here today. If it is the desire of the Senate and the desire of the President to have as Attorney General one who is an administrator—an effective administrator—rather than an outstanding and seasoned lawyer, then let us make up our minds both at the executive and the legislative levels, because that marks a departure from tradition, and we shall have to contend with that problem in the future.

I have no objection, if that is the way it is to be; but I know that people throughout the country have been a little upset about it, as I can testify from some of the letters I have received. I believe this nomination has evoked more interest, more mail, more telegrams, more telephone calls, more comments, and more columns than any other of the nominations which are before the Senate. I shall read just two paragraphs from a letter I received from Texas. I prefer to select one from Texas rather than from my own State because I am sure that to choose one from Illinois might indicate some bias. I shall not say from whom the letter came. It was addressed to me on the 18th of January and reads as follows:

I am violently opposed to the confirmation of Robert F. Kennedy as Attorney General and trust you will do all in your power to prevent this. At least, make a strong speech putting us on record as opposing his confirmation.

All the information you need is in David Lawrence's column published January 13, entitled "Advise and Consent. Senate Will Debate Bobby"; plus the editorial by Raymond Moley in the January 23 issue of Newsweek magazine.

There have been many letters like that, and there have been telegrams which have roundly scolded me, as a member of the minority, for failure to make an impressive case in the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not believe a case could be made on the ground of relationship or nepotism. I think it only takes on that aspect if someone is appointed who cannot render adequate, effective public service for which he gets money from the Federal Treasury. I do not believe that situation applies here. There is no question about the integrity of Robert Kennedy. There is no question about his aggressiveness and his administrative talent, as the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has so well said.

So I put it entirely on the ground of competency and experience.

Senators may wonder why I voted to approve the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Kennedy and why I propose to vote for him again. I will tell them why. I think I had better read my reason because it is contained in a telegram addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which, singularly enough, somehow was lost in the shuffle, because I have not seen or heard it paraphrased or reproduced in its entirety in the press, or on the radio or television. But I read it, and here it is:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 12, 1961.*

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I believe that Robert F. Kennedy is determined to do a fine job as Attorney General and that he should be confirmed. From published reports he has administrative ability and has rendered fine public service. Appointments in the Department already announced indicate that he plans to have a strong team working with him. Any problems which could possibly arise out of family relationship can be avoided or overcome by intelligence and singleminded devotion to the public interest. His decision to continue the present cooperative arrangement with the American Bar Association under which the Attorney General refers to its Federal judiciary committee for investigation and report on qualifications, the names of those under consideration for appointment as Federal judges indicates his responsible attitude toward a most important part of the duties of the office. This cooperation has been of value to the President, the Attorney General, and the Senate Judiciary Committee and has served and will serve the public interest in a notable way.

Who signed that telegram? It was signed by Whitney North Seymour, president of the American Bar Association. The American Bar Association has a membership of 95,000 lawyers, and among them are the outstanding lawyers in the country. It operates, of course, through committees which function in the Nation's Capital.

I am a member of the American Bar Association and a Member of the U.S. Senate. I have a constitutional duty here, but I am not insensible of the judgment that was rendered by the American

Bar Association in this case. However, I reemphasize what I sought to make manifest to the committee; namely, that on his own candid admission in the committee the nominee has never tried a case in any court, at any level.

If there is to be that departure, and we shall have to think of the Attorney General as an administrative officer rather than as a great lawyer, and that in that capacity he can engage the services of all the great lawyers in the country, I have no obstacle to intrude. I simply say that it will be a departure from the tradition that was set when George Washington, the first President, sent to the Senate the name of one of the great lawyers of the Colonies, Edmund Randolph, of Virginia.

I am getting a little too old to throw overboard completely what the ancient sages wrote on the sacred parchments when they said:

> Remove not the ancient landmarks, which our fathers have set.

I propose to vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reference has been made to departures from tradition. There have been departures before. It was said that there could not be such an event, but we saw an instance of it yesterday, when we witnessed an inauguration that was a departure from all the traditions about which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has spoken.

One could go to any corporation in the country, especially among those which were alined with the last administration, and find thousands of lawyers who never saw a courtroom. There is no "departure" about this young man.

I joined the bar association in 1920, late in life, because I could not arrange to go to law school until I was employed by the Senate. As far back as 1928, I was a delegate to the American Bar Association in Memphis, Tenn. I know about the bar association. I agree completely with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that there should be a lawyer at the head of the Department of Justice. But I know that not all the lawyers go to the courtroom. Some simply give advice—and sometimes, consent. That is, sometimes, all they do. What is the matter with young Kennedy?

He was well trained. I am happy that he studied at Harvard, and I am even happier that he studied at the University of Virginia. He will provide a fine administration, in keeping with those of the illustrious persons mentioned by the Senator from Illinois.

I know of one the Senator from Illinois did not mention; I refer to the Attorney General during the Harding administration. I do not know why his name was not mentioned; evidently he is not regarded as sufficiently illustrious.

Mr. President, I am happy that the President of the United States has a brother who was sufficiently qualified to serve with the McClellan committee and who was able to devote to that service his time, his efforts, and his knowledge of the law. A greater knowledge of law is needed there than in many other places.

I am sure that when history comes to be recorded, this nominee will be listed as one of the illustrious group referred to by our good friend, the Senator from Illinois.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination of Robert Kennedy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Robert F. Kennedy is a citizen of Massachusetts and a voter in Massachusetts. He and his family are much respected there. He is a man of integrity and intellect, and he has great administrative ability. I believe he will make a good Attorney General, even though he has not had much experience in the practice of law. I hope his nomination will be confirmed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for the reasons stated by the distinguished minority leader, I do not plan to oppose confirmation of this nomination.

However, for the record, I believe it fair to point out that among all these nominations, this is the only one on which I have received a substantial amount of adverse correspondence.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I voted to report favorably the nomination of Robert Kennedy for the Cabinet position of Attorney General. In this Chamber, I propose to vote for confirmation of the nomination.

It is true that by tradition we have come to look upon this office as one to be filled by men learned in the law and experienced and seasoned in all aspects of that profession. We have come to look upon this position as one to be occupied by scholars of great eminence in the law, and usually preeminent. This is being changed now, because the nominee does not possess such qualifications; that is plain from the record. That record was not made by me or by any other Member of this body; it was made by the nominee himself. Not only has he represented only the Government, during whatever career he has had, but he has represented the Government in a very limited capacity and in a very narrow jurisdiction. That limited capacity consists of 7 months of service with the Department of Justice. Two or three of these months were spent in the section of internal security; and the remainder was spent with the Criminal Division, where his assignment had to do, for the most part, with the presentation to the grand jury in the city of New York, of two or three cases of tax evasion. Aside from that, his service has been limited to membership on the staff of one or another of the congressional committees.

I may say that his experience in the Department of Justice and his experience on the staffs of various congressional committees has been limited to the role of an investigator and prosecutor—no less and no more. That describes his total experience.

The reasons for placing in the Office of Attorney General a man with that type of experience challanges the imagination, as all of us know, because the greatest part of the activities of the Department of Justice is to be found in areas other than that of purely criminal law, let alone purely investigative or prosecuting duties, as such.

However, it has been truly testified by Members of this body that this nominee has had a great deal of experience as an administrator. He is a good organizer. He has worked with a great deal of zest and has shown a great deal of courage in the performance of the duties he has assumed.

It has been said here that we are not given the duty of appointment; we have only the duty of advising and consenting. If it is the desire of the President of the United States to appoint, for assistance to himself, an Attorney General who is a good administrator, rather than a scholar learned in the law, that is a decision for the President to make; and it is for him to bear that responsibility.

I may say there is no constitutional requirement or statutory requirement that the Attorney General be a lawyer, at all. He need not be a member of the bar. However, it is true that his assistants must be. The statute specifies that they must be "learned in the law"; and if, in the judgment of the Senate, they are not considered to be learned in the law, that would be a good ground for refusing to confirm their appointment. But that is not true in the case of the Attorney General.

I recall that about a year and one-half ago there was considerable debate in regard to the question of confirmation of the nomination of another Cabinet appointment, and we considered the matter from the historical point of view. We found that, historically, there were only two or three, or perhaps four, grounds on which the Senate would be justified in refusing to confirm. One was if it were found that, in the judgment of the Senate, the nominee was not of good character, loyalty, and patriotism. Another would be if the Senate found he was without competence. Another would be if the Senate were to find that by reason of his assumption of the duties of that office, there would arise a conflict of interest which would be too great to be overcome. But in such cases the Senate has no other power, and should not attempt to exercise any other power. That point was argued thoroughly during the debate here, and I was one of the Members who expounded that reasoning. I fully believe that if that rule is followed in the case of one nomination, then both consistency and wisdom require that the same rule be applied by us in the course of our consideration of other nominations.

I have full sympathy with the line of reasoning followed by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]; but I firmly believe that if we refuse to confirm the nomination of Robert Kennedy to be Attorney General, we shall be exceeding the jurisdiction and the power this body has—namely, the power to advise and consent. Our power is confined to a certain area, and we should not attempt to exceed it. If we attempt to go beyond that, we venture into the realm which encompasses the duties and the responsibilities of the one who has the power of appointment.

So, Mr. President, notwithstanding the correspondence I have received, it is my intention to vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination of Robert Kennedy to be Attorney General.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had not intended to address myself to this matter. But the Senator's specification of the considerations which should move the Senate when it acts on this appointment requires me to make an observation at this time, if the Senator from Nebraska will be so kind as to permit me to do so.

Mr. HRUSKA. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, have received considerable correspondence in regard to this matter. Let me say that I have had a little specialized experience on the particular point made by many of those who have written to me; I refer to the fact that the President of the United States and the nominee to be Attorney General are brothers.

For 27 years, from 1927 to 1954 I practiced law with my brother, himself a distinguished lawyer, author, and civic leader in a very honorable way, in New York; and I am very proud of that. We are only two brothers and have always been very close. In that way I learned a lesson which I think should be expressed publicly, because it may be useful to Bob Kennedy, the nominee to be Attorney General. I should like to state that I, too, will vote today in favor of confirmation of his nomination. I believe this is desirable, in view of the President's responsibilities and his choice of the way in which he will exercise them.

I have found that the greatest safeguards that can exist in this relationship, which is both personal and professional—and let me say here that my correspondence has shown disquiet—and there is no use in attempting to fool ourselves on this point—over the proposal to vest in this nominee the enormous responsibilities which arise from the fact that both the executive power of the President and the right to seek indictments of the Attorney General will be lodged in one family—are the canons of ethics of our legal profession. These are very explicit. They are very complete. They have been tried for decades through experience. If one will practice as a lawyer or serve with his brother and obey the canons of ethics, with the discretion which is vested in his own conscience to the courts and to the people—and I am confident Bob Kennedy proposes to do just this—then I am confident that the country will be fully safeguarded and it will bring great honor to our new Attorney General.

Let me make one further observation, and I know this from my own experience. There is something admirable and wonderful about the fact that two brothers can vest such confidence in each other. There is something great about it, and it is something which all mankind loves. Bob Kennedy will be the Attorney General, and when a question presents itself, it can be safeguarded by a strict adherence to the canons of ethics. I shall vote for him, and I make this expression from my own personal experience, because I want very much for Bob Kennedy to succeed. It is in the interest of the country that he do so, and we all feel very deeply about it. I feel that he has every chance to do so, and I base my statement on my own experience of over a quarter of a century.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my privilege as a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to participate in the hearings on the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy. After the hearings, I joined with all of my other Republican and Democratic colleagues on the committee in voting to recommend his confirmation.

This certainly does not mean that I expect to find myself in agreement with all of the Attorney General-designate's policies or other future activities. It does not mean that I regard the selection of Robert F. Kennedy as the best selection that could have been made for this post. These are not the standards by which a responsible Senator can pass upon a nomination by the President. In my opinion, unless there is some overriding reason relating to the character, or competence, or convictions of the President's nominee, the President should be permitted the widest discretion in the selection of the members of his official Cabinet.

Robert F. Kennedy answered the questions put to him by the members of the committee in a candid, forthright, and informed manner. He received the highest tribute from a member of the committee with whom he had worked intimately for several years of his career. It is apparent that although he is young, he has exercised considerable responsibility as a Government lawyer, both in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. I understand the reservations of those who regard the private practice of law as part of the important training of a mature lawyer. But certainly we should not raise this preference, or any other similar single factor, to a level of decisive significance. We have had Attorneys General who did not have any previous Government experience, which in my mind is perhaps as significant as an Attorney General who has not had any private practice experience. A wise man draws on all his experience, and it is apparent that Robert F. Kennedy has learned well from whatever he has done. It is apparent, also, that he is a very intelligent and very dedicated individual.

As to character, Mr. President, I can speak from personnel knowledge since I have known the Attorney-General-designate for years. I have known his fine family. He is a man of outstanding integrity. He is a deeply religious young man whom all of us would respect as a friend or a coworker in the Government service. The nominee is young and he is the brother of the President, and naturally, this has raised questions in the mind of many persons as to his suitability for this important post. Indeed, I have no doubt that these factors will place an added burden on the Attorney-General-designate to perform his duties in an exemplary way. He will be functioning under the watchful and somewhat suspicious eye of many observers, and because of the questions which have been raised concerning him, he will have to do better than any other person would in order to satisfy his critics. He will have to avoid any display of partisanship and both he and the President will have to avoid any suggestion of favoritism. The Attorney-General-designate assured the Committee on the Judiciary that he would not engage in partisan politics, and of course this is a pledge which I fully expect him to live up to and which is vital to the proper performance of his duties.

Mr. President, only the future will tell whether Robert F. Kennedy fully measures up to the requirements of the post of Attorney General. In my judgment, he will do so. I have studied his nomination with the greatest care and I know of no reason which justifies any attempt to veto the President's choice of Robert F. Kennedy to serve as a member of his official Cabinet, or, as is sometimes said, his official family. Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nominee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not wonderful, in this day and age, that the President can have this kind of brother? I think we should all envy anyone who can have a brother of the character and competence such as the President has.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably detained. He is at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is also unavoidably absent.

They want the RECORD to show that if they were present they would support all the Cabinet appointments and also the appointments to ambassadorships.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD so show.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as I have said before, it is fully within the power of the Attorney-General-designate to dispel by his own conduct of the office of Department of Justice any reservations which may have been here expressed or heretofore expressed concerning him.

I view the power to advise and consent as governed by certain tests which have been discussed by other Senators. I believe it is the right and the responsibility of the President of the United States to have serving him in the Cabinet those upon whom he imposes full trust and confidence.

I think it most important in our system of checks and balances that a very clear line be drawn between the executive and the judicial departments, and this is of course demonstrated by the care and consideration which is given to the appointment of Federal judges and Federal district attorneys, so that they may be selected upon considerations

of competence and character and so that the administration of the Department of Justice shall be conducted conscientiously as an arm of the executive department and in no way designed to confuse the functions of the judiciary with those of the executive.

Upon these considerations and upon my firm belief that a President is entitled to choose his own administrators, is entitled to present and to develop his program, and is entitled to all the cooperation which the Members of this body can give to him, I expect to vote in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert Kennedy to be Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Robert F. Kennedy to be Attorney General?

(On a division, the nomination was confirmed.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy as Attorney General of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF J. EDWARD DAY TO BE POSTMASTER GENERAL

The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Edward Day, of California, to be Postmaster General.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I report to the Senate that this nomination was considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We listened to Mr. Day, and all the members of the committee who were present asked various and sundry questions. Then the committee voted unanimously to favorably recommend the confirmation of his nomination to the Senate.

Mr. President, in addition, those members of the committee who were not present supplied proxies, so that three members of the committee who were absent voted in favor of the confirmation of the nomination.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the hearings before the committee, which are very brief. I think that would complete the record. It is only 6 pages.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Senator JOHNSTON.

I can assure you that I approach this responsibility with a tremendous amount of enthusiasm, with a tremendous knowledge of the size and challenge that is involved.

I have had the good fortune to have considerable experience with very large operations. The company in which I have been a senior officer for 8 years has 60,000 employees, $16 billion of assets, and about 2,000 offices all over the United States and Canada, and I have had an opportunity to be familiar with personnel policies, administrative policies, and many things that have close parallel to the huge operation of the postal service. I am also conscious, of course, of the many differences between the business I have been with and the particular type of service responsibilities of the Post Office Department.

I am very happy to have an opportunity to appear here, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Day.

Are there any questions, Senators?

Senator MONRONEY. I believe the biographical information furnished us should be made a part of the record if it has not already been put into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of the record at this time.

(The document referred to follows:)

"BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

"J. Edward Day was born October 11, 1914, in Jacksonville, Ill. He attended the public schools of Springfield, Ill., and in 1935 was graduated from the University of Chicago. In 1938, he received his law degree cum laude from Harvard Law School. During law school, he served as legislation editor of the Harvard Law Review.

"Mr. Day entered the practice of law in Chicago with the firm of Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith. The firm is Chicago's oldest and among the largest. At the time, Adlai Stevenson was a partner in the firm.

"During World War II, Mr. Day served 4 years on active duty in the U.S. Navy. He was an officer on a destroyer escort in convoy service to north Africa and commanded a submarine chaser in the South Pacific theater. He was awarded the Navy Commendation Ribbon for his service in tanker escort duty in the Solomons area during 1944. Mr. Day held the rank of lieutenant on separation from the Navy.

"Mr. Day returned to his Chicago law firm following the war. In early 1949, Gov. Adlai Stevenson named Mr. Day to his personal staff and in 1950, Governor Stevenson appointed Mr. Day insurance commissioner of Illinois.

"At the end of the Stevenson administration in Illinois in 1953, Mr. Day became a senior officer of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America at the headquarters office, Newark, N.J.

"In 1957, Mr. Day was named a vice president of the Prudential, in charge of the 13-State western area. Headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif., the division has 7,500 employees and an investment account of approximately $1½ billion.

"By appointment of Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Mr. Day served as a member of the Governor's Business Advisory Council and as vice chairman of the Governor's Commission on Metropolitan Area Problems.

"In the 1960 California election campaign, Mr. Day was a major leader and the treasurer of the campaign for referendum approval of $1¾ billion bond issue to finance the system to bring water from northern California to the southern part of the State. The bond issue was the largest ever submitted to any American voters. The referendum was approved in November 1960.

"In 1941, Mr. Day married Mary Louise Burgess of Winnetka, Ill. Their three children are Geraldine, 17; Molly, 14; and James Edward, Jr., 12.

"Mr. Day is a member of the governing board of the Wilshire Methodist Church, Los Angeles."

Senator MONRONEY. Mr. Day, I am very much impressed with the record of achievement you have made, both in an executive capacity with the large organizations employing great numbers of people, and also your public service that you rendered to two of our greatest States, Illinois and California.

I wonder, since it should be a matter of record, are there any stockholdings or investments that you might have that would in any way be in conflict with carrying out the duties of Postmaster General?

Mr. DAY. No, there are not, Senator. The Prudential Insurance Co. is a mutual company. It has no stock. As of January 19, I will be completely resigned from Prudential and will have no connections with it directly or indirectly. I own no stock of any kind in any company. I have no business interests, direct or indirect, that will in anyway conflict with my performance of this responsibility.

Senator MONRONEY. As a user of the mails, this is the only conflict that you may have, and there may be an opportunity to improve the services that are rendered to this mighty and very vast organization.

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CARLSON?

Senator CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma has just made reference to the conflict of interest statute, and if the Senator does not object, I suggest that that portion of the statute be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. I hear no objection. The statute shall become a part of the RECORD at this point in the hearing.

(The excerpt of the conflict of interest statute follows:)

"Whoever being an officer, agent, or member or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of a corporation, joint-stock company or association, or any firm or partnership, or a business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years or both."

Senator CARLSON. I, too, think that you have come into this field with a very fine background. You have been part of a large organization, and you are going to be part of a much larger one. You are going to have some problems, as all previous Postmasters General have had, I am sure.

Today we received the President's budget message for the 1962 budget. In checking some figures I found that in 1952 the Post Office deficit was $719 million. In 1953 it was reduced to $650 million. It was further reduced in 1955 to $362 million. Since that time we have had many increases—wage increases, railroad cost increases—and the deficit continued to climb in 1960 to $635 million. I am advised by the Budget this morning that the 1962 deficit will be probably $850 million.

Have you had time to give any thought to what we might do regarding its rising deficit? I realize that it is not only your problem, but also the problem of Congress. All of us are concerned as to what might be done.

Mr. DAY. Senator, of course the matter of attempting to control and reduce the deficit will be a prime priority concern of the Department—to make recommendations on that subject—but just what we will do in that area I haven't had an opportunity to consider. It involves, from the standpoint of recommendations, administration policies. I haven't had an opportunity as yet to discuss it with the President-elect.

One thing I am hoping to do immediately after taking over these responsibilities is to see if there are some areas where dollar savings can be made in the management and headquarters end of the Post Office Department operation.

I don't know as yet whether something substantial can be done there. I want to look into that as a matter of first concern, but we are very conscious of the size of these figures you mentioned, and we will be working on it very hard and very fast and hope to have some recommendations soon.

Senator CARLSON. General, you will be placed in charge of over 500,000 of the finest and most dedicated employees that the Federal Government has. They have secured and earned their positions through many, many years of service in the Department.

The Department heads come and go, but we are fortunate in this country to have a fine administrative group of people that really carry on the operations of this Government.

I have been very concerned recently in reading in the press some of the statements on the civil service program—particularly those written by John Cramer, and Jerry Kluttz and Joe Young, who have been in this field for many years. They have been writing about some proposed changes in regard to the dismissal of employees, and particularly in the schedule C category.

I am going to quote now. This is not my statement but a statement written by John Cramer, and also by others. This is regarding the Civil Service Commission, and, of course, you are not the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission but you will have contact with the Civil Service Commission, and your employees are under that group.

This quote reads:

"The Civil Service Commission has ruled that in the future such an employee," speaking of the schedule C employees, "may be dismissed on the mere statement of his superior that he lacks confidence in the employee."

I wanted to read that into the record because that is a departure from what we have been doing in the past, and I sincerely hope that your Department and the Civil Service Commission will not in any way try to get around the rules and statutes of the Civil Service Commission and merely let the whim of an individual, no matter who he be, remove a Federal employee because he just says the word.

Would you have any comment on that?

Mr. DAY. Senator, to begin with, of course, I am a great believer and admirer of the career public servant in the Post Office Department and elsewhere in the Federal Government. During the month that I have been intimately interested in this Department, and during my visits to a number of post offices to look over their operations during my visit here, and in Los Angeles, with many people in the postal service, I have been greatly impressed with the spirit and the dedication of the people in the postal service, and I have met a number of the people here in Washington in the Department. I haven't observed any from the standpoint of what I have been able to see so far, that I think there would be any justification for dismissing on any such basis as you refer to, and I think that the career service will be respected in that area.

Senator CARLSON. General, it was my privilege to have served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee in the House of Representatives, and through the kindness of the chairman of this committee and the Senate, I have had the privilege to be on this committee for many years. I want to assure you that I am going to try to give you all the cooperation I can, and, whenever the chairman calls the committee to vote, I expect to vote for the Department.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator, for those remarks.

Let me say that during the 10 years that I have been chairman of the committee, Senator CARLSON has been most cooperative. When he was chairman, I tried to cooperate with him, and we have had perfect cooperation through the years.

Senator YARBOROUGH, do you have any questions?

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I had the honor and privilege of having been personally acquainted with Mr. Day for several years. I think that the Nation is extremely fortunate in having him designated as Postmaster General. I feel that he comes to that position with qualifications not excelled by any person who has ever held that position in the long history of this country. He has had a brilliant record in college. He has been commended for 4 years of active duty in combat zones in World War II. He has been eminently successful in the law, in the government of two different States—in Illinois under Adlai Stevenson as a member of his cabinet, and in California in two very important assignments by Governor Pat Brown. He also heads a vast segment of one of the largest businesses in this country.

With that success in law and government, in the military service in time of war, and in business, he brings to this position one of the best rounded experiences in life that I have seen in any Cabinet officer at any time.

I think the President-elect has done the country a service in nominating Mr. Day for Postmaster General. I know it's a very difficult post, and the mounting deficit has been mentioned by the distinguished minority member of the committee, Senator CARLSON, who has studied this matter for a great many years. The postal system renders a number of services which are not postal services, but come under general services to the people, in the field of social security, and even in reporting of game under the migratory bird laws, and in many other fields. They render many services besides postal service to the American people, and it's important business of course.

In the rural areas in small towns the postal official is the only representative of the Federal Government the people ever see in their lifetime, so I am particularly pleased that a man with this broad business and governmental experience has come to this post. I think it will challenge the high talent of General Day.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator YARBOROUGH.

Senator FONG, do you have any questions?

Senator FONG. Mr. Day, I notice from your record that you are a graduate of Harvard Law School in the year 1938. I am an alumnus also, class of 1935, and I want to congratulate you and greet you and welcome you into the Government service.

The present Postmaster General has followed the policy of allowing first-class mail to be sent to the State of Hawaii on space available by plane. Do you think you will follow that same policy?

Mr. DAY. Well, I realize, Senator FONG, that that is an issue within the Department, and it is a congressional issue as well. About all I have had an opportunity to do so far is to become conscious of the fact that there are very intense arguments on both sides of it. I certainly will give it my most careful attention, but I haven't reached any conclusion as to what my recommendation will be.

Senator FONG. If first-class mail goes by the regular route, it will take approximately 10 days, 4 days across the continent and then probably 4, 5, or 6 days by ship. By plane it takes 10 or 12 hours. The present Postmaster General has followed the practice of sending first-class mail by plane on space available. I hope you follow that same policy.

Another question I would like to ask you, Mr. Day is, Do you believe that the Post Office should pay its way?

Mr. DAY. Senator, I have been very recently educated in the fact that there is a major area of dispute as to the allowance that should be made for the public service aspect of the Post Office Department's functions, and that there are many arguments as to just what the amount of the deficit really is, and as to what paying its way amounts to in dollars. I do believe that the matter of controlling and reducing the deficit is our top priority consideration when we come into office in making recommendations on that subject, and that is something that I intend to discuss with the President-elect and with the other officials in the administration at the earliest possible opportunity.

Senator FONG. If, after making a very thorough investigation of your Department, you find that you have been able only to cut expenses in a few cases, and that you still are faced with a big deficit, would you hesitate to recommend an increase in postal rates?

Mr. DAY. No, sir.

Senator FONG. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I noticed that Mr. Day in his answer regarding possible rate increases gave recognition to the Postal Policy Act of 1958 which requires the Postmaster General to list all of the public service functions performed by the Department and to estimate their total cost. These costs should be borne by all of the people and not charged against the users of the mails. This is a sound policy which has not been honored. Until it is we will never know the true deficit of the Department.

I think that is a very important matter that you should study thoroughly before you make any determination, as you have stated here this morning. But we, too, as a committee have given that quite a bit of study, and we came up with a unanimous report under both the Democratic and Republican administrations—setting up policy in this particular field. I know I am speaking for the Congress when I say that should be looked into thoroughly before any definite statement is made in regard to rates or anything in that field.

Senator Jordan, do you have any questions?

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions to ask. I think all the questions that I would care to ask have been asked and have been answered very satisfactorily.

I just want to say that I am very happy that the President-elect saw fit to nominate Mr. Day for this important position, because it is certainly an important position in our Government and one of the agencies that I think is losing the most money of any agency we have got. It is supposed to pay part of its way, and with your excellent background and good judgment and public service, I am certain that you will do a grand job and you will have my fullest support.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. We don't usually permit the public to question our witnesses but if anyone has any questions he wishes to ask Mr. Day, permission is granted. This is a public hearing.

I assume there are none, since I don't see anyone jumping up.

We are very happy to have you before us today, Mr. Day. Immediately after this hearing this morning this committee will go into executive session. We will then vote upon your nomination.

We think, from your statement this morning, and from the investigation that the committee has made, that you will make an excellent Postmaster General. We are glad to have you with us today.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I fully concur in the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in respect to the nomination. The nomination was not only approved unanimously, but also I think expressions were made that we were pleased by Mr. Day's nomination.

I think it is particularly fine that we shall have in the Post Office Department a former chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. H. W. Brawley, as Deputy Postmaster General.

I believe we shall have as the Assistant Postmaster General in charge of operations a man who has had many years

of experience as the chief clerk of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. Fred Belen.

These men should be of great assistance not only to the Postmaster General but also to the Congress.

I am pleased that the chairman of the committee has had the hearings of the committee printed in the RECORD, because I asked one or two questions about problems which are going to confront the Postmaster General. One of them is the great deficit in the Post Office Department, which in the next fiscal year will be over $850 million. This is a problem not simply of the Postmaster General but also of the Congress.

Secondly, I was glad to hear the statement that the Postmaster General is going to insist that the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission and the laws as they affect the Federal employees of this Nation be followed during his administration, because I have read some rather disturbing reports about changes which may be made without regard to the Civil Service laws, with respect to the matter of selecting personnel. The Postmaster-General-designate was very emphatic on it. It is a matter of record. I appreciate very much that the chairman has had the entire hearing printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Mr. Day was also very definite about the fact that he was going to make a thorough study of the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which the House and the Senate passed some years ago, supported by Democrats and Republicans. He stated he would give that serious study and would report to the Senate in regard to it.

Mr. President, I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of J. Edward Day to be Postmaster General?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

The clerk will state the next nomination.

NOMINATION OF STEWART LEE UDALL TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stewart Lee Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to know Stewart Udall since the first day he became a Member of the House of Representatives. I have watched his career. I have great faith in him. I have great confidence in his ability to discharge the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings in regard to the nomination and, by unanimous vote, favorably reported the nomination to the Senate. I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle had a satisfactory hearing. I hope the nomination will be quickly confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I come from a State in which problems of our natural resources, which fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, are of vital importance to the economic welfare of the State. Therefore, Mr. President, my State has a special concern about the personnel of the Department of the Interior, and particularly about the man who serves as Secretary of the Interior.

I rise to offer my congratulations to the President of the United States with respect to the appointment of Secretary-of-Interior-designate Udall — for the honor and the opportunity for public service which has been bestowed upon him by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I think this is a very sound appointment. Representative Udall, as a Representative in the House of Representatives dealing with natural resources problems, displayed a judicial temperament, impartiality and fairness which commended him for the appointment.

I rise to express my enthusiastic approval of the nomination.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I was privileged to hear the statements regarding the Secretary designate.

I am pleased to know of Mr. Udall's knowledge and concern in the Western States, displayed by his attendance at the Colorado River Commission meeting December 2, 1960.

I will vote to confirm the President's nomination of Mr. Udall.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not inform my colleagues of my knowledge of the special qualifications of this nominee, because of the association which I have had with him in the House of Representatives.

For 6 years he and I served together on two of the great committees of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Education and Labor. We sat side by side and worked together on those two great committees. There is no man in America who is better qualified than Stewart Udall to administer the land, water, and mineral resources of our great Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I gladly yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleague in what he has said with respect to the nomination of Stewart Lee Udall from Arizona. Not only the western part of our country, but also the entire Nation is extremely fortunate to have a man of the character of Mr. Udall. He is a man of ability and integrity, and is well qualified to look after the manifold duties required by the Office of Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I am happy to join my colleague, who knows him so well, in asking that the Senate give unanimous approval to this nomination.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the majority leader.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join my fellow northwesterners from Montana in expressing my great delight in the selection of Stewart Udall to be Secretary of the Interior. The people of my State have a particular interest in that Department because of its great influence over our resources, conservation practices, and the national parks. I wholeheartedly support the nomination and am delighted to join Senators in giving unanimous approval.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to join my colleagues in commending the appointment of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior.

A better man could not have been selected. Stewart Udall is not only familiar with the many problems he will face in his new position, he is intimately acquainted with them through his service on the House Interior Committee.

I have had the privilege of working with Stewart Udall and from that association, I know that he will bring to the Interior Department strong ideals and new vigor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of President Kennedy's nomination of the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Udall comes to this post as one eminently qualified to be responsible for the conservation of our Nation's natural resources. As a Member of the House of Representatives he has distinguished himself as a vigorous and able Representative of his State, always balancing his own views against the needs of the entire country.

As a Senator from a State with abundant forest, water, and land resources, possessing the magnificent Acadia National Park and the very fine White Mountain National Forest, I am conscious of the need for an intelligent program of conservation if we are to realize the full potential of our natural gifts. I am confident that in Mr. Udall we will find an able and active friend.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most delighted that the President has appointed Stewart L. Udall to be Secretary of the Interior. The Udalls are westerners, just as much New Mexicans as residents of Utah. We always got along with them. One of the best appointments the new President has made, which are all good, is that of Stewart Udall to be Secretary of the Interior. When the President appointed him it was pleasing to us. We know the Udalls, and we trust them.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for the junior Senator from Nevada to heartily endorse the nomination of Stewart Udall to be Secretary of the Department of Interior.

My State of Nevada, whose land is controlled by the Federal Government to the extent of 87 percent of all the land within its boundaries, views this appointment as one of the most promising signs of the new administration. We are confident that Mr. Udall will take decisive and imaginative steps to promote the orderly development of much of this now idle

territory. We see in this appointment an opportunity to move forward in the field of reclamation.

Nevada, Mr. President, was the site of the Federal Government's first reclamation project, and I hope that the great work begun there many years ago in this important field will at last advance again.

In my judgment, Stewart Udall knows from first hand experience and from his long years of public service the peculiar problems of the West and will do great work in the long neglected field of Indian affairs, in power and water development, and in the marshaling of the resources of the West to meet the challenges which lie before this Nation.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I am highly pleased with the nomination of Stewart Udall as Secretary of Interior, and will be only too happy to cast my vote for confirmation.

I served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives with Mr. Udall during my term in the House. I know of Mr. Udall's dedication to the preservation and development of our natural resources. I know of his unquestioned integrity and devotion to his country. I know that Stewart Udall will be one of the outstanding Secretaries of Interior, and the Nation is fortunate to have the benefit of his abilities and services. As a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I look forward to working constructively with Secretary Udall.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the people of Alaska are particularly blessed to have in the person of Stewart L. Udall a man who has more than a passing knowledge of the 49th State. This statement can be enlarged to encompass all the areas in which the Interior Department has widespread interest. When Delegate in Congress from Alaska I had the privilege of serving with Stewart Udall on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee at a time when a multitude of problems affecting the Western States came before that group. Foremost among those problems was the fight for Alaska statehood. Not only did Stewart Udall devote much time to this cause, for which the people of Alaska will always be grateful, but he displayed at all times a marvelous and articulate interest in the varied problems before the committee. No finer appointment has been made. It is an appointment of which President Kennedy and the entire country can be proud.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to cast my vote in confirmation of Stewart Udall as our new Secretary of the Interior. There are few men so well equipped to administer the affairs of the Interior Department as the man President Kennedy has nominated.

Stewart Udall is a westerner from a pioneer family. He has a native understanding of the matters with which the Interior Department must deal. He is, moreover, a public man, whose service in the House of Representatives has given him both the experience and perspective needed to successfully conduct the high office to which he has now been called.

But more than this, Stewart Udall is one of the strongest, ablest men with whom I have become acquainted since I first came to Washington. I think the country is fortunate to have the benefit of his services in the Cabinet of our new administration.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to support the President's nomination of Stewart L. Udall to be Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Udall has served his State and the West as a Congressman and has been in the forefront of congressional efforts in resource development. He has served with distinction on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and is fully acquainted with the operations of the great Department which he will now head. The Department of the Interior is one of the largest Cabinet departments of the Government and deals with many complex problems affecting every part of our national life. I will not prolong my remarks to discuss in detail the role of the Department nor the detail of Mr. Udall's qualifications. I am sure that he is prepared to give great leadership to this Department and as a member of the Cabinet of our great President, John F. Kennedy. We find in Mr. Udall many of the qualities which we admire so greatly in our President. He is young and vigorous, but experienced and wise. He represents the best of a new generation of leaders in America. I join with my colleagues in wishing him every success in the years ahead and with great pride I cast my vote to confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is approved.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's confirmation of the nomination of Stewart L. Udall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ORVILLE L. FREEMAN TO BE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Orville L. Freeman to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as soon as it became known that Mr. Freeman's nomination was to be sent to the Senate for confirmation I gave notice that the committee would hold hearings on the 13th of January. Practically all members of the committee were present. We held hearings for over 2 hours. I and the clerk of the committee talked to most of the members of the committee who were not present. I do not know of any opposition from any member of the committee to Mr. Freeman's nomination, and I do not know of the opposition of any other Senator. I asked the committee clerk to notify every Senator who had an interest in the nomination, and up to the present time there has been no opposition to Mr. Freeman's nomination. I hope that his nomination will be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in what he has said in relation to the nomination of former Gov. Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota for the office of Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Freeman has no illusions about the difficulty of the job which confronts him, and certainly he enters upon it with the proper degree of humility, understanding, and, I assume, on the basis of his record as Governor of a great State, the proper degree of tolerance as well. There is no question about the difficulties which confront the farmers of this country, but it is my hope that the action requested by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be acceded to by the Senate today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that Senators who may wish to make a statement with respect to the nomination of Orville Freeman be permitted to do so at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who have commented upon the nomination of former Gov. Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, as Secretary of Agriculture. I have just been reminded by the illustrious Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that brevity will assure confirmation, and I shall be brief.

With reference to the Governor of Minnesota, I can only say that his record of public service is exemplary. His courage has been demonstrated on the field of battle and in the fire of the decision-making process of government. He is a man of integrity, probity, and loyalty—a man whom I am proud to call my admired and respected friend. Former Governor Freeman will bring to the office of Secretary of Agriculture an intimate knowledge of the problems of American farmers, long training and experience in administration, and a determination that the problems that afflict the agricultural economy of America must be squarely faced and met. There will be no flinching, no shirking from his responsibility for the welfare of the American farmer despite the unfortunate precedent set in the past 8 years. The new Secretary of Agriculture will speak eloquently and work effectively for the family farmer, and for every segment of agriculture.

Former Governor Freeman is deeply conscious of the role which America's magnificent abundance of food and fiber can and must play in America's new foreign policy, as well as in the relief of suffering here at home. He is dedicated to the idea of Food for Peace.

Finally, Governor Freeman will approach his tasks, as he demonstrated before the Committee on Agriculture, with an open mind, a desire to listen and to learn, a willingness to try new solutions, and a determination to act in the best interests not only of agriculture but also of the entire economy. I feel sure

that his record will recommend itself to every Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, former Gov. Orville L. Freeman will assume the position of Secretary of Agriculture at a time when American agriculture is the envy of the entire world. We have the most productive agriculture in the world. We have the best fed people and best clothed people of any nation in the world. It will be former Governor Freeman's duty to maintain this proud position of American agriculture. He will have among other duties connected with his job the duty of maintaining the soil and water resources of the United States and of improving them. He will also have the duty of attempting to secure for American farmers compensation for their labors which is comparable to that received by people engaged in other areas of our economy.

I have known former Governor Freeman for several years. I have not always approved of the positions which he has taken in relation to farm programs. He has appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and has sometimes supported legislation with which I could not agree. However, when he appeared before the committee, he appeared as Governor of one State of the Union. He appeared as the representative of the people who had loyally supported him and enabled him to reach a high political position which he held, and it was only natural that he should support those people and their views in return.

However, now he will be not merely the representative of Minnesota, not merely a representative of any farm group with which he has previously been in sympathy, but the representative of the people of the 50 States of the Union.

Last week former Governor Freeman appeared before our committee, which is headed by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He made a very good appearance before that committee. He spoke frankly, and I realize from his testimony that he knows that as Secretary of Agriculture he will represent all the agriculture of the United States.

I believe that he has the heart and mind which qualify him for this great and honorable position, and I am glad to support the nomination of Orville Freeman for Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

NOMINATION OF LUTHER H. HODGES TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther H. Hodges, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is my privilege to report the favorable recommendation of the committee for the nomination of Luther H. Hodges to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Hodges appeared before our committee during the past week. I can assure the Senate that he made a very favorable and impressive mark on the members of the committee. We feel that he is ably qualified to assume this very responsible position in these very vexing times.

I had occasion to say once or twice on the floor of the Senate that I believe one of the most interesting challenges which confronts the Congress and the people of the country is in connection with the whole matter of international trade—imports and exports.

I feel that through his background and through his qualifications and through his experience Mr. Hodges is well qualified to assume the responsibility of guiding this Nation in the proper direction.

I urge upon the Senate that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At page 28 of the hearings on this nomination, colloquy is shown as having taken place between the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and Governor Hodges on the question of conflict of interest. In the course of that colloquy it appears that the chairman had directed the nominee to file with the committee, for the committee files, a list of his personal holdings. The question is as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Now, would you be willing to file with the committee for the committee files a list of your personal holdings, what you have divested yourself, what you still hold?

The reason I raise the question is that Mr. Hodges certainly has been an eminently successful businessman. He has had a splendid record, mostly in the textile industry, and has devoted his life to the textile industry. Certainly he has been a national business leader in that field, as vice president of Marshall Field.

It is my understanding that, with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, he is one of three men who makes recommendations to the President with respect to the findings of the Tariff Commission. Obviously, it therefore seems to me that if he still had textile holdings, or if his family had textile holdings, in which he had any benefit, there might be a conflict of interest.

For these reasons I have asked the distinguished acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island, whether this request of the chairman of the committee has been complied with.

Mr. PASTORE. Anticipating the question on the part of my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin, I made inquiry of members of the staff of the committee, and they have assured me that by telephonic communication Mr. Hodges has assured the committee that he has divested himself of all industrial stocks, and now holds bonds and mutual funds with strictly family situations, and is interested in a local lumber company and a restaurant, but that the stocks of none of these companies is traded on the market.

I believe that assures my good friend from Wisconsin and other Members of the Senate that there is no conflict of interest in so far as this particular nominee is concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. As he has indicated, the nominee appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he answered the inquiries directed to him on many subjects forthrightly, considerately, and candidly. He impressed the senior Senator from Kansas as being both candid and frank. He is a man of mature and considered judgment. I am sure he will most capably consider the various facets of the many problems which will come before him in his important position, particulary their relation to the various and sundry industries of our State and Nation.

It was brought out during the hearing that the nominee is particularly experienced and informed in the textile industry. He was asked what his interest would be along agricultural product lines and on promoting additional usage of agricultural products particularly through international fairs, and whether he would advertise agricultural products which are so vital to an important segment of our Nation. He showed great knowledge and sympathetic understanding. He convinced me beyond doubt that he would do everything he could in the furtherance of the entire program.

Governor Hodges is the oldest of our new President's nominees to Cabinet rank. I am happy that we will have his experience and mature judgment in this important post. I believe he will bring to the office of Secretary of Commerce an understanding that will be helpful in every way. I am that sure his nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have the unprecedented privilege of supporting a college mate for confirmation of his nomination to be Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Luther Hodges well ever since he and I were fellow students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I have followed his career since our student days with deep admiration and profound affection.

I believe that the President could not have found anywhere within the United States a man more ideally equipped for the post of Secretary of Commerce than Luther Hodges.

Luther Hodges has brought to every task to which he has put his hand, fine intelligence, unflagging energy, and complete devotion to duty. In my judgment a man is best qualified for the post of Secretary of Commerce when he has had vast business and industrial experience, and when he has had vast political experience. Luther Hodges possesses both of these qualifications in the highest degree. He has made an outstanding success in business and industry. He

has made an outstanding success as Governor of North Carolina.

For these reasons, and also by reason of my deep affection and profound admiration for this old school mate of mine, it is a great privilege to have the opportunity to stand on the floor of the Senate and urge that his nomination be unanimously confirmed for the office for which he is so ideally equipped.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise at this time to urge the confirmation of my good friend and fellow North Carolinian to the high post of Secretary of Commerce.

I believe that all people over the country will agree that the Commerce Department as it now exists in our country is one of the most important agencies of our Government, because it deals with business all over the world—not only domestic, but foreign business also. It is a field in which we have been lagging.

Governor Hodges is no stranger to a great many Members of the Senate. I remember that a good many years ago when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] had a job to do while he was Secretary of Agriculture, he called Mr. Hodges to come in. I believe he worked on that job for about a year for Secretary Anderson, and did a magnificent job.

North Carolina has had a great many other outstanding and fine Governors over a period of many years.

Senator Hoey was Governor of the State and later became a Senator from North Carolina. Senator Scott also served as Governor of North Carolina. So did Senator Broughton. Then there was Senator Umstead. Mr. Hodges served as Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina when Mr. Umstead was Governor. On the unfortunate death of Governor Umstead, Mr. Hodges became Governor of the State. Later Luther Hodges was elected for a full term as Governor. Therefore he is known to a great many Senators.

During the last war he was the head of the Textile Division of the OPA and a consultant to Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, who is now the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico.

Governor Hodges has had vast experience, not only in government affairs, but also in business affairs, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out. Only in the past year he took a group of distinguished North Carolinians all over Europe on a study of business conditions, in an endeavor to bring more business to North Carolina and to stimulate export trade from North Carolina to Europe. Governor Hodges is acquainted with Europe. I do not know of any man whom the President could have selected, as the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has pointed out, who has had more experience in business, and politics also, because politics enters into the dealings between the people of the United States and the people of foreign countries.

I strongly recommend to the Senate the unanimous confirmation of the nomination of Luther H. Hodges to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Luther H. Hodges to be Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg to be Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when Mr. Goldberg was nominated to be Secretary of Labor and appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the consideration of his nomination, he was asked a number of pertinent questions. He answered all of them frankly, freely, and very intelligently. He summed up his conception and understanding of the duties of administrator of that Department in these words:

> My view, briefly stated, is that our society is not a class society and the Department of Labor is not and should not be a class department.
>
> The Department of Labor is charged by statute with the responsibility of promoting the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. As Secretary, I will attempt fully to implement that policy, but in so doing I do not believe the Department should be regarded as the representative of any special interest group but as a Department representing all sections and interests in our society.
>
> It is my firm belief that although each department of government necessarily must place special emphasis on the sphere of activity with which it is concerned, it must, within that sphere, speak for and promote the welfare of all Americans and not any special group or class.
>
> If I am confirmed as Secretary of Labor, I intend to administer the Department in accordance with that belief.

Mr. President, after Mr. Goldberg had answered the questions, after he had made a very impressive and excellent presentation, the committee, on the motion of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate the confirmation of his nomination.

Speaking as the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask that the Senate confirm the nomination of Mr. Goldberg to be Secretary of Labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as a Senator from Illinois, which is Mr. Goldberg's home State, and as a longtime personal friend, I am very happy to endorse his selection as Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Goldberg was graduated from the Northwestern University Law School at an early age at the head of his class. He was admitted to the bar of the State of Illinois, where he quickly made a very brilliant reputation. He was, in a sense, a lawyer's lawyer. He argued many appeal cases with great distinction. He has always been a man of warm human sympathies and great social usefulness.

For many years, he was one of the leading attorneys of the labor movement. In that capacity, he helped to purge the labor movement of a number of unions which had fallen into undesirable hands. He is a man who has not only a keen legal mind, but firm principles, as well. At the same time, he is diplomatic in his conduct, and balanced and fair in his judgment. In every respect, he is a fine person. In my opinion, he will make a truly distinguished Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for at least 25 years I have esteemed Arthur Goldberg as a personal friend. I first knew him as a young attorney in Chicago, when he was but 27 years of age. Incidentally, he is now only 52 years old, and when he came for a visit recently he said he was the second oldest man in the Cabinet. So the second oldest man, at 52, gives some point to the fact that we shall certainly have a young and vigorous Cabinet. I understand that the Secretary of Commerce, former Governor Hodges, is probably the oldest member of the Cabinet.

From my first acquaintanceship with Arthur Goldberg, I esteemed him as a very able and resourceful lawyer, a man of deep conviction, who has done notable work in the labor field. He has never become hidebound in that field, although it is a specialized field of activity.

I believe Mr. Goldberg will perform outstanding service as Secretary of Labor, and that he will direct himself to a very broad objective by working in behalf of industrial peace and a better relationship between labor and management.

I salute Arthur Goldberg as a great lawyer and as a fine, dedicated American. I think he will pursue that broad objective with real vigor. I wish him well in that endeavor.

I was glad to concur in the action of the committee in bringing his name before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to add my voice in commendation of this nomination. In the various capacities in which I have served in the field of labor law, Mr. Goldberg has appeared before me many times as an advocate in behalf of or in opposition to some legal issue. I think I know the leading labor lawyers of America very well. I know of no lawyer in the field of labor relations who is more able, more brilliant, and more thoroughly grounded in the knowledge of industrial-relations law than the nominee for the office of Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg.

I point out to the Senate that Arthur Goldberg is not a labor leader. He is not a union official. Arthur Goldberg is a labor lawyer. I have no objection at all, and would have no objection at all, to the appointment of any one of many great labor leaders in this country to be Secretary of Labor—and I shall mention

a few of them in a moment—any more than I think there would be any justification for objection to the appointment of a great captain of industry to be Secretary of Commerce. The Senate has just finished confirming the nomination of a great captain of American industry for whom I have exceedingly high regard, the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, of North Carolina. I think his is a very fine appointment.

However, in this particular instance a labor leader was not selected to be Secretary of Labor. There is no reason why one should be or should not be. However, I think a great labor lawyer was selected; and if one will read the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Goldberg, he will recognize the truth of what I now say, namely, that the nominee will take with him, when he serves as Secretary of Labor, a highly developed and sensitive sense of judicial responsibility.

I know that often it is said that the Secretary of Labor sits as the representative of labor, that the Secretary of Commerce sits as the representative of commerce, and that the Secretary of Agriculture sits as the representative of agriculture. But that is not so; in my judgment, insofar as their responsibilities are concerned, the members of the President's Cabinet advise him on the basis of what they believe to be best in the public interest in connection with the matters handled by their Departments. These nominations are supposed to be made—and I believe that the ones on which we have already acted today have been made in that way—on the basis of the special qualifications and fund of knowledge of the individual nominee as regards the matters which fall within the Department which he will head.

In this instance, there has been appointed to be Secretary of Labor a brilliant labor lawyer who has an exceedingly long and experienced background in the field of labor law, including labor litigation; and he is particularly well qualified to advise the President as to what in his judgment would be in the best public interest as regards labor problems and labor legislation.

Mr. President, I dwell briefly on that aspect of the matter, because I have served, under the able leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and in that service I have had two different assignments during the past 16 years that I have served in the Senate, and I now continue to serve on that committee. At this session of Congress—and I am sure the Senator from Alabama will be the most expert witness I could call to support my statement in regard to this matter—we shall be called upon to deal with some extremely difficult problems in the field of labor relations. I believe that we are most fortunate in having so experienced a person as Arthur Goldberg serve in the position of Secretary of Labor, for in that capacity he will, in accordance with his duty, come to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and explain and defend the position of the administration in regard to any legislative proposal it may wish to submit to the Congress.

Furthermore, let me point out that at this particularly trying time we not only need a great lawyer to serve at the head of the Labor Department, to advise President Kennedy in respect to labor problems which confront us, but we also need in that position a man with a background of experience in the field of labor relations, one who can work with, and can adjust any differences which may develop among, the labor leaders of the country. Often I am amused when I recognize that some persons are under the misapprehension that labor is of one mind in regard to any labor program in our Nation. When the Secretary of Labor comes to deal with some of the major labor leaders of the country, he will deal with remarkably able persons, great industrial statesmen within the field of labor, but he will also have to be able to adjust their differences and get them to see the point of view of the administration in regard to some of the complex problems which will confront it in the field of labor legislation.

He will have to advise with, and make adjustments in regard to the points of view of, great labor leaders, such as George Meany, Al Hayes, George Harrison, Joe Keenan, Neill Hagerty, David Dubinsky, Jacob Potofsky, Walter Reuther, James Suffridge, Joe Bierne, Jack Lyons, Jim Carey, Maurice Hutchinson, Gordon Freeman, Pete Schoenman, Al Hartung, and many other great labor leaders in our country whom I could name. I believe it is interesting, and is to his everlasting credit, that these labor leaders and a number whom I have not mentioned have made to the public many, many statements in which they have expressed confidence in the ability of Arthur Goldberg and have expressed their support of his appointment.

My last point—and I shall make it briefly—is that we should not forget that in carrying out his responsibilities to the public at large, Arthur Goldberg must also keep in mind the legitimate interests of industry. So often there is made the false assumption that the Secretary of Labor is not going to give due weight and consideration to the legitimate rights and interests of industry. Senators should read the transcript of the record they have on their desks with regard to the statements this nominee made when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In my judgment, industry has a right to take great confidence in this appointment, because, in my opinion, Arthur Goldberg can certainly be counted upon to advance the legitimate best interests of labor and also to see to it that the legitimate rights of industry—upon which the welfare of labor is, in the last analysis, very dependent—are not destroyed by any insistence on the part of some short-sighted persons from time to time that there be taken a course of action which would do irreparable injury to industry, which, after all, provides the wage checks on which the living standards of the American workers are, in the last analysis, so greatly dependent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arthur Goldberg to be Secretary of Labor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this question.

Let me say that I have known Mr. Goldberg for 25 years. This nominee testified at a hearing held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member. For many years Mr. Goldberg has been identified as a lawyer for very important labor interests in the country. I believe the Senate is entitled to have the benefit of the personal knowledge of any Member, such as myself.

Mr. President, based upon my knowledge of Mr. Goldberg and his great distinction as a lawyer and the fact that he has a lawyer's mind and is able to apply to the problems which confront him his profound knowledge of the law, entirely aside from his emotions or sympathies in connection with such matters, when he feels there is a difference of impact as between the two, I believe he will make an excellent Secretary of Labor.

Furthermore, in the days which lie ahead we shall have to appeal very strongly to the morale of American labor. We are now engaged in a great struggle which is tantamount to war; and the morale of American labor is most important, especially as regards efficiency and willingness to undertake the making of adjustments to new ideas and developments, such as those in connection with automation, and the attitude of labor toward strikes similar to the present one in New York, which are so seriously crippling, and when at the same time we wish to maintain for all our people the right to strike. These are very great and challenging problems.

I believe Arthur Goldberg has a great understanding of their significance in the social scheme; and for that reason and also the reason that he is—as he has every right to be—trusted by labor, I am confident that he will turn out to be extremely objective in terms of dealing in a statesmanlike manner with such problems, which affect very deeply both labor and management; and I am sure that his attitude toward them will be so fair that, as a result, both labor and management will be most willing to listen to him, inasmuch as he understands their problems. Certainly he will be much more useful in that service than one who understands only the problems of labor.

Mr. President, what I wish to affirm to the Senate is that I think he has the kind of dispassionate mind and the kind of deep feeling for the public interest, and that he is so organized in his own thinking, his own soul, and his own conscience, in the light of his understanding of that responsibility, that will result in his making a splendid Secretary of Labor.

I am glad to join in the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg to be Secretary of Labor?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM RIBICOFF TO BE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abraham Ribicoff to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Abraham Ribicoff is eminently qualified, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the Finance Committee, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He is qualified not only by experience, but by his own innate ability. He served 4 years in the House of Representatives and was elected twice as Governor of Connecticut. He made a very fine impression on the Senate Finance Committee, and he received a unanimous vote. I hope he will receive the unanimous vote of the Senate.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for yielding to me so I may make brief remarks on the nomination that is before the Senate, that of Governor Ribicoff, of the State of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I believe the confirmation of the nomination of Abraham Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will bring to that post one of the most able and experienced men in American public life.

He comes to this office with a most unusual background. He served, in fact, as one of our most respected judges. He served in our State legislature. He served in the other body of this Congress, in the House of Representatives, and there are many Members of the Senate who served in the other body with him and remember him particularly for his dedication to his work. He also served as Governor of Connecticut.

I think I heard our majority leader say of him, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the other body of Congress, that when there was a really tough problem before the members of that committee, it was expected that the chairman of the committee would refer the matter to Governor Ribicoff. So I say again that we will have in Governor Ribicoff as Secretary of this great Department a most extraordinary and unusual man.

Mr. President, it has most often been said of him that he is one man in public life who does his homework. While this is a simple way of paying tribute, perhaps there is no better way to pay tribute to one who is in public life. He does his homework. He knows his subject when he talks, and he is a careful and capable man whenever he talks.

He brought great qualities to the Governor's mansion in Hartford and added to them a remarkable executive ability. As chief executive of Connecticut, he gave the people progressive but prudent government. He brought about needed reforms that had been resisted for decades. He put through dramatic increases in State aid to education and welfare programs, while insisting on fiscal soundness and proper regard for the rights of taxpayers.

He earned the trust of the people to an unprecedented degree and he worked amicably and effectively with both Republican and Democratic legislatures.

Abraham Ribicoff was reelected to a second term by the largest margin in our history, earning the greatest personal tribute ever paid to a Connecticut political figure.

His astuteness and keen judgment had by this time become nationally known. He was the first outstanding political figure to come out for John F. Kennedy for President, and the support, counsel, and active leadership which he gave to the Kennedy cause were instrumental in its success.

Perhaps if I were to select his greatest accomplishment during his nearly 6 years in office, I would have to say that the reform of our judicial system, which he achieved, will go down in history, certainly in the history of the State of Connecticut, as one of the really great and necessary changes that was made in our judicial establishment in Connecticut.

So this day is a happy and proud one for him. I rejoice not only because a deserved and great honor has come to a good friend and a good man, but also because his appointment holds such promise for the success of the new administration, of our country, and of the many humanitarian programs for which so many of us have been striving for so long.

Mr. President, I do not wish to burden the RECORD, but, if the Senator from Virginia will indulge me one moment longer, I should like to ask unanimous consent that five or six editorials I have selected from a great number of editorials on the nomination be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York News, Dec. 3, 1960]

GOOD CHOICE, SENATOR

We can't find any fault with President-to-be Kennedy's choice of Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

If confirmed by the Senate, Mr. Ribicoff will head a huge Federal agency which can be either an instrument for valuable public service or a happy hunting ground for do-gooders and bleeding hearts.

As Governor of Connecticut, Ribicoff has insisted on economy and efficiency in the State's government, though he has not been a martinet or a pennypincher.

If he follows the same middle-road course in his Washington job, he should be a notable success. We hope Senator Kennedy's other Cabinet choices will look as good as this one.

As for David E. Bell, Kennedy's selection for Budget Director, he is a professor at Harvard, was in the Marine Corps in World War II, is an old Truman man, and is said to admire balanced budgets in defiance of such Harvard spend-and-spenders as John K. Galbraith. We wish Bell well in what is at best a tough and thankless Government job.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Dec. 3, 1960]

RIBICOFF FINE CHOICE

President-elect Kennedy has made a commendable Cabinet selection in his appointment of Gov. Abraham Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The new Secretary, whose term as Governor of Connecticut still has 2 years to run, has amply demonstrated his ability and popularity in the administration he has given his State during his two terms as chief executive.

Governor Ribicoff, who had been prominently mentioned for the post of Attorney General or a U.S. Supreme Court seat, is well prepared for his new Cabinet assignment by virtue of the programs in the field of health, education, and welfare he initiated as Governor.

The 50-year-old Governor has been honored nationally for introducing many new concepts in the treatment of the mentally ill in Connecticut, particularly in the field of mentally retarded children.

His administration was also responsible for greatly aiding education by providing State funds for primary schools in areas where local taxes failed to meet the need.

While launching new programs in these fields in his home State, the Governor has also demonstrated his fiscal responsibility and is not one of the narrow idealists who would advocate driving a six-mule team through the Federal Treasury.

We extend our heartiest congratulations to Governor Ribicoff on his new appointment.

[From the Stamford Advocate, Dec. 2, 1960]

FIRST IN THE CABINET

Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff is the first Cabinet appointee of President-elect Kennedy. Our Governor is to be the new head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The appointment is well deserved and it is appropriate that Governor Ribicoff should be the first major appointee of Mr. Kennedy.

Governor Ribicoff and John Bailey were not among the first Kennedy supporters, they were the very first. For 4 years this powerful political machine has devoted its effort to the Kennedy cause. Few will forget the able floor leadership of Mr. Ribicoff during those critical days at Los Angeles when the Stevenson forces made their spectacular play contrary to all tradition. Governor Ribicoff held the reins so tightly that the Stevenson balloon never got off the floor.

Then this past year he campaigned with devoted diligence. While Bailey made the home fortress secure, Governor Ribicoff went time and again to critical areas to gain support for Senator Kennedy. Our State was one in which there will be no recount. It went overwhelmingly for Kennedy. It was the first State in the sure column. It is only right that Governor Ribicoff should be first in the new Cabinet.

His appointment will be greeted favorably throughout the Nation. His qualifications for a Cabinet post are unquestioned. He will bring to Washington not only executive ability but a knowledge of congressional methods gained at firsthand.

Only the need that Connecticut has for his leadership in a period of financial crisis tempers our pleasure over the appointment. But we can hope that the new Secretary of HEW will redraft some of the more advanced Federal educational programs proposed so that his native State will not be drained 3 to 1 of needed educational dollars. In fact, the new Secretary might even point out to Federal education proponents that Connecticut solved its own educational problems at the local and State level. This might be a good example for other States to follow.

The appointment of Governor Ribicoff suggests that Senator Kennedy is going to be faithful to his political supporters but not at the expense of good government. The way he cleared the road for our Governor by shifting Walter Reuther's Mennen Williams to Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs was as skillful a piece of political maneuvering as has been seen since the Roosevelt years.

Mr. Kennedy has made a good start.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1960]

TWO GOOD APPOINTMENTS

President-elect Kennedy's announced selection of Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, of Connecticut, as his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be greeted with general approval. It was no surprise to learn that Mr. Ribicoff was entering the Cabinet; the only question was which post he would be given. Mr. Kennedy's choice is a sound one.

It is entirely within the American tradition that members of the President's Cabinet include some of his close political associates; and if any man deserves the title of pioneer in the Kennedy-for-President movement, Governor Ribicoff is the man. He was not only for Kennedy before Los Angeles, before Wisconsin, before January; he and his astute mentor, State Chairman John M. Bailey, have been for Kennedy from the beginning.

But Mr. Ribicoff is a great deal more than a politician who picked the right man early; he is a very successful Governor of an important State, and he can be counted on to administer HEW with competence and with heart. A diplomatic and knowledgeable ex-Congressman, he has both the ability and the temperament to help guide the health, education, and welfare programs of the Kennedy administration into legislative action.

The unusual step Senator Kennedy took in announcing the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State before he had picked the Secretary or Under Secretary may be partially explained by the fact that the man he chose, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, had been prominently mentioned for the HEW post. By giving extraordinary emphasis to Mr. Williams' selection as Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, Mr. Kennedy was obviously trying to do two laudable things: stress the importance of Africa to the United States and make Mr. Williams feel better about not being a member of the Cabinet.

Despite his lack of technical background, we think Mr. Williams' sympathetic approach and inexhaustible energy make him a good choice to spearhead an active and positive American policy toward the new African states. He has a unique opportunity ahead of him, as this will be an area of increasingly vital importance in foreign affairs in the coming years.

[From the Hartford Times, Dec. 2, 1960]

SECRETARY RIBICOFF

The appointment of Governor Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Cabinet of President-elect Kennedy was one of the worst-kept secrets of the year. For several days everybody but Governor Ribicoff and Senator Kennedy seemed to be sure of it.

There was never any doubt that the Governor would have an opportunity to serve in a high post in the Kennedy administration, but it took some time and several conferences to pick the job that suited both men.

As long ago as his two terms as judge of the Hartford police court, Governor Ribicoff exemplified to a high degree the quality of humane and sympathetic interest in the underprivileged that should be found in a Welfare Secretary. His long experience as Governor of Connecticut will be an asset to him when he is confronted with the many administrative problems of a Federal Department head. And though he is a practical politician of great skill, he has a proved reputation for independence even at the risk of unpopularity; he will be no figurehead. His record in Congress, where he intelligently supported measures to support reciprocal foreign trade at some cost to Connecticut manufacturing interests, was a display of this independent spirit.

He has been a good Governor of Connecticut. We wish him success in his new national post and trust that his successor here, Lieutenant-Governor Dempsey, will carry on effectively.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Dec. 3, 1960]

A GOVERNOR—GOOD START ON THE CABINET

As Governor of Connecticut, Abraham Ribicoff has earned a reputation as a man with keen sense of the political value of compromise and cooperation. He has proved himself an excellent administrator and, to the consternation of the State GOP, won votes from Republicans who normally wouldn't think of voting for a Democrat. As President-elect Kennedy's choice for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, it seems to us that Ribicoff has the qualifications of a topflight Cabinet officer.

Certainly his beliefs on social legislation are similar to those of Mr. Kennedy. Otherwise, he wouldn't have gotten the job. But if the next President is as strong a Chief Executive as most people expect, he will be setting the broad policy course of the administration anyway. The limitations will be imposed only by Congress. For the Kennedy purposes, Ribicoff is a good man to deal with the legislators. He has had experience in the House, where he first met John F. Kennedy.

Indeed, there is a little vignette from Ribicoff's Capitol Hill career that tells much of the man. Another legislator told the freshman Representative that the way to stay in the House was to vote for every appropriation bill and against every tax bill.

"I told him that may be good politics but that it is bad government," Ribicoff recalls.

In Hartford, Governor Ribicoff followed the middle of the road in order to get things done in politics and government. His national reputation stemmed initially from a successful crackdown on highway speeders. Ribicoff's own supporters thought it was political suicide. It wasn't.

Ribicoff will take to the Cabinet his acknowledged abilities as an administrator and, insofar as we know, an independence of any particular pressure group. His appointment, in fact, may be regarded hopefully as an indication that John Kennedy will show an independence of mind on his own part. Kennedy obviously wanted his longtime supporter in the Cabinet and he put him there, although others sought the job. It strikes us as a sound as well as a politically logic choice.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, Dec. 2, 1960]

GOOD APPOINTMENT

President-elect Kennedy's first Cabinet appointment is a splendid one. It would be difficult to think of a better choice—by personality, experience, and interest—for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare than Gov. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut.

The three related fields Mr. Ribicoff will administer have been among the areas of his concern for years. His reelection in 1958 by the largest gubernatorial plurality in Connecticut's history gave the Democrats control of the lower house as well as the senate for the first time in 82 years and enabled the Governor to put through consolidation and efficiency programs he favored.

Among them was establishing an office of mental retardation, coordinating various agency activities for care of retarded children. The Governor also stimulated progress in mental health—one of the tremendous problems of our times—and moved his State toward the fairly new concept of small community mental health hospitals. In education Governor Ribicoff prompted the legislature to increase grants to towns and cities where local property taxes were insufficient to carry the burden.

His tenement boyhood as a newsboy, errand boy, caddy, and laborer gave Mr. Ribicoff hard, first-hand appreciation of the value of education and the problems and aspirations of the poor.

His public career displayed both his bent toward moderation and his political courage.

With this background it may be expected that Mr. Ribicoff will conduct his new job neither with misinformed sentimentality nor aloof unawareness but with reason and understanding. He has our congratulations and good wishes.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1960]

RIBICOFF FOR HEW

There will be widespread commendation of Mr. Kennedy's selection of Gov. Abraham Ribicoff as the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Ribicoff has been by general acknowledgment an extremely able and effective chief executive in Connecticut. He has been a liberal, understanding, and decisive leader, and at the same time flexible and careful with a dollar. He has a longtime interest in social welfare matters dating from his service in the House of Representatives with Mr. Kennedy.

From time to time it had been reported that Mr. Ribicoff was a likely choice as Attorney General. His assignment to HEW will make use of his experience in a post for which he is no less qualified, and might permit his consideration for the Supreme Court seat, to which he is said to aspire, with fewer complications if a vacancy should arise.

Mr. Kennedy is known to look upon legislation in the health and education field as some of the most important parts of his domestic program. The selection of Mr. Ribicoff as the first member of the Cabinet thus takes on more than ordinary significance. Not the least of Mr. Ribicoff's assets is a formidable political sagacity demonstrated, among other things, by the strong vote he helped register in Connecticut for the Democratic ticket. This quality, along with his administrative competence, will be highly useful in relations with Congress as well as within the executive branch.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 2, 1960]

GOVERNOR RIBICOFF IS SPLENDID CHOICE

President-elect Kennedy's first Cabinet appointment is a splendid one. It would be difficult to think of a better choice—by personality, experience and interest—for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare than Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut.

The three related fields Mr. Ribicoff will administer have been among the areas of his concern for years. His reelection in 1958 by the largest gubernatorial plurality in Connecticut's history gave the Democrats control of the lower house as well as the senate for the first time in 82 years and enabled the Governor to put through consolidation and efficiency programs he favored.

Among them was establishing an office of mental retardation, coordinating various agency activities for care of retarded children. The Governor also stimulated progress in mental health—one of the tremendous problems of our times—and moved his State toward the fairly new concept of small community mental health hospitals. In education Governor Ribicoff prompted the legislature

to increase grants to towns and cities where local property taxes were insufficient to carry the burden.

His tenement boyhood as a newsboy, errand boy, caddy and laborer gave Mr. Ribicoff hard, firsthand appreciation of the value of education and the problems and aspirations of the poor.

His public career displayed both his bent toward moderation and his political courage.

With this background it may be expected that Mr. Ribicoff will conduct his new job neither with misinformed sentimentality nor aloof unawareness but with reason and understanding. He has our congratulations and good wishes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, a ranking member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as a member of the Finance Committee, I wish to concur in the remarks that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia in construction with the nomination of Governor Ribicoff.

Mr. BUSH previously said: Mr. President, owing to a pressing engagement, I shall not be present in the Chamber when the nomination of Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, is considered as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made before the Committee on Finance be placed in an appropriate place in the RECORD on the confirmation of the nomination of Governor Ribicoff. The statement appears on pages 68 and 69 of the hearings before the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to join my able friend and colleague, Senator DODD, in presenting Governor Ribicoff to this committee.

The Governor has just concluded 22 years of almost continuous service to the people of the State of Connecticut, and has become recognized not only in our State but in the Nation as one of the ablest men in public life today.

I have had the pleasure, the privilege of knowing him as a friend and as a fellow servant of our people, and I say with great satisfaction that we have worked together closely and in friendship for the benefit of our people in connection with issues affecting their welfare, and so I can consider it an honor to my State and, obviously, a great honor to the Governor, that he has been selected by President Kennedy to assume this very high post in his Cabinet.

I believe that, as Senator DODD says, his background qualifies him well, with his experience as legislator, judge, Member of House of Representatives and, finally, the Governor of our State.

I said yesterday at a luncheon that Senator DODD gave for him that I was impressed with what the New York Times said editorially at the time his nomination was announced by Senator Kennedy.

The Times says that not only would the Governor bring to his post a wide background of experience which qualified him, but also he would bring heart. This is a department of our Government where, obviously, the chief executive of that Department must have a sensitivity to the needs of our people, and the Governor has well demonstrated that he does have that, and I thought the comment by the New York Times editor was particularly appropriate concerning Governor Ribicoff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Abraham Ribicoff to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately informed of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

NOMINATION OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON TO BE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Wednesday, January 18, the Committee on Foreign Relations examined in public session the qualifications of the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson to be U.S. representative to the United Nations. For nearly 3 hours members questioned Mr. Stevenson and explored with him his views with respect to the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States.

At the end of that hearing the committee voted unanimously to recommend the confirmation of his nomination to the Senate.

Mr. Stevenson is one of our most distinguished citizens and students of foreign policy. He assisted in the drafting of the United Nations Charter and was a principal representative of the United States when the first General Assembly convened in London. His support of that organization is well known, and I know the United States is fortunate in having him represent us there. I believe his great capacity to communicate with people throughout the world will be a tremendous asset to this Nation. I hope the Senate will unanimously approve his nomination.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my remarks, because I think every Senator knows Governor Stevenson and knows something about him. He appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and his nomination was favorably reported by the committee. He made a great impression upon the committee. He justified the opinion which is held of him by many people, that he is one of the outstanding statesmen of the world today.

Mr. President, Governor Stevenson did not promise us that we were going to have an easy road in the United Nations with reference to world conditions. The President yesterday in his inaugural address pointed out that the rough days which may be ahead are going to challenge all of our energies and all of our efforts, and Governor Stevenson pointed out to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that we face many problems in regard to the nations of the world.

The family of nations of the world has increased greatly over the past few years. I served as a delegate to the Fifth General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950. During the time I served the United Nations took in the 60th nation. Today there are 99 nations. Governor Stevenson pointed out that since he first served in the United Nations as a delegate the number of nations has doubled.

I should like to interject one thought which came out in the course of the hearings. We are trying to carry on with practically the same size organization we had when there were 50 nations in the United Nations. Governor Stevenson made a fine suggestion, even before he accepted the appointment: that we need to replenish, and perhaps to reorganize, our mission to the United Nations.

Governor Stevenson made a very fine impression upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the committee has recommended the confirmation of his nomination by the Senate. I am certainly glad to join in that request from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, no words of mine are needed to eulogize the qualities and character of Adlai Stevenson. Mr. Stevenson is not only the most illustrious citizen of Illinois but he is also one of the first citizens of this Nation and, indeed, of the entire world.

As we all know, Mr. Stevenson has twice been the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, and in those campaigns he conducted himself not only with great intelligence but also with great character. Before he was nominated for the Presidency, he was one of the best Governors the State of Illinois has ever had.

He is now, in a sense, returning to the field of his first interest, for Mr. Stevenson was a member of the American delegation to the London Conference, which first really organized the United Nations after the initial San Francisco Conference.

Since 1952 Mr. Stevenson has made numerous, long and thorough visits to virtually every portion of the world. He has made many trips to Western Europe and thorough trips in Asia, in Africa, and in South America. He is certainly one of the best informed Americans on foreign affairs. Indeed, I do not think it is straining the truth to say that he is probably the best informed American on these areas. He is not only informed about the immediate issues which confront the world but also about the deeper, underlying forces which help to create these issues. He knows these also on the basis of close personal acquaintance with all the leading men and women of most of the nations of the world.

Adlai Stevenson is not only one of our most moving orators but also a master of

graceful and distinguished literary style. In fact, I am inclined to believe I would have said, until the inaugural address of yesterday, that he is the best political stylist we have had in this Nation for many years. He is also a clear and humane thinker, and is gifted in his relationships with the public, with his associates and with representatives of other nations.

He is a devoted and patriotic American who will represent the United States at the United Nations with complete fidelity and with rare grace, ability, and distinction.

President Kennedy has, in my judgment, selected a group of Cabinet members whose general average is extremely high.

In my judgment Mr. Stevenson is preeminent even amongst this select group. We are proud of his selection.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to add my voice in commendation of the appointment of Mr. Stevenson as our Ambassador to the United Nations and to add a personal note. I was privileged to be in Africa a few weeks ago on a fact-finding mission for the Appropriations Committee. Our visit coincided with the announcement of Mr. Stevenson's appointment. Everywhere we traveled the appointment was greeted with great applause and exaltation. People felt that in the personality of Mr. Stevenson there was epitomized the crux of the things that America represented in the hearts and hopes of the uncommitted peoples of the world. The notion was prevalent among some people that the United Nations was a sort of private American club, that it was some kind of anti-something-or-other organization, and some had lost sight of the fact that the organization was really what it was intended to be—an organization of nations united in the interest of achieving peace in the world. No single event, short of the election of Mr. Kennedy himself, could have better symbolized in the hearts of those people a resurgence of hope for the interests of people, rather than the interests of combat and force, than the nomination and the acceptance of that nomination, and approval now by this body of the nomination of Mr. Adlai Stevenson. I think such sentiment augurs well for our hopes and our chances to help the people of Africa and other parts of the world to help themselves, both through the United Nations and our own endeavors.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. I have known Adlai Stevenson for many years, though perhaps not as long as has the able Senator from Illinois. I have read the record of his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, and was impressed, as I have always been, with the truth, candor, and keen intellect with which Adlai Stevenson addresses himself to difficult questions. I think his candor was demonstrated the other day in his warning about where we are going and what we face.

As the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has said, great changes have come about in the structure of the United Nations since its formation. Our position in the world is changing, as seen in our voting position in the United Nations. Adlai Stevenson, with his truthfulness and his candor, has described the problems that lie ahead, some of which we must face soon. I commend President Kennedy for being able to enlist the services of this great American, and especially do I commend Adlai Stevenson for taking on this difficult task in a perilous time of American history. As the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said, Adlai Stevenson is a great American and patriot who has the esteem, the love, and the affection of people throughout the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in their commendation and praise of the appointment of former Governor Adlai Stevenson as our Ambassador to the United Nations. I believe it is well known that for some years I have been a supporter of Adlai Stevenson in various political activities. A great many Americans had hoped, and even expected, that he might be the new Secretary of State. The President, for reasons sufficient unto himself, decided on another appointment, and he appointed a great Secretary of State, as I said earlier this afternoon. He has appointed a great team, with Dean Rusk as Secretary of State and Adlai Stevenson as the head of our delegation at the United Nations.

I have recently finished 3 months service as a delegate from the United States to the United Nations. I wish to express confirmation of the point made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] that when the nomination was made, it was a day of great rejoicing throughout the United Nations, so far as non-Communist nations are concerned. They recognize that Adlai Stevenson is one of the great statesmen of our generation and, working shoulder to shoulder with Dean Rusk, as I know that team will work, I prophesy here today a considerable change in the year ahead in regard to the standing of the United States in the United Nations.

In making these commendations of Adlai Stevenson, I should say a word of commendation of the head of our delegation who served us so well in the General Assembly this last fall, namely, Ambassador James Wadsworth. When we consider the instructions under which the representatives of our country had to work, instructions in some instances contra to the judgment of the unanimous delegation and in many instances of an overwhelming majority of the delegation, Ambassador Wadsworth is deserving of great praise for the splendid public service which he performed as the head of our delegation at the United Nations.

Our difficulty was that frequently we received instructions from within the State Department and, as I said on one occasion in order to describe my feelings in the matter, I felt sometimes that they were instructions that had come from offices that were apparently located about six floors below ground surface at the State Department.

What we need is a much closer relationship between the Ambassador at the United Nations, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States. I am satisfied that if we had had such a close relationship, we would not have lost as much standing as we lost in the United Nations this last fall on such issues, for example, as Southwest Africa and the colonial issues about which I shall report to the Senate, I hope, next week.

With Adlai Stevenson as the head of our delegation and with Dean Rusk as our Secretary of State, I expect to see a dramatic improvement in the relationships between the United States and the other nations in the free parts of the world at the next session of the United Nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the interest of expediting the confirmation of the nomination, and yet associating myself with the remarks that have been made, let me say that the expressions made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] surely express my feelings about the nomination and about Adlai Stevenson as a man, as a great citizen, and as a patriot. He brings to this high office a reservoir of good will for the United States which is desperately needed at this hour. He brings with him the capability of careful negotiation and of diplomatic presence, which I believe is required.

By this one nomination the President of the United States has emphasized the importance of the United Nations as an instrument of international understanding and cooperation. By the selection of one of our leading citizens as the Ambassador to represent the United States at the United Nations President Kennedy has said to the world that we, the people of the United States, and the Government of the people, look upon the United Nations as the hope of peace, of progress, and of freedom. Adlai Stevenson will be able as much as many, to fulfill that hope, and probably more.

I concur in what the Senator from Oregon has said about the importance of close cooperation between the Ambassador at the U.N., the Secretary of State, and the President, as well as the importance of having the world understand that we in the United States look upon the United Nations as a viable, vigorous instrument for the conduct of an effective foreign policy by not only our allies, but all the people throughout the world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I commend to the Members of the Senate

a reading of the very brief hearings held in the case of Governor Stevenson, and particularly the very fine, clear, and forceful statement he made at the beginning of the hearings, given at pages 1 to 6 of the printed hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Adlai Stevenson to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America to the Security Council of the United Nations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the nomination. I merely rise to express the feeling that the appointment is not the joyous appointment, in the best interest of our country and its fundamentals, that may have been outlined by a number of Senators thus far.

I am aware of the fact that Governor Stevenson in many ways is a brilliant man. I am aware that he has a rapidly acting mind. I am aware that he can turn a phrase with great sharpness. I am aware that he is astute in making his presentations. I am aware that he has great acquaintance around the country.

I do not intend to oppose the nomination, because I yield greatly to the President of the United States, whether he is in my party or in another party, in his right to select those members of his official family, such as Ambassadors and Cabinet members and sub-Cabinet members, who will advise and assist him in the Government. After all is said and done, the Democrat Party was elected to the administrative leadership and executive leadership of this country. President Kennedy was elected President, and he has the responsibility of operating his office, and the responsibility for the wisdom of his selections of Cabinet members and administrators is upon him.

I do not have a reason which is generally accepted among the reasons for voting against the confirmation of the nomination of a Cabinet member or an Ambassador.

I believe Mr. Stevenson is a man of integrity. I believe he is a man of character. I disagree with many of the positions he has taken in the past. I do not understand many other positions he has taken in the past. I have a sense of uncertainty. I have the feeling that his attitudes are somewhat mercurial in connection with actually putting a finger on something and getting it actually confined and understandable in a certain area.

I hope he does not support a policy of erosion toward the fundamentals of American philosophy which we have undertaken to defend so strenuously in this country for these many years, merely under the guise that new frontiers demand new and revolutionary sacrifices of our whole house of freedom and association in this country.

I do not say that he does. However, let me say that he has been confusing. I disagree with my friends who have referred to his statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations as a clear and concise statement. I do not believe his statement was very clear or very concise. I was disappointed that he was not firmer in his statement on attitude and policy. I refer, for instance, to the fact that he has many times discussed Quemoy and Matsu. However, when these questions were asked of him at the hearing only the other day, he asked to be excused from discussing these points because, he said, he would become a public citizen rather than a private citizen. I see no reason why his views would not be the same the day before yesterday or the day before that, when he was at the hearing, than they were a month or 2 ago or 3 months ago, or even a year ago. I could see no reason for his not being perfectly willing to discuss his basic views on these subjects.

I feel he has failed to march up clearly and definitively and take a real, understandable position on other issues.

It is not easy for me to take a position of this kind, because I have respect for Mr. Stevenson. I have hope, of course, as we all do, that the formula for peace can be found, and found soon. I am not deluding myself into believing that it will be found in the immediate future. I certainly hope—and I will do anything I can to aid the cause—that it will be found soon.

I have faith that the strength of President Kennedy and the strength of Dean Rusk, his Secretary of State, will prevent any cleavages between the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, on the one hand, and this vast, rather uncertain organization called the United Nations, on the other hand. I hope there will be no tendency on the part of the President's representative at the United Nations to undertake what we sometimes in the field of law call frolics of his own, and make individual determinations which are not necessarily compatible with the policies of the President or the Secretary of State; in other words, that the policies carried out in the United Nations will be indeed the policies which are directed from the executive authority of this country.

I am not opposing any of the nominations that are before us. I wish to make it clear that there are some nominations before the Senate which have been sent here by the President that, certainly, if I had the authority to make them, I would not have made. There are some in which I am perfectly happy to acquiesce with perfect enthusiasm. However, in voting for these nominations I do not vote for them on the theory that I am enthusiastically approving every last one of them; I am approving the President's right and latitude in selecting the members of his own official family, for which he has the responsibility.

I find no basic reason in connection with any of the nominations before us which would justify me in my mind opposing the nominations. Insofar as the nomination of Governor Stevenson is concerned, I again wish to make clear that I do not stand in opposition. I stand on the floor of the Senate saying that if the President wants him as his Ambassador to the United Nations, then the responsibility lies there, and I shall not attempt to stand in the way.

I may say that I think one of the sad days in the Senate, and one of the most indefensible actions on the part of the Senate, was a year ago when one of the ablest public servants in modern times was turned down by the Senate. I refer to the tragic rejection of Lewis Strauss, who was nominated as Secretary of Commerce.

I think the events since then, including a recent decision by the Supreme Court itself, have clearly shown that a major argument which was used against Lewis Strauss at that time had no substance whatsoever and fell completely flat when all the facts were finally exposed. But the damage was done. The tragedy was committed.

I presume I have much more reason for voting against many of these nominations than I believe could possibly have existed in the case of Lewis Strauss. However, I believe the President should have the leeway to select his official family; and in the absence of certain conditions which do not exist in the instant case, I do not believe we are justified in voting in opposition to the nominations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think an answer should be made to the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] with respect to the nomination of Adlai Stevenson to be U.S. representative to the U.N.

The Senator from Iowa is one of the most fairminded, honest, candid individuals I know of; and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who has been nominated as U.S. representative to the U.N. is one of the most able and distinguished public servants of our time.

The arguments which the gentleman from Iowa advanced on the floor this afternoon were the arguments which he stated in the committee, in public session at the time Mr. Stevenson was before the committee. The Senator from Iowa pointed out that Mr. Stevenson did not feel, because of his possible assumption of a new position, that he should discuss such things as Quemoy and Matsu, and other related items about which he had talked and written in the years since 1952.

I think it ought to be kept in mind that when a person is nominated to a position of great importance—and there is none greater than that of the U.S. representative to the United Nations—in a sense he loses a certain amount of the freedom which he would possess as a private citizen.

In accepting such a position, provided his nomination is confirmed by the Senate, he clearly understands that under the Constitution the conduct of foreign policy is in the hands of the President of the United States; that the agent of the President in the administering of foreign policy is the Secretary of State; and that so far as other officials in the diplomatic or foreign service are concerned, they are subordinate to those two individuals.

I point out that in 1953 the Committee on Foreign Relations had before it a

nomination made by President Eisenhower. In my opinion, the person so nominated was a great man, a man of ability, integrity, and courage. That man had made a speech in Louisville, Ky., in which he stated that he favored the so-called Bricker amendment. That man wrote a book entitled "War and Peace," which on page 121 contains some very pertinent statements about the recognition or admission to the U.N., I do not recall which, of Communist China. The Senate was aware of those factors when the nomination was before us. Nevertheless, we approved the nomination unanimously, and John Foster Dulles became one of the Nation's great Secretaries of State.

I point out that when the time for the consideration of the Bricker resolution came before the Senate, one of those who was opposed to the resolution was the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, even though some years previously, in a speech at Louisville, Ky., he had advocated it or something on that order.

Then, too, we all know of his position on the question of recognizing Communist China and its admission to the United Nations. However, we must keep in mind that he had written a book entitled "War and Peace," which on page 121 contained certain statements which could have been open to question. But in the same sense of fairness that the Democrats showed in 1953 in approving unanimously the nomination of John Foster Dulles, I appreciate what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has done and said, because in making the record clear, he is pointing out also that in the new position, based on the evidence and the testimony, what Mr. Stevenson will be doing will not be to carry out what he personally believes may well be the right thing to do, but will be, under the Constitution, to follow the orders, recommendations, and policies set forth by the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Adlai E. Stevenson to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF NOMINATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED ON MONDAY—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I felt it would be unwise to make a statement with respect to every nominee before the Senate today. However, the fact that I made statements in behalf of only some of the nominees does not indicate that I have any doubt whatsoever about all the nominees. I think all of them, together, comprise an outstanding group. In my opinion, we are indeed fortunate to have had the selections before us and to have had them approved today.

Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that other nominations have been received this afternoon. They will be considered on Monday.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next, for the purpose of considering those nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May we be advised as to what nominations have been received today, so that on Monday we will not become involved in any rules problem?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The nominations will be distributed, will be made a part of the RECORD, and will be sent to the Senators interested.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNING SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier today the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, issued his initial Executive order directing the new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, to deal with the matter of a better distribution of Government-owned surplus food commodities to the people of the United States who have need for such surplus foods.

Earlier today I sent the following telegram to the President:

You are to be highly commended for your prompt act of humanitarian leadership in ordering the expansion of the surplus food distribution program so as to provide more nutritive diets for the needy citizens of our country. West Virginians especially applaud your affirmative action and are genuinely appreciative of the speed with which you begin to move to fulfill your pledges to the people of our State and the Nation.

Mr. President, the Kennedy Task Force on Area Redevelopment and Aid for Depressed Areas appointed by Mr. Kennedy soon after his election, was headed by our colleague, the discerning and very able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I believe it is appropriate for me to say in his presence, and certainly not as a mere pleasantry, that the work and reports of that task force very definitely pointed up the need for the action the President has carried into effect through issuance of the Executive order to which I have made reference. I am pleased, too, that the Senator from Illinois had a group of outstanding and understanding West Virginians serving with him on the task force which produced a forthright and factual report for the then President-elect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy that the Senator from West Virginia has commented so generously on the Executive order. We in the State of Minnesota look with favor upon this prompt Executive action.

We have had considerable hardship—and I might add suffering—in the northern and northeastern sections of our State. In the last 9 years we have had less than what one might call 3 years of reasonably good economic conditions. Hundreds, thousands, of people who are hard working, industrious, skilled workers, have been without jobs. The situation has been tragic.

The Executive order will be promptly implemented, because the order was sent to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it is fitting and proper that the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Minnesota should comment upon this, because the area of distress in West Virginia is well known by the Senator from Minnesota. I assure the Senator from West Virginia that the Secretary of Agriculture will move in his typically quick, decisive, and effective manner to implement the order, because an Executive order is only as good as its implementation. Thank goodness for the spirit of cooperation which at last exists to get the job done, not only to provide more food but also, as the Senator has said, to provide a balanced diet.

I saw the food which was being supplied to our needy. It was dried beans, powdered milk, sacks of flour, powdered eggs, and occasionally a pound of lard.

The Senator from West Virginia can rest assured that the program of food distribution will include additional items which are nutritive and which will provide a balanced diet to our fine American citizens who are in need.

I compliment the President. I thank him with deep sincerity for this act of compassion, of generosity, and of justice.

I assure the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture has been trained in the school of effective administration. He is a marine, like the great Senator from Illinois, and when the order is given it will be carried out. There will be results.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I respond to my friend from Minnesota by saying that we have every reason to believe there will be the necessary followthrough by the Secretary of Agriculture in compliance with the order issued by the President.

The Senator from Minnesota is knowledgeable on this subject. I know of the legislative effort he has made in this area of national concern.

I should like to further indicate that, as of the end of December, there were in West Virginia approximately 290,000 persons who were certified as being eligible for surplus commodities. We have been grappling with their difficult problem in our State, and it is one which is in existence in other States also. We must remember that if there is an erosion of the economy affecting so many of our citizenry within one area or within one State, the deteriorating effects move into other sections of the country.

I compliment the Senator from Minnesota for joining in the Senate today to commend the President of the United States for his prompt action in this important area of our national life.

RENTAL OF PRIVATE HOMES DURING THE INAUGURAL PERIOD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a situation in which certain individuals in attendance at the inaugural ceremonies are renting private homes for the week's use with the proviso that the rent paid shall go to charity.

Under this arrangement, allegedly, the payment will be made directly to a charity designated by the owner. Allegedly, it is intended that under this arrangement, it would have the net result of allowing the expense of attending the inaugural ceremonies to be charged off as a charitable contribution.

Because I felt certain that such an arrangement would not qualify these payments as charitable deductions by those renting the homes, I directed an inquiry to the Treasury Department, citing a hypothetical case and asking for a ruling. I shall incorporate both letters in the RECORD.

In its ruling the Treasury Department suggests that these payments must be counted as income to the owners of the homes, and that when the money is turned over to charity, it will then be allowed as a charitable deduction to offset the income. However, the ruling is clear that under no circumstances can the lessees of the homes claim the rental payments as charitable deductions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury and his reply thereto be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1961.

Mr. JAY W. GLASMANN,
Assistant to the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GLASMANN: My attention has been called to a situation wherein certain individuals in attendance to the inaugural ceremonies are renting private homes at rates of $1,000 to $1,500 for the week's use with the proviso that the money go 100 percent to charity. Allegedly the arrangements are that the payments will be made directly to a charity designated by the owner, and in this manner the expenses of attending the inaugural ceremonies would be charged off as a charitable contribution.

My question is: Can a person attending the inaugural ceremonies use such an arrangement and thereby be permitted to charge off as charitable contributions this part of his expenses while attending the inaugural ceremonies? Would not such an arrangement in effect still be a payment for services and thereby not deductible as a charitable contribution?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

JANUARY 19, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of January 18, 1961. You inquired whether an individual who comes to Washington to attend the inaugural ceremonies and rents a house with the proviso that the rental go 100 percent to charity may thus deduct, as a charitable contribution, this part of his expenses of attending the inaugural ceremonies.

We do not believe that in this situation the person renting the house may claim a charitable deduction. He is paying an amount for the privilege of occupying the house and the amount which he pays would be considered a payment of rental. It does not seem that the fact that the owner of the house is willing to rent his house and have the rental paid to a charity designated by him should give rise to a charitable deduction to the tenant. The rental paid would be considered income to the owner of the house who would be entitled to a charitable deduction subject to the appropriate limitations upon the amount of the contribution which may be claimed as a charitable deduction.

Sincerely yours,

JAY W. GLASMANN,
Assistant to the Secretary.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have a letter over the signature of the President of the United States with respect to the National Cultural Center Act, which was signed in 1958. The matter is of some importance in proceeding with the plans and design, because it is necessary to acquire some small parcels of land.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter and the text of the bill that I introduced be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 516) to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1698), as amended, is amended by striking out section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The Board shall construct for the Smithsonian Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by the Inner Loop Freeway on the east, the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge approaches on the south, the Potomac River on the west, and G Street, between the Potomac River and Twenty-sixth Street, and F Street, between Twenty-sixth Street and the Inner Loop Freeway, on the north, which shall be selected for such purpose by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission shall acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, lands necessary to provide for the National Cultural Center and related facilities. Such building shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Commission of Fine Arts."

The letter presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 18, 1961.

The Honorable EVERETT MCK. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: The National Cultural Center Act, signed in 1958, provided for the establishment of a national center for the performing arts. Organizationally, the center is a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. Its trustees are broadly representative of Government agencies and include appointments from the general public.

This statute set aside a parcel of land in the Foggy Bottom area in the Nation's Capital as a site for the National Cultural Center.

Over a period of many months of discussion and planning, the Board of Trustees of the center concluded that the somewhat awkwardly shaped site described in the law was not adequate for the type of facilities contemplated by the Congress in the National Cultural Center Act.

Consequently, the architect-adviser to the Board of Trustees, Mr. Edward D. Stone, in cooperation with the head of the National Park Service and other officials, developed a plan involving a small addition to the site which would establish the center in a more convenient and useful location immediately upon the Potomac River. This change in plans permitted Mr. Stone to develop the beautiful design for the structure that has received enthusiastic support from the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the District of Columbia Commissioners. It has been my impression that the public's response to the plans also has been very favorable, and, at my invitation, 11 of the chief national organizations concerned with the performing arts have become associated with the project.

If plans are to be carried forward for constructing the center in accordance with the approved site plan, it will be necessary to acquire three small parcels of land just outside the boundaries now described in the National Cultural Center Act. In addition to redescribing the boundaries to include these parcels, the boundaries need to be changed in order to permit construction of the center in part on parkland which the

Park Service is willing to substitute in order to create the new enlarged site. This exchange of land with the Park Service will make possible the establishment of the center in a beautiful riverfront setting, surrounded by parks and with adequate traffic approaches, as befits an important building in the Nation's Capital.

Last spring legislation was introduced by you and Senator CHAVEZ, Representative JONES of Alabama, and others to enlarge the boundaries of the site in accordance with the approved plan. Executive branch clearance was given these bills, but in the press of the business in the last session no action was taken. The trustees earnestly hope, of course, that these bills will be reintroduced in the 87th Congress.

It is apparent to me that the whole national fundraising effort for the center may be jeopardized if the trustees are not given a clear title to the land necessary to accomplish the approved plan.

The National Cultural Center project, if brought to realization, would be a tremendous national asset, one which could do a great deal to strengthen the arts in America and thereby improve our cultural image at home and throughout the world.

I hope it will be possible for you to advance this undertaking by supporting the needed legislaton early in the session.

Because these matters I have discussed above concern a project in which I believe all of us should have a deep interest, I am sending similar letters to other Members of the Senate and House leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH INSURRECTION AGAINST CZARIST RUSSIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 22, 1863, Polish patriots led an insurrection against czarist Russia. However, the revolt failed, and the Polish people were brought under the domination of the Russian Empire, which proceeded to ruthlessly punish and oppress the Polish people. History records that Poland became a free and great nation, but the chain of events in history once again brought Poland under the domination of Russia, this time under the Soviet Communists. The Polish people, as is the case with other peoples in central and eastern Europe who are under the yoke of communism, have always maintained their great spirit and love for freedom, and they look forward to the day when again they shall be free. It was not too long ago that the world was shocked at the brutalities inflicted on the Polish people because of their desire and bid to throw off the yoke of tyranny and oppression.

Mr. President, we, the people of the United States, who always are concerned with the rights and dignities of all people, must ever be conscious of the difficulties and oppressions that freedom-loving people must endure under tyranny of any kind, and that we in Government and the United States as a nation of the United Nations should exercise a policy that will reassure the people of Poland and the wonderful Americans of Polish descent in this country and do everything that we can to achieve peace throughout the world, with the right of freedom and self-government for all nations in the world.

Mr. President, quite apropos of this occasion is the following statement taken from the remarks of my colleague, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois:

The tragic consequences of the Yalta Conference, when the wartime American President blindly betrayed the free peoples now behind the Iron Curtain, are known to all.

The people in Poland cannot commemorate on January 22 the anniversary of their struggle for independence, so many years ago. However, to once again fly the banner of freedom is their most cherished goal.

Nations, just as individuals, are endowed with faith. We salute the brave Polish people now suffering under Communist tyranny, knowing that their steadfast faith will one day reward them with the previous gifts of freedom that they deserve to possess.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and those nations entirely irradicated by Soviet expansion; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which are suffering the same tragic fate that is Poland's. Our words of appreciation and encouragement must, at all times, go out to those people as well.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINE AS A FREE AND INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, January 22, 1961, marks the 43d anniversary of the proclamation declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent Republic.

The independence of Ukraine, proclaimed by the National Council at Kiev, in 1918, most tragically was a brief one, for in 1920 the Communists brutally subjugated the people of Ukraine, and have held them under their yoke since that time. Like other wonderful peoples in Europe and Asia under the domination of communism, the Ukraine people have lived under the blackest periods in the history of mankind, because of the brutalities and crimes committed against them. However, the oppressed Ukraine people have never given up hope and heart for the day when they may have complete freedom. It is this dream of freedom that places no limit to the number of forces which motivate and put into motion the human desire to move forward toward freedom. The Ukraine people have possessed many fine virtues through their long and turbulent history, and they have clung to them steadfastly.

Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., 302 West 13th Street, New York, N.Y., in a letter to Members of Congress, sees hope in the actions of the 86th Congress, which by means of a Captive Week resolution, passed legislation—Public Law 86-749—authorizing a Shevchenko statue; and Congress issued House Document No. 445, entitled "Europe's Freedom Fighter," which today powerfully counteracts Moscow's distortions about bourgeois nationalism in Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the "Union of Soviet Slave Regions."

Professor Dobriansky further pointed out:

These advances scarcely scratch the surface of this New Frontier. Much, much more can be done peaceably and skillfully to seize the initiative from Moscow, to demolish the spurious Russian image of power, to gain a strategic political leverage among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., and to abet those natural forces within the U.S.S.R. which would enable us to win the cold war and thus stave off a hot one. Entailing a Freedom Academy and other measures, a program aimed at a commonwealth of nations in Eastern Europe and central Asia can be realized. It is, for example, nothing short of deplorable that Khrushchev should take the initiative on the colonialism issue though mountains of evidence favor us concerning Russian imperialism and colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I hope the day soon will come when all freedom-loving people who are under the yoke of communism will again be free, and that all peoples will live in peace and brotherly love.

A GENTLE, BELOVED PRESIDENT STEPS DOWN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday a gentle, beloved man and a great leader put aside the mantle of high public office and became a private citizen. This is one of the amazing things about our free system of government. Were it not for the determination by the people that the tenure of the Chief Executive be limited to two terms and had he been willing to again accept the responsibility of this high office, it is entirely possible that he would be taking the oath of office as President for a third time.

In due course, historians will assess his impact on world and national affairs and seek to catalog his place in history, according to their lights. With the detachment which the march of mankind through time provides, each in his own way will endeavor to evaluate his impress upon the problems of his administration and render judgment.

But I am not a historian. For the moment, I am content to set down an appraisal based upon a modest participation in the events of the last 8 years. I can do no better than to re-echo some of the sentiments which I expressed when it was my privilege to present him to our National Convention in Chicago, last autumn.

When, in 1952, he was elected to lead this Nation, a kind of frustration and moral fatigue had settled upon the land. Faith in our own free institutions had weakened. The leaders who preceded him had taken the Nation down one extreme road and then another. Government had become defeatist. It had retreated from the basic principles which made this a great Nation. There was a deficit of resolve, courage, and dedication.

To this vacuum, Dwight Eisenhower brought new faith, new simplicity, and a purposeful political credo. It was all so simply stated. It was modest enough to vex pedantic critics and basic enough

to deeply enshrine him in the hearts of his countrymen. They still revere him.

His dedication to the cause of peace never faltered. Humbly and persistently, he pursued this goal. To the alarm of his associates and at great risk to himself he journeyed to far-off peoples that the warmth of his personality and the earnestness of his message might dissipate their fears and bring to them the unremitting assurance of our devotion to peace. He knew, even as we all know, that the alternative to peace might be coannihilation.

As the grand captain of the greatest military crusade in the history of mankind, his devotion to our national security was foremost in his thoughts. It is the oldest problem of modern society. And it could well become the most pressing of all problems in the years ahead. What he sought always was a balanced defense which would provide the greatest security with the least burden. He had to contend with special pleaders. He noted the self-generated groups which issued critical reports. He witnessed men, educated at Government expense, retire from Government to civilian life where they might utter their frustrations from platforms or by the printed word. As he noted all this, never did he scold or strike back. But at no time did the people lose faith in his judgment or perspective.

From the very beginning, he made it clear that a nation's strength lay not merely in its armed might but in its solvency as well. Over and over, he affirmed the conviction that strength abroad required stability at home and that stability could be achieved only through sound policies. Well did he know that the savings of little people in whatever form could be conserved only by policies which could nullify destructive inflation. This course took courage. It meant the disapproval of measures which had momentary political appeal. It meant resistance to personal appeals from friends and political associates. It meant quiet submission to the sharp attacks of political opponents. It meant holding the budget line. But in this struggle, he never faltered.

He was ever mindful of human needs and the legitimate function of government in meeting the problem. Over and over, he reemphasized the sentiment once uttered by Lincoln that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

And by no means least in the fresh viewpoint which he brought to the peoples government was a new sense of courtesy and good manners. Over the years, close students of government could detect a certain fear and apprehension on the part of our people as if government was their enemy. They could detect a certain growing arrogance in government as if those who were their servants had undertaken the role of master. Good manners retreated and courtesy became an uncommon attribute. By his own unfailing courtesy and his gentle nature, these attributes were restored.

These then were the elements of a simple credo of a gentle man and great leader—devoted to the cause of peace, to national security, to national solvency, to human needs, and to a recognition that this is not a system in which government is master and people are servants but in truth and fact a government by, of, and for the people. So today, we can say to him Godspeed, good healing, and a deserved respite from 8 years of responsibility for the direction and well-being of this Nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is at the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. It authorizes certain members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida as witnesses and produce certain documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have cleared this with the leadership. The resolution is the usual one, and authorizes the subcommittee to cooperate with the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) authorizing certain members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida as witnesses and produce certain documents, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of S. Res. 255, section 5, Eighty-sixth Congress, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation dealing with James R. Hoffa, Henry Lower, and Robert E. McCarthy, Jr., which investigation was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field under S. Res. 44, Eighty-sixth Congress; and

Whereas the Department of Justice has advised that a criminal trial in the aforementioned matter is pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Orlando Division, against said James R. Hoffa, Henry Lower, and Robert E. McCarthy, Jr., charging violations of Federal criminal statutes involving the Federal crimes of fraud by mail, fraud by wire, and fraud by telephone; and

Whereas the United States Department of Justice has advised that a pretrial proceeding in the aforementioned matter is scheduled to commence January 24, 1961, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Orlando Division; and

Whereas staff members of the subcommittee and former staff members of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field will receive subpenas to appear and testify as witnesses in these court proceedings; and

Whereas, under rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, such documents in the hands of the subcommittee are the property of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the subcommittee is granted leave to permit properly designated staff members to appear as witnesses, testify and produce documents before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Orlando Division, pursuant to the subpenas and to permit the copying and presentation of certain records for examination in connection with these court proceedings and thereafter to be returned to the possession of the subcommittee.

NOMINATIONS RECEIVED ON JANUARY 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the nominations sent to the Senate on January 21, 1961. In looking over the list hastily, I note that there are certain nominations on which hearings have not been held. Let me say, for the information of the Senate, that so far as those nominations are concerned, they will not be considered by the Senate until the hearings have been held and until the material is made available to all Senators.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATIONS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 21, 1961

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert V. Roosa, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Frank Barry, of Arizona, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

William Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

Jerry R. Holleman, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Kermit Gordon, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

John S. Gleason, Jr., of Illinois, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for something for which he has not received commendation, so far as I know. I believe it is time that acknowledgment be made.

In 1953, when the Eisenhower Cabinet was nominated, there was an effort, which very nearly succeeded, to have the nominations approved forthwith, without providing adequate opportunity for Senators to study the hearings on the nominations and, obviously, at least, according to my view—without adequate consideration. Thanks to the Senator from Oregon, that did not occur.

A similar situation developed this year. At a conference of Democratic Senators, the Senator from Oregon made it clear that he would object to immediate consideration of nominations to the Cabinet, and he insisted that the nominations go over for one day. He did so for a very excellent purpose. It is a fact that the Constitution requires that the Senate give its advice and consent to these nominations. Furthermore, in the next 4 years, and perhaps the next 8 years, no more important nominations will come before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon made it perfectly clear that his principal purpose was to make sure that Senators have adequate opportunity to be informed, and yesterday the Senator from Oregon took great pains to make sure that that be done by stating that it was his purpose to have the hearings on the nominations made available to all Senators. Mr. President, I think this is a most important and most serious matter in the interest of the country, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay my respects to the Senator from Oregon for his diligence in seeing that that be done. I believe this is one of the many occasions on which the Senator from Oregon, because of his great knowledge of parliamentary procedure and his insistence that the proper procedure be followed, has made a significant contribution.

I understand that the Senator from Oregon is about to speak on the President's nomination of the new Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Connally. I do not know exactly what position the Senator from Oregon will take on the nomination, but I know he has some questions about it. I wish to say that I join the Senator from Oregon in his concern about the nomination, and at this time I desire to serve notice that I intend to discuss the nomination when it comes up on Monday.

This Senator intends to raise questions with the committee chairman who will make the Connally nomination. There appears to be a serious and grave conflict of interest involved. I believe it should be explored most carefully by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his graciousness and kindness. I never follow a course of action for the purpose of seeking to obtain approval. My only purpose is to serve the public interest.

In a few moments I shall have something to say about the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy. But, first, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his generosity and kindness, and for the friendship which his statement portrays.

PARENTS NEED SPECIAL TAX CREDITS IN PROVIDING HIGHER EDUCATION; SUPPORT GIVEN TO BILLS FOR THIS PURPOSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have introduced, for myself and my colleague [Mr. BYRD of West Virginia], a bill (S. 391) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents.

During the recent election campaign in my home State, I discussed the advisability and need for such legislation. At Beckley, W. Va., October 12, 1960, I stated that the years during which parents have one or more children in college are heavy impact years on the family budget and there is cause for recognition of this expense by our Government. The problem is one of importance.

I said, too, that our Nation needs more expertly trained teachers, more diplomats educated to speak foreign languages fluently, and more engineers, if we are to meet the requirements of our country's rapidly expanding population and the trend of world affairs.

Mr. President, if we are to meet the challenge of the Soviets, and if we are to have adequate representation in a world in which scores of new nations are coming into being as colonialism disappears, we must prepare our youth for positive leadership.

Our young people need to be encouraged and helped to acquire the best obtainable education compatible with their talents, and many parents must likewise be encouraged and assisted if their children are to acquire college educations.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a sensible article in the educational section of the Washington Daily News, Wednesday, January 11, 1961, under the heading: "Start Budgeting Now—High College Costs Are Worry to Parents." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

START BUDGETING NOW—HIGH COLLEGE COSTS ARE WORRY TO PARENTS

One of the tragedies of our era is the high cost of education.

A Government survey reports some 50 to 60 percent of students, eligible for college on the basis of school marks, are unable to meet the expense.

A just completed poll from the Institute of Student Opinion shows one secondary school student in four needing financial aid to continue his education and not sure how to get it.

TUITION

Count on $1,700 a year for tuition, living expenses, transportation, clothes, books, and incidentals if you're planning on a public college, $2,500 for private colleges.

These costs are double what they were in 1940. Worse still, they are expected to double again by 1970. What is the solution?

Many factors are involved, including whether you are faced with this problem immediately or a couple of years from now, whether you must raise the total cost of college or whether a portion of it might come from current earnings.

Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought that the Government's National Defense Education Act and the thousands of available scholarships will solve your problem.

COMPETITION

Competition for the latter is at a peak. The Government Aid Act, unless renewed by Congress expires in 1962.

Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought of financing college solely on the installment plan.

One banker, who is hesitant to make such loans to parents whose retirement may not be secure, points equally to the tragedy of saddling students with debt which they must repay at just the time when they might be starting out in life.

Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought that savings alone will provide for college costs, unless perhaps you have a toddler and you budget from this very minute, taking into consideration the projected cost of college in the 1970's.

PLANS

One unhappy parent of two college-age youngsters tells how when his children were infants and he could ill afford the premiums, he bought insurance to cover the cost of college. What he bought 20 years ago now covers 1 year's cost.

Dependent upon how many years lie ahead, you must work out your own formula of savings, investment, borrowing, and perhaps add additional earnings both from parent and student.

Don't count on a scholarship, but don't overlook the possibility.

If you are planning to borrow, shop your education loan carefully.

One of the most interesting savings plans comes from Don Lester Waage, manager for finance in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Department of Taxation and Finance.

He shows how, using 3 percent interest compounded quarterly, annual college expenses ranging up to $2,500 can be met with 5½- and 7½-year plans.

SAVINGS

The monthly deposits range from $33 to $154, depending on the amount you are planning to save and the number of years you have in order to meet this savings goal.

If you are facing the dilemma of immediately financing a college education, possibly there is a company which would hire your youngster and send him through college at their expense.

Most often this means going to college at night. Banks and insurance companies are among the leaders in this type of aid.

Educators report much good brain power going to waste because of the high cost of education. The younger your child is today, the more aware you are of this problem, and the greater the chance that you can solve it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Also, Mr. President, I would wish to share with you a most constructive communication on this subject, from the Honorable Ralph J. Bean, of Moorefield, W. Va., former president of the West Virginia State Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1961.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I write you concerning a matter in which I have a keen personal interest, as well as a firm belief that prompt action is needed for the good of hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

I have no objection to paying our Federal income taxes, as I realize that our Government must have money for the multitude of purposes set forth in our budget. I consider it a privilege to pay my small share in helping to keep our country great and good.

However, within the past 2 years, two of my children have been fortunate enough to enter West Virginia institutions of higher education, and I have, under our American way of life, been fortunate enough to have the needed income to pay all of their expenses. For the school year of 1960–61, it will cost me approximately $4,000, or $2,000 per student, to keep these two in college. At the same time, under our income tax laws I am allowed an exemption of only $600 per student or a total of $1,200. Within the next 3 years, if providence permits, I shall have a third child in college, and my average cost for the three will be $6,000 per year, and my total exemption will be $1,800.

I firmly believe that higher education affords one of the best ways of providing better American leadership, and I have always strongly urged every American father to attempt to provide his children with college educations. If this recommendation is followed, I believe that America will become a better country in which to live, and that we will thereby make certain that America will always remain the greatest leader among world powers.

Accordingly, I urge that legislation be enacted to increase the personal exemption under our income tax laws to at least $1,200 for each child that the taxpayer wholly provides with a college education.

In addition to giving the interested parents a deserving break, such enactment will stimulate an interest in the field of higher education, and will contribute much to making our country a better one in which to live, work, and play.

I sincerely hope you will give my recommendations your very careful consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH J. BEAN.

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNING SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, without losing the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I just heard of the Executive order of the new President directing an improvement in the amount, variety, and nutritional quality of food distributed to needy families. I think this is a humane action, and one that is long overdue.

I am not the only one in the Senate who has expressed concern over this matter. I remember that 3 years ago I urged on the Senate floor that such action be taken. I urged the Department of Agriculture again and again to increase the amount, variety, and quality of surplus food for needy people.

Finally, when no action came, I offered an amendment with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, to the mutual security bill, to require the Department of Agriculture to supply surplus food to the needy and to give it priority over food to be sold abroad for local currencies.

Finally we did get some action. I am sorry to say that we were never able to secure the kind of action to supply food in the variety, amount, and nutritional quality that unemployed men and women and their children need.

So today I think it is fair to say it is just that the first order of the President of the United States should be a humane act. I think it is very appropriate that his first act should be for the benefit of the needy people of our country.

PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING NOMINATIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has demonstrated again his belief in orderly and due process and orderly procedure. There is a maxim somewhere which states that all law and justice run at least to some degree to procedure. At least, the rights of this body should be protected. I think that by insisting that there be orderly hearings in the Senate on nominations, the Senator from Oregon has performed a great service, not only to us, but to the country.

I have received communications about the nomination of Mr. Connally to be Secretary of the Navy. I do not know him. I do not know anything about him other than the information I have received from letters and through the press. I assume from what I have heard today that the Senator intends to discuss this matter, and I shall look forward to hearing at least a part of his discussion. If I am not able to hear all of it, at least I shall look forward to reading it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for about 3 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York, without losing the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, for myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], proposed housing legislation to first, remove the limit on relocation payments under the Federal urban renewal program; second, increase to $150 million the urban renewal extender fund; third, permit the FHA mortgage insurance premium to be lowered to one-fourth of 1 percent; and fourth, raise from 10 to 12½ percent the total amount in college housing loans which may be borrowed in any one State for the construction of dormitories and related facilities.

The last of these bills is sponsored by the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE], and the other three bills are sponsored by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Following the introduction of similar legislation last year, these measures were accepted by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, and they were incorporated in the major housing bill subsequently passed by the Senate, but which died in the House Rules Committee.

Action on an omnibus housing bill in 1961 should be of priority concern to the new Congress and the new Administration. The emergency legislation rushed through last year, when the Senate-passed Housing Act of 1960 became hopelessly pigeonholed in the House Rules Committee, gave a last-minute transfusion of funds to a few programs. But urban renewal and public housing along with many necessary amendments to improve established programs such as those being introduced today were bypassed. A repetition of last year's failure must be avoided at all cost in the interest of housing and of our economy.

The legislation proposed today was an integral part of the major housing bill as it passed the Senate, and if anything, it is more necessary now than at the time it was favorably considered in this Chamber. The proposal to increase the present limit on urban renewal relocation payments—fixed at a maximum of $200 to individuals and families and $3,000 per business—is aimed at eliminating an inequity which is most often experienced by those living on urban renewal sites in large metropolitan areas. Such maximums are unrealistic in an area like New York City, where the city finds that, in connection with its own housing projects, the cost of relocating tenants usually runs several hundred dollars above what the Federal Government would pay in similar circumstances on an urban renewal site.

Also, some studies of the fate of businesses forced to move off these sites

reveal that up to 25 percent of them did not survive; some business mergers were reported; some owners retired; others failed in new locations; and some disappeared altogether. My proposal would allow the locality and the Federal Governments to treat payments over and above the existing Federal maximums as a regular urban renewal cost, to be shared on the same basis of one-third to two-thirds. Thus, we would minimize the risk that slum clearance would mean slum transference. Instead, tenement families could hope and be helped to relocate in decent housing in a healthier environment.

The proposal to increase the urban renewal extender fund from $100 million to $150 million does not increase the total grant authorization for the program itself. But it does assure States which have the greatest number of projects, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California, that they are not going to be penalized for their vigorous participation in the urban renewal program. A more adequate extender fund of $150 million would mean that when a State exceeds its 12½ percent share of the regular funds, the statutory maximum, its localities could avoid a slowdown or stalemate by seeking new financing from this source.

Another housing measure which I believe would be of substantial assistance to middle income families is the lowering of the annual FHA premium charge for mortgage insurance to one-fourth of 1 percent at the discretion of the FHA Commissioner. The present minimum is one-half of 1 percent. However, the reserve fund for all FHA insurance companies is well above the $850 million mark, and the savings which my proposal envisions would be substantial to several million families. If the suggested minimum was put into effect, the owners of more than 3 million homes with FHA mortgages would realize an average saving of $21 a year and up to $30 on new mortgages. The cost of more than 683,000 units of cooperative or rental housing would be reduced about $30 each year. This reduction could prove an important stimulus to housing construction in a bracket within the purchasing or rental reach of the middle income group, a group which is now slowly but surely being driven outside many of our big cities because of inadequate housing.

The last proposal I am submitting, which also passed the Senate as part of the Housing Act of 1960, will enable those States which educate an unusually large proportion of college and graduate students to receive their fair share of funds under the college housing program. States like New York and California are making a tremendous effort to house and care for the rapidly growing college population. Today, New York or any other State cannot borrow more than 10 percent of the construction funds for college dormitories and similar facilities, and yet, in our case, we educate between 11 percent and 12 percent of all the graduate and undergraduate students in the United States—418,675 young men and women. California also has passed the 10 percent figure. At the rate this enrollment is growing, by 1970 New York colleges and universities expect to have to house as many as 110,000 more students than they do right now. With this responsibility, coupled with the admittedly higher construction costs in New York, often 20 percent higher than in other States, permitting any State to utilize up to 12½ percent of the college loan funds will enable New York, California, and any other State that needs to, to undertake new building programs which are more realistically scaled to future as well as existing college housing needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills referred to by Mr. JAVITS were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 517. A bill to amend the laws relating to mortgage insurance, urban renewal, State limitation, and relocation payments; and

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 518. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 with respect to the amount of loans permitted to be made in any State.

DR. THOMAS DOOLEY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, who has so graciously yielded to me and others, the passing of a great hero, who fought with heart and skills, not with weapons—although they are to me the most effective weapons. I refer to Thomas Dooley, who died at age 34. I should like to read the last sentence from a New York Times editorial:

He had so little time, but how superbly he used it.

Mr. President, the Thomas Dooley story is very well known. He was the jungle doctor of southeast Asia who contributed to humanity in a most fantastic way. When it was discovered he had cancer, it spurred him on to making a lecture tour from which he raised $1 million in order to carry on his work and build new centers for hospitalization and surgery in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any life that is superior to the life of Dr. Dooley in the flaming desire to convey to people in newly developing areas like Laos the aids of medicine and the conviction that Western civilization does have a mission for humanity.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune, as well as the obituary notice in the Herald Tribune, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM DOOLEY, DOCTOR OF MEDICINE

Tom Dooley is dead at 34, but he leaves behind him a rich legacy of good works and well deserved good will.

His life, even after he knew it must soon be forfeit, was dedicated to providing the means by which the people of southeast Asia might at last have badly needed medical care. He drove himself relentlessly, building hospitals, writing books, raising money, training staffs, caring for the sick and bringing hope to the helpless. He became a living symbol of that concern for human, personal welfare which the United States tries, with mixed success, to project.

In a birthday telegram Tuesday, President Eisenhower told him: "It must be a source of heartened gratification to realize that in so few years you have accomplished so much for the good of distant peoples and have inspired so many others to work for all humanity." The world needs more Tom Dooleys.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1961]

THOMAS DOOLEY, M.D.

Tom Dooley moved fast in his haste to bring healing to the kingdom of Laos. He had to move fast when there were so many hundreds of thousands of ailing and pain-stricken people who needed help and weren't getting it—and so little time. He couldn't be patient or diplomatic with sorrow and death. He couldn't be patient with the disease that finally came over his own strong frame; he fought it and went on doing his work, and his spirit was like a flame in the dark jungle. He couldn't bring the full resources of a New York clinic and hospital to northern Laos, but he brought what he could and was a teacher as well as a physician.

An accident in 1959 stirred up the cancer that was to kill him. He returned to New York for an operation, waited impatiently to regain his strength and plunged again into his faraway field of service. He knew his trouble might recur, and it did. Tuesday, January 17, he had his 34th birthday and Wednesday night, as courageously and calmly as he lived, he died.

Messages from President Eisenhower, Cardinal Spellman and others had comforted him with their assurance that he had done more in 34 years than most men have been able to do in threescore and ten. He had so little time, but how superbly he used it.

MASSES IN TWO CATHEDRALS WILL HONOR DR. DOOLEY—JUNGLE DOCTOR OF SOUTHEAST ASIA IS FLOWN TO ST. LOUIS FOR BURIAL

A requiem mass will be offered for Dr. Thomas Dooley at 10 a.m. Monday at St. Patrick's Cathedral. A similar mass will be offered at St. Louis Cathedral, St. Louis, Mo., at 10:30 a.m. the same day.

Dr. Dooley, who died of cancer at Memorial Hospital Wednesday, was flown to St. Louis last night. Medical students at the University of St. Louis will serve as pallbearers for Dr. Dooley. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery, St. Louis.

Dr. Dooley dedicated himself to providing medical aid to the people of southeast Asia and he became widely known as the jungle doctor.

CHOSE HARD CAREER

Two years of ministering to the needs—food, shelter, sanitation, and spiritual as well as medical—to thousands of refugees at an evacuation camp in South Vietnam brought Dr. Dooley to a decision, when he was not yet 30 years old that he must forsake a future as a physician in prosperous, comfortable America to dedicate his life to the succor of the helpless and needy of southeast Asia.

He had been serving his medical internship as an officer in the Navy, assigned to an evacuee staging area at Haiphong after the French Indochina war was over. He later wrote of this experience:

"I had to provide shelter and food, sanitation, and some human solace to a flood of humanity, undernourished, exhausted, bewildered, and pitifully frightened—my primary task was medical—to stamp out contagious diseases, but there was no ducking the huge problems of housekeeping and

administration for the shifting camp population, normally between 10,000 and 15,000 persons."

Upon leaving the service in 1956 when he returned to the United States, Dr. Dooley wrote his first book, "Deliver Us From Evil," telling the story of the work at Haiphong. It became a bestseller, and with the proceeds, augmented by donations of material from pharmaceutical companies, he set out to establish a small village hospital at Nam Tha with permission from the new Government of Laos. With him went three former Navy corpsmen who had worked with him at Haiphong.

He turned over this hospital to the Laos Government in 1957 and returned to the United States to raise funds for another such medical mission. In Washington, he met Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, who had been working on acceptance of an international program of direct physician-to-patient medical aid in areas where no facilities existed at all.

FOUNDED MEDICO, INC.

Together, the two physicians founded Medico, the Medical International Cooperation Organization, a voluntary, nonpolitical, nonsectarian enterprise which was launched under the auspices of the International Rescue Committee but in 1959 became a separate entity, incorporated as Medico, Inc.

Some of the funds came from the proceeds of Dr. Dooley's second book, "The Edge of Tomorrow," which also became a bestseller after it was published in May 1958. To this money he added proceeds from other writings and a lecture tour that preceded his return to Laos to establish another hospital in the remote village of Muong Sing, the first such institution under the aegis of Medico.

By the end of 1960, Medico had 17 projects in operation in 12 countries.

These included seven hospitals in southeast Asia, and Dr. Dooley had an important role in getting all of them under way. Medico adhered to a policy of establishing its projects only on invitation by the host government, and Dr. Dooley played a principal role in the preliminary negotiations as well as in the details of getting the institutions started.

SURGERY FOR CANCER

In August 1959, the young doctor learned that he had a highly malignant cancer of the chest wall and flew to New York for major surgery at Memorial Hospital. After a brief convalescence, he undertook a nationwide lecture tour, raising nearly $1 million for Medico, before returning to the Medico hospital at Muong Sing.

There he resumed a schedule that involved working 20 hours a day. Two more trips to the United States disclosed no recurrence of cancer, and last spring he delivered 55 lectures in 30 cities in 34 days. He also published his third book, "The Night They Burned the Mountain."

But last November he entered a hospital at Hong Kong, suffering from extreme fatigue and exhaustion, and increasing pain required his return to Memorial Hospital. There, on January 10, it was announced that the cancer had renewed its attack.

Dr. Dooley was a native of St. Louis, Mo., and received his early education there. He attended the University of Notre Dame in 1943–44, and served 2 years in the Navy.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a very important engagement to which I must go shortly, so I shall not yield further.

I wish to complete the remarks I intend to make on the major subject to which I shall address myself, but before I turn to that subject matter, I want to make a brief comment on some observations which have been made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon in regard to the nomination some years ago of Mr. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

I did not raise the issue, but the observations made were to the effect that those of us who led the fight against the Strauss nomination—and I was one of them—had been proved as a result of subsequent events to have been wrong, it being said that even the Supreme Court decision recently on the Dixon-Yates contract case proved we were wrong. I was quite surprised by that comment because, as I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, the Dixon-Yates case proved how right we were.

The Dixon-Yates case was so infamous, so notorious and shocking in the conflict of interest which gave it birth, that the U.S. Supreme Court set aside a judgment of the Court of Claims, which was a split decision, also, even allowing the Dixon-Yates Co. so-called out-of-pocket money in respect to preliminary preparations in connection with the substance of the contract.

The opinion of the Supreme Court should leave no room for doubt in the mind of anyone how right a group of us in the Senate were in standing up against one of the most powerful lobbies I have ever seen at work in the cloakrooms of the Senate at the time of the Dixon-Yates fight. The great Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who was our leader—many of us strengthened his hand at the time—brought before the Senate the undeniable evidence of the shocking conflict of interest in which Mr. Wenzell engaged when, as an officer of the First Boston Corp., he was slipped into—I think it is the proper use of the words—he was slipped into the Bureau of the Budget to assist the Bureau of the Budget in laying the framework and the groundwork for the provisions of that notorious contract, when it was well known that the First Boston Corp. would be one of the principal beneficiaries of the securities which would be involved in the transaction.

When the Senator from Tennessee asked the Bureau of the Budget to send up the list of personnel involved in the transaction, it was interesting that the list omitted the name of Wenzell. Apparently they did not know we knew. Then when the Senator from Tennessee called the attention of the Bureau of the Budget to the fact that Wenzell's name was not included, and asked for an explanation, the weak, lame alibi was, "It was an oversight."

I said then, and I repeat today: It was a shocking example of political corruption within the Eisenhower administration, repeated in many other instances during the 8-year life of that administration, and some of us have dared to discuss those shocking examples of political corruption on the floor of the Senate in what will be historic debates in the history of this body.

Did the Supreme Court clear Strauss? The comment made by the Chief Justice—as I pointed out in my speech on January 17 replying to an article written by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times, who, as I said, had not done his bookwork—which was an obiter dictum comment, labored under the impression that the Atomic Energy Commission did not know of the conflict of interest, but of course this was not the issue in the Supreme Court case. The issue in the case was whether there was a conflict of interest involved in the contract. The Court found that there was, and on that basis rejected any claim of the Dixon-Yates Co. to any compensation because of the conflict of interest which was involved.

I pointed out the other day, and I point out once more, in reply to the comments made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon: Mr. Lewis Strauss, under oath, testified before the committee of the Senate he knew, at the time, that Wenzell was an officer of the First Boston Corp. That is the answer. It cannot be denied. There it is, the testimony under oath in the records of the Senate of the United States.

I took the position then, and I take it today, that no man is entitled to have his nomination confirmed as Secretary of Commerce when as an official of the Atomic Energy Commission, as the Chairman thereof, he knew that Wenzell was an officer of the First Boston Corp. at the time of such an incident. So far as I am concerned, it disqualified him to be Secretary of Commerce. It was a shocking example of conflict of interest, which must be prevented from occurring in connection with the confirmation of any nomination in the Senate.

I shall always be proud to stand on the record I made in my opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

SENATE PROCEDURES IN REGARD TO NOMINATIONS

Mr. MORSE. I turn now, Mr. President, to a subject matter I wish to discuss very briefly.

The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Kentucky were very kind to refer to the position which I took in 1953 in regard to the procedures which ought to be followed in the handling of nominations in the Senate of the United States. It is a much more popular position today, although some of the gentlemen of the press have not learned it yet, judging from some of the stories today, than it was in 1953 in the Senate of the United States.

I shall not take any time to summarize that record, Mr. President, but I shall ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20, 1953, when I raised my objection to the immediate confirmation of the nominations of Cabinet members submitted on that day. I should like to have these excerpts reprinted in the RECORD in my remarks today, saving me the time necessary to read them, because the latter part of the argument I am going to make today on the procedural matter was raised for the first time in 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have these passages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1953 printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that these nominations may be taken up by motion today for consideration and debate, but that on the basis of an objection from any Senator they cannot be voted on today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the rule by the Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection to a discussion and a debate on the nominations, but I shall object to a vote on the nominations today, for the reasons which I shall state.

We have had placed on our desks a few minutes ago the reports of the committees of the Senate which considered the nominations and a copy of the hearings held in connection with the nominations. However, Mr. President, confirming nominations of Cabinet officers places upon each Member of the Senate such a solemn obligation that, speaking for myself at least, I do not desire to vote on the nominations until I have had an opportunity to read the reports of the committees and the transcripts of the hearings.

It is my judgment that in all probability, when I do finish reading the committee reports and the transcripts, I shall agree with the decisions of the committees. Nevertheless, I cannot substitute the committees judgments for my own responsibilities. I do not agree that there is any great need for haste in connection with these nominations. The various departments will continue to function under subordinates until the Cabinet officers are confirmed. I believe it to be much more important that we demonstrate to the American people in this democracy of ours that we do not approve of nominations quickly and hastily until each one of us has had at least an adequate opportunity to study the record. I believe such action on our part is in conformity with the checks which our constitutional fathers intended we should exercise with respect to the Executive, as they also gave the Executive checks against the actions of Congress. In my judgment, Mr. President, it would not be in keeping with what I consider to be the checks-and-balance system of our form of government for us to proceed to approve the nominations this afternoon without first having had an opportunity at least for a thorough study of them by any Member, or all Members of the Senate, who may wish to take the time for such study.

Therefore, in fairness to my colleagues in the Senate and to the majority leader, as well as because of all the activities which are planned for this afternoon, I believe it to be only fair that I announce at the beginning of the session that I shall object to a vote on any of the nominations today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the hearing on the nomination of Mr. John Foster Dulles took place 5 days ago. The hearing was open to the public and it was open to the Senator from Oregon. The report of the committee and the copy of the hearings were available yesterday afternoon to all Senators. Therefore I hardly believe that the objection of the Senator from Oregon is sound.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Oregon is within his rights, of course, to interpose an objection to a vote on the nominations. The parliamentary situation is that the motion to proceed to the immediate consideration of the nominations, however, is in order, and may be passed on today. I shall make similar motions with respect to the other eight Cabinet nominees, and we shall take them up this afternoon, and consideration of them will be in order tomorrow, when a vote on them can no longer be prevented.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Just for the record, Mr. President, let me say that the junior Senator from Oregon never saw the reports of the committee or the copy of the hearings until he arrived on the floor of the Senate today. He has checked with his office, and he has been informed that the reports were not delivered to his office. The junior Senator from Oregon is neither a messenger boy nor an errand boy who must run errands around the corridors of the Capitol or of the Senate asking for committee reports on matters which are of so great importance to our country as are these nominations. If the Republican leadership felt that there was a need to rush these nominations through the Senate today it could have at least called a meeting of the Senate for yesterday for a preliminary discussion of the nominations and a delivery of the committee reports to the Senate. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that the nominations be taken up tomorrow, after we have had adequate time for study and consideration.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object to a vote on the nomination at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the point of order is well taken, and the nomination goes over.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe the RECORD should be very plain in relation to this particular nomination, as well as in respect to the other nominations. The RECORD should show plainly that a request has been made by the President of the Unted States. We have just listened to an address by him in which he stressed the fact that probably today we are in the most critical period of our Nation's history.

It has been a known fact for weeks that the President of the United States would send the nominations to the Senate today. While, of course, I realize that every Senator has his privileges, and that every Senator should exercise them, there has been a custom, as I remember, that with relation to his official family, special consideration should be given to the wishes of the President of the United States. In view of the President's statement that we are now in a critical period in our history, it seems to me that we owe our country the duty of proceeding in these matters with dispatch. I hope that my dear associate from Oregon will not object to a vote on the nominations, particularly in view of the fact that he has in front of him the report of the committee and the testimony relating to the character and ability of the nominees. I say it with no reflection upon the purpose of the objection. However, I believe there comes a time when collaboration and cooperation mean something when we are told by the Chief Executive of this country that we are in a very serious situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin in pointing out that the committee reports are in front of me. Certainly he did not imply, I hope, that therefore I should accept what is between their covers without having an opportunity to read them.

Furthermore, I may say to my good friend from Wisconsin that on this side of the aisle I have heard the view expressed—and I myself have joined in the expression a good many times in criticism of the Democrats—that we have been moved for a good many years by the argument of one emergency after another, when actually the cry has been "Wolf! Wolf!" It is somewhat humorous now that the Republicans are in power to hear them resort to the same fear argument when they want to steamroller something through the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that I know of no emergency of the present hour which involves any jeopardy to our country if we take the time we need to take in order to study the record with respect to these nominations.

I believe that the rule was put in the rule book for the purpose of having it apply to exactly such a situation as confronts us today, and I intend to follow the rule.

I may say also that I have a great deal of respect for the wishes of the President of the United States, but I also have a great deal of respect for our system of checks and balances. They are applicable to the President as they are applicable to the Senate. His expression of a wish will not turn me at any time into a rubber stamp. I shall judge his requests on the basis of the record before me. I have not had the time to study the record, and, under the rule, until I have had the time to do so, I shall press my objection.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, and, by way of comment, let me say I do not share the view expressed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that failure to confirm these Cabinet nominees will in any way interfere with the administration of the Federal Government by the executive branch for any period of time whatever. There is not a department that today does not have a subordinate officer who is going to carry on whether the nomination of the department head is confirmed by the Senate or not. Mr. Hoover is still going to function in the FBI. There are other top but subordinate officials in the Department of Justice who are going to carry on the functions of the Department. The same situation exists in every other executive department. Therefore, I object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON rose.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the President of the United States has authority to permit those subordinates to carry on until the nominations of the Cabinet officers are confirmed.

One more point, and I shall yield to the Senator from New Jersey in one moment. In reference to the precedents, Madam President, they have not been uniform. There have been a good many occasions when there have been discussions at the beginning of an administration in regard to various Cabinet officers, and Senate debate has gone on in some instances in our history for several days. So the junior Senator from Oregon today is not taking a position that is at all out of line with the history of this country. The position he is taking is in keeping with what at least I consider to be my obligation in the Senate, and that is not to sit here and vote on a matter so important as confirming the nominations of Cabinet officers until I know what the record shows. The committee records have been submitted to me a few brief minutes ago. I intend to study them between now and tomorrow, and I shall be ready to vote tomorrow in accordance with the spirit and intent of the rule.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the junior Senator from Oregon feels that he should be able to rely on the procedures of the Senate, and that is what he has done. Under the procedure of the Senate, the reports were placed upon his desk today, and he has seen them today for the first time. He is going to read them tonight and vote tomorrow.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to speak for a few minutes on the principles which, in my judgment, are applicable in connection with the confirmation of nominations of persons to be members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

I drove down Constitution Avenue this morning, by the Department of the Interior, and I saw it still standing. Likewise, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture and of Treasury were there in brick and stone, as they were yesterday, and as I am sure they will be for many years to come. I took judicial notice—as I think it was proper for me to do—of the fact that the activities of those Departments were continuing as usual. Those employed in the Departments appreciate the fact that no emergency was created by the failure to confirm the nominations of the heads of those Departments yesterday.

As I recall, it was on May 7, 1945, that I presented to the Senate, I believe in connection with the nomination of Robert Hannegan for Postmaster General, a résumé of some research work which occupied me for a good many days prior to my speech at that time on the history of confirmation fights in the Senate. With the assistance of members of my staff, I had previously analyzed to the best of my ability the results of that research. We analyzed the history of every confirmation fight in our entire history with respect to which we could find any printed record. Without repeating in detail certain excerpts from that speech today, but giving only a résumé of it, I ask to have inserted at this point in my remarks excerpts from the speech to which I have referred. In the course of that speech I also discussed the Henry Wallace nomination.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish my remarks first. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the RECORD will show that in my previous statement on the floor of the Senate in connection with the subject of confirmation I indicated my belief that the President of the United States is entitled to have his official family consist of men in whom he has confidence and men whom he believes will carry out the policies which will characterize his administration.

After an analysis of the record which was submitted to us when the Senate convened yesterday at noon I am satisfied that the nominees whose nominations were sent to us yesterday meet the tests I have just enumerated. I have one question to ask later in regard to one of them, because I do not believe the record is entirely clear about it. I am sure it will be cleared up quickly. But speaking of them as a group I do believe the nominees meet the criteria which I have mentioned. I believe the President of the United States is entitled to have his nominations confirmed.

I think also, Mr. President, that each Member of this body was entitled at least to have what I sought yesterday, namely, an opportunity to study the record affecting each one of them. Having had that opportunity we can today, as we come to a vote on the nominations, feel assurance in the knowledge that we are fulfilling our representative responsibilities to the people of our States. We can be confident that we have kept faith with the trust inherent in the oath which we took when we were sworn in as Members of this body that we would act on the basis of our judgment, not on the basis of accepting without analysis the judgment of a committee of the Senate.

That leads me to make a few brief comments about the position which the junior Senator from Oregon took yesterday. Of course, he is well aware of the fact, and was well aware of it yesterday, when he took a position in opposition to immediate confirmation in the face of the great desire to speed through the nominations so that we could go out to see the beautiful and symbolic inaugural parade, that there would be those who would say that the junior Senator from Oregon was motivated by a spirit of vengeance, retaliation, or vindictiveness.

Those who know me, of course, were aware that I would take the position I took yesterday irrespective of the action taken by the Senate in regard to what I considered to be my rights in connection with committee assignments.

My action yesterday was based entirely on my conviction that hasty action in confirming Cabinet nominees is a mistake and not in the public interest. I shall continue, as I have in the past, to support my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle when I consider them to be right, and to oppose them when I consider them to be wrong. Mr. President, others may differ with my judgment, as some did yesterday, but not all in the Senate yesterday disagreed with me, judging by the 17 Members of this body who up until noon today had said to me, either in personal conversation or over the telephone, that they were glad I took the position I did yesterday. They expressed views agreeing with me that it was important that the principle of checks and balances in our Government, which I endeavored to uphold yesterday, should be protected. They know that I was not then, and am not now, activated by the motivations that some attributed to me.

But, be that as it may, my skin is thick when it comes to such matters. I am not afraid of being defeated, and I am not going to do things necessary to be reelected if doing those things cannot be squared in my judgment with the political principles in which I believe.

Mr. President, many people share the point of view which I expressed yesterday. I have received many telegrams also of the opposite nature—critical telegrams—but I have received a good many telegrams which endorsed the position I took yesterday. I have taken a sampling of them, and I ask unanimous consent without the names of the senders being printed, to have the telegrams inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I very well recall the situation in 1953, Mr. President, when we came to the Senate Chamber to go to the inaugural stand. The committee reports on the Cabinet nominees were on our desks when we arrived in the Senate Chamber. I recall it very well, because I asked, in conversation at that time with some of my colleagues:

Is it anticipated that we will pass on these nominations today?

I was told by several Members that was the practice. I checked the rules and I discovered that if it were the practice it nevertheless was a practice which could easily be stopped by the application of the rules.

The rules provide that a nomination must be placed before the Senate 1 day and cannot be voted on in the Senate that day unless there is unanimous consent. What a very sound rule that is, and how well we have proved the soundness of that rule today.

Let us suppose, Mr. President—and this would have been as true in 1953 as it is in 1961—with all the pressures we are under, with the many responsibilities we had to be in many places at the same time yesterday, which was physically impossible, that an attempt had really been made to confirm the nominations of Cabinet members yesterday. The whole setting of Inauguration Day simply is not fitting for a reasoned discussion of nominations, nor is it fitting for adequate debate in case controversy arises.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin today, no nomination is more important for the consideration of the Senate under the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution, than a nomination to a Cabinet position. I did not teach the legal and historic meaning of the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution for many years simply to walk away from my own knowledge of it because I walked into the Senate of the United States. I consider that each one of us assumes a solemn trust when he comes into this body and takes the oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, upholding the Constitution of the United States does not call for pro forma action. Upholding the Constitution of the United States in the carrying out of a Senator's duties calls for hard work, thorough consideration, due deliberation, and the carrying out of what our forefathers intended. They intended that when nominations are sent to the Senate of the United States they should be given serious consideration by each Senator. In order to have that serious consideration it is necessary, of course, that we have before us the reports of committees which have had the hearings on the nominations.

No Senator can possibly attend all the hearings on every nomination. They are assigned to different committees, and usually when one committee is holding a hearing on a nomination, we have manifold duties to perform elsewhere, if we are not on the committee that is considering the nomination.

The entire procedure is gaged to deliberation and thorough consideration. As I said in 1953, there is no need whatever for immediate confirmation of a nomination of a member of the Cabinet. There is not a single department downtown that is going to fall down unless the nomination of the Secretary of that Department is confirmed immediately.

Our majority leader, the very able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], talked to me about this subject several days ago. He wanted to know if my position had changed since 1953, and I good naturedly replied, "What do you think?" He smiled, and did not require an answer. I proceeded to tell the Senator from Montana that my position had not changed; and that, in my judgment, the nominations should be presented on Inauguration Day, and we should then proceed to give consideration to them after Inauguration Day, which we did today.

Consider the record that has been made today. I think it will prove to be a very important record. It provided an opportunity for every Senator, if he wanted to make any comment on any nomination, if he wanted to register any reservation, if he wanted to offer any opposition—and it was done in one instance and reservations made in another—or if he wished to make any

statement in support of the nomination, he had adequate time to do so, without any pressure being put upon him to the effect that, "We must hurry, because we must get out to see a parade."

I believe the record that we have made today supports the position that I have taken on procedure; and so long as I am in the Senate I have no intention ever to let any nomination that requires Senate approval to be passed upon on the same day that it is submitted to the Senate, because I believe we should do our bookwork. I believe we have the duty as students of government to see to it that we carry out the meaning of the oath that we took when we came into the Senate.

Furthermore, misunderstood as it seems to be in part of the press today, at least, the position I took on the floor yesterday afternoon was that I did not think that there should be any consideration of nominations today on the floor of the Senate unless we were first supplied with the committee reports on the nominations. It will be recalled that yesterday afternoon, for a period of time, there was a little confusion as to whether all the reports had been printed. But they had been. My position was simply that the reports should be made available on the desks of Senators. Although there is no rule that requires such action, there is a long-standing custom in that regard. Again the majority leader, the great able Senator that he is, gave assurance to us that the reports would be in our hands some time yesterday afternoon or evening. I wish to thank him, because the special service that I was given certainly was not necessary. The reports were delivered to my apartment, so when I got back from the parade they were there. I give my word that I read them, and I found them very helpful in my final appraisal of the nominees, and very helpful in making such comments as the RECORD will show I made in certain instances today in respect to certain nominations.

I now wish to discuss a specific nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

NOMINATION OF MR. JOHN B. CONNALLY, JR., TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received today a report from the committee on the nomination for the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. John B. Connally, Jr. I am making this brief statement today in regard to that nomination, though it will not come before the Senate for consideration before Monday, so that Senators who have made up their minds to support the nomination may, if they care to do so over the weekend, supply additional information, which I certainly will require before I will vote to approve the nomination, because I find the committee report on the nomination unsatisfactory, and I shall vote against it, if the report is the only reference material on which I shall have to rely in order to make up my mind affirmatively or negatively on the nomination.

This afternoon some Senators said that with respect to certain nominations they have received a great deal of mail, telegrams, and telephone calls. On the nomination of Mr. Connally, I can say that I have been deluged. I find widespread opposition to the Connally nomination. I have tried to figure out why so much public interest has been aroused in regard to the Connally nomination. I have come to a tentative conclusion, which I will state in a moment.

The latest telegram I received, which was received after the Senate convened today, came from my home State. It is very typical of many telegrams and letters like it:

EDDYVILLE, OREG.

We oppose the appointment of oil lobbyist John B. Connally, as Secretary of the Navy. We do not want another big oil administration.

H. R. GLASCOCK, Sr.,
DOROTHY S. GLASCOCK.

Many telegrams and telephone calls of this nature have been received; and if I were to summarize them by way of a descriptive term I would say that the objectors take the point of view that the nominee spells the short word "o-i-l" and personifies it.

I need not remind the Presiding Officer that our problems with oil, legislativewise in the Senate, are among the most controversial ones that confront us in each session of the Congress. The American people are very much concerned about the oil policies of the country, and they should be, because in a very real sense oil happens to be one of the very small number of vital commodities that can very well determine the survival of the United States. We know from past debates that any discussion of oil raises questions in regard to our natural resource policy. Although oil is possessed through legal title by a great many of our citizens, as I have said before and repeat this afternoon, every oil company is but a trustee of a great resource that, in the broader sense belongs to all the people of the United States. Such a view is not inconsistent with a private property conception or philosophy of government. But because this industry, like so many others, is vested with a public interest, Congress long ago decided that the Government has the legal right to exercise certain controls, regulations, and jurisdiction over the oil industry. That statement applies to natural gas, too.

We all know there is a columnist by the name of Drew Pearson. All of us have felt in our bloodstream the pinpricks of his pen many times.

He has been the recipient and the butt of a great many descriptive terms, which I would not put on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this afternoon, because the pages of the RECORD are not made of asbestos. They would burn up the inflammatory paper of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that the best description of Drew Pearson is the term "muckraker," as I said on another occasion. I think he is the most able and the most effective journalistic muckraker we have had in the United States in our time, if not in our whole history.

When I use the term "muckraker," Mr. President, I speak in a complimentary and not in a derogatory sense. I speak in the sense that the verb "to muckrake" is defined in Webster's New International Dictionary; namely, "to seek for, expose, or charge, especially habitually, corruption, real or alleged, on the part of public men and corporations." Muckrakers, in the foregoing sense, perform a great public service.

If we go out to dinner, and we think it is a little bit dull, all that anyone need do is to mention the name of Drew Pearson, and the host and hostess do not have to worry whether the party is going to lack conversational topics for the rest of the evening.

He has been writing on the Connally nomination. I get that impression from the mail and telegrams that have been coming to me, and telephone calls also. He has published a series of columns on the Connally nomination. I have gone over them very carefully. I have deleted from them any sentence which violates rule XIX of the Senate. In the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted, as deleted by me, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDDYVILLE, OREG., *January 20, 1961.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We oppose the appointment of oil lobbyist John B. Connally as Secretary of the Navy. We do not want another big oil administration.

DOROTHY S. GLASCOCK.
H. R. GLASCOCK, Sr.

OIL LOBBYIST AND NAVY

(By Drew Pearson)

If President-elect Kennedy had switched the appointment of his Secretaries of the Army and the Navy a lot of his Senate supporters would be happier. As it is, he has appointed one of the top oil lobbyists of the United States, John B. Connally, to be Secretary of the Navy, a branch of Government which is the biggest oil purchaser in the world.

If he had been made Secretary of the Army, Connally, an able lawyer, would have no problems. But in appointing Connally Secretary of the Navy, Kennedy has put Senate colleagues on the same embarrassing spot that Harry Truman put Senate Democrats when he appointed his close friend, Ed Pauley, to a lesser post—Under Secretary of the Navy. Pauley is able, honest, loyal—but an oilman. Even close Democratic friends of Mr. Truman opposed him. Truman bowed. Pauley's name was withdrawn.

The case against Connally is even stronger, first because he will be top man in the Navy, not Under Secretary; second, because Connally has been much closer to the oil-gas companies than Pauley. Pauley is an independent operator. Connally was the attorney and lobbyist for a group of oil-gas companies which raised $1,500,000 in 1956 to lobby the natural gas bill through Congress.

Connally was the mainspring of that lobby, helped direct the expenditure of its funds, masterminded the battle on Capitol Hill. Almost every important gas-oil company in the Nation contributed to this lobbying fund, thereby also paying for Connally's professional services.

Yet Connally, as Secretary of the Navy, not only will buy more oil than any other man in the world, but will be charged with the supervision of one of the greatest oil reserves in the world. He will have to decide whether to lease certain areas to avoid

loss from adjacent wells, and if so which companies to lease to. Inevitably some will be his old lobbying associates.

Since this column has reported on the oil influences around President Eisenhower, it's only fair to report on the oil influences around incoming President Kennedy.

TREMENDOUS OIL DOMAIN

As Secretary of the Navy, Connally would supervise 23,700,000 acres of oil land, plus 156,113 acres on oil shale reserves. Here is a brief breakdown of this vast property now governed by the U.S. Navy:

1. Elk Hills, Calif.: 46,095 acres of proven oil land of which the Navy owns 81.7 percent; Standard Oil of California owns 18.3 percent. This is part of the area which got involved in the famous Teapot Dome scandal during the Harding administration when Edward Doheny delivered $100,000 in a little black bag to Albert Fall, then Secretary of the Interior.

2. Buena Vista Hills, Calif.: 30,181 acres, owned one-third by the Navy and two-thirds by private companies. Since Navy holdings are checkerboarded with those of private companies, the Navy, to protect loss from offset drilling, has leased 17 plots of land to seven operators. They are: Standard (Calif.), Richfield, Union, Socony, Honolulu Oil, General American Oil of Texas, and Tidewater.

Most of these—through their executives—have been heavy political contributors to both lobbying and political campaign funds. Most of their money went to Eisenhower. However, Connally at that time was on their side of the fence. He was a big Ike booster, did his best to defeat Adlai Stevenson.

3. Teapot Dome, Natrona County, Wyo.: 9,481 acres. This also figured in the famous Harding oil scandal. Four years ago, MKM Oil and Trigood Co., both of Casper, started a new development along the eastern boundary of the Navy's holdings.

So the Navy started offset operations to prevent its oil from being drained off. It let a contract to Intex Oil of Bakersfield, Calif. This is the kind of decision Connally would have to make as Secretary of the Navy—namely, whether to lease or not, and if so to which private company.

4. Arctic Slope of Alaska: 23,680,000 acres, all Navy owned, with no private drilling in the area except for Colorado Oil and Fuel which, however, has to keep 2 miles away from the Navy reserve.

The Navy's oil shale reserves include 41,353 acres near Rifle, Colo., 92,160 acres in Carbon and Unitah Counties, Utah, and another 22,600 acres near Rifle. None of it is being developed.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1961]

McNAMARA GIVES CHIEF HEADACHES

(By Drew Pearson)

Robert McNamara, former president of Ford Motor Company, has all the earmarks of making an excellent Secretary of Defense, but he certainly caused his new chief in the White House some political headaches. The headaches run deep and could be permanent.

Headache No. 1 came when McNamara vetoed veteran labor leader Joe Keenan as Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of manpower. This is still causing labor resentment. Furthermore, the Defense Department is sure to have labor troubles, such as the strike which tied up missile base construction, and McNamara will be wishing he had a man like Keenan to straighten things out.

Headache No. 2 came when McNamara vetoed Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., for Secretary of the Navy and accepted John B. Connally, Texas oil attorney, instead.

The Roosevelt appointment as Secretary of the Navy was to have been a cornerstone in Mr. Kennedy's political strategy. F.D.R., Jr., had fought hard for him, long before the bandwagon rush developed. His appointment would have followed an old tradition, set by Teddy Roosevelt, of a Roosevelt serving in the Navy Department. Finally, the Navy post was to be a buildup for F.D.R. to run for Governor of New York against Nelson Rockefeller.

However, Mr. Kennedy had given McNamara the right to veto his assistants in the Defense Department and McNamara turned thumbs down.

Since then, Kennedy has frequently been up in New York conferring with Democratic leaders regarding the best man to replace F.D.R., Jr., as Democratic candidate against Rockefeller. Mr. Kennedy regards Rockefeller as the Republican candidate for President in 1964, not Nixon, and he wants a potent, popular Democrat to try to polish Nelson off in his Gubernatorial reelection race in 1962. F.D.R., Jr., with a Navy buildup, would have been ideal.

This has caused Kennedy advisers to do a little speculating as to why the new Secretary of Defense should veto Roosevelt for the Navy, yet take an oilman like Connally.

Connally could have been appointed to various other jobs, such as Secretary of the Army—which long remained open—and there would have been no argument. He's an able, intelligent attorney. But Vice President JOHNSON very much wanted him to be Secretary of the Navy.

Some Kennedy advisers note that McNamara is taking advice from the New York attorneys for the Ford Motor Co., headed by Eddie Weisl, close friend and counsel to Johnson. Weisl's law partner, Cyrus R. Vance, will now become McNamara's counsel in the Defense Department. They wonder if it wasn't one of these New York advisers who "put the kibosh" on Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy. If so, he did a great favor to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, also made an opening for Johnson's campaign manager, John Connally.

NAVY CONTRACT

Vice President JOHNSON is famous on Capitol Hill for phoning publishers, editors, and TV executives to try to kill or modify news stories he doesn't like. One story he was not able to kill was published in Fortune magazine last month regarding three of JOHNSON'S Texas supporters, plus his brother Sam, and the amazing Navy contract awarded them, practically without competitive bidding.

JOHNSON'S former assistant, John Connally, when he becomes Secretary of the Navy, will administer this contract. It was awarded the Transport Co. of Texas in which his late boss, Sid Richardson, was third largest stockholder, at a time when Connally was attorney for Richardson.

Second largest stockholder in Texas Transport is ex-Congressman John E. Lyle, of Corpus Christi, a faithful contributor and money-raiser for Vice President JOHNSON.

At the time the contract was signed, in April 1959, Sam Johnson, younger brother of the Vice President, held a $16,000 Senate clerkship under the aegis of his elder brother. Sam conferred with Edgar Linkenhoger, president of TCT, while the Navy negotiations were going on. Afterward, Sam went to work for the company.

The contract was for operating the Navy's housekeeping facilities at Kwajalein in the mid-Pacific, and Fortune describes in well-documented detail how the admirals made sure that the Texas Co. was placed in a favored position to get this profitable, cost-plus-fee deal.

"The $5,200,000 estimate for the first 15 months was followed by a $13,300,000 estimate when the contract was extended for another 15 months," reported Fortune. "The $18,500,000 total includes $1 million in fees for TCT."

John Connally, the attorney for the third largest owner of the company, hereafter will administer the Navy end of this same contract.

OIL AND SECRETARY OF THE NAVY CONNALLY

(By Drew Pearson)

There are striking similarities between the confirmation battle of Edwin Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy in 1946 and the confirmation question of John B. Connally to be Secretary of the Navy in 1961.

Harold Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior under Truman, challenged Pauley's appointment because of the fact that the Navy had jurisdiction over approximately 100,000 acres of oil lands and because Pauley had raised political contributions for the Democratic Party with the hope that the Democratic administration and Members of Congress elected to support it would oppose any test by the Supreme Court regarding the jurisdiction of the offshore oil lands which the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana then claimed.

One essential difference between the Pauley debate and the Connally situation is that the Navy's oil reserves have now been multiplied many times. A total of 23,000,680 acres in Alaska have been added to the less than 100,000 acres in Wyoming and California which would have come under Ed Pauley's jurisdiction had he been confirmed as Under Secretary of the Navy. One other difference is that Pauley was to occupy a less-important job than Connally, who has been appointed Secretary of the Navy.

The Senate, in 1946, went along with Ickes' argument that a man who had shown himself to be very much in favor of private and State exploitation of oil was not a man to be put in charge of Government oil lands. There was no charge that Pauley wanted the Navy oil for his own use or his company's use; but rather that he had been active politically in following the policy to prevent Federal jurisdiction of tidelands oil.

Although President Truman rewarded his friend Pauley (later bowing to Senate demand and withdrawing his name, however) he differed drastically with Pauley's philosophy and proceeded to test tidelands oil jurisdiction in the Supreme Court. Truman had received large amounts of campaign funds from oil sources but ignored their donors' demand that he abstain from a Court test. The Court test was favorable to the Federal Government.

Almost simultaneously legislation was introduced in the Congress to overrule the Supreme Court. Likewise simultaneously, various Democrats began flirting with Eisenhower to run for President, first as a Democrat, later as a Republican. Among these was Sid Richardson, one of the three wealthiest men in the world, who in 1952 retained John B. Connally as his attorney.

Connally had been active publicly in 1948 in proposing that Eisenhower run for President as a Democrat, instead of Truman. In 1952 Connally went all out for the Republican ticket to elect Eisenhower, though not until after definite pledges had been made to oilmen by Eisenhower that he would reverse the Supreme Court in its decision over the jurisdiction of tidelands oil.

Connally was considered one of the leaders in Texas of the drive to make sure that tidelands oil did not continue under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. His philosophy was exactly the same as Ed Pauley's. To make sure that Eisenhower was properly coached and pledged on this point, Sid Richardson went to Paris to confer with General Eisenhower in the spring of 1952. And just as oil money was raised by Pauley for candidates supposedly pledged on private and State exploitation of tidelands oil, so Eisenhower's expenses at the Commodore Hotel in New York, totaling approximately $200,000 were paid by Richardson

and Murchison, together with a large part of his campaign expenses in Chicago during the 1952 convention.

Just prior to this convention in July 1952, Ike's oil backers faced some skepticism from other oilmen who pointed out that they had backed Truman with the belief that he would side with them on tidelands oil, only to be disappointed. Accordingly, it was arranged that Eisenhower should send a telegram to H. J. "Jack" Porter, Republican national committeeman from Texas, which read: "I see no conflict in this responsibility which interferes with the vesting of title of tidelands in the States."

This telegram was used with oil backers of Senator Robert A. Taft to wean them over to Eisenhower at the Chicago convention.

Connally was one of the masterminds of this strategy. His client Richardson put up the money, it is true, rather than Connally. In this respect there's a difference between Connally and Pauley insomuch as Pauley contributed both his own funds and raised money from others. However, Connally's whole philosophy and energy and legal brains which were considerably sharper than Richardson's, went into the effort to make sure that the Supreme Court decision which Pauley wanted to avoid, would be reversed.

There followed the effort by the Texas, Louisiana oil and gas men to then reverse the Supreme Court decision that natural gas in interstate commerce came under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. This resulted in the natural gas bill of 1956 which Connally helped to lobby through Congress. For many weeks he had headquarters at the Mayflower Hotel from which he directed the legislative battle. He was close to Elmer Patman, the lobbyist for Superior Oil, who later was convicted of attempting to bribe Senator CASE of South Dakota. Patman, a native of Austin, had known Connally in that city when Connally was practicing law and when he organized a radio station in Austin.

During the very brief hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 18, 1961, Connally was asked no questions regarding his gas lobbying activities and none about his efforts to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on tidelands oil.

However, his record as a very astute attorney for one of the three biggest oilmen in the world shows that approximately 10 years of his life were devoted to trying to upset Federal jurisdiction, first over tidelands oil, second, over natural gas. He seemed to think that his problem as Secretary of the Navy was in buying oil, and as a buyer of oil he might favor one of the companies with which Richardson had been associated. Connally neglected entirely, however, the question of oil reserves and whether his background was of a nature which made him impartial as a public servant in protecting the U.S. Navy's future fuel reserves. This was the essential issue in the Pauley debate.

As Secretary of the Navy Connally will face the problem No. 1, of offset drilling by private companies which may lessen the Navy's oil reserves. In the Buena Vista Hills in California there are 30,181 acres of which the Navy owns one-third and private companies two-thirds, with the Navy holdings checkerboarded with those of commercial companies.

No. 2, Secretary of the Navy Connally would have to decide whether to keep this acreage, including the 23,000,680 acres in Alaska, all Navy owned. There has been some debate as to whether this area which has not been well proven should be retained or turned over to private companies for exploitation.

During the Pauley debates vigorous editorial opinion was expressed by the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Walter Lippmann and the Washington Post that Pauley should not be confirmed. Events have moved so rapidly that there has been little editorial comment regarding Connally. However, the Washington Post which appears to favor Connally's confirmation, published the following vigorous editorials on essentially the same issue during the Pauley debates:

"[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1946]

"THE NAVY'S OIL

"In one respect at least, Harold Ickes has helped to clarify the picture of Mr. Edwin W. Pauley which is gradually coming into focus before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. The Secretary of the Interior was apparently not quite sure whether he was supposed to be testifying about Mr. Pauley or about Mr. Max Thornburg, a former Department of State petroleum adviser, whom he seems to dislike. Most of his spleen was reserved for the latter. But he did definitely confirm a reported conversation in which Mr. Pauley was alleged to have said that he could raise several hundred thousand dollars if the Government would abandon any claim to the submerged oil lands off the coast of California.

"This and other testimony tends to reveal Mr. Pauley as a man who used his political position to advance his personal interests. Whether this testimony is true or whether, as Mr. Pauley insists, the Secretary of the Interior 'is mistaken,' seems to be less important than a simple fact established by Mr. Pauley himself. The nominee for the Under-secretaryship of the Navy has a direct personal interest through the Petrol Oil Corp.—to the tune of a thousand barrels a day—in the oil off the California coast. His interest is in direct conflict with the interest of the U.S. Navy, which should jealously conserve this oil for the future defense of the Nation. It is this stubborn fact which disqualifies Mr. Pauley, apart from any other consideration for the particular office to which the President has nominated him."

"[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1946]

"NO, NO, NO

"The President will not withdraw the nomination of Ed Pauley as Under Secretary of the Navy. This was to be expected. Mr. Truman is a man of his word, and having promised Mr. Pauley a Cabinet job, he intends to abide by his pledge. This is understandable. It is the first principle of the politician that debts must be liquidated. But the restatement of the President's faith in Mr. Pauley cannot hide the fact that the President is deeply embarrassed. The revelations of Mr. Pauley's oil politics are only one reason for the embarrassment. The wholesale nature of Mr. Pauley's denials is another. Even when confronted with the plain record of Secretary Ickes' notes, he refuses to acknowledge their truth. He says 'no' to everything except one thing, and his 'yes' here merely adds to the indictment against him. Mr. Pauley says he will drop all his convictions about oil in the event that he becomes Under Secretary.

"All that Mr. Truman can do is to wait for Mr. Pauley to withdraw his name for the post he covets. Reiterating his refusal to withdraw, Mr. Pauley says he will risk a showdown. Ed Flynn was equally stubborn when President Roosevelt sent his name to the Senate for a high diplomatic post, but confronted with an unofficial nose count of 50 to 35, he backed down, and the nomination was withdrawn. The case against Ed Pauley is far more damaging than the case against Ed Flynn, the post far more significant. If the Senators have an elementary regard for good government, they will get together without delay and enable Mr. Pauley to withdraw. By so doing they would be doing the President a kindness which Mr. Pauley himself refuses to do. It is a painful thing to witness a President giving the Nation's youth such a bad lesson in the elements of good government. A no, no, no, is the language that Mr. Pauley understands, and it should be given without delay, so that the President can have his mind relieved for his important duties and yet have the satisfaction of having liquidated his personal pledge."

"[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1946]

"PAULEY BOWS OUT

"That Mr. Pauley has decided to withdraw his name from Senatorial consideration for under-secretaryship of the Navy amounts to a facing of the inevitable. He could never have been confirmed. The evidence against him, chiefly out of his own mouth, was too damaging, and the Senate would have had to bow to, as it seems to us, an outraged public opinion. Oil and politics made up Mr. Pauley, and no one seemed to know where the one ended and the other began. He implied on the witness stand that he had no convictions. Such a combination does not add up to a good public servant, particularly in the expectant post to which Mr. Pauley aspired.

"The cause of good government gains with the rebuff of Mr. Pauley's great expectations. In these days when free government is on trial, the appointive power has assumed a singular importance. We have every sympathy for the President in his difficulty in getting first rate men to serve the Government. His task is the harder because Government salaries are relatively low and Government appointees are sometimes made the butt of senatorial irresponsibilities. But the stomach of the Senate is not particularly sensitive. For the sake of the Presidential prerogative, it is prepared to swallow a lot. However, in the appointive functions it has a duty sometimes to save the President from himself, and in the Pauley case it did precisely that."

"[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1946]

"POST PAULEY

"The magnitude of the administration's defeat in the matter of Mr. Pauley was emphasized by the very reluctance to concede it. Now the Democratic Party is seeking to repair the damage, and the first effort is, strategically, creditable, namely, the effort to persuade either Governor Darden or Joseph P. Kennedy to be Under Secretary of the Navy. But either would have his work cut out as an angel of healing. The battle for and against Mr. Pauley, as waged at committee hearings and in the newspapers, was too bitter to be easily forgotten or forgiven. Many hard words were said publicly, harder ones privately and many hard feelings were engendered which will almost certainly have repercussions in the primary campaigns 2 years hence. As a result of the Pauley affair, the rift in the Democratic Party has grown wider and perhaps irreparable. Mr. Ickes, in his melodramatic manner, abandoned the administration that he might be the freer to carry on his fight against Pauley with his old-time vehemence, and with all his exhaustless resources of invective.

"It seems to us that the administration has only its own bad judgment to blame for the serious loss of face involved in this defeat. Quite apart from any question of Mr. Pauley's personal or business ethics, there was an obvious and almost shocking impropriety in nominating a millionaire oilman to such a position. At the time when the national oil resources have become such a matter of life or death importance, it is necessary that any public official who may be given power to make decisions or dispositions concerning them, should be not only above reproach, but above suspicion of reproach. Whatever his personal character, Mr. Pauley could not, in the nature of things, be above suspicion. His business interest and the national interest were at conflict at so many points that his appointment to a high post in either the Navy or the Department of Interior would have been almost as

incongruous as the appointment of a professed anarchist to be Chief Justice of the United States. This was not plain to the party managers, but it was crystal clear to the electorate, and thank God that it was."

CONNALLY AND GAS

Apropos of his efforts to pass the natural gas bill in 1956, Connally is listed in the McClellan hearings as a member of the steering committee of the General Gas Committee, organized by every leading oil and gas company in the Nation, to "effectuate a legislative program." Fellow members of this committee included officials of Standard Oil of California, which leases part of the Buena Vista Hills reserve from the Navy.

The McClellan committee gave sworn testimony regarding fake telegrams sent by the General Gas Committee to influence the legislation. The testimony showed that 900 telegrams had been received by Senator Edward Thye from various parts of Minnesota, signed by people who subsequently testified that they had never sent the telegrams. Testimony of Senator Thye and other witnesses begins on page 310 of the committee report under Senate Resolution 219.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, whether the proponents of Mr. Connally agree or not, the fact is that I believe the allegations, the statistics, the evidence, and the information contained in the Pearson columns are responsible for a considerable amount of the deluge of telegrams and mail and telephone calls that I have been receiving on the Connally nomination. In my judgment, the public wants an answer to them. The public is entitled to an answer. It can be said, "Oh, I am not going to pay any attention to what Pearson says." We cannot sell that to the public. The public is entitled to know whether Pearson is telling the truth in regard to every allegation that he makes in connection with the Connally nomination.

Included in the columns which I have inserted in the RECORD is the one which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. It is the last comment by Pearson on the Connally nomination. Of course, Pearson is not the only source of information that is giving rise to some question marks about this nomination. I wish to point out that, as a matter of public policy, there is grave doubt in my mind, when everyone in the administration knows that we are bound to be confronted each year with great oil problems legislativelywise in Congress, to appoint a man so closely connected with the oil industry as John B. Connally has been.

It was in 1945 that I made the research study that I used in that year on the historic criteria which had been applied throughout the history of this Republic in connection with the operation of the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

In that study which I summarized in the form of a speech in the Senate in 1945, I discussed the four historic criteria that I believed cannot be denied to have been the major criteria of the Senate from the beginning, as applied in connection with its responsibility of giving advice and consent.

As was brought out in the debate today, I brought out in 1945 that the advice and consent clause is a clause of limitation, as we lawyers use that phrase. It is language which permits of a review. It is language which permits the Senate to say to the President, "Our advice is, You are making a mistake with this nomination, and we are not going to confirm the nomination unless the vote of a majority can be obtained."

What are the four criteria?

First, character. Is the nominee a person of good character? There can be great differences of opinion on that criterion because it is a subjective matter. There can be a great difference of opinion in regard to the matter of character. Certainly our history shows—and I have studied every confirmation vote in the Senate in the history of our country of which there is any record—that the criterion of character does not mean that the individual is superhuman, or that he does not possess any of the human frailties that characterize human beings generally; but that there is no such defect in his character that it can be said because of weakness of character it cannot be expected that this man can perform the high duties of the office to which he has been nominated by the President of the United States.

The second criterion is the criterion of competency. That does not mean, is he the best man for the job from the standpoint of ability. It does not mean that the President appointed the most able man. However, there must be a finding that his record shows that he possesses the mentality and competency on the basis of which reasonable men can agree that he can perform the duties of the office to which he has been nominated.

The third criterion is, Does the nominee believe in our form of government? That brings up the issue as to whether in any particular case the person is subject to any question as to his loyalty, patriotism, and dedication to our constitutional system of government.

The fourth criterion is the matter of conflict of interest. Does he possess, as the result of his background and experience, such a conflict of interest as to justify the conclusion on the part of any Senator that he does not believe the person can perform the duties of his office impartially, unbiasedly, and without being possibly a victim of undue influence because of his past associations and past performances and connections.

Many Senators seem to think that the conflict of interest criterion is limited to the matter of finances. In my judgment they are in error. I believe that the conflict of interest growing out of finances is one manifestation of a conflict of interest. That is easier to prove. That is very objective. Conflict of interest also involves a subjective matter. That is whether, after we have looked over the record of a particular nominee we have doubts still reserved as to the ability of the nominee or the probability of that nominee to perform the duties of his office without possibly being unduly influenced by his past associations, or being suspected of being unduly influenced by his past associations.

I have said in debates before, but I want to repeat the point today, that we have the right to expect the President of the United States to send us nominees who, like Caesar's wife, can be considered to be above suspicion. In my judgment, this nominee does not meet the Caesar's wife test on the basis of the record that has been made to date on the nomination.

The question of the legislative influencing work of a nominee in times gone by, particularly in the field of the Natural Gas Act and other oil issues, raises a grave doubt in my mind—and if they will say the same things on the floor of the Senate as they have said to me in the cloakrooms of the Senate and in my office—I know grave doubts have also been raised in the minds of other Senators concerning whether or not this man, in fact, is free of a conflict of interest. In my judgment, he is not, on the basis of anything which has been advanced in his support to date.

I do not believe one should be appointed Secretary of the Navy, considering the Navy's great jurisdiction over the naval oil reserves of this country, who has had the past associations with the oil industry that Mr. Connally has had.

Then, too—and there is not a word of it in the committee report—what about the Francis Case case? To what extent was Mr. Connally involved in the attempt, some years ago, when the natural gas bill was before the Senate, to channel into the Francis Case campaign, or into any other receptacle of that Senator, the sum of $2,500? Knowing FRANCIS CASE, we were not at all surprised when he rejected it. This is a matter of public comment. This is a matter of comment from one of the Pearson columns.

So I point out that the matter of oil, the connection of Mr. Connally with oil, and the Navy's jurisdiction over the great naval oil reserves of the country raise grave doubts in my mind as to whether or not this man, in fact, is free of a conflict of interest in the full sense of the meaning of conflict of interest.

It is reported in the press that one member of the committee thought it was a good thing to have in the position of the Secretary of the Navy someone who knew something about oil. I do, too. But it is possible to choose such a person from among many without going into the oil industry itself to get one. Does anyone want to support the proposition that the only person in the United States qualified to serve as Secretary of the Navy and having knowledge of oil has to be one selected from within the oil industry itself, or having the background, association, and past performance in the oil industry of Mr. Connally? Tell that one to the birds, not to me. There are many qualified men who could be appointed to the position of Secretary of the Navy without going into the oil industry to select one of their well-known and able representatives in Washington, D.C., for some years past, one whose name is certainly associated with the special interests of the oil industry.

I voted against Wilson as Secretary of Defense because he was not free of conflict of interest, based upon his past connection with Government contracts. I doubt very much that Connally is free, based upon his past associations with legislation dealing with oil.

Mr. President, the subject of oil was discussed in an article entitled "How Not To Award a Navy Contract," written by a reputable author, Mr. Herbert Solow, and published in Fortune magazine for December 1960.

I ask unanimous consent, without my taking the time to read it, that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NOT TO AWARD A NAVY CONTRACT

(By Herbert Solow)

In April 1959 the U.S. Navy made what seemed to be a routine contract award to an enterprise called Transport Co. of Texas. The contract, which runs until next October, has become the object of widespread criticism. There has been gossip to the effect that it was politically influenced, and the name of LYNDON B. JOHNSON keeps popping up in the case, though his role seems to have been that of an innocent bystander. Even aside from politics, however, the case suggests that the Navy manages some of its business affairs with less logic than U.S. taxpayers have a right to expect.

The contract stipulates that T.C.T. shall serve as a kind of "housekeeper" in the Marshall Islands, on Kwajalein Atoll, which is slated to be an important adjunct of the Navy-operated Pacific missile range. T.C.T. provides transient Government planes and crews with terminal, refueling, and maintenance services, and a hotel and other facilities. For on-station Government personnel, who may soon number around 2,000, it also operates and maintains power and sea-water distillation plants, sewerage and firefighting services, schools and churches, and other facilities. The point of turning over such jobs to a civilian contractor is primarily to conserve uniformed personnel for military missions, but the Air Force has also found that civilians can do the jobs more cheaply and efficiently than its own personnel can. Presumably, civilians could save money for the Navy, too.

It is not the use of a civilian contractor, but the contracting procedure in this case, that has stirred up all the fuss about Kwajalein. Some of the bitterest critics are defeated competitors for the award. "If this sort of thing can go on," one of them told Fortune, "we will consider ignoring Navy invitations to bid." Since he and other defeated competitors are hardheaded businessmen who win their share of contracts and do not automatically cry foul when they lose, they cannot be dismissed out of hand. The Navy itself defends the Kwajalein award. However, one admiral concerned with it has acknowledged to Fortune that the unprecedented procedure followed by the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics in making the award was "not necessarily logical."

WHAT'S FEASIBLE IN THE PACIFIC?

The story begins in August 1952, when the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet informed the Chief of Naval Operations that he was short of uniformed personnel and wanted to replace his Kwajalein base forces with civilians. The Navy had not previously used a civilian housekeeper, but the C.N.O. in September ordered the Bureau of Aeronautics (later merged into the Bureau of Naval Weapons) to seek one. The Bureau's Shore Establishments Division was to undertake the procurement, not only for Kwajalein, but also for naval stations on Guam and Midway.

Since it was not, at first, certain how big these jobs would become, the Shore Establishments Division decided on a cost-plus-fixed-fee rather than a fixed-price arrangement. The Navy also decided to hire a civilian organization to analyze the problems and estimate the economies involved in the civilian housekeeping program. The Navy set aside the contract for this preliminary job for bids by small business, defined under the Small Business Act as independent companies that do not dominate their field and employ no more than 500. T.C.T. and three other eligible companies drawn from a master list were asked to bid for the study contract.

T.C.T. offered to deliver the feasibility study, as it is called in Navy parlance, by January 1959. The company said its expenses would be $4,000 and its fee $1. T.C.T.'s bid was the lowest, and on November 3, 1958, the company and the Navy signed a contract for the study. (The bid, as it turned out, was unrealistic; eventually, the Government paid T.C.T. about $6,800 for expenses.) Two company executives visited the three islands, spending about 10 days on Kwajalein, and late in January turned in their report.

Meanwhile Rear Adm. R. M. Reynolds, Assistant Chief for Maintenance and Support in the Bureau of Aeronautics, ordered a panel of four Bureau employees to suggest an appropriate procurement procedure for the housekeeping contracts. He told the panel that the Kwajalein project was especially urgent. Apparently because of this urgency, the panel recommended against competitive bidding and for negotiation with a "sole source." The panel also recommended that T.C.T. be the sole source. The original reason for this choice appears to have been T.C.T.'s unique familiarity with current conditions on Kwajalein—i.e., the familiarity the two company executives had acquired during their Government-financed visit. In reply to questions from Fortune, however, the Navy has advanced supplementary reasons for selecting T.C.T. Some of them are puzzling.

The Navy says that there was a lack of interest among other contractors when the feasibility contract was up. Yet two of the other three companies then invited did, in fact, respond and submit bids.

The Navy cites T.C.T.'s familiarity with naval air stations. It is true that the company had for some years been engaged in contract refueling operations on stateside Navy and Air Force bases. But many U.S. companies, including both of T.C.T.'s rivals in the bidding for the feasibility job, were also familiar with such stations.

The Navy says that T.C.T. had plans for procuring key personnel it would need for its first oversea job. But others already had key men with island experience on their payrolls.

The Navy cites T.C.T.'s readiness to start fast. Actually, T.C.T. was slow in stabilizing its labor force and perfecting its plane-handling operations.

The Navy points out that T.C.T. was classified as a small business. But T.C.T. was not the only small business available, and anyway the housekeeping contract was not a set-aside for small business.

The Navy also cites T.C.T.'s financial capability. But at least one competitor in the feasibility phase had greater financial strength.

Finally, the Navy cites T.C.T.'s "company reputation." Though it did have a good reputation for meeting its bills and for its performance as a refueling contractor, the company's president and principal stockholder had once been the object of a Federal tax-fraud complaint. (By stipulating a negligence rather than a fraud penalty, this was settled for $200,000, including a claim against the president's wife.) He had once been fined for violating Interstate Commerce Commission trucking regulations. He has since been convicted a second time, along with an affiliate of T.C.T. of which he is also president, and more heavily fined.

It may be relevant to point out here that one member of the panel that recommended negotiations with T.C.T. as the sole source was a high-ranking civil servant named Clayton Jones, then head of a branch of the Shore Establishments Division. Jones continued to play a role through most of the contracting procedure. Shortly after the contract was signed, he resigned from the Department and took a job as chief of the Pacific operations of T.C.T. at a salary higher than the Navy had been paying him. Jones has told Fortune that he did not discuss employment with T.C.T. until after the contract was awarded, and Bureau flag officers express confidence in his integrity.

In any case, Rear Admiral Reynolds immediately passed the panel's choice of T.C.T. up to Rear Adm. R. E. Dixon, then Chief of the Bureau. The latter ordered Rear Adm. Joseph E. Dodson, Assistant Chief for Procurement, to negotiate with T.C.T. and to produce a contract within 10 days. Admiral Dodson completed the negotiations on March 6, 1959, and a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract was ready for signature on March 10. The contract provided for expenditures of $5,200,000, over a 15-month period; $340,000 of this amount was to be T.C.T.'s fee. But several interesting events were to intervene before this contract could be signed.

THE ADMIRAL HAS MISGIVINGS

First of all, during the sole-source negotiations, representatives of several other companies had got wind of the Kwajalein job and had asked Admiral Dodson if they could bid for it. He says that he began then to feel that sole-source negotiations might prove to be a mistake, after all. He discussed his misgivings with Admiral Dixon, and even while the negotiations with T.C.T. were proceeding he began to explore the possibility of calling for competitive proposals for Kwajalein. (The Guam and Midway contracts were also to be let on a competitive basis.) Admiral Dodson's staff was able to compile a list of a dozen companies that might be interested in and able to do the Kwajalein job.

On March 11, the day after the draft contract with T.C.T. was ready for signature, Admiral Dixon authorized Admiral Dodson to seek competitive proposals. And so, instead of signing at once with T.C.T. the Bureau sent out wires to 12 companies announcing that there would be a briefing session on the housekeeping project. Nine of the companies were modest in size: T.C.T., Baltimore Contractors of Maryland, Standard Construction of Minnesota, M. & T. of Pennsylvania, Moore Service of Texas, Maytag Aircraft of Colorado (unrelated to the appliance company), and three California companies, Transocean Air Lines, Holmes & Narver, and Aircraft Engineering & Maintenance. Three companies were substantially larger: Pan American World Airways of New York, Lockheed Aircraft of California, and Chance Vought Aircraft of Texas. (Chance Vought had just been the victim of two big hardware contract cancellations by the Navy, and badly needed orders of any kind.)

The response to the notice was good, perhaps because the companies felt that the housekeeping contracts might lead to others connected with the burgeoning Pacific missile range. As a business opportunity these might, in fact, challenge the Atlantic missile range, where the Air Force budget for civilian contractors has run as high as $250 million annually. Forty-eight hours after the invitations went out, representatives of 12 companies assembled in Washington for the briefing.

"SO YOU WILL BE TAKING A CHANCE"

When the meeting began, each representative identified himself and his company. The Navy's minutes show that the T.C.T. spokesman took this opportunity to declare that his presence was "not to be construed as indicating any acquiescence" in the competitive procedure. This may have been T.C.T.'s way of laying a basis for a protest in case it

should lose out. However, the presiding Navy officer merely replied, "All right, sir," and apparently none of the other company representatives saw any significance in the exchange. The presiding officer then announced that this was to be "one of the shortest briefing sessions that has ever been held in the hallowed halls of BuAer." The companies were free to bid on any one, any two, or all three, of the islands. The Navy explained its housekeeping requirements on Midway (which was eventually dropped from the civilian contracting program), Guam (which needed only a refueling service), and Kwajalein. Detailed job specifications were set forth in a 6-inch-high stack of documents distributed to the competitors on the morning of briefing day. Concerning Kwajalein, there were two documents. One, 38 pages long, described the many chores to be done on the atoll, as well as the allowable basic civilian pay rates, housing costs, and the like. The other, 27 pages long, was the feasibility study, identified on its face as a T.C.T. product. It described the available facilities and noted some special Kwajalein problems (tropical heat and the corrosive effect of high humidity and salt-water spray). The study also estimated that proceeding through civilian contractors would cost up to $6,660,000.

Introducing this last figure, T.C.T.'s original estimate of the cost would have been fair enough had the Navy qualified it. But the competitors were not told that the figure had already been knocked down to $5,200,000. They were not even told that there had been negotiations with T.C.T. as the sole source.

The company representatives were given the morning hours to study the documents. After lunch there was a supplementary verbal briefing, at which the Navy chairman laid out one particularly onerous requirement: that proposals for all three islands be submitted within 6 days. The Navy's minutes show that the chairman said of this condition: "Please do not request any deviation or any extension of time * * * two of you gentlemen have asked concerning a hurried visit to one or all of these islands." The Navy, he said, would try to get clearance from the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, in Honolulu, but "from there you operate in accordance with space available * * * in other words, Cincpacfit sits in judgment on your visit * * * so you will be taking a chance having your representative getting to his destination."

One company executive asked when the award would be made. The Navy chairman said March 20—i.e., within 8 days. "You are a pretty ambitious group," commented the questioner. "Yes, sir," replied the chairman. The competitors burst out laughing. "Frankly," the chairman added, as the meeting drew to a close, "we have to run over this at breakneck speed." He then invited all hands to have a cup of coffee. One company representative exclaimed, "Who's got the time?" The minutes record more laughter.

MODIFYING THE REVIEWERS

One immediate, and predictable, effect of the 6-day limit was to prevent T.C.T.'s competitors from sending anyone to see Kwajalein. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that some companies did not bother to submit proposals for that island. The Navy says that one company abandoned its expressed interest after an unsuccessful effort to get the 6-day deadline altered.

Six new proposals were submitted, however. The Navy characterized some as not responsive to the bid request or as not in conformity with requirements and gave them no further consideration. One proposal that was considered further by a Procurement Review Board was T.C.T.'s The company proposed simply to sign the shelved contract. The Board also considered further a proposal by Pan American to undertake all three island jobs. No details of this proposal have been disclosed. However, on March 19, the Board unanimously recommended to Admiral Dodson that he accept Pan American's proposal.

The next day Admiral Dodson took an unusual step. He modified—as he puts it—the Board's recommendation by splitting the award. He says that he did this "for the good of the country," and goes on to explain that it was important to open the Pacific missile range to some company other than Pan American, which already dominated Atlantic missile range contracting. He points to a Procurement Review Board suggestion that "if a split award were desired," the Kwajalein contract should go to T.C.T.—though the Board did not recommend a split award. Admiral Dodson has offered Fortune an additional reason for modifying rather than adopting what the Board did recommend. He says that there was a moral obligation toward T.C.T. because the Navy had put T.C.T. to great expense during the sole-source phase of the negotiations.

After Admiral Dodson's modification, in any event, the Navy moved fast. Admiral Dixon approved the new recommendation on the same day and on April 1, without further negotiation, the Navy took its contract with T.C.T. off the shelf and signed it. The Navy accepted the terms worked out earlier, apparently down to the last comma.

It may be appropriate here to ask why the Navy felt no moral obligation to T.C.T.'s competitors whom it had invited to make proposals. They had sent representatives to the Washington meeting in good faith and at some expense, expecting to take part in a bona fide competition. Half of them incurred additional expenses in drawing up and submitting proposals.

And then there is the question of whether the Navy fulfilled its moral obligation to U.S. taxpayers. After all, if T.C.T.'s favored status had been known to the other competitors, and especially if they had been in a position to learn that T.C.T. was ready to accept a $5,200,000 cost estimate, they might have had a compelling incentive to work out responsive, conformable bids at lower figures.

The taxpayers' interest may be gaged from the rate at which the Kwajalein job has been expanding. The $5,200,000 estimate for the first 15 months was followed by a $13,300,000 estimate when the contract was extended for another 15 months. The $18,500,000 total includes $1 million in fees for T.C.T.

THE FRIENDS OF ED LINKENHOGER

Why did the Transport Co. of Texas get all this special treatment? What is T.C.T., anyway? Its home office is in Corpus Christi, Tex., and it is the nucleus of a group of companies engaged in varied petroleum-products operations—selling, hauling, fabricating bulk containers, and refueling aircraft on military fields. Its president and chief stockholder is Edgar M. Linkenhoger, 49, a stocky, blue-eyed, hardboiled operator. He used to be a produce trucker in Robstown, Tex., and he got into military contracting during World War II. Though allocations for essential materials were hard to come by during the war, T.C.T. always seemed able to get what it needed, and its business boomed. Today Linkenhoger has a fine home in Corpus Christi, flies his own plane, and is said to be worth around $3 million. In addition to running T.C.T., he dabbles in real estate and is a director of a local life insurance company. Linkenhoger has long been close to George Parr, the longtime political boss of nearby Duval County, and to LYNDON JOHNSON.

Another stockholder, originally and perhaps still the second largest, is John E. Lyle, Jr., a war hero and attorney. In 1944, Linkenhoger and Parr backed him in a successful race for the 14th Congressional District, which includes Corpus Christi. His firm, Head & Lyle, has been doing legal work for Linkenhoger and his companies ever since. In Congress, from 1945 to 1954, Lyle was a Lyndon Johnson man.

The third largest T.C.T. stockholder at the time of incorporation in 1951 and presumably until his death in 1959, was oilman Sid Richardson, who was long a financial supporter of Lyndon Johnson campaigns.

Linkenhoger, Lyle, and other T.C.T. people were among the initiators of Johnson-for-President organizations in Nueces County (Corpus Christi). Cecil Burney, a member of a Corpus Christi law firm that shares T.C.T.'s legal work with Lyle, is one of the top Johnson men in southern Texas politics. W. A. Wakefield, who is on the Linkenhoger payroll, doing, he says, "special work and things like that, more or less public relations," is an active Democrat from Corpus Christi. Says Wakefield of JOHNSON: "I know him casually, but I'm not real close to him—I'll put it like that."

JOHNSON is closer to another Linkenhoger business associate. This man is the Senator's brother, Sam Houston Johnson. Sam Houston, 5 years younger than LYNDON, has held a variety of jobs with the Federal Government and with the Senator. He has also been a paid Linkenhoger consultant. His first business connection with Linkenhoger seems to have been in 1949, when he worked for the partnership that preceded the reorganization of T.C.T. as a corporation. In 1955 he was with Star Tank & Trailer, another Linkenhoger-Lyle organization, but left that summer to help his brother after the latter's heart attack. Early this year he returned to Star Tank as a consultant at $500 a month. His duties are, he says, confidential, but include what he has described to Fortune as appearing at conferences with Linkenhoger.

Sam Houston Johnson's last U.S. Government job was as a $16,000 clerk to the Conference of Democratic Senators, of which Senator JOHNSON is the head. (After a 1959 newspaper clamor against congressional nepotism, Sam Houston resigned.) While on that job, he has said, he was off the Linkenhoger payroll. But the period of his service as a Senate clerk was also the period of the Kwajalein contracting procedure, and when Linkenhoger was in Washington on Kwajalein business, he visited Sam Houston's Senate office and—Sam Houston has said—they would "have dinner together and so forth."

Is it likely, or possible, that, even without Senator JOHNSON's knowledge or approval, reference to his power and prestige helped to mold a procedure that was unprecedented and favorable to T.C.T.? JOHNSON's power and prestige are, of course, well known to the Navy. In the House, JOHNSON was on the Naval Affairs Committee. As a Senator, and as majority leader, he has long been influential on other committees with great power over the Navy.

A NAME IS DROPPED

Among the Navy officers who had heard of a link between Sam Houston Johnson and Linkenhoger's company was Admiral Reynolds, the officer who first recommended to Admiral Dixon that T.C.T. be the sole source. Admiral Reynolds says that he was not influenced by hearing about Sam Houston. Indeed, he says he cannot remember who told him about Sam Houston's T.C.T. connection. It also appears that he cannot remember how far the conversation went. He wrote to Fortune that after somebody told him about the connection, "There was the inevitable question, 'You know who he is?' to which I probably made no answer * * * which is my usual procedure with name droppers who are attempting to impress me."

If Admiral Reynolds is uncertain in his memory, another Navy officer, now in civilian

life, alleges one vivid recollection about name dropping. He has stated that, during the contracting period, a T.C.T. executive said to him: "We are in like Flynn, because Linkenhoger is a good friend of LYNDON JOHNSON."

LYNDON JOHNSON and his brother, Admirals Dixon, Reynolds, and Dodson and Linkenhoger all deny that any authorized or unauthorized Johnsonian political pressure was put on the Navy. The denial is supported by Clayton Jones, who helped the Bureau of Aeronautics produce the contract, and who is now with T.C.T. And the Secretary of the Navy has given the T.C.T. award his blessing in a letter to LYNDON JOHNSON. However, the letter contains some evidence that the Secretary does not know what went on; unlike his admirals, who know that their procedure had no precedent, he calls it standard.

Linkenhoger offers his own explanation of why T.C.T. got the Kwajalein contract. He contends that T.C.T. was the best entry in the field, and adds: "There had been two or three Navy captains on Kwajalein who, you might say, hadn't done a damn thing, just serving themselves. It's a hell of a long story. It's none of the public's business. There's no telling what it would have cost the taxpayers if we hadn't got the contract. Best we could tell, never before had a contract of this nature been taken at the price we took it. It looks like that west coast crowd [i.e., Lockheed and others that entered bids] thought nobody else should get this business. It apparently was a shock to them and their hirelings began fabricating rumors. But there's no scandal involved."

Asked whether T.C.T. ever discussed its interest in Kwajalein with any Navy personnel at a higher level than the Bureau of Aeronautics, Linkenhoger commented: "I'm not going to tell my competitors how I operate."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let no one think I find it pleasant to raise any question concerning one of the nominees of the President of the United States, for whom I have such great admiration, and who, I believe, on yesterday, as I said last night to a group, made one of the historic speeches of our entire history. I am not talking about one of the historic inaugural speeches of our history; there is no question about that. The President made one of the historic speeches that have been made by any President of the United States in all our history. I think it will be ranked as one of the 20 or 25 greatest speeches made by American Presidents throughout our country's history.

I had hoped I would not have a reservation about any of the President's nominees to his Cabinet. But I took an oath, as he did yesterday, to uphold the Constitution, he in his capacity as President, and I in my capacity as a Senator. That oath carries with it the responsibility to live up to my obligation under the advice and consent clause. Based on my judgment, on the basis of the record presented up to this hour, the nomination by the President of Mr. John B. Connally to be Secretary of the Navy is not one that is free of a conflict of interest in the broader sense of that term, because of Mr. Connally's past association with the oil industry. In my judgment, while he was acting as Secretary of the Navy, he would be bound to be suspect because he does not meet the Caesar's wife test.

Unless there can be a much clearer justification of this nomination than I have heard to date—and the committee's report is of no aid to me in this matter—I shall vote against the nomination. In the event of the possibility that I may not be in the Senate when this nomination is acted upon, I want the RECORD to show my opposition to it as of now; and I want the staff of the Senate to record me as opposed to the nomination, when the RECORD is made, unless they hear from me to the contrary between now and the vote on the nomination.

I yield the floor.

THE NEW YORK HARBOR STRIKE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the new Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, is off to a good start in his new position. Even before his nomination was unanimously confirmed by the Senate, he vigorously asserted his interest in helping to resolve the present and very acute New York Harbor labor dispute. I am hopeful that his effort will contribute to a speedy and satisfactory solution of that crippling strike.

It was most unfortunate, of course, from Governor Rockefeller's point of view, and also the point of view of all of us, that the Governor was not able to be in Washington yesterday. There is no question that he would have liked to be here. An American Presidential inauguration is an important and significant occasion. In the finest American tradition, the Governor of New York wanted to be here to participate in the solemn ceremony which marks the turning over of the reins of American leadership.

But Governor Rockefeller is saddled with a serious responsibility in the State of New York. I refer to the New York Harbor strike, which has disrupted transportation throughout the State of New York and all along the east coast. A heavy responsibility has fallen upon his shoulders.

The Governor of New York has requested a suspension of the picketing for 10 days. He has forcefully urged that this be done. Governor Rockefeller is to be commended for his vigor and his firmness in handling this dispute. I very much hope that his efforts will be fruitful.

It is absolutely imperative that recognition be given to the fact that in disputes such as this, the public interest must be paramount.

Commuters, residents of the city of New York, and travelers into and out of the city of New York have been greatly inconvenienced as a result of the New York Harbor dispute.

Over the past several days I have on several occasions been in close touch with the National Mediation Board, which has jurisdiction in this dispute. I have urged that it leave no stone unturned in its efforts to bring these parties together.

Governor Rockefeller, his administration, the local officials, and all who represent the people of the communities affected by the strike, are agreed that a speedy and satisfactory settlement must be reached. Snow and ice have compounded the frustrations of the commuters who are affected by this dispute, just as snow and ice have confounded many of us here in Washington, during the last few days. The patience of New York commuters has been sorely tried. Their interests must be protected. The parties to the strike have a fundamental and far-reaching obligation to move with dispatch. Men and women all over the Nation are looking over their shoulders and are giving serious thought to the issues and to the impact of this unfortunate dispute.

And it must be remembered, too, that we in the Congress have to consider incidents such as this one in connection with our responsibilities as legislators.

Again, I commend both Governor Rockefeller for his close attention to his job and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, for his forthright action.

CONFIRMATION OF CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first, I wish to join the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in noting that although my comments on the President's nominations to the Cabinet which were acted upon today were limited to only two—namely, the nomination of Governor Freeman, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture, and the nomination of Mr. Stevenson to be Chief of Mission and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations—I wish the RECORD to show quite clearly that in each and every instance I could have, and would have liked to do so, pay my respects to the other nominees, and to cite for the RECORD, even if only briefly, their excellent accomplishments and their dedication and devotion to public duty and public service.

I am particularly heartened by the action of the Senate on the nomination of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State and by the action of the Senate on the other nominations made by President Kennedy to important positions in the State Department.

Of course I shall take an active interest in the other nominations, as they are presented to us, and shall make whatever comments I deem necessary.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to call its attention to the presence in the Chamber of a very distinguished visitor who comes to us today as a friend of many of the Members of the Senate—in particular, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. There is now in the Chamber the Honorable Andrew Cavendish, Duke of Devonshire, a Member of the House of Lords of Great Britain. For 10 years, as well as presently, he has been a member of the administration of the British Government, serving as Under Secretary for Commonwealth Affairs. He is truly a distinguished visitor to these shores; and, as I have already indicated, he is a Member of the British Parliament, one of the truly great Parliaments of freemen

in the world. He is also, I believe, brother-in-law of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Harold Macmillan.

I wish to welcome this distinguished citizen of Great Britain, and to let one and all know that the Cavendish family is well recognized for its dedication to public service and for its great, liberal traditions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. On behalf of the minority, I wish to join in this tribute to our distinguished visitor. He knows more about being in the majority than does the present speaker, who has had very little experience in that happy state during his 14 years in the Congress. [Laughter.]

We welcome our visitor to our shores. We know of his distinguished career. He knows, as well as we do, of the great ties which bind his country and ours. I know that I can express, in this Chamber, the affectionate greetings of all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there is other business to be transacted at this time—and I gather there is none—I now move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to Monday, January 23, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert V. Roosa, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Frank Barry, of Arizona, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

Jerry R. Holleman, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Kermit Gordon, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

John S. Gleason, Jr., of Illinois, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1963.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 21, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert S. McNamara, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

J. Edward Day, of California, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Stewart Lee Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Luther H. Hodges, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

UNITED NATIONS

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Msgr. Nicholas Babak, rector, St. Basil's College and Preparatory School, Stamford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O almighty and everlasting God, Creator of the world and its people, we, Thy servants, thank Thee for the many blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us. Especially do we thank Thee for the blessings Thou hast showered upon these United States of America and its citizens. We are thankful to Thee that we live in a land of plenty, where we enjoy the priceless gift of liberty.

O merciful Father, endow our new President and the Members of the Senate with vigorous health and the strength to fulfill the exhausting demands of their office. Give them the wisdom always to perceive what is right, and the courage to be leaders in the fight against injustice. May they ever be mindful of the common good, and avoid selfish gain. Grant that they continue to be the hope of freedom for the oppressed according to the spirit expressed in the Captive Nations Week resolution of the Congress.

We humbly pray for the liberation of all enslaved people. Especially on this celebration of the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, we pray that the Ukrainian people will be given the strength to bear the sufferings of ruthless persecution inflicted upon them by the forces of godless and imperialistic communism. Bless them with ultimate victory in their struggle for freedom, so

that they may worship as freemen in a world at peace.

Inspire the members of our Government with the indomitable spirit and love of liberty as expressed in the moving words of Taras Shevchenko, the great poet and champion of freedom of the Ukraine.

Keep our Nation ever vigilant, and grant even greater strength to better preserve the peace throughout the world, by protecting the helpless whom the forces of tyranny seek to enslave.

Deliver us from the fear of our enemies so that we may pass our time in peace under Thy protection, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Saturday, January 21, 1961, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that on last Saturday, January 21, President Kennedy sent to the Senate 12 nominations within the Department of Defense, which must be confirmed by the Senate. The Senate Armed Services Committee has conducted hearings on each of the nominations, and the hearings were available for all Senators on last Saturday. Unfortunately, the Armed Services Committee did not receive official word about the nominations last Saturday; and, as a consequence, the names of the nominees do not appear on the Executive Calendar today. Because of the error of transmission, and inasmuch as all these nominations have been reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the following nominations, reported today by the Armed Services Committee, be acted on today by the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that they have not officially gone over 1 calendar day:

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, a holdover, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, a holdover, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, also a holdover, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State; Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States; Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General; and H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General, be considered on the same basis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ROLE OF SENATOR METCALF ON INAUGURAL DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the last day of the Eisenhower administration and the first day of the Kennedy administration, the State of Montana was the recipient of an exceptional distinction. The new Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] was selected as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate for the day. In that capacity, Senator METCALF, in effect, presided over the withdrawal of the old administration and ushered in the new administration. He received on behalf of the Senate, the nominations for the Cabinet of the new administration. He led the Senate in a body to the east front of the Capitol, there to witness the inaugural ceremony, the great symbol of American democracy in action, whereby one administration recedes into the glow of our history after it passes on to the new administration the torch of temporary authority, and all Americans reaffirm their subordination to the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It was a great day for the Nation, Mr. President. And it was a great day for the State of Montana that an outstanding Montanan, the able new Senator, LEE METCALF, should have played such an auspicious role in it.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

USER CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PERFORMED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6(d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(d)) to authorize certain persons who complete a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPUTATION OF PAY FOR CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE OF PAY OF CERTAIN PROFESSORS AT THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY AND U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEDENDENTS AND BAGGAGE AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions, for the quarter ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NICKEL AND COBALT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 96 short tons of 91 percent nickel in ingot form, approximately 4 short tons of sintered nickel powder, and approximately 9 short tons of cobalt, now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NICKEL-COBALT-COPPER

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 3,431 short tons of nickel-cobalt-copper calcines and approximately 87 tons of nickel-cobalt-copper matte, now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of that Administration, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SALES AND TRANSFERS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on sales and transfers of foreign excess property by that Administration, for the period January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO PAINTING AND ILLUMINATION OF RADIO TOWERS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO OATHS ON CERTAIN DOCUMENTS FILED WITH FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GERARDO P. MAGCANAM AND PEDRO F. BANTILLO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Gerardo P. Magcanam and Pedro F. Bantillo (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSAULTS UPON CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration within the provisions of the United States Code relating to assaults upon, and homicides of, certain officers and employees of the United States as constituting a crime (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–17 AND GS–18, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during calendar year 1960 no changes occurred in the following four positions in that Department, three in grade GS–18, and one in grade GS–17; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF BRIDGE COMMISSIONS AND AUTHORITIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas a great number of gangsters, outlaws, mobsters, racketeers, and other violators of laws and society in the United States are immigrants from other countries; and

"Whereas no definite steps have been taken to reduce the percentage of immigrants from the countries which furnish the greater number of such immigrants; and

"Whereas a reduction of immigrants in the same ratio as to the crimes the immigrants from such countries commit would help reduce such crimes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to make rules and regulations to require that the percentage of immigrants to the United States from any country will be reduced in the same ratio that the immigrants from that country participate in crimes in this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall furnish a copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

"MELVIN T. CHAMBERS.
"ROY MILIUM.
"JOE LEE ANDERSON.
"DOUG BRADLEY.
"JIMMY SLACK.

"Attest:

"LEE REAVES,
"Secretary of the Senate."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND SAM RAYBURN — RESOLUTIONS OF TEXAS SENATE

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate of the State of Texas, certified by its president, the Honorable Ben Ramsey, Lieutenant Governor of Texas, did on January 11, 1961, by unanimous action pass Senate Resolution 7, expressing admiration and esteem for Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and extending best wishes to President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON for a constructive and stable administration.

Moreover, the Senate of Texas, did on January 10, 1961, by unanimous action, pass Senate Resolution 3 marking the 40th anniversary of the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, and expressing appreciation for his leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country.

Mr. President, I, concurring in the expressed sentiments of the resolutions, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these resolutions passed by the Senate of the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 7

Whereas in the course of events the American people authorized a change in the administration of their Government with the election of Hon. John F. Kennedy, as President, and Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as Vice President; and

Whereas, with the eyes of the world focused on the National Capital, the new President and Vice President will be inaugurated on January 20, 1961, and thus launch the country on a program of constructive achievements and stability in these precarious and troublous times; and

Whereas the transition in administrations is of tremendous importance to the free world and to our country, and of particular interest to Texas and to Texans; and

Whereas in the person of Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON to become the Vice President of the United States and as such, President of the Senate of the United States, the State of Texas has given to the country a talented and able leader; and

Whereas this distinguished native Texan served his district in the U.S. House of Representatives, followed by representation of his State in the U.S. Senate, to which he was elected three times, and by reason of his ability, energy, integrity, and devotion to duty, was chosen as majority leader of the U.S. Senate in which capacity he exercised those qualities of leadership which gained the respect of all his colleagues and reflected credit upon himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader his cooperation with the administration, of a different political faith, demonstrated his patriotism, his capacity, and his desire to serve the best interests of his country; and

Whereas the Senate of Texas is grateful for the service rendered to the State and the Nation by its former U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and desires to extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, all good wishes in their new official roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That we do hereby express our appreciation for the services so ably rendered the State and the Nation by Vice President-elect JOHNSON, and extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, our best wishes for a constructive and stable administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, under the seal of the senate, be forwarded by the secretary of the senate, to Hon. John F. Kennedy; and to Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON; and to the members of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3

Whereas 50 years ago on this date, a young man from north Texas, serving in the Texas House of Representatives was elevated to the position of speaker of the house; and

Whereas following his service in such capacity, he was chosen by the people of his district to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives where he has served continuously, with distinction, since 1913; and

Whereas by hard work, integrity, devotion to duty, and dedication to the best interests of his adopted State, he grew in stature and in the respect of his colleagues in the House of Representatives in which he served as its majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses, followed by his selection as Speaker on September 16, 1940, which position he has held continuoulsy since such time with the exception of the 80th Congress, during which he was the distinguished minority leader; and

Whereas by reason of his outstanding ability and fine character he has served his State and Nation in the Congress and as Speaker of the House longer than any other person in American history; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to mark this anniversary and congratulate this outstanding Texan upon his constructive contributions to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That it does hereby extend its congratulations and best wishes to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his great and outstanding leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate of Texas, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN and to members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has for many years planned and developed a program for irrigation, flood control, and recreation facilities in Kansas.

Some of these projects are completed and are rendering outstanding service to our citizens.

Programs on the planning boards and other projects not completed need additional funds and Congress was urged to appropriate them in this session.

The projects already completed have demonstrated the value of water for beneficial uses in every section of the State.

At the 21st annual meeting of the Kansas Reclamation Association held at Osborne, Kans., on October 27, 1960, definite resolutions were adopted, urging funds for Big Creek near Ellis and Hays, the Glen Elder flood control and irrigation project near Beloit, and the Cheney Reservoir project on the Ninnescah River west of Wichita.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 21ST ANNUAL MEETING AT OSBORNE, KANS., OCTOBER 27, 1960

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Corps of Engineers have, under the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, investigated and recommended several projects in the State of Kansas for the purpose of flood control, stabilization of agriculture through irrigation, and to provide needed water for domestic, municipal, and industrial use; and

Whereas these projects have been authorized by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend that the investigation, planning, and construction be accelerated to the end that the completion of these plans be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the economy of the Western States depends on the control and use of the water for irrigation; and

Whereas since the beginning of the development of the West it has been generally recognized by administrative officials and courts of law that the water rights belong to the several States: Be it

Resolved, That this association concur with and affirm action by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the senate concurring therein, that the Congress and the President of the United States and the Representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully urged and requested to take all necessary action to: (1) Preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States, the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas a disastrous flood occurred on Big Creek on June 16, 1957, which resulted in the loss of several lives and direct damage to property of more than $3 million to the cities of Ellis and Hays and surrounding rural areas; and

Whereas a similar flood occurred in 1951, which likewise resulted in the loss of several lives and great destruction of property: Now, be it

Resolved, That this association urges the investigation by the appropriate Federal and State agencies to determine feasible plans to prevent future flood disaster and that Federal funds for such investigation be included in the 1962 budget.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is investigating Glen Elder Reservoir flood control and irrigation project;

Whereas this reservoir is urgently needed to control floods not only on the Solomon but the Kaw River as well and to stabilize the economy of the Solomon River Valley by irrigation of agricultural products and to provide urgently needed municipal water to the city of Beloit; and

Whereas these investigations will be completed in 1961: Be it

Resolved, That this project be allocated sufficient funds to start construction in 1962.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has completed a feasibility report regarding the Cheney Division, Wichita project (Kansas), commonly called the Cheney Reservoir located on the north fork of the Ninnescah River; and

Whereas this project has been approved overwhelmingly at the polls in the city of Wichita and has met with the favorable comments of the Federal and State agencies concerned; and

Whereas this project envisions flood control, irrigation, fish and wildlife, municipal supply, and recreational benefits; and

Whereas a proposed contract has been negotiated between the city of Wichita and the United States providing for the repayment to the Federal Government of that portion of the project cost allocated to municipal water supply; and

Whereas has authorized this project: Now, therefore, this association urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to initiate construction of this worthwhile project.

RESOLUTION 6

The Kansas Reclamation Association reaffirms its opposition to a Missouri Valley Authority.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is authorized to plan for and cooperate in construction of recreational areas at its reservoir sites, but is not permitted under Federal reclamation laws to operate recreational facilities: Now, therefore, this association commends the Kansas Park and Resources Authority and the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission for the cooperation with various Federal agencies in the development of such areas for recreational use by the general public and urges continuation of this development.

RESOLUTION 8

Resolution urging legislation to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to allocate joint reservoir costs to recreation and to construct basic recreational facilities on a nonreimbursable basis

Whereas one of the products of the technological advances of modern society is the gradual extension of leisure time; and

Whereas it is a matter of national concern that such leisure time be provided healthful outlets; and

Whereas multiple-purpose reservoirs constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation create centers for a wide range of recreational activities including fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, water skiing, and picnicking; and

Whereas although recreation is served by creation of these manmade lakes, there is no provision for allocating any part of the joint costs to recreation; and

Whereas present scale construction of minimum basic facilities at the Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs is purely a defensive program of protecting the reservoir from the people and the people from the reservoir and falls woefully short of being a positive program for enhancing recreation potentials of the reservoirs; and

Whereas this defensive and wholly inadequate policy of construction of recreational facilities is reimbursable and therefore repayable only by water and power users: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allocate joint reservoir costs to recreation to a degree commensurate with recreation benefits created by the reservoir and that such allocation be nonreimbursable; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to construct such basic recreational facilities as required to permit and facilitate eventual maximum recreational use of the reservoirs and that funds so expended be nonreimbursable; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Reclamation Association for referral to its resolution committee with the recommendation that a similar expression be registered by the national body, and that copies be sent to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress to make the provisions stated herein.

RESOLUTION 9

Recognition of future needs in construction of projects: By general survey the Kansas State Board of Water Resources has definitely shown that the growth of agriculture, industry, and commerce in Kansas depend on available future water supply. In order to store and use for beneficial purposes all surface water available, and as the location sites for large storage reservoirs are limited, we believe that anticipated future needs for water, as well as present needs, should be recognized by the people of the State of Kansas. We recommend that the State legislature develop and adopt a basic State water development policy establishing the principle of State participation in water projects, in cooperation with local and Federal agencies, for the purpose of assuring full development of the surface water resources of the State.

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas history has proved that the well-being of any people is related directly to the productivity of the land on which they live and the protection they have from the ravages of uncontrolled waters; and

Whereas we believe the welfare of future generations of Americans will be directly affected by these conditions;

Whereas we now have knowledge and technical skill, if used with vigor and foresight, to preserve our heritage of natural resources: Now, therefore, we recommend that the State board of education adopt the teaching of conservation as a required subject in our public schools.

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas an irrigation district has been organized below the Kanopolis Dam consisting of some 17,000 acres; Be it

Resolved, That this association request the Congress of the United States for sufficient funds to begin construction of this worthwhile project.

RESOLUTION 12

Be it resolved, That this association recommends that in all future contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and any irrigation district that there be included therein a 10-year development period and further that all existing contracts upon request by any irrigation district be amended by the Secretary of Interior granting a 10-year development period rather than the present 5-year period.

RESOLUTION 13

This association heartily endorses the fine work which has been done in Kansas by the following agencies in the fields of flood control and conservation of water and soil: U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Soil Conservation Service, Water Resources Council of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, Kansas Water Resources Board, Kansas Water Resources Division of Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Kansas Industrial Development Commission, The Missouri-Arkansas Flood Control Association, the Republican Valley Conservation Association, U.S. Geological Survey, the State Geological Survey of the University of Kansas.

RESOLUTION 14

This association extends its thanks to the city of Osborne, the chamber of commerce, Ralph Wyckoff, and all others who have extended such fine hospitality to the delegates to this 21st meeting of the Kansas Reclamation Association.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HENNINGS, OF MISSOURI—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably the resolution (S. Res. 19) to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Hennings, of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 19), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Thomas C. Hennings, Junior, late a Senator from the State of Missouri, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution providing for the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the 87th Congress. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-seventh Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 519. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 520. A bill to authorize certain modification of the existing project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, for navigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Utterback; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 522. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 524. A bill to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 525. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act;

S. 526. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith;

S. 527. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia; and

S. 528. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr.

McGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 529. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 530. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 532. A bill for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 533. A bill for the relief of Irena Maria KOLLER; *and*

S. 534. A bill for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 535. A bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 536. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 537. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes;

S. 538. A bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses;

S. 539. A bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

S. 540. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 541. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen; and

S. 542. A bill to amend section 203(j), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HART):

S. 543. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 544. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 546. A bill for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung; and

S. 547. A bill for the relief of Young Jei Oh and Soon Nee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 548. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; and

S. 549. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Chirco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 551. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 552. A bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 553. A bill for the relief of George John Coutsoubinas, Olga G. Coutsoubinas, Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas, and Agatha G. Coutsoubinas;

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Suzuki Davis; and

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 556. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

S. 558. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1901 and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia;

S. 559. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

S. 560. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 561. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 562. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; and

S. 563. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL) (by request):

S. 564. A bill to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; and

S. 565. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 566. A bill for the relief of Renata Najman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 567. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place in grade 18 of the general schedule the positions of hearing examiners of the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 568. A bill providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 569. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 571. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 572. A bill to extend the Farmers' Home Administration operating loan program to bona fide fur farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 573. A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court-martial, or if not court-martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a higher education or in providing a higher education for his spouse or children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 575. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; and

S. 576. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to

clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62; and

S. 578. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 579. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 581. A bill to amend the Act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 582. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to create a joint committee for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KERR, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS ON "PROJECT HOPE"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) expressing the sense of Congress on "Project Hope," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 87th Congress, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

STUDY OF UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE, which appears under a separate heading.)

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST SUCCESSORS TO THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year I introduced, at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, a bill to close the gaps that exist in present law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line to the Presidency. This proposal was favorably approved by the Judiciary Committee, and passed the Senate on May 26, 1960; but final action was not consummated by the Congress before adjournment.

Existing law provides penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States and authorizes their protection by the U.S. Secret Service. The objective of these provisions would appear to be to take care of any contingency that may arise as to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who may become President. However, existing law does not take care of the situation that would occur in the event of the death or disability of either the President or the Vice President, or both. Furthermore, existing law does not provide protection for the Vice President-elect while he is waiting to assume office after his election. This proposed legislation would remedy this lack of coverage, by making the threat and protection provisions coextensive with the possibilities of succession to the Presidency.

With regard to the protection of the Vice President, existing law authorizes the full-time protection of the President, but provides protection of the Vice President only upon his request; that is, the protection of the Vice President is at the present time at the discretion of the Vice President. In its letter of transmittal, under date of January 27, 1960, the Department of the Treasury expressed the opinion "that this presents an untenable situation."

Part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded. Therefore, this proposal would remove the discretion of the Vice President as to his protection. It would, therefore, provide mandatory protection by the Secret Service for the Vice President, the Vice President-elect, or other officers next in order of succession to the Presidency.

I, therefore, introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "To amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury addressed to the President of the Senate, under date of January 27, 1960, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 27, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to close gaps that exist in present law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line to the Presidency.

Existing law provides penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States and authorizes their protection by the U.S. Secret Service. The objective of these provisions would appear to be to take care of any contingency that may arise as to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who may become the President. However, existing law does not take care of the situation that would occur in the event of the death or disability of either the President or Vice President, or both. Also, existing law does not provide protection for the Vice-President-elect while he is waiting to assume office after his election. The draft bill would remedy this lack of coverage by making the threat and protection provisions coextensive with the possibilities of succession to the Presidency.

With respect to the protection of the Vice President, existing law authorizes the full-time protection of the President, but provides protection of the Vice President only upon his request. In other words, the protection of the Vice President is at the present time at the discretion of the Vice President. The Department considers this an untenable situation. Part-time protection is ineffectual since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded. Consequently, the draft bill would remove the discretion the Vice President presently

has as to his protection, effective upon the expiration of the term of the present incumbent. It would also provide similar protection for the Vice-President-elect or other officer next in order of succession to the Presidency.

A comparative type showing changes which the proposed legislation would make in existing law is enclosed for convenient reference.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 519) to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT ON THE KASKASKIA RIVER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last month the Army Engineers made a favorable report on the Kaskaskia River, with respect to navigation improvement from its mouth to Fayetteville, in St. Clair County, Ill. The Engineers submitted a finding that the proposed project is sound and feasible at an estimated cost of $58,200,000. Therefore, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize this navigation proposal.

The report contains, among other things, a recommendation for dredging and widening the Kaskaskia River, to provide a 9-foot channel along the 45-mile stretch from the Mississippi River.

This would open up the rich Illinois coalfields, through which the Kaskaskia runs, to economical commercial exploitation. Coal reserves in this vicinity are estimated to be in the neighborhood of 2 billion tons. With the river open for commercial navigation, the Illinois coal industry would be revived. Current shipping costs now price Illinois coal out of the market. What is more important, in the long run, is the possibility that the coal would naturally attract industry to the lower reaches of the Kaskaskia. Electric power can be generated at a reasonably low cost in coal-fired steamplants.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that the proposed improvement of the river will induce industry to come into that area; and the project certainly is in conformity with all the emphasis that has been placed upon the development of distressed areas. The project will result in the improvement of a river which now is not navigable, and which traverses the southwest section of Illinois; and the project will open a great area that is abundant in natural resources and includes some of the finest coal fields in the country.

Industrial concerns have already indicated an interest in locating in this area. In fact, one large aluminum company has already acquired a site of approximately 2,200 acres near the mouth of the Kaskaskia, for an aluminum reduction plant. This process requires vast amounts of electricity. Illinois coal, plus the newly discovered iron ore deposits in Missouri, could also mean the location of a steel mill in the Kaskaskia River Valley. Furthermore, prime industrial producers always attract satellites who want to be close to their source of supply.

A proposal of this nature is a long way from the time of its authorization to the time when the dredges go into action. This project is worth dreaming about and working for, inasmuch as this area could very well some day become a "Ruhr Valley of America." At the same time, it fits into the programs to asist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies and to create new employment opportunities, as already set forth in various area assistance measures—including one I introduced early in the session—which have been introduced in the Senate, and now are under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Everett T. Winter, executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association, endorsing this proposed Kaskaskia River navigation project.

In conclusion, I may add that this measure also has the strong endorsement of the Missouri-Illinois Bi-State Development Agency, of St. Louis, as well as the endorsement of other industrial enterprises in both States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 520) to authorize certain modification of the existing project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., for navigation purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: We are very pleased to learn of your interest in seeking quick authorization of the navigation part of the overall development of the Kaskaskia River Basin.

Our organization has enthusiastically endorsed this project and a year ago in our official platform, we stated, "We urge the expeditious processing of the Kaskaskia River navigation report and prompt action in accordance with the findings and recommendations therein."

As you know this area has been the victim of some serious chronic unemployment, and we believe the completion of the Kaskaskia River project will do much to alleviate this condition.

The metroplex of St. Louis which includes both sides of the Mississippi River is dependent upon the coal deposits in Illinois for the millions of tons of coal needed to generate electricity for domestic and industrial uses. The completion of this canal will make possible the movement of this coal to the generating plants at a much reduced cost for transportation, and this reduction of cost will be reflected in the power and light bills of every consumer in a very wide area.

A nationwide grain company has informed us that as soon as the canal is assured they will build a grain elevator which will give the farmers of the area an improved market for soy beans, corn, and wheat.

One of the large aluminum companies contemplates the building of a plant on the canal that will mean a great many new jobs.

On the Missouri side of the Mississippi River, a very high grade iron ore deposit estimated to be some 30 billion tons has been discovered, and is being developed. With the opening of the Kaskaskia navigation project we will be able to bring together the almost unlimited deposits of coal from Illinois and this iron ore from Missouri to the benefit of both States, and of the entire Nation. The canalization of this river will change the Kaskaskia Valley from its present state to a midcontinent "Ruhr Valley."

We certainly wish you success in getting this very meritorious project authorized, and under construction.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT T. WINTER,
Executive Vice President.

STRENGTHENING OF LAWS AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, just before completing his distinguished tenure in office, William P. Rogers, the past Attorney General, proposed, on behalf of the Department of Justice, that in the criminal law there be made certain changes which would aid in the Nation's struggle against organized crime. In proposing these changes in the criminal law, the Department of Justice stated that it has long been concerned with the existence in the United States of nationwide crime syndicates which plunder the country of many billions of dollars each year.

It was the feeling of the Department of Justice that although combating crime is fundamentally the responsibility of local law-enforcement agencies, syndicated crime does not respect State boundaries, but operates on a national basis, and even in foreign countries.

It was, therefore, the position of the Department of Justice that Federal law enforcement should in every way possible aid the States to cope with the increasing interstate character of organized crime. It is the conviction of the Department of Justice that only through the use of such additional legal tools can this Federal assistance be adequately given to the States.

On behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I now introduce six different bills which would aid in the fight against organized crime.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD, preceding each bill, an explanation of its purpose.

I further request unanimous consent that the bills lie on the table for a week, to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and explanations will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received, read twice by their titles, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance.

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES.

"No deduction otherwise allowable under this subtitle shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for rent, wages or salaries if under any statutes of the United States, or of the State, Territory or Possession of the United States in which such amount is paid or incurred, the payment of such amount constitutes a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES.

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred after such date."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 523 is as follows:

Organized crime has derived huge profits from certain businesses carried on illegally. It is obvious that a business conducted furtively and unlawfully will yield larger profits than one transacted openly by law-abiding citizens. It is equally clear that the furtive character of such a business increases the expense and difficulty of tax collection. The Government is entitled to be reimbursed for this drain of its resources, and to secure its full share of taxes from these illegal ventures.

One example of this type of business is organized crime's illegal gambling enterprises—perhaps its principal source of illgotten funds. Almost all of the States have laws prohibiting "bookmaking," "slot machines" and related activities of the organized gambling fraternity. Policing illegal gamblers is primarily a State and local responsibility.

There are, however, areas where the Federal Government can properly assist local authorities in the enforcement of their antiracketeering and gambling laws. This bill is designed to deny persons engaged in illegal activity, such as gambling, certain tax deductions allowed to legitimate businesses. This would deal a severe blow to the organized racketeer by hitting him where it hurts most—in his pocketbook. (See *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27).)

To the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 524. A bill to amend the Act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(a)(2) of the Act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. 1171), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) any other machine or mechanical device (including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices) designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, provided that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to parimutuel betting equipment or materials used or designed for use at racetracks where betting is legal under applicable State laws; or".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(d) The term 'interstate commerce' includes commerce between one State, possession, or the District of Columbia and another State, possession, or the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'foreign commerce' includes commerce with a foreign country.

"(f) The term 'intrastate commerce' includes commerce wholly within one State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device in interstate or foreign commerce: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State if the State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of manufacturing, repairing, reconditioning, dealing in, or operating any gambling device if in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, unless such person shall, during the month prior to engaging in such business in that year, register with the Attorney General of the United States his name and trade name and the address of each of his places of business, designating his principal place of business within the United States.

"(b) Every person required to register under the provision of this Act shall maintain an inventory record of all gambling devices owned, possessed, or in his custody as of the close of each calendar month. The record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, together with the location of each item listed thereon.

"(c) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices sold, delivered, or shipped in intrastate, interstate, or foreign commerce. The record of sales, deliveries, and shipments for each place of business shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and the description of each separate subassembly or essential part sold, delivered, or shipped, together with the name and address of the buyer and consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier.

"(d) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired. This record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired together with the name and address of the person from whom the device was purchased or acquired and the name and address of the carrier.

"(e) Every manufacturer required to register shall number seriatim each assembled or partially assembled gambling device which is to be sold, shipped, or delivered, and shall stamp on the outside front of each such assembled or partially assembled gambling device so as to be clearly visible the number of the device, the name of the manufacturer, and the date of manufacture. And every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall record the data herein designated in the records required to be kept.

"(f) Each record required to be maintained under the provisions of this Act shall be kept for a period of five years.

"(g)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this Act to sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device which is not marked and numbered as required by this Act or for any person to remove, obliterate, or alter the manufacturer's name, the date of manufacture, or the serial number on any gambling device;

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to make or cause to be made, any false entry in any record required to be kept under this section; and

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any person who has failed to register as required by this Act or who has failed to maintain the records required by this Act to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device.

"(h) Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, at the principal place of business within the United States of any person required to register by this Act, at all reasonable times have access to and the right to copy any of the records required to be kept by this Act, and in case of refusal by any person registered under this Act to allow inspection and copying of the records required to be kept, the United States district court where the principal place of business is located shall have jurisdiction to issue an appropriate order ocmpelling production.

"(i) No person shall be excused from maintaining the records designated herein, producing the same or testifying before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But upon asserting the privilege against self-incrimination any natural person may be required to open the records designated herein to inspection or to testify before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto: *Provided,* That no such person shall be criminally prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of the inspection of such records or testimony with respect thereto. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt com-

mitted while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this Act.

"(j) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to make and enforce such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and the breach of any of such regulations shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this Act."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 524 is as follows:

In 1951 Congress passed the Johnson Act (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. secs. 1171–1177), which in general forbids the interstate transportation of any gambling device and requires manufacturers of and dealers in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General.

Experience with the enforcement of this act has demonstrated a need for its amendment in several respects. It is proposed to broaden the definition of gambling device so that not only the slot machines would be covered, but also additional types of machines and mechanical devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling.

The proposal would also enlarge and more clearly define the categories of persons to whom the registration and filing provisions apply. It would require the maintenance of detailed records with respect to the acquisition and disposition of gambling devices, with provision for inspection and copying of such records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Provision is made in the bill for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the required records or testifying before a grand jury or court of the United States. Thus, our enforcement authorities would be able to compel the disclosure by underlings of information necessary for reaching the upper echelons of the crime syndicates.

Finally, the bill would extend the scope of the act to apply to the transportation of gambling devices in foreign commerce; at present it applies only to the interstate transportation of such devices. This extension would not only eliminate a possible area of gambling device activity, but would further strengthen enforcement of the act with respect to interstate violations, since it is difficult to segregate from an investigative standpoint interstate and foreign shipments.

S. 525. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for a crime, or an attempt to commit a crime, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year under the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees, or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 525 is as follows:

Section 1073, the Fugitive Felon Act, now provides that "whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing offenses as they are defined either at common law or by the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees * * * shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Prosecution under this section is now limited to those crimes listed above, whereas the proposed amendment would broaden the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act to include all felonies or offenses punishable by more than a year in prison. If this amendment is enacted, local law-enforcement agencies could seek Federal assistance in locating offenders who have fled interstate to avoid prosecution, custody, or confinement for a number of serious offenses not presently included within the statute. It is the view of the Department of Justice that this amendment will strengthen considerably the legal arsenal directed at curbing major criminal activities in the Nation. It will supplement the powers of the States to fight against crime by adding the force of the Federal Government's investigative and enforcement agencies to those of the States, with either Federal trials of persons apprehended or their return to the proper State jurisdiction for prosecution or other appropriate action.

S. 526. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1952. Immunity of witnesses.

"Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of section 1951 of this title or of section 302 of the Act of June 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 157; 29 U.S.C. 186), or of any conspiracy involving the foregoing, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under the provisions of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"1951. Interference with commerce by threats or violence.

the following:

"1952. Immunity of witnesses."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 526 is as follows:

In labor racketeering cases the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimoney before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful to interfere with commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the act. Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses prescribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This bill would add a new section to the "Racketeering" chapter of our criminal code, in which the Hobbs Act is contained. As amended, the chapter will provide that whenever in the opinion of a U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, for the measure would accord him immunity from prosecution (except for prejury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination. Legislation such as this is not uncommon; there are many such immunity statutes and they have been of considerable assistance in accomplishing the more effective administration of justice.

S. 527. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chapter 95 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

"Whoever except a common carrier in the usual course of its business carries or sends in interstate or foreign commerce any records or paraphernalia used or intended or designed for use in (a) bookmaking; or (b) wagering pools with respect to a sporting event; or (c) in a numbers, policy, bolita, or similar game shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years or both."

and by adding the following item to the analysis of the chapter:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 527 is as follows:

This bill would make it a felony to send or carry in interstate commerce numbers

slips or wagering paraphernalia and would be of inestimable aid in stamping out syndicate numbers operations which extend across State lines. This occurs more frequently when State lines are close to major metropolitan areas. A typical example would be Washington, D.C., with its close proximity to Maryland and Virginia or Cincinnati, Ohio, which is across the State line from Newport, Ky. Whereas many of the numbers operations are intrastate, if this bill were enacted the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to investigate and act in those instances in which there is some indication of interstate activity.

S. 528. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the purposes of this Act are to assist the various States, territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like connection between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

(b) "Gambling information" means bets or wagers or related information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or transactions or information facilitating betting or wagering activities on any such sporting event or contest. In connection with horseracing, gambling information includes among other things entries, scratches, jockeys, jockey changes, weights, probable winners, scheduled starting time of race, actual starting time of race, track conditions, the betting odds, changes in the betting odds, the post positions, the results, and the prices paid.

(c) "Transmission in interstate commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from any place in any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Transmission in foreign commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 3. (a) The use of, or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of any communication facility which is or will be used for the transmission of gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce is prohibited. When any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility, but no damages, penalty or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any common carrier for any act done in compliance with any such notice. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prejudice the right of any person affected thereby to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State or local tribunal or agency, that such facility should not be discontinued or removed, or should be restored.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information in connection with the news reporting of sporting events or contests, which might be gambling information as defined in this Act, if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, and received only for printed news publications in newspapers, magazines, journals or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting.

(c) No radio or television broadcasting station, for which a license is required by any law of the United States, shall broadcast or permit to be broadcast any gambling information relating to horse racing before the start of any race on the day it is scheduled to be run, or during the one-hour period immediately following the finish of such race or before the start of the next race at that track whichever period is longer. This section shall not preclude the broadcasting of the progress of, or information concerning, a horse race where such broadcast is carried as a special event: *Provided,* That no more than two horse races shall be broadcast by any station or chain of stations per day.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person or persons who shall lease or otherwise obtain from a common carrier or other supplier a private line communication facility to be operated in interstate or foreign commerce for or in connection with the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests shall file with the Federal Communications Commission through its agent an affidavit that the communication facility so obtained is to be used for such purposes. For the purpose of receiving the affidavits required by this section the carrier or other supplier from whom the communication facility is obtained is designated the agent of the Federal Communications Commission. The affidavits on file with the Federal Communications Commission, through its agents, the carriers or other suppliers, shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

SEC. 5. (a) The interstate or foreign character of any transmission of gambling information in, or intended for transmission in, interstate or foreign commerce shall not create an immunity in respect of any criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses.

(b) Any remedies afforded by this Act are in addition to remedies now existing under State or Federal law, including law applicable within the territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 528 is as follows:

This bill would provide that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility." Thus, it will approach the overall purpose of striking at organized crime by providing a means of preventing persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials.

It should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services. The proposal would permit the broadcasting of horseraces when such broadcasts are carried as special events, provided not more than two horseraces a day shall be broadcast by any station.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 65 other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States. This proposed legislation would establish a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of an equal number of Members from each of the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations. It would be staffed on a nonpolitical basis by outstanding experts and technicians and would provide the Appropriations Committees of the Congress with the same kind of expert staff facilities and technical information as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation provides for the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means, and the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the names of the cosponsors will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 529) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Senators cosponsoring Senate bill 529 are as follows:

Senators MCCLELLAN, ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BIBLE, BLAKLEY, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD of Virginia, CANNON, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DODD, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HICKENLOOPER, HOLLAND, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, JOHNSTON, KEATING, KEFAUVER, LAUSCHE, LONG of Hawaii, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MILLER, MONRONEY, MORSE, MORTON, MUNDT, MUSKIE, PASTORE, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, TALMADGE, THURMOND, WILEY,

WILLIAMS of Delaware, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the basic objective of this measure is to remedy serious deficiencies in appropriations procedures and to improve the surveillance exercised by the Congress over the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes, in my judgment, a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in part:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

From the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood and accepted that this clause vested exclusively in the Congress the right to grant supplies of money to the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purpose for which the money shall be used.

The meaning of this clause of the Constitution has never been in issue. It was explained long ago by our first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, who was also a Founding Father, as follows:

> The design of the Constitution in this provision was, as I conceive, to secure these important ends—that the purpose, the limit, and the fund of every expenditure should be ascertained by a previous law. The public security is complete in this particular, if no money can be expended, but for an object, to an extent, and out of a fund, which the laws have prescribed.

Now I submit, Mr. President, that there is a very big difference between having duties and responsibilities and handling them wisely. Thus, the mere vesting in the Congress of unquestioned authority and responsibility for passing appropriations acts and determining the purposes for which public money may be used, does not necessarily guarantee that this function will be exercised either wisely or well.

If the Congress is to carry out this important responsibility, vested in it by the Constitution, it has the duty of informing itself as to the needs of the various departments and agencies of the Government, the reasonableness of their requests for funds, and whether or not the funds requested and obtained are being used for the purpose for which they have been requested.

Early in January of each year, the President submits the Federal budget to the Congress. It is usually a document of telephone directory dimensions, running more than 1,000 pages. It represents a full year of work on the part of the agencies and departments of the Government, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. The material contained in the budget has been developed and assembled by a vast number of persons in the departments and agencies, reviewed and reorganized by each department and agency and reviewed, revised and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget where some 500 persons are involved in the preparation and submission of the final document. In addition, available figures indicate that in the Washington headquarters area a total of some 2,000 persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year.

In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed budget information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for many months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages. Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriations bills running many hundreds of pages and containing thousands of separate items. In the 84th Congress, there were 38 appropriation measures, including 13 supplementals. In the 85th Congress, these committees processed a total of 45 appropriation measures of which 29 were regular and 16 were supplemental. In the 86th Congress, there were a total of 41 such measures, of which 30 were regular and 11 were supplemental.

I realize, of course, that all Members of this body are thoroughly familiar with the actual procedures by which the Congress handles appropriations measures. However, I would like to review them briefly in order to demonstrate more graphically the urgent need for the enactment of the legislation which I have proposed today.

Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees perform their functions through subcommittees which deal with the appropriations requests of one or more departments or agencies. Hearings on budget requests are held by these subcommittees beginning sometime in January or early February and continue on until their work is completed. Subcommittee recommendations are submitted to the full Appropriations Committee in each House and final action is then taken by the respective committees. All along the line, the procedure is duplicated in both Houses in that following hearings by House subcommittees, identical hearings are held by Senate subcommittees.

Once again, I know that we are all familiar with the manner in which these proceedings are conducted. However, a detailed examination of them appears to be in order at this time. The usual procedure is for witnesses representing the executive branch department or agency making the request to appear before a subcommittee, usually accompanied by a corps of technical experts from that agency, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. The entire proceeding is virtually ex parte in nature, and these witnesses represent exclusively the point of view of the executive branch of the Government. Since it is their duty as executive branch officials to support all of the budget items contained in the President's budget, it is their function and responsibility to demonstrate, both by oral and written justifications, that the amounts requested are absolutely necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications and exhibits, based upon extensive agency research, and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they have been working. As a rule, and it is not my intention to impugn their motives in any way, since these technicians have as their main objective the continuation or extension of programs and operations of their respective agencies which they sincerely believe are in the public interest.

Unlike hearings on substantive legislation, where witnesses appear for or against pending bills, at appropriations hearings testimony from the public is rarely, if ever, received. No witnesses are present to represent the taxpayer and the only manner in which the public interest can receive any consideration and protection, with respect to either the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of the requests and justifications by the one or two staff members assigned to handle each of the appropriations bills, and by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress who do not serve on the Appropriations Committees must, and generally do, rely largely on the recommendations of these committees when final action on appropriations measures is taken on the floor of each House.

Unfortunately, members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give adequate attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities for obtaining the information necessary to enable them to pass judgment on the necessity for the funds requested. Thus, for the most part, they are forced to rely upon the representations made by the respective initiating agencies of the executive branch, whose representatives appear before these committees in an ex parte type of proceeding for the sole purpose of justifying their budget requests. As a result, the Congress is often unable to obtain impartial information and facts to enable it to effect needed economies in the operations of Government. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its vital fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of the actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have, in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already overburdened taxpayers.

The duties and responsibilities of the Appropriations Committees, in connection with examining and passing upon budget requests for the operation of the Federal Government, have increased tremendously in recent years. These committees are presently staffed with competent personnel. It is almost impossible, however, for their relatively small staffs to examine and evaluate the annual budget with its many thousands of items, running in excess of 1,000 pages each year, within the very limited time available. This precludes

the detailed analysis which is so essential to the performance of the congressional function of controlling Federal expenditures.

Examining the results of a survey made by the Committee on Government Operations on the activities of the Senate in the 84th Congress, we find that exclusive of sessions called for the purpose of making up appropriations bills, the Senate Committee on Appropriations held some 300 open hearings consuming approximately 825 hours on appropriations measures. In addition, at least 30 executive sessions were held to consider other matters pertaining to the functions of the committee, involving approximately 67 hours. In summary, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the 84th Congress, held a total of 330 meetings and consumed an estimated 900 hours on appropriations measures alone.

As a further illustration of the tremendous workload of this committee, during the 84th Congress, the committee had regular standing subcommittees for each of the 12 major appropriations bills. Each member of the committee had at least four subcommittee assignments, and, in most instances, five assignments, with some members serving on as many as six subcommittees. On many occasions, there were two or three hearings in progress simultaneously, and members sometimes found it necessary to attend one hearing for a limited time and then to participate, insofar as time permitted, in other hearings of subcommittees on which they served.

With this picture in mind, how do we stand? I have already pointed out that the hearings before the various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees are attended by representatives of the executive branch departments and agencies seeking funds. These men have often devoted a lifetime to a particular activity or group of activities; they are thoroughly familiar with every phase of the program for which they seek funds; and they are prepared to answer every possible question in justification of their demands.

What do we have on our side of the table? The truth of the matter is that we are forced to rely upon two major sources of information: First, the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their requests; and who tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose; and second, information media, such as newspapers, periodicals, books, radio, and television. Of course, there are some Members of Congress who have additional sources of information such as members of their own office staff, interested groups, confidential informants and reliable friends within the executive branch.

Now I raise this question, Mr. President: Is this the way for the Congress of the United States to obtain information necessary to enable it to formulate the considered judgment which is so vital if it is to carry out its responsibilities and obligations to the American people?

Is this the way to look after the interests of millions of American taxpayers who are struggling under a very heavy tax burden? Is this the way in which responsible legislators should vote on budget requests averaging between $78.4 and $80.7 billion during the past 3 fiscal years?

The answer is obvious. It is most definitely and emphatically not the way in which Congress should handle these tremendous responsibilities.

What can be done? What should be done?

Years of both study and practice convinced me long ago that it is absolutely imperative that the Congress equip itself with the machinery and tools necessary to enable it to do the job which needs to be done. In other words the Congress must have whatever it needs to enable it to secure detailed and accurate information concerning each item of proposed expenditure in the President's budget for which an appropriation is sought and a justification is presented. To do this, it must have the type of manpower and brainpower which the executive branch has at its disposal for the preparation, presentation, and defense of the President's budget.

It is my firm conviction that the best way this can be accomplished is by means of the legislation which I am introducing today. This bill, which represents many years of careful study, would establish a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 14 members, 7 from the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and 7 from the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by the respective committees.

The Joint Committee would be authorized to elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session, with the chairman designated from among members who are Members of the House of Representatives, and the vice chairman from among members who are Members of the Senate in even-numbered years; and during odd-numbered years, the chairman would be selected from among members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman from among members who are Members of the House of Representatives. The Joint Committee would be authorized to adopt its own rules, except that provision is made that no measure or recommendation may be reported unless approved by a majority of the committee.

The proposed Joint Committee would be required to inform itself on all aspects of the annual budget of the agencies of the Government, to examine expenditure reports and to investigate the details of Federal operations in order that the Appropriations Committees may be provided with detailed information concerning each item in the budget and in the budget justification. It would also be required to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, and to utilize fully information emanating from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and from all other sources as to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions, in order that a well-considered fiscal program may be devised to hold expenditures to the minimum in relation to anticipated Federal revenues, and consistent with essential requirements of the Government operations and national security.

In addition, the Joint Committee would be authorized to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing jurisdictional committees so that they would be in a position to eliminate wasteful practices, correct deviations from programs authorized by the Congress, and recommend cutbacks in such programs as are consistent with the public interest.

To aid the Committees on Appropriations in determining the action necessary to conform to this program, the Joint Committee would be required to submit, at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, and periodically as deemed necessary, schedules of total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the current, succeeding and subsequent fiscal years, where the program extends for more than 1 year.

The most important feature of this measure would be the establishment of a permanent, full-time, nonpolitical staff of experts. The proposed legislation authorizes the appointment of a staff director, an associate staff director and such other professional, technical and clerical employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Joint Committee without regard to civil service rules or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director would be appointed by and responsible to members of the party of which the chairman of the Joint Committee is a member, and the associate staff director would be appointed by and be responsible to members of the opposition party. The members of the staff would be made available to the Committees on Appropriations and the several subcommittees thereof during periods in which appropriation bills are pending before the respective bodies, and staff members, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, would be authorized to examine fiscal books, documents, papers and reports of any Federal agency and data related to proposed appropriations included in the President's annual budget.

The bill would require further that the annual budget include an analysis of all long-term construction programs authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, the actual or estimated expenditures during prior, current, ensuing, and subsequent fiscal years. Also all grant-in-aid programs could be included in the analysis covering grants of an indefinite duration, and the annual cost for a 10-year period.

In addition, the bill would require the Comptroller General of the United States, at the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee, to make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable the Joint Committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to the agency indicated. It would also require all committees rec-

ommending legislation which would authorize appropriations to include in their reports estimates as to the initial cost of the projects or programs and their continuing cost over the succeeding 5 years, based upon estimates from the department or agency primarily concerned, after review by the Bureau of the Budget. The Joint Committee would be required to maintain compilations of all such estimates and to print such compilations annually for the information of Members of Congress.

The bill would also authorize the Joint Committee to recommend joint hearings by the Appropriations Committees and subcommittees thereof, in the interest of expediting action on appropriation measures. This is designed to insure conservation of time and energy of the members of these committees and of administrative officials of the Government, without in any way interfering with the independence of separate committee deliberations and decisions. The importance of this provision lies in the fact that time is one of the major stumbling blocks to adequate consideration and deliberation of budget requests. Joint hearings would greatly ease the time problem, because members of the subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee would be able to participate at early dates each year in the joint hearings with their opposite numbers in the House Appropriations Committee, and would be prepared to act almost immediately on the many appropriations items which are frequently subjected to little or no change as reported and as passed by the House of Representatives. Further hearings would presumably be limited to those appropriations items concerning which the Senate Appropriations Subcommittees felt additional information was needed because of substantial cuts or increases in proposed appropriations as finally voted by the House of Representatives.

Finally, members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget would be authorized to be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to assist the subcommittees in connection with their consideration of proposed appropriations.

Mr. President, the approach I am suggesting is not new. Ample precedent is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which has provided joint expert staff facilities and technical information for the revenue committees of both Houses of Congress for more than a quarter of a century and with much success.

Nor is Senate consideration and action on this measure new. This bill, in virtually identical form, has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Government Operations and approved in the Senate during the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. It was approved by a vote of 55 to 8 in the 82d Congress, and after the committee had adopted further perfecting amendments, passed the Senate under unanimous consent in the 83d and 84th Congresses. In the 85th Congress, the bill had 70 cosponsors and passed the Senate by unanimous consent, following debate.

In each Congress, Mr. President, following approval by the Senate, the House of Representatives withheld approval of these bills, although no vote has ever been permitted on the merits of the proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for the remainder of the day, so that any other Senators who desire to cosponsor the bill may be listed, and I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD along with the others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CULTURE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 48 hours for other Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 535) to provide for a National Academy of Culture, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS, WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 536) to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. HICKEY is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e), there are enclosed a copy of a secretarial order canceling and adjusting irrigation charges of certain non-Indian landowners of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and a draft of a bill to approve the order. Congressional approval is required before the order may become effective.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Copies of schedules A, B, and C, which are referred to in the secretarial order, and copies of the individual justifications for each case listed in schedules A and B, were transmitted to your office with our letter dated February 24, 1958.

Schedule A involves a cancellation of charges totaling $15,745.12 for 17 non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued before December 31, 1946, and a deferral of payments of charges totaling $7,149.87, which accrued from 1947 through 1956. Deferred payment contracts have been signed by each of the landowners involved.

Schedule B involves a cancellation of charges totaling $2,093.14 for three non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued before December 31, 1946, and a deferral of payments of charges totaling $1,556.40, which accrued from 1947 through 1956. Deferred payment contracts have not been signed by the landowners involved, but the cancellation will not be effective until the contracts are signed.

Schedule C involves a cancellation of charges totaling $18,601.44 for 83 non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued prior to the Lien Act of March 7, 1928. No contracts were executed obligating the purchaser to pay the charges and they do not constitute liens against the land. Section 4 of the 1936 act directs the Secretary to cancel such charges.

The amounts listed in the schedules are principal amounts and do not include accrued interest. In most cases interest will be as much as the principal. Cancellation of the principal amounts is intended to cancel the accrued interest also.

The cancellation of the charges that accrued before December 31, 1946, is based upon an investigation and administrative determination that the repayment capabilities of the lands are such that the operators can reasonably be expected to pay current annual assessments and to liquidate over a 10-year period the delinquent assessments that accrued after 1946, but that the lands cannot be operated profitably unless the charges that accrued prior to December 31, 1946, are canceled.

The Bureau of the Budget on December 30, 1960, advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosures.

ORDER

Whereas, an act of Congress approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e (1952)), authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to cause investigations to be made to determine whether the non-Indian owners of lands under an Indian irrigation project are unable to pay irrigation

charges, and provides that where the Secretary finds that "because of inability to operate such lands profitably by reason of lack of fertility of the soil, insufficiency of water supply, defects of irrigation works, or for any other causes he may adjust, defer or cancel such charges, in whole or in part, as the facts and conditions warrant," and may enter into contracts with landowners for the payments of past due charges over a period of not more than 10 years, and

Whereas, schedules A, B, and C of an investigation and report of conditions on the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, show that adjustments involving $45,145.97 of operation and maintenance assessments against non-Indian-owned lands should be made and that all except three landowners have executed contracts agreeing to pay the adjusted balances of charges against their lands after canceling amounts justified under the said act: Now therefore

I find that the landowners are unable to operate such lands profitably because of seepage and other conditions covered by the Act and hereby (a) cancel $36,439.70 of delinquent charges shown on schedules A, B, and C of the said report, provided that the cancellation of $2,093.14 under schedule B shall not become effective until the landowners have executed contracts as provided in the act of June 22, 1936, agreeing to pay the balance, amounting to $1,556.40, of delinquent charges against their lands described as the W½SW¼, section 1, SE¼NE¼ of section 22, T. 1 S., R. 1 E., and the W½NW¼NW¼ of section 10, T. 1 S., R. 4 E, Wind River meridian; and (b) approve the contracts executed or to be executed by the landowners as provided in the said act of Congress providing for the payment of $8,706.27 of delinquent charges against their lands.

Done in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 12th day of November 1957.

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

REVISION OF RESTRICTION ON CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS LAND

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to facilitate the transfer of surplus land for historic-monument purposes.

Under existing law, before a State or political subdivision thereof may acquire surplus land from the United States for historic-monument purposes it must be determined suitable and recommended by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. The law requires that the area shall not exceed what is necessary for the preservation and observance of a historic monument, and that it was acquired by the United States prior to January 1, 1900. This bill is designed to remove the rigid restriction relating to the date of acquisition and substitute a requirement that no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes unless it has possessed historic significance for more than 50 years.

I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior under date of January 11, 1961, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 537) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would amend section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to remove a technical restriction, relating to date of acquisition, presently imposed on the transfer of surplus land of the United States for historic-monument purposes.

Existing law places certain restrictions on the transfer without monetary consideration of any surplus land of the United States to a State, political subdivision, or municipality for historic-monument purposes. In the first instance, no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. Additionally, no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes if (1) its area exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic monument, or (2) it was acquired by the United States after January 1, 1900. The proposed amendment to existing law would remove the restriction relating to date of acquisition and substitute the restriction that no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes unless it has possessed historical significance for more than 50 years preceding the determination.

The rigid requirement that the acquisition date be a factor in determining the eligibility of surplus land for disposal has hampered seriously a number of desirable conveyances of land to States and political subdivisions on which historic events have occurred. For example, surplus acreage situated at Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, S.C., on which an outstanding historic event of the American Revolution occurred, could not be disposed of under existing law although it was found suitable and desirable for transfer for historic-monument purposes. Authority for the transfer was lacking because the land was not acquired by the United States and added to Fort Moultrie Military Reservation until after January 1, 1900. In other instances, the transfer of surplus land for historic-monument purposes is precluded because of the acquisition-date restriction, a factor having no relevancy to the historical significance of the land.

Under the proposed amendment no surplus land could be transferred unless it possessed historical significance relating to a period of time more than 50 years preceding the determination that the land was suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes. Such a restriction would conform to one of the Advisory Board's criteria for consideration of historic sites. That standard is that "Structures or sites of recent historical importance relating to events or persons within 50 years will not as a rule be eligible for consideration." We believe this to be a well considered requirement because it is calculated to assure that by an appropriate lapse of time historic matters will be considered in their proper perspective. At the same time, it provides for some flexibility in the exercise of this function, which we consider essential in order to accomplish equitably the purposes of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would not result in any additional expenditures of Federal funds.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 5, 1961, advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosure.

A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last clause of section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 1622(h)(2)), is amended by striking out the words "it was acquired by the United States at any time subsequent to January 1, 1900", and substituting the words "its historical significance relates to a period of time within the 50 years immediately preceding the determination of suitability and desirability for such use."

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS TO WITNESSES BY CERTAIN OFFICERS OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961. I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Administrator of the General Services Administration under date of January 9, 1961, and a statement of justification, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 538) to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
January 9, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith draft of legislation "To amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

The proposed legislation would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377; 40 U.S.C. 486), as amended, by adding a new subsection to section 205, which would authorize and empower all officers and employees of the General Services Administration engaged in investigatory functions to administer oaths in the performance of their duties, when so designated by the Administrator.

Such legislation is urgently needed to enable GSA to improve its investigatory functions by administering oaths to persons prior to securing statements or in other capacities which will be beneficial in the protection of the Government's interests.

This statutory authority will aid GSA in carrying out its responsibilities with respect to protecting the Government's interest by a continuing administrative investigation and surveillance of the merchandise acquired by GSA for the use of all civil departments and agencies and the acquisition of strategic and critical materials for the Government's stockpile. GSA's tremendous construction program and the maintenance of Government owned or leased buildings also requires constant, thorough administrative investigation.

The specific citations above merely indicate some of the fields in which it is necessary for this agency to carry on investigations. During fiscal year 1960, this agency investigated 1,918 cases of law violations resulting in 36 arrests, 30 convictions, and 93 disciplinary actions. The fines and recoveries totaled $952,067. Enactment of this legislation would enable GSA's investigators to obtain statements which would be helpful in bringing to justice those who attempt to violate the law. In addition, it is believed that such authority would result in increased recoveries.

The enactment of the proposed legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds, but could result in increased revenue.

The General Services Administration urges prompt and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

JUSTIFICATION

This proposed legislation would amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, by adding a new subsection. This subsection would authorize and empower all officers and employees of the General Services Administration who are engaged in investigative work to administer oaths, when so designated by the Administrator.

This authority is needed to enable the Administrator of General Services to carry out the responsibilities placed upon him by the Congress of the United States under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended. Among other things, the Administrator of General Services is required to acquire all common-use items for the use of all civilian departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government. Constant surveillance must be kept of the manner in which these items are acquired and of the quality of merchandise supplied by the contractors. The amount of Government funds expended is approximately $862 million annually. Due to the tremendous volume of this purchasing program and the variety of contractors with whom GSA can and does do business, problems requiring inspection and investigation arise frequently.

There is the further necessity of investigating cases involving employee misconduct, generally.

Due to the widespread activities of the General Services Administration in the construction of buildings for the use of the Federal Government, many contract violations arise. The demand for quarters for Government agency activities is very heavy. It is contemplated that it will be necessary for GSA to project a building program which will require the expenditure in excess of a billion dollars over a period of 5 to 10 years. Since the major portion of these buildings are erected by contractors and subcontractors, it is incumbent upon the Administrator to determine that no statutory authority has been violated by the contractors before Federal funds are expended. This particular field needs the protection of every phase of this investigation.

Since General Services Administration is charged with the responsibility of acquiring the strategic and critical materials for the Government's stockpile and the necessary rotation of much of this material, a constant inspection and investigation surveillance of the activities leading to the accomplishment of this function is necessary.

The statements above give some indication of the variety of investigatory and protective work that is required to carry out the programs and functions of this agency. During fiscal year 1960 GSA investigated 1,918 cases of all types of violations of law. The results of these preliminary administrative investigations were submitted to the Department of Justice for further handling. As a consequence, 36 arrests were made, 30 convictions obtained and 93 disciplinary actions were taken. The fines and civil recoveries totaled $952,067.

These investigations were made under the handicap of the investigator's not being able to place witnesses under oath at the time and place of taking statements. It is believed that the authority sought by this proposed legislation would enable this agency to secure a higher rate of recovery for the Government and assist in bringing to justice cases of actual violations. The persons interviewed in cases of this kind are found at many locations, sometimes after a difficult tracing and the statement taken by the investigator is all too frequently the only statement that can be obtained. A statement which is not made under oath does not result in a document that is of substantial weight in the prosecution of violations of the law. Furthermore, the person making the statement tends to be careless in his use of the truth when he realizes that he is not under oath and cannot be subjected to any penalty or legal action for any statement made, regardless of its falsity.

Upon the enactment of this much needed legislation, the Administrator of General Services will issue regulations setting forth the manner in which this amendment will be carried out. The Administrator is willing to assume the responsibility for making certain that the authority is not abused by those designated to exercise it. Only the officers and employees of this agency who are engaged in investigatory functions and will be so operating as to be able to use the authority effectively to secure sworn statements of witnesses, admissions, confessions, etc., will be designated as persons authorized and empowered to administer oaths.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN NATIONALS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

This proposed legislation is introduced at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior in order that the people of American Samoa, who are now excluded as nationals of the United States from the allocation of foreign scholarships which are financed from the proceeds of the sale of surplus property in foreign countries, a program established under a bill introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for the benefit of Americans desiring to study abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, addressed to the President of the Senate requesting this legislation, be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, at this point.

The bill (S. 539) to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

By section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 1641(b)(2)), a system of foreign scholarships, to be financed from the proceeds of the sale of surplus property in foreign countries, was established for the benefit of Americans desiring to study abroad. The wording of the law restricts the benefits of this program to citizens, thus, perhaps unintentionally, excluding from consideration the very small class of persons, principally the indigenous inhabitants of our possession of American Samoa, who are legally classified as American nationals.

The people of American Samoa have demonstrated their complete loyalty to the United States and their dedication to American ideals, equally with the inhabitants of

any of the other territories of the United States. We believe that their exclusion from eligibility for these scholarships is an unfair discrimination against them. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to remove this discrimination by adding the words "or nationals" after the word "citizens" wherever it appears in such section.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 11, 1961, has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

PAYMENT IN ADVANCE BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the legislative program of that Department.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill, I request that the letter transmitted to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 540) to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) prohibits advance payment for articles purchased by the Federal Government. The act of June 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 580), permits the advance payment of "subscription charges" for "newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals." This language, however, does not cover charges for publications that do not fall into the category of periodicals.

The proposed legislation would permit advance payment of "subscription or other charges" for "newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and other publications."

Our acquisitions program has suffered as a result of our inability to make advance payment for publications. In some cases we have been unable to procure publications at all; in others we have had to pay a premium either to the publisher or to an agent.

For example, we were unable to obtain the Proceedings of the Fourth World Petroleum Congress held in Rome in 1955, since we were prohibited from complying with the fiscal requirements of the Congress for advance payment of $70. Likewise, we were unable to procure the Fifth Decennial Index of Chemical Abstracts published by the American Chemical Society at a prepublication price of $900. The post-publication price is likely to be $1,200 and in all probability more. The Comptroller General has ruled in 37 C.G. 720 that the Index is not a periodical and consequently advance payment cannot be made.

The Bonneville Power Administration has difficulty in purchasing the American Standards Association Standards which are published as separates at 25 cents to 50 cents each. It is the Association's practice to add 50 cents to each order not accompanied by a remittance. In order to facilitate advance payments of small amounts they sell coupon books, but the General Accounting Office has ruled that we cannot legally purchase them.

In recent years many State governments which formerly gave us their publications, such as session laws, have changed their policy and now require advance payment. These must now be ordered through a dealer, who charges a premium for advancing the money.

These are but a few examples of the difficulties encountered in attempting to procure with facility, and at savings, much needed and required publications for the offices of this Department.

There is ample precedent for liberalizing the statute to permit this Department, as well as other agencies, to pay in advance for required publications. Set forth below are the statutory exceptions which have previously been made for the Department of Agriculture, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration) to pay in advance for subscriptions to publications without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes:

1. The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1910, approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054), provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the subscriptions for publications for the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of this Department."

2. The act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362), provided that the Quartermaster Corps may pay in advance for "other publications" from funds authorized for the corps.

3. The appropriation act for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to subscriptions for publications for the U.S. Veterans' Bureau, and the Director is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of the Bureau."

The same authority should be given to this and other departments in the furtherance of our library services.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 6, 1961, has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress, but that the Comptroller General has recommended the inclusion of a section 2 that repeals the present special laws granting similar authority to specific agencies. We have no objection to the inclusion of a provision of this kind if the Congress believes it is advisable, and if the inclusion will not delay the consideration of our proposed legislation. The language suggested by the Comptroller General is as follows:

"SECTION 2. The following parts of acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"(1) The proviso to the paragraph headed 'General Expenses, Library' under the caption 'Library, Department of Agriculture' in the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1954);

"(2) The first proviso to the paragraph headed 'Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps' in the act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362);

"(3) The first parenthetical phrase under the caption 'Pay, Miscellaneous' in the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 929);

"(4) Section 5 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1049);

"(5) The 10th paragraph under the caption 'United States Veterans' Bureau' in the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533)."

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior.

APPOINTMENT OF NONUNIFORMED SPECIAL POLICEMEN BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference.

This bill proposes to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

Mr. President, I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Administrator of General Services under date of January 7, 1961, with a statement of justification, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 541) to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith draft of legislation, "To amend the act June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen." A statement of justification is also enclosed.

This proposed legislation is part of the legislative program of General Services Administration for 1961, and is identical to S. 2581 which passed the Senate on June 23, 1960.

This proposed legislation would amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281) by adding a new section which would authorize and empower the Administrator of General Services, or officials duly designated by him, to authorize officials and employees of GSA engaged in investigative functions to act as nonuniformed special policemen. This act now permits the Administrator to appoint uniformed guards as special policemen. This proposal is needed to enable General Services Administration to improve its effectiveness in protecting Federal property through the investigation of suspected criminal activities in and around buildings and property under the charge or control of the General Services Administration. The effective surveillance of individuals suspected of being engaged in illegal operations is impossible if the investigators may be identified readily by their conspicuous uniforms.

There is statutory authority (43 Stat. 174, 176) permitting nonuniformed policemen to make investigations within the District of Columbia. Amendment of the act of June 1, 1948, is sought for the purpose of extending to all GSA-controlled properties the authority of the Administrator of General Services to appoint and use nonuniformed special policemen as well as uniformed special policemen to protect Federal property. The experience of General Services Administration is that nonuniformed special policemen have proved valuable for such protection purposes with respect to the Government land and buildings within the District of Columbia, and it is believed that other Government properties could be better protected by GSA's investigative personnel possessing the additional authority of special policemen.

The proposed legislation would also authorize such special policemen to carry firearms, whether on Federal property or in travel status, and they would also have the power to enforce Federal laws and make arrests while on real property under the charge and control of the General Services Administration.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds.

The General Services Administration urges prompt and favorable consideration of this draft bill.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

JUSTIFICATION

This proposed legislation would amend the Act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281, 5 U.S.C. 318), by adding a new section which would authorize and empower the Administrator of General Services, or certain officials designated by him, to appoint employees of the General Services Administration engaged in investigative functions, to act as nonuniformed special police. Such employees would be empowered to enforce Federal laws for the protection of persons and property, and to enforce rules and regulations issued by the General Services Administration for protection of such property. The policemen so designated under this proposed bill would also be authorized to make arrests without warrant for any offense constituting a felony when committed on Government property, if such police had reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested is guilty of such offense. They would also be authorized to carry firearms while on duty whether in travel status or on Federal real property under the charge or control of the United States.

This authority is needed to enable the Administrator of General Services to meet the requirements placed upon him by the Congress of the United States under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (63 Stat. 377), as amended. In the prevention of crime and the protection of buildings and grounds under the control of this agency, it is essential that certain civilian employees engaged in investigative activities be empowered to act as special policemen without being required to wear uniforms. The effective surveillance of individuals suspected of being engaged in illegal operations is enhanced if these investigators are not readily identified by their uniforms.

Since special policemen with their arresting powers carry firearms and may frequently be reassigned from one public building or area to another, and may even be required to cross State lines, it is essential that they be specifically authorized to carry their firearms while in travel status. This will help to clarify their right to do so while within State and local jurisdiction.

The authority to these nonuniformed employees to exercise the powers of special policemen is a necessary adjunct to their investigative activities, since it is frequently of prime importance to make an immediate arrest of an offender whose identity is not known or who may have incriminating evidence in his possession. The services of these nonuniformed policemen have proved valuable in the District of Columbia where they are now operating pursuant to the Act of May 27, 1924 (43 Stat. 174, 176).

The reasons for utilizing nonuniformed special policemen are valid throughout the Nation. In the past, such investigators have not had the authority of special policemen in such areas as that of the Pentagon and are not able to cope with suspected gambling offenses and other similar problems. Careful surveillance and immediate arrest are almost prerequisite to successful prosecution when such offenders have incriminating documents in their possession.

ALLOCATION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to limit the distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense, and to transfer the responsibility for administering the request of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Defense by letter dated January 3, 1961, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The letter from the Secretary of Defense in support of the proposal sets forth the purpose and need for this legislation, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 542) to amend section 203(j), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that Act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961, and the Bureau of the Budget advised by letter dated December 23, 1960, that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to limit distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense and to transfer the responsibility for administering the requests of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under criteria developed over the past years within the scope of the present statute, the Department of Defense has found certain fine organizations eligible to receive surplus property. It is unnecessary to emphasize the worth to this country of organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and the Boys Club of America; however, it is believed that determinations with respect to the distribution of such property to such organizations more properly belong within the purview of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On the other hand, the Department of Defense has a direct responsibility for military training programs conducted at educational institutions maintaining and conducting military programs at standards acceptable to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Armed Forces benefit from these programs by receiving militarily trained manpower. It is therefore entirely reasonable that a direct responsibility for supplying needed surplus property to institutions of this nature should be imposed upon the Department of Defense.

Similar reasoning impels the inclusion of the proviso in the bill which would preserve the present eligibility of the Civil Air Patrol to receive surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense.

The Civil Air Patrol maintains a capability to assist both civil and military activities during emergency and during periods when no emergency exists, by the voluntary efforts of the Civil Air Patrol senior members who operate and maintain light aircraft, mobile support units, and a nationwide radio communication network. Therefore, it is the position of the Department of Defense that the Civil Air Patrol should continue to receive support of their overall program through the donation feature as heretofore.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Deputy.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that Act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) In the case of any surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational institutions which are of special interest to the armed services because they maintain military training programs which are approved by the Secretary

of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, and which apply for such property: *Provided*, That any organization established by law of the United States whose object is to encourage and foster the development of aviation that was eligible to receive surplus property under this paragraph on the day before the enactment of this proviso continues to be so eligible to receive surplus property under this paragraph. If the Secretary of Defense shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational institutions. If the Secretary determines that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection."; and

(2) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (3) by striking out the word "and" before the designation "(B)" and inserting before the period at the end thereof the words ", and (C) any other tax-supported or nonprofit activity which, under a designation effective on the day before the date of enactment of this clause, received property under paragraph (2) and which is not eligible to receive property under that paragraph after that date."

COST OF LIVING INCREASES FOR ANNUITIES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Public Law 85–465 authorized cost-of-living increases for certain persons receiving annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This law also provided annuities for certain survivors of former employees or annuitants deceased prior to February 29, 1948. Public Law 85–465 stipulated that these benefits would terminate after July 1, 1960, if Congress did not make an appropriation to reimburse the civil service fund for the cost of such payment. On January 17, 1961, the Civil Service Commission recommended that the increases and annuities provided under Public Law 85–465 be made permanent. I, therefore, introduce a bill to make permanent certain increases and annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 549) to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide increases in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219; Public Law 85–465), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annuities and increases in annuities provided by the preceding sections of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and Senators MORSE, SALTONSTALL, CASE OF New Jersey, and SCOTT, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality laws of the United States, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 551) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. I also send to the desk a summary of the measure and ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT)—PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONGRESS

SHORT TITLE: "IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961"

Title I

Section 101: Amends sections 212(a)(15) and 241(a)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212(a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental process the probability of future proscribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287(a)(1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353, and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. Repeals section 350 of Public Law 414 which provides for divestiture of nationality in the case of dual nationality of natural-born Americans. Repeals section 355 of Public Law 414, which deals with loss of American nationality through the expatriation of a parent.

Section 105: Amends sections 101(2)(37), 212(a)(28)(D), 241(a)(6)(D) and 313(a)(3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244(a)(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Section 107: Amends section 201(e) of Public Law 414, eliminating provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 108: By amending section 202(a)(5) and 202(e) and repealing section 202(b), (c) and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

Section 109: Amends section 222 of Public Law 414 to eliminate the requirement that an applicant designate "his race and ethnic classification."

Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101(a)(6) of Public Law 414, restores preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose.)

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212(c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235(c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241(d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206. (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 207. Repeals section 260(a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 208. Amends section 260(c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by the Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360(b).

Section 209. Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Title III

Section 301. Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation by Executive order of the President the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists. Such reallocations are subject to disapproval by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1960 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

Title IV

Section 401: Amends Public Law 85-316. Petitions for admission by fourth preference quota immigrants which were approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, will be admitted to the United States without reference to quota. For those filing petitions subsequent to July 1, 1957, therefore, the waiting time for admittance would be greatly diminished.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate very briefly. The measure which I am introducing must be taken together with the measure introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] as part of a package on immigration legislation.

My colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], with the same cosponsors, will introduce a bill to cover the phase which relates to refugees, displaced persons and escapees from various forms of tyranny, including the Castro tyranny. That part which I am introducing as the principal sponsor relates to the amendment of the immigration laws to realine the quota system and to eliminate many injustices now contained in the present immigration laws.

Mr. President, under the provisions of the bill being introduced by my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the cosponsors on his bill, nonquota visas for up to 40,000 refugee-escapees would be provided. These would include those fleeing from Communist persecution or from the Middle East and other areas where forces are at work against the free world.

The undiminished flow of such refugees is confirmed by the latest estimates based on State Department information: In 1960, 200,000 East Germans escaped to West Germany, more than half of them through the great door to liberty provided by West Berlin; and 10,000 non-German refugees also fled from European Iron Curtain countries; 110,000 Chinese sought refugee in Hong Kong. Right next door to the United States at least 30,000 Cubans fled the Castro regime, mostly to this country.

In addition, this bill would authorize the President to parole into the United States refugee-escapees from future upheavals, such as the Hungarian uprising of 1956. This power could be employed to aid people fleeing from the tyranny of a Castro or similar tyrant, the Senators indicated.

The second bill, which is being introduced by me, my colleague [Mr. KEATING], and Senators CASE of New Jersey, MORSE, SALTONSTALL, and SCOTT, deals primarily with immigration matters. It would revise and modernize the national quota system to reflect the 1960 rather than the 1920 census.

During the past 40 years, the U.S. population increased by some 75 million people and this would be reflected in the increase of annual immigration to the United States from 155,000 to about 300,000—an expansion fully justified by the greater absorption of our population and of our national wealth which had quadrupled in these four decades.

This bill would also permit the pooling of unused quotas and their reallocation by Executive order of the President. Another provision would allow the admission of fourth-preference quota immigrants approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, without reference to quota.

During the past 6 years, only 574,000 quota numbers—or 62 percent of the potential U.S. quota of 930,000 over that period—were actually used for immigration. The reason for the large percentage of unused quota numbers is that the two quota areas located in the British Isles do not use the major part of the quotas allotted to them. In fiscal 1960, these two areas accounted for 48,000 unused quota numbers—or 94 percent of all the quota numbers not used.

Under this new legislation, these two areas would receive an additional 38,000 quota numbers, thus making a total of up to 90,000 unused quota numbers available for redistribution annually, if the performance during the past few years continues.

Furthermore, the annual quotas of most countries, especially those most in need of them, would be increased substantially. For example, Italy's quota would be increased by 252 percent, and Greece's by 846 percent.

No more important service could be performed in the name of justice, humanity and our own national self-interest than substantial revision of our immigration statutes. The bills we offer are a most reasonable and realistic program which would remove glaring inequities and shortcomings in our present laws.

We must never forget that the world watches closely to see what this country does with regard to helping immigrants, just as it follows closely what we do in the field of civil rights. In our view, reform of the immigration laws is an integral part of our responsibility as leader of the free world. It is essential if we are to remove the black eye we receive abroad because of the discriminatory nature of the present statutes. It is also vital if we are to remain true to our proud national heritage of offering haven for the world's homeless and oppressed.

No fundamental revision in this field would be complete without a refugee-escapee provision which indicates by its very adequacy that we will not abandon opponents of communism and other forms of totalitarianism. We can hold out the bright hope for the world's homeless that at least some of them can find a haven in our land, by means of these proposed reforms.

In addition, our immigration proposals recognize the fact of life that we are living under a 1960 census, not the outdated figures of 1920. This provision and that providing for the reallocation of unused quotas to oversubscribed countries would go a long way in improving the unjust, inequitable and hopelessly archaic national origins quota system. Progress in this area is the most urgently needed revision.

Enactment of legislation such as we have proposed would strike a tremendous blow for American prestige the world over. It would be of immeasurable assistance in the conduct of our foreign relations and would improve substantially our position in the struggle for peace. Finally, these changes in the immigration laws would permit America to remain true to its proud traditions by proving to a watching world that we care and care deeply about the plight of humanity and are prepared to do our part to alleviate this suffering.

Mr. President, so far as my action is concerned, I wish to emphasize it is in pursuance of a pledge which I made on the floor of the Senate, which I intend to honor. The pledge was that I shall not sit by again at the point of a legislative gun and let a general immigration bill of a very limited character go through the Senate without seeking to do something fundamental about the immigration laws.

Mr. President, I am introducing the measure now to give clear notice of what I have in mind. I am fully cognizant of the fact that the effort to get a just immigration policy may result in 1,500, 1,700, or 2,000 very deserving immigrants from some particular place or other suffering seemingly a temporary hardship—that was the type of bill we had with respect to the Azores, which made a special exception, which was the only bill permitted to be passed in the last session. Mr. President, we have to call an end to that kind of thing, because our national policy simply cannot stand for this limited way of approaching what must be done on immigration.

Mr. President, the immigration laws of the United States are one of the worst refutations against us when we say we want an open society and an open world. They represent a closed society and a closed world. The laws discriminate against Asiatics and against Negroes. They allow thousands of quota numbers to go unused. They give relatively minuscule quotas to countries such as Italy and Greece, in regard to which there is the greatest need for a just immigration policy.

Nobody is suggesting that we should be inundated with immigrants, but we are suggesting that the United States take its fair share of immigrants in a working and just world.

As an example, Mr. President, over the past 6 years only 62 percent of the potential U.S. quota has been used. Why? One reason is because for immigration quotas we are using the 1920 census, though we have had censuses every 10 years up until 1960. This tends to depress and to distort the immigration quotas.

There is a minuscule quota of 100 for the so-called Pacific triangle, excluding those who have an Asiatic background to the extent of 50 percent, which is an unheard of provision under the Constitution of the United States and under the attitudes of the American people.

Mr. President, it is a time to bring an end to the procedure we have followed. The only way to bring an end to it is to stop being put upon by the idea that we can pass only one particular immigration bill and that if a Senator suggests any amendments the bill will be withdrawn or will be defeated, or will get nowhere in the other body. It is time to have a showdown. I propose we shall have it.

Mr. President, that is the reason I am introducing this proposed legislation. I am very pleased that my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is joining with me in this effort and will join to carry the fight for the bill.

This is a bipartisan bill in its very fundamental essence and approach, as will be noted from its sponsors, and I have a deep feeling that it will receive bipartisan support in the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to join in sponsoring and cosponsoring bills dealing with our Nation's laws on immigration.

During the last few months, it has not been uncommon to hear remarks directed to the U.S. position of world leadership. In order to maintain this position, all are in agreement that affirmative action must be taken both at home and abroad.

I would suggest at this time that one area for early action is in the sphere of immigration laws. In many instances a warped reflection of the United States is cast overseas because of discriminatory immigration laws at home. In order to cross over this barrier of distrust and to extend freedom abroad, it is imperative that we first establish and record our faith in the peoples of all nations by legislative action in the Congress. If we are willing to continue laws discriminating against individuals because of race or national origin, what trust can we in turn expect from the emerging nations of Asia and Africa?

The proposals which we offer today are designed to allow this country to share fully in its world responsibilities and reform many of the discriminating features of our immigration laws.

The bill pertaining to refugees cosponsored by the Senators named, would authorize the issuance of 40,000 special non-quota-immigrant visas for refugee-escapees from the trouble spots around the world. People subject to persecution or fear on account of race, religion, or political opinion who have fled from a Communist-dominated nation would come within the definition of refugee-escapees. In addition, individuals fleeing from Middle Eastern countries or other areas where forces against the free world are at work would be defined as refugee-escapees.

The bill also has measures which would empower the President to direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees, should future world developments create another situation similar to the Hungarian uprising. The provisions would also provide relief, at the discretion of the President and subject to the approval of Congress, to people fleeing from the tyranny of a Castro or a similar tyrant.

The provisions of the bill with respect to immigration are similar to proposals which President Eisenhower repeatedly made to bring our immigration laws up to date. These proposals were in substance strongly endorsed in both the Republican and Democratic platforms. They would provide revision of our national quota system to reflect the 1960 census rather than the census of 1920, on which the law is presently based. The bill would also provide for the pooling of unused quota numbers and their reallocation by Executive order of the President. The reallocation of unused quota numbers by the President would be subject to disapproval by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress.

Another important provision of our proposal is to allow the admission of fourth-preference-quota immigrants approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, without reference to quota.

In considering these various proposals for eliminating inequities and shortcomings in our immigration laws, we have given serious thought to the effect such changes might have on employment in the United States. At the present time, this Nation has a work force of more than 72 million people. Should these proposals be enacted into law, the resulting increase in our work force would be less than two-tenths of 1 percent.

When we take into consideration that in many cases immigrants with special skills actually provide work for other Americans, we see that the impact on our domestic economy of a broadened and more humanitarian immigration law might well be to increase rather than decrease job opportunities for American workers. As an example, Mr. President, in my hometown of Rochester, which is an important clothing manufacturing center, there is a serious shortage of skilled tailors. Every skilled tailor brought from Italy or other countries to fill these positions is able to create work for eight additional people in related skills.

It should also be noted that immigrants to this country have in the past been a source of some of our best technical know-how, scientific research and philosophical thought. Immigrants have, throughout the history of America, provided the stimulus for unparalleled development in all areas of our national growth. There is no reason to believe that this will be untrue today.

As we broaden our horizons of world leadership, it is fitting and appropriate that we should attempt to eliminate the anachronistic blemishes of our domestic complexion, which serve only to bar complete faith and trust in the United States.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, and a short analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 552) to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188), is amended (1) by inserting "(A)" after "(5)" at the beginning of such paragraph, and (2) by adding the following additional subparagraphs:

"(B)(i) As used in this paragraph, the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, (2) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, or (3) from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion.

"(ii) Whenever the President shall find that a situation has arisen causing the creation of a class or classes of aliens who fall within the meaning of the term 'refugee-escapee' and that it would be in the interests of the United States to permit the prompt entry into the United States of refugee-escapees, he may by proclamation, direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees selected by the Secretary of State, who are within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied and who are not nationals in the area in which they reside.

"(C) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or any other law, any alien who is or has been paroled into the United States by the Attorney General under the authority of this paragraph and has not otherwise acquired permanent residence status in the United States may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(D) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien has remained in the United States for at least two years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety or security, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admis-

sion for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. A complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the alien shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) In addition to any refugee-escapees paroled into the United States by the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5 of subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188), or the provisions of Public Law 86-648 of the Eighty-sixth Congress (74 Stat. 504), there are authorized to be issued during the two fiscal years beginning July 1, 1961 a total of forty thousand special nonquota immigrant visas to aliens who are refugee-escapees seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and children, if accompanying them.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law which would exclude from the United States any alien who (1) has or has had a mental or physical disability, (2) has a physical defect, disease or disability of such a nature that it may affect the ability of the alien to earn a living, or (3) is likely at any time to become a public charge, five thousand of the visas authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available for issuance to nonsettled hard-core refugees.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, no visa shall be issued pursuant to this title to any alien unless such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, any special nonquota immigrant visa authorized to be issued under this title shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make grants, not to exceed $5,000,000 in the aggregate, to public or private agencies in the United States to be used by such agencies for the purpose of financing the resettlement in the United States, including care and rehabilitation, of any nonresettled hard-core refugees receiving visas under subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act who lack the resources to finance the expenses involved. Such grants shall be made subject to such conditions and limitations as the Secretary of State may deem necessary to impose in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 6. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "refugee-escapee" means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, (2) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, or (3) from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion;

(b) the term "nonresettled hard-core refugee" means any refugee-escapee listed as a nonsettled hard-core refugee by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, including those who suffer from conditions not responsive to treatment and requiring institutionalization; and

(c) the term "child" means any unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age, including a stepson or stepdaughter and a son or daughter adopted prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL PROVIDING FOR ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS FOR REFUGEES

Section 1 empowers the President to direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees, selected by the Secretary of State, who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, have fled or shall flee from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area from a Middle Eastern country, or from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world are at work, and who cannot return on account of race, religion, or political opinion. Sets up a procedure whereby the immigration status of parolees may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident by permitting the Attorney General to grant such adjustment in his discretion after the alien has been in the United States for 2 years and if the applicant is of good character, and if the adjustment would not be contrary to the national interest. Requires a report of such adjustment to be submitted to the Congress and if Congress does not register disapproval then the alien's entry would be recorded as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States.

Section 2 authorizes the issuance of 40,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to refugee-escapees for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1963, of which 5,000 may be nonresettled hard-core refugees. This is pointed to the reservoir of refugees presently awaiting settlement and would be in addition to the refugees to be admitted under Public Law 86-648 enacted in 1960.

Section 3: Refugee-escapees under section 2 to be admitted only if eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act except for nonresettled hard-core refugees.

Section 4: Special nonquota immigrant visas authorized in section 2 shall be issued in accordance with section 221 ("Issuance of Visas") of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except for nonresettled hard-core refugees.

Section 5 authorizes $5 million in grants to U.S. public or private agencies for resettlement in the United States of nonresettled hard-core refugees admitted under section 2.

Section 6: Definitions.

Section 7 authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out provisions of this title.

REGULATION OF RATES FOR CERTAIN INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on August 29, 1960, our distinguished former colleague, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, introduced a bill to repeal the fire and casualty laws for the District of Columbia and to substitute therefor a single comprehensive bill providing a totally new and more competitive approach to the regulation of fire and casualty insurance rates. As chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I was most happy to join with Senator O'Mahoney, together with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], from the Committee on the District of Columbia, in cosponsoring the proposed legislation. It is my pleasure to reintroduce the bill in amended form today and to again have as cosponsors the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 568) providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Senator O'Mahoney presided over the insurance study conducted by the Antitrust Subcommittee during the last several years. This study represents the first appraisal by the Congress of the effectiveness of State regulation of insurance since the passage of the 1945 McCarran-Ferguson Act. This law acknowledged that the business of insurance was in fact interstate commerce. Its essential feature provides that the Federal antitrust laws shall apply to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by the States. The present Senate inquiry seeks to ascertain how the States have exercised this mandate from the Congress to regulate the insurance business in the public interest.

The bill introduced by Senator O'Mahoney in the closing days of the last Congress reflected the results of the intensive study by this subcommittee into the problems of State rate regulation. During these hearings, spokesmen for the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—NAIC—together with individual witnesses on behalf of various States testified as to the different approaches by the States to the regulation of fire and casualty rates. In addition, numerous witnesses from the industry testified and brought to the attention of this subcommittee a great number of complaints concerning defects in the State rating laws and their administration. For the first time Congress was able to ascertain whether the regulation of rates by the States was in conformity with the spirit of the McCarran Act in preserving the maximum degree of competition in insurance consistent with the public interest.

The attention of the Antitrust Subcommittee was immediately called to a provision in the District of Columbia fire insurance rate law which is in open conflict with the philosophy of that basic

body of law adopted by the Congress over the years for the regulation of business. In plain disregard of the salutary influence of competition in our free-enterprise system, this law makes it mandatory that all insurers be members of a single rating bureau in which lower rates occur only by means of a cumbersome deviation procedure.

This fire-rate law has been detrimental to insurance buyers in the District of Columbia. Moreover, its ominous overtones have been felt in other areas of the country. In seeking to preserve the status quo which existed prior to the South-Eastern Underwriters decision, many insurance officials argued that Congress, in adopting the District of Columbia law, had sanctioned similar restrictive laws in other jurisdictions.

The bill which I am offering today is not directed solely at this defect in the fire-rate law. It is a bold new approach covering both the fire and casualty fields and designed to bring rate regulation in tune with the times.

In introducing the bill Senator O'Mahoney summarized the essential purpose of the proposed District of Columbia rate law as follows:

> The ability of insurance companies to be free to provide less costly insurance to the public is the very heart of competition. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this measure to make the free play of competition the chief arbiter over the rate level at which fire and casualty insurance will be sold in the District of Columbia.

However, he further cautioned:

> While the measure places chief reliance upon competition in the determination of rates, it nevertheless recognizes the vital importance of the Insurance Superintendent's office and fortifies his authority in the areas where it should properly be exercised.

The present Superintendent of Insurance in the District of Columbia has discharged his responsibilities in administering these rate laws in a highly creditable fashion. Because of his enlightened administration of these acts, the harmful effects of objectionable features in both the fire and casualty acts have been kept to a minimum. But the Congress can scarcely afford to rely upon the judgment of good administrators to overcome the defects of laws which are faulty in their inception. Nor do I think it a valid position that we should be content with the form of the casualty rate law against which no substantial volume of criticism has been directed. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has completed its study of the rate problem, and its declarations will be watched with considerable interest by all the States. Therefore, to correct only the obvious inadequacies of the law and to ignore others merely because complaints have not arisen would be a plain breach of our duty. What we are proposing here is a basic revision of the approaches to the regulation of rates adopted by the States and for the District of Columbia. The impact of such a law will be great since it will represent the first expression by the Congress of its intentions concerning the kind of rate regulation which conforms most closely to the purposes of the McCarran Act.

This bill would prevent rating organizations from adopting any rules or engaging in any practices requiring either members or subscribers to agree to adhere to the rates filed. The bill provides greater latitude for independence of action than now contained in the District of Columbia fire or casualty laws. Section 5(d) provides that a rating organization shall have authority to make a filing on behalf of any member or subscriber only where officially authorized in writing by such member or subscriber. Therefore, if a member or subscriber does not so authorize a bureau to make a rate filing, said insurer, whether a member or a subscriber, may then make its own independent rate filing. With the elimination of the adherence rules, the need for any deviation section is obviated.

In addition, this bill would correct the disastrous consequences of the aggrieved persons provision which appears in most State rating laws and would resolve the uncertainty concerning similar language employed in the District of Columbia casualty rate law. Such provisions have seemingly served no other purpose than to frustrate or delay the healthy processes of competition. The bill I am introducing today strips from the rating bureaus and from any competitor their status as an aggrieved party in any hearing or suit involving a competitor's rate filing. Only a policyholder or the company whose rate is involved is recognized as an aggrieved party who would be a party in interest in any hearing or appeal from the Superintendent's ruling. Of course, the bill preserves the right of any person, including rating bureaus, to bring to the attention of the Superintendent facts leading him to believe that any rate filing does not comply with the standards of the act.

A vast amount of criticism of the various regulatory laws enacted in the wake of the McCarran Act was directed at the provisions which, in effect, have required prior approval by the Insurance Superintendent before rates become effective. Such provisions have in many cases perverted the function of the office of the Insurance Superintendent. The cumbersome and uninformed processes of State bureaucracy have been substituted for the normal workings of the competitive market in the establishing of rate levels. More often than not, politics rather than healthy competitive processes have become the touchstone for rate approval.

This problem apparently had its genesis in the belief that the McCarran Act's exemption from Federal antitrust action could be achieved only by affirmative regulation. Thus, motivated more by the desire to obtain antitrust immunity than the need for obtaining the best regulatory system, the States seized upon the requirement of advance approval before rates become effective. Unfortunately, certain of the deliberations of the Congress prior to the enactment of the McCarran Act gave weight to this argument. The history of these prior approval provisions has clearly demonstrated that the insurance departments possess neither the budget, the manpower, nor the necessary competence effectively to carry out the responsibilities inherent in such provisions. The infinitely complex processes involved in the setting of rates are better suited to the workings of the marketplace.

Under the bill which I am introducing, rates become effective automatically upon filing with the Insurance Superintendent. The bill reposes sole responsibility in each insurer for the making of rates. However, the Superintendent retains comprehensive powers to protect the public interest by reviewing these filings, and disapproving them wherever he finds them to be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. In providing that rates become automatically effective upon filing, the bill accomplishes the following purposes:

First. It removes from the ratemaking area the bureaucratic system which obstructs and delays innovation, and interferes with private initiative.

Second. It eliminates the impossibly burdensome review of routine filings which involve the Insurance Superintendent in clerical details to the detriment of more important regulatory responsibilities.

Third. Rates are determined by each insurer through the operation of competition, and the judgment of the Superintendent is thus not substituted for the underwriter in the determination of rates.

Fourth. It eliminates the political pressures upon the Superintendent to reject meritorious rate increases and thus focuses the responsibility, and blame, if any, upon the companies, not the Superintendent, for rate increases.

Unlike the various laws adopted by the States and for the District of Columbia, this bill for the first time would subject advisory organizations to the careful scrutiny of insurance departments. No effective supervision over advisory organizations has been maintained by the States or by the District of Columbia, despite the disclosure in the subcommittee's hearings that such bodies are the real repositories of ratemaking responsibilities throughout the country. This has been particularly true in the fire insurance field. However, the subcommittee's record has clearly demonstrated that the offices of these advisory organizations, operating on a nationwide scale, have been carefully utilized in an attempt to restrict and otherwise delay competitive rate filings.

These same national advisory organizations which have pursued such noncompetitive policies have exercised their influence in the District of Columbia. The subcommittee discovered in the course of its study that there was a very tight interlock among the companies making up the governing boards of the various State and regional rating bureaus and the national advisory organizations who were instrumental in establishing fundamental rate policies. This interlock exists for companies operating in the District of Columbia the same as in the many other jurisdictions throughout the country. Therefore, it behooves the Superintendent of Insurance in the District to be fully ap-

prised of the activities of national organizations engaged in the implementing of policies which fundamentally affect the rate structures in the District of Columbia. This bill provides adequate safeguards for protecting the public interest against such national advisory organizations.

In introducing this bill Senator O'Mahoney realized that no action was possible in the 86th Congress, but expressed the hope that it would provide a working model on which careful public hearings could be held. Since then, certain defects in the bill have been brought to the attention of our subcommittee, and I have incorporated perfecting amendments directed at these objections. While these revisions do not affect the basic philosophy of the bill, I am satisfied they improve the measure.

A new title has been added to the bill which is directed primarily at the features of the present law permitting the costs of examination to be assessed against companies or bureaus being examined. The elimination of such provisions conforms with the position adopted by the Judiciary Committee in its Report No. 1834 entitled "Insurance: Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulation," issued on August 10, 1960. This report noted that an effective system of examinations cannot be predicated on the assumption of any part of the cost by the companies or organizations being examined.

In its report the committee urged that the great responsibilities of insurance regulation cannot be achieved unless adequate funds are appropriated and sufficient salaries are paid to attract competent personnel. Therefore, I believe that for the Congress to urge such a course upon the States would be hypocrisy unless it were willing to take the lead in appropriating adequate funds for the District of Columbia and in fixing the salary of the Superintendent at a rate commensurate with his responsibility. Therefore, I shall urge that the District of Columbia Committee consider the feasibility of establishing the same salary for the Insurance Superintendent as Congress set for the Director under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 when this post was created.

INCREASED AMOUNT INDIVIDUALS ARE PERMITTED TO EARN UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits.

The purpose of this bill is to allow social security annuitants to earn up to $1,800 per year without sustaining a loss in their social security benefits.

During the closing days of the 86th Congress, the Social Security Act was amended in this regard establishing a complex sliding scale system of allowing social security recipients to exceed the previous $1,200 limitation. This was a step in the right direction but I submit that it remains inadequate.

Mr. President, during these days of inflated prices and a depreciated dollar, it is folly to suggest that $1,200 represents sufficient annual earnings even when supplemented by social security benefits. Additionally, at a time when this country needs to utilize its human resources to the fullest, it is wasteful to force inactivity upon our senior citizens by penalizing them for earnings in excess of $1,200.

I would hope, Mr. President, that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 569) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATION OF DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and need for same, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 575) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter, together with the statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers."

The Board has been advised by letter from the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 28, 1960, that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WHITNEY GILLILLAND,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

In common with other regulatory acts, and carrying forward the provision of section 407(d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 directs that the Board shall prescribe a system of accounts to be kept by air carriers.

Under the authority of section 407(d) to "prescribe the forms of any and all accounts," the Board has proceeded, since its establishment to prescribe the uniform system of accounts required to be kept by all certificated air carriers. The controlling purpose of such a uniform system of accounts is to provide the Board with financial statements which fairly reflect the financial condition of the air carrier, on the one hand, and the operating results of the carrier for a given period of time, on the other hand. The purpose of the system of accounts is to prescribe uniform practices which will provide, in general substance, comparable information in respect to each of the various carriers subject to the accounting regulations. Financial statements would, of course, be useless to the Board unless they fairly reflected the actual financial condition of the carriers and the actual operating results of the services performed for the period reported.

In the past, the Board has, in general, prescribed rates of depreciation as a part of its ratemaking process. The depreciation rates so prescribed through the ratemaking proceedings of the Board have generally been used by air carriers for accounting purposes. So long as the depreciation rates used by the various air carriers for accounting purposes fairly reflected the depreciation costs as determined in the rate proceedings, further prescription of these rates through accounting regulation would have served no useful purpose. Moreover, until recent years, the widespread dependence of the industry upon Federal subsidies necessitated the frequent review by the Board of the operating results of the carriers, including an appraisal of the reasonableness of charges to expense for depreciation on property and equipment which resulted in bringing the depreciation practices of the carriers under frequent review by the Board.

However, with the emergence of a large part of the industry from dependence upon subsidy, the opportunity for such frequent review of the reasonableness of depreciation charges to expense by the Board no longer exists. Nevertheless, the need for reliable financial data from which to appraise the true financial condition and operating results of the various air carriers continues. In recognition of this need, the Board undertook to prescribe the depreciation accounting practices of air carriers by the issuance of appropriate regulations. (E.R. 224, adopted Nov. 18, 1957.) However, the Board's authority to issue such a regulation was challenged and appealed to the courts. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia sustained the action of the Board, but on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit this decision was reversed. The Board sought review of this decision by the Supreme Court, but that Court declined to take the case and the Board's application for writ of certiorari was denied on November 10, 1958.[1] Consequently, in order that the Board may effectively carry out its functions with respect to the depreciation accounting practices of air carriers, legislation is essential.

The requested legislation would not involve any departure from well established concepts pertaining to the regulated industries generally. On the contrary, it would bring the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in this field in line with similar powers already expressly given to other agencies such as the

[1] *Alaska Airlines et al* v. *C.A.B.*, case No. 3638–56,, dec. June 25, 1957 (D.C.D.C.); rev. 257 F. 2d 299 (C.A.D.C., 1958); cert. den. Nov. 10, 1958.

Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. (See 49 U.S.C. sec. 20(4), sec. 220(c), and sec. 913(d), 15 U.S.C. 717h(a), 16 U.S.C. 825a(a), and 47 U.S.C. 220(b).)

Depreciation expense constitutes probably the most critical element in the determination of the financial condition of a business inasmuch as, unlike virtually all other elements, it does not lend itself to objective physical measurement. Unless uniformly reported by the carriers in the manner recognized by the Board for regulatory purposes the Board will be left unprotected against potential misinterpretation of the reported data. This would necessarily follow from the fact that the Board's staff could not be reasonably expected to independently recast each carrier's report each and every reporting period on a time basis which would meet the Board's recurrent operating needs.

The amount of depreciation charged to expense involves the substance of the accounts, the control over which is necessary to provide financial statements that produce a fair presentation of the carriers' financial condition and operating results for the periods reported to the Board. Insofar as the impact upon the carriers' financial condition and operating results is concerned, improper charges to expense for depreciation would undermine the integrity of the financial statements in exactly the same manner as inaccurate charges for salaries, rents, and other operating expenses of the carriers. Depreciation is becoming an increasingly important operating expense for air carriers with the addition of new and more expensive aircraft equipment. Errors in the reporting of depreciation tend to accumulate over a period of years and are difficult to correct in the accounts of carriers once the inaccuracies have become rooted over an extended period of time. Improper reporting of depreciation expense will distort the accounts and financial statements of air carriers to such an extent that comparability will be seriously undermined or completely destroyed. Since the property and equipment on which depreciation is computed will continue in service over a period of years the distortion from misstatement of depreciation charges accumulates with the passage of time. Accordingly, the prescription of depreciation rates by the Board will prevent such comparative distortion and thus increase proportionately the relative reliability of the financial statements of certificated air carriers from the point of view of both the industry and the Board as well as the general public.

Vice Chairman Gurney is opposed to any legislation which would empower the Board to prescribe depreciation accounting practices of the air carriers. He believes that depreciation practices are primarily a function of management and any regulatory supervision over the details thereof constitutes an unnecessary interference with the operation of an air carrier. In view of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which afford business a choice of different methods of depreciation for tax purposes, he sees no reason for any additional legislation.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

[New matter in black brackets]

Title IV—Air carrier economic regulation

Accounts, Records, and Reports

Depreciation accounting

SEC. 407 [(e). The Board may prescribe for air carriers the classes of property for which depreciation charges may properly be included under operating expenses, the method of depreciation accounting, the rate or rates of depreciation which shall be charged, the depreciation period and the residual value, with respect to each of such classes of property, classifying the air carriers as it may deem proper for this purpose. The Board may, when it deems necessary, modify the classes and rates so prescribed. To the extent that the Board shall have exercised its authority under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, air carriers shall not charge to, or in any form include under, operations expenses any depreciation charges other than those prescribed by the Board, or employ a method of depreciation, depreciation period, or residual value other than those prescribed by the Board.]

Inspection of accounts and property

SEC. 407(e) [(f)]. The Board shall at all times have access to all lands, buildings, and equipment of any carrier and to all accounts, records, and memoranda, including all documents, papers, and correspondence, now or hereafter existing, and kept or required to be kept by air carriers; and it may employ special agents or auditors, who shall have authority under the orders of the Board to inspect and examine any and all such lands, buildings, equipment, accounts, records, and memoranda. The provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this Act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 576) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter, statement, and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a draft bill, and a statement of the purpose and need for legislation, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, and to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel. This legislation is designed to accord with the recommendations of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the Academy, and the recommendations of the Advisory Board to the Academy.

The proposed legislation involves primarily conversion of positions of executive, administrative, custodial, and service personnel to positions subject to the civil service laws generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States, and to establish an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation for the faculty at the Academy comparable to that provided for the civilian faculty at the U.S. Naval Academy.

The accompanying statement sets forth the need for and the purpose and provisions of, the proposed legislation. The draft legislation was developed by the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission.

On December 29, 1960, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 216, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

GENERAL PURPOSE

In the administration of the maritime training program under section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126) since 1942, it has been the practice of the former Maritime Commission and of the Department of Commerce (to which the Maritime Commission was transferred in 1950) to enroll in the U.S. maritime service not only volunteers for training and reserve purposes, known as trainee enrollees, but also other persons assigned to administrative duties, known as administrative enrollees. The term "administrative enrollees" includes the employees service as the permanent cadre at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which comprises the executive staff, administrative force, faculty, custodial, and service groups.

These administrative enrollees have been employed (i.e., enrolled) under the authority of the above-mentioned section of the Merchant Marine Act. They have been given ranks and ratings, and have been compensated and granted allowances at rates similar to those provided by law for the Coast Guard under authority of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, the annual appropriation acts, and section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by the act of May 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 79). The enrollees have been granted leave under a leave system prescribed by regulations pursuant to implied power under the Merchant Marine Act. Insofar as circumstances and applicable laws have permitted, administrative enrollees have been administered on the same basis as members of a military-type organization performing similar duties.

Over the years a number of questions have been considered by the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and Department of Justice concerning the employment status of these employees. In order to clarify and regularize the employment status of administrative enrollees, it has become apparent that it would be administratively desirable to convert the enrollees, as far as practicable and appropriate, to positions subject to the same civil service, compensation, and leave laws, which are generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States.

In the interest of simplified and more efficient administration, and of making available and preserving to these employees the same benefits as are granted to other civilian

employees of the United States, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission have reached agreement (1) that an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation should be provided by law for the faculty of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, similar to that now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy; (2) that future appointments to nonfaculty positions should be made in accordance with the civil service and classification laws (except as otherwise authorized by law, e.g., to wage board positions); and (3) that present administrative enrollees should be converted to positions subject to the civil service, classification, and leave laws under provisions of law which will authorize adjustments to be made that will avoid undue personal hardship or inequity to the employees and avoid any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Academy.

As a result of careful study for several years of the problems involved in effecting this transition for persons presently serving as administrative enrollees, the Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office have reached agreement that legislation is necessary to,

(1) Provide an appropriate compensation system of the type described above for faculty members at the Merchant Marine Academy;

(2) Avoid serious loss of compensation to nonfaculty administrative enrollees upon conversion to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to wage-board positions;

(3) Avoid serious curtailment of enrollees' existing leave benefits upon conversion to a position under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended; and

(4) Provide for creditability of prior service as administrative enrollees for all purposes.

The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes and enable the Department to administer these positions on the same basis as other comparable civilian positions in the Government service. Upon enactment of this legislation, it is contemplated that faculty members will be employed under excepted appointments authorized by the Civil Service Commission under schedule A of the civil service rules, and that they will be compensated under a system of compensation appropriate to the requirements of an accredited educational institution and similar to that now provided for the faculty of the Naval Academy. It is contemplated that nonfaculty administrative enrollees will be employed under the civil service laws, and that they will be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or an appropriate prevailing wage schedule, as appropriate. Both groups of employees will receive leave, medical, and other benefits under the same laws as apply generally to other civilian employees of the Government.

In view of the fact that the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, currenly the only federally operated maritime training installation, was made a permanent institution by Public Law 415, 84th Congress, the Department recommends favorable consideration of the attached proposed legislation in order that basic personnel policies and problems in administering the maritime training program may be considered and acted upon by the Congress. The need for clarifying the status of administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service in order that present uncertainties may be eliminated and the Merchant Marine Academy may proceed on a stable basis in personnel matters was recognized in the Report of the 12th Congressional Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. The report included the following provision:

"The Board urges those charged with carrying on the discussions directed toward establishing the status of the administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service to make every effort to bring about an appropriate resolution of this problem, to the end that suitable personnel policies may be established."

Additionally, the report of the Advisory Board to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, made to the Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, May 2, 1957, stated, among other things, "The Maritime Administrator has issued appropriate orders defining the status of the existing faculty and setting forth probationary periods for those to be appointed to the faculty in the future. This is all that could have been done and it has been well done. But the position of the faculty at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy will not be thoroughly satisfactory until appropriate legislation has been enacted."

Later Advisory Board reports in 1958, 1959, and 1960, again affirm this position.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 216(a): This section is amended to—

1. Make clear that henceforth enrollments will be made only for training and reserve purposes in the U.S. maritime service, as distinguished from administrative duty purposes such as instruction of trainees, clerical work, maintenance work, and the like;

2. Make clear that the Secretary's authority to fix the rates of pay for trainees also includes authority to fix their allowances;

3. Provide clear authority for the Secretary to prescribe and regulate the furnishing and wearing of uniforms of persons in the Service;

4. Transfer to a new subsection (e) the existing provision for employment of instructors; and

5. Make an appropriate, minor correction in a pronoun in the second sentence to refer to discretion transferred to the Secretary from the former Maritime Commission.

Section 216(e): This subsection would provide authority for the employment, and compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of all levels of civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended. Such professors, lecturers, and instructors would be considered civilian officers and employees of the United States for purposes of laws of general application to civilian employees of the United States.

Under existing law the Civil Service Commission is empowered to authorize the Department to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors under excepted appointments, on the same basis (schedule A) as is now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy. This section will also make possible the establishment of an appropriate compensation system for the faculty of the Merchant Marine Academy, similar to that provided for faculty of the Naval Academy.

Section 216(f): This subsection provides for (1) conversion of existing administrative enrollees, both faculty and nonfaculty on a date mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission, in order to effect an orderly transition; (2) clear-cut legal recognition that after conversion, former administrative enrollees will be subject to laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States except as otherwise authorized by law; and (3) certain authority necessary to make possible the conversion of enrollees without undue personal hardship or inequity, and without any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Merchant Marine Academy, with particular reference to compensation, leave, and creditability of prior service for various purposes.

Section 216(f)(1): This subsection defines how the basic compensation of administrative enrollees shall be determined upon conversion and provides for salary-saving and related safeguards in order to avoid reducing the compensation of enrollees as a result of conversion. For example, if an administrative enrollee's total basic pay, quarters, and subsistence allowances amount to $9,570.96, and his position is classified at grade GS–11, he would have his salary set at GS–11, $9,640, which is the next longevity rate over the total amount he is receiving for basic pay, quarters, and subsistence. An enrollee receiving a total of $8,105.76 for basic pay, subsistence, and quarters allowances whose position is classified at GS–9, for which the maximum longevity rate of the grade is $7,920, will have his salary set at $8,150, which is the first longevity step at GS–10, until he leaves such position, or otherwise is entitled to receive a higher rate by reason of operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or other applicable law, as indicated below.

This subsection applies only to persons serving as administrative enrollees on the date preceding the date of conversion. It does not provide retroactive benefits to any person.

Section 216(f)(2): This paragraph makes provision to specifically insure what is commonly referred to as salary saving by establishing the fact that the basic compensation as set upon conversion, as provided for in section 216(f)(1), will continue until the employee affected thereby is either separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation as might occur in the case of promotion, Federal salary adjustments, etc.

Section 216(f)(3): This paragraph takes cognizance of the fact that administrative enrollees have earned, accumulated and used annual leave on a calendar day basis, and most enrollees have a much greater leave accumulation than the accumulation which would be authorized on conversion of such personnel under provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act. This paragraph would provide for the conversion of all unused annual leave without actual loss of leave for purposes of future use to the enrollee on the basis of 5 work days' leave for each 7 calendar days of leave.

Administrative enrollees are authorized to take sick leave, up to 4 months in emergencies, as may be necessary, but do not accumulate sick leave. If they had been permitted to accumulate sick leave, most administrative enrollees by reason of their length of service would now have a large accumulation of sick leave. To minimize the effect of losing the sick leave benefits to which administrative enrollees have been entitled, it is proposed that they be credited on the date of conversion with 13 days' sick leave. Thereafter, sick leave credits would accrue on the same basis as for other employees subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act.

Section 216(f)(4): This paragraph makes specific provisions to recognize active service as an administrative enrollee performed prior to the date fixed for conversion as civilian employment creditable for all purposes in the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the exception that in computing length of service as used under the Classification Act for the determination of one periodic step increase or one longevity step increase, all such prior service shall be counted toward the attainment of same which occurred immediately preceding the date fixed for conversion, as provided in subsection (f). Thus, for such basic purposes as retirement, leave accruals, seniority, length-of-service awards, etc., all previous active service as an administrative enrollee would be creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for every purpose, except that in computation of length of service for salary step increases or longevity step increases, only such service as was continuous and uninterrupted immediately prior to the date

fixed for conversion would be creditable in the determination of said step increases. Under these circumstances, an employee's salary thus established which is less than the maximum scheduled rate of the grade would be immediately considered against the requirements for one periodic step increase; and, as provided in subsection (f)(1), for purposes of determining eligibility for a periodic step increase, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee would be considered as the total amount of value of basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances. Such prior service and basic compensation would also be considered in determining eligibility toward the 10-year aggregate period and 3-year waiting periods for one longevity step increase.

Section 216(f)(5): Administrative enrollees disenrolled from the maritime service are entitled to payment of travel and transportation expenses to their place of enrollment, etc., whether or not such transportation is actually furnished in kind. Administrative enrollees on active duty also receive free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care under the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696; 42 U.S.C. 249).

This paragraph is for the purpose of making two practical provisions. First, it provides that administrative enrollees who accept conversion shall forfeit such rights to travel and transportation expenses. Those who elect to resign prior to conversion will be entitled to such benefits in keeping with the terms under which they were enrolled as administrative enrollees. Second, it provides that administrative enrollees after the effective date of conversion as authorized by this legislation shall not continue to receive free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944. After conversion, however, these employees and their immediate families will be eligible for health benefits on the same basis as other civilian employees of the Government under the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of September 28, 1959 (73 Stat. 709; 5 U.S.C. 3001).

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATIVE TO RETIREMENT OF MEN, WITH REDUCED BENEFITS, AT AGE 62

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will permit men to retire under social security at the age of 62.

LOWER AGE REQUIREMENT

The Senate has already indicated its approval of retirement of men at age 62 at reduced benefits. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate last year voted to permit this earlier retirement, but we were unable to get final approval because of the opposition of the Eisenhower administration.

Our laws permit women to retire at age 62. We should recognize that earlier retirement of men may also be necessary because of illness, unemployment, or other reasons. The cost of such reduction would not affect the solvency of the social security trust fund because earlier retirement would be at actuarily reduced benefits.

The earlier retirement would be completely voluntary. The worker would retire or not at this earlier age as he desires. These workers paid into the social security fund—this is not a Government dole—and they should be permitted to receive the benefits of the program when they need them most.

When Congress permitted the earlier retirement of women it was contended that this would encourage employers to retire their older workers at the earlier age. But, experience has proven that this argument was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Many of our elderly citizens are confronted with the problems of illness and unemployment. I think we would make a real stride in the right direction and improve these conditions by permitting men to retire at age 62 when these and other personal reasons necessitate their retirement at this age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 577) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS WHILE RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will completely remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

REMOVE EARNINGS LIMITATION

I believe, Mr. President, that the Senate recognizes the inequity of the limited ceiling set on earnings of social security beneficiaries. Last year in the Senate Finance Committee I offered a series of amendments to either remove or increase the amount which persons receiving social security could earn. The committee and the Senate voted to increase the limitation to $1,800, but this was not acceptable to the Eisenhower administration. It was necessary, therefore, to get any improvement to compromise and permit only a slight modification of the earnings limitation.

The social security bill approved by Congress last year provided that a social security recipient who earns up to $1,500 will lose $1 of benefit for each $2 of earnings over $1,200. For earnings over $1,500 the bill provided for a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 earned.

But, this does not go far enough. We are still penalizing our great American initiative. The earnings limitation continues to apply the brakes to national growth. Contributing individuals to social security are not treated equally. Those receiving income from so-called unearned sources, dividends, rents, et cetera, are preferred in the law. They have no limitation on income received, their resources may be unlimited and they still may receive their monthly social security checks. But those actually in need, those desiring to continue to work and supplement their meager social security benefits may not earn more than $1,200 without being penalized.

In 1940 when social security coverage was much more limited in scope, the retirement test applied only to covered employment. The cost of living index was 59.9. In 1954, when the $1,200 annual earned income retirement test was first enacted, the cost of living was 114.4. The present cost of living, according to figures published recently by the Department of Commerce, is at an alltime high—over a 100-percent increase since the program was enacted and more than 10 percent higher than in 1954.

There is a definite need for this legislation and it would make a substantial difference in the lives and standards of living of several million of our senior citizens. There are over 15 million individuals in this country who are 65 years old or over. Over 11 million are receiving OASI benefits or could receive them if they were not working.

Is a retirement program equitable which restricts an individual's earning capacity? Our great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need this protection. The limitation is inequitable and unrealistic. We cannot continue to penalize the healthy and vigorous members of our society who would like to continue working in jobs for which they are qualified and needed in order to supplement the bare subsistence income they receive under social security.

Can we continue to penalize individuals who find it necessary to continue working during their retirement? Perhaps a better and more logical way of looking at this matter would be to consider the increases in Federal revenue which will result from increased employment and utilization of our Nation's resources. An individual who is over 65 and earns $1,200 or less pays no income tax. Obviously, the Government will profit by increased revenues if the retirement test is removed, and the brakes are removed from one of the great impediments to expanded national growth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 578) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN DISTRICTS OF INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for one additional judge for the U.S. court for the southern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the northern district of Indiana.

A tremendous burden is now being imposed on the judges of these courts due to their heavy dockets and the fact that courts in these districts are held in several divisions.

The dockets of these courts are much heavier than the great majority of the courts for which additional judges have been requested.

An additional judge for each of these districts has been unanimously approved by the Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit, consisting of all the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and by the house of delegates of the Indiana State Bar Association.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT

Jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana covers 60 Indiana counties. It has been necessary for the court to be divided into four divisions, with the court sitting in Indianapolis, Terre Haute, Evansville, and New Albany.

Total civil cases commenced for each judge in the southern district during the last year numbered 279. This is almost 30 percent higher than the national average of the other U.S. district courts.

The present two judges must operate five courts, two in Indianapolis, the State capital, and three in the other divisions. The caseload of the Indianapolis division, the largest metropolitan area in the State, is sufficient to keep two judges busy. It is necessary, therefore, that one of the present judges remain in Indianapolis, while the other judge must tour the circuit and hold court in another division. Regardless of this arrangement, it has been impossible for the judges to sit in one of the divisions in Terre Haute, Evansville, or New Albany more than twice a year—and then only for a very limited time.

Should an additional judge be authorized, he could take care of the business in Terre Haute, Evansville, and New Albany divisions while the other two judges would tend to the business of the Indianapolis division.

NORTHERN DISTRICT

The northern district of Indiana comprises a heavily industrialized area of Indiana. The court is divided into three divisions, the South Bend division, the Fort Wayne division, and the Hammond division. Court is held in both Hammond and Lafayette for the Hammond division.

Total civil cases commenced for each judge in the northern district during the last year numbered 243. This is almost 20 percent higher than the national average of the other U.S. district courts.

The present two judges must operate four courts. They run into the same difficulties which confront the judges of the southern district.

CONCLUSION

The present heavy caseload has required day and night work by our U.S. judges. An additional judge for each of our Indiana districts would help solve the problem and the tremendous burden now imposed upon the present judges. I am certain that additional judgeships are enthusiastically supported by the practicing bar and the citizens of Indiana. I earnestly hope that the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress will give early consideration to our needs, and that the heavy dockets of the U.S. district courts for Indiana's southern and northern districts will be relieved by the approval of this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 579) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, all informed persons agree that we are at present locked in a death struggle with the Communists, who now say, according to the press of yesterday, they are going to defeat us by economic means, that they no longer have to depend on military accomplishments alone, because their system of productivity and their system of economy is better than the free enterprise system.

It seems to us that all of us must recognize that this actually is the case, not that they are better, but that we are in this enormous struggle. To win this battle of survival, we must be able to keep pace with the rapid scientific and technological developments that render obsolete machinery and equipment in a considerably shorter period of time than was the case in the postwar period. Our economic growth must be stimulated and substantially increased. For us time has now become of the essence. We cannot afford to fall behind in our productivity.

It appears to be generally agreed that methods of depreciation authorized under existing law have a stultifying effect on our economic growth and are rendering economic growth impossible.

Recently there appeared in the Washington Star under date of January 14 an editorial entitled "Needed Tax Reform," in which it was pointed out that the great and rapid technological developments have quickened the pace of obsolescence and that compensating modernization carried a price tag that has moved steadily and sharply higher. The editorial suggests strongly the need for constructive reform in tax depreciation allowances in order to stimulate economic growth and keep pace with scientific know-how which we have presently at our disposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED TAX REFORM

At this time of keen interest in governmental action which might stimulate economic growth, the Treasury Department has available an informative cross-section of business opinion on the current impact of tax-depreciation allowances and the possibilities of constructive reform—either by statute or by regulation—in this area. The information is contained in approximately 3,500 answers to Department questionnaires sent out last summer, both to large corporations and small business firms. Additional answers are expected and all the material is subject to further analysis before specific recommendations are made by the Department.

Among the large concerns particularly, accounting for more than $200 billion worth of depreciable property, there was a heavy response that the alternative methods currently permitted for estimating depreciation allowances are unsatisfactory. For the most part, their objections centered on two points, namely, insufficient allowance during the early years of service of plant or equipment and inadequate total allowance to cover the rising costs of replacement. Other studies have provided support for these same complaints. The great and rapid technological developments of the postwar period, for example, have quickened the pace of obsolescence. At the same time, compensating modernization carries a price tag that has moved steadily and sharply higher.

Not surprisingly, among eight alternatives on which the Treasury asked for reaction, the solution favored by most companies, large and small, was to permit the exercise of their own judgment in calculating the useful life of equipment and how much of its cost should be written off each year. In exchange for greater flexibility in this respect, most respondents indicated a willingness to pay a higher tax rate on the sale of old equipment—treating such proceeds as income, for example, rather than capital gain. The second most popular choice was some form of depreciation adjustment to reflect increased replacement costs.

Suggestions for liberalization of depreciation allowances inevitably become subject to political considerations as well as economic ones. During his campaign, Senator Kennedy indicated an interest in some changes in depreciation rules but did not spell out his specific views. It is generally argued, however, that capital investment would be stimulated by liberalization in some degree and that the end effect would be expanded employment and higher net tax revenues. The subject is one that the incoming administration and the new Congress should consider carefully.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, to resolve this dilemma in which we find ourselves and recognize the crying need for giving the economy of this country a necessary shot in the arm, as well as to provide the necessary incentive for taxpayers to replace wornout equipment, I am introducing at this time proposed legislation designed to provide the taxpayer an election to utilize existing methods of depreciation, or to write off at a more rapid pace property acquired after December 31, 1960. The measure would permit a taxpayer to write off new equipment in a period of 5 years and used equipment in a period of 3 years.

Specifically, the proposed legislation, in my opinion, would eliminate the objections to the present system of depreciation allowance by providing as follows:

First. A taxpayer may elect any period of depreciation he desires, so long as that period is not less than 5 years on all new machinery and equipment purchased after December 31, 1960.

Second. With respect to all used equipment, and this applies primarily to many of the small businesses throughout the Nation, the taxpayer may elect any period of depreciation he desires so long as that period is not less than 3 years. Used property is defined as being

property at least 2 years old in order to prevent the resale of new property immediately after its acquisition in order to get a more favorable tax writeoff.

Third. Under its provisions, the salvage value of any property will remain the same as if the normal method of depreciation had been used.

Fourth. On the sale of depreciable property under existing law, any gain is treated as capital gain. Since the new election would provide for a more rapid writeoff, this would not result in giving the taxpayer an unintended additional capital gain. Thus on the sale of property where the taxpayer elected to use the rapid depreciation under the proposed bill only that portion of the profits will be treated as capital gain which would have been so regarded if normal depreciation had been elected. The balance would be treated as ordinary income.

For example, let us assume a piece of property is purchased in 1961 for $10,000. Let us assume further that it has a normal life of 10 years, and that it will have no salvage value at the end of this period. If the taxpayer elects to depreciate the property over a 5-year period, and at the end of the 5-year period, sells the property for $6,000, the results under the proposed legislation would be as follows:

Over the 5-year period the taxpayer would write off his entire cost under the rapid depreciation provisions. If he had used normal depreciation under existing law he would have written off only $5,000 for that period. Of the $6,000 obtained on the sale of the property, $1,000 would be treated as capital gain and $5,000 as ordinary income in the year of the sale.

The bill provides further that the election to use rapid depreciation may be made within the time prescribed by law for filing the return for the year in which the property is acquired. Once the election is made by the taxpayer it is irrevocable with respect to the particular property. However, the election may be made on a selective basis, that is for only those acquisitions which the taxpayer designates. In other words, it need not be made for all property acquired by the taxpayer in a given year.

This measure will, in my opinion, permit taxpayers to write off new and used property just as quickly as they deem appropriate subject to the safeguards described. This does not mean that a taxpayer must elect to use the shortest period. Nor, as under the present system, must he use the so-called normal life of the property. He may elect any period that fits his own situation so long as it is not shorter than the statutory minimum. This will encourage the replacement of old and obsolete plants with modern equipment since taxpayers will be able to write off the cost over a period selected by them and based on their own individual financial and profit positions.

It must be evident to all people, regardless of political complexion, that this country is in a period of recession. In certain economic areas, many will feel that the word "recession" is too mild.

The Department of Labor announced recently that unemployment rose by one-half million in December to 5,540,000. This is the highest December total in 20 years. Compared with a year ago, unemployment is up about 1 million. This trend has a serious adverse impact on our economy.

We know too that the heavy goods industry—the people who make machinery and equipment—is probably in the worst shape it has been since before World War II.

Because of increased costs of replacement and unrealistic depreciation allowances, many corporations are not able to replace their old machines fast enough to keep up with technological advances. This affects not only that segment of our economy. People employed in that field cannot buy the goods produced by others. Soon the whole cycle of recession accelerates its pace and other groups are affected adversely.

We also have seen that today the flow of gold from this country abroad has assumed alarming proportions. Measures are being conceived to stem the critical drain on Treasury gold reserves.

One major factor contributing to this has been the shift in the direction of goods. After World War II, our goods were dominant in most world markets; today the trend has been reversed. Germany, Italy, and Japan had to start from scratch in rebuilding war-torn industries. They put in modern machinery and equipment, adopting all the technological improvements conceived after the war. As these new foreign plants developed, our plants were no match for them in turning out products at lower costs. The result in terms of foreign trade and the effect on our employment are now obvious.

In my opinion, all of this—the rise in unemployment, the recession in the heavy goods industry, the unfavorable flow of gold—stems from the reluctance or inability of American business to replace old, wornout, and obsolete machinery and equipment with the most modern equipment available.

What is one of the principal causes of this reluctance on the part of American business? I believe it is the repressive and unrealistic depreciation provisions we now have on the tax books. This is borne out by a recent study conducted by the Treasury Department in cooperation with the Small Business Administration. The overwhelming majority of those contacted—both large and small businesses—agreed on the inadequacy of the present depreciation allowance, including the so-called accelerated provisions authorized under the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

By liberalizing depreciation rates and encouraging the revitalizing of our plants, we will be going a long way to restoring the heavy-goods industry to its normal and healthy status. Employment will rise with the concomitant effect on the rest of our economy.

Finally, our industry, so revitalized, will be able to compete in the world markets. Labor will not be at a disadvantage with its cheaper foreign competitors. And the unfavorable flow of gold reserves will in time be reversed. This measure thus affords, in my opinion, a simple solution to a whole spectrum of economic problems without adversely affecting the revenues. In fact it will have the ultimate effect of increasing revenues.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent also to have inserted in the RECORD an excellent editorial by David Lawrence, dealing with the same subject matter, entitled "What Samuelson Report Omits," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 9, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SAMUELSON REPORT OMITS—KENNEDY TASK FORCE HELD OVERLOOKING RECESSION CAUSES, TAX AID TO BUSINESS

(By David Lawrence)

What shall one think of a 9,000-word report to President-elect Kennedy by a special task force studying the current economic situation that doesn't throw any light on the basic causes of the current recession?

What shall be said of a report which recommends that the Federal Government increase the amount of personal income available to the citizens through temporary tax reductions when the American people today continue to save a large part of their disposable income anyhow instead of spending all of it?

What encouragement can there be for the development of a formula to solve the Nation's economic ills when today—as in the 1930's—there is such conspicuous indifference to the problems of the heavy-goods industries?

Temporary measures in New Deal days failed for 7 consecutive years to bring the unemployment figure below 8 million as "leaf-raking" and other crackpot schemes were adopted, while the heavy-goods industries were not able to begin their important task of job creation until the Second World War started.

Not a single sentence in the report issued by Professor Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology discusses the all-important subject of tax allowances on depreciation which, if adjusted on a replacement-value basis, would do so much to renovate and modernize America's plants and create millions of new jobs. It is estimated that $96 billion is required to replace obsolete equipment in American industry over the next several years.

Toward the end of the report is a rather significant confession that a solution for the wage-price spiral is really vital. The report says:

"It is important, though, to realize that there are some problems that fiscal and monetary policy cannot themselves come to grips with. Thus, if there is, indeed, a tendency for prices and wages to rise long before we reach high employment, neither monetary nor fiscal policy can be used to the degree necessary to promote desired growth.

"What then may be needed are new approaches to the problem of productivity, wages, and price formation. Will it not be possible to bring Government influence to bear on this vital matter without invoking direct controls on wages and prices? Neither labor nor management nor the consumer can gain from an increase in price tags. Just as we pioneered in the 1920's in creating potent monetary mechanisms and in the 1930's in forging the tools of effective fiscal policy, so may it be necessary in the 1960's to meet head on the problem of a price creep. This is a challenge to mixed economies all over

the free world, and is not to be met by Government alone."

High-sounding statements like the above are often heard, but nothing concrete is ever done about the wage-price problem. Government controls could only worsen the situation and bring on a controlled economy. What is needed is some task forces to get at the reasons why big labor-union monopolies are as shortsighted as the steel union was in 1959 in forcing a strike and increased wage benefits at a time when the workers were getting very high incomes and when the economy, to use Professor Samuelson's phrase, was "tired and sluggish."

On the whole, the Samuelson report is not as radical as might have been expected from politically motivated economists. But the document is noted for its contradictions. It warns against "a massive program of hastily devised public works whose primary purpose is merely that of making jobs and getting money pumped into the economy." Then it turns around and advocates "expansions and accelerations in expenditure programs that are desirable for their own sake." The politicians on Capitol Hill usually interpret what is desirable for their own sake in their own congressional districts. Included in these proposals is a sizable item for teachers' salaries. Adding it all up, it might mean the biggest deficit in peacetime.

There's one lesson which has yet to be learned by the theorists. It's that a planned economy will not overcome the hard facts of a free market and that, if America refuses to tackle her wage-price problem, none of the remedial measures being suggested in the Samuelson report will help this country out of its recession.

When the American people finally demand pitiless publicity and a thoroughgoing exposure of the misuse of power by big labor unions, acting sometimes in collaboration with timid or complacent management, there will begin to be a clue to what wrecked the American economy in 1959 and 1960 and what set off the chain reaction which is now increasing the unemployment figure.

For until some stability in prices can be achieved and plants can be modernized on an efficient basis so as to permit cost reduction and a downward revision of prices in many products, there isn't much hope for a cure to the recurring recessions in America. Of what good, for instance, are low mortgage rates and easy installment terms if the house costs too much?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the proposed legislation will be acted on promptly and favorably. Obviously, it is in the national interest.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 580) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPOSITION OF USE TAX ASSESSMENTS WITH RESPECT TO SALES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill may be printed in the RECORD, following the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and announcement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 581) to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of matters pertaining thereto", approved September 14, 1959 (Public Law 86-272), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE III—SALES AND USE TAX MINIMUM STANDARD

"SEC. 301. (a) No State, or political subdivision thereof, shall have power to impose, after the date of the enactment of this title, a use tax assessment upon any person with respect to sales in interstate commerce if the only business activities within such State by or on behalf of such person during the period for which such assessment is imposed were or are either, or both, of the following:

"(1) The solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State for sales of tangible personal property, which orders are sent outside the State for approval or rejection, and, if approved, are filled by shipment or delivery from a point outside the State; and

"(2) The solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State in the name of or for the benefit of a prospective customer of such person, if orders by such customer to such person to enable such customer to fill orders resulting from such solicitation are orders described in paragraph (1).

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to the imposition of a use tax assessment by any State, or political subdivision thereof, with respect to—

"(1) any corporation which is incorporated under the laws of such State; or

"(2) any individual who, under the laws of such State, is domiciled in, or a resident of, such State.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), a person shall not be considered to have engaged in business activities within a State merely by reason of sales in such State, or the solicitation of orders for sales in such State, of tangible personal property on behalf of such person by one or more independent contractors, or by reason of the maintenance of an office in such State by one or more independent contractors whose activities on behalf of such person in such State consist solely of making sales, or soliciting orders for sales, of tangible personal property.

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'independent contractor' means a commission agent, broker, or other independent contractor who is engaged in selling, or soliciting orders for the sale of, tangible personal property for more than one principal and who holds himself out as such in the regular course of his business activities;

"(2) the term 'representative' does not include an independent contractor; and

"(3) the term 'use tax assessment' means any assessment, fine, or penalty imposed or levied under the provisions of the retail sales and use tax law of any State because of the failure or refusal of a seller either to: (A) register as a seller or dealer; (B) collect a use tax from a purchaser; (C) file a use tax return; or (D) remit the use tax to such State.

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be construed to prohibit the collection, after the date of the enactment of this title, of any use tax assessment which was assessed on or before such date for a period ending on or before such date.

"SEC. 302. If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this title or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE IV—STUDY AND REPORT BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 401. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, acting separately or jointly, or both, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the imposition of sales and use taxes by the States on sales and other business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce, or which are a part of interstate commerce, for the purpose of recommending to Congress proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing sales and use taxes on such sales and business activities.

"SEC. 402. The committees shall report to their respective Houses the results of the studies authorized by this title together with their proposals for legislation on or before July 1, 1962."

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 23.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH said today he is introducing a bill to exempt certain business concerns engaged in interstate commerce from any obligation to collect State use taxes.

Senator BUSH's bill was drafted as a result of a 1960 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Scripto, Inc.* v. *Carson,* which upheld a Florida statute requiring a corporation to collect the Florida use tax even though its sales in the States were solicited by independent representatives or brokers, were consummated outside the State and the products shipped in interstate commerce from a plant outside the State. The Scripto decision was an extension of an earlier Supreme Court decision that had held that a State has the right to demand that an out-of-State seller act as a use tax collector where it has a salesman operating in the State.

"Businessmen and manufacturers in my own State of Connecticut, as well as in other States, have been alarmed by the predicament in which they have been placed by these two decisions," Senator BUSH said. "Unless Congress takes prompt corrective action, they face the prospect of learning the details of the sales-and-use tax laws of every State in which they do business, collecting use taxes from their customers, and filing periodic tax returns. This imposes an impossible burden, particularly on small businesses, and is a serious interference with interstate commerce."

A companion bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut's First District.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND HOMEOWNERS LOAN ACTS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, when the mutual security authorization bill was considered last year, the Congress expressed its sense that the Development Loan Fund be utilized to foster and encourage an FHA-type housing program in underdeveloped countries of the free world. Primarily, this sense of the Congress was designed to combat the Communist economic offensive and gains in Latin American countries. The start of pilot housing projects along this line would be invaluable in promoting economic stability which in turn would be a force against Communist tyranny.

Little if anything has been done about starting these pilot housing projects. I am hopeful that the new administration will give programs of this nature priority attention.

To permit the maximum utilization of free enterprise facilities in fostering this type of program, I am introducing at this time a bill which would amend section 5 of the Homeowners Loan Act of 1933 and section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set up an International Home Loan Bank which in turn would serve mutual institutions whose main purpose would be to encourage savings and finance homeownership. The bank would assist and participate in the establishment and development of mutual savings and loan associations in underdeveloped countries consistent with the foreign economic policies of the United States.

Funds for the bank would be raised from investments in its stocks and shares by Federal and State savings and loan associations in the United States.

The funds would be invested in shares, accounts, deposits, or certificates of indebtedness of mutual thrift and home financing institutions in other countries.

Federal and State savings and loan associations would be authorized to invest funds in stock, accounts, and securities of the International Home Loan Bank and in shares, accounts, deposits, and certificates of indebtedness of mutual thrift home-financing institutions located outside of the United States.

With the enactment of this proposed legislation we will encourage needed housing programs which will in turn raise the standard of living of the peoples of these countries and strengthen the cause of freedom throughout the world. We can achieve this objective through the facilities of private enterprise in cooperation with our Government. It is an essential program which will drive a striking blow for the cause of freedom in those areas where the seeds of the Communist menace have a readymade formula to succeed.

The economic and social fabric of the United States carries the indelible imprint of the thrift and homeownership functions performed in large measure by the savings and loan industry.

America's more than 4,000 insured savings associations provide a saving repository for the savings of more than 27 million Americans. These savings—amounting to more than $60 billion—represent funds set aside for future use by Americans largely of modest means. These people are interested mainly in the safety and easy availability of their savings rather than the quick profits of speculation.

This legislation seeks to extend the principle of massive accumulation of small savings to those areas of the world where capital starvation is a major stumbling block on the road to economic and social advancement.

I believe, and experience confirms, that the savings and loan principle will be warmly received beyond the continental limits of the United States. The primary needs of the underdeveloped world are for seed capital and know-how.

To a limited extent, the amendment which I sponsored last year to the Mutual Security Act will help to satisfy the seed capital requirement. This amendment received enthusiastic support from an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body.

I believe, however, that the current legislation is even more necessary to the realization of our purposes than was the mutual security amendment of last year. This is so not only because the current bill would make seed capital available in a continuing stream, but also because it will bring to bear upon the task of establishing savings and loan associations outside the continental United States the professional know-how of the U.S. savings and loan industry. For the simple truth of the matter is that the United States has at the present time a virtual monopoly on knowledge in this very important field.

We must remember that even in the United States itself the phenomenal growth of the savings and loan industry has occurred relatively recently. Since the end of World War II the savings and loan business has increased ninefold. In 1945 total industry resources amounted to $9 billion. Today the aggregate assets of the industry exceed $72 billion. Eight of every ten of these dollars are invested in homes. The savings and loan business is by far the primary source of home finance in this country. Along with the various guarantee programs undertaken by the U.S. Government the savings and loan principle, I think it fair to say, is the chief reason, the United States is a land of homeowners.

More than 7 million Americans now have home mortgage loans from insured savings associations. These loans totaling more than $60 billion, represent over 40 percent of the Nation's total home mortgage debt.

The recent growth of the savings and loan industry goes a long way to explain how it is that the United States has been able to construct some 15 million homes since World War II.

I believe that extension of the savings and loan principle overseas would materially strengthen the free world against the threat of communism and do much to improve the Western World's position economically, socially, and politically.

Much progress along this line has already been achieved. In cooperation with the Housing Division of the International Cooperation Administration, many leading executives of the savings and loan industry are now providing technical know-how to fledgling savings and loan associations around the world.

The ICA and the International League of Insurance Savings Associations which has sponsored industry participation in this program are to be congratulated for their efforts.

However, we have not even begun to meet the enormous need. I am aware, as all other Senators are aware, that the economic requirements of the underdeveloped world are very great indeed.

The United States, with unexampled generosity, has given freely of its resources to assist the underdeveloped countries along the way to economic progress. Most of our effort has gone toward the building of what the economists refer to as the infrastructure—roads, harbors, airports, and so forth, which are required before economic progress can take place and which cannot normally be financed by private capital.

We have been concentrating on projects of this kind in the belief that solidly based economic progress would eventually bring social and political stability.

Increasingly, however, it has become obvious that such an approach is dangerously lopsided. Without immediate attention to the causes of social and political instability, slow economic advance will not by itself overcome the steady drumfire of Communist propaganda. The lesson of recent years in Latin America and elsewhere is that the disinherited are impatient and that they will pull down the entire social structure if they do not see immediate gains in prospect.

The Senate recognized this reality in the last Congress when adopting my amendment to the Mutual Security Act. We also recognized it by approving the vigorous social reform program envisaged in the $500 million special authorization for Latin America requested by the Eisenhower administration and later, embodied in the Act of Bogotá.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The future is very precarious indeed unless a measure of social stability can be attained in the underdeveloped countries to permit the hard labor of economic advance to take place without social resentments and frustrations exploding and bringing the entire structure tumbling to the ground.

Anyone who has traveled around the world as I have traveled in Latin America can tell you that the wretched living conditions of the laboring and middle classes are a primary source of social tension.

The slums which fester like great sores in Lima, Santiago, Buenos Aires, Rio, Caracas, and the other cities of this hemisphere not only disfigure these cities; they disfigure the souls of the people who inhabit them; they disfigure the politics of the entire area.

These slums are the favorite territory of Communist agitators, the breeding

ground of maggots which bid to destroy the society.

The alarm bells have been ringing with rising urgency during the last 2 years. We cannot afford to ignore their meaning. The future depends on a prompt and effective response.

I am not going to pretend that this proposal will sweep away all of the problems confronting us and turn the future into a clear and open highway toward the dawn. However, I do believe that it will contribute importantly to the solution of our difficulties. I do believe that the time has come to loose the productive intelligence of the great American savings and loan industry on the problem which their experience qualifies them to tackle.

We cannot rely alone on government-to-government grants and loans. We must mobilize the ingenuity and knowledge of private citizens, working on a person-to-person basis. Savings and loan industry can perform an important task in the service of our larger national purposes. I hope that the Housing Committee of Banking and Currency will give early attention to this measure and that we may see its passage early in this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 582) to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JOINT COMMITTEE FOR COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S FIRST INAUGURATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, March 4 will mark the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. In view of the difficulties which the Nation faced at that time, with a divided country, I think perhaps we can obtain inspiration in our endeavors to solve the problems of a divided world, which we face today.

I think the inaugural address of President Kennedy last Friday will rank as one of the three or four great inaugural addresses of all time and as well worthy to rank with Lincoln's second inaugural and Franklin Roosevelt's first inaugural.

Mr. President, I therefore introduce a joint resolution to provide that the 100th anniversary of the taking of the oath of office by Abraham Lincoln as the 16th President of the United States may be commemorated with fitting ceremonies, and that a joint committee be created for the planning and the conduct of such a commemorative service. I hope this will be done. It would be splendid to have such a man as Raymond Massey repeat at least a part of Lincoln's inaugural address, and to have other features reenacted.

Mr. President, Representative SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, is introducing a similar resolution in the House today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the table until the conclusion of the session today so that any Senators who care to associate themselves with it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the table, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to create a Joint Committee for the Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROJECT HOPE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution commending Project Hope, an organization bringing medical training and teaching to the newly developed countries in southeast Asia.

The vehicle for this mission is the good ship *Hope*, which is now touring the outlying islands of Indonesia, helping the native medical population there learn modern medical techniques from American doctors, nurses, dentists, and other trained personnel.

Project Hope, a part of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., was founded by Dr. William B. Walsh, who has long lived and practiced here in the Capital. His concept of a floating school to teach and train the medical personnel of the new nations is now an actuality. The vessel which is the former Navy hospital ship U.S.S. *Consolation* arrived in Jakarta, capital of Indonesia, on October 16 last year, and has so far visited the islands of Surabaya, Bali, and Sumbawa. The ship is scheduled for six more stops in Indonesia before it completes its maiden 7-month tour in that nation.

All of us can feel particularly proud of the reception which has greeted this mercy ship. One of the Indonesian newspapers said: "She represents the heart of a mighty Nation."

In his year-end report, Dr. Walsh said that invitations have been extended to the *Hope* vessel from Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Korea.

The Project Hope report also notes that the organization has been asked to aid in staffing the School of Tropical Medicine in Dacca, East Pakistan; and to help establish a cardiac clinic equipped with trained teachers and modern scientific appliances in Karachi, capital of Pakistan. The Indonesian Government has also asked aid in staffing the new 600-bed Ibu Sukarno hospital outside of Jakarta.

In addition, Project Hope has recruited and cataloged more than 2,000 American medical volunteers, including doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel, who are willing to serve for short terms wherever they are needed; it has aided the Pakistan flood victims of 1960 with shipments of drugs and medical supplies; established a manufacturing and training center for artificial limbs at the Solo Rehabilitation Center in Indonesia; and Project Hope has helped to establish and train the staff of a 50-bed orthopedic clinic in Jakarta.

But, according to Dr. Walsh, this is only a beginning. He says:

> There is no limit to the work that needs to be done and there is no change in our concept that floating teaching and training ships are the basis of our operation.

With new frontiers opening throughout the world for millions of people in the newly developing countries, we find that we can prove to these nations that Americans remember the stresses and the strains of our pioneer days. The good ship *Hope* is a symbol to all of southeast Asia that Americans are willing to help the new countries learn to help themselves. It is through the teaching and training aid of dedicated American medical personnel, like Dr. Walsh and those now aboard the SS *Hope I*, as well as those who will board her in the future, that we can show the vision and the idealism of our way of life. And, in order to help millions of other persons Project Hope looks to 1961 to outfit *Hope* vessels for Africa and South America.

Project Hope sponsors its vessel through the contributions of individual Americans as well as through the financial assistance of American business, industry, labor, and civic organizations.

Consequently, in presenting this resolution of commendation, I ask my colleagues to vote unanimously for its passage and to let Americans, as well as the people of the world, know that we are all together in backing this most humanitarian work—Project Hope and the SS *Hope I*.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> Whereas the need for ever-increasing peaceful, humanitarian cooperation between the peoples of the United States and the people of other nations of the world is apparent; and
>
> Whereas under the authorization of the President of the United States the United States Navy has furnished a mothballed hospital ship to the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, under private charter; and
>
> Whereas the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, has engaged and staffed and equipped the hospital ship *Consolation*—now known as the steamship *Hope I*—as a floating medical training-teaching center currently serving in southeast Asia; and
>
> Whereas the chief purpose of this undertaking, called Project Hope, is to bring to the medical professions of these developing nations the latest skills and techniques developed by the American medical and dental professions; and
>
> Whereas the medical ship is staffed with medical personnel selected from among the top men and women of our medical, dental and health professions; and
>
> Whereas the $3,500,000 needed to staff and operate this hospital ship for a year is being raised from private sources throughout the country; and
>
> Whereas Project Hope has received the enthusiastic support of Government, industry, business, labor, the medical and dental professions and private citizens throughout the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Project Hope be commended as another step forward in increasing good will throughout the world and in bringing the people of all nations together in a bond of mutual trust, friendship, and cooperation.

INVESTIGATION OF AMERICA'S GOLD LOSS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a study of our Nation's balance of international payments, with a view to determining the extent of its imbalance, recent changes that have occurred in it, the causes of such changes and the significance of these factors in terms of our gold reserves, the maintenance of a sound economy, and the realization of the goals spelled out in the 1946 Employment Act.

Mr. President, the reason for such a study and investigation is plain. In recent months wide public attention has been focused on various aspects of the U.S. balance of payments, and on the outflow of gold from our banks and reserves. It is essential that Congress and the public be fully informed with respect to this situation. Only after careful study of all the relevant factors will it be possibe to know what measures may be desirable. If legislation is called for, it should be enacted only after very careful, thorough, and thoughtful study.

Since 1950, the United States has been spending more abroad than other nations have spent here. Thus our international payments have long been out of balance. Until 1958, the American deficit was not alarming, averaging about $1 billion per year. During the period when the free world as a whole was experiencing a dollar shortage this small imbalance was probably healthy. It enabled our allies, particularly in Western Europe, to build up their foreign exchange reserves of dollars and gold, which in the period after World War II were so low as to make ordinary international trade very difficult.

Beginning around 1958, however, this mild imbalance in our international payments sharply worsened. In that year the United States paid out $3.4 billion more than it took in. This imbalance was accompanied by a gold outflow of $2.3 billion. In 1959 the deficit in our balance of payments was $3.7 billion, and the figure for 1960 is approximately $3.5 billion. Substantial losses of gold accompanied both these unfavorable imbalances. In 1960 for the first time since World War II possible foreign claims against the U.S. supply of gold exceeded our domestic gold reserve. Residents of other nations now hold claims on the dollar which amount to more than $21 billion, while our gold stock stands at around $18 billion.

Questions have been raised and new proposals advanced in several areas connected with our balance of payments. Among those which Congress should study and investigate are these:

First. In recent months there has been strong speculative pressure on gold at the expense of the dollar. At one point in mid-November heavy trading in the London market caused the gold price to rise to $41 an ounce, $6 above the established price. In the opinion of British analysts there continues to be a substantial and widespread demand for gold, which is reflected in a persistent slow rise in the gold price, in spite of the fact that the Bank of England has been releasing into the market gold purchased from the U.S. Treasury. It has been reported that part of our gold stock has been leaking into the hands of private hoarders. If this should continue it could result in a serious snowball effect, leading to loss of confidence in the dollar as a store of value. The study and investigation which I am proposing would provide full information on the nature and extent of the pressure on gold.

Second. The cost in dollars of maintaining our Military Establishment abroad and financing our foreign aid programs has stood between $4 and $5 billion per year for the past several years. How much of this total dollar cost results in a net loss of gold is not at present known. We do not have precise figures on how much of the approximately $1.5 billion which we give each year as nonmilitary grant aid is in the form of dollars. The amount expended for offshore procurement, roughly one-third, does require dollars. But an overall statistical picture of the balance of payments consequences of these programs is not at present available. This is a subject about which precise information should be made available.

Third. It has been proposed that payments in kind be substituted where possible for dollar payments, to finance foreign aid and military support costs. We do not know to what extent this could be accomplished without interfering with other goals of these programs. Nor do we know what effect this would have on our balance of payments. This is another subject on which the study and investigation which I am proposing could cast light.

Fourth. In November, President Eisenhower issued directives designed to cut overseas expenditure by ordering home 284,000 of the 484,000 dependents of American servicemen overseas. It is not immediately clear how much of a saving will result in terms of dollars and gold from this shift in policy. To the extent that the military dependents use goods and materials shipped from the United States, the cost of maintaining them overseas is not a drain on our gold and dollar reserves. It has been pointed out that many of the servicemen affected may attempt to keep their families with them. If these families decide to live overseas, even though military facilities are no longer available to them, the directive could result in an actual increase in the outflow of gold and dollars. The ramifications of this Presidential directive need careful study and investigation before their consequences for our balance of payments can be understood.

Fifth. At the same time the President sent Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson and Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon on an unsuccessful mission to Bonn to obtain West German financial assistance to pay support costs of U.S. troops in Europe. A number of conflicting statements about this mission have appeared, but it is clear that it did not succeed in its primary purpose. It has been reported that the State Department and the Treasury did not see eye to eye on the advisability of making this request in the form it took. The pros and cons of this argument have by no means been fully explained. If a contribution from the German Government is now considered necessary to reduce the imbalance in our international payments, then it would be helpful to know what further steps are being taken in view of the lack of success of the Anderson-Dillon mission. Congress has a duty to inform itself with regard to this situation.

Sixth. At the end of 1960 the Ford Motor Co. invested some $357 million in its British subsidiary. This is one of a large number of recent examples of American firms investing capital overseas. It was reported that high officials in the administration attempted to dissuade the Ford leaders from taking this step, coming as it did on the heels of the Eisenhower directives to reduce the dollar costs of maintaining our forces in Europe. It is argued that a large percentage of direct foreign investment of dollars usually returns to the United States to purchase American capital equipment and exports. At a time of serious and widespread domestic unemployment it is not clear that this kind of capital movement is wise. The consequences, both long and short run, for our balance of payments also stand in need of clarification.

Seventh. On January 14, President Eisenhower prohibited the holding of gold overseas by American citizens and businesses, effective June 1. This is another action prompted by the deficit in our international payments and the accompanying gold outflow. Its effectiveness as a means of combating our payments deficit and gold loss cannot be determined without additional information concerning foreign reactions.

These actions of our Government have caused considerable concern and unease both at home and abroad. It must continue to be a cornerstone of our policies to insure that confidence in the dollar is not impaired. Full and accurate information about the exact state of affairs can help maintain that confidence.

During the 86th Congress the Banking and Currency Committee conducted a study and hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution 105, which I introduced, calling for an investigation of the investment of U.S. capital overseas. Hearings took place on July 13, 14, and 15, 1959, and were published under the title "U.S. Private Foreign Investment." They served to make available information on the scope and impact of such investment.

Private investment overseas is one aspect, and an important one, of our balance of payments. Other subjects which should be studied in connection with an investigation of our balance of payments position include: interest rates, especially those on short-term securities; bank reserve requirements; the nature of

the international gold market; American-owned gold overseas; and related subjects.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution, for consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 65) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the unfavorable balance of international payments with a view to determining (1) the extent of the imbalance in such payments, (2) the changes which have occurred therein in recent years, and (3) the causes thereof and their significance in terms of the gold reserves of the United States Government, the maintenance of a sound domestic economy, and the realization of the goals set forth in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY (S. DOC. NO. 9)

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the inaugural address of President Kennedy be printed as a Senate document.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2) to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961, and the bill (S. 378) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] (for himself and other Senators) on January 13, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT IS GIVEN TO FUELS STUDY RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy, was introduced January 9, 1961, by the Senator from West Virginia now addressing the Senate.

In the period since the date of introduction, the number of cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 has reached 46.

Likewise, in the interim period the Journal of Commerce on January 18, 1961, carried the fact that the American Petroleum Institute and the Independent Petroleum Association of America concurred in general to the proposed fuels study. The National Coal Policy Conference previously had endorsed it.

Today, I am informed that substantial segments of the major fuels industries have consulted and are agreeable to recommending establishment of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study.

I am informed further that spokesmen for the coal, oil, and gas industries will appear jointly before the committee to which Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 will be referred and at such time will recommend agreed language. This is good news because it presages the elimination of all prior major obstacles to the accomplishment of a national fuels study as a basis for the possible establishment of a vitally needed national fuels policy at an earlier date in history than otherwise might have been anticipated.

Also, I point out that, on January 17, 1961, a Kennedy-Johnson Advisory Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Representative FRANK SMITH of Mississippi, issued a report which was said to have been endorsed by over 100 Members of Congress and which declared:

Long-range energy resource development objectives based upon forecasts of need and public interest should be established by the Federal Government. A national energy and fuels policy to guide Federal agencies responsible for resource development should be enacted by Congress.

Mr. President, in view of these important developments, and in order to accord our colleagues additional time to evaluate all factors involved, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 remain at the desk through Friday, January 27, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask further for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, the Journal of Commerce news stories to which I previously referred.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL INDUSTRY OFFERS SUPPORT TO FUELS STUDY

(By Lewis Brigham)

The Nation's oil industry has made a major switch in position and now appears ready to take part in a study of U.S. energy resources, although it still retains its opposition to some aspects of the study which it feels are inimical to its long-range welfare.

The abrupt change in oil thinking was disclosed in a letter sent President-elect Kennedy by Frank M. Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute.

SUPPORT PROMISED

In his letter, Mr. Porter promised the incoming administration full support of any "impartial and objective investigation of our energy position."

But at the same time the API head reiterated oil industry opposition to end-use controls on fuel which would stake out certain portions of the Nation's energy market as a special province for specific fuels.

Over the past few years, the coal industry has generally been recognized as seeking legislation which would lead to this sort of fuel-market allocations. Coal spokesmen have cited declining production and severe unemployment in coal mining areas of the country in seeking support for such fuel study measures.

SEVERAL STUDIES

In his West Virginia primary race, President-elect Kennedy promised support of such a fuels study. Since his election, Mr. Kennedy has also received reports from several special study groups backing the fuels policy investigation.

Because of the pressures building up for a study, oil industry officials were understood to have decided early this week in Washington that the study was inevitable. Accordingly, it was felt the industry should participate in it.

In his letter to President-elect Kennedy, Mr. Porter promised support of any "impartial and objective investigation of our energy position."

LETTER QUOTED

"As producer and supplier of over 70 percent of the energy needs of the Nation," the letter said, "the American petroleum industry is keenly aware of the importance to this country of the continued availability of low cost and abundant fuel resources."

He said the industry in the past had participated in similar studies, and would continue to do so whenever the President, the Congress, or the public deems them necessary.

"However," he said, "while any objective study of energy resources is fully in accord with the public interest, certain recent proposals urging that such a study be designed to create a so-called new, 'national fuels policy' are subject to grave question and are the source of deep concern to many segments of the industrial community and the public."

CITES COAL ROLE

Mr. Porter said the leading supporter of fuels policy proposals was the coal industry "which through legislative flats and the imposition of Government-enforced 'on-use controls' hopes to gain advantages over its competitors, despite the overwhelming consumer preference for a cheaper and more convenient oil and gas."

Mr. Porter referred to a statement by the National Coal Association which said Government action would enable the industry to sell more coal and which endorsed a national fuels policy as an integral part of such action.

INDUSTRY VIEW

He said any policy that forced consumers to switch to less desirable fuels would be dangerous to the public well-being and inimical to the principles on which this Nation and its economy are founded.

"The petroleum industry has long taken the position that the Nation's policy of free consumer choice among competing fuels is in itself a successful fuels policy, and that only within the framework of an economy free to grow and compete can the best interest of the Nation be served and the problems faced by it be met," the letter said.

"Regardless of the route decided upon or the body assigned to the subject by the President and/or Congress, the petroleum industry stands ready to offer its fullest cooperation and participation."

BACK STUDY PLANS

HOUSTON.—Independent oil and gas producers backed congressional efforts to study the Nation's fuels policy, it was announced after an executive session here.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America said it never opposed such a study and will back efforts to assure "sound energy policy."

It said there have been many proposals, citing those in Congress and reports to President-elect Kennedy, but did not specify which of them it would support.

IPAA said that the United States' "energy supremacy" is at stake.

Meanwhile in Congress, Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, father of unsuccessful bills to end utility regulation of the gas industry, told the Journal of Commerce he favors a fuels policy study.

Mr. HARRIS' testimony last year before the House Rules Committee was considered influential in killing a coal-sponsored move to set up a joint committee to look into fuels policy.

PRAISED BY COALMEN

The National Coal Policy Conference praised the American Petroleum Institute and the Independent Petroleum Association of America for favoring a fuels policy study, it was learned.

NCPC, speaking for coal producers, marketers, workers, and railroads, said it hopes the oil groups will back Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 setting up a joint congressional committee to make the fuels study.

The proposal urges that the information developed by such a committee would lead to specific legislative recommendations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement by him before Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1, the area redevelopment bill of Senator DOUGLAS, dealing with the importance of enacting distressed areas legislation.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts of address delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations.

TRIBUTES TO VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the finest things that can be said of any man is that he is an intelligent and hard worker. That simple, direct statement expresses the many praiseworthy attributes which have been typical of Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. President, I have known Vice President Nixon for more than 14 years of his long and useful career. I knew him, first, as a Member of the House of Representatives; later, as a Member of the U.S. Senate; and, for the last 8 years, as the Vice President of the United States, and, therefore, the President of the Senate.

During World War II, Vice President Nixon served with distinction in the Armed Forces of our nation.

Vice President Nixon has made outstanding contributions by his display of dignity and courage while he has represented our country abroad.

This Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude for the help he has given in uncovering international communism and the international Communist conspiracy which existed in some high places.

I am sure everyone acknowledges that in presiding over the Senate, Vice President Nixon has generally been impartial and fair in his rulings. At no time during the 8 years he has occupied the chair have any of his rulings been reversed, following an appeal.

Vice President Nixon's family life has been exemplary and outstanding.

Thus, Mr. President, as Dick Nixon leaves public office, he can be proud of a job very well done—first, in the House of Representatives; subsequently, in the Senate, as one of its Members; and, during the last 8 years, as Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate. Certainly his outstanding services are deeply appreciated by all American citizens, of both political parties. I am sure he appreciates the statements made by Senators on both sides of the aisle in paying him tribute.

Mr. President, undoubtedly in his new endeavors, Dick Nixon will demonstrate the same courage, the same conviction, and the same leadership that he has shown so outstandingly throughout the years we have known him.

As he puts aside his official duties, Mrs. Bridges and I wish him and his gracious and charming wife, Pat, Godspeed and a happy and fruitful future.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, and though we will be unable to so address you outside as well as inside this Chamber, your contributions to the United States and the Republican Party over the past 14 years may be summed up in one word: Dedication.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and then the Senate, you dedicated yourself to the preservation and expansion of the traditions of this Nation. Through your work as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, you helped to awaken America to an internal threat which few believed could happen here. It was my privilege to serve with you as a Member of this body for 2 years, and then, as now, your energy and determination marked you for success.

Your record of the past 8 years is well known to every American—the trips and tours abroad, the unending study and illumination of issues at home, the campaigns of 1952, 1956, and 1960. Caracas, Moscow, Warsaw, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles—there are many names and cities and dates that come to mind. Most significantly, Mr. President, your public career has coincided with the emergence of the United States as the leader of the free world. Your efforts have helped to lead her there and to keep her there.

But all of this is past—and the best is yet to come. My colleagues and I are not tolling the end of a career, but listing a few of the accomplishments of a man who has been a leader and who will continue to be a leader of his country and his party.

None of us can predict the future, but one thing is certain, Mr. President: The coming decade holds great promise, and its promise will be fulfilled through the leadership of men like yourself.

THE VALIANT WARRIOR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in their tribute to you. I shall treasure the many years which we have shared in the House and then later here in the Senate.

Your service and dedication throughout these past 8 years as Vice President of the United States and as Presiding Officer of this body have earned the respect and admiration of those of us who have been fortunate enough to be Members of the Senate during these years.

The American people and peoples all over the world have a deep sense of gratitude for your labors for the cause of peace; labors which I am assured you will as diligently pursue in the future as you have in the past.

I shall particularly cherish our personal association during these years of service together. First was membership on the Select Committee of Foreign Aid, the so-called Herter Committee which went to Europe in the fall of 1947 to study the needs for economic rehabilitation of the war-devastated countries and our reports which provided the background for congressional action to terminate some of the ill-advised limitations on postwar recovery and to lay the framework for constructive action.

That was followed by our joint service in the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1949 and 1950, marked by successful enactment of the Internal Security Act.

And then, our common experience in becoming candidates for the Senate which again brought us together in this body in January 1951.

Through both the House and the Senate, I took pride in the growing responsibilities assigned you and was glad to be among those who applauded your selection as the vice-presidential nominee in 1952.

In your service as vice president, you have abundantly displayed courage to a very high degree. You shrank from no assignment. You comported yourself with a clear sense of responsibility yet, modestly, participated in the emergency situations that confronted you in the illness of the President. Your administration of your duties of Presiding Officer of the Senate was accomplished with a sense of fairness and impartiality that won and deserved the respect of every Member.

As you now retire from these halls, Mr. President, I would like to suggest that you are worthy of a term similar to that which was given another candidate for the Presidency some years ago, who, although he did not win the election, left the scene with the sobriquet "The Happy Warrior."

I should like to say that in my book, Mr. President, you will always be "The Valiant Warrior," and I express the hope that it will not be too long before you return to the scene of active political endeavor.

Now as you are about to enter private life, may I extend to you best wishes for success in whatever you choose to do. As recent indications show, South Dakota, as always, has the welcome mat out for you. We should be pleased to have you honor us with your presence whether in the scenic Black Hills and the Badlands or the wonderful Missouri River Valley country with its chain of great lakes or the prairie country with fertile farms and teeming towns and cities. Come anytime, Dick; the welcome mat is always out.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Vice President Richard M. Nixon, by offering words of praise and appreciation.

Here, in Richard Nixon, we have the kind of greatness which has become a symbol of American opportunity and achievement. Here we have one born to humble surroundings. He worked in his father's general store. Early in life he learned the lessons of hard work, thrift, and the kind of life which builds moral character. He attended public schools like most American boys. From early in life, Richard Nixon had high ideals and, like the typical American boy, high ambition. His story is a Horatio Alger story.

One cannot talk about Richard Nixon without mentioning his wonderful wife, affectionately called Pat. Pat Nixon worked in hospitals and department stores to gain a college education, and, after her marriage to Dick, taught school to help him through his law course.

By their own efforts, the Nixons rose in esteem and prominence. While still quite young, Richard Nixon was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, then to the Senate, and then to the Vice-Presidency.

He is still a young man. I am sure the best part of his life is ahead. He has much to offer a troubled world. The world is going to hear a lot about Richard M. Nixon for years to come. Of that, I feel sure.

To Richard Nixon, whom I am proud to call "a friend," I say farewell for now.

NOMINATION OF STEWART LEE UDALL TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in commendation of the action of the Senate on Saturday in confirming the nomination of Stewart Udall to be Secretary of the Interior.

I know of no nomination which more typifies the spirit of President Kennedy's new administration of new frontiers than that of Stewart Udall. Coming from that part of our country which historically has breathed the spirit of frontier challenges, Stewart Udall, during his years as a Congressman, distinguished himself by becoming one of the foremost authorities in this country on our natural resources.

Stewart Udall brings freshness of vision, zeal of spirit, and a disciplined determination to this position. We can surely expect from him new programs for a new age. I heartily endorse the nomination of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak in commendation of the action of the Senate on Saturday in confirming the nomination of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior.

There is no person in this country more erudite in the entire field of natural resources than this outstanding man. No one has perceived more clearly or expressed more eloquently the fact that the many problems associated with our natural resources are in truth God-sent opportunities.

This country can look forward to a new era and a new spirit in this country's development of its national riches under Stewart Udall. My congratulations to our new Secretary of the Interior, and also my sincerest pledge of close cooperation.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP FOR POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history and progress of our country depends, to an inestimable degree, upon the many unsung heroes who serve us individually, and as a people.

Today, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to one such corps of unsung heroes in our national life—the police officers of America.

Upon these public servants, we depend greatly for the attainment of the goals set forth in the preamble of our Constitution, that of insuring domestic tranquillity.

As sentinels of law, order, and domestic peace, these officers protect life and property; promote safety; and generally serve as a major stabilizing force in the community, providing a real sense of security for our citizens.

However, these patrol officers of our highways and byways of life do not have an easy beat.

Their services, all too often at inadequate pay, involve duties of great sacrifice and dedication, including the imperiling, and sometimes loss, of life.

Over the years, commemorative stamps have been issued to honor individuals or groups, playing a significant role in our national heritage.

Recently, I received a letter from Michael T. Feider, State secretary of the National Police Officers of America, Wisconsin chapter, recommending the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring policemen in communities throughout the country.

A tribute of this nature, I believe, would be a well-deserved recognition of outstanding public service, enhancing respect for police officers individually, and it would also stimulate a higher public esteem for the system of law and order in the Nation.

Commemorative stamps, of course, are chosen by citizens advisory committees, and then issued under the auspices of the Post Office Department.

I sincerely, hope, however, that the advisory group will give favorable consideration to this well-warranted recognition of our police officers.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Secretary Michael T. Feider printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As State secretary for the National Police Officers Association of America, I urge you to support the resolution which will order the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the policemen in every community throughout the United States.

The National Police Officers Association of America has built a National Police Hall of Fame which is located in Port Charlotte, Fla. This shrine has been erected to the memory of our valiant dead. We feel that the commemorative stamp should be issued from this building in appropriate ceremonies.

Thanking you for your support, I remain,
Respectfully,

MICHAEL T. FEIDER,
State Secretary.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, President Kennedy's first official order directing Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to increase the distribution of food to poor people is most commendable.

It is my earnest hope that Secretary Freeman will not confine this increase to what are now surplus commodities such as cornmeal, flour, and powdered skim milk, but will include in the distribution program such protein foods as meats and dairy and poultry products, as well as fresh fruits and vegetables, when available.

I am sure he has both the legal authority and the funds with which to do this at least for the most distressed people and areas.

Such a course would do more than merely reduce want in distressed areas and among individuals elsewhere. It would be an economic booster, providing more business for processors, more markets for farmers, and more employment for all. It would serve to reduce the accumulation of surplus grains through increased feeding of poultry and livestock.

In the long run, this program, aimed at reducing want and improving health among American people, will prove to be less costly than a program which merely suffices to keep body and soul together for several million deserving but unfortunate people.

For almost 20 years I have been urging a program of this sort. I am glad that President Kennedy has shown that he possesses the foresight to order it effected.

I do not expect it to end distress and be fully effective all at once. It will have

to be developed carefully, and possibly some legislation may be needed later.

With the backing of the President, Secretary Freeman has a great opportunity to apply a program which will raise both our social and economic standards to a higher level and at the same time permit our farmers to continue to produce bountifully and without the fear of stricter Government regulations and controls.

I will say that President Kennedy has started out on the right track.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for what he has just said, because I know how long he has worked over the past years—I may say the past decade—to bring about the culmination of a program of this kind. I am particularly gratified that President Kennedy has seen fit to follow this procedure and to put the program into operation so soon after his inauguration.

RECENT TUGBOAT STRIKE IN NEW YORK

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the tugboat strike in New York has now been settled, but only after it paralyzed the Northeast and caused intolerable inconvenience and hardship to commuters, including 30,000 in Connecticut, who are dependent upon train service to travel to work.

This unfortunate dispute has dramatized the need for better ways of settling differences between labor and management, and for preventing strikes which make the public at large their victims.

A thoughtful editorial in the Hartford Courant of Friday, January 20, entitled "Something Is Wrong," reflects widespread public indignation because of strikes of this kind. I commend it to all, but particularly to the attention of my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING IS WRONG

There is something radically wrong with a social system that allows a handful of strikers to disrupt the transportation of a third of the country inconvenience millions of people, and threaten the food supplies of our largest city.

There is something radically wrong with three small unions that have no more sense of responsibility than to launch a guerrilla war against the whole eastern seaboard. And why? Over the question whether there should be five men, needed or not, on every railway tugboat in New York harbor.

There is something radically wrong with labor leaders who allow this to happen. There is indeed something wrong with a government that is helpless in the face of such a situation. Or with a people who will tolerate such helplessness.

Only 664 men are members of the three marine unions that started the strike against 11 railroads serving the immense transportation complex in New York. In one of those fantastic, nightmarish moves that mark too many union operations today, this handful was given the dutiful support of other unions, and so brought basic operations in the most thickly settled part of the United States to a standstill.

For a whole generation now the position of labor has been secure. No one in his right mind would seek again to make it insecure. Indeed, we can now see it as a shame that the ownership and management of past generations were so insensitive, so shortsighted, as to leave labor no way to achieve a decent life except to resort to industrial warfare. And warfare is what a strike is. But it is one thing to strike a single plant. It is another to strike a third of a nation—to empty the Hartford railroad station because of a tugboat dispute in Manhattan.

We hear much nowadays about the social responsibility of labor. It is about time we saw some of it. It is obvious, indeed, that we need to rethink our whole philosophy about relations among labor, management, government, and the public. Repeatedly in the postwar years we have seen management in such big industries as steel and automobiles make the mistake of simply resigning itself to labor demands for ever more. Labor should get more. But it should get no more than is justified by its fair share in increased productivity. When management has accepted labor demands beyond this it has passed along the cost to the public. And so the vicious wheel of inflation was given another turn until we suddenly find our gold draining away and our goods priced out of the world market.

If this situation requires a new statesmanship on the part of management and labor, and perhaps new legislation as well, its beginning must be a realization that at least in the big national industries, and also in complex situations like that in New York harbor today, the strike is outmoded.

Through a long and bloody history Western man learned that a system of impartial courts achieved justice far more readily than allowing adversaries to club each other over the head. Once upon a time labor had no recourse but to club management on the head. But today it clubs not only its adversary but a vast general public as well. And that is what must be stopped.

Surely it is time we learned how to use justice rather than force in labor disputes. Whether through negotiation or arbitration or labor courts, or some wholly new way of having third-party experts settle these issues on the basis of facts, there must be a way. We cannot much longer tolerate such outrages against public decency and commonsense as the present strike in New York, and the nationwide strikes that have preceded it. And if labor does not assume responsibility for realizing the harm it is doing, then it risks having an outraged public lose its perspective and strike back. And then we are likely to see not the new and just philosophy of labor relations our complex society demands, but a retrogression into the bitterness of the past.

DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we know, last Wednesday evening Dr. Thomas Dooley died in New York City. His loss is deeply felt by all who knew him, and knew of him—for he was one of the Nation's most distinguished young men.

Dr. Dooley was a native of the State of Missouri. He was also one of those rare Americans who was truly a citizen of the world.

His work among the peoples of southeast Asia is already a legend. Humanity, vigor, and tenacity characterized all that Tom Dooley did. He treated the sick in jungle villages; he built hospitals; he found time to write three books; and he toured this country raising money to support an expanding group of hospitals and medical facilities in the less fortunate nations of the world.

Dr. Dooley himself once remarked about his travels and constant work, "I figure what I have crammed into my life makes me really 65."

When he was stricken by cancer, Tom Dooley said, "I am not going to quit." He had the judgment and foresight to make this statement come true. His work will go on.

The organization which he founded, Medico, is made up of men and women with the dedication and spirit of Dr. Dooley. Under their guidance, Medico will continue to bring the blessings of modern medicine to sick and unfortunate peoples throughout the world.

This is what Tom Dooley wanted. His ideas, his projects are moving ahead.

His loss is deeply felt by everyone. But we are all very fortunate to have had such a man among us.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, the following editorials: "The Beautiful American," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 20, 1961; "Exemplar for a Generation," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 20, 1961; "Thomas Dooley, Humanitarian," from the Kansas City Times of January 20, 1961; "Dr. Thomas A. Dooley," from the Washington Post of January 20, 1961; and "Dr. Thomas Dooley," from the Washington Star of January 20, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 20, 1961]

THE BEAUTIFUL AMERICAN

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep.
And miles to go before I sleep."

In 6 short years, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley became one of the best known and best loved Americans in the world. Now he is dead.

Wednesday night, at Memorial Hospital in New York, cancer did what tropical diseases, primitive jungles and sometimes deep discouragement couldn't do—it stopped this zealous, energetic young St. Louisan who set out to show a sometimes doubting world what Americans are really like.

Tom Dooley, bright, handsome and born with a silver spoon in his mouth, found what he wanted to do in life aboard a U.S. Navy transport in the Gulf of Tonking. There the U.S.S. *Montague* was picking up refugees fleeing from North Vietnam Communist troops.

The refugees were wretched, fearful and often bore on their bodies the marks of the cruel treatment dealt to them by the Red soldiers. There, amid the poverty-striken and mutilated, Tom Dooley decided to help.

He ran the Navy refugee camp at Haiphong, healing the sick, comforting the afflicted, harboring the homeless. Through his efforts, hundreds, perhaps thousands, who would otherwise have been too ill or too weak for evacuation, made the journey to freedom.

When the Communists took over Haiphong, Dooley and the three Navy corpsmen with him stayed till the last refugee left. Later, they returned to Laos to continue their work. To extend the benefits of American medicine to other far, neglected corners of the world, he and Dr. Peter Comanduros founded Medico.

At a time when our nationals abroad were being depicted in a popular bestseller as the "ugly" Americans, Dr. Dooley soon became known as "the beautiful American." His courage, charity and idealism made that somewhat embarrassing compliment inevitable.

Early in his life, the words quoted above from the poem of Robert Frost made a deep impression on the quick-witted, quick-tempered, warm-hearted Tom Dooley.

"I am not going to quit," he said, when he arrived a few weeks ago at Memorial Hospital for treatment of the malignant cancer that killed him. But before it did, Tom Dooley kept magnificently his promises to himself, to his God and to humanity, and traveled many, many miles before he slept.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 20, 1961]

EXEMPLAR FOR A GENERATION

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley's 6 years as a doctor in Asia form a substantial offset to the indifference and irresponsibility which are the themes of those who deplore the "postwar generation" and its gadget-dull future. With the practice of a "society doctor" open to him, young Tom Dooley was on the U.S.S. *Montague* when she picked up the first refugees from beyond the Bamboo Curtain. After that, he never was away very long from the sick, the hungry and the uprooted. His concern for them was the beginning of Medico, now responsible for 17 projects in 12 countries.

To write this "success story," he used the methods of contemporary success-hunters—books, radio, and television appeals, appearances at dinners and conventions. He did not hide his light under a bushel, but the methods were transformed by his purpose. And he was understood. A little more than a year ago he told the Missouri State Teachers Federation that "you must arouse in your students a sense of duty toward all men." This was not a hat-passing occasion, yet the audience spontaneously showered the platform with money.

Dr. Dooley might never have become a philosopher like his model, Dr. Schweitzer. He probably would not have found time. He was a man who had encountered the sight, sound and smell of poverty, pain and fear—and he would not turn from them. This is a thought for keeping in bounds the not unjustifiable good feeling which comes with writing a check to help work such as Tom Dooley's.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 20, 1961]

THOMAS DOOLEY, HUMANITARIAN

Dr. Howard Rusk of New York University called Dr. Thomas A. Dooley "the splendid American." The splendor was not of pomp or fortune, but of humility and dedication. The selfless career of young Dr. Dooley must go down in history as one of true compassion toward fellow men.

An articulate and talented youth from St. Louis, Dr. Dooley had the promise of a brilliant future in medicine. But he abandoned personal ambition and wealth for the jungles of southeast Asia. Within 5 miles of Communist China, he healed weary and broken refugees who had escaped from tyranny.

The profound experience that changed his life came in the mid-1950's. Assigned as a naval doctor to help evacuate exiles, he learned firsthand of the shocking suffering and multiple needs of an impoverished region. Promptly he decided to give his life to the cause. After building his first hospital in Nam Tha, he wrote and lectured to gain funds for new medical centers. Even after cancer put his life in danger, he carried on his jungle work.

With the death of Dr. Dooley, suffering humanity in southeast Asia lost a friend. A reverent man, his was the spirit of human charity. As a modern apostle of good will, he went "to heal the sick." The world is better because of Dr. Dooley.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1961]

DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Dr. Tom Dooley was an exemplar of the American humanitarian impulse at its best. He was a showman and promoter of sorts, but a showman and promoter for a cause beyond himself—that of the refugees from communism in Vietnam, or of his hospital at Muong Sing in the mountains of northern Laos, or of Medico, the organization he helped found to take medical care to the people of remote countries where it is not available. The slim young doctor, now dead of cancer at 34, lived altogether too short a life; but it was long enough to enable him to carry a bright gift of concern, brotherhood, and practical assistance to thousands of human beings who might not otherwise have known them.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 20, 1961]

DR. THOMAS DOOLEY

Youthful Tom Dooley is dead, but his selfless good works for the sick and maimed in far parts of the world will be long remembered. More than that, the memory of what this dedicated doctor accomplished in providing hospital and medical care for the victims of disease in Laos, in Kenya, and in other distant places should inspire others to carry on the work he started.

It was Dr. Dooley's fate to be cut down at 34 by one of the diseases he had battled in others—cancer. Even when it became clear to him and to his own physicians that the dread killer at work in his chest could not be stopped, Dr. Dooley continued to raise funds for new clinics and hospitals. In fact, he redoubled his efforts in apparent realization that he must make every minute count. "I am not going to quit," he said after being flown back to a New York hospital from Hong Kong last December. "I will continue to guide and lead my hospitals until my back, my blood, and my bones collapse." He did just that. The American people will join with those of many distant lands in mourning the untimely passing of this zealous benefactor of suffering mankind.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I think it is well that we take a few minutes to note that January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. These proud and gallant people maintained their independence for just over 2 years until the Russian Communists overran the country in 1920. However, the spirit of nationalism and fierce dedication of the Ukrainians to the ideals of freedom and justice has lived on despite the Communist yoke.

Americans of Ukrainian descent everywhere, including my State of North Dakota, celebrated this anniversary last week in a fitting and solemn manner. Under the leadership of Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, North Dakota president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as well as under his predecessors, these people have long carried the banner of freedom which they cherish so much. Their devotion to the cause of liberty is a source of inspiration to all Americans.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, January 22, the Ukrainian people celebrated the 43d anniversary of their independence. On this date, in the year 1918, they threw off the centuries-old yoke of Muscovite domination, and proudly proclaimed themselves a sovereign nation.

But their freedom was short lived. A few years later the Bolsheviks hurled the Red army against the newborn Ukrainian state. The Ukrainian people resisted bravely, but they were vanquished by overwhelming odds. Night again descended on this heroic and long-suffering people.

There has been too great a tendency to accept the Soviet Union as a monolithic state. The Soviet Union is not a monolith, but a gigantic prison house of nations, where men are persecuted as individuals and where peoples are persecuted as peoples. And the chief of the imprisoned nations within the confines of the U.S.S.R. is the Ukrainian nation.

The Ukrainian people have never reconciled themselves to the Bolshevik regime. Time and time again they have resisted—and resisted to the death. Five million Ukrainians died resisting the forced collectivization in the thirties. They rose again against the Bolsheviks during World War II. Even in recent years, the Soviet press has been constrained to admit that Ukrainian guerrillas were still active.

Let us remember these things when Khrushchev threatens the West with nuclear blackmail; and let us remind Khrushchev that we are aware of these things.

We have made a practice of observing Ukrainian Independence Day on the floor of the Senate, and it is fitting that we should do so.

It is fitting that we should join with the millions of Americans of Ukrainian descent who today commemorate their day of liberation.

It is fitting that we should tell the 35 million Ukrainians, who groan under the cruelest yoke in their history, that we have not forgotten them, that we do not accept their enslavement as final, that we are confident the sun of freedom will again shine on them and that they will take their place, as is their God-given right, among the community of sovereign nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in pride mixed with sorrow, Americans of Ukrainian extraction and friends of liberty everywhere yesterday observed the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The democratic Ukrainian Republic was established in 1918 after the Ukraine had remained for more than 2½ centuries under the authoritarian rule of Czarist Russia. But this welcome flowering of freedom was unhappily short lived. Less than 3 years later the Ukraine was overrun by the Communist armies, and the Ukraine remains today, against its will, a Soviet Socialist Republic.

Despite all suffering and oppression, the Ukrainian people have shown great

strength and resourcefulness, and the desire for liberty burns as fiercely as ever in their hearts. In the light of this spirit, and in tribute to the outstanding Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko, Congress last year authorized a statue of this patriot, long the acknowledged spokesman of national independence of the enslaved Ukrainian nation.

In noting the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, friends of liberty are serving notice that the valiant struggles of the Ukrainians have not been forgotten. With the support of liberty-loving peoples everywhere, those who cherish Ukrainian freedom so dearly, persisting through all adversity, must yet see the realization of their fondest hope, a brighter future for their beloved land.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence is marked this week in official proclamations, in words uttered in Congress and elsewhere, and in the hearts of all who hope that the Ukraine will once again join the free nations of the world.

The anniversary is an important event because once again it reminds us of their hope. It reminds us, too, that the frontiers of freedom are not lines on a map; they exist wherever men have the power to maintain freedom or to seek its return.

I would like to join, therefore, with those who specifically ask the world to remember that the Ukraine won its independence 43 years ago, only to lose it soon afterward. When we remember this and other occasions when the aspirations of a free people were smothered by the expansionist policies of the U.S.S.R., then we are better able to understand the reasons for Premier Khrushchev's propaganda campaign against "colonial powers." He is attempting to throw a smokescreen over the history of his own nation while he presents imagined or actual abuses by other nations. We should be capable of making the distinction between truth and reality in this dispute.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, yesterday in Seattle and countless other communities in America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America observed the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. I should like to take this opportunity to join other colleagues in calling attention to this anniversary of the proclamation which set forth the national desires and aspiration of the Ukrainian people to be free.

The observances in American communities are by those of Ukrainian descent who enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom within our shores. Theirs is an expression of sympathy and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

We are familiar with the valiant fight of the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine, who despite being overrun by Communist troops of Moscow have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to press for their liberation. It is only proper that we note this occasion and our high regard for the Ukrainian people who have demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since time immemorial, the rugged and industrious Ukranian people have lived in their historic homeland, the fertile country extending from the Black Sea to the heart of today's Poland. Throughout their long history theirs has been an endless struggle in defense of their freedom. They fought valiantly, against heavy odds and powerful adversaries, but in the end, in the mid-17th century, they were brought under czarist Russia. Since then, except for the brief but glorious period of 1918–20, freedom and independence have been denied to the unfortunate people of the Ukraine.

The democratic forces let loose by the First World War and the Russian revolution of 1917 offered the Ukranian people the long-cherished chance to free themselves. In the midst of that war, on January 22, 1918, while their oppressors were preoccupied with fighting, they proclaimed their independence. A year later, when western Ukraine was freed from Austro-Hungarian rule, both eastern and western Ukraine formed a united Ukrainian National Republic. Thus, on January 22, 1919, the national dream of the Ukrainians was realized. They attained their independence as a united nation. Unfortunately, however, this period of joy and jubilation did not endure.

The freedom promised and proclaimed by the Russian revolutionary leaders proved to be devoid of meaning, and no sooner had they established themselves in Russia than they began to pursue the oppressive policy of the czars. In the fall of 1920 the Red army overran the Ukraine and put an end to the Ukrainian National Republic in October of that year. Then Ukraine became a Soviet Socialist Republic, thus placing the fate and fortune of some 40 milion Ukrainians into the hands of Communist leaders in the Kremlin.

For four decades the Ukraine and its stouthearted, liberty-loving people have been a reluctant and unwilling part of the huge Soviet Empire. They are part of the Soviet Union, but they fervently cherish their freedom and independence. On this 43d anniversary of their independence day we hope and pray for the realization of their dream, freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

BROADWAY PRESENTATION OF "ADVISE AND CONSENT"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the outstanding book "Advise and Consent," written by Mr. Allen Drury. Like all of my colleagues, I had read the book and enjoyed it immensely. But just last week it was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to see the play by the same name now showing in New York. Naturally I sat through the performance in a critical mood, first as a Senator trying to see how others would depict this body, and second, as a reader of the book to see how closely the play would follow its excellent portrayal of the Senate and Government. I am happy to say that on both counts the score is superior.

The play gives the viewer the feeling that he is actually sitting in the U.S. Senate, so closely and accurately do the players follow the customs and traditions of this body. I know that it is not usual to extol the virtues of a Broadway production on the floor of the Senate, but because this one is so outstanding and because it concerns this body, I feel it perfectly proper to stand this morning as a Member of the Senate and commend this play highly to my colleagues.

CANDIDACY OF SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently our esteemed colleague, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, announced his candidacy for reelection in 1962.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has brought to that group a lifelong experience in banking which has been invaluable during consideration of bills by that committee.

He serves with equal distinction on the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that all Senators will agree that the editorial which appeared in the Greenwich Times on January 3, 1961:

> What is apparent, however, is that Senator BUSH is among the best Senators that ever represented Connecticut in Washington. We are happy to see that he has removed an uncertainty about his future plans.

That feeling seems to prevail across the great State of Connecticut, and I have selected a few of the many editorials that have appeared in the newspapers of that great State extolling the virtues of Senator BUSH, and indicating a unanimous opinion among the people of the State of Connecticut that they are happy that Senator BUSH will seek reelection.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterbury American-Republican, Dec. 31, 1960]

HAT IN THE RING

Republicans in particular, and thousands of Connecticut people who hold to other political convictions, will be delighted to know that PRESCOTT BUSH, of Greenwich, U.S. Senator from Connecticut since 1952, has announced his intention to run for reelection in 1962.

For Senator BUSH has proved, in many ways, that he has the interests of the whole State of Connecticut at heart, and especially with respect to Connecticut's position in the national picture.

He was first named to the upper House of Congress in a special election in 1952, and was reelected for a full 6-year term in 1956. His plurality in that year, 130,894, exceeded all previous totals recorded in this State by a candidate for the U.S. Senate of either party.

During his service in the Senate, Senator BUSH has received national recognition as an authority on Government finance, and

as an effective advocate of fiscal responsibility in Government and of measures to curb the rising cost of living. Since 1953 he has been a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. For 4 years he has been a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works in the 83d and 84th Congresses, he was the author of legislation to permit closer cooperation among the New England States in dealing with flood control problems. He also played a leading part in the drafting of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which authorized construction of a national system of interstate and defense highways.

The Senator has also showed particular interest in the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal. He has assisted many Connecticut towns and cities in their urban renewal and redevelopment programs. As a result of his interest, Federal grants totaling almost $100 million have been earmarked for 25 Connecticut communities. Today Connecticut has per capita the largest renewal program of any State in the Nation.

Frankly, we are delighted that Senator BUSH has announced at this early date his candidacy for reelection; that he has not seen fit to play the coy politician. Not that we would have expected such from him. He is too much an honest man to play the coy role. We hope that he will be nominated and reelected. He has given his State and his Nation exemplary service. He is entirely deserving of reelection.

[From the Greenwich Times, Jan. 3, 1961]

BUSH ANNOUNCES

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH is a credit to the Nation, the State, and the town. He has served and is serving the people of Connecticut extremely well and we are happy that he has decided to continue his distinguished career in Washington.

Despite Senator BUSH's statement in December that he was "weighing a decision" as to whether he would seek renomination, we never had any doubts he would seek another term. His formal announcement on Friday that he will run in 1962 is good news for the Republican Party and for the people of Connecticut whom he has served so well.

There has been a great deal of speculation about 1962, especially since Gov. Abraham Ribicoff will not be a factor. Some were of the opinion Governor Ribicoff, had he not been named to a Cabinet post, would have run against Senator BUSH.

There are extreme partisans in both the Republican and Democratic Parties who would consider it heresy for a party member to admit that someone in an opposition party is good. These are narrow-minded, small people. It is interesting to note that Senator BUSH, in the course of Friday's news conference in Washington, praised the appointment by President-elect Kennedy of Governor Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He said Ribicoff's appointment "is one of the better ones. He is able, with a broad political background and experience in health, education, and welfare matters."

It is well known that Governor Ribicoff has a high regard for Senator BUSH's ability. The two men, despite political differences, highly respect each other.

Regardless of what the political experts say, no one knows at this time what will happen in 1962. The contest for the Senate seat will depend on the man selected by the Democrats. It will depend on the political atmosphere 2 years hence. It will depend on a great many factors not now apparent. What is apparent, however, is that Senator BUSH is among the best Senators that ever represented Connecticut in Washington. We are happy to see that he has removed an uncertainty about his future plans.

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 3, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH ANNOUNCES HE WILL RUN AGAIN

The announcement by Senator BUSH that he plans to seek reelection in 1962 is good news. Senator BUSH never engages in the pettier kind of publicitymaking. Instead he has been a hard-working, intelligent, and forthright Senator. History shows us, however, that this is not always enough to insure reelection. The Nation's highest legislative forum has often enough been the goal of some of the country's most energetic demagogs. Senator BUSH falls into that other category of Senator, a man dedicated to doing what he considers to be the right thing. Nor is he a rubberstamp, as some representatives in Congress become on election. While he has kept in contact with the electorate, in signal contrast to some other recent Republican officeholders, he has in the final moment made his own decisions.

In a fully matured country, with a completely thoughtful electorate we would have an end to the nonsense of voting tables compiled by the various pressure groups to indicate the degree of subservience to their advantage of each representative in Congress. And that is precisely what these tables show, subserviency rather than rightness. Senator BUSH rarely scores high on these tables, because he follows the ancient and honorable tradition of making up his own mind.

One may not always agree with Mr. BUSH. But there can never be any question as to how he arrives at his decisions, and what matters he considers important in reaching them. Paramount at all times is his belief in what he considers to be right and most advantageous for the country, not for any special group.

As an honestly avowed candidate to succeed himself, Mr. BUSH now has 2 more years in which to inform the electorate as to his record and the reasons why he should be reelected. One must be realistic and agree that his chances have been greatly enhanced now that Governor Ribicoff has withdrawn from State politics to assume a seat in the Cabinet. Mr. Ribicoff was a real threat to Mr. BUSH's reelection. Pending further developments, his withdrawal, leaves the field open to several others who are perfectly willing, but who have nothing like the pulling power of Governor Ribicoff.

Senator BUSH has been a member of the important Armed Services Committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has become recognized as an authority on Government finance. His range of interest has been wide and diversified. He is an active advocate of fiscal responsibility in Government, and at the same time has taken an especial interest in the national slum and urban renewal programs, among other things.

Senator BUSH is a broad-gaged man in every sense of the word. He has been a Senator of which this State can be proud. If we know what is good for us, we shall reelect him 2 years hence.

[From the Meriden Record, Jan. 9, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH'S CANDIDACY

The announcement by U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH that he will be a candidate for reelection in 1962 is good news for the people of Connecticut and for the Nation.

Senator BUSH has served with credit in the U.S. Senate for 8 years. He has distinguished himself by his forthrightness and his courage in support of progressive legislation. He has won the admiration and respect of colleagues of both parties. At the same time he has served his own Republican Party well by his enlightened leadership. Senator BUSH has been in the vanguard of progressive Republicanism, a position which has not always endeared him to some of the diehard elements within the party.

Regardless of whom the Democrats may nominate to oppose him—and there are some able Democrats who are eligible—the voters will do well to heed Senator BUSH's personal qualifications, his record, his experience, and the advantage to his constituents arising from his seniority in the Senate.

It is good to know that Senator BUSH will run again. The people of Connecticut are fortunate to have the opportunity to vote for such an able and diligent public servant.

[From the New Haven Register, Jan. 1, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH DECIDES TO RUN AGAIN

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH's decision to run again for the U.S. Senate in 1962 is good news for Connecticut.

The Senator has given this State effective representation in Washington for the past 10 years, and his early announcement assures Connecticut citizens of both parties that they will continue to receive vigorous, forthright, and fair spokesmanship at a time when the new Kennedy administration poses something of a challenge for all lawmakers.

It will be a long time between this weekend's announcement and the 1962 campaign. But the Senator's hat in the ring is more than a declaration of intent for Republican ticketmakers. It reminds Connecticut voters of the fact that there is now a fortunate balance in this State's Republican-Democratic representation in the Nation's Capital—and it invites them to consider a retention of Senator BUSH's basically conservative viewpoints at a time when experiment, and innovation, and heedless dollar juggling may well become the order of the day. We welcome Senator BUSH's renewed candidacy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the first that I have heard definitely that Senator BUSH is a candidate for reelection, and I join with the Senator from Arizona in congratulating the State of Connecticut upon its desire to have him serve another term.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] said the other day, "Me, too."

The distinguished record of the senior Senator from Connecticut is well known to all of us. He has conscientiously and ably served his Nation and State for many years, and I certainly hope that privilege will be accorded him, and that benefit be extended to his State and Nation for many years to come.

MEMORIALS SHOULD MAKE PEOPLE AWARE OF THE MAN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last summer I took occasion to express some thoughts on what might or might not make a worthy memorial to Theodore Roosevelt. It will be recalled that others did likewise. In the end, the Congress agreed to my suggestion that the living children of the 26th President should have a veto on any design accepted for placement on Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Within the past few weeks plans for another memorial have been unveiled for another Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Models and drawings are currently on display at the Corcoran Art Gallery downtown. I hope all Senators may see them.

Whether they do or not, however, I think all Senators will find it worth while to read the observations of George Kennedy who writes the very readable column in the Washington Evening Star under the heading "The Rambler."

I hope all memorial committees will heed the thought expressed in the Rambler's closing paragraph:

Let's insure that future generations will not go away from the memorial unaware of the man for whom it was constructed.

Whether for President or player in baseball's Hall of Fame, that is a sound and prudent guideline.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER—PONDERS ON MEMORIAL FORM

(By George Kennedy)

What form should a modern memorial to a great leader take?

That question became paramount yesterday in viewing the models and drawings entered in the contest for a design for a Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial to be erected in West Potomac Park between the Tidal Basin and the river.

The models are being exhibited by the American Institute of Architects in the Corcoran Gallery.

The show opens today with some ceremony.

But William F. Pederson, the winner of the $50,000 prize, will not be on hand. His office is in New York.

In the days of the New Deal, leaders of commerce and industry had an understandable complaint that the Washington atmosphere was not friendly to business.

Apparently Mr. Pederson feels, with much justification, that the Washington atmosphere is not friendly to modern art or architecture.

His suggested monument has been mockingly called a 20th-century Stonehenge, after the prehistoric megalithic memorials, to something everyone has forgotten that rise from Salisbury Plain.

Creative spirits are very sensitive. I am sure Mr. Pederson has been hurt by the reception accorded his design. The $50,000 prize he won is insufficient balm.

As Henry Dorra, assistant director of the Corcoran, suggested yesterday, Pederson's team—there are a landscape architect and a sculptor in on the plan—probably spent more than that working on their design.

You can realize that when you see the model and the drawings submitted.

As everyone knows by this time the suggested memorial is a number of stone hinges (that's as good a term to describe them as any) of various breadth and height. The largest ones will be over 165 feet high.

They would make an interesting addition to the Washington skyline where everything conforms to the classical except the towers of the old Smithsonian and a few steeples.

The drawing states that they are to be "incised"—I like that word—with the writings and speeches of F.D.R.

What should a modern memorial be? Lincoln sits comfortably within his colonnade. Jefferson stands nobly in his rotunda.

If bronze were used F.D.R. with his legs in painful braces could be coming down the ramp of his plane with the long cigarette holder and the famous smile that showed his indomitable spirit.

But that's out. Anything representational is not modern. None of the drawings I examined suggested a sculptured figure.

A Mr. Barnett of the Corcoran staff pointed out that several of the contestants had been shooting in the same direction as the winner. One suggested a number of masonry pylons (for want of a better word) of varying rectangular cross section and varying height.

Apparently pilgrims could enter rooms in the bases. The lettering on the drawing suggested that this memorial would provide for vocal and visual reproduction of the great events in F.D.R.'s career.

Now to this journalistic mind that suggestion makes sense.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor in New York when the great change came in the movies—sound.

Sound was immediately successful in the newsreels. There used to be little theaters that showed newsreels only.

More than 10 years ago selected newsreels were strung together into a full-length movie called "The Roosevelt Story." It was a good picture for those interested in recent history.

Let the monument take what form distinguished architects and laymen decide on. But let's not be content with the great F.D.R. phrases "incised" in stone. We have something more modern than that.

Let's make use of it to insure that future generations of schoolchildren visiting Washington will not go away from the memorial unaware of the man for whom it was constructed.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on January 11 I reported to the Senate on the hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. I reported that on that precious day the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security had been presented with proof that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had, from its inception, violated the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, and that Mr. Robert Taber, the head of the committee, had acted in collusion with the Castro government and had committed perjury when he testified before the subcommittee on May 5.

In the same statement, I replied to some of the lying charges that had been made in Harper's magazine by the British playwright, Kenneth Tynan; and I took Harper's to task for printing this mendacious and clearly libelous article without troubling to check on the facts.

I also pointed out in my statement that the real purpose of Mr. Tynan's article was not so much to defend himself as to ridicule the subcommittee's investigation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and to turn public opinion in this country and abroad against the Senate subcommittee.

Finally, I pointed out that many American editors, because they accepted Harper's as a responsible and authoritative magazine, swallowed Mr. Tynan's mendacious account and wrote columns criticizing and ridiculing the subcommittee.

I regret that some of the prominent national newspapers which featured Mr. Tynan's libelous attack on the subcommittee and, accepting it at face value, criticized the subcommittee editorially, failed to devote a single inch of space to my rebuttal. I am not so much hurt by this unequal treatment as I am baffled. Apparently the rule is that when a Senator is maligned by a fellow-traveling British playwright, it is news. But when the same Senator attempts to defend himself by proving conclusively that the fellow-traveling British playwright has lied on point after point, it is not news.

I am happy to report, however, that there were many American newspapers that dealt with the entire matter fairly and that responded with indignation when the facts about the Tynan article were made public. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks two of the several editorials that have already come to my attention—the first from the Ansonia, Conn. Sentinel of January 13, the second from the Stamford, Conn., Advocate of January 14.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, Jan. 14, 1961]

SENATOR TOM AND THE UGLY BRITISHER

Senator TOM DODD, when he was conducting a hearing for his Senate Subcommittee on Subversion, called on a British drama critic, named Kenneth Tynan, to explain his activities in connection with something called the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In the course of questioning, some of Mr. Tynan's other activities, especially a British TV program which presented such Americans as Arnold Johnson, a Smith Act Communist, Clinton Jencks, head of a union expelled from the AFL–CIO for being Communist-controlled, and Alger Hiss, were explored. Mr. Tynan was indignant. The very idea of even being questioned about his activities threw him into a tizzy. He thought the whole thing beastly.

When he returned home, he wrote an article about the episode. This article, full of typical fuzzy thinking, and some downright inaccuracy, was published in full in Harper's magazine. When Senator TOM protested, Harper's, in fairness, gave him its editorial columns for rebuttal. He used the space well.

He bearded the intellectuals in their own literary den, and came off a clear winner. By the time he had used his razor on the argumentative clothing of Mr. Tynan, this personification of Socialist thought was so cut apart that even Harper's felt it necessary to come to his aid, despite his opportunity for reply.

The editor decided he had had enough of the whole thing. He yelled uncle by falling back on an attack on the purpose of the congressional committee. This resulted in the suggestion that, in committee, the legislative branch takes on judicial and police powers which break down the boundaries between the three branches of Government. This argument had nothing to do with the Tynan affair, but we always thought that the right of a congressional committee to ask questions, so that it could draft legislation, had been adequately tested. We are sure that Senator DODD, a former prosecutor of Nazis, would never violate his constitutional restrictions.

Affairs of this sort are unfortunate. They paint a sort of ugly Britisher picture of our most important ally. But we are sure that most Americans wouldn't dream of judging all Englishmen by the antics of a drama critic who used such questionable taste while a guest on our shores. At the same time, we are pleased with our Senator. He met the liberals on their own field, with their weapons and emerged with all the honors.

[From the Ansonia Sentinel, Jan. 13, 1961]

SENATOR DODD'S STRONG CASE

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, appears to have vindicated the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee from the charges made against it by British Drama Critic Kenneth Tynan in Harper's magazine last October.

A full-page advertisement had appeared in the New York Times, sponsored by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, defending the regime of Fidel Castro. The Senate Committee, in the course of an inquiry to determine if the advertisement violated the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, invited Mr. Tynan to testify before it. It had a right to assume that, as one of the signers of the advertisement, Mr. Tynan might be in a position to enlighten the committee as to its origin and financing. Later Harper's magazine published an article by Mr. Tynan entitled "Command Performance," portraying himself as an injured innocent unjustly haled before a barbarous and ludicrous inquisition. On the strength of this article, the Senate committee was widely pilloried.

In a reply to Harper's, which that magazine limited to a letter to the editor, Senator DODD presented a rebuttal of Mr. Tynan's article protesting his interpolation of questions never asked by the committee. The Senator's original reply was refused as being too long and the one he was finally permitted to make, the following January, had to be screened by a battery of the magazine's lawyers and accompanied by an agreement to hold Harper's free from all harm if Tynan sued for libel, a precaution the Senator doubts was taken with Mr. Tynan's article.

The Senator's reply was followed by a reply by Mr. Tynan and by a comment from Harper's editor, who did not discuss the merits of the Senator's reply but pontificated that congressional investigations have done more harm than good, which as far as we can see had nothing to do with the matter at issue.

This week the Senate Internal Subcommittee heard testimony by Dr. Santos-Buch, one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that he and Robert Taber, the head of the FPCC, had met with the Cuban ambassador to the United Nations and had received $3,500 to pay for the Times advertisement, which is contrary to earlier testimony by Mr. Taber.

Senator DODD declared on the floor of the Senate that this testimony had demonstrated the need for congressional inquiry and he charged that a widespread effort had been made to turn opinion here and abroad against the Senate subcommittee, of which there can be little doubt.

It is certainly an advantage to the American people if it has been demonstrated that funds of the Castro government were used to brainwash American opinion at a crucial period of our country's relations with a regime which from its inception has shattered the longstanding friendship with the United States, and continues to picture our country and its people as the No. 1 enemy of the Cuban people, which they are not, and, what is more, has reduced Cuba to a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean and a base for the subversion of Latin America with especial animus toward the United States of America.

One wonders if there is not emerging a design to pillory Senator DODD in the same manner that others before him have been pilloried. One suspects that if this develops, American people's sense of fair play will want to know why.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there is a little footnote which I should like to add here to my report on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The subcommittee has been seeking to serve Mr. Taber with a subpena to appear before it and reply to questions in the light of the testimony given by Dr. Santos-Buch on January 10. Mr. Taber, however, has not been available for service. Indeed, he seemed to have disappeared entirely from the New York scene.

He did not make a scheduled appearance on a radio program, and his position as Secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was filled by a substitute, Mr. Richard Gibson.

Within the last several days there has been a press report that Mr. Taber is in Havana and that he has requested asylum from the Cuban Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, long ago I used to hear a song entitled "Muldoon Was a Solid Man." That is a great expression, Mr. President. A solid Member of the Senate is having a birthday anniversary today. He is FRANK CARLSON, one of our most distinguished Members, the Senator from Kansas.

He has the distinction of living in the State in which he was born. In this mobile age that is something of a distinction.

He has served in the House of Representatives, he has served as Governor of his State, and he now serves in the Senate. He exemplifies what I like to refer to as a good definition of progress. It is the constant, intelligent, undramatic application of life on what is the constant loyalty and devotion to duty, and taking life in the stride that will go to improve it. So I salute FRANK CARLSON on his birthday.

I shall not disclose his age, out of shyness and timidity, but I salute him on his birthday.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show my desire to extend happy birthday greetings to our friend FRANK CARLSON. When we served together in the House of Representatives, his district and mine were alongside of each other. I have known FRANK CARLSON for a long time. One could say many very fine things about this kind, Christian, effective statesman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to add a word in expressing birthday greetings to my colleague, FRANK CARLSON. He was a great friend of mine long before I came to the Senate. He has remained a close friend. He has done many kind things for me, and I am delighted today to express my affection for him. I hope that he and his fine family will enjoy happiness and prosperity for many, many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in what they have said about FRANK CARLSON. Like the distinguished minority leader, I served with FRANK CARLSON in the House of Representatives, and it has been my pleasure since then to serve with him in the Senate. There is nothing flashy about FRANK CARLSON. I am glad that there is not, because he is a fine, solid citizen, and a decent man. If I could describe him with one word I would say he is a gentleman. The Senate is better off because of a man like FRANK CARLSON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the fine encomiums they have put on the record about Senator CARLSON. I agree he is a gentleman. More than that, however, he is a hard worker. More than that, he is a good thinker. More than that, he is a good friend. I believe it is one of the fine things that we do on the Senate floor, especially after the brainstorms we get at times, to take time out to say kind and true things about one of our associates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to express my felicitations to Senator CARLSON on the occasion of his birthday. My own contact with him goes back about 12 years, when he was Governor of his State, and I was Governor of the State of Ohio. I had an opportunity to observe the metal out of which he is made, in my contacts with him as Senator and as Governor. I express commendations to him on his birthday. I thank him for the services which he has rendered to his country. He is a man of extraordinary stability. He has the courage to state his views. My belief is that he has subordinated himself and has elevated his country in the consideration of all the problems that have come before him.

I wish for him many more birthdays and many years of good health.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I wish to join in the remarks which have been made about our good friend, Senator CARLSON, of Kansas. I do not know of any other Senator who has been thrown closer together with him than I have been for the past 10 years. He is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. At one time he was chairman of the committee, during the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, in 1953 and 1954. Prior to that time I was chairman of the committee, and since that time I have been chairman and he has been the ranking Republican member of the committee.

He and I have been thrown close together. I know what he is made of, and what a fine character he has. He and I have worked together in the committee at all times, and I have found him to work for what he thought was in the best interests of the people of the United States.

So it gives me a great deal of pleasure to wish him well as he passes another milestone. My only wish today is that he may have many more birthday anniversaries, that he may live even longer than some of the older Senators who have served in the Senate, and that he may have health and strength in the future. That is my wish to him on his birthday anniversary today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has called our attention to the fact that this is the natal day of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I extend to the Senator from Kansas my congratulations and felicitations.

In my State we have a mountain known as Stone Mountain. We proudly

boast that it is the largest solid block of granite in the world. When we wish to pay ultimate tribute to the stability, honesty, and forthrightness of a man, we say he is as solid as Stone Mountain.

I say with respect to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that he is as solid as Stone Mountain. In the lexicon of my State, no higher tribute can be paid to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I certainly second what the Senator from Georgia has said with respect to the Senator from Kansas. I suppose, and I hope, that I might refer to Mount Rushmore in the same way as the Senator from Georgia has referred to Stone Mountain. The Senator from Kansas could be given a similar tribute in my State by referring to him as being as solid as the granite of Mount Rushmore.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that a short time ago, while I was called out of the Chamber, several Members of the Senate extended felicitations and congratulations on my birthday.

I wish to say that these birthdays are coming too often; they are getting closer together.

But I do appreciate the kind remarks which were made; and I shall read them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MULTIPLE SPONSORSHIP OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 85th and 86th Congress I carried on a one-man crusade for a modification of the rule which permits dual sponsorship of legislation. I doubt whether Senators are actually aware of the confusion and difficulty with which the Journal clerks and other employees of the Senate must cope simply because of the multiple sponsorship of proposed legislation.

My resolution will be before the Committee on Rules and Administration once more, and I hope other Senators will join me in getting the rule modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the statement made by the distinguished minority leader with respect to his resolution dealing with multiple sponsorship of bills and resolutions. I have watched this practice grow in the years since I first became a Member of the Senate. When I first came to the Senate there was no such thing as multiple sponsorship by Members of the Senate. When a Senator introduced a bill, those who believed in the purpose of the bill supported it, and those who did not believe in it, opposed it. As it is today, I have watched Senators who have introduced a bill, going around to other Senators urging them to sign their names to it as cosponsors.

It has been one of my toughest tasks since I have come to the Senate to adhere to my decision not to join in multiple sponsorship of legislation. I have been terribly embarrassed at times. In fact, my distinguished colleague from Georgia has introduced bills of which I am strongly in support, but, due to my position on the matter of multiple sponsorship I have refrained from joining him in introducing those bills in the Senate.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that multiple sponsorship adds anything to the bill itself. Nothing is added by a large number of Senators sponsoring a bill. Certainly such a practice detracts from the work of the individual Senator who has prepared the bill and who is the real inspiring force behind it.

I wish we could, not only for the sake of our hard-pressed staff, but for the sake of the Senate itself, get away from the practice of saying, "Well, now, I have 51 names on the bill; I shall introduce it."

There is not a Senator who has not been embarrassed at one time or another by multiple sponsorship, if he has engaged in it very widely, because we find things in bills that we did not know were in them.

I have seen distinguished Senators rise to the floor and say, "I signed the bill as a coauthor; but after hearing it discussed I am convinced that I cannot support it."

With the exception of bills relating to one State, where the two Senators from that State sign it, or in the case of one Senator from each party, at least, I see no occasion for multiple sponsorship of bills. I realize, though, how difficult it will be to do away with the practice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the observations of the Senator from Georgia with respect to the joint sponsorship of bills and resolutions. I entirely agree that it is a bad practice. For some time, I resisted it. However, I must confess that when I found I was being asked by many constituents and others, "Why do you not join in the sponsorship of such and such a bill? Your colleague has and Senator So-and-So has. Are you not in favor of that proposed legislation?" it led me on occasion to ask that my name be added to their bills; and also I have sought to make it possible for others who might want to do so to join with me in the sponsorship of proposed legislation by asking that bills or resolutions remain at the desk for that purpose.

However, I do not believe it is a good practice. There have been occasions when, as the Senator from Georgia has said, a Senator has had his name placed on a bill because he was in favor of the general purposes of the bill, only to learn that some particular provision of the bill was not in accord with his beliefs, or to have the bill reported by committee amended in such a way that it was hardly recognizable. Then he would be obliged to make a statement on the floor that he could not support the bill on which his own name appeared. It seems to me that that is unfortunate.

It is unfortunate from another aspect, namely, the apparent standing a bill may be given from the statement that there are 30 names on the bill, before it has had any committee hearings.

I believe it would be desirable to abolish this practice by adopting a rule which would prevent joint sponsorship except when a bill or a resolution pertaining to something for one State alone might be sponsored jointly by the two Senators from that State, or by one Senator from each party.

It might be remembered that the distinguished former Vice President, the late Senator Barkley, of Kentusky, was very outspoken in his belief and convictions against this practice, and submitted a resolution to forbid it.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for submitting his resolution and bringing the matter up. It is a matter which deserves the consideration of the Senate in the interest of the integrity of proposed legislation, and I hope the resolution will have widespread support.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not only does this particular subject involve a situation in which a number of Senators sign their names to a bill when many of them have not even read the bill; it involves pressure from out in the country. For years, I have followed the rule laid down by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Only recently it was said to me, "Oh, come on. So and so signed it." I have fallen for these requests several times, but I think the practice is a very bad one.

I can remember distinctly an occasion when the distinguished Senator from Georgia introduced a bill, and on the floor of the Senate we amended the bill. I heard the Senator from Georgia say on the floor, "Now, I shall have to vote against my own bill." That is one instance of situations which occur and which could be multiplied many times, if we are to continue the practice of multiple sponsorship of bills.

I sincerely hope we may adopt an amendment to the rules. The rule might provide, as has been suggested, that one Democrat and one Republican may sponsor a bill; or if it relates to the welfare of a State, then the two Senators from the State concerned might associate themselves in the introduction of such a bill. That would make a majority of three. I think that is more than enough. However, I think the practice of multiple sponsorship of bills is very bad. Persons have come to my office and said to me, "We want you to join in the introduction of a certain bill." I have said in the past, and I say again today, that when I get word from back home to the effect, "We want you to agree to this and agree to that," I say, "My dear sir, bills are referred to committees. I have sent bills to committees; and in committee they have been amputated and amended so that when they are reported, they are not the same bills."

Furthermore, on the floor of the Senate bills can be amended again. They then go to the House and go through the mill there. It does not make sense for us then to stand by and say, "That is my bill"; because it is not the same bill after it has been operated on. But if one's name is on the bill, and it is the same numbered bill, one gets credit for it nevertheless.

Of course, the practice continues of changing the nature of a bill in committee or on the floor of the Senate or in the House; and then the bill goes to conference.

I have had to explain many times to the people back home why I have not been willing to join as a cosponsor of bills.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to subscribe to the views expressed by several Senators who have spoken on this subject. In my opinion, no Senator ought to be subjected by a fellow Senator to the necessity of saying "No."

Whenever there is delivered to me a bill with a request that I join with a fellow Senator in its sponsorship, it requires that I give either an affirmative or a negative answer. To give an affirmative answer, I may have to subscribe to some of the provisions in the bill with which I do not agree. To give a negative answer, I must tell a fellow Senator, "No." In my opinion, I ought not to be subjected to that type of approach, requiring me to do what obviously is unpleasant.

Day after day into each Senator's office come bills. Many of them are sent there through the promotion of pressure groups. I know the bills in which I wish to join as a sponsor. I know what I believe is needed at any particular hour for the welfare of the Nation. I may be mistaken, but I believe I am just as alert to the subject as are my fellow Senators. I do not need the prompting of A, B, or C, suggesting that I join with them in the promotion of a particular bill. My fellow Senators ought to show me the courtesy of allowing me to determine whether I will join in the sponsorship of a bill, and they ought not to join in the common movement of trying to pressure me. For that reason I express the view that it would be a very healthy thing for this proposal of the Senator from Georgia to be given support by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire—if I am within the rules, and I believe I am—to make another brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). If no other Senator desires recognition in the morning hour, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to make another brief observation with respect to the question of multiple sponsorship, so that all our discussion of this subject will appear at one place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This whole procedure is in derogation of our legislative process; and if we continue to follow it, it will destroy our ordinary process of dealing with legislation. Here we have a bill signed by 60 or 70 Senators, although no committee hearings have been held on the bill, and there has been no discussion of the bill, and there has been no opportunity for any adversaries of the bill to point out any of its weaknesses.

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has said, all of us receive letters in which we are asked, "Why haven't you signed this bill," and undertaking to commit a Senator in advance to some very intricate and complicated legislative proposal which he has not had an opportunity to study.

Ordinarily a bill is introduced and is referred to a committee, and in the committee it is subjected to hearings and to amendment, and then it is brought to the floor of the Senate; and it is thought that on the floor of the Senate, Senators will debate the issues involved in the bill, and that here, in the clash of mind with mind, we finally shall make the sparks of truth scintillate, and shall be able to determine the correct course in connection with the enactment of such legislation.

But it is becoming dangerous, and threatens our whole parliamentary system, when, on the basis of letters, 65, 70, or even a greater number of Senators commit themselves in advance of any detailed examination of a bill, as is our usual custom. If this practice is continued, it may finally lead to a situation in which it will be said there is no need for the Senate to meet; we could simply permit the pressure groups to travel about the country and persuade 51 or 52 or 53 Senators to sign a bill; and then it could be said, "Why have the Senate discuss the bill? A majority of the Members of the Senate have already signed it. Why have any committee hearings on the bill, inasmuch as a majority of the Senate have already signed it."

Mr. President, I think multiple sponsorship of proposed legislation is very dangerous; and I hope we recur to the old practice of the Senate, by means of which not more than two Senators could sign proposed legislation. Then let us thresh out the measures here on the floor, where we are supposed to settle such matters, rather than have multiple sponsorship on the basis of letters written to Senators.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I firmly believe there has developed in the Senate a technique by means of which lines of communication, supposedly running back home, are used to tell people to contact and pressure Senators to join in the sponsorship of particular bills.

I repeat my statement of a moment ago; namely, I believe it is a grave affront to the intelligence of a Senator even to request him to join in the sponsorship of a bill, when there is being built up pressure of the type described by the Senator from Georgia. Furthermore, of course, as the number of sponsors increase, if there are Senators who are hesitant about the bill, that hesitancy is likely to turn into a lack of courage, and that situation is likely to result in procuring their subscription to proposed declarations of law in which such Senators do not honestly believe.

I ask my fellow Senators on this floor today not to pressure me by asking that I join in the sponsorship of their bills. I shall join in sponsoring them when I feel there is a need to do so. I repeat that I beg Senators not to ask me to join in such sponsorship of bills. I think I have sufficient alertness to know what is going on; and if I wish to become a sponsor of a bill, I shall do so on my own volition, without being badgered and beaten into submission, following pressure to join in sponsorship.

SUPPORT OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the regions of our country which has suffered from long and persistent unemployment is the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan. In recent weeks there have been additional announcements of layoffs and closings by mining firms operating in the iron ore industry in this region.

Mr. President, the people and the communities of this area are deeply disturbed about the bleak prospects facing them in the months ahead. They look hopefully to the new administration and the Congress for speedy action on the area redevelopment bill. They are appreciative of President Kennedy's first act upon taking office, in ordering a substantial increase in the surplus food distribution program. But, above all, they want an opportunity to participate in programs which will bring new employment opportunities, through industrial and recreational development to the Upper Peninsula.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in my remarks copies of resolutions, letters, and telegrams I have received from the people of northern Michigan, expressing their desire to have an opportunity to help themselves.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION BY GOGEBIC COUNTY

"Whereas Gogebic County is in dire need of economic assistance; and

"Whereas Gogebic County in the upper peninsula of Michigan has been steadily losing population, declining from 33,225 in 1920 to 24,370 in 1960, while the Nation has been growing rapidly in population; and

"Whereas followup studies of local high-school graduates over a period of 25 years reveal that upward of 60 percent of each graduating class leaves Gogebic County; and

"Whereas there has been sharp curtailment in the iron ore mining and lumber industries; and

"Whereas 30 percent of the Gogebic County budget is devoted to welfare costs; and

"Whereas the average unemployment figure in Gogebic County has averaged 14 percent during 1958, 1959, and 1960; and

"Whereas the economic trend of Gogebic County is downward and the list of direct relief recipients and persons unemployed continues to grow; and

"Whereas the basic industry of iron ore mining is importing foreign ore because of cheap labor costs and because of tax benefits given by the Federal Government and because the Federal Government has failed to recognize the need to take care of the local people as well as the foreign nations; and

"Whereas Gogebic County would be able to develop economically by development of the vast natural resources such as iron ore, copper, and timber that are located in Gogebic County; and

"Whereas a program of highway construction to further develop transportation resources into the county would help the economy greatly; and

"Whereas the availability of natural gas would assist the local economy; and

"Whereas a program of expanded vocational training for persons that have been displaced due to job demands would make available our large labor reserve for national employment or employment in service industries; and

"Whereas an expanded program of research and development of mineral resources, in wood products, and in the tourist industries would make available economic opportunities; and

"Whereas the Federal Government should divert and relocate defense industries for the national security of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of Gogebic County have paid substantial amounts in income taxes to the Federal Government without receiving any direct benefits, and further, that this money received from the citizens of Gogebic County has been used to support and develop foreign nations to the detriment of the people of Gogebic County; and

"Whereas there is a direct responsibility on the Congress of the United States to provide employment and work opportunities for the people of Gogebic County rather than the welfare programs and increased unemployment compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors, That they request the Congress of the United States to give their support to the proposals of the special labor, management, Government program study group headed by PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois, and that congressional action be taken to implement these recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved That the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors request the Congress of the United States to support the Flood-Douglas bill that deals with the problems of areas of economic unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Gogebic County Board high priority in any assistance given under distressed area legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered by William E. Carroll, Jr., to the Honorable U.S. Senators PATRICK MCNAMARA, PHILIP HART, and PAUL DOUGLAS, and that copies of this resolution be also delivered to U.S. Representatives JOHN B. BENNETT and DANIEL J. FLOOD."

I, Rudolph J. Egizi, clerk of the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors do herewith certify that the resolution, of which the above is a true copy, was unanimously adopted by said board at its meeting on the 13th day of January 1961.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said county, at the city of Bessemer, in said county, on this 13th day of January 1961.

RUDOLPH J. EGIZI,
County Clerk.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 5, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram sent to President-elect John F. Kennedy:

"DEAR SIR: May I extend my congratulations on your decision in taking immediate action on a program of Federal aid to chronic unemployment and depressed areas. Please permit me to call your personal attention to the desperate economic situation within the deep shafts iron ore producing districts of Upper Michigan. These districts were not directly mentioned in the AP news releases as were the Minnesota ranges. Our people would be gratified by your personal reassurance for full and complete consideration of Federal aid to Upper Michigan's iron producing areas under your proposed program. My best wishes for your personal success.

"Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH S. MACK,
"Michigan Democratic State Representative Elect, Gogebic-Ontonagon Districts, Ironwood, Mich."

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL, WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas due to the critical unemployment situation which faces Gogebic County in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area, but in other areas throughout the United States; and

Whereas the percentage of unemployment has risen above the 6½ percent mark which is required to determine a distressed area; and

Whereas the situation today requires the development of a program by the Federal Government which utilizes the talents of our young women graduating from high school wherein they will be prepared to act in any national emergency, such as an atomic war: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., hereby appeal to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, PATRICK MCNAMARA and PHILIP HART, to take immediate action to encourage the Federal Government to institute a specialized program to train young girls graduating from high school to be able to act in any national emergency requiring abilities including nursing, administration, etc. This type of program would help alleviate not only the unemployment situation in distressed areas, but also could be developed into a program whereby the entire United States would benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to Mr. William Carroll, Jr., which he may forward to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and to the Honorable Governor of Michigan, John Swainson.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL, WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas there are approximately 1,000 unemployed in Gogebic County, and in the city of Wakefield, Mich., there are approximately 55 unemployed and a total of approximately 275 unemployed during the week the mines do not work; and

Whereas the city of Wakefield is not in a financial position to employ the number unemployed; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area but throughout the entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas all of the efforts to alleviate this situation have met with meditative and negative results; and

Whereas a goodly number of the unemployed are veterans, and

Whereas the unemployment situation in this area needs immediate remedial action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., hereby appeals to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, the Honorable PATRICK MCNAMARA, and the Honorable PHILIP HART to take immediate action to secure Federal aid by setting up work programs to alleviate this unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and any of the other States in need of aid.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY OF IRONWOOD, GOGEBIC COUNTY, MICH.

Whereas there are approximately 1,000 unemployed in Gogebic County, and approximately 500 unemployed in the city of Ironwood, Mich.; and

Whereas the city of Ironwood is not in a financial position to employ the number unemployed; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area but throughout the entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas all of the efforts to alleviate this situation have met with meditative and negative results; and

Whereas a goodly number of the unemployed are veterans; and

Whereas the unemployment situation in this area needs immediate remedial action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Commission of the City of Ironwood hereby appeals to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, the Honorable PATRICK MCNAMARA, and the Honorable PHILIP HART to take immediate action to secure Federal aid by setting up work programs to alleviate this unhealthy, serious and distressed condition in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and any of the other States in need of aid.

LUTHER C. SWANSON,
Mayor.

ABE N. LADIN,
HERBERT J. WILLIAMS,
EUGENE B. VELIN,
RAYMOND E. MANCHESTER,
LEONARD J. ERICKSON,
JOHN LASOTA, Jr.,
Commissioners.

PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS FOR IRONWOOD, MICH., JANUARY 1961

General: This report contains in general form public works projects which could be initiated to help alleviate the unemployment which presently exists in the Ironwood area.

These projects include storm and sanitary sewers, water mains, buildings, sidewalks, street projects, and flood control. In the winter, we could put many people to work immediately on flood control and in the summer, we could put many people to work on either flood control or on sidewalk jobs without too much delay due to advance planning, etc.

Sewer projects: The city of Ironwood has a pressing need for storm sewers throughout the city. It would be desirable to have a complete storm water collection system paralleling our sanitary collection system. For the present however, we have urgent need for the completion of 16 projects for a total estimated cost of $120,500.

Sanitary sewers:

Approximately 10 isolated sanitary sewer jobs at an average cost of $3,500	$35,000
2 booster pumps at $8,000 each	16,000
1 mine waste sewer with a settling pond	32,900
Total	83,900

Say, $85,000.

Water projects: We have several substandard water mains in Ironwood which should be replaced in addition to some new lines. Fifteen projects for a total of $100,500.

Parks: We have four park projects for a total of $15,000.

Buildings: The city needs a new storage garage, a new bandshell, and two new park buildings for a total cost of $55,000.

Sidewalks: Ironwood has very few adequate sidewalks. We could start crews to work on them immediately when weather permits—say, $75,000. This amount would not repair all the poor sidewalks by any means.

Street projects: We have recently completed a study in conjunction with the Michigan State Highway Department in order to determine our municipal street needs for the next 20 years. Approximately $750,000 worth of work could be incorporated into public works project.

SUMMARY	
Storm sewers	$120,500
Sanitary sewers	85,000
Water projects	100,500
Parks	15,000
Buildings	55,000
Sidewalks	75,000
Streets	750,000
Total	1,201,000

In addition to the above figures, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has a flood control project slated for the Montreal River at Ironwood. No cost figures are available at present.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 8, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to use every possible means to include upper Michigan as an area of economic distress to be studied by the newly appointed committee headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. We need an immediate program to correct current difficulties and a long-range program to develop our resources for the future.

PETER BENSONI,
Representative, United Steelworkers of America, Ironwood, Mich.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 9, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your cooperation and support to declare Gogebic County as a distressed area. Your help will be appreciated.

JOE SOLTIS,
President, United Steel Workers of America, Local 1922.

NOVEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. JOE SOLTIS,
President, United Steel Workers of America, Local 1922, Ironwood, Mich.:

As you know President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in northern Michigan. PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs. Would appreciate your keeping me informed of any other actions we might take.

PHILIP A. HART.

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, IRON COUNTY, MICH.

Whereas Iron County has suffered the loss of a number of mining operations within the past few years; and

Whereas it is felt that numerous other mining operations in this area will be closed in the near future; and

Whereas the economy of Iron County is primarily and directly associated with said industry; and

Whereas it is the belief of many that the cessation of mining operations is directly attributable in large part from the importation of foreign ores: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the County of Iron be designated as a distress area and Federal funds be appropriated for the purpose of reestablishing the economy of said Iron County; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal action be taken for the purpose of placing quotas on the importation of foreign ores; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal funds be made available for the purpose of establishing research projects for the increase in iron ore production so as to stabilize the economy of the area; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable John B. Bennett, Representative in Congress of the 12th Congressional District of Michigan and Senators PHILIP A. HART and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA.

HELEN JOHNSON,
County Clerk.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 2849,
Crystal Falls, Mich., November 19, 1960.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We, the undersigned, being all officers of the United Steelworkers of America, District 33, AFL–CIO, Local 2849, Tobin Mine, located in Crystal Falls Township, Iron County, Mich., at the request of the local membership, wish to point out to you the following facts:

The Tobin mine in Crystal Falls, prior to October 1957, employed 180 men, who were laid off at that time for a period of 18 months. In March of 1959 this operation reopened with a smaller staff and operated until June of 1960, at which time it again ceased operation. Since that time all of these employees were put out of work and there is no evidence of a reopening.

Most of the employees are over 40 years of age and too old to be considered for work elsewhere, according to present-day requirements in the mining industry. Practically all of the employees have necessarily used up their savings during this shutdown. In 1957 the Book and Warner mines, operated by the North Range Mining Co., also closed down in this area, laying off about 200 employees. Neither of these operations have reopened.

Being a small mining community, the loss of these three mines have dealt Crystal Falls a distinct economic blow, inasmuch as there is no other industry available for the hiring of these laborers. On the basis of this, it is our opinion that Crystal Falls is a distinct depressed area, and we are asking that you, as our representative in Congress, take whatever steps are necessary to obtain Federal assistance for a work program in the Crystal Falls area in the near future.

It is also our opinion that the importation of foreign ores, with yearly increased tonnage, is a direct cause for the present economic situation, and we, therefore, feel that there should be a reasonable tonnage limit on the importation of iron ore.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROZAK,
President.
JOE T. BENDA,
Vice President.
WALTER SULASALMI,
Secretary.
ARVID J. MAKI,
Financial Secretary.
LOUIS KREMPASKY,
Treasurer.

DECEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. JOHN L. BROZAK,
President,
Mr. JOE T. BENDA,
Vice President,
Mr. WALTER SULAVALMI,
Secretary,
Mr. ARVID J. MAKI,
Financial Secretary,
Mr. LOUIS KREMPASKY,
Treasurer
Local Union No. 2849,
United Steelworkers of America,
Tobin-Columbia Mine,
Crystal Falls, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your letter describing the situation and conditions existing at the present time in Crystal Falls. As you may know, President-elect Kennedy has appointed Professor William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments in the local employment situation in Crystal Falls, and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

Sincerely.

PHILIP A. HART.

MARQUETTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL,
Marquette, Mich., January 3, 1961.

PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Marquette County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, requests that immediate action be taken to relieve the desperate situation that exists in the iron-producing counties of nothern Michigan.

Men between the ages of 40 to 65, with up to 20 years service have been laid off. The recent curtailment in Marquette County alone has affected more than 600 families.

On January 3, 1961, the largest underground mine, Mather (A) in Ishpeming, Mich., will cease operation indefinitely. There has been a reduction in every mine on the Marquette Range.

In addition the Merger of the D.S.S. & A. and Soo Line has affected approximately 130 families. The E. J. Longyear Co. has transferred their operation to Minnesota. And the Munising Woods Products have gone out of business.

Because of the long and severe winters, we urge that immediate action be taken on a public works program. Also on a more adequate surplus food distribution program.

So you can see that our situation is very serious and any effort expended in our behalf would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary,

MARQUETTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL,
Marquette, Mich., November 30, 1960.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Marquette County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, urges the establishment of a public works program for the Upper Peninsula of Michigan due to the curtailment of mining activities and also of construction during the long winter.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 8, 1960.

PETER BENSONI,
Representative,
United Steel Workers of America,
Ironwood, Mich.
JOSEPH S. MACK,
Michigan Democratic State Representative-Elect, Gogebic-Ontonagon Districts,
Ironwood, Mich.
Mr. MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary,
Marquette County Labor Council,
Marquette, Mich.:

Pleased to inform you that President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on Special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by

Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in northern Michigan. PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs. Would appreciate your keeping me informed of any other actions we might take.

PHILIP A. HART.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 2656,
Ishpeming, Mich., December 7, 1960.

Hon. PHIL HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Due to the fact, of the curtailment of work by the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., on the Marquette Range in the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan, the rank and file of Local 2656, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO of Ishpeming, Mich., at a meeting on December 4, 1960, made a motion that the recording secretary send you a letter urging immediate Federal aid to the Marquette Range.

The unemployment situation on the Marquette Range is serious at the present.

Yours truly,

REINO PELLONPAA,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. REINO PELLONPAA,
Recording Secretary, United Steelworkers of America, Local 2656, Ishpeming, Mich.

DEAR MR. PELLONPAA: As you know President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Area Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Thank you for your letter concerning the local situation on the Marquette Range. Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments there and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 4793,
Negaunee, Mich., December 20, 1960.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tracy Mine Local 4793 Negaunee, Mich., would like to go on record in asking your support in seeking some type of Federal public work for the distressed areas of the Upper Peninsula.

As of this writing one large mining concern is contemplating some type of curtailment at its operations, which may mean greater unemployment in these areas.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. JOHNSON,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 28, 1960.

Mr. GEORGE B. JOHNSON,
United Steelworkers of America, Local 4793, Negaunee, Mich.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Thank you for your letter of December 20 asking support for help in the distressed areas of the Upper Peninsula. As you may already know, the President-elect has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Both Professor Haber and the Senator are, I am sure, fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

Senator MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. Also, I am working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments in the local employment situation in Negaunee, and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

MARQUETTE, MICH.

Hon. PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may wonder why a constituent from a different State is addressing a letter to you as well as to elected officials from my own State, and I hope that this fact does not deter you from reading it before it enters file 13.

The reason that I am writing to all of you is to ask for your wholehearted support for legislation to aid depressed areas, and to include, or even start with, the economically weak areas of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and western upper Michigan. The aforementioned regions are probably the most unadvertised areas of unemployment, but nevertheless, need help desperately.

I am a former resident of Ironwood, Gogebic County, Mich., a city which lies in the Gogebic iron mining range, and I will use it as an example of the poor economic conditions that exist in these areas.

With the transition of iron mining from underground extraction to the development of low-grade taconite or pelletizing processes, the Gogebic Range has suffered heavily. The latest census pointed out a population decline of almost 3,000 in a county which formerly had about 27,000. The city of Ironwood had a population drop of 11 percent, the highest of all cities in upper Michigan. Of course, similar declines were noted in Iron and Ashland Counties of Wisconsin, and I imagine declines were posted in northern Minnesota, in the Vermilion and Cayuna mining ranges especially. Along with the decrease in population, there has been the accompanying deteriorating effects such as poor retail business, low real estate values, poor wages, reduced State aid to education, but most of all, I believe, disgust and apathy among the residents. In fact, now that legislation is pending that may help these areas, the residents probably will not even express themselves vocally or by means of composition to attain their hopes of economic self-sufficiency. This should not necessarily be construed as a negative attitude toward Federal aid to depressed areas, but rather a feeling of pessimism due to failure of promised legislation in the past. I hope, therefore, that you gentlemen will accept this letter as not only expressing the ideas of an individual, but of thousands of others who are too apathetic to write, or else too old and conservative to strive for economic improvement.

As you are all certainly aware of, an area that is economically depressed and that has lost its younger generation also loses its motivating force, and the road to economic recovery is indeed, a rough one. I, just as thousands of other young people, left my birthplace soon after graduation because of economic necessity. Many of us did not want to leave, but did rather than become members of long unemployment listings. With this condition prevailing for many years, the impetus of the cities declined rapidly, with the result that more energetic cities have received greater benefits from the State and Federal governments. Even now, the automobile manufacturing cities are starting a clamor for Federal aid because of increasing unemployment, and probably will be distress areas as their workless force numbers over 6 percent. (I believe this is the criteria for naming distress areas.) I know that other cities have been named distress areas when their work force increased to this figure, but to my knowledge, no cities in the previously mentioned areas have been cited. Actually, when the population declines as fast as it has in these areas, they probably never met the standards for the present system. I mention this because I believe that such factors as population declines, lower State aid for education, lowered tax valuation should all merit consideration. Also, the type of industry that is located in a town. For example, will not an area which has a high percentage of construction workers and a short construction season always be eligible for aid to depressed areas? I realize that some standards have to be followed, but I hope that these factors will be considered by all of you.

Of course, there is a great difference between a want and a need. There may be instances which arise if this pending legislation becomes a reality which will bear this out, so I would like to suggest several things which I consider a need, whether they would fit into proposed aid to depressed areas or not.

In the first place, I believe that a Federal survey of mining reserves should be carried out, to determine the potential of these areas. Furthermore, I suggest iron ore research in conjunction with the various mining companies to develop the cheapest methods of extracting ore, whether from underground or surface mines. I think additional funds should be provided for research to be carried out by our fine engineering school here in upper Michigan, to keep our mineral industry competitive with foreign ores.

Then, too, with all the hue and cry about the Federal Government acquiring more land under the "save our shorelines" bill, I am wondering if it would not be feasible to set aside areas in our large national forests for tourism and recreation. There are three large forests in these areas: the Ottawa, the Chequamegon, and the Superior which must have scenic attraction possibilities. And speaking of forests, I have before me a copy of a report published by the U.S. Forest Service in 1959, entitled "The Feasibility of Using Lakes States Hardwoods for Newsprint and Other Pulp and Paper Products." This is a very enlightening report of the possibilities of a hardwood newsprint plant located in these northern regions. It emphasizes the fact that mill trials are essential for more exact appraisals of the opportunities for the use of northern hardwoods in newsprint, yet as far as I know, no experimentation has been carried out or even encouraged. Our forests are showing a resurgence, and even are showing a surplus over the allowable cut, so that there would be no shortage of wood if a plant were built.

Another item which I feel that is lacking in this area is adequate aviation facilities. The Ironwood-Ashland (Wis.), area, although serviced by the Nation's leading feeder airline, has no Federal aviation communication or weather reporting agencies. The closest ones are at Duluth (120 miles), Houghton, Mich. (100 miles), and Wausau, Wis. (130 miles). The Wisconsin State Aeronautic Administration is planning a series of beacons to aid pilots flying north from the Milwaukee-Chicago area as far north as the Rhinelander-Land O'Lakes, Wis., vacation area. There will be a large increase in private flying both in winter and summer

into this area, as more emphasis is put on winter sports. When flying into this area, however, drastic changes in flying weather are often noted near the Lake Superior shoreline. To keep pilots informed of these conditions, I believe provision should be made for safeguarding the flight of both private and commercial pilots as they fly near Lake Superior. The Federal Aviation Administration is putting great emphasis on private pilots acquiring their instrument ratings—yet in this area, there are no facilities to aid the instrument pilot. I realize that the Federal Government installs aviation equipment as the demand warrants it, but I also realize from observation that aviation safeguards encourage flying. It's something like asking which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Several years ago, I was fortunate enough to hear Senator DOUGLAS speak in Marquette when he visited Northern Michigan College. I remember he spoke about his trip to the Near East, especially the oil-rich countries of Iraq and Iran. He mentioned the economic impact that the foreign oil investments had on these countries, with improved living standards for the oil workers, and a large share of England's bond market by the Shah of Iran. Yet, the lot of the desert nomad had hardly improved. I mention this because we do have parallels in our own country—not as severe, but nevertheless, many still wanting. Good examples can be found in these areas.

There are other fields which could be broached upon also, but I have probably exhausted your patience already, for I know you are busy. May I again ask for your support of this legislation for the people in these areas, for I know they need it, and will appreciate it greatly. May I also extend my wishes for a happy holiday season to you all.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. WICK.

DECEMBER 28, 1960.

Mr. DONALD E. WICK,
Marquette, Mich.

DEAR MR. WICK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your interesting and constructive letter to Senator DOUGLAS about the situation in the Gogebic Range, and giving some suggestions as to how you think the situation could be bettered. As your junior Senator, I am particularly pleased that you took the time and thought to write such a letter, and I am sure it was helpful to Senator DOUGLAS and his Depressed Areas Committee.

Perhaps you know that the President-elect appointed Prof. William Haber to represent Michigan on the committee?

Please be sure to send me any other constructive suggestions you may have on the issues we face. Certainly they are so huge and so crucial that we need all the help we can get.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

JANUARY 9, 1961.

Mr. EARL T. BESTER,
Representative, Lake Superior Region,
Distressed Area Committee,
Duluth, Minn.

DEAR SIR: A meeting was called by the undersigned with the cooperation of our chamber of commerce, and was eagerly attended by officials, industrialists, businessmen, and citizens of Watersmeet Township. The meeting was in response to the Federal Government launching a recovery program for distressed areas. We, of a seriously distressed area are quick to come to the fore, to seek such help, but not necessarily of a dole nature. In an attempt to assure ourselves, that we shall not miss an opportunity for assistance and help, the following list of a varied number of projects is recommended. Their order will not necessarily indicate their importance with us.

Resolved, That a water and sewage system be built for Watersmeet Township, especially within the village limits. Sewage now, to a great extent, now spills into our local trout streams, and it looms vividly apparent that it is only a matter of time, when the State will force us to install a sewage system, at a time when it is impossible, due to a constantly declining tax situation.

Resolved, healthwise again, That a medical and dental clinic be built to attract doctors and dentists to our village. The nearest Michigan practitioner of this nature is 30 miles away.

Resolved, That an experimental paper mill be built of a size consistent with the available water supply, to find more uses for the unlimited forest products that would and are not now utilized.

Resolved, That a youth conservation program be inaugurated here in the vast forest area, to divert their energy in a gainfully employed manner, toward the improvement of public parks, picnic areas, and other recreational projects that would attract tourists and vacationists.

Resolved, That our area be alerted to any civil defense benefits that could be directed advantageously toward our community or area.

Resolved, That some arrangement be instituted whereby at least a small percentage of the vast lakefrontage holdings owned by the U.S. Forest Service, be made available to prospective summer home purchasers, to the gain of the Forest Service coffers, the gain of the summer home purchaser, and just as important to the gain of the township taxwise, the tax situation of which township is being bled white by the lack of sufficient tax return on a great percentage of lands the Forest Service owns. The tax famine in Watersmeet is most acute.

Resolved, That some arrangement be allowed, whereby a grant, loan, or subsidy be allowed to finance and construct a skihill, either Government operated or privately operated, on what is known as tower hill, West Paulding, Mich.

Resolved, That secondary-township roads be blacktopped to alleviate the maintenance problem that gravel roads constantly present.

Resolved, That the 500 miles of forestry roads now planned in this Forest be built immediately, but to build out of Forest Service funds, and not out of funds that would be at the expense of the townships interests. None of the governmental expenditures of a Forest Service nature should be at the expense of diminishing the funds available to the township.

Resolved, That a research and training center be built and established here, to cope with at least the local forestry problems. The center should be of a nature that would have the private enterpriser in lumbering entirely in mind, and should have a staff that would have the rehabilitation and recovery of a sick and dying lumber industry completely at heart. The Forest Service already had elaborate facilities to protect their interests.

Resolved, That a strong governmental effort be made whereby the 25 percent of national forest receipts that go to local units on a per capita basis, be changed so that the receipts go to the local township units in direct proporation to the acreage that the U.S. Forest Service owns in each township of the particular national forest. Watersmeet Township's large acreage of U.S. timberlands produces the lion's share of the timber, while it collects a very small proportion of the forest funds, a very unfair situation indeed. Equally unfair as it would be for us, to expect funds from natural resources that another township has within its boundaries.

Resolved, That Federal aid be given for housing projects for low income and county aided persons, such as handicapped persons, aged persons, Indians, or any needy persons, to aid in clearing our slum areas.

Needless to say, your studies will reveal we are in a seriously depressed and distressed area, what with a vicious round of decline in population, decline in taxes, decline in employment, departure of our young population to the industry of larger cities, lack of taxes from the vast national forest here, lack of taxes from the vast commercial and tree farm forests, and in the face of all this, a rising cost of welfare due to the high proportion of elderly and retired folks as compared to the productive population.

May we solicit the faintest opportunity to be allowed to re-submit our proposal or appeal for help in which the funds for this recovery plan will be spent.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK J. BASSO,
Committeeman Gogebic Range Area, Distressed Area Committee, Watersmeet, Mich.

CITY OF WAKEFIELD, MICH.,
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
January 16, 1961.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We are enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Wakefield City Council concerning unemployment benefits.

Your serious consideration in this matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CITY OF WAKEFIELD,
MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas the number of unemployed in this area and other areas of the State of Michigan is steadily increasing; and

Whereas the number of unemployed will be increased in this area to an even greater number due to the recent layoff of approximately 500 men by the local mines; and

Whereas if this condition continues beyond the 26 weeks allotted for drawing unemployment benefits, it will overload our welfare and relief departments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., urge and request that the proper officials adopt measures to extend the period of drawing unemployment benefits beyond the present 26 weeks, and also to liberalize the program of unemployment benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our United States and State Senators and Representatives, the Governor, and also the Michigan Unemployment Commission.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, has morning business been closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric and ask that the Chair lay the nomination before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

U.S. PHILANTHROPY: 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "U.S. Philanthropy: 1960."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. PHILANTHROPY: 1960

In these days of self-criticism and unkind comments from abroad it will be heartening to see the annual rundown of American philanthropy made by the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. The association's 1960 "Giving U.S.A." will show that, in spite of the business downturn that developed last year, philanthropy went up—although at a slightly slackened pace.

According to the association's estimates philanthropy went over the $8 billion top for the first time last year—8.2 compared with 7.8 in 1959 and 7.1 in 1958. The large donations of foundations and business concerns and notable charitable bequests leave the impression that these are the most important kinds of giving. As a matter of fact they account for about one-fifth of the total. The great bulk of funds comes from individuals. The last available income tax figures showed that 58 million taxpayers claim deductions for contributions.

Over the years individual gifts have steadily increased, but somewhat behind the growth of the economy as a whole. Last year showed a gain over the year before, but at a slightly lower rate than in 1959. Gifts by corporations and firms, however, actually declined, showing the direct relation between the profits of business and their philanthropic contributions. On the other hand, foundation grants and charitable bequests went up.

The association's figures for 1960 show that, as usual, about half of the total goes into the field of religion. Giving to education is moving ahead in importance faster than the other major fields—in second place last year, with 16 percent of the total—while the relative position of welfare and health declined a little.

Over the years philanthropic giving has been growing faster than personal income and very much faster than the population, while the purchasing power of the dollar has declined. All this shows that the American people are increasingly able and willing to spend their money for the public good.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the people of the United States contribute the great bulk of the funds mentioned in the editorial. Fifty-eight million taxpayers claim deductions for contributions of $8.2 billion to philanthropic causes in this country.

Mr. President, it seems to me a new administration could start no more auspiciously than to bring this to the attention of the world. This represents the American heart, which works so munificently in an infinite multitude of causes. This is what dominates the philosophy of the American way of life.

FINANCIAL SUCCESS OF THE TVA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has long been noted for its achievements in resource development, engineering and power development. Its financial success has received far less attention.

Recently, the TVA published two documents containing the latest evidence of its financial soundness—its annual report to the President and the Congress, and a report on its sales of electric power to municipal and cooperative systems.

A news article in the New York Times of January 1, 1961, sets out the major points of the TVA's report to the President and the Congress. In an editorial entitled, "TVA: A Going Concern," the Times on December 26, 1960, praised the Authority for its achievements in the power field.

I request unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1961]

PRESIDENT AND LAWMAKERS TOLD OF PROGRESS BY TVA IN 1960

KNOXVILLE, TENN., December 31.—Development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley region this year continued to yield increasing returns, the Tennessee Valley Authority reported today in its annual report to the President and Congress.

The most widely noted development in TVA activities during 1960 fiscal year was the new bond financing program to obtain private capital for power facilities.

The report, however, pointed to steady progress, in resource development activities as well, including increased savings in shipping costs from use of the Tennessee River waterway, further industrial expansion, along the waterway, greater use of electric power, large-scale reforestation and more forest product industries, and increased assets in the recreational value of the TVA lakes.

The core of the resource development program is its multipurpose system of 31 dams on the Tennessee and tributary rivers, making possible flood control, navigation on a 650-mile-long waterway, and hydroelectric power. The operation also provides bonus benefits to recreation and municipal-industrial water supplies.

Congressional action authorized TVA for the first time to obtain private capital through the sale of up to $750 million of power bonds. The financing program is designed to provide a new source of non-Government funds for expansion of power facilities needed to meet rapid increases in electric power use in the seven-State TVA region.

The first bond issue, totaling $50 million was sold in New York on November 15.

The power system's net income of $51 million for the year, and total net power proceeds—funds available for TVA's debt service and repayment of Federal appropriations—were $100 million, the report said.

"As a result of this issue of retained earnings, the stockholders of the system—the citizens represented by the Federal Government—owned power assets of nearly $1,800 million, compared with an investment of only $1,200 million of Treasury funds," the authority added.

TVA also is gradually repaying $1 billion of the net appropriation invested in the power system and will pay an estimated $1 billion more in dividends to the Treasury during this repayment period.

"The power system generated more than 63,400 million kilowatt-hours in 1960, an increase of 2,400 million kilowatt-hours from the year before. Improved hydro conditions made it possible to obtain this increased generation from the hydroelectric plants. They produced nearly 17,500 million kilowatt-hours compared with less than 15 billion the year before. Generation at the steam-electric plants remained about the same as the year before, just under 46 billion kilowatt-hours, the report said."

Steamplants consumed about 18,600,000 tons of coal, which cost $82,600,000.

TVA entered into a number of long-term coal contracts to assure steady fuel supplies. The largest was for 65 million tons of coal to be delivered to the new Paradise steamplant in Kentucky over 17 years. The base price for the coal is only $2.95 a ton delivered to the plant. Because of the long term of the contract, the contractor, Peabody Coal Co., will use strip-mining equipment of unprecedented size. "Since the coal will be mined within a 5-mile radius of the plant, the novel arrangements between TVA and Peabody will practically eliminate coal transportation as an element of cost at the Paradise plant," TVA said.

TVA and municipal cooperative distributors paid about $16,300,000 in State and local taxes and tax equivalents in 1960. This was an increase of $1,600,000 above 1959.

Major construction during the year included completion of 425,000 kilowatts of generating capacity for the power system and initial operation of the new main lock at Wilson Dam in Alabama. At the end of the year about 3 million kilowatts of capacity, including several large new starts, was under construction and scheduled for completion in the fall of 1963.

Installed capacity of the generating system, including Aluminum Co. of America dams in the Tennessee Valley and Army Engineer projects in the Cumberland Basin, was 11,373,460 kilowatts at the end of the year. TVA is planning a new plant in the eastern part of its system, the first generating unit of which will have a record breaking capacity of 800,000 kilowatts.

[From the New York Times]

TVA: A GOING CONCERN

Tennessee Valley Authority's power business in the Tennessee Valley continues to prosper. Its October report showed that it was paying off its indebtedness to the Federal Government, as required by law; was preparing to issue bonds in the open market, as now permitted by law, for new construction; was selling nearly half its power to Federal agencies; was getting about two-thirds of its energy from fuel and only about one-third from running water, and in an engineering sense as well as a financial sense was a going concern.

The Authority has now issued a follow-up report on its sales to about 150 municipal

and cooperative electric systems. Sales for the fiscal year 1960 were 13 percent, measured in kilowatt-hours, above the previous year; for the first time the rates charged for residential consumers dropped below 1 cent a kilowatt-hour; homeowners were using about two and a half times the national average, and all in all the outlook was cheerful.

TVA and its wholesale customers pay taxes or sums in lieu of taxes. Admittedly these may not always precisely equal the taxes a private corporation might pay on similar properties. Admittedly, also, it took Federal credit to get TVA's power program started. But it simply isn't true, as is sometimes alleged or implied, that the TVA power system is a parasite on the American taxpayer. It has been, and is, a good investment for the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. SIDNEY GORDON GILBREATH

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, few men of my acquaintance have left such an indelible influence on the advance of education in Tennessee as Dr. Sidney Gordon Gilbreath. When he passed away at his home near Johnson City, Tenn., on January 6, my State lost a true patriarch and I lost an excellent counselor.

Dr. Gilbreath's life spanned 91 years and was in every sense a full one. Born in my native Madisonville, Tenn., where he was a classmate of my late father, he began his service to education at the age of 19, when he became a public school teacher. At 21, he was superintendent of Monroe County Schools. At 26, he became Tennessee State Superintendent of Schools—the youngest man ever to hold that office.

Thereafter, Dr. Gilbreath served successively as president of Hiwassee College at Madisonville, which his grandfather had founded; as a professor of education at Peabody College in Nashville; as superintendent of schools at Chattanooga; and then, for 15 years, as the first president of East Tennessee State College at Johnson City. He also served as president of the Public School Officers Association and of the Tennessee State Teachers Association.

As is characteristic of men of great intellect, he had a broad range of interests, deeply held. On his 21st birthday, he had been admitted to the Tennessee bar and was recognized as an authority on school law. He helped to write the law creating Tennessee's State normal school system. In later years, he wrote a newspaper column signed simply, "SGG."

Dr. Gilbreath retired from his last full-time position, as Southern manager for a textbook firm, in 1942. But despite advancing age, his mind retained its brilliance, his interest in current events remained unflagging; so that those who sought his counsel and guidance were ever rewarded.

This was truly a remarkable man, and Tennesseans will long mourn his passing.

THE PRESTIGE OF NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in recent months the prestige of nations, particularly our own, has been a matter of unusual concern. We wonder whether our prestige in the world is as high today as it has been in the past, and what direction it will take in the future.

Before we can know how true prestige may be achieved, we must know in what it consists. Drawing upon her broad historical perspective and keen insight into current events, the noted British economist and author, Barbara Ward, has written a provocative article which undertakes to identify the elements of national prestige and, in the process, presents a number of challenges for the entire free world.

This article appeared in the New York Times magazine of January 1, 1961. I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Jan. 1, 1961]

THE HIGHEST RESOLVE—TRUE PRESTIGE

(By Barbara Ward)

As the new year opens, one issue, made clear by last year's storms and dissensions, is paramount. Nations are obsessed as never before with "prestige." They are not only concerned about what they do; they are immensely preoccupied with the impact on other states of what they do.

France is anxiously pursuing policies aimed at recapturing the sense of power and la gloire. Britain, with equal anxiety, debates whether closer association with Europe would undermine its Commonwealth ties and, with them, any claim to separate great power status. And the leading neutral states try to make good their claim to independent influence and standing in the world's councils.

This concern for status is not confined to nations on the precarious verges of power. The two most powerful states in the world seem at times positively obsessed with the impact they are making on other governments. Why else should Mr. Khrushchev spend a month in New York clowning, roaring, beating the rostrum, waving actual shoes and symbolic rockets, belaboring his opponents, embracing his friends, if he did not think other nations worth impressing? Stalin did not given a brass kopeck for the views of others. Khrushchev cannot leave them alone.

Nor is the United States immune. In the presidential elections, America's standing in the world was one of the major campaign issues. Certainly there seemed to be no other question over which the candidates were more utterly at variance—one contending that American prestige had never stood so high, the other that it had never fallen so low.

What are we to make of this obsessive issue of prestige? Is it, should it be, a genuine matter for national concern? Should it be a serious aim of national policy? These are far-reaching and insistent questions.

The word "prestige" itself gives us a hint of the importance of these questions and indicates that the answers may not be so straightforward as they seem. In old French, the word simply meant a conjuring trick, and from there moved on to convey first illusion, then glamour, and at last ascendancy over other men's minds. In old English practice, a prestidigitator was a conjurer, and the adjective "prestigious" conveyed the meaning of juggling or deceitfulness. And both go back to the old Latin root, praestigium, which, without any equivocation, simply meant delusion.

Thus, if we are to be guided by the ancient wisdom of our language, we may well conclude that the contemporary rage for prestige, for ascendancy, for good standing in other eyes, is rooted in some of the least reputable attributes of our age—the tricks of propaganda, the modern hucksters' make-believe world of supposed values and suggested virtues, all the restless uncertainty and hypersensitiveness of a fiercely competitive world.

Nor is the meaning now given to the word always more reassuring. Most of the current meanings, examined closely, have an element of ambiguity about them; and perhaps the most ambiguous of all is the one on which most states would nevertheless agree—that prestige depends almost solely on power.

Until our world carries through its most needed political revolution and achieves a properly policed and institutionalized rule of law, political relationships clearly remain power relationships. However, the brutal weight of atomic weapons, the scale of economic and technical progress needed in their production—and the overwhelming fear of ever having to use them at all—have made sheer military power a most uncertain element in the prestige of all save the giant states.

Even for countries of the size and stature of Britain and France, the straining and stretching to produce atomic weapons largely at the expense of other aspects of defense have added not one jot either to their security or to their status. They depend, after as before, upon the strength and vigilance of the United States and the integrity of the NATO alliance.

Further down the scale, similar pretensions to power become merely ludicrous. A small nation ordering itself a jet air force and bankrupting itself in the process gains neither power nor prestige. Even a conventional military establishment which empties the state's coffers only gives the illusion of grandeur. On all such "prestigious" efforts, the last word was said by Aesop in his fable of the bullfrog blowing itself out to the size of an ox and exploding in the process.

With the atomic titans, power and prestige are clearly inseparable. There can be no retreat from power for them save toward agreed, controlled disarmament. Meanwhile, nothing short of a genuine and obvious parity of power in all aspects of defense can give America and hence the West any real security, let alone prestige.

It is not simply that Russia, unchecked by America's counterstrength, might fall into that state of "dizziness through success" to which Stalin thought his people all too prone. It is that any marked American inferiority would stir up other governments to question their own survival and set in motion that process of doubts and wobbling politics that produced the Quislings and the Lavals of prewar Europe.

If the more ruthless powers also appear more formidable, many states will find it convenient to be "neutral on their side." There have been traces of this mood in recent years, during which America has appeared all too often to be more concerned with balanced budgets than with balanced strength; and the warning cries of "national bankruptcy," coming from the capital of a nation commanding at least Russia's gross national product, have been interpreted as a failure of nerve.

Since the means of strength—skilled manpower, industrial potential, vast resources—are so clearly and obviously available in America, it is an easy conclusion to argue that what is missing is the will—a conclusion even more damaging to prestige than any supposed lack of power.

But if power alone exhausted the content of prestige, there would be some strange redrafting to be done in the human record. Few nations have held such undisputed military mastery as the Assyrians or the Mongols, yet few have left so prestigeless a reputation behind. More recently, the Nazis were

engaged, during the widest extension of their military might, in exterminating 6 million Jews. There is no doubt which of these activities will determine their standing in history.

And today, in spite of the terror of atomic destruction, physical force is probably not the main determinant of prestige. Horrific power exists, but it is held in check by the very nature of its horror. It follows that the battle for influence over the interests and loyalties of other states is only partly played out in terms of force. The fight is also a struggle for understanding and conviction waged on the ultimate battlefield of men's minds—and here physical power is only one influence among many.

Even the usual definitions of prestige recognize this fact. The idea of prestige is closely bound up with that of leadership, of being respected and followed by other states because of achievement. Clearly, this route is open to great states and small alike. Pitt the Younger spoke for all of them when he proclaimed, during the Napoleonic wars, that Britain would save itself by its exertions and Europe by its example. And history is witness again and again that size and prestige have no fixed correlation. Indeed, its first lesson is that true prestige has always been the product not so much of genuine power as of genuine excellence.

In its golden age, Athens was a city a good deal smaller than Columbus, Ohio. But what other city in the human record has produced in a few decades philosophers to equal Socrates and Plato, dramatists of the powers of Sophocles and Euripides, sculptors to equal Praxiteles, statesmen of Pericles' stature?

This community of scholars and artists, this little world of scientists exploring for the first time the great symmetries of geometry and music, this society of citizens experimenting and innovating in all the arts of free government was in its own day the education of Hellas, and has remained ever since the education of the West.

Wherever a comparable outburst of native genius has occurred—in Renaissance Italy, in France's Grand Siècle, and, for the civic and industrialists' arts, in Victorian England—there has been no need to ponder about prestige or seek out its sources. The communities were quite simply preeminent and mankind beat a path to their door.

To excellence one should add innovation. There are times in history when the gramophone needle of human effort seems stuck fast in the record. Round and round the nations go, sticking in the same dilemma, breaking off in defeat at the same irremediable crack. The stuck needle of autocracy, the stuck needle of subsistence agriculture, the closed doors of science and technology, the barriers to communication have bound man for millennia to the cycle of birth and death and sowing and harvest and victory and defeat.

Given the long dominance of this melancholy wheel, it is not surprising that the great moments of prestige in history have been, again and again, moments of innovation. The Greeks broke through one barrier when for the first time they practiced citizenship under a government of laws—not men. The England Voltaire admired had evolved the practice of limited and constitutional government on a national scale. The American Revolution undermined the fundamental assumptions of empire and established free federation on a continental scale.

Britain's 19th-century prestige was securely rooted in pioneering every aspect of industry and science; and, as the London Times sadly concluded, when pondering the condition of England, at Queen Victoria's death in 1901: "Others have learnt our lessons and bettered our instructions while we have been too easily content to rely on methods which were effective a generation or two ago."

In short, innovation had passed to others and with it went prestige.

While excellence and innovation are the bases of true leadership and influence, they are open to quite as much misinterpretation as the link between prestige and power. Small states misunderstand the nature of creative innovation and innovate themselves into steel mills for which they have no materials and heavy industry for which they lack all the skills.

New states believe that their excellence will be judged by the size and luxury of their embassies abroad. Modernizing states see that science is the high road to modernity, and build scientific institutes for which they lack scientists and funds.

In short, the element of keeping up with the Joneses in the international world creates false judgments of value, mistaken estimates of influence, posturing, and playing for effect.

Even the greatest powers are not immune to similar errors. In the postwar world Russia has had at least two solid grounds for true prestige.

One is the speed of its postwar economic reconstruction and the distance it has traversed in 40 years, bringing a community of peasants from the wooden plow to the atomic pile in little more than one generation. Wherever nations are poor and backward and long for the prestige of modernity, Russia's forced-draft methods of growth make their impact, especially where backed by sizable offers of economic aid.

The other achievement has impressed all nations, developed and underdeveloped alike. Nothing has given Russia so powerful a boost in world prestige as its performance in outer space—its pioneering rockets, the intricate mastery of its moon probes. Not only were they portents of power and remarkable in themselves; they were external evidence of a real if one-sided pursuit of excellence in Russia which has made education the prime interest and activity of the state.

It was this revelation of a whole community dedicated to the tough disciplines of study that stirred—rightly—an awed awareness among Americans that in some crucial fields they might have dropped behind.

And it is not altogether a comfort to reflect that in promising his people American living standards within a decade, Khrushchev has made his bow to an opposite achievement in the United States.

It is true that an almost unconscious acceptance of American standards of informality and liveliness and dress has spread all through the youthful world, so that the young Marxist in Warsaw may still want above everything to buy a T-shirt and students in Asia sit down to talk politics and break off for jazz.

But the true hierarchy of excellence cannot be inverted. A nation dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge will gain a prestige that the pursuit of pleasure cannot give. As the Report to the President on National Goals expressed it: "In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences * * *"—and none of these springs from uneducated, uncultured, and indifferent minds.

Yet, in spite of Russia's undeniable achievements in education and economic growth, these do not seem to be the Communists' chosen determinants of prestige. The present profoundly bitter and envenomed dispute between Moscow and Peiping for leadership in interpreting Communist ideology suggests that Russia sets far more store by its claim to lead the Communist bloc.

To plot the laws of the future, to lay down the objective fatalities of history, to outstrip America, to see capitalism wither, to lead a whole universe into the Communist camp—these are Moscow's most prized claims that give least ground for true influence and respect.

The Communist system, in genuinely objective fact, is of such uncertain popular strength that not one Communist government dares test its backing freely at the polls. This is the practical, contemporary failure. But the historical failure goes deeper still. Precisely at the point—in politics and interstate relations—where the Communists claim to innnovate most bravely, they have plunged back to mankind's oldest, rawest, most discredited governmental forms: to imperialism abroad, to crude autocracy at home.

But before the Western Powers congratulate themselves on avoiding comparable confusions, it is well to remember that they, too, are likely to make their mistakes chiefly over the points which seem to them self-evident.

One of the main prestige themes of Western life in recent years has been the abundance and wealth produced by the free-market economy. Elections have been fought on the theme: "You never had it so good." The German "miracle" is recounted and extolled. Nations are lectured on the merits of free enterprise with an ideological zeal that almost recalls Moscow's.

But what is the reality? Certainly the Western Powers can take pride in a system that works so much more effectively than it did, say, in the twenties and thirties. But they need to recognize the fundamental difference between now and then. It is that so many more people now enjoy the benefits of the economy, there is a new kind of affluence in which all, or nearly all, have a real share.

In other words, prosperity becomes a matter of prestige when it is widely diffused and can claim to have its roots not only in enterprise but in justice as well. There is, after all, no excellence in selfishness, no innovation in unshared wealth. Both are as old as history—or as autocratic government itself.

These conditions set the limits to the system's attraction and prestige. American private enterprise has little appeal to the Latin-American masses, for they have no sense of sharing in its gains. The German miracle is no longer so attractive since West Germany's overvalued currency and unshared reserves are beginning to stem the affluence of everyone else. And all the Atlantic nations are seeing their influence in the world increasingly shadowed by the fact that they are growing richer while others tend to grow poorer.

In these conditions, to expect prosperity alone to confer prestige is as gross an error as for Russia to think that dictatorship, however camouflaged, can attract people who have known what it is to be free.

The very weaknesses in Western prestige suggest how it may be genuinely achieved in the future. The basic elements are sure—power, excellence, creative innovation, the trinity of genuine leadership in the world. But they must be embodied in strong convictions and working policies.

Balanced power until controlled, policed disarmament is achieved; a new value set on excellence of every sort—above all, on this fundamental excellence of education; bold innovation where it is most clearly called for—in international association between states and continents, in economic cooperation to close the widening gap between rich and poor; these are the broad determinants of true prestige in our days.

If the Western Powers go forward boldly enough in pursuit of such policies, they will soon discover the great paradox of prestige—that those who think most about it enjoy it least, and those who put the obsession aside,

and concentrate on vision and action instead, find it most plentiful. Once, during the Marshall plan, America and its allies were thus engaged on a great enterprise that transcended national interest and self-absorption. At no time, before or since, has their prestige stood so high.

After all, the wisdom of our language does not entirely mislead us. Too great a preoccupation with prestige can lead to the pursuit of illusion and the cult of deceit. The healthy man does not worry about his health, the confident state about its reputation. And the Western Powers will be less concerned about their standing among the nations when, once again, they are actively engaged upon great projects and farsighted policies that, with achievement, will earn their own prestige.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 22 the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic was celebrated.

Today several Senators have spoken of the Ukraine and have spoken about the significance of the observance. I contemplate talking on this subject in a measure on account of the Ukrainian people, but primarily because I believe the plight in which the Ukrainians find themselves is symbolic of the plight occupied by many people now under the yoke and the imperialistic domination of Red Russia.

Very little may be understood about the significance of Ukrainians generally; however, they have a history which ought to be known and when it is known, in my opinion, will be respected.

The Ukraine is larger than France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy or Spain. It has an area of about 215,000 square miles, approximately five times the area of the State of Ohio.

The Ukraine has a population of over 40 million people. From that standpoint it ranks respectively with France, Italy, and England. It is the most densely populated state within the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics.

Tragically, over 5 million of its approximately 40 million people are in the Soviet Far East and central Asia, many of them being in the concentration and labor camps proliferated by Red Russia for occupancy by those human beings who have the courage to speak up and who wish to occupy the position of dignified entities upon this earth.

The Ukraine is known as the breadbasket of Communist Russia. Its fields are fertile. Its people are versed in agriculture, within the limits of the opportunities that have been provided for them. They are capable of sustaining themselves. The Ukrainians have a culture that goes back 1,500 years. They are a religious people, hard working, respecting their families and womanhood. They yearn for learning, and have taken great advantage of their limited opportunities. They are a fighting people, especially when the cause is the liberty of human beings. These Ukrainian people—40 million in number, 5 million in concentration camps, the slaves of tyrannical communism—are waiting the day of liberation. They know it is to come. When it will arrive they do not know.

Let us take a look at the highlights of these people.

First, they have a separate and distinct Slavic language. Its base is Slavic, but it is distinctive. It had its first independent and free state known as the Ukrainian Kievan beginning in the 9th and going to the 14th century. It embraced Christianity more than a thousand years ago. It lost its independence in the 15th century, but reestablished it in the year 1648, and enjoyed it as a distinct, honorable people until 1783 when it was again lost.

In 1918 these Slavic people, known as the Ukraines, not subscribing to the Marxist and Engel doctrine, but wanting to be liberated from the domination of the czarist Russia, joined in the revolution of that year, and they contributed in great measure to the overthrow of the czarist regime. That was January 22, 1918. For a period of 2 years 40 million Ukraines believed that they had regained the independence and freedom which had been theirs for several centuries. But instead of that independence abiding with them, in 1920 the Communist armies overran the soil of the Ukrainians and began their communization, which has continued until this day and happily, I say, without success. Between 1920 and 1922 the Ukrainian people were controlled and dominated by imperialist Moscow in the guise of an independent Ukrainia, and in my opinion that label of them as an independent Ukrainia is significant, but shockingly false.

In 1923 Red Russia forced independent Ukraine into the fictitious federation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and since that time the Ukraine has remained in bondage under the exploitation of Red Russia. If one should speak with Khrushchev today or with his Ambassador at the United Nations, he would be told that the Ukraine is an independent nation, living within the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics. That, however, is not the truth.

Ukranians are a servient people, worthy of being independent, but suffering the burden of the tyranny of Red Russia, and being exploited by the Communists not only with respect to their farms and factories and homes, but also their blood and lives.

What are some of the facts belying the claim that Khrushchev, Stalin, and Red Russia contemplated independence for the Ukraine? In 1930 there were the famous Kharkov trials. The intelligentsia of the Ukrainian people, their philosophers, their poets, and their political leaders—and they are humble but decent people—were speaking of an independent Ukraine. In the Kharkov trials the judges were witnesses and prosecutors, and the patriotic leaders were liquidated. In the 1930's there was again a resurgence of leaders hoping for the achievement of a free Ukraine, but the persecution again began. After numerous executions there followed a series of suicides.

Rather than bear the heel of the Communist tyrant, many of the leaders preferred death, and found comfort and solace in death through their own hands.

We then come to the Moscow-made famine in 1932 and 1933. Genocide has been mentioned. The greatest expert in genocide is Khrushchev. By design and plan, about 5 million patriotic Ukrainian people were put to death by keeping them from obtaining food.

Then we come to 1937. In the town of Vinnitsia, where there was a desire for freedom, leaders were speaking not to the satisfaction of the Communists, bringing to the Ukrainian people what is known as the massacre of the Ukrainians at Vinnitsia.

We then come to the yearly purges and deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, beginning in the early 1930's and continuing into the 1940's, and even until today. It is not known, but it is believed that the Ukrainians constitute the largest population of any of the subjugated people now slaves in the labor and concentration camps of Moscow.

We now come to 1945. I have previously said that the Ukrainians are a God-fearing people. Their Ukrainian Catholic Church in 1945 practically suffered destruction at the hands of Red Russia.

Ukrainian political prisoners in 1953 and thereafter led uprisings in Vorkuta and Karaganda concentration camps.

I should pause for a moment on that point. This is a Ukrainian speaking:

> I live in a concentration and slave labor camp. I am a human being. I want to think and I want to speak. I want to be free. I have never done a wrong, except to think and to seek for freedom. Yet here I am within these bleak walls in the snow and windblasted plains of Siberia. I have suffered pain. The prospects are that I will not be liberated out of this camp, but I shall rise and I shall fight.

That is what they did in the face of guns and might, to go to their death.

Ukrainians have demonstrated through the last 43 years their desire to be free. However, that opportunity has not been provided for them.

In September of last year Khrushchev came to the United States and attended the United Nations Assembly. He spoke there at great length. He demeaned himself in a manner which made many of our people wonder what stability there was in his thinking. But in one of his talks he began to speak about the freedom and independence of people. He spoke about the exploitation the imperial powers are practicing upon allegedly enslaved people, and he condemned the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other countries, alleging that we are imperialistic nations.

I wish to put into the RECORD today a narration of the conduct of Red Russia. It begins back in 1920, at the time Red Russia first took control of the Ukraine. The Ukraine became independent on January 22, 1918. It was officially recognized as an independent nation by many governments. By the end of 1920 independent Ukraine no longer existed. It was conquered, overrun by Red Russia.

Byelorussia, also within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, proclaimed its independence on March 25, 1918. It was conquered by Communist Russia in 1920. It no longer lives as an independent nation, but has become a servient people, the slaves of tyrannical communism.

Georgia established its independence on May 26, 1918. It was subjugated by Moscow in 1920. It no longer is an independent nation.

Armenia established its independence on May 30, 1918. It was overcome in 1920. It has now as the headstone, as I call it, Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Azerbaijan, which proclaimed its independence on May 29, 1918, lost its independence to Moscow in 1920.

Cossackia, which proclaimed its independence on May 5, 1918, was conquered and subjugated in 1920.

Estonia, which proclaimed its independence on February 24, 1918, was occupied by Communist Russia in June of 1940.

Latvia, born on November 18, 1918, was slain by Communist Russia in June 1940.

Lithuania, born to freedom and independence on February 16, 1918, was molded and subjugated by Communist Russia in June 1940.

All of these countries were independent republics. They wanted to live as free republics, but the Red greed, and desire to rule the world, brought those ambitions to an end. Each one of these nations today is a colony of Communist Russia, ruled with an iron hand, subjected to slavery, russification, and colonial exploitation.

Communist Russia has another brand of colonies. They are the so-called satellites of middle and eastern Europe. They are so enmeshed in Communist Russia's military, political, and economic machinations that they cannot act with any semblance of freedom and independence.

I would put into this category the whole list of captive nations. I do not know whether I can identify all of them, but I would begin with Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. I would include Yugoslavia and Poland. The great masses of people in those nations want to be free, but they are not given that privilege by this imperial Red dragon.

Mr. President, I desire to quote what was said by a number of leading statesmen in the United Nations Assembly after Khrushchev had labeled France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and the United States as imperial powers, exploiting the people. Before doing so, I point out that the United States has provided $75 billion of aid to help the people in underdeveloped economies and to aid in the resurrection of nations which were destroyed in the war.

After Khrushchev got through beating the desk with his shoes, and after not one of our representatives at the United Nations spoke up, the representatives of several small nations rose to their feet for violent protest. I wish to quote what was said by Australian Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies:

> I venture to say that it is an act of complete hypocrisy for a Communist leader to denounce colonialism as if it were an evil characteristic of the Western Powers, when the facts are that the greatest colonial power now existing in the world is the Soviet Union itself.

Later, Francisco A. Delgado, chief of the Philippine mission, rose to his feet to give expression to his thoughts. It was while Delgado was speaking that Khrushchev, with his shoe, pounded the desk, causing a disturbance, to the end that Delgado would not be heard.

Delgado, speaking of the United States, said:

> They helped us to establish a public school system so that, by the end of the American regime, the Philippines had one of the highest literacy rates of any country in Asia. * * * They constructed hospitals and stamped out epidemic diseases. They built roads and bridges and developed agriculture and industry. They permitted our people the full enjoyment of civil liberties. They developed and strengthened our democratic institutions.

That was a quite significant statement made by the representative of the Philippines, especially when we recognize the type of justice which is administered in the Communist nation of Soviet Russia and its colonial servants around the world.

Further, in rebutting the attacks of the representatives of the so-called people's democracies to the United Nations, Ambassador Tingfu F. Tsiang, representative of the Republic of China, emphasized the traditional sympathy of the Chinese people for the Eastern European peoples, and asserted that none of the representatives of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Ukraine, and Byelorussia is free to speak his mind; all are captive prisoners and mouthpieces of the Kremlin.

These satellite nations are supposed to be independent, but they cannot speak their minds. They are the puppets of Soviet Russia. Not a single one of them is in a position to act as an independent nation.

Finally, I come to the words of the Prime Minister of Canada, John J. Diefenbaker. I think there is material within his statement which we ought to remember, as we proceed in the Senate in our debates and actions this year. Mr. Diefenbaker stated:

> Since the last war, 17 colonial areas and territories, comprising more than 40 million people, have been brought to complete freedom by France.

I emphasize that: 17 colonial areas and territories of France have been given freedom since the last war. I continue to quote Mr. Diefenbaker:

> In the same period, some 14 colonies and territories, comprising half a billion people, have achieved complete freedom within the Commonwealth.

Seventeen colonies have been given their freedom by France; 14 by Great Britain; making 31 in all.

> Taken together, some 600 million people in more than 30 countries, most of them now represented in this Assembly, have attained their freedom with the approval, encouragement, and guidance of the United Kingdom and France.

And, I may add, with the encouragement of the United States. Mr. Diefenbaker continued:

> These facts of history invite comparison with the record of the Soviet domination over peoples and territories, sometimes gained in the name of liberation, but always accompanied by the loss of personal and political freedom.

I have identified those countries. The enslavement began in 1918 and is continuing down to this very day. Mr. Diefenbaker continued:

> The General Assembly is still concerned with the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. How are we to reconcile that tragedy with Mr. Khrushchev's confident assertion of a few days ago in the Assembly?

Mr. Diefenbaker then quoted Mr. Khrushchev as saying:

> It will always be the Soviet * * * stand that countries should establish systems * * * of their own free will and choosing.

Mr. Diefenbaker then asked:

> What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples * * *?

I venture to say that on the floor of the Senate there will be Senators who will be condemning the United Kingdom, France, and Belgium as wanting to continue their colonial policies.

I ask Senators to remember that since 1945, 31 nations have been set free after they made their choice as to whether they wished to live within the Commonwealth of the United Kingdom or wished to be completely free. There has been a purpose on the part of our country and our allies to allow peoples to determine for themselves what type of government they want. But that cannot be said about the Soviet. It has enslaved millions of people. It has deprived them of their liberties, has drunk of their blood, has stolen their property, and has made abject slaves of them. Yet the leader of that great power has the audacity constantly to label these Western freedom-loving nations as "imperialistic, colonial powers." The truth, Mr. President, is quite to the contrary. The exploitation and the use of these peoples to their own disadvantage have been practiced by Khrushchev, not by anyone else.

Mr. President, I would say to the Ukrainian people that the day is unrelentingly advancing when the Ukrainian poets and writers will have a chance to speak out and write in the Ukrainian language; the Ukrainian scientists will be able to act; Ukrainians interested in political life will be able to speak as free people; the Ukrainian clergy will be able to lead the Ukrainian people in the worship of God in accordance with their consciences. And the many million people of the Ukraine will, one day, bring their charges and accusations before the final Tribunal. Those charges will be about the shedding of innocent blood, the tortures and the suffering imposed upon the Ukrainian people, and the carrying of those enslaved people into concentration camps.

The Communists' wave of terror has created new mass graves; it has created endless trains winding toward Siberia, carrying thousands of the Ukrainian people and thousands of the people of other of the subjugated nations. By every rule of justice and every law of nature, these conditions cry out for redress; the Ukrainian people will have their day.

I call upon my fellow citizens in Ohio to ponder on the creation of the independent Ukrainian Republic 43 years ago yesterday, its brutal extinction by the Communists; and to envision the resurrection of the Ukrainians as a free people. They are our friends, and believe in freedom; they are worthy of our sympathy and our help.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR COTTON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial appearing in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, congratulating my able colleague, Senator COTTON, for his sponsorship of Senate bill 293.

I am much pleased to note this public recognition of Senator COTTON's efforts to provide a reasonable program of aid to education.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial, entitled "Congratulations to Senator COTTON," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Jan. 13, 1961]

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR COTTON

Senator NORRIS COTTON has certainly proposed a mighty sensible idea when he suggests that the Federal Government remit to the States 2 cents out of the 8 cents they collect on each package of cigarettes sold in the United States. Under COTTON's plan the many millions of dollars that this represents would be used by the States for aid to education.

What makes Senator COTTON's plan so sound and desirable is that this would give the States not only increased money for education, but the complete control of the spending of this money. Under this plan, the Federal Government could not start telling the States or local communities what they should teach in their schools, or how they should run their schools.

It is quite obvious that one of the reasons why local communities and States have such a hard time covering their expenses is that the Federal Government taxes the individuals so heavily that they take out of the States a great deal of money that could ordinarily go to support the cost of State government and local education.

Instead of taking more money out of our pockets, Senator COTTON's proposal would prevent all this money from going down to Washington, where so much of it is wasted, and would send it directly to the States where the States could have immediate control over it.

We hope that the bill Senator COTTON has introduced into Congress will pass. His plan could go a long way toward keeping local control of education and at the same time lightening the financial burden that now rests on many localities in connection with their school budget.

Congratulations to Senator COTTON.

TRANSPORT REVOLUTION—ADDRESS BY MORRIS FORGASH

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, too few individuals in America recognize the necessity for vision and foresight with respect to matters which affect the lives of every one of us daily. Too few men are exercising the necessary daring and courage to think in a revolutionary manner within their own fields and, having successfully reached bold and consequential thoughts, to apply their reasoning in a practical and efficient way. Such men enrich our lives through their intellect and their contributions to our future well-being. The "works of art" of these men of vision and accomplishment too seldom attain proper recognition or appreciation by the beneficiaries of their words and deeds.

In my opinion, the entire transportation industry has benefited, and the public has benefited as a consequence, because of the thought and the accomplishments of one of its leaders. I refer specifically to my good friend, Morris Forgash, president of the U.S. Freight Co., who has devoted countless hours and days, from a busy schedule for many years, in devising new techniques for utilization by the transportation industry. His interests range the entire field, in all its components; and his voice has been raised, on numerous occasions, all over the country, urging his colleagues to dare to think, and, having thought, to dare to act.

In a recent speech, he has summarized in one place the results of many years of advanced thinking about how to move the necessary goods and commodities essential to our living anywhere on the globe in the fastest and most expeditious manner possible. Because his address intrigued me with the breadth and importance of the techniques he proposes—particularly those regarding "piggyback" and compartmentalization—I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORT REVOLUTION—PROGRESS REPORT

(Address by Morris Forgash, president, United States Freight Co., before the Motor City Traffic Club, Detroit, Mich., October 10, 1960)

It is a notable experience to meet with so many traffic and transportation people in a city so closely identified with transportation.

Detroit has played the role of the giant in the industrial revolution that has taken place in this century. The genius and industry concentrated in this area have changed the habits of a nation and had a potent influence on the entire world. In war and in peace, the economy and the safety of the Nation owe a great deal to the industry of Detroit.

Standing unchallenged as the automobile capital of the world, Detroit literally put America on rubber tired wheels, and it is your purpose, I am sure, to keep America rolling. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say "keep America mobile," for change has characterized the entire history of transportation and we are in a period where change is being accelerated.

Just take one example, we know that the wheel—the oldest symbol of transport, an invention lost in the gray mists of unrecorded time—is in some danger of meeting its first challenge to survival. A new vehicle of sea, land, and air transport, that functions without wheels or wings, and without water displacements, is getting into production. An examiner of the ICC recently tried to define what it is and the best he could come up with is that "We have here a new commodity."

You are not worried about this new development, I am sure, because it presents only a challenge to versatility and not to your productive capacity, and Detroit has met such challenges before.

Lined up behind the air car are the monorail, the conveyor, the rocket, the submarine freighter, and other curious things that only a few years ago were given serious thought only by the writers of science fiction. The anatomy of transportation is changing.

But we cannot stand still while we retool the transportation plant. We must be prepared to meet the demands of an expanding economy and an exploding population with the physical transportation plant that we have in operation. In terms of present consumption of transport service that means we must turn out anywhere from 1,200 to 1,400 billion ton-miles of service before this time a year from now.

That should not prove a staggering task for the most massive and efficient transportation plant ever devised by man. Surely the United States has the physical transportation capacity to move anything she can produce, anywhere it needs to be moved, under peacetime conditions or wartime emergency.

The salient fact is, however, that we have devoted more time to building up capacity in the transportation system than we have devoted to improving efficiency, evolving new techniques, and eliminating waste and duplication. In struggling to build up a system that would give the shipper a choice of modes of common carriage we have permitted conditions to develop under which the shipper has created for himself another choice—private carriage. And thus has come into being a new dimension in transportation.

The verdict of the long-range future will show that as of right now—today—the choice of private versus public carriage is at the core of the very real problem of maintaining a common carrier system under private management and control. This choice has literally forced upon an enlightened shipping public entirely new concepts of transportation, the essential ingredients of which are time and price. Service still has the same value of the shipper that it always had but he has found a new yardstick by which to measure value. What would it cost him to do it himself.

It is no answer to explain to the shipper that the common carrier has to consider his capital investment and maintenance costs, has to assume responsibility for safe carriage, has to perform expensive terminal and accessorial services, has to take into calculation empty-return miles. The shipper knows about these things when he buys his own truck and he reduces them to a simple formula—money and time.

When do-it-yourself transportation poses a serious threat to the mass-producing professional carriers something is wrong. It suggests that we have completed a cycle in defiance of the practical working of economics. Our forefathers on this continent, of necessity, were almost completely self-sufficient. They grew their own food, milled their own grain, spun their own cloth, tanned their own leather, made their own clothes, and hauled their own products. Industrialization and specialization did away with all that.

The proposition, that the great mass of shippers in this country can produce their own transportation more efficiently and economically than they can obtain it from the

common carriers, is as repugnant to basic economics as that we should find it profitable for everyone to buy knitting needles and, like the Pilgrims, produce their own clothes.

Nevertheless, the trend is in that direction. In terms of total output, common carriers are not maintaining their place in the distribution system. Something like two-thirds of highway transportation is produced by private or exempt carriers. The railroads, admittedly the most efficient mass and distance haulers in our system, are losing their place in the economy at an alarming pace.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has just released a study showing the actual versus the potential railroad tonnage trend over the 10-year period, 1947 to 1957. It shows that in 1957 the railroad slice of the total production pie was 26 percent less than it was in 1947. And to those who say "Why shed a tear for the railroads?" I say "Send not to learn for whom the bell tolls." If we cannot maintain our railroads in the realm of private industry we will not long so maintain the other carriers.

We cannot afford to permit the "decline and fall" of the common carrier because common carriage is the only means of transport that can adequately serve the whole economy—the only medium that offers any hope of security and survival in a world of mounting danger. The question is not whether but how we will support and maintain a strong and fully adequate system of common carriage. And if we reach the point of diminishing returns we will discover that the alternatives are increasingly higher freight rates or tax dollars. We have an opportunity to do something now, on our own initiative, in the area of freight rates as equated to transport output in terms of speed and service. If we follow the rest of the world down the road to Government ownership of public transport we will lose that initiative.

You are more concerned with solutions than with problems and I want to suggest for your consideration some solutions that seem quite obvious to me. First, I think we have tended to lose sight of some fundamentals and first principles in our thinking about our transportation system, such as its ultimate mission—the role of Government in transportation—and the means for achieving the goals of transportation policy.

Regulation was designed, initially, to protect and promote the public interest, and that should be its cardinal purpose and effect today. It is true that as the transportation system expanded, and new modes of carriage came into being, transportation policy was directed to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States and the national defense. Transportation policy also seeks to preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of carriage. But if there were no need to protect the public interest there still would be no need for regulation of common carriers, any more than there is need for Federal regulation of the steel industry or other businesses.

If we subjugate the needs of the public to the needs of particular segments of the transportation industry we will achieve neither a coordinated nor an adequate transportation system. If we consider the effect of change and innovation designed to obtain the maximum benefits from the natural advantages of each mode of carriage, not in the light of the public benefits flowing therefrom, but of the effect of such change on another mode of carriage, we will stifle progress. The Transportation Act of 1958 was designed to prevent just that.

Technological advances mean nothing unless they are translated into advantages to the shipping public. And if improved technology demands new technique and method, new standards of service and price, we should not throttle progress in the straitjacket of old concepts and old ways of doing things.

The history of transportation in this country is a history of revolution succeeding revolution. The wagon train, the canal and barge, the steam packet, the steel rail, largely succeeded each other because of their ability to serve the needs of a growing Nation. Then came the airplane and the revival of highway and domestic water transportation due to invention, technology, and improved facilities on which to operate. But we reached a point in time where a viewpoint took hold that we should not disturb the status quo. This viewpoint seems to stem from a philosophy that science should be permitted to improve technique, but technique should be geared to what everybody else in transportation is doing.

We ought to reread history so that we may clearly understand that the status quo will never be possible in transportation. Transportation is the dynamics of mobility. It has paced civilization since the invention of the wheel and we cannot freeze transportation in the posture it achieved in the fifth decade of the 20th century.

The revolution I came here to talk about tonight is unique in the history of the evolution of transportation, and, may well rank in importance with the development of the diesel locomotive. It is not based on a new means of locomotion or propulsion, or upon new physical pathways to resolve the elements of time, terrain, and distance, but upon new concepts for the adaptation of old services to current demands. If we permit it to succeed it will apply to every subsequent development in transportation because, like Newton's law, it rests on a basic theorem and is not subject to obsolescence. The theorem is that the shipper should have available to his use the best, the safest, the fastest, and the cheapest avenue of transportation that the physical transportation system is capable of producing at any given time. We cannot get away from the fact that this is the basic mission of transportation as a regulated public utility, and it ought to be the basic objective and purpose of regulation.

It is surprising, with all our knowledge, that this revolution was not triggered long ago. We have realized for many years that to make our transportation system fully effective it must be coordinated, and coordination has been one of the major objectives of our national transportation policy since it was adopted in 1940. It also has long been recognized that the common denominator of our system of transportation is the unit of haulage or freight container. Twenty-five years ago Joe Eastman recommended use of the container as a coordinating factor and urged standardization before the lack of standardization spread to such proportions as to neutralize all economic benefits of containerization. For more than a hundred years "piggybacking," in one form or another, has been employed sporadically as a means of unifying one mode of carriage with another.

But notwithstanding policy, knowledge, and experience, coordination through containerization gained little headway until the early part of the decade of the fifties. It was only along toward the latter part of the decade that the idea developed into the proportions of a full-scale revolution. The Interstate Commerce Commission clarified some legal questions concerning piggybacking in 1954 and this old, old innovation in transportation was hailed by electrifying reports in the press—but we were still thinking about transportation in compartments. We had not yet oriented thinking about piggybacking and containerization to the shippers' viewpoint.

Perhaps the real stumbling block was that while everyone was talking about coordination there was no agreed-upon definition of what coordination means, so that we were talking about different things. Everyone was agreed that coordination is a good thing but there was no real agreement because the term meant different things to different people. The confusion has not yet been fully dispelled, and until it is we will continue to work on a Tower of Babel.

If we stop to think for a minute we will realize that coordination of transportation is not meaningful in and of itself. What purpose would be served in coordinating a rail haul from here to Chicago with a truck haul from Chicago to the coast? Why would anyone send a shipment from here to San Francisco by air and put it on a slow freighter for Tokyo?

The only kind of coordination that serves any useful purpose is a combination of services of different modes of transportation on a conjunctive basis that will give the shipper the maximum benefits of each mode—in terms of economy, speed and convenience. If we can agree on that definition we will readily see that a good deal of the talk and thinking about coordination is fuzzy.

Substitution of one form of carriage for another is not coordination because it is not conjunctive. It is an arrangement of convenience—not the convenience of the shipper but of carrier management. An example is the substituted service arrangement for piggybacking called plan I. Under this plan the motor carrier contracts with a railroad to haul the freight of the motor carrier in the motor carrier's trailers for a part or all of the journey within the truckman's authorized territory. To put it another way, the motor carrier simply subcontracts to the railroad a part of his obligation to haul, and the shipper gets just what he bargained for in the first place—truck service at truck rates.

Another form of coordination much talked about—coordination of the services of differing modes of transportation on the basis of joint rates—has theoretically been possible from the very beginning, but it has made little headway. We may as well face the economic fact that for terminal-to-terminal hauls by land for any appreciable distance the most efficient and economic means of carriage on the scene today is the railroad. Conversely, the flexibility and maneuverability of the truck makes motor carriage superior, and indeed indispensable, for the ancillary or shorter distance hauls.

In addition, the short-haul motor carrier is a vital link in a comprehensive system of nationwide coordination. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why this important segment has been and still remains so silent about a development which holds forth so much promise for its economic well-being. On the other hand, the most vocal exponents of coordination are the long-haul motor carriers and here, unfortunately, is where the confusion sets in—when they speak of coordination between rail and motor carrier, they are actually advocating "substituted service" which is an entirely different doctrine.

In addition to his important role of furnishing the transportation service for which it is best fitted from every economic standpoint, the short-haul motor carrier can be a real factor by coordinating its operations with that of the railroad for the longer distances to and from the railhead, thereby providing a much improved overall service to the shipping public. This also provides the only means the railroad has to supplant expensive freight and short-haul operations by means of the motor vehicle. In short, the short-haul motor carrier holds a principal key to proper coordination, and, I submit, this is the area in which exploratory work and research has been sadly neglected.

Future developments may realine some of the economic factors to some extent. We may see the advent of the truck-train on

the superhighway. New means of propulsion, and I do not exclude the possibilities of atomic power, may bring changes in present concepts of water and rail carriage. But whatever the situation, the basic movement must yield to the medium best qualified to perform that movement.

True coordination, in my opinion, must be founded upon two essential ingredients. The development and use of a standardized container that is completely interchangeable among all modes of transportation; and the adoption of a simplified rate or charge that will reflect—for the shipper—the inherent advantages of the basic line-haul carrier or carriers. Within the past few years tremendous strides have been made in the two areas I have mentioned. That, of course, is the revolution about which I am talking and as to which I wish to give you a brief progress report.

Perhaps the greatest single stride yet taken toward containerization was the publication in September 1959 of the report of the special subcommittee on containerization and standardization of the National Defense Transportation Association. This subcommittee, which was formed in 1958, and of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman, is made up of eminent representatives of the various transportation media industry. After thorough study and research, and the sifting of our own views and ideas in work sessions and meetings, we unanimously recommended a standard container with a basic unit length of 20 feet, for use singly or in multiples, up to a maximum length of 40 feet, and with a standard width and height of 8 feet by 8 feet. Containers of these dimensions can be used on the rails aboard the latest 85-foot flatcars; on the highways aboard 40-foot trailers for long-distance hauling and 20-foot demountable trailers for city street and short-haul delivery routes; and aboard ships and in cargo planes now in use or on the drawing boards.

We are fully aware that our recommended standard is merely a goal; that trailers and containers of many different sizes are already in use; and that not everyone agrees that we have come up with the best possible specification. Nevertheless, it is significant that we have agreed on a goal, for, without such a goal, containerization will defeat its own purposes and succumb, through obsolescence, to the forces of change.

May I at this juncture say a few words about the important part ocean carriage can play in this coordinating development. Steamship companies must realize that the economies achieved by the reduction of labor at the pier will not of themselves insure the success of marine containerization, because water carriage is neither the beginning nor the end of the distribution cycle. Such economies are certainly desirable—in fact, they must be achieved if the operations of the steamship companies are to continue being profitable. Because every container originates and terminates on land, however, the hauling of the container must be commercially feasible and attractive to surface carriers.

A steamship company will not help itself, except to a minor degree, by instituting a container program that is not integrated with highway and rail movements. Marine containers must be so designed that their cube and handling features do not penalize other carriers.

The next step is the all-purpose, or universal container, that can double in "brass" and be adapted to haul almost anything that moves. This is something of particular importance to you here in Detroit, and I will have more to say on the subject a little later.

Neither standardization nor the ultimate, all-purpose container, will bring about coordination unless we can bridge the gap between the physical modes of carriage, and the essential "bridge," in my opinion, is the freight rate of charge that will permit and encourage the shipper himself to effect the coordination. The first long step in that direction was taken when the railroads, a little more than a year ago, began to publish simplified charges for the hauling of freight in the shippers' own containers, from ramp to ramp. Under one plan, known as plan III, the charge contemplates the furnishing, by the railroads, of the flatcar to haul the shipper-owned trailers. Under the other, known as plan IV, the shipper is required to furnish both trailers and flatcar, and the railroad provides only the motive power.

This new and revolutionary basis for containerized transportation met with instantaneous success because it made sense to the shipper. The shipper always has packaged his own freight shipments in cartons, crates, or what-have-you, but when he went to ship it he had to pay for weight of packing, countless manual handlings, and absorb the cost of needless and expensive services wholly incidental to the line-haul movement of his shipments. Why not "package" the freight to ride in the first instance, and avoid all these handlings, all the exposure to loss, damage, and pilferage, all the wasted hours in terminals and yards?

But the shipper could not afford to invest in the necessary equipment, "package" the freight with his own labor, and arrange for its movement to and from the railheads, unless he could obtain a price for the line-haul movement of the total "package" that would reflect the advantages of hauling a prepackaged lot of freight over steel rails.

The old standards of ratemaking provided no yardstick for pricing this new type of service. Under the new concept the railroads had to disregard, in whole or in part, the factors which normally constituted the composition of a freight rate; namely, capital investment in and maintenance of equipment (except motive equipment); common carrier liability; cost of terminal switching and other accessorial services; and empty car movements. And to that last, elusive, traditional ratemaking stand of "value of service" they had to apply a new meaning—"How much would it cost the shipper to provide the same haul with his own equipment?"

Striking out boldly, the railroads changed the "atomic structure" of the freight rate to meet these known facts and obvious shipper demands. They simply published a charge of so many dollars for hauling shipper-packaged freight on flatcars between given points. For the complicated formulas of the past they substituted a formula with the known per-mile cost of hauling the shipper-owned equipment over the road at the bottom and, at the top, what the shipper would pay, which increasingly is determined by what it costs him to do the complete job himself. In between they fixed a charge that provides a profit to the carriers and a savings to the shipper.

Thus the freight rate proved the catalyst that finally broke containerized, coordinated transportation out of its chrysalis. Technology developed the hardware—the freight rate was the fusing element.

But the path of progress has never been easy, and because this new service represented change it brought forth cries of anguish from vested modal interests. Far and wide the lament was heard: "This will break down the traditional freight-rate structure—it will throw the sacred classification out of the window." Traditional methods and concepts always must give way to the onslaughts of economic change.

Surprisingly enough, these charges are echoes out of the past, for while this concept of containerized piggybacking is new in the sense that it uses modern tools and is tailored to the needs of modern distribution, it is old in theory and practice. Once, in the early thirties, an administrative interpretation that containerized freight had to be sold, if at all, on the old freight classification basis instead of the unit-price or mileage basis, set the movement back about 25 years. But here and there piggybacking of the same kind, represented by the current plans, was conducted successfully, if sporadically, and with the Commission's blessing. For example, the Chicago Great Western Railroad began a service between Chicago and the Twin Cities in 1936, based on a published tariff, naming charges in flat amounts per movement of shipper-owned trailers, in precisely the same manner as the current plan III rates. The rate was challenged and the Commission approved it as lawful.

The flat piggyback charges do not ignore rate classification. One of the most important characteristics of freight in today's competitive transportation system is its density. The space limitations of the trailers used in piggyback service—their cubic capacity—provide a near perfect classification of the lading, based solely upon density and the ability to load. Thus the rates do reflect classification principles which are the most significant under modern conditions.

But neither precedent nor economic fact have stilled the outcry against this new adaptation of an old theory. Litigation involving the plan III and plan IV rates is still in progress. Dire predictions about the assumed competitive effect of these plans have been spread before a committee of Congress. I recall that once when some freight forwarder legislation was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, over the objections of competing interests, the committee expressed itself in its report as follows:

"The function of Congress is to legislate in the public interest. It has not been demonstrated that allocation of traffic as between competing carriers, by legislation, is in the public interest" (S. Rept. 1285, 81st Cong.).

That statement of congressional policy was made in 1950, but it is timeless and it is all that need be said on the subject today.

We stand at a crossroads in the history of transportation, and we will take the wrong turn if we permit narrow or selfish, or simply timeworn and outmoded, concepts to deprive the public and the Nation of the tremendous and limitless potentials of this new kind of service.

So vast are the potentials, and so rapidly are they being realized, that it would require a series of lectures to do the subject justice. In my limited time let me use some broad brush strokes on the canvas of some old prophecies of mine. It is not that I want to establish myself as a prophet, but I need a convenient yardstick.

About 2 years ago, when piggybacking was in its embryonic stages, I stood before a gathering of traffic and transportation people in Los Angeles and read some of the things I saw in the future of this development. I made a number of predictions, which, in the interest of time, I will only epitomize here. They were as follows:

The larger portion of the rail boxcar and refrigerator fleets will be supplanted—within 10 years—by trailer and demountable truck bodies on flatcars; this will bring about revolutionary changes in the production, merchandising, and transportation of the essential element of goods—perishable, frozen, and otherwise; and the eroding empty-car movement, which consumes 40 percent of the productive capacity of the rail system, will be reduced by 50 percent or more through the use of refrigerated trailers and containers.

We have made history faster than we have recorded in all of these areas. Just what the census of the piggyback fleet would show as of this moment I do not know, but

the carloading reports show that for the first 34 weeks of this year piggyback loadings were running 35 percent ahead of last year.

But figures do not tell the whole story. We can read the future of piggybacking by the enthusiasm with which it is being accepted not only by the shipping public but by men in the transportation industry who are doing something about it. For example, in an interview printed in the New York Times last September 26, President Harry W. Von Willer, board chairman of the newly merged Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, was very optimistic about the benefits the two roads could achieve in extending their "piggyback" or trailer on flatcar operations. He predicted that the future of the railroads lay in that direction and that eventually 60 percent of all freight will move in containers or trailers on flatcars. Stating that, "while piggybacking, at the present time, accounted for only 3½ percent of the railroad's total traffic, it was, nevertheless, doubling regularly each year."

When I predicted transport revolution in the area of food production and distribution I was simply using one example of many. The all-purpose container will revolutionize the transportation of new automobiles, of liquids, grains and almost everything else that today requires the use of special-purpose, one-way equipment. A prototype of such a container was unveiled at the NDTA convention in Seattle last fall. It could haul new automobiles on retractable ramps, liquids in collapsible rubber containers, or dry cargo—separately or in any combination.

Since that time such a container is being engineered to its ultimate capability—the hauling of refrigerated products. As another innovation, a collapsible tank has been introduced which, by use of disposable plastic liners, can be used to haul liquids in one direction and grains in the other, without danger of contamination.

The all-purpose container is not only in production, by several companies, but in actual use. Right now, new automobiles are being hauled in one direction and the same trailers are bringing back a payload of other commodities. I do not need to tell you, here in Detroit, what that means in terms of economy. Your freight rates have necessarily been geared to a 50-percent-empty movement—you have been buying a round-trip ticket to take a one-way ride. When the use of this new equipment makes it possible to sell all the return tickets to somebody else, it cannot help but reduce your cost of distribution. Who can say to what extent a final development of all-purpose trailer or container may influence the policy of the automotive industry in the operation of decentralized assembly plants? It is my belief that this built-in double freight cost may have had its effect on decisions of the automobile industry in establishing assembly plants closer to the source of sales.

The national ratio of empty to loaded movement is not quite as high as yours in the automobile business, but it is a whopping 40 percent, and that is the greatest waste in the entire economy. If we can cut that in half—and I predict we can do much better than that with all-purpose containerization—we will have made the greatest improvement in the transportation system that has occurred in our lifetime—perhaps in this century.

The elimination of this colossal waste, and the increased productivity which it will introduce into the transportation system without any increase in the physical plant, is of vital significance not only to the economy of the Nation but to national defense. The Department of Defense not only is pioneering containerization on its own, but has intervened in the legal proceedings and testified in support of the plan III and plan IV rates that are under attack.

The military potential of a standby fleet of all-purpose equipment, ready to haul anything, anywhere, from the end of the production line or the depot platform to a foreign beachhead and beyond cannot be overestimated. We cannot afford to stockpile such a pool of equipment from public funds, nor can we hope to build one on the eve of emergency or after the enemy strikes. But we are building one now—very largely with private capital—and it can be diverted to emergency use if the time comes when survival depends on the capacity and flexibility of the transportation plan.

Just to give one specific example of the military potential of containerization, I refer to an article by Rear Adm. Thomas A. Long, Deputy Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy, which appeared in the September-October 1960 issue of the National Defense Transportation Journal. Admiral Long said that terminal handling absorbs 69 percent of the Navy's ocean transportation costs. He said if that factor cannot be licked American-flag commerce will disappear from the world sealanes. He pointed to containerization as the answer and added: "All that is needed is leadership and coordinated effort within government" to realize its full potential.

Again reverting to my earlier prophecy, I said that the passenger deficit to which we have become resigned as a necessary concomitant of the obligation of the railroads to carry everything anywhere, can be solved by merging this fringe area of rail service with a payload. Passengers don't object to riding with a kitchen—why should they object to riding with a commissary? With roller bearing flatcars and harmoniously designed containers there is no reason why piggybacked freight should not lend elegance to the finest passenger trains in the country—and give them the respectability of paying their way.

The fact is that freight already is being piggybacked on passenger trains in some sections of the country.

Transportation is not a complicated thing in the shipper's perspective. He views transportation in terms of speed and cost—how much, how far, how fast. I said in 1958, and I repeat it now, that roller bearing piggyback equipment will shrink freight transit time between the east and west coasts to 48 hours. As one consequence of that kind of speed I said the railroads would be able to prevent further erosion of their higher rated commodities to air transportation.

A great many people thought there was a typographical error in my manuscript when I predicted that kind of speed, even though I looked ahead 10 years. But look at the record. Ten years ago the coast-to-coast rail time was eighth night arrival, ninth morning delivery. Today it is fourth night, fifth morning delivery—and we are on the verge of shaving off another day. I doubt if the airlines even in a jet age, will take very much freight off of the rails on the basis of a 1- or 2-day differential in transit time on a transcontinental haul.

Events along this line are moving faster than anticipated. Only the other day the Santa Fe Railroad docketed for consideration a proposal for the establishment of an extra charge in piggyback service for containerized shipments from Chicago to Los Angeles. The basic charge, in regular third morning arrival service, is $924 per car but this proposed service carries a price tab of $1,600 per car. At the outset this service will be established experimentally for a period of 6 months and will begin with movement in the rail carriers mail and express train. Cars will leave Chicago 11:30 p.m. and arrive in Los Angeles 7:30 p.m. the second night. Some time within the next 2 years we can look forward to the establishment of solid piggyback trailer and containerized trains between principal trading centers in the United States.

My final prediction—that ultimately we would be able to ship a container load of freight from any point in the United States to any point in the world without physically rehandling the contents—is already being proved out.

United States Freight Co. and its affiliates operate internationally, and it will not be long before intercontinental piggyback service, from New York, Chicago, and other points in the Middle West to the Orient, will be in regular operation. This highway-to-rail-to-ship-to-rail-to-truck globe-circling service will be conducted with our own standardized equipment. The freight will be picked up at the shippers' docks in the interior of the United States with 20-foot trailers, two of which can be locked together for over-the-road movement as a 40-foot unit. It will be delivered to the consignees in the Orient from the same trailers, without physical rehandling. It will move all the way on one bill of lading, by one carrier, on one charge.

This kind of freight pipeline can be established between any two points in the world—national barriers permitting—and it will be established because the shippers will demand it and they are entitled to no less.

In 2 short years we have made more progress toward coordinated transportation, through standardized containerization, than we made in all the years since it dawned upon a young America that we could not have coordinated rail transportation without standard widths of track and interchangeable equipment. But we have only seen the beginning. We are still in the early morning of enterprise.

The United States is growing, physically, economically, and in population. Industry is shifting away from the railheads. The world is getting smaller—the peoples of the free world are growing more interdependent upon each other. There is urgent need for a system of transportation that will extend the benefits of fast, low-cost rail transportation away from the railheads, and provide the most economical combination of rail and highway service. There is need for a worldwide transportation pipeline that will facilitate the flow of commerce, give new life to our lagging merchant marine, and strengthen our posture for defense.

This new concept of piggyback containerized service, at realistic charges which permit the shipper to acquire and use his own equipment, is the only development that offers any hope of filling these needs. It is the only development that offers the faintest hope of halting the increasing spiral of freight rates and stemming the growing trend to private carriage. It is coordination in action and not in theory.

If we have the vision and wisdom to give this new development an opportunity to survive and grow, and the patience to help it through the experimental stage, we will achieve a new dimension in transportation. Engineering and technology have done their part. All we have to do now is make up our minds that it is time to break with the past and we will inherit a better future.

THE HIGH COST OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the question of which side benefits most from so-called cultural exchanges between this country and Soviet Russia is still being debated.

The American Legion magazine for December 1960, carries a well-written and thought-provoking article on this question, entitled "The High Cost of

Russian Culture," written by Esther Julie Pels. Most Members of this body who are also Legionnaires have probably seen the article. I therefore commend it to the attention of others, who may have missed it.

In addition to reviewing the long, 40-year record of Communist effort to achieve social and cultural equality with the United States, through the medium of exchanges, this article also points out the importance that Khrushchev himself places on such cultural and other exchanges. Last June, while delivering one of the most insulting and coarse personal attacks ever made against a President of the United States, Khrushchev was careful to add:

> Russians will continue to get visas for the United States and Americans for Russia, and all delegations which had planned to make trips to the United States—scientific, educational, technical, and artistic—will still make them.

Personally, I have a suspicion that the technical, educational, and scientific exchanges are far more important to the big Red boss of the Kremlin than any cultural or artistic exchanges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The High Cost of Russian Culture" be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

(By Esther Julia Pels)

This is why the Russians are in favor of the cultural exchange program. As usual, they manage to get a lot more out of the arrangement than they give.

In Moscow last June while delivering the most insulting diatribe ever directed against the Government of the United States, Premier Khrushchev paused long enough to say: "Russians will continue to get visas for the United States and Americans for Russia, and all delegations which had planned to make trips to the United States—scientific, educational, technical, and artistic—will still make them."

This was in reference to the so-called cultural exchange agreement between the United States and Russia which has now been extended to the end of 1961.

In light of recent events we could reasonably hope that this would mean finis to this particular Soviet booby trap. But don't bet on it. We have some pretty myopic gentlemen in our State Department who are prepared to argue that cultural exchange is a sure-fire way to reduce international tensions. However, they overlook a lot of history, especially in the case of Germany and Japan, with whom we had some very nice cultural relations—up until the outbreak of hostilities.

The "cultural" theme has been too profitable for the Russians for them to want to drop it. Hence the remarkable alacrity shown by them when it comes to signing cultural treaties. Conferences on disarmament, nuclear weapons control, and American POW's lost in Korea may be dragged out for months and years, but cultural bargains with Uncle Sam are snapped up by the Reds in a matter of days.

Considering the success they have had in softening up Americans to accept Ukrainian choruses, orchestras, and the ballet as representative of Communist culture, who can blame them?

Actually the agreement signed between the United States and the U.S.S.R. calls for exchanges in "cultural, technical and educational fields." Somehow or other the technical and educational aspects of the exchange have been played down and the program is widely known as the "cultural exchange" program. This gives it an air of untouchability, since no one, not even a lout, dares to attack or question culture. Accent on culture by the Communists therefore is, first, designed to attract and appeal to intellectuals and, secondly, to establish a "bridge to the non-Communist masses," as they phrase it.

It also serves to give protection to the exchanges in the program which might otherwise alarm Americans if they were fully aware of their implications. The proposed exchange of visits of the delegations of Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and Members of the U.S. Congress is one. The obvious folly of giving away our industrial know-how to a backward nation in the exchange of delegations in the fields of iron and steel, mining, and plastics industry is another. Fortunately, the proposed visit of the "Red Banner song and dance ensemble of the Soviet Army" proved too strong for some American stomachs. The widespread protests forced the cancellation of the project, so for the time being at least, Americans are spared the sight of the Red troops who mowed down the helpless people of Hungary.

A careful reading of Communist documents would prove invaluable to anyone planning a cultural deal with the Russians. However, few people ever bother with that. Communists seem to know this because they are amazingly frank and candid in drawing up their directives for cultural exchanges and other Trojan horse activities.

Khrushchev has expressed his views on the role which culture must play in Communist life in the following statement taken from the New Times, February 1956: "In the battle which our party is waging against the moribund ideas and conceptions of the Old World, for the dissemination and affirmation of Communist ideology, a major role belongs to the press, literature, and art."

The whole infiltration of this country by Communists through various fronts, began with, and was successfully carried out under, the guise of this same cultural activity.

By 1928, Stalin, having liquidated all opposition in his own country, was ready to proceed with the infiltration of communism into other countries.

The depression in the United States in 1929 gave him a golden opportunity. Many people were willing to try new, radical solutions to the problems of unemployment and want. Whittaker Chambers and others have written extensively on the widespread disillusionment which swept through normally conservative segments of our population. The storm of the depression unhinged and bewildered many American intellectuals. Communist supersalesmen were on hand to assure them that they and they alone held the key to a rational and well-ordered society of the future.

This trend was noted in the New Masses, a magazine known in Communist circles as "the leading organ of the proletarian cultural movement of the U.S.A.," with the following statement: "The first organizational expression of this radicalization occurred at the very beginning of the economic crisis with the formation in October 1929 of the first association of revolutionary writers and artists of the United States, the John Reed Club."

This discontent was quickly seized upon by the Communists. Up to this time most Americans, regardless of social or economic position, had rejected communism for the alien revolutionary movement it was. The Communist movement had been organized and largely controlled by foreign-born elements.

In 1930, according to the New Masses, a conference was held: "At Kharkov, the capital of the Socialist Soviet Republic of the Ukraine, there was held from November 6 to 15, 1930, the second world plenum (conference) of the International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature. Revolutionary writers and artists from 22 countries and 5 continents, as well as numerous representatives from the Soviet Union gathered to discuss their problems and tasks—creative, organizational, and political—and adopted a common international platform and specific programs for each country."

Translated from Communist gobbledygook, this means that the Communists had set up for the first time a worldwide network for cultural penetration into the countries they planned to subvert and overthrow.

The American delegates were from the New Masses and the John Reed Club. They were Fred Ellis, Michael Gold, William Gropper, Joshua Kunitz, A. B. Magil and Harry Alan Potamkin. These names figure prominently through the pro-Communist cultural groups established in the 1930's.

Since not all the delegates to the conference were Communists but were in sympathy with the aims of the Communists and willing to travel down the same road to achieve those aims, they were addressed not as comrades, but as fellow travelers. This was probably the origin of this now well-known expression used and understood so widely.

In addition to the political program which they brought back with them, in which they pledged themselves "to fight in defense of the fatherland of all the workers and revolutionary intellectuals of the world, the Soviet Union," the delegates had a planned 10-point program for cultural infiltration. The New Masses was to be used to win over intellectuals to the Communist cause. The John Reed Club was to be expanded, and closer contacts with revolutionary cultural organizations and publications in other countries were to be maintained. All of these were to be controlled by Moscow, and in the hands of disciplined Communist organizers. It was also organized to give technical assistance to the revolution. The delegates signed an appeal in the New Masses "to the young intellectuals of America, break with the dying culture of a dying class. Join us in the fight for a new world."

All Communist propaganda is based on the dictum that capitalist culture is rotten, decadent and dying, and that Communist culture represents the new, the virile, and the dynamic culture of the future. Cartoons, which are always a highly effective means of political indoctrination, hammered on this theme in the New Masses year after year.

The standard defense alibi used by those apologizing for sending abroad so-called art by Communist artists is "We are not interested in the artist's politics, only in his art." Many of these defenders of Communist artists are undoubtedly conservative, patriotic Americans and some probably even fancy themselves anti-Communists. Those using this argument obviously have no knowledge or familiarity whatever with Communist directives on this question. Note the following open political orders to a group of people previously infiltrated and seduced on the cultural level, taken from the New Masses of 1934: "If, for example, an artist is interested in Negro problems and portrays scenes from Negro life, he would become a member of the group that would cooperate with the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. The group of artists would then join the latter organization, become active members of it, participate in its struggles, acquaint themselves with the problems confronting the Negro masses, and come to know the masses themselves.

"There are many advantages in such a plan. The artist gains in knowledge of his

material and in understanding of the situations that he deals with. The revolutionary movement on the other hand benefits from the propaganda value of such works."

With the artists well organized to serve the Soviet Union, the Communists next turned their attention to writers. Writers had been organized in the John Reed Clubs and the Kharkov conference had been formed around the International Union of Revolutionary Writers. Still there was need, the Communists said, "for a further organization of revolutionary writers to convince the people of the necessity of the struggles against capitalism and for the institution of Marxism, as well as to fight Fascist tendencies in the United States."

This new organization was founded by the leaders of the John Reed Club and the call to set up this new front came from Earl Browder, then national secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. The name of this outfit was the League of American Writers. Membership in this new group was open "to all writers whose work has been published or used with reasonable frequency in channels of communication of more than local scope including magazines, newspapers, the radio, the stage, and the screen." Among the aims of the organization were: "To enlist writers in all parts of the United States in a national cultural organization for peace and democracy and against fascism and reaction," and "to effect an alliance in the interest of culture between American writers and all progressive forces."

As you can see, this new "cultural" front gave the Communists the opportunity to influence all the great media of propaganda in the United States for the advancement of Soviet aims.

Only by reading these manifestos of what the Communists have achieved under the banner of culture can one appreciate the point of an anecdote told about the Nazi gauleiter who sneered: "When I hear the word 'culture,' I reach for my gun." This anecdote illustrates the cleverness of the Communists and their superiority over the Nazis. The Hitlerites openly boasted of their detestation of bourgeois culture. The Communists, infinitely smarter, realized that only through culture could they establish contact with important intellectuals and subvert them to party aims.

These revolutionary cultural fronts—of film workers, dancers, musicians, folk singers, youth groups, athletes, etc.—grew so rapidly that the active Communists in each unit decided to unite in one big cultural front. This was called the Workers Cultural Federation and by 1931 it comprised over 179 organizations. Each of these fronts was set up to ensnare various groups. For instance, the Workers Anti-Religious League was affiliated as part of "cultural" activity. This outfit had as some of its aims "the launching of a campaign against Bible teaching in the New York schools and the establishment of antireligious Sunday schools for children."

Eugene Lyons has written the whole story of this cultural infiltration and its tragic results for America in his book called, so aptly, "The Red Decade."

The highlight of Communist cultural activity in America was the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City in 1949.

More than 1,800 people paid $10 a plate (a lot of money in 1949) to attend. The New York World-Telegram headlined it this way: "Reds To Stuff $10-a-Plate Culture Down Their Throats." The cultural part of their program was a coverup for the real purpose of the meeting: To downgrade America and advance the current line of the Soviets—"peace."

The climate of such tolerance toward communism changed in the United States when thousands of American boys lay dead in Korea. Americans had been shocked and sickened by the revelations of wholesale spying by Communists revealed by congressional investigating committees. The true nature and horror of the Soviet system came to light with the massacre of Hungarians, including children, by Soviet troops in 1956. Yet it seems incredible that a short 2 years later the United States should be signing a "cultural" agreement in 1958 with these same Soviets.

It is hard to see just what our State Department hoped to gain from a "cultural" exchange with the butchers of Budapest. Why should our great American heritage of human freedom and the dignity of man be adjudged equal and exchangeable (since obviously one does not exchange unequals) with that of an admittedly backward country whose government is based on total terror through a secret police system for the suppression of all basic human values?

One must assume that our officials entered into this cultural exchange program in a sincere, albeit misguided, effort to penetrate the Iron Curtain and create good will for America. But what of Khrushchev? Stalin had always been wary of opening up Russia to the eyes of foreigners, having set up the greatest mass spy network in all history. Stalin naturally suspected that the United States would attempt to match every spy he sent into, or had recruited in, America. Stalin permitted some tourists to visit Moscow and a few other Russian cities partly because of the foreign exchange they left behind and partly because a small number of gullibles could always be counted on to return to America singing the praises of the Soviet system.

Khrushchev proved much smarter. He knew that it would be relatively simple to restrict tourists to certain "safe" areas. With the largest secret police force in the world, reinforced by a massive army of voluntary informers among those having contact with visitors, keeping an eye on suspected tourists presented no real problem. On the other hand Khrushchev knew that Americans were an openhearted and trustful folk who would recoil from the idea of shadowing "cultural" visitors, even if they had the manpower to do so.

Unfortunately, recent press dispatches bear this out. A New York Times article on December 25, 1959, reported "U.S. Students Get Rebuffs in Soviet." The article stated: "The 24 young Americans who went to Moscow and Leningrad last September complain that they cannot gain access to laboratories, archives, and other scientic facilities essential to their work. In an annex to the recent agreement, the Soviet Union undertook to guarantee American students access to its archives. So far this Soviet commitment has largely remained on paper only, it is reported. In contrast, the report continued, the Soviet exchange students in the United States are unrestricted in their use of scientific facilities."

Despite such occurrences, gullible Americans still flock to the Soviet Union. Last year 12,000 made the pilgrimage; this year it is estimated that 15,000 will go to a land where our own President was rudely refused entrance.

The loss of prestige suffered by the United States in the art and literature exhibition which we sent in 1959 to the Moscow exhibition aroused much unfavorable comment. On Soviet insistence we quickly and abjectly removed more than 100 books from the exhibition shelves. The Communists insisted that "only books relating to American culture should be shown." We left up to them which books represented American culture. The chairman of the State Committee for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, Georgi Zhukov, informed the U.S. Ambassador at Moscow "that unless the books were removed the Soviet Union would have to take unspecified measures." We immediately gave in without argument.

It was a different story when the State Department objected to a few books in the Soviet exhibition in New York. They remained.

The art exhibition we sent to the Moscow Fair aroused criticism from every conceivable quarter. Chairman FRANCIS WALTER of the House Committee on Un-American Activities declared in a speech that "more than 50 percent" of the artists whose works were in the exhibit had Communist or Communist-tinged backgrounds.

President Eisenhower remarked of a painting by Jack Levine included in the exhibit that "it looks more like a lampoon than art." The picture was a caricature of a gross, swilling U.S. Army general and is indeed typical of the cartoons and drawings found in the old New Masses in the thirties.

Overlooked in the general hullabaloo over the paintings in the exhibition, was a statement made in a report of the affair appearing in the New York Times stating that the State Department had added some early American paintings to the controversial exhibition. The article stated that the art sent over in the first exhibition had "followed an informal agreement with the Soviet officials that the Soviet fair here and the American show in Moscow reflect art created since 1918." From this it would appear that our officials allow Communists to dictate to us that no art or culture previous to the Communist revolution of 1917 should be recognized, not even in our own country.

This is part and parcel of the subtle pressures generated by Communists as milestones in their march to world power. It is the culmination of what the despised Communists started at Kharkov so long ago.

The whole question of the value of these cultural relations is causing deep concern among thinking Americans. The concern is justified particularly after a recent report from Japan that the Communist-inspired riots which caused the cancellation of President Eisenhower's good-will tour were probably financed with the earnings of Soviet cultural troupes—dancers, musicians, and others.

The whole concept of our cultural exchange agreement with the U.S.S.R. is based on an obvious fallacy. The agreement states: "This agreement is regarded as a significant first step in the improvement of mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." It goes on to say that it is hoped that this will contribute "to a lessening of international tensions." Almost any bright eighth-grader should be able to figure out that the tensions between the two Governments are due entirely to Soviet Government pressures against us all over the world. The Soviet people have nothing to do with these pressures. The Communists in power thoroughly know and understand us. They have also made it pretty plain that they despise us and indeed intend to "bury" us. They have no genuine desire to know us any better—only to destroy us.

INTEREST RATES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the recent political campaign much was said in criticism of what was described as the high interest policy of the past administration as well as in criticism of the number of unemployed.

Actually there are many instances where our Government has paid higher rates of interest than those prevailing during the past administration. Furthermore, one point which is ignored by the critics is the fact that interest on Government bonds today is taxable,

whereas in earlier periods such interest was tax-exempt. This feature alone would account for a great difference in the prevailing rates.

Also, when speaking of the number of unemployed, the critics ignored one very important factor; namely, that during the 8 years of the past administration our country has been at peace. When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953 we were in the midst of the Korean war, and when that war ended it necessitated the absorbing into the civilian labor force the veterans as they returned home. On December 31, 1952, there were 3,507,205 men in uniform; on December 31, 1960, there were 2,492,700 in uniform.

However, rather than argue these points further, I thought it best merely to incorporate in the RECORD a statistical report of what was actually achieved or not achieved by the past administration in each of these two categories.

With this thought in mind I first requested the Treasury Department to compile a report showing the average rate of interest that was being paid on all outstanding Government obligations during each of the 8 years, 1953 through 1960.

This report is not a statement of the interest actually being paid at any given time, but, rather, it represents the average rates paid on all issues outstanding during each fiscal year.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Treasury Department's letter, signed by Mr. Julian B. Baird as Under Secretary, along with the accompanying table showing the computed average interest rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1960.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of December 6 to Secretary Anderson requesting average interest rates on Government obligations from 1953 through 1960.

The attached table shows the computed average rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities as of the end of each of the calendar years you requested. These averages are not a reflection of interest actually paid but are rather the average rates on issues outstanding at a given point of time.

The averages are obtained by multiplying the interest rate on individual issues (each issue year in the case of savings bonds) by the amount of the issue outstanding and dividing the sum of the products for each type of security by the total of that type outstanding.

This information is readily available on the basis of the classifications shown and will, I believe, suit your purposes. As you probably know, among the marketable obligations of the Treasury, bills and certificates are by statute, originally 1 year or less to maturity and notes, 1 to 5 years to maturity. Bonds are all originally 5 years and over to first call date or maturity. Thus, the computed average rate on bonds reflects the rate on issues which were originally of longer term. Among nonmarketable securities, savings bonds are redeemable on demand; special issues are redeemable on demand or after 1 year; and the bulk of investment bonds are subject to exchange for 5-year marketable notes.

The information for December 31, 1960, is, of course, estimated but should correspond closely to the actual figures when they are available.

Please call on us again if you require any further information.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN B. BAIRD,
Under Secretary.

Computed average interest rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities

[In percent]

Dec. 31	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 [1]
Direct obligations								
Marketable:								
Bills [2]	1.51	1.06	2.43	3.05	3.51	2.93	4.50	2.93
Certificates	2.48	1.26	2.39	2.93	3.70	2.21	4.13	4.03
Notes	1.76	1.80	1.94	2.34	2.87	2.95	3.92	3.77
Bonds	2.39	2.48	2.49	2.48	2.51	2.59	2.62	2.75
Total marketable	2.17	1.96	2.32	2.59	2.96	2.62	3.47	3.19
Nonmarketable:								
Savings bonds	[3] 2.73	[3] 2.78	[3] 2.83	2.86	2.91	2.94	3.26	3.32
Special issues to trust funds	2.75	2.66	2.59	2.70	2.64	2.65	2.70	2.79
All other [4]	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.72	2.71	2.72	2.72
Total nonmarketable	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.78	2.78	2.80	2.98	3.04
Guaranteed obligations	2.55	2.61	2.58	2.59	2.62	2.62	2.65	2.92
Total interest-bearing securities	2.41	2.29	2.49	2.67	2.89	2.69	3.30	3.14

[1] Estimated.
[2] Rates of simple interest based on amounts borrowed.
[3] Includes Treasury savings notes.
[4] Mostly investment bonds.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Debt Analysis Staff. Dec. 15, 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to get a true picture of the past administration in dealing with the problem of employment, I asked the Labor Department to prepare certain statistics.

These statistics cover a 14-year period beginning with the year 1947 and extending through 1960. The first report will show the annual average of the total civilian labor force.

The second report shows the annual average of the total civilian employment for each of the years 1947 and 1960.

The third table shows the annual average of the number of unemployed, while the fourth chart will show the annual average unemployment rates broken down percentagewise.

These charts cover the past 14-year period, and are broken down giving the statistics for each month, as well as the annual averages. For example, the annual averages for the calendar year 1960 are as follows:

1960 civilian labor force (annual average)	70,612,000
1960 total employment (annual average)	66,681,000
1960 unemployment (annual average)	3,931,000
1960 percentage of civilian labor force unemployed (annual average) percent	5.6

I fully recognize that there are those who will criticize these figures by pointing out that, while the average number of unemployed in 1960 was 3,931,000, the December 1960 figure shows 4,540,000 unemployed, or 6.4 percent of the labor force.

However, to those who wish to pick out particular months for emphasis, I call their attention to the fact that in the month of July 1949, during the Truman administration, the percentage of the civilian labor force unemployed reached a high of 7 percent, and the annual average of unemployed for the calendar year 1949 was 5.9 percent, while it was 5.6 percent for calendar year 1960.

These charts dealing with the employment and unemployment percentages have been compiled on a monthly basis as well as to show the annual averages for each of the past 14 years.

I let the charts speak for themselves with just this final comment—the past 8 years were years of peacetime employment.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from the Department of Labor, dated January 19, 1961, and signed by Mr. Walter C. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of Labor, followed by chart No. 1, showing the civilian labor force of the past 14-year period.

Chart No. 2, showing the total number employed during each of the months as well as the annual average of employment for the past 14 years.

Chart No. 3, showing the unemployment record of the past 14 years broken down both by months and annual averages.

Chart No. 4, showing the percentage of the number of unemployed as compared to the total labor force for the same period.

There being no objection, the letter and charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In accordance with your request, I am enclosing information on labor force employment and unemployment in the United States from 1947 to date.

I hope this information will be helpful to you. Should you need more, please call Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, here at the Department.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. WALLACE,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CHART 1.—*Civilian labor force*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual averages
1947	57,790	58,010	58,390	59,120	60,290	62,609	62,664	61,665	60,784	60,892	60,216	59,590	60,168
1948	59,214	59,778	59,769	60,524	60,422	63,479	63,842	63,186	62,212	61,775	61,724	61,375	61,442
1949	60,078	60,388	60,814	60,835	61,983	63,398	63,815	63,637	62,763	62,576	62,927	62,045	62,105
1950	61,427	61,637	61,675	62,183	62,788	64,866	64,427	64,867	63,567	63,704	63,512	62,538	63,099
1951	61,514	61,313	62,325	61,789	62,803	63,783	64,382	64,208	63,196	63,452	63,164	62,688	62,884
1952	61,780	61,838	61,518	61,744	62,778	64,390	64,176	63,958	63,698	63,146	63,646	62,921	62,966
1953	62,896	62,885	63,339	63,155	63,285	65,147	65,214	64,931	63,905	64,059	63,975	62,993	63,815
1954	62,840	63,725	63,825	64,063	64,425	65,445	65,494	65,522	65,244	64,882	64,624	63,526	64,468
1955	63,497	63,321	63,654	66,647	65,192	66,696	67,465	67,726	66,882	67,292	67,206	66,592	65,847
1956	65,775	65,491	65,913	66,555	67,846	69,430	69,489	68,947	68,069	68,082	67,732	67,029	67,530
1957	65,821	66,311	66,746	66,951	67,893	69,842	70,228	68,994	68,225	68,513	68,061	67,770	67,946
1958	66,732	67,160	67,510	68,027	68,965	70,418	70,473	70,067	68,740	69,111	68,485	68,081	68,647
1959	67,430	67,471	68,189	68,639	69,405	71,324	71,338	70,667	69,577	70,103	69,310	69,276	69,394
1960	68,168	68,449	68,473	69,819	70,667	73,002	72,706	72,070	71,155	71,069	71,213	70,549	70,612

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii, raising the level by about 280,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 2.—*Total employment*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual average
1947	55,268	55,406	55,852	56,430	58,094	59,741	59,779	59,256	58,635	59,079	58,437	57,761	57,812
1948	56,843	56,927	57,093	58,079	58,393	60,906	61,296	60,908	60,128	60,008	59,659	59,162	59,117
1949	57,045	56,899	57,417	57,550	58,418	59,308	59,335	59,611	59,110	58,754	59,305	58,326	58,423
1950	56,728	56,809	57,332	58,476	59,482	61,129	60,946	62,196	61,028	61,627	61,129	60,099	59,748
1951	58,830	58,740	59,974	59,829	60,990	61,507	62,226	62,372	61,280	61,668	61,140	60,858	60,784
1952	59,502	59,480	59,480	59,874	60,938	62,232	61,972	61,984	61,924	61,642	62,030	61,357	61,035
1953	60,729	60,901	61,489	61,368	61,714	63,313	63,444	63,389	62,271	62,476	61,930	60,317	61,945
1954	59,246	59,731	59,772	60,194	60,734	61,642	61,712	61,983	61,781	61,919	61,478	60,487	60,890
1955	59,800	59,738	60,327	61,460	62,481	63,676	64,684	65,115	64,521	64,975	64,612	63,935	62,944
1956	62,684	62,354	62,787	63,799	64,950	66,027	66,354	66,421	65,774	65,955	65,084	64,306	64,708
1957	62,578	63,190	63,865	64,261	65,178	66,504	67,221	66,385	65,674	66,005	64,873	64,396	65,007
1958	62,238	61,988	62,311	62,907	64,061	64,981	65,179	65,367	64,629	65,306	64,653	63,973	63,966
1959	62,706	62,722	63,828	65,012	66,016	67,342	67,594	67,241	66,347	66,831	65,640	65,699	65,581
1960	64,020	64,520	64,267	66,159	67,208	68,579	68,089	68,282	67,767	67,490	67,182	66,009	66,681

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii, raising the level by about 265,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 3.—*Unemployment*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual averages
1947	2,522	2,604	2,538	2,681	2,196	2,869	2,884	2,409	2,149	1,812	1,779	1,829	2,356
1948	2,371	2,851	2,676	2,444	2,028	2,574	2,546	2,278	2,083	1,768	2,065	2,213	2,325
1949	3,033	3,490	3,397	3,285	3,565	4,089	4,480	4,025	3,652	[1] 3,823	3,622	3,719	3,682
1950	4,699	4,828	4,342	3,707	3,306	3,737	3,481	2,671	2,539	2,077	2,382	2,438	3,351
1951	2,683	2,572	2,352	1,959	1,812	2,276	2,156	1,836	1,906	1,784	2,024	1,830	2,099
1952	2,278	2,358	2,038	1,870	1,840	2,158	2,204	1,974	1,774	1,504	1,616	1,564	1,931
1953	2,167	1,984	1,850	1,787	1,571	1,834	1,770	1,542	1,634	1,583	2,045	2,676	1,870
1954	3,594	3,994	4,052	3,869	3,690	3,803	3,783	3,539	3,464	2,963	3,146	3,039	3,578
1955	3,697	3,583	3,326	3,187	2,711	3,019	2,781	2,610	2,361	2,317	2,593	2,657	2,903
1956	3,092	3,136	3,125	2,755	2,896	3,403	3,134	2,527	2,295	2,127	2,648	2,723	2,822
1957	3,244	3,121	2,882	2,690	2,715	3,337	3,007	2,609	2,552	2,508	3,188	3,374	2,936
1958	4,494	5,173	5,198	5,120	4,904	5,437	5,294	4,699	4,111	3,805	3,833	4,108	4,681
1959	4,724	4,749	4,362	3,627	3,389	3,982	3,744	3,426	3,230	3,272	3,670	3,577	3,813
1960	4,149	3,931	4,206	3,660	3,459	4,423	4,017	3,788	3,388	3,579	4,031	4,540	3,931

[1] Unemployment exaggerated by coal strike.

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 4.—*Unemployment rates*

[Percent of civilian labor force who were unemployed]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual average
1947	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	3.6	4.6	4.6	3.9	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.9
1948	4.0	4.8	4.5	4.0	3.4	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.6	3.8
1949	5.1	5.8	5.6	5.4	5.8	6.5	7.0	6.3	5.8	[1] 6.1	5.8	6.0	5.9
1950	7.7	7.8	7.0	6.0	5.3	5.8	5.4	4.1	4.0	3.3	3.8	3.9	5.3
1951	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.2	2.9	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.3
1952	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.5	3.1
1953	3.5	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.5	3.2	4.3	2.9
1954	5.7	6.3	6.4	6.0	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.3	4.6	4.9	4.8	5.6
1955	5.8	5.7	5.2	4.9	4.2	4.5	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.9	4.0	4.4
1956	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.1	4.3	4.9	4.5	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.9	4.1	4.2
1957	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.8	4.3	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.7	5.0	4.3
1958	6.7	7.7	7.7	7.5	7.1	7.7	7.5	6.7	6.0	5.5	5.6	6.0	6.8
1959	7.0	7.0	6.4	5.3	4.9	5.6	5.2	4.8	4.6	4.7	5.3	5.2	5.5
1960	6.1	5.7	6.1	5.2	4.9	6.1	5.5	5.3	4.8	5.0	5.7	6.4	5.6

[1] Unemployment rate exaggerated by coal strike.

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii.

Prepared by: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

TRACY S. McCRAKEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great citizen of my State of Wyoming, as well as a great American. On December 26, 1960, my dear friend, Tracy S. McCraken, our Democratic national committeeman, and a very distinguished newspaper publisher, passed away very unexpectedly.

Mr. McCraken was distinguished on many fronts, active on more, but always insisted on remaining behind the scenes. He asked for no public plaudits. He asked for no popular recognition. And as it stands today, there were ever so many selfless and unselfish things Tracy McCraken did the outside world knows little or nothing about.

It was this kind of selflessness that endeared him to all who knew him well. My personal acquaintance with him began with my employment at the University of Wyoming as a professor. I can say with all honesty that he was one of the very few men I have known around the country who truly understood what a university was all about, what a liberal education really means, and what the maintenance of an academic atmosphere strictly requires. Thus, in the academic world, he carved a place for himself in the history of higher education in this country.

As vice president of our board of trustees for many years—again turning down the presidency because it would be too conspicuous a role—in one of the most exciting moments in the university's history, he presided over its expansion and helped to guide its useful growth.

On another level, that of his chosen profession, journalism, the professionals in that pursuit have long since paid their undying tribute to Tracy McCraken. He was one of the giants in the land in the newspaper field. We in Wyoming were proud of him on that score alone.

Finally, in his third pursuit, which was almost an avocation of his, but which took so much of his time and personal endeavor that it became at moments his vocation, namely, his service to the Democratic Party as national committeeman, he distinguished himself repeatedly in raising his voice not only in the interest of the party but in the interest of the less populous segments of the Democratic Party. While I refer to him as a Democratic national committeeman and a member of my own party, I hasten to add that his keenest interest of all was that all Americans be more interested in politics, whatever the party of their choice, and his personal efforts were devoted to stimulating public interest in all levels of politics. He became widely interested in that matter on a nationwide scale rather than in Wyoming alone.

In conclusion, this man, who served so significantly the public interest in a private way, deserves the plaudits of all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief background statement I have prepared of his own rise to success on so many fronts be printed in the RECORD immediately following my own remarks in regard to Mr. McCraken.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO TRACY S. McCRAKEN

Mr. President, on December 26, 1960, this Nation lost a great public servant and an outstanding American. I refer to the untimely death of Tracy S. McCraken, a noted newspaper publisher in the State of Wyoming who was also our Democratic national committeeman.

Tracy—as he was affectionately known throughout our State—was born in the State of Illinois, but came to Wyoming during the First World War to attend the University of Wyoming, and he was graduated from that university in 1917. He returned to Illinois after his graduation and became a reporter for the Belvidere Republican.

He rose from reporter to city editor and to editor-manager of the Laramie Boomerang in Wyoming shortly after returning to Wyoming in 1919. He then served as secretary to Gov. William B. Ross, and for 3 years was secretary to a great U.S. Senator from my State, John B. Kendrick.

Mr. President, in 1926, Tracy purchased the Wyoming Eagle, which was at that time a weekly newspaper at Cheyenne. He built it to the largest weekly in the State and converted it into a daily morning tabloid in 1933.

In 1936, he assumed ownership of the Wyoming State Tribune and Leader, Cheyenne's other daily newspaper, and he then gradually added other newspapers and radio and television stations to his chain. At the time of his passing, Tracy's chain included the Wyoming Eagle and Wyoming State Tribune at Cheyenne, the Laramie Boomerang, which is an outstanding newspaper in my hometown, the Rawlins Daily Times, the Rock Springs Rocket and Miner, the Northern Wyoming Daily News at Worland, stations KFBC and KFBC–TV at Cheyenne and KVRS at Rock Springs. He stepped down as president and publisher of the Cheyenne newspapers in 1957 in favor of his son, Robert. He remained as chairman of the board until his death last month.

Mr. President, Tracy McCraken was a distinguished politician as well as a distinguished newspaperman. Formerly a member of the Democratic national executive committee, he was Wyoming's national committeeman from 1942.

Tracy, at the time of his death, was also vice president and a member of the University of Wyoming board of trustees. A successful businessman, he was a director of the American National Bank of Cheyenne, vice president and treasurer of the Wyoming Realty Co., and owner of the Plains and Frontier Hotels in Cheyenne and the Connor Hotel in Laramie.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, as well as the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], who now occupies the chair, in his capacity as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, in expressing my personal sense of loss on the passing of Tracy McCraken. In many respects, he has been one of the outstanding citizens of Wyoming; a man who, as has been indicated, has had a very sympathetic interest in the welfare of the State of Montana, as well as the Rocky Mountain region as a whole.

Many people outside of Wyoming will miss Tracy. The good things which Tracy has done will live after him and, I think, will serve to commemorate a life which was full and which certainly accomplished much in the way of real results, and which personified the man whom the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming has so graciously described at this time.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Montana for his stimulating comments in regard to our mutual friend, Tracy McCraken.

AWARD TO SENATOR MAGNUSON BY INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on November 21, 1960, my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was honored by the Inland Empire Waterways Association of Walla Walla, Wash., for his untiring efforts in behalf of the comprehensive water resource program in the Pacific Northwest and to the entire Nation. As an indication of the association's appreciation for this service, the association's board of directors presented him a certificate of appreciation at their annual convention held in Portland, Oreg.

I ask unanimous consent to have the certificate printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the certificate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION FOR HONORED SERVICE IS AWARDED TO WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. SENATOR

For distinguished service to the United States of America and the Pacific Northwest from 1937 to 1960. His outstanding accomplishments in the field of comprehensive water resource development have resulted in expediting the development of power, reclamation, flood control, and navigation in the Columbia River Basin. His interest in maritime matters and coastal harbor improvements has won him the plaudits of the Nation. His continued efforts in this regard have led to the enhancement of the economy of the Northwest States. His exemplary leadership as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has resulted in coordinating all transportation interests to work for a more comprehensive and competitive transportation network in the Nation. His continued efforts in the field of transportation have resulted in legislation which has been constructive and more recently was responsible for the establishment of the transportation study group to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which is analyzing the position of transportation during the next decade. All of his efforts have helped to gain for the Pacific Northwest and the comprehensive water resource development program great prominence and public support.

CHARLES BAKER,
President.

NOVEMBER 21, 1960.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion

of the Senator from Nevada to consider the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Roswell L. Gilpatric, a distinguished citizen of New York and an able and outstanding member of the bar of the city and State of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. As a fellow lawyer, Mr. Gilpatric has for almost 20 years been a member of the highly respected firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

Mr. Gilpatric has demonstrated a progressive, forward-looking attitude in his professional and public life. He has had a deep interest for years in the problems of our Defense Establishment. He has carefully studied our defense posture, and has been a leader in suggesting needed changes. While I by no means intend today to endorse all the changes which he has proposed, I recognize that he has given long and intensive study to problems in this area. His views on the subject are deserving of our respectful and thorough consideration.

In my opinion, Roswell Gilpatric's knowledge, experience, and independence of judgment fit him admirably for the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense. I urge the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination.

Mr. MORTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry that I could not be in the Chamber when the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr to be Secretary of the Army was confirmed. My colleague, Senator COOPER, today is in Somerset, Ky., where a well-deserved Cooper appreciation day is being held. I ask unanimous consent that Senator COOPER'S statement, made before the Armed Services Committee, be printed in the RECORD just prior to the action of the Senate in confirming the nomination of Mr. Stahr; and I wish to say that I associate myself with that statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER IN SUPPORT OF THE NOMINATION OF ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
January 17, 1961.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have known the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army-designate, personally for over 10 years, and before that time was acquainted with his outstanding record as an educator and in various posts in the service of the United States. His brilliant record is before this committee and speaks for itself.

I do want to say that he is held in the highest respect in his native State of Kentucky, for his fine qualities of mind, his administrative ability, and for his integrity.

I am very glad that he has been named to be Secretary of the Army and I am happy that I shall have the chance to vote for his confirmation in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOHN B. CONNALLY, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I correct in stating that the present business before the Senate is the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to make a few observations with respect to the pending business.

First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate for being excused for my absence last week due to a very tragic accident which resulted in the death of the foreman at my ranch. He left a widow and six small children. I was advised of the serious turn of the accident a week ago yesterday, Sunday, and immediately left Washington. The man unfortunately passed away during the week. His funeral was held Saturday afternoon. The various problems that arose incident to the unraveling of the facts surrounding the accident—the insurance, arrangements for the bereaved family and for a ranch operation in midwinter, and so forth—made it impossible for me to be present in Washington during the week when hearings were conducted on the nominations for the various defense posts.

In connection with the nomination of Mr. Robert S. McNamara for the office of Secretary of Defense, the chairman of the committee had circulated to members of the committee a copy of the proposed trust agreement, which had reached me before I left Washington.

I was able in that instance to dictate a letter to the chairman of the committee raising some questions. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators took note of my questions and saw that the questions were asked and answers developed.

There was no similar opportunity, however, for me to make a study of any questions or allegations relating to Mr. Connally.

In view of a speech which was made on the floor of the Senate last Saturday by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in which he considered some of the questions which had been mentioned in the press, involving my name, and because the Senator from Oregon in his discussion referred to me by name on two or three occasions during his remarks, I thought I should make some observations at this time.

In addition to regretting that I was not able to be here for the hearings last week, may I say that I regretted that I was unable to be present for the inauguration.

I noticed the interesting speech of the President as reported in the press. I was impressed by it, and particularly wish to commend President Kennedy saying that we should not negotiate out of fear, but that we should not fear to negotiate. I was also impressed with his statement on the responsibility of citizens to try to do something for their country instead of asking what the country could do for them.

Having served with both President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, I want it clearly understood that anything I might ever say with respect to the present administration will be in the belief that President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON will pursue their duties with high dedication and with eminent qualifications for the posts to which they have been elected.

With respect to several aspects of the pending nomination which were discussed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and in various press statements or columns, I personally have no great knowledge. I have no personal knowledge that Mr. Connally was in any way connected with the incidents of the spring of 1956, when certain individuals attempted to put some funds into a campaign fund for my benefit on the eve of the vote on the natural gas bill.

I had no information at that time that Mr. Connally had any interest, in any way, shape, or form, in the matter. I suppose I might have met him at some time, but if he were to walk into the Chamber or were present in the gallery, I would not be able to recognize him today. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no knowledge that he had any connection with that incident in any way, shape, or form. If he had such, through his interest in the proposed nat-

ural gas legislation, that is not a matter of knowledge by me.

Under the circumstances, I have not had an opportunity to investigate or to make any check, or to submit any questions to him in connection with the allegations of these articles which have appeared in the press and in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

I have, since noon today, read the hearings as they were developed in the Committee on Armed Services on the nomination of Mr. Connally. I would have to say that, on reading the statements made by him in response to interrogations by members of the committee, I thought he made a very good response, and that his answers were satisfactory so far as the questions propounded to him were concerned.

Had I been present at the hearing, undoubtedly I would have had some additional questions to ask him. However, under the circumstances related, it was not possible for me to be here the past week.

If it were proved that Mr. Connally had any personal connection with the operations attempted by Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, I would have to vote against his confirmation. Were I to do so, it might be alleged that I was an interested party and prejudiced. Without an opportunity to explore this matter in committee, I do not feel that, as a party of possible interest, I should participate in this judgment. The rules of the House provide that Members should not vote in a matter where they have a direct personal interest.

Therefore, Madam President, in view of the fact that the intimation—if not the allegation, at least the intimation—was that Mr. Connally had some connection with or some interest in the incident of 1956, I recognize that to a certain degree I am a party of interest, and therefore, under the rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from voting on the Connally nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, there is one other comment I should like to make in connection with this matter. In one of the columns written by Mr. Pearson, appearing in the newspapers of Monday, January 16, 1961, appears this paragraph:

NOTE.—In the end, Elmer Patman and John Neff, lobbyists for Superior Oil of California, were fined only $2,500 each and given only 1 year suspended sentences for offering money to a U.S. Senator. The U.S. judge who let the two off so lightly was Joseph C. McGarraghy, appointed by Mr. Eisenhower after he had served as an Ike delegate to the 1952 GOP convention, and chairman of the Eisenhower-Nixon Inaugural Parade Committee. Neither Howard Keck, head of Superior Oil, nor any of the Keck family were made defendants, though the corporation, which cannot be put in jail, pleaded guilty and was fined $10,000.

Madam President, I should like to offer a bit of comment on that statement, in fairness to Judge McGarraghy. I have never personally discussed the matter or the case with Judge McGarraghy, either before the matter came before him or since. I know Judge McGarraghy, and I have always had a high regard for him. I first came in contact with him when I served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. However, this particular matter has never been the subject of discussion by me with him. I think it is incumbent upon me, perhaps, to make a comment in justice to Judge McGarraghy. I feel I should do so because Judge McGarraghy cannot speak here and being a member of the bench, he is unlikely to make any statement about it.

Actually, Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, as I understand, pleaded guilty to a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act. The judge could not have imposed any sentence for bribery as such if there were neither a conviction nor a plea of guilty on a bribery indictment. The only sentence the judge could have imposed was one provided within the provisions of the Lobbying Registration Act. That law permitted the imposition of a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment for 1 year.

I do not know, but I have always had the hunch, that probably when they pleaded guilty to these particular counts to which they did plead guilty, they did not anticipate anything more than a monetary fine. The fact that they were fined $2,500, rather than the $5,000 fine which might have been imposed, I have always surmised was for the purpose of reminding them of the $2,500 figure involved in each of their intended operations. As Mr. Neff said when asked about his attempted activities in another State "that figure seems to come up everywhere." But whatever considerations led the judge to fix the individual fines at $2,500, it was one-half of the maximum fine that could have been imposed on each of them.

The 1-year sentence was the maximum that could have been imposed for violation of the particular act to which they pleaded guilty. The judge did suspend the sentence. However, practicing attorneys do not welcome the imposition of any prison sentence of 1 year, whether it is suspended or not. I am sure that the imposition of the 1 year sentence was not only a punishment to them during the year in which the sentence lasted but would forever carry with it a professional stigma for any practicing attorney.

The fact that the corporation pleaded guilty and was fined $10,000 speaks for itself. A corporation, as such, could not have been put in jail.

Under the circumstances, in view of the fact that the Lobbying Registration Act was the act under which the conviction was had by the plea of guilty, I have thought that the judge acted appropriately. Judges customarily take into consideration that the costs and uncertainties of trial are avoided when parties charged admit guilt and enter guilty pleas.

There is one other penalty which a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act carries by terms of the statute itself. The act provides that anyone who is convicted of a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act may not appear before a congressional committee for a period of 3 years following that time. So that the two individuals involved, Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, in addition to the $2,500 fines and the year's suspended sentence, were prohibited from appearing before congressional committees in connection with any legislation for a period of 3 years following that time.

I have added these remarks with regard to this subject merely because I thought that Judge McGarraghy, being a member of the bench, was not in position to say anything about the matter himself and because there may have been some misunderstanding as to what statute was involved. It was not a conviction for a violation of the bribery statute; it was a conviction for a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act. If the other counts of the indictment voted by the Federal grand jury had been pressed and if there had been a conviction under those counts, it might have been a different matter. The judge could only pronounce a sentence within the statute under which convictions were obtained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of John B. Connally. I do so with very great reluctance and a heavy heart. I do so even though I recognize that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle who have been reluctant to approve nominations have been very anxious to give the President the benefit of the doubt. I know that Republican Senators have shown very great and very proper reluctance to oppose any nomination. I am a Democrat, a northern Democrat, and a Kennedy Democrat. I was for Senator Kennedy enthusiastically before the nomination at Los Angeles and am for him now enthusiastically. I believe that his nominations for appointments to the Cabinet have been excellent. I have said so, and I have said so publicly.

However, I feel that in good conscience I am bound to speak out and oppose the nomination of John B. Connally to be Secretary of the Navy.

I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that what I intend to do is ask of him certain questions and, if he would be patient with me, I should like to establish in each case the background for the question, so that it would be a little clearer.

At page 13 of the hearings on the nomination the Senator from Georgia is quoted as having said:

Chairman RUSSELL. Personally, I think we are fortunate to have a man who knows something about the oil business to handle these oil reserves. No contract relating to them can be entered into until it is submitted in detail to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. Both of those committees have subcommittees who go over these contracts, and examine them in great detail. I think it would be a distinct advantage to the United States to have someone who does know something about the oil industry.

Madam President, I have very carefully examined the biography of the nominee, printed in the hearings. Frankly, it appears to me that the nominee's only qualification is that he has been in the oil industry. It is true that

he has been an active and efficient administrator, but strictly in the oil industry. He has a law degree and has practiced law, but that practice was confined to 2 or 3 years when he was a young man. He also served in the armed services, like 16 million others of us during World War II and, like several million, served in the Navy.

He was administrative assistant for a few months to a very distinguished former Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

For several months, he ran a small radio station.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if the nominee's only real, important qualification, his principal experience, has been his employment as an executive of one of the world's biggest private oil empires?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not checked the time of Mr. Connally's service in each capacity. I have forgotten the number of years he worked for the late Sid Richardson, who was a very large, independent oil operator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that he joined the firm in 1952 and worked there from then until the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. If he was graduated in 1940, he had not spent more than half his time in Mr. Richardson's employ. He stated he practiced law for several years. I know of my own knowledge that he was in Washington for a time and was associated with the present Vice President when he was a Senator. I have not actually checked the time, but Mr. Connally apparently has worked for some 9 years for the Richardson oil interests.

He said he came to Washington in 1939 as secretary to then Congressman JOHNSON.

Apparently he had not spent half his time in the oil industry. He spent some in the private practice of law with the firm of Powell, Wirtz & Rahout, in Austin, Tex. I knew Mr. Wirtz quite well. He was Under Secretary of the Interior during a part of the time of Harold L. Ickes, if not for the entire time.

He spent some of his time in the operation of a radio station.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that, important as the experience is that this man has had, and recognizing, of course, that service as an administrative assistant to a Senator is important, too, the main reason why this man can be looked upon as an administrator, the main reason why he can be looked upon as qualified for the high position of Secretary of the Navy, is that he has had substantial executive experience in the oil industry, having been connected with a very large private oil empire?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should say that that was his largest administrative experience.

The evaluation of experience is a relative matter.

The Senate on Saturday confirmed the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy to be Attorney General of the United States. The junior Senator from Wisconsin supported the nomination. If Mr. Kennedy had had any administrative experience in private life equivalent to that which he had in government, it certainly did not come out in the hearings. The only previous experience he had had was as counsel for a committee of Congress, which is even much more limited experience than that of administrative assistant to a Senator. Mr. Kennedy's experience was limited to only one area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I respond by saying that the distinguished Attorney General has had a very impressive administrative record. The work of that committee comprised an enormous project with many lawyers and investigators. The committee had an extremely complex and difficult job to perform. Its staff was brought together under very trying circumstances. They were new men. They had, in a matter of a couple of years, to do one of the biggest, most impressive jobs in government. The whole group was administered, led, and directed by Mr. Kennedy, the new Attorney General. It seems to me that Robert Kennedy made a very fine, a remarkable, showing of administrative ability.

Also, Mr. Robert Kennedy managed the campaign of the successful presidential candidate. That was a difficult, trying job. He showed great administrative ability in that capacity, ability which I believe qualifies him for his new position.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire and, I think, most of the members of his political party, have tried to take a very fair and reasonable view of the nominations submitted by President Kennedy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has just said so.

Mr. BRIDGES. However, if we had been looking for things to criticize, we certainly could have picked out many in the nominations which have been made and which are to be taken up.

Measured by the test which the Senator from New Hampshire expressed in the Senate on Saturday as applying, and considering some of the glaring inadequacies of some of the nominees for various positions in the whole field, it is necessary to be fair and very broad-minded. I believe, certainly by the standards which we are trying to follow here, to be fair to the new President at the beginning of his term, Mr. Connally measured up very well in proportion. And I listened to his testimony very carefully, and I have known him for many years. He is an able, outstanding man, and will make an excellent Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Hampshire did set forth a series of criteria. I agree with those criteria. I subscribe to them. One of the criteria was conflict of interest, and that is the area I expect to establish.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe the RECORD should be left quite as it is, to the effect that Mr. Connally's major administrative experience was in the oil industry. I have known John Connally for quite some time, and, I recall, he managed not only a gasoline refinery and a carbon plant, but also several housing corporations, three radio stations and television stations, a number of ranches, and a large amount of real estate, both city and country. So he has had a really diversified administration experience.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the Richardson holdings are very vast and diversified; but they are comprised primarily of oil holdings, and the oil is by far the most valuable property and the property of greatest importance.

At the same time, there were the other interests, and Mr. Connally acquired additional experience from them. My argument does not go to the point of competence; it goes to his identification with particular economic interests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought the record showed there were three coexecutors of the estate, and that Mr. Connally devoted himself mainly to the items I have just cited in the RECORD. I thought that was the burden of his testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall come to that subject a little later.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do I understand the burden of the Senator's argument to be that the nominee is not qualified by reason of the experience which he has had in the oil industry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; the burden of my argument has not been developed yet. I simply asked my first question, which was to determine whether it could be agreed that the nominee's principal experience has been in the oil industry. I have said that in the oil industry he may well have acquired competence and experience which will be valuable to him. I have not pursued other implications, but I intend to do so. I have nothing against his experience or his acquiring competence in any field.

Mr. SMATHERS. I know that nominees to the Federal Trade Commission, for example, have come before the committee and said they were qualified to be members of the FTC because of their experience in the field of monopoly.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of the Secretary of Labor because he had experience in the labor field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He was a lawyer.

Mr. SMATHERS. He was a lawyer and represented certain labor unions.

Those are factors which are important in determining whether a nominee is qualified or disqualified for the position to which he is appointed. I was wondering whether Mr. Connally was to be disqualified because he was engaged in an area in which the Navy was interested. Mr. Connally said he would not let any past experience or action he may have had in any way influence the conduct of this office to the detriment of the Government. I think we have to take his word for that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I certainly do not disqualify Mr. Connally because of his experience. It is an important qualification. I am simply attempting to establish his experience, where it came from, and what his attitude is likely to be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator remember that I asked Mr. Connally:

And you are satisfied, are you, that you can proceed completely clear of the oil industry with respect to any of your functioning as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. Connally replied:

Senator, beyond any question of a doubt.

Referring to what the distinguished Senator from Florida just brought up, I then asked Mr. Connally:

As I understand, what you are saying is that because of your broad experience in this industry in the past, you believe that you can get maximum return for the taxpayers' dollar in the interest that the Navy has in the purchase and use of oil?

Mr. Connally's answer was:

That is correct, sir.

Then I asked:

But, nevertheless, from your own personal standpoint, if you did have any interest that might be in conflict with your present position, you have taken all the steps that, as a lawyer, and as a former Government employee, you believe are necessary and right to be sure there was no conflict of interest of any kind whatsoever, is that correct?

Mr. Connally replied:

Yes, sir; that is correct.

I present to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin the fact that in the committee this matter was gone into in great detail.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am certain it was. I read the hearings carefully. It is to that exact point that I shall speak in quite some detail.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall look forward to listening to the Senator. I have known John Connally for many years. I believe he is a man of high character. If there was any conflict of interest, and he says he has handled it properly, I am certain he has done just that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin will do his best to avoid any discussion of character and personality, and will try his best to give the facts and indicate why, on the basis of those facts, this Senator cannot vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his typically gracious courtesy in yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I wish to point out that although the comparisons are not exact, Mr. Connally's background and business experience are very much like those which Mr. Robert Anderson had when, 8 years ago, he came before our committee. He came before the same committee, and he came from the same State, and he had been nominated to the same post; namely, Secretary of the Navy. His business experience and background were similar to those of Mr. Connally; and Mr. Anderson's prospects were bright, as are Mr. Connally's. As Senators know, Mr. Anderson later became Deputy Secretary of Defense, and later became Secretary of the Treasury. He served for 8 years; and the other day he left office with a record as outstanding, in my opinion—and, indeed, in the opinion of all others—as any made during those 8 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly experience in the oil industry can be of great benefit. That is one point among those I shall submit. But I shall establish that point first.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator knew Mr. Connally as well as I do, after attending the hearings, and after reading what the columnists have written, he would realize that the only objection which has been raised has been made by some newspaper columnists who have attempted to spew out some "oil" on Mr. Connally.

I believe it is well that the Secretary of the Navy does know something about oil and oil interests. Oil is one of the principal commodities used by the Navy. Certainly the nominee knows something about that subject, and, in my opinion, anyone who deals with the nominee on that subject will have to do so at arm's length—which will be another asset which Mr. Connally will have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The very point the Senator from Mississippi has made is, if followed through fully, in my opinion, one of the nominee's major disqualifications.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, in reading from page 9 of the hearings, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] quoted only part of Mr. Connally's reply. I think the reply in full is very helpful, particularly to the Senator from Wisconsin, as he is presenting his views to the Senate. Therefore, I wish to have the entire paragraph included in the RECORD. The preceding statements are as follows:

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to ask several questions with respect to the testimony that you have given this morning, which I think is to your interest as well as that of the committee.

As I understand it, you made a full disclosure of all oil interests that you have or that your family have to the committee this morning. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And, as you know, the Navy is a large buyer of oil.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. You also know that your former employer was known as one of the world's greatest oil men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And I admired him, respected him, proud to have him as a friend.

Undoubtedly, therefore, you have read some of the comments that Senator STENNIS referred to in the columns about the fact that your former work has been in the oil industry at least to some extent.

And you are satisfied, are you, that you can proceed completely clear of the oil industry with respect to any of your functioning as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. CONNALLY. Senator, beyond any question of a doubt.

It was up to that point that the Senator from Missouri quoted.

In addition, Mr. Connally said:

There is no—absolutely no question in my mind whatsoever. And may I add, sir, that I have revealed what oil and gas holdings I have. Again, let me reiterate that I was an employee, I was a salaried employee. I think my experience in the oil and gas business—and it has been considerable, the last 9 years, along with the other enterprises that I mentioned—will stand me in great stead in the position as Secretary of the Navy. I am not a geologist, a geophysicist, or a petroleum engineer, but I understand something of the jargon that they use, and I think my background and experience that I have had will be invaluable to me in administering the naval petroleum reserves, and the oil problems of the Navy.

We also brought out in the hearings that none of the oil holdings with which the Richardson firm had been concerned has anything to do with the naval reserves or is anywhere near them. I think it is very important to bring out that fact.

I shall have other things to say on this subject, although I shall not say them at this time.

But I believe it important to note that Mr. Connally was a salaried employee, and had no interests—except those he stated, which were very small—in the oil industry or the gas industry, and that he has had this experience.

I wished to make this statement at this time, in connection with the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I may say that later in my remarks I expect to dispute some of the points the Senator has made.

Madam President, this nominee has been associated with the General Gas Committee, which was formed by the petroleum industry at the time of the natural gas bill fight, to coordinate the efforts of the petroleum industry to push the natural gas bill through Congress. That fight resulted in use by the proponents of the bill of such improper and unethical tactics that President Eisenhower, who favored the substance of the bill, vetoed it because of the excessive and wrongful lobbying practices.

I want to make it very clear that there is no evidence that would involve the nominee in those practices.

But the fact is that that very aggressive, militant, special-interest group did select the nominee as one of the members of the 24-man steering committee. He was one of the 780 members of the group, and he was selected to be one of the 24 members of its steering committee. The duties of the steering committee were to lead and to coordinate the fight to exempt natural gas producers from regulation. That fight became a national scandal of such great proportions that it caused President Eisenhower to veto the bill. The nominee was recognized by that vigorous group of proponents of the special-interest oil viewpoint as worthy of selection as a member of their governing committee.

I am concerned because the petroleum industry, which has shown its concurrence in the views of the nominee, has the following record:

First, in 1920, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, wrote:

I have been compelled to fight almost every day of my incumbency in office to prevent the dummy entrymen and illegal operators from taking the naval reserves.

Second, this conflict of interest between the oil industry and the public interest—regarding the naval reserves has continued ever since. Recently the Oil and Gas Journal asserted:

The whole concept of naval petroleum reserves is a lot of bilge water. The Navy does not need petroleum reserves any more than it needs iron ore reserves to build ships, or wool ranch reserves to make uniforms or pulpwood reserves to sustain its paper work.

The National Petroleum Council recently insisted that—

Continuous peacetime development, by private industry, rather than public standby facilities is the way to safeguard the Nation's resources.

The United States Code gives the Secretary of the Navy the following discretionary authority—and I may say that I make this statement in response to the statement made by the senior Senator from Georgia at the hearings, where he very properly pointed out that the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services have to review the contracts that are made:

7421. (b) The Secretary has exclusive jurisdiction and control over those lands inside the naval petroleum reserves (of various numbers) * * * and shall administer those leases.

Madam President, my staff and I checked very carefully into the law. We could find no checks on the exercise of discretion by the Secretary of the Navy.

In the second place, under the code, 7422, it is provided that—

(a) The Secretary of the Navy, directly or by contract, lease or otherwise, shall explore, prospect, conserve, develop, use, and operate the naval petroleum reserves in his discretion, subject to approval by the President; (b) that such lands shall be used and operated for—first, the protection, conservation, maintenance, and testing of those reserves; (d) production of petroleum * * * but only with approval of President and by joint resolution of the Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, at this point will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the distinguished Senator's sincerity when he takes the position that perhaps a Secretary of the Navy who may have had experience in the oil industry might be dangerous. I happen to come from an oil-producing State. I know the situation which exists in Oklahoma, and also that which exists in Texas. If Mr. Connally has—as I am told—a very small amount of oil company stock, held in his own name or in his own right, and if he also administers some oil-company stock as trustee for an estate, if he is like all oil men in Oklahoma and, I believe, in Texas, where, because of imports of foreign oil, the production—at least in Texas—from those properties was reduced to less than 5 days a month, the last thing in the world that a man of that nature would want to do would be to have a vast amount of new production come in—which would further reduce the allowables for the production of oil from the properties those companies now own.

These are the plain facts of life. Certainly, these men who deal in oil, who explore for oil, are not looking with any great amount or degree of lust on any Naval oil reserve being brought into production, which would further cut down their allowables and which would reduce the production which they now have. One further point——

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I reply to that particular point before the Senator continues?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that the Senator from Oklahoma has made a point with which I agree 100 percent. It is exactly why we should not have an oil man in charge of the Navy Department. I was about to read the next clause, which states that—

If he finds that the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

That gives the Secretary the authority to reduce production to benefit the oil industry.

The oil men of Texas and Oklahoma will follow a predictable course, a course designed to benefit the oil industry, and resulting in disservice to the public.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator will find that the naval oil reserves are there to be used in the event of a prolonged drain on our present oil production and resources. In my memory, I do not know of a situation where there has been any widespread drilling or opening up or increasing of naval oil reserves, because the purpose of the reserves is to have them against the day when we may not have sufficient oil reserves. Those reserves are to be held inviolate against the day when oil production is not adequate to meet our needs. We could probably run the whole Navy by opening up the fields, but certainly the wisdom of the past will not dictate our doing so.

My point is that the last thing an oil man would do would be to exploit the situation and put into production large amounts of oil, in view of the imports from foreign countries and from the Williston basin, and elsewhere, and thus bring about a further reduction in the existing facilities which today are very marginal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that, whereas there has been a policy to preserve the oil reserves, as the Senator has stated, as a safeguard against the time when the Nation will have reduced oil supplies, there have been negotiations to benefit private organizations. This may be good policy. I am simply saying this man would go into the Navy as its Secretary with a background and attitude which would prevent him from exercising the kind of objective judgment which it seems to me a Secretary without those associations would take into that office.

Mr. MONRONEY. Because one happened to be engaged in business in a State where the production of oil was the principal business, where the economic opportunities were good for a man of ability to go into that field, I fail to see that, ipso facto, he must be disqualified from entering the field of public service.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I would have no objection whatsoever to his having any other office, Secretary of the Army, or Secretary of any other department that would occur to me offhand, or Attorney General. I simply object to his being confirmed to this particular office because he is in a position where his whole background, and I think I can say his whole pecuniary interest, would lead him to take a certain course which might be against the public interest.

Mr. MONRONEY. We both have expressed our positions on that matter. I appreciate the kindness of the distinguished Senator in yielding to me. In the course of the discussion, I think there are some points which can be amplified with respect to our feeling in regard to the gas bill, and the Senator said there were improper and unethical tactics used by the Superior Oil Co., by a Mr. Frank Keck, whom I have never known. I know none of those in this field who have been guilty of improper and unethical practices. The Superior Oil Co. was a member of the committee of 24 which the distinguished Senator outlined as having been associated in or working in a common objective to benefit their interests.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The entire purpose of the gas committee, of which this man was a principal director, he being one of the 24 on the steering committee, was to direct and organize the whole fight. This was not the only instance of such efforts. Former Senator Thye received over 1,000 telegrams which were proven by the McClellan committee investigation to be frauds. They were sent by people who did not exist. There was also the well known bribe attempt of a distinguished Republican Senator, which has been discussed. Those are two intances. The then President of the United States, who favored the bill, who asked for the bill, who wanted to sign the bill, felt that the whole series of instances was so grave that he vetoed the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand the Superior Oil Co. made a contribution to the campaign fund of a Senator, who, quite properly and ethically, revealed it. I do not know about the telegrams. I know it is rather common, when I receive a number of telegrams on certain matters, that when I acknowledge the telegrams I receive many replies stating, "I never authorized anyone to sign the telegram." I am sure the Senator is no stranger to the showering of Congress with telegrams when certain legislation is under consideration, whether it be labor legislation, or tax legislation, or interest

rate legislation, in which we are often associated in the fight. He knows we receive telegrams which quite often are signed by the names of persons who did not authorize the use of their names.

The point I am trying to make is, Are we going to assume that one is guilty by association? The Senator and I abhor that principle. The nominee is a fine young man, who has served us well, and who has done fine staff work, having been intelligent enough to be employed by a wealthy man who has been engaged in oil production. Is he to be associated with the unethical, improper advances made to one Senator? Is he to be termed unfit for rendering public service because he has been in a particular field, even though he is willing to serve and is fully capable of doing so?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin was very careful to dissociate himself from any charges that Mr. Connally was guilty of improper lobbying.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator said there was no evidence of it whatsoever, but the statement was made of improper tactics. All I am saying is, Was he associated with the group or the lobby with which the Superior Oil Co. was connected?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not think Superior Oil was represented directly among the steering committee members. It is my understanding they may have been associated with the gas committee. The fact is that the industry is a hard, determined, militant bunch. The 1956 incident is only one incident. It is well known that the oil and gas business is as aggressive and vigorous, a special interest group as there is. They know what they want out of government, and they go after it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Well, certainly the dairy farmers know what they want out of government, and go after it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Their organization has never been cited by anyone, certainly not the President, as unscrupulous.

Mr. MONRONEY. They wanted us to repeal the oleomargarine law.

The point is that it is going to happen again and again where economic interests are involved. Are they going to be guilty because they are in the business of producing oil?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oklahoma knows I have not called anybody a public enemy.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have said that this man is a man of character. I have said that he would be well qualified for another public office. I have said that this particular office may involve a conflict of interest, and in my judgment it definitely does. This does not demean anybody's character.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to hear the remainder of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I admit that I have not yet made my full case.

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot concede that simply because a man has some past knowledge of the oil industry this, ipso facto, makes him unqualified to take a high position, particularly when he is well known to be a man of great ability and character, a man who is honest to the *n*th degree. Those of us who know him better as a servant of the Senate than as an oil man know that.

I have had very few relationships with the Texas oil industry. We are the "poor relations." We have the smaller oil fields, those which are more fatigued and which do not produce as much oil. Still, oil is as important economically, in a way, to the Senator from Oklahoma, as is dairying to the Senator from Wisconsin, or as corn and wheat are to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. These are the economic facts of life.

We do not like to hear people who are engaged in these industries, so important to the economies of our States being called, let us not say public enemies, but let us say second-class citizens. I do not think they should be.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me, and I apologize to the Senator for taking so long a period of time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, who is characteristically gracious and courteous.

I should like to invite attention to page 13 of the oil and gas lobby investigation, which lists the members of the oil and gas committee which selected the nominee.

W. M. Keck, Superior Oil Co., 610 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, is listed as a member of that committee. His name is listed at that point in the hearings.

Madam President, I am going to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the many other instances in which the Secretary of the Navy has very great discretion and power over the oil reserves. I have already indicated the most important area in which he has unchecked and complete and total discretion, without any review whatsoever and without any consideration of the way in which this, it seems to me, could affect income for the oil industry generally and for the Richardson interests specifically.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these items may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

7423. The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense. (No check indicated.)

7425. (a) Whenever the Secretary of the Navy is unable to make arrangements he considers satisfactory for—

(1) exchanges of land or agreements for conservation * * *; or

(2) contracts for joint, unit, or other cooperative plans * * * he may acquire, with the approval of the President, such privately owned lands and leases—

(1) by purchase, inside the naval petroleum reserves, or outside these reserves on the same geologic structure; and

(2) by condemnation, inside naval petroleum reserve numbered 1, or, if there is substantial drainage, outside that reserve on the same geologic structure.

(b) The Secretary shall report annually to Congress all proceedings for purchase and condemnation under this section.

7427. The Secretary of the Navy, with the consent of the President, may make agreements, with respect to lands inside the naval petroleum reserves, of the same type as (provided in sec. 226e of title 30, to wit)—

"For the purpose of more properly conserving the natural resources of any oil or gas pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof * * * lessees thereof * * * may unite * * * in collectively adopting and operating under a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of such pool or field or like area, or any part thereof, whenever determined and certified by the Secretary of the Interior * * * to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. The Secretary is thereunto authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the holders of the leases involved, to establish, alter, change, or revoke drilling, producing, rental, minimum royalty, and royalty requirements of such leases and to make such regulations with reference to such leases * * * in connection with the institution and operation of any such cooperative or unit plan as he may deem necessary or proper to secure the proper protection of the public interest.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not clear in my mind whether the name of Keck is related to the small committee or to the large committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The name of Keck is related to the large committee of 780 members. He was one of the very large number.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, in the light of the record, and in view of the history of the days since Secretary Daniels was Secretary of the Navy, considering the expressed viewpoint of the special interests with which this nominee has been principally identified, is not the administration of the oil reserves likely to be prejudiced in the interests of the petroleum industry, which may not be the public interest?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a matter of opinion. I do not think so.

I have tried to point out that in the administration of the reserves the Secretary of the Navy can do hardly anything and cannot enter into any contract that is binding unless the proposal has first been submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

I should like to read section 7431 of the Civil Code:

The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives must be consulted and the President's approval must be obtained before any condemnation proceedings may be started under this chapter and before any of the following transactions authorized by this chapter may be effective:

(1) A lease of any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(2) A contract to alienate from the United States the use, control, or possession of any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(3) A contract to sell the oil and gas products, other than royalty products, from any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(4) A contract for conservation or for compensation for estimated drainage.

(5) An agreement to exchange land, the right to royalty production, or the right to any money due the United States.

That is the law.

There is a further provision, in section 7426:

No contract may be made under this section until the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been consulted as to all its details.

The conclusion that if a man is engaged in the oil industry he is therefore suspect of anything that has ever gone wrong is not a proper one.

The chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee that handles those matters is not an oilman. He does not represent an oil State. I designated the distinguished Senator from Missouri Mr. [SYMINGTON] as the chairman of the subcommittee, which must review and go into the details of each of the contracts which must be submitted to Congress. There is no question in my mind that the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri will go into all of those contracts.

I do not think the mere fact that Mr. Connally has been connected with the oil industry makes him subject to suspicion, any more than we could say that if one banker were to rob a bank in which he served as a trustee for the depositors it would mean, ipso facto, that every banker is a scoundrel and we ought to turn against every one of them.

I have heard what the Senator has said about not making any implications of guilt by association, and so forth. He may not be making such an implication, but otherwise what is all of this about the man named Keck? I do not know who he is. Apparently he must have been subject to some criticism, because the Senator has mentioned him a few times.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the Senator from Wisconsin did not bring up the name of Keck. That was brought out by various Senators who engaged in colloquy with me. I did not mention Mr. Keck first.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator mentioned that Mr. Keck was in the oil business, and that Mr. Connally's main experience has been with Mr. Richardson in the oil business, and that all of this ought to bar the nominee from being the Secretary of the Navy. I do not share that view. I know Mr. Connally personally, so perhaps I have some advantage over the Senator from Wisconsin, who I assume does not know him.

I have great faith in Mr. Connally's character and integrity, as well as in his ability. In my opinion, he will make an outstanding Secretary of the Navy. I do not think the mere fact that he has been a success in the oil industry means he is going to steal the naval reserves, or any part of them, or that he will otherwise stoop to any violation of the law. Let us not forget that he is a man who spent 5 years in the service of his country, in the uniform of the Navy.

He knows something about the Navy from both sides. He knows about the Navy from the fighting side. He has received decorations and citations for heroism under fire. He served in the procurement division of the Navy before he left the service in 1946. He is as well equipped to serve as Secretary of the Navy as any man whose name has been submitted for that office during my service in the Senate, and I have served on committees dealing with naval affairs for nearly 30 years.

When asking a question of that kind, the Senator will not get an affirmative reply from me, because I do not believe the mere fact that the man has been identified with the oil industry should permanently debar him from serving as Secretary of the Navy.

I have known some very fine men in the oil industry. It may be popular to attack all of them and to say that every one of them has made a lot of money, but if one looks further than the obviously prosperous oil men, one will find that a great many of these men have gone broke.

It so happens that I knew Mr. Sid Richardson in his lifetime. In my opinion Mr. Richardson, who has now gone to his last reward, was a very fine and patriotic citizen who loved his country and who would make as much sacrifice for it as almost any other American.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should prefer to reply to the Senator from Georgia first, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Madam President, I know there are fine men in the oil industry. I do not question the fact that there are very fine men in that industry. There are able and patriotic men with excellent character. I am not talking about that.

What I am talking about is the fact that these men have a special interest. If the conflict of interest statutes means anything, if the conflict of interest principle means anything, it means that very fine men in some circumstances should be found to be not qualified for the offices to which they are appointed.

I do not raise any question as to this nominee's character, and I have not done so. I certainly do not think he is going to steal the Navy blind. I think everything he will do he will do in good conscience, but it is going to be done upon the basis of long experience in the oil industry, operating from their viewpoint.

This man has had a good record in the Navy as a fighting man. That is certainly to his great credit. But, after all, no one would seriously argue the fact that simply because a man served in the Navy with distinction as a fighting man he thereby would be qualified to be the Secretary of the Navy.

To reply to the distinguished Senator from Georgia specifically, the Senator has quoted several sections which state, as I conceded, that it is necessary under some circumstances for the Secretary of the Navy to have contracts approved by the committees of the Congress.

Section 7423 is the principal section, as I said in my remarks, which gives the Secretary of the Navy discretion. I quote:

The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

There was no check whatsoever indicated, which is what I was speaking about.

In the second place, I believe we would all agree that Senators will give very great weight to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy. After all, the fact that appointees must check with a Senate committee does not mean that we can ignore the kind of attitude such appointees will have. My brief experience in the Senate, which has been reinforced repeatedly almost every month I have been in the Senate, demonstrates that we give great weight to the attitude of representatives of the various departments of the Government. They are the experts. They are the people who have the facts and the enormous staffs that are able to furnish recommendations.

I venture to suggest that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy will be followed in most cases, and perhaps in virtually all cases.

Some people may be surprised to know that the great majority of the recommendations of Ezra Taft Benson, who was not in high favor with most Democrats and many Republicans, were followed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I serve.

The fact that we appoint a man of the caliber of Mr. Connally as Secretary of the Navy, although he is a fine man, but one with his background, means that we can expect Navy policy, so far as oil reserves are concerned, to be a policy which would certainly not be unfriendly, and might be very useful to the petroleum industry.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, although the Senator from Wisconsin may already know it, I wish to point out to him that the law which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] read was originally adopted in 1920, amended in 1938, and I believe it was amended a third time in 1944. That law was the result of the Teapot Dome scandals, if my memory serves me correctly. Those scandals involved a question of drawing oil from the naval reserves through wells placed close by, which could drain oil out of the naval reserves.

I was chairman of the Armed Services Committee for 2 years, following the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is now again chairman. He has held that position for many years. The whole principle upon which we acted in that committee was to preserve the naval reserve areas for accessible oil in the event there was not sufficient oil elsewhere.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out, the oil in-

dustry is not working full time now. Therefore, certainly any contracts made with relation to the naval reserve should be very limited, and those reserves should be maintained for use in future years.

I was one of those who, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], went through the so-called Ed Pauley case. The Ed Pauley case was completely different from the case of John B. Connally, Jr., because Ed Pauley, to whom we gave a clean bill of health morally and ethically, just as the Senator from Wisconsin is doing with respect to John B. Connally, Jr., today, was a producer of oil. He was a speculator in oil wells. That situation was completely different from the situation involving Mr. Connally. Mr. Connally was a salaried employee with no oil interests himself, except a very small interest that gave him $325 a month.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator be persuaded if it could be shown that the nominee could conceivably benefit very greatly from policies of the Navy and that he has a prospective opportunity for a very large income as a result of oil production? Does the Senator know that what happens to the petroleum industry in the future will very definitely affect the pecuniary interests and advantage of the Secretary of the Navy-designate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thought we went into that question very carefully in our committee. I refer the Senator to page 8 of the committee report. I asked the question myself, because I thought it was pertinent in view of the Pauley case:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. Is there any arrangement for back salaries or pensions or anything of that character with that firm, when you now come over to Government employ?
>
> Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir. The partnership has no pension or retirement system in effect at all, Senator. I have, up until this point, during the almost 16 months since the death of Mr. Richardson—I would be entitled, under normal circumstances, to receive, if and when the estate was in a position to pay it, and the executors determined that they would—I would be entitled to receive some fees for the work that has been performed during the past 16 months. But I have had a clear understanding with the executors that in the light of my failure or inability to perform functions, that I would earn no fees whatsoever during the time I was in Government service, and that during my Government service I would not collect any moneys due and owing me, even for past services.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] section 240 of the Texas Probate Code, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes of Texas, volume 17A:

> SECTION 240—Joint executors or administrators
>
> Should there be more than one executor or administrator of the same estate at the same time, the acts of one of them as such executor or administrator shall be as valid as if all had acted jointly; and, in case of the death, resignation, or removal of an executor or administrator, if there be a co-executor or coadministrator of such estate, he shall proceed with such administration as if no such death, resignation or removal had occurred. Provided, however, that this section shall not be construed to authorize one of several executors or administrators to convey real estate, but in such case all the executors and administrators who have qualified as such and are acting as such shall join in the conveyance, unless the court, after due hearing, authorizes less than all to act.
>
> Acts 1955 54th Legislature, page 88, chapter 55; and other legislative history dating back to 1876.

That statute is interesting because under that statute, while Mr. Connally remains as executor of this estate, he has agreed to take no compensation as an executor while he is in Government service. He has agreed that only with respect to the 16 months he has served will he take any compensation.

So in answer to the question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]—a question which was very much in my mind when the hearings were held—there is no way that I see in which Mr. Connally, unless he violates his word, unless he violates his statements to the committee, can benefit from oil during the time that he is Secretary of the Navy, because during the previous period he was only a salaried employee and had no oil interests of his own beyond the $325 a month referred to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I believe I can answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts quite fully, but I would prefer, if he would permit me to do so, to proceed with my speech and cover that question as I come to it. I believe I can answer it convincingly, at least from my standpoint.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, but with the request that he ask me only a brief question, if that is possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota rose merely to say that he hopes the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed to develop his thoughts in this regard.

I have always thought that this subject was a very difficult area in which to legislate. The basic consideration of the conflict-of-interest statute is that a Government official should not do business with himself. Technically, the Government official should meet that requirement by divesting himself of his stocks or financial interests in an enterprise which, by reason of background or by reason of his philosophy, might operate in such a way that there could be a definite conflict between the best interests of the Government and the interests the official might pursue.

I have always thought that it was a difficult field in which to legislate. We might say to an individual, "You divest yourself of your stocks. You divest yourself of your holdings." However, I know of no way in which we can legislate to have a man divest himself of his basic philosophy of life or his basic interest. The problem is, in the final analysis, to determine whether a man has that kind of character and those convictions and ability which will let him operate on the basis of the interest of the Government, whether or not he holds certain business interests.

I believe that a statute states the Government shall not receive uncompensated services. The purpose of that statute certainly is that when a man works for the Government he is supposed to work for the Government, and place that employment in the primary and not secondary position.

So I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed with his statement. I recognize that he has assigned to himself an unpleasant duty, to go into this subject. I think it is in the interest of good government that when these matters arise they be explored to the extent that Members of the Senate have the ability, interest, and time to do so. I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin is making the speech. I am sure the exploration of this subject will be beneficial to the Federal Government as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota very much. I very much appreciate his comment.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I rise to commend the able Senator from Wisconsin for making this inquiry. It was only this morning that I read in the newspapers that President Kennedy was creating a three-man panel to examine into the conflict-of-interest situation. Congress will have to meet this issue head on. The New York Bar Association has given us a voluminous report. We may have to change some of our basic statutes. I believe it will be helpful, as the committees go into this subject, to have all these matters before us. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I will have to go into this issue.

I wonder if I could have the attention of the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. As I understand, this subject has to do with a law. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may ask questions of the Senator from Georgia without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I have not made up my mind as to how I will vote on this nomination. I am putting my questions for the purpose of obtaining information for myself. As I understand, certain congressional committees have the right to post-audit the action of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to contracts and with respect to leases having to do with the individual oil reserves themselves. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Not only do they have the right, but the contract is not a valid contract until that has been done, and it is not binding until that has been done. This requirement is provided by statute, and I have read that statute into the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that under another section of that statute there is the provision that the production can be reduced by the Secretary of

the Navy. He has the discretion, without any supervision or restraint by congressional committees.

Mr. CARROLL. I wanted to come to that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot say that I agree with that construction the Senator has placed on the statute. So far as I am advised, in practice there is no action that is taken with respect to the oil reserves of the Navy looking to a reduction or an increase in the production in any way without consultation with the committees of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Would it not also be the fact that no action could be taken by the Secretary of the Navy in this regard—and I am not familiar with the statute—without the approval of the President?

Mr. RUSSELL. That statute specifically so provides.

Mr. CARROLL. With respect to production?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Section 7423 of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Act provides:

SEC. 7423. Periodic reexamination of production requirements

The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds that the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

I would appreciate it if the Senator from Georgia or any other Senator could find any provision in the statute which indicates that a reduction depends upon approval by a congressional committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. In any event, in my opinion, no Secretary of the Navy would alter the terms of these contracts without consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. I was going to say that that would be my viewpoint, because this question has been gone into in the Antimonopoly Subcommittee. We went into it at great length. The question came up at the time of the breakdown in the Middle East. I am confident that the Secretary of the Navy would not take any such action without consulting the President of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The whole purpose of the law is to prevent a depletion of the oil reserves. It is not intended to encourage production. The purpose is to try to conserve the resources that are in the ground, so that we will have them available for our use by the Navy in a great emergency. I do not know anything about the oil industry, but I do know that when the oil is in the ground and it belongs to the U.S. Government, we will have the oil available in case a great national emergency arises.

I am not familiar with the oil industry, but I have not had much sympathy with the oil people complaining about the importation of oil. So long as the oil is in the ground in this country, it is available to us. The oil in Arabia and in other parts of the Middle East may be denied to us almost at any time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point I have been making repeatedly is clear, that in these cases, where a Senate committee or a House committee has to act on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, those recommendations are very impressive and very important, and those recommendations have to be given enormous weight. Senators are busy people. Few of us are experts. Even the members of the Committee on Armed Services, while they are distinguished, competent, able and of fine character, must take primarily the finding, judgment, and expression and argument which are put forth by the Secretary of the Navy. Of course, they will stand up against him when they think he is in error. However, the Secretary of the Navy has a great advantage when a congressional committee is his principal check, or only check. So far as the recommendation of the President is concerned, we must remember that he is a very busy man. Certainly he must primarily rely on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

All this is an argument against having as the Secretary of the Navy a man who might be biased or not objective, or whose judgment cannot be accepted at face value by the President and by congressional committees.

Mr. CARROLL. I come now to my third question. We have dealt with this type of contract. I remember that the question of the possibility of increasing or reducing the production was brought up before our Antimonopoly Subcommittee by Rear Adm. O. P. Lattu, who in 1957 was the Executive Director of the Military Petroleum Supply Agency of the Navy Department's Supply Corps.

As I remember, it was testified that the Navy purchases all the oil for the Military Establishment. The Navy spent in 1957, the year of our hearings, a billion dollars a year, and I assume the amount has been increased since then.

I assume these contracts are let by competitive bidding. Is there any evidence in the record before the committee that the company for which this young man was the attorney had been doing any business with the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. The evidence showed clearly that the estate of Richardson, while it is a large oil company, had never done one dollar's worth of business with the Government of the United States or with any agency of the U.S. Government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe I can show that that is not the case. Sid Richardson has owned an interest in a firm which has done business with the Government of the United States, and it appears, on the basis of the evidence I have, that the estate of Richardson may have done business with the U.S. Government, too. I would be very much interested in the reaction of the Senator from Georgia when I come to this particular point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to listen to what the Senator has to say. I hope what he says will be more susceptible of proof than some of the innuendoes that the distinguished Senator has given us heretofore.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to draw this distinction between three categories. We have the situation of the Military Establishment purchasing a billion dollars' worth of petroleum a year. Is it done by contract? Do the subcommittees of Congress review those contracts? Or is this within the purview of the Department itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. We do not review each and every contract for the purchase of petroleum, no. Such purchases are made all over the world. As I recall—and I think I am correct in this statement—the Mediterranean fleet uses oil that is purchased in the Middle East because the oil is closer and cheaper to get than to have it shipped from the United States.

No, we do not review every one of these contracts. There are any number of them in effect under which the Navy is purchasing oil. It purchases every kind of petroleum product, including jet fuel for the Air Force. The committee does not review all those contracts, any more than it reviews the various contracts for the transportation of goods and household effects. There is much more than a billion dollars a year spent for those items by the various elements of the Defense Department.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the chairman tell us how much was spent last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I cannot. I have in my mind the figure of $1,200 million, but please do not bind me to it. It is a very large sum of money. Nearly everything that is used in the Department of Defense, from missiles to halftracks and trucks, is fueled with petroleum products. Most of our ships at sea and all our land transportation, including trucks and halftracks, airplanes and missiles, and the facilities used to launch missiles—practically all of them are powered by petroleum products.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask my fellow Senators to help me, if possible, to get through with my presentation. I have no desire to hold the floor. I am sure Senators want to proceed with the nominations as fast as possible. I should very much appreciate it if the colloquy could be limited. I realize that in these circumstances it is desirable to have colloquy, because in this delicate position a man's future is involved. A Senator should be expected to be interrogated, but I should like to have the interruptions limited as much as possible.

I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the courtesy and patience which are always shown by the Senator from Wisconsin. May I ask another question of the Senator from Georgia, with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin will not lose the floor, in order to amplify an answer given by the distinguished chairman of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, from reading the RECORD, that what oil production the Richardson estate has is sold at the wellhead, and is thus commingled with the production of other producers in the same field; and that the only way it would humanly be possible for the Government to use any of this oil would be oil that one of a dozen or thirty pipelines working in the various

fields owned by oil producing or oil refining companies channels into the refinery?

The Government does not buy crude oil, as I understand; it buys refined oil products, and the refineries have pipelines which serve the various fields. So it would be as physically impossible to say that this company has direct interests in the sale of oil as it would be to say that a farmer in Kansas had a direct interest in the purchase of flour or bread that the Army might have in its supply, because he had generated the sale of the basic product which went into the final product that the military purchased.

Mr. RUSSELL. We endeavored to be reasonably careful in the discharge of our duty in examining this nominee. I refer to page 7 of the hearings on the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., where the following interrogation took place:

Chairman RUSSELL. Does the Sid W. Richardson estate do any direct oil business with the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir, it does not.

Chairman RUSSELL. None at all?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir.

I had thought perhaps it did. I continue to quote:

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Richardson was a rather large independent operator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir, he was. But there again, Senator, his operations were strictly the production. And his production was sold at the wellhead, or at a central point in the field to any one of 30 or 40 different crude purchasers, depending on where the properties lay, and who was buying in the area.

Mr. Connally has testified, at some point, that Mr. Richardson's business or his estate, during the time he was employed by it, was strictly that of a producer of raw products which were sold to refiners or processors of oil.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have never questioned that. On that point, I expect to develop in a moment the fact that there can be substantial benefits to the Richardson interests.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement of his satisfaction concerning the moral character, integrity, and high standing of the appointee. It was my pleasure to appear before the committee in Mr. Connally's behalf. Perhaps my statement now could be considered to be somewhat biased, in a sense. It is my unusual pleasure to have known Mr. Connally for a great many years, both personally and businesswise. Therefore, I wish to express especial appreciation to the Senator from Wisconsin for accepting Mr. Connally's position as that of a man of high moral standing in our Nation.

One further thought: In reaching the position of conflict of interest, would it be considered that because a person had been associated or closely allied with a certain particular industry, that he might have influenced, he might be accused or suspected of a conflict of interest? For instance, only a day or so ago I had the great pleasure of voting to confirm the nomination of former Governor Freeman to be Secretary of Agriculture. I thought one of the outstanding supports for Governor Freeman was not only his understanding and knowledge of the problems of agriculture, but also his interest in agricultural problems.

With that statement, and not desiring to speak any longer, I was wondering if this theory were to follow: If the great, distinguished, outstanding military record of Mr. Connally in the Navy would be called upon to stand against his qualifications to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the record of the nominee in the Navy is greatly in his favor. He has a record of valor and of fine distinction. But I have said, and I repeat, it does not qualify him to be Secretary of the Navy. I think there are thousands of persons having fine records in the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps—wonderful men—who deserve the best from their country, and deserve the admiration, respect, and gratitude of all of us. But that does not mean in any sense that they are qualified for a particular administrative position. This does not mean that those attributes disqualify Mr. Connally in any way at all.

Mr. BLAKLEY. They do not disqualify him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Does his knowledge and experience in the oil industry disqualify him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; certainly his experience and knowledge of the oil industry are useful to him. All I am saying is that, this experience and knowledge has, inevitably, come, it seems to me, on the basis of this particular nominee's life, associations, record and identification of interests with the petroleum industry and with the petroleum industry's profits and welfare.

I think I can show, at least to my own satisfaction, that this will be of specific pecuniary benefit to Mr. Connally after he retires from government service.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I join with the Senator from Georgia in expressing the hope that the evidence which will be presented by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin will be genuinely explicit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

NAVY SECRETARY HAS POWER TO BLOCK NAVY CONVERSION TO ATOMIC FUEL—COMPETITIVE WITH PETROLEUM AND TO SLOW OR SPEED ATOMIC RESEARCH

The Navy is an enormous customer for oil, as was brought out a moment ago in the colloquy between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma. Certainly, the Navy is one of the biggest customers for oil in the world. The Secretary of the Navy buys oil for the other services. He buys some $1 billion worth of oil per year. At the same time, the Navy has closely watched the atom-powered submarine Nautilus, which logged 62,500 miles before changing its nuclear core.

Admiral Rickover has calculated that a conventional submarine of equal displacement and horsepower would have burned about 2,170,000 gallons of oil. This would fill 217 tank cars. The admiral has also recently said that "We are right in the middle of a vast program for changing our Navy."

I recall very well how the Senate debated last year whether we should build an atomic-powered aircraft carrier or a conventional-powered aircraft carrier. How rapidly we proceed to convert the submarine fleet from petroleum fuel will affect the oil industry. This is a decision as to which the President and Congress will have to look to the Secretary of the Navy. He is the key man, in a crucial position to make this decision. It is clear that the Navy may convert faster or slower from petroleum power to atomic power. Should we have more aircraft carriers powered by atomic fuel or by conventional fuel? Should we have more aircraft carriers powered by atomic energy fuel or by conventional fuel? Who will make that decision? Oil operator John Connally will have to make the decisions on that point, knowing his future income will depend on it.

How assiduously will the Navy pursue its research in these fields? With this atomic fuel available and competitive with petroleum, and so greatly threatening to reduce the value of all oil fields and holdings—or, shall we say, the value of the fabulous Richardson holdings—these matters will be greatly affected by the attitude of the Secretary of the Navy.

In view of all this, I assert the proposition that while it may be valuable to have a man who knows something about oil as Secretary of the Navy, many American citizens may be concerned that the Secretary is a man whose principal occupation before he was appointed Secretary of the Navy was oil producer, on the inside of the oil industry.

Madam President, the fact is that the man now nominated to be Secretary of the Navy has not severed his personal connections with the oil industry, which have been—and whenever he severs his connection with the Navy, will again be—enormously valuable to him. Together with two others, he is coexecutor of the estate of the late Sid Richardson. Under the laws of Texas and under the arrangement made, the nominee received, until his appointment, one-third of the executor fees from this estate. After he leaves the service he will once again receive—unless at that time he resigns—one third of the fees of this estate.

It seems to me that if he is going to resign, the time to resign is now. But he has held on to this position.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has correctly brought out, while Mr. Connally serves as Secretary of the Navy, he will receive nothing from the estate; but I shall now state what he can look forward to. Let me say, Madam President, that this morning I talked to the nominee; and he told me, personally, that the fees are 5 percent of the amount paid into the estate and 5 percent of the expenses paid out; but no fee is earned on any distributior of the body of the estate, as I understand.

How much will that amount to? He said the size of the estate has been greatly exaggerated in the statements which have been made. He said it is not $1 billion or $500 million, but that the

value is closer to $100 million. With a gross income of around $2 million or $3 million or so and including expenses, and that is the way the fees of an executor are computed—of another $1 million or so, his share of the fees would be around $40,000 to $80,000. Would the gross income from this estate vary as the military speeds up or slows down its conversion from petroleum to atomic power? What do you think?

It seems to me that the answer is apparent, as this tremendously important customer for the entire petroleum industry contracts or expands its purchases of petroleum and as it pushes ahead with its research program, which has an enormous impact on the petroleum industry. In those circumstances, of course the future of John Connally will be tremendously affected. Disregarding for a moment his connection with that industry and his service as an important spokesman for it, does not what I have just now pointed out suggest a direct pecuniary conflict of interest, especially in view of the fact that the nominee's recital, before the committee, of his holding and income indicates that the fees from this estate would be by far the greatest share of his income?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I do not think any conflict of interest is involved, under any law of which I have knowledge or under any code of ethics with which I am familiar.

If we jump to conclusions, if we carry this further and further, we can become suspicious of almost anything. The Senator from Wisconsin has trained at this matter, but I see no conflict of interest here.

I think the Senator could make a much stronger case of conflict of interest—if we are to proceed on the basis of suspicion and innuendo—if he were to state that the President of the United States should be watched very closely because he has sold all of his common stocks and has put the proceeds into Government bonds. The President has appointed the Secretary of the Treasury and other officials in the Treasury Department, and just think what a wonderful opportunity will thus be afforded to the President of the United States to raise the interest rates on Government bonds and thereby greatly to increase the value of the substantial amount of Government bonds that he has acquired.

If the Senator wished to distrust everyone and did not wish to believe in the integrity of anyone, and even if he wished to impute all kinds of improper motives and a willingness to perform immoral acts to various people, the Senator could make a much stronger case against the President of the United States. But I do not believe it. I think the President of the United States is going to try to bring down the interest rates on Government bonds.

I also think—in light of the testimony taken before our committee—that John Connally will honestly and honorably administer the duties of Secretary of the Navy; and I see no bugaboo in the point that after he concludes his service as Secretary of the Navy, he will take up again the duties in connection with the administration of the estate to which reference has been made. I see no reason why such an argument is a valid one.

I do not know all about the nominee's investments. The Senator from Wisconsin obtained, this morning, more knowledge about the Richardson estate than I did at the hearings. During the hearings, after the nominee said that none of the oil wells in which the estate has some interest are in any way connected with any of the naval reserves or even are in close physical proximity, and after he said that the estate does not now have and, to his knowledge, Mr. Richardson never had, an oil and gas lease or a royalty interest of any kind or character, or a mineral interest of any kind or character in any of the States in which the naval petroleum reserves are located, I decided that in my opinion this situation did not disqualify him under the conflict of interest law—unless we simply desire to impute illegal and immoral acts to the nominee; and I know of no reason why we should do that.

So my answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is in the negative.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that the fact is that the nominee's holdings—as clearly set forth in the hearings—include insurance interests and a small share in a Texas bank, and he owns an oil lease, and still owns it; and his total investment income—in a few minutes I shall discuss the oil lease—would be approximately $13,000, $14,000, or $15,000. If a man looks forward to a $40,000 to $80,000 annual income after he finishes his services in the President's Cabinet, it seems to me it is very clear—disregarding any notion that I challenge his integrity or anything of the kind—that—if the conflict of interest statutes mean anything—a man in that position would be in an indelicate, embarrassing, and compromising position under such circumstances, in view of the great power and authority the Secretary of the Navy has, particularly with regard to developing the competitive atomic energy fuel, which directly competes, and may devastatingly compete, with the petroleum industry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have any estimate of what the petroleum industry's own indications are as to the use of petroleum in the future, even with the competition from atomic energy? It might interest the Senator from Wisconsin to know that the oil companies estimate—and, incidentally, they are hedging, so far as atomic energy is concerned, and are purchasing uranium deposits, and so forth, so as to be in the fuel business in any event—are that 10 years from now we shall be using at least 50 percent more petroleum than we are using now, and perhaps much more than that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How many years from now?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Ten years from now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But it is not given to us to see the future. What happens then will depend on our research programs. As the Senator from Louisiana knows far better than I do, the Federal Government is the big source of research funds, and the Navy is an enormously important part of this. If the Navy presses very fast its research in the field of atomic fuel and tries to apply it, that can make a great difference to the petroleum industry. If the Navy does not do so, it may be that 10 or 12 years from now the petroleum industry will be selling more petroleum than it is selling now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the point is that its estimates are based on a greatly expanded use of atomic power. The estimates are based on the fact that there is such a tremendous demand for and use of petroleum and petroleum products, and new uses are being developed all the time—for instance, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, there are literally thousands of future uses for petroleum products, in terms of plastics and goodness knows what. As for atomic energy, although it is a very expensive fuel, atomic fuel is being used for submarines; and certainly we should push in the direction of development of its uses as rapidly as possible.

Even as one coming from an oil-producing State, I would recognize that fact. Nevertheless, there is a tremendous demand for petroleum, and, even with the very optimistic demand anticipated for atomic power, there will still be an added, rather than a reduced, demand for petroleum products.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The oil industry is a sick industry right now. The oil industry cannot sell all of its petroleum. It may be that the oil industry will be able to sell increased production in the future. However, the future cannot be foreseen. There may be an adverse effect on the Navy's position in research in promoting a competing fuel, which can be dependent primarily on the future attitude of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The present problems that the oil industry has do not have anything to do with the expansion of atomic energy. The effect of atomic energy is so infinitesimal that it is hardly worth talking about. The problem of the oil industry is the problem of dumping oil imports into this country. The same would be true with regard to the cheese and milk industry of Wisconsin, if the tax barriers were put down, and imports of those products were allowed to come into this country at a 1 percent ad valorem tax. Such a procedure could give Wisconsin "fits."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Secretary Benson has done exactly this.

Let me continue.

The nominee told the committee that he still holds oil leases from which he is currently receiving $325 monthly, or nearly $4,000 per year. This constitutes about a third of the nominee's investment income, and as secretary it will be 10% of his total income. In view of the

fact that all oil production and oil prices can and will be influenced by Navy policy, why does not this constitute a conflict of interest in principle?

It has been argued that the Secretary of Defense had to dispose of his holdings at a great sacrifice. The President had to dispose of his holdings. The Attorney General did the same. Here is a man who could dispose of his holdings without any sacrifice at all. I admit that resigning from the S. W. Richardson interest would have involved a very great sacrifice. The nominee did not make it. I disagree with that but I understand it. I do not understand why he held on to this oil lease. It constitutes a very substantial amount of income. $4,000 annual income is a large sum of money to most of us. It may not be much to a wealthy man. This man is in about the same income bracket as most Senators. Certainly, I would recognize $325 a month, or $4,000 a year, as a substantial income. I do not see why he cannot dispose of the lease.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi questioned Mr. Connally on this matter. The Senator, of course, knows that this oil lease involves oil which is in the ground. It does not pertain to any company with which he has made a deal. The oil is sold to the gathering company or the pipeline companies that may be in the area. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree 100 percent. There is no contract with the Government, but it would be affected by the policy of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. STENNIS. The situation would be the same as that involved in taking out of the ground sand or clay, or the growing of products. The oil is a product of the ground. It is not connected in any way with the Secretary or the Navy. So the effect of a policy of the Navy would be relatively infinitesimal on a small lease as to its increased worth, on a monthly basis. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

I am going to make a point raised several times by the Senator from Massachusetts and by other Senators, which was very emphatically stated by the nominee, when he said, as appears on page 5 of the hearings:

> Let me parenthetically say here that the estate does no business with the Defense Establishment to my knowledge of any kind or character.

Then, as appears on page 7, he said:

> But there again, Senator, his operations were strictly the production. And his production was sold at the wellhead, or at a central point in the field to any one of 30 or 40 different crude purchasers, depending on where the properties lay, and who was buying in the area.

On Friday the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] put into the RECORD an article from Fortune magazine which discussed the almost fantastic favoritism shown by the Navy in a contract with the Transport Co. of Texas. The article, dated last month, December 1960, states that Sid Richardson was the third largest stockholder in this firm that contracted with the Navy. I read from Fortune, which is conservative and very careful in its statements:

> The third-largest TCT stockholder at the time of incorporation in 1951 and presumably until his death in 1959 was oilman Sid Richardson.

Mr. President, this was a substantial contract. It was for $5,200,000, and has been extended to reach $13,300,000. The $18,500,000 includes $1 million in fees for TCT.

Now, on page 5 of the hearings the nominee says:

> The estate does no business with the Defense Establishment to my knowledge of any kind or character whatsoever.

I ask the Senator from Georgia, in the absence of a direct assertion from the nominee that this property has been disposed of by the estate—or that the Fortune story was not accurate—does it not appear that there would be a conflict of interest between the nominee acting as Secretary of the Navy on the one hand, in dealing with the Transport Co. of Texas as a contractor, and as the former and future coexecutor of the estate, which presumably is still the third largest stockholder in that contractor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, this question was brought to the attention of the Senate on Saturday last by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I earlier had occasion to bring it to Mr. Connally's attention. I asked him what the facts were. He has gone into it in a letter, and I will read the letter he has written me:

> JANUARY 20, 1961.
>
> Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
> *Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Certain accusations in the public press concerning an alleged relationship between the late S. W. Richardson and Transport Co. of Texas and Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger have been called to my attention.
>
> This is my reply:
>
> The S. W. Richardson estate does not now own and never has owned at any time in its existence any stock or any interest whatsoever in the Transport Co. of Texas, or in any business or enterprise owned or controlled by Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or in any contracts or agreements which Transport Co. of Texas, or Mr. Linkenhoger, or any of his companies might have with the Department of Defense, the U.S. Navy, or any person, firm or corporation whatsoever.
>
> A careful study made for the purposes of preparing the inventory of the estate of S. W. Richardson has indicated the existence of no business association whatsoever between the estate of S. W. Richardson and Transport Co. of Texas, or Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or any company or business owned or controlled by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Our full investigation indicates, and I am informed, that Mr. Richardson on or about October 27, 1951, purchased $10,000 of capital stock in Transport Co. of Texas. This stock, which never paid any dividends, was sold by Mr. Richardson for $15,000, representing a profit of $5,000, on or about May 29, 1958. I am further informed that these transactions represent the only business transactions which were ever had between Mr. S. W. Richardson and the Transport Co. of Texas, Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or any business or company owned or controlled or participated in by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Neither the purchase nor the sale of the stock by Mr. Richardson was ever discussed with me by either Mr. Richardson or Mr. Linkenhoger at any time. Furthermore, the only knowledge I have of the Kwajalein contract has been obtained through the public press. It has never been discussed with me by any of the participants—in or out of the Government.
>
> The purchase of this stock in 1951 predated my employment by Richardson and Bass by some 5 months. Its resale by Mr. Richardson was in May of 1958. According to the public press, this predated by some months even the conception of the Kwajalein Island contracts between Transport Co. of Texas and the Navy.
>
> Mr. Richardson died on September 30, 1959, and at the time of his death owned no interest in Transport Co. of Texas or in any business owned or controlled by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> JOHN B. CONNALLY.

So it appears that unless this statement is out of the whole cloth, conclusions based on this article from Fortune magazine, a conservative magazine, can be erroneous.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Georgia. I think his statement is very useful and very helpful. The fact is that the statement was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Saturday. I think this particular letter satisfactorily answers the statement or the insertion in the RECORD from Fortune magazine, and I am glad to find that the nominee has cleared it up, because it was an obvious contradiction of his testimony.

Madam President, I think it is apparent that I am not relying on this particular item to support my position.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his graciousness and for his patience. I should like now to take 2 or 3 more minutes to sum up my arguments. I have no further questions for the Senator from Georgia.

Madam President, in recapitulation, in the first place:

The nominee has one principal qualification to be Secretary of the Navy, and only one. He has been one of the principal administrators of one of the world's richest private oil empires. He knows oil.

Second. The nominee for Secretary of the Navy was a leader—a member of the 24-man steering committee of the general gas committee, the organization whose lobbying activities were sharply censured by President Eisenhower in his veto of the natural gas bill in 1956. In this capacity the nominee was clearly identified as a spokesman for the petroleum industry, which for 50 years has been badgering Secretaries of the Navy to get at the Navy's oil reserves, and which has expressed resounding denunciation of the whole principle of naval reserves.

As Secretary of the Navy, the nominee will have great discretion over the reserves, including unchecked power to reduce their production and to lessen competition with the private oil industry. He will have massive and often decisive recommending influence with regard to contracts with private interests for operation of the reserves.

Third. This leading private oil operator would, as Secretary of the Navy, have the principal responsibility for buying oil for all the services; and would be the key—the critical man in recommending a decision and making a decision on the conversion by the Navy from petroleum power to atomic power. Also, John Connally, the oil operator, would be in a crucial position to influence the Navy's research and development program for atomic fuel, the big competitor of oil.

Fourth. The fact is that the nominee has not severed his personal connections in the oil industry. He has the $325-a-month oil lease. Many people, I suppose, would say, "That is peanuts." It would not be "peanuts" for me. I do not think it would be "peanuts" for most Americans. It is $325 a month, or nearly $4,000 a year; which constitutes, as I said, about 30 percent of the investment income of the nominee. It is a very substantial amount.

It makes no sense at all to me to say that this particular lease cannot be liquidated, cannot be sold, in order to avoid a conflict of interest. There would be no substantial sacrifice on the part of the nominee, and it seems to me there is a clear conflict of interest.

Mr. President, this next point is the big point, of course. The nominee will continue as the coexecutor of the Richardson estate, with his own compensation directly dependent on the policies adopted by himself as Secretary of the Navy. The compensation in fees from this estate would be in excess of $40,000 annually and would constitute, by all odds, the nominee's principal income after leaving the office of the Secretary of the Navy.

It seems to me that we should not approve the nomination of a man who looks forward to a principal income in the future—a very, very large income—from an estate which is overwhelmingly an oil estate, when the man will have the big responsibility in our Federal Government with respect to oil, will be the big purchaser of oil, will be the man who buys oil for all the services, will be the man who has discretion with respect to research. This constitutes a conflict of interest if there can be such a thing.

As I stated before, Madam President, I have been reluctant to make this fight. I very heartily approve of the President of the United States. I have approved of him for a long, long time. I was enthusiastically for him before the Democratic convention.

I approve the President's appointments. I think these men are excellent and outstanding men. I dislike very much to vote against one of the President's nominees.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in commenting on the Pauley nomination for Under Secretary—I realize the situation was somewhat different, but I think the point Mr. Lippmann makes is applicable one for one—said:

> Where oil is involved the high officials of the Navy Department should be above all suspicion, political or personal, warranted or unwarranted. Mr. Pauley would always be suspect, and every action of the U.S. Government in critical areas like the Middle East and Indonesia, where oil is so important, would be laid open to suspicion.

Madam President, this certainly applies to the new Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will yield to the Senator from New York in a moment.

Of course, I do not expect to block the appointment. I doubt if another Senator will join me. In fact, I presume no other Senators will vote with me, except the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who indicated his position on Saturday. I have had no indication of support from other Senators, although I think I have made my views known to them, privately.

I realize that the purpose of this fight is to try to make a record, to try to make as emphatic a record as I can that the nominee should be placed on notice that his conduct is going to be closely watched.

Furthermore, Madam President, I am adopting once again the motto I adopted in February of 1959, when I made a speech with respect to the then majority leader. That motto is from William the Silent: "It is unnecessary to hope in order to undertake; or to succeed in order to persevere."

I hope this effort of mine will serve notice on those who are concerned with oil that there are voices in the U.S. Senate which will be raised in loud protest as they move to extend their special advantages in taxation, regulation, and military procurement. This is no "bogeyman." This is as real as every tax we pay, every gas bill we have to meet, and the immense reliance every American citizen must place on the Navy and the military services to defend our Nation without the interference of selfish special interests.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand that the nominee has stated he will not receive any income as executor of the estate during the period of his tenure as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct. Not only that, but he will not receive the fees he previously earned while he is the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand that Mr. Connally will, at the end of his service as Secretary of the Navy, draw fees from the estate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I asked the nominee this question today, and he said that he may or may not return as coexecutor of the estate. It is pretty apparent that if he is not going to return he should resign. He wants to have the opportunity to return.

That is very understandable. After all, what man would wish to resign as an executor of an estate which will pay him from $40,000 to $80,000? It would seem very logical and very predictable that the nominee will return as an executor of the estate and will receive a percentage of the gross income and a percentage of the expenses paid out by the estate.

Mr. KEATING. I was a little puzzled as to why the estate would run on so long. Is the nominee also a trustee under the estate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say to the Senator from New York that this estate, as the Senator knows, is an enormous estate. It involves in excess of $100 million. As the Senator well knows, some estates run on 4, 5, 8, or 10 years. The estate may not run on that long. It may terminate. It is perfectly possible it will.

Mr. KEATING. Normally the estates do not run on so long. Even a large estate has to be closed up under the laws of most States after a relatively short period of time. There may be trusts created under the will which would continue for a longer time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that this nominee is not a beneficiary, to my knowledge, in any sense from the estate. He would get nothing. He is an executor. This would be his only compensation.

Mr. KEATING. Is he a trustee as well as an executor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no knowledge. I assume he is not a trustee. I do not know. He may be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the Senator from New York has fallen into the same error that beset me when I heard about the subject. I started to apply the laws of my State on administration to the present facts, and I discovered that the laws are very different. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] pointed out, one of several executors can pass title to any part of the estate except the realty without consulting the others. Such a power is entirely different from the law of my State and the law of most of the common law States. I came to the conclusion after listening to the debate that an executorship in Texas is what we call a trusteeship in my State.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and apologize for getting into the field of Texas law, of which I am completely ignorant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I believe it would be of interest to read section 240 of the Probate Code of the State of Texas. I quote:

> Should there be more than one executor or administrator of the same estate at the same time, the acts of one of them as such executor or administrator shall be as valid as if all had acted jointly;

This is completely different from the law that I know in my own State when I was a practitioner.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to ask a question about the law of Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will not carry me far beyond the section to which I referred.

Mr. KEATING. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia can tell the Senate whether there would be any power of removal of the executor for anything except misconduct in office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not answer that question.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that would be so. I recognize the burden of the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is that the nominee,

while he would be surrendering his income during the time he would serve as Secretary of the Navy, might still have a conflict of interest because it is his intention to return, and that if he had a conflict between oil interests and his duties as Secretary of the Navy, and if he landed on the side of the country rather than the oil interests, he might then be subject to some disciplinary action as an executor of the estate. Apart from the character of the nominee, I think that probability would be very remote. In other words, I assume that he could not be removed as an executor of the estate merely because he made a decision as Secretary of the Navy which might be against the oil interests.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident that this would not be true. The statute to which I referred would exonerate him on that issue.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I do not wish to imply that I possess any unusual knowledge, but I have practiced law in Texas for about 35 years and I can say that under a will independent executors are, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia read, able to act independently and separately, and no executor is held liable for the act or endeavors of another executor; neither is he held responsible for the result.

Mr. KEATING. If I may impose on the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Texas a question——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I shall yield the floor in a moment. It seems to me the principal point is not whether the two other coexecutors can act in the absence of the nominee. It seems to me the point is whether we are confronted with an effective trusteeship in Texas called receivership that can go on indefinitely even though, technically, the nominee is not a trustee.

I think it is possible, as the nominee made clear, that the bulk of the estate will go to charity. It may be that the surviving beneficiaries will benefit from the estate as long as they live, and then the estate may pass on to charity. It seems to me that the point was not made clear in the hearings. It is a perfectly possible situation, and it is a situation in which the nominee would receive substantial benefit from an oil estate for many years after he had left the service—perhaps through his life.

Mr. KEATING. Do I not correctly interpret the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin to be that he feels there is a conflict of interest for the reason that the nominee, after serving as Secretary of the Navy, would again become an executor of the estate, and that the prospect of returning to the capacity of such executor might or would in some way affect his judgment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. The Secretary-designate would continue as executor of the estate. He would continue to perform ministerial duties. He would not draw or earn compensation during the period of his secretaryship, but he would not have to claim his executor status. He would automatically assume it as soon as he resigned from the public service.

Mr. KEATING. The entire field is difficult. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for raising the question. I know he is very sincere in what he has said. He has raised a question that every Senator must decide for himself in voting time after time. It seems to me that it becomes very difficult to differentiate between the character qualifications of a nominee and his qualifications concerning conflict of interest. A conflict of interest could be so outstanding—and perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin feels that this conflict is in that category—that it could override the character qualification. I realize how careful the Senator has been not to get into the character qualification. I know the nominee. I know others who are not in the oil business who hold him in the highest regard. I have known him for some time. I know of his work in Congress. I consider him to be a man of high character, and I am prepared to give the President the nominee he has asked for, and allow the character qualification to overweigh, in my consideration, the questions which the Senator has brought out. I recognize the seriousness of the questions. And of course, confirmation of Mr. Connally will not excuse him from complying with any applicable conflict-of-interest laws. I think the Senator has performed a constructive service in bringing them to the attention of the Senate. But I shall support the nominee, because I believe him to be a man of high character. I believe he will do a good and conscientious job as Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator. I am ready to yield the floor. First, however, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has requested me to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I desire to make a few observations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was recognized, but I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, it may seem a little awkward or strange that one on this side of the aisle should defend the New Frontiersman against his own frontiersmen, but I have known John B. Connally, Jr., and I have great faith in him.

However, I have an interest beyond that point, which is that I do not want to see a person destroyed. We came close to destroying a good man 18 months ago. I refer to Lewis Strauss, the nominee of President Eisenhower to be Secretary of the Department of Commerce. If Mr. Strauss were not a man of such grace, adaptability and greatness, the issue might well have destroyed him.

I shall never forget the incident, because two Senators on this side of the aisle were absent. I made no bones about the problem. I asked the White House to provide military planes to return those two Senators. I do not care how much others scolded about it. One of the Senators we got back here in time. But we failed in that endeavor on the 19th of June 1959, because shortly after midnight, by a vote of 49 to 46, the nomination of Mr. Lewis Strauss was rejected by the Senate.

However, it is rather interesting to look at the Supreme Court decision. Even though it is in part dicta by the Chief Justice, certainly no other Justice took issue with him. On that occasion the Chief Justice had the following to say with respect to the question:

> No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

And they indicated some surprise.

Yet, Madam President, the word went out that he was unfit, for one reason or another, to serve as a member of the Cabinet of President Eisenhower.

Here we have a young man—and John Connally is reasonably young—against whom a case is endeavored to be made, first, because of his interest in oil. I know the story. It is that his first $10,000 investment is no good. I am sure that anyone who wants those stock certificates for wall paper can get them for nothing.

His second venture, an oil well, has in 9 years produced $1,200. He spent $10,000. So if he lives for 63 years more he will get his money back.

My friend argues that a principle is involved. Perhaps a great many Senators own some oil stock. I do not know. I once had an undivided interest in oil that paid me $2 a month, until it stopped paying. I do not know what happened to it. One may say that a principle is involved, but in our present complicated economic situation, how is it possible to find a man who would not have a few shares of oil stock? If he lives 63 years more, when he will be over 100, and has a long gray beard, he will get his second $10,000 back.

He has another investment of $10,000 in oil. That is very complicated, Madam President. I believe it is a one-thirteenth of one twenty-first over 64 undivided interest. If anyone will get out his logarithms and slide rule and quadratics, he can figure it out. I do not know even whether under Texas law he can sell it.

It can be argued, possibly, that because he gets $325 a month out of oil it will warp his judgment. I do not believe so.

I was on the other side when John Connally first showed up in Washington. I have seen his operations. I have a

little faith in him. I cannot imagine a man who has devoted so much time to the defense of his country letting his country down for a few paltry dollars. There must be some emphasis on character in these situations. If a man of solid character cannot rise above some of these considerations, we are sunk as a country. I believe we overdo the business of conflict of interest. We get into all sorts of incongruities with respect to it. I heard what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said. He said, "Of course, you can divest yourself of it, but that is not the whole story." He said, "Can you divest yourself of the indoctrination you got when you were identified with the industry?"

Why did not the Senator raise that question with Arthur Goldberg, who since 1920 has been identified with labor? In the Labor Committee I said, "Mr. Goldberg, after all your identification, do you think you can divest yourself of that indoctrination?"

He said, "I think I can, and I will work at it." I believe he will. It depends on what shoe one wears. I believe that John Connally is big enough to divest himself of any indoctrination or inclination or feeling or affection or tendency or anything else that might color his judgment so far as the job of Secretary of the Navy is concerned.

The second point made is his identity with the industry. The testimony is clear. He did not know anything about the lobbying activities insofar as they affected the Superior Oil Co. or Mr. Keck. He was a hired man. What is wrong with it? When all of that business was going on, the first man who walked into my door was a former U.S. Senator. He was representing the other side. I said, "Are you getting a good, big fee?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "Can I help you get it made bigger? I disagree with you, but go back and tell the people who hired you that after all you did in trying to sell me, you have failed. You deserve a bigger fee than you are getting for the sweat you put in trying to convert the Senator from Illinois."

He was a hired man. He had a right to come into my office.

John Connally had a right to come into my office because he was working for pay. I do not believe that is any reason for rejecting him or reflecting upon him.

He testified that his family owns an interest in an oil well or has some oil stock and that he owns some insurance stock, a mutual fund stock, but that that is limited. It is Insurance Securities, Inc. It is a mutual fund, and under its charter it cannot buy stock other than insurance stock. So we see that it cannot buy any oil stock, and, therefore, there is no great conflict of interest.

I cannot believe that a man who owns roughly 7½ percent of two sixty-fourths of an undivided interest in West Texas land comes within the purview of the conflict-of-interest statute. He bought an undivided interest in a piece of land. If there were no oil under it, obviously, not a single question would ever be raised.

I am willing to take John Connally's word on it, and I am willing to take a chance on his character, having seen him in action, and having seen him perform, and knowing, of course, that he was a candid witness before the committee and laid it all on the table. I still think that we can pretty well know a man like that. Therefore, I trust his nomination will be approved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I wish to take only a moment to discuss the nomination. I was one of those who had some doubts when the nomination was sent to the Senate, as to whether it was a wise course for the then President-elect to take. Even though I knew Mr. Connally only casually, that casual acquaintance was one that was impressive. I found him to be a very friendly, sociable, and intelligent man. It was quite clear that he was, as the record indicates and as the press reports indicate, identified with oil.

I have listened to the arguments. I have listened to the Senator from Oregon. He made an able argument. He made a restrained argument and a responsible argument. I have listened to the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin. He has been exceedingly careful in his argument not to impugn the character of the nominee, or in any way impair his effectiveness when and if his nomination is confirmed.

I have read the columns in the newspapers which relate to Mr. Connally. As a result, I decided to call up Mr. Connally and have my own kind of cross-examination of him. I read the testimony given before the Committee on Armed Services on January 8, 1961. I also read a number of news stories and columns concerning the alleged activities of Mr. Connally. I asked Mr. Connally to come to my office this morning at 10 o'clock, and he did.

When he arrived I had all of the so-called evidence laid out across the desk. I said, "Mr. Connally, I want to be very frank with you. First of all, on two counts I should like to support your nomination. First, I consider you to be a good man. You are a patriot. Your record demonstrates that. Secondly, you have been named by the President, a man whom I supported for the office of President and one who, I gather, looks to me for some support for his program. On the basis of those two counts, I should like to tell you openly that I want to support your nomination, and that I shall do so. But, Mr. Connally, before I can give you that kind of assurance—not that, perhaps, it is so significant to you—I want to ask you about a dozen questions. I want you to give me some frank answers. I do not want any diplomatic talk: 'Maybe' or 'could be'; I want 'yes' and 'no,' and I want some facts."

I spent 40 minutes with Mr. Connally. During that time I called the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. Then we, together, had some discussion with Mr. Connally. I may say right now that the Senator from Wisconsin cross-examined Mr. Connally very carefully. The Senator from Wisconsin at no time indicated anything else but a high regard and personal respect for Mr. Connally in terms of his character, his ability, and his competence. But he said, with equal candor, that he had serious doubts as to whether the Secretary-designate of the Department of the Navy could administer his office without, at least, bordering upon a conflict of interest. I believe I state the case rather fairly.

I have given this question a great deal of what might be called soul-searching thought. I do not believe it is right for a Senator to call upon his colleagues to share in an experience that relates to the integrity of the man as well as the job without standing up and giving his own point of view, once he has gone through this experience.

I came to the conclusion that if I were both the judge and the jury, or either the judge or the jury, after listening to all the testimony of Mr. Connally, I would have to vote "not guilty"; and I would further have to say, "You have a good record. You are worthy of the trust that has been reposed in you by those with whom you will be associated and by those who are called upon to confirm the nomination."

So I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Connally.

I shall advert, however, to the fact that I think the oil industry gets far too many special considerations. I have no intention of changing my point of view about the depletion allowance. I am always aware of the activities of the so-called gas lobby. I believe in Federal regulation of the gas industry. I shall be watching with a careful eye every activity of this administration relating to the conservation and regulation of our natural resources.

But, having said that, I do not believe we have a right to be suspicious of a man, particularly when the evidence demonstrates that he is a man who is able to keep his word, a man of integrity, a man who has divested himself of any interest, if he ever had any, that was in conflict with the Government or his position.

I remind Senators that I do not think a single one of us can take the position that there is any evidence available that the Secretary-designate of the Navy will in any way put his private interests above the public interests. For him to do so would, first of all, be to betray the man who appointed him—the President of the United States. The President, as a former Member of this body and also of the House of Representatives, voted repeatedly, as did the Senator from Minnesota, on the question of the taxation of the oil industry and the regulation of the gas industry.

So, first, of all, if the nominee were to place his private interests above the public interest, he would betray the man who appointed him to his position. Secondly, he would expose himself to public scorn. I cannot believe he would do that.

We do not confirm the nomination of a man on the basis that he is a good fellow. Of course, we need good fellows, but we need, more than that, men of good character, courage, and integrity. I hope, and I believe, that Mr. Connally possesses most of those qualities, if not all.

I cannot believe that a man who is 43 years of age, who has worked himself up in the world, who was a child of rela-

tively poor parents, and who got a college education by his own efforts would stand in the way of research for the fuel that is necessary to keep America strong. I cannot imagine that a man who gave 5 years to his country in the Navy would stand in the way of research for atomic fuel for our Navy or for whatever other mechanisms or vehicles are required for our defense. I think Mr. Connally is more on the spot than someone else would be. The public eye will be upon him.

I have the feeling that a man who is able, energetic, and intelligent, as John Connally is, will perhaps make the Department of the Navy hum.

I say to my own good friends that one of the qualifications of a New Frontiersman is to have a little zip, vim, vitality, and perhaps a shot of vitamins, so that we can be up and at it 18 hours a day.

I believe Mr. Connally has those qualities. I hope he has. I urge upon him that he have that sense of mission.

I trust his nomination will be confirmed, so as to demonstrate that we in the Senate first rely upon a man's character and recognize at all times that we have ways of supervising him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, in connection with my remarks about the former Strauss nomination, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "An Obiter Dictum of Some Antiquarian Interest," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of January 17, 1961; and an editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1961]

AN OBITER DICTUM OF SOME ANTIQUARIAN INTEREST

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Shortly after midnight, June 19, 1959, the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46 declined to confirm President Eisenhower's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Commerce. Many of the Senators who voted to reject, including the majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, gave no reason for participating in an action by which the President of the United States has only on eight occasions been overruled in his Cabinet selections.

Senator Kennedy generalized the rejection as a disagreeable job done in the national interest. But others of the 49 explained they voted against Strauss' confirmation because, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, he had been active in behalf of negotiating the Dixon-Yates contract.

As sometimes before when the Senate has sought more popular ground on which to base an action dominated by partisan politics and/or personal vendetta, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, had provided it. Senators MCGEE and O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, had already done some effective scouting in the area. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, had previously made it clear to some Democrats who were disposed to vote for Strauss that he would take rejection as an endorsement of his position in the longstanding controversy between him and the AEC Chairman. And news reporters had found a strong impression in the Democratic cloakroom that a vote against Strauss would be far from displeasing to Majority Leader JOHNSON, who eventually also voted to reject the nomination.

Then rose Senator MORSE to say as follows: "I do not deny that Mr. Strauss is probably a very intelligent man * * *. I do not think he is disloyal to our country and our form of government. [Strauss had been accused of obstructing the right of Congress to be given executive information within its constitutional sphere.] * * * I do not find that Mr. Strauss has used his powers or office, or will use them, to enrich himself * * *. There is no indication of [his] personal conflict of interest."

"But," he continued, "the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has given the Senate a carefully documented account of the Dixon-Yates scandal and the role Mr. Strauss played in its negotiation, * * * [and] in his effort to foist this illegal contract upon the country Mr. Strauss was an enemy of the American people."

Last week the Supreme Court decided, six to three, that this contract between the Government and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (the Dixon-Yates combine) was indeed illegal and therefore unenforcible. Chief Justice Warren, for the Court, upheld the Department of Justice's claim to this effect, on the ground that the role of Adolphe E. Wenzell as a Budget Bureau consultant in the negotiation of the contract, while retaining his connection with and pay from the First Boston Corp., violated the conflict-of-interest statute. The Chief Justice held it to be irrelevant that the Budget Bureau sought and encouraged Wenzell's participation with full knowledge of his dual role. And he rejected a Court of Claims award, made on the basis of this knowledge, to the M.V.G. Co. of about $1.9 million for costs it had incurred in preparations to execute the Government-signed contract.

However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau knew of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston, it is significant, we think, that: * * * No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project."

It is also significant, though now of mere antiquarian interest to anyone but the victim of the charge made by MORSE and other Democrats as a principal reason for rejecting Strauss, that in this period he was Chairman of that very AEC in which no one knew of the duality of Wenzell and which had been reluctant at all times to negotiate the contract. But it is characteristic of politics, and therefore, not at all significant that no Senator who made the charge against Strauss of "an effort to foist this illegal contract on the country" has taken any notice whatever of the finding to the exact contrary by the entire Supreme Court, dissenters included.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 12, 1961]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In confirming the patent conflict of interest that existed in the controversial Dixon-Yates contract of 1954, the Supreme Court has done what the U.S. Court of Claims should have done 18 months ago. Adolphe H. Wenzell of the First Boston Corp., who acted as the agent of the Government in helping to arrange a contract for a private utility combination to furnish power to the Tennessee Valley Authority, was in a possible position to benefit financially from the transaction.

The fact that his interest was only indirect, as noted by Justice Harlan in a dissenting opinion joined by Justices Whittaker and Stewart, does not negate the applicability of the conflict-of-interest statute. Wenzell's primary allegiance as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget "was to First Boston," Chief Justice Warren observed for the Court majority, and "his loyalty to the Government was a fleeting one."

The Dixon-Yates contract was contrived by the Bureau of the Budget so as to avoid construction of the new TVA power facilities and still permit TVA to continue serving plants of the Atomic Energy Commission. The particular point at issue was whether the private firms represented in the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. could recover damages from the Government because the contract was canceled.

Contrary to the 3 to 2 decision of the Court of Claims in 1959, the Supreme Court ruled that the company is not entitled to damages even though it was guilty of no wrongdoing, because the contract was tainted. Sponsors of the contract, the Court noted, recognized Wenzell's conflict of interest almost at the beginning, but continued negotiating with him.

Several conclusions emerge from this wretched bungle. The first is that, whatever Mr. Wenzell's fault, the basic responsibility was that of the Bureau of the Budget. The conflict of interest, in the Court's words, "was directly caused by high officials of the Bureau of the Budget." The Atomic Energy Commission, which came into the proceedings at a later date, was not to blame for the details. That is a point made repeatedly by this newspaper. It is a substantial vindication of former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, even though Mr. Strauss complicated his own position by his dogged defense of the contract.

Second, the role of the administration throughout the matter was, to say the least, devious and ambiguous. After siring the contract, the administration disowned its child and sought to leave others—particularly the Dixon-Yates group—holding the wet baby. The antecedent of this slick maneuver was a doctrinaire political effort to cripple the TVA as an example of creeping socialism. It is an affair that sheds no glory on any of the principals, from the President on down.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened with great interest to the debate this afternoon on the nomination by the President of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy. I have known John Connally for a number of years, because he served as an administrative assistant in both the House and the Senate. I have known him in Texas and outside Texas. I have nothing but the highest regard for him. I believe him to be a man of good character. I think his record is not impeachable. I hope, most sincerely, that the Senate will confirm his nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the majority leader whether he proposes to have the Senate complete action today on all nominations that were submitted; and whether it is his intention to have the Senate adjourn over until Wednesday or Thursday, in the event we complete action on the nominations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in response to the question of the distinguished minority leader, it is the hope of the leadership that we can finish action on all the nominations before us today. Several Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has a speech to make and will do so, desire to address the Senate. It is my hope that if we can finish action on the nominations today, we can adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, the results of the actions of Mr. Connally as Secretary of the Navy may very well be felt within the oil industry. I do not assume that any Senator who, out of the good judgment of his thoughtful mind, votes for Mr. Connally will not hesitate to take whatever position he may feel obliged to take with reference to the oil industry, and with reference to the part of Texas in the oil industry. That I would accept and recognize. But, most of all, I wish to express appreciation, on behalf of our State, for its native son, and hope that the body of the Senate will consider him and accept him on the basis of his qualifications and on the basis of his stature as a man.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I realize that the die is cast and that this nomination will be confirmed. I am certainly the last Member of the Senate who wishes to labor a question or to speak unnecessarily for the RECORD.

I feel, however, in view of the fact that I am chairman of the committee which considered the nomination, that in all justice to Mr. Connally and the members of his family, I should make a brief statement.

I listened with avid interest to all that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] had to say on this subject. He started by talking about facts. I listened to all the inferences, imputations, and innuendoes. As nearly as I could understand them, two facts were stated that bear on this question.

One of them is the fact—and, Madam President, I say very frankly that I am stating this for the RECORD, particularly for the benefit of those who will read it, in justice to Mr. Connally—that Mr. Connally may later serve again as executor of the S. W. Richardson estate. Almost every month that Congress is in session, as well as whenever a session of Congress begins, the Senate confirms the nominations of persons who leave a great law practice, and who say that while they serve the country, they will not receive any fees from that law practice. But after they leave the Government service, they return to that practice. So let us not apply only to Mr. Connally what the Senator from Wisconsin has said on that point. In that connection, I think also of Robert Stevens, who will be remembered for his controversy with the late Senator McCarthy. Mr. Stevens left a great textile empire; and everyone knew that when he left the secretaryship of the Army he proposed to return to that empire. In fact, I could cite dozens of instances of men who severed their connections with private industry when they entered Government service, but thereafter returned to their former employment or activities.

The Ford Motor Co. has had contracts with the Government; but no one has asked Mr. McNamara to make an oath that he will not later return to the Ford Motor Co., and I do not think he should be called upon to make a statement of that kind. So when such a rule is invoked, let those who read the RECORD know it will be the first time it has been invoked. Never before has it been claimed that, following service to his Government, a man should not return, in good faith, to a concern with which he previously was connected, although he severed those connections during the time when he served the Government of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, at this point will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. Connally stated unequivocally that he would remain 4 years or for as long as he was asked or as long as was desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, he said he would continue to serve for as long as his services were satisfactory to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the nominee did not sever his connections with the Richardson estate. He continues as executor, but simply foregoes the earnings during this period, but with the clear understanding that as soon as the period is over, he may accept the earnings, and certainly with the absolute expectation that he would do so. My point is that if Mr. McNamara continued to be president of the Ford Motor Co., but received no compensation during this period, the two situations would be analogous, and I think there would be a conflict of interest.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is simply splitting hairs very fine; but the Senator knows that has been true of all the points he has made in this debate.

The other charge that has been made here is that because Mr. Connally receives some return—a certain number of dollars a month—from an oil well, that disqualifies him. However, everyone knows that the petroleum from the well is sold in its raw state, as it comes from the well, whereas the Government uses only petroleum products, after they have been refined. So I submit it would be just as logical to say that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of a wheat farmer to serve in a position of importance in the Government, simply because the various armed services purchase large quantities of flour. If one argument holds true, the other would. This is a very tenuous argument, and we have never gone that far in any application of the conflict-of-interest rule. Never before has it been claimed that because a man has sold a raw product to a processor and because some of the processed commodity may eventually find its way into Government use, the one who sold the raw product should be disqualified from serving the Government. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that an attempt has been made to apply such a rule.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HART. Do I correctly understand that there has been read into the RECORD the portion of the hearings which showed that this point was made by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]? Did not the Senator from Georgia ask Mr. Connally directly whether the estate of which Mr. Connally is executor had sold oil to the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I did. I approached this subject with some qualms, because I thought the Richardson estate had some dealings with the Government. But it was shown that this could not possibly involve a conflict of interest, because even the S. W. Richardson estate does not do any direct business with the Government.

Mr. HART. I appreciate the Senator's answer. I understood that the matter had been referred to in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, and I have already read it into the RECORD.

Mr. HART. I am sorry that I did not know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I do not wish to go into all the charges to the effect that the oil industry is suspect. For my part, I do not approve of all the advantages the oil industry has, under present laws. But I do not propose to condemn a person who has worked in the oil industry merely because the Congress has not seen fit to correct all the complications and eliminate some of the inequities in those statutes. However, that would be done in this case, if the charges to which we have listened today were to be supported. We have been told, today, that it is improper for this nominee to serve in this office, because he has been connected with the oil business. However, I submit that is an unjust position to take.

The nominee has stated his qualifications. He has been a lawyer. He was engaged in various capacities as a lawyer before he became connected with Mr. Richardson. He served in Washington; I knew him during that period, and formed a very high opinion of him. That high opinion was enhanced after he left Washington. He spent 5 years in the Navy in a variety of assignments. He was cited on two occasions for heroism in combat. Later he was brought back to Washington. He is familiar with the Navy, and he is qualified in every respect, by virtue of his background.

I think it is a compliment to him that he was sought to represent an operation as large as the one S. W. Richardson had; and unless there is some direct conflict of interest, that fact in itself is a tribute, because businesses of that size employ only the most efficient of those whose services are available.

Mr. Connally was judged to be an extremely outstanding officer when he served as radar and radio officer, and later as fighter direction officer, on the aircraft carrier *Essex,* and when for a time he also served as CIC officer for Task Group 38.1, during which service he participated in many actions in the Pacific. In connection with his service there, Admiral Sprague observed him to be an extremely outstanding officer; and Admiral Sprague, who was in command of Task Group 38.1, said the nominee's work was, in great part, responsible for the success of the task group.

The nominee was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V", and a citation reading in part as follows:

For heroic achievement while serving as fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* during a concentrated attack by enemy (Japanese) aircraft against that vessel in the forward Pacific area on April 6, 1945.

He received the Gold Star in lieu of the second Bronze Star Medal, but it was rescinded in favor of the Legion of Merit, with combat "V"; and the citation read in part as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as force fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* in later combat.

Madam President, I ask that these citations of Mr. Connally, as taken from his official record in the service of his country, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V," and citation, in part, as follows: "For heroic achievement while serving as fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* during a concentrated attack by enemy Japanese aircraft against that vessel in the forward Pacific area on April 6, 1945. Alert and aggressive in the performance of duty as an overwhelming force of hostile planes flew in over the task group, Lieutenant Connally rendered gallant and effectual service in coordinating a determined and prompt aerial offensive and, by his professional skill, brilliant tactics, and cool courage in the face of grave peril, contributed essentially to the success of embarked planes in shooting down 69 Japanese aircraft and to the security of the *Essex* from all damage."

A Gold Star in lieu of the second Bronze Star Medal was awarded, but rescinded in favor of the Legion of Merit, with combat "V," citation to which follows, in part: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as force fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex,* flagship of Task Force 58, from July 7, 1944, to June 26, 1945; and later as task group fighter director on the staff of Commander Fast Carrier Task Group 38.1, with flag in the U.S.S. *Bennington* during operations against Japanese forces at sea and against the Japanese mainland from June 26 to August 28, 1945. An officer of resourcefulness, mature judgment, and clarity of mind, Lieutenant Connally effected notable improvements in fighter director and CIC policy and doctrine. His practical application of these doctrines together with his thorough knowledge of aerial tactics made possible the utilization of the air power available to cause maximum destruction of Japanese planes threatening our forces and to afford the greatest protection for elements of the carrier task group. * * * By his distinctive service in this vital phase of operations, (he) made a substantial contribution to the success of our offensives in the major campaigns conducted during this period, thereby upholding the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I think that no charge that has been made in this RECORD justifies the Senate's even considering disapproving the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Armed Services that this nomination be confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I desire to join the Senator from Georgia in stating that this nomination should be confirmed by the Senate. I had intended to make additional remarks on the nomination. However, in view of the lateness of the hour, and also in view of the statements which already have been made, I shall not speak further at this time, except to say that in the committee we went into this situation as thoroughly as we possibly could. Those who knew Mr. Connally personally gave him a very high endorsement. Certainly his qualifications, on the basis of what he has done in the past, and his statement of what he is giving up in order to take up the duties of the position to which he has been nominated, indicate, I believe, that he will make an excellent Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, I have known John Connally a good many years. He is a friend of mine and of many of us, and the more one is in this profession, the more one values friendships one has grown to cherish. Nevertheless, if I did not believe he would be an outstanding Secretary of the Navy, most certainly I would not vote for him.

Another matter that occurs as we continue to pursue this whole question of conflict of interest, in the executive branch, is the paradox of applying to the members of the executive branch rules we do not apply at all to ourselves. It seems to me that the statutes on conflict of interest should embrace us all through full disclosure.

Mr. Connally came before our committee after many years of Government service, and after having achieved that high record of distinction in combat and elsewhere so well presented to us by the senior Senator from Georgia, distinguished chairman of the committee before which the nominee appeared. In his presentation, Mr. Connally assured us he has done everything he should do in order to comply with both the spirit and letter of the conflict-of-interests law.

I have complete respect for those who do not believe Mr. Connally is the right man for this job. But, I cannot agree with them. I believe that John Connally has proved many times by his previous record that whatever he does in this new position will be done in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield, but I agreed to yield to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I shall take only a moment or two. I merely wish to associate myself with those favorable comments that have been made about John Connally. It has been my privilege to have known him 10 years. He is obviously a man of great ability, or he would not have accomplished the many things he has done. He is a man who has proved that he is a patriot. He has demonstrated that he has character. He has stated he will do only that which is in the best interests of his country. I certainly believe his record entitles him to be believed. I know he will be an outstanding Secretary of the Navy. Because almost every Senator feels that way, I believe his nomination will be overwhelmingly confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly shall not detain the Senate long, but I have followed this matter from the first mention of Mr. Connally's name, through the hearings, and until the argument today.

The one outstanding thing that impresses me is the unanimity as to this man's character, his capacity, and his valued and varied experience. It is my very definite conclusion that it is to the benefit of the Navy and the Government that those experiences include some very practical experience in oil matters, problems, and questions, and how to deal with Navy purchase of oil, and other related matters. It is crystal clear to me that, whoever does so, will have to do it at arm's length; and I am sure that he, representing the Government, will be a man of very fine capacity and excellent judgment on that as well as other subjects.

If I may make a comparison, it reminds me very much of 8 years ago, when a gentleman unknown to this group and to Washington came here from Texas with a similar background, to a degree. He was manager of the Waggoner estate, as I recall, which included vast oil interests. His name was Robert Anderson. His nomination as Secretary of the Navy was first confirmed in the Senate. His nomination as Deputy Secretary of Defense was later confirmed. Later his nomination as Secretary of the Treasury was confirmed. He retired last week with one of the best records on achievement, and with the very highest respect of every Member of this body, as well as of the people of the Nation.

I think it may well be that the record of the present nominee will almost parallel and almost equal that of Mr. Anderson.

I wish there could be a unanimous vote on the nomination, but I hope that every Senator will seriously consider it, and that the Senate will overwhelmingly confirm the nomination.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I shall be very proud to vote to confirm John Connally's nomination. It was my privilege to know him very briefly while he was here in Washington. I believe he will make a fine Secretary of the Navy. I think the record very well supports that belief based on the experience of those who know him.

Madam President, I would not want the RECORD to be closed, however, by an

inference anywhere that purchases of oil from naval reserves represent any significant portion of the oil production of this country. It is my impression that less than 6 million barrels a year are produced from U.S. naval reserves. The private producers produce about 6 million barrels a day. So one can see that the production of U.S. naval reserves is only about one-quarter of 1 percent of the oil production of this country. I do not think any major oil company would regard the U.S. Navy as being a competitor in the production of oil, with only one-quarter of 1 percent of the oil production of the country, and that being produced mostly in areas where there is production offsetting Navy reserves.

If someone owns land alongside naval reserves and is producing oil from that land, in order to prevent oil from being drained away from the naval reserves the Navy is required to drill offsetting wells. There his been no competitive conflict between private oil and naval oil production.

Insofar as naval purchases of oil are concerned, there are no purchases, so far as we know, from the Sid Richardson estate. All purchase of oil is completely competitive in this country, and is based on competitive conditions throughout the entire industry. No one is willing to pay any more than the going market price throughout the country.

So I really cannot see that there is any basis for the charge of conflict of interest because someone happens to have some interest in oil production.

As one who represents an oil-producing State, I very much look forward to the United States advancing its capacity to use atomic power. It is essential to the defense of this country and the protection of our freedom. I think it is completely unfair to suggest that anyone in the oil industry, including the major oil companies, should hold back the maximum development of atomic power which is in the best interests of the United States. Certainly the interest of Mr. Connally, who has merely a royalty interest of $325 a month, involves no conflict of interest. It would be like saying that no one could represent the Treasury if that person were a taxpayer himself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall, no doubt, as I recall, that we did not provide atomic power for the new aircraft carrier last year, because we believed it would be more valuable to us if it burned oil. It is not clear that we are going to equip every new ship with atomic power, by any means.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is true. If atomic power reaches a point where it can be used competitively, at a lower cost, it may be desirable to have all Navy ships in the future constructed to use atomic power. At present this is a very high cost fuel, as the Senator knows. So far as I have been able to determine, it is not the most economical fuel for the Navy, although in many cases it will prove to be the most desirable.

Even if such were the case, the use of petroleum as a fuel will continue to expand for many years in the future. There is a tremendous growing demand in the automotive industry, to cite only one example.

I shall be happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of John Connally, who I believe will make a very able and competent Secretary of the Navy. I am certain that he will serve the Nation admirably.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, John Connally is an able and dedicated man. He is a true patriot. He has made a fine record in peace and in war. It is my opinion, he will be a great Secretary of the Navy, and I shall take pleasure in casting my vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, I rise to support the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I was present during the hearings on this appointment. Not only does Mr. Connally possess the necessary background and ability to discharge the duties of this office—but, he has a record of distinguished service in both Government and civilian endeavors.

The Governor of my State, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, has given Mr. Connally a strong recommendation.

There has been some suggestion of a possible conflict of interest in this case.

Madam President, the testimony before the Armed Services Committee should remove any doubts concerning the nominee's ability to render impartial service.

I intend to support the nomination of Mr. Connally with the knowledge that his record proves him to be a man of ability, dedication, and integrity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, if there is no objection I should like to ask unanimous consent that the other nominations for positions in the Department of Defense with respect to which no opposition has been recorded be confirmed. The Senate is in executive session.

NOMINATION OF EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES JOHNSTON HITCH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF PAUL H. NITZE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR SYLVESTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. MORRIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF CYRUS ROBERTS VANCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH V. CHARYK, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF LYLE S. GARLOCK, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JAMES HENRY WAKELIN, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

NOMINATIONS OF BYRON R. WHITE, OF COLORADO, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL; OF ARCHIBALD COX, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; AND OF H. W. BRAWLEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General; of Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States; and of H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General; be considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed by the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of Senators, the remaining nomination is that of Mr. Chester Bowles. The nomination will be considered after the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] concludes his speech.

OUR BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I wish to speak today about the budget of the United States, recently presented to us by President Eisenhower, and about its relation to President Kennedy's financial programs as he forecast them during his campaign.

During the campaign, President Kennedy made a speech in New York City to the Associated Business Publications Conference on October 12, 1960. In this speech he set forth his views on American economic policy. These views were reiterated and emphasized in a statement issued in Philadelphia on October 30, 1960.

The principles expressed by President Kennedy in his speech in New York and in the statement released in Philadelphia, in my judgment, are sound and constructive and should be followed by this Congress.

Speaking of the budget, President Kennedy advocated using this tool positively—as an instrument of economic stabilization. He said in his New York speech, as I myself have advocated for many years, that the budget should be more than balanced over the whole period of the business cycle, and that the public debt should be reduced when business is operating at a high level. Failure to heed this principle has cost us dearly in the past. For instance, a major factor contributing to maladjustments in our economy in 1960 was the large deficit which faced the Treasury in calendar 1959—generally a year of rapid recovery and expanding activity—throwing the Treasury into competition with private industry for the Nation's savings.

To achieve all of the necessary things which we hope to accomplish in the years ahead, I believe strongly that we must bring fiscal policy under control and use it effectively to contribute to stability. We must not commit ourselves to programs of extraordinary expenditure in periods of temporary slack, which will carry over and come to fruition in periods when we are pressing our capacity to produce the growth that we need and expect.

If extraordinary expenditures are really necessary to combat economic recession, these can and must be made. But they must be accompanied by measures which will assure that the balance is reversed rapidly as recovery proceeds. We must not again permit, as in calendar 1959, a large Federal deficit to converge on the financial markets at the same time that growing demands, stemming from rapid recovery in the private sector, also converge upon them. This pushes up interest rates unnecessarily and places the Treasury in a nearly intolerable position.

For specific examples of such expenditure programs, let us look at several of the Federal housing programs. From the viewpoint of the current budget, one of the most expensive is public housing, where local communities build or acquire projects with borrowed funds and the Federal Government pledges itself to make whatever annual contributions are needed, over and above net operating receipts, to amortize the costs of construction or acquisition.

In fiscal 1961, the Federal Government's payment of annual contributions toward eligible projects is estimated in the budget document to be almost $152 million; in fiscal 1962, as much as $169 million may be required. As large as these amounts are, they are only part of the story. The Federal Government has committed itself to pay annual contributions over a period of up to 40 years—and only thereafter may some of these outlays eventually be recovered. On the basis of contracts already executed or authorized, the Federal Government has agreed to pay maximum annual contributions of up to about $258 million yearly for this one program.

Nor is that all. In addition, the Federal Government expends millions of dollars annually toward administering the low-rent program; in fiscal 1961 alone, it is estimated that these administrative expenses will exceed $13 million. The United States loses millions of dollars more through Federal tax exemption of bonds issued by local housing authorities to finance the subsidized projects.

Last year's omnibus housing bill (S. 3670), which passed the Senate, provided for authority to build 25,000 more public housing units involving an estimated development cost of $625 million over the 40-year life of the loans. This bill did not become law, but I understand pressure is being brought to bear to ask for 100,000 more units in 1961. This would mean an additional Federal Government commitment of nearly $2½ billion over a 40-year period.

Another housing program requiring large amounts of Federal funds is the urban renewal program. Contract authority totaling $2 billion has been authorized so far for urban renewal. Present law calls for the Federal Government to pay $2 in grants for every $1 in local contributions toward the net cost of urban renewal projects. This ratio of two-thirds is excessive. Our cities could and should carry a larger share of the total burden.

On a number of occasions, the proposal has been made to reduce the Federal share to 50 percent, which would make it consistent with a number of other Federal programs. Unfortunately, the Congress did not approve this change in the formula, but I believe it should be seriously considered again this year. There is no reason why Federal aid to cities for city land improvement should be at any greater ratio than soil conservation aid to farmers for farmland improvement—a 50–50 program.

If urban renewal assistance were extended on a 50–50 basis rather than under the present 2-to-1 formula, a given amount of Federal aid could be used to finance a greater number of urban renewal projects. Alternatively, less aid would be required to underwrite a given number of projects, thus reducing budgetary expenditures. Currently, for instance, $1 million in Federal urban renewal grants are needed to underwrite a project with a total net cost of $1½ million. Under a 50–50 formula, the same $1 million in Federal grants would be stretched one-third by helping to finance not only the $1½ million project but also an additional project costing as much as $500,000. Alternatively, the Federal Government would save one-fourth in urban renewal grants by paying out $750,000 rather than $1 million toward the $1½ million project.

Our cities could well afford to carry a larger share. The city of Hartford, Conn., for instance, was recently reported to have invested $1,350,000 in one urban renewal project. In return for this investment, the assessed value of the property in the renewal area will increase from $2 million to an estimated

$35 million at the completion of the project. This will yield taxes of approximately $1 million yearly to the city. The same kind of analysis has been made in many other places, and I believe the substantial benefits to cities require their carrying a larger share of the cost.

These examples from the housing field show the dangers of rushing into vast expenditure programs that tend to change only in one direction—upward—and hence increase the difficulty of adhering to the principles I mentioned earlier.

Fiscal policy must, of course, be kept in proper balance with monetary policy. Regarding the monetary structure, President Kennedy said in his same address in New York City that he did not "advoacte any changes in the constitution of the Federal Reserve System. It is important to keep the day-to-day operations of the Federal Reserve removed from political pressures."

To this I say "amen." I earnestly hope that President Kennedy will never tamper with the independence and objectivity of this great institution, established during the administration of President Wilson, largely as the result of the untiring efforts of Senator Glass and other members of the Democratic Party.

President Kennedy did say that we should have "a flexible, balanced, and, above all, a coordinated monetary and fiscal policy." Properly conceived, such a policy would use all the available instruments—budget surpluses, expenditure reductions, and monetary restraint—to check an inflationary spiral. Such a policy should go far toward minimizing, if not eliminating, the need for counterrecessionary action because it would prevent the maladjustments that lead to recession.

During the campaign, President Kennedy criticized the rate of economic growth which the United States has shown during recent years under the Republican administration. But in pledging to follow policies which will raise the rate of economic growth, he also promised to maintain traditionally conservative financial policies.

To combine at the same time the pursuit of an accelerated rate of economic growth and a balanced budget will require careful and precise policy formulation, and the full cooperation of labor and management to prevent the wage-price spiral. Appropriate policies will have to be executed with near-perfect timing. Our new President is aware that he must sail a difficult course between the Scylla of inadequate growth and the Charybdis of unbalanced and inflationary budgets. I am hopeful that President Kennedy can accomplish this difficult feat of navigation. I wish him well in his attempt, and I personally intend to give him my wholehearted support in achieving those objectives.

In order to accelerate our economic growth, however, we must continue to reject any proposal to depreciate the currency. That would lead, not to growth, but to decay. Previous experience in artificially supporting the price of Government securities by Federal Reserve purchases proves that such steps undermine the soundness of our money—both at home and abroad—and depreciate the integrity of our economic leadership.

Fortunately, these are not the things that President Kennedy proposed, in discussing the subject of economic growth. With respect to prices, he expressed specific concern for the "upward drift since World War II," and stated that "reasonable stability in the price level is a vital goal of economic policy." With regard to the endless expansion of bank credit involved in rigidly supporting the Government securities market by the central bank, he has generally recognized the need for flexible monetary policies and specifically acknowledged "monetary stringency as a potential method of curbing extravagant booms."

Turning now to foreign economic problems, our new President has acknowledged the need for proper concern about our balance of international payments and for keeping our financial house in order. In his economic speech delivered in New York City last October, he said;

> There is still no substitute—for the Nation as well as the individual—for a good cash position.
>
> We can no longer feel isolated and protected from the rest of the world when it comes to our economic and financial dealings.
>
> It is of the greatest importance that our exports of goods and services remain well above our imports in order to cover our essential international commitments—economic as well as military and diplomatic. We must maintain adequate military aid as well as military forces around the world. To do this requires a continuing substantial surplus of exports over imports. To the extent we continue to earn a substantial surplus, concern about the loss of foreign confidence in the dollar, about so-called hot money, and about the gold outflow, will eventually disappear.

But where do we stand now? One of the most dramatic signs of our current position is the gold situation, including the rapid increase in the gold outflow, the speculation in gold in foreign markets, and the related substantial deficit in U.S. balance of payments. In all years but one during the past decade, the United States has had a substantial unfavorable balance of payments amounting in all to a net figure of $17.6 billion. In 1958, the unfavorable balance was almost $3.5 billion; in 1959 it was over $3.8 billion. Although the average over the first half of 1960 was lower than this, in the third quarter the deficit in the balance of payments rose to an annual rate of over $4 billion.

Our stock of gold, which reached a peak of $24.6 billion toward the end of 1949, was down to approximately $17.8 billion last month, and is even $252 million lower than that today. In fact, since the end of 1957, our gold stock has dropped about $5 billion, or by more than one-fifth. During the fourth quarter of 1960, the outflow of gold was estimated to be over $900 million, which if continued over 1 calendar year would amount to more than $3½ billion. Had it not been for the special sale of $300 million of gold to the United States by the International Monetary Fund, the total outflow in the fourth quarter would have been greater than $1.2 billion. Moreover, it is probable that short-term liabilities to foreigners—other than international institutions—which have been increasing recently, substantially exceed our total stock of gold. Such short-term liabilities take the form chiefly of deposits in our banks, as well as Treasury bills and certificates, owned by foreign holders.

These trends cannot be permitted to continue. They must be stopped but not in a spirit of panic. After all, our gold supply still represents more than 40 percent of the total stock of gold throughout the entire free world. No other free government holds even one-fifth as much gold as we do.

What makes the situation particularly bad at the present time is that at least part of the current outflow of gold, and in particular the speculative flurries in the price of gold abroad, has reflected doubt that the United States seriously intends to do whatever is necessary to maintain a sound dollar. Unless we make it crystal clear that we firmly intend to maintain a sound dollar, we may expect that more and more of our short-term foreign liabilities will be exchanged for gold by foreigners fearing devaluation of the dollar.

Time does not now permit a full discussion of what we need to do to end the gold outflow and the unfavorable balance-of-payments situation. I should like, however, to stress three things. First, there must be cooperation between management and labor in industry to prevent price inflation, so that American commodities remain competitive in world markets. Second, we must adjust our foreign loans and grants to the drastic necessity for a balanced budget. In doing so, we must ask nations of the free world whose financial situations are increasingly strong to carry their fair share of the burden of our mutual security and the growth of underdeveloped areas that wish to be allied with the free world. Third, we must maintain a sound and stable domestic economy, both in order to keep our products in a competitive position with the rest of the world and in order to give complete assurance to foreigners that their funds will be safe in the United States.

Recently the pace of economic activity has slackened, causing doubts in the minds of the most optimistic that the budgets for fiscal 1961 or 1962 will be balanced. In the fourth quarter of last year, gross national product—representing our Nation's output of goods and services at market prices—remained at $503½ billion. This was only slightly below the seasonally adjusted annual rate of $505 billion in the second quarter, an alltime high. The small decline in gross national product has reflected a further cutback in business inventories which was nearly offset by an additional rise, to a record high, in all other demands for goods and services.

In December, the index of industrial production again declined and was 7 percent below the record level at the beginning of last year. The seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment rose to 6.8 percent. The parity ratio of the prices received and paid by farmers remained at 81. In November, consumer prices continued to rise slightly.

The Federal budget for the current fiscal year was originally supposed to provide a substantial surplus. Even as late as October, a surplus of more than $1 billion was expected. The budget document released recently, however, postulates only a minute surplus of $79 million with a larger surplus of $1,468 million in the following year.

I earnestly hope that both budgets will be balanced. But deficits rather than surpluses appear more likely even if one accepts the rosy prediction in the document:

> Higher production, employment, and income as the calendar year 1961 progresses.

Some assumptions, for instance, underlying the budget estimates appear highly questionable. To cite only one example: the small surplus of $79 million for fiscal 1961 is based upon the assumption that postal rates will be increased not later than April 1, 1961. The effect of this proposed increase, along with appropriate administrative action, would be to raise revenue by $160 million in the current fiscal year and by $843 million in 1962. Failure to adopt this single change, in other words, would unbalance the 1961 budget and more than halve the surplus for 1962.

But even the remaining surplus of $625 million for fiscal 1962 is contingent, as the budget document candidly points out, on adopting proposed legislation which would increase receipts and decrease expenditures by a total of over $3.2 billion, excluding the effects of the assumed increase in postal rates. Among the proposals is a $1 billion tax rate extension on corporation income taxes. Also included is a proposal, involving approximately $800 million, to raise the excise tax rate on aviation gasoline to 4½ cents per gallon, to impose the same excise tax rate on jet fuels, now untaxed, and to increase by ½ cent per gallon the present tax rate on motor fuels. A third proposal, involving $164 million, calls for the temporary prepayment of premiums by associations insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, at the rate of 2 percent annually on the net increases in savings in the institutions. If any of these proposed changes were not adopted, the remaining surplus for fiscal 1962 could well become a deficit of perhaps significant proportions.

Repeated deficits in 1961 and 1962, to the extent that they promoted inflationary developments in our domestic economy, would increase the foreign demand for gold in exchange for depreciated dollars. For this reason, plus the fact that we cannot permit ourselves to be priced out of international markets, we must proceed with great caution in adopting, however temporarily, any policies designed to expand the economy at the expense of inflation.

As long as deficits persist in our balance of payments, we cannot afford to follow free spending policies either at home or abroad. No one would really benefit if actions were taken prematurely in an effort to remedy the domestic economic situation or if prescribed remedies were administered in excessive doses. We should not overreact to a situation which may go far toward correcting itself if we adhere to the sound economic principles which I have discussed earlier.

In particular, I would like to reemphasize the admonition that we must avoid embracing crash programs that involve large commitments or expenditures in periods of economic slack which will, in fact, carry over to be honored during periods of prosperity. Such programs may not only fail to remedy the slack conditions they were designed to alleviate. They may also needlessly overtax our resources in more prosperous times, thus fostering unwelcome inflationary developments which lead to later domestic and international economic woes.

Even though Edmund Burke said that nations do not learn by experience, we are too young a nation to forget the fundamental principles upon which our national strength was built: faith in God, faith in our manifest destiny, a capacity for hard work, and a willingness to sacrifice. Any national program that appeals to our softness instead of our strength, that substitutes principles of the welfare state for those of private enterprise, and that advocates the support of the people by the government instead of the support of the government by the people, will give new significance to the Khrushchev boast that "we will bury you."

NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I desire to announce that the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness. Let the record show that were he present he would have been in favor of confirmation of all the nominations specifically submitted today by the President of the United States.

MANY MOVED BY CBS TELEVISION DOCUMENTARY "HARVEST OF SHAME" DEPICTING PLIGHT OF MIGRATORY WORKERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, last fall when I was traveling extensively in Wisconsin I was deeply impressed by a sudden and overwhelming wave of compassion for migratory workers. If an army of firebrand orators had swept into Wisconsin pleading with the 4 million people of my State to concern themselves with the plight of migrant farmworkers, their impact would not have compared to the effect caused by a single television program, the CBS documentary "Harvest of Shame."

It has been said that a picture is worth 10,000 words. Well, a moving picture of a 30-year-old woman who looks 60, bowed and broken by exploitation in excess toil since childhood, can arouse widespread concern when it is multiplied and related to the systematic, continuing misery which is the lot of the bulk of our migratory workers. This program enabled us to be firsthand witnesses of the unforgivable conditions in which these unfortunate people live. We witness the malnutrition bordering on starvation. We see the children working long hours in the fields at an age when they should be learning to read and write in school. We note the almost total lack of security, as the migratory workers remain at the mercy of the seasons, of their hiring bosses and crew leaders, and of the vagaries of a fluctuating farm economy.

This program touched an unusual chord of response in the American people. I was personally solicited on this matter over and over and over again in Wisconsin last fall. I receive a great many letters on a multitude of subjects. But rarely have I received such an outpouring of mail expressing concern about a social issue with which the correspondents had no direct connection. What the writers had in common was the fact that they had watched CBS television between 9:30 and 10:30 p.m., e.s.t., on the night of November 25, 1960. At that time they saw "Harvest of Shame," and having seen it they were moved to action.

The reporter for "Harvest of Shame" was the distinguished broadcaster Edward R. Murrow, and the producer was David Lowe, who did much of the on-the-spot camera work in the field which so movingly illustrated the plight of these "excluded Americans." The executive producer was Fred Friendly, and the program was sponsored by Philip Morris, Inc.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of "Harvest of Shame" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> FIRST HAWKER. Seventy over here. Over here—70 cents.
>
> SECOND HAWKER. Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today. We'll pay more and the longest hours. Seventy cents. Here we is today.

THIRD HAWKER. Seventy cents today. Seventy cents—all day jumping. All you have to do is——

FOURTH HAWKER. Eight cents a box and we guarantee you if you pull today and we pull what we got to pull today, you'll have $11 in your pocket.

Mr. MURROW. This scene is not taking place in the Congo. It has nothing to do with Johannesburg or Capetown. It is not Nyasaland or Nigeria. This is Florida. These are citizens of the United States, 1960. This is a shapeup for migrant workers.

The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields. This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best-fed people in the world get hired. One farmer looked at this and said, "We used to own our slaves, now we just rent them."

The Secretary of Labor looked at the migrant plight and said:

Mr. MITCHELL. I think they're the great mass of what I call the excluded Americans. They are people who cry out, workers and their children and their wives, who cry out for some assistance and whose plight is the shame—the shame of America.

Mr. MURROW. The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest farmers' organization, says:

Mr. SHUMAN. I think that most social workers will agree that it's better for a man to be employed, even if his capacity is such as to limit his income, and we take the position that it's far better to have thousands of these folks who are practically unemployable, earning some money, doing some productive work for at least a few days in the year.

Mr. MURROW. This is an American story that begins in Florida and ends in New Jersey and New York State with the harvest. It is a 1960 "grapes of wrath," that begins at the Mexican border in California and ends in Oregon and Washington. It is the story of men and women and children who work 136 days of the year, and average $900 a year. They travel in buses. They ride trucks. They follow the sun.

Mrs. DOBY. Well, I don't know. It don't look like we'll ever get ahead. I guess we'll just have to keep going till we can find something better.

Mr. MURROW. A minister named Cassidy who works with them says:

Mr. CASSIDY. They are just as bad as the slaves. Only in name they are not a slave, but in the way they are treated, they are worser than slaves. And somebody has made thousands of dollars out of his sweat? Is that a slave or not?

Mr. MURROW. They are the migrants, workers in the sweatshops of the soil, the Harvest of Shame.

This is CBS Reports, "Harvest Of Shame." It has to do with the men, women and children who harvest the crops in this country of ours, the best-fed Nation on earth. These are the forgotten people; the underprotected; the undereducated; the underclothed; the underfed. We present this report on Thanksgiving because were it not for the labor of the people you are going to meet, you might not starve, but your table would not be laden with the luxuries that we have all come to regard as essentials. We should like you to meet some of your fellow citizens who harvest the food for the best-fed Nation on earth.

David Lowe talks to Mrs. Doby, 34 years old, mother of nine children.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Doby, what things do you pick up north?

Mrs. DOBY. We pick strawberries and cherries.

Mr. LOWE. Who works with you out of this family here?

Mrs. DOBY. Everybody except the baby.

Mr. LOWE. Who takes care of them in the fields?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, they just kind of stay along with us, or take care of theirself. The one that can't walk usually stays in the baby buggy.

Mr. LOWE. What is an average dinner for the family?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, we just—you mean what do we have in——

Mr. LOWE. Yes.

Mrs. DOBY. We—well, I cook a pot of beans and fry some potatoes——

Mr. LOWE. Yes.

Mrs. DOBY. Some corn or something like that.

Mr. LOWE. How many quarts of milk do you buy for the children?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, we don't—I don't—we don't have milk except maybe when we draw our paycheck; we have milk about once a week.

Mr. LOWE. For all these children you have just——

Mrs. DOBY. The baby has, but—she is on the bottle, and she uses about 15 cans of milk a week, but the older children have milk about once a week.

Mr. LOWE. Do they like to drink milk, Mrs. Doby?

Mrs. DOBY. Yes; they like milk.

Mr. LOWE. The only reason I asked that question, I was quite shocked that they had milk only once a week.

Mrs. DOBY. You thought they didn't like it. But they—they like milk, but it's—well there's so many—a gallon of milk will make 'em a glass around, and so we just can't afford it every day.

Mr. LOWE. What do you want most for your children, Mrs. Doby?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, I'd like for 'em to have a career or whatever they'd want to be when they get older. Course the smaller ones—they're not—don't realize yet to know what they'd like to be, but the older—older girl, she'd like to go to school if she could. She'll probably be like the boy, have to quit soon as she's old enough. She—she really likes to go to school, but she had to miss last week because she had to keep the baby for me to work.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Doby, wouldn't you ever care to have a house of your own?

Mrs. DOBY. I'd like to have a house that—we plan to buy one if we could ever get enough to pay down on one; we'd buy one.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think this will ever happen?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, it don't seem like it.

Mr. MURROW. This is Belle Glade, Fla., where the exodus has its beginning every year. The migrants call it their home, what the circus people call their winter quarters near Sarasota.

Charles Goodlet, chief of police of Belle Glade, says:

Mr. GOODLET. The problem that we have now are the ones that—that come here that don't have the money to rent a room. They—they'll sleep around the bars, in the grass, in the packinghouses, around the lake area, in the parks—any place they can find to sleep, to rest for a few hours. They come here with one thought in mind. It's to survive till the end of this season and save enough money to get to the next State going north.

Mr. MURROW. From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South the 2 to 3 millions move out on their annual migration, which ends late in November. They carry with them whatever little they possess, whatever little they are. At the Okeechobee labor camp, while families were preparing to move north, there was still some work in the beanfields. Children, as usual, were left to fend for themselves.

Mr. LOWE. Jerome, how old are you?

JEROME. Nine.

Mr. LOWE. Nine? Do you go to school?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you go to school, Jerome?

JEROME. At the Okeechobee Elementary School.

Mr. LOWE. I see. What is your sister's name?

JEROME. Lois.

Mr. LOWE. That's Lois. And what are your other sisters?

JEROME. Katherine and Beulah.

Mr. LOWE. Katherine and Beulah. What happened to your foot, Jerome?

JEROME. I drive a nail in out there by the washhouse.

Mr. LOWE. So you drove a nail in out by the washhouse? What did your mother do for that?

JEROME. Put some alcohol on it.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you sleep, Jerome?

JEROME. In this bed.

Mr. LOWE. You have this big bed?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. What happened? How did you get that hole in that bed there, Jerome?

JEROME. Rats.

Mr. LOWE. The what?

JEROME. Rats.

Mr. LOWE. Now, Jerome, you are taking care of Kathy, of Beulah, and Lois?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Now, are you going to give them lunch today?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. What are you going to feed them?

JEROME. I don't know, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Do you have any food here to give them?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. I see. What time does your mother come home?

JEROME. I don't know, sir.

Mr. MURROW. The following day Alean King, the mother of Jerome, Kathy, Lois, and Beulah again was picking beans.

Mr. LOWE. Alean King, I saw your children yesterday at the Okeechobee camp. Why didn't you put them in the nursery?

Mrs. KING. Don't make enough to pay for it.

Mr. LOWE. How much does it cost to put them in?

Mrs. KING. 85 cents.

Mr. LOWE. 85 cents?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. What time did you come out to the field this morning?

Mrs. KING. Six o'clock.

Mr. LOWE. What time will you get home?

Mrs. KING. About 3:30—4 o'clock.

Mr. LOWE. Six this morning to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. How much did you earn?

Mrs. KING. A dollar.

Mr. LOWE. $1?

Mrs. KING. That's right—$1.

Mr. LOWE. Is that because the beans were of poor quality?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. Has this happened before?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. How much will your food cost you today?

Mrs. KING. About $2.

Mr. LOWE. Alean, how old are you?

Mrs. KING. Twenty-nine.

Mr. LOWE. How many children do you have?

Mrs. KING. Fourteen.

Mr. LOWE. How old were you when you first started working in the fields?

Mrs. KING. Eight.

Mr. LOWE. You been working 21 years in the fields?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. Alean, do you ever think you'll ever be able to get out of this kind of work?

Mrs. KING. No, sir.

Mr. MURROW. All the migrants travel fourth class. If there is a privileged class, they ride in their own jalopy, in the best Joad family tradition. The long journey begins—through Atlanta, Nashville, Indianapolis, en route to the fields and orchards of America.

Lowe has been following the migrants for the past 9 months. Some are freewheelers who travel as a family unit. He met the Parsons family as they were about to leave Belle Glade tomatoes for Indiana strawberries.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Parsons, do you think the farmers you work for care about your problems?

Mr. PARSONS. No. sir. They're not in particular worried about you. They just want their stuff out and you get away as quick as possible.

Mr. LOWE. Would you say that you're welcomed when you're needed?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, that is the only time that you are welcome, is when they're needing you. They're friendly and everything, but once they're done with you, why they'd rather for you to move.

Mr. LOWE. Did they ever ask you to leave their places?

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, yes. They tell you, if you're finishing up like tomorrow why they had rather for you to be out and gone in about 3 days, and that way it'll cut down on their electric bills and all the other stuff.

Mr. LOWE. What do you want most in this world for you and your family?

Mr. PARSONS. I'd like for my family to be well, stay together as much as possible. I'd like to be on a farm somewhere out away from so many people to where they could attend one church and be interested mostly in one school, and that way I believe they'd all be better satisfied.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Parsons, do you think this will ever happen?

Mr. PARSONS. Not at the rate that I'm going now, no.

Mr. MURROW. Most of them ride 1,500 to 2,000 miles to work, in vehicles owned by crew leaders who recruit the workers for the migration north. This is the Roach family looking for work.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Roach, how did you happen to come to this place?

Mr. ROACH. Well, I came to Augusta and I talked with some people and they told me to come on down to Waycross, it was lots more work around Waycross, see.

Mr. LOWE. Well, how—how many miles you've been traveling looking for work so far?

Mr. ROACH. About 1,600 and something.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Roach, where did you spend the night last night with your family?

Mr. ROACH. Over in the woods. Pulled off on the side of the road—on a little dirt road—and slept in the woods outside the car.

Mr. LOWE. May I ask you, sir, what did you have for dinner and your family last night?

Mr. ROACH. Well, we had bologna sausage and a loaf of bread.

Mr. LOWE. That isn't very good food for a growing family, is it?

Mr. ROACH. Well, we made on it.

Mr. LOWE. How much money do you have in the world right at this moment?

Mr. ROACH. Oh, I have about a dollar and forty-five cents.

Mr. LOWE. Well, what do you intend to do about food for your family today?

Mr. ROACH. Well, I've always worked and I always figured I could get work. I have never been where I couldn't get a little something to do.

Mr. MURROW. The vegetables the migrants picked yesterday move north swiftly on rails. Produce en route to the tables of America by trailer is refrigerated and carefully packed to prevent bruising. Cattle carried to market by Federal regulation must be watered, fed and rested for 5 hours every 28 hours. People—men, women, and children, are carried to the fields of the North in journeys as long as 4 days and 3 nights. They often ride 10 hours without stop for food or facilities.

The first stop is normally at Yulee, Fla., 1 mile from the Georgia border, a checkpoint for farm labor leaving the State.

Mr. MAN. Okay. Okay.

Mr. MURROW. There are other stops—Kingsland, Ga., for bread and sandwich meats. Darien, Ga., for facilities. A roadside stop en route in South Carolina.

One thousand miles north of Belle Glade, Fla., by way of U.S. Routes 17 and 301, through Jacksonville, Savannah, Charleston, Wilmington, and New Bern, is Elizabeth City, N.C., a bean stop, good for 6 weeks' work. This camp was home for 40 days for the families of Tom Lockett's crew, now 30 hours out of Belle Glade.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Blakely, how many years have you been working in agricuture in the fields?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Oh, practically all of my life. I haven't did no other work much but in the field, all of my life. I raised all of my kids with it.

Mr. LOWE. I notice that there is some straw over there. What is that for?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Well, that was the straw they brought for the people to sleep on.

Mr. LOWE. Well, weren't mattresses supplied here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. They used to be but they ain't now.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Blakely, where is the water supply over here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. That's it right yonder.

Mr. LOWE. For how many people?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Well, this and that over yonder. All we use the same.

Mr. LOWE. And how many bathrooms are there here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. None.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you—where do you use the bathroom? Where is—where are the facilities?

Mrs. BLAKELY. We haven't one. We use our tin tubs.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, how do the children fare on the journey up north?

Mrs. BROWN. Well, they got kind of sick, you know, you know that old ride, got sore riding, handling them but we made it.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, may I ask how old you are?

Mrs. BROWN. I'm 37.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, how many years have you been working in the fields?

Mrs. BROWN. All my life.

Mr. LOWE. Do you remember how old you were when you started?

Mrs. BROWN. I was about 8 years old.

Mr. LOWE. Would you like to get out of this work?

Mrs. BROWN. I sure would.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think you'll ever be able to?

Mrs. BROWN. I'm hopin' so.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think you'll be able to, though?

Mrs. BROWN. I don't know.

Mr. MURROW. Twenty miles from Kitty Hawk, N.C., the workers driven 900 miles north by Crew Leader Norman Hall pick beans at the prevailing rate of 50 cents a hamper.

Lunch is not a picnic, whether brought from the labor camp or purchased at the open-air kitchen or in a bottle, heated by the rays of the sun.

In a survey in 21 States conducted by the National Council of Churches, the migrants themselves listed the evils of labor camp life: Bad housing, flies, mosquitoes, dirty beds and mattresses, unsanitary toilets, and lack of hot water for bathing. One employer of hundreds of migrant laborers was asked, "Are they happy people?"

Mr. JONES. Well, I guess they got a little gypsy in their blood. They just like it. Lot of 'em wouldn't do anything else. Lot of 'em don't know any different. That's all they want to do. They love it. They love to go from place to place. They don't have a worry in the world. They're happier than we are. Today they eat. Tomorrow they don't worry about. They're the happiest race of people on earth.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Jones, do you think that the migratory laborer makes a living wage?

Mr. JONES. They make a poor living. In other words, sometimes just like the farmer. Sometimes when things are good, when the yields are good and they can make good money, they make a good living, but take year in and year out from different seasons, different sections of the country, I'd say no, that they make a poor living.

Mr. MURROW. There are days when beans are not ready for harvest and that's 1 more day with no income. Ed King, a crew leader, hauled his workers to this camp at Powell's Landing, Va., where they worked 5 weeks pulling corn and picking beans. And when the fields have been stripped in North Carolina and Virginia the trucks and buses again move north.

This is Little Creek Ferry outside of Norfolk. Twenty thousand migrants are ferried to the fertile fields of the Virginia Cape and the eastern shores of Maryland and Delaware for beans, tomatoes, asparagus and potatoes.

For one crew hardship was climaxed by disaster, the death of a migrant.

Mr. JOHNSON. We had a little trouble on the road about 4 o'clock this morning, Sunday morning, and our car—a little wreck—one was killed.

Mr. LOWE. Has this ever happened before with any crews coming up north?

Mr. MAN. Once that I remember in Fayetteville, N.C.

Mr. LOWE. What happened?

Mr. MAN. Everybody got killed.

Mr. MURROW. Every year, as predictable as the seasons, there are accidents resulting in death and serious injury to these laborers. On June 6, 1957, at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and State Highway 102, 9 miles from Fayetteville, N.C., 21 migrants were killed, 17 males, 3 females and a baby boy. The police report stated one of the causes of the high loss of life was the packaging of the occupants of the truck. Today only six States have laws providing for the safe transportation of migrants within their borders. The State of North Carolina is not one of the six. Secretary of Labor Mitchell.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hardly a year goes by that we don't read in the paper of some very serious accident where sometimes a dozen or more people have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety.

Mr. MURROW. Another complication of the migrant stream is the constant flow of foreign workers into the available pool of domestic workers. Hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros and thousands of offshore laborers from the Caribbean area, hired by contract, depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant. This controversy is most bitter on the west coast.

Joseph Woods, a Marine combat veteran of the Pacific, competes against the braceros. Lowe talked to the Woods family under a tree which was their home in California.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Woods, how did you happen to pick this spot to camp?

Mr. WOODS. Well, someone told us about it and they said it was all right to camp here.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you get your water supply?

Mr. WOODS. We go to town after it.

Mr. LOWE. And how do you bring it back here?

Mr. WOODS. In cans. We have a 10-gallon can.

Mr. LOWE. What do you use for sanitary facilities, Mr. Woods?

Mr. WOODS. Well, just get by the best we can.

Mr. LOWE. How many days will you have to be picking cherries in order to find enough money to move into a house?

Mr. WOODS. Well, probably quite a few. They usually want a month's rent in advance so by the time the cherries are over here we'll be moving somewhere else anyway.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Woods, tell me about the children? Do they go out in the orchards and work with you when you work?

Mrs. WOODS. Well, we have taken them out sometimes with us, but they're a little too small to work.

Mr. LOWE. Who takes care of them here?

Mrs. WOODS. My father stays here and takes care of them, usually.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think that you'll ever make enough money picking fruit, Mr. Woods, in order to get settled down in one place and have a home of your own?

Mr. WOODS. I don't think so.

Mr. MURROW. Throughout the United States there are others like the Woods family who are not able to enjoy the luxury of living in a labor camp. In New Jersey, a few miles from Princeton, is this labor camp. There are two water taps and two outhouses. Families live in one room, usually in one bed. The single men live in the "bullpit," their space one bunk. Four people live in this room in New Jersey. A family of six will move into this room. Nearby a trotting raceway has new stables for horses. They cost $500,000.

At Cutchogue, N.Y., 300 migrants live in this camp owned and operated by the Potato Growers Association of Long Island. This is migrant housing, 90 miles from Times Square. Some have tried to leave the endless migratory stream. Wherever this happens, the local slum areas expand. This is Riverhead, Long Island, N.Y. A minister said, "This is as primitive as man can live." This settlement of former migrants is called the Bottoms. In Chenango County, New York State, a farm labor camp, the ultimate goal of Ed King's crew, 1,257 miles from Belle Glade. The Migrant Mission serves one-half pint of milk and one cracker to each child. This is their lunch. Their parents eat lunch in the fields, sometimes 75 miles away.

This is the living space of Alean King and her five children. The room is similar to their winter quarters in Belle Glade, only smaller.

Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, says:

Mr. SCHUMAN. We're the only group of people that furnish housing for workers and we furnish these extra benefits, prerequisites as some people will—some sections call it "the furnish" and it's almost impossible to calculate the value of these added benefits. At the same time we don't condone inadequate housing.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Schuman, why does the American Farm Bureau Federation so violently oppose Federal legislation?

Mr. SCHUMAN. I think there'd be more rapid progress with State regulation than there will be with Federal regulation. We think that Federal legislation will follow the route that almost all Federal legislation does of additional and more stringent and more regulations, with more and more redtape and more cutting to a certain pattern all over the country. In effect, it would probably rule out the use of migrant labor very quickly.

Mr. MURROW. The middleman between the farmer and the migrant is the crew leader, a remnant of the padrone system in wide use 60 years ago. Ed King, a crew leader, says:

Mr. KING. Well, the crew leader he have to—in a way, he have to be the father and the mother and all when he takes this crew out because the whole crew will mostly be depending direct on you.

Mr. MURROW. Rev. Michael Cassidy, who travels with the migrants, says:

Mr. CASSIDY. Well, some of the crew leaders they are good but the majority of them they're bad. They're so bad that they are the worst that they can be. They're trying to skin alive these migrants. They take every dime they make. They try everything that's possible. For instance, they pay the owner—the grower pays them 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes, and then they turn around they pay the laborer 12 cents at the most—and naturally, they have 40 or 50 or a hundred people picking tomatoes. He makes, I know a man last year he makin' here, right in here, $14,000, the crew leader—and all the men that left here and I met 'em in Alabama, they were broke. They didn't have a dime, because they didn't make the money themselves.

Mr. MURROW. Everyone who knows anything about this situation agrees that the best hope for the future of the migrants lies in the education of their children. But for the children of migrants, education is not easy to come by. There are 600,000 of them. Most State child labor laws ignore farm children—and so far as the children of migrants are concerned, almost without exception they leave school at the age of 16 forever. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country. Approximately, 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant laborers, finishes grade school. Approximately, 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma. Only six States have summer schools for migrants. The New Jersey School Center is at Cranbury.

Mr. LOWE. Laura, how old are you?

LAURA. Eleven.

Mr. LOWE. Eleven. What grade are you in?

LAURA. Sixth.

Mr. LOWE. Sixth grade. Do you intend to go to high school, Laura?

LAURA. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What would you like to be?

LAURA. I'd like to be a teacher.

Mr. LOWE. What would you like to teach?

LAURA. I'd like to teach the fifth grade.

Mr. LOWE. What do you think about going to school here in Cranbury, N.J., Harriet?

HARRIET. I'd like it.

Mr. LOWE. Oh good, would you—do you have any idea what you want to do when you grow up?

HARRIET. Be a teacher.

Mr. LOWE. Oh, good. How old are you, Patricia Ann?

PATRICIA ANN. Eight, nine.

Mr. LOWE. What grade?

PATRICIA ANN. Nine.

Mr. LOWE. Nine? What grade are you in?

PATRICIA ANN. Fourth.

Mr. LOWE. Do you have any idea what you want to be when you grow up?

PATRICIA ANN. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What's that?

PATRICIA ANN. A nurse.

Mr. LOWE. Otis, what would you like to do when you grow up?

OTIS. Be a doctor.

Mr. LOWE. Going to be a doctor?

OTIS. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What kind of a doctor, do you know?

OTIS. I'd rather be a dentist.

Mr. LOWE. A dentist?

OTIS. Drill teeth.

Mr. MURROW. Mrs. Christine Shack, their teacher, was asked about her pupils.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Shack, do your pupils who are, most of them, children of migrant families, are they anxious to get an education?

Mrs. SHACK. Terribly anxious—even more so than the child in the normal school year.

Mr. LOWE. Do they get any help from their parents as far as school work is concerned?

Mrs. SHACK. Usually, you will find that the parents themselves are not educated. When we go out to enroll the children, oftentimes the parent will make an X, and the person interviewing will have to sign it in order to get permission for the child to be enrolled in school.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Shack, how does this problem affect you personally?

Mrs. SHACK. I think maybe I feel a bit of responsibility toward these children because I realize that we here in New Jersey reap the benefits of their parents' labor, and the children are suffering because their parents are here doing this.

Mr. LOWE. I saw one bright little girl, her name was Laura Weeks. Will she really have a chance to continue her education?

Mrs. SHACK. Laura is from a rural area in Florida, and she is from an exceedingly large family. In fact, I believe there are eight or nine girls, all girls, in the family. They have been coming to New Jersey now for about 3 or 4 years to my knowledge. Laura is one of my returning pupils. I've seen great progress, from year to year, in Laura; we've had her for three sessions. However, I think because of the family's financial condition and the size of the family and the fact that she is in a rural area, that she probably will get no farther than upper junior high school or maybe complete high school, with luck.

Mr. LOWE. What about Harriet Damon?

Mrs. SHACK. Harriet, too, is from a very large family. There are nine children in the Damon family; we have six of them here in the summer program. She is the oldest of the nine. I doubt seriously that Harriet will have an opportunity to advance her education. One can't help but have compassion for those who find themselves in such a condition.

Mr. MURROW. The Federal Government spends $6½ million annually protecting migratory wildlife. This year Congress failed to appropriate $3½ million to educate migratory children. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, was asked if State or Federal legislation was the answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Many aspects can only be successfully dealt with at a national level. For example, wages. We can't—we see States in competitive positions; they're reluctant to raise wages through legislation in their State because their farmers are competing with farmers in other States. And we see in education some States who have taken great strides. But we can't expect States to do it alone when they know their neighboring State with whom their farmers compete are not doing anything. We know that just about everybody in this country has some Federal support for adequate housing through FHA or whatever the program is, except the farm community—and the migrant farmer is the most poorly housed member of our society.

Mr. MURROW. Senator WILLIAMS, a Democrat, and Secretary of Labor Mitchell, a Republican, have called for legislation which will probably come before the next session of Congress. And only last week President Eisenhower made the Presidential Committee on Migrants a permanent body. But the real problem is that there are many kinds of farmers and many kinds of crops. The big, mechanized grain and dairy farmers use little or no migrant labor. Some of the

major canneries do pay fair wages and provide adequate housing. However, it must be stated that most of the fruit and vegetable farmers find it economically impossible to build good housing, like this, to be used only 6 weeks a year. The farmer claims he is trapped between what society expects and his market demands. Howard Jones, a grower in Florida, was asked if he knew what his beans, picked that day, would bring in the market.

Mr. JONES. Well, you can't tell from one day to another. Some days you go down there and you'll get $5—and I've seen them drop to a dollar and a half the next day. Or one day they'll be $3, the next day they might be two or one day they'll be two and the next day they could be four.

Mr. LOWE. Who sets your price?

Mr. JONES. Well, that's what we're all tryin' to figure out. Everybody—I don't know the answer but the chains seem to have more to do with setting the prices than anyone else. There's too much difference between the price that they're paying the farmers all over the country. And somethin' * * * we've thought about trying to get somebody to investigate it, some of the Congressmen, the Senators. But you go up there to Washington—we had a group of boys go up there, here * * * a couple years ago. They gave them a runaround. The Agriculture Department, they all give them a runaround. We believe that those chains have lobbyists in Washington, and they're going to do pretty well just what they please.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Mitchell, some of the growers have told us that the chainstores fix the prices, and they cannot meet those prices if they pay their labor a higher wage. What about that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I wonder if that's a very valid argument that might be said of many other industries. It might be said, for example, of the garment industry and I've heard it alleged that retailers dictate to the manufacturer the price they will pay for a garment and, in effect, say "You produce the garment at that price no matter what it takes to produce it." However, the garment worker in this country fares very well, in terms of standard of living, due in large measure to the efforts of people like Mr. Potofsky and Mr. Dubinsky of the ILGWU and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and others who have taken what was a very substandard industry not so long ago, 1911, great fire in New York. Today these workers are thriving members of the community, and the price that my wife pays for a garment today she gets a much better garment than her mother ever had at a lower price. So this argument that the farmer has to meet the dictation of the chainstore leaves me rather cold.

Mr. MURROW. The migrant farmworker occupies the lowest level of any major group in the American economy. The soil has produced no Samuel Gompers or John L. Lewis, as Secretary of Labor Mitchell states.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the AFL–CIO, in the past, has been too preoccupied with other affairs and probably the farm problem was so tough that they were reluctant to tackle it. I think their attitude and policy has changed, and they're making a greater effort now to organize than they ever have in the past.

Mr. MURROW. Farm labor, however, is excluded from all Federal legislation designed to protect the rights of those engaged in interstate commerce to organize and bargain collectively.

In 1959, the AFL-CIO set aside $100,000 in an effort to organize the fruitpickers of California. One of the large growers in California was asked what he thought of this effort to organize the fruitpickers.

Mr. ZUCKERMAN. I think their very lack of progress and their very lack of success in signing up members has shown that the industrial type of union which they represent has no place or application to agriculture.

Mr. MURROW. Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was asked how his organization felt about unions.

Mr. SCHUMAN. I think that the agricultural worker needs to have the right to change jobs, freedom to move about, freedom to quit if he doesn't like it, freedom to protest, freedom to negotiate where they are organized, but the right to strike at the time of harvest ought to be regulated in some manner.

Mr. MURROW. The AFL–CIO organizing committee in California thinks differently. Earlier this year, they called a strike meeting of cherrypickers in Stockton. "They're always on the go—for a winter's take in summer—and the pay has been too low."

A meeting reminiscent of the days of auto and steel organizing in the thirties.

Louis Krainock, an official of the organizing committee.

Mr. KRAINOCK. Your negotiating committee met with cherry industry representatives for the first time in the history of agriculture. They set a minimum of $1.10 per 16-quart bucket for good and average picking. Now, some contractors and growers will try to beat down that minimum price, and they'll say that they can't afford to pay $1.10 a bucket for the big crops, that they're squeezed, that the Chrysler Imperial needs fixing, or junior's Thunderbird is on the blink. Now, it's up to you and the rest of the pickers. It's your program. It represents united action.

SECOND SPEAKER. Sure, you can get a job but if you can't live on what you make, what good is the job?

THIRD SPEAKER. You make $5 or $10 today and tomorrow you just alookin' for a job and you stand on the street looking for a job. Now, you ain't got no job for another day. What does the local people forced to do?

FOURTH SPEAKER. We live anywhere, in a tent, under a shade tree, under the river bridge. We drink water out of a creek or anywhere we can get it. Five or six families drink out of one cup, tin can or anything else. Well, we're to blame. We tolerate that stuff. If we'd stick together and say we won't do it, we won't pick your cherries until you give us some restrooms in the field for the ladies, and some for the men, and some water fit to drink, we won't pick 'em. We'd get 'em.

Mr. MURROW. The fruits of the earth must be harvested to feed and sustain mankind.

The question posed by thoughtful men is, must the 2 to 3 million migrants who help feed their fellow Americans work, travel, and live under conditions that wrong the dignity of man?

Howard Van Smith, awarded a Pulitzer Prize for his series of articles on migrant labor in the Miami News, says this:

Mr. SMITH. I knew next to nothing of the migrant situation 4 to 5 years ago. I knew there were migrant camps, but a migrant was just a person who worked on a farm to me. After seeing what I have, I am sure that I will devote the rest of my life to doing what little I can to help solve this problem.

Mr. MURROW. Secretary of Labor James Mitchell says:

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel sad. I feel sad because I think that it's a blot on my conscience as well as the conscience of all of us whom society has treated a little more favorably than these people. They have no voice in the legislative halls. They certainly have no voice in Congress, and their employers do have a voice. Their employers are highly organized and make their wants and terms and conditions known to our legislators. I know of no greater pressure lobbies, so-called, in Washington than the farm group. In all the matters in which I am interested in, I have been frustrated to a greater extent than in any other sphere of activity, as Secretary of Labor, in my inability to make any impact at all in terms of either regulations or law that would help the farmworkers, and the pressures of the farm groups are tremendous. We guarantee to the farmer no loss in certain crops. There the farmer likes to participate in Government largess, but Lord help the fellow like myself who dares suggest that perhaps the Government should do something about the workers that work on farms. It seems to me that, in our kind of a country, we no longer quarrel with the idea that man's worthy of his hire, a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. After all, the employers of this country, as indeed the workers, are part of our way of life. And it's morally wrong, it seems to me, for any man, any employer, to exploit his workers. In this day and age, I don't think we should tolerate it. As a citizen, in or out of this office, I propose to continue to raise my voice until the country recognizes that it has an obligation to do something for them.

Mr. MURROW. And while men of good will seek to right injustice, the migrant, the lonely wanderer, the outcast, is trapped in the stream.

Now it is November, the last of the laborers, in trucks, buses, and cars, approach the Southern States to start the cycle all over again.

The Sunshine State welcomes them back: Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee, Belle Glade, and hundreds of other communities. This is home. New housing is available. The rent, $15 per room, per week.

The migrant is at the mercy of the weather. This year in Florida there was a freeze, killing beans, tomatoes, celery, corn. Its byproduct was a breadline. Migratory farmworkers are not eligible for unemployment insurance. This happened in the United States in 1960, a line of humans waiting for a ration of tinned goods, milk, and bread.

The Secretary of Labor says: "For the rest of my life, in or out of office, I propose to do something for them."

A hardened newspaperman says, "For the rest of my life, I will do what little I can to help."

But perhaps Julian Griggs, a chaplain for the migrants, speaks for all of us:

Mr. GRIGGS. Is it possible to have love without justice? Is it possible that we think too much in terms of charity, in terms of Thanksgiving Day baskets, in terms of Christmas baskets, and not in terms enough of eliminating poverty?

Mr. MURROW. The migrants are back in Belle Glade winter quarters after months of travel and work. One said he brought back a dollar and sixty-five cents; another said $6. Another said, we broke even; we were broke when we left; broke when we got back. We asked him what they thought they could do to help themselves, and they said, nothing. What can we do?

Last week a Presidential committee, made up of the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, made certain recommendations regarding the migrants. Here are some of them: Extend child labor laws to cover agricultural workers. Eliminate residence requirements so that migrants will be eligible for health, education, and welfare programs. A Federal law requiring crew leaders to register, thus protecting migrants from exploitation—extension of workmen's compensation laws to agriculture. New housing regulations—States to pay local school boards for the education of migrant children.

There will, of course, be opposition to these recommendations; too much Government interference, too expensive, socialism. Similar proposals have been made before. In fact, a hundred and fifty different attempts have been made in Congress to do something about the plight of the migrants. All except one has failed. The migrants have no lobby. Only an enlightened, aroused, and perhaps angered public opinion can do anything about the migrants. The people you have seen have the strength to harvest your fruit and vegetables. They do not have the strength to influence legislation. Maybe we do. Good night and good luck.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. FRANKE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is in the hospital. I understand he was operated on today. I am happy to report that he is getting along quite well, I think. He had hoped very much he could be present to pay tribute to the Honorable William B. Franke, the recently resigned Secretary of the Navy. In behalf of my colleague from Vermont I respectfully request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a short tribute to the former Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROUTY

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dedicated and patriotic public servant—William B. Franke, the recently resigned Secretary of the Navy. I am sure that the other Members of the Senate join me in this expression of appreciation to Bill Franke for his many years of valuable services in positions of great trust and difficulty in the Department of Defense.

Never one to indulge in self-aggrandizement, Secretary Franke has in his quiet and unassuming way been one of the most stalwart members of the Defense team, and the excellent state of readiness of our Navy and Marine Corps forces is due in no small measure to his inspiring and devoted leadership.

Born in Troy, N.Y., and educated in the public schools of that city, Mr. Franke showed early evidence of self-reliance and a fondness for hard work by obtaining self-supporting employment while receiving his accounting training at the Pace Institute of Accountancy, New York City. Upon graduation and successful completion of the examination for certified public accountant, he then forged ahead in the business world, eventually forming his own firm in New York City. To cap a successful business career, Mr. Franke brought a wealth of experience to the service of his country when he first accepted a position as a member of the U.S. Army Controllers Civilian Panel in 1948. He was a Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in 1951–52 and in 1951 was given the Patriotic Civilian Commendation by the U.S. Army. In 1952 he was awarded the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Award. He then served as the Navy's first Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management) from October 1954 until April 1957, and as Under Secretary of the Navy from April 1957 until June 1959. He was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of the Navy and took his oath of office on June 8, 1959. In this post he has served with great distinction and has made an outstanding contribution to the financial management and business administration of the Department.

Secretary Franke's leadership, integrity, judgment, and objectivity have made him an invaluable member of the Defense secretariat. I firmly believe that we have been most fortunate to have had Bill Franke in a key post in our defense organization. I consider it an honor to count him among my friends. I believe the people of the United States owe him a great debt for his dedicated and valuable services, performed so willingly with personal financial sacrifice. Further, I know that with his deep and sincere patriotism the Government can always turn to him as a valuable source of wisdom on Government affairs. I am sure that I voice the feeling of all the Members in wishing him and Mrs. Franke all good fortune in the years ahead.

I trust that they will both have many years in which to enjoy their charming home in Rutland, Vt.

THE NEW YORK HARBOR STRIKE

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, happily, the New York harbor strike is settled. The trains will be running tomorrow. The many thousands of commuters who have been so greatly inconvenienced by this dispute will return to happier families and will be able to have their meals on time.

The frayed nerves of thousands of commuters will be soothed. Fruits, vegetables, and other supplies will flow in an orderly way into the great city of New York. Freight and passenger traffic throughout the east coast will return to normal.

I want to take just a moment today to commend all who played a part in bringing about this settlement. The new administration and the Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, are indeed off to a good start in demonstrating their willingness to stand up for the public interest in serious and disruptive national labor-management disputes.

I want especially to commend Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, for his vigorous efforts to resolve this dispute. Few people realize the extent to which the Governor has devoted his full energies to resolving this dispute. I have been in touch with the Governor's office, and I know how hard he worked at this.

Last Thursday, the Governor went to New York City, to personally see to it that the parties continued to meet in good faith. He stayed with the negotiations around the clock, day and night. From the early mornings until late in the evenings, he cajoled and prodded in the name of the traveling public and in the interest of resolving the huge transportation tieup that then threatened the entire Northeast.

This morning, he stayed with the negotiators until 6 a.m., when the break finally came and a temporary settlement was reached. Without getting any sleep, he then returned to Albany, to catch up on the affairs of the State.

Madam President, the Governor has performed a great service and has set a fine example in urging—with all the might of his office—that the two parties in this dispute come to some agreement.

He has persevered, and I commend him. He is very tired today. But he and all the rest of us shall sleep more comfortably now, in the knowledge that the New York harbor dispute is over.

Madam President, I hope this settlement will set an example by which, in the future, Federal and State authorities will cooperate to serve all of us in difficult and particularly disruptive labor-management breakdowns.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish to speak in behalf of confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Bowles has many qualifications which should make him capable of fulfilling the requirements of the position to which the President has nominated him.

Mr. Bowles served with distinction as United States Ambassador to India. He served—again with distinction—as Governor of a great State. He made a fine record as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Connecticut. In all those positions he conducted himself with understanding, courage, and tolerance.

It is my recollection that this nomination was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I hope the Senate in its wisdom will see fit to confirm the nomination of this outstanding man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, last Thursday, as the majority leader has said, the Foreign Relations Committee considered the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. During the several hours of the committee's session—the meeting began at 10 a.m., as I recall, and continued until 1 p.m.—the various committee members subjected Mr. Bowles to a wide variety of questions dealing with many subjects. Some emphasized especially his view about Red China and our country's relations to it. But, in addition, there were wide-ranging questions about India, Europe, and Latin America. I believe that a reading of the committee record, which is before the Senate, will convince Senators that Mr. Bowles is eminently qualified to be the Under Secretary of State. Not only has he served in the diplomatic service of our country as Ambassador to India, but he has also written extensively on foreign-policy subjects in connection with nearly every field of our international relations.

I think Mr. Bowles will bring to the State Department a wide knowledge and, certainly, new initiative, originality, and integrity.

So, Madam President, I certainly hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I can agree with and concur in the statements which have been made by the distinguished majority leader and by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee about the capacity, the qualifications, the integrity, the character, the patriotism, and the diligence of Chester Bowles.

Nevertheless, I am compelled, with reluctance, to voice opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

A week ago I made some remarks on the floor of the Senate, prior to Mr. Bowles' appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, in which I raised some questions relating to his position and his attitude on our recognition of Communist China and the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. In testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee Mr. Bowles clarified his position in an admirable manner. I felt that he met many of the issues, on the whole, fully and head on.

However, I feel that Mr. Bowles left unchanged certain distinct impressions which I have, and which I believe many in this country and in other countries have, regarding his real feeling on this matter.

Mr. Bowles was quoted, some time ago, as saying, during a television interview:

> In the long run we can solve this situation on China through some kind of two-China policy.

On January 19, when he was before the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Bowles stated, in reply to a question from the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]:

> Well, as a matter of practical necessity, we are dealing with a government on Formosa called the Republic of China; we have contracts, agreement, treaties with them.
>
> We are also agreeing with some other kind of government or meeting with some other kind of government, whatever you want to call it, in Warsaw. We have had over a hundred meetings with this other government.
>
> Now, whether you want to call it the other government, the other China, or whatever you want to call it, it is something we are meeting there with. I think we can get lost in this two-China argument. But there are two entities here, and we are dealing with both of them, whether we admit it or not.

Madam President, there are certain other points on which I might comment. But, to me, this is the crux of the whole question.

To my mind, there can be no doubt that Mr. Bowles, in his heart—and, more than that, by his statements through recent years and at present—feels, and, I suspect, quite strongly, that we have been dealing, in a manner, with 2 Chinas, with 600 million Chinese living on the mainland under a Communist government, and that, sooner or later, by force of circumstances, or, as he phrased it, by facing the realities, we shall be compelled to recognize Red China as governing the mainland while we continue to recognize the Republic of China as governing the island of Formosa.

This viewpoint, if it is the viewpoint, of Mr. Bowles—and I think it is—is shared, undoubtedly, by many Members of this body, who, from time to time, have been making speeches to the effect that we must be realistic; we must stop trying to hide our head in the sand, and stop trying to ignore the existence of 600 million Chinese on the Chinese mainland. Similar statements have been made in the press and by various public figures throughout this country.

Invariably I notice that they avoid taking the logical next step and saying that, sooner or later, we must recognize Red China.

Having said what Mr. Bowles said—and he surely said it with sincerity—they have shied away at a certain point. They then say, "But, oh, no, no, I am not in favor of recognizing Red China at this time." Then, sometimes they say, as he said before the committee, in regard to admitting Red China into the fellowship of the United Nations, there must be some "clear commitments." "Commitment," in my dictionary, means a future promise, not a unilateral action—like agreeing to open the door and releasing American prisoners.

Mr. Bowles is no more to be assailed because of his feeling in this matter than are many others, some of them Members of this body, who take the same position. But, these others are not candidates for or have not been designated as the American Under Secretary of State.

I am not so much interested, although I cannot vote for the nomination, in seeking to prevent confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles as Under Secretary of State as I am in trying to make the record clear in this body so that in the future—and possibly the rather near future—should we be facing the decision of determining whether Red China shall be recognized, this vote and this action cannot be raised as being in any sense an affirmative action on the part of the Senate on that question.

Madam President, on every side we hear the word "realism." We hear, "Let us face realities." As I said only a moment ago, what is meant is that, because there are 600 million people on the Chinese mainland, under the control and domination of 2 percent of that number, a Communist dictatorship, and because there is no immediate prospect of that situation being changed, to be realistic we must swim with the tide, cease swimming against it, and accept Red China.

Everything we have done under that term "realism" since the close of World War II has been a moral retreat. In fact, it began before then. I sat on the divans in the rear of the Senate Chamber as a young man, serving as a clerk of a committee and on the staff of a U.S. Senator, and listened to the debates in this room about the recognition of the Soviet Union. I heard some great and sincere Senators whose names are well known—for instance, Senator Borah, of Idaho—state on the floor of the Senate:

> Let us be realistic. How can we ignore the millions and millions of inhabitants across parts of two continents under the dominion of the Soviet Union? It is a fact, and we can do so much better by dealing with them.

And so we were lured into recognition of the Soviet Union. How much we have gained from that recognition could well be debated.

After World War II, in the name of realism, the United States stood by and even participated in the partition of Korea. It stood by and acquiesced in the dismemberment of Poland, and in the establishment of a Communist government there. It stood by and agreed to an unnatural, distorted, unheard of, unreasonable division of Germany, with the isolation of Berlin, that has come back to haunt us. We acquiesced in the taking over of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, by the Communists. And always the reason given was, "Let us be realistic. We are faced with a fait accompli, and there is no use swimming against the tide. We can deal with those people. We have to get along with them."

It was largely that concept of realism that caused us to acquiesce in the advance of the so-called agrarian reformers, thus betraying the Government of free China, to whom we were committed by the most sacred obligations, and allowing all of the mainland of China to slip away from our grasp.

So now people ask, "How can you continue to oppose the recognition? Let us be realistic. There is no prospect of any improvement. There is no prospect of the comparatively small number in Formosa going across the channel and reconquering the mainland. They are entrenched. You are faced with a fait accompli. Let us be realistic and learn to deal with them. Other nations are going to do it, anyway."

In the first place, I am not impressed by the argument that other nations are on the verge of recognizing or have already recognized Communist China.

We have spent 75 billion of American dollars abroad, throughout the world, since World War II, in seeking to assert our leadership, to bolster and build the bastions of liberty. We had the costly sacrifice of American lives in World War II and in the Korean conflict. If, with all this investment of blood and treasure, we are simply going to swim with the tide, and let the fruits of those efforts go out the window in the name of realism, then this country has spent billions of dollars and thousands upon thousands of lives uselessly because we are too flabby and too flaccid to stand up and to assert before the world a moral leadership.

We must remember, Madam President, the day we recognize Red China is the day we shall close the door, probably

forever, upon the hopes and aspirations of the Chinese in Formosa and the millions of Chinese overseas who still cherish in their hearts the dream, the vision, the hope and the belief that the day will come when the Chinese nation will no longer be dominated by 2 percent of its population and by a tyrannical dictatorship, and that the day will come once more when freedom will be revived. If we close the door by recognizing the government of Red China as the ruler of all the Chinese mainland, then we shall say to those who have been keeping the spark of freedom alive in Formosa, and in mainland China itself, "We are closing the door for you."

Mark my words: That ember would soon burn out and die away.

I have visited Formosa. I was there in company with my distinguished friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I came away—and I suspect he did—with the very profound and deep impression that the thing which was keeping the people gathered in Formosa—a tremendous army of young people, with a population which is alive and alert, facing the horizon—was the hope and the belief that some day the march would go the other way.

I have been impressed by the words of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] who has said repeatedly in my hearing, "It is not enough to fight communism, we must beat communism."

We shall not beat communism by retreat.

Madam President, only a few days ago I stood with every other Member of the Senate and with a mighty throng of Americans outside this Capitol and heard a young, vigorous, fearless, fighting President. I admire President Kennedy; and I hope, as I know every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle hopes, he will have success in meeting and dealing with these problems. I heard him use these words:

> Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.
>
> This much we pledge—and more.
>
> To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

That does not stack up very well in my mind with all this talk about, "Let us be realistic. Let us face things as they are. We do not desire to recognize Red China now, but probably we shall be compelled to do so."

The inaugural address was a challenge and an inspiration to me, and I am sure it was to everyone who heard it.

I am not attacking Mr. Bowles, but if I read the English language correctly and if I have been able in past months to read it correctly, he is one of those who thinks with complete sincerity we should sooner or later—at least, as soon as we can get something in the nature of a quid pro quo—give recognition to Red China. We cannot have two Chinas, of course, obviously, without recognizing Communist China.

Though he is an able man, I think it is unfortunate that he was selected to stand before the world as the American Under Secretary of State. This is no time, as we face the so-called New Frontier, to lower our sights or to lower our standards.

Whatever Mr. Bowles may consciously feel, subconsciously and actually, I think there shines through his language as clear as day the fact that he is convinced, and honestly convinced, we can hold the citadel only a little longer so far as recognition of Red China is concerned.

Madam President, I am sorry to have taken so much time. I wish to say further that so far as I am concerned I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The reason I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote is not that I am afraid to stand all alone, or with only a few who will vote "no." It is not that I do not wish to put other Senators on the spot, because they feel, as I also feel, that insofar as possible we should give the President of the United States the privilege of choosing his official family, who are to carry out his policy.

I think this is much too grave a question for mere courtesy, or consideration of fellow Senators or anybody else.

I am very frank to say that so far as I am concerned the reason I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote is that I feel if, because of a feeling that the President should have his choice and that Mr. Bowles is a perfectly reputable man of good character and integrity, such a vote resulted in an overwhelming confirmation of the nomination with only a few Senators voting "no," inevitably that vote would be quoted in some months or years to come when the Senate may be facing the real question of recognition of Communist China, as a move in that direction. This vote must not stand as a record on recognition of Red China, so I say that, although I admire Mr. Bowles, who has and will have my very best wishes and my earnest cooperation—I hope for him every success—I shall ask unanimous consent that when the vote is taken, if it is a voice vote, the record may show that the junior Senator from New Hampshire voted "no."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the Senator has made a very impressive statement, and I quite agree with him that at some future time we shall find it necessary to come to grips with the problem. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished Senator that he should draft a resolution to the effect that it is the sense of the Senate, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, that recognition of Red China would constitute moral retreat and a forfeiture of our leadership, so that this Congress at an early date can go on record, even as did the 86th and 85th Congresses, so that all the world may see.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished minority leader, and with his assistance I shall gladly draft such a resolution and offer it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I rise to speak for a few moments on the subject of the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. At the outset, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not question the honesty of Mr. Bowles. I do not question his devotion to the country or his service. He has said in the course of the hearings that he is opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. I cannot stand on this floor and doubt the word of Mr. Bowles, and while the question concerns me because of his previous attitude relative to the question, that is not the reason that I would vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles if a vote were taken this evening.

What concerns me about Mr. Bowles' position relates to disarmament, and included in that question is nuclear testing. If disarmament means consultation with Red China—and I must assume it would involve such consultation from the statements of Mr. Bowles—then that in itself is tantamount to recognition of another Communist nation.

I believe history will record that one of the greatest mistakes ever made in the field of foreign policy by any nation was the recognition of Russia by the United States. I have many times on the floor of the Senate, and across the Nation advocated breaking off relations with Russia and other Communist-dominated countries.

I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] in his statement that if we are to be the world's leading power, we must act like the world's leading power and not allow other countries to formulate our foreign policy, which I am afraid has been the case in the past.

In the course of the hearings a question was asked by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I shall not quote the first sentence because it does not bear quotation. On page 45 of the transcript of the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations appears the following:

> It is true, is it not, that perhaps the most important—certainly to me the most important—thing in the world is the preservation of world peace?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. That is correct.

I might say parenthetically that we would all agree with that statement. Senator SYMINGTON then went on and asked:

> And to that interest the question of disarmament is paramount—perhaps better wording to use is "arms control"?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. Yes.

Further down in the course of the testimony the Senator from Missouri asked another question. He said:

> Just one more question: How could there ever be a meaningful arms control agreement, skipping the details, without recognizing in the agreement the people and the governments of Red China?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. Well, I think if we did not take into account the 650 million people of Red China in arriving at any arms control or disarmament agreement, the joke would be on the rest of the human race. I cannot

think of anything more fantastic than to have China building up her own armament and moving into the nuclear field, while the rest of us all disarmed.

In the first place, Mr. Bowles spoke about taking into account the 650 million people in Red China. I wish that someone in the State Department would take into account the 650 million people in Red China, and the two-thirds of the population of the world under the domination of communism. We have not done so. I think it is to our eternal discredit that we have turned our backs on the peoples of the world while being concerned only with a handful of the world that governs those people.

My concern in this field is that disarmament has been tried all throughout the course of human history. Disarmament has never worked. I can recall the efforts after World War I to get the peoples of the world to disarm, and if at this rather early age in man's history of civilization we could trust Communists, we might be able to talk meaningfully about disarmament. But we who are the greatest airpower in the world, greater than the combined airpowers of the remainder of the world, are speaking from a position of strength against a position of strength in an area where we are not particularly strong, namely, on the ground. If we speak about disarmament, the chief subject that will be broached by the Communists will be disarmament on our part in our air fleets. The Communist-dominated countries, not being vastly equipped in this field, would not be concerned. The area in which we might be worried is their refusal to disarm on the ground, in which field they are vastly stronger than we are from the standpoint of manpower.

As I stated at the outset, my concern is not with Mr. Bowles' honesty, his devotion or service to the country. My concern is rather that from his testimony he seems to be dedicated to the idea that we can proceed with disarmament at the present time. There is an absence of any testimony that I can find, although it may be in the transcript, with respect to the continuance of the ban on nuclear testing which, I might say, has already set this country back 2 or 3 years in the race of warhead power vis-a-vis the Soviet.

If a vote were taken tonight—and I shall not insist that there be one—I would vote against the nomination of Mr. Bowles, and I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have recorded my vote as being against Mr. Bowles if a vote were taken.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I intended to make a few remarks on the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. The hour is late. I think the subject has been very well covered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the very able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I share somewhat their feelings. I feel no question about Mr. Bowles' personal character. I have no question about his ability. I do have a great question about his past remarks and his past record which, to a large degree, so far as Red China is concerned, has been cleared up in his very forthright statements in the hearing. I do have reservations due to that past record and also on the very subjects covered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

I shall not request a vote on the nomination, but if a vote were to be taken, I would wish to be recorded as voting against the nomination of Chester Bowles.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, Chester Bowles is a modern American. He was born in the 20th century. He recognizes that we live in a time of deadly peril in the 1960's. By his success in business, in politics, and in diplomacy, he is in my judgment eminently qualified to be Under Secretary of State, perhaps as well qualified as any other living American. I do not intend to deal tonight with the complex question of China. There will be another time for that question to be considered. But when I listen to the kind of speeches made today by the two distinguished Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], and the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I wonder whether the Senate, which we all love, is not in some danger of becoming a serious roadblock to the safety of our country and to the peace of the world. I agree with Mr. Bowles, with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and with a host of other Senators on both sides of the aisle that disarmament is the paramount issue of our times.

Total disarmament must come, and it must come soon, if we are not to be blown to bits. I hope that, as the debate on the confirmation of the Bowles nomination goes forward to the American people, the press will appreciate that there are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who feel as I do but who also feel that the hour is late and, with confirmation being inevitable, perhaps it is not necessary to make any more of a record in support of Mr. Bowles than has been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say to the junior Senator from New Hampshire, who perhaps will read my statement in the RECORD tomorrow, and who undertook to quote a part of the great inaugural address made to the country and to Congress last Friday by the President of the United States, that he should take a look at other parts of the address and say whether he does not agree with it and if he is not very sure, indeed, that Mr. Bowles agrees with it thoroughly, too, as I am sure Secretary Rusk also agrees, as does the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson, whose nomination, as also the nomination of Secretary of State Rusk, was not opposed when brought to the floor of the Senate earlier.

I should like to read into the RECORD a part of the inaugural address:

> But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.
>
> So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.
>
> Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us.
>
> Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Then, with omissions:

> And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.
>
> All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

For God's sake, Madam President, let us begin.

I support the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, I rise to indicate that I speak only for myself when I express some doubts as to my desire to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles to the important position for which he has been nominated. Like the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, as well as the senior Senator from New Hampshire, I do not question the patriotism, the motivation, the honesty, or the sincerity of approach of Mr. Bowles.

I believe that I cannot support his nomination because of how I feel toward the recognition, in the near future, or the establishment of a precedent which might point to the recognition of Red China.

As the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire has said, it was my good fortune to be in Formosa with him. It was on that occasion that I had an opportunity to talk with many of the Chinese from the mainland, who had hopes, aspirations, or desires that some day the overwhelming majority of the mainland Chinese, if left to their own good judgment, would not choose to be under the yoke under which they are today.

Although I have great admiration for Mr. Bowles, I wish to be very frank and fair and say that if there is a vote—and I am not going to ask for a record vote—my vote, unfortunate as it might seem to some people, must be "no" on the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I will not detain the Senate. I merely wish to say that I consider Mr. Bowles one of the most able and competent men in American public life. I feel that the President's nomination of Mr. Bowles as Under Secretary of State is a fine nomination. Mr. Bowles will bring to that position not only his managerial competence, which is well known, from his record of service in our Government in previous years, but will also bring with

it his imagination, his creativeness, and his inspiration, which both our foreign policy and the State Department need.

Mr. Bowles is very highly regarded throughout the Nation and throughout the world. He, along with Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Rusk, brings a great reservoir of good will to this country in its dealings with other nations.

I am pleased to have the privilege today, as a Member of the Senate, to say a few words in support of the nomination, and I surely will cast my vote in favor of the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I have known Mr. Bowles since he first entered the service of our Government in one of the most explosive and most difficult jobs that a man has ever been called on to perform: that of maintaining the purchasing power of the American dollar in the face of the inflationary impact of the gigantic spending during our effort to win World War II. He performed the job with great courage, skill, and understanding.

I have followed his career as a great Governor of the State of Connecticut, and later the dedication he showed when President Truman appointed him for the very important position of Ambassador to India.

Mr. Bowles at great personal sacrifice determined to see the real India and to have his children participate in India's schools, and to have his wife and others bring about a real understanding of this great people.

A traveler in India will hear most of his affection and service. Certainly Mr. Bowles will bring to the high post to which he has been named by President Kennedy vast knowledge of all facets of government, both domestic and foreign.

I intend to support with great pleasure the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, today I received from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] a note in which he states that it is necessary that he be at his home in Kentucky today and tomorrow; and he requests that when the nomination of Chester Bowles is before the Senate, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, the statement which Senator COOPER made in support of Mr. Bowles' nomination when that matter was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The statement is to be found on page 47 of the hearing, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR COOPER ON MR. BOWLES' APPOINTMENT

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bowles, we do not, under the traditions of the Senate, invite questions from Members other than of the committee, but we happen to have present this morning a very distinguished Member of the Senate who served in India after you did, and I would like to invite him to make a statement or say anything he wishes to say at this time.

Senator COOPER, of Kentucky.

Senator COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I certainly do not want to break any precedents or create any precedents. I am not a member of this committee, and I do not want to entrench upon your time.

Certainly I know I am not supposed to ask any questions, but you have been kind enough to ask me to comment, and I would like to say that I am glad to come here and say that, as a Member of the Senate, I support very strongly the nomination of Mr. Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

I do not have to comment upon this record. I think it is a rather unusual record of public service that he had made. He was Governor of his State, he was a Member of the Congress, he was one who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is in the unusual position of having represented a State government, of having been in Congress, and of having been on the executive side of the Government.

I would like also to say that he has had the opportunity to do what a great many of us would like to do, for between these periods of service he has had the chance to study, to think, to meditate, and to consider these great problems which trouble all of us. But I do want to say this, too: he has had the opportunity also to put them into application.

I had the honor to serve a short time as Ambassador to India and Nepal, where Mr. Bowles had served. Before him and after him there have been many distinguished men who have served, Mr. Grady, Mr. Henderson, and Mr. George Allen, and now Mr. Bunker, a very distinguished man, is serving there.

I did find out there in my service that in addition to performing the duties of an Ambassador, he had been able to communicate to the people of India an understanding of our country, of its system, of its people. And I think he developed that understanding for a more sympathetic response upon their part toward the United States and, perhaps, even more so, he developed a feeling that the people and the Government of our country were sympathetic to the aspirations of the Indian people. That is just one country, of course, but it is typical of other emerging and independent countries.

I have read a great deal of what Mr. Bowles has written in his speeches. I had been in college with him but I never knew him, as we were in different classes. But since that time I have had occasion to talk to him many times, and I think he does have an unusual understanding of what is happening in the world and what has been happening, particularly since World War II, not only in terms of the political revolution but also the economic revolution, and the necessity for our country being understood in its traditional and historical revolutionary tradition, and being understood as being sympathetic and helpful to these emerging countries and their people. I think he has this quality to a rare degree, and I just wanted to come here and say that. I feel that not only was it my duty to do so, but I also wanted to do it, and I am glad to have this chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator COOPER.

Mr. BOWLES. Senator COOPER, I am very grateful for these comments, particularly since they come from you, who have served in so many areas of foreign affairs, and who served with such great distinction, including India.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very encouraging to have such discriminating Republicans in the Senate. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. CURTIS subsequently said: Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may show, at the appropriate place, that had there been a yea-and-nay vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles, I would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair notes in the RECORD at this point the objection voiced by the Senators from New Hampshire, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles, and of the other confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will return to legislative session.

PARTICIPATION BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR IN THE SETTLEMENT OF THE HARBOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTE IN NEW YORK HARBOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to express a word of commendation to Mr. Arthur Goldberg, the new Secretary of Labor, for his splendid leadership in the settlement of the 2-week-old New York Harbor labor-management dispute which, according to dispatches in our press today, caused a paralyzing railroad tieup throughout a large part of the East. The dispute was producing very serious conditions, and its effects were spreading even as far inland as Cleveland, and into the Middle Atlantic States.

The press reports deal with Mr. Goldberg's participation in the settlement of the dispute. I read from an Associated Press dispatch published in this evening's Evening Star:

Both Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Governor Rockefeller, who had invited Mr. Goldberg to attend the sessions, praised the new Labor Secretary for his contribution to the settlement. The three officials looked haggard after their long sessions.

Mayor Wagner called Mr. Goldberg a tower of strength.

Mr. Goldberg flew from Washington to New York City. He participated in the negotiations over a period of many hours. I believe it was almost a 24-hour session.

He was able to perform what I consider to be an act of skill and diplomacy in the field of labor-management relations and thus bring about a prompt settlement of the dispute. It is indicated that both management and labor will readily ratify the conditions of the settlement, and that all will be well.

I consider this action a demonstration of the kind of vigor, vitality, and imagination with which this administration will tackle the problems that beset the Nation. The Secretary of Labor acted with the full knowledge and support and

at the request of the President. He acted, however, only after he had been invited to do so by the responsible local and State officials.

I commend Mr. Goldberg for his excellent work. He has performed a real service to the Nation.

NOMINATIONS PENDING IN COMMITTEES

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I desire to make the following statement:

Several nominations are still pending in various committees. The respective chairmen have been asked to hold hearings on these nominations as soon as possible, in order that the Senate may proceed to act on them.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 26, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Leo Wesolowsky, rector of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Vladimir, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, Almighty God. We thank you for all good which you send down on our country and its people.

We humbly pray to you to lead our Congress, the President, and his Cabinet by paths of your commandments to justice, freedom, peace, and abundance.

From hunger, fire, war, and every attack protect us, O God.

Turn your eyes, Merciful God, upon the millions of enslaved people of the world, who are under a social and national yoke of Communist imperialism. Give them your help in their struggle for independence. Remember, O God, among those enslaved peoples the people of the Ukraine during this, the year of the centennial of the death of Ukraine's genius and prophet, Taras Shevchenko, who sacrificed his life for his country; grant his desire for a "Washington with a new and just law" for Ukraine.

Bless, O God, the work of the Congress of the United States of America, the President and his Cabinet, keep them in good health and clear mind for the benefit of our country and the peoples of the world.

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 20, 1961, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from Washington present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office?

Mr. HORAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 117

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of fifty members.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 118

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Rules:

Howard W. Smith (chairman), Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 119

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations:

Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John L. Riley, South Carolina; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; John F. Shelley, California; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Don Magnuson, Washington; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; Alfred E. Santangelo, New York; Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico; George E. Shipley, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 120) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; John R. Pillion, New York; Phil Weaver, Nebraska; William E. Minshall, Ohio; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts.

Committee on Rules: Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee.

Committee on Ways and Means: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; John W. Brynes, Wisconsin; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; Victor A. Knox, Michigan; James B. Utt, California; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Bruce Alger, Texas; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO TWO DISTINGUISHED TEXANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point in two instances and include two resolutions passed by the Senate of Texas concerning two distinguished Texans who are serving at each end of the Capitol at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF TEXAS EXTENDING ITS CONGRATULATIONS AND BEST WISHES TO THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN FOR HIS OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS FOR AND ON BEHALF OF HIS STATE AND COUNTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep regret to many thoughtful people that living men have such poor and inadequate ways of saying thanks to one among us who has done exceptional, indeed, immeasurable service to his country.

Even so, the pressures of current events and the pressures of differing ambitions concerning the immediate policies of Government make it difficult for a large, official body even to say thanks. It is a rare man in the political arena who receives such an expression of thanks as has been given the Honorable SAM RAYBURN this month by the Senate of Texas. Speaker RAYBURN'S towering mark in history is unquestioned.

Under unanimous consent I insert Resolution 3, adopted by the Senate of Texas on January 10, 1961, to be reprinted in the RECORD as follows:

S. RES. 3

Whereas 50 years ago on this date, a young man from north Texas, serving in the Texas House of Representatives was elevated to the position of speaker of the house; and

Whereas following his service in such capacity, he was chosen by the people of his district to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives where he has served continuously, with distinction, since 1913; and

Whereas by hard work, integrity, devotion to duty, and dedication to the best interests of his adopted State, he grew in stature and in the respect of his colleagues in the House of Representatives in which he served as its majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses, followed by his selection as Speaker on September 16, 1940, which position he has held continuously since such time with the exception of the 80th Congress, during which he was the distinguished minority leader; and

Whereas by reason of his outstanding ability and fine character he has served his State and Nation in the Congress and as Speaker of the House longer than any other person in American history; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to mark this anniversary and congratulate this outstanding Texan upon his constructive contributions to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, and it does hereby extend its congratulations and best wishes to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his great and outstanding leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate of Texas, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN and to the members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate,
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF TEXAS EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE SERVICES SO ABLY RENDERED TO THE STATE AND TO THE NATION BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON, AND EXTENDING TO HIM AND TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BEST WISHES FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE AND STABLE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Senate of Texas adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to a native Texan, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for the ability, energy, integrity, and devotion to duty with which he has served his State and the Nation during his several terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, and during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader.

Under unanimous consent I insert Senate Resolution 7 to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

S. RES. 7

Whereas in the course of events the American people authorized a change in the administration of their Government with the election of Hon. John F. Kennedy as President and Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as Vice President; and

Whereas with the eyes of the world focused on the National Capital, the new President and Vice President will be inaugurated on January 20, 1961, and thus launch the country on a program of constructive achievements and stability in these precarious and troublous times; and

Whereas the transition in administrations is of tremendous importance to the free world and to our country and of particular interest to Texas and to Texans; and

Whereas in the person of Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON to become the Vice President of the United States and as such, President of the Senate of the United States, the State of Texas has given to the country a talented and able leader; and

Whereas this distinguished native Texan served his district in the U.S. House of Representatives, followed by representation of his State in the U.S. Senate, to which he was elected three times and by reason of his ability, energy, integrity and devotion to duty, was chosen as majority leader of the U.S. Senate in which capacity he exercised those qualities of leadership which gained the respect of all his colleagues and reflected credit upon himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader his cooperation with the administration, of a different political faith, demonstrated his patriotism, his capacity, and his desire to serve the best interests of his country; and

Whereas the Senate of Texas is grateful for the service rendered to the State and the Nation by its former U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and desires to extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, all good wishes in their new official roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of Texas, That we do hereby express our appreciation for the services so ably rendered the State and the Nation by Vice President-elect JOHNSON and extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, our best wishes for a constructive and stable administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, under the seal of the senate, be forwarded by the secretary of the senate, to Hon. John F. Kennedy; and to Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON; and to the members of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

HON. WILLIAM B. FRANKE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my personal feeling of gratitude to the Honorable William B. Franke the distinguished Secretary of the Navy who is about to leave his high office with an enviable record of accomplishment.

Secretary Franke has generously and unselfishly served our country and the U.S. Navy. In his many years in Washington he held several top positions within the Navy Department. In the high and honored position of Secretary of the Navy he has provided the Navy with the leadership and inspiration to move forward in this rapidly changing nuclear world.

Throughout his service his broad knowledge, ability, and experience, provided the sound judgment necessary in the making of correct decisions. His ability along with his frank and honest manner have earned for him unbounded respect, here in the Congress and wherever his many tasks took him.

Not only the Department of the Navy, but our Government as a whole, including many of us here in the Congress, are deeply appreciative of the cooperation and the help so ably contributed by Secretary Franke. He has led his Department in a period of uneasy peace, when a Secretary of the Navy was called upon almost daily for decisions and guidance in questions vitally affecting the entire world. He has provided excellent leadership for his military subordinates and has assisted the Congress in carrying out those naval matters which are charged to the legislative division of the Government by the Constitution. The Congress has profited greatly by its association and work with Secretary Franke.

In bringing the attention and appreciation of the Congress to the work of Secretary Franke, I am delighted also to speak of his able assistants, the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, Messrs. Bantz, Jackson, Milne, and Wakelin who also have given unselfishly of themselves to aid the Secretary in his arduous duties.

Secretary Franke may be proud of the example he has set as an American citizen in giving to his country his time, his energy, his talents.

He has served his country with great distinction. This distinguished service has helped to build a finer Navy and a greater country. As he leaves his high position of Secretary of the Navy, I am sure the Navy and the Government as a whole say to him, "Well done, Mr. Secretary."

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND SUBCOMMITTEES—AUTHORIZATION TO SIT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 121), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SPEAKS FOR WORLD FREEDOM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1961, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated as President of the United States.

It was a bright, cold day.

The city of Washington was robed in gleaming white, sequined by the fresh-fallen snow.

A multitude of people had come to the Nation's Capital from the 50 States and beyond, to bear witness to a new birth of freedom.

Fifty years and more from now, many who were there on that eventful day in 1961, will tell their grandchildren: "I remember when young John Kennedy became President."

The weather was a bone-chilling challenge, as if testing the heart and mind of a liberty-loving people to find out if they measured up to the pioneering vision of their forebears.

In answer to it came the human courage and the human warmth, reaffirming the unconquerable belief of man in the divinity that shapes his quest for truth and dignity in this life.

It was heard in the spoken prayers of four clergymen who invoked the help of our Creator in the search for freedom with justice that will bless all the sons of man.

We who were there will never forget the beautiful voice of Marian Anderson, singing "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Or the young spirit of the aged poet, Robert Frost. As he spoke the rhythm-in-words he had written many years before, we sensed the future of our land, asking us to go forward and be worthy of it.

On the inaugural stand was the oldest President, departing with the gratitude of the Nation.

And the youngest elected President, taking the oath: "that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me, God."

From old to young, the unbroken continuity of leadership rising from the people, the symbol and sum of our aspirations guiding us toward the undiscovered fulfillment beyond the horizon.

To be there was to feel a people stirring with expectation, lifting their eyes from the imprisonment of the present, to the liberating goals of tomorrow.

Eagerly waiting for the voice to speak for their silent hopes and thoughts.

As the new President stood up to address the thousands before him, he also reached out through the magic of radio and television to communicate with the largest audience ever to participate in this pledge to work for the freedom of the world.

But millions of American children did not hear the message that spoke for the bright hopes and ideals that must be nourished so that the best within them will develop, for the realization of a better tomorrow. Even as many children of another time—100 years ago—did not hear the inspiring inaugural address of another President, who brought vision and purpose and strength to their fathers when they wanted to know what was required of them in the crisis of that generation.

Every boy and girl since then has studied the moving words of Abraham Lincoln, which encompassed the hopes of humanity.

In like manner, the pupils of today should identify themselves with the message of President Kennedy, and be inspired by the goals and the heartening purpose that he has set before us.

Because there is not much time left for leadership.

And we, their elders, need constant reminders from the young of the decisions we must make, and the peace we must build to justify their faith in us.

I therefore include, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy.

For I regard it as my personal responsibility to send reprints of this address to the schoolchildren of my district, so that they may be guided by it to prepare themselves for their future as good Americans and as citizens of a free world.

KENNEDY INAUGURAL TEXT

My fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change.

For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

WORLD DIFFERENT PLACE NOW

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all form of human poverty and all form of human life.

And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first Revolution.

Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, or oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

LOYALTY OF GOOD FRIENDS

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far greater iron tyranny.

We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought to find power by riding on the tiger's back ended up inside.

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right.

If the free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

OFFERING A SPECIAL PLEDGE

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty.

But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas.

And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request:

That both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

COST OF WEAPONS A BURDEN

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides join to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens * * * (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation can be made in the jungles of suspicion, let both sides join in the next task: Creating, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

GRAVES AROUND THE WORLD

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans have been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered that call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, and the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

WHAT CAN YOU DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY?

And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice that we ask of you.

With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing a bill to amend Public Law 86-382, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so as to eliminate discrimination against female employees with nondependent husbands.

The Government's contribution for each enrolled employee who is paid biweekly is as follows: For an employee enrolled for self and family, $3.12; for a female employee enrolled for self and a family which excludes a nondependent husband, $1.82. This is a penalty for the female employee of $1.30 each biweekly pay period. The bill that I am introducing today will place the female employee enrolled for self and family, which excludes a nondependent husband, on the same financial contribution basis from the Federal Government as a male employee enrolled for self and family.

Section 1 of this bill amends the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act so as to eliminate a special provision for Government contribution to a female employee with a nondependent husband. This has the effect of providing for these employees the same contribution as is presently provided for other employees who elected to enroll for self and family. There are approximately 75,000 female employees with nondependent husbands enrolled for self and family under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, out of a total enrollment under the act in excess of 1,700,000. The cost of the additional Government contribution for these employees for 1 year at present rates is estimated at $2½ million. This cost would be in part recovered by a savings in accounting, statistical services, and other administrative costs on the part of Government agencies, carriers providing health benefits plans, and the Civil Service Commission, due to the elimination of certificates of dependency for husbands and to the elimination of special reporting requirements and accounting and statistical records for females with nondependent husbands. While these savings cannot be estimated, they will be appreciable.

Section 2 of the bill makes the amendment effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than 60 days after the date of enactment. This will afford sufficient time for the Commission to issue instructions to payroll offices for the change in rate of contribution for these employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am also today introducing a bill to amend Public Law 86-724 to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act to certain widows and other retired employees who are now excluded because these retired employees and annuitants received a deferred annuity.

Section 1 of this bill extends the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act to annuitants on the rolls July 1, 1960, who would be entitled to those benefits but for the fact that the title of annuity is deferred rather than immediate. There are about 55,000 of these retired employees. Approximately 16,000 to 18,000 of the estimated 55,000 total are widows who were not eligible for an annuity until after 1958 and most of these had been widows for 10 or more years. The cost of the Government contribution to these people for the first year is estimated not to exceed $2,700,000.

Section 2 of this bill makes the effective date of this amendment July 1, 1961, which is the effective date of the retired Federal employees' health benefits program.

CARE FOR OUR ELDERLY AND RETIRED CITIZENS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems confronting the American people today is adequate care for our elderly and retired citizens. The early retirement of millions of our workers, together with the reluctance of certain industries to hire people who have passed middle age, has created problems which have resulted in economic hardship for many people.

The executive departments of our Government, as well as the Congress and private organizations, have become increasingly aware, during the past several years, of this situation. I have been particularly pleased to note that several very excellent studies have been made in connection with the problem. So far, however, nothing constructive has been done to assist the many thousands of our citizens who, because of age or disability, have not been able to find employment or qualify under existing law for social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, one of the contributing factors to the economic distress now being suffered by thousands of people in this country is their inability to qualify for disability benefits or the disability freeze under the present definition of total disability in the existing Social Security Act. Under the rigid provisions of the present law and the decisions made thereunder by the Social Security Administration, it has been impossible for thousands of our people, otherwise considered totally disabled by their em-

ployers and competent medical authority, to secure disability insurance benefits or to qualify for the disability freeze.

Under the present rigid definition of the term "disability" in existing law, a person must be so incapacitated as to permanently preclude him from engaging in any type of gainful employment. The result of the application of the present definition of disability has been to deny disability benefits to thousands of disabled persons who have become unable to perform work in which they have been engaged for a substantial portion of their lives. Many of these people, in addition to being considered totally disabled by their personal physicians and their employers, are not qualified to engage in any other type of employment due to age, lack of training, experience, and education. As a tragic consequence, thousands of our citizens who have made substantial contributions to the social security system have been forced to turn to welfare agencies for support or to become financial burdens on their relatives.

Few of us will take issue with the fact that the Social Security Act must, of necessity, provide that disability claimants should meet certain medical and employment tests in determining the extent of their disabilities. From the numerous cases I have observed during my service in the Congress, I am convinced, however, that the definition of total disability, as presently applied by the Social Security Administration under existing law, is too rigid and impossible for thousands of deserving claimants to meet.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct some of the inequity and hardship now being experienced under the interpretations placed upon the term "disability" in our present social security law, I have introduced a bill today to provide a more realistic definition of disability for social security purposes. My bill will not change the term "disability" in the present law other than to specify that a person will be deemed unable to engage in any substantial gainful employment if he is precluded by reason of his physical or mental impairment to engage in the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of his disabilities.

My measure simply provides, Mr. Speaker, that when a worker becomes totally disabled from performing the duties necessary for the job or profession for which he is trained and in which he has been employed for many years he will become eligible for disability benefits or the disability freeze.

It is my hope that my colleagues in the House will support my measure. I feel sure that every Member has had occasion to observe the inequities in our present law from investigating disability cases that have come to their attention. The enactment of my bill will be a step forward in providing a measure of support and a sense of security for countless numbers of our citizens who, through the strict application of the present disability features of our existing social security law, have been unable to qualify for benefits to which they are rightfully entitled.

AID TO EDUCATION FOR FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to extend for 4 years the entire current program of aid to federally impacted school districts, known as Public Laws 815 and 874.

In my opinion this is vital and urgent to school districts throughout the United States even if we have a general aid to education program, which I ardently hope we will have.

The law was first passed in 1950 to provide school construction aid to areas experiencing sudden population increases due to defense activities. It also provides operating funds to school districts that educate children whose parents live or are employed on Federal Government land.

The laws have been extended several times. In 1958 the provision for children whose parents live on Federal Government land was made permanent. The other provisions were extended until June 30, 1961.

In last year's budget, the administration recommended phasing out the provisions which are to expire in June and recommended cuts in appropriations. The Congress not only restored the cuts but increased the appropriation.

For thousands of schools, including many in my area, failure to continue this program means many school districts may virtually have to go out of business. Vitally needed education would not be available. Other districts will be seriously crippled by lack of funds, because of the influx of people who work in the defense program. The quality of education in these districts would decline at a time when better education is urgent in this age of science.

Under the necessary Federal policy of dispersion of defense installations, most of our military facilities, employing millions of citizens, are located in rural areas. In many instances school districts which previously have educated only a few hundred children must now provide education for thousands. It makes no difference to these districts whether the children live on or off Federal lands. There is no logic to make two classifications in the law.

All 50 States, territories, and the District of Columbia are vitally affected.

Because I am most familiar with the situation in my district, I will cite examples from it.

One small district, the Atwater School District, reports more than 60 percent of its students are the result of Castle Air Force Base. The district tax limit has been pushed to the maximum to support its educational activities. It is completely inadequate to support the district without the Federal impact aid.

Construction of Lemoore Naval Air Station is now underway in the midst of a completely rural farming area. The Federal Government has invested up to $100 million in the project which will bring 30,000 persons into the area. It will throw the tremendous load of thousans of children into small rural school districts. The establishment of the base is taking land off the school tax roll not only for the base itself but for a large buffer zone.

The school district in this area will not be able to exist without continuance of the Federal impact aid program.

California has 917 Government installations. This includes more than 45 million acres of land of which less than 300,000 acres are in urban areas. There are almost 56,000 Federal buildings in the State. The value of the Federal holdings in California is $345,410,000 in land; $2,025,250,000, buildings; and $2,486,426, other structures and facilities, for a total Federal holdings in the State of $4,857,086,000.

All of these Federal facilities not only are free of taxes to support schools, but they actually correspondingly reduce available tax bases. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of persons whose children must be educated are employed on these school tax free facilities. The responsible school districts face an impossible dilemma, with less money to educate more children.

Most of the Members are faced by the same problems in the districts they represent and I am confident they will join in support of this urgently needed legislation.

TO INCREASE AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS PERMITTED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted under the Social Security Act to $2,400 per year.

Surely, in view of our increased living costs today, such an increase is more than warranted. Many of our older people are anxious to do a limited amount of work. In many cases, they can contribute to our economy. There is no reason why there should be an earnings limitation. It may have been necessary at one time, but today it can be a detriment to a happy retirement for those affected as present social security benefits are just not adequate enough to maintain an average standard of living.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation early consideration.

TO PREVENT INTERFERENCE WITH MOVEMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1960 I introduced legislation and again on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 64, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce and for other purposes. This was in light of the disastrous Long Island Railroad strike, followed a little later by the same type of strike against the Pennsylvania Railroad, whereby not only tens of thousands of commuters but freight, business, and industry were seriously handicapped.

Now, again in January 1961, 660 members of the railroad tugboat operators tied up not only the tugboats, but completely paralyzed the New Haven and New York Central Railroads. This strike and its effects cannot be calculated in terms of dollars alone, but of great disservice to the public.

I ask you, and the committees of Congress, to take immediate action, as soon as committees are organized in the House, that hearings be held and action taken to bring about compulsory arbitration in matters affecting the national interest and welfare. This sort of strike can no longer be tolerated with the public-be-damned attitude. It not only reacts against the public interest, but also against the very people it is intended to help, the workingman. Because, Mr. Speaker, this sort of strike puts out of work tens of thousands of other working people, who are innocent victims of this strike. The public will no longer consider merely words; they are entitled to action. I shall constantly press for action; it is needed at once.

FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act which I have recently introduced. This act, among other things, requires the registration of persons employed by certain foreign principals which disseminate propaganda in the United States. Section 1 of that act contains a definition of terms. Among those definitions is "foreign principal" and it is defined to include a domestic organization which is "subsidized" by a foreign government or a foreign political party. Experience in the administration of this act shows a need for the inclusion within the term "foreign principal" domestic organizations which are not only subsidized by a foreign government or political party, but also those which are substantially controlled, directed, or financed by a foreign government or foreign political party.

In other words, because of the existing definition of the term "foreign principal," agents of a domestic organization today need not register even though their organizations are financed, controlled, supervised, or directed by a foreign government or political party, unless the Department of Justice can establish that such domestic organization is "subsidized" by a foreign government or political party. The new bill will define foreign principal so as to bring domestic organizations within the purview of the registration requirements of the act, irrespective of whether they are subsidized, if a foreign government or foreign political party supervises, directs, controls, or finances them in such a manner as to exercise substantial control over their policies and activities.

Section 2 of the bill amends another provision of the act; namely, section 3(d). Section 3 relates to the so-called commercial exemption and exempts agents from the obligation of registering if their foreign principals are engaged only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal.

This exemption has proved to be ambiguous. The language has led to confusion and unnecessarily difficult problems in the administration of the law. Argument has been made that if a foreign principal meets any one of the above quoted conditions, as distinguished from meeting several or all of the requirements, its agents need not register. As rewritten the section with its proposed changes and sentence structure will make it clear that for an agent to qualify for exemption from the obligation of registering, the foreign principal must be engaged in activities which meet either of two sets of three requirements: The activities must be private and nonpolitical and financial, or private and nonpolitical and mercantile. If any one of these requirements is lacking, the agent cannot qualify for exemption and therefore must register under the act.

UKRAINE, SPEARHEAD OF FREEDOM'S ADVANCE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take notice of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, which occurred yesterday.

Ukraine today is not one of the free nations; but it had its taste of freedom, and the 40 million people of the Ukraine, comprising the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, will never forget that period of their history nor let up in their resourceful efforts to obtain complete and lasting freedom as an independent nation.

Among the nations, now almost at the 100 mark, united for peaceful solution of the problems of mankind, the Ukraine has a place as a member. It is a "republic" of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; but as such it is a captive nation, a satellite, an officially recognized component of the Russian system of stooges, and the government does not represent the people, nor do the people of that nation accept, except by force, their unhapy role as a part of the Soviet Union.

The bonds which hold the Ukrainian people within that Union, however, can be but temporary. They have struggled for centuries for freedom and independence. They won it, then lost it, but they have never diminished their own particular kind of cold war against the Russian oligarchs, in their efforts to regain and retain their freedom.

In the fight for freedom, in Europe and all over the world, the Ukraine, with our help and that of our allies, can be the spearhead. They and all of the other captive nations look to us, and with ingenuity, with timeliness, with determination, even with enlightened self-interest, we must help them in their fight for freedom. Every inch of gain strengthens the entire free world in the struggle for survival.

UNITED STATES TRADING CORPORATION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous weapons currently being employed by the Soviet bloc in its struggle for world domination is the use of international trade to achieve that objective through economic means. This is a field in which the Soviets have shown increasing interest and skill and one in which the dictatorial Russian Government enjoys certain advantages over its competitors, the private businesses of the United States and other free countries of the world.

In the study which the Joint Economic Committee undertook last year into the comparisons of the Soviet and American economies, it was shown that we in this country have a large and impressive lead in the economic race of nation against nation. This lead, it was demonstrated, has its foundation in the basic strength and progress of our free enterprise system, and this lead is one which our free enterprise economy can safely maintain. These hearings also pointed out that the Soviets are growing economically, that their capacity for waging the economic features of the cold war is increasing.

The real danger of the Russian economic capacity in this battle for world trade is not that they will overwhelm us in every country and in every product in which our businesses compete. Rather it is that, in the interim before the basic economic facts of life catch up with the inhuman and unprogressive system

of communism, the Soviets may use the powers of planning and control which characterize their economy to launch attacks in specific and limited areas, accepting a temporary loss to drive the competition from the field and recoup these losses by exploitation, and in some cases enslavement, of small nations, when the competition has been driven out.

This is the classic concept of monopoly power at work, the destruction of competition in one area or for one product by planned losses, losses which will be more than repaid by subsequent exploitation when there is no competition to serve as a restraint. The effects of this type of competition, or rather destruction of competition, has the same deleterious result in the international economy as do the effects of monopolistic practices in our national economy. Economic assaults of the type mentioned, coupled with the subversion which accompanies Russian and satellite trade missions and economic assistance advisers, present a very grave threat to our national security. And, as mentioned, the Soviets may direct this threat to such points of economic competition as will best serve their political ends.

Individual American businesses may be faced down by the concentrated power of the Soviet economy, although on a national scale our output, capacity, and growth potential far exceed that of the Soviet bloc. It is the imbalance of nation competing against private business that gives an advantage to the Russians in this field. In an effort to overcome this imbalance, we must not fall into the trap of adopting the policies of the Communists. We must be in a position to aid and help individual business enterprises and the capitalist system, so that there will be no encroachment by the Government on free business. We must achieve a cooperation between private business and government to counteract this Communist threat.

As a part of this effort, I am today reintroducing a bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation. This Corporation would provide assistance to American business to help it compete in the markets in which Soviet policy dictated an economic assault. If Soviet Russia does not engage in this kind of activity, the corporation would not have to act. If it does, the Corporation would be there to insure that through such temporary activity, although it lasts for several years, would not result in Russia's taking over any market, destroying any competition or enslaving the economy of any nation.

The bill which I introduce is not a final solution to the problem which I have outlined. Rather, it is a definition of the problem and one concrete proposal in reference to it. I urge that the Congress and the country give sincere consideration to this proposal and to the problem which it is designed to help solve.

I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a news feature by Sid Goldberg, syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance, on this proposed United States Trading Corporation.

NEW YORK.—A key Congressman, in response to Premier Khrushchev's declaration of economic war, proposes strong countermeasures to Soviet dumping—a complete revamping of the U.S. tariff system, and creation of a Secretary of Foreign Economics as a full Cabinet member.

"Khrushchev has challenged us to economic war, but our arsenal is empty of effective weapons in this field," says Representative TOM CURTIS, of St. Louis. "We've got the bombs and missiles to stand up to Russia in a military showdown, but in a battle between economies—the kind we're now being forced into—the United States is almost defenseless."

Representative CURTIS, the only Missouri Republican holding high elective office, is the ranking minority member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and fourth-ranking Republican in the House Ways and Means Committee.

RUNNING MATE

Now completing his fifth term in the House, the 48-year-old Congressman has been mentioned as a running mate for either Vice President Nixon or, should he be drafted, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

The first of Representative CURTIS' unorthodox proposals is the establishment of a United States Trading Corporation, capitalized by the Government at $1 billion with a potential of up to $4 billion. Purpose of the Corporation would be to enable U.S. firms to compete with the artificially low prices set by Soviet state trading monopolies.

Payments from the Corporation would assure a U.S. firm of a fair profit margin if it were forced to drastically lower its prices to meet the monopoly prices of Russia.

"Right now Russia is engaged in the same kind of unscrupulous business practices that were outlawed by our antitrust legislation in the last century," CURTIS explained in an interview during a visit here.

UNFAIR FIGHT

"The U.S. exporter, in competing with Soviet monopolies, often is up against the type of unfair competition that many small businessmen faced in America before the Sherman Antitrust Act," he said.

The St. Louis Congressman stresses that the Corporation would be designed as a defense only against totalitarian economies such as Russia's, and would go into action only when U.S. firms could prove they were up against unscrupulous foreign competition.

"There must be built-in safeguards against U.S. firms taking advantage of the Corporation," he continued. "Some firms inevitably would try to blackmail the Corporation into helping them underbid foreign competitors. But payments would be made only when the competition could be shown blatantly unfair."

Mr. CURTIS cites several examples of how Russia cuts corners in its economic war with the West. Two years ago it tried to create anarchy in the world aluminum market by dumping vast quantities of the metal at below-cost prices. At the same time it outbid the United States for Icelandic fish, trying to tie the island's entire foreign trade to Kremlin purchases.

He also points out that Poland recently agreed to supply Cuba with textile machinery; yet for several months Poland was negotiating to buy textile machinery from the United States, claiming a serious shortage at home.

THREAT MAY DETER

"This kind of trade deal often is expensive economically to the Soviet bloc, and is entered only when an outstanding political goal can be achieved," Representative CURTIS said. "Perhaps the mere threat of U.S. retaliation through the trading corporation would be enough to dissuade the Russians from these practices.

"Just as the possession of the hydrogen bomb works as a deterrent to military aggression, existence of the trading corporation could work as a deterrent to economic forms of aggression," he suggested.

Mr. CURTIS hopes that the Corporation, if set up, some day could be internationalized, growing into an "Economic Court of Justice" that would eliminate the cut-throat practices that still persist in international trade.

RESOLUTION TO CREATE COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT UNIONS AND UNRECOGNIZED GROUPS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been quite concerned for some time about the lack of recognition accorded the unorganized labor groups and independent unions throughout the country, particularly on the Federal level. It has been my feeling for some time that the Congress has fallen down in its duty to this large segment of our population and, because of this, I have today reintroduced a resolution which provides for the establishment of a committee on independent unions and unrecognized labor groups. It is my belief that such a committee is necessary and it should be comparable in dignity and in operation to the House Committee on Small Business. Small unions and small business comprise the largest portion of their respective field by far; for this reason alone they deserve recognition.

I envision this committee as giving the small unions and unrecognized labor groups an opportunity to air their problems before an appropriate congressional forum, and giving us in Congress a better idea of the operation and needs of these groups. This, in turn, would be of inestimable value to Congress in drafting appropriate legislation to meet the problems which are presented.

I believe that experience has proven that interests which do not have a forum from which to present their views to the Congress are often lost in the shuffle. Small labor represents an estimated 30 million workers, twice the number represented by the AFL–CIO; certainly groups speaking for this large a number of Americans deserves to be heard.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CHRISTINE FAHRENBRUCH

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a private bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a bill identical to one passed by this House in the previous Congress. Because of the limitations of time, action on it was not taken in the other body. This bill would reimburse Christine and her parents, Sgt. and Mrs. Raymond Fahrenbruch, for the expenses which they have incurred in the treatment of Christine's hearing defects and the special school required by it.

The nature of the injury to Christine's hearing is such that she will be permanently deaf. Special medical treatment and special education to equip her to lead as normal a life as possible have resulted in great expenses to the Fahrenbruch family. It is for these expenses this this bill would reimburse the Fahrenbruchs.

Christine was born in 1950 in an Army hospital in Germany. When she was only days old, an illness of undetermined origin and nature swept the hospital nursery, killing three of the seven children in the nursery. This illness resulted in the hearing defects from which she now suffers.

At the time of the hearings on this matter in the last Congress, it came to light that the illness which struck the nursery in the hospital in which Christine was born had been caused by the negligent action of one of the Army orderlies working in the hospital. On the basis of this new information, the Department of the Army undertook to revise its previously adverse report on the bill. With this new understanding of the situation, this bill was passed in this House but, as noted, no action was taken in the other body.

It is only through action on the part of the Congress, acting as it may upon the extraordinary claims against the U.S. Government, that this relief can be given.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today an occasion significant to the people of the Ukraine and equally significant to the millions throughout the world dedicated to the cause of freedom. Although it was January 22—yesterday—that marked the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic, it is fitting that on this Monday, when the Congress of a free people meets, we pay tribute not only to the anniversary but to the men and women of courage who on January 22, 1918, regained their liberty and national independence following over a century of subjugation.

None of us can forget that the current conquerors, by use of force and fraud, deprived the Ukrainian people of their right to determine their own political, economic, and social institutions a scant 4 years after the proclamation of their Republic. The world well remembers the harsh nature of the aggression and colonialism which, through military, economic, and political means, has brought slavery to over 100 millions of people in eastern and central Europe and denied to them their divine right to liberty and individual freedom. We would emphasize today that it is indeed only through such force and through such negation of individual rights that alien governments are presently maintained in many countries of this world. Even the master in control must know, despite all assertions to the contrary, that the governments in being do not represent the will of the governed. And among those people who are denied this basic right of self-determination none are more to be remembered and honored than the valiant inhabitants of the Ukraine. No imperialism to which they may fall victim can drive from their hearts, nor the hearts of their brothers throughout the world, the instinct and yearning to be free.

We, today, who do honor to our own free Nation in marking this great Ukrainian anniversary know full well that so long as men and women anywhere are deprived of their basic freedoms, the peace for which the world longs and prays will not become a reality. Such peace, indeed, will have no chance of becoming a reality until human rights and freedom prevail for all peoples.

It is appropriate to look back to days of victory for freedom and to the courage and idealism which originally established even a short-lived Ukrainian National Republic. It is equally appropriate to point out that this hour calls for a united and firm stand against totalitarianism and against the intimidation of the human spirit which it produces. It is appropriate to acknowledge that the deprivation of freedom and liberty any place in this world is a threat equally to the continuation of freedom and liberty among those peoples which are privileged now to hold that gift in their fortunate hands. It is most of all appropriate for us here, today, in commemoration of this Ukrainian anniversary, to acknowledge that we must work for the delivery of those in slavery and strengthen those who waiver in the battle of freedom for the world.

Especially, Mr. Speaker, would I add a tribute to the Americans of Ukrainian descent who have made such valuable contributions to the political heritage and culture of our own country. Our devotion to democratic ideals has been strengthened by the heritage which they have brought us. Today, we take honor in joining with all Ukrainians, therefore, in paying tribute to the courage of the captive Ukrainians who continue to strive and fight for their freedom. Today we, with freemen everywhere, rededicate ourselves to the great cause of human liberty.

THE LATE HONORABLE KEITH THOMSON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to pay tribute to a former Member of this body, the late Honorable KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, as there are many Members of this body who are not able to be present today, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we in Wyoming have lost an outstanding citizen, a dedicated public servant, and a close friend in the sudden death of Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON on December 9. It was a shock to all of us to realize we had lost one whom we had come to count on so much. The loss to his family was even greater. They lost a loving husband and father, one whom they will always remember with love and affection and with pride because of his achievements and the esteem in which he was held by all.

Those of you who served with him during his 6 years of service in this body, representing the State of Wyoming, know that he worked with only one thought in mind—that of serving his State and country ably and well. Not only was he recognized in this body and elsewhere for his outstanding abilities, but he was also especially known for his unwavering dedication to those principles in which he believed and for which he fought.

As a young man of humble beginnings, he devoted himself to long hours of hard work and to uncomplaining self-denial and sacrifice to rise to a position of influence, prominence, and esteem. He was a man of action, a doer; a man of intensity, striving relentlessly to accomplish worthwhile things for the people of Wyoming and of the Nation.

His record as a combat officer in the Armed Forces of his country in World War II, and as a husband and father shows the same dedication to the highest ideals of love and service.

I was particularly impressed with the remarks made by the Reverend John M. Pattison, his pastor and friend, at the services for KEITH in Cheyenne, Wyo. Dr. Pattison expresses better than I can the love and affection felt by all of us for KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Reverend John M. Pattison be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDRESS GIVEN AT THE FUNERAL OF HON. KEITH THOMSON, CONGRESSMAN FROM WYOMING, AND SENATOR-ELECT FROM WYOMING, IN FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, CHEYENNE, WYO., BY THE REVEREND DR. JOHN M. PATTISON DECEMBER 13, 1960

The news of the sudden death of my esteemed friend and public servant KEITH THOMSON came as a hammer blow. It left me stunned and shocked. It had a paralytic effect upon me and my family. I feel sure that most people throughout the region felt the same way as I did when they first learned the tragic news. A veritable pall of gloom settled over our hearts and over the population of our State.

His sudden passing, in the prime of life and when he had just reached a plateau in his life which gave promise of a long and distinguished career in our national life and of service to the State he so much loved, is difficult to understand.

I knew the deceased and his family most intimately. It was my good pleasure to be pastor here when the family was received into the fellowship and communion of this church. I followed his meteoric rise to fame with much satisfaction, and rejoiced with him in every honor which came to him and in all the good fortune which he was able to attain.

He served as a member of our board of deacons before he was elected to Congress and had to move from our city. He was a constant and loyal member of the Sunday congregation and a good supporter of his parish. We exchanged letters frequently during the years he was in Washington, and often we were together at social functions when he was in our city visiting his old friends.

The career of this young man of 41 years has come altogether too soon to its close. During those short years of his life he reached the supremacy of achievement in 41 years that would cover twice those years in experience and accomplishment of most people.

One of KEITH'S good friends and an honored citizen of our State wrote this and gave it to me:

"His humble beginning as a cowboy soon became obscured by his appearance in World War II as the youngest and ablest Infantry Officer of his rank in the entire U.S. Army. On his return to civil life his brilliance in the legal profession brought local and national recognition.

"He entered the field of politics with equal success—he became a State legislator, then Congressman for 3 terms—then U.S. Senator-elect by one of the greatest tributes ever paid by an appreciative electorate in the State. National recognition of his talents was of such magnitude that many offers for his services were made—and refused—for he had become dedicated to service for the people of Wyoming and the cause of private enterprise.

"He drove himself relentlessly each day and night to justify the confidence of his electorate. He once said, 'To be a good Congressman requires 18 hours a day,' and he gave that and more. Possibly that is why we are sorrowing together today in the loss of a friend who meant much to the State and the Nation.

"Truly, a great man, who has given every ounce of devotion and application of his brilliant mind to the multiple problems that confront our Republic has laid his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so ably represented.

"His keen mind that grasped instantly the tactics of military warfare, of litigation, and of national policies is now at rest. We have lost one who was said, 'Knew most about missiles,. including the scientists themselves'—one who had compassion and kindness, firmness and conviction—one who expressed the thoughts and ideals of people from all walks of life—because he had served in all of them in his meteoric career from cowboy to U.S.-Senator-elect.

"We wonder how Divine Providence could strike down one who had reached a plateau of his career that looked forward to a distant horizon of realization of his objectives. Some day we will know. Suffice it to say now that he has brought inspiration, hope and renewed courage to those who have had their faith restored and their individual dignity honored.

"Throughout this brief career KEITH had the support and encouragement of a lovely wife and family; for whom, with others, he has created a nation of security, promise, opportunity and peace."

We all know that KEITH was an indefatigable worker. He drove himself relentlessly day and night. No matter what he undertook he threw himself into the task with all his ability, force and capacity. He gave every ounce of his strength and the application of his keen and brilliant mind to the endless problems that confront our Nation in this hour. As one of his friends said so ably: "He has laid down his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so capably represented."

KEITH was not only a devoted public servant but also a family man. Even in the endless rush of such a busy life as that which he lived, he always found time for his wife and boys. His love and affection for his family was outstanding, and it was a source of much regret to him that his position in life took so much time away from his growing boys. I would say in this connection that his wife was constantly at his side, giving him her loyal support, encouragement, and inspiration. She shared with him his success, she also shared in his disappointment when they came, as they always do come in the life of a public servant. They were a happy couple, and no home could have been more ideal than theirs.

All of us realize that Wyoming has lost one of its finest young men—yes, one of its great statesmen. But we also know that his wife and family have lost a wonderful husband and a loving father. The loss which these have sustained in this sudden death cannot be filled either by election or appointment, because no one on earth can fill the vacancy in the lives of these who were closest to him.

We rejoice today in our Christian faith in life eternal and in the knowledge that, "To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord."

Our religious faith and our basic beliefs teach us that life, the true life of the soul, is not terminated by physical death. KEITH has laid aside his physical form, he has gone from us in life's prime, but his spirit is with God who gave it.

Life must never be estimated, or its worth measured, by longevity. It is wonderful to live a long and useful life. Yet, we know that there are some, like our deceased friend, who live more in 40 years than some others live in 9 decades. Again I say, he lived intensely, he lived enthusiastically, he lived and served and attained great heights. Now he lives a fuller, happier and more abundant life than any of us can ever know on this earth.

No word of mine can add to or detract from the luster of his name, nor from the high opinion which all people had who knew him. His life is his greatest eulogy, and his achievements will live as a memorial unto him for ever.

I know that all of you join with me in expressing our sincere and deep sympathy with Mrs. Thomson, her boys, the parents and all other members of the bereaved family in the loss which they have sustained. Our prayers will ascend on their behalf, that the peace of God which passes all understanding may keep their hearts and minds now and always.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the passing of KEITH THOMSON will be deeply felt by all of us. His life and his achievements will be an inspiration and our love and affection go out to his loving family who have lost so much. We will miss him here in the House, and Wyoming will lose the services of an outstanding citizen as their Senator.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion for all of us when the time comes to pay our last respects to the memory of a colleague who is no longer with us.

Usually there is some small consolation in the fact that death has come only after a long and honorable career of service. But there is no such consolation as we speak here now of the life and achievements of KEITH THOMSON, for he left us far too young in years. His was truly an untimely death. It was untimely because it took from the scene of the very important affairs of this great Republic of ours a young man of great promise.

During his three terms in the House KEITH THOMSON distinguished himself as a man of unusual diligence who took his responsibilities with the utmost seriousness. His was a rare combination of energy, talent, and personal charm that won for him widespread admiration and respect. KEITH THOMSON gave to the Congress the same courage that earned him citations for bravery as a young combat officer in World War II. He brought with him to the Congress the same dedication to public service that won for him high honors as a citizen in his hometown of Cheyenne.

His many friends here, while sorry to see him leaving our ranks for a seat in the other body, were happy and proud of his success in the recent election.

Those of us who knew him best were certain that KEITH THOMSON was about to embark on a new series of achievements for the people of Wyoming and the Nation.

It is not for us to question the wisdom of a Divine Providence in mourning the death of our friend.

Having visited with KEITH in Wyoming on several occasions in recent years I feel a particularly personal sense of loss in his passing. KEITH THOMSON'S was indeed a bright star, a star prematurely dimmed by a power that is above us all.

In their bereavement I offer my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her fine sons and to all of KEITH'S family and friends.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSON was one of the best Congressmen I have ever known. I was impressed

with him when he first became a Member of the House of Representatives 6 years ago. I saw in him a man of integrity who was wholly devoted to his job. He was a thorough student of legislation, and I always felt KEITH knew what he was talking about when he took the floor.

It was difficult for us to understand why such a young man, perhaps at the apex of his career, should so suddenly be taken from us. We know it was God's will and so must be reconciled to the loss that is ours. KEITH THOMSON was loved and respected by all those who knew him and we shall miss him in the days ahead. We take consolation in the fact that he served well his day and generation and has left behind him only happy memories of our association together. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and all members of the family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand why divine providence in its wisdom sees fit to take from us, and from our beloved Republic, a man of the abilities, the stature, and the capacities of KEITH THOMSON. Those of us who were privileged to serve in the Congress with him know something of his character, and of his good work in behalf of this country of ours. He not only served his Nation in time of peace, when he battled for the principles that have made this country great and strong, but he also served with great distinction on the battlefields of World War II defending this Nation against its foreign enemies.

He was honored by the people of his State by election last November to the Senate of the United States, an honor that seldom comes to a young man of his age. Then, suddenly, death struck him down.

His passing is not only a loss to Wyoming, but a great loss for all the people of America, regardless of political affiliation. We, of Ohio, especially feel that in the passing of KEITH THOMSON, those of us who have worked with him have lost a great friend and a most able leader.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of KEITH THOMSON. KEITH THOMSON fought for our country with great valor in time of war. When he came to the Congress, he continued to fight for the country in a different area of endeavor. He wanted to keep this country strong and free. He became a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and in that capacity he worked hard to keep this country strong and free. I think I have never known a man who worked with greater dedication and intensity than KEITH THOMSON. He had the admiration and respect of those of us who worked with him on this important assignment. He had his feet on the ground, and his heart was with the best interest of our Nation. He put the best interest of the country above partisan considerations. He was able and effective in his work.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of so fine a man as KEITH THOMSON, and I also want to join with you in words of sympathy for his charming wife and family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues, I, too, rise to express my deep regrets over the passing of a wonderful man, KEITH THOMSON.

While with my family on a southern vacation during the holidays, I picked up a newspaper to note his untimely passing. This shocked me because here was a young man, vigorous, energetic, so full of life, yet at the age of 40 years taken from us at the height of his career.

In the 6 years he was a Member of this body I had close association with him. As the party whip it was always a pleasure to sit down and talk with him about pending issues under discussion and to be voted on. He often presented fresh ideas. He invariably had something new to offer. It was enlightening to get his thinking as he approached what he was about to do on various questions.

I knew of no man I would rather call a friend than KEITH THOMSON. Having served his Nation on the battlefield and in the House of Representatives, he was elected U.S. Senator last November. He was a man of real ability and felt the Senate would provide him with a larger opportunity for service to his State and the country.

To his wonderful family, his wife and his boys, I express my heartfelt sympathy. May God bless them in their time of sorrow.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock that I learned of the death of KEITH THOMSON. Here was a dynamic personality cut down at the very threshold of his greatest potentialities. He was one of America's great young leaders. Here was a man who enjoyed the confidence and friendship of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It was my pleasure to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations and on the Defense Subcommittee of that great committee. He was always fair, objective, and able, and his contributions were very important to the work of the committee and the Congress. It has been my privilege to visit in his home and to enjoy the warm hospitality which was always extended there. I considered him a close personal friend whom I shall miss very much indeed. I know his family and I share in their grief. I extend my earnest and heartfelt sympathy to each of them in the great loss which they and our Nation have sustained.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and unselfish services of the late KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming. I was shocked when I heard the news of his untimely death, which cut short an outstanding career at a time when our distinguished colleague was about to enter on a new and challenging phase of that career. Our late coworker served as a colleague on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years and I came to know him there for his sincerity in working for what he believed was right and for his fairness in considering the views of those who might happen to differ with him.

In the last session of the 86th Congress, it was KEITH THOMSON who contributed greatly to the successful work of the House in amending the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. This was a service of love and dedication for he was at that time a member of the Committee on Appropriations rather than a member of the committee handling the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and my fellow Members of the House from the Rocky Mountain area especially and the Nation generally, join in expressing our heartfelt sorrow at the loss of a great public servant from the West. Mrs. Aspinall and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the boys in their loss of a fine husband and a proud father.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the death of KEITH THOMSON removes from our midst a talented legislator with great promise of a long career of public service. It is rare to find one so young who has achieved promise in so many fields as our former colleague. An outstanding military record, a successful law practice, and a brilliant record in the House of Representatives, marked him as a man destined for leadership in the Senate to which he had been elected.

I was shocked to hear of his untimely passing and I am saddened at his loss not only because he was a distinguished public servant, but because he was a close personal friend. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to KEITH THOMSON as one who gave much to his country and express my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I join the gentleman from Wyoming and our other colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of KEITH THOMSON.

KEITH THOMSON and I came to Congress within a few months of each other. We, as well as our families, became warm personal friends. Geographically we are separated by many thousands of miles; politically we sat on opposite sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives, and yet I know I gained a great deal from working with him as a Member of this body. He was an able, conscientious, and hard-working Member of the House.

KEITH THOMSON was a distinguished soldier in time of war; KEITH THOMSON was an outstanding citizen and public servant in time of peace. I like to think that his native State of Wyoming is a better place because of the contributions he made during his lifetime. He was the kind of man who inspires the confidence of his fellows in this body. He was a devoted husband and father.

His State has lost a distinguished son. We have lost a fine and able colleague. Our Nation has lost a loyal and patriotic citizen.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending to Mrs. Thomson and her sons our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last November 9, when the election results were made known, I looked forward to rising in the House and paying tribute to a valued friend who, as the 87th Congress convened, would be taking his seat in the U.S. Senate. It still seems incredible that the tribute I make today is not one of heartfelt good wishes to a strong young soldier going forward in the cause of freedom.

During World War II KEITH THOMSON fought, with many honors, to preserve American liberty. Returning home, he recognized the need of fighting to assure an American future of freedom and vitality firmly anchored on the steadfast rock of our Constitution. With the vigor of his youth, the brilliance of his insight into historic truths, he was well armed to do battle for the living Constitution.

I never knew KEITH THOMSON to qualify, or apologize for, his faith in the continued ability of Americans to determine freely their own and their Nation's destinies. I never knew KEITH THOMSON to bow to political expediency. And I knew KEITH THOMSON well. We met as freshmen in the 84th Congress, were active members of the 84th club. At the beginning of the 86th Congress, both of us were named to the House Committee on Appropriations and sat next to one another in the Defense Department Subcommittee. KEITH THOMSON was a skilled and imaginative legislator, diligent in performing his duties. He was a warm and loyal friend.

No man is without his faults. KEITH THOMSON'S only fault was that he worked too hard. It cost our Nation a great leader.

KEITH THOMSON died in the triumph of knowing that the citizens of his State of Wyoming had given him an overwhelming mandate to carry the battle for freedom to the U.S. Senate. He died in the knowledge that his was a righteous and a live cause. He leaves a living memorial. In his brief 41 years, this remarkable young man wrote a noble record of courage and faith in the United States which will inspire men to carry his battleflag so long as American liberty is cherished.

To Thyra Thomson, his charming wife, who stood so closely at his side in all his endeavors, and to his three sons, Mrs. Minshall and I extend our deepest sympathies in a loss we deeply share.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when KEITH THOMSON became a member of the Committee on Appropriations we put him to work upon the most important measures that the Appropriations Committee has to handle, namely, the military establishments appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMSON took a very active part in the hearings that we held and I believe that his work did more than anything else to clear up the missile situation with which our country was and is faced.

He went along to other subjects that came before that committee, and did a magnificent job.

In my opinion, his was one of the most brilliant intellects I have ever seen. The energy and the foresights that KEITH THOMSON had made him an exceedingly valuable Member of the Congress. We lose too many Members of that kind.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our departed colleague, KEITH THOMSON. I was in my district when I learned of his untimely passing from a friend who said he heard the report over the radio. I thought it was a mistake, and I could not believe it was true.

I was greatly shocked and saddened over the passing of KEITH THOMSON. He had enjoyed a brilliant career. I enjoyed my association with KEITH THOMSON and was happy to have him as a friend. We had many visits together on matters of mutual interest to Colorado and Wyoming. KEITH did a tremendous job in looking after the interests of the people of his State. I have never seen a more devoted public servant.

I remember when KEITH came to Congress, and how anxious he was to be a good Congressman. He was diligent in all that he did, and I have never seen a harder worker.

I recall that KEITH was interested in oil and gas matters that particularly affected his State of Wyoming. I remember how thoroughly he prepared his statements on legislation which he presented, and which was passed by Congress. He spent a great deal of time and effort in making sure that he presented all of the facts to the committee and to the House. KEITH took great pride in his work, and was enthusiastic in all that he did.

KEITH was also interested in matters relating to agriculture, and I recall his concern over the extension of the Sugar Act in the closing days of the 86th Congress.

There can be no better proof of esteem in which he was held by his people than the splendid vote of confidence he received last November when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. I never saw KEITH after the election, but he must have been very proud over that vote.

KEITH THOMSON was a great American. He was fearless, and he was independent. He did what he thought was right regardless of what others might think. We need more men like KEITH THOMSON in public life today.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I served with KEITH THOMSON on the Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment he was indeed the perfect public servant. Wrapped up in his personality and character were all of the attributes that go to make up an outstanding legislator. He did his job thoroughly, with great ability, absolutely devoid of partisan blindness; his incisiveness was a delight to behold.

Wyoming can be proud, so very proud, of the magnificent, indelible impression he left on the minds and hearts of all those with whom he served in this House and all those he met in his lifetime. The Nation can be proud of the great public service he rendered during his years in the war, his years in the service of the State of Wyoming, and his all too short career here in Washington.

I am privileged to join in this eloquent and moving tribute to a very great and dedicated American. I express my deepest sympathy to his loving wife and devoted children.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, was indeed a shock to the Nation and particularly to us in the West. He had made his mark in the Halls of Congress. He was energetic, a hard worker, and was determined to represent the good people of the State of Wyoming. Wyoming and the rest of the Nation will miss him in the future. I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the family.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I was shocked to learn of the death of KEITH THOMSON. He was a young man, full of vigor and activity, and was esteemed most highly by all who knew him. His work here was of the highest quality. He was diligent, active, forthright; a great legislator. We were proud and happy when he was elected to the Senate of the United States and wished him a great career there. He will be missed here. He will be missed in Wyoming. He will be missed wherever people knew him.

Mrs. Adair and I express our most sincere sympathy to his wonderful family.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the expressions that have been made here today with

regard to our late friend, KEITH THOMSON. It was my privilege to serve with KEITH on the Committee on Appropriations and on the same subcommittee. While he was a loyal party man, he was first of all an American, and as an American he was interested always in his own ideas as to what was sound, and he had the courage to pursue those views to the end. It is not given to us mortals to understand why a man of his age should be taken, but in comfort, perhaps, we can recall the words that have been said before: It is given to some men to do far greater work in a short period of years than it is to others who may live twice as long. Truly it can be said that KEITH THOMSON accomplished more and set as fine an example for the rest of us in the Congress and in these United States in 41 years than many people have in 82. To his beloved family we extend our deepest sympathy. To his boys we say that no father could have left a finer example, and all can take comfort in the good deeds that KEITH THOMSON did. Truly, in a short period, he set a high standard for those that might live twice as long.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to the Congress in the same year that KEITH THOMSON came here. I soon found that he was one of the men that I automatically wanted to know better, because he was that kind of person. We had the opportunity to begin to learn the ropes; to learn the operations of Congress together. I came to respect KEITH THOMSON very greatly because of the fact he was the type of man that he was. In the 6 years he served here in the House he demonstrated to all the Members what an effective job a person can do to represent the people of his State and of the Nation. He never worried about time, because time was no object except to serve the people of his district and the people of the Nation. I think all of us came to respect him for his devoted feeling toward his country. Mrs. Baldwin joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her children in their great loss.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be remiss in my duties as a Member of this great legislative body if I did not join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great, late resident of the State of Wyoming. On his arrival in Washington 6 years ago, and on his appearance on the floor of the House, he immediately alined himself with a large group of the Congress interested in making some basic changes in our trade policies. He was sincere and devoted to this idea during his entire service in the House. The fact that the good people of his State placed their confidence in him in the recent election in electing him to membership in the other body is proof of the greatness of this man. I want to join my other colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the children.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in tribute to KEITH THOMSON. During his three terms in the House of Representatives he gave us ample opportunity to know that both on account of legislative ability and qualities of mind he was destined for a successful and useful future political career.

We admired his talents; we respected his personal character and we held him dear as a friend. Everything about KEITH, his steadfastness in support of his convictions, his unwavering determination in behalf of those ideas and ideals in which he believed, seemed to single him out for successful public service to a degree seldom given to younger men in political life.

Especially I recall my association with KEITH on the House Republican policy committee. There so often he expressed his views and forcefully upheld his always strong convictions. There, I remember it was I first heard him confirm his intention to seek a seat in the U.S. Senate. Nor have I forgotton my immediate reaction. It was that if elected no one of the younger Members of the House could more capably serve in that high office. I thought at once of what a splendid contribution KEITH would make there to the national welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of the House, whenever they listened to KEITH as he spoke in this Chamber, must have felt, as I did, his force and vigor and logic in discussing a cause close to his heart. That I generally agreed with him in controversial issues may have added to my high opinion, but truly I believe those not sharing his views respected him equally for his high intellectual integrity and the obvious sincerity of his argument. Also, even in a sometimes fierce moment of a debate, he never failed to reveal a friendly glint in his eye. He let his opponents feel his respect and understanding of their opposing viewpoint.

At a time like this, Mr. Speaker, when the 87th Congress is in process of organization one feels especially how sad and unfortunate it was that KEITH THOMSON never lived to enjoy the fruit of his hard earned final political victory. Only those elected to high public office can fully appreciate the misfortune of his not being able to take his oath of office and feel with due pride the full honor accorded him by the people of the great State of Wyoming.

Yet, sad as that is, the real misfortune, it seems to me, is the loss to the Nation—the loss of KEITH'S future service to our beloved country. KEITH THOMSON'S sudden death, indeed, has deprived the United States of a devoted and dedicated patriot. In the silencing of his voice and the stilling of his mind and body lies the real tragedy, for he had important work to do. The Nation can ill afford his death.

We, KEITH'S friends and associates, Mr. Speaker, feel a personal sense of grief, and yet we have happy memories and much to be thankful for. In this latter respect, I am sure that in our association with KEITH THOMSON in this House we gained inspiration in such total measure that our resultant higher ideals and efforts for better government individually and collectively will compensate somewhat and help to fill the great individual void left by his absence. I am sure, too, such is what our departed friend and colleague would want as a memorial to his public service.

Meanwhile, to his widow, Mrs. Thomson, and his family of loved ones, I express for myself and my wife our deep sympathy. May the memory of a fine husband and devoted father serve to comfort them in their present adversity and at length sustain them with due pride in the years ahead.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Grim Reaper had struck down KEITH THOMSON at the moment of his greatest political triumph came as a profound shock to all of us who had worked so closely with him in Congress.

Among the able men with whom I have had the privilege of working in the House of Representatives, KEITH THOMSON will always take high rank. He was a gentleman and a scholar. Whenever he chose to take the floor for a discussion of legislative proposals, he received close attention because all of his colleagues knew that he would have something important and constructive to say.

KEITH THOMSON was one of the hardest working members of the House Committee on Appropriations and brought to his service thereon a fine, legal mind which enabled him to separate the wheat from the chaff and cut through the underbrush to the essentials.

The sadness of his passing is dampened somewhat by the realization that he has left legacies more valuable than material things—to his district, his State, and his Nation, a record of service in war and in peace, which time will never erase, and to his sons a good name—"a monument more lasting than brass."

I join KEITH THOMSON'S many friends in expressing profound sorrow over his untimely death and to his dear wife and fine sons my sincere sympathy over the great loss they have suffered. It is my hope and prayer that time will deal gently with them and that they will find the faith and strength to face the inevitable without bitterness, in the realization that a host of friends and admirers mourn with them over the passing of this great American.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as with other Members of the House I was shocked and saddened by the sudden death of our colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, on December 9, 1960. Not only had the Nation lost a valuable public servant but I personally had lost a good and valued friend.

I felt particularly close to KEITH THOMSON because he and I entered the

Congress on the same day and had, throughout our three terms in the House, served on the same committees. In addition we had a community of interest in that his great State of Wyoming borders on my own State of Nebraska and we share many mutual problems.

All of these ties bound KEITH THOMSON and me close together during our terms in Congress.

KEITH was a product of our times. He was young, vigorous, and capable. He represented ably the viewpoint of his constituents and his State. He fought vigorously for principles and ideals.

KEITH was born in Lancaster, Wyo., in 1919. He graduated from the Wyoming Law School in 1941 and almost immediately entered the Army to fight bravely and with distinction during World War II. He was decorated for valor in Italy and won the Purple Heart. He was noted as the youngest battalion commander in the Army by the time the war came to an end. He rose rapidly to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

After leaving the service he entered private law practice in Cheyenne and became active in civic affairs and politics. He ran for and was elected to the Wyoming Legislature in 1950 and served in that body for two terms. In 1954 he ran for Congress on the Republican ticket and was elected.

Mr. Speaker, all of us here know of his record from that point on. He showed keen interest and insight into the problems of the veterans of our Nation. He showed interest and a great deal of knowledge about the water and natural resource development problems of the Middle and Far West.

His capabilities came to the attention of the leadership on our side of the aisle and Mr. THOMSON was appointed to the House Committee on Appropriations. There he served faithfully and well and brought to that committee a broad knowledge and great commonsense.

His record in the Congress so impressed the people of his home State of Wyoming that KEITH THOMSON was this past fall elected to the U.S. Senate. He is the first man in history in the State of Wyoming to have moved from the House of Representatives to the U.S. Senate, another noteworthy achievement for one so young.

I would, at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to extend to his wife and fine family my own condolences and those of Mrs. Weaver. Although we have lost a good friend and the Nation a fine public servant, they have lost a devoted and loving husband and father.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks before returning to Washington a news bulletin flashed on the television screen in my home. It brought to me the sad and saddening news of the passing of a dear friend, KEITH THOMSON. I had known KEITH THOMSON during the 4 years I worked with him here in the Congress, and I had come to appreciate him not only as a capable legislator and as a man with a great military background, but, most of all, as a true gentleman in every sense of the word.

I think it was particularly shocking that one who had just earned the victory that had come to him at the polls in his State should have his life taken in the very midst of the joy that so many felt for the great victory that he had earned at the polls. But, those of us who knew him and appreciated him and loved him can really take comfort in the fact that even though he was denied the earthly joys of this great victory at the polls, through his life, service, and his Christian character he has earned the even greater victory to which mortal man should aspire.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in expressing to Mrs. Thomson and their fine sons our deep sense of sorrow we felt and still continue to feel by reason of the passing of this great and good man.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many, many times in the last 6 years that I have risen on the floor of the House and in personal conversation to pay tribute to KEITH THOMSON. It is certainly with profound sorrow that I find myself paying tribute today and that he is not among us to hear it or to hear of it. Like several others of my colleagues who have preceded me here today, I came to the House in the 84th Congress, the same year as KEITH THOMSON. Irrespective of the social circles, Mr. Speaker, that we find ourselves joining—irrespective, I think, of our committee assignments, or irrespective of almost anything else, we naturally find ourselves just a little closer to those Members who join this body in the same year that we did. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I have had a continuing and a very pleasant relationship with KEITH THOMSON. I visited his home both in Washington and in Cheyenne, Wyo. I think on the basis of my privilege of being a guest in his home on numerous occasions and on the basis of the experience I have had of serving with him, perhaps in this short time after his passing I can put into perspective some of the outstanding characteristics of our departed colleague from Wyoming. I think, further, they may have been touched upon already, but I would just like to recite them again for you. One of the most outstanding characteristics of KEITH THOMSON was his fearlessness. That was demonstrated on the field of battle as well as in the area of legislative debate right here in the well of this House. Never once did KEITH retract from a position that he thought was right, not only to vote for it, but to stand here in the well of the House and fight for it. If there is one important characteristic of a statesman, that would be it. On some occasions, I might add, it probably was not politically expedient for him to take that very firm position.

Another outstanding characteristic of KEITH THOMSON was his great capacity for work. I think that has already been pretty well covered here today.

I would like to point out one unique aspect of his dedication to his work. As I recall, there are only three Members of this House who represent States having only one Member in this particular body. So on that basis those three Members have more work to do than anybody else. Not only do they usually have a larger geographical area to represent, but they have all the problems affecting that State, and it becomes their responsibility to represent them, not only in this Chamber but with the agencies and committees as well. I would say in that particular respect whereas most of us have one or more associates in this House, there are two Members in the other body. In the case of the Congressman from Wyoming, he has all the responsibility in this body as compared with other Members representing a portion of their States in this body.

The third characteristic I want to mention is the deep love and affection which KEITH THOMSON felt for his family. Despite his workload, for which we have already paid tribute, he never found himself so busy that he did not have all the time it required to accompany his boys or his wife to any function that he felt was of importance to their family circle. I think that is a symbol we like to see in every American family today.

KEITH THOMSON'S service to his country, both in war and in the Congress of the United States, and as a father and husband has become a symbol of our great American institution that we could call the ideal family man.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too share the sorrow of many of the Members of this House today on the passing of KEITH THOMSON. He was an outstanding young man, cut down in the very prime of his life. He rendered to the people of this great Nation of ours a service way beyond the call of duty. Wyoming and the Nation have lost a man who showed great promise of rising to great heights in the councils of this Nation.

I knew KEITH THOMSON as many of you have. I visited in his home in his home State and here in Washington during his service in the Congress. I am sure that any person coming into contact with that fine man certainly must feel a sense of loss in his untimely passing.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, join with my colleagues today in paying my last respects to a man who I think above all things loved his family and his State. He also loved his Nation and he loved the institutions which have made us a great nation.

I join with the other Members in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his fine family in their great loss—a loss that is shared by all of us here in the Congress and by the whole Nation which he loved so well.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today about KEITH THOMSON, but considering his dedication, his Americanism, and his integrity, certainly not too much. Indeed,

not enough could be said in respect to the memory of this great man.

KEITH THOMSON was my friend, and I loved him. I was in his house as he was in mine. I campaigned with him in the State of Wyoming. I know of no man in the scope of my entire acquaintance who had more dedication, more integrity, more unselfishness, more principle than did KEITH THOMSON. This was demonstrated on the field of battle and in the Halls of this Congress. The State of Wyoming, this House of Representatives, indeed our country is better off today because KEITH THOMSON passed this way.

Mr. Speaker, my wife joins with me in extending to Mrs. Thomson and her family our sincerest, and, indeed, our profound sympathy.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of the day KEITH THOMSON passed away, I dictated a letter conveying an invitation for him to address an important gathering in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia. The invitation was initiated by a group of men and women, none of whom had ever met the Senator-elect personally. However, all of them knew him by reputation and admired what they knew.

I knew him personally. I knew him intimately. I knew him fondly. KEITH was one of that select group of public servants who methodically, quietly, and without fanfare devote themselves to the painstaking detail and the careful, meticulous thought and deed which turn the wheels of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Not given to much talk, his words always carried the ring of conviction. He was a persuasive advocate.

As a soldier, a lawyer, a statesman, a husband, and a father, KEITH THOMSON left footprints on the sands of time. Upon his bereaved ones I invoke the blessing and comfort of the Creator.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, this was indeed a tremendous shock to all of us in the House of Representatives, but in particular it was a shock to those of us who came in with KEITH THOMSON as neophyte Congressmen at the beginning of the 84th Congress, and I would now like to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his three surviving sons in their hours of sorrow.

This is one of those young men who came out of the West to serve his Nation. He was firmly devoted to his country in time of war and completely dedicated to it in time of peace. This man was truly a prince among men. On one occasion, King David said to his servants upon the happening of the death of Abner: "Know ye not that there is fallen a prince and a great man this day in Israel." And so we ourselves now note that upon the death of KEITH THOMSON there fell a prince and a great man of our country, one who was high in intellectual attainments, totally dedicated to the service of his country in time of peace, and also zealously patriotic in time of war.

Life is quite a mystery and we do not understand it. The poet said:

Life, I know not what thou art, but know
that thou and I must part;
And when or where or how we met, I own
to me is a secret yet.
But this I know, when thou art fled, where
e'er they lay these limbs, this head,
No clod so valueless shall be as all that then
remains of me.
Life, we have been long together through
pleasant and through cloudy weather;
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear, perhaps 'twil cost a sigh, a tear;
Then steal away, give little warning, choose
thine own time;
Say not goodnight, but in some brighter
clime bid me good morning.

And so even though we have had to bid this young man of the West goodbye, we feel that in God's good hour we shall bid him good morning in a life immortal that shall know no end.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, some men have the ability to write and speak words at a time like this which are in proper tribute to the memory of a departed colleague. Lacking that ability I shall not attempt to do so now, lest my words fall short of what KEITH THOMSON's memory deserves.

I shall say only this: We will never know a more honorable man nor a finer individual than was KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSON was one of our outstanding young Republican leaders and he will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him and served with him.

It was my privilege to get to know KEITH soon after he was elected to the 84th Congress, and to quickly learn that he was an able, sincere, and dedicated legislator.

Having served with distinction in World War II as a commander of troops in the field, KEITH THOMSON displayed in his work in the House the reasons why he was chosen for such military leadership.

He was not a compromiser. He believed that nothing short of right was right. He was firm, tough, yet understanding of human problems.

KEITH was in his proper element in his most recent committee work in the House. Serving as he did on a Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, he was firm in the stand he took for a strong Defense Establishment. He was particularly interested in the ballistic missile program and his incisive questions in committee showed this keen and searching desire to improve our ICBM capability.

Most importantly, KEITH THOMSON was a true and steadfast personal friend. He was always willing and eager to help his colleagues in their problems.

KEITH will long be remembered in the House of Representatives. And, I am sure the people of Wyoming who honored him with such a resounding vote of confidence by electing him to the Senate of the United States will remember him, too.

To his widow, Thyra, and their three fine sons, my wife joins in extending sympathy and condolences.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound shock to me, and it is still a shock, to contemplate the passing of my very good friend KEITH THOMSON. In his passing the U.S. Congress has been deprived of one of the most capable men ever to grace this Hall and one of the most able men who would ever have served in the other body across the Capitol.

All of the things which have been said by our colleagues concerning this fine man are true, and in a measure beyond belief. I do not have the eloquence to add to them, and I do not intend to try.

I merely want to say that my own personal feelings about KEITH THOMSON are those of one friend to another. The quality of friendship is, I suppose, a nebulous one in many ways, but when you analyze it you realize that to be a good friend you must be loyal, you must possess integrity, and over and above that you must possess the emotional ability to feel an affection toward your fellow man.

A person who has good friends must be a good friend. KEITH THOMSON had many good friends. He possessed all of the qualities of friendship which made it possible that he would have good friends. He had friends not only in the House of Representatives but also in his own home city and in his own home State. I do not think I have ever seen a group of people so profoundly affected by the passing of one man as was the group of people who attended the funeral of our departed colleague in Cheyenne, Wyo. I do not think I have ever known as many people who have expressed to me regret at the passing of any individual as have expressed that regret at the passing of KEITH, and during his lifetime I do not know of anyone who held the approbation and good will of as many people not only at home but in all parts of the country as he did. He was my friend, and his wife and his sons certainly will fall heir to the friendship which I felt toward KEITH.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in wishing them all the best in the future and in assuring them that anything which they desire or need which is within our power to give, they will possess.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn with the lovely widow and with the family of the late Congressman KEITH THOMSON. I also mourn with his own great State of Wyoming. The people of this wonderful State, his beautiful, smiling homeland, have lost a tremendous fighter, a man who believed in fairness, who tried to do right, who fought for justice and hated intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that have been so eloquently stated by those who have preceded me in eulogizing our beloved late colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, of Cheyenne, are in-

deed deserved tributes to a great American and I believe demonstrates in part at least the extent to which he will be sorely missed by those of us who remain to carry on the responsibilities of government affairs. I have been privileged to know and to serve with KEITH THOMSON since the day he came to Congress. During this period I have valued his friendship and admired his professional ability as a legislator and as a leader. You may be assured that the rich memories of those years will always be cherished by Mrs. Belcher and myself.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our departed colleague, KEITH THOMSON, was an extremely close personal friend who made in many fields a tremendous record of public service. During his 6 years as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives I learned to know KEITH THOMSON intimately and I can say without hesitation or qualification he was a legislator of great skill and competence. He was conscientious, yes too dedicated, because he worked unbelievably long hours and I feel this effort contributed to his premature passing. No Member of Congress ever worked longer hours. It seems tragic that this fine effort to do a better job should perhaps be a factor in the early termination of a great career.

In 1959 and 1960 it was my privilege to serve on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations with KEITH THOMSON. During this 2-year period I was ranking minority member of this group and can say KEITH was a bulwark of strength in strongly defending the sound defense policies of President Eisenhower. He was diligent, consecutive, and experienced in this committee responsibility. He will be badly missed by the members of the Defense subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans alike, and I have lost a committee colleague whose counsel and support was invaluable.

In 1959 I was invited by KEITH to address a Lincoln Day dinner in Cheyenne, Wyo. It was a wonderful experience to be in KEITH'S home State to see the esteem that came his way from his multitude of friends. He was respected, truly admired by his constituents and this attitude is best evidenced by his successes as a candidate for the House of Representatives and the recent victory as a candidate for the Senate.

KEITH THOMSON'S career was just beginning, but in the years previous he had accomplished much. His military career was beyond comparison. His legislative career was an inspiration for others. In addition he was a man of highest character and reputation.

I will badly miss KEITH because he was one of my best friends. To his wonderful wife and fine three sons, Mrs. Ford and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest shocks I have ever received was as Mrs. Berry and I were returning to Washington. We were driving down the highway when the news was flashed over the radio of the death of KEITH THOMSON. The news struck me as it would had it been my own brother. We almost had to pull off to the side of the road until we could recover.

I have known KEITH since he was in college. My brother and KEITH were very good friends at Black Hills Teachers College in western South Dakota. His family lived in western South Dakota. We became close friends through our service in Congress, primarily because the problems of his State and of my district are so very similar.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to what has already been said so very eloquently many, many times here this afternoon. I would simply say that perhaps one of the things that contributed to his untimely death was the fact that in all of his work and in all of his efforts, KEITH had never learned to relax.

Mr. Speaker, KEITH was not only a great legislator, as all of us know who served with him here on the floor of this House, but he was also a loving husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Berry joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and to the boys on this sad occasion.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our beloved colleague and friend, KEITH THOMSON, brought sorrow to all of us who knew him and served with him here in the House of Representatives. I had the opportunity to serve with him not only as a Member of the House but also as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and in particular as a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee.

I admired KEITH THOMSON as a man, as a legislator, and as a friend.

There are many tributes that could be paid to KEITH. We have heard many here on the floor of the House today. There is one tribute, though, that I think KEITH truly deserves. It is a tribute that really expresses how great an American KEITH was. KEITH was genuine. He was genuine in all his thinking and in all his doings. He was a man of genuine convictions, with great courage to express and stand by those convictions.

I wish to join my colleagues in these tributes to KEITH THOMSON, and to express again my sympathy and the sympathy of my wife and family to his beloved wife, Thyra, and to their three fine sons.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are times when words are futile and when one feels inadequate to the challenge when situations like this present themselves, but commonsense and decency dictate that we must say or do something even though what we say or do is inadequate.

I, like many, came here with KEITH THOMSON in 1955. In our daily and intimate associations I learned early to respect him and honor him and love him. His sudden and untimely passing was indeed a shock to me and to all who knew him.

I am glad to join my colleagues today in paying tribute, and I might say well deserved tribute, to KEITH THOMSON, to a friend, to a fine public servant, to a great American who in 6 years here in the Congress earned for himself and his State and the country the exalted title of a statesman. He was respected and loved by all who knew him.

In this Congress as a legislator he always considered what was best for the country first, what was best for his State second, and what was best for his party third. This is the order in which all of us I think should consider the issues and problems that come before this body.

In his presentations he was always able and intelligent, always precise and logical. He served his State and his Nation very, very well.

Somehow a quotation from Thomas Jefferson comes to mind just now that I think is appropriate. Mr. Jefferson was asked one time about the things that are most important to observe in life. He said, after a few preliminary remarks to this friend of his:

> Few words will be necessary with good disposition on your part. Adore God, reverence and cherish your parents, love your neighbor as yourself and your country more than yourself.

I believe KEITH THOMSON'S life and his work was a testimony to the fact that he loved his country more than himself.

Probably because of my interest in Abraham Lincoln and because I know of his interest in this great American and his part in bringing into being a great and appropriate memorial to Abraham Lincoln in his State, the lines of a great American poet of that era come to mind, and they apply also. They are:

> Here is a man who posed against the world, a man to match the mountains and the sea.

I know no greater tribute that can be given to a man than to say that he will be missed, and most surely KEITH THOMSON will be missed. Mrs. Schwengel and I want to express our extreme sorrow and regret in his passing, and to extend our sincere and deep sympathy to the people he represented so well and to his beloved and fine family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this body knows that KEITH THOMSON was a capable, honest, and sincere legislator, representing his district and his country well. There is but little I can add to the tributes that have already been paid to KEITH THOMSON, but there is one thing which to me was always outstanding about him. I have never known a man who was more courageous and a harder fighter for the things that he believed were right. But I have never seen a kinder man in public life. Even on the floor of the House when debate might get rather vigorous and heated, KEITH, while forceful and articulate in voicing his

views, there was never a barb or any indication of bitterness toward anyone in any statement made by him. I never heard KEITH THOMSON say an unkind, mean, or vicious thing about anyone. He was in every respect a capable legislator and a gentleman. I deeply appreciate my 6 years of association with him. He will be greatly missed on Capitol Hill. I want to express my deep sympathy to his lovely family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, having consumed the time allotted to me, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of KEITH THOMSON was a tremendous shock to me. Although my association with KEITH was not intimate, seldom did a day pass while Congress was in session that I did not chat with him on the floor of the House or in the cloakroom, where we very often had lunch. His deep and sincere interest in all legislative matters was always evident. The thorough manner in which he carried out his committee assignments was a challenge to all of us. His desire to become a U.S. Senator was one of his great ambitions, and we had discussed it several times. With this ambition achieved, the good Lord saw fit to remove him from our midst before he had an opportunity to serve his country in that capacity. Although he will not be with us in person, the imprint of his association with us as a man of great character, courage, and friendly spirit will remain. I shall always cherish having known him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family. May the good Lord give them supporting strength in their hour of great loss.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to our late colleague, KEITH THOMSON, and in expressing heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

I was aware of the extraordinary energy, determination, and zeal KEITH devoted to his work as Representative from the State of Wyoming and to his successful campaign for the Senate. The abrupt and untimely end to his brilliant career in public service gives us all pause and rudely reminds us of the tenuousness of the thread of existence.

I share the grief of his family, his friends, and his constituents in Wyoming who chose KEITH to be their spokesman in the U.S. Senate and join in testifying to the high character of one whose service, though abbreviated, was outstanding.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress who were privileged to serve with KEITH THOMSON are saddened by his recent passing. He was a young man of great promise. That he delivered in large measure on that promise in his 6 years as a Member of the House of Representatives was attested to by the voters of Wyoming in electing him on November 8, 1960, to the Senate of the United States.

It can be said of KEITH THOMSON that in all his endeavors he was a standout. Seldom does the electorate send to the Congress a Representative as well qualified by experience in such a variety of important fields. He was a lawyer, a university instructor, one recognized by the junior chamber of commerce as the outstanding young man in his community, a respected member of the Wyoming Legislature, and also a highly decorated hero of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, in extending to the members of KEITH THOMSON'S family my deepest sympathy, I want them to know that KEITH was held in the highest respect and affection by his colleagues. The tragedy of his untimely loss is felt by us all. We will always cherish the memory of his friendship.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the richly merited tributes which my colleagues have already paid to KEITH THOMSON other than to record my own profound sorrow and sense of loss at his most untimely passing and to proffer the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Johansen and myself to his loved ones.

Mr. THOMSON first became a Member of this House the same day that I did, on January 3, 1955. He was an exceptionally able Member and a devoted adherent to fundamental constitutional principles.

The poignancy of his death is, of course, greatly heightened by his comparative youth and by the fact that he was on the threshold of a new and immensely promising career as a Member of the other body.

We can only accept with humble faith the dispensations of Providence, grateful that we have had the privilege of his friendship and association and determined to carry on in the performance of our own duties with the same high purpose and dedication KEITH THOMSON exemplified so splendidly.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our good colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON grieves me deeply.

I had learned early in his membership here in the House of his dedication to duty as a Representative of the good people of Wyoming and the Nation.

I urged that he be made a member of the Appropriations Committee and then as a member of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations of which I am ranking Republican, because he was a stanch conservative, and would fight with all his power against wasteful spending of the people's tax dollar and because of his unlimited knowledge of the problems which affected the Great Plains area which he loved with an abiding faith.

KEITH proved to be a most valuable member of that committee—able, honest, and attentive to duty.

Like his multitude of friends and admirers in and out of Congress, I shall miss this great and good statesman, KEITH THOMSON. My heart goes out to his devoted loving wife and family.

God rest his soul.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Colorado, which I represent, borders on our friendly neighboring State of Wyoming and long prior to my entrance into this congressional campaign, I had the opportunity and honor of meeting and admiring KEITH THOMSON.

As has been said here so eloquently by others, he was a dedicated American who not only defended his country and our ideals in World War II in active combat, but carried his enthusiasm and drive to preserve our American form of government into his political life.

On one occasion I approached him on a matter which concerned many Colorado residents and a small Wyoming company. He knew immediately of the company, grasped an extremely complex problem in a very few minutes and assisted us in taking necessary steps to solve the problem. All of this occurred near adjournment of a session when tremendous pressure was being faced by all Members, but he was unfailingly courteous, determined to prevent unnecessary Government interference and available for conferences at all hours of several very difficult days for counsel and advice.

The toll on his strength which such dedication took has created an irreparable loss to his State, to the West, and to the country. On behalf of good government, on behalf of the residents of Colorado, and on behalf of all the citizens to whom he had been a Representative, a friend, a counselor, I wish to add my thanks and to extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on this day when we pay tribute to our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, whose untimely death has brought such sadness to all of us, I am thinking, too, of the fine family he leaves behind him. I wish most of all that I could find some words of comfort and inspiration for them. The Nation, the State of Wyoming, and we, the Members of Congress, have lost a dedicated public servant with the passing of KEITH, but Thyra has lost a beloved husband, and those three fine boys have lost a wonderful father. When a man has given so many years of his life to the service of his country in both military service and public office, surely the inspiration he leaves behind him for family and friends and colleagues can temper the bitterness of that loss. God entrusts to all of us a role to play in protecting our freedom, and, as an unusually able Member of Congress, KEITH THOMSON played his role with skill and honor. To me, he was typical of the western area of America which he so well represented. He was outspoken and vigorous, courageous, and he was as uncompromising with himself as he was with the truth. Perhaps his life stands to teach us all to be more concerned with how well we live, rather than how long. And this is a very proud heritage to leave to that beloved and fine family of his.

I should like to include in this eulogy something that those three young sons of KEITH'S might read one of these days, and find the comfort in it that I did when I lost my own father some years ago. It is a letter written by Abraham

Lincoln—a man whom KEITH greatly admired—to a young girl on the death of her father back in 1862:

DEAR FANNY: It is with deep regret that I learn of the death of your kind and brave father; and, especially, that it is affecting your young heart beyond what is common in such cases. In this sad world of ours sorrow comes to all; and, to the young, it comes with bitterest agony, because it takes them unawares. The older have learned ever to expect it. I am axious to afford some alleviation of your present distress. Perfect relief is not possible, except with time. You cannot now realize that you will ever feel better. Is not this so? And yet it is a mistake. You are sure to be happy again. To know this, which is certainly true, will make you some less miserable now. I have had experience enough to know what I say, and you need only to believe it, to feel better at once. The memory of your dear father, instead of an agony, will yet be a sad sweet feeling in your heart, of a purer, and holier sort than you have known before.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSOM'S untimely passing is a sad blow to individual liberty and constitutional government. KEITH THOMSON was dedicated to the principles and ideals that made this Nation great. He was devoted to the free-enterprise system, to a minimum of bureaucracy and big government.

He always placed the welfare of the United States before any political consideration. He had courage. He was a statesman, a great American, and warm personal friend.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson, his children, the State of Wyoming, and freedom-loving Americans everywhere.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have known KEITH THOMPSON well during all the time he has been a Member of this body.

It is rare that one so young in years should be so wise in action. KEITH THOMSON not only knew where he was going, but knew how to get there. The intensity of his drive and the sincerity of his belief led him many places where others would fear to tread.

For his constituents, nothing was too small if he believed it ought to be done. He was never afraid to oppose popular opinions or projects if he believed they were unwise in the public interest.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he vigorously opposed matters that he believed were not in the long-term interest of his State or his Nation.

Personally, KEITH THOMSON was vigorous and physically active. He liked the outdoors. The great State of Wyoming was his happy hunting ground. He loved that State and its people.

It is perhaps unfortunate, and a great loss to the country, that in the prime of his life he should be called by his Maker. His future was one of great promise built on the solid ground of effort which he had made in the years that he had been a Member of this body. We, in the Congress, both in this and the other body, will miss his kind words and his good advice.

To his wife and sons, Mrs. Springer and I extend our deepest sympathy upon a loss so great.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying my most sincere respects to the memory of KEITH THOMSON. KEITH was a dedicated man and his devotion to duty, his clear analysis of every situation, and his love of country were certainly outstanding. Mrs. Horan and I wish to join the others in extending our deep sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and their fine family.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our Nation lost a great American when our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, was called by his Maker. To me it was also a great personal loss because through our close association I had come to cherish his friendship.

The State of Wyoming recognized the abilities of our late colleague when it saw fit to elect him to the U.S. Senate shortly before his death. His career was studded with public service, and each time he received a new assignment he applied himself to the task before him with all the ability and wisdom at his command. Whether in his country's military service, his legal profession, or the State and Federal legislatures, KEITH THOMSON made it a point to conscientiously devote himself to duty. Little wonder that people of his State admired him so greatly and repeatedly gave him recognition.

I wish to extend my sympathies to the family of our departed colleague.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues at this time to pay my deepest respect to our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, the late Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming. All of us I know were shocked and saddened by his untimely death on December 9, 1960.

It was a very distinct privilege to me to have been closely associated with KEITH during his service in the House from the 84th through the 86th Congresses, and to know him as a warm personal friend. During the last Congress we were colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee.

KEITH was a hard working and conscientious Representative, a credit to the State of Wyoming and the Nation. He approached his work with the zeal and dedication of purpose characteristic of outstanding men, which he was.

Tragically, KEITH was taken from us a short month after having been chosen by the people of Wyoming to serve in the U.S. Senate. Had he been granted the privilege of serving in that body, most assuredly he would have done so with great distinction.

My heartfelt sympathies go out to Mrs. Thomson and their three young sons. In their time of grief, I sincerely hope they are able to find some measure of consolation in the fact that the outstanding record of public service of their husband and father will stand to his and their credit always.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of KEITH THOMSON removed from our midst an able and distinguished public servant who served with honor in peace and war.

I had the privilege of meeting KEITH shortly after he entered Congress. He was a dedicated Congressman and it was no surprise to me when I learned of his victorious campaign for the U.S. Senate. I was, however, deeply shocked when I was informed that death had claimed him shortly after this tremendous victory. I shall miss him greatly and I join my colleagues in conveying my sympathy to his family.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, sadness strikes deeply at my heart as I join in paying tribute to our beloved late colleague, KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming.

Those of us who were privileged to know this man admired his brilliance of mind, his fighting spirit, his devotion to people and service, and his steadfastness for the right, as God gave him remarkable vision to see the right.

While I did not serve on any committee with KEITH, I do know that his work and interests were directed toward a great breadth of subject matter. He was, for instance, vitally interested in the problems that came before the House Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, and I valued his counsel on such items as wool and sheep, and on the cattle industry and the domestic beet sugar industry, just to mention a few.

The people of Wyoming held KEITH THOMSON in high regard, as was evidenced by his election in 1960 to the U.S. Senate. I learned of this esteem firsthand when I accepted KEITH'S invitation to speak in Riverton and Torrington, Wyo., in 1959. This turned out to be a very pleasant trip, and it was indeed an exciting and pleasing experience to observe right up close the fine support with which KEITH was honored in his State.

It so happened that last summer I was once again in Torrington. While there I purchased a local newspaper, which contained an exciting report that was written by Mrs. Thomson and told Wyoming folks about some interesting happenings in Washington. I derived considerable pleasure from this article, feeling that here again was more proof that KEITH and Thyra Thomson were indeed a splendid team, one that worked effectively to serve the best interests of the State of Wyoming and the Nation.

It is certainly sad to see a young man taken in the prime of his life, but we who are but mere mortals can never question the wisdom and dictates of our God on high. We can, however, be thankful for the constructive life that was KEITH THOMSON'S, and we will always be grateful for the great gift that is ours—the cherished memory of our friendship.

In concluding my comments, I would like to say that Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending to Thyra and the boys our deepest sympathy.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, The untimely death of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, again challenges man in his Godly percepts of religious understanding and faith. This noble man loved life and was dedicated to God's purposes on earth—to serve others with a sense of humility and understanding. He labored with an absolute tenseness of courageous action.

He loved human beings and never wavered in defense on their behalf. Whether on the battlefield, in the legislature, the courts, or the Congress, KEITH

THOMSON enjoyed the respect and honor of his fellow citizens.

We suffer from a deeper sadness of heart that, after being victorious in his senatorial campaign, he lost to the omnipotent wisdom of the giver of all victories—the good Lord, "who giveth and taketh away."

His whole ambition was centered on service in the U.S. Senate. This was denied. And so we say, with great regret, that a great man has fallen to his destiny. It is the only answer that we know.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife and family. And may they take strength in the memory of his rich accomplishments and gentle love for his family. The Nation, the State of Wyoming, and the Congress have lost a dedicated statesman and patriot of distinction and honor.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, during my 8 years in the House I have not heard such an outpouring of deserving and sincere testimony as to the character, ability, talent, and capacity of any of our deceased Members as I have heard today from both sides of the aisle concerning the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON.

This spontaneous expression of national, personal, and family loss is an impressive memorial to which I can add nothing, but I can wholeheartedly and with all candor approve everything which has been said. The most difficult prayer to offer is "Thy will, not mine, be done" and it is the one we have the most trouble comprehending.

Mrs. Younger joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Keith Thomson and the sons who have a truly precious birthright.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of KEITH THOMSON, I lost more than a respected and honored colleague. I lost a personal friend for whom I had deep affection.

KEITH and I served together from the day we first came to Congress. We shared many intimate thoughts and discussions of our role here and our attitudes toward the responsibility of the service which the people entrusted to us. In this manner I came to know KEITH THOMSON as one of those rare individuals with a devotion to duty which was almost a fault. He drove himself hard in giving his best to the job in hand.

From combat experience in time of war which we also shared, although in different theaters, we often talked of the sacrifice of those who put love of country and service to mankind above their own self-interest, and many times we wondered at the turn of fate which seemed too soon to take the best, the noblest from us.

That KEITH THOMSON had to leave this life so young in years, cannot help but be a loss to the land he loved and to the people he served so well. But that land and those people are the better, I am sure, because KEITH passed this way. In a way he had a full life. He put so much into it.

To his devoted wife and sons, I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy.

Perhaps the creed which guided KEITH THOMSON could be found in the following lines. written some time ago by a friend of mine:

Calvary, the shadows hastened the end of day,
And those near the Master heard Him say,
"It is finished," He bowed His head,
The soldiers muttered, "He is dead."

Now I, trying to follow in the Master's way,
Lift up my eyes and to my Father say,
My life is thine, take it, Oh God,
That another's path may be less hard to trod.

If I can stoop to lift or ease one single pain,
Or utter one word of beauty that may live again,
Then I may say, when at last I stand alone,
It is finished, Father, I am coming home.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to KEITH THOMSON. We were both elected as freshmen to the 84th Congress, and in the past 6 years I came to regard him as one of the ablest and most respected Members of the House, as well as a close personal friend. When someone like this with a great future before him dies still young, it is indeed tragic. Mrs. Bass joins me in sending Thyra and his three fine boys our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to put words together to express my sorrow over the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON. It would be difficult and repetitious for me to recite all the achievements of this outstanding young man who such a short time ago was one of us here in the House of Representatives. Loving husband and father, patriot, statesman, are attributes that truly belonged to KEITH. That he was a brilliant young man with an enviable record of accomplishment and a great future, no one can deny. It is particularly regrettable that he was not permitted to enjoy serving in the U.S. Senate after his strenuous and successful efforts to become elected.

Because we grew up in the same area of the Great Plains, KEITH and I had much in common. Because we represented people who were livestock producers, our interest in legislation before Congress was almost identical. Because of our background of association with cattle ranching, we perhaps had a feeling of understanding for each other. Whatever may have been the reason, I was drawn to KEITH when I came to Washington as a new Member in the 86th Congress. He did all of those little helpful things for me that an older Member can do for a freshman. Because of his willingness to help others, as well as his dedication to his job as a Representative of the people of Wyoming, I believe it is apparent now that he just tried to do more than the human body can endure.

My wife and I extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her three boys. Their loss of a husband and father is perhaps tempered in a slight degree by the knowledge of the high esteem in which KEITH was held by those who knew him best.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, along with all other Members who had the good fortune to know him well, I was saddened by the sudden and unexpected death of our colleague, the Honorable E. KEITH THOMSON, who had been elected as a Member of the U.S. Senate beginning with the 87th Congress.

I first came to know KEITH THOMSON when he was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He worked closely with me during his service there and had a real and abiding interest in the welfare of our veterans. He was a hard-working member of our committee and we were all sorry to lose him when he was reassigned to the Committee on Appropriations.

He had a distinguished war record when he commanded the 2d Battalion, 362d Infantry Regiment of the 91st Division during World War II. In addition to winning the Combat Infantryman's Badge, he was awarded the Purple Heart, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star for heroic achievement in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor.

To his lovely wife and his three sons I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss and feel that all of us who were privileged to know him share in this loss as well.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to speak of the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON. We first came to Congress together back in the 84th Congress. I worked with him on many matters, and was deeply appreciative of his profound knowledge of happenings in Congress. He had a deep and sincere interest in the welfare of his country as well as his great State of Wyoming. He had a magnificent dedication to service, as was evidenced by the many hours of overtime he worked at his duties in Congress.

The country and his State have lost a great, dedicated public servant, and I was shocked at the news of his untimely passing just as he was reaching another high rung in the ladder of his success.

I join his many friends and colleagues in extending deep sympathy to his wife and family. Their loss is shared by all who knew and worked with him.

IMMEDIATE APPROVAL OF H.R. 581 WILL CURB RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS AND PROVIDE A "QUICK AND EFFECTIVE REMEDY" FOR UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, particular attention is directed to H.R. 581, which I have introduced again this year because I still live in hope that the Congress of the United States will come to realize that—in this legislative body and here alone—lies the one definite and dependable source of security for the American worker whose job is taken away or threatened by imports.

My bill would limit residual oil imports to 10 percent of domestic demand for the corresponding quarter of the preceding year. I recognize that this figure might have to be adjusted upward before it would become acceptable to the majority of our membership. Whatever the final decision, the study necessary for Congress to reach an agreement will produce information that cannot help but arouse demand for immediate action on this problem.

I mention a willingness to permit a moderate boost in the percentage prescribed because I am well aware that the purveyors of alien fuel have become so arrogant and confident about their position in our east coast markets that they have convinced a number of customers that their product will always be available. As a consequence, some consumers have been credulous enough to install oil-burning equipment exclusively in their plants, factories, and apartment houses. What would happen in these instances in the event of a cutoff of ocean-shipped supplies is a subject that international oil discreetly avoids in contacts with new construction.

Unfortunately, victims of this selling policy failed to engage themselves in the simple research that would produce glaring examples of the folly of depending upon ocean-shipped oil. From the time that I undertook this crusade against excessive residual oil imports more than a decade ago, I have emphasized that there was severe hardship and suffering—particularly in New England—when ocean transportation was interrupted in early 1942. Factories, office buildings, and schools had to be closed until railroad facilities were expanded and coal came to the rescue.

Many of the plants that have risen on the Atlantic seaboard in recent years are not equipped to burn anything but oil. The source of their supplies is Venezuela. Though we have persistently protested Government policies that permit oil shipers to capture American markets at the expense of domestic suppliers, the deluge from abroad has continued almost unabated. Not until the President of the United States, on the advice of Cabinet members involved in defense planning, created a mandatory oil import control program in 1959 was there any semblance of protection for the U.S. independent oil and coal industries. The President's order was a step in the right direction, but its implementation has fallen short of expectations and emphasizes the urgent need for legislation to meet security standards and at the same time to provide an opportunity for distressed coal regions to reenter markets captured by alien oil.

If there is any doubt that a medium in addition to the Executive order is required to place an effective check on shipments from foreign refineries, import figures since the order went into effect will provide the answer. On March 10, 1959, the White House issued the proclamation adjusting and regulating imports of crude oil and products into the United States. Incoming shipments of residual oil were not to exceed the level reached in 1957, during which year, incidentally, a record 173 million barrels were imported. The importer's reaction to the proclamation is now notorious. For the year 1959, 223 million barrels of residual oil—or 50 million barrels over the 1957 mark—were imported into the United States. For 1960, the figure reached an all-time high of 230 million barrels.

For the information of Members of Congress who may not yet be aware of the impact of residual oil imports on the domestic economy, I point out that last year's incoming shipments of residual oil were equivalent in energy value to 55 million tons of bituminous coal. To anyone familiar with the poverty and misery that persists in areas of chronic surplus labor, the policy of permitting seriously distressed areas to be unnecessarily deprived of such a substantial volume of business is a mystifying paradox. For a number of years many Government officials and Members of Congress have demanded legislation to stimulate the economy of chronic labor areas, of which coal communities are a prominent part. The fact is that a reasonable restriction on imported residual oil could constitute the most sudden and most effective economic remedy possible under peacetime conditions.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress will enact a 10 percent quota on residual oil imports, you will see an unprecedented business comeback in many, many mining communities of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States that serve the Atlantic Seaboard. Had H.R. 581, setting the quota at 10 percent, been in effect in 1960, it would have limited residual oil imports to about 56 million barrels. Approximately the same amount entered this country in 1948, the third year of the postwar invasion of America's fuel markets. What foreign residual oil has done to my part of the country since that time is reflected in any number of statistical analyses, including the Department of Labor's surveys on surplus labor areas. The same story is detected in reports of coal-carrying railroads.

The total coal freight originated on the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1948 amounted to 49,776,000 tons. In 1958, the last full year for which this record is available, the figure amounted to 24,359,000 tons. Here, then, is a drop of 25 million tons of coal—or just about a 50 percent business decline. That loss in tonnage to the Pennsylvania Railroad is easy to understand. Throughout central and western Pennsylvania over the last 12 years one mine after another has fallen prey to the inequitable competition of residual oil imports. A mine closes and its employees become surplus labor. Additional surplus labor is occasioned by the drop in railroad freight tonnage. Timbering firms, equipment manufacturers, and miscellaneous suppliers to the coal industry add their share to the surplus labor category. From then on, the incidence of unemployment increases unchecked.

Residual oil imports were responsible for the early economic deterioration of mining and railroad communities. As they increased in intensity—from more than 56 million barrels in 1948 to 230 million barrels last year—they extended economic havoc throughout wide regions of Pennsylvania and many other States throughout the Appalachian area.

Let us look once more at the 10-percent quota limitation which I have proposed. I have conceded that Congress may find it necessary to revise the percentage after a careful study of the importers' practices, and of the present consequences of their handiwork. What must be determined is how much—if any—residual oil imports are actually necessary. Like the coal industry, independent domestic oil producers and refiners have lost considerable business to foreign oil. They certainly merit an opportunity to regain some of the business which has been taken away by the international oil crowd. In addition, heavy volumes of residual oil are refined in this country from foreign crude. The total impingement upon the markets that would normally have been served by domestic oil and coal holds the key to considerable joblessness in this country.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD the following excerpt from a paper presented recently to an international labor organization meeting in Geneva by Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, representing the U.S. bituminous coal and anthracite industries:

> The first definite official limitations on crude and products, including residual oil, took effect in April 1959 on orders of the President of the United States after U.S. Cabinet officials reported that national security required a limitation on foreign oil imports. The subsequent cutbacks have provided a modicum of help to the coal industry, but incoming shipments are still far too high to permit us to recapture any of the seaboard markets preempted by international oil shippers over the past 12 or 15 years. Many of the countries represented here may by experience understand the difficulties that can come from an excess in the world oil supply. In our country, foreign residual oil has been offered to domestic consumers at whatever price is necessary to undersell coal. Because it is difficult to determine the actual cost of producing this residue of higher grade products of crude, residual oil can actually be offered as low as the marketer finds it necessary to go.

Why legislative action alone will cut back residual oil imports has been evidenced in the shipper's response to the mandatory oil import control program. Here are further interesting data:

From 1946 through 1950 residual oil imports amounted to 347 million barrels. The next 5-year period—1951–55—shows a total of 660 million barrels. And a total of 971 million barrels appears on the 1956–60 scoreboard. The increase of the past 5 years over the first 5 postwar years amounts to 180 percent.

One more figure which I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time refers to 1948, in which year residual oil imports amounted to approximately the level at which H.R. 581 would set current shipments. The increase of residual oil imports for 1960 over 1948 amounts to 326 percent. I leave that figure with you. Perhaps it will startle this Congress into quick action on this issue.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the national histories of east European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland. Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, more than 40 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For more than 300 years they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately the new-born Republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy of jubiliation had ceased. Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, the Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country. Soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for more than 40 years, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Empire, and the Ukrainian people suffered grievously under Soviet totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, to go to Ukraine. Thus the country has become a large prison house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every devise to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Communist totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stout-hearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they live. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physique, and their tenancious nature have served them well. Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent account of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my congressional district, and have seen them at work. In certain parts of this State they constitute the core of sturdy and stout-hearted laborers who perform heavy but necessary tasks with distinction. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions. Today on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to bring to the attention of our Members that this observance of the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is taking place in the Shevchenko Centennial Year. Last year the 86th Congress passed a resolution honoring Taras Shevchenko. That resolution, now Public Law 86–749 authorizes the erection of a monument in his honor on public grounds in our Capital. Moreover, this body authorized the publication of a documentary biography of Schevchenko under the title "Europe's Freedom Fighter." This brochure, Document No. 445, is being read today not only in this country but also abroad, including the capitals in Moscow's colonial empire.

As was predicted by those who furthered this farsighted action, a wrench was thrown into Moscow's propaganda machine. Recently, Moscow and its puppets have attacked our action in the bitterest terms. Articles in Sovietskaya Kultura, Radianska Kultura, and Literaturna Gazeta, clearly indicates that the initiative taken by us has blunted Moscow's propaganda appeal to the captive 40 million Ukrainians who in their hearts and minds honor Shevchenko as their freedom fighter, as their eternal inspiration for genuine national independence and freedom.

Those who furthered this action in the 86th Congress deserve our highest esteem. The story of this has been written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. I request that his article, which appeared in the autumn issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, under the title "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" be included as part of my remarks at this point:

PUBLIC LAW 86–749 AND THE SHEVCHENKO CENTENNIAL

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

As reported by the national press, on September 13, 1960, President Eisenhower signed a resolution passed by Congress authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in Washington, D.C.[1] The resolution was sponsored by the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, and progressed through Congress as House Joint Resolution 311. It is now known as Public Law 86–749. This far-seeing action prepared an official groundwork for the celebration of a significant centennial in 1961, the observance of the death of Taras Shevchenko on March 10, 1861. Shevchenko is widely revered as Ukraine's poet laureate and one of Europe's outstanding freedom fighters.

The law, as passed and approved, reads as follows:

"86TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 311, 74 STAT. 884, SEPTEMBER 13, 1960, JOINT RESOLUTION

"Whereas throughout Eastern Europe, in the last century and this the name and works of Taras Shevchenko brilliantly reflected the aspirations of man for personal liberty and national independence; and

"Whereas Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land; and

"Whereas in many parts of the free world observances of the Shevchenko centennial will be held during 1961 in honor of this immortal champion of liberty; and

"Whereas in our moral capacity as freemen in an independent Nation it behooves us to symbolize tangibly the inseparable spiritual ties bound in the writings of Shevchenko between our country and the forty million Ukrainian nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) any association or committee organized for such purpose within two years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution is hereby authorized to place on land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia a statue of the Ukrainian poet and national leader, Taras Shevchenko.

"(b) The authority granted by subsection (a) of this section shall cease to exist, unless within 5 years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution (1) the erection of the statue is begun, and (2) the association or committee certifies to the Secretary of the Interior the amount of funds available for the purpose of the completion of the statue and the Secretary determines that such funds are adequate for such purpose.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select an appropriate site upon which to erect the statue authorized in the first section. The choice of the site and the design and plans for such statue shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission. Such statue shall be erected without expense to the United States."

A close reading of the whereas clauses shows immediately the meaningful framework in which the resolution is cast. Without this framework the measure would have met with a stillbirth. It was within this framework that reasons and arguments for the passage of the resolution were formu-

[1] E.g., the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1960, p. A–12.

lated. Anyone familiar with the processes involved in the consideration of such measures can readily appreciate the almost insurmountable difficulties and obstacles that lie in the path of their successful passage. Hundreds of such bills fall by the wayside each session. The author sensed from the start that the justification for a Shevchenko memorial in the Nation's Capital must be couched in essence in the measure submitted. Congress responded favorably to this introduction of Shevchenko. But this, of course, constitutes not even a tenth of the story.

THE ASCENT TO PASSAGE

The background to the passage of House Joint Resolution 311 actually discloses a number of important truths. First, it reveals the vital meaning of the Shevchenko Centennial to the United States and, by implication, to the nontotalitarian free world in the present mortal conflict with Russian totalitarian imperialism. Second, it shows the foresight and clear vision of the many who quickly perceived this meaning and with cooperative dispatch took a hand in the passage of the resolution through many difficult stages. Third, the vigorous support of groups and individuals throughout the country for the success of this undertaking forms an indispensable part of this background. And lastly, the long ascent to the passage of House Joint Resolution 311 is suggestive not only of the splendid opportunity that has been presented for demonstrating to the world the real colonial nature of the Soviet Union but also of the heavy responsibility that has been placed on the shoulders of those guiding the centennial.

As indicated in the history of bills enacted into public law, House Joint Resolution 311 was introduced on March 17, 1959.[2] The House Administration Committee reported it out on June 2, 1960, and the House passed the bill on June 24. Subsequently, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee reported it out on August 29 and 2 days later, on August 31, the Senate passed it. Two weeks later, on September 13, the President signed it and the measure became Public Law 86–749. Needless to say, this chronology of the successive progress of the resolution scarcely describes the real history of it.

The substantive history of the Shevchenko bill actually does not commence until February 1960. Soon after its introduction in March 1959 Congressman OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, the chairman of the House Administration Committee, indicated the desirability of holding hearings on the measure and referred it to the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials. However, the hearings, which were planned for June of that year, were made contingent on the early receipt of recommendations and reports on the bill from the Commission of Fine Arts and the Department of the Interior. The bill circulated among a number of executive agencies for almost a year and, as a result, the hearings did not take place until March 1960.

Considering the vast amount of bills of this type which are introduced annually, the Department of Interior quite logically assumed an initial negative position toward the Shevchenko proposal. It cannot be denied that a cemetery of statues would be the blight of the Nation's Capital if an easy policy were pursued in this respect. Members of Congress recognize this as well as responsible private citizens. This writer was fully aware of this consideration at the time he formulated the resolution and, rationally, could not disagree with the Department's decision on these grounds. As it turned out, these were not the only grounds of careful consideration. Thanks to the insight and quick perception of the Honorable Roger Ernst, the Assistant Secretary of Interior, and his knowledgeable associates, the meaning and significance of Shevchenko in the context of the current struggle was almost instinctively grasped, and the Department finally withdrew any opposition or criticism to the measure. Its representatives were particularly impressed by the argument that in the forthcoming centennial we couldn't allow the Russians and their colonial puppets to exploit the name and honor of Shevchenko who rightfully belongs to us. Only recently a meeting of the Government Republic Committee for Preparation and Carrying Out of the T. H. Shevchenko Jubilee was held in Kiev under the chairmanship of Academician M. P. Bazhan to hear progress reports on their observance.[3]

The next significant stage of development was the hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials under the astute chairmanship of Congressman JONES of Missouri. The hearing took place on March 31, at which time consideration was also given to the important Theodore Roosevelt memorial project.[4] Participating in the Shevchenko hearing were the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan; Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University and president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; Mr. Dmytro Halychyn, president of the Ukrainian National Association; Mr. George Wolynetz, Jr., commander of the Ukrainian American War Veterans; and the writer, representing the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. In addition, excellent statements in support of House Joint Resolution 311 were submitted by the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS of New York and Mr. Mykola Lebed, president of Prolog. All the statements are available in the offices of the House Administration Committee.

Following the hearing, some unfavorable reports appeared in the press. One paper ran a story under the caption "Graveyard" of Statuary Here Scored and stressed that "Interior Department officials fear that Washington is becoming an overcrowded graveyard of statuary."[5] It quoted Assistant Secretary Ernst as saying, "We have nothing against Shevchenko, but we thought it good time to bring the subject of statues to the attention of Congress." In reality, as we noted above, Mr. Ernst was emphasizing what is already generally known in Washington and recommending a more formal procedure of disposition of such bills. The Department had previously recognized the value of erecting a statue in honor of Shevchenko. And in this first lap in Congress a similar recognition was emerging.

By the beginning of May the members of the subcommittee approved the resolution and presented it favorably to the full Committee on Administration, chaired by Congressman BURLESON. The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman JONES, and its members deserve the highest praise for their critical evaluation of the resolution and their patient inquiry into all of its aspects. As indicted earlier, Congressman BURLESON perceived the possible value of the measure at its very inception. Moreover, the salutary impressions created at the March hearing were evidently so forceful that an authorization for the publication of a biographical documentary on Taras Shevchenko was introduced by Congressman JOHN LESINSKI of Michigan. The vital role played by this distinguished legislator is discussed at greater length below.

On June 1 the Committee on House Administration met in executive session and ordered favorably reported to the House both House Joint Resolution 311, authorizing the erection of the statue, and House Resolution 524, authorizing the printing, as a House document, the biography of Shevchenko.[6] The following day Congressman LESINSKI submitted the reports on both measures in the House. Report No. 1741 covered the Shevchenko statue. Because of certain unexpected developments concerning the House calendar, the memorial bill was not considered for a vote until later in the month. This seriously complicated the project as concerns the Senate. The authorization for the biography was passed earlier. The complication led to an intensive effort via very conceivable means to apprise the members of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee of the forthcoming passage of the bill in the House.

It was on June 24 that the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without objection.[7] A fine statement on the event was made by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI who declared among other things that such "an idealistic undertaking should understandably be endorsed by the Congress as a very important factor during this cold war of ideologies between the United States and the Kremlin."[8] The success realized at this stage in the passage of the bill would surely not have been possible without the cooperative and understanding efforts of all those mentioned above and also of Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the House majority leader.

The next stage was, of course, the Senate. With talk of adjournment rife in the air, the mentioned complication could now be well appreciated. A further embarrassing difficulty arose from the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 54, a parallel but bare and undescriptive measure sponsored by Senator JAVITS in hasty and unfortunate circumstances, failed to be reported out favorably by the Rules Committee. When House Joint Resolution 311 reached the committee on June 27, it was clearly evident that in this complicated situation only the most concentrated action could reap full success for the bill.[9] Every means was seized to expedite the measure. There aren't words adequate enough to express public gratitude for the superb cooperation and efficient understanding displayed by Mr. Gordon F. Harrison, chief clerk and counsel of the Rules Committee, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, and their respective staffs. In this phase and the subsequent one, their efforts were indispensable and most praiseworthy.

Once it was decided that a recess would take effect, prudence dicta' d that this action be postponed until August, during which period of time a more expanded base of familiarity with Shevchenko's works and significance could be formed. In the month of July this wri¹er edited and prepared the House biographical document on the poet. This definitely provided a broader foundation of understanding concerning the man and his contributions. Advance copies were sent to every member of the Rules Committee prior to the reconvening of the Senate. Moreover, letters from groups and individuals continued to pour into the Senate in support of the resolution. These and other preparations were made to assure the successful passage of House Joint Resolution 311 in the final days of the 86th Congress.

Thus, on August 29, the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 16, p. D513.

[3] Pravda Ukrainy, Aug. 12, 1960.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 16, p. D163.

[5] The Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1960.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, p. 12050.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14237.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14397.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14413.

Joint Resolution 311 in its Report 1930.[10] Two days later, on August 31, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, who played an instrumental role in the expedition of the bill, moved that it be considered for a vote, and the resolution was passed.[11] On that occasion Senator JAVITS addressed the Senate with a concise statement containing all the essentials about Shevchenko. In addition to the sustaining support given by the popular Senator of New York, the wholehearted efforts and aid of Senator Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut and their staffs, as well as of Mr. Harry Burke, will long be remembered and appreciated. As in the House, many other legislators in the Senate were properly informed about the bill and expressed their willingness to support it. Their valuable backing led to a speedy affirmative vote on the bill which then was quickly cleared for the President's signature.[12] On September 13 the President signed it.

EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

It was pointed out above that one of the most significant developments in this entire undertaking was the publication of House Document No. 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–1861." This was made possible by the action taken by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI who introduced House Resolution 524 on May 11. The measure was agreed to on June 7. Congressman LESINSKI made a solid contribution in this regard since many Americans are totally unfamiliar with this champion of liberty. In preparing the 45-page pamphlet this writer received the finest possible cooperation from Mr. John Haley and other staff members of the House Administration Committee.

This valuable documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero is so arranged that any reader can quickly appreciate the greatness of Shevchenko. The articles incorporated in it deal with the major facets of his life and work. The pamphlet consists of the resolution sponsored by Congressman LESINSKI, a foreword, the text of Public Law 86–749, an impressive illustration of Shevchenko, seven select chapters, an appendix, a short bibliography, and a useful index. It makes for easy reading and should prove to be informative to countless citizens during the period of the centennial.

Early newspaper reactions to both the statue and the pamphlet were exceedingly favorable. Featured on the first page of the Washington Evening Star was an article titled "Free Man or Slave? Cold War Warming Up Over Obscure Poet," with a picture of Shevchenko.[13] In it the writer accurately stresses that "As far as the West is concerned, Shevchenko's poetry reflects man's aspirations for liberty and national independence." Shortly thereafter another extensive account appeared on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune.[14] The writer of this article also points out the cold war significance of the Shevchenko project. As he starts out to say, "Next year will see a new twist in the East-West cold war. * * *" There can be no doubt that a mounting reaction will result from the nationwide distribution of the Shevchenko pamphlet. Most of it doubtlessly will be favorable once the meaning and value of the Shevchenko Centennial is understood in terms of U.S. national interests. This is the end the pamphlet is designed to serve.

THE SHEVCHENKO CENTENNIAL

The House document on Shevchenko's biography represents the first official Western governmental publication in honor of any Ukrainian national hero. For those familiar with this East European figure, this is a new and encouraging development. But the legislation for a statue in honor of the poet has precedents elsewhere, for example, in Canada. As a matter of fact, the idea for such a statue in the Nation's Capital is an old one. This aspiration has been expressed for years and in the experience of this writer, strong pressure for such a project was exerted by Dr. Smal-Stocki, the president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, some 5 years ago.

With the necessary foundation laid, it is now the task of the Shevchenko Centennial Committee to resolve the many problems connected with the success of the centennial in 1961. First and foremost is the problem of familiarizing numerous sectors of the American populace with the man and his works. The excellent medium for this, of course, is the House document which should be distributed throughout all spheres of our society. Second, the problem of financing heavy orders of his novel pamphlet and the statue itself should not be difficult if the administration is both vigorous and efficient. The response to the financial problem will surely not be restricted to only American circles of Ukrainian background. As concerns this and their participation in the centennial, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that many other American circles of East European and other origins are vitally interested in this centennial. Indeed, Shevchenko's appeal was cosmopolitan and humanist. In its informational activity the committee has the task of establishing the cold war significance of the Shevchenko project.

A third major problem is the efficient coordination of effort with interested executive agencies. The smoothness and proficiency of the applied project depend on this. And, finally, the fourth problem concerns the magnificent opportunity the centennial affords to feature and highlight the colonial makeup of the synthetic Soviet Union and the captive and occupied status of Ukraine and all other non-Russian nations in this basic empire. The fulfillment of this crowning task is obviously contingent on the successful resolution of the three preceding problems. A heavy responsibility is involved in all of this; the challenge is formidable: but the opportunity is historic. With good sense, a vigorous drive, and in the firm knowledge that America's interests are being vitally served, those charged with this responsibility will meet the challenge for we cannot afford to muff the opportunity and its far-reaching consequences.

Mr. Speaker, the reaction of our own press to the action taken by Congress in this matter was generally good. Many saw the importance and significance of the Shevchenko measure despite the fact that certain highlights of East European history still escape popular notice. I believe that many of us will find the contents of the following representative articles of considerable interest. I include as part of my remarks the articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Chicago Sunday Tribune:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1960]

FREE MAN OR SLAVE? COLD WAR WARMING UP OVER OBSCURE POET

(By John McKelway)

The United States and the Soviet Union next year will engage in a tug of cold war over the memory of a dead poet.

Both countries want to honor him. The United States has sanctioned a statue in his memory in the District of Columbia. It is possible another memorial may go up in Moscow.

To be remembered on the centennial of his death in 1861 is one Taras Schevchenko, a Ukrainian poet who died at the age of 47. He is buried on the banks of the Dnieper near the town of Kaniv in the Ukraine.

As far as the West is concerned Shevchenko's poetry reflects man's aspirations for liberty and national independence.

However, Soviet Russia, after several readings of Shevchenko's works, has interpreted the material to be that of a Bolshevik who died before his time.

The obscure skirmish between the East and West over the poet is an attempt by both countries to impress 42 million Ukrainians who consider Shevchenko something of a saint.

While the Capital of the United States may wind up with a statue to a man hardly known to every American schoolboy, there are those who feel its presence will promote discontent behind the Iron Curtain.

One of these is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a chunky, talkative professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University.

Since coming to town in 1948, the professor has undertaken to discomfit Soviet Premier Khrushchev in a variety of ways. For the last 2 years, for example, he has authored resolutions declaring a Captive Nations Week and succeeded in guiding them through Congress.

His point is that most Americans do not realize that Russia is made up of a number of nations which were once independent entities and that the Soviet is actually an empire guilty of colonialism.

Dr. Dobriansky's latest effort to get the psychological jump on Mr. Khrushchev is a resolution passed in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

Passed first by the House, and later by the Senate on August 31, was a joint resolution authorizing a statue to Shevchenko in the District but without expense to the United States. President Eisenhower signed the resolution September 13.

The professor had done his work well. No one, in either the House or Senate, asked who Shevchenko was as the authorization for the memorial sailed through Congress. Yet it came at a time when Members balked at allowing a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt.

Two years ago, Dr. Dobriansky has since explained, he heard that Russia was preparing to honor Shevchenko in some way. Already, he said, the Communists had distorted the work of the poet, twisting and rewriting his efforts so that he appeared to be a revolutionist of the Marxist school. They had to reckon with the poet's tremendous popularity among the Ukrainians as well as other nationalities.

But Dr. Dobriansky has written: "A reading of Shevchenko will convince any objective person that he belongs to us, not to tyrannical Moscow."

CENTENNIAL IN 1961

Dr. Dobriansky worked up a resolution pointing out that there would be world ob-

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 18102.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 18529.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 19110.

[13] McKelway, John, "Free Man or Slave?" the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1960, pp. AI, 7.

[14] Wingenbach, Charles E., "A New Twist in the Cold War," New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 15, 1960.

servances of the Shevchenko centennial in 1961 and authorizing the statue.

He needed the approval of the Interior Department. At one point, a spokesman said the Department could not go along with the statue idea because of the feeling that Washington was being turned into a cemetery of statues to great men.

But when the professor explained what was behind the move—the attempt to offset Moscow's manner of remembering Shevchenko—he got the needed approval.

In the House, Representatives Bentley, Republican, and Lesinski, Democrat, of Michigan, and Representative Jones, Democrat, of Missouri, worked for the bill. In the Senate, groundwork was handled by the two Republican Senators from New York, Javits and Keating, and Senator Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

During the adjournment for the two conventions, Dr. Dobriansky worked up some material on Shevchenko for members of the Senate Rules Committee, who at one point voted down the resolution. By the time the Senate was back at work, the bill had been reported out and sent to the Senate floor for action.

MONEY ANGLE STUDIED

Today, Dr. Dobriansky reports, a committee of the Ukrainian Congress of America is planning the centennial observance of the poet and studying ways to raise the money for his statue. He says it is entirely possible Russia may also build one in Moscow. Locally, the site and design have not been selected.

"In the incessant cold war," Dr. Dobriansky has written, "it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation."

FROM SERFDOM

The Ukraine, according to Dr. Dobriansky, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain and the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. itself.

Shevchenko rose out of serfdom to become the greatest of Ukrainian poets. He dreamed of a Ukrainian language and literature separate from Russian and of his country's independence and freedom from the rule of the czars.

And in one of his poems, influenced by the American Revolution, he asked:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday!"

[From New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 15, 1960]

A NEW TWIST IN THE COLD WAR

(By Charles E. Wingenbach)

WASHINGTON.—Next year will see a new twist in the East-West cold war—that is, if a long-dead Slavic poet few Americans ever heard of and a host of very-much-alive Congressmen and college professors have their way.

If this sounds as macabre as opening Grant's Tomb, it isn't. But the same kind of controversy and confusion are involved.

Prodded by a persuasive Georgetown University professor, the President and Congress recently approved a project to build a statue in honor of Taras Schevchenko, the poet-laureate of now-Soviet Ukraine who died in 1861. Reports that Soviet Russia planned a mammoth centennial celebration next year spurred American officials to try to beat the Reds at their own propaganda game.

Here Schevchenko is regarded as a bard of freedom—Western style. Once the Soviets condemned him as a "bourgeois nationalist," but continuing Ukrainian adulation caused the party to relent and the official word now is that after all he was a good Bolshevik, who died before his time.

Amazing is the only word for the American project's progress. After more than a year of wandering through a maze of congressional committees and hurdling the formidable opposition to the Interior Department and the Fine Arts Commission, the resolution was suddenly whisked through the politics-ridden "bobtail" session of the 86th Congress, then signed by President Eisenhower. Last week the office of Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, released a 45-page brochure on Schevchenko's life and times.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, author of the bill, disclaims any intention to bamboozle the honorable gentlemen of Congress. No novice in politics nor stranger to international controversy, he has been fighting battles for this or that cause for years. A native New Yorker and a Republican Party aid, he was succeeded in lining up support for his project in a bipartisan way that has confounded admirers and critics alike. His successful Captive Nations Week resolution sparked Ukrainian-born Nikita Khrushchev's now-famous "kitchen debate" with Vice President Nixon last year in Moscow. His activities as head of the large Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents most Ukrainians in the free world, have earned him a dubious position as perennial Soviet target.

Asked, in view of his works in behalf of the captive nations, whether he had ever been behind the Iron Curtain, he replied with a smile: "For reasons of health, I'm afraid not."

Dr. Dobriansky's overriding concern is what he terms the West's ignorance of the Soviet Union's "prison of nations." This, he says, is the issue involved in the Schevchenko bill. The poet rose from serfdom to become Ukraine's national hero, and was free from czarist Russian jails or slavery only 9 out of his 47 years. In one of his poems, inspired by our Revolution in 1776, Schevchenko cries:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday."

In constituent-minded Congressmen's eyes, not the least of the Schevchenko bill's virtues was its stipulation that no public funds be used in the project. This, combined with a sudden understanding of the cold war issues at stake, assured the project smooth sailing.

Success, however, is not without its headaches. Right now, a harassed and balding Dr. Dobriansky is wondering whether, in view of local complaints that the Nation's Capital has become a graveyard for famous men's statues, the proposed statue would really be worth while.

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune, Nov. 6, 1960]

DEAD POET NOW A LIVE ISSUE—UNITED STATES, RUSSIA VIE IN HONORS TO UKRAINIAN—DIFFER ON POLITICS OF SHEVCHENKO

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, November 5.—Ever hear of Taras Shevchenko?

If you haven't, you have plenty of company. Those who haven't the faintest notion of whether Taras Shevchenko might be the name of the Soviet Union's delegate to the United Nations or a fancy Russian dish akin to beef Stroganoff run into the millions.

It is likely, however, that next year Taras Shevchenko will become another issue, albeit a minor one, in the cold war between the United States and Russia.

Taras Shevchenko was a Ukrainian poet who has been dead nearly a century. He was born in 1814 and died at the age of 47 in 1861. He is buried on the banks of the Dnieper River near the town of Kaniv in the Ukraine.

STATUE AUTHORIZED

Both the United States and Russia are planning to honor the memory of Shevchenko in 1961, the centennial of his death. At the moment, the United States seems to have taken the lead in doing the honors because it already has authorized a statue of Shevchenko in the District of Columbia. In all probability, Russia will match this with a memorial of some kind in Moscow.

As might be expected, the United States and Russia have different reasons for honoring Shevchenko's memory. In this country, the poet is regarded by those heading the memorial movement as a fighter for freedom, a patriot whose writings reflect man's aspirations for liberty and national independence.

BOLSHEVIK COLORING

Russia, on the other hand, sees Shevchenko as a Bolshevik who died before his time, a revolutionary whose poetry voiced the hopes and protests of downtrodden Ukrainians struggling to throw off the tyrannical rule of the czars.

Be that as it may, until a couple of years ago the name Shevchenko meant nothing to anyone in the United States except a relative handful of historians, literature scholars and Ukrainian Nationalists, including Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Russian economics at Georgetown University in Washington.

Dobriansky, an energetic and articulate educator born in New York City of Ukrainian parents, has devoted considerable time in recent years to attacking communism and making things as uncomfortable as possible for the Kremlin.

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

He has drafted congressional resolutions proclaiming Captive Nations Week, an annual project which has provoked irritated outbursts from Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and other Russian leaders.

Dobriansky makes the point that most Americans do not realize that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is made up of several nations which once were free and independent and that by taking in and holding these nations by force, Russia is guilty of the very tyranny and colonialism that it so vociferously lays at the doorsteps of Western countries.

The professor seeks through his Captive Nations Week proclamations to underscore the fact that in addition to the recognized satellites of Russia, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia, there are captive nations within the Soviet Union such as the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Armenia, and Turkestan.

CASE OF THE UKRAINE

The Ukraine, he contends, is a separate, non-Russian entity, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and the second largest nation in the Soviet Union.

A couple of years ago, Dobriansky learned that Russia was planning to honor the memory of Shevchenko. Dobriansky already knew that the Communists had distorted the poet's writings in an effort to make him appear a Marxist revolutionary. Dobriansky knew also that the Kremlin was well aware of Shevchenko's important place in Ukrainian history and literature.

Dobriansky recalls that his task as he saw it was to convince the American people that Shevchenko might be an obscure, virtually unknown 19th century poet in the United States, but to 42 million freedom hungry

Ukrainians, Shevchenko is a national hero. The professor declares that it is in the best interests of the United States to symbolize in every way the friendship and spiritual ties between this country and the Ukraine.

NO TAX CASH INVOLVED

Dobriansky drafted a congressional resolution authorizing a centennial commemoration in 1961 and a statue in Washington honoring Shevchenko. He obtained the approval of the Interior Department for the statue, despite the feeling within the Department that the Nation's Capital already is cluttered with statues and monuments.

Finally, sympathetic Senators and Representatives introduced the Shevchenko resolution last summer and President Eisenhower signed it September 13. The joint resolution authorizes a statue to the poet, but specifies "without expense to the United States."

Dobriansky reports that a committee of the Ukrainian Congress of America is planning a centennial observance of Shevchenko's death next year and is working out ways to raise money for the statue.

SEPARATE LITERATURE

Shevchenko doesn't rate a separate biography in the Encyclopedia Britannica, but he does figure importantly in an article on Ukrainian literature, which the encyclopedia recognizes as emerging separate and distinct from Russian literature in the 16th century.

The encyclopedia relates that Shevchenko, born a peasant and a serf, introduced a new and essentially democratic spirit into what had become modern Ukrainian literature. The poet is described as a romantic nationalist in his early writings, a revolutionary internationalist in his later work, who has become the symbol of Ukrainian nationality.

LINKED TO AMERICA

Dobriansky says that Shevchenko dreamed of a Ukrainian language and literature separate from Russian and of his country's independence from the rule of the Russian czars. Emphasizing his belief that there are close spiritual links between the American and Ukrainian people, Dobriansky points out that some of Shevchenko's writings were influenced by the American revolution.

In one of his poems, Shevchenko asked:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday."

Mr. Speaker, on this 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, which we observe in this significant Shevchenko Centennial Year, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is, indeed, the new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. It is a frontier which we must assiduously explore and cultivate; it is a frontier which colonial Moscow seeks to hide from us and the free world. And on this occasion I believe it is necessary to stress the importance of becoming more and more familiar with the basic facts of the many captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Toward this end, with reference to Ukraine—the largest captive non-Russian nation both within the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. I take this opportunity to append to my statement the text of an informative lecture on "Basic Facts on Ukraine and the Ukrainian People" delivered at Fordham University by Walter Dushnyck, the editor of the Ukrainian Bulletin:

BASIC FACTS ON UKRAINE AND THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

At the outset of my talk I should like to take the opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to Father McBrearty for inviting me here and providing me with this opportunity to try to give an informal talk on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

I believe that you who are studying the Russian language and history as well as the political system of the Soviet Union can only gain in knowledge and information by learning a few new facts on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people who, although against their own will and interest, are an integral part of the Soviet totalitarian structure.

1. UKRAINE—A HISTORICAL UNITY

Historically speaking, Ukraine constitutes a compact national political and economic unity. Ukrainians are the second largest Slavic people, being ranked numerically only by the Russians. The history of Ukraine began in the 10th century with the formation of the powerful State of Kiev, known as Rus. Such famed names as Prince Volodymyr the Great, Yaroslav the Wise, Volodymyr Monomakh and others are the first rulers of Ukraine-Rus, atlhough the Russian historical school maintains that the period of Kievan Rus was common to both the Russians and Ukrainians. On the other hand, the Ukrainian historical school, supported by the Polish and other historical schools, contends that Kiev was the original nucleus of the Ukrainian state, while the history of Russia began in Moscow and Suzdal after one of the Muscovite princes, Prince Andrei Bogolubsky, sacked and destroyed Kiev in 1169. The Ukrainian state existed on the Dnieper River and in the Galicia-Volhynia provinces until the 14th century, at what time it became part of the Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian federation.

The second period of Ukrainian statehood is known as the Kozak State which existed from the middle of the 16th century until the beginning of the 18th century, specifically the battle of Poltava of 1709, after which the sovereignty of Ukraine was gradually liquidated until it was finally suppressed by Empress Catherine of Russia. Such famed Ukrainian Hetmans as Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Petro Doroshenko, Ivan Vyhovsky, Ivan Mazepa, and Pylyp Orlyk were actual chiefs of the Ukrainian state who maintained their own military forces, maintained diplomatic relations with other nations, had their own monetary units, administrative and judicial systems, and were treated as the sovereigns of the Ukrainian people.

The third phase of Ukrainian national statehood began in recent times, in March 1917, when with the fall of Russian czardom the Ukrainians first proclaimed their autonomy and, subsequently, full independence. The Ukrainian Central Rada or Council issued its Fourth Universal, or manifesto, on January 22, 1918, whereby Ukraine became a separate and independent state known as the Ukrainian National Republic. This republic, headed by such prominent Ukrainian leaders as Michael Hrushevsky, Ukraine's foremost historian, Simon Petlura, Volodymyr Vynnychenko, and others, was promptly recognized de facto and de jure by several European states, such as Germany, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Brazil; and also by France and Great Britain, which granted de facto recognition to Ukraine. The Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federative Republic, in a note signed by Lenin and Trotsky, recognized the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine as well. This, of course, did not prevent them from sending an ultimatum to the Ukrainian Central Rada demanding that the Ukrainian Government stop disarming Bolshevik bands in Ukraine. Moscow followed up its ultimatum by sending two great armies under the command of Muraviev and Antonov-Ovsienko. For almost 2 years the Ukrainians waged a desperate defensive war against the Communists, and having received no support from the Western Powers, were finally subdued in 1920.

Since 1920 Ukraine has been in the Soviet orbit; since 1923 it has been an unwilling member of the Soviet Union. Theoretically, the Ukrainian S.S.R. is an "independent and sovereign state," with the right of secession provided by both the Soviet and Ukrainian constitutions. But in reality Ukraine is one of the first colonies of imperial Moscow with all its attendant features: national and religious persecution, economic exploitation, deportations and executions, cultural oppression and Russification—all of which works toward state-directed genocide of the Ukrainian people.

2. UKRAINE IN THE MYTHICAL MONOLITH OF THE U.S.S.R.

Contrary to the popular conception entertained here and in other parts of the free world, the Soviet Union is by no means a unified and homogeneous nation, but a conglomeration of many non-Russian nations and peoples. There are 16 Union Republics which have their national government with ministries and other divisions of power. Only such matters as foreign policy, defense and finances fall into the jurisdiction of the Central Soviet Government. Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, and Ukraine maintains its permanent mission at the United Nations and has its own Foreign Ministry.

You will recall that in July 1959 the U.S. Congress unanimously passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, which was subsequently signed by President Eisenhower and has become, in effect, Public Law 80-96. It was against this resolution that Mr. Khrushchev remonstrated in most irritated manner in both his public speeches in Warsaw and Moscow and in his article on peaceful coexistence in the October 1959 issue of Foreign Affairs. The pertinent paragraph of the Captive Nations Week resolution, referring to the enslavement of the non-Russian nations, reads:

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others."

This congressional resolution defined Ukraine as well as other non-Russian nations inside the U.S.S.R. as captive nations, a fact which is borne out by indisputable proof of enslavement by Moscow.

The Ukrainian always resisted the Communist rule. They staged many uprisings and bloody rebellions through the twenties, and suffered harsh punishment, such as mass executions, deportations, and a manmade famine in 1932-33. In 1941, when the German troops invaded the Soviet Union, millions of Ukrainians, both civilians and soldiers, welcomed the Germans as liberators rather than as invaders, because such was their hatred and animosity toward Moscow and its oppressive regime imposed upon them.

3. TERRITORY, POPULATION, RESOURCES, AND INDUSTRY OF UKRAINE

The territory inhabited by ethnic Ukrainians is about 328,000 square miles, with nearly 50 million Ukrainians. The Ukrainian S.S.R. has an area of 232,493 square miles and a population of 41 million. The latest Soviet population census disclosed that there were 37 million people in the U.S.S.R. who declared themselves Ukrainian and their mother tongue Ukrainian. It is our assumption that at least 10 million other Ukrainians either were afraid to declare themselves Ukrainians or simply preferred to assume the safe appellation of Soviet citizen.

Ukraine exceeds in territory such European countries as England, Austria, Belgium,

Holland, Denmark, Portugal, and Switzerland put together.

In per capita production of pig iron Ukraine surpasses England, France, Italy and West Germany; in steel production Ukraine surpasses France, England, and Italy; in mining of iron ore Ukraine is ahead of all major countries, including the United States. In 1956 Ukraine accounted for 48 percent of the Soviet Union's total production of pig iron, 38 percent of the steel, 56 percent of the iron ore, nearly one-third of the hard coal, 53 percent of the coke, nearly 30 percent of the natural gas. Ukrainian factories produced 80 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s locomotives, nearly 50 percent of the beet-harvesting combines, nearly 40 percent of the tractors, 60 percent of the traction plows, 48 percent of the freight cars, 44 percent of the tractor sowers, and 72 percent of the Soviet Union's sugar.

The primary industrial area of Ukraine is the Donets Basin. In 1956 the gross output of the large machine-building and metal-working industry exceeded the output for 1913 more than 130 times. A variety of machine tools is made in Ukraine, also tractors, locomotives, turbines, ballbearings, precision instruments, aircraft, and automobiles.

The actual industrial potential of Ukraine is much greater than the figures indicate, since under the present imperialistic policy of Moscow, the development of Asiatic areas is favored for strategic reasons to the detriment of the industrial development of Ukraine. Ukraine is also the breadbasket and sugarbowl of the farflung Communist empire.

4. HIGHLIGHTS OF MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORY AND POLITICAL LIFE

After the fall of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1920 the bulk of the Ukrainian people lived in the nominally independent Ukrainian S.S.R. Some 7,500,000 lived under the domination of reborn Poland, 1 million in Bukovina and Bessarabia under Rumanian authority, and about 650,000 in Carpatho-Ukraine under Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet rule, over 32 million Ukrainians was harsh and inhuman. There were attempts of sincere Ukrainian Communists, like M. Skrypnyk, P. Lubchenko, M. Khvylovy, M. Shumsky, and others, to wrest as much autonomy from Moscow as possible. In the middle of the twenties they succeeded in introducing Ukrainization, and adopted several political measures which favored the development of the Ukrainian culture and language. These Ukrainian Communists were predecessors of the present-day "national Communists" of the Tito-Gomulka type.

But Stalin and his henchmen in Ukraine, such as Kaganovich, Postyshev, Molotov, and Khrushchev, could not tolerate any deviation and proceeded with the ruthless liquidation of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, cultural leaders, professors, and even party members; Ukrainian organizations, such as the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Ukrainian cooperatives, and above all, the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, were liquidated and their members arrested, exiled, or executed as "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists" and "enemies of the people." In this action of liquidating Ukrainian patriots the present Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Nikita S. Khrushchev, was Stalin's most loyal executioner. He was appointed First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine in January 1938, and during his tenure of power in Ukraine he ordered the slaughter of Ukrainians on a tremendous scale. Only in the city of Vynnytsia alone were massacred 10,000 Ukranian men, women, and children in 1937–38. Previously, during the enforced collectivization of agriculture, over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation, while hundreds of thousands of other Ukrainians were deported to Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Arctic area, and the Far East, whence many never returned.

The Ukrainians who lived under Polish, Czechoslovak, and Rumanian rule between 1920–39, were predominantly Catholics of the Byzantine Rite. They had a better opportunity to develop their national culture, schools, and institutions, such as cooperatives, banks, sports and cultural associations, and the press. But they, too, were treated harshly because they never renounced their ideal of complete freedom and unity in one Ukrainian independent state, as they had enjoyed in 1918–20.

5. WORLD WAR II AND UKRAINIAN TRAGEDY

The Ukrainian people met the outbreak of World War II with the expectation that war would bring them an occasion to throw off the Soviet yoke and to regain Ukrainian independence. These same ideals were cherished and shared by the Ukrainians, highly dissatisfied with the nationalistic oppression they had experienced, in Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. They were encouraged by the establishment of the independence of Carpatho-Ukraine in March 1939. Other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., such as Byelorussians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestanis, Azerbaijanians, not mentioning the Baltic peoples, entertained the same hopes and expectations.

But the German Nazis, while paying lipservice to their fight for "liberation" of all oppressed peoples, failed to grasp the great opportunities which the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. presented to them in their struggle against the Kremlin. The initial jubilation of the Ukrainians was soon turned into hatred and opposition, when the Ukrainians recognized the true intention of the Nazis to turn their country into a colony and themselves into inferior slaves. As early as 1942 the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) came into being and declared implacable war against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. Concomitantly with the armed struggle of the UPA, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) conducted a mass propaganda and political warfare against Hitler and Stalin.

This struggle did not cease after the defeat of Germany and the end of World War II. Under the leadership of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, active armed warfare in which tens of thousands of UPA freedom fighters participated, continued until 1950, the year of the assassination by the Soviet MVD forces of Gen. Taras Chuprynka-Shukhevych, the UPA leader. The anti-Communist struggle was waged not only in Ukraine, but extended to neighboring Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. Regrettably, the West did not understand or properly evaluate the significance of this struggle of the Ukrainian underground, and never gave it any support whatsoever.

The first 5 years of Communist rule over Ukraine after the war, and even until the death of Stalin in 1953, the Ukrainians were persecuted at random and with unbridled barbarity. In 1946 the Kremlin physically liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church by arresting 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, and ordering some 3,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests to embrace the spurious Russian Orthodoxy or face exile or execution; hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were deported to Kazakhstan and Siberia for real or imaginary collaboration with the Germans, while other thousands of Ukrainians, especially members of the UPA and their families, were on capture summarily executed on the spot. It was Khrushchev himself who admitted at the 20th congress of the Communist Party in February 1956, that Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians for their disloyalty and opposition to the Communist regime, but there had been no place to which to deport them all.

6. UKRAINE UNDER KHRUSHCHEV

Upon the death of Stalin the Kremlin under the "collective leadership" thought it important to "liberalize" the regime lest it have to face the constant threat of rebellion, armed warfare and passive resistance. In addition to decentralization on all-Union scale, amnesty for political prisoners as well as improvement in their treatment was ordered. This came about after violent and bloody strikes and rebellions in concentration camps in Vorkuta, Kolyma, Kingir, Karaganda, Mordovia, Pechora and other places where the Ukrainians had succeeded in organizing powerful opposition groups to challenge the Communist guards. Many prisoners, were released, but in the case of the Ukrainians, they were not allowed to return to Ukraine, but compelled to stay in Asia as "voluntary settlers."

Moscow began stressing special interest in Ukrainians, and a number of Ukrainian writers were partially rehabilitated, and the number of Ukrainian schools increased. Along with this policy of "liberalization" the course of Russification in Ukraine and in other non-Russian republics continues in somewhat modified form. Attacks against "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism" is systematically being pressed by Moscow. Ukrainian patriots are now depicted as "agents of Wall Street and of the Vatican."

The rule of Khrushchev over the Ukrainian people at present time is characterized by the following features:

1. The Kremlin is continuing the anti-Ukrainian course, seeing in Ukrainian nationalism its greatest enemy within the U.S.S.R.; the anti-Ukrainian policies of Khrushchev include:

(a) trials and executions of members of the UPA and OUN, which have been going on throughout 1959;

(b) assassination of Stepan Bandera, leader of the OUN, on October 15, 1959, in Munich;

(c) persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, as exemplified by the third consecutive condemnation of the 76-year-old Metropolitan Joseph Slipy to 7 years of hard labor;

(d) deportation of hundreds of Ukrainian families from Western Ukraine to Kazakhstan and Siberia for the purpose of implementation of Khrushchev's pet project—settlement and cultivation of virgin lands of Asia.

2. Moscow is endeavoring, through the Ukrainian members of the Communist Party, to give the impression to the world that the Ukrainians are now partners—and hence equally culpable—in the administration and rule of the Soviet Empire.

3. While the all-out anti-Ukrainian drive is relentlessly pursued by the Kremlin, Moscow insists that all the non-Russian Republics, especially Ukraine, are not captive nations but equal independent and sovereign states and can freely secede from the U.S.S.R., if they so desire. Needless to say, any such attempt on the part of Ukraine would be ruthlessly suppressed, as it was in the twenties and early thirties in the case of the Ukrainian national Communists.

7. UKRAINIANS IN DIASPORA

While Ukrainians in enslaved Ukraine cannot openly voice their desire and aspiration to complete freedom and independence, this task is entrusted to some 2,500,000 Ukrainians and their descendants who live throughout the free world.

Ukrainian emigration is concentrated in the United States (some 1,500,000), Canada (500,000), South America (400,000), and some 100,000 in Australia, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and West Germany. The Ukrainians in overseas countries have their roots deeply imbedded in the soil of their settlement. In Canada they are recognized officially as one of the most dynamic ethnic groups: they have flourishing Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches,

schools, banks, cooperatives, political, cultural, and social organizations and societies. They have a Minister in the Dominion Government, two senators, a number of Members of the House of Commons, as well as in provincial parliaments.

In the United States, too, the Ukrainians have succeeded in developing their Catholic and Orthodox Churches; they have flourishing fraternal benevolent associations with assets of $40 million; they possess a well developed Ukrainian-language press (two dailies), as well as publications in English; a number of American nuclear scientists are of Ukrainian origin (Dr. George Kistiakovsky, Dr. Michael Kasha); they have many Ukrainian cultural associations—dance ensembles, choruses, orchestras and a number of soccer teams which are among the best in the country. This year the U.S. Census Bureau for the first time in American history recognized the Ukrainian language and Ukraine as a separate entity that could be entered in the U.S. population census of 1960. Such professional Ukrainian American organizations as the Ukrainian American Medical Association (with 1,200 members), Association of Ukranian Engineers, denists, and the like—number several thousands of highly specialized Ukranian men and women.

In the United States the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA), as in Canada the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, is the overall Ukrainian political representation striving to achieve recognition and support for the Ukrainian people in their struggle for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainians in the free world possess some 100 newspapers, one Ukrainian Free University in Munich, a Ukrainian Technological Institute in New York, the Shevchenko Scientific Society with branches in the United States, Canada, and Europe, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A., and many other organizations and societies.

The Western Powers, regrettably, still do not fully realize the power and potentialities that the Ukrainians and other peoples from behind the Iron Curtain represent in the West-East political and ideological contest. It is true that our "Voice of America," "Radio Liberty" broadcast in the Ukrainian language to the Ukrainians in their homeland, but these efforts are feeble in comparison with the powerful Soviet propaganda designed to lure Ukrainians in the free world to the cause of communism. There are also Ukrainian-language broadcasts from "Radio Madrid," "Radio Rome" and the Vatican Radio, which are much superior in effectiveness than our American broadcasts.

In conclusion, Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. It is a country with a compact homogeneous population, imbued with a fervent desire for freedom and independence. It is decidedly Western-oriented, due to its centuries-long cultural relationship with Western Europe.

For the Western Powers Ukraine, like other captive countries of the Soviet Empire, is a true ally, because it has always aspired to freedom and independence, and would not become reconciled to the alien rule of Moscow.

Whatever the future of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people may be the Ukrainian community abroad is far more unified and consolidated than it has ever been before. It can be counted upon to play a major part in the undying movement to restore the freedom and independence of Ukraine, as a vital and indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world.

A PROTEST AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF RELIGION IN UKRAINE AND A REQUEST TO FREE HIS EXCELLENCY METROPOLITAN JOSEPH SLIPY

1. More than 15 years ago, on March 11, 1945, an unprecedented persecution of the Catholic Church in Ukraine began. On that very day five bishops were arrested together with the metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop Joseph Slipy. Thereupon six other bishops and one apostolic administrator were imprisoned, so that by 1950, Ukraine was deprived of every single representative of the hierarchy.

Out of these 12 bishops, 2 were assassinated by the Bolsheviks, 6 died in prison camps or in exile, 2 died from complete exhaustion immediately after their release from prison, and the fate of 2 others remains unknown. The 68-year-old Metropolitan Joseph Slipy was sentenced in 1959 for the third time for his unrelenting attempts to govern the flock entrusted to him from behind the prison walls.

Yet, despite the persecution, not one single member of the Ukrainian hierarchy wavered in his convictions nor severed unity with the Holy See.

2. After imprisoning the hierarchy, the Communists liquidated all 5 Ukrainian Catholic dioceses and 2 apostolic administrations; disestablished 3,040 parishes with 4,440 churches, filling in the rest with Russian orthodox priests. Fifty percent of the 2,950 secular priests and the 520 religious were imprisoned, 20 percent fled the country or had to perform their sacerdotal duties in the underground, and 30 percent were coerced to accept Russian orthodoxy. All Catholic schools, elementary, secondary, and higher, altogether over 1,000 were transformed into atheistic educational centers; 41 lay Catholic organizations together with their suborganizations were dissolved; all Catholic printing shops and all Catholic publishing houses were confiscated. The most active ones of the 4,283,000 faithful were deported, and many of them gave their lives for their faith. Today the Catholic Church in Ukraine has been officially liquidated. Yet, she continues her work in the underground.

3. Although after Stalin's death the persecution of religion in other satellite countries somewhat subsided, in Ukraine the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite remains outlawed and those who claim to belong to her are severely punished. This is the consequence of the fact that the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in Ukraine was a natural link between East and West—between the Roman church with whom she has comomn dogmas, and the Oriental church with whom she has a common rite.

4. In those Ukrainian territories which were occupied by the Russians immediately after the First World War, the persecution of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church began in 1930. In that year, this church was officially outlawed and all her dignitaries deported. This subjection of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church to the Moscow hierarchy, which is fully dependent upon the political regime, shows that the Russian church policy is a means of the regime's imperialist policy which uses religious institutions to achieve a spiritual subjugation of its conquered territories.

In view of the facts presented, the undersigned does herewith:

(a) Most emphatically protest against the persecution of the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in Ukraine and indignantly rejects the deceiving assertions made by Moscow about religious tolerance in the U.S.S.R.

(b) Demand an immediate reinstatement of the freedom of conscience in the U.S.S.R. according to the basic principles of democracy.

(c) Demand an immediate release of the unjustifiably imprisoned metropolitan, His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipy, especially in the time when it is falsely asserted that Russian prisons hold no political prisoners. The undersigned demands of the metropolitan the right to return to Ukraine and the permission to exercise the functions of his archpastoral office.

(d) Demand information about the Ukrainian Bishop Basil Hopko, in the territories of Czechoslovakia, and in case of his imprisonment, his immediate release and permission to exercise the functions of his office.

Signature ----------

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain publications and newspaper articles, and particularly a petition which is called "A Protest Against the Persecution of Religion in the Ukraine."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his very able presentation today on the anniversary of the liberation and independence of Ukraine.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Ukraine. Tragically, this freedom to which these great people had aspired so long, was short lived. It may seem strange for us to consider the Ukraine in terms of independence, yet this is the manner in which it should be considered. Despite the maps which show this great area as part of the U.S.S.R., the Ukraine, in customs, traditions, and language, has always maintained its rights to nationhood. The masters in the Kremlin have realized this fact of history and, of all the present areas of greater Russia, the Ukraine has suffered specific persecutions to stamp out this fire of freedom.

It is a well-known fact that the Ukrainian people have manifested this desire for independence in 1918 and again in 1941 when the invading Germans held forth the possibility of it becoming a reality only to have their ideal shattered amidst the savagery of the Nazis. When the Ukraine was seized by the Reds again, they resuffered the same persecutions under Stalin. Yet, these brave people have consistently kept alive their firm belief and faith in their eventual independence. When we think of oppressed peoples and captive nations, let us never forget the Ukraine. Here are a noble people, a part of Eastern Europe known as the cradle of Christianity in Russia and whose capital city of Kiev is recognized among Eastern Christians as holy.

It is tragic, indeed, that the present condition of the Ukraine should be a horrible example of the duplicity and brutal application of power by the Communists. The Communists would have us believe that the Ukraine has voluntarily and of its own free will, exercising the prerogatives of liberty—the freedom to vote—joined the so-called Soviet Union. While on the surface this union would seem a peaceful cohesion of var-

ious states, it is, in fact, a union troubled by dissension and sometimes open rebellion. Revolts throughout the years have been a constant source of trouble for the Red masters. The present ruler of Russia is well known for his notorious and bloody role as the man who was sent to crush, without quarter, a Ukrainian attempt to self-assertion and independence.

So, while we contemplate those who are enslaved by the Russian masters, let us never forget that the Ukraine is one of these peoples—it is a captive and oppressed nation.

Let us hope that someday these brave and noble people who have carried in their hearts and minds the ideal of freedom against overwhelming odds, that they will be allowed to have that right to nationhood which is theirs.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. I would like to join in commending Congressman FLOOD for the very fine address he has made in connection with Ukrainian independence. I also call his attention to the fact that the Ukrainians are outstanding athletes. As a matter of fact, the Ukrainian Nationals are the soccer champions of the United States. I had the pleasure of helping several of the players participate in the championship game and in helping them get here for that purpose; also, in attending a banquet held in my district at which awards were made.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, independence and freedom have been the most cherished and noblest of desires for all peoples throughout the ages. Happy is the lot of those who can boast of their national independence for an unbroken length of time, and happier are those who have taken their independence for granted, free to enjoy it to the full, and did not have to struggle against insuperable odds for its attainment. The Ukrainians, one of the largest ethnic groups in Eastern Europe, and one of the most sturdy and stouthearted fighters for liberty and freedom, have not been fortunate in this respect. Centuries ago they lost their national independence. They regained it in 1918, only to lose it again in 1920.

For the 40 million Ukrainians who have been suffering for almost four decades under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship and who still yearn for their freedom, the 2-year happy interlude counts for everything, for the 1918–20 period of national independence was their most memorable and unforgettable years. They, as well as their more fortunate kinsmen who are living in the free world, enjoyed their freedom for a short time in their homeland, and they all venerate the beginning of that period, the day of the proclamation of their independence, the January 22 of 43 years ago. Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrate that memorable day as the Ukrainian Independence Day. I am glad to join these Americans in the celebration of this historic anniversary, the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might remark, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] never appears in the well of this House unless he has a message that is deeply imbedded in his conscience, his convictions and the challenge within him to battle for the rights of freedom to which all peoples are entitled. Today he has spoken on a subject with which his heart and his mind are filled. His eloquent remarks, framed in the sincerity so evident by the emotion with which they were spoken, and on the spiritual pattern of the inspiring and heartening prayer of the acting chaplain, the Very Reverend Leo Wesolowsky, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, truly reflects the universal sentiment of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I commend him for this latest of his many services to the cause of freedom, and wish to be joined in his remarks.

Yesterday, January 22, 43 years ago the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence. As a result of the Russian revolution, the czarist autocracy was shattered and the Ukrainians, the largest non-Russian ethnic element of that empire, asserted their freedom and declared their independence. Little more than 2½ years later, however, Ukrainian independence fell before the deadly onslaught of invading Russian Communists. Thus the first and original Iron Curtain was lowered on the Ukraine.

The institution of the Iron Curtain which has served to perpetuate the centuries-old oppression of the great majority of the Russian people, itself is a proven necessity for the Russian Communist policy of effectuating systematic genocide, political terrorism, and continuous aggression against the many non-Russian nations already brought into the captivity of the Red colonial empire on the one hand, and of spreading the propaganda of the workers paradise. The Iron Curtain thrown about the Ukraine and other non-Russian nations has proved effective in keeping many Western nations unaware if not uninformed of the struggle for freedom going on behind it.

For 40 years the Communists have ruled the Ukraine with an iron hand. They have turned a fair land into a prison house. Since 1920 there has been no semblance of freedom in that land.

Fortunately, however, neither the tyrants of Moscow nor their minions in the Ukraine can extinguish the spirit of freedom and of independence which all liberty-loving Ukrainians claim as their birthright. As long as that noble spirit lives, as long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by the Ukrainians, no dictatorship or tyranny can rob them of the independence of their hearts and souls.

For more than 250 years, the Ukrainians have cherished the spirit of freedom and independence. Today, as we celebrate the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian declaration of independence let us call upon Moscow as a test of their sincerity in calling for peace, to abolish the Iron Curtain and recognize in fact the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so have 5 legislative days in which to file a statement on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. The proclaiming of independence on January 22, 1918, in the city of Kiev, was the culmination of the desires, the aspirations, and the cherished dreams of the Ukrainian people. But, despite the gallant efforts of the Ukrainian people, within 2 years their freedom had been treacherously and ruthlessly suppressed by the forces of Communist Russia. They have since endured the yoke of Soviet tyranny, awaiting the day of their liberation. Although their freedoms have been exterminated, we know that the spiritual and moral fiber of the Ukrainian people cannot be suppressed. Nor can their desire for liberty.

The Ukrainian nation numbers over 42 million people and is a most important ally of the free world in the struggle against communism. During the past decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have continued to demonstrate their devotion to freedom and the ideals of independence by maintaining a relentless opposition to Communist rule.

It is with great sympathy and understanding for our Ukrainian friends everywhere, and with steadfast hope for the future, that I join my colleagues today in reaffirming the goal of eventual liberation for all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 there was celebrated the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence. Many people throughout the free world were able to openly and happily enjoy this celebration, but there were also too many behind the Iron Curtain who could only celebrate with heavy hearts and hope that the time may soon come when they too may happily enjoy this day and freedom. As this day is celebrated and one of the great Europe's freedom fighters Shevchenko, remembered, we also must remember our duty to work for the continued freedom of the free world and all people and the removal of the Iron Curtain so that people throughout the world can enjoy this great civilization we are a part of and take their place on the stage of life without bondage.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is an occasion which deserves special attention here in the Congress of the United States.

As the legislative forum through which the people of the greatest free nation in the world govern themselves, it is fitting that we commemorate the efforts and struggles of other nations to secure and to maintain their own freedom and national independence.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values and the riches of a distinctive culture. I have seen the great importance of these contributions in my own congressional district and, as a result, I feel I have a closer, more personal understanding of the deep dedication which Ukrainians everywhere have for the goal of personal liberty and national independence in their homeland.

The heritage of Ukrainian freedom is an ancient one. The oppression of Ukrainians under the Russian czars could not kill this heritage. And despite the incredible sufferings borne by Ukrainians during the 41 years of Soviet Communist domination, the spirit of freedom still burns as intensively as ever in the hearts of these brave people.

We owe it to Ukrainians everywhere, as to freedom-loving people throughout the world, to speak up on their behalf, to reiterate our sense of kinship, to condemn dictatorship and oppression, to share with them their heavy burdens, to assure them of our understanding and support, and to rededicate ourselves to the greatest work on earth—the struggle for true peace, the peace that is the fruit of freedom and justice.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago yesterday the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of subjugation under the yoke of the Mongols and the Russian czars. The independence and liberty of the freedom-loving Ukrainians was almost immediately stamped out by the Soviet Communist dictatorship, but the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people survives despite the purges, repressions, and cruelties of the Communist dictators. The flame of liberty still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of the Ukrainian people.

It is eminently fitting that we pay tribute today to these liberty-loving people who comprise the largest captive non-Russian nation both within the U.S.S.R. and behind the Soviet Iron Curtain. It seems fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we offer tribute as well on this occasion to all Ukrainian-Americans and to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., whose moral support and assistance in so many ways help the people of the captive Ukraine to keep alive the spark of freedom and to maintain faith in their ultimate liberation. With these thoughts in mind, I join my colleagues in honoring the freedom-loving Ukraine for her inspiring example in continuing the unabated struggle for recovery of the liberty which is rightfully hers.

A year and a half ago, in observing Captive Nations Week, we took due cognizance of the struggle for liberty of the peoples who for the present live under oppressive Communist tyranny. As counseled by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, we must continue to remind the people of the Ukraine that we have not and will not forget them in their struggle for liberty, while stripping the mask of hyprocisy from the Kremlin leaders and exposing them as the arch-imperialists of our time. It is the sincere hope of America and the entire free world that soon the Ukraine will join them in the family of free nations.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 22, millions of Ukrainians, both here and abroad, observed the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic, a nation which was established in the latter part of World War I. For the brief period of about 2½ years they enjoyed freedom. But the forces of oppression and destruction were gathering, and the Red army was on the march.

Late in 1920, the Russians invaded the Ukraine, occupied it, and put an end to all forms of freedom there. Since that time some 42 million Ukrainians have been oppressed and enslaved under Communist totalitarian tyranny. They have been subject to Soviet control longer than any other minority in the Soviet Union. Their people have died by the millions in slave labor camps, in prisons and in the vast expanses of the Siberian wilderness.

Even under unheard-of hardships and privations, and under untold misery, these dauntless and freedom-loving people have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their struggle, ceaselessly and systematically, with all the means at their disposal, in the hope that eventually their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence, will win out.

I am honored to join in saluting these courageous people, and I join in their fervent prayer that one day soon, they will indeed be able to celebrate their national independence day in their own free country.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, as a culmination of national desires and aspiration of the Ukrainian people.

Although the young Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of states, including the Soviet Russian Government, it was subjected to treacherous attack and assault by Communist Russia which through devious ways, including overt military aggression and subversion from within, endeavored to destroy the independence of the Ukrainian people and turn the Ukraine into a colony of Moscow. For almost 4 years, beginning with establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in March 1917, the Ukrainian people fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence, but deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic support by the West, they could not sustain the pressure of Moscow and by the end of 1920 the Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

But the freedom-loving people of Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation. During the past four decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have amply demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence of their country by waging relentless wars and opposition to the Communist rule of Moscow.

Both the U.S. Congress and President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate at the U.N. General Assembly session in the fall of 1960, a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of the Republic of China and others, raised their voices in protest against the persecution and enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

We are all fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshaling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, should demonstrate our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence comes at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under a new leadership. Let us hope it will be an era of peace and freedom for all peace-loving nations.

I trust that in the near future we shall once again see the United States and the free world regain the initiative in world affairs and that we shall play a leading role in the determination of such affairs. It is important that in the concept of the New Frontier we should not forget or omit the captive nations of Eastern Europe which have been suffering under the yoke of communism for many years.

The Ukraine, a nation of more than 40 million people, still remains enslaved under the ruthless rule of the Kremlin. Nevertheless, the people of the Ukraine have not given up their hopes for freedom and independence. They are waiting and hoping patiently, silently, and grimly.

On this anniversary of their national independence, we must extend a hand of friendship to the Ukrainian people and our moral support of their aspirations. We must also join them in prayer that their just cause will soon be realized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the proclamation declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent Republic was observed this week. Unfortunately, the freedom of the Ukraine was short lived as the new Republic was brought under the tyranny of

Soviet Russia in 1920. However, the flame of and desire for freedom has never been extinguished. Today, the spirit of January 22, 1918, remains alive in the hearts of over 40 million Ukrainians.

The devotion of the United States to the cause of liberty serves as an unseverable bond between the American people and the oppressed Ukrainians. The American people and our way of life must continue to shine as a beacon of hope to all peoples everywhere who have been deprived of their independence by tyrannical oppressors. It is our obligation and our privilege to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere so that all people might one day enjoy the blessings and joys of real and lasting freedom.

Today, the hope of freedom and the opposition to tyranny is strengthened by the knowledge that Ukrainians have not forgotten their experience with freedom and continue to strive for the restoration of liberty to their land.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, again this year, Americans of all faiths and of all national origins, pause to commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. January 22 marks the 43d anniversary of that proclamation, which was a culmination of the legitimate national desires and political aspirations of the Ukrainian people. Despite initial diplomatic recognition, the Soviet Union, in a pattern now so frequent that it is the rule rather than the exception, violated the sovereignty of the Ukrainian State and after 4 years of war, brought it under the physical control of Moscow.

The spirit of the Ukrainians is such, however, that they have never accepted Soviet domination, and political independence and freedom continues to burn in their hearts.

All freedom loving Americans join with Ukrainians, and with Americans of Ukrainian origin and parentage, in marking their continued protest against Soviet imperialism.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the observance of the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic which was marked on January 22.

The meaning of this observance has been eloquently stated by Mr. Wasil Dombrowsky, president, and Mr. Mykola Derbush, secretary, of the Minnesota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excerpt of their forthright statement:

January 22, 1961, will mark the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev, as a culmination of national desires and aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

Although the young Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of states, including the Soviet Russian Government, it was subjected to treacherous attack and assault by Communist Russia which through devious ways, including overt military aggression and subversion from within, endeavored to destroy the independence of the Ukrainian people and turn Ukraine into a colony of Moscow. For almost 4 years, beginning with the establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in March 1917, the Ukrainian people fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence, but deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic support by the West, they could not sustain the pressure of Moscow and by the end of 1920 Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

But the freedom-loving people of Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation. During the past four decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have amply demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence of their country by waging relentless wars and opposition to the Communist rule of Moscow.

Both the U.S. Congress and President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate at the U.N. General Assembly session in the fall of 1960, a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of the Republic of China and others, raised their voices in protest against the persecution and enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in this city are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1961, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. We, therefore, respectfully ask you to make an appropriate statement on the floor of the House of Representative on January 22, 1961, in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshalling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, should demonstrate our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the spirit that moves men to freedom was aflame in Russia just under a half century ago. One tyranny had been thrown off, and the nationalities that made up the mighty czarist empire asserted themselves. They formed republics of their own volition and set forth on the path of independence.

But, like humans, these republics and new states are most vulnerable in the weeks and years after birth. And the republics that formed in the aftermath of the Russian revolution perished when a new tyranny swept across the land. One such republic was the Ukrainian National Republic, which marked the 43d anniversary of its birth on January 22.

Words sound empty when it is the anniversary of freedom that died. But the men and women of Ukrainian descent who keep alive the memory of independence have turned their eyes to the future. They have and they support a program that would bring freedom again, they are convinced, to their beloved land. Some of that program has been proposed and considered in this Congress. Much of it has merit, but most of all we should be aware of the spirit that asserts the need to seize the initiative from the Soviet menace.

The Hartford Courant marked this anniversary with an editorial which I believe is worth noting. I offer it for the RECORD:

UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE DAY—WITH A LESSON FOR ALL

Today, Americans of Ukrainian descent are marking the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the Ukraine National Republic. It is hardly an occasion for unalloyed celebration, for in one sense Ukrainians are people without a country. Although the independence of the Ukraine was declared on January 22, 1918, and at that time recognized by Soviet Russia, it was only 3 years later that Communist troops overran the new nation, enslaved it, and in a variety of ways brought about the deaths of untold numbers of Ukrainians who refused to submit to Red rule.

On the other hand, the Ukrainians are very much a people with a country—even though at the moment it can only exist in their hearts. Under Communist rule, or around the world, they fight with every determination and in whatever ways large or small they can, for the eventual freeing of their nation and the return of independence.

But the occasion of the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day is certainly not for Ukrainians alone. Now more than ever, it has meaning for free countries everywhere. The Ukraine National Republic was the first victim of Soviet aggression. Since then a host of other nations have been grabbed by Soviet imperialism, on some pretext or another, or none at all. A few days ago, Premier Khrushchev confidently announced that communism is on the verge of taking over the world altogether. But even though this was a familiar boast, it is plain that international communism intends to continue to seize what it can.

What happens to its victims, the commemoration of Ukraine Independence Day bitterly attests. In the face of the increasing Communist threat, the cause of the Ukraine and of the rest of the free world is welded in one. All the democracies, the older ones, the newer ones, the conquered ones, and the many about to be born, have no recourse but to unite against the implacable totalitarianism intent upon making freedom something that exists only in the minds of those who lose it.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this month the Ukrainian people will celebrate the 43d anniversary of their independence.

It is particularly ironic that a freedom for which so many fought so long was so short lived, and that the observance this year must be held while the Ukrainian people are gripped in the most merciless form of slavery ever known. But it is heartening to realize that despite the years of suffering Ukraine has endured, its spirit of independence still lives.

In the past I have paid tribute to the great Ukrainian people for their devotion to liberty and I think it is well at this time to reiterate that behind the Iron Curtain, in the most oppressed of all lands, there glows the spark that someday may set the world ablaze with a newer and nobler freedom, because the love of freedom and the devotion to human liberty of so great a people well could provide the inspiration for all free peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I join all America in saluting the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which speaks for them in this country.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, as we reach the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, this January 22, it creates anew a desire on the part of our Nation to seek an extension of freedom's frontier.

The 86th Congress was militant in its pointed legislative action toward this end—the sincerity of its attitude toward captive nations and their leaders was reflected in the passage of the Captive Week resolution, Public Law 86–749, authorizing a Shevchenko statue and honoring this "Europe's freedom fighter," House Document No. 445.

The reaction was a God-sent message of hope to those behind the Iron Curtain and counteracted Moscow's distortions of our materialistic and conservative nationalism.

It is of monumental importance that the United States impress further the peoples within the immediate control of the Soviet nation that the false image of the capitalistic system and its leaders are but the mental figments of a clever propaganda—thus, to influence their loyalty and support of the Soviet Union.

We must, in our future actions, not only contrive to stop the spread of communism, but must, by every means, counteract false propaganda within the Soviet Union itself and its satellites to thus weaken our enemies from within.

The victory of this age of the cold war will speedily be ours when the internal control of the Soviet states will be weakened.

It can be best accomplished by destroying the Russian image of power and falsity of purpose.

The freedom loving patriots within these captive nations, armed with the truth and realistic proof, can cause such a measure of unrest and confusion that enormous military forces will be needed for security surveillance.

This aroused populace, flexing its muscles of freedom, will in itself weaken and destroy the stability of the controls at Moscow. It will hasten the end of the cold war and result in independence and freedom among all nations at the new, extended frontier of peace.

We must persevere to this end.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

On this memorable occasion I would like to join with my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to those peoples of the Ukraine who have labored and suffered under the yoke of communism since the brutal suppression of their rights and freedoms by the Communists in 1920.

History has demonstrated that the undaunted human spirit cannot be suppressed. The Ukrainian people and Americans of Ukrainian ancestry can take great courage in the fact that the free mind of man has always conquered the tyranny of a powerful aggressor. Above all else, this basic truth must be recognized and nurtured, for it is our basic weapon in the struggle with communism.

The Ukraine in particular has been a source of constant fear to the rulers of the Communist empire. The sympathies and hopes of the free world are with the Ukrainian people in their fight for freedom and independence. We must pledge ourselves to the goal of a better world where all peoples must live in peace, freedom, and justice.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the Ukraine's independence. Ukraine was the first victim of Russian Communist aggression, therefore, her tragic fate should serve as a warning for the free nations throughout the world, especially now, in these crucial times.

Although the Ukrainian people are no longer free, they still cherish freedom and liberty and they work and dream of the day when they will again be a free and independent nation. History has shown that the United States has always been on the side of those who value liberty and freedom.

Last year, the Congress recognized the plight of those unfortunate people who are still under the heel of Communist domination by enacting resolutions designating a Captive Nations Week and authorizing the erection of a statue to Shevchenko. However, these actions are not enough. Much more can and should be done by the United States to help these less fortunate people in their fight for freedom.

An even greater enemy than Communist tyranny is the indifference of free men to the suffering and enslavement of others and the complacency which accepts an injustice, however monstrous, as legitimate and lawful if only it is continued long enough. We must let the world know that we will not stand idly by while our fellow human beings are deprived of their rights to freedom and independence.

In this day of missiles and nuclear weapons, it is well to take time to remember this: The power of the human spirit and its eternal craving for freedom is a greater force against tyranny than our most destructive hydrogen bomb. To those in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, we must give our continued assurance that their resistance is not in vain and that theirs is not a forgotten front but a goal in freedom's fight for new frontiers. Let us do everything we can to spread the idea of freedom throughout the world so that all peoples now suffering under Communist domination may one day govern themselves in a world at peace.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence we express our solidarity with them in their struggle, and we pray that their wishes and hopes for freedom may soon be realized.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 42 million Ukrainians constitute one of the largest ethnic groups in Eastern Europe, and their country is among the largest in that crossroad between East and West. These hardy and peasant folk of the fertile steppe land, the solid core of East European peasantry, have tilled their farmlands for centuries, not only for their own well-being but also for all their neighbors and their overlords. The fact that their country has almost limitless riches in natural resources seems to have been a prime cause of their misery and misfortune. Its wealth and its geographic position has aroused the envy and anger of its powerful neighbors, and has brought about its conquest by alien tyrants.

For more than 300 years the Ukraine has been submerged in the Russian Empire, and during all that time autocratic czars and tyrannical Communists have done their utmost to suppress and eradicate what we in the West regard as the best Ukrainian traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, and their undying yearning for political independence. Only once in the course of three centuries they had the chance of attaining their goal. That was in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the Russian Revolution in 1917, the Ukrainian leaders seized upon the golden occasion and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. On that day the Ukrainian Republic came into being, and a new day was ushered in for the Ukrainians.

But the Ukrainian Republic thus born in the midst of misery and destruction did not last long. Two years after its birth, in the spring of 1920, it was attacked by Communist Russia's Red army, overrun and then the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Unfortunately for the unhappy Ukrainians, to this day their historic homeland remains under the totalitarian dictatorship of Russian Communists. Under Communist dictatorship they have suffered more than they did under the autocratic czars. Having regained their hard-won and richly deserved freedom in 1918, they were fated to lose it in 1920. But these liberty-loving people have not lost their hope, and they have not abandoned their longing for independence. In joining loyal and patriotic Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I share their genuine sympathy for the oppressed Ukrainian people in their historic homeland.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people on this the 43d anniversary of their independence. Suffering under the brutal heel of Soviet tyranny, many millions of our Ukrainian friends are free to commemorate this day only in their hearts and memories; it is hoped that they can derive some comfort from knowing that understanding friends in the United States join with them in remembering a happier day 43 years ago.

The Ukrainians are culturally an independent people. They have their own language, their own customs, their own traditions, and their own history. Yet they have been forcefully submerged within a foreign empire for over three centuries. The rulers of that empire have changed, but its oppressive policies remain unaltered. As equally unalterable as Russian domination has been the Ukrainian people's desire for independence.

The record of the Ukrainian people demonstrates that the love of liberty and the desire of a people for self-determination are among the most durable of human aspirations. Decades and even centuries of brutal oppression have frustrated the hope of Ukrainian freedom, but the heavy hand of tyranny has been unable to kill such hope; it lives today as it did 43 years ago.

Around us each day are constant reminders of the contribution to America made by the Ukrainian people who came to our shores. Today let us pay particular tribute to the Ukrainian's contribution to the traditions of freemen the world over. They are a people who while tyrannized refuse to capitulate; they are a people who while enslaved continue to maintain human dignity; they are a people who while subjected to barbarianism seeks a measure of decency and justice which is the right of all men.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the long and turbulent history of the Ukrainian people is saddened by misery and misfortune. Their modern history records, for the most part, their subjugation to alien regimes in their homeland. Though they have been numerous enough and determined enough to fight for their freedom and independence, yet in the almost unending struggles against their foes they were outnumbered and overpowered. That has been the fate of the Ukrainian people for more than three centuries. Only for a very brief period for about 2 years—in 1918–20—they regained their freedom, and against fearful odds, managed to safeguard their independence. But in the end they were engulfed in the Soviet sea of serfdom and servitude.

The overthrow of the autocratic Russian regime in 1917 gave the Ukrainian leaders the opportunity they had been seeking; on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed Ukraine's independence and established the Ukrainian Republic. But from the moment of its birth to the time of its eventual death in the hands of its ferocious foes the fledgling state was faced with insurmountable internal and external difficulties. And before it was able to cope with these, the Republic found itself at war with Communist Russia. Early in the spring of 1920 the Red Army attacked the almost helpless Ukrainian Republic, overran it, and by summer that Republic had ceased to exist. Then the country was made part of the Soviet Union, and the fate of the Ukrainian people placed in the unrelenting hands of Communist tyrants in the Kremlin.

Since then, for more than 40 years Ukrainians have been held down by their oppressors and, of course, they have known no freedom in their homeland. But the spirit of freedom and independence in them is very much alive, and they naturally look forward to the realization of their aspirations. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their Independence Day I join all loyal Americans of Ukrainian origin and echo their genuine sentiments, and with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the south side branch located in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1961, marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, and this is an event commemorated by Ukrainians throughout the world who are joined by all people everywhere who cherish the spirit of freedom and independence, and pray that those nations which have been enslaved by Communist tyranny and domination may be liberated from the rule of Soviet Russia.

Ukraine, after centuries of fierce and valiant struggle by the Ukrainian people for liberty, finally achieved freedom as a nation on January 22, 1918. But Ukraine independence was of short duration, and the Ukrainian people were again subjected to enslavement by the Russian Communists by 1920.

The Ukrainian people have remained free in spirit in spite of all the efforts of the Communist oppressors to destroy the Ukrainian national identity, and wherever the Ukrainian people are found, the words of their historic national anthem will ring out, "Ukraine will never die."

The people of the United States believe in the right of liberty and freedom for all people everywhere, and join with the Ukrainian people in the fervent hope that the yoke of Communist dictators will be thrown off, and that the Ukrainian nation will again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, a highly significant anniversary was observed—the 43d anniversary of the declaration by the Ukrainian people of their independence.

It was on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, that the Ukrainian Central Rada, assembled to represent the people of the Ukraine, proclaimed the establishment of the Ukraine's independence. The Ukrainian National Republic, created during the following year, was not allowed to exist for more than a few years before it fell victim to powerful tyranny. Yet the spirit of freedom still burns in the Ukraine, and in the hearts of those of Ukrainian descent all over the world.

I think that as we note this anniversary, it is appropriate that we also pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an organization which has done so much to keep alive the spirit of Ukrainian liberty. I am proud that in my State of Connecticut we have many dedicated members of this organization.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, which has just passed, is a significant date for those who are lovers of democracy and who are believers in the rights of all peoples throughout the world to have the power to determine their own destinies in their own ways. January 22 marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

The history of these freedom-loving people is well known. In 1918 during the chaos of the closing days of World War I and the turmoil that swept all of Europe the Urainian Republic was established. It was dedicated to the same principles of freedom that are the cornerstone of our Government. It was established with high hopes and with a feeling that these peoples of the Ukraine could contribute their share to the development of mankind and to the better world we all seek. The life of this Republic was all too short-lived for in 1920 the Red hordes of communism engulfed the Ukraine, and to this day these people are like prisoners behind the Iron Curtain that has engulfed better than half the world. It would be redundant to say the usual things here again today and yet possibly the only thing we can say is that these peoples who have suffered so long under the heel of tyranny have never throughout the long years lost their enthusiasm for liberty and freedom and for the right to live their own lives in their own way. Their example and their actions even though half hidden behind the fog of communistic propaganda and lies are a lesson to all of us. They serve at all times as a beacon of liberty and as a warning that we must be ever vigilant to protect our own precious heritage from those who would destroy it.

On the 43d anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Republic I salute it with the fervent prayer that in the not too distant future and in God's time when all of mankind are free to once again control their own destiny the people of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian Republic will take their rightful place beside the free nations of the world.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, I join in the expressions of tribute which are being made this week in observance of the 43d anniversary of the establishment of independence of the people of the Ukraine. We are solemnly and deeply aware of our common bonds with this noble people whose national ideology, aspirations, and desires are being tested in the dreadful trial of alien enslavement. We whose lives are mutually staked in the tenets of liberty and individual freedom are braced and heartened that in this trial the people of Ukraine are not found wanting. They continue an unflagging, valiant resistance to the rule and opposing faith of Communist tyranny. And their endurance gives brightened hope and a firmed strength to us and the peoples of the world who are engaged in this cause. We mark this anniversary together with Ukrainians everywhere with a true sense of deepened commitment to the pursuit of freedom from oppression and want and to the pursuit of peace for all peoples of the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the first day of this week marked the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. As we recall that January day 43 years ago when the citizens of the Ukraine declared their sovereign integrity as a free people, I should like to join in the common hope and prayer that that declaration will soon again be reechoed, and that Ukraine may take her rightful place among her sovereign sister nations of the world.

Freedom and independence are man's most cherished possessions. Individuals as well as peoples aim for their attainment but, even after centuries of ceaseless effort and untold sacrifice, all are

not successful. And, often those who are fortunate enough to attain their goal are suddenly reduced once more to subjugation by their heartless enemies. However, these people at least have the consolation of knowing that they have tried and won—and with this in mind they are armed with the strength and courage to win again. That is the Ukrainian case.

For nearly three centuries Ukrainian people lived under the oppressive czarist regime of Russia, and for about half that time part of them were ruled by the Hapsburg monarchy of Vienna. During all that time they tried to regain their freedom. The opportunity came toward the end of the First World War. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and created the Ukrainian National Republic. The great Ukrainian patriot, Professor Hrushevsky, was elected first President. They hardly had time to rebuild their war-torn country when they were attacked by the resurgent Red army early in 1920. By June the country had been completely overrun, and was subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then some 42 million unhappy Ukrainians have been suffering under the Soviet totalitarian dictatorship. Neither their own efforts, nor wartime conditions, nor postwar international developments have introduced any perceptible change in their sad lot of suppression, subjugation, and human bondage. What the future has in store for them is difficult to predict or foresee, but as long as they cling to their ideals of freedom and independence, they can be sure that their sufferings and sacrifices have not been in vain. I am glad to echo the sentiments of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the celebration of this anniversary, Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, more than 300 years ago the Ukrainian people lived happily in their historic homeland and enjoyed the fruits of their labor in freedom. At that time they were the masters of their own fate and destiny. Then in the mid-17th century a compact signed between the czar of Russia and the Ukrainian leaders, and the failure of the czar to abide by the terms of that compact, placed the Ukrainians under Russia's autocracy. Following the bad faith of the Russian czar, the history of the Ukrainian people is one of misfortune and woe.

For three centuries, except for the brief period of 1918–20, Ukrainians have been subjected to oppressive alien regimes. But the First World War offered them the opportunity to free themselves. The Russian autocracy was shattered in 1917, and the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence in January of 1918. That date, the 22d of January 1918, marked the rebirth of the Ukrainian Republic.

For the next 2 years the Ukrainians worked hard to rebuild their war-torn country and did their utmost to safeguard their hard-won freedom. However, before they had sufficient time to accomplish these goals, they were overwhelmed by their inveterate foes, the Russians. By the middle of 1920 the country was overrun by the Red Army, Ukraine's independence vanished, and the country was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, for more than four decades, some 42 million Ukrainians have been living under the oppressive regime of Communist totalitarian dictatorship. During that time they have endured all the hardships of totalitarianism, but they have not given up their national ideals or their devotion to freedom. On this 43d anniversary observance of their independence day, let us hope that they will again attain their national goal, freedom in their homeland.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. It was an anniversary of both courage and hope; courage against the tyranny of today, and hope for the liberty of tomorrow. In places like Amsterdam, N.Y., and elsewhere throughout the free world, this anniversary has been celebrated in the light of freedom. But the celebration is dimmed by the plight of those courageous Ukrainian people who are unable to celebrate their own independence because they live behind the Iron Curtain.

These people, who fought so valiantly for their freedom in 1918 only to have it taken away by a large, powerful, and greedy Soviet state just 2 years later, are an example to all of us who enjoy freedom today. As President Kennedy said just 2 days before the anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic in his brilliant inaugural address:

> Let every nation know * * * that we shall pay any price * * * to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

Until the Ukrainian Republic, whose people have fought continually against the yoke of their Communist oppressors, can again be secure in the liberty they so justly deserve, the freedom of all of us is to that extent incomplete and impaired.

January 22 is a day that reminds us that the desire for liberty cannot easily be stamped out in the hearts of a people as strong and valiant as the Ukrainian people. But at the same time this anniversary day squarely places the burden of leadership. Let us who are free rededicate ourselves, as our great new President has called on us to do, to the continuing struggle for "liberty and justice for all."

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the story of the unquenchable will of the Ukrainian people for independence is one that should be told and retold. Although the independent republic which was established on January 22, 1918, was short lived and the country by 1920 was subjugated by Soviet Russia, the fierce desire of the Ukrainian people for independence has remained a burning flame in a land wrapped in darkness and has been an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere.

In celebrating this 43d anniversary during the Shevchenko centennial year, I take pride in recalling the privilege and honor I enjoyed last year in working for enactment of Public Law 86–749 to authorize the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital and in sponsoring the authorization of Shevchenko's documentary biography. This biography, known as House Document No. 445, and aptly entitled "Europe's Freedom Fighter," is being read in many quarters of the world today. The recent propaganda blasts from Moscow about our Shevchenko's observance and the Soviet reaction to our enactment of the captive nations' resolution are solid proof that our efforts to assure the enslaved peoples of our continuing interest and support are causing consternation in the Communist circles.

On this occasion let us renew our pledges of support in behalf of the cause of a liberated Ukraine and the freedom of all captive non-Russian nations from the alien totalitarian yoke. This support is in the primary interest of the security and independence of our own Nation. May our actions during the past year always symbolize the spirit of our united hope and efforts toward the freedom of all enslaved nations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is one of the largest countries in Eastern Europe, at the crossroad between east and west. For centuries it has been the meeting place of two opposing civilizations, and became an apple of discord between powerful forces contending for its possession. That is the principal reason for the inability of the Ukrainian people, gallant and courageous as they are, to cope with their envious adversaries in their struggle for freedom. National independence has eluded these people for some three centuries; it has been denied to them by their powerful neighbors on the east, the Russians.

Only at the time of the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917 they saw their chance, seized upon it, and declared their freedom. That was on the historic day of January 22, 1918. Then it seemed that the centuries-old Ukrainian dream of independence, thus attained, would last. Unfortunately the course of international events put the existence of independent Ukraine in jeopardy, and before the end of 1920, the Ukrainian Republic was swallowed by the Soviet Union. Today some 42 million Ukrainians live in their homeland under the oppressive Communist regime instituted there by the Kremlin. But even under the ruthless Soviet taskmaster the Ukrainian people have not relinquished their national ideals, their desire for freedom and independence. On the observance of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we all hope that again they attain their goal, their freedom and independence in their historic homeland.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to those peoples of the Ukraine who have labored and suffered under the yoke of communism since the brutal suppression of their rights and freedoms by the Communists in 1920.

Although the Ukrainian people are no longer free, they still cherish freedom and liberty and work and dream of the

day when they will again be a free and independent nation. History has shown that the United States has always been on the side of those who value liberty and freedom and last year the Congress recognized the plight of those unfortunate people who are still under the heel of Communist domination by enacting resolutions designating a Captive Nations Week, and authorized the erection of a statue to Shevchenko.

The independence of Ukraine, proclaimed by the National Council at Kiev, in 1918, most tragically was a brief one, for in 1920 the Communists brutally subjugated the people of Ukraine, and have held them under their yoke since that time.

The foundation of the democratic Ukrainian Republic was the culmination of a long struggle that began in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were first brought under the autocratic Russian regime. But the joys of freedom were short lived in the new Republic. Late in 1920 Communist forces invaded that fair land. And for the last 41 years the heels of Communist tyranny has lain heavy over the freedom-loving peoples of the Ukraine.

Like other wonderful peoples in Europe and Asia under the domination of communism, the Ukraine people have lived under the blackest periods in the history of mankind, because of the brutalities and crimes committed against them. However, the oppressed Ukraine people have never given up hope and heart for the day when they may have complete freedom. It is this dream of freedom that places no limit to the number of forces which motivate and put into motion the human desire to move forward toward freedom. The Ukraine people have possessed many fine virtues through their long and turbulent history, and they have clung to them steadfastly.

Despite four decades of hardships and privations and of indescribable misery, the spirit of hope and freedom is not dead in the Ukraine. It is my fervent hope that the dreams of Ukrainians the world over can someday be realized. In memory of this anniversary of past independence and in sorrow and grief for the freedom that was only too brief, I offer this tribute to Ukrainians everywhere. On this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, I extend my warm and wholehearted sympathy and my very best wishes to a fine and courageous people.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, each January 22, as it passes, gives the lie to the Soviet myth that Communist policies toward other peoples are peace loving and nonaggressive.

On January 22, 1918, the great and proud Ukrainian people declared their independence and proceeded to establish the Ukrainian National Republic in their sacred homeland. But since genuine liberty was intolerable to the Bolsheviks even in that day, the Red armies soon crushed the infant republic and by 1920 it existed only as another chapter in the long and tragic history of the Ukrainian nation.

Those who live in freedom have a solemn responsibility to encourage the spark of liberty wherever it yet flickers behind the Iron Curtain. We know that in spite of the ruthless suppressions of the Ukrainian people in the 1930's and the 1940's and the 1950's that their hope of freedom still exists to haunt the masters of the Kremlin.

Each January 22 as it dawns must ever be the occasion for us who enjoy national independence and individual freedom to commemorate the age-old struggle of this valiant people.

As long as freemen live, the heroic struggle of Ukrainians against Russian tyranny serves as an example of the human spirit's indomitable drive to secure liberty.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence have always been man's noblest, most cherished ideals, his ultimate goals. This has been no less true with peoples and nations. They all have fought for the attainment of their independence, and have been prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice in its defense. The Ukrainian people are no exception. After losing their freedom to the Russian czar more than 300 years ago they fought with all means at their disposal for its recovery, and in 1918 they had the chance. When the defunct autocracies in Russia and in Austria-Hungary were overthrown, the Ukrainians felt free and proclaimed their national independence. This was done on January 22, 1918. This memorable date then became a Ukrainian national holiday, even though the Republic founded on that day had ceased to exist more than 40 years ago.

In the middle of 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was put out of existence by the Red army, and then the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. But the Communists have been no more successful in their effort to uproot the ideas of freedom and independence among the Ukrainians than were the czarist agents in their day. And today the stout-hearted people of Ukraine cherish freedom as fervently as did their forefathers when oppressed by their ruthless overlords. These people, suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship today, have proudly kept up their heads, and are looking forward to a better future. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day one can only hope that they attain their goal.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many peoples have suffered under Russia's oppressive regimes but none of them have suffered so long and unhappily as the Ukrainian people. These sturdy peasant folk of the fertile steppe country had lived under Russian czars for some 250 years when the First World War broke out. In the course of that war, when the Russian autocracy collapsed, the Ukrainians seized the opportunity to proclaim their independence. This was done on January 22, 1918.

For more than 2 years Ukrainian leaders did their utmost to stave off threats to their newly founded state, but in the end, in 1920, the Ukraine fell victim of Soviet aggression. By mid-1920 the country was overrun by the Red army, the Ukrainian Republic was robbed of its existence, and the country made part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 40 years some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the Communist totalitarian dictatorship of the Kremlin, with freedom denied to them. But the stout-hearted people of Ukraine still cherish their hope for freedom and independence.

On this 43d anniversary of their independence day we echo their sentiments and join the hope that they will regain their freedom soon again.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that for more than 300 years the liberty-loving Ukrainian people have known freedom for only the brief 2-year period, 1918–20. For four decades, some 42 million stout-hearted and gallant Ukrainians have suffered under their ruthless taskmasters, Communist totalitarian tyrants, as had done their forefathers under czarist Russians for 250 years. But these cruel facts do not tell the story of the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom and independence. That struggle culminated in the birth of the Ukrainian Republic in January of 1918. The date of that event, the 22d of January, became a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and thus remains in their annals as a national holiday.

Since the birth of that Republic 43 years ago, and particularly since its destruction by the Red army in 1920, the people of Ukraine have suffered even more than their ancestors had under callous czarist agents. They have been dispossessed of their worldly possessions and reduced once again to the status of serfs. They have been denied all forms of freedom in their historic homeland, and driven to hard work for the benefit of their alien overlords.

However, in all this suffering and misfortune the Ukrainians have kept faith with their tradition. They still fervently cherish their ideals of freedom and independence in their homeland. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people during the last several decades this is the most encouraging fact. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their historic Independence Day we in the free world wish them more power in their struggle for their righteous cause—freedom, independence, peace, and happiness in their homeland.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanmous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Air Pollution Control Act by eliminating the time limitation and the $5 million ceiling on annual appropriations.

Present law authorizes appropriation of not more than $5 million annually for

9 fiscal years beginning with July 1955 and ending June 30, 1964.

There is no question that air pollution is going to be a continuing problem. It is a national problem, and one in which the Federal Government has a great interest and responsibility. Much of the work in the Federal program is of a long-term nature. Planning is difficult if those in charge cannot look for Federal aid with any certainty beyond June 30, 1964.

The $5 million annual ceiling on appropriations is neither realistic nor desirable. With this ceiling a sudden breakthrough in research requiring appropriations beyond the ceiling could not be followed up speedily. I am not passing judgment on how much can be spent wisely. That judgment should be left to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Public Health Service should not be blocked from requesting whatever sums may be needed.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 16, I introduced a farm bill. At that time I made some brief remarks on the farm problem and asked for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Through some oversight or neglect those remarks never appeared in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I therefore include the following statement in the body of the RECORD:

ON THE FARM PROBLEM—CONSERVATION RESERVE I

Because I come from the best farming section in America—the great State of Iowa—and because I am keenly aware of some of the problems that exist in the areas that depend on agriculture and, more importantly, the problem of the farmer himself, and because the real problem that farmers have to contend with has not been effectively dealt with in the Congress, I am going to become more interested than ever in dealing with this question on a sound basis.

All of us are keenly aware of the fact that this is one of the most difficult domestic problems that we have and it will call for application of the best talents that we can find. This problem, in my opinion, must be looked at from a nonpartisan viewpoint, keeping in mind what is best for the country first and what is best for agriculture second, and creating and passing legislation that will be understood and be of inestimable value to the 88 percent of the people who do not live on the farms, but who have a direct interest in the farmer's welfare first of all because he wants and needs good and adequate food supply and second because he, as a fairminded citizen, is interested in the farmer having his fair share of the prosperity enjoyed by the rest of the people in the United States.

One of the greatest problems with which the farmer must contend is inflation. We who are Members of Congress and can have an influence on inflationary trends must contend with this problem for the benefit of all economic groups but especially for the farmer. Every legislator should be constantly aware of the fact that when he promotes programs that are inflationary, while it hurts all of us, it hurts the farmer a lot more because on a per capita basis, the farmer buys more than any other large economic group in America and; therefore, loses more from inflation. We cannot continue to be uninterested or get calloused about this grave national problem that has been plaguing us and will hurt us more in the future unless it is brought under control.

There can be some things accomplished by the Congress that could have a lasting and desirable effect on the farm economy and we ought to get on with the consideration of that business immediately. I shall be putting forth my best efforts to point up some of the important problems and answers to the problems that have been suggested to me by the farmers of the First Congressional District of Iowa whom I have the high honor and privilege to serve.

I will speak on a number of those subjects at some future date. They are:

1. Voluntary land retirement as a logical method of reducing agricultural production.
2. The popularity of the conservation reserve land retirement program.
3. Voluntary land retirement is effective in reducing agricultural production.
4. Rebuttal to some of the conservation reserve criticisms.

Today I am talking on the subject of voluntary land retirement as a logical method of reducing agricultural production.

Almost every agricultural census since 1880 has shown that American farms are becoming larger and larger. This increase in the size of our farms is caused by technology by new and more efficient machinery aided and abetted by a vast reservoir of land constantly becoming available through death, retirement, ill health, or transference to other occupations. Without effective intervention of any kind, this trend will continue indefinitely.

The record clearly shows that the soil bank's conservation reserve program has taken up much of the land which otherwise would have been placed on the market through the constant attrition of old age, ill health, and kindred factors. Thus this type of land did not continue in active production by becoming parts of larger and larger farming units. Instead, the Government rented the land, took it out of production, and assisted the owners in establishing soil, wildlife, or water conservation measures which preserve it for that day in the future when it will be badly needed by the growing population in America. It is my firm belief that this is the least painful, least irritating and most practical and most effective method of shrinking our national agricultural plant which almost everyone agrees is now much too large.

There are some who say that the agricultural plant should be shrunken through survival of the fittest in the jungle of economic competition. Perhaps this is a sound approach in the field of industrial economics although I doubt it, but when applied to the field of agricultural economics it has one, often overlooked, serious flaw. This flaw is that individual farmers may become bankrupt, but the land they operate continues in production under other hands until often times the soil, itself, is bankrupt. When this happens we have depleted the best natural resource we have. One may observe the result of this kind of economics and tragic neglect within 15 miles of the Capitol dome, where land that produced bountiful crops during colonial days now produces only thin stands of scrub trees and weeds. The loss or serious damage to a quarter of a billion acres of our remaining precious topsoil is far too high a price to pay for adjusting supplies to demand.

There are those who say that the only fair and equitable solution is to share the market pro rata among all active farmers. As a last resort, this may be justifiable. But in my opinion we have not reached this last extremity as long as there are many thousands of farmowners who are perfectly willing to completely retire their land from production.

Why should we demand contraction from those who want to expand, and at the same time force continued activity on the farms of those who are anxious to retire? Such a policy pleases no one. In all sincerity, I say this does not seem to me to be good politics, good economics, good psychology, nor good Americanism.

For these reasons I urge this Congress to immediately push forward toward the solution of agriculture's surplus problems with a vigorous, voluntary land retirement program. No one knows exactly how much land must be retired in order to catch up with our exploding capacity to produce. But surely everyone will agree that if enough land is retired, over production will be solved in the aggregate and those farmers who choose to continue in agriculture can make a decent living.

COMMENTS ON A BILL FOR EXTENSION AND AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1956

After an extended and concentrated study of the problems relative to the farm question, I have authored and am introducing today a bill which I believe ought to be considered immediately by the great Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives.

The bill provides for 10 major changes in the Agriculture Act of 1956. They are:

1. Extend the period during which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into conservation reserve contracts through 1969;
2. Change the authorized period of contracts for the establishment of tree cover from 15 to 20 years;
3. Provide for a limit of 80 million acres under the conservation reserve program in lieu of the monetary limit as now provided in the Soil Bank Act;
4. Make land owned by the State and Federal Government ineligible to be placed in the conservation reserve program;
5. Provide for a $10,000 annual payment limitation to any producer within any State;
6. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make annual payments in cash or by the issuance of certificates redeemable in wheat or feed grains;
7. Require the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce the conservation reserve program not later than March 1 of the year preceding the first year of the contract period;
8. Require producers who enter into conservation reserve contracts to agree to carry out farming operations on the entire farm in accordance with good farming practices;
9. Provide for a 100 percent civil penalty instead of the 50 percent as now provided in the Soil Bank Act; and
10. Provide that for a period of 5 years after such lands are first devoted to agricultural production, newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project of lands reclaimed by flood-control projects shall be ineligible for certain crop loans, soil bank payments, price support benefits, and other farm payments.

While I am sure that these may not be the only answers to the problem and, while in certain respects my bill may need some further study and possibly further refinements and, while an extended hearing on this whole problem might prove some additional amendments are necessary, I do contend that the bill I am introducing is a logical one and a good base to start from.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to mark this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. I am pleased to be able to call attention to the constant battle fought by the Ukrainian people against the Russian rulers who hold the Ukraine and its people as a Red colony, while assailing colonialism in propaganda broadcasts and messages.

The myth of Soviet unity is exploded by the people of Ukraine and other captive nations. The violent reaction of Premier Khrushchev to the captive nations resolution passed by this Congress last year clearly shows the keen awareness on the part of the Kremlin rulers of the deep-seated desire for freedom by the people of the captive nations which are part of the Red bloc today.

The free people of the world are bound together in a desire to release those people of Ukraine who are forcibly held in bondage by the Russian overlords. Let us renew our pledge of friendship and support to the Ukrainian people. Let them know that we in freedom's citadel are with them in their quest for freedom with peace, independence with honor.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I have again introduced my resolution calling upon the President to proclaim as days of observance the historic national days of the Ukraine and 18 other captive nations.

I think it appropriate that Americans express in this way their spiritual kinship with all people who yearn for freedom and particularly with the people of those nations that, once free, are now enslaved by ruthless communism.

On this anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination to all who now suffer behind the Iron Curtain of Red tyranny.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHERER for January 26 and 27, on account of discussion of highway legislation at Kansas City, Mo., on January 26 and Committee on Un-American Activities matters at Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 27.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 1 hour each on January 25.

Mr. BAILEY, for 40 minutes, on January 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SLACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. DOYLE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia.

(At the request of Mr. CONTE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT in four instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

412. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting part VI, "Studies of the Economic and Social Effects of Highway Improvement," which relates to the final report of the highway cost allocation study, pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 387), as amended by section 2 of the act approved August 28, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

413. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Lake Erie shoreline from the Michigan-Ohio State line to Marblehead, Ohio, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

414. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 22, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on Caseville Harbor, Mich., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 24, 1945, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

415. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 3, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Pascagoula Harbor, Miss., made in response to an item in Public Law 86–645, approved July 14, 1960, which calls for an immediate study to be made of the project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, House Document No. 98, 86th Congress, to determine if further modification is warranted (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

416. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 31, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on hurricane survey of Brunswick and St. Simons Island, Ga., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Public Works.

417. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Agriculture.

418. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill amending several laws administered by the Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

419. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

420. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for examples and appropriate assistance by the Federal Government in shelter construction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

421. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report for the period ending December 31, 1960, relating to Federal contributions, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

422. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 17,500,000 pounds of cordage fibers now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

423. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6(d) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(d)) to authorize certain persons who complete a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

424. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

425. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

426. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

427. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

428. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 86–149; to the Committee on Armed Services.

429. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

430. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department of Labor's annual report for fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

431. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of information pertaining to extension of the act's protection to additional employees, and summarizes data concerning the minimum wage, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

432. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

434. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property in accordance with the provisions of title IV, section 404(d), Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, amended, covering the period January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 404(d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

436. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of leases exceeding 5 years entered into by the General Services Administration during the period July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 85–493, approved June 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 294); to the Committee on Government Operations.

437. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

438. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

439. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

441. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 48th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

442. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

443. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

444. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in North Carolina, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended by the act of June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 239; 43 U.S.C., sec. 682b)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), relating to adult Indian vocational training"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

447. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to establish revolving-type funds in the Treasury for the Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

448. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

449. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

450. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

451. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

452. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the classification, segregation, and disposal of public lands chiefly valuable for urban and business purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

453. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to regulate certain unscrupulous activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

456. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, to transfer responsibility for determining the suitability of the home of the adopting parents for such orphans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Gerardo P. Magcanam and Pedro F. Bantillo"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

458. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

459. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary material required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

460. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the es-

cape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

461. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

462. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to modernize and liberalize the quota system and provide for the admission of persecuted peoples, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

464. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

465. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

466. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

467. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone President, Panama Canal Company, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

468. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

469. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in 72 Stat. 213a, 5 U.S.C., 1161(e), pursuant to 72 Stat. 214, 5 U.S.C., 1163; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings, pursuant to section 11(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610(a); to the Committee on Public Works.

471. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Public Works.

473. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 in order to provide for the financing of forest highways and public lands highways from the highway trust fund"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to issue certain regulations concerning air traffic at LaGuardia and New York-International (Idlewild) Airports in the State of New York, and Newark Airport in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3016. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3017. A bill to provide that coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed farmers and ranchers shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3018. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 3019. A bill to provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for uses of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3020. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3022. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to assist in the prevention of the interstate transmission of gambling information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3023. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3024. A bill to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3026. A bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3027. A bill to extend the benefits of the retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discrimination against female employees with nondependent husbands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 3029. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3030. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3031. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3032. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3034. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize the President, during periods of acute unemployment, to provide that all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits thereunder at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3035. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3036. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3038. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3039. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3040. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis (for determining gain or loss) of property acquired from a decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3042. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services to receive benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without relinquishing their retirement pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3043. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 3044. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities less

than total who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain the new $10 per $1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 3045. A bill to correct injustice by providing for back pay to certain officers as required by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat 840, ch. 307); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3047. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3048. A bill to extend the time for making application for compensation for unused leave accumulated on September 1, 1946, by members or former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3049. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3050. A bill to supplement and revise the criminal laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3051. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3052. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3053. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3054. A bill to authorize construction of the Ansonia-Derby local protection project, Naugatuck River, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3055. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3056. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3057. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Slidell, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the placement in grade 18 of the general schedule of 20 positions of hearing examiner in the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3059. A bill to amend section 2(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3060. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to permit employees to acquire an additional unit of insurance under such act by paying both the employee's and the Government's share of the cost of the premiums thereon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3061. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3062. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3063. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3064. A bill to permit the coverage under social security of certain policemen and policewomen in the city of Hammond, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of an individual's wages, salary, or other income shall be exempt from levy to enforce the payment of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3066. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special rule for the computation of net earnings from self-employment by ministers and members of religious orders under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways" as revised, codified, and enacted by Public Law 85-767, so as to provide for effective competition in the construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3068. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3069. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 3070. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3071. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Senior Citizens Service within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 3072. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal assistance, under the program of aid to dependent children, for children whose father is unemployed as well as for those whose father is dead, disabled, or absent from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3074. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3075. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3076. A bill to provide that the President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, an item for not less than $2 billion to be applied toward reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3077. A bill to provide that an officer of the Army, Air Force, or Navy assigned to serve as Director of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology shall hold the rank of not less than brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be, while so serving; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3078. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3079. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3081. A bill to create an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3082. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1955, relating to air pollution control, so as to authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out its provisions, without limitation as to fiscal years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3084. A bill to provide for the crediting to the civil service retirement and disability fund, at the option of employees, of accumulated and accrued annual leave for purposes of providing additional annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3085. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3086. A bill to amend the Clayton Act as amended, to strengthen our competitive enterprise system by providing for competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3087. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 20-percent increase in rates of disability compensation for service-connected disabili-

ties incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3088. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3089. A bill to provide for the development of practical means of producing water suitable for domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other beneficial uses from mineralized and chemically charged water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3090. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 3091. A bill to amend section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code so as to authorize the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of interstate highways to be constructed in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend section 1332(c) of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to diversity of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State's court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend section 3401 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3095. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3096. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, with respect to the recognition of organizations of employees in the Federal civil service and postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3099. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the establishment of National Zoo Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution relative to captive nations days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 122. Resolution to create a Committee for Small Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. Res. 123. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 124. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 125. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 126. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hatridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 3101. A bill for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Emilia, Guido, and Carlo Borsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3103. A bill for the relief of Mrs. P. Gabor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3104. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude F. Moorhead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3105. A bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3106. A bill for the relief of Kestutis Petras Mikaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3107. A bill for the relief of Alicia Kut Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3108. A bill for the relief of Sophie E. Cescolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrsena Nestorides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonore Sidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Kwan Suck Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Perez Garcia de Covelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Carmine Vincenzo Mocciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3114. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Maj. Gen. Howard McCrum Snyder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irith Ina Abileah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Sarah Laing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Woo You Lyn, also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3118. A bill for the relief of Dimitraki and Aliki Efstatopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 3119. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Polifronio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3120. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shing Mei Hui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 3121. A bill for the relief of D. L. Tedrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3122. A bill for the relief of C. B. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3123. A bill for the relief of A. V. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3124. A bill for the relief of F. W. Caddes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Joao de Freitas Ferreira de Vasconcelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Rajinder S. Bling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Amrik S. Warich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3128. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Maria Loncaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Lucille Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria A. Schmoldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Alvin Bardin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Kurt Sorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Linxwiler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Verne J. McCaul; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3138. A bill providing for the Administrator of General Services to convey certain real property to the Morgantown Community Association; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TABER:

H.R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Georg Puffal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3140. A bill for the relief of Najla Malti, Hanna Malti, Fadwa Malti, Constantin Malti, and Marie Malti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Domenico Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Richard Pang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3143. A bill for the relief of Constanzo Manes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3144. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3145. A bill for the relief of Carlo Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3146. A bill for the relief of Jozef Gromada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 3147. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Holtzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3148. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3149. A bill for the relief of Basil Manioudakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and to Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz; and providing for the striking and presentation to General MacArthur and Fleet Admiral Nimitz of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission To Take Action Regarding Tragic Grade Crossing Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention again to grade-crossing accidents that result from what has been termed an inexcusable disregard of duty by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I want to emphasize the tragic developments which may very well be the result of the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to act.

On the morning of January 17 one of the crack trains of the Illinois Central Railroad—the City of New Orleans—on its northbound journey to Chicago struck a tank truck carrying petroleum products. Some say it was hauling a highly dangerous commodity—butane. The accident occurred within the limits of Magnolia, Miss., and resulted in the death by fire of at least nine people, including the engine crew and the truck driver, as well as others not directly involved in the collision. This collision was another one to add to a longer list of occurrences which are identical except as to detail. The accident has been scheduled by Division 3 of the Interstate Commerce Commission for an investigation January 31, 1961, at Robert E. Lee Hotel, Jackson, Miss.

Mr. Speaker, this accident was bad enough. The relatives and friends of those who met this painful death will never forget the shock and horror of its occurrence. But the circumstance which is appalling to me and which begins to engender righteous anger is the utter failure over many months of the Interstate Commerce Commission to take one step—to do any one special thing to prevent such happenings. I am also beginning to wonder about the attitude of the petroleum industry and of those trucking companies engaged in hauling petroleum products.

On September 1 of last year I extended my remarks regarding grade-crossing accidents which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following day. I complained about the action of the ICC in rejecting for the third time the request of the railway brotherhoods for a general investigation by the ICC to determine what could and should be done to prevent these rail-highway grade-crossing collisions with trucks hauling gasoline and other dangerous commodities.

In my remarks I reviewed briefly the developments. I described the collision on March 1, 1960, near Bakersfield, Calif., when a train hit a truck with 7,000 gallons of petroleum, killing 14 people—11 of whom were passengers on the train. I mentioned the incident which occurred a few days later near Chanute, Kans., where a father and son, engineer and fireman, were killed when an M-K-T locomotive hit a tank truck. I spoke of the two separate collisions in June of 1960 near Jacksonville, Fla., when five more men were cremated in the same way. In August of last year near Birmingham, Ala., three of the train crew and the truckdriver followed the same route.

I pointed out that the five brotherhoods of railroadmen who are engaged in operating trains had filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition pleading with that body to conduct a general investigation of such collisions to find out what the ICC could and should do to prevent them. I mentioned the fact that similar petitions previously filed by the same brotherhoods had been turned down by that Commission. Then I pointed out that the ICC on August 15 made a decision again turning down the petition. However, that decision was not announced until August 29, just a few days before Congress was to adjourn.

In the meantime the ICC had received objections to that petition from two presumably responsible bodies; namely, the Central Committee on Highway Transportation of the American Petroleum Institute and the National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc. The gist of these objections was the claim that the investigation would do no good and that the gasoline truckers and shippers were taking care of the situation themselves. This latest occurrence with nine more dead people proves how invalid those arguments were. At the same time various railroads had filed pleadings in support of the effort of their employees and joining in the request for a critical inquiry.

It is amazing that the Interstate Commerce Commission denied the petition of the railroad brotherhoods. Only 6 of the 11 Commissioners voted to take that action and 1 of that 6, only a few days ago, was reappointed by President Eisenhower. One other Commissioner voted to grant the petition and four Commissioners did not vote.

The brotherhoods promptly filed a request for the ICC to reconsider its action. That was filed in September and the whole proceeding is still pending now 4 months later on that petition for reconsideration.

It should be remembered that Congress has delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission—which is a so-called arm of Congress—responsibility for the safety of operation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce. Having acted on this subject we have probably deprived the States and local authorities of power to deal with such safety at least as far as interstate commerce is concerned. Whatever the truck was doing at Magnolia, Miss., January 17, it is certainly an indisputable fact that the train was engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Speaker, a court in Portland, Oreg., has since ruled that there is no regulation over the safety of operation of trucks, by State or national authorities unless the operation is carried on for-hire. This is because some lawyer has discovered a new loophole in the already inadequate regulations of the ICC. In my book, gasoline or butane is just as dangerous whether or not it is hauled free of charge or for hire. However, the ICC has failed to do one single thing to close that alleged loophole or even to see whether or not it actually exists.

Despite the fact that I have had letters from the ICC and from the Petroleum Institute and the tank truckers, tragic deaths at grade crossings continue to go on.

I ask you, as Members of Congress, how would you feel if you were the wife of a locomotive engineer or fireman? Do you believe those men have a chance when their engines hit a tank full of gasoline or butane? Agony, pain, and flaming death are the only results. And how frequently does this occur? For that matter, would you not feel exactly the same way if you were the wife or the father or mother of a man driving one of these trucks? Would you not wonder every time he left on a trip whether or not he would come back? What organization representing men—either trainmen or truckmen—is worth its salt unless it displays some concern for the safety of its members under circumstances such as these?

In my closing remarks last fall I expressed my intention to ask Congress to authorize a full-dress investigation of grade-crossing accidents and what the ICC is doing to prevent them. I have refrained from taking that action as yet in the hope that the ICC would grant the petition of the brotherhoods for reconsideration. It is my belief that an investigation by the Commission, if promptly begun and carried forward, offers an opportunity for a more constructive and fruitful proceeding than one carried on by Congress in the white heat of publicity where accusations and recriminations are necessarily present. Unless the ICC acts at once, however, I will be obliged to ask Congress to authorize a comprehensive and vigorous investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to make part of my remarks the following articles appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, January 17, 1961, and the New York Daily News, January 18, 1961, concerning the tragic accident at a grade crossing in Magnolia, Miss., on January 17, 1961:

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 18, 1961]

EIGHTY-MILE-PER-HOUR TRAIN SMASHES GAS TRUCK, KILLS SIX

MAGNOLIA, MISS., January 17.—The streamliner City of New Orleans, speeding toward Chicago at nearly 80 miles per hour with its whistle blowing like hell, smashed into a gasoline truck today, killing six and injuring six.

The 9-car express rammed the truck at a crossing in downtown Magnolia, a community of 2,200 in south Mississippi, about 100 miles north of New Orleans. Stores and offices line the streets on both sides of the track.

The truck exploded, spewing flames as high as the trees and the length of the train. The big diesel—bound from New Orleans to Chicago—skidded 300 yards along the track that divides the town, then came to a halt.

ENGINEER, FIREMAN DEAD

Among the dead were the train's engineer and fireman, J. A. (Jimmy) Livingston, of McComb, Miss., and John Collins, of Jackson; and the truckdriver, Morris Piggot, operator of a small store near McComb.

The others killed were identified as Bobby Gwin, a freight yard employee, and Hancey Johns and Charles Hughes, grain unloaders. All three were from Magnolia.

R. L. Williams, a Magnolia painter, was in a Main Street store when he heard the streamliner approaching, its whistle blowing like hell. He said the truckdriver apparently didn't hear the train and started slowly across the tracks.

ONLY A WARNING SIGN

There is a red and white sign warning motorists to stop at the crossing, but there are no flashing lights or crossbars.

Flaming gasoline rained on the workers, boxcars, and a nearby warehouse. The freight cars and warehouse were badly burned.

Dr. Claude Pettey, a dentist whose office is near the depot, saw Percy Nelson, a train yard laborer, staggering down the tracks with his clothes on fire. Pettey pulled the burning clothing from Nelson, who kept asking about the other boys.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 17, 1961]

NINE KILLED WHEN TRAIN HITS TRUCK

MAGNOLIA, MISS., January 17.—The passenger train City of New Orleans, speeding through Magnolia en route to Chicago at about 80 miles per hour, rammed into a gasoline truck at a whistlestop crossing today, killing nine persons and injuring six others.

The streamliner streaked 300 yards after smashing into the truck, with flames sweeping the length of its nine cars.

Illinois Central authorities said the train was not due to stop in Magnolia, about 100 miles north of New Orleans. The truckdriver, they said, apparently did not hear the train or realize it was approaching.

The dead were J. A. (Jimmy) Livingston, the engineer from McComb, Miss.; Fireman John Collins, Truckdriver Morris Piggott, Percy Nelson, Bob Gwin, Prentiss Jackson, Hans Johns, and Charles Hughes, all freight yard employees, and one other unidentified yard employee.

The Illinois Central track splits the downtown section of Magnolia, a community of about 2,200. Flaming gasoline from the explosion spewed over the workers unloading grain from three freight cars and onto one warehouse. The cars and the warehouse were bady burned.

Railroad spokesmen said there were no reports of passenger injuries.

There is a red and white sign at the crossing, witnesses said, making a stop at the crossing manadatory under State law. But there were no flashing lights or crossbars.

A Deserving Tribute to Gen. Elwood R. Quesada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in expressing my sincerest regrets over the resignation of Mr. Elwood R. Quesada as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency effective January 20, I take this occasion to compliment him for having shown many unusual qualities sorely needed in Government today. He has demonstrated, in his complicated task, a refreshing frankness, great strength of character, and forthrightness in facing and solving problems.

Mr. Quesada has shown a boldness not often found these days in Government administrators, as well as the trait of standing out against others for what he believed to be the best for the Nation in matters of aviation. In these days of multiple and sometimes unprecedented problems, these characteristics are indeed laudable. One can only wish that his successors and others in the Federal service will follow his lead.

In short, Mr. Quesada has clearly demonstrated that he was a public servant in the best sense of the word, and a truly dedicated one.

In planning and pursuing his course, it can only be said that his program will add greatly to the progress, growth, safety, and efficiency of air travel in this Nation. On this, I feel qualified to speak in view of my membership on the board of directors of the National Rocket Society, which has quickened my interest in, and knowledge of, the problems facing this new age of aviation.

As to his forthcoming role as president of the new Washington Senators' baseball club, and because of my longtime interest and participation in athletic pursuits, let me say that in my opinion, Mr. Quesada has earned the right to the wellwishes of everyone and also hopes for the greatest of success in whatever future endeavors he may undertake.

Louisiana's Only All-Girl Drum and Bugle Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive time a musical organization from Abbeville, La., in the congressional district I have the privilege of representing, has had the honor of being selected to participate in the Presidential inaugural parade. In 1957 the Abbeville High School band marched on Pennsylvania Avenue for President Eisenhower's second inauguration and this year the Mount Carmel High School Eaglettes, Louisiana's only all-girl drum and bugle corps, was chosen for the parade at the inauguration of President Kennedy.

Arriving in Washington Wednesday morning, members of the drum and bugle corps and the adults accompanying them from Louisiana took part that afternoon in a ceremony in which a wreath was laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by Lee Ardoin, corps captain of the Eaglettes, and Sharran Hebert, lieutenant in the color guard, whose father lost his life in action in World War II. I was pleased to have the opportunity to be present for this impressive occasion.

Thursday was devoted to a sightseeing tour by the group.

The Eaglettes were organized 3 years ago and are under the direction of Dr. S. J. LaBorde, assisted by Jackie Arceneaux and Steve Robicheaux. The drum

and bugle corps was formed with the main purpose of performing for school football games and halftime shows, and at area festivals and fairs, but the organization's ability and popularity led to invitations to participate in many other events including the New Orleans Mardi Gras and the national convention of the American Legion at Minneapolis in 1959. Prior to the Presidential inauguration the members had been in 32 parades, marched a distance of 59 miles, traveled 4,741 miles, and given 47 field performances.

A strict set of rules and regulations governs the corps, including a required scholastic average for membership.

The Eaglettes were invited to the inaugural by Frank B. Ellis, of New Orleans, who served as President Kennedy's campaign director in Louisiana.

Members of the Eaglettes on the Washington trip: Lynne Dauterive, Julia Breaux, Marilyn Hulin, Elizabeth Reinsch, Dolores Lejeune, Sonja Stout, Lee Ardoin, Pat Landry, Claire Villien, Judy Hebert, Eloise Stauffer, Catherine Karl, Cheryl Creswell, Suzanne Boudreaux, Karen Broussard, Rebecca Motty, Cathy Toups, Connie Simon, Cynthia Logan, Kay Landry, Anne Soulier, Judy Chiasson, Natasha Villien, Margaret Soulier, Sharran Hebert, Kay Piazza, Waldean Sellers, Donna Trahan, Anne Leonard, Brenda Broussard, Cheryl Theriot, Jane C. Trahan, Rita Gayle Toups, Sandra L. Broussard, Pat Donohue, Cheryl Broussard, Susan Summers, Denese Nunez, Becky Broussard, Pat Veazey, Elaine Robin, Betty Richmond, Karen Breaux, Marjorie Pierce, Gwen Mayard, Louise Minvielle, Jeanette Cormier, Catherine LaBorde.

The ladies serving as chaperones: Mesdames L. Stoute, Alphe Hebert, W. Creswell, E. Soulier, Harold Trahan, Charles Trahan, Justin Broussard, S. J. LaBorde.

In addition to Dr. LaBorde, the director, the following men made the trip to Washington: Floyd Toups, Walton Sellers, Emery Toups, George Veazey, Davey Meaux, Dr. Harold Trahan, Jackie Arceneaux.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of January 20, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

The inauguration, so long awaited and whose preparations have so long dominated the Washington scene, is finally a part of our Nation's history. It was not disappointing, as both end and beginning of administration's past events, and hopes for the future were joined. The entire ceremony spelled out the common bond and unity of all Americans.

It was a prayerful occasion. God-given human rights and the responsibilities which accompany them were repeatedly stressed. President Kennedy's speech was stirring and forceful. It was a masterful statement of high resolve and principle. I was impressed by his recognition and determined acceptance of the challenge ahead for us in this troubled world. There was no mistaking his confidence, no doubt about his willingness to wade into the tough job ahead. Equally certain to me was the good will and Godspeed in the hearts and minds of those present and Americans everywhere for the success of our newly elected leaders. Surely all Americans join now in prayerful hope that freedom and peace will advance under their administration.

The snow and cold, the discomfort, the political disappointments for some were forgotten as we united in our prayers and applause after John Kennedy's "So help me God." I know now I wouldn't have missed this historic and heart-quickening event for anything.

Loyal opposition is the oft-used description of a minority party, and now for Republicans has new meaning. At this post-inaugural moment it is well to understand this phrase. To me it means loyalty to country and to our Constitution, supporting always what in one's own judgment best serves our Nation and people, and opposition to policies, legislation, and actions that do not best serve our Nation in advancing the cause of freedom under God-given rights implicit in our Constitution. Protecting our Constitution, the oath of each elected official, to me is very constructive, certainly not negative, even though it means saying no to certain legislation. Any parent knows that saying no to his child is generally for very positive and constructive reasons. So it is with legislation. Legislation harmful to our Constitution and basic freedoms must be opposed. That means saying no on occasion.

President Eisenhower's farewell address restated our determination to preserve peace with justice and freedom. Interestingly enough, the companion article in the same newspaper reported Khrushchev's claim that communism's worldwide victory is almost at hand. "The policy of peaceful coexistence," he stated, "facilitates the activities of the Communist Party." His boast reminds us of the continuing problem of containing communism and preventing its spread. The fact is we must do more. We must win the world to our side. There is no peaceful coexistence.

The President's budget message and Economic Report were presented to Congress this week. The budget estimates of $80.9 billion expenditures and $82.3 billion receipts should be replaced by $101.8 billion and $103.1 billion, respectively, which represent the total or cash budget. The slim surplus of $1.5 billion is based on continuation of present taxes, the increase of the gas tax and raising of postal rates to a pay-as-we-use basis. Every budget has in it the built-in increase of Federal spending programs. So President Kennedy is faced with a dilemma, either he must abandon most, or all, of his new spending promises or he must raise taxes, or deficit finance with the accompanying inflation.

President Eisenhower said in his budget message we must apply the "test of necessity rather than desirability to the expenditures of government." He also pointed out that the cost of Federal Government today is less than in 1953 in terms of percentage of national income. Maurice Stans, outgoing Budget Director, said, "The budget of the U.S. Government affects all Americans. It is an annual financial plan, in which the President sets forth his proposals for meeting our national objectives and indicates the money needed to carry them out and how the money will be raised." How we raise money is the job of the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member. To have President Kennedy's program, or any part of it, we must raise taxes. I am opposed to this and so will oppose new spending schemes. On the contrary, I believe we should repeal the Korean war taxes and start a broadly based tax cut. But to do this we must reduce Federal spending to stay within a balanced budget.

The Economic Report spells out the increase of real income to every wage earner since 1953, the increased stock ownership, life insurance, and gross national income. Since 1952, disposable personal income has risen 30 percent and per capita income 15 percent. Nor can government take the credit as many seem to believe who think the Federal Government is responsible for us. As the President said, "Government action is not the principal, let alone the sole determinant of the rate of economic growth," and further, "in our free economy, economic growth and the improvement of living standards depend not primarily on what government does, but mainly on what is done by individuals and groups acting in their own private capacities." To this I must add my endorsement.

Defense Procurement in Distressed Areas Can Help To Solve the Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we can no longer continue to ignore the grave problems of distressed areas. This is no longer a political issue. Both major parties have endorsed plans to aid distressed areas in their 1956 and 1960 platforms. Within the next few weeks the Senate and House are expected to take action on area redevelopment legislation.

In addition to many bills pending in Congress providing for area redevelopment, my bill H.R. 275 introduced on January 3 provides for the allocation of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus. This legislation if enacted will help to bring jobs for the unemployed in the areas of the Nation suffering from chronic unemployment.

If H.R. 275 becomes a law, it will permit the Government to do its share in aiding depressed areas by using its vast purchasing powers for which billions of dollars are appropriated annually.

During the administration of President Eisenhower he tried to relieve unemployment in distressed areas by issuing defense manpower, No. 4. This Executive order sets forth specific procedures under which Federal procurement agencies are to give special preference awards to areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus.

Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great disappointment to me that the Defense Department did not fully implement this Presidential directive. For example, in fiscal 1960 only $6.7 million worth of orders have been placed in the distressed areas as a result of preferential treatment. This means that less than 1 per-

cent of the total Defense Department procurement was allocated to distressed areas.

I believe, therefore, that Congress should instruct the Defense Department to allocate a greater number of defense contracts in the distressed areas. To accomplish this purpose I have introduced H.R. 275 which will require the procurement agencies in the Defense Department to award contracts in the distressed areas whenever such action is compatible with the national defense.

My bill, H.R. 275, would not empower defense agencies to pay higher prices to firms locating in the distressed areas. It would, however, require the defense procurement officers to encourage firms in distressed areas to participate fully in defense procurement by making maximum use of competitive bids and set-asides. In plain words, it gives congressional approval to the policy which has been established by President Eisenhower through Executive Order No. 4. I am sure that the new administration will also support my bill. President Kennedy said during the course of last fall's campaign:

> Compassion for the suffering and struggles of persons in distressed areas is a compelling reason to give special consideration to such areas in the procurement of supplies by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we approve H.R. 275 which not only has the support of the Eisenhower administration but, in addition, based on campaign statements last fall by President Kennedy is in line with his thinking on the subject.

As already mentioned my bill H.R. 275 gives to the Federal Government an opportunity to use its vast purchasing powers to provide employment for persons living in the Nation's pockets of chronic unemployment.

The USO: A Home Away From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th anniversary of the United Service Organizations—February 4, 1961—it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Nation the powerful role played by the USO in America's relentless pursuit of peace throughout the world.

It is well for all of us to remember, I think, that the USO is representative of each of the major religious groups in the United States and is actually a federation of volunteer agencies through which all Americans can lend valuable assistance in serving not only the religious, but also the spiritual, recreational, social, welfare, and educational needs of all of our young people who are in uniform.

The USO, then, is truly a "home away from home" for millions of our lonesome military youths. It thus is a unifying force and carries out the American tradition of the family as the cornerstone of our society. As such, it serves as perhaps no other type of organization could, to convince these youths that they still are a very important part of this tradition, especially when they are serving in foreign lands far from home.

The vast majority of these 2½ million young men and women have shown their appreciation of the warm welcome extended to them by the USO, painfully mindful that they are far removed from the stabilizing and personal influences of their homes, their usual friends, their schools, and their customary religious affiliations, many for the first time in their lives.

As a "home away from home" the USO bridges the gap between the lonely American youngster in service and his accustomed way of life. This bridge also enables him to know that he can someday return to the way of life so dear to his heart.

Whatever we do for the USO cannot help but have a far-reaching effect on what our Armed Forces can accomplish as guardians of our peace and security.

Toward Equity in Taxation of Financial Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 2899, a bill to provide for increased Federal tax revenues and to remove the present discriminatory application of Federal income tax law among commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks.

The bill is a very simple one. It would repeal that provision in the Internal Revenue Code which establishes a reserve for bad debts for savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. Such repeal would have the effect of making these institutions subject to the same statutory authority and regulatory procedures for the establishment of bad debt reserves as now are applicable to all other classes of taxpayers.

These procedures could take into account any indicated differences in the bases of tax equity for the associations and the mutual banks which might develop in an impartial evaluation of their financial structures and operating methods.

Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks are vital parts of our financial system, and I would not for a moment wish to hinder the effective conduct of their business operations, but the fact remains that they do enjoy a favored tax position which enables them to avoid paying a fair share of Federal income tax. The Treasury has been deprived of needed revenue through this loophole for 8 years, and the situation will continue unless the law is changed.

Let me give a little of the background for this bill. In 1951, the Congress decided that savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks should be subject to Federal income taxes, at the corporate tax rate. During consideration of the 1951 legislation, a proposal was made that a tax advantage for these institutions was needed in order that they might build up reserves against future losses. An amendment to this effect was adopted immediately prior to final passage. It established a special tax-free reserve for bad debts in a manner not afforded any other type of business operation. Each savings and loan association and each mutual savings bank was allowed to accumulate tax deductible transfers to reserves in any reasonable amount as long as the sum of its surplus, reserves, and undivided profits was less than 12 percent of its deposits or repurchasable shares.

How has this provision worked? In the years since 1951, it appears that protection to shareholders through retained earnings has not increased. The ratio of surplus, undivided profits, and reserves to deposits has declined for both savings and loan associations who are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and for insured mutual savings banks. After 8 years under the 1951 law, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks actually have a greater margin for deduction by transfers to reserves than they did when the law was first enacted. While these institutions are growing at a tremendous rate, the amount they pay in Federal income taxes shows hardly any increase from year to year. For example, in 1952 FHLB member savings and loan associations were reported to have had net profits before taxes of $194,404,000 on which they paid $3,176,000 in Federal income taxes, or 1.63 percent of net profits. In 1959 member savings and loan associations were reported as having net profits before taxes of $555,787,000 on which they paid $5,346,000 in Federal taxes, or less than 1 percent of net profits. At a time when the Government sorely needs tax dollars, these institutions should be required to pay their equitable share of taxes.

The bill only seeks to place savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks on an equal tax basis with other businesses so as to obtain the revenue which was anticipated when the original law was passed. They will still be able to supply mortgage funds needed for home financing, and also earn more than a sufficient return over expenses. All that is required to achieve this purpose is an amendment repealing section 593 of part II of subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Transfers to bad debt reserves would then be based on an amount which the Treasury determined to be reasonable rather than on an arbitrary percentage figure. It is estimated that the new law would raise between $200 million and $250 million the first year after passage.

I am pleased to see that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has introduced an identical bill, H.R. 2900. Bipartisan support is always helpful, and

particularly important in tax matters. This proposed legislation has also been endorsed by five major bankers' organizations: The American Bankers Association, the Association of Reserve City Bankers, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth committee.

The Treasury's needs for funds are large and urgent. They can be partially met by eliminating unjustified tax advantages which accrue to savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. These advantages provide them with a substantially tax-free use of retained earnings. A more reasonable sharing of the tax burden on the part of these institutions would contribute significantly to greater fairness in the application of the Federal income tax.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, with respect to the taxation of banks, savings and loan associations, and other institutions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to banking institutions) is amended by adding a new section 585 as follows:

"SEC. 585. Additions to reserve for bad debts.

"(a) In the case of a bank as defined for certain tax purposes in section 581 the Secretary or his delegate in determining the deduction to be allowed for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts under section 166(c) shall take into account the total net transfers which have previously been made under section 166(c) of the internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 23(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1949 to such a reserve."

SEC. 2. Section 581 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by deleting the words "sections 582 and 584," and substituting therefor "sections 582, 584, and 585."

SEC. 3. Section 593 of subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed and section 594 is renumbered 593.

SEC. 4. Section 166(g)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed.

SEC. 5. The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

H.R. 274 Promotes Industrial Development in Local Areas of Chronic Unemployment Through Granting the Rapid Tax Amortization Privilege to Manufacturers Locating Facilities in These Areas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a statement in Philadelphia October 31, 1960, President Kennedy said:

The country must stimulate plant modernization programs which are vital both to increased production and to building industrial facilities which can compete successfully with the modern plant of Europe and the Soviet Union.

He also said:

Where we are certain that tax revision—including accelerated depreciation—will stimulate investment in new plants and equipment without damage to our principles of equity, we will proceed with such revision.

Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced H.R. 274, a bill which amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants in depressed areas. In other words, through such a fast tax writeoff an incentive would be provided to locate industrial or commercial plants and facilities in economically depressed areas or areas of chronic unemployment. As will be noted, my bill, H.R. 274, would adopt the views of President Kennedy expressed at Philadelphia last October, but to initiate the tax amortization program it would be limited to areas having chronic unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of H.R. 274 on January 3 I have had a lot of mail from interested persons requesting background information on the rapid tax amortization program of recent years. To answer these inquiries, the following information has been compiled:

I. BACKGROUND OF THE RAPID TAX AMORTIZATION PROGRAM

What is rapid tax amortization?

Rapid tax amortization has been a device adopted by the Federal Government to give private manufacturers and other producers an incentive to build needed defense production facilities. Following Korea, production facilities representing an investment of $38 billion were built under this incentive. The incentive is no longer available to industry in general.

The effect of granting the privilege of rapid tax amortization to a specific company (through a certificate of necessity) is to speed up or shorten the time period within which depreciation deductions can be taken by that company. It entitles a manufacturer to amortize for tax purposes the cost of his new plant and equipment over a 5-year period rather than over the much longer period applicable to plants not qualifying under the tax amortization program. It does not give a manufacturer a greater deduction but only a more rapid recovery of his capital investment.

Example of rapid tax amortization

A manufacturer building a $100,000 factory normally would be permitted under internal revenue laws a deduction on his tax return of $4,000 or $5,000 each year for 20 or 25 years, as the case may be. This deduction for depreciation is considered a proper item of business expense.

If the same manufacturer had built a plant to produce an item required for mobilization programs, he could be granted through a necessity certificate the privilege of deducting $20,000 each year for five years.

Assuming for a particular year the company made a net profit of $25,000, over and above all expense except depreciation, it would pay taxes on only $5,000. Without the privilege, it would be required to pay taxes on $20,000 or $21,000.

Legislative authority

Tax amortization of the type described is provided for in section 124–A of the Internal Revenue Code (sec. 216 of the Revenue Act of 1950), enacted on September 23, 1950. A certificate issued under this statute has no value for tax purposes unless (1) the manufacturer makes a capital investment in plant or equipment, (2) the facility is completed and productive, and (3) a profit is earned.

The law contemplates the encouragement of expansion by private investment capital rather than public funds.

Korean experience

Early in the Korean conflict, the tax amortization program provided an incentive to eliminate critical deficiencies in defense production capacities and supplies.

Under the program, a total of 229 expansion goals were established for the purpose of measuring the deficit between estimated defense requirements under full mobilization and industry's capacity to meet such demands. From the beginning of the program through June 1958, over 22,000 certificates were issued, representing a capital investment of over $38 billion, of which $23 billion was eligible for the fast writeoffs.

Current status of program

Over the past 3 years most of the expansion goals have been closed as the required buildup of facilities was completed.

In August 1957 Congress enacted Public Law 85–165 which sharply limited the certifying authority—now extended only to facilities to produce new or specialized defense items or to provide research, development, or experimental services for the Defense Department or the Atomic Energy Commission.

The termination date of the entire tax amortization program was under the law December 31, 1959.

Application to surplus labor areas

Late in the program for encouraging the buildup of production facilities, it was linked by Executive action to the problem of areas of substantial labor surplus.

In the case of firms which expanded or located their new defense facilities in areas of substantial labor surplus, the percentage of total investment allowed rapid tax amortization was increased, usually from 10 to 25 percent. Hence, a company which ordinarily was permitted to write off 60 percent of its investment in a new facility was accorded a writeoff to as much as 85 percent if the facility was located in an area of substantial labor surplus.

Since the passage of Public Law 85–165 restricting the issuance of certificates of necessity, the rapid tax amortization program is no longer an effective aid to labor surplus areas.

II. PROPOSAL TO USE TAX DEDUCTIONS AS A DEVICE TO ASSIST LOCAL AREAS OF CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT

RAPID AMORTIZATION DIRECT TO MANUFACTURERS

The first method would use the rapid amortization privilege as a locational attraction for companies planning new facilities expansions. This method would allow the manufacturer to amortize, in a period of 5 years, a substantial part of all of his investment in such a facility, provided he located the facility in an area of chronic unemployment.

A bill incorporating this idea was pending in the 86th Congress and a similar measure has been introduced in this Congress as evidenced by the Van Zandt bill, H.R. 274, which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Van Zandt bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial surplus. The deduction would be available to "any person who constructs, reconstructs, or erects a substantial unemployment area facility" as defined in the bill.

As it stands, the bill applies to all areas of substantial labor surplus whether this condition is temporary or chronic. New employment-creating facilities are peculiarly appropriate to areas suffering from a chronic unemployment problem.

The solution to areas of temporary unemployment lies in additional contracts, public works, and the like. If the bill were confined to areas with a history of persistent unemployment, a considerable number of areas of temporary unemployment would be eliminated (such as Philadelphia and Baltimore), and the effectiveness of the bill for chronic areas would be accordingly increased.

Mr. Speaker, the fast tax writeoff as provided in my bill, H.R. 274, is aimed at producing general industrial development in the labor surplus areas by providing jobs for the unemployed. The history of tax relief to manufacturers in the past reveals the success of the program. To be more specific many communities in the United States would be suffering from unemployment at this time were it not for the fact that fast tax writeoffs such as my bill, H.R. 274 provides, enabled them to diversify their economy by attracting new industries.

In Europe providing tax incentives to suitable industries located in areas of surplus labor has helped England, West Germany, and others to cope with their unemployment problems. When mentioning the success of the fast tax writeoff in Germany, it is only fair to point to the tremendous prosperity of West Germany and to add that tax policies designed to encourage private enterprise beginning in 1948 paid rich premiums and were instrumental in the phenomenal recovery of the economy of West Germany. In addition, the spectacular recovery of the economy is traceable to the fact that German industry enjoyed this fast writeoff of taxes in the construction of new plants.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me mention again that tax amortization has been used as an economic recovery tool here in this country, as well as in Europe and Canada with equal success. Therefore, my bill, H.R. 274, should receive prompt and earnest consideration by not only the Kennedy administration but by both Houses of Congress.

Adjustments in the Veterans' Benefits Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1961, it was my privilege to submit three bills for consideration by this body. This proposed legislation pertains to what I feel are necessary adjustments in the veterans' benefit program. I would like to make further explanation and provide a greater amplification of the purposes of this legislation and to explain to the Members of the House just what these bills are designed to do and how they will affect the veterans of this Nation. The legislation referred to by me are H.R. 2943, H.R. 2944, and H.R. 2945.

I would like first to discuss the purpose and the intent of H.R. 2945. This bill is designed to give priority to oversea combat veterans in obtaining admission to our system of Veterans' Administration hospitals. At the present time, entrance into our Veterans' Administration hospitals is according to a system of priority or categories defined by the Veterans' Administration regulations. Naturally, emergency conditions must, through necessity, have first priority, and this expediency must be maintained.

A second category in order of preference is those veterans of either wartime or peacetime service who seek hospitalization and treatment for disabilities specifically incurred in or aggravated by service. A third group or category is veterans with a service-connected disability but who seek treatment for disabilities not necessarily adjunct to their service.

In a final category are those wartime veterans who require treatment for disabilities not a result of service but who indicate they cannot financially bear the burden of hospitalization for the disability from which they suffer. It is in this final category that the legislation mentioned, H.R. 2945, would be effective. This group is furnished hospitalization only when surplus beds exist after taking care of the service-connected disabilities or emergency conditions mentioned in those categories of higher priority. In other words, after all the service-connected disabilities and after veterans with emergency medical conditions have been taken care of, then I feel that the combat oversea veteran should be given preference in obtaining treatment from any surplus beds which may exist. I think this is just and fair legislation, and I encourage favorable consideration by this body.

I would next like to discuss H.R. 2944, which I believe corrects an inequity which has existed for many years in regard to veterans' benefits. I might state at the outset that it is necessary to speak generally regarding this subject matter since all of the veterans about whom I speak will not be affected by this change in legislation.

During the history of our Nation, we have been engaged in many campaigns and expeditions, a great many of which actually involved armed conflict with an enemy of our country, but such campaigns and expeditions are not recognized under law as wartime service. To state it another way, many veterans who have been subject to the risk and the rigors of military living during a campaign or expedition against armed enemies are still considered peacetime veterans for many benefits available from our Government. To make this even more clear, I would like to state that one day of wartime service provides the prima facie eligibility for hospitalization, while a veteran may serve 6 months or even a year during a campaign or expedition of our Nation and this service would not constitute eligibility necessary for entrance into a veterans' hospital.

Such men and their dependents receive only benefits which accrue to veterans of peacetime service. This proposed legislation which it was my privilege to introduce would provide that all veterans who served during the numerous campaigns and expeditions, or their dependents, shall be entitled to the same benefits they would have had if they served during a wartime period.

I think you will agree that the risks involved, the mental torment and rigors involved, during such campaigns or expeditions are just as dangerous, just as hazardous and trying as those experienced by veterans who served during wartime service.

The third piece of legislation, identified by H.R. 2943, would remove many of the objectionable features of Public Law 86–211. The bill which I introduced would affect the nonservice benefits to either the veteran or his dependents for service during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. It would provide a great liberalization of the basis on which pensions are payable by eliminating many of the legal bars which now prevent receipt of such benefits. This legislation would provide first that public or private retirement pensions shall not be counted as income in determining whether or not a veteran or his dependents shall receive pension benefits, or in what amount they shall receive these benefits. The bill also eliminates the income of a spouse in the determination of the annual income of a living veteran.

I would like to point out that these changes cover two of the most objectionable features of the current law concerning nonservice benefits. At the present time, public retirement or private retirement payments are counted as income in determining the monthly allotment of pension payable and also in determining whether or not a veteran will qualify at all for such benefits. Also, the veteran is penalized if his spouse continues to work, since the income of the spouse is also counted in determining annual income thereby rendering many worthy and deserving veterans ineligible for this type of benefit.

The legislation which I introduced further eliminates the net worth eligibility test and repeals the requirement of the reduction of pension benefits during hospitalization of the veteran. I would like to point out that if there is ever a time when income is desperately needed, it is during a period of hospitalization. Cases have come to my attention where veterans who needed hospitalization actually refused this benefit because they simply could not afford to lose their pension rights during the period they were hospitalized.

Another feature which has received widespread opposition—and this is also changed by the legislation I proposed—is the so-called corpus of estate feature. This has caused widespread hardship and has penalized the veteran who has attempted to be thrifty and prudent during his lifetime. With the soaring cost of living, I also find it necessary to propose that the annual income requirements to receive nonservice pensions or death benefits be materially liberalized, thereby qualifying many veterans who

at present are barred from receipt of such benefits.

On January 23 I introduced H.R. 3087, designed to further improve the status of the veterans of this Nation, and particularly those who served in combat zones and were injured in line of duty under enemy fire. The present regulations provide disability compensation in the same amount whether a veteran is injured due to actual enemy fire or whether he suffers his disability during service within the continental limits of the United States.

To make this example even more clear cut, a veteran who suffers a disability in a jeep wreck in the United States, or perhaps is injured during an authorized pass at a recreational center receives the same rate of compensation as a veteran who is injured under combat conditions and under fire of the enemy. It would not be feasible to argue the point that one is not just as badly disabled whether he is injured within the United States or on the battlefield. But I do believe and hope that this body will agree that the veteran who has been subjected to enemy fire and whose disabilities were incurred under combat conditions is entitled to some additional consideration. My bill would provide a 20-percent increase over the regular rates for disabilities incurred in combat. This additional consideration of 20 percent would be given only for such disabilities incurred in line of duty and resulting from actual armed combat.

These bills which I have proposed are not tremendously costly items but will result in a fair adjustment with due consideration to the type of service to which our Nation's veterans have been subjected. I would like to point out that the hospital beds are already in existence and available in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This proposed legislation merely gives priority to those who have suffered in armed conflict. Also, this legislation proposed adjustments to those who have served in the numerous campaigns and brushfire wars to which the United States has been subjected in the past and it is possible could be subjected to in the future. The Government would give official recognition to the type of disability of the individual veteran and whether or not such disability was combat incurred.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the inauguration, we await expectantly and hopefully the proposals that will carry us across the New Frontier toward solution of major problems and meeting the complex challenges that confront the world in the early 1960's.

Now the time has arrived for deeds, not just words; for actions, not just admonishments; for realistic solutions to solve our problems, not just repetitions of time-tested, hope-raising ideals unaccompanied by adequate formulas to attain these goals.

These trying times, of course, also demand cooperation, bipartisanship, insofar as possible, and broad support of realistic efforts to meet our national goals.

Building upon the policies and programs of the past—and, as necessary, creating new ones—I am confident that, by putting our shoulders to the wheel, we, as a people, can succeed in surmounting the obstacles and going forward to build a better, brighter future.

Recently, in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review some of the long-range challenges confronting the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have the text printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY REVIEWS ISSUES BEFORE CONGRESS; OUTLINES ANTI-COMMUNIST PROGRAM

On Friday, the inauguration of our 35th President, John F. Kennedy, marked a next step of our Nation's long march toward its destined role in world history.

The occasion was a solemn one—shot through with a realization that upon new shoulders—that of the President and newly appointed administrative officials—rest decisions and responsibilities affecting the welfare and survival of all of us—now, and for the next 4 years.

The inauguration of a new President, also, presented to the world a dramatic demonstration of the workings of a true democratic process.

Now, we must adopt the right kind of policies and programs. If this is done, the nations of the globe—particularly the newly emerging ones—will again witness that a free government, "of, by, and for the people" best serves its citizens. We will again demonstrate also that—our free system—being more than self-serving, is capable of world leadership, of supporting efforts to protect the integrity of other nations; and of participating in programs to promote progress and peace for mankind.

The inauguration—involving parades, inauguration balls, and other festivities—was a gala affair. Now the ball is over. As a nation, we must get down to the business of carrying forward projects—and, as necessary, designing new policies—to serve our country and our people in the trying times ahead.

Currently, the new administration—with new appointees as heads of departments and agencies—is now attempting to get a grip on the reins of government.

While occupants of the driver's seats have changed, we find, however, that many of the long-range problems—more broad scope and lasting than the service of a one- or two-term administration—are still with us.

As we move forward into 1961, these big jobs include:

1. The issue of peace or war;
2. The task of combating communism;
3. Resolving our economic problems;
4. Fulfilling our obligations in education, housing, care of the aging, civil rights, and other fields; and
5. Generally creating the wide variety of policies and programs necessary to serve our country domestically and internationally.

The significance of these and other issues to progress and our survival demands a strong effort from the American people.

From time to time, there will—as in the past—be differences among us on how best to attain our goals. There is no pay dirt, however, in opposing for the sake of opposing. In circumstances of differing opinions, rather, we must encourage the offering of constructive alternatives to policies and programs which—in our individual judgment—are not adequate to the times.

Only by so doing, can we create the kind of constructive, realistic programs necessary to meet the great challenges of the early 1960's.

PEACE OR WAR

Briefly, now, let's take a look at some of the specific steps required in each of the major fields of endeavor.

The maintaining of peace—or, conversely, the prevention of a third world war, as well as brushfire wars—requires:

A strong national defense;

Greater cooperation with our allies—militarily, as well as in other ways—to block the outspreading of communism; and

Effective efforts to prevent the domination of the non-Communist and newly emerging nations by communism—to avoid the Reds' gaining a balance of power in the nonmilitary fields of battle.

MULTIPRONGED PROGRAM TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Combating the worldwide Communist offensive is, in itself, a tremendous challenge.

The American people, despite a natural inclination for peace, must gird themselves for a long, tough pull against the Communist threat to our survival and world peace.

I am confident we have the manpower, resources, and technological know-how—and also a superior political-economic-social system, as well as principles and ideals—to defeat communism.

However, this will not happen by wishful thinking. Rather, it will be done only by creation of a strong anti-Communist program, including:

1. As I mentioned, the creation of an ever stronger nuclear-missile-space defense to deter military aggression by the Communists—since the Reds understand missile muscle better than words.

2. Development of an economic policy—strengthened by cooperation with our allies—to win on the economic front;

3. Carrying forward and, as necessary, expanding, our counteroffensive on the ideological battleground; and

4. Further strengthening our internal security program to protect ourselves from the Communists' nefarious activities.

These, then, are the basic steps for combating communism. However, this must not be allowed to absorb all our efforts, energies, and resources.

Instead, we need to engage in, not just a reaction program, but rather in positive, forward-moving efforts to channel more of the resources and manpower to creating a better life for more people.

STRENGTHENING THE U.S. ECONOMY

Briefly, now, let's take a look at our economic problems.

Across the Nation, there are—regrettably—about 4½ million unemployed and economic slowdowns in some businesses and industries.

As President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, pointed out, however, the country is still moving ahead with levels of employment and output of goods and services unsurpassed in our history.

In dealing with these economic difficulties, let's face some facts of life. The antidote to an economic setback is not to throw up our hands and shout: "Depression!" Psychologically, this could help to create one; perhaps it has already made the situation more difficult in this case.

Nor should Uncle Sam be expected to bear the whole burden of pump priming the

economy—as some would propose. The Treasury is not a bottomless pit, kept full by an invisible genie, creating new money without cost to the taxpayers.

All segments of the U.S. economy have a vested interest in, and a fundamental responsibility for, helping to resolve our economic problems. Among other things, this means attempts to create jobs for the unemployed and keeping the wheels of our free enterprise system rolling forward at a good rate of progress.

Now, what can be done?

In my judgment, new efforts are needed to:

Encourage greater confidence in—not attempt to undermine—our economy;

Encourage greater investment in enterprises—large and small;

Encourage greater labor-management-consumer cooperation; and

As necessary, expand Government programs for highway building, airport construction, etc.; and loosen up money policy; but only as necessary.

In all of this, of course, it is extremely important not to take action that would spur inflation and further depreciate the dollar.

The Nation, I am confident, will be able to deal swiftly and successfully with the economic slowdowns and unemployment—if we (1) encourage the cooperation of all segments of the economy to deal with the situation; (2) realistically emphasize the positive aspects of the picture—not enlarge the negative out of perspective; and (3) get rid of the pass-the-buck attitude of "Let Uncle Sam do the whole job."

MEETING NEEDS OF PEOPLE

Confronting us, also, in Congress is the need to better meet the needs of our people in the following fields:

1. Education: According to reports, we now lack about 130,000 to 142,000 classrooms and about 135,000 teachers, to serve the school population. As a result, our educational program is being handicapped by the lack of well-trained and well-paid teachers; obsolete, overcrowded classrooms—often attended in double shifts by students; a general inability to meet the special needs of students with differing degrees of intelligence and capabilities; and other shortcomings that handicap our system.

2. A good program for the aging: Today, there are more than 16 million people over 65, who do not have adequate incomes to provide a decent standard of living. The Congress will need to give attention to this problem—particularly to the health needs of our senior citizens; and

3. Civil rights: Through the effective administration of existing laws and, as necessary, the adoption of new ones, we need to assure protection of all the constitutional rights of our citizens.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURE

Now, what about agriculture? As all of us recognize, no real solutions have yet been found for the production-consumption imbalance of farm commodities in dairying or other segments of farming.

Unfortunately, there is a strange anomaly: The United States has a stockpile of surplus commodities, valued at about $9 billion. By contrast, however, billions of people elsewhere in the world are living on inadequate diets.

Over the years, efforts have been made to channel these valuable foodstuffs to the needy people. For example, President Eisenhower recently recommended distribution of more surplus foods through the United Nations. In addition, we have distributed these commodities abroad, either for humanitarian purposes or for exchange of other commodities.

Fundamentally, however, the American farmer is interested in—and must have to survive economically—sales, not giveaways.

Recognizing the increasing capability of our food production plant, as well as the growing need by the exploding population for more food, we need more effective, creative ways to distribute these lifegiving products at home and abroad. As this can be successfully done, it will not only serve humanity, but also will strengthen our lagging agricultural economy.

In addition to Federal efforts in the field, farm organizations also could well cooperate by working together, as well as with the United Nations and other international groups, in the much needed effort to find new markets.

On January 26, the national farm organizations are meeting with the new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. I am hopeful that the conference will result in some realistic proposals for dealing with the economic problems, not only in dairying, but also in other segments of agriculture.

The American Weekly Confirms Its Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, before we of the House take up the serious and exacting duties of this 87th Congress, let me ask your indulgence on this first day of congressional activity under the administration of President Kennedy to offer a few comments in recognition of an outstanding public service.

No doubt most of you had occasion to see the American Weekly magazine distributed with the Sunday newspapers of January 15 and to note the magnificent cover portrait of President and Mrs. Kennedy which graced that page. During my years in business and in public life I have never seen a more attractive portrait, nor have I ever seen a more timely and effective public service undertaking by a major publication. I believe all of you have received, as I have, an enlarged copy of this same portrait suitable for framing. This special enlargement arrived at my office during the inaugural days when many of my constituents were visiting with me, and I was amazed and gratified by the unanimous approval expressed by everyone who viewed the picture.

In recognition of a service which in my judgment merits such recognition, I have today written Mr. John K. Herbert, publisher of the American Weekly and extended my congratulations to him. With your permission, I will include a copy of that letter at the end of these remarks.

Recalling the reactions of all who saw the picture in my office, however, I was struck with another possibility. It seems to me that, as we launch this new administration headed by determined and highly skilled young men—young men who will probably sweep aside many existing roadblocks to progress and install new methods and techniques—at this time we might well consider revision not only of the American national image abroad from an economic and political standpoint, but also a complete revision of the image of our President and First Lady.

We have had more than enough dusty oil paintings on the walls of our Embassies and Legations overseas. Our people have broken with precedents in the recent national election—now they have chosen one who is relatively young, but widely acclaimed for his courage, determination, and capacity for meaningful work. And his is the great good fortune to have at his side a consort of such beauty, grace, and charm that even the haughty world of high fashion stands aside in deference to her tastes.

If any of us were to travel in a foreign country, we could point with pride to such a portrait and say, "This is our President and his wife. Regard them well and carefully, for of such is the leadership of our country constituted in these most troubled times throughout the world." I suggest, then, that this is the portrait to be displayed in every country with which we maintain diplomatic relationships, in the most ornate Embassies and most distant outposts of our consular structure.

These are Americans of this day and time, placed in their high position by the popular choice of a free people, and prepared to do what must be done at any cost in personal sacrifice. Let our friends be reassured, and let our enemies make of it what they dare.

Further, 10 million copies of this portrait distributed throughout the sensitive areas of the world will do more for American prestige at the beginning of this new administration than all of the loan funds dispensed during the past 4 years. By means of the qualities so beautifully portrayed in this portrait our friends will know that they have chosen wisely in their allegiances, and our enemies will give pause to think again before they reopen the gates of vituperation at the American Chief Executive.

JANUARY 23, 1961.

Mr. JOHN K. HERBERT,
Publisher, the American Weekly,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HERBERT: Periodically in the Halls of the Congress complaints are voiced about the American press. Speeches are made criticizing various publications and denouncing the positions taken by certain editors and publishers. The question of just what liberties are included in the freedom of the press is raised, and sometimes ill-considered motions designed to limit or inhibit that freedom are introduced. In the long run, however, the good sense of the majority prevails, and our press remains free, chiefly because each of us who must consider the laws that govern our country has some recollection of instances in which the press has performed an enormous public service.

In recognition of such a service I write you and your colleagues of the American Weekly on this, the first official day of congressional activity under the administration of President John F. Kennedy. From many sources I have heard complimentary references to the magnificent portrait of President and Mrs. Kennedy which you distributed to 10 million American homes through the American Weekly, and to these approving words I wish to add my own compliments. You have played a major role in lending a certain tone of national unity and broad fellowship to Inaugural Week in Washington and to the beginning of a new national administration.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Herbert. This was a "10-strike" indeed. The election results were close and many of our people were troubled about the outcome. Precedents were broken in all directions.

President Kennedy is the youngest man ever to be sent to the White House; he is the first man of his particular religious faith to be elected; he is the first President who was born in the 20th century; and, most thought provoking of all, he is our first President to have matured in his convictions since atomic fission turned loose among us the power to destroy all life on this planet. There is no previous President to whom he can be compared, and it is easy to see why many of our people held reservations about his candidacy.

But the votes have been counted and the proclamation has been made; he has taken the oath, and now he stands alone to face burdens of crushing weight and gargantuan size. Our people must learn to know him well, and they will look often at his picture for reassurance during the coming days of turmoil around the world. You have placed in their hands a superb portrait of a man who seems linked to high destiny—who has survived the dangers of war and the threat of serious illness to rise to the highest national office.

By your forethought, skill and sense of public duty you have made one of those great public service contributions which reaffirm the faith of our founders in the constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press to pursue its course without interference from government at any level. Again, I congratulate you upon what must be for you a most prideful accomplishment.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.

Importance of Enacting Distressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Wednesday, I was afforded the privilege of testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1, Senator DOUGLAS' area redevelopment bill. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I made before that committee inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, the English poet John Keats penned a line of striking simplicity and truth when he wrote, "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The reason I recall those words at this time is that they bring to my mind a somewhat resembling thought: A good piece of legislation is always a pleasure to talk about.

I refer, of course, to S. 1, the so-called distressed-areas bill, which has been offered for our consideration by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

With the keen foresight which we have come to admire and appreciate in him, Senator DOUGLAS, as far back as 1955, foresaw the chronic nature of the problem and at the time offered the Congress an opportunity to enact legislation to strike at the root of the recession problem. He saw that many sections in the country were not sharing in the rising standard of living and in the expanding economy of the Nation, and he sought to aid them before their distress became a contagion affecting the entire country.

In each succeeding Congress, as the problem of chronic unemployment and underemployment grew, as the number of economically declining areas began to multiply, and as the lengthening lines of unemployed workers also began to cast elongating shadows across the land, the earnest and courageous senior Senator from Illinois beseeched us again and again to harken to his warnings and pass legislation to help those declining areas.

The recession which the country is experiencing right now is, no doubt, at least partially, due to the drag that the chronically depressed areas have had upon the economy. The record is clear that the country has never fully recovered from the 1958 recession. We cannot have a healthy economy when large numbers of people in distressed areas are poor customers for the products made in other sections of the country.

Right now we have at least 100 areas in the country which have been classified by the U.S. Department of Labor as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. But in a number of these distressed areas, unemployment has reached depressionlike proportions. In these areas we find that every fifth able-bodied person willing to work and seeking work cannot find gainful employment because of the distressed economic conditions existing there.

This appalling situation has forced some 4 million people throughout these United States to depend for basic subsistence upon the meager rations distributed from surplus commodities by the Department of Agriculture. I used the word "meager" advisedly because the surplus food distributed by the Department of Agriculture is totally inadequate for the maintenance of even reasonably good health. Our people are the greatest and most important resource of the country. They are a resource we cannot afford to neglect through unemployment and through a handout diet of flour, cornmeal, rice, powdered milk, dried eggs, and lard.

Few people realize that we are trying to feed needy families on rations amounting to a retail value of less than 8 cents a day per person. Can anyone wonder, therefore, that there is real hunger in some sections of the country—not just an inadequate diet?

My own State of West Virginia has suffered most sharply from economic reversals during the past decade. Today, almost 295,654 persons, or about 1 out of every 6 in the State, are now dependent upon surplus foods. Today, too, the only balanced meal which many children of the unemployed get is the hot lunch served in schools.

Despite the gravity of the situation, the Federal Government has done very little to promote a positive program to help the depressed areas in these United States. The Government has demonstrated an ability to act speedily when disasters occur, either in the United States or in any part of the world. But it has also demonstrated an ability to shut its eyes to the disastrous situation that exists in many of the depressed areas.

The day for eye shutting is over. Our bitter experiences during the past decade should convince the most sincere believer in occult arts that the depressed areas are not going to disappear from our midst just because we choose to ignore the plight of the millions of people living in those areas.

Economists frequently suggest that a solution for the unemployed in distressed areas is to migrate elsewhere. Many have done just that. They try to find jobs in other areas. The population of West Virginia has declined by 145,131, or about 8 percent, during the last 10 years, while the population of the United States increased by almost a fifth. But migration does not offer a solution to the problems of distressed areas. If anything, it adds to those problems because it encourages the dilapidation of vast invested social capital in the form of churches, schools, roads, and many other kinds of public facilities.

There is also another side to this migration proposal which thoughtful economists should consider. And that is that the movement of unemployed into new areas creates social and economic problems for those areas—increasing the pressure for housing, schools, and other public facilities, at a time when job opportunities have sharply diminished throughout the Nation. In recent years there has not been a single area in these United States which has experienced labor shortages.

There is no single simple solution to effectuate the rehabilitation of distressed areas. A variety of programs is needed. Happily, this is a situation recognized in the bill which the senior Senator from Illinois has introduced and which I have cosponsored.

This bill has four major provisions:

1. It provides technical assistance to communities to enable them to study their physical and human resources and evaluate their economic potential. On the basis of these facts, an economically distressed community would be able to approach potential employers with definite proposals as to the type of industry it could absorb.

2. In order to encourage prospective businesses to locate in a distressed community, or to encourage existing businesses to expand in the area, Senator DOUGLAS' bill would provide employers with needed capital at attractive rates of interest.

It is a well-established fact that conventional lending facilities are inadequate in distressed areas, particularly insofar as long-term, low-interest capital is concerned. What is needed, therefore, is an effective program to provide essential capital when it can be usefully employed. This should be a joint venture on the part of all levels of government and private enterprise, and S. 1 provides for such a joint endeavor.

Consequently, the Douglas bill provides for Federal loans which would cover, at most, 65 percent of the total capital needed for land and for building a new plant or commercial facility, or for the rehabilitation of a plant. The balance of the needed fund would have to be supplied either by the State, community, or by private capital.

In exceptional cases, the loans may also cover part of the cost of the machinery or equipment needed for the establishment of a successful enterprise, providing the working capital will be left completely to private enterprise.

I submit that this is a realistic approach to supplement the inadequate investment capital that exists in distressed areas. Altogether, the bill would establish revolving funds totaling $200 million from which loans would be made for new businesses locating in distressed areas, as well as for expanding businesses. The loans would cover industrial and commercial enterprises, including tourist facilities.

I am of the opinion that the $200 million in revolving funds established by the bill is a rather modest sum in view of the great needs and the large number of depressed areas. The fiscal year 1962 budget for foreign aid, I am advised, provides $200 million for technical assistance and there is a request for $700 million for development loans. As late as December 27, 1960, we extended, according to the newspapers, an additional $100 million to Yugoslavia—this on top of all the millions of dollars we have already

extended to that country. We have long been cognizant of the needs of peoples in foreign countries, and now that we are equally concerned with the needs of our own people we should not be stinting in the aid we extend to them.

3. Many of the distressed areas do not have needed public facilities to attract new industry. Because of a deteriorated tax base over a long period of chronic unemployment, or chronic partial employment, these areas do not have sufficient resources to provide such facilities without outside help. The Douglas bill would, therefore, establish a revolving fund of $100 million from which communities would be able to borrow funds in order to build industrial parks, improve public facilities, when necessary, and provide industrial water supply or other facilities essential for industry.

In extreme cases of need, the Federal Government would make grants to the communities on a matching basis to build such facilities. The extent of the Federal grants, however, would depend upon the ability of the communities and the States to participate in establishing the essential public facilities.

4. Finally, the bill also provides for training and retraining of workers in the distressed areas. The Federal Government has made grants to States for vocational training since 1917, when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. The Douglas bill provides additional funds to expand such vocational facilities in distressed areas. The type of training or retraining that would be provided in these communities would, of course, depend upon the needs of the individual distressed area and the industries likely to be attracted.

Many of the unemployed workers in distressed areas have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. It would hardly be reasonable to expect that workers without any means of subsistence could undergo an effective training program. The Douglas bill, therefore, provides a limited appropriation of only $10 million from which subsistence payments will be made to workers who are no longer eligible to collect unemployment insurance while they are undergoing training or retraining. The subsistence payments, however, would be limited to a period of 16 weeks.

These, in brief, are the major provisions of the area redevelopment bill.

There are many other provisions in the Douglas bill which merit careful consideration. However, I would like to touch on only two controversial provisions:

1. I have also heard that the bill would rob nondepressed communities of potential employees and additional jobs. Underlining this criticism of the bill is the assumption that our economic growth is extremely limited. This, I believe, is not true.

If anything, I believe the bill will help establish an atmosphere which will foster expanded economic growth, and that the new plants which it will encourage will provide additional jobs in the distressed areas. This will make it possible for additional total growth of the economy. Distressed areas, instead of serving as a drag on the economy, will aid in total economic expansion and growth. The distressed areas bill will, therefore, aid not only the people in these communities, but will also contribute to the healthy economic development of the whole Nation.

Finally, I would like to stress that the area redevelopment bill does not offer the total solution to the problems of the distressed areas. But this in no way detracts from its importance. As I have stated before, to evolve a comprehensive plan to solve the problems of distressed areas requires diverse measures. Such a full-bodied program has been thoroughly spelled out by the task force to aid distressed areas which President-elect Kennedy appointed in December of 1960.

A major recommendation of that task force was the passage of the area redevelopment bill which I have just outlined. This committee, to which I had the honor to serve as a consultant, rightfully gave priority to the passage of the area redevelopment bill. It is my deep conviction, and hope, that the 87th Congress will assign highest priority to the approval of this bill. The Douglas bill is not only a good piece of legislation; its enactment into law is vitally necessary.

Federal Rail Equipment-Leasing Agency Bill, H.R. 2078, Provides Needed Assistance for Our Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2078, a bill to establish a Railroad Equipment Administration within the Department of Commerce to purchase, finance, lease, and dispose of railroad rolling stock and to have available to it a working fund of up to $500 million.

The proposed administration would be authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time negotiable bonds in an amount aggregating not more than four times the total advances to its working fund and its accumulated surplus.

Under the proposed administration would be established a Railroad Equipment Board, composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or their nominees, plus four persons appointed by the President from outside the Government.

My bill, H.R. 2078, embodies provisions much like those of the so-called Symes plan put forward in mid-1957 by the Eastern railroads and presented to a House subcommittee by James M. Symes, then president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Similar legislation was introduced in the last session of Congress by Representative FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2078 would provide that no lease would set a term of years with respect to any particular class or type of railroad equipment exceeding the true economic life of such class or type. And unless the equipment board later changed the span, the following economic lives would apply to the classes indicated:

First. In the case of equipment to be used wholly or partly for the transportation of passengers, not more than 10 years.

Second. In the case of equipment designed solely for the transportation of property, not more than 20 years.

Third. In the case of equipment designed solely as locomotive power for the movement of other equipment, not more than 15 years.

When determination is made by the board of the true economic life of any class or type of railroad equipment the same shall not be changed for a period of 3 years thereafter.

The bill carries the following declaration of purposes:

It is hereby declared to be a matter of legislative determination that the equipment now being operated in interstate commerce by railroad companies is, to a considerable extent, inadequate and outmoded; that the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of such equipment is essential to (1) the proper functioning of the Government of the United States, (2) commerce among the several States, (3) carrying out the national transportation policy adopted by the Congress, and (4) the postal service and the national defense; that the Congress finds these essential objectives cannot be effectively achieved with the limited resources of the railroad industry, particularly in periods of shortages in the capital markets, that, in order to provide public participation in attaining these ends, it is necessary to enact the provisions hereafter set forth granting to a public agency certain powers to accomplish these objectives, and that the purchase, financing, leasing, and disposition of such equipment by the public agency hereinafter created, all as provided in this act, is hereby declared to be a public use and purpose.

The railroad lessees would assume sole responsibility for the construction of the equipment and would be obligated to assume the full cost and expense of securing proposals or bids for the construction. The submission of bids would be by public advertisement.

No tax could be imposed by any State or political subdivision on the manufacture, sale, purchase, or use of equipment owned or to be acquired by the rail administration.

In drawing up the leases, the bill provides that the following be included:

The amount of rental to be paid by the railroad to the administration over the term of the lease, which shall aggregate the following: (a) The original cost to the administration of purchasing the equipment covered by the lease, less such amount as the board shall at the beginning of the lease estimate to be the current scrap value thereof, and (b) the estimated interest cost to the administration of providing the funds with an added interest factor equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum annually with such combined interest factor being applied against the declining balances.

The railroads would be required to keep the equipment in good condition, would have to make good any equipment losses, would have to comply with all laws and with the equipment rules of the Association of American Railroads and would have to obtain permission to assign or transfer the lease or sublet the equipment. The administration could repossess equipment in case of default of any terms of the lease.

Section 304 of H.R. 2078 deals with the disposition of the equipment. It reads as follows:

SEC. 304. (a) Upon the expiration of the term of any lease, or sublease or assignment thereof, the administration shall promptly accept return by the railroad of the equipment covered thereby, or shall repossess the same by appropriate judicial process.

(b) Railroad equipment repossessed by the administration prior to expiration of the term of the original lease thereof may be

leased by it to another railroad for not more than the balance of said term, upon such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the board are most favorable, and the leasing of such equipment need not be subject to such terms of the standard lease as the board deems inappropriate in the circumstances.

(c) When the administration repossesses railroad equipment at the end of the term of the original lease, or is unable to re-lease equipment repossessed prior thereto, the administration shall offer to sell such equipment to the department or agency of the U.S. Government designated by the President by Executive order to undertake the stockpiling of railroad equipment. The sale price for each unit shall be the fair value as determined by agreement between the administration and such agency, but in no case may be less than the then scrap value of the said equipment. The department or agency acquiring such railroad equipment for stockpiling purposes shall not thereafter dispose of the same for other purpose than scrapping the said equipment, except that (1) in the event of national emergency declared by the President or by joint resolution of the Congress, or (2) pursuant to a decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission that a shortage exists in particular classes or types of railroad equipment, any such equipment may be temporarily released for use by the railroads under appropriate terms and conditions until new equipment can be acquired.

(d) Any railroad equipment repossessed by the administration, which is not leased to another railroad under the provisions of the act, and which is not purchased for stockpiling purposes by a department or agency of the the U.S. Government, shall thereupon promptly be sold and disposed of by the administration under such terms and with such guaranties as will assure that the said equipment shall be scrapped and not used by any railroad.

Among other provisions of H.R. 2078, the ICC would be directed to report to the new agency at least once a year on the supply and demand for railroad equipment. Rail equipment owned by the new agency would be subject to applicable provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and to the exercise of jurisdiction by the ICC, with the agency required to file copies of all leases of equipment with the Commission.

A fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, is provided for anyone making any false statement for the purpose of influencing the rail administration or for obtaining money, property, a lease of real equipment, or anything else of value.

Terms of the members of the Railroad Equipment Board, aside from the three Government officials, would be 6 years. The Board would be directed to hold at least four meetings a year. The members would receive $100 a day when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such. An executive director would be appointed by the Board itself, but the bill does not specify what his salary would be.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that most of the railroads of the Nation are faced with serious financial problems. As a matter of fact, the future of some of the eastern railroads is in jeopardy. The program provided for in my bill, H.R. 2078, is badly needed, and I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule early hearings on the legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 10: 22: *Let us draw near unto God with a true heart in full assurance of faith.*

Most merciful God, at this noon hour, we are again entering the sacred retreat of prayer and approaching Thy throne of grace where none has ever been repelled or sent away without Thy needed blessing.

May our minds and hearts be the shrines and sanctuaries of Thy love and gird us with the spirit of humility and devotion as we strive to build the highway toward peace and good will.

Show us how we may dispel our doubts and fears by the expulsive power of a strong faith and teach us the wisdom of yielding our wills to the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine spirit.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 127, Rept. No. 1), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of fifteen members.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 109

That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

THE STORY OF AN INDUSTRY, A UNION, AND A LAW

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, today I had an opportunity to join with other Members of Congress from the New England States and representatives of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, at a breakfast meeting held in the Congressional Hotel. The purpose of this get-together was to urge participation by the Members of Congress in the program of this textile trade union and to avail these leaders in the trade organization an opportunity to discuss with us their legislative aims in the 1961 session of Congress.

We were informed that the matters that interested the textile labor unions included an increase in the Federal minimum wage, area redevelopment, medical care for the aged, aid to education, adequate housing and tariff, and related problems affecting the welfare of textile workers and the economy of the communities in which these textile industries are located.

Each one of us was presented with a special so-called "white paper" which the Textile Workers Union of America had prepared and which was addressed to the Congress on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Law, and the abuses heaped upon labor by the present National Labor Relations Board as presently set up.

From the various speakers that addressed our meeting, I am thoroughly satisfied that there is an immediate need for a congressional committee to be set up to investigate and review the policy, the workings, and the decisions of that Board. I am hopeful that such a committee will have an opportunity to investigate this Board that evidently leans heavily to the side of the employer and management instead of rendering fair and reasonable decisions.

So that the Congress may be afforded an opportunity to know more about this situation that was so vitally brought to our attention by the 1951 report of the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to include their "white paper" document entitled "Almost Unbelievable—The Story of an Industry, a Union, and a Law":

This is the story of 14 stormy years in the life of America's oldest industry, textiles, one of the Nation's most responsible trade union organizations, the Textile Workers Union of America, and one of the most controversial and least understood laws of the land, the Taft-Hartley Act.

Although it has been temporarily elbowed aside by the Landrum-Griffin Act, a law even more sweeping in scope, Taft-Hartley continues to be a colossus which stands in

the way of American workers seeking to organize in unions of their own, free choice.

As matters now stand, we merely have an opinion of Landrum-Griffin. We believe it to be evil in conception and destructive to labor in purpose; we believe it will be ruthless in its application and discriminatory and excessive in its penalties; we are dubious of its constitutionality. But all our fears and suspicions must await the verdict of future history.

Taft-Hartley, on the other hand, has been tried and tested. It has been challenged in the courts. It has been applied to countless industrial disputes. It has been hailed and assailed, glorified and vilified, analyzed, criticized, and memorized. It has made its own history. The evidence is in.

This is the story of Taft-Hartley, as it relates to the sprawling textile industry. At the same time, it is a story of how the members of the National Labor Relations Board—political appointees and not elected representatives—have amended that law, in all but the most literal sense, through "administrative interpretations"; and how, unchallenged and unchecked, these very same men have usurped powers which the Congress of the United States never intended them to have.

The Taft-Hartley Act declares it to be the policy of the United States "to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection."

Textile workers have lived under this law for well over a decade. Has it been good or bad for them? Has the right of free association in unions of their own choice been protected or abridged? Has the law stabilized labor-management relations? Has it contributed to a climate of fairplay? Has it been wisely and impartially applied and administered? Has it hindered or hurt the bona fide union of textile workers? Have the owners of textile empires, particularly in the South, had their enormous powers curtailed by this law, or have they further entrenched themselves?

This story will provide the answers to these and other questions. It will show that the interpretation and administration of the Taft-Hartley Act, for all practical purposes, has deprived the American textile worker of his right to organize—unless he is willing to risk all-out economic reprisal and even physical punishment. It will explain why a Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations has called the situation in the southern textile industry "almost unbelievable."

It is a story prepared with a restraint difficult to maintain in the supercharged atmosphere in which it has unfolded. It is a simple story told without embellishment. It is a factual story, the hardest of all to relate.

We invite your attention to it. We trust you will read it through. We earnestly solicit your frank comment.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
WM. POLLOCK,
General President.
JOHN CHUPKA,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

THE INDUSTRY

The textile industry is one of mankind's oldest. It is basic; man must be clothed.

Certainly it is the oldest form of manufacturing in America. The first settlers cleared the forests, planted fruits and vegetables, and hunted game to feed themselves; but someone had to build and operate a loom to provide clothing. Man can feed himself off the land, but he must manufacture clothing.

The history of the textile industry is as grim as it is long. Callousness and brutality have hovered over the mills since the first yarn was spun into cloth. Even today, in an era of a supposedly enlightened attitude of man toward man, the industry is still the lair of violence and contempt for human rights. This is not to brand all textile employers. Many are fair, progressive, responsible, and farsighted. But the charge of widespread cruelty is not an idle one made for dramatic effect. We shall document this allegation fully.

Down through the years, the chief characteristic of this industry has been its individualism, a tradition that even now prevents it from making the sweeping social progress that has marked the growth of nearly all other big business in America.

And make no mistake about it: the textile industry is big business today. With 7,950 separate establishments spread across the land, with almost 900,000 production workers turning out material at the highest rate of productivity in history, and with total national sales of $13 billion, it is more than just a basic industry; it is a giant industry.

It has been moving through changes in its structure so fundamental that today a handful of mammoth chains dominate the field. Burlington Industries, Inc., giant of the textile giants, has over 100 U.S. plants employing some 50,000 workers. Other large chains include J. P. Stevens with 31,000 employees; Cannon, 25,000; Lowenstein, Dan River and Deering, Milliken, with 17,000 each; Abney-Erwin, 16,000, and Cone, 15,000.

Some 20 textile companies reached such proportions that they are listed in Fortune magazine's directory of the 500 largest U.S. industrial corporations. They seem to have the outward characteristics of other large companies on the American industrial scene; yet their old individualism sets them apart.

Practically all segments of big business today recognize and deal with trade union organizations representing their employees. Some of them may do it grudgingly; some may do it voluntarily; nearly all of them do it.

The sole exception is the textile industry. Individualistic to the core though it is, the industry nonetheless has developed a concerted front in one area: stubborn and often vicious resistance to unionization of its workers. In the marketplace millowners may snarl at one another but they are united, for all their individualism, in opposition to unions.

This is especially true in the South, now the heart of the industry. More than 80 percent of the cotton industry, the major subdivision of textiles, is now located below the Mason-Dixon line. The movement from the North, where the industry was born, is intensifying. More and more new plants dot the southern countryside. And more and more of the technological improvements are being made in southern mills. The future of textiles is in the South, just as the future of the South may well be in textiles.

The economic stakes are enormous. Low wage rates and substandard working conditions for their employees have always given southern employers an unfair competitive edge over northern employers whose workers are more widely unionized.

Southern textile employers, in particular, do not intend to sit back and watch that advantage disappear or narrow. They see in unionization of their mills a steady lessening of that margin of extra profit. The ferocity of their historic opposition to unions is explained to a large degree by this factor.

Until 1947 there were encouraging indications that unionization would take root among southern textile workers. Success was slow but steady. The passage of the Wagner Act had stiffened the courage of textile workers. They felt that the prestige and power of the Government was behind them in their efforts to join unions of their own choice to improve their working conditions. The Textile Workers Union of America won 58 percent of the representation elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board in the 5 years prior to Taft-Hartley.

From 1947 on—with the passage and implementation of the Taft-Hartley law—that tide turned. Additional weapons were placed in the hands of the employers. Countless restrictions and obstacles faced the workers and their union. The climate changed to one of extreme hostility toward unions and this, in turn, aggravated the normal fear and apprehensions of the textile workers. Where unionization had been on the upgrade, it was first stopped in its tracks and then pushed downward. The TWUA lost 63 percent of all representation elections in the 5 years immediately following Taft-Hartley. Where the once untrammeled power of the employers had been checked to some degree, it again was given free rein.

In the 5 years prior to Taft-Hartley, successful and continuing collective bargaining relationships were established in 116 of the 150 plants where elections were won by the union. In other words, in 77 percent of the situations that developed, some foundation for ultimately harmonious labor relations was established.

In the 5 years immediately following passage of Taft-Hartley, the picture changed drastically. In that period the union was able to win but 56 representation elections. In only 24 instances was it possible to establish any sort of continuing relationships. The previous average of 77 percent was cut to 43 percent. In 18 percent of these cases initial contracts were signed, but the employers soon afterward refused to deal with the union. In 22 of these cases, or 39 percent, no contract was ever signed and the local unions involved were wiped out.

In simple terms, this meant that with the passage of Taft-Hartley union efforts were seriously throttled; more than half of the time the workers couldn't get a union even after they voted for it; and new organization was brought to a virtual standstill.

The decline in union strength and prestige has been more than matched by the enormous increase in employer power so that today, once again, the flag of feudalism flies above the Stars and Stripes in the textile strongholds of 16 Southern States.

THE UNION

Organizations, like people, often develop streaks of modesty. This is true even of trade unions which, in the past, seldom found time to blush in the midst of extravagant self-praise. Yet growth and responsibility have bred in TWUA the kind of humility which now makes it impossible for us to pat ourselves on the back. We are fortunate in that we do not have to do so; the history and activities of our organization have been commented upon frequently enough through the years by experts from outside the union ranks.

We herewith quote verbatim excerpts from a description of TWUA written by Alton Levy, a veteran reporter on labor affairs. For many years Mr. Levy was the close associate of Victor Riesel, nationally syndicated labor journalist, whose column appears in more

than 300 of the Nation's leading daily newspapers. This is what he wrote:

"In a sprawling, chaotic industry with a turbulent and chaotic history, the Textile Workers Union of America has achieved a unique distinction: it is here to stay. Therein lies perhaps its greatest strength and its greatest promise. At long last, here is a union to which the workers can look for assistance and guidance, and from which responsible elements in the industry's leadership can expect cooperation and sincerity in coping with the multiplicity of economic and social problems that have beset textiles through the years.

"TWUA is no stranger either to problems or struggles. It was born of both back in the surging thirties when it swept through the Nation's mill towns under the banner of the Textile Workers Organizing Committee, enrolling textile workers by the thousands in its crusade for better working conditions and better treatment. Other international unions already established in some phase of the garment end of the industry provided much of the early guidance and finances for the organizing drive that led to the formal creation, in 1939, of the TWUA as such.

"This union has been led from its inception by men of ability and responsibility who came up from the ranks with an intimate, firsthand knowledge of the mechanics and the economics of the industry. But just as they were part of textile, textile was part of them and to this very day this strong sense of identification has made possible enormous contributions by the union toward the stability and welfare of the industry.

"One can only marvel that this union has insisted on making its contribution to the development of the industry in the face of the vicious attacks launched against it and its members by important segments of the industry, especially in the South. One marvels at that and then is awed by the thought of how much more good this union could do if ever the textile industry learns—like all other big business—to recognize responsible, legitimate trade unionism, to deal with it, to cooperate with it for mutual benefit and to harness the ability, imagination, and knowledge of its leaders for the benefit of the industry per se.

"It is the measure of the TWUA that it is still prepared and willing to cooperate in this bold concept and still of the belief that the industry will ultimately see the errors of its ways.

"That TWUA is here to stay is apparent from the businesslike way in which it operates its farflung operations and the imaginative way it administers eight special departments that not only help run the day-to-day affairs of the union but plan new ways to better service its members, new ways to enroll new members and new ways of helping the responsible elements of the industry to improve production techniques and increase consumer demand for textile products. This latter effort will be sparked by the union's newly formed union label department.

"TWUA has 616 local unions and 50 joint boards serving the some 220,000 textile workers it represents across the land. It has 208 employees on its payroll, consisting of two general officers, 128 field representatives, 21 technical specialists, and 57 secretaries and clerical employees.

"TWUA has never had the slightest suspicion leveled against its officers and their conduct. It has been among the early opponents of corruption and wrongdoing within labor's ranks and was a strong supporter of the ouster of unethical unions from the AFL–CIO. Its most violent opponents have never hinted at wrongdoing and there has never been any investigation, informal or otherwise, of TWUA by any local, State, or Federal agency or committee.

"Of special interest is the carefully devised system of checks and balances employed by this union to safeguard its funds. This precautionary program, like TWUA's special ethical practices code, is so thorough that it goes far beyond the suggestions even of the AFL–CIO's ethical practices committee and the yardsticks proposed by various congressional committees.

"To insure that its affiliates are equally scrupulous in the handling of funds as is the national office, TWUA has issued a special manual for local and joint board auditing committees. In addition, it has developed a filmstrip to illustrate the instructions spelled out in the manual. Field audits are made periodically. Trained auditors are in the employ of the union and these specialists not only check the books and records of the various funds but even inspect leases, deeds, and other pertinent data relating to realty operations to insure that these are conducted on the highest ethical level as well.

"Matching its time-honored antiracketeering attitude is the TWUA's historic and vigorous anti-Communist position. Communists, like all totalitarians, are barred from holding office in the union. The union's officials are all active in anti-Communist organizations. When the old CIO expelled various Communist unions from its ranks, TWUA was among the ardent supporters of the then CIO president, Philip Murray, in his drive to keep the Nation's trade unions loyal to the traditions and precepts of America.

"While lunatic fringe groups will raise this issue from time to time in their virulent opposition to the union, particularly in the South, there is not a single responsible industry or community leader below the Mason-Dixon line—even among those who may be openly antiunion—who will level this charge seriously at the TWUA. Privately, even the smut groups concede that raising the 'Red' question is done only because it is sometimes effective, but that they know it isn't true about the TWUA."

This, then, is the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO—the second in the cast of characters of the story we are about to unfold.

THE LAW

The Taft-Hartley law, enacted in 1947, was described by its sponsors as a measure designed to restore balance to labor relations. The public, hit by a massive propaganda barrage directed by conservative political and industrial groups, was led to believe that labor had grown too strong and that the employers needed relief.

The Wagner Act, it was said, had been designed to strengthen the power of the unions. By encouraging the formation of unions and protecting workers in their selection of unions to represent them, we were told, this act played favorites. Presumably, the Taft-Hartley law would restore simplicity to the intricate push and pull of labor relations.

This was the "line" of the antiunion forces. Unfortunately, the public fell for this oversimplified, misleading and, in large measure, inaccurate picture of the labor relations situation in the country in 1947. Captivated by catch phrases, few studied the bill carefully. Few were aware of the dangerous precedents established in this vaguely worded statute. Few realized the menace contained in the many loopholes.

Even within the labor movement there was an unfortunate tendency to attack the new law violently in sweeping general terms like "slave labor" or "neo-Fascist," etc., while not properly evaluating the ugly uses to which skilled antilabor lawyers might put the so-called "fine print"—the less publicized, complicated sections of the bill that never received too much public attention.

After 14 years of experience with the Taft-Hartley law, it is apparent that, instead of balancing labor relations, it has destroyed all vestiges of equilibrium. Instead of imposing peace, it has revived and intensified industrial strife. Instead of bringing relief to the allegedly harassed employers, it has given them a new and heavier club to use against unions and has set up new legal forms to protect them in the indiscriminate wielding of this legislative bludgeon. Moreover, it has negated, for all practical purposes, the right of unorganized workers to join a union without fear of coercion, intimidation, and economic reprisal.

By amending many of the sections of the old Wagner Act, Taft-Hartley has hacked away at the very things that might have protected the right of workers to join unions of their choice. As TWUA declared in a presentation before a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

"The 'free speech' amendment under the Taft-Hartley Act and the National Labor Relations Board's interpretations have revoked every reasonable limitation that previously existed on employers' freedom to oppose unions. They are no longer subject to the Wagner Act Board's 'totality-of-conduct' doctrines in appraising their behavior. There are practically no effective prohibitions on individual interrogation, 'captive' audience addresses, or the use of coercive 'plant closing' prophecies.

"This unrestricted freedom to oppose unionism has been particularly fatal to union efforts in mill towns and rural textile communities, where workers have few alternative employment opportunities. Employers have fought unionism with threats of plant closing if the union wins an election, and with insidious propaganda labeling unions or their leaders as unsavory and associates of undesirable persons. These broadsides, which stamp all unionism with the misconduct of the few, are very common.

"Another increasingly common weapon against unionism has been the use of community agencies or other outsiders as fronts for hostile managements. Since Taft-Hartley does not concern itself with the conduct of third parties, they have complete license to fight unions with whatever means they wish. The Wagner Act had permitted the NLRB to reach out to third parties and thereby prevented such 'volunteer' union-busting activities from interfering with organization. But the Taft-Hartley Act stops the National Labor Relations Board from providing workers with such protection under the law. These outside groups have proved to be most coercive and have done much to terrorize union workers."

The framers of the Taft-Hartley law were very astute men. They knew that in their zeal to jam the law through the 79th Congress, while the carefully stirred up public anger at unions was at its height, they might inadvertently omit some necessary piece of restrictive legislation. So they prepared even for this eventuality by tucking in a provision that allows individual States to pass their own labor relations laws to supersede the Federal law if—and this is a mighty big if—the State laws were more restrictive.

The Southern States answered the call. In short order, most of the 16 States below the Mason-Dixon line rushed through their own so-called "little Taft-Hartleys," quaintly characterized as right-to-work laws. Whatever loopholes were left by the daddy of all antiunion laws were immediately plugged by these State laws. In the main, these State laws wipe out union security clauses in collective bargaining agreements and make extremely difficult the checkoff of union dues.

For all practical purposes, the combined impact of Taft-Hartley and the restrictive State laws has made successful union organizing impossible in the South. This is an ugly fact of which TWUA is more pain-

fully aware than most unions because almost all of its organizing activity has been in that area. In recent years TWUA has spent several million dollars on organization work in the South. TWUA is frank to admit that the few thousands of workers it enrolled were totally disproportionate to the time and effort and money spent. Yet the union's fight goes on even in the face of these frustrating odds, for to abandon the southern textile workers would be to acknowledge that 20th century labor-management relations cannot prevail over naked feudalism.

The spectacular lack of success this union and others have found in the South is attributable as much to the climate generated by Taft-Hartley and right-to-work laws as to the laws themselves. Where there was fear among southern workers before Taft-Hartley, there is total terror now. Where there was uncertainty—even under the Wagner Act—that the Government could or would protect workers against the millowners, there is no question in the minds of Dixie workers today that they have been abandoned by their Government and that the labor law of the land has given the employers carte blanche. Where once there were tangible signs of hope among southern textile workers, there is now obvious frustration, disillusionment, and despair.

Political appointees being what they are, it is not surprising that members of the National Labor Relations Board—designated by the same political party that fathered Taft-Hartley—should reflect this change in atmosphere.

Where complaints of unions and workers once were swiftly investigated and ruled on, there is now endless delay—delay which plays into the hands of the employers by giving them that much extra time in which further to coerce and intimidate workers seeking to enroll in a union.

Where once employers were hard put to stall certification elections, today the NLRB has made it easy for delay after delay. Indeed, the record is full of instances where the Board allowed so much delay that union strength disappeared by the time an election was ordered.

In a nutshell, the NLRB today—reflective of the climate generated by the Taft-Hartley law—is a biased body favoring employers and antiunion groups against workers seeking to unionize their plants. This is a serious charge to make but it is a charge we shall document fully, and the documentation is sufficient to justify a full congressional investigation of the NLRB.

Historians of tomorrow, seeking to pinpoint the pressures that beset workers of this era, may well single out not the specifics of the law but rather the antilabor climate it created.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who have had to live with the Taft-Hartley law, night and day, that the men who devised it and sponsored it were devilishly clever foes of trade unionism whose intent was to weaken or smash effective trade unionism. But the passage of time makes crystal clear the one-sidedness of this measure in content and application and raises the very serious and important possibility that the Members of the 79th Congress who voted for the bill were themselves victimized by the skilled schemers. In retrospect, it is hard to believe that a responsible body of lawmakers could or would have passed such an absurdly unbalanced measure if they had not had the intent misrepresented—deliberately and persuasively.

There is an urgent need to undo some of the damage created by the 79th Congress. The story we shall unfold on the following pages—told simply and documented fully—justifies another long, sober look at this law and justifies, too, immediate and deep-rooted changes to restore decency, sanity, and equity to labor relations in our great land.

PATTERN OF THINGS PAST—PATTERN OF THINGS TO COME

Henderson, N.C., has always been a small, sleepy, southern textile town. It is still a small southern textile town. But it is no longer sleepy. It is wide awake with smoldering resentments nourished at various times by dynamite blasts, gunfire, shouts, imprecations, fist fights, and even soldiers in battle dress carrying rifles with bayonets fixed.

Henderson, N.C., is a community split asunder by a strike none of the strikers and few of the townspeople really wanted. It is a community that is experiencing, firsthand, the sort of civil war that has divided scores of other southern textile towns in the past decade.

The full, ultimate, inevitable effects of Taft-Hartley have visited Henderson, N.C., pitting brother against sister, nephew against uncle, son against father, friend against friend. Hand in hand with this deterioration of personal relationships have come hunger, despair, privation, frustration, and unhappiness.

Yes; there's a strike in Henderson. It's a strike of more than 1,000 men and women—members of the Textile Workers Union of America. They have been out on strike, at this writing for more than 2 years.

They picket, day in and day out, before the gates of the Harriet and Henderson Cotton Mills where they had worked some 14 years under the protection of a collective bargaining agreement between their employer and Locals 578 and 584 of the TWUA.

Under the watchful eyes of heavily armed National Guardsmen dispatched to the scene by North Carolina's chief executive, these men and women have trudged back and forth in front of the plants' gates in a simple effort to preserve their jobs, their standards, their union, and their dignity.

Fourteen years with a union contract—and now this? Were the relations between union and management that bad? Was there a history of repeated strikes and stoppages? Was the union "arbitration-happy"—taking the firm before an impartial arbiter on any and all grievances?

To all of these questions the answer is a resounding "No!" Relations had been surprisingly amicable. From the time the union first began to organize in 1943, there were but two interruptions—a brief strike in 1951 and an equally short-lived stoppage in 1954. In the last 5 years only 11 grievances had to be referred to arbitration for settlement—an average of about 1 grievance per plant per year.

Yet, despite this history of seeming amity, there is a strike. There are pickets. There are strikebreakers. There has been violence. There may be more.

Why? Why?

The obvious facts, on the surface, tell us that although the local unions indicated willingness to continue the old contract, the company refused and said it wanted termination.

This action was coupled with company demands for contract changes. But, you may say, the firm certainly has a right to seek changes in a union contract.

Yes, it does, but the company sought changes in every single clause in the contract with the sole exception of one, relating to military service, and that's governed by Federal law binding on both sides. Most drastic of the changes sought by the company was the elimination of arbitration of unresolved grievances or differences.

It must be borne in mind that workers and employers had lived amicably and profitably for 14 years with a union contract which included the arbitration clause. The union asked no increase in wages, pensions, or fringe benefits and sought no improvements in the old contract. Still the company insisted on provoking the strike.

One can only conclude that the employer is not a completely free agent; that he is no longer making his own decisions; that the language and nature of the contract changes for which he asked came from others, elsewhere; and that this situation was deliberately created as part of a calculated conspiracy among southern textile operators to weaken and, if possible, destroy the trade unions freely selected by textile workers—specifically, the TWUA.

No other explanation makes sense. John D. Cooper, Jr., president of the Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills, had never really been a vicious man in years past. His acceptance of the union led to 14 years of peace and profits for all concerned. The community-at-large benefited from the continuity of employment and the improved pay of the TWUA members in the plants.

All signs now indicate outside control of the situation—outside decisions Cooper cannot contest—outside direction of the tactics that have led to strikes, scabs, deep bitterness, and violence.

This is not to dismiss from consideration the peculiar personality of the man—a narrow-minded, sick, embittered old man whose shrill refusals to meet the moderate proposals of a conservative North Carolina Governor have unnecessarily prolonged the dispute and made a peaceful solution that much more difficult.

We are acutely aware of the complications that have arisen as a result of Cooper's quirks. We know that he has publicly announced that he is, "in principle," opposed to the concept of binding arbitration of unresolved issues between his company and the union. Yet we also know that Cooper, in fact, is an ardent champion of the principle of compulsory binding arbitration—in his commercial dealings. The records of the American Arbitration Association show that Cooper and his firms are among the most frequent users of arbitration when it comes to settling commercial disputes. All of this bitter old man's public protestations about arbitration, therefore, are of special concern to us, for we know this is a smokescreen that can serve only to stall an equitable settlement of this long drawn-out dispute.

We know that Cooper deliberately misled the union and Gov. Luther Hodges of North Carolina when a tentative agreement to settle the strike was reached on Friday, April 17, 1959, in Raleigh. At that time TWUA agreed to a "compromise" which eliminated the arbitration clause from the contract, eliminated the checkoff of dues and called for the rehiring of strikers for all immediately available jobs, with further rehiring on a seniority basis as soon as vacancies occurred. Everyone was given the clear impression that a substantial number of jobs were at once available to the strikers.

On the recommendation of the union, the strikers voted to accept these terms on Sunday, April 19, 1959. When they reported for work on Monday, April 20, in accordance with the settlement agreed upon in the Governor's office, the strikers found that "scabs" had been hired even for the jobs that were supposed to be kept open for the original employees on the second and third shifts. This "doublecross" upset the agreement and provoked a continuation of the strike.

Even the normally cautious and conservative Governor Hodges was appalled by this crass disregard of the terms of the settlement. He exploded in all of the southern papers with an attack on Cooper for "misleading" him and the union. But from that point on, the Governor retired to the sidelines.

However, proemployer State police authorities continued their strikebreaking efforts. Having failed to break the will of the

workers to resist, despite wholesale picketline arrests and the use of the National Guard, the State bureau of investigation arrested eight strike leaders, including a TWUA vice president, on June 13, 1959, and charged them with conspiracy to dynamite company property.

The eight men were tried in an atmosphere of antiunion hysteria and under circumstances that should trouble the consciences of Americans everywhere. They were speedily convicted on the testimony of an ex-convict in the hire of the SBI. The witness, incidentally, was a former TWUA member with a grudge against the union. The eight were subsequently sentenced to terms ranging between 2 and 10 years, and are now behind prison bars.

Let no one assume even for a moment that there is no realization on the part of TWUA of the enormous complications that have resulted from the almost unfathomable machinations of a rancor-ridden old man. We are painfully aware of how aggravating such personality problems can be. But the entire fight and the issues involved go much deeper than one man's irrationality.

Were John D. Cooper, Jr., a younger man today, less plagued by illness, loneliness, bitterness, and power lust, the strike would have been forced on the community anyway. Cooper's complex psychological structure makes settlement tougher, but his foibles didn't cause the strike. Henderson is not an isolated instance nor are the issues at stake peculiar to Henderson alone. Henderson is part of a pattern—a pattern dating back to 1947 when the Taft-Hartley law was passed.

There have been a hundred Hendersons throughout southern textile towns. The bitterness and violence, in one degree or another, have always been there. Even a congressional committee, which only superficially examined the southern textile industry, was appalled at the scope and ferocity of employer opposition to organization of trade unions by textile workers.

Henderson, we have said, is no isolated instance of antiunionism; it is a natural development of a pattern brought into existence by the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. It was inevitable.

These are strong allegations. Can they be substantiated? Do the demonstrable facts bear out our harsh indictment? Is there enough documented evidence to justify this sweeping characterization of developments in the textile industry below the Mason-Dixon line?

Step through the pages of the past decade's history with us. Take a long, objective look at the facts we have compiled. Consider the situations we have described calmly and dispassionately. And then, you be the judge.

But before we start our tour of a countryside littered with the residue of hundreds of bitter industrial explosions, read what a Senate subcommittee concluded after an examination of the southern textile industry's labor relations policies:

"In stopping a union organizing campaign, the employer will use some or all of the following methods: Surveillance of organizers and union adherents; propaganda through rumors, letters, news stories, advertisements, speeches to the employees; denial of free speech and assembly to the union; organization of the whole community for antiunion activity; labor espionage; discharges of union sympathizers; violence and gunplay; injunctions; the closing or moving of the mill; endless litigation before the NLRB and the courts, etc. If all this fails, the employer will try to stall, in slow succession, first the election, then the certification of the union and, finally, the negotiation of a contract. Few organizing campaigns survive this type of onslaught."

SURVEILLANCE OF ORGANIZERS AND UNION ADHERENTS

Charlottesville, Va., close to an historic shrine and the home of the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, was the backdrop for an example of company behavior that would, in the ordinary person's mind, be associated with a totalitarian state.

At Charlottesville stands the plant of Frank Ix & Sons Inc., a rayon throwing, knitting, and weaving mill. It had been in existence some 20 years. It had always paid substandard wages. Besides this, the then vice president and general manager of the firm, Frank Ix, Jr., had extensive real estate holdings, renting homes to many of his employees. In times of housing shortage, workers at his plant were often more fearful of being evicted than they were of being fired.

TWUA was asked by the workers to organize the plant in 1946. Within a few weeks after arriving at Charlottesville, the TWUA organizer was able to identify almost every one of the more than 30 Ix supervisors, including the superintendent and personnel manager. It was not difficult, for he saw their faces often. Upwards of 10 of these "boss men" (a southern worker's term for supervisors) trailed the organizer as he called upon the workers at their homes. The surveillance was not subtle. On the contrary, these supervisors went in groups, their cars forming a caravan trailing behind the organizer's automobile.

Almost invariably after the organizer had seen an Ix worker, either on the street or at his home, that employee was questioned by a foreman or some other official about what had been said during the conversation with the organizer. Even workers who had not actually spoken to the organizer were cornered and quizzed. The foreman would have noticed the organizer's car near a worker's home and would assume the organizer had come to his door. As it turned out in several instances, the organizer had parked his car in front of one place and then visited some other individual on whom he did not want suspicion fastened.

In TWUA's files is an affidavit that the Ix company tried to rent a room from a millworker whose home overlooked the place where the organizer roomed. Sometimes union committee meetings were held in his room by TWUA sympathizers. The foreman who tried to rent the room said flatly to the landlady that the company wanted to keep someone at this place of vantage at all times to record who went to the organizer's room and when. "We will pay you well for the room," he said. As it turned out, the woman refused to allow her premises to be used for labor espionage.

Elsewhere in the union's file on Ix you will find letter after letter and report after report made by workers who were pressured by the company to attend union meetings and report to manageemnt on what was said and done. In an effort to ease their consciences, many of the workers gave the union copies of the reports they handed in to the supervisors.

At one time, more than 700 Ix workers had signed union cards. Clearly, this is an indication that the workers wanted a union not only in order to better their wages and working conditions but to shrug off this blanket of inquisition and persecution. Yet by 1950, this brazen intimidation by surveillance had become so effective that the union had to withdraw from the situation, despite plaintive pleas from some of those workers who still clung wistfully to the hope of having a union. An election would have been fruitless. Too many of the workers had been too intimidated. At that point, they would have been afraid to vote for the union, even in a secret election.

The fear was compounded by the disappearance of any vestige of protection from the National Labor Relations Board. Late in 1948 the NLRB ordered the company to rehire five employees who had been fired for union activity and to give them nearly $4,000 in backpay. Within a matter of weeks, four of them had been fired again. The background of these firings was almost identical to that of the first occasion; yet, this time the regional NLRB office decided in 1949 that it could not discover sufficient evidence to go to a hearing and the new complaints brought by the workers and the union were dismissed.

For some time, the phones at TWUA's office would continue to ring with calls from Charlottesville workers pleading for the union to come to their assistance; but the discouragement of the many, plus the lack of protection offered by the NLRB, led TWUA to the heart-rending and reluctant conclusion that a campaign at Ix would end only in defeat and further humiliation and danger for those workers still bold enough to vote for a union.

How can such a thorough network of surveillance be thrown around a cluster of U.S. citizens? Read from the proceedings of the NLRB's decision in the case of *Bibb Manufacturing Co.* (82 NLRB 338) dated 1949:

"The town of Porterdale was incorporated under the laws of Georgia a number of years ago. However, despite this act of incorporation, Porterdale remains in effect a 'company' town. All of its property, excepting a railroad right-of-way and churches, which the respondent (i.e., the company) donated to the various religious congregations, is owned by the respondent. All of Porterdale's utilities and public services, excepting police protection and education, are controlled directly by the respondent. In this setting, the relationship between the respondent and the police department, as set forth below, establishes a significant pattern of conduct."

In effect, every city official of Porterdale was an employee of the company. The mayor was the "house agent" of the company and in charge of police. The city recorder was the company's paymaster and treasurer. The city's attorneys were the company's attorneys. How effectively these men wove a web of surveillance around the workers and the union's organizers was described by an NLRB trial examiner in an intermediate report in this case. In part, he wrote:

"From July 10, 1946 to August 10, 1946, or a few days thereafter, policemen of the town of Porterdale were assigned to and maintained a 24-hour a day surveillance over the activities of each and every organizer for the union while he was inside the city limits of Porterdale, as well as surveillance over the home of employee Walter Reynolds, which the organizers made their local headquarters in Porterdale and in which much of the union activity took place.

"By this 24-hour watch over the Reynolds' home the police were able to know when the organizers were in town and to follow or trail them throughout the town while they were calling upon employees of the respondent. As soon as the organizers left the house on foot or by vehicle, the police followed by police car. If two organizers started out together and then went separate ways, there would be a policeman following each of them. Everywhere the organizers went, the police were sure to follow. For at least the above period of time, there was a policeman within 60 to 75 feet of any organizer who was in Porterdale.

"The police, except for one new employee who was unable to secure a uniform due to the clothing shortage, were always in uniform. They utilized the regular police car or the chief's automobile, both well known as police cars to the approximately 3,200 in-

habitants of Porterdale. The police made no effort to conceal their activities, but in fact made their surveillance as open and public as possible. The police remained at times on public thoroughfares. They said nothing. As described by one witness, the police were always around 'sitting and staring.'

"A number of the employees were afraid to talk to the organizers upon discovering their police escorts. One employee left the union organizer to whom he was talking for the purpose of telling the police escort that he (the employee) had not joined the union. The organizer offered to confirm this statement to the policeman if he should doubt the employee's word."

To anyone acquainted with the South, Porterdale's size, civic setup, and dependence upon one well-entrenched and all-pervading employer is not unusual. It is not even the exception that tests the rule. It is the rule. In mill town after mill town, such surveillance is not only possible but usually begins almost as soon as any group of employees begins expressing a desire to seek remedy through a union and a responsive union organizer checks into the community. Certainly the files of TWUA bulge with reports, affidavits, and case histories to that effect. They have not been kept secret. They have been presented time after time to committees of Congress. They have been publicized in the columns of the union's publication, Textile Labor. They are still available to any Government agency interested enough to inquire.

This invasion of the privacy of a southern citizen is possible because of the Taft-Hartley Act's insistence that any person influencing or interfering with a worker's free and open choice of a collective bargaining agent must be proved to be a direct "agent" of the employer. Since the Taft-Hartley Act does not patrol the behavior of third parties, the door is open to any and all avenues of assistance an employer may find. In the South, his friends are legion.

An era ago, under the Wagner Act, the NLRB was guided by a totality-of-conduct doctrine that allowed it to reach out and restrain these volunteers, curbing the license with which they attacked or invaded the privacy of unions and their adherents by making the employer justly responsible for these excesses, committed either in his interest or on his behalf.

Still, in a generation that has become familiar in one way or another with the totalitarian techniques of unrestricted police, such as the Gestapo and the MVD, any reasoning, civilized observer cannot help but find distasteful the terror bred by surveillance. Man does not move forward by looking back over his shoulder in fear, or ducking his head to avoid eavesdroppers.

PROPAGANDA THROUGH RUMORS, LETTERS, NEWS STORIES, ADVERTISEMENTS, SPEECHES TO THE EMPLOYEES

Words are wonderful weapons for textile employers these days, thanks to the Taft-Hartley law and the political appointees of the National Labor Relations Board.

The chief reason employers try to delay Labor Board elections nowadays is to get more time in which to hammer their workers over the head with spoken or written words of coercion. Thanks to the NLRB, they get delays almost for the asking. And thanks to Taft-Hartley, there are wondrous new uses to which they can put words—creating fears among workers, inciting suspicion and violence against unionists and spreading rumors of plant closings, to mention just a few.

Under the Wagner Act, this was seldom possible. Under the Taft-Hartley law, it is seldom impossible.

No provision of the Wagner Act dealt specifically with employer free speech. No special rules were required. From the statement of workers' rights contained in section 7, and the prohibition against interfering with those rights, stated in section 8(1), proper restriction on employer expressions logically followed.

Under the Wagner Act, a threat of reprisal in the event the union won was an unfair labor practice. A threat that the plant would close down in the event the union won an election, or a threat to discharge employees because of union affiliation were all unlawful because they destroyed the employees' free choice of a bargaining representative.

Under the Wagner Act, the Board developed a totality-of-conduct doctrine designed to curb more subtle employer efforts to deprive workers of their rights. Under this doctrine, noncoercive language combined with coercive acts was seen as part of a pattern of coercion. The doctrine received the sanction of the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in a utilities case in Virginia:

"But certainly conduct, though evidenced in part by speech, may amount in connection with other circumstances to coercion within the meaning of the act. If the total activities of an employer restrain or coerce his employees in their free choice, then those employees are entitled to the protection of the act. And in determining whether a course of conduct amounts to restraint or coercion, pressure exerted vocally by the employer may no more be disregarded than pressure exerted in other ways. For slight suggestions as to the employer's choice between unions may have telling effect among men who know the consequences of incurring that employer's strong displeasure."

Practically all of the reasonable limitations on employer expressions of views were set aside by the enactment of section 8(c) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which reads:

"The expressing of any views, argument or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit."

Section 8(c) did more than just wipe out limitations on the free speech of employers. It went much further. For one thing, it abolished all rules against captive audiences. Today, 8(c) stands as the only statute in Federal law which says that a man cannot be held legally liable for, or have used against him, statements and utterances made freely and publicly.

There isn't much doubt that this grants textile mill owners freedom of expression beyond any constitutional requirement. By virtue of this provision, and the way it has been interpreted by a Republican-controlled NLRB, employer expressions have been deemed legally noncoercive, when in fact they have bulldozed countless thousands of workers in their choice of a bargaining representative.

It has been held that when an employer threatened to close his plant if the union won an election, this was not a threat but merely a prediction and, therefore, legal. Nor is it any longer the rule that employer questioning of individual employees on union membership is in itself coercive. Today, the question and answer session must be accompanied by some other act in order to be a violation. An employer may tell his workers that even if the union wins a representation election, he will not recognize it. The Board didn't consider this a threat, but merely an expression of the employer's legal position.

The Board exonerated an owner who prohibited union solicitation and distribution on his premises while at the same time passing out antiunion literature. The Board's pro-employer bias was perfectly clear when it stated: "Management prerogative certainly extends far enough so as to permit an employer to make rules that do not bind himself."

Again, the Board pegged this decision on section 8(c), noting that the antiunion literature did not contain threats, promises or frightening statements.

The Board used section 8(c) to throw out the Wagner Board's totality-of-conduct doctrine. Now employer expressions are considered apart from their context. If the expressions themselves are lawful, then the Board does not regard as material any independent coercive conduct.

Section 8(c) also wiped out the prohibition against the captive audience. Some of the harmful effects of the captive audience address were lessened by the doctrine developed from a case involving a department store, Bonwit Teller. Under this rule, a boss could deliver a captive audience address, but a union had the right to reply. All of this was abolished by later decisions of the Republican-controlled NLRB. Now an owner may compel attendance at a meeting called to denounce a union, subject to certain limitations which do nothing to blunt the impact of his haranguing.

According to section 8(c), noncoercive language may not be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice. Some lawyers have contended this is unique in that it prohibits the use of language as evidence of the motive or the intention of some act.

While "free speech" for the millowner might have little or no effect in some other industry, in southern textile communities it usually gives him lethal effect. TWUA has given various Congressional committees example after example of hate and fear literature heaped upon workers during organizational campaigns.

One pamphlet depicted a Negro union leader with a white woman, above which was the caption—"Don't let your wife or daughter or sister be found in the same position."

Another described a Negro in a photograph as a CIO vice president, in charge of organizing workers "including the white employees."

A publication which calls the CIO carpetbaggers and cartoons a fight between management and labor, egged on by a Communist, carried an article listing the birthplaces of labor leaders and describing them as "foreign-born propagandists" who set themselves up as self-appointed dictators.

In the latter part of 1955, TWUA began a campaign at various southern plants of Burlington Industries, Inc., the country's largest textile chain. None of the plants of this company in the South are organized.

The union was met with a flood of literature designed to provoke race hate and other prejudices of the workers and direct them against the union. At the company's Steele Mill in Cordova, N.C., a one-page reprint of an article entitled "Total Mongrelization," from a sheet called the American Nationalist, published in Inglewood, Calif., was handed out. A picture with the text shows the former CIO president, Walter P. Reuther (identified as "Russian-loving"), presenting $75,000 to the NAACP president, Arthur Spingarn, "the Jew who has headed that troublemaking organization since 1939." The article urged "white Americans to take action if this Jew-inspired program for compulsory mongrelization is to be defeated."

At Burlington plants in Hurt and Altavista, Va., there was distributed a caricature of an inhuman carpetbagger with a long nose and drooping tongue, boasting: "The NAACP sent me down here to desegregate you trashy bastards!"

At the firm's Altavista weave mill, in August 1957, a newsletter entitled "The Dan Smoot Report," published in Dallas, Tex., was

handed out. It contained an article by one William P. Bersch, Jr., called an employee of the Kohler Co., in Kohler, Wis., which charges the UAW–CIO with wanton violence during a strike, and concludes with the question, "Is this America?"

The news article in the "Report on Civil Rights" denounced the then Attorney General's civil rights position "as an open insult to the whole southern part of the United States" and demands his attention to union violence. A third article in the report deals with communism, claiming "the Communists would have a labor union harass a company with strikes and outrageous demands until the company was on the verge of bankruptcy, and then the union would buy the company out."

Word-of-mouth use of the racial issue by Burlington supervisors was discovered during TWUA's campaign in a pattern strongly suggesting central direction. For example, on October 1, 1955, a supervisor called a worker into his office and, during the course of a 2-hour "brainwashing" session, told him: "Don't you know that the union is 100 percent for racial integration?"

At the Radford, Va., mill, workers were told by the plant manager that union leaders have given large sums of money to the NAACP. On April 4, 1956, employees at the Drakes Branch (Va.) mill were told that if the union got into the plant, white workers would have Negroes as shop stewards.

At Burlington's Peerless woolen mill in Rossville, Ga., clippings of especially provocative material from the Chattanooga Free Press were displayed. After the campaign started, copies of the Chatham Star-Tribune were sent to the houses of the Altavista finishing and Altavista weaving workers, including those who were not subscribers—a clear tipoff that the mailing list of workers had been supplied to the paper. Newspapers in areas near Burlington plants played the plant-closing theme, emphasizing that unionism could well mean the loss of jobs.

The Post Dispatch, published in Rockingham, N.C., carried an article in its issue of September 20, 1956, noting that the Darlington mill, in Darlington, S.C., closed after "the CIO won a bargaining election."

"And our Burlington chain may do just that if the CIO should wedge in on the Steele plant in Cordova. Been done elsewhere, and could happen at Cordova. Burlington is simply not going to operate even one unit under CIO control," the paper warned.

The May 9, 1957, editorial published in the Charlotte Gazette, Drakes Branch, Va., stated: "Citizens know that industry has sought to leave the labor unions behind them when they moved here and that if labor unions get a hold here that trouble might follow."

The May 17, 1956, issue of the Altavista (Va.) Journal said in an editorial that many plants have come South because of the strangling effects of the unions, and adds: "Did you ever stop to realize that Altavista could become a ghost town with empty, unpainted stores and homes, a town devoid of its present property?"

Southern millowners and their allies have apparently concluded that the twin theme of race hate and plant closing constitutes the most effective double-barreled verbal blast against union organization. It is demonstrably effective, for TWUA's campaign among several of Burlington's southern plants did not succeed in organizing any of them.

The distribution of anti-Semitic and anti-Negro propaganda during that Burlington campaign knocks into a cocked hat the notion that only in backwoods southern companies can such uncivilized conduct go on. The fact is that Burlington is the largest single textile company in the United States, employing approximately 50,000 workers in about 100 plants. It also has mills overseas. Its securities are sold publicly on the New York Stock Exchange; and at the end of a recent fiscal year, it showed sales of $671 million and total assets of $523 million.

The triggering of blind hatreds by racist rantings and the paralyzing fear of union affiliation produced by threats of plant closing could not possibly be excused under the concept of free speech. Any realistic analysis of the first amendment must withdraw constitutional protection from such written and verbal trash.

The Taft-Hartley Act itself immunizes employers from responsibility for use of the twin fear and hate themes. We have seen how predictions and prophecies of plant closing, for instance, became legal when the Board indulged in fantasies to ignore the fact that such statements are threats within the meaning of section 8(c).

Lawyers have argued that the bulk of racist material used against unions is not clearly threats within the meaning of this section of the law, but that ample grounds are available to set aside any election in which they appear. A case decided shortly after Taft-Hartley was enacted reaffirmed the idea that an election will be set aside if surrounding circumstances prevent employees from registering a free and untrammeled choice.

"Conduct that creates an atmosphere which renders improbable a free choice will sometimes warrant invalidating an election, even though that conduct may not constitute an unfair labor practice. An election can serve its true purpose only if the surrounding conditions enable employees to register a free and untrammeled choice for or against a bargaining representative. For this reason the Board has sometimes set elections aside in unconsolidated representation cases, in the absence of any charges or proof of unfair labor practice. When a record reveals conduct so glaring that it is almost certain to have impaired employees' freedom of choice, we have set an election aside and directed a new one."

Another early Taft-Hartley case made it perfectly clear that the free speech limitations the act imposes, of finding unfair labor practices, just can't be applied to expressions of views that interfere with freedom of choice in an election.

"Section 8(c) prevents the Board from treating as evidence of unfair labor practices any expression of views, arguments, or opinion which contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. Section 8(c) does not, however, prevent the Board from finding in a representation case that an expression of views, whether or not protected by section 8(c) has, in fact, interfered with the employees' freedom of choice in an election, so as to require that such election be set aside."

Although the Board has flip-flopped between applying the unfair labor practice rules to conduct affecting the results of an election and recognizing interference in an election—even in the absence of unfair labor practices—it recently gave some hope that it was beginning to recognize that a free election can't be held while the race issue is being exploited. But a decision on May 5, 1958, killed any hope that the Board had realized how racial issues affect workers in rural southern areas.

An election was held November 8, 1957, at Sharney Hosiery Mills, Inc., in Madison, N.C. The union lost and filed objections based on the company's use of the race issue. The Board's regional director dismissed them. The union filed exceptions. In a supplemental decision issued on May 5, 1958, the Board dismissed these exceptions, noting that 2 weeks before the election the company mailed a letter to the workers stating that TWUA is strongly prointegration, that it submitted a prointegration brief to the U.S. Supreme Court, and that it is striving to bring about integration in every phase of American life; also that TWUA is a member of the AFL–CIO which, at its convention, contributed $75,000 to the NAACP.

TWUA asked that the election be set aside because the injection of the racial issue created an atmosphere of hate and bias. But the regional director again found that the company's letter contained no threats of reprisal or promise of benefit and didn't go beyond the bounds of preelection propaganda.

In sustaining the regional director's dismissal, the Board stated:

"The issue before us is a narrow one. The petitioner concedes that there were no threats or promises, and it is not suggested that the employer misrepresented the petitioner's position. We are asked, rather, to hold that the mere mention of the racial issue in an election campaign is per se improper and grounds for setting aside any and all elections where such might occur.

"We have not, in the past, attempted so to limit campaigning, but have relied on the good sense of the voters to evaluate the statements of the parties. We are satisfied that this is the better course and adhere to it in this case."

In a separate, concurring opinion, the Board chairman and a member stated:

"While under the special circumstances of this case we concur in the result reached by our colleagues, we again express our concern over the injection of the racial issue in any election."

But such expressions of "concern over the injection of the racial issue" don't deprive textile owners of the deadly race-issue weapon against unions. The devastating use to which "free speech" is put by owners in southern communities contrasts sharply with the denial of means of communication to unions in these same communities.

The difficulties of getting across the union's viewpoint were increased when the U.S. Supreme Court decided that an employer may bar union organizers from distributing union literature on company property. According to the principle of this case, union organizers are not entitled to distribute literature on a company's parking lot simply because a plant is located outside of a town, or because the employees live in widely scattered distances from the plant, and there are hazards—perhaps legal as well as physical—to distributing literature at the intersection of the highway and plant roadway.

So, while a union which organizes in rural southern communities is barred from spreading its message, southern textile employers have all the means of communication at their disposal and can project those devastating expressions of opinion, euphemistically called employer free speech.

Unless the verbal and written license Taft-Hartley hands to employers is checked, workers probably will never be free to express how they really feel about union affiliation. The evil against which the Wagner Act employer's speech rules were directed is as prevalent today in unorganized plants as when that statute was enacted.

The Wagner Act employer speech rules furthered the national policy of encouraging collective bargaining. Taft-Hartley free speech completely destroys it in many situations. A balance between employer and union strength requires the elimination of the right of the employer to coerce and intimidate workers verbally. This power is often misleadingly described as employer free speech. It is really employer license. A return to the principles established under the Wagner Act is overdue.

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY TO THE UNION

If there is any single conviction shared by most Americans it is that, in this land, a man can have his say.

But a man who wants to join a union in the South, or an organizer who wants to broadcast his position to the public in Dixie, would smile wryly at the suggestion that he can be sure of being heard below the Mason-Dixon Line, especially since Taft-Hartley became a law of the land.

The advertising columns of most small newspapers (and textile mills are for the most part located in small towns in Dixie) are not usually available to TWUA; nor is radio time. News reports about union activities are, for the most part, either so terse as to be uninformative (if, indeed, the paper bothers to cover them at all), or so biased as to be utterly misleading. In the meantime, the editorial columns of the very newspapers that hamstring the union's efforts to present its viewpoint, often are most virulent in their condemnation of the union, its leaders and its policies.

The reverse side of the coin is that the textile employer finds all these media completely at his disposal, usually because he controls them by ownership, direct, or hidden, or because the mercantile life of the community depends upon his generosity.

In Kannapolis, N.C., in 1951, TWUA wanted to broadcast to the 25,000 or more textile workers employed in the 10 plants run by the Cannon interests, located within an 8-mile radius. The radio station there was WGTL, managed by Fred Whitley, a member by marriage of the Cannon family. When TWUA first requested time, it was flatly turned down. Whitley himself told the union's representatives that no time was available.

Union representatives told the station that they had a file of scripts that already had been broadcast over a score or more of southern radio stations and that these were the kind of programs they wished to put on the Kannapolis air. They offered to submit each script in advance and pledged to keep all material in good taste, free of libelous and scurrilous matter. WGTL still declined.

The union then called the matter to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission which, after some months, managed to arrange a discussion of the matter with the station's Washington counsel. Meantime, the union continued to write to WGTL, repeating the request for a chance to discuss the impasse. The letters, sent by registered mail, were returned unopened.

The argument of the station's attorney was that there was no labor controversy in Kannapolis; therefore, no need to permit TWUA a voice on the air. Yet, as he argued, the station daily devoted considerable amount of the time of its newscasts to the 1951 southern cotton strike (with much of the information slanted against the union). TWUA did not base its claim for time upon the accuracy or lack of it. It simply urged that the FCC enforce the regulations assuring a reasonably fair hearing to differing points of view.

In November 1951, the FCC reported Whitley had consented to meet with union spokesmen. But it was not until January 1952 that the meeting was arranged. Whitley finally presented a contract allowing the union to rent 15 minutes a week for 13 weeks. It did not allow "live" broadcasts; the scripts had to be submitted a week in advance and then transcribed. The charge to TWUA was higher than any the union had ever paid for comparable time on larger stations in larger cities. But the union signed the contract and complied.

Censorship of the scripts was immediate and unusual in its severity, whole sections being cut, often to the point of rendering the material incoherent. Still, the union advertised widely and continued the broadcasts. Then abruptly, on April 1, WGTL knocked the union off the air, claiming previous commitments.

The union again went to the FCC, arguing that most of the time "committed" was devoted to unsponsored drivel, and supported its contention with monitored full-day programs. The FCC claimed it was unable to move in the matter. While there had been a technical breach of contract, the union felt a civil suit would not bring an effective remedy. TWUA had simply been choked off the air.

"We realize the Taft-Hartley Act does not, by its written terms, give a warrant to local radio stations to stifle a reasonable but also free discussion of the pros and cons of trade unionism," TWUA said in a brief filed with a Senate committee. "We do say, however, that the Congress should legislate on the problem of labor-management relations with full knowledge of what actually goes on in a place like Kannopolis when a union attempts to avail itself of the ordinary media of communications, such as press and radio."

It is not unusual, either, for the union and its adherents in the South to be denied another basic freedom ostensibly guaranteed them in America—the right of free assembly.

In 1954, TWUA began an organizing campaign in Elkin, N.C., the site of the Chatham Manufacturing Co.'s large blanket mill. Nowhere in this town of 4,000 could the union find a place to rent in which to hold a meeting. First, the YMCA was denied them (the board of directors of the YMCA consisted of Chatham management personnel).

That was late in May. On July 2, the company closed the mill for a couple of hours and marched all employees to the YMCA, where Chatham officials loosed upon them a barrage of antiunion speeches. A union organizer who wanted to attend the meeting was barred at the door.

Next, the union tried to rent an empty movie theater. The owner refused. A second request was made and again rejected. Yet, within 4 months after TWUA began its Elkin campaign, the theater was being used by an antiunion committee to hold rallies.

Early in June the union secretly arranged with the Austin, N.C., school board to rent its closed school for a meeting. The school was 15 miles from Elkin and the meeting was not advertised until just the day before it was scheduled. Yet, over 500 turned out, many standing outside listening through the windows because they could not get into the jammed building. Enthusiasm swelled so high that a suggestion from the floor to hold another meeting the following Sunday was approved.

But the following day, C. B. Eller, Wilkes County superintendent of schools issued an order that the school could no longer be used for union meetings. Members of the Austin school board muttered they would resign in protest, but the doors of the building remained closed to TWUA. A few days later, an organizer tried to rent a school in Elkin. A school board member, Porter Carder, said he saw no reason why the empty building could not be used. He went with the organizer to see C. K. Osborne, the principal.

"Chatham contributes a sum of money each year to our school lunch program," he told the organizer. "Knowing how Chatham feels about the matter, I personally can't make a decision that might take away the children's lunch and milk program."

A committee went to another Wilkes County school at Benham, 12 miles from Elkin. The principal refused use of the building, adding he personally was opposed to a union at Chatham mill. A Yadkin County school at Jonesville was not available to the union, the school board said, because it did not wish to jeopardize the Chatham company's annual contribution to maintain the school auditorium and gymnasium.

Finally, use of the Yadkin County school at Boonville was contracted for, but the night before the meeting was to take place, the principal notified the union he was withdrawing permission. Some 300 workers who were thwarted by the Boonville closing met in over 100 degree heat in a wooded grove some 15 miles from Elkin. As they drove up to the meeting, their cars were stopped by police who examined every driver's license, explaining they were making a "road check."

A few days later, the owner of the Boonville theater turned down an offer from the Union to pay $100 for the use of his theater for one night. The reason, he said, was that he had been visited by Chatham officials who warned him that his business would suffer if he rented the hall to the union. He would not identify the company figures except as "top brass."

Attempts by Chatham workers who lived and paid taxes in nearby Surrey County to use the auditorium in their courthouse at Dobson, 20 miles from Elkin, were equally futile. At first, the county clerk said the proper authorities at Raleigh (the State capital), who would have to decide if the building could be used, were on vacation. After several weeks he told a delegation permission would have to await a county board meeting. The workers gave up.

Eventually, an unused, dilapidated building was found. Barely usable in the summer (the roof leaked) it was too uncomfortable in the winter. (The concrete floor refused to respond to heat from the single pot-bellied stove.) The building was too rundown to be used as an office and operators of the motel, where the organizers lodged, threatened eviction if their rooms were used for union business. During the entire campaign in Elkin, the union never did obtain office space, despite its offer to pay premium rentals.

It might prove of interest to some to note, in passing, that during the time the union was unable to find a place of assembly in Elkin, the chairman of the board of Chatham Manufacturing Co. was the late Thurmond Chatham, at that time a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Here again, only two examples have been cited. TWUA files are replete, however, with reproductions of newspaper stories in which the bias in reports of union activities and policies is not even thinly veiled. Similarly, instance after instance has been documented to show that the southern community, so often tied to one all-powerful textile employer by an economic square knot, is not a showplace of human and civil rights. The U.S. Supreme Court has so noted.

An unfair labor practice charge against the Stowe Spinning Co. of Belmont, N.C. was carried to the country's highest tribunal. Its decision in favor of TWUA in the case (336 U.S. 226, 227, 228) read in part:

"In sum, North Belmont is a company town. We mention nothing new when we notice that union organization in a company town must depend, even more than usual, on a hands-off attitude on the part of management. And it is clear that one of management's chief weapons, in attempting to stifle organization, is the denial of a place to meet. We cannot equate a company-dominated North Carolina mill town with the vast metropolitan centers where a number of halls are available within easy reach of prospective union members."

The contempt so openly shown by the southern textile owner for basic human freedoms explicitly guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution is another stern indictment of the moral as well as economic climate created by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Can a statute be healthful for a nation if it encourages the erosion of the foundation stones of political and civil liberty for any citizen anywhere?

ORGANIZATION OF THE WHOLE COMMUNITY FOR ANTIUNION ACTIVITY

High on the list of distinctions with which TWUA would be be more than happy to live without is the dubious honor of facing

more hostility from entire communities acting in the interests of the local employers than any other union in the country.

Credit where credit is due. Thanks to the Taft-Hartley law this kind of mob offensive against the union is more prevalent today than prior to 1947. This is not to say that the employer-dominated communities thought any more kindly of the union before; they didn't. But under the Wagner Act, all of the coercion, threats, beatings, kidnapings, rumors, falsehoods, and assorted antiunion activities carried on by local businessmen, elected authorities, ministers, newspapermen or others, could be pinned directly on the employer, who obviously stood to benefit if his employees were scared away from unionization.

Under the Wagner Act, the term "employer" was broadly defined as "any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly." This wide net caught and deterred third persons who technically had no legal tie with the employer but who were helping him with his union busting.

Taft-Hartley narrowed this definition sharply. Today you can't enjoin anyone from union-busting activities unless he is "acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly." This "agency" requirement gives legal immunity to all of the "volunteers" who just happen to show up in southern community after community whenever the union begins an organizational drive. They can now do all the dirty work for the employer without transgressing upon the law.

The records of TWUA, the NLRB and various congressional committees bulge with instances of mob or community activities or schemes by persons not in the direct employ of the millowners, which technically violated no law despite the fact that the only beneficiary was the employer who was seeking to smash his workers' efforts at unionization. Thus, in one instance, an employer was held not responsible when certain of his "loyal" employees kidnaped an organizer or when others engaged in espionage and surveillance of union sympathizers.

The technical gimmick that allowed the employer to go scot free was the finding by the NLRB that these employees were not supervisors and therefore not the employer's "agents." This ruling that nonsupervisory employees are not "agents" of the employer also allows them to spread threats of plant closings if the union wins or allows them to take part in any variation of union busting on the plant premises without casting any legal liability on the employer.

In Elkin, N.C., the Chatham Manufacturing Co. proved that an employer with the press, businessmen and clergy in his hip pocket can always kill off a union campaign. This town is a church-going community. Attacks on the union by practically all of the ministers were perhaps the single most effective weapon in Chatham's bag of tricks. Community leaders boasted that in 1954 Chatham had contributed more than $75,000 in gifts to the Elkin churches. This is a fantastic amount for a single donor to contribute in a town of that size. Small wonder that clergymen who had willingly accepted these disproportionate gifts sang the praises of the company so vociferously.

Don't think for one moment that the opportunistic publisher and editor of the Elkin Tribune allowed the churchmen to establish a monopoly on patting the backs of the owners of Chatham. Harvey Laffoon, the operator of this local paper, soon threw its columns and pages open to any and all diatribes against the union and its leaders. The attacks ranged from calling them racketeers to picturing them as Reds. Mr. Laffoon was not content with transforming his paper into a veritable house organ for the Chatham company. He also opened its pages to Militant Truth, one of the foulest of the hate sheets that circulate among southern communities, especially when a union campaign is on.

But Laffoon and the clergymen were not alone in their union-busting efforts. Local businessmen and professionals formed a citizens' committee to fight the union. The town's prominent persons spoke at antiunion rallies and broadcast over the local radio station. Among these dignitaries were: Mayor Atkinson of Elkin; Mayor Blackwood of nearby Jonesville; Laffoon, the Tribune's publisher; the Reverend Howard Ford, pastor, First Baptist Church of Elkin; the Reverend J. T. Reichard, pastor, First Methodist Church of Elkin; the Reverend Homer Bradley, pastor, First Baptist Church of Jonesville; Garland Johnson, president of the Elkin and Jonesville banks; Dr. V. W. Taylor, Elkin physician; Mrs. J. R. Johnson, wife of an Elkin surgeon, and Claude Farrell, local businessman and member of the State board of education.

Not for naught was the bank president in there pitching. He was especially helpful to the company by putting the squeeze on prounion Chatham workers by demanding payments on loans and other debts. Thanks to his efforts most storekeepers in town stopped credit to persons known to be prounion. Union adherents were listed as "poor risks" wherever they went to make purchases.

Needless to add, this cruel, community-wide pressure on the Chatham workers paid dividends for Chatham. When the NLRB election was finally held, the union lost.

The remarkable part of this whole episode is that, even in the face of this extraordinary coercion, 730 workers voted for the union. The night of the election, drink-crazed company supporters roamed the town in boisterous and obscene demonstrations, while in the ramshackle headquarters of the union, strong men wept in utter despair and frustration.

The next day—and for some time thereafter—active union supporters were fired from their jobs.

Thanks to the radio station owners, the newspaper publisher, the bank president, the physicians, the storekeepers, the racists, and the ministers in Elkin, Chatham had triumphed and benefited. But you couldn't pin a rap on any of them. For, you see, under the Taft-Hartley law definition, none of these union-busters were "agents" of Chatham. Just "volunteers."

Like the community leaders of Jackson, Ala., who, with equal zeal and equal success, battled the TWUA at Clark Mills, a subsidiary of Vanity Fair, in their sleepy town of 4,000 residents, some 70 miles north of Mobile.

The appearance of the union woke up the natives. Soon after it became apparent that the union campaign would be successful, the Jackson Chamber of Commerce took over the anti-TWUA battle. Nothing was left to chance. Every important storekeeper and professional was "organized" and each was given a specific assignment. Lists were carefully checked and a survey made of each and every business in town.

Thus, if a worker owed money to a grocer, it was the owner of that grocery store who visited that particular employee. If someone still had payments to make to the local car dealer, the dealer suddenly appeared at that worker's home. The same pattern extended to all others from furniture store owner to landlord to bank official. A high school principal was even drafted for duty and he made sudden visits to former pupils who just happened to be employees at Clark Mills. Even the manager of the local employment office was utilized.

All these nocturnal visitors made the same pitch—don't be unfair to Vanity Fair. If the union should win, ran the refrain, the mill would move away. This would be bad for business and bad for the good name of the community. To keep the mills in Jackson, all that was necessary was for the worker to sign a slip withdrawing from the union.

By some strange coincidence the chamber of commerce had such forms already prepared. When the nighttime siren songs failed, the chamber of commerce officials got tougher and more open in their antiunion activities. They would appear at the mill during working hours and call certain people away from their jobs in full view of their coworkers. The bulldozing by the businessmen was crude, but finally effective. The union drive was smashed.

So severe was the terror that most of the workers refused to talk even to NLRB investigators. The businessmen—most of them owners of stock in the building that Jackson had thoughtfully erected for Vanity Fair—violated no section of Taft-Hartley, for after all, according to this law they were not agents of the company in whose building they just happened to own stock. Just good neighbors.

Competition among such "volunteers" is keen. Some of them can't wait for plants to come to town or are champing at the bit if the union doesn't start a drive so they can graciously offer their unsolicited services to the employer, as was the case with the chamber of commerce in Wilson, N.C.

These enterprising volunteers conducted an industrial survey of their town as part of a pitch for new businesses to locate there. Many were the inducements offered, especially the community's wholehearted antiunionism. On page 9 of a special brochure prepared in 1956, under the general heading, "Unions," the chamber of commerce relates that:

"There are only two unions in Wilson manufacturing plants. One is a company union affiliated with AFL Wagon and Body Workers and there is no local representation. The other union is * * * the FTW. This union is in the tobacco processing plants, which is a seasonal business lasting only 4 months. Its members are 100 percent Negroes, mostly Negro women.

"In Wilson County unions affect less than 3 percent of the total working force. Our working people are from 100 percent American stock, from rural areas, used to hard work and, for the most part, are independent. The majority of workers are between the ages of 20 and 40 and most of them have secondary education. This accounts for the lack of enthusiasm for unionization.

"The chamber will actively fight any attempt by union organizers to bring a union into the local industries. A smaller city like Wilson has the advantage of combating unionization if requested to do so."

Give these boys credit for initiative and ambition. They've volunteered in advance to do the dirty work involved in fighting unions. Should they induce a plant to come to Wilson and should there be an effort by a union to enroll the workers, like the Chatham "volunteers" and Jackson's "good neighbors," these fellows will be in there pitching. If the law remains unchanged, neither they nor the employer who will benefit from their activities will be guilty of a violation.

The simple fact is that Taft-Hartley's narrow and legalistic definition of an employer is inconsistent with the act's purpose of encouraging a free choice in the selection of a bargaining representative. All persons who interfere in any way with this free choice should be deterred and the employer held liable for their conduct—not only the agents but any who act "in the interest of the employer," as was the case under the Wagner Act.

DISCHARGES OF UNION SYMPATHIZERS

Nothing is certain but death and taxes—and the firing of union sympathizers from

jobs in southern textile mills as soon as an organizing drive is launched by TWUA.

From the day in 1939 that the TWUA was formally set up as an international union, it has been established that sympathetic southern textile workers have been fired in every single organizing situation.

The reason for the wholesale dismissals is obvious. It weakens the union which, under the politically-appointed NLRB of the Taft-Hartley era, can rarely get anyone to investigate discharge cases speedily or fully. By the time the Board can be prodded into some kind of action, union support has dissolved to such a degree that TWUA either loses the election or has to withdraw from the situation. The records of the union and of the various southern offices of the NLRB are loaded with evidence, fully documented, of the scope and regularity of this terror tactic.

At Belcraft Chenilles, Inc., in Dalton, Ga., 35 active union supporters were dismissed soon after the union drive began. The NLRB dragged the case along for almost a full year before ordering the immediate reinstatement of just 4 of the 35 who had been fired.

At the Lawtex Corp. in Dalton, Ga., the same pattern developed. Twenty-four active unionists who, incidentally, were all parish members of the only church in town that supported the union, were dropped from their jobs. In this case, the NLRB refused to issue a single complaint for any of the 24 victims.

Forty-seven active union supporters were fired at General Latex & Chemical Corp., also in Dalton, Ga., after the company had provoked a strike of its employees by laying off seven union committee members. Despite the fact that evidence proved anti-union animus sufficient to compel the NLRB to issue a cease and desist order, the Board would not order reinstatement or back pay. In the course of the NLRB proceedings, four workers were reinstated upon application. The remaining 43 never got their jobs back.

Rarely in the past 10 years under Taft-Hartley has the TWUA been able to process successful reinstatement of dismissed workers through the NLRB. But that is just one phase of the problem. In all too many instances the NLRB will refuse to accept the cases at all and they never are investigated by this Federal agency, let alone successfully adjusted.

Both aspects of the problem—the failure to win reinstatements and the failure in most cases to get a formal hearing—can be attributed to the climate engendered by the Taft-Hartley law. Under the atmosphere of the old Wagner Act, the NLRB was zealous in protecting the rights of workers, especially when firings took place. Complaints were followed up quickly. There was a minimum of stalling—even in the South—and there was a tangible feeling that the Board personnel wanted to help.

Today, procrastination is the byword. Little or not effort is made to establish the accuracy of union claims that particular workers were unfairly fired. The prevailing attitude is: OK. You prove it beyond all doubt; you dig up the evidence; you get the affidavits. Then, maybe we'll consider the case—as at the E. T. Barwick Co., also of Dalton, Ga., where five unionists were fired for their activities, or the Central Manufacturing Co. of Dalton, where two were dismissed.

In both these cases, the union's complaints got short shrift and the Board never made the slightest effort to investigate; curt letters indicated the refusal of the Board to issue a complaint or proceed otherwise with the cases. In the case of Blue Ridge Spread Co. of Dalton, it took the Board more than 5 months to decide that firings of two union adherents should be dismissed for insufficient evidence.

The situations briefly referred to above were all part of a special survey made of the dismissal problem in a single year in an area covering just 16 textile mills. In that single year—in those 16 plants—there were 200 workers fired for what was clearly union activity, ranging from signing cards, to attending meetings, to signing up other workers, to being committee members, and to standing at the plant gates distributing union literature. Of the 200 workers involved, only 14 were ordered reinstated by the National Labor Relations Board. In 9 of the 16 actions filed, the Board either dismissed the cases or refused to hear them at all.

It would be an impossible task to calculate the number of textile workers fired in the South for union activity. TWUA is constantly organizing in all of the 16 Southern States. And from the very first day it appeared at a plant back in the thirties, it has never had a single experience that didn't find workers being dismissed for their involvement with the union.

Firings in one-mill towns inevitably spread fear which invariably mounts as the firings increase. In most cases this fear, plus the many other pressures brought to bear on textile workers by the employer and his stooges in the community, is sufficient to weaken or destroy the union's campaigns. But one of the more ugly manifestations of this technique—and one which strikes even greater terror in the hearts of workers—is the firing which, in turn, leads to eviction from company-owned homes. And this, too, has been a common practice in all parts of the South where TWUA made inroads.

Pacific Mills owns the village of Rhodiss, N.C. When TWUA began to organize the employees there, Pacific ordered the chief of police of Rhodiss, who just happened to be in its employ as a plant guard, to keep all union meetings and active adherents under strict surveillance. This was done. Soon there were discharges and finally a union committeeman, who had personally signed up 50 Pacific workers for the union, was fired and then evicted from his mill village home. The NLRB trial examiner in this case was moved to report that:

"I believe the respondent's plan to rid itself of Hamby (the active union man who had signed 50 people) included not only his separation from the payroll but separation from the right to occupy the company house. Not only was it calculated to impress on Hamby, but also to impress on all others employed by the respondent and living in company-owned homes, the disastrous effects of engaging in union activities."

The eviction technique is an old one in the South. It has been used not only to weaken union organizing efforts but to smash strikes. It is a naked and almost indecent display of feudalism in the textile industry and is but one more weapon in the arsenal used by millowners to keep their workers from being unionized.

VIOLENCE AND GUNPLAY

Alexander City might be considered a typical southern cotton mill town. It is isolated in an essentially agricultural county, distant from the industrial areas of Alabama.

Politically and economically it is dominated by one force, the Russell Manufacturing Co., and one family, the Russell family. The mayor 10 years ago was Thomas C. Russell, uncle of Thomas D. Russell, president of three cotton mills owned by the Russell family. The mayor's name appeared on the company letterhead as treasurer. He owned the principal bank. The Russell company owned the hotel and the town water supply. The firm's other holdings included a woodworking plant, a grist mill and a creamery * * * about the only other sources of employment for those of the town's 16,000 citizens who didn't trudge to the cotton mill to work every day.

An organizer for TWUA paid the town a visit to see his father who had lived there for some years and had quietly acquired a reputation as a respectable and responsible citizen. The organizer himself was not unknown. He had been born and raised in that part of Alabama.

His visit originally was personal, but he soon became aware of the discontent among the cotton millworkers. With the permission of his director, he returned to Alexander City, registered at the hotel and invited friends of his who worked at the mill to talk over the task of forming a union.

Before any formal campaign was underway, the organizer was called to city hall by the chief of police, G. Mack Horton, who told the TWUA staff member to "get the hell out of town" or expect to be "mobbed." Horton intimated he could be influential in getting the organizer drafted into the armed services. The organizer was not too impressed; threats are commonplace in the life of a union organizer and he was on leave from the Merchant Marine, after having served in combat areas.

Surveillance of the organizer's day-to-day activities began soon. For months, two members of the police force, Alfonso Alford and Floyd Mann, followed the organizer. When he sat down in a restaurant, one or the other of them would also find a table. Whenever the organizer drove out to the mill village, the police car followed. He could not talk to a soul in town out of view of either of these men. Still, he collected signatures on TWUA cards. Something more drastic evidently had to be done.

It was. In plain daylight. Right in the middle of town.

The organizer was assaulted without a word by two thugs who "worked" in the cotton mill. He was beaten in sight of a uniformed police officer, Alford, who stood within 10 feet of the fight and shouted abuse at the organizer while he was smashed in the face until he bled, had his head rapped on the pavement and was kicked in the ribs as he lay in the gutter.

A soldier walking down the street made a move to intervene, but Alford insisted that no one "interfere." The officer also shouted to the 20 or so shopkeepers witnessing the slugging that he would "make cash bond for anyone who beat up a union organizer."

The organizer staggered to his feet as Chief Horton drove up to the scene. Horton bundled the organizer and the two worker-thugs into his car and took them to city hall. The workers he dismissed, telling them to return to the mill. The organizer he arrested, without making a formal charge. The local representative of the Veterans' Administration, who heard of the beating, came to city hall and put up bail for the organizer.

Horton refused to issue a warrant against the two men who had beaten the organizer. A few days later, the organizer returned to Alexander City with an out-of-town lawyer who tried to have the local justice of the peace issue a warrant against the assailants. Finally, the justice did issue a warrant and later said that one of the two millworkers had been fined $25. Months later, when the case was presented to a grand jury, no action was taken.

Officer Alford, who had witnessed the beating and offered bail for the assailants, openly threatened on other occasions to kill anyone who joined the union. One of his favorite expressions, it was reported at an NLRB hearing, was:

"My gun will belch fire and smoke if I catch anyone joining."

Another TWUA organizer took oath that Alford threatened to shoot him if he remained in Alexander City.

Officer Mann apparently also was assigned to an intimidation detail. He found a veteran, Roy H. Boddie, then working in the

Russell mill, who agreed for $100 to pick a fight and beat up Ernest Willis, a union sympathizer. Boddie was given a job on a set of looms next to those Willis tended. But, after Boddie became acquainted with Willis, he refused to go through with his bargain. He quit the mill.

This bald recital of one case in one campaign in one town in one State out of the whole South may not have excited any reader, but within it lies a record of brutality, official perversion of justice, and callousness in law enforcement that should shock any decent citizen, whether or not he lives in the shadow of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The long sordid story of violence in the South since the Taft-Hartley Act became the law could—and does—go on and on. TWUA files are packed with documentation of Taft-Hartley inspired violence.

At Silvertown, Ga., a TWUA organizer who was directing a campaign at the B. F. Goodrich Co.'s Martha plant was beaten with a blackjack, slashed with a knife and ordered out of town under pain of death.

A woman organizer was kidnaped by armed antiunion employees of the American Thread Co.'s Tallapoosa, Ga., plant, and union members who were distributing leaflets at the plant gates were assaulted.

A grisly story was unfolded before the Senate subcommittee on labor-management relations at a hearing held in Morristown, Tenn., to inquire into the violence surrounding the calling of the State militia into a strike at American Enka Corp.

The sworn testimony reported here is that of Lonnie A. Warwick, an executive board member of a TWUA local at the plant. He had been arrested on a charge of violating an injunction. A State policeman, a deputy sheriff and a National Guardsman took Warwick and several others to jail. He was to be locked up. His sworn statement taken from the subcommittee transcript reads:

"Jailer Haskins says, 'Follow me.' I followed him to the back of the jail where you start down the steps. At the moment I turned my head. I heard something coming shuffling, and Sergeant Gilbert (a State policeman) threw out his foot and attempted to trip me. At that moment I grabbed the rail. When I grabbed the rail, he hit me on the right side with a blackjack. By that time Patrolman Chapman is up to me, and he laid my scalp open with another blackjack here. By that time Tommy Sams (another State policeman) was on the scene. He hit me three times with a blackjack. I am on the first landing then.

"Then jailer Haskins used his key ring on my arm. Then he proceeded to hit me in the kidneys here with a pistol butt. I went down then, and they kicked me down the three or four remaining steps, and I was bleeding very freely. And they kicked me the remainder, or the length of the jail, into the jail cell, and left me there for 2 hours without medical attention. They did come every once in a while and look in.

"So, after about 2 hours, a man came into my cell with a briefcase, stated he was a doctor, and asked me how I received my injury. Of course, the National Guard and Haskins was there, so I told him I had no statement to make. So he did give me just a brief examination and walked out.

"So in a few minutes—"

Mr. Cooley (committee counsel): "Do you know who this man was?"

Mr. Warwick: "It turned out to be Dr. Davis. He was a physician. So, in a few minutes, Sergeant Gilbert, Sams and Chapman and Jailer Haskins came into the cell and told me to get up off the bunk, of which it took me some few minutes to get, so I could get straight so I could get up. I was in great pain. So then they made me walk upstairs without any assistance."

Warwick's narrative continued with another incident at Dr. Davis' office.

"There the blood was washed off me by the nurse. Then there was some pictures taken. Then I was taken into the X-ray room and, with a lot of trouble, they finally got me to lay on the X-ray table. Then there was a commotion and I asked the National Guardsman what had happened. He said that they had beat Switzer (a TWUA representative) up and taken him to jail. And my attorney, they had knocked him out; but he was a damn good man, he had come to already. And they locked him up."

Dr. Davis, according to Warwick, said the beaten man belonged in a hospital. Presently, Warwick continued:

"So in some 5 minutes, or something, I was helped by National Guardsmen off the X-ray table, put into the car with National Guardsmen, Sergeant Gilbert, and a State police officer. I was pushed over and in great pain, and there was three National Guardsmen in the back seat of the car with me.

"Sgt. Carl Gilbert started to cussing me. One young National Guardsman, with fuzz on his face about half an inch long, threatened to knock my teeth down my throat or knock them out with a club. I was then taken for a ride to Nabor's Clinic."

Bitter and distasteful as these stories are, they do not tell in themselves the deeper tragedy of violence. That must be inferred by the reader—the reader who realizes that the deeper tragedy left behind by violence is not the bleeding skin, broken bones and scars left on the bodies of the victims, deplorable as these may be.

The ultimate tragedy of violence is that it reflects a breakdown of law and order, a return to the code of fang and claw, another retreat instead of an advance for mankind in its struggle to go forward. These incidents—but a handful taken at random from TWUA files—demonstrate dismally that the Taft-Hartley Act, especially in its effect in the South, has become a blueprint for violence and a dark monument to brutality.

THE CLOSING OR MOVING OF THE MILL

Fear inspiring as violence is, there is still another horizon almost as bleak to the southern textile worker. That is the specter of unemployment.

Because so large a proportion of this basic American industry is still unorganized, its wage scales are woefully behind those of the other major manufacturing occupations. The textile worker almost never piles up a financial backlog in Dixie. If his standard of living is more than from hand to mouth, it is almost invariably because more than one member of his family tends the loom or doffs the spindle.

For that reason, when violence fails to halt an organizing drive or does not stop the flow of signed membership cards into the union office, the southern millowner threatens to, or actually padlocks his factory and leaves poverty in the mill village. Even more, his departure may, and very often does, splinter the economic spine of the community. Darlington, S.C., can testify to that.

In 1956, Darlington Manufacturing Co. was the main source of revenue for this town, providing about one-third of the community purchasing power. A modern, efficient cotton mill operated by Deering, Milliken & Co., it gave over 500 workers an income. To be sure, the income was modest for the wage scales were low; but the mill was at least a steady source of rent and grocery money. Working conditions were deplorable by comparison with standards TWUA has been able to secure in mills it has organized.

For that reason, the workers at Darlington wanted a union. They wanted it so desperately that they survived the burden of surveillance, brainwashing, and scorn heaped upon them by management and the conservative elements of the community. They went to the NLRB poll and they voted to have TWUA become their bargaining agent. That was in September.

Seven days after the election Darlington's board of directors announced they would recommend liquidation of the mill at a special meeting of the stockholders called for October 17.

That meeting was held and, in a brief 30 minutes, the economic artery of the community was gashed and left to drain. The man with the lancet was Roger Milliken, young but conservative, quiet but arrogant scion of an aristocratic New England family. He had taken over control of a chain of more than 30 textile mills several years before on the death of his stately father, Gerrish Milliken.

Roger Milliken himself owned 110,000 of the 150,000 shares of stock in Darlington Manufacturing Co. When he announced his decision, the mill's fate was sealed. This was underlined by the fact that the press release announcing the liquidation of the mill was mimeographed before the brief meeting was held.

By the following December the mill and its fixtures were put on the auction block. Within a matter of a few months some 200 of the 500 or more workers who had run the machines for Milliken had left the community in search of work elsewhere. The city's leaders were frantic in their search for some other firm to come to Darlington to occupy the brick structure that once had been the economic lifeblood of the town.

Immediately the newspapers of the area leaped upon the terrible consequences of Milliken's callous indifference to the fate of Darlington. But rather than denounce this cold financier who had left them stranded, they blamed the closing upon the handful of textile workers who had simply wanted a fairer share of economic security and had dared to vote for a union in order to obtain it. To the press and the business community, the liquidation of Darlington Manufacturing served as a bitter lesson—not to management, but to workers. It was made out to be a crime committed by unionism, not by management.

The NLRB, at the instigation of TWUA, held a hearing, now that Darlington Manufacturing Co. was a corpse. The examiner reported that nothing could be done to bring the owner, Roger Milliken, to book. Still, TWUA has not given up the fight over Darlington. It cannot, for this flagrant case of a runaway mill is an example to other textile managements who care little for their workers and less for their social responsibility to the community that supplies their labor.

Among the gestures that TWUA has made to attract public and Government attention to the plight of the town of Darlington was to send a delegation of the mill's workers to Washington to picket the office of the NLRB. Their placards were to the point. One read, "NLRB, Are Bosses' Voices All You Can Hear?" Another asked, "While the NLRB Stalls, How Can We Eat and How Can We Live?"

A TWUA representative who accompanied the group to Washington reported that one worker paused as they passed the statue of "Justice." She stared at the monument and then turned to her companion and said:

"It makes me wonder whether that blindfold was supplied by a southern textile millowner, and I'm ready to believe that if you could rip off that blindfold, we'd find 'Justice' winking one of her eyes at us."

Roger Milliken was not the first such runaway employer TWUA has dealt with. Chances are he will not be the last, unless something is done to make the National Labor Relations Act and the agency that administers it strong enough to stand up to managerial arrogance.

Even the Taft-Hartley Act says, "Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations * * *." Instances such as the Darlington liquidation to avoid unionization makes a mockery of what is supposedly a guarantee to workers of their right freely to choose a union.

Remedies must be found if the principle of collective bargaining is to be maintained, if management is to be held socially responsible, and if free choice is still to be the right of the men who make the Nation's cloth.

THE EMPLOYERS WILL TRY TO STALL

First dawdle, delay, and defer. Then postpone, protract, and prolong. Take one step forward and two steps backward, then hedge, haggle, and hinder. That's the way to do the big stall. That's the way to waltz around workers while their efforts at self-organization are kicked to pieces in the courts and before the National Labor Relations Board.

Southern textile millowners were taught these steps in a hurry by a small band of crafty lawyers. And they learned fast, especially since the accompaniment of the Taft-Hartley law made the whole routine simple.

And they can change partners easily without missing a step. If they aren't following Taft-Hartley, then they can take their lead from the "right-to-work" laws or from the politically appointed and politically biased members of the NLRB.

This "never-do-today-what-can-be-put-off-till-tomorrow" philosophy has paid real dividends for southern textile employers. It has stopped effective organization in its tracks. It has wiped out established local unions of textile workers. It has prevented certification of the Textile Workers Union of America as bargaining agent for workers, even after NLRB election victories; and it has made impossible the culmination of collective bargaining in signed contracts.

The southern stall has more varieties than Heinz has condiments. And in all instances the purpose is the same—to squeeze out extra time in which to terrorize employees, spread rumors, fire union adherents, channel community pressure on all who sign union cards and, in many cases, to evict union followers from company-owned homes. Under Taft-Hartley and under the new administrative rulings of the politically appointed NLRB members, getting delay after delay is easy. In most cases the employers are accommodated merely for the asking—even when the request is not made in writing, as required by the law.

In other cases the millowners—or, to be more exact, their sly legal experts—display a remarkable ingenuity in finding new ways of stalling for extra time in which to frighten off union sympathizers.

Like the owners of Cherokee Textile Mills in Sevierville, Tenn., where the TWUA petitioned for an NLRB election on October 9, 1956, with a clear-cut majority of the workers signed up. Two days later the company distributed large posters through the plant warning employees against union activity. While this pressure was being exerted, supervisors undertook a systematic questioning of all suspected union adherents.

Two weeks later the NLRB announced that a hearing on the union's petition for an election would be held on November 14. On November 1, the Board indicated that the employer had been granted a postponement of a week, since the president of the company said he couldn't attend the scheduled hearing because he had a date with a customer.

The union notified the Board at once of the terror tactics that had been launched in the plant and pointed out that the delay served only to allow the employer that much more time for intimidation of unionists in his employ.

It took 6 weeks to get to the first hearing and it is significant that the president of the firm, A. G. Heinsohn, Jr.., who was too busy to attend the original hearing, did not say a word throughout the hearing. Neither did his local attorney, M. W. Egerton. Instead, the company's case was presented by Whiteford S. Blakeney, mastermind of much of the employer opposition to TWUA in the South.

Blakeney killed time at this and subsequent hearings by deliberately demanding that certain plant employees be included in the voting and bargaining unit even though these categories are specifically barred by the law. By making formal demand, however, he forced the hearing officer to file a formal report to the NLRB which, in turn, had to issue a formal finding.

Cherokee wanted the head nurse at the plant, its mechanical negineer, its draftsman in charge of machine research, its laboratory technician and all of the watchmen included in the production and maintenance unit for which TWUA had petitioned.

But fearful that this might not win a lengthy enough stall, Blakeney demanded that the vice president in charge of fabric research also be included in the unit. And to top even that, he insisted that the pilot of the company-owned airplane be placed in the very same unit.

The case dragged on and on. The company's ridiculous demands were rejected and an election was finally ordered. The intimidation and brainwashing of union adherents had been thorough and effective, however, in the months that elapsed. TWUA lost by a vote of 2 to 1.

At the Valdese Manufacturing Co. in Valdese, N.C., the same pattern developed. The union signed up a majority. An election was sought. The company asked for and secured several delays. Many months elapsed between the TWUA petition and the date of election.

During these months, the company spread fear and intimidation. Its pressure paid off again, thanks to the extra time so generously given to the employer by the NLRB—over the protests of the union and despite the fact that the company had not made its requests for postponements in accordance with the requirements of the law. TWUA lost the election and the Valdese employees once again were at the mercy of the company, with no protection of any kind against reprisals.

There are scores of cases for which TWUA has documentation where this technique of stalling is invoked to gain precious time for the employer—time in which to frighten off union adherents and hack away at union strength in the mills. And the representatives of the National Labor Relations Board, strangely responsive to the rising antiunion climate generated by the Taft-Hartley law, the right-to-work laws, conveniently put no obstacles in the path of southern textile millowners when they seek delay after delay, postponement after postponement, or when they use the most brazen and obvious subterfuges in order to stall cases.

The following report from TWUA southern staff member, whose sole activity is the processing of cases before the NLRB, pinpoints the pattern:

"Invariably the employer appears at the hearing with his attorney, or a special labor consultant, or both, and proceeds to stall. When he no longer can get delays he starts to 'build a case' by means of voluminous proceedings based on demands that he and his advisers know are out of order and will not be upheld by the Board in the end. But what care they? They will have gained valuable time.

"As a general rule, every classification in the plant is developed and argued extensively at the hearings. In most cases the employer and his representatives distort the facts about supervisory employees, clerical and office workers, and others who are not normally included in the production and maintenance unit. It thus becomes necessary for union attorneys to engage in long cross-examination in order to prove that these employees are ineligible to be included in the voting and bargaining unit. But even this is complicated by the obviously coached evasiveness of the company witnesses.

"This is done in plants of all sizes. In the smaller plants it enables the employers to win inordinate delays. In the larger plants, with more numerous classifications about which to argue, the delays are even greater. But small or large, the pattern is the same.

"Here again, as in the case of all other types of antiunion activities, the conduct of the employers is so much of a piece, so identical in character that it becomes quite evident that a highly efficient and carefully coordinated conspiracy to prevent collective bargaining exists in the textile industry in the South. Same actions, same language, same chronology and—usually, the same lawyers and labor consultants."

Credit the southern textile owners with flexibility. When they weren't able to kill off the union during the first phase of stalling prior to an NLRB election, or prior to actual certification, they swung into action with the second stage of their guided muscles. For to these employers, certification merely marks the beginning of a new phase in the warfare, a phase directed by high-powered, high-priced barristers.

Scratch a union-busting southern textile owner and you find a man who sanctimoniously claims to believe in the principle of collective bargaining and who boasts that he never refused to sit down with the union if it was certified to represent his employees. This is technically true; but since the law does not compel the completion of an agreement, the southern millowner and his advisers go through the motions, secure in the fact that their good faith will not be attacked by the NLRB and quietly exultant and confident that the dreary, drawnout haggling and higgling will ultimately kill off the union in the plant.

It is discouraging to report that time has proved them to be right. The union lost 28 locals, all when employers went through the motions of negotiating but refused to make one move in the direction of honest dealings as a prelude to a contract.

The roster of lost locals in the files of TWUA, with the following, typical notations is a depressing tribute to the deadly effect of Taft-Hartley on southern unionism: "Lost decertification election," "Strike for renewal, lost," "Dropped after renewal negotiations failed," "Dropped, 1953. No longer effective bargaining agent," "Strike for renewal lost," "Dropped, renewal negotiations stalled," "Dropped, negotiations fruitless," "Lost strike after renewal negotiations broke down," "Lost members. No renewal obtainable," "Lost strike for renewal," "Lost membership; couldn't get contract."

This file of frustration grows steadily. Talk of the monopoly of labor to TWUA field representatives and they will smile ruefully and silently hand you this organizational obituary in rebuttal.

Let's take a trip through some mill towns down South where they cotton to everything but union contracts.

There's Roanoke Mills Co., of Roanoke Rapids, N.C., where, in 1948, TWUA was certified as bargaining agent for the workers and the company agreed to negotiate. But the president of the firm, F. C. Williams, decided that his workers no longer wanted to be represented by the union despite the fact that they had voted for it in the secret election and despite the fact that the NLRB had finally certified it. Williams made no bones about this position and, in fact, told it to his employees in a letter in which he also

bragged that he was out to show that the union not only wasn't wanted by the workers, but would never get a contract with his company.

Despite this, Williams met with the union negotiators whenever he was requested to and even "bargained" over various contract proposals. After each negotiating session he would dash off a letter to the employees telling them what had happened—always stressing that one of the union demands was for a checkoff of dues. Williams insisted throughout the protracted bargaining that he would never agree to a decent seniority system, would never accept a proposed grievance procedure, would not agree to arbitration, would not grant any protections against unjust discharges, would not agree to checkoff of dues or a union security clause, and would not give any wage increases. To top that, he demanded that the union be held financially responsible for any unauthorized strikes that might occur.

A full year went by with nothing accomplished. All during that time, Williams was piling on the pressure in the plant. At the end of a year a group of loyal employees filed decertification proceedings. An election was ordered; the union lost. The stall had worked once again.

When it comes to forcing workers to desert their union, southern textile millowners seem to operate on the theory that if at first they don't secede, try, try again. Aldora Mills of Barnesville, Ga., adopted that approach. It took half a decade of deceit and delay, but in the end they made it. The TWUA was smashed in the plant.

It all began here when the Taft-Hartley law was little more than a gleam in the eye of the National Association of Manufacturers. On August 18, 1945, the union filed for an election at Aldora. On April 8, 1946, the election was held and TWUA won. On April 23, 1946, the union was certified. On April 17, roughly a week before certification, the union, on the basis of having won the election, wrote to the company requesting that negotiations for a contract be started.

It took until August 27, 1946, to get the company to sit down at the first joint negotiating session. In that period, TWUA tried by letter, telegram and telephone to get the firm to talk contract on more than a dozen occasions. First the plant manager stalled. Then he passed the buck to the company attorney who killed more time. He finally passed the baton to the company's industrial relations director who followed the pattern of procrastination set by his colleagues.

The first bargaining session was of so callous a nature that even the NLRB was aghast. In commenting on this first meeting in a later decision involving this firm the Board pointed out that "The stenographic reports of the negotiating meetings received in evidence at the hearings are replete with statements by the respondent's counsel to the effect that he did not consider the union a representative of the employees, that he did not think there was a bona fide labor organization in existence * * * the respondent unlawfully refused to bargain with the union. * * * In addition, we find not only evidence of bad faith but also a per se violation of section 8(5) of the act in the respondent's studied derogation of the union's status as the bargaining representative of the employees. * * * In our opinion such behavior impugns the validity of Board certifications and evinces disdain for the orderly processes of collective bargaining. These delays and evasions * * * constitute, in our opinion, the antithesis of the good faith bargaining required by the statute. We find the respondent's unlawful refusal to bargain began with the first request for negotiations on April 17, 1946."

Following the first meeting, which even the NLRB found intolerable, there were 16 separate negotiating sessions in 7 months clear through to March 20, 1947. Needless to say, all of these sessions were fruitless in view of the company's stall.

Late in March 1947, the NLRB held a hearing following a formal complaint by the union. It took more than 2 months for the NLRB trial examiner's report to be issued. It took another 15 months before the NLRB ordered the firm to bargain with TWUA and to cease and desist from interfering with the employee's right to self-organization and, incidentally, to reinstate four active unionists who were unjustly discharged. Nothing happened. The company, by totally ignoring the NLRB, told it, in effect, to go to hell.

But, despair not, dear reader. Think not that justice was blind. No—just deaf and dumb. Only another year and a half passed before the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, enforced the order of the NLRB on March 20, 1950. Thus, exactly 4 years and 7 months from the time it all began, it ended.

No contract. No members. No union. Chalk up another one for the Big Stall.

These scattered samplings of stalling spell out a pattern that can be documented in detail by the TWUA. Hundreds upon hundreds of similar situations are described in reports, letters, and affidavits which we are prepared to furnish to any governmental group seriously seeking to study the effects of 14 years of Taft-Hartley upon southern workers and their unions.

Nor is it strange that the tactics used from plant to plant and from State to State are so similar. These are, for the most part, not isolated instances of union smashing. They are part of a shrewdly and carefully devised pattern evolved primarily by two highly successful lawyers for whom the loopholes of Taft-Hartley have proved to be a real bonanza.

So exact is the pattern that, in many instances, company demands or counterdemands upon the union are in identical language.

Notices on bulletin boards, letters to employees, circulars, ads in newspapers, and even lectures to captive audiences of workers turn up the same language.

The curiously concerted character of the counteroffensive against attempts of textile workers to form unions of their own free choice suggests almost a conspiracy to thwart self-organization and to subvert the law's guarantee of the right of workers to join unions. It certainly suggests that Congress should take more than a fleeting glance to determine whether all of the improper acts by southern textile employers are not, in fact, clear violations of the Federal statute.

THE REMEDY

You have just read the unadorned story of an industry, a union, and a law.

The industry, sprawling, profitable, and basic to the well-being of our Nation, operates as though it is not part of America's economic picture and as though this is not 1961. In the most literal sense of the word, the southern textile industry is feudalistic. Arrogant in its strength and immunity, it continues to gain strength from the lopsided labor law of the land which so blatantly favors employers over workers in its actual day-to-day operation as to violate the intent even of the Members of Congress who enacted it in 1947, in the mistaken belief that they were balancing labor-management relations.

The union—which prior to 1947 represented more than one-third of the textile workers and today represents less than a third, despite the passage of 14 years and the expenditure of $10 million—still carries on its crusade to bring 20th century labor-management relations to the dark corners of the South, where textile millowners rule supreme.

It is clear that, given a free choice and a fighting chance, textile workers will seek the benefits of decent, democratic trade unionism as practiced by the Textile Workers Union of America. In situation after situation, up to 50 percent of the workers in a given textile plant sign union cards and voice their desire to be represented by TWUA. There is no trouble, as a rule, getting the cards signed. The trouble starts after an election is sought. It is then that the real danger and the actual one-sidedness of the Taft-Hartley law become apparent.

The ramifications of the Taft-Hartley law have been illustrated by the true stories you have just read—stories that are still being reenacted at places like the Avondale mills in Sylacauga, Ala., the Olson Rug Co., in Chicago, Ill., Monroe Upholstering Co., in Baltimore, Md., and Danville Silk Co., in Danville, Pa.

There are literally hundreds of other cases, carefully documented, which cover similar situations. TWUA is ready to make all of these records available to any interested governmental agency.

Our files are open; the facts are there. Does any Federal agency or committee care to study them in detail?

Even a cursory examination of events in textile mills and villages in the South during the past 14 years of Taft-Hartley is shocking. A detailed congressional study of how this law has harmed workers and their unions while aiding and abetting employers is in order, not by a hastily designated subcommittee of an already overburdened parent committee, but by a new select committee with funds and trained personnel that will enable it to dig up facts and figures beyond what TWUA is prepared to make immediately available.

Such a congressional investigation of a basic industry and a basic law should also address itself to the serious question of whether a group of political appointees can be permitted to twist the law out of all recognition—indeed, to amend it, in effect—by capricious and biased administrative interpretations.

This is precisely what the members of the National Labor Relations Board have done to the Taft-Hartley law. Yet the NLRB has been allowed to subvert the law and usurp powers it was never intended to have and remain uninvestigated, unchallenged, and unchecked. This danger to the democratic concept is of as much concern to us as citizens as the effect of Taft-Hartley on organization of southern workers is to us as trade unionists.

Such an investigation by a select committee will do more than establish the truth or inaccuracy of the details we have presented in this story and the voluminous information in our files. What we have presented are facts, solid and incontrovertible; so we are not worried on that score.

Such a probe can, at this critical moment in the industrial life of our Nation, restore the faith of all Americans in the value and benefits of orderly, decent labor-management relations. It can prove to the world that ours is not a Government that seeks to enrich employers while enslaving or punishing workers. It can shatter the myth spread assiduously by Communists and other foes of the democratic structure in government that elected representatives aren't really interested in or capable of creating an atmosphere of fairness and equity.

Such a probe can, we believe, help the textile workers by restoring the governmental protection to which they are entitled. It can help the textile industry by eliminating obstructions to true stabilization. The Textile Workers Union of America would welcome such an intensive investigation of the industry, the union, and the law. We do not believe the leaders of the textile industry

should oppose it; they, too, should cooperate fully.

If, as southern textile millowners and their apologists insist, the workers want no part of unionism, such a congressional inquiry will make that apparent. If, as some prominent Washingtonians have charged in the past, TWUA is in bad repute among southern workers and, therefore, incapable of effectively organizing these employees under any circumstances, such a farflung probe will establish that, too.

We are ready and willing—indeed, anxious—to take our chances on such a thoroughgoing study of this phase of the industry in which we have operated over these many years.

The AFL–CIO, of which our union is a part, has urged the passage of several amendments to Taft-Hartley with which we are in full agreement. However, the unusual position we are in makes necessary our call for additional specific amendments to restore a semblance of sanity and stability to southern labor relations. For while we believe that every union and every worker has lost something because of the effect of the Taft-Hartley law and/or the climate it created, we know that of all the major industrial groups in the Nation, only the textile workers have lost nearly everything.

As an industrial citizen, the unorganized southern textile worker is back where he was in 1932; he has no rights at all. This condition is atypical; it is different from conditions prevailing in all other branches of American industry.

The southern section of the textile industry is an area where legitimate collective bargaining has not been accepted; where the union is struggling desperately to maintain life; where employers utilize any means, including the most horrendous violence, to smash the union before it takes steady steps toward maturity; where entire textile-geared communities are mobilized against the right of workers to organize; where employers play a kind of hide and seek with a hesitant Federal agency charged with the responsibility of removing obstructions to the rights of workers to form, join, and maintain trade unions of their own choice.

Barring a more dramatic and more fundamental approach to this problem of all Americans, particular amendments are essential—amendments that go somewhat beyond those suggested by the national office of the AFL–CIO.

The special nature of southern textile's labor relations headache was recognized by the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In its report to the 2d session of the 82d Congress in 1951, the committee stated:

"Self-organization and collective bargaining (in the southern textile industry) are steadily losing ground. The retreat of union organization is being compelled by employer campaigns on an areawide front. Much of this campaign is being conducted in shocking violation of the Labor-Management Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board appears to be powerless to cope with the situation.

"The extent and effectiveness of this opposition in the southern textile industry are almost unbelievable."

In suggesting the following amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, the Textile Workers Union of America merely seeks to restore real balance to labor relations in America. We ask no special favors. We ask for the southern textile worker only that protection by law, in the pursuit of his right to self-organization, to which he is entitled.

We are not asking anyone to organize workers for us—least of all the Government. Given half the opportunity in a less terroristic climate, we are confident that we can win to our union the great mass of the underprivileged and underpaid southern textile workers. Enrolling these men and women in our ranks and protecting their standards and their interests is our responsibility—more than that, our primary basis for existence.

We have the money, the manpower and the know-how. We have the experience, the desire and the confidence. We will fulfill our function. We will bring to southern textile workers all of the benefits of honest, American trade unionism. That is our job and we will perform it. We want no one else to assume this obligation for us.

What we propose are five simple steps to sow in the South the seeds of sanity, sincerity and stability in labor-management relations. These are, in our view, minimum recommendations. We frankly do not believe they go far enough. They will not solve the problem. But they do represent movement in the right direction.

Nor will these amendments by themselves guarantee success in our organizing efforts. The nature of the southern textile industry is such that progress in unionization will be slow, hard and unspectacular. But at least the workers will have a fighting chance to win the benefits of bona fide unionism. And the union will have a degree of freedom in communicating with the workers and trying to convince them that membership in the Textile Workers Union of America is to their distinct advantage.

That's all the workers in southern textile mills seek—just a fighting chance to make a truly free choice about their future.

Ultimately, in our view, no piecemeal approach to this problem can prove effective. The textile industry is basic and unique. Its problems—in particular, its labor relations problem—are so radically different from those of other major industries in America as to justify a bold approach in an effort, not merely to protect the textile workers, but to safeguard the industry itself from its own shortsightedness, planlessness, outmoded production, research and distribution techniques, reckless competition, and unwillingness or inability to unite against external pressures such as mounting imports from Japan and other low-wage countries.

Toward this end, we favor the eventual introduction of a special act—following closely the form and substance of the Railway Labor Act—to govern this essential industry and guide it toward stability and further growth.

But for acutely needed, immediate relief in our industry, we urge the enactment of amendments to the Taft-Hartley law along the following lines:

1. Revocation of immunity given to employers under existing laws to coerce and intimidate employees under the guise of free speech; employers should be held responsible for their words in labor-management disputes to the same extent that others are held liable for the spoken word.

2. The rule of agency in the present law should be changed so that an employer can be held responsible for the unlawful anti-union conduct of those acting in his behalf or in his interest, and so that such agents shall also be held accountable.

3. Restore the right of the National Labor Relations Board to conduct prehearing elections on the basis of evidence presented by a union that it represents employees in a plant, as one step in the speeding up of all NLRB decisions. The interests of justice require speedy resolution of NLRB cases in weeks—not months or even years as is the common situation today.

4. Provide adequate penalties against employers who persistently and repeatedly commit unfair labor practices.

5. Repeal section 14b. The Federal Government should insure uniform laws in the labor relations field affecting interstate commerce so that different State courts and State legislatures will not continue the confusion of a veritable Tower of Babel and continue to be free to overrule Federal policy in this field.

Even though there is not enough background of experience at this writing, the difficulties which the Landrum-Griffin amendments add to Taft-Hartley are obvious in at least three respects.

The new law has the effect of forcing union members to work on struck goods even where the employer is willing, by contractual provision, to exempt them from such distasteful tasks.

It places severe restrictions upon organizational and unfair labor practice picketing, thus denying unions the right to protest against substandard conditions.

It also restricts the right of labor to advise the consuming public that merchants are selling struck goods.

Each of these provisions is inequitable and, in our opinion, cries out for amendment.

The story we have unfolded has been the same story from 1947 to 1961. The sequel to this story is in the hands of the men and women in Washington who make the laws that govern us.

The executive branch of the Government and every Member of both Houses of Congress have been presented with this book. We can only hope that what they have read will convince them that serious measures are essential to cope with this national scandal.

We hope, too, that the many readers of this book who are just ordinary folk wind up with a clearer picture of a phase of American life of which they were formerly unaware. If they then write to their own Congressmen, urging that some remedial action be taken and suggesting a comprehensive inquiry by a select committee, then literally hundreds of thousands of textile workers below the Mason-Dixon line will know that they are no longer the forgotten men and women of our generation.

REPLY TO AD IN WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, a two-page ad appeared in the Washington Post petitioning the Members of this House to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Three hundred and twenty-seven persons signed the ad. A number of them have been identified as members of the Communist Party. A few dozen of them are notorious for the fact that, over a period of many years, they have unwaveringly promoted the line of Moscow and the Communist Party in this country.

As I read the charges made against the committee in the ad and attempted to analyze them, I could not help thinking of numerous propaganda charges I have read in the past which have been made against the United States by the Soviet Union. The ad had certain characteristics which are typical of Soviet anti-U.S. propaganda, the principal ones being these:

First. The accusations made are broad, sweeping and vague—so much so that it is difficult to determine precisely what actions they refer to. For this reason, as our representatives in the United

Nations and the officials of our information agencies have learned, the charges are difficult to answer briefly and concisely.

Second. The accusations are also completely without foundation, reminiscent of the "big lie" technique usually associated with Hitler but practiced by the Communists long before anyone ever heard of Hitler—and still used by them.

Third. The accusations are ostensibly based on idealistic, noble and democratic principles but are actually designed to put an end to policies or practices which hinder or frustrate the advance of communism.

As I read the text of the petition in this ad, and the five charges it made against the committee, I was also reminded of a statement made by Lenin many years ago—after he had been cited for slander before a party tribunal because he had used lies in attacking his adversaries. This is what he said on the occasion:

> The wording [of our press campaign against our political foe] is calculated to provoke in the reader hatred, disgust, contempt. * * * The phrasing must be calculated not to convince but to destroy the ranks [of the enemy]—not to correct the adversary's mistake, but to annihilate, to raze to the ground, his organization. This wording must really be of such a kind as to provoke the worst notions, the worst suspicions about the adversary; it must sow discord in the ranks of the proletariat and be the opposite of phrasing which would convince and correct.
>
> I am intentionally sowing discord in the ranks of * * * [the proletariat]. In regard to such political enemies I conducted at that time—and in case of a repetition or development of the split, I will always carry out—a fight of extermination.

The ad in the Washington Post was calculated to provoke in its readers "hatred, disgust, contempt" for the Committee on Un-American Activities, "to provoke the worst notions, the worst suspicions" about it—all with the purpose of bringing about its liquidation.

The most discouraging aspect of the ad was the fact that of the 327 signers, 69, or 21 percent, were clergymen and another 6 were lay leaders of religious organizations. In view of the Communists' proclaimed hatred of God and religion; of the unrelenting persecution of all religions carried on for many years by Communist regimes; and in view of the countless and unspeakable atrocities inflicted on believers in God by the Communists, I had hoped that the day might have arrived in this country when clergymen, at least, might refuse to join with known Communists in an enterprise of any kind. I was wrong. As I said a moment ago, 69 clergymen signed this lying, defamatory ad. Ten of them were bishops and another six were presidents or former presidents of theological schools.

There is only one charge against the committee in the ad that is all specific and can, therefore, be readily answered. The ad charges that:

> The committee has perverted and thereby imperiled the proper and necessary powers of the Congress to conduct investigations.

Tied in with this accusation is the charge, in the introductory text, that the Supreme Court in the Watkins case "made it clear that the committee has habitually misused its mandate in unconstitutional ways for political purposes; that it has become an agency for repression; that it has usurped the functions of the executive and judicial branches of our Government."

Both of these charges are outright lies. The only finding the Supreme Court made in the Watkins case, as the Court itself subsequently pointed out most explicitly in Barrenblatt, was that Watkins "had not been adequately apprised of the subject matter of the subcommittee's investigation or the pertinency thereto of the questions he refused to answer."

The Court did not find in Watkins that the committee's investigation had lacked a proper legislative purpose.

It did not find the committee had in any way exceeded its authority.

It did not find that the questions Watkins refused to answer were not pertinent to the committee inquiry.

It did not find that the committee "habitually" or in any other way misused its mandate; that it operated unconstitutionally in any sense; that it was repressive in any fashion, or that it had usurped the functions of the executive or judicial branches.

The Court's failure to make any such findings in Watkins is a complete refutation of the above charge in the ad, because the Court itself said in Watkins that the issue in the case was the "fundamental principles of the power of the Congress and the limitations upon that power."

Clearly, if the Committee on Un-American Activities had been guilty of unconstitutional procedures, the Court, in deciding a case that went to the fundamental principles of congressional committee power and the limitation upon that power, would have made a finding to such an effect. This, by its own wording in Barrenblatt, it did not do.

The Washington Post ad in referring to the committee, made another statement that is pertinent to this issue. It said:

> We are confident that only a return to constitutional procedures can protect us against subversion without at the same time subverting the very liberties we seek to protect.

But in the Barrenblatt case, in which the Court upheld the contempt conviction of a professor who had refused to answer committee questions, the Court again examined the question of the constitutionality of the committee's procedures. Summarizing the basic issue in the Barrenblatt case in its decision, the Court said:

> Once more the Court is required to resolve the conflict of constitutional claims of congressional power and of an individual's right to resist its exercise.

So in Barrenblatt again, the Court went to the issue of the constitutionality of the committee's procedures—and found that its actions were in no way violative of the Constitution.

There is, therefore, absolutely no judicial authority for the charge that the committee has used unconstitutional means or procedures. As a matter of fact, all judicial authority is to the opposite effect because on numerous occasions in recent years the committee's actions have been reviewed—and upheld—by numerous courts on all levels.

Obviously, there can be no "return to constitutional procedures" such as the ad demands unless there is first a deviation or departure from them. The implied accusation against the committee in this statement, in the face of the numerous judicial findings to the contrary, can be classified only as another lie.

The second numbered charge the ad made against the committee is as follows:

> The committee has helped discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace while the world is threatened with destruction.

Who threatens the world with destruction? The answer is common knowledge—the international Communist conspiracy, of which some of the ad signers are members and to which many of the other signers have given yeoman service for years.

It follows that, since it is international communism that threatens the world with destruction, the true workers for peace are those who impart factual knowledge of this evil force so that it can be better fought and, if possible, its threat to destroy the world eliminated.

Did the committee help discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace when last month it relased volume II of its "Facts on Communism" series—a work of over 350 pages on communism in the Soviet Union, from the time of Lenin to that of Khrushchev? This volume is largely the work of Dr. David J. Dallin, author and coauthor of over a dozen outstanding books on communism and the Soviet Union and a man who is recognized throughout this country—and in other lands as well—as a leading authority on communism, the Soviet Union and its foreign policy and internal affairs. This volume, moreover, does not represent merely the views or scholarship of Dr. Dallin. It is heavily documented with quotations from dozens of recognized scholars of many nations.

Volume I of "Facts on Communism" was released by the committee last year and dealt with the Communist ideology. This volume was largely the work of Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, coauthor of "An Inquiry Into Soviet Mentality" and also a recognized authority in his field.

Was the committee discouraging "free study and inquiry in working for peace" when, last year, it also released volume I of "Selected Chronology of the World Communist Movement"—a work covering all major developments in the growth of world communism during the years 1818–1945? In the future, this chronology will be brought up through the year 1957. It was prepared by Dr. Joseph G. Whelan, analyst of Soviet and East European affairs of the Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in consultation with Dr. Sergius Yakobson, senior specialist in Russian affairs for the Library's Legislative Reference Service, and the committee staff.

In 1956, the committee published a 5-volume, 2,000-page work, "The Communist Conspiracy." This series contained basic documents on Communist doctrine, aims, strategy, tactics, and objectives, not only as regards the Soviet Union but the United States and other nations of the world as well.

Was this an attempt to discourage free inquiry for peace?

Also, in 1956, the committee published a 2-volume, 900-page work entitled "Soviet Total War." Over 120 persons—educators, labor leaders, journalists, security officials such as J. Edgar Hoover and Allan W. Dulles, military and religious leaders—all of them authorities on one aspect or another of communism or the Soviet Union, contributed material to this series.

Was free inquiry and world peace endangered—or strengthened—by this action?

Can anyone honestly claim that the committee has discouraged free study in working for peace because it has published seven consultations on the "Crimes of Khrushchev"—the butcher of Budapest who is now dictator of the Communist world? Or because it has published 10 volumes, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, on the leaders of the Communist movement in the Soviet Union, Red China, and various satellites?

Has the committee discouraged free study for peace when it has published consultations with numerous authorities on communism covering such subjects as Communist psychological warfare, the Communist strategy of protracted conflict, Moscow's motivation in proposing summit conferences, the persecution of religion in Red China and North Korea, Communist use of language—and also trade—as a weapon?

Surely, it is obvious that such publications, by helping inform the Congress and the American people about the nature of their enemy, not only help preserve the peace but also promote further inquiry in the same or related fields by giving capable scholars recognition and an opportunity to impart their knowledge to many thousands of people who would not otherwise have the benefit of it.

In addition, of course, in thousands of pages of hearings held over the years, the committee has kept the Congress and the American people informed of shifting U.S. Communist Party strategy and tactics (which reflect Soviet directives) so that they may better cope with the Communist challenge both here and abroad while preserving the peace.

If it were true, as charged, that the committee discourages free inquiry and study in the cause of peace, would educators, journalists and clergymen such as the following be active supporters of, and cooperators with, the committee in its work?

Dr. George Loring Allen, University of Oregon; Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Georgetown University; Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the foreign policy research institute of the University of Pennsylvania; Prof. William C. McGovern, Northwestern University; Dr. Anthony T. Buscaren, Le Moyne College; Dr. James D. Atkinson, Georgetown University; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, University of Notre Dame.

Also, Max Eastman, John C. Caldwell, Henry A. Kissinger, James Burnham, Eugene Lyons, Edward Hunter, Constantine Brown, Frederick Woltman, Ludwell Denny, Willard Edwards, Ralph deToledano, Dr. Charles W. Lowry, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, and Bishop Fulton Sheen.

Is it conceivable that men such as these, who have devoted their lives to working for peace and to free inquiry for that and other purposes, would support a committee that worked to the opposite purpose?

The truth about this charge in the Washington Post is that a great number of its signers fear free study and inquiry into communism and hate the House Committee on Un-American Activities because it promotes this type of activity. The only peace many of these people want is the peace of a global jail, which will be imposed on the world if Moscow succeeds in its aim of subjecting all peoples to its tyranny.

The next of the false charges made against the committee in this ad reads as follows:

> It has harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice.

It is committee policy to subpena as witnesses only those who, sworn testimony, "reliable confidential information," or documentary evidence in its possession indicates, are presently or have recently been members of the Communist Party—except, of course, in hearings which indicate by their very nature that witnesses are not suspected of being Communists. Are the signers of the ad claiming that the Communists are the only ones in this country working for racial equality and justice?

I believe I know the type of committee activity that is referred to, in typical Communist smokescreen fashion, in this charge. In hearings on Communist activity among youth held last February, a young Negro who had recently broken with the Communist Party testified as follows before the committee:

> I went into the party with the idea that the Communist Party was the solution to the Negro people's problem, but as my experience in the Communist Party I find out that the Communist Party wasn't a party for the Negro people, that the Communist Party have one of the worse discriminations in their own party themselves.
>
> If the Communist Party can use the Negro people as a tool and use them for their own advantage, the Communist Party don't give a darn about the Negro people * * * and I also witnessed discrimination in the party. If something happened to the Negro people, the Communist Party finds out * * * the Government of this country changed things around and worked the things in the favor of the Negro people, it seems like the Communist Party they get sad and they want to drop the issue altogether. In other words, the Communist Party want to see the things really keep on happening to the Negro people so they can use this as a weapon to try to rally the masses of the Negro people around the Communist Party.

The testimony of this young man, Albert Gailard, was not the first such testimony given before and released by the committee—testimony of a kind which had revealed the duplicity of the Communist Party and its agents in claiming to work for racial equality and justice.

In 1954, the committee published a report "The American Negro in the Communist Party" which included the testimony of half a dozen Negroes who had held official positions in the Communist Party and who had broken with it—all of whom had testified that the Communist Party does all in its power to promote race hatred and tension, rather than racial equality, in the United States.

It is work such as this by the committee that inspires certain of the ad signers to use the "stop-thief" technique in trying to discredit the committee. They know that they themselves have been guilty of the false charges they make here. I defy each and every one of the signers—including the 103 learned professors and educators, as well as clergymen and bishops—to name one person the committee has harassed simply because he or she has worked for racial equality and justice.

Not content with this unfounded charge the signers of this lying ad made another related charge against the committee:

> It has increased bitterness between racial and religious groups of our citizens, which in turn has imperiled our good relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I cannot conceive how any honest and informed clergymen or educator could make a charge such as this when committee activity in the racial and religious fields has been limited strictly to revealing the tactics of the Communist Party in deceiving and exploiting racial and religious minorities for its own ends—or in revealing Communist religious or racial persecution in furtherance of Moscow's aim of destroying all opposition to its goal of world conquest.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its publications and in the statements of its members in the course of various hearings, has consistently emphasized the fact that religion and the churches are the foundation of our opposition to communism and our strongest bulwark in fighting it.

At the same time, the committee has exposed certain Communists who have engaged in the most despicable of all forms of treachery—that of posing as clergymen in order to carry out the Communist design of perverting or destroying all religion—so that the triumph of Red totalitarianism will be guaranteed.

Does anyone in this House actually believe that this phase of the committee's activity has increased bitterness between religious groups in this country? Or that it has imperiled our relations with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—many of whom are deeply religious?

Not long ago the committee released a consultation with five Protestant leaders from Asia—clergymen and lay leaders—who gave details of the persecution of all religions in Red China and Communist North Korea and spelled out some of the revolting atrocities inflicted on the people of these countries by the Communists in their antireligious war.

Can anyone claim that, in doing this, the committee fomented bitterness between religious groups in this country—or that it imperiled U.S. relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America?

The answer, obviously, is "No." This last quoted charge, too, is a lie.

The final charge made against the committee is as follows:

> It has discouraged social and cultural contacts with our neighbors on this shrinking planet. It has discouraged U.S. students and scholars from studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand.

In looking back over the committee's activities during the past year or so, I can think of only one of two things that this charge could refer to. Revealingly, when the charge is considered in the light of these committee actions, it places the signers of the ad on the side of the Kremlin and Red China, and against the United States.

Early last year the committee held hearings on Communist training operations, with a considerable part of them devoted to the seventh World Youth Festival which was held in Vienna in the summer of 1959 under Moscow's auspices, with the World Federation of Democratic Youth and International Union of Students serving as sponsors.

As the committee stated in its recently published annual report, an important reason for this hearing was:

> To consider the advisability of sending to future festivals, delegations which are versed in Communist tactics and accredited by the U.S. Government as true representatives of American youth.

In an effort to discover what really happened at Vienna, the committee called witnesses from both elements of the American group which went to the festival—the Communist faction and the anti-Communist faction.

The Communist witnesses uniformly invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer all questions about their part in the festival. The anti-Communist witnesses, on the other hand, spoke freely and answered all questions to the best of their ability.

The hearings developed certain truths which all Americans—and particularly our youth, who are now the target of an intensified Communist agitation and propaganda drive—should know about certain social and cultural contacts referred to in the ad, truths, by the way, which the Communists do not want known.

The hearings revealed that the youth festival was rigged from beginning to end to serve Communist purposes; that the controlling personalities at the festival were not young people but old revolutionaries, skilled in methods of hoodwinking youth. They revealed that, although the Communists were very much a minority in the American delegation, they maneuvered control of the group initially and—when the anti-Communist young Americans tried to gain control in Vienna so that the group's actions and statements would reflect the anti-Communist sentiment of the great majority of its members—they were completely frustrated by the cunning operations of a Communist machine they were not prepared to cope with.

The hearings revealed that there was no free speech or expression for anti-Communists at the festival. They revealed that a former Nazi had a hand in controlling the Communist faction of the U.S. delegation. They revealed that the youth delegations from the Communist satellites were kept separate from the non-Communist youths and not permitted to mingle or speak freely with them.

Naturally, Moscow and the U.S. Communist Party did not like these hearings and the truth revealed in them. At the time of the hearings, the committee received 11 letters and cables from Communist-dominated youth organizations in as many foreign countries protesting the holding of the hearings.

Apparently, the signers are as unhappy about these hearings as the international Communist apparatus was.

There is another committee action which, I believe, the signers of the ad had in mind when they made the last quoted charge against the committee.

Last summer, the committee published a consultation it had held with Mr. Robert Loh, who was born in China and came to this country to complete his education. In 1949, after receiving his masters degree at the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Loh returned to mainland China—which had just fallen into Communist hands—at the request of a former professor.

After teaching there for 2 years and becoming thoroughly disillusioned with the Communist regime, Mr. Loh became a mill manager and "showcase capitalist" and receptionist-host for visiting foreigners in Shanghai while waiting for an opportunity to escape to freedom.

In his consultation with the committee, Mr. Loh revealed that the Red Chinese for years have been spending huge sums of money and organizing tens and even hundreds of thousands of their enslaved subjects in various ways to keep all visitors to that country from learning the truth about conditions there. He spelled out in detail the numerous, devious ruses used by the Communists to mislead and hoodwink visitors to Red China.

Red China, the committee knows from other hearings it has held, is now trying to get American students of Chinese ancestry to go there to study. I have no doubt but that, to use the phraseology of the ad in the Washington Post, the committee's publication of Mr. Loh's testimony discouraged young Americans of Chinese origin from studying in Red China and that it, combined with our hearings on the Communist Youth Festival in Vienna, has discouraged other Americans for certain types of social and cultural contacts with the Red Chinese.

At the same time, however, I also have no doubt but that these committee actions have helped inform the American Congress and people about certain countries which, as the ad says, "we Americans desperately need to understand."

Obviously, the Committee on Un-American Activities had done nothing to discourage social and cultural contact with Britain, France, Italy, Turkey, Mexico, or any other free nation in the world. It has done nothing to discourage scholars from studying in such countries. It has, however, done much to uncover the truth about the nature of, and the conditions in, those nations which are our enemies and are working unceasingly to destroy us.

This, it appears, is what the signers of the ad in the Washington Post do not like—and are determined to end—if they can possibly do so.

That the charges against the committee in the Washington Post ad are composed of falsehoods and distortions is obvious from the facts I have presented. There is also one other element of duplicity in the ad that I would like to refer to briefly before concluding my remarks.

The committee has already received word from one alleged signer of the ad—a lay religious leader—indicating that she was in some manner tricked into lending her name to the ad and saying she is "very sorry my name was used." In the case of at least one signer, it appears, the ad is also false, lying, and duplicitous.

I am pleased, of course, to know that the Members of this House—or at least the overwhelming majority of them—did not give the faintest consideration to the Communist-serving proposition that this body should give up the one continuing, formalized expression of its determination to fight the Communist enemies of freedom at every turn. This is without question a tribute not only to the Members of this House, but also to the people of America who have chosen them as their Representatives.

I have also been most pleased, of course, to note the weakness of the effort to destroy the committee. Certain elements worked long and hard for this ad. But what they wound up with was not very much. First, they had to resort to distortion and falsehood in attempting to make a case against the committee. Then, out of the estimated 107 million adults in this Nation, they could produce only 326 persons, at the most, who were deemed prominent enough to sign their ad. To get this number, moreover, they had to descend to the traitorous level of Communist Party membership in some cases and, in many others, to the not much higher level of the confirmed Communist fellow traveler.

This certainly puts in an unenviable position those signers of the ad—particularly the clergymen, professors and other so-called intellectuals—who are neither Communists nor fellow travelers. They are indeed in strange company. I cannot help wondering just what they would do if placed under oath and asked to produce evidence to substantiate the charges against the committee to which they have affixed their names.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES FOR DISABLED WORKERS IN GOING TO AND FROM WORK

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill which would provide an income tax deduction for expenses, up to a total of $600 a year, that are incurred by a disabled worker in transportation to and from work. The purpose of this bill is to assist these disabled individuals in returning to a full and useful life. This is the proper purpose, in my estimation, of every program of aid to the disabled—to put them back in the position of helping themselves and not to make them permanently wards of the State welfare programs.

By the definition of this bill, one is disabled if he "has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work." The expenses thus included are those necessary for the individual to be gainfully and independently employed. It would help the individual to help himself.

In our society one of the problems which still seeks solution is that of the integration of the disabled individual into the mainstream of community life. It is a goal which these individuals desire to have attained and one which is desirable for the benefit of society.

TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in 1957, the National Science Foundation, in a report to the President, indicated that America's basic research efforts must be substantially increased. Progress in the modern world is intimately linked to the efforts of basic research and to maintain America's scientific and industrial preeminence we must encourage basic scientific research in this country.

To this end, I have today reintroduced legislation which would permit tax concessions to individuals and corporations for their contributions to basic research. For individuals, contributions to universities or nonprofit organizations for basic research would be treated as a credit against taxes. By the provisions of the bill, the individual taxpayer could claim 90 percent of his contribution as a credit against his tax liability, up to a total of 5 percent of that liability. For businesses which undertake basic research, there would be a credit of 75 percent of the contribution made up to a total of 3 percent of the tax liability.

The control of the incidence of the tax burden has proven to be an effective way to encourage certain activities and discourage others. What it does, in effect, is tell the individual or corporate taxpayer, "We will not order you to make certain expenditures and not others, for this is the legitimate area of personal choice; the disposition of your funds is in your hands alone. We will, however, recognize expenditures which contribute to the general welfare, we will encourage better exercise of your right to do with your funds as you see fit, and we will do this by making the amounts so spent or some part of them free from taxation." The legitimate right of choice remains with the taxpayer, both in the question of how to spend his money and its exact distribution among the competing areas of basic research.

Such a system would be, in my estimation, far preferable to a program by which the Federal Government would underwrite these costs. Guarantees of the good faith of the research expenditures would be left in the hands of the universities and nonprofit organizations where they are involved and in the hands of a certifying board of scientists where corporations are concerned. This bill would foster our national progress in the context of individual freedom which has been so important to our growth in the past.

PRINTING OF REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the final determination, the Congress of the United States has as its primary function the consideration and enactment of the legislation which will be observed in the country. Our efforts in this House are turned to that end, and it is essential that the Rules of the House of Representatives help promote it. One of the important parts of this consideration is the debate which occurs on the floor of the House. It is, and should be, the testing ground of ideas, the place in which a proposal must stand or fall on its merits. It is also one of the major channels by which information of what occurs in the Halls of Congress gets back to the people, either directly or through the news media.

The reporting of congressional debates through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, provided for in the Constitution, assumes special importance in this day in which it is beyond the physical capacity of a Member of Congress to report directly to his constituents. This being the case, it is clear that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should, insofar as is possible, reflect what was said on the floor of the House, those statements which appear in it that were made in open debate and subject to rebuttal by those of opposing views.

At the present time, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not accurately reflect what has been said in open debate. By the rules of the House, a Member may, by leave of the House, revise or extend his remarks, putting into the RECORD of spoken debate matters which were never said on the floor. This is an example of just such a use of this privilege to revise and extend. These remarks were not spoken on the floor of the House; they were inserted by permission into the RECORD.

I do not contend that this privilege is given without good reason. Rather, I commend it; without it the remarks of 437 Members of this body could not, by limitations of time, be made a part of the RECORD, as well they should. Without it time better used in the presentation of legislative matters for consideration would be consumed in reading material for insertion into the RECORD.

Nor do I condemn the other use of the privilege, the original use—that of permitting a Member to put into more cogent language his statements made in the heat of debate. This is often necessary for the true sense of a colloquy or debate to be made clear. But in this area, too, abuses have arisen which endanger the integrity of the congressional forum. As previously mentioned, matters not spoken on the floor of the House may appear in its official RECORD; entire speeches, not subject to the testing of debate, may be added. The second problem of which I speak is perhaps even more dangerous. Under the guise of making a statement more comprehensible, a Member may, if he so wishes, add to or delete from his statement, changing its meaning entirely, or making the statements in reply to his meaningless. This has happened to me; I am sure it has happened to many other Members also.

It is clear that in either context, that of the speech not open to rebuttal on the floor or that of the change in meaning made while revising comments spoken in open debate, this threatens the integrity of congressional forum in its reported form.

In order to overcome these weaknesses and to return to the official RECORD of the House its proper place as an accurate report of what has transpired in House debate, I have reintroduced a resolution which would require that, in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a change in type-face for those items which appear in it but which were not spoken on the floor of the House. There would be no limitation beyond that which now exists on the right of a Member of Congress to alter or add to what he said; it would rather permit those who read it to be able to distinguish between that which has stood the test of open debate and that which has not.

I urge upon the serious consideration of my colleagues the problem which I have outlined and the solution which I have offered.

REPUBLICAN WHIP

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the membership that we on our side have again designated the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, to be the Republican whip during this Congress.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the benefit of the House that the rule just reported out of the Committee on Rules will be brought up for consideration of the House on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

474. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

475. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1959 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

476. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

477. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report certifying by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by the law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period prior to January 1, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

479. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) negotiated fixed-price contracts AT (05-1)-709 and AT(05-1)-765 with the Western Nuclear Corp. (WNC) for the procurement of uranium concentrates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

480. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1960, pursuant to the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

481. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the study and recommendations as to the appropriate participation by the Federal Government in the West Virginia Centennial of 1963, pursuant to Public Law 86-508; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

482. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to operations carried out by the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the period ending December 31, 1960, in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, pursuant to Public Law 86-648; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

483. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of Treasury Department positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

484. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to furnishing the necessary information for the U.S. General Accounting Office on its positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. A resolution providing that during the 87th Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of 15 Members; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend section 902(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that the criminal penalties provided therein will apply to violations of civil aeronautics safety regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3151. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3152. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 3153. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3154. A bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3155. A bill to confirm the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3156. A bill to make the Panama Canal Company immune from attachment or garnishment of salaries owed to its employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3158. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3159. A bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3160. A bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3161. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage basic research in science by the allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3163. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3165. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3166. A bill to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as a uniformed service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3167. A bill to prohibit the transfer to the General Services Administration of custodial employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit employees with at least 30 years of service to retire at 55 years of age with full annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3169. A bill to extend benefits under the civil service retirement system to certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3170. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3171. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Elephant Butte Reservoir area, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 3173. A bill to extend service pension benefits to certain persons who served honorably as commissioned officers in the Philippine Constabulary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3174. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 3175. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3176. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 3177. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky, and the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3181. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, and to encourage and promote actions by foreign governments to improve their own levels of such wages and working conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the construction, repair, modernization, and alteration of State homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3183. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3184. A bill to extend the direct loan program for Korean conflict veterans and provide an earlier termination date for the World War II loan guarantee and direct loan programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3185. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3186. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3187. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3188. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3189. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3190. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3191. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3192. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3193. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 3194. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3195. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3196. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3197. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3198. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3199. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 3200. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3201. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 3202. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3203. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3204. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3205. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3206. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 3207. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3208. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3209. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution providing for the reimbursement of Members of the House of Representatives for amounts expended by them for certain travel and subsistence; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 92; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 129. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect

to the printing of remarks of Members of the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3210. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 3211. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Czajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3212. A bill for the relief of Efstathia Varela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3213. A bill for the relief of Beddo Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3214. A bill for the relief of Chao-Wei Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3215. A bill for the relief of Eduard Nicolas Theodorus Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3216. A bill for the relief of Anna Kuhweider Krenn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H.R. 3217. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tom Shue Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Roger Chong Yeun Dunne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 3219. A bill for the relief of Vita Schiralli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Teachers Guide for Earth and Space Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding contribution to education made by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction in the preparation of a publication entitled "Teachers Guide for Earth and Space Science."

The National Aviation Education Council stated they appreciated the opportunity of reproducing this book for the teachers of America.

Dr. Charles H. Boehm, superintendent of public instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was awarded a citation of honor by the Air Force association at their meeting in San Francisco in September 1960, for his "outstanding contribution to space age education by establishing in the junior high schools of Pennsylvania, the Nation's first comprehensive course of study in aerospace science."

Dr. Boehm prefaced the publication with the following comments:

The idea for the earth and space science program was conceived at the 1958 Air Force convention in Dallas, Tex., when for the first time the swift progress being made in space travel and aerodynamics was demonstrated to a group of educators. This experience led to the realization that the space age in which we live and about which we still know so little will be commonplace to our children. Therefore, the inclusion of earth and space science in the programs of Pennsylvania's public schools has become an imperative issue.

We of Pennsylvania, are indeed proud of this achievement by our department of public instruction.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 55: 22: *Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee.*

Almighty God, together we turn to Thee with eager and earnest hearts, one in our need of divine guidance and wisdom, for the tasks and responsibilities of this new day.

Inspire us to walk diligently in the ways of Thy commandments and may we have poise and power of spirit when feelings and moods of fear and futility assail us.

Grant that in times of hardship and adversity we may prove faithful to our highest trusts and never recreant in discharging any duty.

May we be the messengers of help and hope to the struggling and troubled heart of humanity, lifting it to those heights whence cometh the strength of vision and victory.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF RULES CHANGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I had announced that the resolution concerning the Committee on Rules would be brought up tomorrow; but some Members are unable to be here. Some Members understood, by implication at least, that there would be a 72-hour layover period before the rule would come up. Because of these circumstances, instead of bringing it up tomorrow, it will be programed for next Tuesday.

POSTPONEMENT OF RULES CHANGE CONSIDERATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is not said in any spirit of criticism, but this postponement was unknown to me until I came here on the floor today. I should like the RECORD to show also that our Members were alerted to be here. As a result, many of them canceled engagements they had out of town and many who were honoring commitments in their districts have made extraordinary efforts to be here. I had understood that a 48-hour notice was what was involved, and that this notice had been given. It was understood by all of us that the vote would come on Thursday. Of course, the majority leader has given us the reason for the postponement, and I am not going to argue with that, nor contend against it nor question it. But I think it should be fairly well understood that there have been efforts at the Cabinet level to call Members on our side in the last few hours. Perhaps other moves may be in contemplation—I do not know. In any event, there is nothing we in the minority can do, of course, except to go along with the revised programs as announced.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF RULES CHANGE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say to the majority leader that, as the minority party whip, I am embarrassed this morning because of this wholly unexpected change in program. Because of efforts that have been made by myself with my Members, assuring them that the vote would be on Thursday, and at great inconvenience to many of them forcing change in plans to be here tomorrow, I now must say to them I am sorry, you must be here next Tuesday. To say the least, this last-minute change in plans should not have been made.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for centuries, unhappily, Ukrainians have seldom had the chance to enjoy peace with freedom in their historic homeland. After suffering for more than 259 years under Russia's autocratic czars, in 1918 they had a chance to free themselves from foreign rule and on January 22 of that year they proclaimed their independence. That event marked a turning point in the lives of the Ukrainian people.

For the next 2 years the Ukrainians worked hard and struggled against forbidding odds to maintain their freedom, but they were unable to cope with the rising tide of communism in Russia. In 1920 Ukraine was overwhelmed by the Red army and thus Ukraine's independence was brought to an end. Subsequently Ukraine was brought into the Soviet Union, and since then Ukrainians have been living under Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

However, these gallant people have not given up their hope for freedom; they still cherish their memories of independence and liberty. On the 43d anniversary of their Independence Day, let us hope that they attain their goal and live in peace.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our veterans are now without national service life insurance. Many of these veterans lost their policies by reason of the fact that they were not properly notified by the Veterans' Administration of the lapse of their policies. In addition, numerous other veterans allowed their national service life insurance policies to lapse due to economic hardship or insufficient information as to their rights, privileges, and benefits under the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give these veterans an opportunity to participate once again in our national service life insurance program, I have introduced a bill which will authorize the renewal of expired 5-year level premium term national service life insurance where reinstatement is made prior to January 1, 1963. My bill would permit veterans to have their policies reinstated under such rules and regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would prescribe.

During my service in the Congress I have noted numerous cases where veterans have lost their national service life insurance through error on their part or on the part of the Veterans' Administration. It appears only fair to me, therefore, that these veterans and other veterans who wish to have their rights under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 reinstated should be given the opportunity. It is my hope that my bill will receive favorable consideration by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and will be enacted by the Congress.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to require the Veterans' Administration in the case of veterans whose policies of national service life insurance or U.S. Government life insurance has lapsed to send within 1 week following the expiration of the grace period of their policies a notice of such lapse with an explanation of the requirements for reinstatement of the insurance policy. My bill will further require the Veterans' Administration to send the notice of the lapse of the policy by certified mail addressed to the last known address of the veteran.

During my service in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, numerous instances have come to my attention where veterans have allowed their policies of national service life insurance and U.S. Government life insurance to lapse by reason of the fact that they have not been properly advised when premium payments were due or other administrative action was necessary in connection with their policies. My measure, therefore, would give these veterans whose policies have lapsed through no fault on their part an opportunity to have their insurance reinstated. Inasmuch as the notice of the lapse of the policy and the opportunity to have it reinstated would be transmitted by certified mail, I feel sure that every veteran who is in danger of losing his U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance would be properly informed as to his rights and privileges under the law for the reinstatement of his insurance.

I hope that it will be possible to secure favorable action on my measure at this session of the Congress. I have discussed the subject covered by my measure with numerous veterans and officials of veterans' organizations, and they have all been in favor of its passage.

LET'S KEEP ADMIRAL RICKOVER ON THE JOB FOR THE NAVY AND THE NATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing President Kennedy, if he so desires, to retain on active duty in the Navy beyond the statutory retirement age limit of 62, one of our outstanding officers and the father of the nuclear propulsion program, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Under existing law regulations Admiral Rickover is slated for retirement because of age prior to July 1, 1962. By then he will have attained the age of 62.

However, the thought that this great officer, whose services to the Navy have created a major technical revolution in our defense, have given the Navy a new lease on life in the current overall defense picture, and have provided the one area of defense strength in which this country is clearly well ahead of the Soviet Union, should be dropped from the naval service purely because of a technicality is, to me, completely incredible. I find it perfectly ridiculous for the U.S. Government, involved as we are in a desperate race for military supremacy with the Soviet Union, to permit administrative redtape to deprive us of Admiral Rickover's services just because of some particular date on the calendar. Admiral Rickover's service to the Navy and to the country is performed at a desk or in a laboratory, not on the bridge of a rolling ship at sea, and as long as he is anxious to serve the Nation and as long as the great job of constructing a nuclear naval fleet which he started has not been finished, no artificial barrier should be erected to prevent the President of the United States from continuing to utilize his services.

We have ample precedent for retaining outstanding officers on duty beyond the statutory age limit; for example, in the case of General MacArthur and Admiral King during World War II. Admiral Rickover's services are just as vital to our country, and we would be fortunate, indeed, to be able to continue to call on them for just as long as they are available to us.

Of course, an officer of Admiral Rickover's capability has no need to stay on in the Navy. He could easily find a position in private industry that would pay a great deal more than what he is getting now as a vice admiral. But I have talked with Admiral Rickover, and I know his first and overriding interest is to be of service to his country. I know that what he wants more than anything

else to do is to see the nuclear-propulsion program through to completion. He would welcome the opportunity to remain on active service. So let us not tie one hand behind our back in the race for military supremacy by allowing any technicality to deprive us of the services of Admiral Rickover for this critical and important time.

A NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the vital and urgent need for a national fuels study for the United States. This proposal I am introducing today is to establish a joint congressional committee to be devoted to studying the Nation's fuels and to recommend a substantive national fuels policy to the appropriate committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The national delegates of both major political parties have, as shown by their respective platforms, recognized the serious need for, and the urgency of, a national fuels policy. Both party platforms now support the establishment of such a policy. Sponsors of this proposed fuels study have always known that this resolution, embodying the machinery leading to such a study, is far removed from political partisanship. I strongly urge the House to take immediate action to put this machinery to work in this session. I do so because I am convinced that we are faced with immediate problems in this economic and security area demanding rapid solutions for the good and perhaps even the survival of the United States of America.

Our most distinguished American, President John F. Kennedy, a man who has achieved the highest recognition, has set forth in straightforward terms his views on this crucial problem. In a speech delivered on April 26, 1960, the then Senator said:

> The time has come to put some commonsense and consistency into the way this country handles its vital fuels supplies.
>
> The time has come for the Federal Government to adopt a national fuels policy—a concrete set of plans and principles to restore fair play and prosperity to our hard-hit, neglected fuels industries.
>
> The Congress should adopt such a policy—and adopt it now—at this session.
>
> No single industry—no segment of any industry—should be singled out for any special treatment. Our objective is a stronger, better America—a prosperous America—using all its resources and all its manpower in its competition with an enemy that grows stronger every day.

In addition, the report of the Task Force on Area Redevelopment, of which our distinguished colleague, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, was Chairman, and with which I was associated, dealt with serious problems of areas of chronic unemployment under fuels and minerals subsection (3), titled "National Fuels Policy," which said:

> We recommend development of a national fuels policy. The lack of a national fuels policy is an underlying reason for some of the existing conditions of distress in the coal-producing regions, and in some independent oil-producing communities. A national fuels policy would help alleviate prevalent distress, would help improve the economic health of these industries, and would be beneficial to the Nation's security.

All three domestic fuels industries, gas, oil, and coal, are involved in this crisis. The vast world oversupply of petroleum has caused a serious situation among American oil producers, as prices have weakened and upward spiraling costs make exploration for new oil sources less and less attractive. The outlook of the natural-gas industry in this country is clouded by inflexible Government controls and ever-increasing costs of pipeline construction, and of exploration for new sources of supply. The American coal industry has been in the economic doldrums for several years and is currently existing at little more than a standby level. With an assured supply of low-cost fuel absolutely vital to the future health and welfare of our Nation, these critical problems facing the energy industries thoroughly document the urgency of developing a sound, equitable national fuels policy.

Our disorganized and disrupted domestic fuels industries must find a firm, long-range foundation if the United States is to meet successfully the challenges facing it in the years ahead. Chief among these is, of course, the economic competition between this country and the Soviet Union, a competition that grows steadily more intense. A case in point is the recent announcement, by the Esso Export Corp., on August 10, 1960, that the market price of Middle East crude oil has been effectively broken by Soviet price cutting. The true significance of this development is revealed in a followup statement by a leader of the American independent oil producers, John Hurd, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, who warned "that a marketing war between international companies could bankrupt the domestic producing industry in a hurry." And a serious complicating factor in this situation was cited by the United Press International in an August 16, 1960, dispatch which said:

> The oil industry and the Western Power governments are facing a rising tide of discontent in the Arab countries over the low price of oil. The matter may come to a head at the meeting of the Arab Oil Congress in Beirut. By that time, some of the Arab governments may be pressing for renegotiation of some of their older concessions to the big international oil companies, or for supplemental subsidies to tide them through the present depressed oil market.

This is the frightening double-edged sword of Communist economic competition.

We also face the challenge of keeping economic pace with the vast population growth predicted in America and in the world during the next few years without surrendering the great American concept of a steadily rising standard of living. And we cannot forget the challenge posed by maintaining our country's security in the face of a troubled and extremely delicately balanced world situation. These challenges again indicate the absolute necessity of formulating a national fuels policy with all possible speed.

It is not yet too late to undertake this important project but it soon may be. Action during this session of Congress is, in my opinion, absolutely essential to the national welfare. When we consider that the factual data that must be compiled before any substantive policy declarations may be proposed will require an exhaustive study occupying an estimated 2 years of work, the urgency of this matter is apparent. We cannot, in conscience, afford to delay this undertaking any longer. Action is needed and needed right now.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to prevent the expiration of an important provision of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The purpose of my bill, therefore, is to strengthen and make more effective the small business investment program created by the Congress 2 or 3 years ago. This program, incidentally, while slow to get underway, has since taken hold and now gives some indication of measuring up to the expectations of the Members of Congress who voted for the program in such overwhelming numbers.

Under section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans to local development companies. This authority, however, was given only for a limited period of time. It will expire June 30, 1961. The authority to make these loans must not be permitted to die because it provides a most desirable method of giving encouragement and valuable assistance to small business concerns.

The proceeds of the loans granted to the local development companies must be used solely to assist a specific identifiable small-business concern. All of the loans must be so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. Although the Small Business Administration generally is authorized to make loans direct to small-business concerns in amounts up to $350,000, loans to the local development companies may not exceed the sum of $250,000 for each small-business concern to be benefited.

Approximately 100 of these loans have been made to date to local development companies situated in various parts of the country.

A few months ago the Small Business Administration announced a plan to help small-business concerns participate in neighborhood shopping centers. Its plan utilizes the powers granted by section 502 which, as mentioned above, will expire in 5 months unless the Congress takes remedial action. Since it is urgent that small-business concerns become enabled to locate and participate in suburban shopping centers, the need for permitting the Small Business Administration to continue to make these loans becomes doubly important.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution which expresses the commendation of Project Hope, a mission of mercy which has received the enthusiastic support and cooperation of Government, industry and business, labor, the professions, and the public of the United States of America generally.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls for no appropriation of money. The $3,500,000 which it costs to staff and operate the hospital ship, formerly the U.S.S. *Consolation*, has been raised through private contributions.

This ship, now called the *Hope I*, is the first of what it is hoped will be a fleet of such vessels, operating as floating medical-training teaching centers.

Hope I is now operating in Indonesia, and, after stops at many more ports of this new nation, it will have completed a maiden tour of that nation which will have taken 7 months.

During the present year, the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., which sponsors Project Hope, has plans for outfitting similar American hospital ships for Africa and South America.

The good ship *Hope* and those which later join it are almost perfect demonstrations of American neighborliness in global action. In presenting this resolution, I ask for its appropriate consideration and for its adoption, unanimously I hope, by both Houses of this Congress.

THE DEFENSE POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a study prepared by the Republican policy committee. It has to do with the defense posture of the United States as the administrations change. It will be our idea and our desire to set forth a picture of the defense posture of the United States as it was on January 20, 1961, so that for all time we may have a guidepost, a point of reference, for comparison with those things which may happen in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] originally intended to make this keynote presentation. He is undergoing an examination at the hospital today and will be unable to be on the floor of the House until tomorrow. He has given much thought and study to the field of national defense ever since his World War I service when he was described by General Pershing as the most decorated young officer in our Army.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] strongly feels the need for public understanding of the policies of the last administration, policies which have preserved the peace with firmness. I had intended to present one of the other papers in this discussion today but because of the absence of the gentleman from Tennessee, I will present in his behalf this summary of our position upon which he has worked so hard.

I heartily endorse these views and make the presentation with pride.

Mr. Speaker, at noon on January 20, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration passed into history.

I wish those who never came back from bloody Belleau Wood, scarred Iwo Jima, and desolate Heartbreak Ridge now could be in this distinguished Chamber. They could instruct us how to cherish 8 years during which an administration kept the peace with strength and honor.

The Eisenhower administration is the first administration which did not disarm America after a war. So, it is shocking that a few highly vocal, especially motivated armchair strategists try to discredit such a record. Among the discreditors who flare loudly their discordant trumpets of criticism are those who fiddled soothingly upon their violins of praise for the Truman administration, an administration that ignored the dangers of communism and dismantled the finest conventional armies and the largest air and sea armadas in history.

Today, the United States has rebuilt the strongest, best prepared nation on earth. Should the Russians be foolish enough to attempt a Pearl Harbor, our intelligence system will alert us, and our retaliatory forces will strike back and destroy Russia. Said the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Lyman Lemnitzer, on a March night last year:

> As one familiar with our capabilities, I want to assure you that even if the Communists launched an all-out thermonuclear attack on the United States tonight, nothing could prevent their bringing down upon themselves vast destruction from the retaliatory blows which we would still be able to deliver against them.

Said the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke:

> We are stronger, far stronger, than any potential aggressor. This is true not only of our nuclear weapon capabilities—it is true of our whole military posture.

Said Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay:

> We maintain military forces capable of deterring Soviet aggression. Our forces are strong enough to prevent war—or win such war if it is thrust upon us.

Mr. Speaker, these clear-cut, concise pronouncements were made not by politicians, not by theoreticians, but by military men. They were made before we had perfected the most nearly invulnerable weapon in the history of warfare, the Polaris.

To those in the other party who sought political benefit in belittling America's military strength, I say now: For the next 4 years your party must bear the awesome responsibility of insuring that Russia does not catch up with the vast military lead this Republican administration bequeathed to you on January 20. And I warn you that the enactment of your platform promises into legislation would so sap the economic strength of our Nation that military preparedness would suffer, and our lead would be lost to Communist Russia, and freedom might die.

BRUSH FIRE WAR PREVENTION

In this dangerous age, let us never forget that we face the outbreak both of brush fire wars and general nuclear wars.

We should be concerned that our capability to extinguish brush fire wars remains constantly ready. For few Americans have forgotten how, on the eve of Korea, we had only a one-weapon capability, the big bomb, and we had only one Army division at full strength. The Korean disaster forced the Truman administration to cease famishing the military in order to conduct a crash program of limited war rearmament. So great were the global Communist threats that the military strength of our allies, waning because of apathetic U.S. leadership, had to be built up.

By July 1960, the Eisenhower administration had not only freed many allied divisions from a tiedown in Korea, a tiedown which permitted the Communists freedom of action elsewhere, but also had raised the allied limited war deterrent capability to approximately 200 ground divisions, and some 250 strategically located bases.

Had the Truman administration prepared as had the Eisenhower administration, Korea, had it occurred at all, would have been a mere Lebanon operation, not a taker of thousands of American lives.

The problem of limited war preparedness, I point out, needs constant reevaluation. The vehicles of waging nuclear war are vehicles of the supersonic age, while the vehicles of waging limited war, the steamer, the railroad, the airplane, are still subsonic: It takes about 14 minutes for the Polaris missile to span 1,200 miles to land on target. It takes days and weeks to move divisions of troops by aircraft and ship.

True enough, our airlift performed well in Lebanon, and more recently in the United Nations action in Africa.

Still, the only way that we can decrease limited war reaction time to a par with nuclear war reaction time is by the development of missile carriers for troops. The best technological research, as yet, makes this impossible. Thus, we must maintain our marvelous aircraft carrier versatility, our allied divisions near troubled spots, and improve our conventional airlift. This means continuing what General Lemnitzer has called a forward strategy.

Only recently, the Eisenhower administration took a bold, imaginative step to supplement this forward strategy. The recent offer of medium range ballistic missiles to NATO can refortify the NATO deterrent and, along with a recommended conventional war buildup, foil any Kremlin attempts to divide and nibble away NATO by actions of a lesser magnitude than a direct attack on the United States. The Eisenhower administration, even in its last days in office, constantly reevaluated military needs, met new demands with the best, latest modern technology and research.

U.S. STRIKE-BACK CAPACITY

Let us now turn to the type of war resulting from an attack by the Soviet Russians on the United States.

What are the Russian capabilities for such an attack?

The recent report of Britain's Institute for Stretegic Studies credits Russia with about 35 operational ICBM's, and about 200 long-range bombers. Her fleet of medium-range bombers have a questionable capacity for hitting U.S. targets. Their IRBM's cannot hit targets in the United States. In other words, Russia and Red China combined—the entire Communist axis—have about 235 instruments that have an alleged capability of nuclear delivery upon the continental United States.

What are the comparable U.S. capabilities?

Roaming the seven seas able to hit almost any important part of the Russian heartland, are two Polaris submarines with a combined total of 32 missiles, each missile capable of much more destruction than was rained upon Hiroshima. No military man would be willing to trade these invulnerable, flexible, solid fuel, instant reaction missiles of the second generation with the 35 first generation, vulnerable, liquid fuel Russian ICBM's, which in some cases experience a 30-minute delay before fueling for firing can be completed.

About 16 intercontinental Atlas missiles, a number in firing position.

Over 600 long range B–52 jet bombers, each carrying more destructive, explosive power than used by all the combatants in World War II, and many equipped with the Hound Dog, a 500 mile range missile. Could these bombers penetrate the Russian air defenses? Secretary of Defense Gates recently noted that, in the past 4 years "American reconnaissance planes have riddled their air defenses and made a proper mockery of their refusal to open their skies as willingly as we would open ours to them." So, it seems apparent that sufficient numbers of these planes, with their bombs and missiles, could reach Russia to destroy Moscow and key industrial areas, not once, but many times over.

Nearly 1,400 B–47 medium range jet bombers, based in United States and abroad, with a 4,500 statute mile range and distances beyond with air to air refueling.

Only recently SAC placed in operation B–58 Hustlers, the first of U.S. supersonic medium range jet bombers which incidentally just broke the world speed record for strategic bombers.

Fourteen aircraft carriers able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force. Well over 200 of these aircraft are with the 6th and 7th Fleets capable of strikes at areas of Soviet military concern.

Eighteen wings of tactical aircraft, each wing with a substantial nuclear attack capability deployed globally.

Sixty Thor IRBM's deployed in England capable of raining nuclear destruction on Russia.

Thirty Jupiter IRBM's being installed in bases in Italy, from which Russia can be hit.

Totaling all this, we see that the United States has well over 2,000 nuclear carrying vehicles capable of reaching Russia. This represents a sizable superiority of destructive power.

SOVIET STRATEGY OF DECEPTION

Mr. Speaker, this military lead over Soviet Russia, which a Republican administration passed to a Democratic administration on January 20, should afford that new administration with no reason for complacency. Time and again military history tells of the disastrous defeat of stronger nations by weaker ones. The instruments of such defeats always have been surprises and deceptions which have destroyed the opponent's freedom of action and will to resist.

I would remind the new administration of the classic deception at the battle of Cannae. Hannibal baited the Romans into attacking his center, which he steadily withdrew. While the Romans poured their legions into the widening jaws of this trap, Hannibal's reserves closed in on the exposed Roman flanks and rear. A massacre ensued.

For 8 years now, the Kremlin masters have tried to lure America into traps like Cannae. For example, from 1954 through 1956, the Soviets attempted to deceive us into concentrating on an unbalanced, massive bomber buildup, at the very time actually they were switching to missiles.

What is more, the Soviets wanted to decoy our vision by dramatizing one or two dangers, so we would forget other dangers and react in a way which would open up our flanks, our military, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual flanks. The Soviets wanted to brainwash America into an inferiority complex which would downgrade our own achievements and thus weaken our will and confidence to remain firm. The Soviets wanted us to think in terms of 1 or 2 crisis years, not in terms of an age of conflict; in terms of a numbers-matching game where Russia picked the weapons, not in terms of military forces, balanced and versatile.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration fell into none of these traps, and I want the new administration to avoid them.

Neither has the Eisenhower administration deigned to use preparedness as a political football. Despite all the partisan shenanigans during the recent election campaign, the Democratic Congresses during the Eisenhower administration increased the defense budget over the President's request only in election years. In off election years, they cut back so much that during the entire Eisenhower administration, $1,658 million was cut from President Eisenhower's requests.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a table to document this statement:

TABLE A

Fiscal year	Defense appropriations	Budget requests
1956	$33,082,000,000	$33,700,000,000
1957	36,134,000,000	35,197,000,000
1958	36,648,000,000	39,257,000,000
1959	41,232,000,000	40,830,000,000
1960	40,598,000,000	40,836,000,000
1961	40,991,000,000	40,523,000,000

Summary: During the Eisenhower administration, Democrat-controlled Congresses provided $1,658,000,000 less than the President requested.

In preparedness spending, the Eisenhower administration, standing above politics, avoided the perilous peaks of panic and valleys of complacency characteristic of previous administrations. President Eisenhower and his first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, geared preparedness to the long pull, where not only would our economic base remain strong, but where there would be adequate forces in being, capable of deterring at any time and place all types of war. The Eisenhower administration kept in mind the protracted conflict and the whole danger.

I hope and trust that the new administration will not return us to the past ups and downs of the Truman administration defense programs. But I am quite concerned about the task force reports submitted recently to the new President. These domestic programs will jeopardize the long-pull policies and imperil our liberty.

MIRACLES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Eisenhower preparedness philosophy gave birth to a brilliant record in research and development.

After World War II, some Americans debauched themselves in the heavy wine of a White House leadership, unaware that future preparedness would be predicated upon nuclear weapons and guided missiles. As Roman citizens once lulled themselves into false confidence over long outdaded legions, the Democratic administration lullabied itself to sleep with outdated World War II ideas. Even worse, the Democratic President placed the vital Atomic Energy Commission into the hands of those against the military uses of atomic energy. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union feverishly searched for atomic means to dominate a sleeping America.

Alarmed by such a setup for disaster, Dr. Edward Teller, as early as 1946, sounded the alarm in Washington. His voice, pleading that America should not discontinue attempts to develop an H-bomb, was drowned in soothing seas of complacency. From 1945 to 1949, the Truman-Lilienthal-Oppenheimer trio blocked even Teller's efforts to make a more effective deterrent of the A-bomb. Continued protests by Adm. Lewis Strauss, plus an August 1949 B–29 flight which luckily recorded evidences of a Soviet A-bomb explosion, plus Dr. Klaus Fuchs' confession that he had been leaking atomic secrets finally awoke the slumbering White House. It was almost too late. We had forfeited much of our atomic lead, and Russia had a good chance of beating us to the H-bomb.

Even after all this, the White House had to be prodded by patriots like Dr. Teller, Admiral Strauss, Senators Hickenlooper and McMahon. Fortunately, the Eisenhower administration later made up for these tragic lost years.

President Eisenhower inherited an equally dangerous lag in guided missiles, for which he had to make up.

In 1946, the Army, using German scientists such as Dr. Wernher von Braun, had started to rebuild the German V–2 for use as a first-stage booster rocket with the already developed WAC Corporal as the second stage. Meanwhile, the Air Force began a program, termed MX–774, to develop ICBM's.

What happened in 1947? Mr. Truman impounded $75 million the Republican Congress had appropriated for research and development, and $17 million of this was to be specifically for missile development. Gen. Curtis LeMay complained that this was "the straw that broke the camel's back." The alarmed Chief of Staff, Dwight Eisenhower, warned that "In the field of guided missiles we must keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appallingly few hours."

Mr. Truman met these warnings by cutting more deeply in 1950 fiscal year. He impounded $735 million of Air Force funds, and ICBM development through public funds came to a standstill.

What was happening in Russia? In 1947 the rocket theories of the German scientist, Sanger, created such great excitement that Stalin assigned top priority to this work and ordered Col. Gugori Tokaev, an aerodynamics expert, to seek out Sanger and his ideas on a superrocket. Tokaev, who later defected, reports that Stalin was almost in "an hysterical clamor" for such scientific data to build an intercontinental rocket, which, Stalin said, would make it easier for him to talk to "the gentleman shopkeeper, Truman."

Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration did increase its research and development budget after the Korean invasion. That budget, however, concentrated on World War II type research and development, and long-range missiles were downgraded. But within the first year after the Eisenhower administration came into the office, the President set up a full-scale review of the entire missile program, and in fiscal year 1954, spent over twice as much on longer range missiles than Mr. Truman had done during his entire time in the White House. In any one day last year, the United States was spending 10 times more on ballistic missiles than we spent in all of fiscal year 1952 of the Truman administration.

Marvelous miracles were performed under the Eisenhower administration to make up for the ground lost to Russia. In 1954, the Von Neuman committee said America could have an operational ICBM somewhere between 1960 and 1963, but under this past administration's leadership the Atlas became operational on September 1, 1959.

In the remarkable Eisenhower administration space program, the United States cut leadtime, came from behind to race ahead of Russia by placing 32 satellites in orbit, obtaining a vast variety of scientific knowledge, and obtaining a remarkable series of "firsts" in exploration areas where Russia lags in her space program. Russia, by the way, has placed only nine satellites in orbit. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a table listing these firsts and hence paying tribute to the soundness of NASA's broadly based program:

TABLE B

Eleven major firsts achieved by U.S. space program during 1960:

Pioneer V. First to send message 22.5 million miles from earth.

Tiros I. First weather satellite—sent back 22,000 photos.

Transit I–B. First navigation satellite to help ships, planes, and submarines to fix positions.

Midas II. First heat-sensing satellite, to direct missile launchings.

Transit II–A. First to carry another satellite into space, to study solar effects.

Discoverer XIII. First satellite capsule recovered after orbit.

Echo I. First reflector communication satellite.

Discoverer XIV. First satellite recovered in midair after orbit.

Courier I–B. First repeater communication satellite.

Explorer VIII. First satellite to investigate methods of improving radio communications, in the ionosphere.

Discoverer XVII. First to record effect of solar-storm radiation on human tissue after long space flights.

POLARIS

No development has been more spectacular than the Polaris fleet ballistic missile, originally planned to be operational in 1963, actually operational today.

Problems in shooting a missile from a submerged submarine and hitting a target 1,250 miles away were as fantastic as shooting a beer can off a far distant fencepost, when the marksman, blindfolded, was mounted on a galloping horse.

For the Polaris, a superior brain had to be created to make up for every up and down, side to side roll; every sway and yaw of the submarine. In determining the direction of the submarine from true north, 1 degree error could mean dozens of miles off target. Our other big missiles under development—the Atlas and the Jupiter, for example, used liquid fuel. But liquid fuel missiles in a submarine presented dangers of a sudden explosion; sailors trapped underseas in a doomed vessel. Safer solid fuel rockets, on the other hand, as old as the ancient Chinese, did not, however, have sufficient thrust.

Men like Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh Burke, and Chief of the Polaris project, Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., faced and accomplished the possible in a little time and took a bit longer on the impossible. These men had the courage to make decisions, to eliminate bureaucracy, to build a superior armed services—research—private enterprise team, and to keep in mind the big picture, the whole package.

Although Washington bureaucrats would have hired a big staff for 6 months to write job descriptions for a still bigger basic staff, Admiral Raborn was no such bureaucraft. Within 10 days after his arrival as head of special projects, he had twisted Parkinson's law into reverse, hired his basic staff of 50 people, and was slicing leadtime in two. His men did not dillydally with long unnecessary redtape memorandums for the office down the street, but instead they "hot-handed" their questions in person to the person who could give them a prompt, satisfactory answer.

"Red" Raborn built teamwork within his steering task group:

Lockheed solved the problem of shutting off thrust at the right moment so that the missile would hit the target.

General Electric produced the remarkable fire control and guidance system.

Aero Jet General Corp. tested large quantities of solid fuel which did have adequate thrust.

Westinghouse helped in solving the launching problem.

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, and other companies, busily constructed the submarine.

Sperry Gyroscope Co. took MIT research and put together a navigational system containing more than 1 million parts.

No wonder Admiral Raborn wrote this for the guidance of many working under him:

I must be able to reach down to any level of special projects activity and find a plan and a performance report that logically and clearly can be related to the total job we have to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me pass from the particular to the general, philosophize a bit on this success, and point something out to the new administration. We want to know how America can stay far ahead of Russia. If America can cut bureaucracy, make courageous decisions, develop the free enterprise team, and relate each facet of national activity to the total job of preserving freedom, the free society will stay far ahead of the regimented society.

For the preservation of peace and freedom is, as was the Polaris, a package program.

As to the past 8 years, cynical critics skilled in tearing down instead of building up, of course, can pick apart the package until the whole is lost. Filled with brilliant hindsight and devoid of any foresight, they can look back over the past 8 years and show how certain things might have been better done.

Certainly, after the fog of unknowns and uncertainties have long since lifted, anyone can see how some things might have been done better. Napoleon wisely spoke from experience when he said that the best general is not a mythical general who makes no mistakes, for only the commander without a command makes no mistakes. The best general is he who makes the fewest mistakes.

The Eisenhower administration made mistakes, but fewer mistakes in military preparedness than any administration in American history.

PEACE POWER

Even more important, the Eisenhower administration recognized that peace power is a two-sided coin. On one side is preparedness. On the other side is firmness.

It is easy to coast toward seeming peace, down a low road rutted with secret appeasement and creeping retreat. At Munich, sometime English leaders slid down this way toward what they called peace in their time. At Yalta, sometime American leaders left principle for temporary harmony with an incompatible ally. On the eve of Korea, sometime American leaders left in doubt whether we would defend freedom from communism.

In contrast to these downhill equivocal ways, it is hard to climb to those straight sunlit heights silhouetted by proper peace achieved through preparedness, firmness, and justice. This, the Eisenhower administration achieved, and so achieved, despite vast handicaps.

Prof. James Atkinson, in his recently published book "The Edge of War," recognizes the biggest of these handicaps. Too many Americans have been for appeasement, although they dared not so call it. They have been frightened into wanting an accommodation with the Russians at almost any price.

Atkinson observes that an article studying the position of the United States and the Soviet Union, appearing in the London Economist, posed this penetrating question: The American's hand is all trumps. But will any of them ever be played? Atkinson concludes:

> The trumps can and will be played by an America that calls back again its greatness. That greatness was of the spirit. And there is yet an America that in this conflict of will can draw once more on its spiritual heritage with the call to action of the Prophet Isaiah: "Strengthen ye the feeble hands, and confirm the weak knees. Say to the faint-hearted: Take courage, and fear not."

Unfortunately, there have been those with feeble hands and weak knees and faint hearts during military crises over the use of atomic weapons in defense of freedom or over diplomatic crises in regard to Berlin, Suez, Lebanon, Formosa, Quemoy-Matsu. Some have permitted fear to fester inferiority complexes which would weaken the trumps that America has. Some have been all too willing to let the Kremlin name the suits, set the goals for space programs or economic growth, with America being the weak mimic.

But the Eisenhower administration, unwilling to play the weak mimic, took courage, feared not, ended the Korean war, played from the highest trump of all, a free unfettered system, set our own goals, and maintained the honorable peace through military preparedness, diplomatic firmness, and high spiritual faith.

Let credit rest where credit is due. A principle taught in training for World War II has even lasted out the space age. A commander is responsible for whatever his command does or does not do.

In the past 8 years, Dwight Eisenhower was the Commander in Chief. In the past 8 years, every American hearth has been increasingly safe from war and from appeasement.

As these magnificent 8 years blend into the strong heritage that has enobled the American spirit, I salute our retiring Commander in Chief. I pray that all Americans may be grateful.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his very factual and statesmanlike presentation of our defense posture. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: Had we listened to those sirens of crash programs on bombers when they were howling some years ago, would the gentleman care to tell us from his position on the appropriation subcommittee on defense, what would have happened to our defense posture?

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me, if we would have listened to the cries of those who wanted us to develop a single system defense posture, those of us on the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress would certainly have been dropping the ball, we would have weakened our deterrent capability. It is important for us at all times to keep our military program in a balanced position and that has been the aim of this administration. We have not had the peaks and valleys which so typified the defense programs of previous administrations.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Another question to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Does the gentleman from Arizona yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Arizona has yielded to the gentleman from New York for the time being. The gentleman from Arizona will yield to the gentleman next.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Mexico defer that motion for one moment?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion temporarily.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] has the floor.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin contend that the defense of this Nation is a partisan matter?

Mr. LAIRD. My contention is that the defense of this Nation is something that is the concern of every American. It is my intention to point out the position that we are in today after the 8 years of leadership by President Eisenhower, and to try to point out where we are today as we face the future. You will find Republicans as well as Democrats have cooperated on this matter during the last 8 years. We feel it is imperative that we point out to the country the position of our defense posture in this year 1961 as a new administration takes over. We are not criticizing the new administration. We are simply pointing out to the new administration our position, and hope and pray that this new administration will follow the same policy in maintaining a balanced defense force in the next 4 years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You realize that 6 of the 8 years there was a Democratic-controlled Congress, do you not?

Mr. LAIRD. I made that very clear, and under the unanimous-consent request which was granted me I inserted a chart showing the appropriations which had been made by the Democratic-controlled Congress during each of the last 6 years. My presentation sets that out clearly. I also point out that during these last 6 years the Congress appropriated $1,658 million less than was asked for by President Eisenhower. The charts and tables which I have inserted in the RECORD substantiate that fact very clearly.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is there anything in that chart that indicates that the Congress of the United States ever refused President Eisenhower anything in the way of appropriations in connection with the national defense?

Mr. LAIRD. I would be happy to read the chart to the gentleman. The chart shows the Defense appropriations and the budget requested by President Eisenhower for each of the last 6 years, from 1956 through 1961. It also includes the total amount of appropriation made in

answer to that request. It shows that during the Eisenhower administration the Congress has provided $1,658 million less than President Eisenhower requested of the Congress. These figures are taken from the records of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that is over an 8-year period?

Mr. LAIRD. It is over the last 6-year period during which time the Democratic Party controlled both Houses of this Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What years specifically——

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further.

Mr. LAIRD. I will be happy to give the gentleman from Colorado a copy of the chart.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has performed a great service to the Nation in drawing such a clear picture of an administration which will go down in history as the Nation's finest in the field of military preparedness.

Mr. LAIRD has spread upon the record of this Congress the overall results of the Eisenhower defense policies—policies which have brought this Nation to a pinnacle of might never before attained by any other state in the history of mankind. He has issued a clear warning that he will not stand idly by and permit that strength to be sapped away in the name of devotion to a political party platform that promises all and asks nothing in return.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I pledge to MEL LAIRD our firm support of his stand.

This afternoon, five of my fellow Republicans will lay before this body our convictions in the field of national security. These convictions, Mr. Speaker, constitute our line of battle—the bulwark behind which we stand and beyond which we cannot permit any forays by those interested in draining our economy for the purpose of engaging in the implementation of the fuzzy tenets of liberal social engineering.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a single Member of this body who does not wish to assist in the promotion of the great needs of America in this latter half of the 20th century—peace, prosperity, security, liberty, and the promotion of individual initiative.

I am very much concerned, however, when I read of the task force studies prepared by the President-elect's advisers. The logical order of priorities that must be assigned to these needs and the sensible ways of meeting them seem to be disregarded to the extent that our national security is imperiled.

We now stand face to face with an enemy that is sworn to destroy our Nation, enslave our citizens and pervert the very nature of our humanity. This fact must be the paramount consideration which guides us in all our undertakings as servants of the American people.

There can be no question raised about the fact that we are engaged in a war. And in a war, in the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, "There is no substitute for victory."

This then must be our goal—victory.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has given us the tools by which this victory can be attained—patience and forebearance, carefully planned strategy, an unbelievably comprehensive intelligence system, all buttressed by overwhelming military might.

But the advantages which we have gained through the Eisenhower policies can be lost by imprudent economic policies here at home, coupled with unnecessary spending abroad.

I would remind my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, that all the welfare programs in the world would be utterly useless if we lose the freedom to enjoy the security which these programs are supposed to produce.

Mr. Speaker, we say to all of those whose monomaniacal obsession with animal security has dulled their understanding of the peril presented to us by international communism, "Stop; here is the line, and you shall not pass over it as long as there is breath in our bodies. We are at war, and victory in that war is our primary concern. If you attempt to weaken us in the name of the principle of spend and elect, we will oppose you with every means at our disposal. We will cripple your power to tax, oppose your spendthrift proposals, cut your budgets, expose your maneuverings, attack you, harass you, and, ultimately, defeat you, here and at the polls."

In a moment five of my Republican colleagues will take the floor to examine specific areas of the Eisenhower defense policies. These policies are proven ones—they constitute a firm base upon which we can build in the future. They are our policies, Mr. Speaker, and we will fight to maintain them. As the passions of the presidential campaign drift off into the mists of political history, I commend them to my colleagues as a blueprint for the future.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished minority whip [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, much of the most severe criticism of the Eisenhower administration defense posture has been directed at our ability to wage so-called limited war. The gentleman from Wisconsin has sketched well the administration's efforts in this area, and he has shown how they have constantly reevaluated needs and demands in this key field.

To separate and discuss strategy of brush-fire war prevention without regard for our overall strategy of deterrence would be misleading. However, statements by responsible leaders have emphasized that the United States has kept and must keep its Armed Forces so organized, balanced, and equipped that it can cope with any emergency, large or small, with the type of weapons and force which the situation calls for.

As President Eisenhower said on December 15, 1954, he would "rather improvise and resort to expedients in little wars than he would in big wars. He would rather cast and mold his security arrangements to meet the great threats to the United States and take the others, as far as he could, in stride." Under the deterrence policies of his administration, aggression has ceased to be a paying proposition. Why? First, because most of our forces could be used in limited wars.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no one here would argue that our 2 million men, 900 ships, and 35,000 planes are mere byproducts of general war deterrence. Besides our general nuclear deterrent, we have tactical atomic weapons. Our aircraft carriers are able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force. Three divisions of marines are prepared to move quickly and effectively to trouble spots anywhere in the world. Allied nations provide the United States with some 250 strategically located bases, and contribute to our collective defense more than 5 million men; air forces of over 25,000 planes, and help insure free world control of the seas with their 2,200 combat vessels.

General Taylor states that "if one regards the force structure of our three services, one finds that nearly all of the Army and of the Marine Corps, much of the Tactical Air Force, some of the Navy's carriers, and large parts of our strategic air and sea lift must be associated with limited war forces and are available in an emergency."

Yet the critics keep alleging that one more division in NATO or in Korea is necessary. We are not preparing to win a ground war in Europe or Korea. They forget our goal—to deter aggression by military power, real or apparent to all concerned, and by application of that power to specific situations as they arise. In Lebanon, for example, we moved in with a great determination to do what was needed at that particular time. Our 15,000 soldiers in the area were as overwhelming at that time and place as were millions in the European theater of World War II. Considering the nature and the scope of likely situations, the forces that we possess, both conventional and nuclear, are ample.

Second, the gain from such local aggression on the part of the Soviet Union is small—the risk is comparatively large. Perpetuating an aggression such as in Korea is almost unthinkable today. The United States shrunk from employing the atomic bomb in Korea and the Dien Bien Phu crisis in 1954. The fact that it can be used, however, must be included in the equation of any potential aggressor. Declarations have been made since that time intimating that the United States would make a decisive use of its atomic potential right at the outset of any clearcut aggression of the Korean type. With graduated retaliation, a variety of responses to military aggression is feasible. The U.S. flexibility in striking power, though we do not have to resort to the most destructive weapons, means that any aggressor has been put on notice that his aggression will be met with appropriate retaliation.

Thus the Eisenhower administration has established and maintained a policy of selective and flexible deterrence, in which our services have been equipped not only with weapons of massive nuclear retaliation but also with the highly trained and mobile forces equipped with nuclear and conventional weapons as the situation demands to deal with local emergencies in order to stop their expansion into a general war.

The challenge is clear; the need for continued "strong frontiers" against aggression rather than "new frontiers" of appeasement and apology is great. There can be no doubt that the United States possesses a respectable military posture. Let the Kennedy administration heed the warning of General Twining in 1958 that:

> It would be an unnecessary tragedy if our vital policy were weakened because of the mistaken impression that the Soviets have achieved military ascendency over the free world. * * * Such mistaken conclusions could actually increase the probability of total war because this might result in bolder courses of Soviet action and greater opportunity for fatal miscalculation.

DEFENSE INVENTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed with pride to the Eisenhower administration achievements in space, and has included a list of the significant series of firsts in areas where the Soviet Union has lagged in her space program.

Dr. James Conant warned in 1950 that "until such time as disarmament becomes a reality, the free nations must be deeply concerned with finding and developing scientific pioneers, for on their efforts we must rely as much for increasing national security in a war-torn decade as for industrial progress in periods of peace." The Eisenhower administration has been true to the challenge of Dr. Conant, and has made steady strides of progress in the realm of space achievements.

In sum total, the Eisenhower administration has spent well over a billion dollars on the exploration of outer space. As of July 1, 1960, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was operating at a $915 million annual rate, as compared to $335 million 21 months before. The result of this added attention to space has been well expressed by the famed Dr. Wernher von Braun, who agreed that not only are our scientific flights more numerous than the Soviets', but also that our total scientific achievements have been more solid.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, columnist Roscoe Drummond praised the recent progress in our space program, and showed how in two fields—putting nonmilitary space exploration into the hands of the independent, civilian agency of NASA and in developing the heavy-thrust rocket, the Saturn—we have corrected previous shortcomings in this field.

U.S. News & World Report stated on December 19, 1960, that:

> By standards of scientific achievement, the United States now has wrested the lead from Russia.

Furthermore, Russian magazines no longer carry cartoons poking fun at the U.S. space program and hailing Soviet achievements. In fact, Soviet scientists have abandoned a program of broad scientific exploration such as that being pursued by this country. John Finney, in the New York Times, October 2, 1960, says:

> In terms of scientific results and the utilization of space for peaceful and military programs, however, the United States seems to have acquired a decided edge.

The Sputnik-sputtering of some, however, has led to nothing but their own embarrassment, since we now realize that only the one most recent Soviet satellite remains in orbit that is transmitting information, while several of our own still riding through the reaches of space continue to send back most of the scientific information they were designed to uncover.

The United States has shown that it cannot be counted out of competition in the contest for superiority in science and technology. Rather, we have spurted into the lead in making practical applications of "near outer space" for the benefit of all nations and peoples. This is an illustration of the fact that our democratic ideals, which insist on the primacy of the individual and not the drive for aggrandizement of the state, make science the servant and not the master of mankind. In addition, these accomplishments show that America is not only a nation placing high values on the worth and dignity of the individual but also emphasizes competitive spirit and dreams of discovery.

Despite the firsts cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ad hoc Committee on Space which submitted its report to President-elect Kennedy on January 10, 1961, claims that our impresive scientific achievements to date "against the background of Soviet accomplishments with large boosters have not been impressive enough." In addition, the panel also criticizes freely the organization of the overall space program. It is significant that with these few exceptions the Kennedy task force group could not find more alleged weaknesses in the Eisenhower administration space achievements.

A word about task force reports, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that you would agree with the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] when he stated on the floor of the House last year that:

> A national strategy should not be tucked away in a national security document. To be a public affair, it must be readily understood and enthusiastically supported by the scientists, the educator, the reporter, the engineer, the Congressman and the housewife. Such an understanding would enormously refortify our present position of strength, and enable a real cold war victory.

This was in connection with the release of a report on American strategy and strength by a special task force of the Republican policy committee. This report, given on the floor of the House and later reprinted as a public document, represented the thoughts of 15 Republican House Members and was based on study papers submitted by academicians and professional people from all over the Nation, without regard for party affiliation. The study papers as well as the final report were circulated to libraries, academic circles, and the public media, and it is significant that requests for the documents are still being received.

In contrast, the policy committee notes with some concern the method by which the so-called Kennedy task force studies are being released. Newspapers have carried only brief and sometimes contradictory excerpts. The task force report on space indicates that the panel has made a hasty review of the national space program and that there has been inadequate time to examine all facets of the program or to permit full consideration of the possible answers to many of the questions raised. If libraries, scholars, and Congressmen are not able to have the evidence of background thinking—if, indeed, such was the case—who can obtain proof and documentation? Where is the sound evidence leading to the controversial conclusions to which the task forces come? Is the scientist, the educator, the reporter, the engineer, the Congressman, and the housewife to take these recommendations on blind faith alone? Is Mr. Kennedy to have the benefit of mere recommendations without knowing what influenced their adoption?

I, for one, would like to have these task force reports distributed widely, with any background papers included, so that all citizens could have the benefit of the thinking which went into their preparation and conclusions. Since the Republican policy committee feels that all would benefit by a detailed discussion of these most vital recommendations on great issues of our time, they plan to issue several long-range studies during the 87th Congress based on the thoughts of prominent scholars, academicians, and professional people, and they would hope that all other studies issued would meet similar criteria.

Further analyzing the Kennedy space panel recommendations, the criticism of our lag in the field of large boosters certainly cannot be laid to the Eisenhower administration. For the Soviet Union began intensive work in the field of high-thrust ballistic missiles immediately after World War II, while it was 5 or 6 years before any organizational activity seriously began in this country. Due to this headstart during the Truman years, the U.S.S.R. has demonstrated a considerable lead over the United States in the field of propulsion and, consequently, the ability to project heavier payloads into space. Within 2 years the present U.S. vehicle development program should enable the United States to catch up with the present efforts of the U.S.S.R., but it will take at least 4 to 5 years be-

fore we expect to significantly surpass their present capabilities.

It should be noted that our concentration on manned bombers, which have greater military value, and work on the problem of lighter, smaller, and more efficient atomic bombs preceded all-out programs to produce a rocket to carry these bombs to their targets. Even so, in about half the time taken by the Russians, our scientists, engineers, and industrial contractors have produced the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's and the Atlas ICBM as operationally useful missiles capable of carrying to the target warheads as powerful and destructive as may be required. Aside from a psychological advantage, the Soviet rockets are more powerful than they now need for military weapons systems. Many now feel that the psychological impact of Russian space experiments, aided by outbursts of indignation and reactive political comment in this country, is the only space area in which we today suffer in comparison with the Soviet Union.

I am equally amazed at the partisan criticism of space organization under the Eisenhower administration. The facts of the matter are these: NASA has been in business only 27 months. At the start, it had to complete projects initiated by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Defense Department. It had to develop a long-range plan and also specific projects for 2 years calling for concentrated attention to the need for more powerful launch vehicles and a program of satellite and deep space flights amounting to about 26 major flights per year. It had to integrate the efforts of 8,000 workers from NASA, 2,400 from the Jet Propulsion Lab, 5,500 who made up the Von Braun group at Marshall Space Flight Center, a 2,000-man operation at New Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt—all these with the headquarters staff of 550 in Washington. These tasks had to be done in the spotlight and heat of congressional and public concern. NASA has made an outstanding record of solid accomplishment in spite of these handicaps, and it would indeed be foolish to attempt any drastic reorganization of our space program at this time.

If the long-range mission target dates of NASA are not sabotaged—if an adequately pared funding program continues, and if normally accelerated advancement of the technologies involved goes on—we will see the first launching of the two-stage Saturn rocket by 1963; the first controlled launching of an unmannned vehicle on the moon by 1963–4; the first reconnaissance of Mars and/or Venus by an unmanned space vehicle by 1964, and the attainment of manned space flight—Project Mercury—in 1961 or shortly thereafter. This has all been planned, Mr. Speaker, despite action by the Democrat-controlled Congress which cut $45 million from the NASA budget for fiscal year 1958; $6.7 million in 1959, and $23.2 million for 1960—a total of about $75 million in cuts from the operation the Kennedy task force now wishes to beef up.

I might mention a fundamental inconsistency in the so-called ad hoc committee report. It criticizes the administration by implication on page 15 in claiming that it is very unlikely that we shall be first in placing a man in orbit around the earth, and that this would provide a necessary stepping stone toward the establishment of a space station and for the manned exploration of the moon and planets. On the very next page, it goes on to assert that "by having placed highest national priority on the Mercury program, we have strengthened the popular belief that man in space is the most important aim of our nonmilitary space effort" and that we "exaggerate the value of that aspect of space activity where we are less likely to achieve success and will probably reap further successes in the future." If task force studies like this would be consistent, if they would give public credit to those aspects of space activity in which we have achieved success, and would not criticize us for being beaten to manned space flight in the same breath with which they emphasize the lack of importance of this feat, public opinion of the Nation and of the world might tend to discount Soviet propaganda which this sort of disservice strengthens and extends.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Eisenhower administration, through sound, scientific advances in the field of space, has achieved more than mere blueprint promises and predictions. Our space program has brought dreams into reality, and has lifted the United States into first place in space, to stay.

Let the new administration use the precedent of the fifty's as a model for the sixty's and maintain our lead in space, completing the projects earmarked for the years ahead and continuing the driving stimulus to scientific creativity initiated by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of the new administration, it is well to determine just where we are and the direction in which we are going in our national defense. It is especially important that we should have an unbiased appraisal of our defense capabilities at this time, for during the last campaign many allegations were made that the United States was becoming second class, that our defense capabilities had been deteriorating, and that there was a great lag in our development and production of missiles which greatly endangered our country. It is difficult to know how much these allegations of weakness affected the election or to what degree they may have damaged American prestige abroad. I do not intend to discuss these points, but I do want to point out clearly the real situation in our national defense.

It is true that prior to President Eisenhower's inauguration in 1953, America had for several years allowed research and development in the missile field to lag, but today America leads the entire world in development and production of military missiles. The reason that our missile development lagged is clear. In 1947 President Truman canceled our intermediate-range and intercontinental ballistic missile program, which was termed project NX–774, although Russia was going "full speed ahead" with her similar programs. I am not criticizing President Truman for canceling these missile programs, but it is difficult to understand the National Democratic Advisory Committee making a so-called missile lag their political issue when their party was responsible for the missile lag. I am merely pointing out the reason for our missile lag before President Eisenhower was the Chief Executive. As late as fiscal year 1950, our country spent only one-half million dollars on such programs. During the period 1947 to 1952, our country spent 20 times as much money for price supports on peanuts as it did in the ballistic missile field.

The National Democratic Advisory Committee which made the so-called missile lag a political issue issued a statement on October 19, 1957, just 15 days after sputnik, saying:

> As supposed budgetary pressures have become intense, the administration has increasingly starved our national defense.

On the same day they issued this further statement:

> The administration has tailored our Defense Establishment to meet preconceived budget goals rather than to provide the strength needed to preserve our national defense.

If the National Democratic Advisory Committee on May 24, 1957, just 4 months and 9 days before sputnik, was aware of the Russian missile threat and the need to spend more money for missiles and defense generally, they certainly did not transmit this information to the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives on that day, just 4 months and 9 days before sputnik. The Republican minority attempted to restore $313 million which had been cut from the President's budget. On this vote to raise the defense appropriation by $313 million the vote was:

Republican: Yea, 140; nay, 39.

Democrat: Yea, 11; nay, 203.

This vote shows that 78 percent of the Republicans voted for more defense and 95 percent of the Democrats voted against the same raise.

Our progress, however, since 1953 in the missile and satellite field marks one of the greatest technological and industrial accomplishments of our age.

The U.S. News & World Report of January 23 of this year says:

> Soviet shots into the mid-Pacific last summer, for example, gave evidence that the United States is at least abreast and perhaps ahead of the Soviet Union in quality of long-range missiles. The Atlas has proven more accurate, and has shown longer range than anything Russia unveiled during those Pacific tests.

The Atlas missile has been fired more than 9,000 miles, and its relative accuracy in the last 40 shots is greater than a golfer making a hole in one at a distance of 300 yards.

The Titan missile, which has capabilities of being fired from silos in the ground where it is protected from enemy attack, is now also operational and has

a range as great as the Atlas, and has an even more powerful atomic warhead. The Minuteman, a solid propellant missile, will soon be operational. It is easily mobile and will defy the enemy capabilities in locating it. It can also be fired from underground silos, and is much cheaper than the Atlas or Titan missiles. The Minuteman is well ahead of any missile that Russia has, and by the end of 1964, we will have 600 of these missiles ready to fire. We already have 2 Atlas bases operational, and will have 11 more by the end of 1962 with a total of 129 missiles ready to fire. We now have nine Titan bases under construction and all will be operational by the end of 1962 with a total of 126 missiles ready to fire. All locations in Russia will be within range of these missiles. At four sites in England there are now 64 intermediate-range ballistic missiles which are capable of striking most of the vital targets in Russia. Thirty Jupiter missiles are being placed in position in Italy, and 15 in Turkey covering vital targets in Russia. We now have two new atomic Polaris submarines roaming the sea each carrying sixteen 1500-mile Polaris missiles, armed with nuclear warheads. Four more of these submarines will be in operation before the end of the year.

We are now far ahead of Russia in bombers. United States has 600 long-range bombers in our Strategic Air Command, each capable of carrying two H-bombs 1,000 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima. We have 1,100 SAC medium-range bombers which by means of refueling are also capable of reaching Russia. We have 2,000 Air Force fighter bombers, many of them at our bases adjacent to Russia. The United States has 400 heavy carrier-based bombers with atomic capabilities. We now have in operation missiles that can be launched from a bomber hundreds of miles away from its target.

The real importance of the U–2 incident is often lost in the controversy as to whether we should have been spying on Russia. The impact of the U–2 incident is that it shows to the entire world the fact that the United States is so far ahead in airplane development that they can fly over Russia at will—something which she cannot do to us. In fact the U–2 planes have flown over Russia some hundreds of times. To those who might doubt the U.S. superiority over Russia in planes and air defense, the U–2 incident clearly demonstrates our superiority. The combination of these two strengths place Russia at our mercy at this time. So, the United States need not be ashamed of the U–2 incident, but it may well be proud of the capabilities which we have displayed as a great deterrent to Russian aggression. The B–58 bomber, a still greater medium bomber, is now operational in limited numbers. The B–70, a much faster long-range bomber is rapidly approaching the operational stage.

What do our top military experts think about our strength? Admiral Burke testified in 1959 that:

> We can destroy Russia many times over with the weapons we now have in existence. There is no way that she can stop that. We could break her back.

Air Force General Twining stated that Russia's air power is "not half as big as ours and not nearly as effective." Even General Taylor insisted that the U.S. "already has too much atomic retaliatory power. We have thousands of vehicles which could rain nuclear destruction on the Soviets, whereas the job could be done with hundreds."

In his new book "American Might and Soviet Myth" Jameson Campaigne points out the fact that too many have surrendered weakly to the Soviet psychological offensive, but that on the two occasions we actually called a Soviet bluff—Quemoy and Lebanon—the Russians backed down. "We have only to knock the chip off his shoulder," Campaigne continues, "and he is suddenly quiet. He knows who has the stronger force; economic, political, ethical, military, and every other. It is we who are not sure. With great cunning he has exploited our growing weakness of character to create in us this dangerous uncertainty. It is time we saw ourselves as the enemy sees us—formidable and in fact unbeatable."

I could go on and on pointing out the great American military strength. But I believe these facts are sufficient to show that America is not second class. It is especially noteworthy that these great advancements have taken place during the last administration. Our space program has been developed from its infancy during the Eisenhower administration. Russia was far ahead of us in that field in 1953, because of the cancellation of our long-distance missile program in 1947. Today space is rapidly becoming an all-American highway, and the only field in which Russia leads us in space is in the matter of rocket engines with greater thrust. If the new administration keeps up the pace that was set by the last, we will have passed Russia in that field within the next 2 years.

For too long the United States has had either a feast or famine policy in our national defense. Eight years ago the Eisenhower administration commenced and has carried through a strong defense policy to meet America's needs. Not a defense strength that ebbed and flowed as the Kremlin smiled or frowned. This defense policy includes both our strong atomic retaliatory strength as well as our ability to wage limited wars.

America is still the "real McCoy" and is superior to Russia today. I can safely assure the new administration that the Republican minority in Congress will help in every way to keep the United States well ahead in all defense capabilities.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred to the foresight, the imagination, the efforts, and the effectiveness of our research and development over the past 8 years. This research and development has played a great part in our standing today as the strongest, best-prepared nation on earth. I would like to contribute some thoughts and examples of the research emphasis of the Eisenhower administration which bear on Mr. LAIRD's remarks.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, said in 1945 that—

> The people have been talking about a 3,000-mile, high-angle rocket, shot from one continent to another, carrying an atomic bomb, and so directed as to be a precise weapon which would land exactly on a given target, such as a city.

Dr. Bush went on to say:

> Technically, I don't think anybody in the world knows how to do such a thing. * * * I wish the American people would leave it out of their thinking.

By 1954, Dr. Von Neumann told the Air Force that an operational ICBM could be achieved by this country in from 6 to 9 years, provided that an all-out development effort was initiated immediately. His committee felt a 5,500-mile range was feasible, and hoped for an accuracy goal of 5 miles from target. The Eisenhower administration went to work with just the accelerated ICBM program necessary. And the result?

An ICBM, the Atlas, became operational on September 1, 1959—within 5 years rather than 6 to 9. Its range has now exceeded 9,000 miles, as compared to the 5,500-mile forecast. And shots within 2 miles of the target have been reported, one just a few days ago, as compared to the 5-mile goal.

The research and development program under the Eisenhower administration has been characterized by throwing pessimism into the ashcan and by setting goals which are feasible, giving them top priority, then achieving these goals and even surpassing them.

When the Eisenhower administration came into power, only about $3.4 billion was spent annually for overall Department of Defense support of research and development. Within 2 years this had increased to over $5 billion, over twice the estimated annual expenditure for R. & D. by private industry. Much use has been made of university and private research organizations on a constant contract basis in pushing this enviable record forward.

This effort has achieved remarkable results in all branches of the Armed Forces. Take the Army, for example. If someone had asked the previous Democratic administration whether they could come up with, in less than a decade of peacetime, a man-carried, nuclear capable rocket for the use of frontline troops, a portable missile for the defense of forces in the field against low-flying aircraft, over a billion dollars for research on an antimissile missile, and an annual delivery of 720 new M–60 tanks armed with 105-mm. high velocity guns and equipped with longer range diesel engines—all of these Army improvements by 1960—they would probably have said, "Impossible."

If you asked the same official whether, in the same 8-year period, research and development could be accelerated to the point where the Navy could have an atomic submarine by 1955; a nuclear

submarine carrying 16 missiles with a range of over 1,000 miles to the extent that 336 Polaris missiles are now committed to the U.S. fleet; nuclear aircraft carriers joining the fleet as a complement to the Polaris—all within this period of time—he again would have said, "Impossible."

When asked about the possibility of adapting 1952 Air Force weapons and capabilities to produce higher speeds and altitudes, development of air refueling to make two-way intercontinental operations feasible, and greatly improved weapons systems in the field of strategic air warfare he would have called you a "dreamer." His was the world of B–36's and some medium range B–47's. To the Eisenhower administration, the long-range B–52 and B–58's are augmenting the obsolete earlier generations. Equipping of long-range bombers with Hound Dog air-to-surface missiles which can be air launched hundreds of miles from their targets, and eventually doubling their range with the Sidewinder weapon, will enable planes to disorganize enemy defenses from a distance, come in with safety, and perform their missions still carrying a payload several times greater than an ICBM. Meanwhile, research continues on a B–70 bomber three times the speed of sound.

The development and dramatic expansion of Atlas ICBM forces which President Truman recklessly delayed during his administration, and the scheduling of Titan bases in hardened, underground sites, would seem equally impossible, as would achievement of the Minuteman solid-fuel ICBM which, by 1962 or 1963, will provide our missile force the mobility to roll the length and breadth of the country. In the meantime, the Midas satellite system will double our warning time in the event of enemy attack.

The ironical part of the "impossible" comments from the officials in the Truman administration is that they would have been correct, had their attitude toward research and development continued. Certainly, as long as the previous Democratic administration cut R. & D. funds to the bone and promoted policies leading to crises orderly, systematic development of new weapons systems would have been impossible. As long as the Truman administration abandoned initiative, foresight, and improvement in favor of vacillation and shortsighted policies, American strength compared to that of the Soviet Union would inevitably have suffered.

Perhaps the most telling statement concerning our R. & D. programs was made by the Democratic-controlled House Committee on Science and Astronautics which recently concluded that "both the Air Force and Navy have achieved an outstanding record in the planning, organization, and management of their respective research and development missile programs."

Nearly one-eighth of President Eisenhower's $80.9 billion budget for fiscal year 1962 is allocated to scientific research and allied technological development—the biggest share ever given over to these purposes in any Federal budget. From $3 billion earmarked for R. & D. in fiscal 1953, we have advanced with an increase of 312 percent in total Federal funding of research and development through the latest budget. Adding private industrial and important academic research work, the Nation's total R. & D. bill runs about $15 billion annually—3 percent of our gross national product.

Dr. George Kistiakowsky, former Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, wrote that the decade of the fifties may become known best for its identity with two capital letters, "R" and "D." Would that the decade of the sixties continue an emphasis on research and development, so that the "R" and "D" legacy to future generations does not become ruin and destruction.

Under the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the impossible was realized. America made the greatest progress quietly, patiently and undramatically on the true frontier of knowledge—the laboratories of basic research. Dreamers of the American dream, inspired by the unleashing of private enterprise and government support, have led the way. The lesson is plain to the new Kennedy administration—if we fail to continue to push forward the frontiers of scientific discovery, the pace of development will slow a decade hence and the gains of the Eisenhower years will fade into an old frontier—bungling, backtracking, and boondoggling the United States into second place in the world of the future.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has described well the extent to which the Eisenhower administration has improved our posture of deterrent strength for both general and limited war situations. To me, it has been especially significant that our defense against the Soviet threat in a military way has been accomplished at the same time America has developed with determination its productive power. For it is evident that the United States must have not only the military, but also the economic strength to induce the Soviets to refrain from all forms of aggression.

In 1957, Khrushchev stated that—

> We do not intend to blow up the capitalist world with bombs. If we catch up with the United States in per capita production of meat, butter, and milk we will have hit the pillar of capitalism with the most powerful torpedo yet.

Certainly, we as a Nation can afford neither the luxury of inadequate defense nor an unsound economy stemming from habitually unbalanced Federal budgets. If our free society is to be preserved, we must reject the philosophy that our only choice in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat.

The Eisenhower administration has been aware of this fact from the beginning when the President said, in 1953, that—

> This policy of ours will not be tied to any magic, critical year, but will be based on the sounder theory that a very real danger not only exists this year, but may continue to exist for years to come, and that our strength must now be made stronger not by inefficient stops and starts, but by steady, continuous improvement.

Under previous administrations, national security expenditures ranged from $42 billion in fiscal 1946 down to around $11 billion in the fiscal 1948–49–50 years up again to $50 billion in fiscal 1953 as a result of the Korean war we were so unprepared to fight. Parenthetically, I was pleased to note that Secretary of State Dean Rusk remarked in 1959 that one of our most grievous mistakes was pulling the last combat team out of Korea, resulting in what he called an insufficient force to meet our commitments.

Under the Eisenhower administration, however, the defense budget from fiscal 1955 through the proposals for fiscal year 1962 has varied only in a small way from year to year, thus tying to our preparedness a "long-haul concept" beneficial to concepts of defense and our economy alike. Whereas the policies of the Truman administration in military spending can be summed up in two phases—demobilization, disillusion, and disaster followed by indecision, increased expenditures, and inflation, the Eisenhower years have resulted in orderly appropriations ranging from total defense expenditures of $35.5 billion in fiscal year 1955 to $40.9 billion in fiscal year 1961—an increase of only about 2 percent a year due to increased procurement costs and improvements in weapons and weapons systems.

Truly we have been getting "a bigger bang for our bucks." The critics who claim that we have sacrificed strength for economy have overlooked two fundamental things. First of all, according to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretaries of the Services throughout the Eisenhower administration, there has been a consistent overall adequacy of the budget for carrying out our assigned missions. Second, during all but two of the Eisenhower years, the Democrats were in control of Congress, which establishes appropriation figures. It is interesting to note that since 1955 Democratic Congresses have revised President Eisenhower's defense budget requests less than 2 percent—and that represents a decrease—a cut, mind you, of close to $3 billion in President Eisenhower's requests by Democratic Congresses in the past 6 years.

Admittedly, the cost of maintaining a strong defense posture is great today, what with the high cost of modern weaponry. The first Atlas missile could be barely paid for by 100 workers, each making $5,000 a year, if they would turn over all of their earnings for the next 70 years. The B–52 costs $8 million as compared to a cost of just over $½ million for the heavy bomber used at the end of World War II. One submarine, loaded with 16 Polaris missiles, exceeds the cost of $110 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree that faced with all these increases in costs of weapons; increased efforts in research and development; increased unrest throughout the world; and demands from those who put self-interest ahead of

national interest, it is amazing, if not incredible, that the Eisenhower administration has managed to keep the United States the strongest Nation in the world both economically and militarily.

However, I am frankly worried about statements and promises alleged to be part of the so-called new frontier. Inflationary pressures resulting from defense spending for spending's sake could cripple our economic and military strength alike, for us and for future generations. Increases in defense spending must be undertaken with a full awareness of the implications for private living standards, economic growth, and the progress of public programs other than defense, lest they lead to shifts away from private consumption, private investment, nondefense public spending, and low priority defense items themselves.

President Kennedy said in Washington last September 20 that—

> The next President must promptly send to Congress a special message requesting the funds and authority necessary to give us a nuclear retaliatory power second to none.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the gentleman from Wisconsin prove that we now, and I emphasize now, have a nuclear retaliatory power sufficient to destroy Russia many times over. Polaris, Atlas, Minuteman, and Titan missiles are being developed with a daring and imagination which previous administrations would not believe possible.

Our speakers today are agreed that the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, in giving us effective defenses without economic chaos, have been marvelous to behold. We are also agreed that, as Allen Dulles put it, the "fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be found and fought in the economic arena." Strong in this sense of pride and determination, we hope and pray that the Kennedy administration continues the policies aimed at national security and the maintenance of a stable economy. We will be here to guide the Nation in the direction of survival for a purpose—the maintenance of a civilization which exalts the dignity of the individual, his freedom, and his opportunity.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin and the other distinguished Members who have spoken on the problem of national strategy and strength have emphasized the strength of our defense posture under the Eisenhower administration and the need of continuing sound policies of deterrence in the years ahead. From the facts they have compiled and presented, several things are clear.

The United States has built up a force-in-being which concentrates on variety, flexibility, continual modernization, and dispersion of our weapons systems—a truly balanced force. It was in reference to this force that Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON said last February 23:

> No responsible person would contend that our present defenses are inadequate to our needs.

The progress accomplished in stabilizing military planning and procurement during the Eisenhower administration contrasts strikingly with the chaotic decade that preceded his tenure of office. The principles that guide our present policy for the long-range outlook cannot be reasserted too strongly.

While recognizing the need for a strong national defense, the Eisenhower administration has realized that as the possibilities of space exploration become actualities, the requirements of our international position extend to the space race as well as more purely military matters.

Mr. Speaker, a reduction in leadtime is extremely important if we are to make the progress which we all desire in our space program.

We cannot reduce leadtime if the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is without an Administrator. It is deplorable that the Kennedy-Johnson Administration has not selected a successor to Dr. T. Keith Glennan whose term in office ceased on January 20. Ten weeks have elapsed since the election, a task force on the space program has reported to Mr. Kennedy, yet there is no successor to Dr. Glennan. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence that little has been done by the Kennedy administration to date in coming to grips with the space program and its problems.

I urge the immediate appointment of a new Administrator for NASA to carry on this important assignment. The facts on this matter are best set forth in Roscoe Drummond's column this morning entitled "Slow Down in Space." I include this article at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1961]

SLOWDOWN IN SPACE—STEP FOR TAKEOVER NEGLECTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is one seriously frayed and ragged edge in the takeover of the Kennedy administration.

The transition has been so almost uniformly smooth, efficient, and harmonious that it is the more startling to come abruptly upon a break in the pattern.

One bad gap does not make a calamity. But because this exception affects the seventh biggest spending agency in the Government and concerns one of the President's most discussed campaign objectives—to speed and expand the exploration of outer space—the facts ought to be brought out into the open.

There is no doubt, I think, that Mr. Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON, who will become chairman of the National Space Council, will be distressed at what has happened—or hasn't happened—in an area which is so important to the Nation's prestige.

I am referring to the following:

The fact that, 10 weeks after the election, no one to head up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been appointed.

The fact that no liaison whatever between the incoming administration and the outgoing director of NASA, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, was ever established.

The fact that no representative of the Kennedy administration, including the chairman of the "task force" committee on space, made any effort to see, to consult with, or to get information from Dr. Glennan or any of the NASA officials.

The fact that, while in every other major agency of the Government a skeleton Kennedy team was working with their opposite numbers in the Eisenhower administration, not one advance man from the incoming administration set foot in the offices of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The fact that Dr. Glennan and his top division administrators and technicians had spent weeks assembling material to enable their successors to have a firsthand, three-dimensional picture not only of what NASA was doing and preparing to do but also a detailed explanation of every project.

The fact that the outgoing NASA officials waited in vain for the opportunity to help the new administration take over—but the phone never rang, there was no knock on the door—and in the end Dr. Glennan's time ran out, January 20 passed, and Dr. Glennan is consequently no longer on hand, no longer in Washington. (Deputy Director Hugh Dryden, whose resignation is on the President's desk, is willing to stay around in case anybody wants to talk with him.)

And, finally, the fact that a Kennedy task force ad hoc committee would issue a "hasty review" (its own description) patronizing and disdaining much of the top personnel of NASA whom they will either lose because of this report or with whom they will have to work after this inauspicious beginning.

To most newspapermen who have long covered the space program, the task force critique, prepared under the direction of Jerome B. Wiesner, who will be President Kennedy's science adviser, reads like a melange of observations based on superficial study. I have read it in full and the sum of it seems to me to be that the United States "now holds a position of leadership in space science" and that we ought to radically reorganize and get better people to direct what we are doing in order to maintain that position.

Obviously this whole situation is crying for the attention of Vice President JOHNSON who, when Congress and the President give him the authority, must help rescue it from further deterioration. Every day's delay is a setback.

Mr. Speaker, we have also emphasized the fact that a nation which lacks economic strength cannot be militarily strong for any period of time. Since a healthy growing economy makes it possible to meet the challenges of economic and trade competition, forms the base which makes it possible to carry a strong military defense program, and brings the benefit of material progress in the form of rising real incomes, the Eisenhower administration emphasized the imperative of a vigorous, adaptive, expanding economic system.

The United States has achieved a flexible and selective posture of deterrent strength. This includes not only the maintenance of strong capabilities for retaliation, but also the highly trained and mobile forces equipped with both nuclear and conventional weapons as the situation demands to deal with local

emergencies to stop their expansion into general war. As President Eisenhower said:

> There is a tragedy greater than winning a war—and this would be losing it.

Thus we have built our forces, nuclear and conventional, to the point where the United States enjoys a marked global strategic superiority over the Soviet Union.

Overlooking the objectives for cold war strategy in this day and age; swallowing exaggerated claims as to bomber and missile capabilities of the Soviet Union and thus creating a misshapen, mistaken missile gap illusion; and relying on a more expensive defense instead of a stronger defense, the critics of the Eisenhower defense policies overlooked several vital truths.

First. The Eisenhower administration has kept the peace.

Second. We have established a sound long-range program of national strategy for victory in the cold war.

Third. We have set up forces capable of carrying out their assigned roles and missions.

Fourth. This we have done while holding the line against unnecessary spending and centralization of power and authority.

This we have done—established military strength with freedom, the blueprint for victory through the economic, social, and strategic might of America over the Communist bloc. We point with pride to this record, and assure the people of the United States that we will be eternally vigilant to keep the faith with the Eisenhower administration and build an even greater record in the years ahead, and to keep moving forward toward what President Eisenhower called "effective, flexible types of power calculated to deter or repulse aggression and to preserve the peace."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF 1961 COTTON PRICE SUPPORT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House a bill to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop.

Back in 1958, we were faced with the possibility that Secretary Benson would lower the national cotton allotment from over 17 million acres in 1958 to about 14 million acres for 1959. To avoid this situation, the Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1958, fixing the minimum level of the national cotton allotted acreage for any year at 16.3 million acres. The same act contained price support provisions considered necessary to satisfy the many cotton industry groups and producing areas. The time is now approaching when some of these provisions will take effect with respect to the 1961 crop. As I understand them, it is clear that these provisions of the 1958 act authorize reductions in the price of cotton far beyond that which farmers can reasonably be expected to absorb.

Price support was reduced from 90 percent of parity in 1955 to 75 percent of parity for 1960 crop Choice A cotton. Present law would let the Secretary set price support for 1961 cotton at as little as 70 percent of parity and would require him to shift the price support base from Middling seven-eighths-inch cotton to average of the crop cotton. Dropping the support price to 70 percent would mean a reduction of $9 or $10 a bale for cotton, and changing the Middling base would mean a further reduction to farmers of about $8 a bale.

Per acre yields of cotton have moved up sharply in recent years, and we are now producing a bale an acre on land formerly yielding 200 pounds or less. But the cost of producing a crop has even run ahead of this progress in production methods, and the cost spiral continues upward. We cannot permit the provisions of current law to take effect under conditions farmers are now facing. Our cotton farmers cannot spend more to make a crop in 1961 than in 1960 and take $15 to $20 less a bale for it. Not only they, but the entire economy of the cotton area and of the Nation will suffer from such an unrealistic program for this great agricultural commodity.

While I am confident that the new Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville Freeman, is mindful of the harm that would be visited upon our cotton farmers in the event that price support is established at this minimum level, and while I do not believe he would want price support to drop to the minimum level, I feel that the Congress should take affirmative action at this session to guarantee cotton producers a fair return on their crop.

This bill, I have introduced today, is in the nature of emergency legislation. It will provide a floor of 75 percent of parity for the 1961 crop and will postpone until 1962 the change in the price support base. Passage of this bill will protect our cotton farmers from ruinous prices for the 1961 crop and permit needed program changes to be made after thorough study during this session.

I invite the careful study and support of this bill by my colleagues. Surely, we need this much protective legislation for this year's cotton crop, and I fervently hope that we can enact this bill into law before cotton planting begins within the near future.

OKINAWAN CLAIMS BILL

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize a contribution to the government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty. This is the identical bill that I introduced on August 31, 1960, as H.R. 13258, 86th Congress, 2d session. Identical bills are today being introduced also by Members who have special knowledge or responsibilities with respect to American actions and interests in Okinawa and the western Pacific, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

This bill is designed to clear up the last major outstanding problem in the U.S. administration of the Ryukyu Islands. Since 1958 the use of land in the Ryukyus by our forces has been conducted on a basis which is mutually acceptable to the people of Okinawa and to our administration. The 86th Congress enacted Public Law 86–69, which for the first time places a proper legal foundation under the annual appropriation which the Congress has made for expenses connected with the U.S. administration of these islands. The present bill authorizes a contribution by the United States to the government of the Ryukyu Islands to enable it to provide equitable compensation to the inhabitants of Okinawa for personal and property claims for the period prior to the treaty of peace with Japan.

Since the adjournment of the 86th Congress there has been a major development with respect to this matter. On November 9, 1960, the U.S. High Commissioner in the Ryukyus announced that he was notified by the executive branch of the U.S. Government that a decision had been made to authorize the consideration and settlement of certain claims of Ryukyuan landowners for the use of Ryukyuan land by U.S. Forces during the period July 1, 1950, to April 28, 1952, the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan. He said that this was based in part on review of a petition submitted by the Ryukyuans and that other claims in that petition covering prior periods were still under review by the executive branch. The basis for this administrative decision was that the United States has long since treated land used after July 1, 1950, as under implied lease, and the only question is the adequacy of the compensation rendered. Negotiations between the civil administration and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands are proceeding to determine the precise basis for the settlement, and the amounts that will be payable to the individual landowners.

This is a welcome step, which should resolve a substantial part of the problem without the necessity for new legislation.

There remain, however, the question of compensation for the use of land and appurtenances and for damage thereto before July 1, 1950, and the questions of tort claims for the entire pretreaty period. These questions, as indicated by the statement of the High Commissioner, are still under review by the executive branch of the U.S. Government. This bill is introduced in order that the study of this subject may be commenced in the appropriate committees of the Congress, and in the expectation that those committees will have the full benefit of the views of the executive branch before they make their reports. The bill as introduced contains no ceiling amount for the contribution to be made by the United States, but it is the intention of the sponsors that such a ceiling amount shall be introduced after the views of the executive branch have been received. The background of the bill is as follows:

Between the termination of hostilities with Japan in 1945 and the entry into force of the treaty of peace with Japan on April 28, 1952, the United States exercised exclusive powers of administration in Okinawa as a military occupation under the laws of war. Unlike the situation in Japan, however, it was solely a unilateral and not an inter-Allied occupation, and also unlike the situation in Japan, it was a direct military government, and the Government of Japan was allowed to exercise no authority whatever. During this period, land and buildings required by the Allied forces in Japan were requisitioned through the Japanese Government, and the Japanese Government made compensation to the owners. In the Ryukyus, however, extensive requisitions of land were made without compensation by any authority. Finally, after the peace treaty, some compensation was effected for the period beginning July 1, 1950, but this was on an inadequate basis.

It has never been questioned that, in justice, the inhabitants should be compensated by some authority for the use of their property during the pretreaty period. Compensation has been delayed by uncertainty with respect to legal responsibility and the urgency of other problems. The theory of this bill is that, independent of and apart from any question of legal responsibility, the United States should make the resources available to the local government of the Ryukyu Islands to settle this matter on an equitable basis.

When a ceiling amount is determined for the sum to be contributed by the United States, the sponsors of this bill intend that it shall not include any sums for the initial period that our forces were in the Ryukyus, which resulted from the war against Japan. However, we stayed in the Ryukyus and, commencing long before the Japanese Peace Treaty went into effect, built vast bases there in order to protect our own long-range security interests. For that period it is equitable that we furnish the funds necessary for fair compensation. It is both right and wise for us to do so.

Included also in the contribution authorized by this bill are so-called tort claims—injuries and losses resulting from accidents and acts of U.S. personnel. The amounts are small, but there are a number of cases that are very important from the human point of view, involving, for instance, civilian deaths and dismemberments in a munitions explosion and the crash of a U.S. bomber.

We have spent vast sums in Okinawa in the interest of our security. Our bases there would be greatly weakened or even made useless by a disaffected population. We would be pennywise and pound foolish if we did not make possible the satisfaction of the reasonable and equitable requests of the people to be compensated for their losses resulting from the actions of our forces well after hostilities had ceased.

THE "SPENDERS" SEEK AN UNFAIR, UNAMERICAN ADVANTAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the "spenders" are those who desire legislation which would give special advantage, or tax dollars which we do not have, to selected individuals or groups.

The volume of proposed legislation introduced in the House is so great that it is not practicable for Members to read, much less understand, it all. Hence, a procedure separating the grain from the chaff.

For years, the party in control and responsible through its Speaker and the Rules Committee for legislation, has, and properly so, dominated the Rules Committee by naming a working majority of its members—in recent years, eight from the majority party, four from the minority.

Of late, a substantial number of office-seekers and officeholders have followed an attractive "pie in the sky" policy of taxing, spending, going ever deeper into debt. That group, though a minority, is insistent, vigorous, and ruthless.

That minority group has found itself unable to enact the legislation it proposed. This was because a majority of the Rules Committee and the two-thirds Democrat majority in the House did not favor, refused to pass, legislation which, while attractive to some was unnecessary, called for the expenditure of tax dollars which were unavailable. Fourteen percent of our tax dollar goes for interest on the national debt. The program would have imposed an additional tax burden upon already overburdened citizens.

The failure of the spenders to put across their proposed legislation was due to the fact that a two-thirds party majority either lacked faith in its soundness or the courage to stand up and be counted. That is a harsh but true statement.

Since 1935, when it was my privilege to become a Member of the House, there has never been a time when a majority, sincerely believing in and insisting upon the passage of legislation—not vetoed by a President—could not carry out its will. We now have a Democrat President.

This group, misnamed liberal, now proposes to pack or add additional members of their political convictions to the Rules Committee so that it will report out to the House proposed legislation under a rule which will bar amendments, cut off debate.

True, the House, by majority vote, has power to reject such a gag rule. The answer is that all too often, because it is a physical and mental impossibility, Members who are not on the legislative committee which reported the legislation, or on the Rules Committee, cannot know the full implications carried in a bill or properly anticipate its harmful implications. Hence, the opportunity to learn the implications of a bill would be limited or denied by what is known as a closed or gag rule which outlaws amendments and denies adequate debate.

True, Members could reject a rule, but, because they must to some extent trust and rely upon leadership and a Rules Committee, in practice a rule is seldom rejected.

The insistent and vigorous minority group seeking to impose this unjust, un-American procedure upon the House is not even a majority of the dominant Democratic Party. By and large, it is made up of spenders, carried away perhaps by their own sincere convictions and enthusiasm or it may be by the thought they can give effect to wild, political promises used to win an election. They seem to believe the Lord will take care of us, rescue us from folly.

Unable to count a majority of their own House membership in favor of their proposals, they now seek control of the Rules Committee and to thus gag the House membership, deprive Members of free speech—a right they themselves always insist upon exercising. If they succeed by controlling the Rules Committee—which is their purpose—in denying adequate debate, preventing amendments to proposed legislation, they will create a situation where we will, as predicted by a farsighted Russian, destroy our ability to remain strong, spend ourselves into bankruptcy, and Communists will find it unnecessary to wage a fighting war to establish communism as the dominant world power.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, apparently, those on the other side try to adhere to the old theory: "We are those who are strong and we are those who make the Nation strong," and that to attack this policy or to have cooperation from anybody else is wrong

and unfair. In the remarks that were made, and I direct the attention of the House to a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, the minority whip, where he said this:

> The challenge is clear. The need for continued strong frontiers against aggression rather than new frontiers of appeasement and apology is great.

Now how unfair can one be, that even before the Kennedy administration has sat down in its chair that we hear the accusation of appeasement and apology by the administration? How unfair and how unjust can you be? That, Mr. Speaker, compares to all the things that we have heard here today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am glad to hear of that. I did not know that we had ever accused—any Republican ever accused—the present administration of anything except that I did hear today that members or individuals appointed to the Cabinet, having positions as Cabinet officers, are now telling or saying to some of our folks that if they do not go along on this rules business, or vote, they will not get any Federal projects in their districts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What is your question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What is your question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you think that is all right?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; that is all right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To put the heat on in that way?

Mr. GROSS. Is this appeasement—what kind of operation is that?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What I have reference to is the statement of the gentleman from Illinois accusing the administration of appeasement at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I see. But the gentleman would not call this use of a Cabinet office to attempt to pack the Rules Committee as being appeasement?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is there any evidence of a Cabinet officer packing the Rules Committee?

Mr. GROSS. No; I said the use of the office.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is there any evidence of any use of the office?

Mr. GROSS. Apparently, there is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSIONS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

At the request of Mr. CAHILL, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter: Mr. RAY, Mr. NYGAARD, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, and Mr. CRAMER in two instances.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the gifted and gallant people of Ukraine have a long and eventful history, but their modern history has been mostly one of misery and misfortune. Though they constitute one of the larger ethnic groups in Europe, some 42 million today, they have seldom been powerful enough in modern times to cope with their far more numerous and powerful foes.

Except for a brief period of 2 years, since the mid-17th century, they have been under Russian regimes, and during all that time they have suffered under oppressive alien rulers.

In 1917 Russian autocracy was shattered, Ukrainians felt themselves free, and on January 22, 1918, proclaimed their independence.

That historic day marked the rebirth of Ukraine and the rise of the Ukrainian Republic. Unfortunately, from the time of its birth the new and young Republic found itself surrounded with foes. The most dangerous among these were Communist Russians. Early in 1920 the Red army attacked the Ukrainian Republic, overran it, and subsequently Ukraine was made a part of the Soviet Union. Of course since then there has been no freedom in Ukraine, but stouthearted Ukrainians still cling to their ideals and yearn for their independence. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day I gladly voice their fervent sentiments.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding groups of citizens in North Dakota are the former Ukrainians who are now making their home in our State.

North Dakota has benefited greatly from these citizens who have brought with them a willingness to work, a love of freedom, and a high regard for the benefits of our American democracy.

January 22, 1961, marks the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, a date which persons of Ukrainian descent observe with justifiable pride.

Although Ukrainian independence was recognized by the Soviet Government, and although the Ukrainian people fought gallantly to retain their independence, the pressure from Moscow proved too great and eventually the Ukraine was overrun by Communist troops.

The freedom-loving people of the Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed on them by their powerful neighbor and they have continued to demonstrate their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence by resisting Communist rule.

I would therefore urge my colleagues to join me in paying respects to these people whose example today provides a bright torch lighting the way to freedom for enslaved people everywhere.

REMOVAL OF THE UNJUST TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DEBIT LIFE INSURANCE AGENTS

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill to amend section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This bill would recognize the so-called debit life insurance agents as outside salesmen, just as other life insurance salesmen are so classified for tax purposes.

The subject section of the Internal Revenue Code permits an outside salesman to deduct all of his ordinary and necessary business expenses from gross income in computing his adjusted gross income for tax purposes. The outside salesman is then allowed to take either the standard 10 percent deduction or to itemize deductions, as he sees fit, in determining his taxable income.

The so-called ordinary life insurance agents are now covered by the provisions of section 62(2)(D). The jobs of the "ordinary" and the "debit" life insurance agents are nearly identical: they hold the same kind of license, sell basically the same lines of insurance—the difference being that the debit agent can sell what is known as industrial insurance, conduct their operations away from their employers' places of business and generally must defray their business expenses out of their own pockets. The debit agent differs from other life insurance agents in one respect; he normally takes care of the collection of the premiums on the industrial insurance, premiums which fall due weekly or monthly, in person.

It is upon this distinction, which in many cases is of minimal importance in the day-to-day work and income of the debit agent, that the differentiation in tax treatment of the two types of agents are based. The nature of industrial insurance is such that a great deal of selling is involved in even the collection activities of the debit agent; industrial insurance is terminable at will and there is no obligation on the policyholder to continue his coverage. Each collection requires a new sale, effectively, and a

distinction based upon a collateral collection activity in connection with sales is capricious.

At present, debit agents may take their business expenses as deductions only as part of their itemized deductions. My bill would give these agents treatment equal to that of other life insurance agents and end the inequity that presently exists.

THE CONTINUING NEED FOR A FIGHT AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 23, I introduced several bills which I believe will go a long way in rooting out the $22 billion take of organized crime, together with the criminal activities involved in protecting that illicit gold mine, such as extortion, bribery, blackmail, murder, racketeering, narcotics, prostitution, maiming and assault, together with other gangster-type criminal activities. I continue to believe this to be one of the major challenges facing the Congress, and this position is substantiated by recommendations of the Attorney General of the United States. I list below the bills I have introduced, followed by the explanation and recommendation of the Attorney General.

GRANTING IMMUNITY TO GATHER EVIDENCE

The Attorney General has proposed legislation for granting immunity to persons who claim the fifth amendment in Federal gambling cases, and thus law enforcement officers could compel underlings to give them information needed to reach the upper echelons of crime syndicates. This legislation would also apply to labor racketeering cases granting immunity to needed witnesses who now claim self-incrimination.

I have introduced H.R. 3021 to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. My previous bill, H.R. 7392 of the 86th Congress, received a favorable report from the Department of Justice, and I include herewith a letter from the Deputy Attorney General to the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, dated June 17, 1960:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1960.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (H.R. 7392) to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. The measure was introduced at the request of the Attorney General as one part of a three-point Department of Justice legislative program designed to supplement the efforts of the States to eradicate from the American scene the so-called organized criminal.

In labor racketeering cases the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimony before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful to interfere with commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the act. Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses proscribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

H.R. 7392 will add a new section to the "Racketeering" chapter of our criminal code, in which the Hobbs Act is contained. As amended, the chapter will provide that whenever in the opinion of a U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, for the measure accords him immunity from prosecution (except for perjury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination. Legislation such as this is not uncommon; there are many such immunity statutes and they have been of considerable assistance in accomplishing the more effective administration of justice.

The Department of Justice urges early enactment of this important legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Deputy Attorney General.

H.R. 3021 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1952. Immunity of witnesses.

"Whenever in the judgment of a United States Attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of section 1951 of this title or of section 302 of the Act of June 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 157; 29 U.S.C. 186), or of any conspiracy involving the foregoing, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under the provisions of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"1951. Interference with commerce by threats or violence."

the following:

"1952. Immunity of witnesses."

The explanation and recommendation of the Attorney General is as follows:

In labor-racketeering cases the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimony before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful to interfere with commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the act. Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses prescribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law-enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 802 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This bill would add a new section to the "Racketeering" chapter of our criminal code, in which the Hobbs Act is contained. As amended, the chapter will provide that whenever in the opinion of a U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 802 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, for the measure would accord him immunity from prosecution (except for perjury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination. Legislation such as this is not uncommon; there are many such immunity statutes and they have been of considerable assistance in accomplishing the more effective administration of justice.

PROHIBIT TRANSMISSION OF GAMBLING INFORMATION

I have also introduced H.R. 3022 to amend title 18 of the United States Code to assist in the prevention of the interstate transmission of gambling information. The Attorney General has endorsed this proposal, which I introduced last session.

H.R. 3022 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

1081 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"The term 'gambling information' means information relating to, or which might be used in, the process of making, settling, paying, registering, evidencing, or recording any wager.

"The term 'wager' means—

"(1) any wager with respect to a sports event or a contest placed with a person engaged in the business of accepting such wagers,

"(2) any wager placed in a wagering pool with respect to a sports event or a contest, if such pool is conducted for profit, and

"(3) any wager placed in a lottery conducted for profit. For the purposes of this definition, the term 'lottery' includes the numbers game, policy, and similar types of wagering. The term does not include—

"(A) any game of a type in which usually (i) the wagers are placed, (ii) the winners are determined, and (iii) the distribution of prizes or other property is made, in the presence of all persons placing wagers in such game, and

"(B) any drawing conducted by an organization exempt from tax under sections 501 and 521 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, if no part of the net proceeds derived from such drawing inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

SEC. 2. Chapter 50 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"§ 1084. Affidavits respecting interstate or foreign transmission of gambling information

"(a) Each person required to pay a special tax under subchapter B of chapter 35 of subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall, at the time he registers as required by such subchapter, submit for transmittal to the Attorney General an affidavit stating (1) whether he has or has not, during the preceding twelve months, transmitted gambling information in interstate of foreign commerce, and whether he has or has not, during such period, received gambling information so transmitted, and (2) whether he intends or does not intend to transmit gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce during the period the registration is in effect, and whether he intends or does not intend to receive such information so transmitted during such period.

"(b) Any person whose intention expressed in an affidavit submitted under this section changes during the period the registration is in effect shall, within ten days, submit a revised affidavit to the Attorney General.

"§ 1085. Failure to file affidavit; false affidavit

"Whoever files an affidavit required by section 1084 which is false or misleading shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"Whoever fails to file an affidavit which is required under section 1084 shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"§ 1086. Providing communications service without affidavit

"Whoever, being a common carrier by wire or radio, provides communication services to any person whom it has reason to believe is a person required by section 4412 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to be registered; or

"Whoever, being an employee of a common carrier by wire or radio, assists in providing any communications service, or assists in the installation of any equipment to be used to provide any communications service, to any person he has reason to believe is a person required by section 4412(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to be registered—

"without informing the Department of Justice of the circumstances which give rise to such belief shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 3. The analysis at the beginning of chapter 50 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1084. Affidavits respecting interstate of foreign transmission of gambling information.

"1085. Failure to file affidavit; false affidavit.

"1086. Providing communications services without affidavit."

The explanation and recommendation of the Attorney General is as follows:

This bill would provide that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility." Thus, it will approach the overall purpose of striking at organized crime by providing a means of preventing persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials.

It should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services. The proposal would permit the broadcasting of horseraces when such broadcasts are carried as special events, provided not more than two horseraces a day shall be broadcast by any station.

BROADENING FUGITIVE FELON ACT

One of the most important bills which I introduced on Monday is H.R. 3023 to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act. The purpose of my proposed legislation in this regard is to amend the act so as to broaden the scope of existing law in order that a number of serious crimes not presently included within the statute will be included in order to assist local law-enforcement agencies in the apprehension of fugitives through the services of the Federal Government.

Under existing law it is provided that anyone who moves in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to avoid prosecution or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for certain specified crimes is upon conviction subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both. The crimes specified are murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, as well as an attempt to commit any of the enumerated offenses. The section further provides that these offenses shall be considered under the definition of either common law or under the law of the place from which the person fled.

Under my proposed amendment to this section, the scope of the act is broadened so as to include all felonies or offenses punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year under the laws of the place where the fugitive flees, or second, to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged. The effect of the proposed amendment will permit local law enforcement agencies to seek Federal assistance in locating offenders who have fled in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution, custody or confinement for a number of serious criminal offenses which are not presently included within the statute. It will supplement the powers of the States in criminal law enforcement through the assistance of the agents of the Federal Government's investigative forces. It will provide either for Federal trials of the persons apprehended or their return to the proper State jurisdiction for prosecution or other appropriate State action. Customarily the States' jurisdiction is honored by the Federal Government.

This bill does not place an undue burden on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Department of Justice has stated that despite the broadening of the jurisdiction under the proposed bill, the FBI will not be unduly burdened with unwarranted investigations.

In my opinion, this legislation will be a major step in strengthening the law enforcement forces, both State and Federal, in the war against crime and criminals. This proposal I introduced last session and it passed the House.

H.R. 3023 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for a crime, or an attempt to commit a crime, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year under the laws of the place where the fugitive flees, or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The Attorney General's explanation follows:

Section 1073, the Fugitive Felon Act, now provides that "whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing offenses as

they are defined either at common law or by the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees * * * shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Prosecution under this section is now limited to those crimes listed above, whereas the proposed amendment would broaden the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act to include all felonies or offenses punishable by more than a year in prison. If this amendment is enacted, local law-enforcement agencies could seek Federal assistance in locating offenders who have fled interstate to avoid prosecution, custody, or confinement for a number of serious offenses not presently included within the statute. It is the view of the Department of Justice that this amendment will strengthen considerably the legal arsenal directed at curbing major criminal activities in the Nation. It will supplement the powers of the States to fight against crime by adding the force of the Federal Government's investigative and enforcement agencies to those of the States, with either Federal trials of persons apprehended or their return to the proper State jurisdiction for prosecution or other appropriate action.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF ALL GAMBLING DEVICES

The Attorney General has further recommended that the 1950 law forbidding the "interstate transportation of any gambling device," which now applies to slot machines, should be broadened to include any other device manufactured specifically for gambling purposes, and also to prohibit the shipment of such gambling devices out of the country. In submitting that proposal the Attorney General had the following to say:

In 1951 Congress passed the Johnson Act (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. secs. 1171–1177), which in general forbids the interstate transportation of any gambling device and requires manufacturers of and dealers in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General.

Experience with the enforcement of this act has demonstrated a need for its amendment in several respects. It is proposed to broaden the definition of gambling device so that not only the slot machines would be covered, but also additional types of machines and mechanical devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling.

The proposal would also enlarge and more clearly define the categories of persons to whom the registration and filing provisions apply. It would require the maintenance of detailed records with respect to the acquisition and disposition of gambling devices, with provision for inspection and copying of such records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Provision is made in the bill for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the required records or testifying before a grand jury or court of the United States. Thus, our enforcement authorities would be able to compel the disclosure by underlings of information necessary for reaching the upper echelons of the crime syndicates.

Finally, the bill would extend the scope of the act to apply to the transportation of gambling devices in foreign commerce; at present it applies only to the interstate transportation of such devices. This extension would not only eliminate a possible area of gambling device activity, but would further strengthen enforcement of the act with respect to interstate violations, since it is difficult to segregate from an investigative standpoint interstate and foreign shipments.

On Monday I introduced H.R. 3024, the same as the bill I introduced last session, to implement that recommendation, with certain modifications, which I believe to be sound. H.R. 3024 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(a)(2) of the Act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. 1171), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) any other machine or mechanical device (including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices) designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, provided that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to parimutuel betting equipment or materials used or designed for use at racetracks where betting is legal under applicable State laws; or".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(d) The term 'interstate commerce' includes commerce between one State, possession, or the District of Columbia and another State, possession, or the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'foreign commerce' includes commerce with a foreign country.

"(f) The term 'intrastate commerce' includes commerce wholly within one State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device in interstate or foreign commerce: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of manufacturing, repairing, reconditioning, dealing in, or operating any gambling device if in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships or delivers such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, unless such person shall, during the month prior to engaging in such business in that year, register with the Attorney General of the United States his name and trade name and the address of each of his places of business, designating his principal place of business within the United State.

"(b) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain an inventory record of all gambling devices owned, possessed, or in his custody as of the close of each calendar month. The record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, together with the location of each item listed thereon.

"(c) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices sold, delivered, or shipped in intrastate, interstate, of foreign commerce. The record of sales, deliveries, and shipments for each place of business shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part sold, delivered, or shipped together with the name and address of the buyer and consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier.

"(d) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired. This record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired together with the name and address of the person from whom the device was purchased or acquired and the name and address of the carrier.

"(e) Every manufacturer required to register shall number seriatim each assembled or partially assembled gambling device which is to be sold, shipped, or delivered, and shall stamp on the outside front of each such assembled or partially assembled gambling device so as to be clearly visible the number of the device, the name of the manufacturer, and the date of manufacture. And every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall record the data herein designated in the records required to be kept.

"(f) Each record required to be maintained under the provisions of this Act shall be kept for a period of five years.

"(g)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this Act to sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device which is not marked and numbered as required by this Act or for any person to remove, obliterate, or alter the manufacturer's name, the date of manufacture, or the serial number on any gambling device;

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to make or cause to be made, any false entry in any record required to be kept under this section; and

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any person who has failed to register as required by this Act or who has failed to maintain the records required by this Act to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device.

"(h) Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, at the principal place of business within the United States of any person required to register by this Act, at all reasonable times have access to and the right to copy any of the records required to be kept by this Act, and in case of refusal by any person registered under this Act to allow inspection and copying of the records required to be kept, the United States district court where the principal place of business is located shall have jurisdiction to issue an appropriate order compelling production.

"(i) No person shall be excused from maintaining the records designated herein, producing the same or testifying before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But upon asserting the privilege against self-incrimination any natural person may be required to open the records designated herein to inspection or to testify before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto: *Provided,* That no such person shall be criminally prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any trans-

action, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of the inspection of such records or testimony with respect thereto. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this Act.

"(j) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to make and enforce such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act and the breach of any of such regulations shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this Act."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its amendment.

This is a continuation of my efforts to get strong antigambling legislation written into law in areas where it has been proven to be needed by recommendations of the Attorney General and reports from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with other reports made available to the Congress. These proposals are directed primarily at syndicated gambling and criminal activities largely nationwide in scope, which is an element that is readily admitted to be in existence and has to date proven itself beyond the grasp of criminal legal processes under existing law. My previous bill, H.R. 7393 of the 86th Congress, received no objection from the Post Office Department, the Secretary of Commerce—although the Department did indicate it was in sympathy with the objective of the proposed legislation. It received favorable recommendations of the Attorney General and there was no objection received from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

DISALLOWANCE OF TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR RACKETEERING BUSINESS EXPENSES

I have introduced H.R. 3025 which is intended to deny persons engaged in illegal activities, such as gambling and racketeering, certain tax deductions which are allowed to legitimate businesses. These deductions were given some semblance of legality in the decision of *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27), in which the Supreme Court refused to disallow such deductions on the part of gamblers and criminals in the absence of express declaration by Congress. This bill, which I also introduced last session, is broadened and made more comprehensive by the Attorney General's recommendations, and it would deny tax deductions to persons engaged in illegal activities such as gambling, and clearly shows the congressional intent that such business expenses cannot be deductible for tax purposes. This is one of the recommendations made by the Attorney General in submitting his proposals to Congress. Concerning the elimination of such tax deductions the Attorney General has the following to say:

Organized crime has derived hugh profits from certain businesses carried on illegally. It is obvious that a business conducted furtively and unlawfully will yield larger profits than one transacted openly by law-abiding citizens. It is equally clear that the furtive character of such a business increases the expense and difficulty of tax collection. The Government is entitled to be reimbursed for this drain of its resources, and to secure its full share of taxes from these illegal ventures.

One example of this type of business is organized crime's illegal gambling enterprises—perhaps its principal source of ill-gotten funds. Almost all of the States have laws prohibiting bookmaking, slot machines, and related activities of the organized gambling fraternity. Policing illegal gamblers is primarily a State and local responsibility.

There are, however, areas where the Federal Government can properly assist local authorities in the enforcement of their antiracketeering and gambling laws. This bill is designed to deny persons engaged in illegal activity, such as gambling, certain tax deductions allowed to legitimate businesses. This would deal a severe blow to the organized racketeer by hitting him where it hurts most—in his pocketbook. (See *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27).)

H.R. 3025 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES

"No deduction otherwise allowable under this subtitle shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for rent, wages, or salaries if under any statutes of the United States, or of the State, Territory, or possession of the United States in which such amount is paid or incurred, the payment of such amount constitutes a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred after such date.

In addition to the above enumerated bills, I have today introduced a bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

This bill follows in its entirety:

H.R. 3246.

A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chapter 95 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

"Whoever except a common carrier in the usual course of its business carries or sends in interstate or foreign commerce any records or paraphernalia used or intended or designed for use in (a) bookmaking; or (b) wagering pools with respect to a sporting event; or (c) in a numbers, policy, bolita, or similar game shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years or both."

and by adding the following item to the analysis of the chapter:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia."

The explanation accompanying my bill is as follows:

This bill would make it a felony to send or carry in interstate commerce numbers slips or wagering paraphernalia and would be of inestimable aid in stamping out syndicate numbers operations which extend across State lines. This occurs more frequently when State lines are close to major metropolitan areas. A typical example would be Washington, D.C., with its close proximity to Maryland and Virginia or Cincinnati, Ohio, which is across the State line from Newport, Ky. Whereas many of the numbers operations are intrastate, if this bill were enacted the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to investigate and act in those instances in which there is some indication of interstate activity.

I strongly recommend this legislation for serious consideration by the Congress. It is an anti-organized-crime package, which I believe is essential in fighting organized racketeering which is costing the taxpayers in excess of $22 billion annually, which is an amount second only to national defense expenditures. Organized crime must be stamped out and Congress must accept its full responsibility in making certain that it is done. Of course, in addition to the $22 billion pried out of the pockets of the taxpayers in these illicit operations, these national gangster activities also have the effect of undermining the basic morals of our Nation.

I am happy to know that the Attorney General has made legislative recommendations and that all of those recommendations are consistent with legislation which I have previously introduced, and which I have now introduced in this Congress. It is high time that Congress do everything within its power to put an end to these criminal activities. This is a very real challenge that must be met immediately and with effective legislation.

MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not blame our friends on the other side of the aisle for eulogizing the past administration. I think it is proper that they do so.

I would like to ask a question and hope they will furnish the answer for the RECORD in the future. Where do we have any operational Titan missile squadron? Is it not true that the Mercury project is behind schedule? And is it not true that the Sky Bolt missile project, an air-to-ground long-range ballistic missile, is far behind schedule? Is it not true that the past administration withheld funds from the Polaris missile system?

Those things I hope the Members on the other side of the aisle will also include in their next eulogy of the past administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, February 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. LINDSAY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. PELLY.

(At the request of Mr. MORRIS, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. TUCK.

Mr. FOGARTY in two instances.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. ANFUSO.

(At the request of Mr. CAHILL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CRAMER in four instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

(At the request of Mr. MORRIS, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 26, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

485. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the prices paid for certain jet engine components purchased from Bendix Aviation Corp., South Bend, Ind., by General Electric Co., Aircraft Gas Turbine Division, Cincinnati, Ohio, under Department of the Air Force fixed-price incentive prime contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

486. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of programing and financing of selected facilities constructed at 63 Army, Navy, and Air Force installations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

487. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

488. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a report relating to GS–17 positions allocated to this agency, pursuant to section 1105a of title 5 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

489. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide uniform cost-sharing standards for non-Federal entities cooperating with the Federal Government in local flood protection or flood prevention projects, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3220. A bill to authorize a contribution to the government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. Forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 3221. A bill to authorize a contribution to the government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. Forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend section 4(a) of the act of April 1, 1942, so as to confer jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and crossclaims in any action in which such court has initial jurisdiction; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3223. A bill defining and prohibiting unfair sales, providing remedies for violations thereof, and establishing penalties therefor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3225. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3227. A bill to amend section 1732(b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3228. A bill to amend section 4208 of title 18, United States Code, so as to require a report in certain cases as to the suitability of a Federal prisoner for parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3229. A bill to provide for the disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of lands within abandoned and forfeited railroad rights-of-way, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 3230. A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation by the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3233. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend section 454 of title 38, United States Code, to provide an exclusion from income for veterans' survivors eligible for pensions, for amounts paid by them for debts of the veteran and expenses of his last illness and burial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend Public Law 959, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3236. A bill to provide additional funds for education in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3237. A bill to provide additional funds for education in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3238. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 3240. A bill to amend the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 with respect to the annual salary of the U.S. member of the Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3241. A bill to assist the city of New York in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred in protecting the Communist leaders during their attendance at the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3242. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3243. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3244. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3245. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws by amending chapter 1 of title 1 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3246. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate

crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3250. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3251. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3252. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is deaf; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3254. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to make it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee by reason of his participation in proceedings brought under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3256. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3257. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3258. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 3259. A bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3260. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3261. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3262. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 3264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3266. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3267. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3268. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for contributions and gifts to nonprofit industrial development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of commutation fares paid by an individual in traveling to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3271. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable in case of a taxpayer or spouse who is a woman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend section 545 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows of veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3276. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a 10-year program of grants for education in the fields of medicine, and dentistry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 3277. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans in certain cases to farmers and stockmen where they have a reasonable chance to continue their farming operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 3279. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3280. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3281. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3282. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 3283. A bill to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 3284. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3285. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 3286. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of pension or compensation to veterans concurrently with reserve retired pay under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3287. A bill to amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that all cast iron soil pipe and fittings imported into the United States be marked with the name of the country of its origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 3289. A bill to authorize a contribution to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage

to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3290. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 3291. A bill to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 3292. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at Fort Phoenix, Fairhaven, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3293. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 3295. A bill to provide that motor vehicles sold or shipped in commerce must be equipped with seat belts which meet certain safety standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3296. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to nominate citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to be cadet-midshipmen at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3297. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 3298. A bill to equalize increases in annuity for certain employees retired before October 1, 1956, under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with the annuities of other employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3299. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3300. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 3301. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1956, in order to provide for payment for rights-of-way used for the Ainsworth unit, Missouri River Basin project, being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 3304. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3305. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 3306. A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of library facilities and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Connecticut among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3309. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3310. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3311. A bill relating to rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3312. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3314. A bill to equalize increases in annuity for certain employees retired before October 1, 1956, with the annuities of other employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to liberalize the standard for determining the earning capacity of disability annuitants and to permit the restoration of disability annuities in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3317. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3318. A bill to make the civil service retirement and disability fund available for annuity benefits authorized by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3319. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3320. A bill to extend health benefits to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 3321. A bill to implement section 4 of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3322. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3323. A bill to facilitate the transmission of electric power by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3324. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3325. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3326. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3327. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3328. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3329. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workman, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3330. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3332. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 3333. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3334. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3335. A bill to amend section 93(b)(2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3336. A bill authorizing the city of Madison, Ill., to maintain, operate, and construct toll bridges across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3337. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3338. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3339. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3340. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 in order to provide for certain educational programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 3341. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3342. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of five thousand acres in the aggregate for any project for facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3343. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3344. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 3345. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of turkeys and to assure consumers an adequate supply of turkeys and turkey products of wholesome quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3346. A bill to provide for the disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of lands within abandoned and forfeited railroad rights of way, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 3347. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 3348. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3349. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3350. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the reduction in the special aid and attendance allowance paid to seriously disabled veterans during periods of hospitalization at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 3351. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 3352. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 30 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 3353. A bill to permanently extend the Armed Forces and veterans dairy programs and the special milk program for children and to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 3354. A bill to enable the States to provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3355. A bill to authorize the renewal of expired 5-year level premium term national service life insurance where application for reinstatement is made prior to January 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3356. A bill to require notice by certified mail of the lapse of Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 3357. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States, or the transfer of a leasehold interest therein, to the city of Cheyenne, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3358. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3359. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3360. A bill to authorize a contribution to the government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. Forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3361. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to require an order, issued by a U.S. district court, to be obtained before any investigation is undertaken in connection with alleged violations of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to establish the third Thursday in August of every year as Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day in Sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D.C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution to promote through the United Nations an effective and enforceable system of worldwide disarmament and calling for a crusade for world peace and freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution that Project Hope be commended as a global demonstration of the sincerity of the people of the United States of America in being good neighbors to the people of all lands, and as another step forward in increasing good will for the people of this country throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 131. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended and to enact certain legislation in regard to the sugar industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adele Chalom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 3364. A bill for the relief of Juanito Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Silvio A. Guasti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H.R. 3366. A bill to provide for the promotion of Lt. Col. George R. L. Cole; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3367. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacqueline Gauthier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3368. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos D. Koukounas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Monica Gil-Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3370. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Montgomery Bramble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3371. A bill for the relief of George Sauter also known as Georgois Makkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil, Edward G. Trousil and Robert E. Trousil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Ligor Simyanoglu, Agavni Simyanoglu, Emilia Simyanoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3374. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Theodore C. Dros and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3376. A bill for the relief of George A. McDermott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3377. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Albert R. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3378. A bill for the relief of Eisig Metzger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3379. A bill for the relief of Irene Hryciew, Krystyna Hryciew, and Ewa Hryciew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3380. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Dwight David Eisenhower to the permanent grade of general of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3381. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Mariani and Annunziata Mariani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3382. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elethia Louise Rawlins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3383. A bill for the relief of Joseph Starker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 3384. A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Triplett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 3385. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of Wadley Research Institute of Dallas, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Berta Grinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Kwan Chung Yin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 3388. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Gromak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Zeldi Bornstayn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Barbara (Konik) Wojtusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Ranzi Y. Toutros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Karna Salmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3394. A bill for the relief of Angela DiChio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3395. A bill for the relief of Nolan Sharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3396. A bill for the relief of George Steve Eraklianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 3397. A bill for the relief of Milroad Radjevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3398. A bill for the relief of George Angelos (Filis) Philles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3399. A bill for the relief of Ivan Henec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3400. A bill to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Leif J. Sverdrup, U.S. Army Reserve (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 3401. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cairo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3402. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Spagnoletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 3403. A bill for the relief of Mihaly Matrai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3404. A bill for the relief of Elemer Christian Sarkozy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3405. A bill to authorize the retention of Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U.S. Navy, on active duty without regard to laws otherwise requiring his retirement on account of age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Arnold George Kelly and his wife, Melvina Birdyln Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esfira (Esther) Berkowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3409. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Apolonia Ocenar-Luz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

44. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Velma Edmonds and others, Salinas, Calif., relative to believing that changing the House Rules Committee would not be conducive to good, constitutional government, and respectfully demanding that the House Rules Committee be kept as is; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. William B. Franke, the Recently Resigned Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my personal appreciation—and I am sure that all Members of this body are of similar sentiment—for the dedicated and patriotic services rendered this country by William B. Franke, the recently resigned Secretary of the Navy. Such dedication in the positions of great trust which he has held should never be passed over lightly, and I should like to dwell for a moment on the background and career of this fine public servant, who can rightfully be called a self-made man.

Secretary Franke has worked selflessly, quietly, and unceasingly in various and critical defense posts for over 12 years. His dignity of character and his sound judgment have lent prestige to those positions. The razor-sharp readiness of our Navy and Marine Corps forces is evidence of the way he does this job and the devoted leadership he has provided.

Born in modest circumstances in Troy, N.Y., and educated in the public schools of that city, Secretary Franke exhibited at an early stage in life a spirit of independence and dogged ambition. While receiving accounting training at the Pace Institute of Accountancy, New York City, he provided for his own support and tuition by after-school employment. Upon graduation and successfully passing the examination for certified public accountant, Mr. Franke embarked on his business career, eventually forming his own firm in New York City. Secretary Franke first entered in Government service in 1948 when he accepted a position as a member of the U.S. Army Con-

trollers Civilian Panel. His wealth of business experience was of great advantage in this position and when he was special assistant to the Secretary of Defense in 1951–52. In 1951 he was given the Patriotic Civilian Commendation by the U.S. Army and in 1952 he was awarded the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Award. He then served as the Navy's First Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Financial Management, from October 1954 until April 1957 and as Under Secretary of the Navy from April 1957 until June 1959. He was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of the Navy and took his oath of office on June 8, 1959.

Under Secretary Franke's guidance and leadership, the Polaris weapon system became operational and has strengthened collective security throughout the free world. During his tenure with the Navy Department, Mr. Franke instituted management and fiscal practices which brought substantial savings in time and money and initiated organizational changes to make the Navy more responsive to advances in the service and technology of modern weapons systems.

I am convinced that the United States owes him a great debt for his unselfish and valuable services and I am sure the House joins me in wishing him well in the future.

Tax-Free Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the accent on youth by the administration in its search for new frontiers which, undoubtedly, will cost the taxpayers more money—it is encouraging to note that in one municipality in my Second District of New Jersey, the oldsters have so well managed municipal affairs that there are no property taxes for local government, and have been none for the past 6 years.

The Borough of Folsom in Atlantic County, N.J., had 476 residents and covers about 8 square miles. It has a mayor and six councilmen, all Republicans, serving without remuneration, some salaried officials, and a volunteer fire company.

Its annual budget is based on anticipated revenues from various sources such as six tavern licenses, municipal court fines, a portion of State gross receipts, taxes from railroad and bus franchises, State aid funds on borough roads, and interest on invested surplus. For 6 years these revenues have been sufficient to meet all local government expenses and, hence, no tax rate for local purposes has been necessary.

The mayor, Jack Eckhardt, has been in office since 1937, and a member of borough council since 1930. Council members are Theodore Whitmyer, councilman since 1929; Paul Hile, councilman on and off since 1931; Albert Gandolfi, councilman since 1949; William Kiger, councilman since 1953; Hugh Wilkinson, councilman since 1945; Joseph Ingemi, councilman since 1955.

This is the kind of success story in government that is convincing proof that our system can work for the benefit of the taxpayer. The governing officials, the mayor and council of Folsom are deserving of great credit and commendation for their service to American government, and for the encouragement they have given to the American taxpayers.

In passing, it is interesting to note the comment of Florence M. A. Fair, a very capable correspondent for the Atlantic City Press in publishing the story when she concludes as follows, after telling of the early history of the borough: "The very early minutes of the council show a motion that may well be part of the answer as to why there are no taxes for local purposes. It was noted that a complaint was received in a communication. A motion was made by a councilman and seconded and then was passed in regular procedure to throw it in the waste basket. Who knows, maybe we all complain too much."

Perhaps constituents and Congressmen could give thought to the admonition contained in the last sentence.

The 1960 Review of National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Progress and Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee I am submitting herewith a part of the report to Congress by the President of the United States on the progress and accomplishments of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, January 1 to December 31, 1960.

The accomplishments of the past year in scientific exploration of outer space through the successful launching of highly instrumental satellites such as Tiros I, Tiros II, Pioneer V, and Explorer VII have revealed the ability of man to penetrate the outer reaches of space and to use this vast area to his benefit for peaceful purposes hitherto unknown. There remains, however, much to be done to make practical use of the discoveries we have made which will eventually lead to interplanetary travel and communications.

I am confident the Members of the House will find this information both interesting reading and valuable reference:

In 1960, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which directs the Nation's nonmilitary space effort, moved out of its formative stage, accelerating its space research and development and its fundamental aeronautical research programs. Adding breadth and depth to the near-term objectives, a long-range U.S. plan of space exploration—which envisions manned expeditions to the moon after 1970—was developed and set in motion.

At the year's end, preparations for the first manned suborbital flight in NASA's Project Mercury were nearing the final stages. The agency plans to launch astronauts on both suborbital and orbital flights during 1961. Another very high priority NASA project, Saturn was progressing satisfactorily as static testing of the clustered 1.5-million-pound-thrust engine went forward.

Among other significant activities, NASA and Department of Defense earth-satellite, space-probe, and sounding-rocket programs moved ahead, along with construction of tracking and data-collection networks.

NASA and the Department of Defense established an aeronautics and astronautics coordinating board with cochairmen from the two agencies.

NASA made headway with other elements of its launch vehicle program as the first of a small fleet of standardized units, tailored specifically for space mission, approached the flight-test phase. They will replace interim launch vehicles, evolved or modified from models designed originally either for Department of Defense programs or for Project Vanguard.

NASA's aeronautical program was highlighted by performances of the rocket-powered X–15 experimental airplane which achieved world speed (2,196 m.p.h.) and altitude (136,500 feet) records. The agency continued advanced research and development work on VTOL (Vertical Take-Off and Landing) and on STOL (Short Take-Off and Landing) aircraft.

In U.S. field centers and stations, basic research continued in many areas, including: Advanced instrumentation and propulsion, combustion, plasmas, cryogenics, special materials, and structures for future airplanes and spacecraft.

Early in the year, NASA established the Office for the United Nations Conference to direct this country's participation in the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Several space projects were carried out jointly with other nations; agreements were made with foreign governments; and discussions were held with various foreign scientists and groups concerning further cooperative space research activities.

To date (December 31, 1960), the United States had successfully launched 31 earth satellites and 4 deep space probes; of these, 16 satellites are still circling the earth and 2 probes are in orbit around the sun. Data accruing from NASA and Department of Defense (DOD) programs during 1960 added substantially to the growing body of scientific knowledge of space and to the technology of space applications.

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

NASA activities

During the year, NASA launched four satellites into orbit and one space probe.

The NASA space flight program was highlighted by the successes of the Echo I passive communications satellite and of the Tiros I and Tiros II experimental weather satellites (which pointed the way to operational systems having practical applications) as well as by achievements of Pioneer V, the sunorbiting spacecraft, and Explorer VIII, an ionosphere-probing earth satellite.

The 1-ton, bellshaped Project Mercury capsule and its escape tower underwent numerous flight tests, culminating in an unmanned, suborbital flight launched by a Redstone on December 19.

The seven Mercury astronauts continued their training schedule, to prepare for the first manned (Redstone) suborbital flight and the first manned (Atlas) orbital flight,

both planned for 1961. At the same time, construction of the worldwide Mercury Tracking and Ground Instrumentation Network approached completion. Formal agreements for all NASA tracking stations abroad had either been signed or were near conclusion as 1960 ended.

The NASA Pioneer V space probe achieved the orbit around the sun which NASA scientists had calculated. It transmitted invaluable scientific data on the phenomena of deep space, while establishing the greatest range—22,462,740 miles from the earth—over which radio contact has been maintained with a spacecraft.

NASA's Tiros I, an experimental meteorological satellite, transmitted 22,592 photographs of cloud cover and other weather phenomena after attaining a nearly circular orbit with an altitude averaging approximately 450 miles.

Echo I, the world's first passive communications (or radio mirror) satellite, also achieved a nearly circular orbit, averaging about 1,000 miles in altitude. The inflatable sphere was used for numerous communications experiments, including two-way telephone conversations, transatlantic signal relays, and transmission of facsimiles, photographs, and music.

Explorer VIII was launched by NASA into an orbit enabling it to carry out the first intensive direct measurement study of the earth's ionosphere. The data are being analyzed and related to earlier information.

Cloud pattern photographs and radiation data from Tiros II, an advanced version of Tiros I, are still being analyzed.

The X–15 rocket-powered airplane (No. 1)—a joint NASA-Air Force-Navy project—set a new world's speed record of 2,196 m.p.h. with NASA test pilot Joseph A. Walker at the controls. With Air Force Maj. Robert M. White in the cockpit, the aircraft flew to a record altitude of 136,500 feet.

In March, all administrative and technical responsibilities for the Saturn, the powerful 1.5-million-pound-thrust, clustered-engine launch vehicle, were transferred from the Department of Defense to NASA.

Saturn satisfactorily completed a first series of static tests when the prototype first stage was fired for 2 minutes and 2 seconds at Marshall Space Flight Center.

In addition, NASA carried out many upper atmosphere experiments with sounding rockets.

Successful U.S. satellites and space probes, 1960

Name	Launch date and lifetime	Dimensions	Shape	Weight	Type	Perigee	Apogee
				Pounds		*Miles*	*Miles*
Pioneer V (1960 Alpha)	Mar. 11, 1960 (100,000 years)	26-inch diameter	Spherical	94.8	Planetoid in solar orbit.	[1] 74,967,000	[2] 92,358,000
Tiros I (1960 Beta 2)	Apr. 1, 1960 (50 to 100 years in orbit).	19 inches high; 42 inches in diameter.	Cylindrical	270	Satellite	435	468
Transit IB (1960 Gamma 2)	Apr. 13, 1960 (16 months)	36-inch diameter	Spherical	265	do	233	479
Discoverer XI (1960 Delta)	Apr. 15–26, 1960	19.2 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	Cylindrical	1,700	do	109	380
Midas II (1960 Zeta 1)	May 24, 1960 (40 months)	22 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	do	4,500	do	292	322
Transit IIA (1960 Eta 1)	June 22, 1960 (50 years)	36-inch diameter	Spherical	223	do	389	665
Solar radiation satellite (1960 Eta 2)	do	20-inch diameter	do	42	do	382	667
Discoverer XIII (1960 Theta)	Aug. 10, 1960–Nov. 14, 1960	19.2 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	Cylindrical	1,700	do	161	436
Echo I (1960 Iota 1)	Aug. 12, 1960 (indefinite)	100-foot diameter	Spherical	136	do	945	1,049
Discoverer XIV (1960 Kappa)	Aug. 18, 1960–Sept. 16, 1960	19.2 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	Cylindrical	1,700	do	116	502
Discoverer XV (1960 Mu)	Sept. 13, 1960–Oct. 18, 1960	19.2 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	do	1,700	do	130	472
Courier 1B (1960 Nu 1)	Oct. 4, 1960 (several years)	51-inch diameter	Spherical	500	do	501	658
Explorer VIII (1960 Xi 1)	Nov. 3, 1960 (10 years)	30 inches long; 30 inches in diameter.	Biconical	90.14	do	258	1,423
Discoverer XVII (1960 Omicron)	Nov. 12, 1960–Dec. 29, 1960	25 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	Cylindrical	2,100	do	116	616
Tiros II (1960 Pi 1)	Nov. 23, 1960 (50 to 100 years)	19 inches high; 42 inches in diameter.	do	280	do	387	453
Discoverer XVIII (1960 Sigma)	Dec. 7, 1960 (1 month)	25 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	do	2,100	do	154	459
Discoverer XIX (1960 Tau)	Dec. 20, 1960 (1 month)	25 feet long; 5 feet in diameter	do	2,100	do	120	400

[1] Perihelion. [2] Aphelion.

Department of Defense activities

During the year, the Department of Defense continued intensive effort on its Discoverer program. For the first time in history, a man-made object was recovered from space after it had orbited the earth, when a Discoverer capsule was retrieved from the Pacific Ocean on August 11. Later in the year, three more capsules were recovered in mid-air—a far more difficult operation—by aircraft equipped with special slings.

Other important firsts included feasibility demonstrations by navigation (Transit) and communications relay (Courier) satellites.

Twenty-one launch attempts were made, with 12 successfully attaining orbit.

Included among key Defense Department projects were:

1. GREB (Galactic Radiation Experiment Background), a solar radiation experiment satellite launched pick-a-back on Transit in a multiple payload experiment.

2. Notus, a communications system program of which the Courier launching (above) was a part.

3. Shepherd, a program to obtain a space surveillance tracking system.

4. Longsight, a project to find and remedy serious short- and long-term gaps in study and research relating to foreseen military needs in space technology.

5. Samos—a program to determine the capabilities for making observations of the earth from satellites.

6. Vela, a project whose objective is a system for detecting nuclear explosions.

7. Saint (satellite inspector system) program, intended to develop and demonstrate a rendezvous and inspection satellite.

8. Lorraine, devoted to advanced energy conversion.

9. Blue Scout, a project to develop and standardize an economical, versatile, and reliable test vehicle.

10. Midas, a satellite-borne missile-defense alarm system.

11. Dynasoar, a project to construct and test a manned, maneuverable aerospace vehicle that will explore hypersonic flight approaching orbital speeds. To this project NASA is contributing research services.

Summary of other Government space-related programs

The following space-related work went forward in other Government agencies:

The Atomic Energy Commission continued cooperation with NASA on project Rover, directed toward attaining nuclear rocket propulsion; and project Snap, a series of nuclear-generated auxiliary electric power systems for spacecraft.

The Department of State was active in matters related to the emerging political and legal problems of space. In all activities, which have ranged from participation in United Nations General Assembly meetings to nongovernmental scientific meetings, the United States has pursued its national policy of fostering international cooperation in space research and exploration, and in seeking effective international control of outer space activities.

The National Science Foundation forged ahead with its policy of supporting basic research of a pioneering nature. The foundation made a number of grants to nonprofit institutions for the support of research projects proposed by staff scientists of the institutions involved.

The Department of Commerce, through the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, participated in many aspects of the space program.

The Space Science Board pursued its endeavors in both domestic and foreign space programs. General study groups were convened to consider specific problems, and a report, entitled "Science in Space," issued in nine separate pamphlets, was distributed in the United States and abroad. The Board's international activities were carried out mostly through COSPAR (Committee on Space Research).

The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, under a NASA grant, continued its technical direction and related responsibilities of the Baker-Nunn Optical Tracking Network.

The Federal Communications Commission increased its activities, both domestic and international, in the fields of space communication, radio astronomy, and aeronautics. Progress was made toward implementing the 1959 Geneva Radio Regulations which provide specific frequencies for space communications research and radio astronomy.

The U.S. Information Agency issued news releases, photographs, pamphlets, magazine reprints, and employed a variety of communications media—including radio, television, motion pictures, and exhibits—to disseminate information abroad on space activities of the United States.

International cooperation in space

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 stipulates that NASA should cooperate "with other nations and groups of nations" in aeronautics and space activities "and in the peaceful applications of the results thereof."

In keeping with this policy, NASA requested negotiation of formal agreements with other nations for establishment of U.S. tracking stations abroad; made available to foreign scientists, through COSPAR, data from several U.S. experiments such as Echo I and Tiros II; entered upon joint space projects with scientific organizations of several countries and initiated discussions leading toward more such projects; and es-

tablished the Office for the United Nations Conference, to serve as a focal point—with guidance from the Department of State—for U.S. participation in the First International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Summary evaluation of U.S. space goals and problem areas

During 1960, the practical benefits of space research—especially in the fields of meteorology and communications—came into sharper focus. At the same time, experiments in other areas continued to add to the immense store of significant scientific data. (For example, when Explorer VIII's transmission ended on December 27, it had produced 700 miles of magnetic tape, now being analyzed.)

After consolidating its organization, NASA began implementing its long-range plan with the full resources at its command. Beyond the strict research and development aspect, the Agency's Committee on Long Range Studies arranged for four studies centering on wide-ranging socioeconomic and political implications of space activities.

The basic problem areas of 1959—lack of high-thrust launch vehicles designed specifically for space missions, lack of reliability in space experiments, etc.—were still in evidence as 1960 ended. But new, standardized launch vehicles had been developed and soon would be operational. Progress was also being made in development of midcourse and terminal guidance equipment and techniques. Research into the performance of materials and fuels in the temperature extremes and stresses of space flight, and development of technology for deep space flight technology were productive.

In sum, despite setbacks to be expected in any new, highly active and complex research field, the civilian and military space programs of the United States had to their credit many noteworthy scientific achievements as well as a respectable list of sound technical accomplishments. Together with their implications, the year's developments forecast that the United States will exercise dynamic and fruitful leadership as men range deeper and deeper into new dimensions of space exploration.

A Bill To Prevent the Use of Stopwatches in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service.

The Post Office Department now has in effect a system known as the distribution guides program which was developed to let the employee know just how he is doing. However, I am certain the Department did not go to all the trouble of developing a program merely to let an employee know just how well he was doing or was not doing. From all indications, this is at best a speedup system.

When time and motion studies are made in private industry, employees are consulted through their union representatives. Therefore, if the Post Office Department had been sincerely interested in the employees' welfare, employee representatives and employees represented could have been consulted to work out a suitable program.

I commend this legislation to the serious study of my colleagues.

Too Much Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star on yesterday carried two articles which dealt both objectively and directly with the question of just how much longer the American public can be expected to tolerate the tactics of irresponsible labor groups such as the tugboat strike which last week all but shut down all traffic in and out of New York City.

In his daily column "The Political Mill," Gould Lincoln, in conjecturing the extent of new labor legislation under the Kennedy regime, makes this observation:

The Kennedy administration already has had an indication of the stranglehold which organized labor holds over the daily lives of millions of people—the strike of 664 railroad and ferryboat tug workers, members of three maritime unions, operating in New York particularly. Picket lines established by them prevented the operation of railroad trains by the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroad systems. The issue was, in the parlance of the unions, job security. The employers demanded in a new contract the right to determine how many workers they needed to operate the tugboats. Involved was the whole question of featherbedding which has plagued the railroads for years—the payment of employes not actually engaged in or needed for certain tasks. The end of the 2-week strike came after a decision to postpone a decision on this issue until next December when a President's commission is to make its report on railroad manpower problems. President Kennedy's new Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, played an effective part in the strike settlement. The settlement, however, merely postpones the issue. In the meantime what will be the direction of the administration toward this New Frontier?

Supplementing Mr. Lincoln's observation the Star, in an editorial relative to the New York tugboat strike entitled "The Public Be Damned," made this relevant query:

If the combined Herculean efforts of Secretary Goldberg, Republican Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner were able to produce a fair settlement of this strike 2 weeks after it had begun, why was not this dispute settled at the outset? Why should 100,000 commuters be stranded and put through the wringer because 664 strikers and their employers couldn't agree on whether a tugboat should be manned by 5 crewmen?

The same editorial then went on to point out how utterly futile this much touted action at all levels of government actually was:

The answer is that the public interest is being trampled on in disputes of this kind, disputes which can shut down a facility or service of vital importance to the public. It is a latter-day version of the old public-be-damned attitude. And we see nothing in the reported versions of the New York settlement which really gets down to this problem. For all the settlement does, if the news reports are right, is to postpone the issue and the fight until next December. After that, we suppose, the commuters can sweat it out all over again.

The Star finally editorializes on what is needed; namely, the absolute proscription of strikes in public utilities or related industries and makes this emphatic recommendation:

What is needed is recognition that strikes in public utilities or related industries are not really clashes between labor and management. Actually, they are strikes against the public—strikes which inflict so much punishment on the public that something finally has to give. We think that such strikes ought to be forbidden by law, and that it should be obligatory to submit such disputes to binding arbitration. The New York experience suggests, if Mr. Goldberg is right, that it is not necessary to convert the public into a whipping boy before a reasonable settlement can be reached.

Finally, Mr Speaker, too much stress cannot be placed on the fact that irresponsible actions like those are not arguments between labor and management but are actually a despotic, dictatorial, and arbitrary flouting of the public interest and constitute an undeserved punishment on the American people. There was one bright spot, however, in this latest trampling on the rights of free citizens. Most of the trainmen of the Pennsylvania Railroad refused to recognize these arrogant pickets and to their eternal credit they kept the trains running. God bless them, but have mercy on all of us if something is not done, and quickly, to protect us from a repetition of such irresponsibility.

The State of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the New York Times printed an editorial entitled "Kennedy and the Recession." I replied to that editorial with a letter to the editors of the New York Times which was printed on January 14. I should like at this time to enter the editorial and my letter about it in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1961]

MR. KENNEDY AND THE RECESSION

The key domestic problem that will face the Kennedy administration when it takes over later this month is obviously the current recession. Yesterday's publication of the report of the group headed by Professor Samuelson provides the first extensive statement of the new administration's thinking in this field. Both the President-elect and the Nation are in debt to the authors of this responsible and realistic document. Both in basic philosophy and in detailed suggestions

the Samuelson report gives evidence of informed understanding of the problems we face and of willingness to take needed action. Yet at the same time the report does not dodge the dangers that could arise if action were taken recklessly.

We are now in a period of contraction of economic activity whose significance is increased because it comes so relatively soon—in terms of post-World War II experience—after the 1958 recession. Even if an upturn in the current recession comes relatively quickly, the more basic fact of the sluggish and tired behavior of the American economy in recent years remains a problem.

The Samuelson report's prescription is markedly cautious. The crux of our economic problem is obviously the deficiency in demand for goods and services as compared with our productive potential. On the optimistic assumption that much of this deficiency will be made up later this year by a reversal in the private economy—particularly a turn toward rebuilding of inventories—the immediate suggestions made are for a series of relatively modest actions to increase demand by increasing Government spending by an amount estimated at no more than $5 billion—that is, about 1 percent of the Nation's annual total output. Given the existing substantial level of unused human and material productive capacity, such increased spending seems to pose little danger of setting an inflationary spiral in motion.

Like good strategists, however, the report's authors have not looked away from the darker possibility that the optimistic assumptions about revival of private demand may prove false. The second line of defense to be used later, if it should prove necessary, is a proposal similar to that made in 1958 by President Eisenhower's former chief economic adviser, Prof. Arthur R. Burns, a proposal which this newspaper endorsed at that time. This is a temporary tax cut of 3 or 4 percent, which could be applied quickly through the withholding system if proper legislation were passed. Such a move would quickly increase the spendable income in the hands of the public and act as a stimulus to increasing private demand.

Implicit in all this, of course, is a willingness to incur budgetary deficits if required by cyclical downturns of the economy. For those to whom such willingness seems radical, it should be pointed out that the Eisenhower administration, without taking any very drastic remedial action to combat the 1958 recession, nevertheless suffered a deficit of more than $12 billion in the fiscal year 1959.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 14, 1961]

DYNAMIC ECONOMY SEEN—INDICATORS, IT IS DECLARED, FAIL TO REFLECT REAL GROWTH

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your January 7 editorial titled "Kennedy and the Recession" contains this statement: "Even if an upturn in the current recession comes relatively quickly, the more basic fact of the sluggish and tired behavior of the economy in recent years remains a problem."

The term "sluggish and tired behavior" is not an economic term; at best it is a political term and, therefore, has little business in an editorial which seeks to discuss economics.

However, the economic indicators reveal that the economy, far from being "sluggish and tired," whatever interpretation an economist might place upon such purple prose, is quite dynamic and has been quite dynamic in recent years.

Technological advancement has been so rapid that the rate of frictional unemployment has continued to rise in the face of a rapidly rising gross national product. The rising rate of unemployment is the result of dynamism, not sluggishness, as an analysis of it reveals.

The greatest incidence of unemployment is among the unskilled and the semiskilled because technological advancement has been rapidly eliminating the need for unskilled and semiskilled labor. There is a great unfulfilled need for new skills at the same time we have this rise in technological unemployment.

SHIFT IN SECTORS OF ECONOMY

Furthermore, our society is showing a great shift from employment in the manufacturing and agricultural sectors to the service and distributive sectors of the economy. Manufacturing and agricultural employment has both actually declined in percentage and absolute numbers while manufacturing and agricultural production has increased. Yet, even during the periods of increased unemployment, the employment figures in services and distributive fields have increased.

The Kennedy administration has urged that we double the amount of money we spend on education in the next 10 years. Why the slowdown? We doubled the amount of money spent in education in the past 8 years. Money spent in education and research and development is the surest way to be certain that our society remains dynamic and moves ahead and yet money spent here shows up poorly in the GNP indicator. Moneys spent enlarging capital plant loom large in the GNP indicators.

The observers who suggest that our economy is sluggish and tired are those whose eyes have been riveted to the GNP indicator as a test of economic growth. It is a valuable tool, but it is a poor measure of real economic growth in a dynamic economy, for the reasons I have stated, and for other reasons besides.

NATIONAL PRODUCT'S DECLINE

A great deal of real economic growth is shift, particularly as an economy matures. The shift from manufacturing to services indicates real economic growth, yet probably if it (just the shift) could be measured, it would show a decline in GNP.

A shift from building capital plant to research and development would certainly show a decline in GNP. So would a shift from school construction to teachers' salaries. Furthermore, much of real economic growth is increased quality.

A flight from Washington to St. Louis now takes less than 3 hours; a few years ago it took over 5 hours. At the same time, there has been a great increase of choice of flights in the flight schedules. Increased quality and choice are the essence of real economic growth, yet they show up little in our economic indicators.

The Times can argue if it wishes that our economy is sluggish and tired. It certainly flies in the face of even a casual observation of the American scene. But please state it not as a basic fact but as a hypothesis of the present school of economic pessimists.

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

WASHINGTON, *January 9, 1961.*

The Rapidly Growing Shortage of Physicians, Dentists, and Other Health Workers in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of the House to the rapidly growing shortage of physicians, dentists, and other health workers in the United States. The shortage stems largely from three developments in American life—the rapid population growth, with the greatest increase in the younger and older age groups which require most medical service; from increased demands for medical service; and from the expansions in medical research which require more physicians.

In my discussions of the dimensions of the problem, I have urged the House to move swiftly in two specific directions—first, to provide Federal financial assistance in the expansion of existing professional schools and to aid in the construction of the needed new schools, and, second, to provide medical and dental scholarships.

Today I will add a third part to the program for increasing the supply of physicians and other health personnel in order to protect the maintenance of our present health standards and to safeguard our investment in medical research and medical care facilities.

The bill I am introducing would make possible Federal grants to augment basic operating incomes of our schools of medicine and dentistry. I have not included schools of public health in these provisions because operating grants already are available to those schools under the provisions of the Rhodes Act, which was enacted by the 85th Congress.

Coupled with aid for the expansion and construction of teaching plants and with the provision of scholarships for worthy, qualified students, financial assistance from the Federal Government to assist in meeting operating costs will go a long way toward meeting most of the future needs of medical and dental schools. A strong point should be made that financial assistance made available to the schools under this bill would be used to supplement, and in no way replace, the existing incomes and resources of the schools.

As most of you know, the increasing difficulties encountered by the medical schools in meeting expenses has been a matter of wide concern for some time. Several years ago, under the aegis of the American Medical Association, the American Medical Education Foundation was set up to channel physicians' contributions to the medical schools. Similarly, the National Fund for Medical Education was established to solicit the financial assistance of industry for medical education. A number of foundations also have helped. These efforts have been highly commendable; yet despite very substantial assistance, they have fallen far short of meeting the need. Moreover, much of such aid has gone to the better known and better financed schools, rather than to those in the worst straits.

The basic operating incomes of our medical schools range from $5 million to less than $800,000 a year. These differences do not represent differences in the number of students—indeed some of the largest schools are in the lower range—but rather the differences in the financial resources of the schools. I am told by authorities on the subject that to meet today's standards of teaching and

staffing, an annual operating budget of about $1.5 million to $2 million is essential. This means that more than a third of the schools are struggling along on emergency level budgets.

The situation is well described in the report of the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Medical Education. The consultants wrote:

> Although many factors besides funds available affect the quality of the teaching program, nevertheless, one of the most serious problems of medical education today is the underfinanced school. * * * The underfinanced schools are hard pressed to maintain an educational program within minimal requirements. In the meantime, the expansion of knowledge both in breadth and depth has raised the desirable standards of medical education above the minimum required for accreditation. Continued underfinancing of some of the medical schools will make it impossible for these schools to meet desirable standards of medical education.

The Surgeon General's consultant group also found that while tuition and fees make up an important source of income in some medical schools, overall they cover at best a declining proportion of operating expenses. For medical schools as a whole, tuition and fees in 1941, for example, accounted for 32 percent of basic operating budgets, in 1948 for 23 percent, and currently to around 12 percent. Meanwhile, while the schools' relative income from tuition and fees has declined, the actual expenditures per medical student has increased sharply.

It would seem ironic—if it were not so dangerous—to remain complacent about this serious problem at a time when we so desperately need more, not less, medical schools, and more rather than fewer physicians.

Among our schools of dentistry, expenses have more than doubled in the past decade. Moreover, little in the way of private support has come to the aid of dental schools whose gifts, grants, and direct income from endowments are negligible. In fact, I have been told that for every $75 received by the medical schools from endowment income, the dental schools receive only $1.

Yet, in dentistry the situation with regard to supply is even worse than in medicine. The ratio of dentists to population is now lower than it was 30 years ago, despite the increasing demands for dental services. To meet only the needs associated with population growth will require that the number of graduates be increased by some 2,700 a year, or about a 75-percent increase in training capacity. Obviously we cannot hope to achieve anything near this without substantial Federal assistance both in the construction of teaching facilities and in the meeting of operating costs.

The legislation I am proposing today calls for action on the part of the Congress to assist schools of medicine—including osteopathy—and schools of dentistry in meeting their operating costs up to but not exceeding 50 percent. As I stated earlier, these funds would supplement and could not be used to replace funds currently being used.

Specifically, this legislation would provide for annual block grants to each school for a period of 10 years, plus an additional amount based on the number of students enrolled. Eligibility for this Federal assistance would be confined to public and nonprofit institutions within the United States and exempt from Federal income tax.

The proposed legislation calls for:

First. A block grant of $100,000 a year to each school of medicine and dentistry which provides training leading to a medical or dental degree. To schools offering only 1, 2, or 3 years of such training, grants of $25,000, $50,000, or $75,000 would be paid annually.

Second. Annual payments of $500 to all schools of medicine and dentistry for each student enrolled.

Third. An additional payment of $500 to the schools for each student enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment. This additional payment would be computed on the basis of limitations set forth in the legislation.

Fourth. Establishing in the Public Health Service a National Council on Education for Health Professions to advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and on policy matters arising in the administration of these grants. Ex officio members of this council would be the Surgeon General, as Chairman, and the Commissioner of Education. Ten additional members would be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from leaders in the fields of health, science, education, or public affairs. Four of the ten would be persons active in the fields of health profession education.

I urge your rapid consideration of this bill as a companion to the legislation I have already introduced for Federal assistance in the construction of health education facilities and in the provision of scholarships for the health professions. If favorable action is taken early by the Congress to make this assistance available, we may still be in time to avert the shortage of doctors and dentists which looms over us and which would indeed prove a national disaster.

The Washington Peace Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Civil War Commission, as a part of its centennial program, will on Sunday, February 5, 1961, at 4 p.m., at a special service to be held at the Washington Cathedral in Washington, D.C., dedicate a memorial plaque to the Washington Peace Convention. This plaque which is being donated by the Virginia Civil War Commission, will at a later date be installed near the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance to the Willard Hotel.

I hope that the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as the Members of the Senate and other interested parties, may find it convenient to attend this dedication ceremony. As vice chairman of the National Civil War Centennial Commission and at the request of the Virginia Civil War Commission, I am delighted to extend to you a cordial invitation to attend.

Dr. Francis Pendleton Gaines, chancellor of Washington and Lee University, and who recently retired as president of that institution, will be the principal speaker in the ceremonies at the cathedral. Dr. Gaines is recognized as one of the Nation's outstanding speakers.

The text of the memorial plaque is as follows:

THE PEACE CONVENTION

The old Willard Hotel was the scene of the last major effort to restore the Union and prevent the Civil War. At Virginia's invitation, delegates from 21 to the then 34 States met in secret session from February 4 to 27, 1861, in a vain attempt to solve the difference between the North and South. To honor those who worked for peace and unity this memorial is erected by the Virginia Civil War Commission, February 1961.

The Peace Convention was called by Virginia. Twenty-one of the then 34 States sent delegates to this assembly in a last desperate attempt to prevent war. The movement was led by former President John Tyler, who served as President of the United States from 1841 to 1845. It was the last visit that President Tyler ever made to Washington, for a short time later, he was elected to membership in the Confederate States Congress of America and died in Richmond, Va., while serving as a member of that body.

The Peace Convention met in the old Willard Hotel from February 4 to February 27, 1861. The solution adopted by the Peace Convention and the Crittenden compromise proposal were both rejected by the U.S. Senate and the Civil War began less than 2 months later. The Peace Convention headed by President Tyler represented the last united effort and constituted the last opportunity for peace among the people of our Nation.

In my judgment, it is highly appropriate that we should pause to commemorate the efforts of John Tyler and these other patriotic Americans, both North and South, and many of whom on both sides gave their full measure of support to this movement to establish peace and thus prevent a cleavage and a catastrophic civil war. If the statesmanship of John Tyler and other leaders of that convention had succeeded we could have avoided this gory strife and warfare which brought so much grief to both sides, particularly to the States of the South.

May the example of these statesmen and the spirit which prevailed amongst them serve as a lesson to us of the present generation and constitute the foundation upon which we build. It behooves us therefore to join in paying tribute to all of those who in the darkening days prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, rose above selfish and local interest and the onrushing tide of fanaticism and hatred.

Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, Chairman of the National Civil War Centennial Commission, has issued a public statement likewise calling attention to the

historical importance of the peace conference wherein he said:

I praise Virginia for taking the lead in paying tribute to these men for their honest attempt to avoid one of the most deadly wars in history. This State not only originated the convention, but she supplied the leadership. Her delegation was headed by the distinguished American, John Tyler, a veteran diplomat who despite his advanced age paced this meeting. It is symbolic and praiseworthy that a State that later played such a leading role in the war should have taken such a prominent part in trying to avert it.

Kennedy-Meany-Reuther Program: A Ruinous One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, labor leaders, who came up with so many votes contributing to Kennedy's success, naturally are now seeking their reward through the enactment of legislation which will give special benefits to union members at the expense of all.

Essentially, they suggest we reduce the tax levied upon lower income employees, spend additional millions of your money for school construction, the payment of teachers' salaries, help to distressed areas, medical care for the aged, public works, increased unemployment benefits, to name just a few and, in addition, the enactment of a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour.

Dr. Samuelson, head of Kennedy's task force, advised Congress to: Stimulate economy by spending an extra $3 to $5 million a month. If spending does not do the trick, then make a temporary tax cut, but continue pumping additional money into circulation.

The program is as old as civilization. It never solved a problem. It was tried in Pharaoh's time, the Romans tried price fixing and government control in A.D. 301. Subsequently, other nations endeavored to end their economic troubles by putting more of whatever passed for dollars into circulation. It always failed.

For years, those who believe that nature's laws cannot be ignored, that supply and demand must be recognized as a regulatory force, those who are convinced that only through work and thrift, observance of the Golden Rule, can any people enjoy freedom, prosperity and contentment, have tried to prevent disaster.

Still visualize the picture in one of my childhood books, showing money authorized by Congress, but without purchasing power, pasted on a dog. Out of that incident grew the expression "not worth a continental."

Today, some of the results of our unsound spending policy are with us. "The chickens are coming home to roost."

Even some so-called liberals and spenders, like Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, who for some time, with others, has been enthusiastically engaged in spending other people's money for desirable but unnecessary things, is, through political spectacles, beginning to see the result.

Recently the Senator denounced the recommendations of Dr. Samuelson, some of which were quite similar to the Senator's previous ideas. The Senator in effect said the Samuelson report meant a deliberately planned deficit. Added that we should not take on the problem of persuading Congress to spend for spending's sake—to deliberately unbalance the budget. A Democrat Congress has been doing just that and harvesting votes.

We can assume the Senator has become convinced that his former views are unsound, though there is some suggestion that the folks back home, upon whom we all depend for our jobs, have been taking him into the woodshed.

Naturally, like you, I have a personal interest in the matter, for the purchasing power of every dollar which the good wife and I have earned and saved has been cut in half. Moreover, almost daily some letters from one group, then another—those of this week from Federal employees retired years ago—who, because the cost of living has gone up, now insist that Federal benefits be increased so they may purchase as much as in the years gone by. A remedy which will increase—not lower—prices.

The real remedy is obvious. Less spending. A little more judgment in selecting purchases, pleasures, a little less gadding about from here to there, not knowing the reason for our haste nor just how we are to use the time "saved."

A little more work, a little more thrift, a little less advice from those who in Washington and the State capitols seem to think they are magicians, can make something worthwhile out of nothing, will be helpful.

United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the United Service Organizations, Inc., on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. For a score of years the USO has contributed in innumerable ways to the morale and well-being of millions of young American men and women in our Armed Forces all over the world.

The USO is known and esteemed by millions of Americans as a federation of volunteer service agencies representing all major religious faiths. This distinguished organization merits the gratitude of the entire American people for its services to the religious, spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational needs of our men and women in the Armed Forces. The USO represents a stabilizing link between our young service people, most of them away from home for the first time, and the wholesome influences of family, community, church, and school.

Through its many services to the morale and well-being of our service men and women, the USO contributes significantly to the mission of our Armed Forces in guarding the peace and security of the United Staes. It is fitting, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we pay tribute to the USO for its many services to the American people while expressing the hope that its work of the past 20 years will be continued for many score more.

The Need for a House Rules Committee Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few brief moments to express my gratitude and appreciation to our beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, for his able leadership in the present struggle to change the House Rules Committee and assure passage of the legislative program of the Kennedy administration. The Speaker can certainly not be accused of being partisan. He has the interests of the whole country at heart. He is first and foremost an American—and a great American, at that. I wish some of his opponents in this struggle would follow his example and place the country's interests ahead of their own narrow and partisan views.

I wonder whether the Members who are opposing this rule change realize who our enemy in the world really is. Is it communism? Is it dictatorship? Communists and dictators by themselves could never appeal to the hearts and minds of human beings throughout the world, regardless of their race, color or creed, because every man who is free wants to remain free, while those who are not free want to remove the shackles that enslave them. The real enemy often lies within ourselves—our failure to comprehend a serious situation, our failure to act decisively when action is needed, our lack of national unity which weakens and undermines our position.

Hitler, before he came into power by a coup, could never muster a majority of the people behind him. Unfortunately, those opposed to him were never able to get together to present a united front against him and his henchmen—and that made it possible for him to attain power. So it was with Mussolini, and so it has been in every country where dictators or the Communists rose to power.

This country is not different, and we are not immune from such events.

When Democrats and Republicans fail to get together on issues such as this to give a new administration a fair chance to enact its legislative program which affects the lives and the security of all our citizens, then we make way for those who would destroy us to step in. When we cannot show other nations desiring to be free and independent that we ourselves can act in unison as a nation, we shatter the natural hopes and aspirations of these peoples and we forfeit our privilege to lead them.

Helpless people, weak people, whether they like it or not, cannot fight alone against the organized and systematic infiltration of a powerful enemy. To people all over the world, America is their only hope for freedom and a life of human dignity. If we fail them, we fail ourselves, too.

So this issue of a change in the Rules Committee runs deeper and beyond the boundary lines of Mississippi, North Carolina, or any other State in the Union. The issue, likewise, runs beyond narrow partisan lines. In the long run it involves the survival of the United States as a free nation able to formulate its own destiny, as in the past. Let us, therefore, recognize this issue in all its ramifications—not only in terms of today, but in terms also of tomorrow; not only in terms of certain regional or partisan viewpoints, but in the larger scope of the interests of the entire Nation, its obligations to the free world, and its position of leadership.

I urge all of you to cast your vote on this issue, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans. I urge you to cast your vote to give the new administration a fair opportunity to launch its program on the domestic and international scenes so that our Nation can regain the initiative in every sphere of endeavor. I call on you to stand behind President Kennedy and Speaker RAYBURN at this crucial moment in our history.

President Kennedy's Views Toward Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that the press has been engaged in a great deal of speculation about various aspects of President Kennedy's foreign policy.

Today I take the liberty of including for the attention of my colleagues excerpts from remarks made by President Kennedy during the recent campaign when he addressed the Polish-American Congress in Chicago on October 1 of last year.

I hope the program that President Kennedy had outlined as a candidate for this office will assist those who are today speculating about the future and who did not have an opportunity to hear this very penetrating speech.

Mr. Kennedy's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY AT THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 1, 1960

Our task is to pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny—a policy that looks toward evolution, not revolution—a policy that depends on peace, not war.

More is involved than our policy toward Poland alone. We must show in West Berlin that we have no intentions of yielding to false Soviet claims or fierce Soviet threats—that we believe history will in time yield a free and united Berlin and a free and united Europe. We must convince the Russians that we are rebuilding our defensive strength so that the route of military force can no longer be open to them. And we must prove to the men in Moscow that colonialism is doomed everywhere in the world, including Eastern Europe.

But the next administration must also devise a specific policy for Poland and Eastern Europe—and I would suggest seven points:

First, we must arm ourselves with more flexible economic tools. We must be willing to recognize growing divisions in the Communist camp, and be willing to encourage those divisions. My amendment to the Battle Act would permit the President to use our economic strength to promote peaceful change behind the Iron Curtain wherever this would help wean the so-called captive nations away from their Kremlin masters. In the 85th Congress this amendment was defeated by one vote. In the 86th Congress it passed the Senate but died in the House. In the 87th Congress, under new Presidential leadership, it must become law.

Secondly, we must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressures the Soviets may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned.

Third, we must strengthen the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States—by expanding reciprocal trade, tourism, and information services. We can encourage the investment of American capital and technology. We can recognize the needs of Polish ships and airlines. And, perhaps most important of all, we can open our doors to refugees from the terror of tyranny.

Fourth, we can increase the exchange of students, teachers, and technicians—to give more Poles an opportunity to see the blessings of liberty—and to give us an opportunity to assist the Poles in building an independent economy, particularly in agriculture and the management of medium sized industry. The facts of the matter are that there are 10 times as many students here on government grants from the Ryukyu Islands as there are from all of Poland. I think we can do better.

Fifth, we must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet empire. We should invite all satellite nations to participate in all-European projects, to share in intellectual and cultural exchanges, to lower barriers to travel and trade, to work toward the resolution of ancient disputes. For Poland back through the centuries has belonged to the European tradition of freedom and national independence. It has been a part of European culture, of European economy and European history. And even the Soviet Union cannot rewrite that history.

Sixth, we must eliminate Poland's fear of the West, fears that are very real, and this includes, in particular, a fear of Germany. We must make plain our intention that disputes between West and East be settled by peaceful negotiations, not by force—that never again will Eastern European nations be violently stripped of their territories and resources. We cannot impose a boundary settlement on other nations, but we can encourage peaceful and mutual accommodation in the spirit of free Europe.

Seventh, and finally, we must make use of our frozen Polish funds to remind the people of that nation that we share their traditional pride in culture, learning, and human welfare and offer to use these funds to build a national library and archives, a housing district, new schools, or—and I think this would be particularly effective—the reconstruction of the Warsaw Castle.

When I was in Warsaw in 1955, I found no Poles who enjoyed the gaudy Soviet Palace of Culture. And I believe that the millions of dollars worth of zlotys we have idle in Poland—acquired from our surplus food sales—could be put to no better use than to answer this new symbol of Soviet arrogance by rebuilding this traditional symbol of Polish independence.

I know that some will say that all of this is wasted effort—that the people of Poland, however brave, are in a prison from which there is no early escape. But is this reason to ignore their needs? Is this an excuse for inaction? Have we forgotten the words:

"I was hungry, and you gave me to eat;
Naked, and you covered me;
Sick, and you visited me;
I was in prison, and you came to me."

Extension of Benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity.

During the last Congress we enacted Public Law 86–724, and, to be eligible for benefits under this law, an employee must have retired on an immediate annuity after at least 12 years of service, or for disability. An immediate annuity is one which begins to accrue no later than 1 month after the date of the employee's separation.

To cite one example of the inequity of this law, one individual in my district left Government employment on October 19, 1956, at the age of 61, after 25 years, 7 months, and 4 days of service. Under the provisions of the Retirement Act in effect at that time, however, he was not eligible to begin receiving an annuity until he reached age 62. His annuity commenced on August 1, 1957, the 1st day of the month following his 62d birthday. Since this was more than 1 month after the date of his separation,

his annuity was a deferred annuity, and he therefore is not eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act.

Public Law 86–724 imposes the immediate annuity requirement by incorporating the same eligibility requirements for persons who retired before July 1, 1960, as were spelled out in Public Law 86–382—the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959—for employees retiring after July 1, 1960. Such employees, must, among other conditions, retire on an immediate annuity in order to continue after retirement the health benefits protection they had as employees.

It is the purpose of my bill to correct this inequity, and I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to the passage of this corrective legislation.

John N. Irwin II Awarded Medal of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a constituent of mine, John N. Irwin II, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, was awarded the Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award within the power of the Secretary of Defense to make in peacetime. The award was made in the presence of Secretary of State Herter, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and numerous others. I was honored to have been present at this ceremony. The citation was read by Lt. Col. John Eisenhower and I should like to include it in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

John N. Irwin II, for outstanding contributions to the security of this Nation and the free world. As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and more recently as Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Mr. Irwin has worked tirelessly in furthering the solidarity of our alliances with friendly nations. Through his breadth of vision and leadership, far-reaching programs for improving the free world's military power have been instituted. His patriotic devotion to duty, his acumen, and his sound judgment have contributed immeasurably to the resolution of problems in connection with arms control and the modernization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. His considered analysis of the multiple views forming the basis for defense contributions to the deliberations of the National Security Council Planning Board, his tactful and competent resolution of differences, and his comprehensive and searching recommendations have been invaluable in the formulation of national security policy. For these and his many other contributions to the national security, I take great pleasure in awarding to him the Medal of Freedom.

This award to John Irwin is a token of the outstanding contribution he has made to our Government. He represents the highest kind of public service and he has left the Defense Department with the high regard of everyone with whom he has worked and with a "well done" from each of the services that were a part of his responsibility.

On the international front John Irwin's work was just as outstanding. The testimony of the Secretary of State at the ceremony was a tribute to the results that John Irwin was able to achieve.

One of the things that makes service in the Congress so rewarding is having as one's constituents men like John Irwin. One of the things that makes our country strong is having in the Government service men like John Irwin. He returns to private life with the highest esteem of all of Washington.

Liberalization of Our Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 37, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that the base year for determining any quota shall be 1950, to provide that the unused annual quota of any quota area be made available for use in quota areas where the annual quota is oversubscribed, and for other purposes.

There are six sections in this bill; the first section amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and deals with the updating of the base quota from 1920 to 1950, and adds a new subsection which empowers the President to reallocate unused quotas in such portions as he may direct, and to such areas as he may designate.

Under existing law, quotas allocated to each country are one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants whose national origins were attributable to the various countries according to the 1920 census.

The proposed amendment to base the allocation of quotas on the 1950 rather than the 1920 census would give the countries of southern Europe a proportionately greater share in the allocation of quotas. This is because there has been a proportionately greater migration from countries of southern Europe since the turn of the century. Hence, the makeup of the country in 1950, according to the census of that year, reflects a greater proportion of inhabitants whose national origins are in the countries of southern Europe than does the census of 1920.

Under existing law, the quota numbers that are not used during any annual year are not available for use during succeeding years even by nationals of the countries concerned much less by nationals of other countries.

The proposed amendment would authorize the President to make quotas not used in one year available for use during the next fiscal year—in any proportion he chooses—by nationals of those countries whose quotas are oversubscribed. For example, Great Britain has a large quota that is not entirely used—65,360—and Spain a small one—250—that is constantly oversubscribed. Pursuant to the amendment, the President could in the next year increase the Spanish quota by adding to it the quota numbers or any portion of them not used by nationals of Great Britain this year.

Section 2 repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Under existing law, section 207, once a visa is issued the quota number allocated is regarded as used. Hence, if the individual to whom the visa is issued does not come to the United States that quota number is not available to any other national of that country who may desire to migrate to the United States.

The proposed repeal of section 207 would make it possible to reissue quota numbers in such cases and would to that extent make possible a more complete utilization of quota allocations.

Section 3 amends subsection 212 (d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and under section 3(a) empowers the Attorney General to parole or let into the United States up to 60,000 refugees in any one year and defines the term "refugee" to include first aliens who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion have fled from any Communist area; and second, aliens who cannot on account of religion, race, or political opinion return to the Middle East.

Section 3(b) provides that an alien who is admissible as a refugee under section 3(a) and who does not have in his possession documents as required by section 212, subdivision (a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be regarded as lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival and that the quota for an area shall not be decreased by reason of the lawful admission of such alien.

Under existing law there is no express provision for the admission of refugees generally as immigrants.

The proposed amendment would authorize the Attorney General to parole into the United States each year up to 60,000 refugees, defined as aliens who fled or flee from Communist countries or any country within the Middle East because of persecution, who cannot return on account of race, religion, or political opinions. Aliens so paroled who are found to be admissible as immigrants are to be regarded as admitted for permanent residence as of the date of their entry into the United States. The documentary requirements of section 212(a)(20) visas and passports do not apply to such cases and the aliens are considered as nonquota; that is, no reduction in quota allocations would result.

Section 4 amends section (4) of the Immigration Act of September 22, 1959—Public Law 86–363. Section 4 of my bill provides that an alien who is registered on a consular waiting list under a prior-

ity date earlier than December 31, 1955, and is eligible for quota immigrant status on second, third, or fourth preference on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General before January 1, 1961, and the spouse and children of such alien shall be held to be nonquota immigrants and shall be issued nonquota immigrant visas.

Under the existing statute, section 203, parents of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or older; the unmarried sons and daughters of citizens; the spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and the brothers, sisters, married sons, and married daughters are entitled to preferences in the issuance of quota immigrant visas.

The amendment accords nonquota status to aliens of the classes listed above registered on consular waiting lists before December 31, 1955, as entitled to a preference under section 203 as parents of U.S. citizens or children of citizens, spouses, or unmarried sons or daughters of lawful permanent residents, and brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of U.S. citizens, provided visa petitions for them were approved before January 1, 1961, and provided the alien applicant has the status and relationship to the petitioner as he had at the time the visa was approved. The proposed amendment declaring aliens of the classes listed above to be nonquota would permit their immediate entry and obviate their having to wait indefinitely until quota numbers become available.

Section 5 amends section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section revises the provisions relating to persons in second preference status and grants second preference status to unmarried brothers or unmarried sisters of U.S. citizens as well as to parents of U.S. citizens.

Section 5(b) amends section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by revising the provisions relating to an allotment of quotas and limits fourth quota status to married brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The unmarried sisters and brothers of U.S. citizens are granted second preference status under the terms of section 5 of my bill.

Under existing law, second preference status in the issuance of quota numbers is accorded to the parents of citizens of the United States who are at least 21 years of age; to the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States. Under the present law, parents and sisters of U.S. citizens are accorded fourth preference status and inasmuch as many quotas are used up by first, second, and third preference cases, few quota numbers are available for use for those in fourth preference status. In many countries, fourth preference quotas are unavailable.

The proposed amendment adds the unmarried brothers and unmarried sisters of citizens of the United States to the classes of aliens presently entitled to second preference status in the issuance of quota numbers. This is another step toward making possible the uniting of families.

Section 6 provides that the foregoing provisions apply to fiscal years beginning on and after July 1, 1961. This section makes the effective date of the amendments July 1, 1961.

The Need for Studies Into the Fields of Gerontology, Geriatrics, and Allied Problems of Senior Citizens; Establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to provide for an Assistant Secretary to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to direct said Bureau; to authorize Federal funds to conduct and encourage research and studies into the fields of gerontology, geriatrics, and allied problems of senior citizens; assist in the operation of projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes.

I have a very devoted interest in the problems of our senior citizens, particularly in view of the fact that my district, the First District of Florida, has more senior citizens percentagewise than any other congressional district in the United States. I have thus had an opportunity to gain firsthand knowledge of what some of the problems of senior citizens are, and have devoted many hours of my tenure in office in an effort to meet the challenge offered by some of these problems.

Since the turn of the century, our total population has a little more than doubled, but in the same period senior citizens increased 3½-fold, with there being in excess of 18 million people in this country today over the age of 65.

The tremendous increase in the total population in itself has caused profound changes in the age structure of the population, particularly in the sharply increased life expectancy of the individual and the resulting increase in the number of senior citizens.

It is now quite apparent that the fastest growing segment of our population consists of persons 65 years of age and over, the number of whom totaled approximately 3 million in the year 1900 and whose number increased to 15 million in 1956, a growth which is expected to continue and to reach approximately 21 million in 1975.

During the last 50 years our national economy has moved from one based primarily upon agriculture to one of huge industrialization, creating many new and unanticipated social problems, particularly with respect to our senior citizens; these have been shunted more and more to an insecure, dependent, and much more aggravated situation in our society, through the deprivation, because of their age, of their opportunity for gainful work, by compelling them to retire prematurely and by failure to assist them in rehabilitating themselves.

As a result, many of our senior citizens have inadequate financial resources to maintain themselves and their families as independent and self-respecting members of their communities, are unable to find adequate housing and healthful recreation activities for themselves and their families, are confronted with disabling health and medical problems, are sometimes driven by frustration and despair to private and public mental institutions and general hospitals, are often forced into positions of isolation and lonesomeness, and are placed in increasing numbers on old-age assistance rolls.

It is, therefore, essential that such trends be determined by further study and checked by concerted and comprehensive efforts to formulate, and put into operation, programs which will permit our older people to continue to lead productive, proud, and independent lives, which will restore and rehabilitate many of them to useful, happy, and dignified positions among their neighbors; which will enhance the vigor and vitality of the communities; and which will prevent further growth and aggravation of their problems with resulting increased social, financial, and medical burdens. Coordination of existing Federal programs, and a study of their interrelationship as well as new planning is essential, and an authority to accomplish this is needed.

The primary responsibility for caring for and working out the problems of our older persons is that of the States and local communities; however, it is the purpose of my bill to aid and advise the States in developing long-range plans, and so far as practicable, in helping to solve the problems of senior citizens through projects which will help—

First, to assure to senior citizens an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

Second, to enable senior citizens to achieve a retirement income sufficient for healthful living on a reasonable standard and for participation in community life as happy self-respecting citizens;

Third, to provide senior citizens, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in a community of their own choosing in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in cooperative service projects or institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

Fourth, senior citizens to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions and economic ability of their years;

Fifth, to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their

homes, to the fullest extent possible, senior citizens who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

Sixth, to assist senior citizens to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

Seventh, to assure that senior citizens, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

Eighth, to relieve the problems of senior citizens through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging, geriatrics, and gerontology.

I feel so strongly about this problem that I cannot emphasize too greatly the need for legislation in this field, and urgently implore the membership of this House to enact my bill into law.

Small Business Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 3515, a bill designed to provide a tax adjustment to encourage the expansion of small- and middle-sized business. My bill would permit any person engaged in a trade or business to take as an additional deduction for Federal income tax purposes an amount measured by additional investment in that trade or business.

The deduction would be the smaller of two items: First, $30,000, or second, 20 percent of the net income from the trade or business. The additional investment would be considered as the increase in the aggregate investment in (a) depreciable assets, (b) inventory, and (c) accounts receivable over the aggregate of these three items for the preceding year.

At the outset, I should like to say that this is definitely not a measure inspired by any threatened recession or depression. On the contrary, it is a real tax reform, long overdue, which is essential if small business is to survive, and expand with our ever-expanding economy.

In the present era of high taxes and rising prices, a small businessman needs additional funds just to stay even, to say nothing of expanding. He is shut off from most sources of such funds, sources to which his larger competitors have easy access. Without these funds, he must inevitably fall behind in the competitive race. Thus, if we are to keep small business in a competitive position, some source of additional funds must be found. The reinvestment principle bill provides that source.

I believe that the bills proposing the tax adjustment through a reinvestment deduction are unique among measures designed for the assistance of small business, for several reasons.

In the first place the loss of revenue would be minimal. Bear in mind that the small businessman, in order to receive a deduction from taxable income—and thereby effect a tax saving—would be required to have spent enough money in advance to increase the aggregate of his depreciable assets inventory and accounts receivable. The money thus spent would already have created new taxable income—in wages and profits—in other parts of the economy. And also bear in mind that unless the businessman could look forward to the tax saving made possible through the reinvestment principle he possibly would not, and probably could not, have made the additional investment in his business.

Second. The reinvestment principle is unique in that it is designed to assist small business without penalizing larger business. As a matter of fact, the deduction would be available to all sizes of business, although its real effects and true assistance would be felt by small business alone.

Third. The plan is available to all business, whether incorporated or unincorporated. Many otherwise fine plans have been offered to help small business in the past, but practically all, if not all, of them would have been available only to smaller corporations. Yet more than 80 percent of the small business community of this country operates as single proprietors or partnerships. It is this group which particularly needs the added funds which my plan would provide, for it is this group that is furthest removed from access to funds from other sources.

Finally, and by no means the least important, is the fact that this plan lends itself, better than any other to the characteristics of the small business which uses it. This is due to the fact that the tax adjustment depends upon increased investment—upon an increase in the aggregate investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable. Thus a business whose greatest need is for new equipment, such as a small manufacturing operation, can modernize its facilities, keeping its inventory and accounts receivable at approximately the same level and be eligible for the deduction. Another kind of business, such as retailing, finds that equipment; that is, depreciable assets, represents a very small part of its expansion needs. What it needs is a greater inventory. Thus, in expanding this and keeping its assets and accounts receivable more or less level, it becomes eligible for the deduction.

This is not the first time that I have introduced legislation for this purpose. In the previous Congress, I introduced H.R. 7049 which contained the "reinvestment of earnings" principle to aid and encourage smaller business concerns to expand. The economic conditions which inhibited the growth of smaller retailers at the time I introduced this principle in the last Congress have grown even more acute since then. I also note, Mr. Speaker, that more and more emphasis is being given to the need for expanding our national economy. Modern manufacturing techniques permit the manufacture of more shoes with less manpower. Yet, each pair of shoes sold must be fitted individually to every customer. The entire economic cycle from farm or mine through manufacturing and into the wholesale and retail distribution channels has no benefit until these final goods are moved into the hands of the consumer. This last act gives meaning and fruition to all the labor which went into the goods or commodities. My approach will give equal incentive to all parts of the economy.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will give careful attention to the "reinvestment of earnings" principle to aid smaller business concerns as provided for in my bill H.R. 3515.

Communist Sympathizers Mislead American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the cold war is the persistent and determined effort by Communist sympathizers to mislead and confuse the youth of this country.

As an example, I am including with my remarks a letter I received recently from a student in my State of Washington, and also my letter in reply.

This young man is highly critical of the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in general, and specifically of the film depicting the student riots in San Francisco last May during a committee hearing in that city. My reply answers the questions he raises and provides the true facts. For obvious reasons, the young man's name has been deleted.

The letters are as follows:

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This letter is in reference to your appearance on the television program, "Congress Reports," seen on January 15, 1961, 9:30 a.m., on KOMO–TV (in Seattle). On that program I watched with great interest your discussion with Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, for I had recently completed research for a theme on congressional investigations of un-American activities. As a part of this research, I watched the film, "Operation Abolition," in a showing at Everett High School. When you and Congressman WALTER were discussing this motion picture, I was most disturbed by your public denial of the fact that "Operation Abolition" is extremely slanted. While I watched the film, I observed the following:

1. Use of music to evoke desired emotions from the audience. This included solemn, throbbing music as demonstrators were being dispersed, and triumphant, patriotic music as a member of the committee spoke in front of a picture of our Capitol.

2. Use of the emotional appeal of a 70-year-old police officer who was pushed over and suffered a stroke during the demonstrations. Why was such a man sent to break up a riot in the first place?

3. Men, Communists and non-Communists, shown in a bad light while exercising their right of free speech. This included making two San Francisco councilmen appear to be inciting a riot, which they were not.

Further concerned about this subject, I found an article on it by Mr. Paul Jacobs in the Reporter of November 24, 1960. He noted the following:

1. Although this supposedly commercial film was edited and narrated by members of the House Un-American Activities Committee staff, Operation Abolition contained none of the usual credits.

2. Quote Mr. Jacobs: "Separate sequences have been run together in "Operation Abolition" to give the impression of mob action, and the film shows students displaying defiance after police warnings, although actually the demonstrations occurred at a completely different time. And the police use of fire hoses on the students is justified on the basis of the claim that the students attempted to rush police barricades inside the city hall, where the committee was holding its hearings. But no film accompanies the commentary about this alleged attempt; in fact, photographs taken at the time show the students seated on the floor and in the corridors when the hoses were turned "on them."

3. In the same article: "After the riots were over, the sheriff of San Francisco County said: 'There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students.'"

4. Mr. Jacobs: "The film offered no evidence that the original demonstration was under the control of the Communist Party."

5. Mr. Jacobs also stated that William Wheeler of the House committee staff has admitted on a Los Angeles TV program that there were distortions in the film.

I have read books on the Communist conspiracy and am against communism as I know you are. I also disapprove of the unruliness shown by some of the students at San Francisco. I do, however, approve of the American rights of dissension and free speech, which I am convinced this film and the committee that put it out undermine.

Congressman PELLY, if you are the fair and just man I think you are, you will let the people you represent know, in your next report, that Operation Abolition is a slanted film. Furthermore, you will take steps to see that this film be shown in schools only when the whole truth is told along with it. I will be eagerly watching "Congress Reports" and my mailbox for your reply.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1961.

DEAR ——: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated January 17 and wish to note my interest in your remarks about the film "Operation Abolition." But I cannot agree with your view that the film is slanted. On the contrary, the film is factual—a newsreel portrayal of incidents actually occurring at the San Francisco hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is not a fictional account, or the product of imagination. It is, in short, a documentation of current events.

Of course, I am aware that there has been a determined effort to discredit this film. In this effort, the enemies of freedom and free speech have not hesitated to employ artifice, irrelevancies, and slander. The message of the film, namely, that the Communists instigated and led the riots, is clearly established. I am forwarding to you, under separate cover, certain documentation and items, including the recently published hearings held at San Francisco, which should clarify this entire matter for you.

I would like to comment briefly on your numbered observations:

1. You note the use of music to accompany the narration of the film. This is quite a common device in documentary films, to preserve interest in the narrative; however, I will not debate the desirability of employing music to accompany any documentary film, but you must agree that the question of the use of music is totally irrelevant to the question whether the scenes portrayed in the film are facts, photographed and recorded at the time and place purportedly covered. The music has no bearing at all upon the truth or falsity of the scenes recorded by the cameras.

2. You observed what you call the "use of the emotional appeal of a 70-year-old police officer who was pushed over and suffered a stroke during the demonstrations." You ask why was such a man sent to break up a riot in the first place? First, I should point out that our information is that this policeman was about 60 years old—an age that one day you will understand and appreciate is not too old for employment, particularly in courthouses and municipal buildings where elderly policemen are traditionally employed because the activity in such places is not considered arduous but suitable for such age. But it is not a question of this man's age or employment, but a question of an assault actually committed upon him by people who should have conducted themselves in an orderly fashion. Secondly, this film does not purport to discuss the sociological issue whether that particular age group should be employed in particular capacities. The question is obviously irrelevant. Moreover, you wish to dismiss the fact which occurred at the rioting because it has an incidental emotional appeal. Do you realize that your suggestion would be to delete a fact which actually occurred? Moreover, there are many facts that have incidental emotional reactions. These are facts of life. For example, the depiction of a burglary would create an emotional reaction. Would you for that reason close your eyes to the occurrence?

3. You say that "men, Communists, and non-Communists," are "shown in a bad light while exercising their right of free speech." This assertion is incomprehensible. You should realize that facts are facts—whatever conclusion or judgment particular individuals may draw from them as to the light in which they appear. Hitler frequently exercised his right of free speech, and we have seen his performance in movies. We also found him to be in a bad light.

You next raise the subject of a certain article by Paul Jacobs in the Reporter, and you have five observations in connection with that:

1. You said the film did not contain the usual credits. What has this to do with the facts portrayed in the film? Jacobs' assertion in this respect is obviously totally irrelevant to the issue.

2. You quote from Jacobs that, "separate sequences were run together to give an impression of mob action, etc." This assertion is completely false. The pictures speak for themselves and give no other impression than a relation of fact.

3. Jacobs makes a statement in his article that "after the riots were over, the sheriff of San Francisco County said: 'There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students.'" This statement of Jacobs is not true. Sheriff Carberry of San Francisco has repudiated this report made by Jacobs.

4. You quote Jacobs' charge that "the film offered no evidence that the original demonstration was under the control of the Communist Party." This statement of Jacobs is likewise contradicted by the facts. The evidence establishes the contrary.

5. Jacobs took William Wheeler's statement out of context, as the transcript of the discussion demonstrates. Wheeler was referring to an immaterial error in the film which passed unnoticed until the film was already produced. A section of the narration stated that Harry Bridges was escorted out of city hall shortly before the riots took place, whereas Harry Bridges actually was taken out of the building shortly after the rioting occurred. There are no distortions in the film.

Finally, perhaps I should comment upon your demand that I should "take steps to see that this film be shown in schools only when the whole truth is told along with it." I must regard this as something of an impertinence. This film is truthful and factual. I do not see why the people who show it in the exercise of free speech on their part, should be under any obligation to invite detractors of the film to make a counter-demonstration. If anyone wishes to comment adversely on the film that is their affair, but certainly free speech does not require that anyone showing the film should be required to produce those who wish to talk against it.

I trust that this will answer your inquiries and will serve to clear your mind on certain points, about which you appear to have been misled by the inaccurate reporting of Mr. Jacobs in the Reporter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY.

Address of the Honorable John E. Fogarty, Second District, Rhode Island, at the University of Rhode Island Convocation on January 12, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the convocation of the University of Rhode Island on January 12, 1961:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, SECOND DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND CONVOCATION ON JANUARY 12, 1961

Dr. Horn, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, and students of the University of Rhode Island, as one who has watched the growth and development of this institution of learning over many years, I am deeply gratified and honored to have been invited to address this university convocation. It is an important occasion in a period of significant progress toward ever greater excellence in the university's contribution to higher education in Rhode Island and in the Nation. The conferring of advanced degrees at the doctoral level, which marked the commencement exercises of last June, points to the full maturity of the university's graduate programs and gives promise of an even greater future.

In my capacity as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I am happy to say that it has been my privilege to have a share in promoting the past accomplishments of our State university, and I can assure you that I will continue in my efforts to do so.

The great Benjamin Disraeli, speaking before the British House of Commons during the reign of Queen Victoria once described a university as "a place of light, of

liberty, and of learning." The light of higher education gives a person a clear view of his own opinions and the ability to see and judge things as they are. From that light comes a greater liberty, for it is the power of intelligent judgment which is the source of all true freedom. Students and teachers joined together in a university for mutual stimulation and the common pursuit of knowledge are in a position to develop their full potentialities for successful and constructive living.

It is the goal of our Government to see to it that the opportunity of such personal development which higher education can give will be open to all who have the ability and the desire to take advantage of it. Education in our free America is not the special privilege of any one group. On the contrary, the principles of democracy and the challenge which confronts us from communism today call for a widening and deepening of the opportunities of higher education for all our people without regard to race, creed, or economic condition.

As this is true of American higher education, so must it also be true of the opportunities for public service which elective office presents. No test of race, religion, ancestry or personal wealth should ever be permitted to influence the choice of political parties or the electorate in the selection of candidates. The only tests should be those of proven ability, personal integrity, and the evidence of a desire to serve the common good of all.

That is the ideal. An honest and realistic appraisal of the history of politics in our State and Nation, however, forces us to the conclusion that while we have made some progress toward the fulfillment of that ideal, we still have a long way to go in reaching it. The scope of civil rights legislation, it is true, has been greatly expanded in the last 15 years. Going beyond fair employment practices legislation, it has been extended to the Armed Forces, schools, public housing and such places of public accommodation as hotels and theaters in many areas. As recent events in Louisiana have clearly shown, the battle for equal justice under law is by no means won. Those who, like myself, have taken up the fight for civil rights in Congress are well aware that a great deal of hard work still lies before us. Yet, I am confident that in the end, all that can be accomplished to advance the cause of civil rights by Federal legislation will be done.

But legislation alone cannot eliminate the evil of group prejudices from American public life. Such prejudices are based on emotion, not on reason. They reach down deeply into the hearts and minds of men and flow from attitudes which no laws by themselves can alter. To get at the root of the problem, we must first have some reasonable understanding of its historical origins.

What has, for example, produced the emphasis on ancestry which seems to govern the selection of candidates by our political parties here in Rhode Island? Some have named it "League of Nations" politics, for instead of treating all of our people as equally good Americans, the careful balancing of a ticket on the basis of ancestral origins gives the impression that we are not one nation but a collection of nations. It is a contradiction of the great ideal of those Founding Fathers of our country who, like Thomas Jefferson, hoped to see America become a society where individuals of all nations might truly be melted into a new race.

As we look back into our history, we can see how "League of Nations" politics came to be a feature of American life.

The story of the making of the United States into the world's greatest free power, is of course, a story that involves succeeding waves of immigration. Here in Rhode Island, as elsewhere along the Atlantic coast, the first settlers were mostly from the British Isles, and especially from England. Yet even in the first 200 years of our State's history there were, as you know, a number who came from other parts of Europe. Many German and Irish names were on the rolls of the Rhode Island Regiment during the American Revolution, and the contribution to our growth and progress made by the Jewish families of Spanish-Portuguese origin who settled in Newport is well known. Certainly no State has had closer associations with the important part which France and her armies played in the winning of American independence.

As America prospered, especially in the years between 1837 and 1857, economic distress and political oppression combined to cause tens of thousands of immigrants to come here from Ireland and Germany. The tragic story of famine and tyranny that drove these people from their homes is familiar. But what is sometimes not mentioned is the fact that thousands of them were offered every inducement to come here. Manufacturers in search of cheap labor, railroad builders looking for workers to build the expanding lines, new steamship companies looking for passengers—all these combined to drum up immigrant traffic. Many of the ships in which they came were little better than floating coffins, as they were often called. Many died during the trip across the Atlantic, and many were cheated and abused upon their arrival here. Yet wages of 50 cents a day and the promise of a free life looked good to those who were strong enough to survive.

The new immigrants, wherever they came from, were almost always looked down upon. Furthermore, the low wages they were more than willing to accept made them feared and disliked by those of the older American groups who had previously done the heavy work of building the new Nation's industry and transportation facilities. If the immigrants were not group conscious when they arrived, they were soon made so.

Until late in the second half of the 19th century the immigrants came almost entirely from the countries of northwestern Europe, from Great Britain, Scandinavia, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Belgium, and France. In Rhode Island the Irish were most numerous. At first they worked building the Blackstone Canal and the new railroads, but by 1850 they had taken their places in the textile mills and other industries of the State. They were soon joined, however, by the French Canadians, the first non-English speaking group to come to Rhode Island in large numbers.

The 20 years from 1890 to 1910 were the heaviest years of immigration for this country. The foreign born made up 60 percent of the workers in the packinghouse industry; 57 percent of those in iron and steel, 61 percent of our miners, and nearly 70 percent of those in textile mills.

These people came after the free lands were no longer open. Many came from Eastern Europe, while in Rhode Island the years between 1890 and 1920 were marked by a rising tide of immigration from Italy. Labor unions were weak; housing conditions were very poor; and wages for the immigrants were just above the subsistence level.

In Rhode Island, as elsewhere in industrial America, during the late 19th and early 20th century, there was segregation in housing and almost no real social contact between groups. Laborers and managers lived in worlds in which the separation between them was as complete as that which once existed between lords and serfs in the Middle Ages. It is not surprising that group differences based upon language, religion, or the strong bonds of ancestry grew and flourished.

To every immigrant, America has been, from the earliest times, a frontier, a chance to begin all over from the beginning. As the Historian Frederick Jackson Turner has said, every new frontier settlement took Americans further away from dependence upon European conditions and made them more and more into members of a single, new society.

It is easy enough to see how this was true for those who first penetrated the wilderness and crossed the Western plains. But it has been equally true in modern times for those who have managed to rise up out of older segregated housing areas into newer and better neighborhoods. Subways, streetcars, buses, and the automobile took the place of the covered wagons and opened up the suburbs. Immigrant fathers and mothers through drudgery and careful savings played a no less heroic role in moving their families to a better life than did the pioneers who mastered the savage frontier.

If the immigrants of the last century were often given a false idea of what America had to offer them, it is still true that by hard work and a constant effort to better themselves, each group that has come here has not only contributed to our country's present greatness but also proved that America is indeed a land of promise.

Land hunger was the great drive behind the conquest of the West. The desire for dignity, recognition, and a share in the abundant material blessings of science and industry has been the driving power behind the rise of all the groups of immigrants who helped to build our modern economy. Out on the old frontier the obstacles were those of nature. There were deserts and high mountains to be crossed, great rivers to be bridged. In the industrial cities, the obstacles were manmade. Rents and restrictions blocked the way, and the terrible threat of unemployment hung over the family's economic security.

In the great adventure of building the kind of national social unity which a free, industrial society requires, we have inevitably developed group conflicts and competitions. Our democratic political system, no less than our industrial development, has provided an opportunity for each segment of the growing Nation to fulfill its ambitions for improvement. From each immigrant group that has contributed to the industrial and economic growth of our own State, there have come men who can truly be called outstanding public servants. The same thing can also be said of Rhode Island education from the primary school to the university level.

In the years after the Civil War, in which foreign-born citizens and their children contributed so much to the victory of the Union, the political life of Rhode Island remained in the hands of the descendants of the earlier settlers, who thought of themselves as the true Yankees. The first real break in this situation took place in 1928, when the outmoded property qualification on voting was repealed. Since that time, Rhode Island has been a leader in the Nation in according to most of the groups which make up our cosmopolitan State a chance to participate fully in its political life.

As we look about at the modern scene, we can indeed be grateful that our people are not divided, to the same extent as they once were, by sharp economic differences. The majority of our citizens have found their places of real acceptance in the business and professional world as well as in industry. We still have a long way to go, but I believe that most Rhode Islanders look upon this State and Nation as places where the dream of betterment for all can be realized. The Communist notion of class warfare does not have any validity for modern America. It is something which we utterly repudiate and reject. The competition in American economic and political

life comes not from poverty but from the opportunity for progress for all.

Such competition is a healthy thing, and the effort of minority groups to gain their rightful place in the public affairs of the State and Nation has, in many ways, contributed to their coming of age as Americans. Compelled by the historical circumstances which I have outlined, each group in its turn has risen to take advantage of its opportunities.

Now, however, I believe that we have reached a stage of political development in which we need to grow out of, and away from, the so-called "League of Nations" attitude. It has been said of Abraham Lincoln that the important thing about him was not that he was born in a log cabin, but that he came out of it and made his way to the White House. Lincoln had the true American attitude when he said, "I don't care so much about who my grandfather was; I am much more concerned with what his grandson will be."

From a practical point of view, it is clear that we in Rhode Island cannot hope to see the end of "League of Nations" politics overnight. For some time to come, there will be minority groups who will feel that they have not yet obtained the full recognition of their numbers and will continue to press for it by group action. But the gap between the various groups is steadily becoming more narrow, as we merge more and more into the common life of American progress. In another generation the old group distinctions will be virtually meaningless, and I am of the opinion that it is the responsibility of our political leaders to hasten that process.

We have an obligation to look beyond the borders of our local concerns in order to grasp the role of our great country in the world today. We are engaged in a life and death struggle with an enemy whose avowed purpose is our destruction as a free people. The power and the democratic example of the United States to the emerging new nations are the main bulwark against the march of communism. Countries like India, with its variety of conflicting races and ethnic groups must learn from us the lesson of how the distinctions of language and ancestry can be overcome by a real democracy.

Now is the time for us to recall the words of President Franklin Roosevelt, who said: "Every American takes pride in our tradition of hospitality to men of all races and creeds. We must remember that any oppression, any injustice, any hatred between groups is a wedge designed to attack our civilization."

NATIONAL UNITY IS ONE OF THE MAIN FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The work of educators at great universities such as this, the labors of scientists, the plans of leaders in our Armed Forces—all these must rest upon the support of a unified people. In every war which America has fought we have put aside our group differences in the common cause. No American is asked to be classified according to his ancestry when he is called upon to take up arms in his country's defense. The men who fought and died in the great wars of this Nation from the days of the Revolution to the conflict in Korea did so, simply as Americans, without any hyphens attached. They defended their country, not as Irish-Americans, German-Americans, Italo-Americans, Franco-Americans, Portuguese-Americans, or any other group designation that might be added to the list. In the time of trial, they were all-Americans, and nothing more or less.

For at least the next decade, and probably longer, we will be facing the challenging tactics of communism. The battle is being fought on many fronts, for the enemy makes education, economics, science, and propaganda into weapons. Right on our own doorstep in Latin America, the Communists are at work trying to picture the United States as a country which exploits and abuses minority groups. Their aim is, of course, not only to divide the American nations of this continent from one another, but, wherever possible, to foster group hatreds within the United States itself.

We may thank God that a shooting war has not engulfed the world. But we must not deceive ourselves into thinking that we are not engaged in a struggle of worldwide proportions which calls for exactly the same degree of national unity which we have displayed in the wars of the past.

For that compelling reason and for the common good of our whole society, it is essential for us to hasten the process by which all the many different cultural groups in this country will reach full civic maturity as Americans. To that end, I believe, we should start to move away from "League of Nations" politics in our national and local affairs. What may have been necessary in the days of the great immigrations to this country, has come to be an unnecessary and even harmful thing in modern times.

Here in Rhode Island all of us live very close together, judging by American standards. Suburban communities are developing at a steady rate, but in our land area, all Rhode Islanders will always be close neighbors. This means that we have to learn to live together as good neighbors should.

Colonial Rhode Island set an example to the world for its proclamation "that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernments." Modern Rhode Island has set an example to the nation in the way in which it has afforded educational, economic, and political opportunities to all of its citizens, regardless of their ancestry. Our record in this regard is by no means perfect, but we do have much of which we can be justly proud. Now we must move forward once again. We must prove that we have the political maturity to rise above group distinctions in the selection of candidates for public office.

It has been rightly said that any man who serves his country well, has no need of ancestors. Loyalty to the roots from which we spring is of course a virtue. Every group that has helped to form our State has reasons to respect and to venerate its traditions and its past. But we cannot live in the past, even though we do live on the benefits of what those who have gone before us have suffered and accomplished. Our ancestors were enterprising and bold men and women or they would never have come to these shores to build a new life for themselves and their posterity. Much that was good in the lands of their origin, they brought with them. Much that was bad, they wisely left behind. The hatreds and bitter national feelings which made Europe a bloody battleground for so many centuries have no true place among us. As Theodore Roosevelt said, we Americans count this country as home and we must not act as if we lived in a boarding house where the tenants quarrel with one another in a dozen different languages.

The University of Rhode Island, together with all the other outstanding educational institutions of our State, day by day provides a meeting place where teachers and students with a wide variety of backgrounds seek the truth of real knowledge. I believe firmly that the fruits of such education, which may be seen on all sides in Rhode Island, will go far to produce new generations for whom the old group classifications will be things of the past. Educated as Americans, our young people will find no appeal in "League of Nations" politics. The future belongs to those who are in our schools today, and it is a part of the responsibility of our present leaders in public life to make certain that in the years to come our youth will not have to find their places in the life of our community on the basis of group distinctions. America today needs the best that each of us can offer, and Rhode Island needs the talents and skills of all of her citizens. In the truly perilous times ahead no portion of the strength, either of our State or our Nation, can be wasted on group conflicts that belong to the past.

It must, therefore, be our common endeavor to make America's future open to all of her people, without distinctions of race, color, or creed. In that great adventure, all of us who hold public office must count on your help. I am confident that you, to whom the future belongs, will not fail to rise to this vital need of our State and Nation.

Bay Pines, Fla., Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 additional beds at Bay Pines, Fla.

Florida in general and the west coast area of Florida in particular are veteran-impacted areas. Thousands of older people come to this area to retire, and many are, of course, veterans. There are more retired veterans in this area than any other area in the State, and many of these older veterans develop needs for hospitalization.

Bay Pines is full—more than full—and many veterans in need of immediate hospitalization have to wait in line. Waiting periods of up to 2 years are not unusual. The waiting list on any day tops 800 veterans in need of medical and surgical care. Twice the number of beds I have requested in my bill would not be too many.

The veteran population of the State of Florida has increased from approximately 250,000 in 1946 to over 578,000 in 1960, and the number is still growing. There simply are not enough beds to accommodate these veterans.

Because of the extreme demand placed upon the VA hospital system in Florida, it has become necessary to send Florida veterans to other States for necessary hospitalization and still many more veterans must lie ill at home and die without the required medical attention, and mental patients must languish in county jails, or roam the public streets.

The continuation of a VA hospital program is, of course, a Federal responsibility. I might say that I have impressed this need upon the Veterans' Administration on numerous occasions, and have repeatedly appealed for acceleration in hospital construction, but this effort has met with only limited success.

An immediate interim increase of 160 beds was authorized by the Veterans'

Administration late last fall, due to be completed in March 1961. However, in order to provide for this increase, it was necessary to convert part of the domiciliary space to hospital use—transferring some domiciliary members to the VA domiciliary at Thomasville, Ga.

An additional increase of 350 was authorized by the President, scheduled for completion in March 1965. Requirements and preliminary plans for a 500-bed hospital are scheduled for June of this year; construction, December 1962.

Veterans' organizations in my district have called to my attention, and the facts show, that by the time these new beds are available for occupancy, an equally acute need problem will exist because of the interim influx of veterans. The present bed capacity enlargement program will only take care of present needs. The accumulated needs over the next 4 years call for advanced planning now, in order to dovetail additional new construction into the program so we do not end up with as serious a problem, even after this facility is completed, as we have today because of the veteran population explosion.

My bill also provides for a geriatrics and gerontology center. This, of course, is the logical location for such a center. The Veterans' Administration has no such facility today, nor does the Public Health Service have any specific and exhaustive program concerning medical problems of the aging. This is obviously becoming a more acute problem, not only nationwide, but relative to veterans specifically, in that they are swiftly joining the senior citizen ranks, and more will obviously fall into this category in the future. This naturally follows the VA program to care for such veterans, and, of course, valuable research findings should be made available not only to the veteran, but also for the benefit of all senior citizens.

There must be a speedup in the program to supply the much needed additions to VA hospitals in the State of Florida, and I strongly urge that the House give serious consideration to the enactment of my bill.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Max M. Landman, D.D., Temple Beth El, West Palm Beach, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Creator and destiny of all flesh, from the depth of my heart I thank Thee and bless Thee for the spiritual honor accorded to me to stand in this citadel of justice to invoke Thy blessing upon this healthy, strong, intelligent body, called the U.S. Senate.

Through Thy will, O Lord, we have noble and loyal men and women representing the welfare of our great country. These leaders are the watchmen over the precious and priceless gift we possess, the Constitution of the United States of America. Bless them, O God, at this time, when the world is sick at heart, when civilization lies dormant, when mankind is still groping in the darkness to find Thy light, which can illumine the path for all on this earth.

Bless the President of our great Republic; bless the Vice President and the members of the Cabinet. Give them wisdom equal to their physical strength, and courage equal to their responsibilities, so that they, too, will close their link of leadership in this great insoluble chain of liberty, justice, and freedom. May they lead us and all men to live a life as it was ordained by Thee from the time of the creation of man.

May we never permit our enemies from without and from within to destroy our faith and our democratic way of life. May our blessed country, America, continue to be the champion and the leader of all mankind toward true nobility and just peace. Bless our churches and synagogues; may they always tower above man's material life. May the human race be truly aware that there is one universal God, who created us all, so that Thy divine light will flood the world with true brotherhood, and the sound of the Liberty Bell shall echo to the four corners of the earth, calling all men to walk side by side to the mountain of the Lord, and there build the temple of love, of faith, and of true peace.

All this we ask in Thy holy name, and in the name of our children's children, and those not yet born, who will call us a blessing, too, for laboring in unity and for our sacrifices in behalf of Thee and Thy beautiful world. Then we shall joyfully chant aloud, "Hallelujah, praised be the Lord." Yehi Sheim Adonoy Mevorach Leolom Voed. Blessed be Thy name from this time forth and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, January 23, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) that the two Houses assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 postmeridian, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) was considered and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that I have been informed that the Government workers are being let off their jobs 4 hours early today; it is anticipated there will be a considerable snowfall this afternoon and this evening. I express the hope that the Members of the Senate will keep that in mind, so that we can at least get as considerate treatment as the other Government workers, and have a chance to reach home at a reasonable hour.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate act today on the nominations of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, whose nominations were reported unanimously yesterday by the Banking and Currency Committee. The members are as follows:

Hon. Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, Chairman.

Hon. Kermit Gordon, of Massachusetts.

Hon. James Tobin, of Connecticut.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate act on the nomination of Hon. George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Export-Import Bank. His nomination was also reported unanimously today by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers;

Kermit Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers;

James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; and

George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury;

Robert V. Roosa, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs;

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States; and

John S. Gleason, Jr., of Illinois, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs;

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State; and

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior;

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and

Frank Barry, of Arizona, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Labor;

Jerry R. Holleman, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor;

Mrs. Esther Peterson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor; and

Clyde O. Brindley, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce;

K. William Jeffers and Donald W. Moncevicz, for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Donald L. Campbell, to be lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Kenneth A. MacDonald, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointments in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider these nominations, and that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me ask at what stage the morning hour will be held?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Immediately after this.

Mr. President, I understand there is no opposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be Chairman and member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; the nominations of Kermit Gordon, of Massachusetts, and James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; and the nomination of George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy;

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant;

S. Res. 40. Resolution to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials (Rept. No. 7);

S. Res. 41. Resolution to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy (Rept. No. 8);

S. Res. 45. Resolution to investigate matters relating to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 9);

S. Res. 47. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 10);

S. Res. 48. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 11);

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 12);

S. Res. 51. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 13).

S. Res. 52. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 53. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 56. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 17);

S. Res. 57. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 59. Resolution to study amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 21); and

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate the problems of American small and independent business (Rept. No. 22).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 43. Resolution to authorize a study by Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 50. Resolution to investigate problems connected with the flow of escapees and refugees (Rept. No. 24); and

S. Res. 55. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 25).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 27); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. Res. 26. Resolution to authorize a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 44. Resolution to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 26); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 66) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the Calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Mansfield, of Montana; and Mr. Miller, of Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Mansfield, of Montana; Mr. Jordan, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Keating, of New York; and Mr. Miller, of Iowa.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORT ENTITLED "FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT"

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 68) to print a committee report entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government," issued by the Committee on Government Operations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, be printed as a Senate document, and that three thousand two hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 69) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of the Federal Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government, and that:

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof be further authorized from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1962, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it seems advisable; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $390,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel, which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, six additional professional staff members, and eight additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY—SELECTED MATERIALS"

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 71) to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials", issued by that committee during the Eighty-sixth Congress, second session.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 1096, 86TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY IN COMMUNIST CHINA"

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 1096, 86th Congress, entitled "National Policy Machinery in Communist China," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 1096, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "National Policy Machinery in Communist China".

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY"

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73) to print

additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Organizing for National Security," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand five hundred additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Organizing for National Security" which were held by that committee during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $315,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75) to investigate matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 583. A bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Po Part Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 585. A bill to authorize Federal loans and matching grants as alternative forms of assistance to colleges and universities for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 586. A bill to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 587. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code relating to trade or business expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 588. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930, in order to increase the authorization for funds for the extension of certain projects from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Borsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 590. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Riva Coolidge;

S. 591. A bill for the relief of William L. Berryman; and

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 593. A bill for the relief of Hans Christian Gunnar Mikkelsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 594. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crater-Long Lake division of the Snettisham project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 595. A bill to provide the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 596. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 597. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Esteves Miranda;

S. 598. A bill for the relief of Luka Pecarina;

S. 599. A bill for the relief of George Michael Barakos; and

S. 600. A bill for the relief of Jesus Miguez Miguez and Camilo Sotelino Miguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 601. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 19 which is located in the State of West Virginia as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 603. A bill to supplement and revise the laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to employees of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 604. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 605. A bill to amend and extend existing laws dealing with urban renewal and redevelopment projects, and to encourage participation by the States in slum clearance and prevention; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 606. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. CURTIS):

S. 607. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1956, in order to provide for payment for rights-of-way used for the Ainsworth unit, Missouri River Basin project, being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 608. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide limited financial assistance with respect to certain communities the orderly redevelopment of which is threatened by projected highway construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 609. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. FONG, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 610. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 611. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 612. A bill to grant certain oil and gas lessees a preference lease right upon revocation of Public Land Order No. 2199, dated August 29, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. CURTIS):

S. 613. A bill to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 614. A bill to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; and

S. 615. A bill to preserve farm wheat acreage history for the year 1961 through 1965 without regard to whether any wheat is planted; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 616. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who, subsequent to World War II, lost their lives in the armed services of the United States during peacetime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 618. A bill to provide for certain payments to the cities of Bismarck and Mandan, N. Dak., in order to compensate such cities for the construction of sewage treatment works made necessary by the construction of Federal dams and reservoirs on the Missouri River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 619. A bill for the relief of Mr. Srecko Kustera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 620. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain benefits for members of the Armed Forces wounded in disturbances other than a state of war; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 621. A bill for the relief of Frank Kramaro and Katica Marinovich Kramaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 622. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of titles II, V, and VI of such act provided for teachers in public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 623. A bill to establish a U.S. Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Claude S. Reeder and Reeder Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 625. A bill to provide for publication of a United States Treaty Code Annotated; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mrs. NEUBERGER and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 626. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 627. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act of 1960 in order to increase the authorization for forest development roads and trails; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 628. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted Indian lands in South Dakota, to provide for an interim trust patent, and for other purposes;

S. 629. A bill providing that hereafter no individual of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood shall be entitled to any rights, privileges, or benefits granted to Indians by any treaty, agreement, Executive order, or act of Congress, and for other purposes; and

S. 630. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 631. A bill for the relief of Elwood Brunken; and

S. 632. A bill for the relief of Mayama Rieko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 633. A bill to provide for the crediting for retirement purposes of certain service performed by John R. Richardson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 634. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 635. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid to students in higher education; and

S. 636. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 637. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CURTIS):

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to interpret the application of the Code of Ethics for Government Service; to recommend modifications and improvements therein, as well as in criminal or other statutes relating to ethics; to investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
ROANOKE ISLAND MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the origin of this Nation was inspired by the timeless quest of man for a destiny commensurate with his potentialities; and

Whereas it was the grandeur of the Renaissance at high noon in England, immortalized by Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh, which gave birth to the American dream; and

Whereas freedom sustained the vision and nourished the faith of those who dedicated themselves to England's greatness beyond the seas; and

Whereas this Nation began its trek across the centuries, founded upon the eternal principles of religious and political liberty, and derived its cultural heritage from a people imbued with the creative spirit of man; and

Whereas at Roanoke Island, N.C., in 1585, the first colonizing efforts of our Founding Fathers crystallized into prophetic achievement and made this spot the spiritual birthplace of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that a nation should mark with honor the cradle of its nativity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be requested to appoint a Commission of five persons, to be known as the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission, whose duty it shall be to formulate a proposal which will enable this country to commemorate in a fitting manner the episode of its spiritual birth.

SEC. 2. That the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission be invited especially to study in what manner the religious, political, cultural, social, and economic life of Tudor England, which initiated the drama of English colonization on American soil, can be portrayed in its true historical significance and natal splendor for the instruction and inspiration of generations to come.

SEC. 3. That the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission be asked to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress of the United States in order that this body may take appropriate action to establish at Roanoke Islands a memorial worthy of the enduring importance of this event, which led to the founding of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67); which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should not recognize the Communist Chinese regime as the Government of China and should oppose the seating of its representatives in the United Nations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRADE ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 76), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARTKE, which appears under a separate heading.)

JURISDICTION BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION OVER ANY PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, OR EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 77) conferring upon the Committee on Rules and Administration jurisdiction over any proposed code of ethics applicable to Members, officers, or employees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XII, RELATIVE TO EXCUSING A SENATOR FROM VOTING IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 78) to amend rule XII, relative to excusing a Senator from voting in cases involving conflict of interest, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS FOR CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce on my behalf and on behalf of Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the termination date of the law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans.

There are many American couples, childless or with children of their own, who are eager to care for deserted children and can provide them with good homes, but find it difficult to obtain such children in this country. Among the happiest letters I have received are those from American citizens who became the adopting parents of children brought from other countries.

Within the past 10 years, more than 10,000 children have been admitted to this country to join American families. Experience has shown that orphans admitted under such special legislation have successfully adjusted to American family life.

The present law exempting such children from the immigration quotas expires on June 30. The purpose of the bill I am introducing is to provide permanent authority for nonquota immigrant visas for such children.

This bill strengthens the provisions of the law and extends to children adopted abroad safeguards similar to those which now exist for children adopted in this country. Such provisions should eliminate any abuses which may have existed in the past.

Under this bill any American couple wishing to secure a visa for a child adopted abroad would have to give assurances satisfactory to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the child will be well and properly cared for in a suitable home.

Also, under this law, a nonquota visa may not be issued to admit children for adoption unless assurances have been given that the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State in which the child is to live, have been met.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 583) to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly in regard to proposed legislation introduced today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], of which I am a cosponsor, to make permanent the admission of alien orphans into the United States.

Mr. President, much unnecessary hardship, delay, grief and frustration has accompanied the process of admission of alien orphans adopted by American families.

One of the important humanitarian activities that were designed to alleviate some of the miseries of the second World War, the alien orphans program, which has been continuing on a temporary basis, should now be made permanent under the legislation just introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself.

The alien orphans program was begun as part of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and has been extended by the act of July 1953, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 85–316, Public Law 85–253 and Public Law 86–648. It has enriched the lives of thousands of childless American couples and brought happiness and a chance for productive growth as Americans to the homeless waifs they have adopted.

This bill establishes safeguards against such abuses as have developed in the course of the program, eliminates the threat of commercialism in proxy adoptions, and sets standards for children adopted abroad equal to those which prevail here.

Authority to accept assurances that the child will find a suitable home with parents who have qualified under preadoption requirements is placed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This will have the effect of eliminating the undesirable practices under previous legislation and meets the needs and requirements of all interested parties. By the adoption of this legislation, the program can become as it should a permanent part of our law.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I am cosponsoring

the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin. This bill would eliminate the terminal date of June 30, 1961, from the provisions of law authorizing the issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to alien orphans and provide more effective safeguards that the children affected will be properly cared for in a suitable home.

It is my belief that such a measure exemplifies in the finest manner the charitable and humanitarian instincts of our Nation. At a time when there is considerable turmoil and friction among international powers, it is fitting that we should pause to consider the unfortunate children of the world who are in many instances the innocent victims of this struggle.

The present law provides for a termination of the alien orphan program on June 30, 1961. One of the changes we have set forth would extend the purposes of the program for an indefinite period.

Currently, whether the child is adopted in this country or a foreign state, the Attorney General is responsible for determining whether the child will be cared for properly. In the case of a child admitted to the United States prior to adoption, it is now up to the Attorney General to decide whether the child will be cared for properly.

Most of my colleagues, I am sure, will agree that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with its social welfare facilities, would be better qualified to pass upon this question than the Attorney General.

Under the bill we are today introducing, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be charged with that responsibility. This provision would apply whether the child was adopted abroad or first brought to the United States and then adopted.

Through supervision by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we can be assured that any unscrupulous forces bent upon the exploitation of these children will be eliminated. The proposed legislation will unquestionably resolve the difficulties encountered in some instances with the present alien orphan program. If necessary, I believe that Federal criminal sanctions should be applied against any unethical international "baby brokers."

It is well known that there is nothing more pleasing to the heart than the warmth provided by the smile of a child. Through this proposal, it is hoped that many American couples will realize that joy and that many broken-hearted children will smile again.

Mr. President, I urge that affirmative and expeditious action be taken with respect to this proposal so that the awaiting beneficiaries may continue to be united with their adoptive parents in the United States.

LOANS AND GRANTS TO COLLEGES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing loans and grants to colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities. Cosponsoring this bill with me is the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the longtime Senate advocate of the enactment of this much needed measure.

Senators will recall that for some years we have had a program of providing Government loans to colleges for the construction of student housing. This has been an outstandingly successful program, which long ago should have been extended to loans and grants for the academic facilities themselves, where the students actually need to go to get the education. The logic of this extension of building aid to the colleges is irresistible; but I shall not retrace the unhappy history of this provision in the housing bills of the last Congress.

No more eloquent statement of the need for this legislation can be found than a statement made last year by the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Senate Education Subcommittee. He stated:

> The colleges and universities of the Nation face a major crisis. I am convinced that, unless Congress acts—and acts in this session—to help these institutions, their ability to serve national needs will be seriously impaired.
>
> Let me be specific. The Nation's institutions of higher education must spend $9 billion between now and 1965 to expand their physical plant. That figure is equivalent to the entire increase in property value of institutions of higher education since 1929. There is encouraging growth of support for this purpose from non-Federal sources.
>
> It would be unrealistic, however, on the basis of actual experience and forecasts of future performance, to conclude that the colleges and universities can, without robbing Peter to pay Paul, meet more than $6 billion of that need.
>
> Thus unless the Congress acts, we will be confronted with a gap of almost $3 billion. A gap of these dimensions is the equivalent of the facilities required to accommodate half a million college students.
>
> The need for physical facilities is, to be sure, only one dimension of the total needs facing higher education, but failure to provide these facilities will seriously undermine the quality of instruction. Furthermore, if colleges and universities find it necessary to use a disproportionate amount of their resources for facilities, it is going to be impossible for them to develop a salary structure that will enable them to attract and retain A–1 teachers.
>
> It is imperative that we act now. Reliable enrollment projections warn us of the need to have vastly expanded facilities ready for occupancy in the fall of 1964. By that time, there will be approximately 1 million more students in our higher education programs than was the case in the fall of 1959. Assistance authorized in this session of Congress would begin to flow to institutions by early 1961, allowing less than 3 years for the inception, development, and completion of the needed educational facilities. We are already behind schedule. Certainly, delay beyond this point constitutes a risk that cannot be justified in an area of such critical importance. Action is needed; just as importantly, it is needed now.

Those are the words of a distinguished Republican familiar with the problem. Further evidence of the need for this legislation can be found in this recommendation which the Education Task Force, under Dr. Frederick Hovde, President of Purdue University, submitted early this month to President Kennedy.

> 1. Grant and loan program for academic facilities.
>
> Although college and university enrollments are now at an alltime high, the period of greatest increase in enrollments is immediately ahead. In order to give urgently needed aid to colleges and universities (including junior coleges) to accommodate a million new students in the next 5 years Congress should be urged to enact legislation providing for a combined program of loans and grants of at least $500 million for the first year, of which $350 million (70 percent) should be for matching grants and $150 million (30 percent) should be for loans on the same basis as the college housing loan program. In succeeding years this program will require increasing sums annually to meet the evolving needs. Grants should be available only for construction which will accommodate increased numbers of students.

The bill I now introduce carries out this recommendation, by providing for loans or grants to colleges and universities which need buildings in order to provide higher education for the greatly increased number of young people seeking it. This bill is the same as S. 3776 of the 86th Congress, which I cosponsored with Senator CLARK, and is the proposal approved by the distinguished members of the Committee on Relationship with the Federal Government of the American Council on Education. This bill reflects findings of the educators themselves, and provides a system which they feel fair both to the Government and to the institutions of higher education. It is contemplated that the amounts authorized and appropriated under the bill will be at the level recommended by the Hovde task force, although the actual needs are so much greater that the amounts may be increased by the committees concerned upon more detailed examination of the problem.

The most recent study of these needs was released on January 19 by the Office of Education. Their careful survey indicates that over the next decade there will be a $2.5 billion gap in the needed support for physical facilities, as college enrollments increase from 3.4 million to 6 million students. This present bill is but a step toward fulfilling our American goal of a higher education for every youth who can benefit thereby.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 585) to authorize Federal loans and matching grants as alternative forms of assistance to colleges and universities for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "College Classroom Assistance Act of 1961."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC FACILITIES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Advisory Council on Academic Facilities, consisting of the Commissioner of Education, who shall be Chairman, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or an official of the agency designated by him, who shall be an ex officio member, and twelve members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare without regard to the civil service laws. Three of the appointed members shall be selected from the general public and nine shall be selected from among serving or retired educational administrators. In selecting persons for appointment to the Council, consideration shall be given to such factors, among others, as—

(1) familiarity with the nature and extent of the national need for increased educational facilities;

(2) experience in the planning, construction, financing and administration of institutions of higher education; and

(3) knowledge of the policies and problems of the various types of institutions.

(b) The Council shall—

(1) advise and assist the Commissioner in the preparation of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and with respect to matters of policy arising in the administration of this Act; and

(2) consider all applications for loans and grants under this Act and make to the Commissioner such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be loaned or granted to each applicant whose applications should, in its opinion, be approved.

(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner may, after consultation with the Council, make a loan to an educational institution for—

(1) the construction of new structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities) necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students or the administration of the institution; and

(2) the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures for the uses described above if such structures are otherwise inadequate for such uses.

(b) No institution shall be eligible for a loan under this section in respect of any structure for which a grant has been approved under section 6 of this Act.

(c) No loan under this section shall be made unless—

(1) the educational institution shows that it is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans hereunder; and

(2) the Commissioner finds that the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement involved will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials;

(d) A loan under this section—

(1) may be in an amount not exceeding the cost of constructing, rehabilitating, altering, converting, or improving the structures involved (including related facilities), and the cost of acquiring any land necessary thereto, as determined by the Commissioner;

(2) shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and

(3) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 4 of this Act.

LOAN FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) To obtain funds for loans under this Act, the Commissioner may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $750,000,000.

(b) Notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of—

(1) 2½ per centum per annum; or

(2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Commissioner and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by educational institutions assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary for making grants-in-aid to educational institutions for the purposes described in section 3(a) (1) and (2) of this Act; and any sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner may, after consultation with the Council, make a grant to an educational institution for any of the purposes described in section 3(a) (1) and (2) of this Act, provided that no institution shall be eligible for a grant under this section in respect of any structure for which a loan has been approved under section 3 of this Act.

(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is recommended by the Council and is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that—

(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction the facility will be used for the educational purposes for which it is to be constructed, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available from sources other than the grant to meet the balance of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C), sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the educational purposes for which it is to be constructed; and

(2) the proposed construction will expand the applicant's teaching capacity, or is necessary to improve or maintain the quality of the applicant's educational program.

(3) the proposed construction represents an increase in the borrower's current rate of capital outlay.

(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Commissioner may prescribe, after consultation with the Council, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b)(1)) fail to meet the requirements for approval set forth in subsection (b) may be approved under condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Council.

AMOUNT OF GRANT; PAYMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Council or such lesser amount as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate; except that in no event may such amount exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of constructing the approved facility, as determined by him.

(b) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this title, the Commissioner shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (a), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

(c) In determining the amount of any grant under this title, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this title, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS

SEC. 8. If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this title—

(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the educational purposes for which it was constructed, unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that

there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,
the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. Any educational institution which, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, has contracted for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion or improvement of any structures for the uses described in section 3 may, in connection therewith, receive loans or grants, at its option, under this Act, but no such loans shall be made in connection with the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion or improvement of any such structure if the work thereon was commenced prior to the effective date of the appropriate section of this Act, or was completed prior to the filing of the necessary application under this Act.

SEC. 10. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

(b) Funds made available to the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Commissioner in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Commissioner under this Act (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Commissioner in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act;

(2) sue and be sued;

(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this Act. In the event of any such acquisition, the Commissioner may, notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling or disposal of real property by the United States, complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(6) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(7) subject to the specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modifications, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title; and

(8) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this Act such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved.

(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this Act if the amount of such contract does not exceed $1,000.

SEC. 11. The Commissioner shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on any project assisted under this Act—

(1) shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931 (Davis-Bacon Act), as amended; and

(2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed; but the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of such project voluntarily donate their services without full compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 12. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this Act in the form of loans, and not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in the form of grants, shall be made available to educational institutions within any one State.

NONINTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 13. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the program, personnel or administration of, any educational institution.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(c) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

(d) The term "educational institution" means—

(1) any educational institution offering at least two years of college-grade courses, including any public educational institution, or any private educational institution no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

(2) any agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of any State established for the purpose of providing or financing housing or other educational facilities for students or faculty of any public educational institution included in clause (1) of this definition.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in response to widespread concern on the part of members of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, and in an endeavor to correct an inequity in the Internal Revenue Code, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a realistic residence rule for business expense deductions of members of all our State legislatures.

The situation as it exists in Vermont—and I am sure it is one which exists among legislators in many States—is best described in the following letter I have received from the Vermont commissioner of taxes, Mr. Austin B. Noble. I ask that this letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
TAX DEPARTMENT,
December 12, 1960.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
U.S. Senator from Vermont,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I have just been working on the problem of income tax deductions for State legislators, for expenses during legislative sessions. I note in IRC section 162 that Members of Congress are considered, for the purpose of deducting traveling expenses, to have a home in the district or State which they represent, but are limited in their deductible expenses in Washington to the sum of $3,000. I also understand that you have at least once before introduced a bill giving the same right to State legislators up to the amount of $2,000 per year. I am heartily in accord with this idea and hope that it may be reintroduced and passed in the next Congress.

As you know, our State legislators are paid $70 a week with traveling expenses from their home to Montpelier twice each session. This $70 per week, of course, does not exceed by much, if at all, the expenditures which many legislators must pay out in traveling to and from Montpelier each week and in paying hotel and meal costs while here. A great many of our legislators are retired persons which means that Montpelier becomes their principal place of business and they are not allowed to deduct their travel and meal and room expenses at all. Moreover, a large number of them are semi-retired, that is to say, they still maintain some business, professional or farming interest but have slowed down or perhaps formally retired from their regular job. It then becomes difficult, if not impossible, to draw fair lines of distinction between those members who have major business interests at home with Montpelier as a minor place of

business and, therefore, may deduct their Montpelier expenses, from those who have no other business so must consider Montpelier their major business during the session.

I feel that the basis of the problem is that a rule which may work well for business has been carried over to a group of people rendering a public service, sometimes at personal inconvenience and sacrifice, and who should all be allowed to deduct travel and living expenses while at the State capitol.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

AUSTIN B. NOBLE,
Commissioner of Taxes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the present law strikes particularly at persons who are in retirement, and directs a double blow at legislators who are receiving social security benefits.

If a legislator has no regular business, his service in the legislature is considered his principal business, and the State capital becomes his "home" for business expense deductions on his income tax.

If he is completely retired—under age 72—and is receiving social security benefits, the compensation which the State pays him as reimbursement for expenses causes his legal income to exceed the social security maximum earnings clause and his social security old age benefits for that year are withdrawn.

The result is that his legislative service costs him the amount of his withdrawn old age benefits and the income tax paid on the amounts intended to cover added living and travel costs.

My bill would correct this by placing the retired legislator on the same expense deduction basis as his colleagues who maintain business connections in their hometowns and, probably, can better afford the costs of public service.

Everything possible should be done to encourage our men and women who have served their home communities over many years to offer their services to their State legislatures, but they cannot do so if they are to be penalized as they are under the present law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 587) amending the Internal Revenue Code relating to trade or business expenses, introduced by Mr. AIKEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT ON THE SNETTISHAM PENINSULA, ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], a bill which would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to construct a hydroelectric power project on the Snettisham Peninsula of Alaska, near the capital city of Juneau.

The Snettisham area of Alaska, in the Tongass National Forest, rich in timber and minerals, represents one of numerous areas in the United States where valuable natural resources lie dormant and cannot make the contribution to the wealth of the Nation which would otherwise be possible if low-cost electric power were available to convert them into commodities needed to supply the world with needed goods.

Last September I conducted a series of hearings at Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau, Alaska, for the purpose of exploring the needs of the State for low-cost electric power and resources available for supplying those needs. At each of these cities I was struck with the fantastic and continuing waste of human and natural resources which comes about through lack of necessary investment to utilize them.

At Fairbanks I heard extensive testimony about the rich potential value of constructing the Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon. Here there could be built the greatest hydroelectric project in the free world—a dam that would produce twice the power of Grand Coulee and more than all the hydroelectric power of TVA—at a cost of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar. Yet the city of Fairbanks is rapidly approaching a time in which there will be a critical shortage of power and, at present, the wholesale cost of power to consumers is more than 22 mills per kilowatt-hour.

If Rampart were constructed it would not only supply the needs of Fairbanks but could supply power for the entire railbelt area as well as provide the base for comprehensive industrial development of the entire State.

Anchorage, the major population center of the State, could be supplied power it badly needs from that which would be produced at Rampart. In the immediate future, pending construction of Rampart, Anchorage might be supplied with hydroelectric power from the Bradley Lake project on the Kenai Peninsula which is the subject of a favorable report from the district office of the Corps of Engineers but now awaits approval of the headquarters of the corps in Washington. Anchorage, like Fairbanks and Juneau, faces a serious shortage of power and is now saddled with power costs which are far too high and which are outrageously high when consideration is given to the bounteous supplies of hydroelectric power which could be made available.

The cities of Juneau and Douglas and the Gastineau Channel area present a striking example of conditions prevailing throughout the State where there is clear evidence of developing shortages of power, where the costs of power are higher than anywhere else in the United States—and where the resources for development of hydroelectric power represent one of the most valuable treasures of the Nation.

Near the Juneau-Douglas area where the Snettisham project would be located, are promising possibilities for development of the great timber resources of the Tongass National Forest by construction of a newsprint mill or for the processing of iron ore deposits in the area—but only if low cost power can be made available.

Aside from potential industrial needs for power in the greater Juneau area it is apparent that the normal growth of the community will require the availability of increasing supplies of power in the near future. The Federal Power Commission has estimated that needs of Juneau for additional electric power will rise by more than 30 million kilowatts by 1970 and by more than 60 million by 1980 above present requirements, which are approximately 30 million kilowatts. Depending, as it now does, for its principal source of power, on that produced by a defunct gold mine, Juneau must have not only larger supplies of power but a system of power supply adequately suited to its needs.

The Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project which this bill would authorize would provide the power Juneau needs at low cost and would be the essential ingredient for industrial development of great significance to the State. The project would provide for tapping the waters of Crater Lake and of Long Lake to be conveyed to a powerplant having an installed capacity of 48,000 kilowatts near the mouth of the Speel River, 28 miles southeast of Juneau. The plant would produce 292 million kilowatt-hours annually at a cost for firm energy of 6.1 mills per kilowatt-hour—a cost lower than that now paid for electric power at Juneau or elsewhere in Alaska. The cost of the project is estimated at $40 million, which would be fully repaid at 2½ percent interest within 50 years.

As President Kennedy remarked on the floor of the Senate on June 24, 1960:

> We must * * * move rapidly to insure the proper development of the new American Continent—the State of Alaska.

The construction of Snettisham will surely result in significant progress toward this goal. As the President further remarked on this occasion:

> This refusal to develop our natural resources—to provide the material base for tomorrow's America—has been justified in the name of economy. But the harsh fact of the matter is that these resource policies have been the most wasteful, extravagant, spendthrift programs since the great giveaways which followed the Civil War. We have recklessly dissipated the resources on which our strength depends. We have thrown away—heedless of our growing needs—opportunity after opportunity to insure that future generations of America will have the water, the power, the timber and the fertile land on which their prosperity will depend. We have failed to invest in America's future—and a future America will have to pay the high cost of our failures.
>
> We must, of course, rebuild the resource programs which are the proud heritage of Teddy Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt, and which have been neglected and ignored: forestry programs, power programs, reclamation programs, river-basin development, and all the rest. In this way we can begin to repair the damage which has already been done and start to restore our resources.

It should be noted that in this case, the outgoing Eisenhower administration approved the construction of this project upon the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. Thus, bipartisan support of the measure I have introduced should be assured.

It should always be emphasized that a project such as this represents a sound investment—not an expenditure of Federal funds for which there is LO benefit

received. The Snettisham project will pay for itself within a 50-year period. It will repay to the Federal Treasury, principal and interest, every cent that is appropriated for its construction. In effect, the money advanced is in the nature of a loan, not a grant, which in addition to repayment will develop other sources of taxable revenue for Nation and State.

It is my hope Congress will act speedily on this proposal and that the Snettisham project will soon become a reality.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 594) to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to construct a hydroelectric power project on the Snettisham Peninsula of Alaska, near the city of Juneau, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (on behalf of himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN LANDS AT LUKE-WILLIAMS AIR FORCE RANGE, YUMA, ARIZ.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 595) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Department of the Air Force explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded a draft of legislation, "To provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961. The Bureau of the Budget has advised by letter dated December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to its submission to the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal would withdraw and reserve certain lands described in the attached draft, located in Pima and Yuma Counties, Ariz., and would restrict the operation of the mineral leasing laws. An application for the withdrawal and reservation of the lands, comprising approximately 487,000 acres, from the public domain has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

The lands involved are desert, covered by a sparse growth of sagebrush, cacti, and greasewood. There are no water resources other than a few small seep springs and waterholes.

These lands are an integral and necessary part of the Luke-Williams Air Force Range, which has been used as a gunnery range since 1942, and which, in its entirety, lies in Pima, Yuma, and Maricopa Counties, Ariz. It is planned that Luke and Williams Air Force Bases will continue to use it as such in the combat crew training of tactical fighter pilot students. The range is also used by the Department of the Navy in connection with the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz., and by the Arizona Air National Guard.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

As the land area involved is currently in use by the Departments of the Air Force and Navy, there will be no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

DUDLEY C. SHARP.

ELIMINATION OF 6-PERCENT DIFFERENTIAL FOR WEST COAST SHIPBUILDERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the 6-percent differential between east coast and west coast shipbuilders.

In 1936 there was included in the Merchant Marine Act passed that year a provision which gives Pacific coast shipbuilders a preference of 6 percent over their Atlantic coast counterparts in cases where they are bidding competitively for the construction of a ship when a construction-differential subsidy has been applied for under other provisions of the act and the ship is thereafter to be used in foreign trade from ports of the Pacific coast.

Section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act actually directs that where the Pacific coast shipbuilders' bid does not exceed the lowest responsible Atlantic coast bidder by more than 6 percent the Commission shall approve such Pacific coast bid.

This very favorable preference which the west coast shipyards presently enjoy, Mr. President, was granted in 1936 because at that time the shipbuilding industry on the coast was dormant and national defense considerations required reactivation of the industry. This is clearly revealed by the legislative history of the Merchant Marine Act itself. That history also reveals that at the time much of the material that goes into building a ship, such as steel, aluminum, and copper, among other things, was not available on the west coast and, therefore, had to be shipped from the industrial East at rates which were of necessity higher than those charged the east coast yards which were nearer the manufacturing plants. Thus, the conclusion was reached in 1936 that some incentive was necessary to carry out the national defense objective of reactivating Pacific coast shipbuilding. The incentive arrived at was the 6-percent preference which was considered necessary to equalize the overland freight rates.

Over the years, Mr. President, this provision has cost the Government many millions of dollars which it would not otherwise have had to spend. This expenditure may have been justified 25 years ago when there was practically no shipbuilding on the west coast and when an incentive was needed to build it up. It may have also been justified at that time because materials were not manufactured on the west coast in large quantities and, also, because transportation costs were based to a great extent on the Pittsburgh-plus basing point system regardless of destination.

But the preference is no longer necessary. The justification for it has been eliminated and the only function the 6-percent windfall has today is to put east coast, as well as the gulf coast and Great Lakes, yards at a competitive disadvantage—in addition, of course, to costing the Government more money than it would otherwise have to spend for construction-differential subsidy grants.

Let us compare for a moment the present situation with that which existed in 1936, exclusive of naval shipyards.

There was justifiable concern in 1936 with the low ebb to which shipbuilding had dipped on the coast. In that year there were only 3 yards with 12 ways. The east coast in the same year had 8 yards with 54 ways. In 1959, the west coast had grown to 7 yards with 29 ways—more than doubled. The east coast, on the other hand, in 1959 had 9 yards, but the number of ways had decreased to 49.

In 1936 activity in the Pacific coast yards was almost nil. In 1959, their 7 yards had 15 ships under contract, while the east's 9 yards had 18.

Notwithstanding that shipbuilding activity was at a standstill in 1936 on the west coast, they were able to expand sufficiently and rapidly enough to construct 44 percent of the World War II-built merchant tonnage.

Not only did they produce in quantity, but they were able to produce the famous Liberty ships at a cost which was lower than that of the yards on any other coast. The combined average cost of that type of ship during the war to all other yards was $1,853,000. It cost the west coast yards only $1,737,000. It cost shipyards in the southeast as much as $1,954,000.

The only point for reciting these statistics, Mr. President, is to show the Members of the Senate that there is a strong, active, and efficient shipbuilding industry on the west coast. There is no longer the need for a preference to the west coast. The objective and purpose upon which the preference was formulated has been achieved. The national defense shipbuilding capability of the west coast has already been tested and it passed with flying colors. Not only has its capability increased, but material costs have gone down.

There is not much doubt that in 1936 material cost more on the west coast, but that unfavorable situation no longer exists.

In 1936, there was no steel produced west of the Rockies. Today, over 9 percent of the ingot ton capacity of the United States is produced west of the Rockies—more than enough to satisfy shipbuilding requirements of the entire country.

In 1936, most of the component parts of a ship were built in the East. Today, the West produces nearly all materials necessary to shipbuilding; in fact, many of the east coast yards buy from west coast suppliers.

In any event, the cost to all yards for materials is today generally uniform regardless of where located since materials are, for the most part, sold f.o.b. shipyard.

One exception is lumber, which the east coast yards must buy from Oregon at a cost 28 percent higher than the west coast yards can get it for. Another exception is boilers made in the East and, thus, costing more in the West.

In 1936, when the Pittsburgh-plus transportation cost system was used, it cost about 26.93 percent more to get steel to Los Angeles than it did to Newport News, Va. This system has been eliminated and today steel is available in Los Angeles at a price lower than it can be had in Newport News.

Therefore, it is my opinion, Mr. President, that since the bases upon which the 6-percent preference was enacted have been eliminated, it should be repealed. There is absolutely no need for the Government to continue throwing money away for the subsidization of part of the shipbuilding industry located in one geographical area. Why should one area receive preferential treatment over another?

This provision, it seems to me, is one of those temporary things which always seem to have a way of becoming permanent. It is now outmoded, unnecessary, and a waste of money.

I suppose this is a testimonial to the west coast yards, but because of their efficiency and technological know-how, as well as changes in the material and transportation situation, they are now competitively equal to the shipyards on the east coast—without a preference. With the preference they have a definite advantage and get a windfall since they can mark up the profit on a bid and still get the award. Because of these facts I am going to reintroduce at this time my bill to repeal the 6-percent preference.

I think, Mr. President, in considering the need for eliminating the preference that, in addition to the factors already mentioned, the fact that 26 or 27 percent of all military prime contracts for procurement, and 31.5 percent of all military prime contracts for research and development, are located in California should be clear in the mind of all. These contracts were awarded for the most part on the basis of competitive bids and without the benefit of a 6-percent subsidization. I think this clearly indicates that materials in general can be obtained and products produced as cheaply in the West as they can in the East.

This is not a problem which should cause an all-out fight between the east coast and west coast delegations to Congress. It should be considered dispassionately and with an open mind by all. The welfare of all U.S. citizens should be foremost. And if no justification exists for the U.S. Government to pay more for a ship built on the west coast than on the east coast, the preference provision should be repealed.

Action is needed, Mr. President. It is long overdue. In the interests of the citizens of my State of Maryland as well as those of the entire United States, I urge early action on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 596) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR A FULL-TIME STUDENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill permitting an extra income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education.

Education of children constitutes a heavy drain on the financial resources of parents. The cost of higher education is steadily increasing. In many instances the extra $600 which my bill permits as an exemption for taxpayers does not cover the cost of tuition, let alone the cost of text books, meals and lodging.

I feel, however, that the Government should encourage and assist our young men and women desiring to receive a college education.

Education is our greatest bulwark against communism. If we are to have an enlightened citizenry we must encourage our citizens to improve their minds. This can only be done with adequate training in our schools.

If we are to encourage higher education we should help the parents of students who must meet the financial obligations of educating their dependents. I believe, that the granting of an extra income tax exemption will help them and I earnestly hope that this proposed legislation will receive the early consideration of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 602) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED ETHICS LEGISLATION FOR EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today introducing, for myself and my colleague [Mr. KEATING], comprehensive ethics legislation to protect against conflicts of interest in both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. The proposals would coordinate and revise existing conflict-of-interest laws affecting executive branch employees and would also create a Joint Committee on Ethics to develop a code of ethics for Members of Congress and all other legislative employees. Representative JOHN LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, is sponsoring similar legislation in the House of Representatives.

There is an urgent need for Senators, Representatives and the some 22,000 employees in the legislative branch of the Federal Government to have the benefit of a clearly defined code of ethics. It is completely incongruous for Senate committees to put Cabinet appointees through rigorous questioning as to their financial affairs and outside interests which might conflict with their new duties, when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements. For our own guidance as well as for the protection of the public interest, we should enact a clearly defined, enforceable ethics code. We should not continue to function on what appears to many to be a double standard of ethics—one set of standards for the executive branch but none for the legislative branch.

Under the proposals an interim ethical code would be in operation while the joint congressional committee prepares its recommendations for a permanent code for Members of Congress and all other legislative employees. This interim code would draw extensively on the New York State code with which I had considerable experience as Attorney General of New York. One if its provisions would require a Member of Congress or other legislative officer or employee to disclose immediately a financial interest, valued at $10,000 or more, in any activity subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. Other prohibitions would limit outside employment, ban the disclosure or use of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties for other than official purposes, and prohibit using official influence to gain special privileges or exemptions.

Another key measure in the package is the Executive Conflict of Interest Act of 1961; it is based on an exhaustive 2-year study of the problem by the special committee on the Federal conflict-of-interest laws of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. It would provide for the codification and updating of existing conflict-of-interest laws and set up rules of conduct for the nearly 5 million Federal employees, including members of the Armed Forces. Under this bill, executive branch officials and employees would be limited and in many cases prohibited from accepting gifts and favors or performing outside work for pay while in

the employ of the Government. As ex-employees, they would also be banned from participating in any way in transactions with the Government in which they were previously involved as Government employees. Special provision is made in the act for part-time consultants, and to permit regular Government officials and employees to retain certain outside economic interests including participation in company pension and welfare plans.

The remaining ethics proposals would require that any written or oral communications between a Member of Congress or their staffs and a regulatory agency be made part of the public record, give the Senate Rules and Administration Committee jurisdiction over alleged violations of Federal ethical standards by Senate Members or their staffs, and permit a Senator to abstain from voting on legislation in which he may have a direct interest without first having to request the permission of the Senate.

Right now is the ideal time to press for prompt consideration of Federal ethics legislation by the Congress. The recent changeover of administrations resulting in the immediate hiring of many Cabinet and sub-Cabinet level employees has focused public attention on the diffuse and often contradictory standards which are applied to potential Government officials to guard against conflict of interest.

The hopeless hodgepodge of existing laws in the executive branch is often a serious handicap in the recruiting of top-flight personnel. They can expose nominees to unnecessary embarrassment, or result in the imposition of harsh, unreasonable financial restrictions. Until a major overhaul is undertaken of existing conflict-of-interest statutes and clear rules of conduct are established, the public interest will not be adequately served.

In this age of specialization, these laws should not try to lump together full-time employees and part-time consultants. The act we sponsor would see to it that outstanding leaders in every field would still be able to advise and consult with the executive branch when needed without being subjected to unrealistic requirements which do not relate to such part-time service.

We welcome President Kennedy's recent announcement of a special committee to investigate this problem. One of the members is Prof. Bayless Manning who was staff director for the special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which helped prepare this Executive Conflict of Interests Act of 1961. We, therefore, have reason to believe that many of its key provisions will be brought to the President's attention. We firmly believe they merit his endorsement.

Every executive branch employee would be required to sign an affidavit attesting to his or her knowledge of the rules and regulations on conflicts of interest, prescribed under the act and subsequently developed by the administrator, who would be appointed by the President and serve directly in the Executive Office. Civil and criminal enforcement provisions would apply to violations of the act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. President, I understood we were proceeding under the 3-minute rule, which applies to all of the articles to be offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator still has some of the 3 minutes left.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been watching the clock, and I thought the Senator had gone well over the 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills, resolutions, and concurrent resolution, will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 603 A bill to supplement and revise the laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to employees of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 637. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedures Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes.

The resolutions, submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (o) of subsection 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph to be subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) Such committee shall also have the duty to consider all matters arising in connection with the application of any code of ethics applicable to Members, officers, or employees of the Senate. The committee shall receive complaints of any violation of such code and may, upon request of any Senator, officer, or employee, give an advisory opinion to the Senator, officer, or employee involved on the conformity of any proposed conduct with any such code."

Resolved, That subsections 1 and 2 of rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate are hereby amended to read as follows:

"1. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate, but any Senator having a direct personal or pecuniary interest, not related to his official duties, in the event of such question shall be so excused without submission of the question of excuse to the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

"2. When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, for any reason other than the assertion of a direct personal or pecuniary interest not related to his official duties, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: 'Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?' which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the rollcall and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement."

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. (a) One of the most vital concerns of a free and representative government is the maintenance of moral and ethical standards for their representatives which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. The people are entitled to expect from their elected representatives in the Federal Government and the employees of the legislative branch a standard above that of the marketplace, for these public servants are entrusted with the welfare of the Nation. Yet these standards must be practical and should be fairly representative of the people who elect their representatives. Some conflicts of interest are clearly wrong and should be proscribed by sanctions in the criminal law; however, many are composed of such diverse circumstances, events, and intangible and indirect concerns that only the individual conscience can serve as a practical guide. But there are many possibilities of conflict in that shadowland of conduct for which guidance would be useful and healthy, but for which the criminal law is neither suited or suitable. Therefore, the Congress finds that a Code of Ethics is desirable for the guidance and protection of its Members and officers and employees of the legislative branch of Government, establishing the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

(b) It is also the purpose of this resolution to provide for a thorough study and investigation to determine necessary and desirable changes in existing conflict-of-interest statutes applying to Members of Congress and to officers and employees of the legislative branch, and to develop a comprehensive code of ethics for the guidance of such Members, officers, and employees, by which the purposes of this resolution may be more fully assured in the conduct of the public business in the legislative branch.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Ethics (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of seven Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the policy objectives set forth in section 1 of this resolution can further be assured. In the conduct of such study and investigation the joint committee shall, among other things, determine to what extent existing conflict of interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened and it shall recommend a comprehensive code of ethics in the formulation of which it shall have considered the following subjects:

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch;

(2) Disclosure by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch of confidential information acquired in the

course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealing by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch in their official capacities with matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust; and

(6) Other matters concerning official propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members of Congress, officers or employees of the legislative branch.

(b) The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the result of its investigations together with such recommendations for the establishment of a code of ethics covering the legislative branch as it may deem advisable. Such report shall be submitted no later than March 31, 1962, and the committee shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

HEARINGS, SUBPENAS, DISBURSEMENT, EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said joint committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House.

(b) The joint committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable, subject to the limitations of its appropriations. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of such departments and other agencies of the Government as it may deem appropriate.

LIMITATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE'S POWERS

SEC. 5. The joint committee shall have no power of enforcement with respect to any Members of Congress or officer or employee of the legislative branch, and such power is reserved with respect to its Members, officers or employees to each House or to any committee thereof which has been designated to carry out such functions.

INTERIM CODE OF ETHICS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of guidance for Members of Congress and officers and employees of the legislative branch during the period during which the joint committee is considering the provisions of an appropriate code of ethics for Members of Congress and officers or employees of the legislative branch, the Congress hereby adopts the following standards as a guide to such Members, officers or employees;

(a) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business, transaction or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the legislative branch give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust.

(b) In addition to the general rule set forth in paragraph (a), the following standards are applied to certain specified transactions:

(1) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties.

(2) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority.

(3) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties or use such information for other than official purposes.

(4) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.

(5) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should not by his conduct give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party.

(6) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should endeavor to pursue a course of conduct which will not give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

(7) Any Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General. As used herein, the term "regulatory agency" shall include such agencies as shall be designated by the Comptroller General, which list shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted today to join with my distinguished colleague from New York in sponsoring a series of bills to develop and establish a unified code of ethics for employees of both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. I have long been interested in legislation in this area. As a Member of the House, I authored and introduced a number of bills to establish realistic and equitable ethical standards for Government employees.

I want today to pay special tribute to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which has been extremely helpful to my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself in drafting the bill which we have introduced today to coordinate and revise the code of ethics statutes which affect employees of the executive branch.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss these several bills in any detail; however, I do want to make two observations which I think are of special importance.

First, there is a serious inequity in having a standard of ethics for executive employees, as we do now, and not having a similar standard for legislative employees. We in Congress cannot and must not take a "holier than thou" attitude in this area. There can be no double standard of governmental morality. Members of the Senate and House have no more right to obtain unwarranted privileges and exemptions than anyone else.

Politics and ethics must be blood brothers. I strongly and enthusiastically urge that the Congress of the United States take action to make this absolutely clear.

Government code of ethics legislation has been discussed and analyzed for years. Recently, in confirming the nominees of President Kennedy, we have again seen the types of difficulties which arise in applying the present conflict-of-interest statutes and regulations to Cabinet and sub-Cabinet nominees.

I am hopeful that the Judiciary and Rules Committees will hold hearings and take action on this subject in the very near future. Introducing bills is not enough. We have come to that stage in the legislative process when the appropriate committees of the Congress must carry the ball. I intend to press with all the vigor that I can to have these bills, and any other proposals which other Senators may care to put forth, taken up at the earliest possible moment. I can think of few issues which should receive a higher priority.

CLEAN ELECTIONS BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have it on good authority from a report soon to be published that the 1960 elections cost in excess of $175 million. This includes all elections—from city officials to the President of the United States.

It is not for me to say whether this figure is too high or too low. But, the thing which concerns me is that the American people, under existing laws, will never know who contributed to the candidates nor how much.

Today, I am introducing a clean elections bill. The primary purpose of this bill is to provide full disclosure of campaign financing in Federal elections.

My predecessor, the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, worked for many years for the passage of a clean elections bill. As early as 1955, he recognized the need to modernize and improve the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act. A year ago this month, the U.S. Senate passed the Hennings clean elections bill by a vote of 59–22.

Unfortunately, the bill did not complete its course through Congress before adjournment.

The present law regulates elections primarily in two ways. It places limitations on campaign financing and calls for disclosure. However, the limitations on expenditures over the past 35 years have become completely unrealistic and candidates often find themselves violating the spirit of the law, while adhering to the letter of the law. Increased costs along with the advent of television require that the present limitations on expenditures be raised.

The disclosure provisions of the present law are completely inadequate. They overlook a great part of campaign financing. They do not require reports on primary elections, caucuses and conventions. Nor do they require political committees which operate in only one State to report.

The American people have every right in the world to know who is contributing to the candidates and how much they contributed.

The bill which I introduce today is similar to the bill which passed the Senate last January.

It requires reporting of campaign finances in primary elections, caucuses and conventions, as well as the general elections. It also requires reports from political committees which operate in only one State if they receive or expend more than $2,500. In addition, it requires that copies of reports be filed locally as well as in Washington in order that such reports will be readily available to local citizens and the general press.

The bill would raise limitations on expenditures to realistic levels. It would also place limitations on expenditures by presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

The present law prohibits a person from contributing more than $5,000 to any one candidate or political committee. Therefore, a person may contribute as much as he wants, but he cannot give more than $5,000 to a particular candidate or committee. This has allowed some of our Nation's wealthiest families to contribute vast sums of money to influence elections. The bill I am introducing would amend the law limiting each person to $10,000, as the total political contribution he could make in a year.

The bill includes one provision which was not a part of the bill passed by the Senate last year, but one which I believe should be given careful consideration. This provision allows a person to claim as a tax credit 50 percent of his political contributions with a maximum credit of $10. Such a provision would be an incentive to many people, who now contribute nothing, to make political contributions and thereby broaden the financing base of our elections. With more people sharing the financial burden, it would help eliminate the need for large individual contributions.

I, therefore, introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a bill to improve and modernize our Federal elections laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 604) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

URBAN RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend and extend existing laws dealing with urban renewal and redevelopment projects, and to encourage participation by the States in slum clearance and prevention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks:

First, an announcement I have made concerning the bill.

Second, a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

Third, the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the announcement, the section-by-section analysis, and the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 605) to amend and extend existing laws dealing with urban renewal and redevelopment projects, and to encourage participation by the States in slum clearance and prevention, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Renewal Amendments of 1961".

SECTION 1. (a) Section 101(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "affected communities" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "localities in which the projects are situated. State agencies may receive capital grants for such projects on a five-sixth capital grant basis, in accord with the second and third provisos in the second sentence of section 103(a)".

(b) Section 103(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the proviso in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided,* That the aggregate of capital grants with respect to all projects approved, at the request of a local public agency, on a three-fourths capital grant basis may exceed two-thirds but not three-fourths of the aggregate net project costs of these projects: *Provided further,* That a capital grant made at the request of a State agency of the type referred to in the second sentence of section 101(b) may exceed two-thirds but not five-sixths of the net project cost of the project for which it is made: *And provided further,* That where two or more such projects on a five-sixth basis are situated in the same community, the aggregate of capital grants with respect to those projects may exceed two-thirds but not five-sixths of the aggregate net project costs of those projects."

(c) Section 107 of such Act is amended by adding the following after "three-fourths capital grant basis" in the second parenthesis: "and one-fifth in the case of an urban renewal project on a five-sixths capital grant basis".

(d) Section 110(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "on a three-fourths basis pursuant to the proviso" in the two places it occurs and substituting "on a three-fourths or five-sixths basis pursuant to the provisos".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by inserting in clause (1) the words "for community improvement" after "workable program".

(b) Section 10(i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting "for community improvement" in the second proviso after "workable program."

SEC. 3. Section 102(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "In connection with any such pledge of a loan contract as security for the repayment of obligations of the local public agency held by other than the Federal Government, the Administrator is authorized to agree to pay, and to pay when due, from funds obtained pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, to the holders of such obligations (or to their agents or designees) the principal of and the interest on such obligations, subject to such conditions as the Administrator may determine but without regard to any other condition or requirement. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any contract or other instrument executed by the Administrator which, by its terms, includes an obligation of the Administrator to make payment pursuant to this subsection shall be incontestable in the hands of a bearer, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such bearer, and the full faith and credit of the United States is pledged to the payment of all amounts agreed to be paid by the Administrator pursuant to this subsection."

SEC. 4. Section 103(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Administrator, on or after July 1, 1949, may, with the approval of the President, contract to make grants under this title aggregating not to exceed $2,000,000,000, which amount shall be increased by such sums as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, but not to exceed $500,000,000 made available on July 1 of each of the years 1961 through 1966, inclusive: *Provided,* That there may also be specified in appropriation acts a further amount, not to exceed $100,000,000 by which the President may increase the grant authority under this title, upon a determination that such action is in the public interest and after consulting with the Council of Economic Advisors as to the general effect of such increase upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy."

SEC. 5. Section 106 of such Act is amended by adding the following new subsection: "(h) Without limiting any authority otherwise provided in this title, any local grants-in-aid may be furnished by the State gov-

ernment as distinguished from other local public agencies, as herein defined. In making capital grants available for projects, priority shall be given a project in a State where the State government has furnished or contracted to furnish local grants-in-aid to the project in an amount which equals or exceeds one-half the total required amount."

SEC. 6. Section 106(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

SEC. 7. Section 106(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by changing the period at the end of paragraph (1) to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That upon request of the local public agency such relocation payments may be included in gross project cost on the same basis as other project expenditures, in which event the dollar limitations set forth in the second sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply."; and

(2) by striking out the last two sentences of paragraph (2) and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "Such payments shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 in the case of a business concern. Payment to individuals and families of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) may be made in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary expenses. All payments under this subsection shall be subject to such rules, regulations, and limitations as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

SEC. 8. (a) The second sentence of section 110(c) of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "and" after paragraph (5);

(2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) adding after paragraph (6) a new paragraph as follows: "(7) acquisition and repair or rehabilitation for guidance purposes and resale by the local public agency of dwelling units which are located in the urban renewal area in which, under the urban renewal plan, are to be repaired or rehabilitated: *Provided*, That not more than (i) 50 dwelling units in any urban renewal area, or (ii) two per centum of the total number of dwelling units in such area which are to be rehabilitated under the urban renewal plan, whichever is the lesser, shall be acquired by the local public agency for such purposes."

(b) The second unnumbered paragraph of section 110(c) of such Act is amended by inserting after "include" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (7) above)".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 110(c) of such Act is amended by—

(1) changing clause (ii) of paragraph (1) to read as follows: "(ii) land which is open or predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, unsuitable topographical conditions, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or";

(2) adding the word "other" immediately after "(iii)" in paragraph (1); and

(3) striking out the last two unnumbered paragraphs.

(b) Sections 111(6) and 112 of such Act are amended by deleting the words "predominantly residential in character or".

SEC. 10. Section 112 of such Act is amended by—

(1) deleting from the first proviso "(from others than the local public agency)";

(2) striking out "(including expenditures to assist in relocating tenants therefrom)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(including expenditures to assist in relocating occupants from buildings or structures to be demolished or rehabilitated)";

(3) striking out "the land is to be cleared and redeveloped" and inserting in lieu thereof "the land is to be cleared and redeveloped, or rehabilitated"; and

(4) adding the following after the colon at the end of the second proviso: "*Provided further*, That no such expenditure shall be eligible as a local grant-in-aid in any case where the property involved is acquired by such educational institution from a local public agency which, in connection with its acquisition or disposition of such property, has received, or contracted to receive, a capital grant pursuant to this title: *And provided further*, That the aggregate expenditures made by any public authority, established by any State, for acquisition, demolition, and relocation in connection with land, buildings, and structures acquired by such public authority and leased to an educational institution for educational uses shall be deemed a local grant-in-aid to the same extent as if such expenditures had been made directly by such educational institution:".

SEC. 11. The Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof as follows:

"SEC. 113. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may carry out, or assist in carrying out, research and studies in urban planning, development, and renewal and may, without regard to section 306 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (39 U.S.C. 321n), disseminate the results of such research and studies. The Administrator is authorized to expend for the purposes of this section an amount not exceeding 1 per centum of the urban renewal grant authorization made available by or pursuant to the Housing Act of 1961 or later Acts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary for such expenditures."

The announcement and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BUSH are as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 26.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH proposed today a $3.1 billion, 6-year urban renewal program, and the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs to administer it.

The Connecticut Senator's proposals were incorporated in two bills he has prepared for introduction in the Senate.

"These bills reflect experience gained since enactment of the basic urban renewal statutes in 1954," Senator BUSH said. "They incorporate suggestions made by men who have had the responsibility of administering that law here in Washington, and by local officials in Connecticut who have worked under it.

"Connecticut has benefited greatly from urban renewal. Our communities have received the largest amount of Federal capital grant reservations on a per capita basis of any State in the Union. Much remains to be done, however, and improvements in the law are needed to make the work go forward more smoothly and rapidly.

"My urban renewal bill is intended to provide a realistic, stable level of capital grant authorizations over an extended period, so that communities may plan ahead, give more generous treatment to families and businesses which must relocate, and eliminate 'redtape' and paperwork wherever possible. It also provides for urgently needed research in urban problems. The bill creating the new Department reflects the necessity that the serious problems confronting our cities be recognized at the highest levels of our National Government."

Senator BUSH, a member of the Senate Banking Committee and one of the draftsmen of the urban renewal laws, said his bill would provide Federal capital grant authorizations of $500 million in each of the fiscal years beginning on July 1 of 1961 through 1966, plus an additional $100 million to be available at the discretion of the President.

"I have determined this level of grant authorizations in consultation with Mr. David M. Walker, who recently retired as Urban Renewal Commissioner," Senator BUSH said. "It is a higher level than Mr. Walker had previously thought necessary, and reflects increased interest in the program by communities throughout the Nation since his earlier estimates last year."

Other major features include:

1. Increased urban renewal relocation payments to ease the burden on families and businesses displaced by projects.

2. A new program of "pilot" rehabilitation projects by which local agencies could demonstrate to homeowners methods by which existing homes may be conserved and improved.

3. An expanded program of research in the areas of urban planning, development, and renewal.

4. A system of priorities in Federal capital grants for projects in States which assist their local communities in meeting the expenses of required local costs, and increased capital grants for State urban renewal agencies which carry on urban renewal projects for smaller communities.

Senator BUSH's bill to create a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was modeled on a bill reported out by the Senate Banking Committee in the last session of the 86th Congress, but not called up for a vote. An additional feature, not contained in last year's bill, provides authorization for the construction of an office building for the new Department.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF URBAN RENEWAL AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Section 1. Increased capital grants for State urban renewal agencies: The Housing Act of 1959 added a requirement to the urban renewal legislation that the Housing Administrator should particularly encourage State agencies established to carry on urban renewal programs for smaller communities who desire to undertake such programs but who are not in a position to establish their own local agency. This new section would provide a concrete method of encouraging such agencies, by authorizing Federal capital grants equal to five-sixths rather than three-fourths of net project cost, when that cost is calculated on the so-called three-fourths capital grant basis. That basis leaves all the administrative and overhead expenses of the local agency out of project cost accounting but compensates for the resulting lower net project cost by providing a higher proportion of Federal contribution.

No increase is proposed for projects on the regular two-thirds capital grant basis, because it is felt that the three-fourths accounting basis is especially well suited for this type of urban renewal project. A State urban renewal agency will be engaging in projects in various localities throughout the State. At the same time it will often be serving other State functions, such as those of State planning agency or public housing agency. Adoption of the simplified three-fourths accounting basis would reduce both paperwork and the need for detailed agency supervision of local expenditures. It would considerably benefit both the local agency and the Urban Renewal Administration.

The new section would also make conforming changes in the general urban renewal grant authorization and pooling provisions, and in the provision for a 100-percent Federal urban renewal grant in the case of land to be used for low-rent public housing.

Section 2. Clarification of workable program: This section does not change the substantive law in any way. It merely makes clear that the workable program referred to

in the provision of law amended by this section relates to overall community improvement.

The phrase "workable program" now includes a reference to an official plan of action, as it exists from time to time, for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community and for the establishment and preservation of a well-planned community with well-organized residential neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment for adequate family life. Because this description is too cumbersome for ready reference, the shorter phrase "workable program" has come into use among technicians in the field. However, it is not sufficiently informative to others, and the proposed change in the law would provide a more self-explanatory nontechnical reference.

Section 3. Amendment to give private holders of obligations of local urban renewal agency assurance of payment without regard to technical and procedural questions: Section 102(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 expressly provides that the Federal Government may make urban renewal loans to local public agencies subject to the condition that, if at any time the local public agency can obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government at interest rates lower than provided in the Federal loan contract, it may do so with the consent of the Housing Administrator without waiving or surrendering any rights to loan funds under the Federal contract. Under this provision, the vast bulk of urban renewal loan funds are in fact borrowed by the local public agencies on the private market. Private lenders are willing to make these loans largely in reliance on the availability of the Federal loan funds when and if needed.

This section of the bill would expressly authorize the Administrator, in connection with such a pledge of the Federal loan contract as security for the local public agency's private borrowings, to agree to pay out to the private holders of the obligations moneys due to them under the pledge arrangement, and this agreement would be incontestable in the hands of the bearer, except for fraud or misrepresentation on his part. In effect, this amendment would permit firmer assurance to the private lenders that the local urban renewal agency's obligations would be paid without regard to technical and procedural questions. Thus, without materially increasing the obligation of the Federal Government, there should be a resulting improvement in the market for urban renewal bonds and some corresponding decrease in interest rate costs, which are shared on a two-thirds–one-third basis by the Federal and local governments.

Section 4. Financing: This section provides for increases in the urban renewal grant authorization to the extent specified from time to time in appropriation acts, but not to exceed $500 million made available on July 1 of each of the years 1961 through 1966, inclusive, plus an additional $100 million which the President may make available upon a determination that such action is in the public interest and after consulting with the Council of Economic Advisers as to the general effect of such increase upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy.

Section 5. Priorities in Federal capital grants: This section would provide priorities in Federal capital grants to projects in States which assist their local communities in meeting the expenses of required local costs. Under existing law, the Federal Government can contribute no more than two-thirds of the net project cost, so that the locality must bear one-third of such cost. Increased awareness of the plight of our urban areas has produced growing State interest in the renewal and rehabilitation of metropolitan areas, and a few States have provided for financial assistance to cities to help meet their required one-third share of urban renewal costs. This should be encouraged by the priority required by this section, in the interest of facilitating urban renewal and increasing the effectiveness of Federal expenditures.

Section 6. Increase in urban renewal grant authorization available to States: This section would increase by $50 million the capital grant funds available in a limited amount for States which exceed the 12½-percent limitation on the use in any one State of the capital grant authorization. The purpose of this reserve fund is to provide some flexibility in the percent limit per State. The fund acts as a cushion to avoid hardship on a particular community which may be located in a State which has reached the statutory maximum percentage.

Section 7. Increased urban renewal relocation payments: This amendment would allow a local urban renewal agency to make relocation payments to individuals, families, and businesses without regard to the present dollar limits on such payments, where the local agency agrees to bear one-third of the total cost of such payments. The Federal Government would bear the other two-thirds, the same as it does for other urban renewal project costs.

The amendment in no way affects the provisions of existing law which permit a 100 percent Federal payment if it does not exceed $200 in the case of individuals or families or $3,000 in the case of businesses. A locality could continue to use this authority, for example, if it is prohibited by State law or constitutional provisions from sharing in the cost of relocation payments.

Section 8. Pilot rehabilitation program: This section would amend existing law to enable local public agencies to undertake "pilot" rehabilitation efforts in urban renewal projects by acquiring a few buildings, rehabilitating them at project expense, and then selling them to private owners. The net cost would be shared by the Federal Government and the locality in the same manner as other net project costs.

If adopted, this amendment would expedite rehabilitation in urban renewal areas, particularly rehabilitation of structures for occupancy by low and moderate income families. It is believed that this amendment would stimulate, by example, the type of activity which is needed to make a rehabilitation project successful. Unlike clearance projects which involve new construction by one or a few experienced builders, rehabilitation requires many owners of small properties, who may have had little or no experience in contracting or in construction financing, to improve a wide variety of properties. Pilot rehabilitation activities would be helpful in showing them how to proceed and in demonstrating favorable results. To the extent that this amendment contributes to the success of individual rehabilitation projects, it would also encourage our cities to make wider use of rehabilitation as a means of accomplishing urban renewal. This is extremely important because the extent and variety of urban blight is such that it cannot possibly be dealt with solely through clearance.

It is understood that pilot rehabilitation should be carried out by the local public agency in a manner and at a cost which would be feasible for property owners in the project area.

Section 9. Removal of "predominantly residential" requirement: This section removes the basic "predominantly residential" requirement of the present law (third unnumbered paragraph of section 110(c)) which in effect limits each urban renewal project area to one which is predominantly residential in character to begin with or which will become predominantly residential when improved in accordance with the urban renewal plan. Today, it is widely recognized that the Federal interest in urban renewal is not strictly limited to housing betterment as such. Eligibility for Federal urban renewal aid should not depend on whether an arbitrary percentage of a particular project involves residential use. Rather, increasing emphasis is being placed on improving the entire living environment of the urban population which now probably includes 70 to 75 percent of the Nation.

Under the amendment, open land which is not subject to obsolete platting or to diversity of ownership would continue as a general rule to be subject to the predominantly residential requirement (clauses 1 and 2 of paragraph (a) of this amendment). The Congress originally made the acquisition of open land eligible as an urban renewal activity for the sole purpose of providing relocation housing in connection with related redevelopment activities. However, later exceptions with respect to disaster areas and institutions of higher education are in no way changed by this section except for the deletion of obsolete references having no legal effect (paragraph (b) of this amendment).

The section would also strike from the law a provision of the 1949 act authorizing loans or advances for development of open land into commercial and industrial uses (fourth unnumbered paragraph of section 110(c)). The provision, which limited these loans and advances to 2½ percent of the estimated gross project cost of other title I projects of the locality will not be needed if the basic amendment to section 110(c) is adopted. Under the amendment, loans and advances will be available, without a percentage limitation, to develop for nonresidential use, any open or predominantly open land which substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of a community because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership or otherwise. With respect to open land which does not suffer from such defects, the Federal lending authority is clearly not needed as a practical matter, nor has any interest been shown in this authority during the 5 years since its enactment.

The added reference to "unsuitable topographical conditions" (clause (1) of paragraph (a) of this amendment) merely clarifies and does not change existing law.

Section 10. Urban renewal areas involving colleges or universities: This section would amend in four particulars the provisions enacted in 1959 to grant special benefits for urban renewal projects that are undertaken in connection with urban colleges and universities:

(1) The amendment would make it clear that the locality may obtain noncash grant-in-aid credit with respect to an expenditure for property acquired by the educational institution from a local public agency in those cases where the local public agency does not itself receive an urban renewal capital grant with respect to the property.

(2) The amendment would permit the inclusion of relocation expenditures made by the university in assisting the relocation of any occupants from buildings that are to be demolished or rehabilitated under section 112. The intention of the present law is not clear on this point in that it refers only to tenants rather than occupants.

(3) The amendment would not change existing law but would technically conform the present statute by adding the necessary reference to rehabilitation.

(4) The amendment would authorize expenditures made by a State-established public authority which acquired the property and leased it to the educational institution to be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the same extent as if the expenditures had been made directly by the educational institution.

Section 11. Percentage of urban renewal capital grant authorization for research: This section would authorize the Housing Administrator to undertake and carry out research

and studies in the areas of urban planning, development, and renewal. It would permit the Administrator to carry out these activities himself or to assist others in carrying them out. In addition, it would permit the results of the studies and research to be published for general use.

The authorization for the program would be limited to 1 percent of amounts authorized in this or later acts for urban renewal grants. The funds themselves would be provided through separate appropriations.

The Federal Government and the States and localities will, in the coming years, be spending many billions of dollars for the rehabilitation and improvement of our urban areas. However, there is now no specific authority for the Housing Administrator to undertake planning and studies, through contract or through Housing Agency staff, designed to add to the general understanding of urban decay and dislocation, and of the effectiveness of various patterns of development and redevelopment.

The present urban planning grant program provides funds for States and localities and only for specific local planning. Similarly, in the community renewal program, grants are available to local agencies, and to aid in determining the location and scheduling of local urban renewal projects.

The section 314 program does provide localities with two-thirds capital grants for "demonstration grant" projects to develop general techniques for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight, and the data and conclusions reached in these projects can be of considerable help to other urban renewal agencies. However, even this program is limited to the types of research which can be carried out by local agency staffs and which fit in with the needs of the specific urban renewal projects receiving such grants.

The authority to be provided by this section would, on the other hand, authorize studies which would be beyond the scope of any local agency, such as comparisons of what happens to people relocated from various urban renewal areas throughout the country. Such authority would be very helpful to the Housing Agency in carrying out its programs of assistance to urban areas.

SHELLFISHERIES RESEARCH CENTER AT MILFORD, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the construction of a Shellfisheries Research Center at Milford, Conn.

I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill, and the text of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the announcement and the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 606) to provide for the construction of a Shellfisheries Research Center at Milford, Conn., was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized and directed to construct at Milford, Connecticut, a research center for shellfisheries production and for such purpose acquire such real property as may be necessary. Such research center shall consist of research facilities, a pilot hatchery including rearing tanks and ponds, and a training school, and shall be used for the conduct of basic research on the physiology and ecology of commercial shellfish, the development of hatchery methods for cultivation of mollusks, including the development of principles that can be applied to the utilization of artificial and natural salt water ponds for shellfish culture, and to train persons in the most advanced methods of shellfish culture.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $1,325,000 to carry out this Act.

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 26.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH reintroduced today his bill to provide for the construction of a $1,325,000 Shellfisheries Research Center at Milford, Conn.

Joining in sponsorship of the bill was his Connecticut colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD. A companion bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut's Third District.

"Marine biologists at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory at Milford, under the able direction of Dr. V. L. Loosanoff, have accomplished an outstanding scientific breakthrough in solving the controlled propagation of shellfish," Senator BUSH said.

"These achievements promise to revolutionize the shellfish industry, and lead to more scientific farming of the seas, producing vast quantities of protein foods.

"To fully exploit these developments, there is need for expanded facilities at the Milford Laboratory so that a pilot clam and oyster seed-producing plant can be put into operation and people can be trained in the necessary techniques."

Senator BUSH said that the State of Connecticut already has donated to the Federal Government land for the new building. His bill would authorize an appropriation of $1,250,000 for the Research Center, and $75,000 for hatchery ponds.

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the Housing Administrator to pay additional construction costs of a highway in order to avoid disruption of orderly community growth and the creation of slums and blight.

On November 29, 1960, Robert Merriam, then deputy assistant to President Eisenhower, raised this question when he spoke before the American Municipal Association convention in New York:

> Why should it not be possible to utilize urban renewal funds to depress a highway through an urban area in need of renewal even though an elevated highway might serve the transportation need? The law does not allow this today.

The bill I introduce today would give force to this view.

Under my bill, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator could provide, within limitations, financial assistance to communities where orderly redevelopment is threatened by highway construction.

Upon application of a local housing agency, the Administrator may make grants up to two-thirds of the additional construction costs which must be borne by the State and localities affected.

This is a problem accentuated by the enormous expansion in new road construction under the Federal Interstate Highway program, now well underway throughout the United States.

It is, I think, axiomatic that without careful community planning, we cannot eliminate the slum; we cannot decently house our people; we cannot reshape our city core; we cannot recreate rising real estate values which can mean, eventually, lower taxes for homeowners.

A massive investment is required to reach these objectives—$100 billion to wipe out housing and industrial slums throughout the land, according to the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods.

The Federal Government is helping. It has made capital grants and loans of many hundreds of millions of dollars to communities for their redevelopment and for the elimination of blight and decay. In New Jersey alone, approximately $100 million has been earmarked for specific urban renewal projects. Our State has been one of the Nation's most active in this field.

What I am concerned about is that the Federal Government be wholly consistent in what it seeks to accomplish, and that one arm of the Government not take any step which runs counter to the objectives of another arm.

For the past several years, the Federal Government has required communities to develop workable programs spelling out citywide redevelopment plans. Approval of a workable program for an entire city is necessary before Federal funds can be reserved for any single project.

Consideration ought to be given to expanding the workable program concept to include regional planning. Under this requirement, specific projects would be approved if they fitted into a concept not only in keeping with the needs of the whole community, but with the needs of an entire metropolitan area.

In this fashion, too, the often cutthroat competition between urban planners and highway engineers for open space and parkland might be brought more closely under control. A new metropolitan area workable program could be required to include approved highway plans in the interest of local development needs and not exclusively in the interest of the motorists.

This approach is, I think, for future consideration. Perhaps when Congress is called upon to consider President Kennedy's proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs there will be an opportunity to search out a solution which will provide better metropolitan area planning than we have been able to produce to date.

In Essex County, N.J., State plans call for a Federal-aid, elevated east-west freeway in one of the most heavily populated sections of the New York metropolitan area. The history of elevated structures through an area such

as this clearly points up the destructive effect on neighborhoods and property values this type of construction breeds.

Yet the area traversed by the proposed highway is already the site of several urban renewal projects, all of which are being financed in considerable part by Federal funds from the Housing Agency. In all, Newark's workable program embraces no fewer than eight redevelopment projects for which nearly $30 million in Federal funds already have been reserved. Funds for two projects in East Orange have been earmarked as well, totaling $2.6 million, and, in Orange, another $1.7 million has been set aside for still another project. And, it is through these population centers that the proposed freeway would be built, adding new problems for the planners should the freeway be elevated.

When the Garden State Parkway in this very area was built to run north-south, the wisdom of depressing the roadway through that particular section was foreseen. The lesson learned, however, may be lost in the shuffle of conflicting objectives with regard to the east-west freeway.

For the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has made it clear that it does not expect to find in its own funds any part of the $13 million in additional funds required to depress the freeway through Newark and the Oranges. The transportation needs are met either way, according to the Bureau; why should it pay more?

Federal funds made available by the Urban Renewal Administration, augmenting Bureau of Public Roads and State and, possibly, local funds, could make it possible to build a depressed freeway through Newark and the Oranges. Is this manner we could meet both traffic requirements and the overall interests of the municipalities through which the roadway would pass.

This highway is vital to the growth and development of the area. It is equally important that its style of construction not destroy the values created by orderly community development. Unquestionably, the problem posed by the character of its design is a problem faced by communities in increasing number throughout America.

This is preventive medicine, Mr. President. This bill simply permits the Housing Administrator to share in the cost of constructing a highway of appropriate design. If he cannot help protect the growth of a community today, he may have to spend many more millions for urban redevelopment tomorrow.

And there are many American communities which will face this tomorrow unless we use commonsense and plan reasonable alternatives today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 608) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide limited financial assistance with respect to certain communities the orderly redevelopment of which is threatened by projected highway construction, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Federal-Aid Highways in Localities Having Approved Workable Programs; Construction Grants.

"SEC. 113. (a) The Administrator may, on application of any local public agency authorized to undertake projects in a locality having an approved workable program under section 101(c), which application is approved by the governing body of the locality, contract to make grants to defray not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of the additional construction costs which must be borne by such locality and/or the State in which such locality is situated to cause certain modification to be made in the design of that part of any Federal-aid highway which will pass through such locality, if—

"(1) the Administrator determines that such modifications are necessary in order to prevent the development or spread of slums and urban blight in such locality, or the disruption of the orderly redevelopment of such locality in conformity with its approved workable program; and

"(2) the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator that such modifications are not acceptable as part of the construction costs of such highway under provisions of the Federal-aid highway laws, but that such modifications are acceptable if the additional cost required thereby is not considered part of the construction costs of such highway for purposes of such laws.

"(b) The Administrator may, with the approval of the President, contract to make grants under this section aggregating not to exceed $———."

SEC. 2. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by—

(1) inserting after "title," in section 100 the following: "and for construction grants under section 113,";

(2) striking out "title" in the first sentence of section 103(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "section";

(3) striking out "grants contracted for" in the second sentence of section 103(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "grants (including construction grants under section 113) contracted for"; and

(4) adding at the end of section 110 the following new paragraph:

"(l) 'Capital grant' means a grant under section 103 (except subsection (d) thereof) but does not include a construction grant under section 113."

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a department of housing and urban affairs, and ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill, and the text of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 609) to provide for the establishment of a department of housing and urban affairs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT; OFFICE OF SECRETARY

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established an executive department which shall be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of departments.

(b) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

UNDER SECRETARY AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs, three Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Affairs, and a General Counsel, who shall be appointed in the same manner as the Secretary and who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and General Counsel shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of the executive departments.

(b) In the absence of the Secretary or when he is unable to perform the duties of his office the Under Secretary shall act as Secretary. In the event of the absence of both the Secretary and the Under Secretary, or in case both are unable to perform the duties of the office of Secretary, an Assistant Secretary to be designated by the Secretary shall act as Secretary; or in the absence of designation by the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary who is senior in office shall act as Secretary.

TRANSFERS TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) All functions and powers of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including the functions and powers of all officers and agencies therein, are hereby transferred to the Secretary, together with its agencies, personnel, offices, property, assets, liabilities, records, and unexpendable balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, available or to be made available. The function of the President of appointing officers heretofore within the Housing and Home Finance Agency are hereby transferred to the Secretary, except as otherwise provided in section 5 of this Act.

(b) The President shall from time to time exercise such authority with respect to the reorganization of Federal departments and agencies as may be vested in him by law with a view to further transferring to the Department functions and agencies of the Government if he deems such transfers will further the purposes of this Act. The President shall submit to the Congress on or before January 31, 1962, a report setting forth any action which has been taken or is proposed to be taken by him in accordance with the provisions of this section and the reasons therefor.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall (1) conduct a continuing study of problems peculiar to urban and metropolitan areas, including problems of coordinating Federal programs as they affect such areas, and (2) provide technical assistance to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems. Such assistance shall include, whenever the Secretary deems it appropriate, the dissemination to interested bodies of the results of the studies undertaken pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary shall from time to time make such recommendations to the Congress, as a result of the studies to be undertaken under this section and after consultation with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, as he shall determine to be appropriate.

(c) As used in this section the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

ABOLITIONS

SEC. 5. The Housing and Home Finance Agency (exclusive of the agencies thereof transferred by section 3 of this Act) and the Offices of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Deputy Housing and Home Finance Administrator are hereby abolished. The Secretary shall make such provisions as may be necessary in order to terminate any outstanding affairs of the agencies and offices abolished by this section.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 6. The Secretary may establish such advisory committees on urban affairs as he may determine to be desirable and in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The members of any such committee shall be reimbursed for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending meetings of the committee.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 7. Section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh: The Department of Housing and Urban Affairs."

REPORT

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall cause to be prepared, published, and transmitted to the Congress an annual report of the activities and accomplishments of the Department.

INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 9. Pending the initial appointment of officers of the Department, the functions of any such officer may be performed temporarily by such officer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituent agencies, as the President shall designate.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS AND INCIDENTAL TRANSFERS

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary may from time to time make such provision as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions by any other official or any employee, agency, or board of the Department, except as provided in section 2 and except functions which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is expressly prohibited by law from delegating. No change in the organization or functions of the Federal National Mortgage Association in connection with its secondary market operations under the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act shall be made under this Act unless the Secretary finds that the change will not adversely affect any rights of owners of outstanding common stock issued under such Charter Act.

(b) To the extent that carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section involves the assignment of major program functions or major groups of program functions to an organizational unit of the Department, now or hereafter existing, the Secretary shall, to the extent he deems practicable, give appropriate advance public notice of the delegation of functions proposed to be made by him and shall afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons or groups to place before the Department their views with respect to such proposed delegations.

(c) The Secretary may from time to time effect, within the Department, such transfers of personnel, records, property, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, or other funds of the Secretary as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act or transfers of functions hereunder, but such funds may be used only for the purposes for which they were originally made available.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. (a)(1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed before the effective date of this Act in respect of or by any office, agency, board, organizational unit, or function affected by this Act shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the office, agency, board, or other organizational unit from which it is removed by this Act, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the Act becomes effective, be considered as vested in the Secretary. With respect to any function transferred by or under this Act and exercised hereafter, reference in another Federal statute to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or to any office, officer, agency, board, or other organizational unit therein shall be deemed to mean the Secretary.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Housing and Home Finance Administrator or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after this Act takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such Administrator or officer under this Act.

OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, maintain and operate an office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as the principal office of the Department and not to exceed a total cost of $40,000,000. For such purposes, the Secretary is authorized to act through the Administrator of General Services. As used in this section the term "construction" shall include the preparation of plans and specifications, the acquisition of a site (by purchase, eminent domain, or otherwise), site clearance and improvement and the erection of an office building and related structures and facilities.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to employ, from funds in the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund created by section 202 of the National Housing Act, such sums as may be needed for construction under subsection (a). The Secretary shall deposit such funds in a trust fund to be administered solely for such construction. From receipts and income held by the Secretary under this section after current operating and maintenance expenditures hereunder, the Secretary shall make such periodic payments to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund as the Secretary determines will be adequate to reimburse the Fund for advances hereunder within a period of thirty years, with interest at 3½ percent per annum on the unpaid balance. All property acquired or constructed under this section shall remain an asset of the trust fund created hereunder until the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund is reimbursed with interest, as herein provided.

(c) The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish reasonable charges for use and occupancy of the property or any portion thereof by the Department. Funds available for the expenses of the Department, including the constituents thereof, shall be available for the payment of such charges. The Secretary, with the approval of the Administrator of General Services, shall lease to others such of the land, appurtenances and building space as he shall determine is not currently required for the needs of the Department.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1. Creation of the Department: This section would establish a new executive department of the Federal Government to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. The head of the Department would be a Secretary appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary would receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the heads of other departments. This section would also provide for an official seal for the Department.

Section 2. Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries: This section would provide for an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel of the Department who would be appointed in the same manner as the Secretary and who would perform the duties prescribed by the Secretary. They would be paid at compensations provided for comparable officials in other executive departments. This section would also provide for the performance of the duties of the Secretary in his absence.

Section 3. Transfers of functions to the Department: This section would provide that all functions and powers of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituents, would be transferred to the Secretary along with all funds, other assets and obligations. The section would also provide that officials in the Agency now appointed by the President would be appointed by the Secretary of the new Department.

The President would be required to transfer to the Department, pursuant to his reorganization powers, any functions of other agencies when he determines that such transfers will further the purposes of this bill. The President would be required to submit by July 1, 1961, a report to the Congress setting forth actions which have been taken or are proposed under this section.

Section 4. Research and technical assistance: This section would require the Secretary to conduct continuing studies of urban and metropolitan problems, including problems of coordinating related Federal programs, and to provide technical assistance

to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems.

Section 5. Abolitions: This section is technical and would abolish certain offices in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Section 6. Advisory committees: This section would authorize the Secretary to establish advisory committees on urban affairs.

Section 7. Technical.

Section 8. Report: This section would require the Secretary to submit to the Congress an annual report on the activities and accomplishments of the Department.

Section 9. Interim appointments: This section would authorize the temporary appointment of officers of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to perform functions in the Department pending the initial appointment of officers of the Department.

Section 10. Delegations of functions and incidental transfers: This section would authorize the Secretary to delegate from time to time any of his functions to officers or employees within the Department, except as provided in section 2 and except as to functions which the Housing Administrator is expressly prohibited by law from delegating. No change in the organization of the Federal National Mortgage Association could adversely affect the right of owners of outstanding FNMA stock.

The Secretary would be required, in making any major change in the assignment of program functions, where he deems it practical, to give advance public notice and to afford an opportunity for interested persons to express their views to the Department.

Section 11. Savings provisions: This section is technical and would preserve pending litigation, contracts, etc.

Section 12. Construction of office building for the Department: This section would permit the activities of the new Department to be centered under one roof. The funds necessary for site acquisition and the planning and construction of the building would be made available from the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. Further, all the funds so utilized would be repaid to the Mortgage Insurance Fund within 30 years at an annual interest rate of 3½ percent.

It is contemplated that the Secretary will act through the Administrator of General Services in matters relating to the location and acquisition of the site, in preparation of plans and the construction and management of the building.

There is a real need for the centralized office facilities proposed by this bill. The present Housing Agency staff is now scattered throughout Washington in 10 widely separated buildings.

Section 13. Effective date: The bill would become effective on the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

The Office of the Administrator, for example, has personnel in five different buildings and the Federal Housing Administration in three.

In contrast to this present very considerable dispersal of personnel, the programs of the Agency require an unusual degree of coordination, both on the policy level and on the day-to-day operating level. For example, the Agency operations relating to an urban renewal project may involve programs of all five of the constituent agencies as well as the Office of the Administrator. The Administrator himself is charged with evaluating and approving the local plans for community improvement ("workable program") which are the prerequisite to eligibility, and form the framework, for assistance under our urban renewal program and other related Agency programs. The Urban Renewal Administration, one of the constituent units, then contributes to the cost of planning where and when urban renewal projects should be undertaken, and contributes both technical assistance and funds toward actual projects.

The Public Housing Administration, a constituent agency, must provide a priority to otherwise eligible persons and families relocated from project areas. The Federal Housing Administration, another constituent agency, also assists those relocated from project areas, through its section 221 program of insurance of especially favorable mortgages on low-cost homes and low-rent apartments for relocated persons. Through its section 220 program the FHA similarly assists in the rehabilitation of existing dwellings and the construction of new dwellings in the urban renewal areas themselves.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, a third constituent agency, in turn aids the urban renewal project through its special assistance program for the purchase of mortgages insured under the FHA section 220 and section 221 programs.

The Community Facilities Administration, another constituent unit, may also assist the locality, through loans for the advance planning of public works to be constructed in or near the urban renewal area.

One of the purposes of the proposed new Department is to provide closer coordination for these various programs of assistance to the locality. The more that the personnel carrying out these and other Department programs can deal face to face with each other, the less danger there is of their overlooking their common purpose of assistance to urban areas, and the more coordinated and effective will be their programs.

A central building would also be a great help to persons dealing with the Department. A State or local official, a representative of a trade organization, or a private individual who has occasion to confer with Department staff members regarding our operations now may be required to shuttle back and forth between several buildings before he gets all the information he needs.

The direct savings in time and money through a centralized building would undoubtedly be substantial. The travel time of personnel between present buildings is a considerable expense which could be eliminated, and the processing of the many papers now requiring transfer between the buildings could be greatly speeded. However, the increase in the effectiveness of Department programs would be by far the greatest benefit from such a building.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been trying for the last 20 minutes to introduce a bill for appropriate reference. The Senate passed the bill last year unanimously. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Last November, President Eisenhower issued a series of far-reaching orders designed to curb overseas spending by Government agencies—including a directive to reduce the number of military dependents living abroad by 50 percent. The sole purpose of this action was to help reverse a critical deficit in our international balance of payments and to ward off the continuing drain on U.S. gold reserves. As you probably know, 1960's foreign payments deficit is now expected to reach $3½ billion, for the second year in a row. As a result, our gold reserves have fallen to their lowest level in over 20 years.

I, for one, was shocked to realize that America's financial position had deteriorated to the point that we are forced to disrupt the lives of 200,000 service dependents in order to protect the soundness of the U.S. dollar in international markets. And yet, although the President's measures are scarcely a cause for rejoicing, they have served at least one good purpose. They have finally awakened us to the real seriousness and bitter consequences of continual failure to earn as much as we spend in foreign transactions, and they have dramatized better than anything else the need for positive and imaginative steps to bring our international account back into balance.

You may remember that I discussed the problem of our balance of payments deficit nearly 1 year ago in connection with a bill to establish an office of international travel for the purpose of promoting a greater flow of visitors to the United States. Based upon our own committee's studies, I called the Senate's attention to the fact that spending by American travelers abroad had become an increasingly weighty item in our foreign payments account, whereas foreign tourist expenditures in the United States remained at a relatively low level. I pointed out that the difference between these amounts—the travel dollar deficit—accounted for nearly one-fourth of our entire balance of payments deficit in 1959, and I predicted that unless immediate steps were taken to close this gap, our net annual loss of dollars through foreign tourism might reach as high as one billion dollars. As it turned out, I was speaking too optimistically. Last year, 1960, American tourists flocked abroad in the greatest numbers in history, while travel to our country by foreign visitors showed no significant gain. As a result, last year's travel deficit jumped to $1,150 million and, instead of only one-fourth, it now represents close to one-third of our total payments imbalance. This means that if we were to bring all of our Government dependents home, the saving would still be less than what is being drained off through foreign tourism.

Another fortunate consequence of the gold emergency was to finally focus the attention of the economic analysts and financial experts of our public press upon the tourist problem and its impact upon foreign economic affairs. The trouble is that far too many of them have taken a completely wrong approach by suggesting that the Government should limit travel by Americans abroad. There is no question that this would be the easiest way to cope with the problem, but it would also completely contradict a century or more of American efforts to facilitate and extend the rights of its citizens to travel freely about the world. The way to deal with this problem is by attacking its causes, not its symptoms.

The reason why Americans are going abroad in ever increasing numbers is not difficult to find. U.S. spending on foreign travel has exactly doubled since 1953. Obviously, our population has not doubled in that period, our economy has not expanded by 100 percent; our levels of disposable income have not gone up anywhere near that much; and travel costs are certainly no less than they were 7 years ago. There is only one reason left to explain why this has happened. It has happened because foreign tourist industries and transportation companies under the active leadership and direction of their own governments have been engaged in a massive program of market development and travel promotion in this country. The reason why American travel abroad has doubled since 1953 while travel to the United States has not is almost entirely because, unlike foreign governments, we as a Nation have done nothing to promote our tourist attractions.

The obvious way of dealing with the travel deficit problem is for the United States to marshal all of its resources to encourage and stimulate the residents of nations abroad to visit this country as other countries have so successfully done. The bill which I introduced in the last session of Congress would have provided the basis for such a promotional program by establishing a new Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce at a high level of responsibility. The Office would be directed "to develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States."

The bill also provided for the establishment of tourist promotion centers in a few selected countries abroad. The total cost of this program would be less than $5 million annually, or about one-half of what foreign governments now spend in the United States on travel advertising and other promotional activities.

This bill was supported by the entire travel industry, by leading members of the business, agricultural and labor communities, and by the executive branch of the Government. It was passed without opposition by the Senate last June, but died in the House because sufficient time was not available there for its consideration before the end of the session.

The need for this measure was serious in 1960. It is urgent today. I am therefore offering it again today for early and prompt consideration.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce plans to hold hearings on this bill on February 2 and 3.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill is sponsored by myself, and Senators PASTORE, MONRONEY, SMATHERS, YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, HARTKE, MCGEE, SCHOEPPEL, BUTLER, COTTON, CASE of New Jersey, SCOTT, THURMOND, FONG, CARROLL, CANNON, BYRD of West Virginia, RANDOLPH, HOLLAND, KEATING, JAVITS—who, incidentally, sponsored the bill with me last year when it passed the Senate unanimously—and several other Senators, who have already indicated their desire to join with us in having the bill passed.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce plans to hold hearings on the bill on February 2 and 3. In the meantime, a message will be sent to Congress which will include the subject we are discussing here, which is one of the main reasons leading up to the gold outflow from the United States. Unfortunately, the bill became stalled in the House at the end of the last session. The Senator from New York has done yeoman work on the matter.

I know of no one in the United States, including the executive department, and including former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, who does not believe that we should take this kind of action as soon as possible on this program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to commend very highly the Senator from Washington for taking the leadership in this matter. I merely wish to emphasize that the subject involves not less than a billion dollars a year, which is the deficit we suffer as represented by the difference between what our travelers spend abroad and what foreign travelers spend in the United States. We are the only Nation of any consequence in the world which makes no effort to attract tourism. That is what the Senator from Washington desires to do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The deficit amounts to almost a billion point two, rather than a billion dollars. This is one of the main causes for the outflow of gold. I hope Senators will join with us again in getting this matter started. We have two or three specific problems we can take care of. One is the problem of people who want to come to this country, to get them into the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not speechless. I ask unanimous consent to continue for 1 more minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must object, under the rule. We are trying to enforce the rule.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator will not deny me the right to continue for 1 more minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are trying to enforce the new rule. I shall have to renew my objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I speak less often than any other Member of this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am almost willing to dissolve under that entreaty, but I insist on the rule.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LOAN INSURANCE ON LOANS TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education.

In introducing this legislation I would like to pay special tribute to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who as a Senator from Texas, last year submitted a similar bill.

This legislation is modeled after the FHA loan guarantee program. The Federal Government would not provide money for the loan. The moneys would be provided by the educational institutions of our Nation, but repayment of the loans would be guaranteed by the Federal Government. There would, therefore, be no Federal grants involved.

The bill provides:

First. An institution of higher education may loan up to $1,000 a year to a student, repayment of which willl be guaranteed by the Federal Government. In no event may any single student receive more than $5,000 over a period of years to complete his or her education.

Second. The loan funds insured by the Government must be made from the funds of the institution of higher education or from funds held by the institution in a trust or similar capacity.

Third. Repayment of the loan will be made in installments each quarter beginning within 1 year after the student ceases to devote essentially full time to educational work.

Fourth. Full repayment of the principal and interest must be made within 10 years after the date on which the first installment becomes due.

Fifth. Cost of the loan is 5 percent—4¾ percent interest and one-fourth of 1 percent insurance premium.

This bill is actually an investment in one of our greatest resources—the minds of our young men and women. We are investing in their future since they may borrow the money needed for education and repay it after graduation when they begin working and when they are capable of making their payments.

In investing in the future of our youth we are investing in the future of our great country.

The struggle in which we are now involved is an ideological struggle. If we are to win we must have better diplomats, better scientists, better military leaders. We can only win this struggle if we permit the full development of the minds and talents of our citizens. This means our educational opportunities must be expanded. No individual should be denied educational opportunities because of insufficiency of funds.

I believe that this type of legislation is needed as a supplement to the program offered under the National Defense Education Act. It will provide some measure of opportunity to all of our citizens. It would not provide for loans for the entire cost of education since the maximum amount which the Government will insure is $1,000 a year, and not more than a total of $5,000 over a period of years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 611) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GRANT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES OF PREFERENCE LEASE RIGHT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant certain oil and gas lessees a preference lease right upon revocation of Public Land Order No. 2199, dated August 29, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 612) to grant certain oil and gas lessees a preference lease right upon revocation of Public Land Order No. 2199, dated August 29, 1960, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, upon the revocation or expiration of public land order No. 2199, dated August 29, 1960, which withdrew certain lands within the Cane Creek Anticline area in the State of Utah from oil and gas leasing for the preservation and development of potash deposits, the record title holders of oil and gas leases covering such withdrawn lands who were unable to obtain extensions of such leases in accordance with the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 226 as the result of the withdrawal, and offerors under pending offers to lease for oil and gas, shall be entitled to preference rights to leases of the same lands without competitive bidding upon application therefor made within six months after the revocation of expiration of such public land order, provided that the lands have not been classified as a part of any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field.

SEC. 2. Rentals shall not be charged against the lands affected by the provisions of this Act during the period in which they are withdrawn under such public land order.

SEC. 3. During the period in which the lands affected by this Act are withdrawn under such public land order, the acreage in which leaseholders and offerors shall have preference rights shall not be chargeable against the acreage allowables of such leaseholders and offerors.

IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL DUTIES ON EXCESS IMPORTS OF CERTAIN LIVE ANIMALS, MEATS, AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, prepared for introduction by my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. Because of illness, my colleague is not able to be here today.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I also ask that preceding the text of the bill there be printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the purposes of the bill. The statement was prepared by my good colleague.

In general, the bill seeks to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 613) to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there is hereby imposed a duty of 25 per centum ad valorem upon imports under any specific import classification covering the following articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1960, in excess of the imports under such import classification during the calendar year 1957, such additional duty to apply only to the respective import classification with respect to which imports in any calendar year are in excess of imports during 1957:

(1) Cattle (including calves), sheep (including lambs), and hogs, except for breeding purposes;

(2) Beef, veal, pork, mutton, and lamb, fresh, chilled, or frozen, or prepared, preserved, or canned, except offal and canned corned beef.

SEC. 2. The duties imposed by this Act shall be treated for administrative purposes as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 3. This Act shall enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which it may conflict, but in any event not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The statement presented by Mr. HRUSKA is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

Of the many problems which confront agriculture this is one which daily becomes more acute—the increased importation of livestock, carcasses and meat products. The growth of imports in the last 2 years has caused a very genuine and general alarm in our livestock feeding areas throughout this land.

Throughout this session we will ponder many of the seeming imponderables which burden this Nation's basic industry. Reasonable remedies will not always be easily arrived, but the acute situation caused by meat imports can be quickly remedied.

Today I am introducing a bill, which enacted, will restrict the level of import of meat and meat products to its 1957 volume. These commodities, imported in excess of 1957 levels, will be imposed with a duty of 25 percent ad valorem.

We fail to take cognizance of the disruption caused domestic livestock production by the dropping of a boatload of lamb or beef carcasses in a given metropolitan area—for example, Los Angeles or San Francisco. The impact on price far exceeds the ratio between consumption of the domestic and foreign products.

Diet in these United States is the best and most varied of any nation in the world. The technology of meat production and a great abundance of feed grains permit us to put the highest quality of meat on America's dinner table. Let us join to enact this legislation so important to our meat producing industry.

EQUAL BENEFITS FOR COLD WAR WARRIORS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am overjoyed, as all America is, at the release of the two American fliers, Captains Olmstead and McKone, who have been held so long and so wrongfully by the Soviet Union. But as we react with feelings of relief and gratitude toward the Russians for this gesture which means so very much to all the individuals concerned, we must not altogether forget that the Russians had no right to shoot down and imprison these men to begin with. The Soviet authorities showed an absolute ruthlessness and lack of principle in shooting this plane down over international waters. Furthermore, by keeping these men imprisoned for 6 months and over Christmas under the flimsiest of political subterfuges, the Communists showed only too plainly what complete scorn they have for the basic rights and liberties of human beings.

Let us, then, not forget that, although the ordeal which these two brave men have undergone is over, the danger and hazards that cold war servicemen face, and will continue to face, in guaranteeing the defense of our Nation against Communist aggression are not over. Our men are going to have to continue to meet the Communist challenge on land, sea, and air.

With that point in mind, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, similar to part of a measure which I introduced last year as my cold war veterans bill, which would entitle men like Olmstead and McKone, and any others who may be hurt as a result of cold war encounters, to the same benefits that are available to men injured in actual time of war. Specifically, my bill would give men who are injured in cold war incidents the right, if it is needed, to vocational rehabilitation, to assistance in purchasing an automobile and to exemption from dual compensation restrictions upon their pensions. This is certainly the least we can do under the circumstances.

Furthermore, I should like to add that, for those families whose husbands and fathers will never return, for the families whose breadwinners are actually killed in cold war incidents, like the other men on that ill-fated RB-47, my original bill provided for educational assistance similar to that received by the families of those killed in actual war. This provision was in fact passed in another bill, in a slightly different form, last session. It will not, of course, console their families for the irreparable loss, but it will assist the widows in paying for the higher education of their orphaned children.

Right now, Mr. President, I repeat, is the time to consider what we can do for these men, and, as I said, I think the least we can do is insure that legislation is enacted along the lines of my bill to make sure that these brave warriors are entitled to the same help, should they need it, that was available to wartime servicemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have this bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 620) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain benefits for members of the Armed Forces wounded in disturbances other

than a state of war, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(28) The term 'apparent hostile act' means an encounter, assault, or other act of a warlike nature committed on or after December 7, 1941, outside the United States involving a member of the active military, naval, or air service in his capacity as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States:".

(2) The subtitle in subchapter III of chapter 15 preceding section 541 is amended to read as follows:

"WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, KOREAN CONFLICT, AND VETERANS INJURED BY AN APPARENT HOSTILE ACT".

(3) Section 1502 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following in subsection (a) before the words "which is, or", and every veteran who has a service-connected disability resulting from an injury incurred in the line of duty as the result of an apparent hostile act,";

(B) by striking out the last sentence of subsection (c)(2) and inserting the following in place thereof;

"(3) Vocational rehabilitation may not be afforded a veteran on account of a service-connected disability resulting from an injury incurred in the line of duty as the result of an apparent hostile act nine years following his discharge or release from the period of service in which such injury occurred.

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, where a veteran is prevented from entering, or having entered, from completing vocational rehabilitation training, because of one of the reasons set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), such training may be afforded him during a period of not to exceed four years beyond the period otherwise applicable to him.";

(C) paragraph (3) of subsection (c) is redesignated as "(5)" and amended to read as follows:

"(5) Vocational rehabilitation may not be afforded outside of a State to a veteran on account of service subsequent to World War II if the veteran at the time of his service was not a citizen of the United States."; and

(D) by striking out the words "Korean conflict service" in subsection (d) and inserting the words "service subsequent to World War II" in place thereof.

(4) Section 1701 (a)(1) and (d) are each amended by inserting the words ", or resulting from an injury incurred in the line of duty as the result of an apparent hostile act" after the words "Korean conflict".

(5) Section 1901(a) is amended by inserting the words ", or resulting from an injury incurred in the line of duty as the result of an apparent hostile act" after the words "Korean conflict".

SEC. 2. Subsection 212(b) of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), is amended by striking out the period after the words "chapter 11 of title 38)" and inserting the following in place thereof: ", or (3) as a result of an injury in line of duty because of an apparent hostile act, as defined in section 101(28) of title 38."

SEC. 3. This Act is effective from December 7, 1941. However, no person is entitled to any accrued benefits under this Act for the period between December 7, 1941, and the date of enactment.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT TO REMOVE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the proper committee a bill to give teachers in private schools benefits comparable to those given public school teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In other words, it would remove the discrimination against private schools which is inherent in the existing act.

Under the provisions of section 205(b) 3 of title II, a student who has obtained a loan can obtain forgiveness of 50 percent of that loan if he or she goes into public school teaching. The obvious reason for this provision in the original act was to encourage students to become schoolteachers. It seems only fair that the same opportunity should be granted to those who go into private schools. I am aware of the fact that the vast majority of our school training is handled in public schools. In fact, of the 1,574,000 elementary and secondary school teachers in America today, 1,366,884 are in public schools and 207,116 in private schools. In other words, 87 percent of our teachers are on the public payrolls.

However, private schools also perform an important public service, and there is no reason why those who are employed in such institutions should not receive the same advantages that the public school teachers do.

Since the Defense Education Act only began in 1958, there are no adequate figures available as yet to show what percent of those receiving loans go into schoolteaching. Most of the loan recipients are still in school. However, of 120,000 loan recipients last year, 52,000 indicated that they intend to become school teachers. When and if they do, they will be eligible for a cancellation of half of their loan payment. I do not have the figures which indicate the percentage who would go into private versus public school teaching, but if we assume that the ratio is the same as the present ratio for those engaged in private and public school teaching, we can guess that approximately 6,800 students receiving loans last year would potentially benefit from my bill, whereas they are now excluded from this section of the act.

In the interest of fairness, I think there is no question but what these changes should be made. These loans are granted to all needy students who can qualify, regardless of whether or not they are going into teaching, and whether they go into public or private teaching. There is no reason why a mathematics student who obtains teaching employment in a privately supported institution should be discriminated against in obtaining his partial loan cancellation when a colleague may have obtained his job in a public school and received such a benefit.

Concerning my amendments to titles V and VI of the National Defense Education Act, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange, through institutions of higher learning, institutes to train teachers in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing in the case of title V and language development in the case of title VI. Under the provisions of the act, teachers from public schools who attend these institutes may receive up to $75 per week while in attendance, plus $15 per week for each dependent, for the period of his attendance. Again, there is no reason why a public school teacher is in any different circumstance than a private teacher in attending these institutes. It is interesting to note that the number of private school teachers who attend the institutes is very small compared to the public school teachers attending. For example, since the program began, only 140 private school teachers attended the counseling and guidance institutes, while 5,730 public school enrollees attended. This is a ratio of only 2 percent private to public school teachers, whereas, as I indicated earlier, private school teachers make up 13 percent of the total elementary and secondary teaching staff. The reason is obvious. The public school teachers get a stipend and the private school teachers do not.

I think the discrimination contained in the act is obvious, and I hope that Congress will correct this discrimination this year. I have drafted my bill in such a way as to limit it to nonprofit institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 622) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of title II, V, and VI of such act provided for teachers in public schools, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 205(b)(3), 511, and 611 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended by inserting before the word "public" the following: "private nonprofit or".

ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a U.S. Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof. This is the same as S. 3180, which I introduced in the 85th Congress, and S. 586, which I introduced in the 86th Congress.

It is still my belief that, as time passes, the indications become clearer and clearer that we shall never go ahead as we should in connection with matters relating to science until we have some overall coordination of our efforts. This bill is an effort to achieve such coordination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 623) to establish a U.S. Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof, introduced by Mr.

KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLICATION OF A UNITED STATES TREATY CODE ANNOTATED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for publication of a United States Treaty Code Annotated.

Such a reference is not now available, and its publication would be of considerable value not only to the Federal Government, but to political scientists throughout the world. The University of Tennessee will provide the staff for the publication of the work, but the university is unable to assume the full burden of printing. It is hoped that in view of the value of the code to it, the Federal Government will provide for its publication.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 625) to provide for publication of a United States Treaty Code Annotated, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference my scholarship proposal, my tuition tax credit proposal, and the student loan insurance bill, and I ask that these bills be held at the desk for 1 week to enable Senators who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 634. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 635. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid to students in higher education; and

S. 636. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

There is a dangerous gap between our needs and our existing available resources in the field of higher education.

We should be investing heavily in education—for we are going to need all the trained brainpower we can muster in the years ahead if we are to meet the challenge of Communist competition. To meet the ideological and technological changes of the space age, we must educate our citizens up to the limit of their capacities. This is the best way we can achieve social progress and fulfillment of our hopes and aspirations as individuals and as a nation.

HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDS

There are no simple solutions to our problems in the field of higher education. Education is expensive.

Our colleges and universities need support from every potential source—from individuals and alumni groups, from private philanthropic organizations and foundations, from labor unions and corporations, and, in the case of State-supported institutions, from State legislatures.

Last June the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee conducted hearings on proposals to widen opportunities for higher education in America.

After the most optimistic predictions and projections have been made, there still exists a dangerous gap between needs and resources.

EDUCATION GAP

Testimony showed college enrollments will double to almost 7 million within the next 10 years—overloading colleges and universities which are already popping at the seams. Faculty salaries must be raised. And the physical plant—classrooms, dormitories, libraries, and laboratories—must be expanded to handle the rising tide of applicants seeking higher education.

Every year thousands of qualified high school graduates ask our colleges and universities for scholarships or other kinds of financial aid—and far too often these talented youngsters are unable to get any kind of financial help.

Every year more than 150,000 young men and women in the top intellectual brackets do not go on to college simply because they and their families cannot afford it. This is a terrible waste of valuable brainpower.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Therefore, to help young Americans seeking higher education, I offer this youth opportunity program.

First, a college scholarship program with awards ranging from $500 to $1,500, based on merit and need.

Second, tax credit up to $450 a year for college tuition payments.

And third, a student loan insurance program to help young people finance their college education by borrowing up to $1,000 a year.

Furthermore, I intend to work vigorously for effective programs of grants and long-term low-interest loans to help America's colleges and universities build urgently needed residence and academic facilities such as dormitories, classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

Some of my colleagues will recall that the House Education and Labor Committee approved a national defense education bill in July of 1958 which included 23,000 new college scholarships a year for a 4-year period, and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee included a similar provision in the education bill reported out for Senate action. The Senate did approve a 20,000-a-year scholarship provision in its version of the National Defense Education Act. But unfortunately the House dropped its provision, and the scholarship program was chopped out of the final NDEA by the conference committee.

I cite this legislative background to remind us that there is little novelty about my own scholarship proposal.

SCHOLARSHIP PROPOSAL

Under my proposal, at least 46,000 outstanding young men and women would be able to enter college each year. Any graduate of an accredited public or private high school would be eligible to apply to his State education agency and winners will get a $500 merit scholarship regardless of need. Youngsters without financial resources could get additional assistance, up to a limit of $1,500 a year for 4 years.

My scholarship proposal would also authorize payments up to $500 per student for the colleges which accept scholarships winners to help these institutions meet expansion costs and indirect expenses.

TUITION TAX CREDIT

Under my tuition tax credit bill, any college student or parent of a college student could charge off up to $450 a year or 30 percent of tuition and fees for higher education as a credit against his income tax.

I am convinced that action on this proposal will not only ease the burden of college tuition payments on many family budgets, but will also permit colleges and universities to set their tuition charges at more realistic levels by removing the fear of penalizing talented young people from low and middle income families.

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE

My third proposal would establish a Federal loan insurance program to protect educational and financial institutions making loans to students who are attending colleges and universities.

In the 86th Congress, Vice President JOHNSON introduced similar legislation, S. 2710. I hope my colleagues will read his testimony on this proposal before the subcommittee hearings last June on "Federal Assistance to Higher Education," and the comments of many distinguished college presidents who are almost unanimous in their approval.

I am submitting the revised version which the Vice President submitted last June after incorporating improvements suggested by the college presidents. I am introducing this legislation because I am convinced that it meets an urgent need—and furthermore it will do so at only a very small cost to the taxpayers.

This double-barreled program would not simply protect colleges against losses on loans to students. It would also protect financial institutions such as insurance companies, endowment funds, and pension and welfare funds, against loss on loans to colleges for student loan purposes.

A student could get up to $1,000 a year in insured loans with an overall maximum of $5,000. The maximum cost to the student would be 5 percent a year which includes one-fourth of 1 percent insurance premium. Repayment would start 1 year after the student leaves school, and could continue over the following 10 years.

When a college needs outside funds for student loans, it could borrow directly from financial institutions by getting insured long-term loans—up to 20 years—at a maximum rate of 4½ percent. If the college charges one-quarter of 1 percent for administration, and the Federal insurance cost is one-fourth of 1 percent, the maximum cost to the student would be 5 percent.

The maximum insurance coverage authorized for loans by colleges to students would be $100 million and the maximum insurance coverage on loans by financial institutions to colleges and universities would also be $100 million.

I think we should bear in mind that a $1,000 loan will not cover all the costs of a year at college or graduate school. At a minimum, the total costs of full-time education reach $1,500 at public colleges and often reach $2,500 at private colleges.

So I think it is clear that college students borrowing money under this program to finance their education will need other resources. They will need help from their

families. They will have to use their own savings. But this loan program can help give them the lift which will make all the difference between entering college or giving up their pursuit of higher education.

This self-financing loan insurance program will not be a drain on the Federal Treasury. The Federal Government's only part would be to insure repayment of loans to colleges or financial institutions by college students.

Just as the Federal guarantees have made a tremendous contribution to housing construction, so Federal guarantees for student loans can stimulate a vast expansion of opportunity for young people seeking higher education in America's colleges and universities.

Some institutions of higher learning already have successful loan programs, but it is clear from the comments of many college presidents that new programs can be started and existing programs can be put on a much firmer basis if they are protected by a Federal student loan insurance program such as I am proposing.

This loan program is not competitive with the loan program of the National Defense Education Act, which should be continued. But the NDEA loan program is limited to "needy" students and it simply does not meet the widespread demand in our colleges and universities for an effective student loan program.

However, to make sure that the NDEA loan program is not cut back or allowed to expire, section 306 of my bill provides that the Federal loan insurance program will be in effect only when appropriations for NDEA are at least 75 percent of the amount authorized, and that the Federal loan insurance program will expire when the NDEA expires.

Enactment of this legislation would vastly increase the supply of funds financing higher education and would do so in a way that will cost the American taxpayer almost nothing. Furthermore, this legislation will encourage the financial institutions of this country to support urgently needed investment in human resources. This is in line with the sound insurance principle which our experience with FHA has proved can be extraordinarily successful.

I am convinced that this loan insurance program can give a tremendous boost to the cause of higher education by helping students from low and middle income families borrow money to finance their college careers. Many of these students are simply unable to pay currently for all the costs of a college education, even when they have scholarship assistance and part-time jobs.

COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION AID

Finally I wish to pledge my support for action to help American colleges and universities build classrooms, libraries, and laboratories. I shall also continue my efforts for a revived and expanded college housing program.

Last year it was my privilege to join the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in proposing a $125 million revolving loan fund to help these institutions of higher learning construct academic facilities. Our proposal was in line with legislation previously approved by Congress in 1959 but vetoed by the President—legislation to provide long-term low-interest loans for construction of classrooms and other academic facilities.

There is ample testimony about the need for an effective Federal loan program to help institutions of higher education expand both housing and academic facilities.

Indeed, there is growing evidence of need and support for Federal grants to help build academic facilities. I refer my colleagues to the testimony of Dr. John T. Caldwell for the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in hearings held last March before the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

We must not only restore and expand the college housing loan program. We must also establish an effective program to help build vitally needed classrooms, libraries, and laboratories, and I look to my colleague from Pennsylvania for leadership in this important field of legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibits A, B, and C, which include the text of these bills, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM OF SCHOLARSHIP AID TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY to the bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency two-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States)

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"TITLE I"

On page 8, line 18, strike out "That this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "SECTION 1. This title".

On page 19, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 12. The term 'this Act' as used in this title means the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

At the end of the bill, insert a new title as follows:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Student Aid Act of 1961.'

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution or, except as provided in sections 14 and 16, over its administration or personnel.

"Administration

"SEC. 3. (a) This Act shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Secretary, make all regulations specifically authorized to be made under this Act and such other regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, as may be necessary to carry out its purposes. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, with the advice and assistance of the National Council, make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports of the effectiveness of the student aid program established by this Act, and prescribe objective tests and other measures of ability for the selection of individuals to be awarded certificates of scholarship.

"(d) At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Commissioner shall make through the Secretary a full report to Congress of the administration of this Act, including his recommendations for needed revisions.

"(e) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of executive departments or independent establishments of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, student-loan, or facilities assistance programs, with a view to the full coordination of all specialized scholarship, fellowship, student-loan, and facilities assistance programs administered by or under all departments and establishments of the Federal Government with the general programs established by this Act.

"(f) When deemed necessary by the Commissioner for the effective administration of this Act, experts or consultants may be employed as provided in section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C., sec. 55a).

"National Council on Student Aid

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a National Council on Student Aid, consisting of the Commissioner, as Chairman, and twelve members appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The twelve appointed members shall be so selected that the Council will be broadly representative of the individual, organizational, and professional interests in education, and of the public. Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of three years, three shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Commissioner at the time of appointment. None of such twelve members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner as specifically indicated in this Act and assist and advise him with respect to other matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this Act.

"(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not to exceed $50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"(d) Whenever the Council considers matter of concern to another agency of the Federal Government, the Secretary may invite the head thereof to designate a representative to be present at such consideration.

"Administrative appropriations authorized

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the administrative expenses of State commissions on Federal scholarships.

"Discrimination proscribed

"SEC. 6. The awarding of certificates of scholarship and the granting of scholarship stipends under this Act shall be without regard to sex, creed, race, color, national origin, or residence.

"Definitions

"SEC. 7. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, the Canal Zone, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a secondary education or its recognized equivalent, (2) is legally authorized within its own State to provide a program of higher education, (3) offers and conducts an educational program extending at least two academic years beyond the high school, and (4) either is nonprofit and tax-supported, or is determined by the Internal Revenue Service to be an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

"(c) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(e) The term 'State commission' means the commission on Federal scholarships established in any State for the purposes of this Act.

"(f) The term 'National Council' means the National Council on Student Aid established in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"Scholarship appropriations authorized

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of providing scholarship stipends for young persons of demonstrated ability and need, to assist them to attend institutions of higher education, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the sum of $46,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $92,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $138,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $184,000,000; and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $184,000,000 or such greater sum as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be appropriated.

"Apportionment of funds for scholarship stipends and determination of fields of study

"SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, estimate the total sum from the appropriation, made for such year under the authorization in section 8, which is necessary for continuing to make payments with respect to such year to individuals receiving scholarship stipends for previous years. He shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, apportion such sum among the States on the basis of the aggregate amount paid in the preceding year to scholars from each State, his estimate of changes in the number of such scholars from each State who will be eligible for continuing payments in the year for which such apportionment is made, and such other factors as he may find to be relevant.

"(b) The remaining portion of such appropriation shall be available for such year for grants of new scholarship stipends. One-half of such remaining portion shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of students graduating from high school in such States during the most recent year for which nationwide figures are available through the Office of Education, and one-half shall be apportioned among them on the basis of the relative numbers of their total population between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, inclusive, as determined by the most recent available estimates furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census.

"(c) In time of actual hostilities involving the Armed Forces of the United States, or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, the Commissioner shall for each such year designate the percentage, uniform for all States but in no event less than 60 per centum, of the total number of scholarship stipends to be paid to students engaging in fields of study which are determined, in a manner prescribed by the President, to be related to the national defense or to defense-supporting activities.

"Selection of recipients of scholarship certificates and stipends

"SEC. 10. (a) To be eligible to compete in any State for a certificate of scholarship, an individual (1)(A) must hold a certificate of graduation from a school in the State providing secondary education, or (B) must be determined by the State commission for the State in which the individual finished his secondary education (or, in case of an individual who finished his secondary education abroad, by the State commission for the State of which he is a resident), to have attained a level of educational advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of secondary school graduation in the State; (2) must not be eligible for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, or title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; (3) must make application for such certificate of scholarship in accordance with such rules as the State commission for such State may establish; and (4) must not have had any Federal scholarship, previously granted under this or any other law, terminated or vacated for any reason (except health) which was inconsistent with continued eligibility to compete for such previous scholarship.

"(b) From among those competing for certificates of scholarship for each fiscal year, the State commission shall, in accordance with the objective tests and other measures of ability prescribed by the Commissioner pursuant to section 3(c), select the individuals who, on the basis of their outstanding ability to do work in higher education, are to be awarded certificates of scholarship for such year. From among those selected for certificates of scholarship (including individuals so selected in prior years), it shall also select the individuals who, on the basis of their financial need and demonstrated ability, are to be granted scholarship stipends from the State's apportionment for new stipends made pursuant to section 9 for such year, determine the amount of stipend payable to each, and, in the case of a scholar whose stipend is to be charged against a percentage quota established pursuant to section 9(c), designate the field of study for which the stipend is to be granted. Such elections and determinations shall be made in accordance with general principles and methods, including objective measures for determining the fact and degree of financial need and the amount of the stipend, prescribed in regulations made by the Commissioner with the advice of the National Council and in accordance with percentage quotas, if any, established pursuant to section 9(c).

"(c) The Commissioner shall award certificates of scholarship, and within the limits of the State's apportionment for new scholarship stipends for a fiscal year and applicable quota (if any) established pursuant to section 9(c) grant scholarship stipends, to individuals certified to him by the State commission of the State as having been selected for a certificate, or for a certificate and stipend, as the case may be, in accordance with the State plan.

"Amount and duration of scholarship stipends

"SEC. 11. (a) The Commissioner, with the advice of the National Council, shall prescribe regulations for determining for each academic year scholarship stipend amounts related to the scholar's financial need (objectively measured pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 10(b)), and for each such year shall fix a maximum stipend amount not in excess of $1,500. The scholarship stipend granted to any scholar under this Act shall, for any academic year of the scholarship stipend's duration (as provided in subsection (b)), be the amount determined (pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 10(b)) with respect to such scholar for such year by the State commission which selected him and shall be payable in such installments and at such times as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

"(b) The duration of a scholarship stipend granted under this Act shall be a period of time not in excess of four academic years (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner) or, subject to such regulations, such longer period as is normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond the completion by the recipient of the work for his first post-secondary school degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, a scholarship stipend granted under this Act shall entitle the scholar to payments only while (1) the recipient is in financial need thereof, as determined annually (pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 10(b)) by the State commission which selected him, (2) the recipient devotes essentially full time to educational work in attendance and in good standing at an institution of higher education (except that failure to be in attendance at an institution during the summer months shall not by itself constitute a violation of this requirement) and, in the case of a stipend charged against a percentage quota established pursuant to section 9(c), does so in the field of study to which his stipend is restricted except as otherwise permitted pursuant to regulation, (3) the recipient is not receiving expenses of tuition or other scholarship or fellowship aid from other Federal sources (other than (A) a monetary allowance under a reserve officers' training program, or (B) compensation for work done for the institution which he is attending or any other work, regardless of the source of the funds from which such compensation is paid), and (4), in the case of a stipend holder considered for a continued payment under a stipend granted for a prior year, the amount of such payment is within the limits of the apportionment for continuing payments made pursuant to section 9(a) to the State from which such stipend holder was selected.

"Place of matriculation

"SEC. 12. (a) An individual granted a scholarship stipend under this Act may attend any institution of higher education which has been determined as such in accordance with section 13 and which admits him, regardless of the State in which such institution is located.

"(b) An individual granted a scholarship stipend under this Act may attend any institution outside of the United States, its Territories, and possessions which admits him, if the Commissioner determines that such institution is substantially comparable to an institution of higher education as defined in section 7(b).

"Scholarships commissions in the States

"SEC. 13. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the administration of the scholarship program under this Act may do so by establishing a State commission on Federal scholarships broadly representative of educational and public interests in the State and by submitting through such commission

a State plan, authorized under State law, for carrying out the purposes of this Act, which is approved by the Commissioner under this section. Such plan must (1) provide that it shall be administered by such commission; (2) provide for the determination of the institutions in the State which are institutions of higher education as defined in section 7(b); (3) provide for the determination, in accordance with the provisions of section 10, of eligibility to compete for certificates of scholarship, for the selection, in accordance with such provisions, of individuals to be awarded certificates of scholarship, and of individuals to be granted new scholarship stipends out of the State's apportionment, for certification of such individuals to the Commissioner, and for subsequent certification of the fact and degree of the continued financial need of, and the amounts payable to, recipients of scholarships stipends and for charging of stipends against any applicable quota established pursuant to section 9(c); (4) provide that the selection of individuals for certificates of scholarship and scholarship stipends under this title shall be made without regard to sex, creed, color, race, national origin, or residence; (5) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner shall from time to time reasonably require for the purposes of this Act, and for compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find reasonably necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and (6) indicate the official to whom funds for the administrative expenses of the State commission are to be paid.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the condition specified in subsection (a).

"(c) In the case of any State which does not establish a commission and submit and have approved a State plan in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall perform the functions of the State commission in such State until such time as a plan has been submitted by such a commission and is approved under this section.

"(d) In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Commissioner, if the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering such plan, finds (1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or (2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until such time he shall perform the functions of the State commission in that State.

"Payment of scholarship stipends

"SEC. 14. The Commissioner shall from time to time determine the amounts payable to recipients of scholarship stipends under this Act, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined and the name of each individual to whom such amounts are to be paid. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon pay in accordance with such certification by check payable to such individual, transmitted through an official of the institution of higher education which such individual is attending. Such official shall be selected by the institution with the approval of the Commissioner. The official thus selected shall transmit such checks to the payee only upon his determination in each instance, and certification thereof to the Commissioner that the recipient is at the time of such transmittal devoting essentially full time to educational work in attendance and in good standing at the institution, that, in the case of a student whose stipend was charged against a percentage quota determined pursuant to section 9(c), he is pursuing such studies in accordance with his designated field except as otherwise permitted pursuant to regulation, and that, so far as can be ascertained on the basis of the recipient's work at that institution, his scholarship stipend has not, under the provision of the first sentence of section 11(b), terminated. If for any reason such certification cannot be made by any such official with respect to an individual, the official shall return the check or checks involved to the drawer for cancellation.

"Administrative expenses of State commissions

"SEC. 15. The Commissioner shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the official designated in each State to receive funds for the administration of the State plan such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the State plan approved under this title). The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving such certification and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to such official, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amounts so certified.

"Payments authorized for compensation to institutions of higher education for educational services

"SEC. 16. The Commissioner shall pay to any institution of higher education providing education to an individual under a scholarship granted under the provisions of sections 8 through 15 such amounts not in excess of $500 per academic year as are determined by the Commissioner to be necessary to reimburse such institution for the estimated costs of services rendered in providing such education to such individual over and above amounts received from or on behalf of such individual for such services. Such amounts shall be determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commission with the advice of the National Council. Costs of services rendered in providing such education shall include instruction, plant operation, administration (including not more than $1.50 a month for administrative costs with respect to such scholarship), and library costs and any other costs reasonably allocable to providing educational services, but shall not include costs of services related to activities not creditable toward the attainment of a degree.

"Appropriations authorized for educational services compensation

"SEC. 17. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the payments authorized in section 16."

EXHIBIT B

A BILL TO PROVIDE A 30 PERCENT CREDIT AGAINST THE FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX FOR AMOUNTS PAID AS TUITION OR FEES TO CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Educational Tax Credit Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. TUITION AND FEES PAID BY INDIVIDUALS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to 30 percent of the aggregate amount paid during the taxable year by such individual to institutions of higher education of such individual or of any other individual at a level above the twelfth grade.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) INDIVIDUAL RECEIVING EDUCATION MUST BE FULL-TIME STUDENT.—Amounts paid for the education of any individual which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only if such individual is a student (as defined in section 151(e)(4)) for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins.

"(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR SCHOLARSHIPS AND CERTAIN ALLOWANCES.—In the case of any individual who for any period receives—

"(A) any scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which, under section 117, is not includible in gross income, or

"(B) any education and training allowance under part IV of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,

any amount paid for tuition or fees for such period which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only to the extent that the aggregate of such tuition and fees charged such individual for such period exceeds the sum of (i) an amount equal to all the scholarships and fellowship grants described in subparagraph (A) received by such individual for such period, plus (ii) an amount equal to 30 percent of all the allowances described in subparagraph (B) received by such individual for such period.

"(3) MAXIMUM YEARLY CREDIT WITH RESPECT TO EDUCATION OF ANY INDIVIDUAL NOT TO EXCEED $450.—In the case of any taxpayer, the credit allowed by this section for any taxable year, with respect to the education of any individual, shall not exceed $450.

"(4) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(c) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only an educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on;

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade; and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which are deductible under section 170."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

EXHIBIT C

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR LOAN INSURANCE ON LOANS TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Johnson of Texas (for himself, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Murray, Mr. Bible, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Frear, Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Hart, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Green, Mr. Symington, Mr. Hill, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Moss, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Hennings) to the bill (S. 2710) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education)

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Student Loan Insurance Act of 1961'.

"Definitions

"SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, the Canal Zone, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

"(c) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"TITLE I—LOAN INSURANCE FOR STUDENT LOANS

"Authorization

"SEC. 101. For the purpose of facilitating loans to students in institutions of higher education, such institutions shall be insured by the Commissioner against losses on loans made by them to such students in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the succeeding fiscal year, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this title. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this title in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this title, assign, within such maximum amount, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education, or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations on individual loans and on insurance

"SEC. 102. No loan or loans by one or more institutions of higher education in excess of $1,000 in the aggregate to any single student in any fiscal year shall be covered by insurance under this title, nor shall the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of loans made to any student exceed $5,000 at any time.

"Source of funds

"SEC. 103. Loans made by institutions of higher education in accordance with this Act shall be insurable whether made from the funds of the institution or from funds held by the institution in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of student borrowers and terms of student loans

"SEC. 104. A loan by an institution of higher education shall be insurable under the provisions of this title only if made to a student in such institution who devotes essentially full time to educational work in attendance at such institution, as determined by such institution, and if evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan in installments each quarter or lesser period beginning (except in the event of default in the payment of interest, or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower) within one year following the date on which the student ceases to devote essentially full time to educational work in attendance at any institution of higher education, (2) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required, (3) requires full repayment of the principal with interest within not more than ten years after the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due, (4) provides for interest on such loan at a per annum rate not exceeding 4¾ per centum on the unpaid balance and accrued interest, but payment of interest accruing prior to the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due may be postponed until after such date, (5) entitles the student borrower at his option to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan, and (6) contains such other terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this title and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this Act as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, at their option, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the institution, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the institution to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"Certificates of insurance—Effective date of insurance—Premiums

"SEC. 105. (a) If, upon application by an institution of higher education, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the institution has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this title, he shall, upon tender by the institution of the first year's insurance premium payable pursuant to subsection (d), issue to such institution a certificate of insurance covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such insurance.

"(b) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans submitted by eligible institutions, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a) by the institution, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when the loan to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the institution in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (d).

"(c) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain (1) an agreement by the institution of higher education to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (d), and (2) an agreement by such institution that if the loan is covered by insurance the institution will submit such reports during the effective period of the loan agreement as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe as necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(d) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this title a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest, or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 106.

"(e) The rights of an institution of higher education arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued under this section may not be assigned or transferred by such institution, except as provided in case of default in section 106.

"(f) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. Upon surrender of the original certificates of insurance in such cases, the Commissioner may issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with this section upon such consolidated obligation.

Procedure on default, death, or disability of student

SEC. 106. (a) Upon default and a reasonable effort toward collection by the institution on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this title, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the institution that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled, determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon the loan or upon any security for such loan, the institution shall promptly notify the Commissioner who shall thereupon, if requested by such institution or on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the institution the amount of the loss sustained upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined.

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the institution upon the insured loan and be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan and any security therefor.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this Act shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude for-

bearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on such insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the institution of higher education or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the institution to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this Act shall be construed to excuse the institution of higher education from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this title, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not insured. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the institution, finds that an institution of higher education has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports required under section 105(c), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify such institution for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this title until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"TITLE II—LOAN INSURANCE ON LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"Authorization

"SEC. 201. For the purpose of assisting institutions of higher education in obtaining funds to make loans insured under title I, the Commissioner, on terms and conditions prescribed by him consistent with the provisions of this title and necessary to protect the interests of the United States, may insure in whole or in part any public or private financing institution, or trustee under a trust or indenture or agreement for the benefit of the holders of any securities issued thereunder, by commitment or otherwise, against loss of principal and interest on any loan to an institution of higher education for the purpose of providing such institution with necessary funds to make loans insured under title I of this Act. The total principal amount of new loans covered by insurance under this title in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this title, assign, within such maximum amount, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations

"SEC. 202. No loan shall be covered by insurance under section 201 unless—

"(1) the Commissioner finds that such loan is necessary to enable the institution of higher education to provide student loans to be insured under title I;

"(2) the rate of interest to be paid on the loan is 4½ per centum or less;

"(3) the terms of such loan require repayment in twenty years or less; and

"(4) the Commissioner finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution of higher education has the ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor.

"Payment on guarantees

"SEC. 203. Payments required to be made as the result of default on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this title shall be made from the revolving insurance fund established under section 301.

"TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

"Revolving insurance fund

"SEC. 301. (a) Premiums under title I and all other moneys derived by the Commissioner in the course of operations under this Act shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. All moneys in the revolving fund shall upon requisition by the Commissioner, be available until expended, (1) for the payment of losses in connection with insurance undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (2) for any fiscal year, in the amount provided for by an appropriation Act, for defraying the expenses of administration incurred under this Act.

"(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund provided in this section—

"(1) the sum of $500,000 for the initial establishment of the revolving fund; and

"(2) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the revolving fund.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, from the revolving fund, pay annually into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, interest on any sums appropriated to the revolving fund pursuant to subsection (b) which have not been repaid into the Treasury as provided in subsection (d). The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance, such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its costs in connection with such appropriated funds, taking into consideration the current average interest rate which the Treasury pays upon its marketable obligation.

"(d) Until all advances made to the revolving fund by appropriation pursuant to subsection (b) (1) and (2) have been repaid through credits as provided in this subsection, the Commissioner shall, at least annually, determine any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by him to be necessary for the requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund, and such balance shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the amount thereof be credited against such advances.

"(e) The Commissioner may authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to invest and reinvest such portions of the revolving fund as he may determine to be in excess of current needs in any interest-bearing securities of the United States or in any securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and the income therefrom shall constitute a part of the revolving fund.

"Legal powers and responsibilities

"SEC. 302. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this Act, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commissioner may—

"(1) sue on behalf of the United States and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) subject to the specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or security, of the provisions of any note, contract, mortgage, or other instrument evidencing or securing a loan which has been insured under this Act;

"(3) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(4) enforce, pay compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this Act—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the financial transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Treatment of certain trusts, foundations, and other organizations as institutions of higher education

"SEC. 303. The Commissioner may by regulation provide for the treatment of any nonprofit trust, foundations, or other similar organizations, controlled by an institution of higher education or the officials thereof, as part of the institution of higher education for the purposes of this Act, if he determines that such treatment would promote such purposes. Such regulations may establish such requirements for the purpose of this section as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"Administration

"SEC. 304. (a) This Act shall be administered by the Commissioner, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Secretary, make all regulations specifically authorized to be made under this Act and such other regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, as may be necessary to carry out its purposes. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution.

"(c) At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Commissioner shall make through the Secretary a full report to Congress of the administration of this Act, including his recommendations for needed revisions in the Act.

"(d) When deemed necessary by the Commissioner for the effective administration of this Act, experts or consultants may be employed as provided in section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806, 810).

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 305. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution or, except as provided in sections 105 and 106(d), over its administration or personnel.

"Authority under Act conditional upon amount of appropriation for title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 306. The authority of the Commissioner to insure any loans in any fiscal year under the provisions of this Act shall be conditional upon the appropriation under the provisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for such year of at least 75 per centum of

the amount authorized for such year under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO BALANCING OF BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a joint resolution on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. The resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget.

This is not the first time that I have introduced this resolution. In fact, I first cosponsored legislation of this type in 1954 together with Senator BYRD. We have introduced the proposed constitutional amendment during each ensuing Congress and in later years have been privileged by the addition of Senators COTTON and CURTIS as coauthors.

I honestly believe, Mr. President, that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation which I have ever sponsored. This is particularly true at the present time when runaway inflation and deficit spending have become accepted procedures in several quarters.

The proposal which I send to the desk is easily understood. It restricts Congress from authorizing expenditures in excess of estimated receipts during any fiscal year. It should be noted that an exception is made during times of grave national emergency. The resolution also allows for a systematic reduction of the public debt in accordance with the recommendations of the President as contained in his annual budget message to Congress.

I feel it is unnecessary for me to cite facts and figures justifying the introduction of this legislation. We all fully realize the staggering proportions of this Nation's public debt and the terrific annual drain on the taxpayer's dollar caused by the interest on this indebtedness. I refrain from the use of figures and percentages because I feel that budget balancing is not merely a matter of bookkeeping.

In my estimation the future of this country may well rest with our capacity for keeping our fiscal house in order. The integrity of this Nation's currency and our ability to maintain the confidence—not only of Americans but of peoples everywhere—in this country's economy is vital.

I firmly believe that, if we are to meet the deadly threats to our future survival, we must give proper attention to the economic health of this Nation. This legislation will go a long way toward reinstating fiscal sanity in the operation of government and I commend it to my colleagues as essential legislation which demands immediate and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget, was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION ON ETHICS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1958 the 85th Congress put its official approval on a code of ethics for Government service. This was a constructive forward step in an extremely difficult field. The problems of ethics in Government are increasing every year. This is not so much because the ethical standards of Government officials are any lower today than they have been in the past. Indeed one could argue that they are higher than they have ever been. The growing problems, rather, come from the growing complexity of our national life and the expanding activity of Government in these complex areas. It is because every day Government officials make decisions that mean millions of dollars to private individuals and companies that the application of high ethical standards has become so difficult.

I was delighted to note the President Monday appointed a group of three outstanding professors of law to conduct "a thorough examination of present ethical standards and regulations." I greet with enthusiastic support this vigorous attack on the problem by the new administration. Its members may wish to consider the proposal which I am introducing today.

The code of ethics for Government service has raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. It is, however, a set of 10 rigid principles and it is clear that the most honest and intelligent of public servants must often find it difficult to interpret the code for some of the intricate and delicate situations in which they become involved. Some of the departments and agencies have gone one step further by implementing the code with a somewhat more comprehensive set of rules which apply more pertinently to their day-to-day problems. Many of these are very good but of course they are necessarily not of Government-wide application and their enforcement and implementation are not always effective. Still we have made progress which should not be lightly regarded.

At the time the code of ethics was adopted the departments were asked about the idea of establishing a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to supervise the implementation of the code. The feeling at that time seemed to be that it might be a better idea to let the code have a period in which to gain acceptance and permeate through the Government. There seems little doubt that it has had a beneficial effect and it has provided a standard toward which the Government has been growing these past few years.

But the departments felt that at a later time a Commission on Ethics might be a logical next step. It seems to me that the time has arrived to take that step. And here I want to pay tribute to Congressman CHARLES BENNETT of Florida, who has done so much in this field and who has such a profound understanding of the difficulties as well as the challenges of moving into this field with legislation. He worked long and hard and successfully for the adoption of the code of ethics. He is now introducing on the House side a companion bill to the one I have for introduction today which would establish a Commission on Ethics. He has contributed serious thought and creative ideas to the proposal.

This bipartisan Commission on Ethics would be a nine-member quasi-judicial body made up of three appointed by the President, two of whom would be private citizens, and one from the executive branch; three appointed by the President of the Senate, one Senator and two private citizens; and three by the Speaker of the House, one Representative and two private citizens. No compensation would be paid for these posts beyond a per diem expense for the private members.

The Commission would be empowered to issue advisory opinions interpreting the code of ethics upon receipt by it of an inquiry from any source, if it determines that such inquiry presents a problem or problems of sufficient public interest and importance to merit consideration and decision by the Commission.

The Commission could recommend modification or improvements in the code of ethics and in the laws. It could also investigate complaints of unethical conduct by Federal officers or employees if it determines that there was a probability that the code of ethics had been violated, and that such investigation would be of sufficient public interest to be warranted and then render a decision as to whether there had been a violation. If the Commission determines that there is a violation of the law, it would certify all facts to the Attorney General.

If the Commission determines that the principles of the code of ethics have been violated, first, by an officer or employee of an agency of the Federal Government it shall so advise the head of such agency; second, by a Member of the House of Representatives or an officer or employee thereof it shall so advise the Speaker of the House; third, by a U.S. Senator or an officer or employee of the Senate it shall so advise the President of the Senate; fourth, by an officer or employee of the judicial branch of the Federal Government it shall so advise a judge of the court concerned; fifth, by a person who may be impeached it shall so advise the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Each person advised of a violation of the principles of the code of ethics under this subsection may take such disciplinary action with respect to the officer or employee guilty of such violation as such person may deem appropriate and as is permitted by law.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a workable, practical, down-to-earth proposal to introduce some adaptability in this area of ethics. A commission of this kind would be in a position to impartially place the facts in some of these complex and delicate situations beside the general principles of the code and advise on how the latter should be applied.

It would build up a body of experience and precedent which would be extremely helpful to Government officials who are trying to maintain high standards. It would give the public confidence that a select group of citizens from public and private life was continually concerning itself with these ethical problems and rendering disinterested decisions. It could not help but raise the prestige and status of Goverment service.

While in the past congressional investigations have looked into specific malpractices, the Commission would have the advantages of continuing interest and of dispassionate and nonpartisan handling. This Commission can bring dignity, purpose, and real progress to the field of ethics in modern government.

Mr. President, I send the joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to interpret the application of the code of ethics for Government service, to recommend modifications and improvements therein, as well as in criminal or other statutes relating to ethics, to investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

UNIVERSITY OF FREE CUBA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a Senate concurrent resolution which is today being jointly introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman FASCELL, of Florida. The purpose of these concurrent resolutions is to put into action steps designed expeditiously to provide a University of Free Cuba and ultimately to establish a "University of the Americas" to help broaden and strengthen the mutal understanding and the mutual opportunities of all citizens and countries in the Western Hemisphere.

I ask, Mr. President, that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and that it lie on the desk until 2 o'clock, Tuesday, January 31, so that any other Senators who might want to join in this concurrent resolution may have an opportunity to do so. They are hereby invited to become cosponsors should they so desire.

Mr. President, this concurrent resolution is in harmony with previous steps taken by our Government to utilize the tools of education and the weapon of truth in creating ties of mutual understanding which promote freedom and prevent tyranny. It is in fact a projection of the good work being accomplished by the Smith-Mundt Act and the Fulbright Act. If the concept of a University of the Americas develops into an actuality as is hoped and expected it will become a great center of good will, culture, and sound public policies as it is anticipated the East-West Institute at Honolulu which it was my pleasure to cosponsor under the guidance of our then majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, will become between the people of Asia and the United States.

When I first saw the proposal for a Free University of Cuba advanced in a newspaper column written by Drew Pearson, I immediately applauded it as a most constructive and worthwhile proposal. I hope this Congress will move promptly to help bring into operation this effective and inexpensive proposal for strengthening the forces of freedom both in Cuba and the entire Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to provide a University of Free Cuba, submitted by Mr. MUNDT, was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas there has long been a bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States dating from the years when the American people did battle for Cuba's freedom; and

Whereas these bonds of friendship between the peoples of the two countries continue despite the unsuccessful efforts of a current dictatorship to stir up suspicion and hate between them; and

Whereas the great goals of freedom set by the patriot Jose Marti are just as revered today by the Cuban and American people despite the current suppression of those freedoms in Cuba; and

Whereas many thousands of Cubans are now residing in the United States in order to take advantage of the freedoms they once enjoyed at home; and

Whereas among these guests in the United States are many students whose education has been interrupted, and many professors from the once free University of Havana who have fled the tyranny and suppression which has replaced the once sovereign right of the university to teach and maintain the hard-won freedoms of Jose Marti; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States recognize and esteem education at all levels, particularly the university level where international educational exchange programs have been operated for many years with great success; and

Whereas the aforementioned students, even if able to locate employment in order to continue their studies, will still need additional financial assistance to accomplish this: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to exercise his authority under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to establish and operate a program to be known as the "University of Free Cuba," under which assistance in the pursuit of education will be furnished to college students in the United States from Cuba in need of such assistance because of the severance of diplomatic relations between Cuba and the United States, or because they are refugees in the United States from Cuba. The President is requested to enter into such cooperative agreements and arrangements with colleges, universities, and public and private associations as he deems necessary to carry out such program; be it further

Resolved, That, concurrent with the administration and operation of this program, the President is requested to examine the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis, a "University of the Americas," under which the facilities of such an institution would be accessible to students and professors of all nations of the Western Hemisphere under a curriculum specially drawn to impart deeper understanding of those legal, social, commercial and political problems common to the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRADE ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a Senate resolution creating and authorizing a special Senate committee to undertake an extensive study of the effect which foreign trade is having on various domestic matters, including employment and unemployment, full use of our ability to produce, and industrial competition.

The Senate committee would be empowered to make a full and complete study and inquiry concerning:

First. The extent to which unemployment or shifts in employment are caused by an increase in imports resulting from tariff reductions.

Second. The likely extent of future unemployment or shifts in employment arising from increased imports resulting from tariff reductions.

Third. The history and content of plans and programs designed to assist workers and industries in adjusting to new competition arising from trade liberalization.

Fourth. A feasible and practical plan or program of adjustment assistance for the United States so as to give the President additional powers to adjust import injury and to assist domestic industry to find new markets abroad.

Mr. President, outcries against competition from imports are becoming ever louder as imports mount faster than exports. The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, of which it was my privilege to be a member, last year completed 27 days of hearings in 24 cities throughout the United States. Everywhere we heard complaints that competition from abroad is injuring American industry and American labor. So extensive has foreign competition apparently become that it is sometimes referred to as the new import competition.

Most of the factual information our subcommittee received and other which is now available, however, is spotty and impressionistic. We know little, specifically, regarding the degree to which imports actually are displacing domestic capital and labor. Most of the testimony that has been presented to congressional committees and to the U.S. Tariff Commission is faulty in this respect. It is not unnatural and certainly it is in keeping with the tariff history of the United States, for those who favor a more liberal trade policy to belittle the harmful effects of import competition and for those who have a protectionist philosophy to magnify them. The protectionist-free debate is typically American. It would be unrealistic to expect the debate suddenly to become completely objective and factual.

The overall statistics, however, are reasonably clear. U.S. merchandise exports have not been increasing rapidly

enough to counterbalance the large payments that the United States has been making since the close of World War II to support its Military Establishment abroad and for foreign grant aid. In recent years these unilateral payments have been averaging between $4 billion and $5 billion a year. Furthermore, there has been a marked increase in U.S. private foreign investment, particularly since 1955.

Because of sustained economic development in Western Europe and Japan, there have been greatly increased imports of competitive products from those areas. In Western Europe the situation has been intensified by the formation of the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association.

American manufacturers are awakening to the fact that they no longer enjoy the international sellers' market that has been theirs since the close of World War II. International selling has become competitive and the sellers' market is being supplanted by a buyers' market.

In consequence, the United States has been accumulating a steadily mounting deficit in its balance of international dollar payments.

As long as U.S. foreign policy calls for the unilateral oversea spending of $4 billion to $5 billion a year for the support of its Military Establishment abroad and for foreign aid, it is imperative that exports expand relative to imports, or, more accurately stated, for international dollar receipts to expand relative to dollar payments.

Increased merchandise imports and the flight of substantial quantities of American capital abroad have combined to squeeze certain producers in the United States. The pressure appears to be particularly oppressive in certain areas of the country where there is already some unemployment.

We all agree that the maintenance of a strong U.S. economy is essential, not only to our own welfare in the short run, but to the entire free world, including ourselves, in the long run. If we can think of no better way of assuring a strong domestic economy than by throttling international trade we shall imperil our own longrun welfare. Foreign trade is the very lifeblood of those countries of the free world whose resources and production are not as varied or abundant as ours. It is imperative that we find a solution that will expand trade, but which, at the same time, will not aggravate unemployment in the United States. I have found no disagreement with this general objective. The difficulties arise when we try to implement it in terms of practical policy and programs.

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Before we can hope to agree on a solution we need to know the dimensions of the problem. How many jobs are at stake? Which industries are vulnerable, and which sections of the country give promise of being injured?

At the present time answers are not available to the following specific questions:

First. How many persons in the United States owe their present employment to imports or exports?

Second. What is the relationship between changes in foreign trade and job opportunities?

Third. How many workers are faced with employment adjustment resulting from the transfer of demand from domestic to foreign sources of supply?

Fourth. What has been the experience of people who have lost jobs because of competitive imports? Have they remained in the same industries? In the same localities? Have they had to leave their community to seek employment elsewhere?

Fifth. What can government, labor, and industry do for persons and industries suffering dislocation from foreign trade? How much of this country's gross national product is shipped overseas?

Sixth. What proportion of U.S. consumption is produced overseas?

Seventh. What proportion of U.S. imports is produced by overseas branches of industries wholly or partly owned by U.S. industries?

About 7 years ago estimates were made of the number of jobs that would be adversely affected if the United States were to suspend all of its tariffs. The estimates were made under the auspices of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the basis of economic conditions that prevailed in 1951. At the request of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy—the Randall commission—the Bureau of Labor Statistics equated these estimates to their job equivalents and found that the temporary suspension of all tariffs by the United States would result in increased imports having a shortrun displacement effect on not more than 200,000 workers. These were only estimates, however, based on informed guesses by foreign trade experts.

Were these 7-year-old estimates tenable? If not, which areas of the economy are more vulnerable than they were then? Information presently available in Government is not adequate to provide answers to these questions. We need vastly more facts if we are to legislate intelligently on this vital problem.

I am hopeful that the special committee which my resolution establishes will provide this information.

It is timely that this be done now since the Trade Agreements Act is due to come up for consideration in June of 1962. Unless the Senate is adequately informed as to the facts, it may find itself being pressured into taking action that may be inimical to the welfare of the country.

We can ill afford to lock ourselves up in a shell of economic self-containment. The struggle of the free world against the forces of totalitarianism is now primarily in the economic sphere. What we do with respect to international economic policy will not only affect our own level of living, but will demonstrate to the uncommitted areas of the world the relative merits of our system and that of communism.

It is incumbent on the United States that it pursue policies that will have the effect of increasing trade in the non-Communist world. At the same time, it must not diminish its efforts to point the way to the development of economically underdeveloped regions. While doing this it must see to it that its own domestic economy is vigorous and not marred by unemployment. Without a strong U.S. economy the economies of other free countries will be endangered. Intelligent action with respect to foreign-trade policy and employment is an important key to the survival of our way of life on this planet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas a sound international trade policy aimed at expanding world trade is essential to the welfare, economic well-being, and national security of the United States; and

Whereas such policy may affect to varying degrees, among other domestic matters, employment and unemployment, utilization of productive facilities and industrial competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special Senate committee to be composed of nine members to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to be known as the Committee on Trade Adjustment Problems. Six members of the committee shall be appointed from the majority party and three members from the minority party.

SEC. 2. The committee shall conduct a full and complete study and inquiry concerning (1) the extent to which unemployment or shifts in employment are caused by an increase in imports resulting from tariff reductions; (2) the likely extent of future unemployment or shifts in employment arising from increased imports resulting from tariff reductions; (3) the history and content of plans and programs designed to assist workers and industries in adjusting to new competition arising from trade liberalization; (4) a feasible and practical plan or program of adjustment assistance for the United States so as to give the President additional powers to adjust import injury. The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than June 30, 1962. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of a director of staff and such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duty. The committee is authorized to utilize the services information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished free or on a

reimbursable basis without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies. The committee is authorized to procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public or private organizations or institutions.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, in an amount not to exceed $350,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

COLD WAR GI BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 349, the cold war GI bill. Through a clerical error, his name was not included at the original introduction of the bill. I ask that it be added to the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1961, the names of Senators SYMINGTON, MORTON, CARLSON, SCOTT, and LONG of Hawaii were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 469) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY on January 17, 1961.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CULTURE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the Senate of January 23, 1961, the name of Mr. CLARK was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 535) to provide for a National Academy of Culture, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota on January 23, 1961.

NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 may remain at the desk through Tuesday, January 31.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In view of the large number of communications which I, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, have received, both in favor of the nomination and in opposition to it, I wish to give notice that all persons desiring to testify in behalf of the nomination or in opposition to it should notify Mr. Matthew Hale, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5304, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible, and in any event, before the close of business on Friday, February 3, 1961.

Mr. President, while it is not customary for such notices as this to be given by the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to nominations, although it is in other committees, I think it is obvious that this nomination is controversial and that such a notice as I have given is entirely fair and proper, both to the proponents and opponents of the nomination, as well as to the nominee himself.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Vice President Nixon.

No man in America has more deservedly earned his country's gratitude and praise. I cannot imagine anyone who has brought greater dignity and distinction to the high office he has held. Each difficult and demanding task undertaken by him these past 8 years was approached as a challenge and discharged with courage, imagination, and zeal.

It is not easy to express in a few words my personal debt of gratitude to Vice President Nixon for his leadership and friendship. In truth I can say that no man has worked harder and with greater earnestness for the principles and programs of his country and his party. Certainly both are the beneficiaries of this service.

Richard Nixon leaves the office of Vice President with the affection and respect of his fellow citizens and coworkers. He can look forward to a career of continued success, knowing that his wise counsel will be sought and his presence honored in all places.

Characteristically he turns to the future with the eagerness of a fresh campaigner to build an even stronger party and to fulfill the goals of our country. We wish him well in this endeavor. His talents, already generously given to these interests, will be in even greater need as we move into a decade of critical decisions.

Nebraska looks forward to the time when he will be among us once again. He is welcome at all times. It will long remember the enthusiastic gatherings occasioned by his presence. We regard and salute Richard Nixon as a great Republican and as one of the Nation's most beloved citizens.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LITHUANIAN LAWYERS AND LITHUANIAN JURISTS IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of January 23, 1961, and the attached resolution adopted by the American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago, on December 17, 1960, at Chicago, Ill., and transmitted by Chairman Pranas Sulas and Secretary J. Gaudusas, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, inasmuch as on February 16 the Lithuanian people will celebrate Independence Day, at which time I shall have some remarks to make on the Senate floor. I hope the Members of Congress will give due consideration to the resolution submitted.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN JURISTS' ASSOCIATION
OF CHICAGO, ILL.,
Chicago, Ill., January 23, 1961.

Senator E. DIRKSEN,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR: We have the honor to transmit to you resolution regarding the plight of Lithuania, adopted by the American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago, on December 17, 1960, Chicago, Ill.

PRANAS SULAS,
Chairman.
J. GAUDUSAS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE LITHUANIAN JURISTS' ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Whereas Lithuania, an ancient nation from prehistoric times and a modern republic, was illegally and forcibly seized by and incorporated into the state of the Soviet Union in 1940; and

Whereas after seizing Lithuania, the Soviet Union agents arrested Lithuania's legal government replacing it with a puppet regime, and introduced a reign of terror in Lithuania; and

Whereas the Soviet Union's regime in Lithuania deprived the Lithuanian people of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, confiscated their properties and business enterprises, converted them into slaves of the Soviet Union, deported approximately 300,000 of them to Siberia, and other parts of Russia; and

Whereas the Soviet Union's acts of aggression against Lithuania and her people are crimes not only against Lithuania and the Lithuanians, but also against the world peace and humanity, as provided in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, of which France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are signatories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the convened American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago, find it necessary on behalf of the Lithuanian people to condemn the rulers of the Soviet Union as aggressors against Lithuania and enemies of peace and humanity; be it further

Resolved, To request the Government of the United States of America and the governments of other countries, through their delegations to the United Nations, to declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and various agents from Lithuania, and to liberate the Lithuanian people from the Soviet Union's subjugation; and be it further

Resolved, To mail copies of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to the delegations of all countries to the United Nations, and to the press and other media of public information.

THE PROGRESS AND THE FUTURE OF MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the January 21 issue of the Missoulian-Sentinel carries a guest editorial written by

Mrs. Robert A. Day. Mrs. Day was born in Mexico, and in 1958 came with her husband to Montana, where both are making significant contributions to the activities of the city of Missoula.

In her editorial, Mrs. Day writes with wisdom and perception of the history of her native country and of the bright future of the great Republic of Mexico. It is a pleasure to include this article in the RECORD, even as it is to have this distinguished Mexican lady a resident of Montana. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO MAKES NOTABLE ADVANCES IN WAKE OF 1911 REVOLUTION

On May 25 of this year Mexico will celebrate the 50th anniversary of its revolution. It was on this date that Porfirio Diaz, dictator of Mexico for 27 years, was forced to relinquish his control of the Government and flee to Paris. As he embarked for his exile he made this famous last statement on the events that had taken place: "They have let the lions out of their cages; now to see who will put them back in again."

His words seem to have been justified, since it was he who was responsible for reinstating law and order to the country after many years of extreme instability that followed Mexico's independence from Spain. In fact, it must be admitted that during his dictatorship Mexico enjoyed peace and relative prosperity, even if it was at the cost of affording many privileges to the upper classes and to foreign businessmen.

It is my opinion that a dictatorship at that time was almost a necessity, since it provided a period of transition from the 300-year Spanish domination to the time when it could begin its struggle for a true democratic government.

The fall of Porfirio Diaz' government unleashed a series of violent struggles for power which were to last for a period of 9 years. This was a chaotic period, with one government toppling after another until, finally, Alvaro Obregon was able to gain enough support to remain in the Presidency for a considerable period of time. With his administration Mexico entered what might be called its new era. Although it was not completely peaceful, with many small uprisings still common, it at least paved the way for the period of relative stability that was to come. It wasn't until after the administration of Lazaro Cardenas and the tensions caused by the expropriation of Mexican oil lands, however, did Mexico seem to be safely on the road to real progress and stability. But, now, everything seemed to lead in one direction, progress. Land reforms were implemented, huge plantations and ranches were divided into small plots for individual ownership, schools were built with the effort to reduce illiteracy, means of communication were extended and improved, commerce and industry were encouraged and everything in Mexico began to flourish. None of this came about suddenly, however, for the progress of Mexico was now being built on a firm foundation, that of the conversion of a subjugated lower class into a middle class that was to become proud of its country and the progress it was making.

We Mexicans should be grateful that our revolution came when it did, 50 years before communism had found real direction in Latin America, for now, our country is free and democratic and is confidently making tremendous strides toward progress. We have had our revolution, the rough road is now behind us, and everything that the future holds for Mexico appears to be bright.

EXCHANGE STUDENT FROM AFRICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1961, appears an interesting story on an exchange student at St. Mary's College, in South Bend, Ind., where Mrs. Mansfield received her degree some years ago. The story concerns Mary Josephine Kasindi, a member of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika. It is a charming account of one of our first contacts in this country with an outstanding citizen of this African nation, which is scheduled to become independent in the near future; and I am delighted to call the article to the attention of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGIATE SNOW FIGHT HELPS TRAIN FUTURE AFRICA LEADER

SOUTH BEND, IND., January 21.—Plop, went the snowball, straight into the face of the honorable member of the Tanganyika Legislative Council.

Another international incident in the making?

Not this time. It happened here on the campus of St. Mary's College. The target was Mary Josephine Kasindi—at the moment without diplomatic immunity in girlish horseplay.

But Miss Kasindi—or Mary Jo, as she is known here—is an unusual student. She's the kind of student American colleges are training today to help shape the nations of tomorrow.

Until shortly before coming to this Roman Catholic girls' school last autumn, she was the youngest member of the Tanganyika Legislative Council—chief lawmaking body of the British protectorate bordering the Indian Ocean in east Africa.

Now she's here to become the second female African citizen of Tanganyika to win a college degree.

PLENTY OF REASONS

"I really don't know why the Governor appointed me to the Council," she murmured in softly accented English. "There's no reason at all I can think of."

The 1,100 St. Mary's students and Sisters of the Holy Cross on the faculty can offer plenty of reasons why the girl was chosen.

"She is delightful to work with," said Sister M. Michaela, dean of freshmen. "Mary Jo has a sharp mind, and she's amazingly mature in her thinking."

Behind the quiet manner and wide grin is a very determined young lady with but one aim—playing a part in the independence of her people.

Remarked Charmaine Hitchcox, 19, of De Kalb, Ill., as a junior and Mary Jo's "big sister" adviser among the students:

"When we talk about world affairs, especially Africa, she has some very strong ideas and she's not bashful about voicing them. Actually, she probably has been more helpful to me than I have to her."

Tanganyika's Legislative Council had 63 members when Mary Jo was appointed, and there were no political parties as such. She was named to the faction supporting the Government, and others belonged to the "opposition" as part of Britain's gradual training program for self-government.

FIRST SIGHT OF SNOW

"I'm so happy to be here," she said while carefully threading her way across ice on a campus street. "But I have to confess I'm still a little afraid of all this snow. I never saw snow before—except on top of Mount Kilimanjaro from a distance."

The 25-year-old African admits she was worried about doing anything which might reflect on her people and endanger the independence they hope is only a year or so away.

Studying in the campus library, she is sometimes reminded that 75 percent of her fellow countrymen can't read at all.

Her mother and seven brothers and sisters still live in a native house of tin roof and sun-dried brick in the southern highland town of Iringa.

Mary Jo was teaching school in Morogoro when a Maryknoll missionary sister helped her obtain a full scholarship here. A Fulbright grant from the U.S. Government paid travel expenses, and she receives an allowance from the bishop of Iringa.

DANIEL J. TAULBEE, INDIAN ARTIST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Charles M. Russell, the famous western artist, was a colorful character who brought a great deal of fame to the State of Montana. Russell also is the first of a long line of very talented painters to come from my State. These artists recorded on canvas the growth of the West, Montana's scenic grandeur, and, more recently, the contemporary Indian. The latest of these artists to come to my attention is Daniel J. Taulbee.

Dan Taulbee is a 33-year-old Flathead Indian who already has gained a nationwide reputation for his talents in recording in oil and canvas the contemporary Indian. Taulbee's realistic work has been recognized with appropriate awards throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a feature story entitled "His Severest Critics Are Men He Paints," from the January 15, 1961, issue of the Great Falls Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS SEVEREST CRITICS ARE MEN HE PAINTS

(By Clyde Reichelt)

BUTTE.—"I paint the story of a race—my folks."

Daniel J. Taulbee was born on a Flathead Indian Reservation ranch 33 summers ago of parents who knew the plains and hills of Texas and Oklahoma. The blood of the Comanche flows in his veins and it is for the red man that he paints.

"They are the strict realists," the tall Taulbee explained, referring to the fullbloods. "They've been there and if what you paint is not right they call you down hard."

Whether or not he has been called down hard many times Taulbee didn't say, but in all likelihood even the sharp eyes of the old warriors can see little wrong with his pictures.

Taulbee was born with the great desire to draw. As a small boy he drew on "butcher" paper or if there wasn't much of that he'd use the walls.

He went to a grade school on the reservation and to a high school at Polson. He was drawing most of the time when he should have been studying and it was one of his teachers who first acclaimed his talents in a roundabout fashion.

He was caught sketching an Indian head and was told to stay after school to consider putting his time to more accepted endeavors.

"She gave me the devil," Taulbee recalls now, "but I forgot all about staying after school until I got about halfway home."

Then he hurried back. The teacher was waiting for him, picture in hand.

"Can you draw this again?" she asked, referring to the sketch.

"Sure."

"Then, can I have it?"

"Sure."

"That's all." And Taulbee went home, the punishment forgotten.

But general public recognition and national acclaim didn't come until some years following World War II. After his return from the South Pacific, he punched cattle and did general ranchwork around Browning and the Blackfeet Indian Reservation before moving to Butte about 10 years ago.

He sold his first picture about that time and a few years later, about 1954, he had his first art show in Butte. In 1958 he was awarded second prize among 70 entries in a national art show put on by the Burr Galleries in New York City.

In May 1959 he had his first one-man show, an exhibition sponsored by the Junior League of Butte. A year later he had his first one-man show in New York City when the Burr Galleries exhibited 19 oils and 20 water colors. He is a permanent member of the galleries now and has pictures on exhibit at all times.

Taulbee has also shown in Bay City, Tex., which is a suburb of Houston; Tulsa, Okla.; and Columbus, Ohio. He has had a private showing in Chicago and will have his work in Crest Gallery, New Hope, Pa.

Taulbee declares a lot of his success is due to just plain luck and to the help and advice given him by Mr. and Mrs. Sam Chase, Butte. He met them at a meeting of the Montana Institute of Arts and since then they've been like parents, giving him encouragement, advising him where to exhibit his paintings and what books to read.

He has read many volumes on painting and has also completed a 2-year correspondence course from Famous Artists, a school whose teachers include such notables as Norman Rockwell and John Clymer. He studies constantly to improve his technique but the knowledge of his subjects has been gained through experience.

"I've seen Indians travel by travois. I've seen a lot of things most people haven't seen," he declared. He's been all over Montana, from one Indian reservation to the other, observing the ways of the Indians and talking with the old fullbloods about the history and long-ago customs of their tribes.

Taulbee never paints a strictly scenic picture and only a few of his pictures depict general western and wild life. His works are of Indians and each must show a bit of history or have a purpose.

"It's history, it's the people, that's what counts," is his simple explanation for painting.

To him painting is also a vice—he cannot escape a driving inner urge that makes him study the bone structure of every face he passes and the play of shadow about the nose and mouth.

The labor of putting all his studying and thinking on canvas begins at his home about 6 p.m. and continues until midnight or after.

But Taulbee never rushes through a painting.

"I don't want to put a clock on myself," he said, "I don't want to be conscious of time. One good picture is worth 20 'not good' ones."

The truth of this philosophy has been proven and with it came the fulfillment of a pledge made to an old medicine man many years ago.

"I promised him I'd put his people in New York City," Taulbee said.

And he has.

BROTHER VAN—FRONTIER MINISTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Montana's relatively short but exciting history is full of memorable events, and abounds with colorful personalities. Perhaps one of the most famous is Brother Van, the Frontier Minister.

Rev. William Westley Van Orsdel, better known as Brother Van, has been the subject of many articles and books. This frontier personality came to the territory of Montana as a Methodist minister and soon became one of the State's most inspiring citizens.

Another fine article about Brother Van has been written by H. McDonald Clark, and appeared in the January 15, 1961, issue of the Great Falls Tribune. Mr. President, I recommend this article to all of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHER VAN: FRONTIER MINISTER
(By H. McDonald Clark)

One of the most inspirational figures in Montana history, Rev. William Westley Van Orsdel, better known as Brother Van, continues to be the subject of many articles and books; one book is now at the publishers that a Montana writer was commissioned to write by the Montana Conferences of the Methodist Church. The book will adhere closely to Brother Van's actual deeds and experiences.

So colorful was Brother Van as a frontier personality that many legends have sprung up about him that in some cases exceed the truth, and it is a moot question whether the individual should circulate accounts of the legends or stick to the true facts. Mrs. Lillie May Nash, of Missoula, whom most biographers of Brother Van contact in preparing any material about him, quotes her father on the matter.

"Dad always felt that Brother Van's life was so colorful in itself that it needed no dressing up," explains Mrs. Nash, who knew Brother Van personally when she was growing up. Her father was also a Methodist minister, known as the cowboy preacher of Montana. He was Rev. Augustus W. Hammer, who for years prior to joining the ministry was a cowboy on the open range. He was better known to his cowboy associates as Gus Hammer.

Brother Van and Reverend Hammer were great friends. And friends to them were the cowboys, for the two ministers spoke the language of the range, and understood the cowboy makeup. One of Reverend Hammer's sermons was so greatly received that he was asked to give it over and over again. Its subject was the cowboy of the West, and it was titled "The Passing of the Cowboy."

It was Brother Van, who received this abbreviated name early upon arrival into the territory that was to become Montana, who was the presiding elder, or district superintendent, as the position is now designated, of the area which Reverend Hammer also helped to service. This gave Lillie May an opportunity to see Brother Van frequently. She has many of his letters, postcards, and notes to her family written by him, as well as pictures of him that she cherishes. When Mrs. Dan Brummit was preparing her book on Brother Van, she stayed at Lillie's home while collecting the material.

"Stella's book was published the year of Brother Van's death," recalls Lillie. "He read and approved the copy. Perhaps that accounts for one of the reasons her book to date is my favorite about Brother Van."

Lillie May, and her brother Henry Hammer, were baptized by Brother Van. Upon his death in the year 1919, Lillie and her sister, Pearl, were attending the Methodist school in Helena, and the two sisters, then about 11 and 12 years of age, were in the choir that sang at Brother Van's funeral.

"I remember well the hymn we sang, for it was a great favorite of Brother Van's," says Lillie. "It was, 'There's No Night There.' Another great favorite of his was 'The Tears of the Sower and the Songs of the Reaper,' and so too was 'Harvest Time.'"

When asked if it is legend that Brother Van had a beautiful baritone voice, Mrs. Nash is quick to declare the veracity of any statement attributing a fine voice to him. "Everyone who ever heard him sing appreciated Brother Van's voice," said Mrs. Nash. "He could put fine expression into his singing."

Lillie recalls Brother Van's favorite expression. "It's glorious," he would say, whether the sun was shining, or it was 20° below zero. "It was always 'glorious' with Brother Van," declares Mrs. Nash. "He always saw the bright side of life. He never seemed to know what it was to be down in the mouth. He was a true optimist. He had such great faith that he sincerely believed the words of the hymn, 'God Will Take Care of You.'"

Brother Van had mannerisms and tastes that made him more human and lovable to those who were well acquainted with him. For instance, his favorite dish at night before retirement was cold potatoes with a little salt on them. "That dish probably wouldn't appeal to anyone else, but it was just what Brother Van craved, and mother enjoyed fixing it for him," remembers Lillie. "Also, when he stayed at our house, he always insisted on helping mother by wiping the dishes. He said every man should wipe the dishes, for it says so in the Bible."

At the look of disbelief from her husband, John Nash, who was present during the interview, Lillie produced the family Bible. "Brother Van would quote what it says in the Bible: 'As a man wipeth a dish and turneth it upside down.' Now we'll see if we can find it."

Lillie found the lines she was seeking in Kings, chapter 21, and she read them aloud: "I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down." Nash, who is a professional smokejumper, still appeared unconvinced at the quotation. At this point, he entered the conversation to recall his own experience concerning Brother Van. Brother Van, with his brother, Fletcher, came to visit at the ranch of John's grandfather, Albert Stoutenburg, near Utica, and Brother Van held young John on his lap. John remembers the odd way Brother Van had of brushing his hair from the back up over his head.

Mrs. Nash is preparing material for an article on her father, who outlived Brother Van some 21 years. When Brother Van died, the Reverend Hammer wrote an article in commemoration of him that is very moving. It was published in the Area Centenary Messenger, January 15, 1920. Of Brother Van, Reverend Hammer penned: "This man had no schoolhouses—the freighters' or cowboys' camp, the cabin or the ranch home, the Indian tepee, the barroom, or the street made him a pulpit. And whatever might be the congregations, he always gave them his best in words and song.

"He saw the watering places of the buffalo and the antelope become the campground of the cowboy and the sheepherder. These oftentimes gave way to ranches and towns. He saw wide places in the trails become cities. He saw the buffalo and antelope give way to the cattle and sheep; these in turn give way to the farmer; saw the great prairies turned into golden wheatfields. And to meet these changes there were no trails but he made them and showed us how to follow them."

Of Brother Van, H. M. Flint had this to say: "He was indeed 20 years a bishop of all outdoors."

The Nashes state that one of the most controversial points about Brother Van's life is whether he actually held his first services in a saloon or at the courthouse after embarking from the steamboat *Far West* at Fort Benton on a Sunday morning in 1872.

"From a study of Brother Van's own writings, it is possible to deduce that he held his first service in a saloon," says Lillie. "Brother Van, in autobiographical accounts given to other writers, related that it was pouring rain the morning he stepped off the steamboat. He told of going to the courthouse, only to find that rain was coming through some of its weathermade openings, for the building was only an adobe structure.

"He related that he was informed another man of God, a Father Van, who was Rev. Van Gorp, a Catholic priest, was about to hold a service in a saloon. Brother Van located him, and it was not quite 10 o'clock, and after they visited a few minutes, Father Van told Brother Van that he would arrange for him to hold an afternoon service at the saloon, commencing at 3 o'clock. This Father Gorp did. 'It proved to be most successful,' said Brother Van. Thus we have Brother Van's own account of the matter, although he never stated specifically the name of the saloon, and we have never learned its true name."

In the book, "Brother Van," written by Alson Jesse Smith, Author Smith gives the saloon the name of the Four Deuces. Since time may never disclose the name of the establishment, some contend that name as good as any. Author Smith does not pretend that his book on Brother Van is absolutely authentic, for in the foreword he confesses he has taken liberties in imagining what might have happened to his hero, Brother Van. It makes for interesting reading, however, although Mrs. Nash confesses she thinks her father might have felt some things were a bit too far stretched for credibility.

Among the contrasts existing in some stories and Brother Van's own accounts is the picture presented by some authors of Brother Van singing in the saloon to an audience composed not only of bullwackers, trappers, traders, cowboys, soldiers, all of whom were doubtlessly present, but also dancing girls. This Brother Van's accounts eliminate, for he said there was only one woman present, a very respectable and sincere Christian, Mrs. George Baker. But it could very possibly be true, as Author Smith presents it, that Brother Van won his audience over instantaneously with such hymns as "Diamond in the Rough." Smith gives an able description of the "diamonds in the rough" present at that first service of Brother Van's in a Fort Benton saloon.

Historians recall that the quickest trip ever made by steamboat on the Missouri from Sioux City to Fort Benton was made that trip by the *Far West* which brought Brother Van to Montana. In his personal account of the trip, Reverend Van Orsdel told that the *Nellie Peck* had left Sioux City 3 days ahead of them, but still the *Far West* reached port an hour ahead of it.

"It had been a race all of the way, and the better time of the *Far West* gave the passengers a time of great rejoicing," he said. Only 1 night had the boat tied up the entire trip. Yet Brother Van enjoyed relating how half a day was spent waiting for a band of buffalo to cross before them in the river.

Like his great friend, Charles M. Russell, the cowboy artist, Brother Van had felt the call of the West from boyhood. He had been offered work in the church amid civilized environments, but even attractive salaries and association with marvelous personages in the service of God could not induce him to stay.

He wrote: "But here this time I had a mighty vision, not only of God's power and man's need, but away out on the frontier, and even up to the summit of the Rockies, I could see the miners, stage drivers, freighters, cowboys, and here and there among them copper-colored natives, holding up their hands and beckoning; I could see the tears fall, and their whole being reached out for the religion of their childhood at their old home, in the old country church far, far away, and the native of the plains rising in his ignorance of the religion of love and peace. To me these were Macedonian cries, and with the all-propelling word 'go' locked up like fire in my bones, I felt like Paul, 'Woe be unto me if I go not,' and thus hearkened to the appeal made by the Holy Spirit."

To back up his determination to spend his life in the West, Brother Van had the advice of Chaplain McCabe: "Go away out West and you will realize what Paul meant when he said that he rejoiced when he did not build upon any other man's foundation. You will find but few foundations out there."

When Brother Van was 68 years old, a formal celebration was held at old Fort Benton on his birthday, and although his friend of long standing, Russell, could not be present to pay him tribute, he wrote him a letter that is a collector's item.

It recalled the first time the two met at Babcock's ranch in Pigeye Basin in the Upper Judith. Jake Hoover and Kid Russell were there, having come from the South Fork with pack animals loaded with deer and elk meat which they had sold to ranchers. Russell recalled in that letter the words of old Bab to him concerning Brother Van:

" 'Boy,' says he, 'I don't savvy many psalm singers, but Brother Van deals square.'" Russell continued: "and when we all sat down to our elk meat, beans, coffee, and dried apples, under the rays of a bacon grease light, those men who knew little law, and one of them I knew wore notches on his gun, men who had not prayed since they knelt at their mother's knees, bowed their heads while you, Brother Van, gave thanks, and when you finished, someone said, 'Amen.' I am not sure, but I think it was the man who had been a road agent."

When the Methodist missionaries held their first Rocky Mountain conference, Brother Van saw a dream realized. Through the years, he grew more dear to the hearts of Montanans. When he died at the age of 69 in 1919, his was the largest funeral Montana had witnessed.

In Lillie Nash's scrapbook, she has a verse by Helen Fitzgerald Sanders that Lillie feels is a deserving epitaph for Brother Van. It reads:

"Pillow his head on a lap of cool earth
Where but yesterday he trod,
And there on his couch beneath the blue sky,
We'll leave him alone with his God."

Brother Van sleeps in beautiful Forestvale Cemetery out of Helena in the Prickly Pear Valley. A large boulder marks his resting place. The stone monument is similar to the one on the grave of his friend, Russell.

DEDICATION OF HOOVER DIKE AT LAKE OKEECHOBEE, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 12, 1961, I was in Clewiston, Fla., along with two of my Florida colleagues, Congressmen PAUL ROGERS and WILLIAM CRAMER, where we participated in the dedication ceremonies attendant to the naming of the dike around Lake Okeechobee in honor of former President Herbert Hoover. Acting for our whole Florida delegation, I introduced last year, as an amendment to the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, the legislation which gave President Hoover's name to this dike, as had been requested not only by the Governor and the cabinet, but also by all county and local governing bodies in the area surrounding the great lake, the State chamber of commerce, and numerous other civic bodies.

Following the devastating floods which accompanied the 1926 and 1928 hurricanes, and claimed about 2,500 lives in the Lake Okeechobee areas, Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce and later as President, supplied great leadership and invaluable assistance to our congressional delegation, and to our State officials. Our then Gov. Doyle E. Carlton, in introducing President Hoover, recounted eloquently and gratefully the facts about President Hoover's coming to Florida at that time and helping to put through, in a time of severe economic depression, the Federal appropriation which made possible the great dike which protects the lives and properties of our Florida citizens dwelling in that area. A crowd of several thousand was present. Gov. Farris Bryant, our State cabinet, Chief Justice Elwyn Thomas, of our supreme court, and numerous other State, legislative, county, local, and civic officials were there. President Henry Coleman, of the State chamber of commerce, presided, and Executive Vice President Harold Colee presented to Mr. Hoover a beautiful miniature replica of the imposing marker and plaque which was unveiled on top of the dike by Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the U.S. Army Engineers, who delivered an eloquent dedicatory address as a representative of the Secretary of the Army. President Hoover spoke briefly and humorously, but impressively, and received an enthusiastic response and greeting, which clearly manifested the gratitude and affection which the people of Florida feel for him.

Mr. President, to make a permanent record of this unforgettable and historic occasion, for myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS], I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of President Hoover included in full in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT THE DEDICATION OF HOOVER DIKE, LAKE OKEECHOBEE, FLA., JANUARY 12, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Senator HOLLAND, Governor Bryant, and the great leaders of a great State assembled here, and my fellow Americans in this distinguished audience.

Never in my long life have I received such a gracious reception as I have on this occasion.

Before I deal with the matters before us, I may tell you that many persons have requested that I use this occasion to explain the remedies to our national dangers of which there is an oversupply.

There are many reasons for my not doing that chore.

I was not elected to that job last November. Moreover, we are here engaged with Lake Okeechobee.

But I can make three observations:

First. I am sure that the American people earnestly wish for the success of the new administration. It is faced with one of the greatest challenges of our whole history.

Second. Our country has met and solved equally great crises in the past 185 years.

Third. This Nation, founded in strength, will not decline or fall if we continue to remedy our slump in morals with its trail of crime and corruption.

While these matters haunt our minds, we can take some courage from the scene here before our eyes as to the alertness of our national mind in coping with dangers, although a comparatively minor one. This huge dike, more than 85 miles long, is proof of this alertness.

This dike has cured the bad habit of tropical hurricanes of using this lake as a weapon of destruction. It has prevented great suffering and loss of life. It has increased the productivity of our country, and in its spare time, part of its surface provides a fine highway.

No one could be more surprised than I was when in a most gracious address in the last short session of the Congress, Senator HOLLAND introduced a bill proposing that the Okeechobee dike should bear my name. He was supported by Senator Smathers, the entire Florida delegation, former Governor Carlton, the chambers of commerce of Florida, Mr. Henry Coleman, Mr. Loy Anderson, Mr. Harold Colee, and many other civic leaders and voluntary associations of Florida. The bill passed unanimously.

Possibly it was the only unanimous act of that session.

It is a generous tribute—and even greater since it was initiated by men of the opposite political party.

Even if it be undeserved, I may tell you that such compliments are good for the aged.

In his address, Senator HOLLAND overstated my part in these works. I will therefore shortly restate my relations to this job to demonstrate that this was not a one-man job but a cooperative undertaking by many men.

My acquaintance with the lake began in 1926 when I was Secretary of Commerce. One of my jobs was to look into disasters and take part in their remedies.

I visited the ruins of the holocaust of 1926. The hurricane of that year had driven the water from the lake and dumped it in the wrong place. Many people were drowned, many were injured, and a host of homes and farms were destroyed. On that inspection trip I had the guidance of your chief justice, Elwyn Thomas. His sympathies and understanding of human suffering, as he has shown over the years, were no less 35 years ago.

In those days we gave these wicked manifestations no endearing names of gentle women such as "Edna," "Carol," "Hazel," "Connie," and others. And incidentally, as to that practice, I propose to you a reform. Why should not the Weather Bureau select the names of historically violent women?

After that visit of 1926, I joined with the Army Engineers in urging more and better dikes. But before the studies and plans of the engineers could be completed, the even worse hurricane of 1928 seized the lake with even greater destruction of lives and homes. Only then did the whole Nation realize that it was imperative to do something about it.

As President, it became my privilege to propose to the Congress, in cooperation with the Florida leaders, the authorizations and appropriations to correct this particular wickedness of tropical storms.

Since this great dike was built, five evil hurricanes have tried their best at destruction around this lake, but they have been foiled in every attack.

Our Nation has been amply compensated by the ending of this loss of human lives and homes.

The American people have contributed huge sums to this and other public works. And so far as I know, there has never been a substantial complaint over the tax burden to build this and other great structures, which add to the safety of our citizens and the increase in national productivity.

THE REAL FOUNTAIN OF YOUTH

This lake has an interest besides its potential for good or evil.

Every Florida school child knows that about 450 years ago Ponce de Leon came to Florida in search of the waters of the Fountain of Youth. In his journeys he missed Lake Okeechobee by only about 40 miles.

Ponce de Leon's advisers were ill informed or he would have come here. I can tell you that he could have found a veritable fountain of youth in this lake.

There are fish in it and hereabouts. And fishing is the eternal fountain of youth. For your assurance of this fact, I will mention that there is said to be a tablet of 2000 B.C. which says: "The gods do not subtract from the allotted span of men's lives the hours spent in fishing."

And as further proof that fishing is the fountain of youth, I may also cite that many Presidents of the United States have sought this fountain of youth.

And fishing reduces the ego in Presidents and former Presidents, for all men are equal before fishes.

I may confess to you that, as a Californian, I have come to Florida during 23 winters seeking this fountain of youth.

But enough on the real fountain of youth. We have other serious matters before us.

This job is not wholly completed. By extension of this dike, this lake can be brought to yield still greater productivity. The Army Engineers recommended it. I commend it for consideration by Congress.

I am grateful for the high honor which Senator HOLLAND initiated, for the support of the Florida delegation, and to the Congress as a whole for naming this the Herbert Hoover Dike.

I have grave doubts if I deserve this distinction. My service in these matters has been a joint one with the Florida leaders and the Army Engineers who brought these great measures to fruition.

You have erected here on the top of this dike a fitting historical marker showing the names of the great men of Florida who brought this project into being and to those Army engineers, whose magnificent abilities designed and built this dike.

I wish the blessings of the Almighty on the further work you have before you.

And do not let the world forget that the fountains of youth are abundant in Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SMATHERS. First I should like to thank my colleague for associating me with the remarks he has made. It was not my happy privilege to be with him on the occasion of the dedication. However, I have heard a good many wonderful things said about Mr. Hoover's speech. I want him to know that I felt honored, along with the other people of my State, to have him in our State. He visits there often. He is there now. I am sure many of us wish we could be there right now. We are always glad to have such a distinguished visitor in our State.

I thank my distinguished colleague.

NBC WHITE PAPER "SIT-IN" DESCRIBES SOCIAL ACTION IN SOUTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year we witnessed a new phenomenon in America. Starting in January, and continuing through the year, a wave of Gandhi-like passive resistance demonstrations swept across the South, aimed at breaking racial bars in public eating places. These were the sit-ins, a new development in the long record of American social action. So new, in fact, was the sit-in that it put a new word into the American vocabulary.

To some, the sit-ins were an outrageous trammeling on tradition-hallowed rights of private association, a cause of fear verging on terror, no less real for seeming, to many, unnecessary. To others they were a dramatic symbol of hope and emancipation, a key which could unlock the doors to social and economic equality.

One of the things which television can do best is explain. Faced with something new in the American experience, like the sit-in, television can place it in a context, reveal its subtleties, describe the methods of operation, and share the humor and intimacies of those actually taking part. All this and more was accomplished with distinction in the National Broadcasting Co. white paper "Sit-In" which was presented on December 20, 1960.

In this program the sit-ins came alive. Using a combination of live interviews and newsreel footage, it presented a documentary account of what actually occurred in Nashville and other southern cities before, during, and after the event, when the Negro young people took their places at the segregated lunch counters and asked to be served.

During the program the distinguished narrator, Chet Huntley, comments:

> One may disagree with the sit-in tactic as a means of achieving the human aspirations of the Negro, and some may disagree with the aspirations themselves. But perhaps the most important thing to realize is not only that they exist, but that Negro leaders of the immediate future are demanding that they be satisfied, and they are impatient with the slow pace of traditional change. The sit-ins are the dramatic spearhead of a changing mood and behind it is the Negro's growing awareness of their economic power, the ultimate weapon in achieving without violence what they feel is right. What we are witnessing is a new kind of militancy, and with it a new kind of soldier.

This thoughful comment indicates the kind of perceptiveness, skill, and insight with which the entire program was presented. The executive producer was Irving Gitlein, and the program was produced and written by Al Wasserman and Robert Young. The sponsor was the Timex Co. To preserve this program as an important historical record, and to bring it to the attention of a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIT-IN

JOHN LEWIS (Negro student). It was January the 13th that we had the very first sit-in in Nashville, and I took my seat at the counter. I asked the waitress for a hamburger and a coke.

WAITRESS. I'm sorry, our management does not allow us to serve niggers in here.

OLD NEGRO PREACHER. My brothers, I'm glad; I'm glad to have the opportunity to tell people today that they are sleeping in a dangerous time.

Rise, rise, rise! I'm here in the midst of all these strange things today. I feel so glad that I'm got the opportunity to tell—tell mens to run; run, run, run! Run, run! Mens and women that hasn't made a start to go before, to pull up and do something for your race, to go before. Wake up! Wake up! Go and make a start and see if God will catch a holt of you.

ANNOUNCER. This series is presented as a public service by Timex, the world's largest manufacturer of watches. More people buy Timex than any other watch in the world.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In 1954, the historic Supreme Court decision on public school desegregation presented that area of the United States traditionally known as the South with its first regionwide crisis in race relations of the 20th century. Six years later, in 1960, the South is again faced with a crisis in race relations of perhaps even greater significance, the sit-in movement. It comes at a time of sweeping social and political changes among the colored peoples of the world, and in our own country, it has challenged certain fundamental concepts of law, affecting the conduct of national politics, and is shaking regional traditions of the South in an entirely new way.

In this NBC white paper, we shall examine the phenomenon of the sit-in, focusing on the one city where it had its clearest and most significant expression, Nashville, Tenn.

In Nashville, on April 19, 1960, 4,000 Negroes marched angrily on city hall to bring to a climax 2 months of tension and violence that had involved a once peaceful city. This is the story of those 2 months.

MAYOR BEN WEST. I am Ben West, and this is my city. For the past 10 years, I have been its mayor. I have watched it grow from an overgrown country town into a great metropolitan complex.

While Nashville is a city, yet the ways of its people are smalltownish. Here we know each other, speak to each other. The morning greeting is commonplace. The people are not country yokels. They are well educated, and they are cosmopolites, too.

Here we have many pleasant surroundings. The beautiful State capital, which was designed by the architect William Strickler; the many, many old buildings that have such historic value to us. Out in Centennial Park you will see the Parthenon. This Parthenon is the only exact replica of the Parthenon on the Acropolis in Athens, Greece, and we are very proud of that.

Nashville has been called "the Athens of the South." We think we have earned this fine title with our rich background of culture.

KELLY MILLER SMITH (Negro minister). Nashville is considered to be the Athens of the South, and I suppose this is true in several ways. The old Athens, the ancient Athens, was a place of both shame and glory, and I think this is true of our Athens of the South here.

There are certainly the aspects of glory in the city of Nashville, its progress, its culture, its educational institutions, and things of this sort.

It is to the glory of Nashville that Negroes are to be found on some levels in our city government. We have city councilmen; we have two Negro city councilmen. We have a Negro on the transit board. We have a Negro who serves on our school board; but it is to the shame of Nashville that when you go down to the city hall, not only do you see segregation signs on the restrooms, but you see the signs of segregation in other places. Stores where you can come in as a customer, but if you come in as an employee, it's only in a very menial capacity. You will serve as a porter, or something of that sort, or as a customer for certain goods; that's goods other than food.

There were virtually no places downtown where Negro citizens could get a cup of coffee, a hamburger, or a meal. Therefore, we felt that something has to be done about this kind of situation. It isn't a matter of choice. It isn't an order that comes from somebody else. It's an order that comes from within, which says you must move against this, if you are to really be able to live with yourself.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The impulse that led to the sit-in movement had been growing for some time, and it was the Negro college students in Nashville, and in other cities, who would bring it into action.

The background of these students was a religious one, and in addition many of them had been inspired by the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi as applied by the Reverend Martin Luther King. A few of the students had prepared to put theory into practice by attending workshops in which they rehearsed for the ordeal they would have to undergo when they began sitting in at white lunch counters.

ANGELINE BUTLER (Negro student). When an idea is something I have never heard of, I like to explore it and see what it really is. I went to this workshop, and on this particular night they were having some rolemaking, and in some of the scenes, you almost cried, because they would have someone playing the part of——

VOICE. Niggah.

VOICE. Niggah.

(General confusion of voices.)

ANGELINE BUTLER. These sort of comments. They touched to your soul, and they make you realize that it is all the more important that you do something about it.

February 13 was our first sit-in in Nashville. On the sit-in, we had about 130 kids. I think on this day many of us didn't realize just how important our movement would grow to be.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The targets of the Nashville students were the luncheon counters of the city's two department stores and four variety stores, and for the first time the community was confronted with Negroes in places where they had never been.

JOHN LEWIS (Negro student). When you go to a counter, you do not request that the person sitting next to you get up and leave. You merely come in and sit down beside him, as any human being would do. You cause no violence. You have no angry words. You're friendly and it sort of helps to project the idea that here sits beside me another human being.

BERNARD LAFAYETTE (Negro student). Altogether there was a moving fear within me that I was sitting there demanding a God-given right, and my soul became satisfied that I was right in what I was doing. At the same time, there was something deep down within me moving me that I could no longer be satisfied or go along with an evil system, that I had to be maladjusted to it. In spite of all of this, I had to keep loving the people who denied me service, who stared at me.

Mr. HUNTLEY. During the early weeks of February 1960, the demonstrations that came to be called the sit-in movement exploded across the South. Within a period of 2 months, the movement had spread to 65 cities involving every Southern State with the exception of Mississippi.

The new tactic came as a surprise creating bewilderment and confusion in the white communities, and even among the Negroes themselves.

Mr. LAFAYETTE. This letter I got from my mother sort of disturbs me, and hurts me in a way. She said, "Dear Son, I was glad to hear from you, and sorry too, because I didn't sleep all night, praying and crying, and thanking God he had been so good to you. What are you fighting for? You don't have a family. Yet you remember what happened in school. It's the white people. What about the people of your race? What are they giving you? Remember, don't hurt yourself. Remember your adviser asked the white people to help you, and they did. So you don't want to fight the people who are trying to help you. Remember God will straighten out everything, if you just wait your turn.

"You don't have to eat with the white people, and you live all these years just praying, trusting God. You're not learning your lesson at school. God is nobody to play with. You're just making disturbance."

See, she didn't even give a complimentary close or anything. I was really upset, man. Gosh—I know she cares for me, I mean. I know she loves me, but—man, she just don't understand. She don't understand. You see what I mean?

JOAN RAMSEY (white housewife). I think that people who strive to gain social acceptance, although they are called nonviolent or passive, resistant, they are the most violent. I also think that it is in violation to my civil rights, if somebody can say "You must serve me." If a man owns an eating establishment, if he can't choose whom he pleases to serve or not to serve, that can affect me and you, and anyone else.

WILLIAM BURTON (white lawyer). I would say that they should examine the white person very closely first to see whether or not they are going about it in the right way. Now, if I am a businessman and people that I do not want in my business insist on either coming in or boycotting, which is their perfect right to do, then certainly it is not going to make me love them.

CECIL SIMS (white leader). Breaking bread is essentially a family custom, almost a sacrament. Now when you claim that you have been denied equal rights in participating in something that is regarded as a family custom or sacrament, and insist on being recognized, you're getting into dangerous ground, and ground that can be misconstrued, and in which you can be wrong.

Now the people in the South have always fed people who came and knocked at the back door and asked for something to eat, but they have always reserved the right to eat only with invited guests.

HELEN CLARK (white housewife). I have thought for a long time that Negroes should be allowed to sit at the counters where we are served downtown. This is just a part of many things that I think they should be allowed to do. I have felt that it really was not fair for them to be served in stores as customers and not be allowed certain services, denied certain services, within those same stores.

MACK HARTLEY (white teenager). It's just like one snake would like a snake of his own kind better than he would another one maybe, something like that. I mean a lion might like another lion better than he would a bear. That's just like white people and Negroes, I mean. White people just naturally are goin' to like white people better than they do Negroes.

BOBBY ARNOLD (white teenager). It's just not the things we're used to down here. They come in and they sit down, and we're not used to sitting down beside them. I wasn't raised with them. I never have lived with them, and I'm not goin' to start now.

Mr. HUNTLEY. During the week after the sit-ins began, opposition in the white communities of the South solidified, and the first signs of violence occurred. Those few whites who sympathized publicly with the sit-ins soon found themselves to be prime targets. One of these was a young divinity student in Nashville, Wilson Yates.

WILSON YATES. While I was downtown with a friend around Memorial Square, I had actually gone back to put a nickel in the meter. My car happened to be parked by Memorial Square where the picketing was going on.

Suddenly we moved into a different world. There were the crowds shouting "Niggers go home," and then there were the Negro students who were carrying posters asking for equal opportunity; and being thrown into a situation with a crisis, I had to act, and I had no other choice than to respond as I did.

So I walked over and I asked the Negroes if it would help or harm if I carried a poster. They said it would help. Right before I went over, some white boys had entered the ring carrying derogatory posters like "Go home, coon," and "Send the bunnies home."

And I entered the ring, and I started walking around. I was with a friend. One of the white boys walked over to this friend. He said something to him.

VIRGIL GLENN (white teenager). I told him when he come down on the white side I'm jes goin' to hit him one time.

Mr. YATES. Here I was in the raw, walking around a square carrying a poster which said "Equal Rights for All," and the crowd on each side yelling "Get rid of the nigger lover," "Tell the nigger lover to go home," and they were referring to me.

The boy came toward me. He cursed me out.

Mr. GLENN. Yeah, cus he was white, taking up for the nigger. I jes—I—it really got me over there, when them two white boys started carrying them signs for the niggers over there.

Mr. YATES. And then the momentum began to build, began to build from the crowd, and they said "Hit the nigger lover," "Hit the nigger lover," and then there is a strange, long, lonely feeling, where you're waiting for something to happen, and you don't know what's going to happen, but somehow down deep, you're ready for it. And he walked up behind me——

Mr. GLENN. I reached and grabbed that Yates boy to jest see how hard I could hit him.

Mr. YATES. He hit me in the back of the neck. I lurched forward, but I didn't fall. I regained my balance, and then in the midst of it, with the shouting and the jeering, and the crowd of people, I suddenly felt this tremendous humiliation. Suddenly I had crossed into another race. I had moved into a different world. I was a Negro feeling all of the rejection and humiliation he must have to go through every time he's rejected.

Miss BUTLER. On the morning of the 27th, this was to be our first real violent day. It was the first time when we could really test our own convictions, as far as nonviolent means were concerned.

Five ministers said to us "If you go downtown today, you're going to be arrested. Please don't go downtown, because we're not prepared. We should have the community behind us."

PAUL LEPRAY. He was one of the few white students who were with us. They always pick on the white students, because they hate to see white sympathizers.

Mr. ARNOLD. I saw a bunch of colored sitting on the stools. They looked like a bunch of idiots waitin' for people to try to throw them off. They looked like they were just trying to egg on a fight.

Miss BUTLER. None of us looked back, but yet we could see everything that was going on in the long mirror, and it seems that what had happened is that all of us wanted to be hit. This is an experience that we needed to keep our movement going, to keep ourselves going, and to convince ourselves that we really were nonviolent.

POLICE CHIEF (Nashville). On February 27, it was on Saturday afternoon, I was cruising down Fifth Avenue in front of McLellan's, a man came out and said that they were a fight on the inside. There had been a disturbance, but they was a bunch of colored boys and girls on the stools in the counters, and the management asked that they leave, and I instructed him to ask them to leave, and they did not leave. I went in and asked each and every one of them separately to leave. They didn't leave. So I instructed the men to place them under arrest.

We placed them under arrest——

JOHN ROUSE. The policemen, they gave me an alternative. They said "Son, you can sit here on the stool and act a fool, or you can get up and go home." I made my choice. I decided that I would keep my seat. And they told me I was under arrest, and then they took me away.

POLICE CHIEF. When we cleared the stools, why, some more colored boys and girls and white boys and girls got on the seats. When we told them that they were under arrest and they have to leave, why, they got up. But as far as having anything personal against them, anything against them because they were either black or white, we arrested in this crowd several white boys and girls.

It was just a case where we had to clean this man's store out, and we did it.

C. D. WARREN. I am C. D. Warren, turnkey of City Jail. I have never seen anything like when we brought these kids in.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On February 27, 80 Nashville students were arrested out of over 300 who were participating in the sit-ins that day, the first of a series of wholesale arrests throughout the South.

VOICE. Man, what's my mother goin' to say when she hears this.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The mother of two students who were in jail.

Mrs. WATERS. For a while there was plenty of anxiety on my part, but I always did think of what Matthew, Jr., told me—when he called from the jail—"Be cool, mother," and that was very trying, and yet it was amusing, too, his telling me to be cool at this point.

So even now, when I think of it, I get quite a bit of fun out of it, just hearing him say it. I can't say it as he said it, but he said "Be cool, mother" and I tried to be cool. I felt, though, that there would be safety for them, because I felt that our faith in God would help to bring them through this safely.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The experience of being in jail together was a bond that unites the students even today.

STUDENT. We didn't have to sing because Harry, you know, he has a big mouth. We heard him singing "Day-O" all night long.

STUDENT. Like Belafonte?

STUDENT. Yeah, Harry Belafonte.

STUDENT. Just holler "Day-O" for us.

STUDENT. I had a date the night we were in jail with my girl. I had a date——

STUDENT. I know just how lonesome you feel.

STUDENT. You're real fortunate. My girl wouldn't even come to see me.

GIRL STUDENT. You've got me here.

HARRY. I got involved in it. I was just walking down the street and the fellows told me, "Come on, man, we're going to get a couple of hamburgers." I said "OK." So we walked down and we walked in this place, and we set down. Immediately a crowd gathers around. I wondered what they were looking at. All I wanted was a hamburger, you know.

STUDENT. What about coffee?

HARRY. I wanted coffee, too, to wash the hamburger down. She come up and she said, "Sorry, we don't serve you." But I said, "I'm hungry." The next thing I know someone was tapping on my back with—what do you call those things?

GIRL STUDENT. Night stick.

HARRY. A night stick—and he said, "Let's go." So I said, "All right, maybe we'll go into another cafeteria."

GIRL STUDENT. That reminds me of a cartoon I saw the other day. It had a lunch counter, and the waitress was behind it, and they had a Negro sitting on one of the counter stools, and the caption under it read "The customer is always white."

STUDENT. That reminds me of another joke. You know what happened when this guy went into a segregated counter to eat? The waitress came up to him and said "I'm sorry, sir, but we don't serve Negroes." So he jumps back horrified and shocked, you know. He said "You don't serve Negroes? That don't bother me, because I don't eat 'em."

Mr. HUNTLEY. We will continue with this NBC white paper after a message from Timex.

Until the arrest of the 80 students the sit-ins in Nashville had involved only a relatively small segment of the city's 100,000 Negroes. But now, on February 29, as the trial of the students began, the entire Negro population would soon find itself involved.

JUDGE JOHN I. HARRIS. I am John I. Harris. I was sitting as special judge in the city court during the sit-in demonstration here in Nashville in the early part of this year.

There was a hot spot for me, as there was much pressure coming from both sides. The courtroom was full—newspapermen, photographers, lawyers, and colored people and white people, and it was very hard to sit there and listen to all these pressure groups and listen to the lawyers, and the defense lawyers and the prosecuting attorney, and the policemen, all the defendants.

There was a pretty hot spot. There came a time when a man had to make up his own mind what the law was, and if that law had been violated.

Now there have been some false accusations from the colored lawyers that I had prejudged the case or had made up my mind before I went on the bench. There is no truth or foundation for none of these accusations. I take it as an intimidation from the lawyers that it might help them in their case. The prosecutors put on their proof, the defendants put on their proof. They wasn't rushed. They had all the time they needed. In the final analysis, I had to make a decision. I made that decision. I found the defendants guilty because they had violated the law, and they should be punished.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Judge Harris fined each of the students $50. A few days later, most of the fines were paid in order to appeal the decision, an appeal which is still unresolved. But at the time of the sentencing, as the students were confronted with the choice of paying a $50 fine or spending over a month in jail, each of them chose jail.

Their attitude reflected the words of Rev. Martin Luther King, who, in a speech made in Nashville at the time said "We will meet the capacity to inflict suffering with the capacity to endure suffering. We will say 'Do what you will to us, but we will wear you down.' "

Following the student trials, as unrest continued in the city, the mayor appointed a biracial citizens committee. One member was Lawyer George Barrett.

GEORGE BARRETT (white lawyer). What concerned the mayor's committee and the Negroes about the trials and arrest was what it was doing to the community. You could

begin to feel the impact of this sort of thing. Really, it was hard to convince lots of white people that the Negroes were really serious. The first attitude was "Well, it's spring," and "panty raids," and "students will be students"—"these kids, instead of running to the girls' dormitories are down here sitting in at Kress', or Woolworth's, or Harvey's, or King Sloan."

This was the first reaction, I think, of a large number of white people. I think some of the Negroes were apprehensive about the method. What really crystallized it and unified the Negroes was the way the police handled it, the mass arrests, the subsequent trials, the convictions, the sort of growing feeling among the Negroes that they were really being pushed for something that, after all, they could go in these stores and be waited on at any of the other counters.

Then the white people began to feel maybe there was something a little bit more to it. But then one of the leading merchants told me at the mayor's committee—we were talking, and I said "So-and-so, do you remember what happened in Montgomery when 40,000 Negroes walked across the county for 18 months, merely over segregated bus seating?" I said "Don't you think that can happen in this city, and do you realize what it would do?" And he sort of sat back and he said "Well, I really don't think the Negroes of Nashville would do anything like that to us."

Dr. VIVIAN HENDERSON (Negro economist). Student sit-ins in Nashville certainly did arouse this community. I think not only were the people of the Negro community bewildered—that is, the total community bewildered—but this question of what can I do in this situation certainly preyed on the minds of people. And, of course, one of the things that did come of it was the discovery, so to speak, of their effective economic purchasing power, and that they could use this to support the students.

It is really seldom that an economist has an opportunity to put his research to work in programs involving social action, but the student sit-in movement really gave me the opportunity to put theory into practice.

For many years, the Negro was a low-income recipient, and he didn't have a great deal to offer the business houses, and he was taken for granted as a customer. But since the war, and particularly in 1960, there has been a tremendous change in the income status of the Negro, and as a result, he does have money now that is worth competing for.

The Negroes have not been aware, to any large extent, of their economic power, particularly at the local level. At the national level, why, there has been a lot of awareness about the so-called $17 billion Negro market, which in 1960 now is well over $21 billion per year in purchasing power, and they are aware of it in the aggregate sense.

But at the local level, the awareness really did not exist, and it took the sit-ins to bring this awareness around, when we really began the pronouncements as to what the Negroes actually spend in this national community.

From the Nashville inner city, that is from the central city itself, the buying power of Negroes runs close to $60 million per year. But I think the important thing here is that downtown in the target area, that Negroes spend about $10 million a year, and it was this particular area that gave us a target that really enabled us to have an effective economic withdrawal.

I will never forget on the first night that we had a mass meeting that I sat in the pulpit in my own moment of anxiety, and perhaps anger, at the developments that any Negro who went downtown and traded at the stores where these kids had been mistreated as they had was really nothing else but a darned fool, and there was really no excuse for anyone supporting discrimination after the course of events that had taken place in Nashville during those 3 days.

Frankly, I think that this kind of stimulation actually went a long ways toward motivating the Negroes to respond to this economic withdrawal. They actually got angry, in other words. They found this weapon and they were willing to use it, and they wanted to whip the merchants with the best weapon they had at their disposal under those conditions, and really that weapon happened to have been the economic withdrawal.

Mr. HUNTLEY. According to local mythology, the economic boycott began with a group of four women who were playing bridge.

WOMAN. We saw the students being herded into the patrol cars, and I was just so moved that I went to the telephone immediately and began calling 50 people, asking them to call 10 more, encouraging people not to trade downtown.

WOMAN. Well, you know, I called at random. I would just get the telephone book each day and just pick out 10 names. That was my duty. I was going to do that. Sometimes I would get white people. So I talked to one white lady. I said "Have you heard the word?" She said "No, I'm white. But my husband says anything that keeps me from downtown is good, and join it."

WOMAN. Look, I had such a hard time about my stockings. You know I like very sheer hose. I like them a certain shade. Do you know I was wearing hose that were almost white? They were terrible. I really had a time.

So I decided that we have a lot of wants which are manufactured for us by the advertisers. So I decided that I was going to wear hose with runs in them. As far as clothes and that kind of thing, you know I really have lost interest in dressing.

WOMAN. You have got a closet full of junk. Don't we all have? And you know, my baby needed a winter coat, and I would have gone downtown, and I guess I would have paid at least $20 for a coat, because to get a nice coat, that would last 2 years it would cost at least $20 and maybe $25. I said, "Well, this child has to have a coat." I went to the Good Will. I found the best coat. It was marvelous; for $2, I got the best coat. Heck, I'm proud of it really. Why, heck, I've been going back there ever since.

WOMAN. Because it really—it boils down to your having a lot of false pride—food and a place to stay. You know it was good, though, from this point of view. There were many whites who actually didn't know what we had been going through all these years.

WOMAN. They hadn't thought about it.

WOMAN. They hadn't given it a thought.

WOMAN. And to me if the sit-ins did nothing else than to focus the attention on it——

WOMAN. I'm saying frankly, from here on out, every meeting that is fighting for them, I'm for it. I'm going to work with it. All of us should really be ashamed of ourselves. Maybe we spend too much time playing bridge.

CUSTOMER. Not as lord and slave, see—the day of Uncle Tom. Uncle Tom is dead. He just hasn't been buried, but he's dead now.

BARBER. Do you think that this sort of thing would be an effective weapon in the future for Negroes obtaining their rights?

MAYLIN GRIFFITH (customer). It's always effective, as long as they expect to stand together. That's something we haven't felt before. We always feel that we are alone in this thing, that any time anything happens, it happens to me alone. Once we get to feeling it happens to all of us, and it happens to us at the same time, it would be a different thing.

DR. DOOLEY (customer). To give you an idea of the spirit of the people, I was in a group who, within a period of a half hour subscribed to a tremendous amount of money, eight people, and never would I have thought that that could happen. That was a good indication of the spirit of the people.

I thought the economic boycott would last until everybody was completely broke.

Mr. GRIFFITH. When we think of our students as being the very best we have to offer, in fact it is our future, our students are—and when our students are treated as the very worst elements of our society, then that makes us—all of us—become more aware; there's the moral implications of it, the economic implications of it. We have always heard that money speaks, but we felt sure that money does speak. So we felt we had so little that it made such a small voice, it wasn't any point in doing anything about it, because we'd be classed as crazy.

But when the whole community rallies behind something, as they rallied behind the students, then it made a tremendous impact. The Negroes stayed away from downtown, and they stayed away from downtown from the fact that they wouldn't support segregation. That was the sole issue.

BARBER. It wasn't very much trouble for me, because we had a daughter in jail, and we could pretty easily get it over to her. We were pretty ragged around Easter, but we held out all right.

Mr. GRIFFITH. They's a wonderful thing about Easter, though. You know we always buy a lot of new clothes for Easter. You've just got to have this, and you've just got to have that. It seems we all took a great pride in not buying things for Easter.

Dr. DOOLEY. Well, I never had it so good pocketbook-wise. They didn't go downtown at all. They didn't buy anything. We paid out all the bills, every account, and during that time bought nothing, and personally I wouldn't mind it happening again, something like that, anyway, on that score.

MONROE CARELL (white businessman). The Negro has a terrific purchasing power. Their standard of living and their earning power has been increased tremendously, I would say, in the last 10 or 15 years. And they have a large amount of money to be spent now, and they spend it very, very fluently. So the merchants, of course, was feeling the pinch, because they was definitely not coming downtown to spend that money.

The uptown streets were absolutely forsaken of any Negroes. I made it a point to go around to the different stores up and down Church Street. All in all, it was reaching some rather staggering and serious proportions.

BERNARD SCHWEID (white businessman). The boycott pretty well killed business downtown. I would say it was roughly 95 percent effective, as far as the Negro citizens staying away from the downtown area completely.

For us it was pretty unfortunate. The violence that had preceded the boycott kept the white people out of town, and then none of the Negroes were coming to town, and I sort of felt like the only customers we had left were the green people, and there aren't too many of them. So our business suffered, as I am sure did everybody else's. We just didn't have any traffic for about a month there. It was pretty rough.

GEORGE BARRETT. What was really disturbing about it, I think, was that you could see the potential of the city for the first time destroying itself. You could see long years of good relations built up between Negroes and whites being destroyed by the struggle going on, by the attitude of the Negroes, and they felt they were right; by the adamant attitude of the merchant, in that they would not move, because they were afraid of the consequences of such a change on their white customers, and the fact that they didn't feel that they should

lead such a change in the community. What was really frightening about the whole thing, I think, was that you could really see the city destroying itself in two armed camps, so to speak, one Negro, and one white, and the end of any real progress over a long period of years.

Mr. CARELL. I talked to some people, and they were very fearful that it could get to very serious proportions here, because, as I told you, I mentioned that it is an emotional issue, and the rougher element—they're just looking for something to where they get into the melee at all times. It's just a certain element that prevails in every city. They're looking for just some good opportunity to become involved.

RUFUS JAMISEN (Negro student). On March 2, I was on my job in the arcade—beauty salon—all of a sudden there was a commotion outside down below——

VIRGIL GLENN. We had slingshots up 'ar, with staples in them shooting niggers up 'ar—you can see out on the street up 'ar. This colored boy in the arcade window up 'ar—you can see out on the street up 'ar.

Mr. JAMISEN. Then they said, "Let's get the coons. Let's get the coons! Bring the coon down!"

Why? I asked myself why? What have I done? Why is this to me? It was a feeling that never could be expressed by anyone 'lessen they was—unless it happened to them.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Early in the morning of April 19 the violence in Nashville reached its climax with the dynamiting of a Negro home. This was the residence of Alexander Luby, a city councilman and leading Negro attorney.

DIANE NASH (Negro student). He was Attorney Luby. He was our lawyer. He came to our defense when we were arrested that day, when we really needed something and somebody had tried to kill him. We felt we had to confront the mayor with this thing.

At first we didn't know quite what to do, but the idea of the massive walk—it seemed to emerge from everybody's mind really, and it was a spontaneous sort of thing, and we walked.

We held our heads high, because we were right, and we knew we were walking for something right. We were really striding toward freedom. It was a wonderful feeling. It was magnificent. We felt unity. We felt power. We felt strength. And it is not very often that a human being is exposed to such a raw feeling of goodness. I don't think any of us will ever forget it.

Here was a situation in which two forces were meeting head on, and there had to be a showdown. He had to say something.

Mayor WEST. Well, I felt like that here were a group of youngsters that were outraged because their leader's home had been dynamited, and I felt outraged along with them. And to that extent, we had a community feeling between us that made me have a feeling that really we were after the same thing, and that I was as outraged as they were by this horrible thing, and that the great majority of the thinking white people were outraged by such a thing. We just couldn't let a thing like that happen.

And so we had this discussion down here in front of the city hall, and I was glad to discuss it with them.

Miss NASH. Well, this was the very first time that I personally had ever felt the mayor's presence as a human being, because up until this moment, he had always been a name on a sign that I had seen, but now I felt a real concern for him. I could sympathize with his situation, because he was really on a spot. Here were 5,000 people who were really angry at him, in a sense, because we felt that he should have done something that he hadn't done, and we were telling him so. And I'm sure he must have felt rather alone at that moment.

Mayor WEST. I'd been asked "Were you afraid?" These children were emotionally upset, and I recognized that they were and tried to treat them with all due respect and courtesy, and let them know that I was willing to meet with them there, or any other way. But the mere fact that there were thousands of them didn't intimidate me in the least, and I tried to tell them factually and straightforward as I could that all the laws were going to be enforced, and that if they violated the law, they were going to be arrested, too.

But I did recognize that they were really upset about it, and I felt that they were justifiably upset about this horrible thing that had happened.

Miss NASH. We needed him to say "integrate the counters," or to tell Nashville to do what Nashville knows it should have done a long time ago, like about 95 years ago after the Civil War.

So I asked the mayor "First of all, Mayor West, do you feel that it is wrong to discriminate against a person solely on the basis of his race or color?"

Mayor WEST. And so they asked me some pretty soul-searching questions, and one that was addressed to me as a man, and I tried as best I could to answer it frankly and honestly, that I could not agree that it was morally right for someone to sell them merchandise and refuse them service, and I had to answer it just exactly that way.

Miss NASH. And we were really very relieved. I think we were very pleased and very happy with our mayor at that moment, and we all applauded, and here was a situation that turned out right.

Mayor WEST. Of course, I received considerable criticism for it, but had I to answer it again, I would answer it in the same way again, because it was a moral question, and was one that a man has to answer and not a politician.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The confrontation at city hall marked the turning point in Nashville. Soon afterward, a committee of merchants and student representatives met and worked out a plan for desegregating the six lunch counters that had been the targets of the sit-ins. The economic boycott was withdrawn, and Nashville became the first major city in the South to permit whites and Negroes to eat together in public places.

The Nashville settlement was studied closely by other communities. By midsummer a total of 27 cities had opened their lunch counters to all customers. There have been no disorders as a result, and none of the merchants affected has reported any loss in business.

But the chain reaction started by the sit-ins is far from complete.

Dr. VIVYAN HENDERSON. I think that the economic withdrawal certainly is going to contribute toward the development of some kind of realism on the part of the southern community in this sense; that I think now they are quite aware of the fact and perhaps for the first time in many communities, such as Nashville, of the tremendous influence that the Negro buying power has on the success and failure of their businesses. I think that the general shock treatment that was given and the general trend will be in the direction of recognition of this economic power, and this in itself will contribute to better racial progress in many areas of our community life.

Mrs. JOHN RAMSEY, JR. I think there has been a feeling since Little Rock, since the Supreme Court decision, that as much as we regret it, that integration is here and will come to pass, and I would like to be able to do as much as I can in a lawful way to prevent its coming, or to even impede its coming, but I just recognize the sit-ins as just one more step, I think.

HELEN CLARK. It's hard when one has been living all his life in the South. It's hard to feel that these are just people, because we haven't many opportunities to associate with Negroes. It's hard to break down the barriers of feeling that years and centuries, and decades have built up. But again, I just didn't feel much of anything, and I was just really glad. I felt like shaking the hands of these Negroes who were sitting down at the counter.

CECIL SIMS. I think that if I were called in to advise the Negro race on the basis of what is their best interest for the next century, I would say "Consolidate your gain in the field of education and become the type of people who would be invited to dinner, rather than breaking down the door to eat a piece of pie on a stool next door to a white person."

KELLY MILLER SMITH. The things that happened here in Nashville the past several months helped to mature the students. I heard some of them speak of how they sat at a lunch counter and suddenly grew up, because things began to take on meaning for them.

Their lives began to take on a note of seriousness, and suddenly they began to get some grasp of the meaning of life itself. They began to get some feel of the fact that a person ought to have a cause for which he can give himself, and a cause which will outlast his own living.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In the winter and early spring of 1960, the efforts of Nashville's Negro college students had led to the integration of lunch counters at six department and variety stores. But they were still excluded from eating at the city's downtown drugstores and restaurants, train depot and bus terminal. And on November 2, only a few weeks ago, they began to march downtown again to launch a new round of sit-ins that are still going on.

The sit-ins in Nashville today are by no means unique. Each day news reports reflect their presence throughout the South. From a legal point of view, it is still undetermined whether the sit-ins violate the private property rights of the store owners, and a Supreme Court test is expected.

One may disagree with the sit-in tactic as a means of achieving the human aspirations of the Negro, and some will disagree with the aspirations themselves. But perhaps the most important thing is to realize not only that they exist, but that Negro leaders of the immediate future are demanding that they be satisfied, and they are impatient with the slow pace of traditional change.

The sit-in is the dramatic spearhead of a changing mood and behind it is the Negro's growing awareness of their economic power, the ultimate weapon in achieving without violence what they feel is their right.

What we are witnessing is a new kind of militancy, and with it a new kind of soldier.

PRODUCTION OF TYPEWRITERS BY REMINGTON RAND DIVISION OF SPERRY RAND CORP. AT ELMIRA, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain introductory remarks and an article with reference to the decision of the Remington Rand Division of Sperry Rand Corp. to continue the production of typewriters at Elmira, N.Y., and not to transfer that production to Europe.

There being no objection, the remarks and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING—TYPEWRITER PLANT TO REMAIN IN ELMIRA, N.Y.

I am delighted with the decision of the Remington Rand Division of Sperry Corp.

to continue production of standard typewriters at its Elmira, N.Y., plant, and not to transfer production from New York State to Europe, as was previously considered.

This decision will mean a great deal to the people of Elmira and New York State. Several hundred residents of this area will keep their jobs and their families will thus avoid the great hardship and unhappiness that comes with the unemployment of a family's main breadwinner.

In a letter to the employees at the Elmira Remington Rand plant dated today, President Dause L. Bibby points out that this decision was based on such factors as our Nation's international balance of payments position, the gold outflow, the present State of our domestic economy, and the welfare of the Elmira community.

President Bibby's announcement has wide implications. The problem of low-wage produced imports undermining selected American markets grows more serious every year.

The January 1961 Industrial Bulletin of the New York State Department of Labor contains a most thought-provoking article about the Elmira situation entitled "International Trade Poses Threat to Southern Tier City in New York," written by Mr. Jim O'Hara, a reporter for the Elmira Star-Gazette. The article points out that a combination of restrictive oversea trade barriers and lower wages in areas producing typewriters and related office equipment has resulted in great hardship to many Elmira workers and their families.

Something must be done to deal more effectively with this broad problem. It is no longer limited to a few isolated American industries.

While I definitely do not favor drastic protective measures, I feel that some sensible middle ground position can and should be developed. Last year I introduced a bill to provide more effective avenues of relief, through the Secretary of Labor, for industries injured by low-wage produced imports. I intend to reintroduce this bill very shortly.

This is no time to moan and wring our hands. Some realistic and practical steps must be taken. Some hard decisions must be made.

I join with the people of Elmira in today feeling relief for their community. But, Mr. President, what are we to do about tomorrow?

ELMIRA'S ECONOMY FACES TWO-PRONGED PROBLEM—INTERNATIONAL TRADE POSES THREAT TO SOUTHERN TIER CITY IN NEW YORK

(By Jim O'Hara)

The ever-growing specter of foreign competition has cast a dark shadow in recent months over a southern tier community in New York State which boasts of the largest typewriter manufacturing plant in the world.

A decision by the Remington Rand Division of the Sperry Rand Corp. to transfer part of its typewriter work to plants in Europe has planted a seed of uncertainty in a labor market which already is listed as chronically depressed.

The community is Elmira, N.Y., a city of more than 45,000 nestled in the Chemung Valley not far from the Pennsylvania border.

The problem is how to find work for the men and women already furloughed by a variety of local industries and the workers who will lose their jobs because of the world-wide trade situation.

In mid-October, the unemployment rate in the Elmira area was 4.7 percent. The month before that, the Federal Government listed the city as one of the areas in New York State which needs help.

In a few months the layoffs caused by a transfer of some typewriter work to Europe will make it worse—unless someone provides a quick solution.

There are two avenues of escape. One is the possibility that Rand will find new products to fill its spacious plant at Elmira and thereby ease the shock of the cutback.

The other is a long-range outlook that community groups working at top speed will be able to lure new industry to the area and provide employment.

Responding to an appeal from the county government, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has promised to do all he can to help. He said the New York State Department of Public Works will be urged to earmark additional work in this locale to provide stimulus to a lagging economy.

Union leaders are trying to help the situation by discouraging the purchase of foreign-made products in a Buy America campaign.

Even after the anticipated layoffs, Rand will be the biggest single employer in Elmira. But the community recalls that 10 years ago it employed more than 6,000 persons in its sprawling 31-acre installation on Elmira's southside.

Today the work-force level is about 4,300 and by early this year, by company estimates, it will be down to between 3,400 and 3,500 because of the typewriter situation.

This prediction for 1961 must be qualified with two big "ifs."

The first is the hope that new products can be channeled here by Rand executives to fill the gap.

The second is an expectation that electric typewriter production—which remains in Elmira—will soar to meet demands of an expanding market.

If new products become a reality on the assembly line, and if the electric typewriter sales soar, many of the community's problems will be solved.

If not—it's hard to tell what kind of an economic situation 1961 will bring.

In all fairness to Rand, it must be pointed out that several other industries in Elmira and Chemung County are operating somewhat below "normal" levels. Their recessions have played a role in the general economic decline of the trading area.

But, because Rand is the largest single employer and appears to serve as the guide to economic well-being, the spotlight has been directed on developments in the office equipment industry.

The company's decision to move portable and standard typewriter manufacturing to Europe has, to say the least, been a disturbing influence on the community.

A brief historical sketch is in order to set the stage for developments in recent months.

First of all, in 1935 the citizens of Elmira found themselves with an idle monster—a potential productive giant left motionless by the demise of the Willys Morrow automobile company.

Through a community organization called Elmira Industries, Inc., the citizens raised and pledged more than $300,000 to buy the facility and offered it without charge to Remington Rand.

The offer was accepted and Elmira became the center of Rand's typewriter operations. For years the Elmira plant has produced every Rand typewriter and adding machine manufactured in the United States.

Through good times and bad, the Rand organization remained the bulwark of the trading area and provided work for men and women living in a 70- to 80-mile range.

In 1942 the Federal Government erected a massive addition to the Rand plant and earmarked it for manufacture of the famed Norden bombsight.

When this World War II mission was completed, Rand purchased the Government-built facility and found itself with a total of 1,300,000 square feet of space to make all types of office equipment.

Down through the years, the Rand plant has had its ups and downs, principally based on the changing demands of the market.

A year ago George Bullen, who was then plant manager, reviewed the impact of foreign competition on the Elmira operation. He said competition practically had eliminated exports and now was starting to cut into the domestic field.

Low labor rates in foreign lands and the absence of a duty in the United States on the imports of typewriters were cited as discouraging factors.

The unions claimed that Rand and other U.S. manufacturers were responsible partly because they were sending machines into this country from their plants abroad.

Bullen said last February that production of standard typewriters in Elmira was 60 percent less than in 1950—and he blamed the foreign market situation for that heavy loss.

Rand, he said, simply could not afford to make a machine here and send it abroad for sale. By the time the company paid labor costs and dealt with tariff restrictions across the sea—the price of the product was prohibitive, he said.

So the company gradually built up a network of plants in Europe, Asia, Central and South America. The management reasoned that the only way to sell a Rand typewriter abroad was to make it abroad.

Obviously, this dealt a serious blow to the economy at home and in this case it hit Elmira. By the start of 1960 there was no such thing as a finished product coming off the assembly line in Elmira for sale abroad.

The management cited figures to back up its case. Hourly wages in Elmira, they said, are four times higher than in Holland. On top of that, our neighbors in Europe had thrown up tariff barriers that sometimes bordered on the ridiculous—but they kept American-made office equipment out of the competitive market.

A classic example of how to discourage American imports was found in Argentina, where Rand put up a plant in Buenos Aires which concentrated on the assembly of parts made in the United States.

Argentina, however, didn't look kindly on this arrangement and imposed a new tariff restriction which went something like this:

A duty on imports was imposed at the rate of an amount 25 times the billing price of merchandise. Therefore, if Elmira produced $10,000 worth of type—to be assembled into machines at Argentina—the duty would amount to $250,000.

Just for the record—Elmira no longer puts up type for shipment to Argentina. It's done in Argentina, to the benefit of workers in that country.

While the foreign situation was recognized by the management and unions for some time, not much was said publicly until the spring of 1959, when the two parties negotiated a wage reopener on a 5-year contract.

The majority of Rand employees are affiliated with lodge 826 of the International Association of Machinists Union.

On this occasion in 1959 the union requested a 20-cent hourly wage increase. The company not only rejected that proposal but stated it couldn't even afford a cent. During the heat of negotiations, the union membership held a mass meeting at which a strike was authorized to gain some economic benefit. Within hours, the management delivered an ultimatum—that the company would transfer all of its typewriter work to Europe if the workers left their jobs for the picket lines.

The union came back with claims that the company was just using the strike threat for an excuse. Its leaders claimed that—strike or no strike—the typewriter work was bound for other lands and they weren't about to be used as the whipping boys.

It all ended on a note of outward harmony—without a strike—as the company approved a union suggestion to grant 5- to 10-cent hourly wage increases in May of 1959 and May of 1960 instead of September of both years, as was provided in the original contracts.

But the dispute provided a sounding board for a subject which was to gain ever-growing importance in Elmira—the bugaboo of foreign competition and world markets.

A company vice president, Bernard F. Anderson of New York City, told the local press and the workers the hard facts of life.

The manufacturing costs of a standard typewriter in Elmira, he said, were $21 more than for an identical machine manufactured in Scotland, France, and Italy. The portable set was listed as being $18 higher in this country.

So it appeared that the American worker in the office-equipment industry was and is the victim of a two-pronged foe. On one hand, his product isn't being exported because the manufacturing costs are too high to make it attractive on the foreign market.

On the other hand, he is being cut out of work by lower cost foreign-made machines coming into America duty free and underselling domestic models.

The worker is complaining bitterly, however, that Rand and other manufacturers are importing machines from their plants overseas to compete on this soil with European products.

This foreign-competition situation was sharply brought into focus last May when the Federal Tariff Commission was asked to recommend a change in the duty-free status of imported typewriters.

The Royal McBee Corp. and Smith-Corona Marchant, of Syracuse, petitioned for the imposition of a 30-percent tariff on imports, with a minimum of $10. Remington Rand remained neutral in the case.

After several hearings, the Commission declined to recommend any change in the duty-free status. It said machines were not being imported in such quantities as to threaten serious injury to domestic manufacturers.

A highlight of the hearings in Washington was the appearance of Lester Elliott, of Elmira, shop committee chairman of the IAM union at Rand.

He accused the company of "importing typewriters from Europe and taking jobs away from us." Elliott claimed that increased imports will result in efforts by the management to "lower wages and our economic standards."

At the same time, Kenneth F. Sparrow, business editor of the Syracuse Herald-American, came up with some interesting figures on typewriter trends.

He said exports from the United States dropped from 224,200 in 1949 to 50,000 units last year. Imports, he added, rose from 36,000 units a decade ago to 454,000 in 1959.

The irony of the sudden flip-flop in the export and import trend was brought out at the Federal hearings. The Commission was told that many of the European companies now posing a threat to the American worker undoubtedly got a start through the U.S. foreign aid program.

So the ills of the typewriter industry even crept into the field of world diplomacy. It was apparent that on one hand the United States has encouraged development of industry by its allies. But, now the well-fed hand is reaching into the grab bag and is taking rations away from the American worker.

Earlier this year, the IAM made a pitch for a community discussion of the typewriter problem. Its officers invited top officials of the Sperry Rand Corp. and the Rand Division to sit down with representatives of Government, business, industry, the news media and the union to assess the future of the Elmira plant.

They cited deterioration of morale, concern over job security and the need for concrete information on the outlook.

Top management rejected the proposal on the grounds that nothing "constructive or productive" would result.

Dause L. Bibby, now president of the Rand Division, said the exploration of "mere possibilities" before final decisions were made would create unrest and uncertainty in the community.

Bibby said the company was studying the domestic and foreign market conditions and pledged that local management would keep the union informed of developments.

Next came the bombshell in mid-August. The union announced it had been called into a meeting by the management.

The report from that session—given out by the union—was that all portable and standard typewriter production was being transferred from Elmira to plants in Europe.

In other words, the backbone of the operation was being transplanted across the ocean as a casualty of the battle of the dollar being waged among the Western allies.

Union officials estimated this would result in a loss of 1,500 jobs by early 1961. The gloom was thicker than London fog. And the puzzling factor was a reluctance by the company to admit anything—not even a statement confirming that the meeting was held.

The union lost little time mustering support in its fight to save the jobs of its members. IAM leaders in Elmira went to the New York State AFL–CIO convention and the grand lodge meeting of the IAM with pleas for a coordinated effort by labor to fight the foreign menace.

The State AFL–CIO group and the State Council of Machinists approved eight-point resolutions calling on Congress to investigate "the motives behind companies that have become international runaways."

The resolutions blasted companies which have established plants overseas and now import products into the United States, to the detriment of the American workingman.

The IAM grand lodge didn't take such a strong stand but did call for a meeting of the local unions within the organization which are affected by the international trade situation. The meeting was designed to map a course of action by the IAM organization.

As a result of the furor, a proposed code of minimum international labor standards was discussed at a series of meetings in September at Switzerland.

At that time a Federal Labor Department official made this significant comment:

"It's easy to make the oversea wages a whipping boy, but labor costs are just a fraction of the problem. The cost of materials, power and transportation, plus tariff and interest rates, must be considered. Foreign interest rates are much higher than ours, for instance."

The complexity of the problem—how to promote international trade as a weapon in the cold war without wreaking domestic havoc—is obvious, it was stated at the time.

The situation has reached the point where Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York has expressed concern that agitation could reach the point where stringent legislation could be imposed to curb foreign imports.

Meanwhile, the I.A.M. local in Elmira moved ahead on another front. It incorporated with the State of New York an organization dedicated to "Buy American-Made—Protect American Jobs."

Composed of representatives of the union and persons selected from the community, its announced aim is to discourage the purchase of items produced overseas.

During this furor, Remington Rand gave strong indications that it does not plan to leave Elmira by pointing to a program of replacing its main powerplant—a project which will run into several hundred thousand dollars.

Then, on September 21, Bibby, the president of the Rand Division, came to town to speak to members of the Elmira Kiwanis Club on the future of Rand in that city.

For the first time since the union announcement in August, he confirmed reports that the manufacture of portable and standard typewriters would be moved to Europe.

But he set the employment loss at about 860 and not the 1,500 claimed by the union.

Bibby was emphatic in a statement that Rand has no plans to close the Elmira operation and said the company will spend $40 million to operate here in 1961, half of it in payrolls.

He also pledged that "we will try to use the plant at full capacity" and claimed "that is not an idle statement." The company president held out hopes that some of the new products being developed can be assigned to Elmira to take up the slack.

He made it clear that with the transfer of nonelectric typewriter work to Europe, the company hopes to expand its electric typewriter output in Elmira.

In addition to finding it difficult in selling domestic machines overseas, Bibby said sales of nonelectric typewriters in this country are dwindling rapidly.

"If we sell typewriters in this country, in my opinion it will be mainly electrics," was his observation.

Bibby pinpointed the growth of foreign manufacturers in this analysis:

He said that the United States produced 68.5 percent of the 1,200,000 typewriters produced throughout the world in 1949. Today, the world output has gone up to nearly 3,500,000 but the U.S. production has fallen to 37 percent of that total.

Actually, more machines are made here today than in 1949 but the loss has come in the percentage pickup by foreign manufacturers in the last decade, Bibby said.

He pointed to the intense desire of Europeans to recover from World War II and the efficient manner in which they have organized their industrial program.

Perhaps, he commented, Americans "are not in training or condition as they used to be." With that he left Elmirans with some food for thought.

The community may suffer economically because of a situation which has worldwide implications.

It's easy to blame low labor costs in Europe. It's easy to say a tariff will solve the problem.

But perhaps, as Bibby also pointed out, the worker on the assembly line and the executive in the front office have been caught off guard by an alert offense.

And once that offense cuts through your line and gains a foothold, it may be tough to gain back the lost ground.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] in commending the Remington Rand Corp.

Mr. President, the decision by Remington Rand to keep in operation its Elmira typewriter plant, rather than to transfer its operations abroad, as had been previously announced, is an excellent example of American business operating in the public interest. I am deeply pleased to see it happen in our own State, where it will be of direct benefit to hundreds of workers at the plant, and to the entire Elmira community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the company's statement of its plans may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM REMINGTON RAND DIVISION, SPERRY RAND CORP., NEW YORK, N.Y.

Remington Rand Division of Sperry Rand Corp. today informed the employees of its Elmira, N.Y., plant that production of standard (nonelectric) typewriters will not be transferred from Elmira to the company's European plants, as had been announced last September.

In a letter to employees, Dause L. Bibby, president of Remington Rand Division, said the company decided to continue making standard typewriters in the United States because of two recent developments, as follows:

"Since September, the business recession in the United States has taken on more serious implications," Mr. Bibby told employees. "While we are confident that general recovery is imminent, we want to do nothing that would in any way aggravate the situation, particularly as it might affect the welfare of our employees and the Elmira community.

"Also, there has been growing national concern during the past few weeks over the gold situation and the unfavorable U.S. balance of payments * * *. This company has no desire to contribute even in a small way to these problems by shifting production of standard typewriters from this country to Europe. Moreover, with the new awareness of this country's problems it is already apparent that the U.S. market will increasingly show a distinct preference for American-made products."

Remington Rand is the world's largest producer of standard typewriters. The Elmira plant makes both standard machines and electric typewriters. Standard machines are also produced at several of Remington Rand's 28 manufacturing plants in 18 foreign countries.

A spokesman for Remington Rand stated today that the move to keep production of standard typewriters in Elmira means continued employment of 15 to 20 percent of the work force—or about 700 employees—who have been directly involved in production of standard typewriters there.

Remington Rand's original decision to transfer standard typewriter production from Elmira to Europe was taken, Mr. Bibby said, because of "several factors that have kept the company from earning a profit on standard typewriters produced in this country."

He identified these factors as follows:

"1. American plants producing typewriters for sale abroad are increasingly handicapped by competition from lower priced machines manufactured abroad at lower production costs. Moreover, typewriters manufactured abroad at low cost and sold here have an advantage over domestically produced machines, since there is no U.S. tariff on imported typewriters.

"2. Demand for standard typewriters in the United States is dwindling. The major market for these machines now is abroad, and is steadily expanding. Sales of standard typewriters in foreign countries have more than doubled in 10 years, while they have dropped 38 percent in the United States, where electric typewriters are in growing demand."

Mr. Bibby said the company hoped that the savings it had planned to make by the move to Europe "can be offset through improved efficiency of management and manufacture and by stepping up our sales activity."

BACKGROUND FACTS

Typewriter production and sales

The position of the United States in world production of typewriters is steadily declining. In 1949 this country manufactured 68½ percent of the approximately 1,200,000 typewriters produced in the world. By 1959 world output had increased to nearly 3,500,000 machines, but the United States made only 37 percent.

Within the United States, demand has been steadily shifting from standard typewriters to electric. Sales of standard machines fell from 550,000 in 1950 to about 350,000 in 1959, a drop of 38 percent. On the other hand, sales of electric typewriters in the United States rose from 50,000 in 1950 to about 250,000 in 1959, an increase of 284 percent.

Remington Rand, a division of Sperry Rand Corp., makes all of its electric typewriters at Elmira as well as all of its American-manufactured standard typewriters.

Outside the United States, the demand for standard typewriters has steadily increased. Sales in foreign countries have more than doubled in the past 10 years.

The Elmira plant

Remington Rand has operated the Elmira plant since 1936. The company was invited to locate there by Elmira Industries, a group of prominent local citizens.

More than 2,400 of the Elmira employees have been with the company for 10 years or more, including over 600 who have worked for the company for 20 years or more.

The plant, occupying more than 1,200,000 square feet of space, produces adding and calculating machines, electric, standard, and portable typewriters and other office equipment.

The plant manager is Rollo Asmussen. The general manager of the Remington Rand Office Machines Division, of which the Elmira plant is a part, is R. D. Brown, who is a vice president. The division headquarters are in New York, at 315 Park Avenue South.

Remington Rand plants abroad

Remington Rand Division has been operating manufacturing plants outside the United States for some 27 years.

The first foreign plants were established in 1934—one in Frankfurt, Germany, and one in Calcutta, India.

Today the division has 28 plants in 18 foreign countries; 10 of these plants produce typewriters.

REMINGTON RAND DIVISION,
SPERRY RAND CORP.,
New York, N.Y., January 26, 1961.

To All Employees at Our Eastern Plant:

In September we announced in Elmira our intention to transfer this year the production of standard (nonelectric) typewriters from Elmira to some of our plants in Europe—closer to the growing market for these machines. We have now decided not to carry through this plan.

We were led to the September decision by several factors that have kept the company from earning a profit on standard machines produced in this country:

1. American plants producing typewriters for sale abroad are increasingly handicapped by competition from lower priced machines manufactured abroad at lower production costs. Moreover, typewriters manufactured abroad at low cost and sold here have an advantage over domestically produced machines, since there is no U.S. tariff on imported typewriters.

2. Demand for standard typewriters in the United States is dwindling. The major market for these machines now is abroad, and is steadily expanding. Sales of standard typewriters in foreign countries have more than doubled in 10 years, while they have dropped 38 percent in the United States, where electric typewriters are in growing demand.

We concluded therefore that to manufacture our standard machines in our existing plants in Europe rather than at the Elmira plant would enable us to cut costs and thus compete more successfully—both in the European market and in the American market—against foreign-produced typewriters.

Since September, when this decision was first announced, the business recession in the United States has taken on more serious implications. In November, for example, nine major cities were added to the Federal Government's growing list of economically distressed areas. While we are confident that general recovery is imminent, we want to do nothing that would in any way aggravate the situation, particularly as it might affect the welfare of our employees and the Elmira community. After all, this company has been operating in Elmira for more than 24 years. We are proud to be part of the community. We are involved in the prosperity and well-being of this area. Indeed, we are continuing our search for new products to be produced at the Elmira plant.

Also, there has been growing national concern during the past few weeks over the gold situation and the unfavorable U.S. balance of payments. On November 17 President Eisenhower publicly emphasized the gravity of the situation.

This company has no desire to contribute even in a small way to these problems by shifting production of standard typewriters from this country to Europe—even though this would be the prudent thing to do if manufacturing costs were the only consideration. Moreover, with the new awareness of this country's problems it is already apparent that the U.S. market will increasingly show a distinct preference for American-made products.

Because of these recent developments the decision has been made to keep production of standard typewriters in Elmira.

We have had all along the understanding and cooperation of all Remington Rand employees in Elmira—and indeed the whole community—in this matter. Therefore we want to get this news to you immediately.

We are hopeful that the savings we had planned to make through the program announced in September can be offset through improved efficiency of management and manufacture and by stepping up our sales activity. This will require full cooperation from our plant employees and the city of Elmira. We know we can count on all of you to do your best to this end.

Sincerely,

DAUSE L. BIBBY,
President.

WISCONSIN COUPLE CELEBRATES GOLDEN WEDDING FACED WITH OVERWHELMING MEDICAL BILLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we in the 87th Congress will, I believe, finally face up to the responsibility we have to the senior citizens of our Nation.

Trapped in the vise of low fixed income and the rising costs of medical care at the time of life when illness is most frequent, these people who gave so much to our Nation during their productive years naturally turn to us. We can no longer ignore their plight.

Last year I rose day after day on the floor of the Senate to bring to the attention of my colleagues the sincere, distressed letters of the older citizens of Wisconsin—letters that tell the story of this problem far better than any statistics.

These letters continue to pour into my office. I wish to present another typical spelling out the tremendous problem faced by one elderly Wisconsin

couple. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, WIS., *January 17, 1961.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. BILL PROXMIRE: Mrs. Reiser and I thank you so much for the best wishes for a Golden Wedding anniversary last September 27. We also wish you a happy 1961.

We are sorry to say that we are in poor shape. I am 76 and my wife is 70 years of age. She had a heart attack about 8 years ago. She has to take two kinds of heart pills a day, she also is a diabetic. She has to take 80 units of insulin a day and 3 diabetic pills a day, and I have to take 3 kinds of pills a day for a nervous condition. Some of the pills cost us 11 cents apiece.

We get $156 social security together a month but that don't reach for the doctor bills and pills. We could use about $50 a month more to pay all our expenses and then we have to be very careful to make it reach. We only have a few dollars left.

We still owe over $100 for doctor bills from 1960. We would like to know if you could be of any service to us in our case. We would appreciate it very much. Neither I or Mrs. Reiser can do any work, we even can't work our garden any more.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR REISER.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently the Nation was shocked when on a Chicago broadcast former President Truman, in answer to a question as to why he fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur, replied that the general considered dropping the atomic bomb during the Korean war.

General MacArthur needs no defense. His contribution to the country as a soldier-statesman and patriot will remain forever enshrined in America's history, and the general will be remembered long after his detractors are gone and forgotten.

So that the story may be made a matter of record, I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD General MacArthur's statement, made in answer to Mr. Truman's charges, together with a letter from one of General MacArthur's close followers, Gen. Julius Klein. General Klein sent this letter to Irving Kupsinet, the director and moderator of the Chicago TV program on which Mr. Truman appeared as a guest.

After General MacArthur was fired by former President Truman, General Klein also was fired and relieved as commanding general of Illinois by the then Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, for defending Douglas MacArthur. The unit which he commanded was liquidated and General Klein was then put on the inactive list as punishment for speaking out against the shameful treatment given General MacArthur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full story of this controversy, which includes General MacArthur's reply to the Truman charge, as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune on December 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR GIVES LIE TO TRUMAN—DENIES HE URGED ATOM WAR IN KOREA

NEW YORK, December 22.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur tonight called completely false a statement attributed to former President Truman that he had advocated use of the atom bomb in the Korean war.

The general also said that the atom bomb was not needed to win the war against Japan in World War II. Truman ordered the A-bomb unleashed against Japan—the first use of nuclear weapons against an enemy in military history.

Truman has said repeatedly that he ordered the atomic bomb used against Japan to save the lives of thousands of Americans who would have been lost in an invasion of Japan.

BLAMES TRUMAN DECISION

MacArthur put the blame for this country's failure to win the Korean war on the decision in Washington to make Communist supply bases in China, as well as bridges across the Yalu River, a privileged sanctuary for Red forces.

This failure, he said, has had fatal consequences in the military rise of Communist China.

Truman was quoted in a recent television appearance in Chicago as saying that MacArthur wanted to use the A-bomb against both Red China and eastern Russia during the Korean war.

Truman removed MacArthur as commander in chief in the Far East in 1951, as his forces neared the Yalu River.

(The Associated Press quoted the TV program moderator as saying he asked Truman whether he had been under pressure to unleash the atomic bomb during the Korean conflict. The moderator said Truman replied: "Yes; MacArthur wanted to do just that. He wanted to bomb China and eastern Russia and everything else."

(On his relieving MacArthur from his post, Truman was quoted as saying, "I recalled him for disobedience of orders. He was in private contact with the Republican minority leader in the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and had been warned that the Commander in Chief was still the Commander in Chief. MacArthur was just another general as far as I was concerned.")

"Any statement such as that attributed to Mr. Truman—that I advocated the use of atomic bombs in the Korean war—is completely false," MacArthur said in a statement issued here by an aid.

"The records are available and will show that atom bombing in the Korean war was never discussed either by my headquarters or in any communication to or from Washington."

MacArthur said he was continuing the controversial dispute over the handling of the Korean war with "deep reluctance."

"I do so only to prevent a complete prevarication of history designed to cover up Mr. Truman's past failures," he said.

WANTED TO END WAR

"The allegation that I contemplated or even considered action against Siberia or areas not directly within the field of operations is equally fantastic," MacArthur said. "My plan was to end the war, not to expand it.

"Victory was actually within our grasp and at less cost in blood and effort than was later expended in the protracted bloody stalemate along the 38th parallel. We did not need the atom bomb here any more than we did in the war against Japan."

MacArthur said it was equally untrue that he had disobeyed any orders—which Truman said was the reason that he removed him as commander in chief.

"The members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, my immediate superiors in the conduct of the Korean war, testified under oath at the congressional hearings that there was no insubordination or disobedience of orders on my part," MacArthur said.

DISASTER FOR WORLD

He said that the failure of the United States to win the Korean war was a major disaster for the free world.

"It is the most basic principle of statecraft that a great nation which voluntarily enters upon war and does not see it through to victory must ultimately suffer all the consequences of defeat," MacArthur said.

"These fatal consequences are now increasingly being felt in the military rise of Red China. It even now threatens all of continental Asia and bids fair to tip the balance of international power."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Klein's letter to the TV moderator, Irving Kupsinet, protesting Mr. Truman's remarks, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 23, 1960.

MR. IRVING KUPSINET,
Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR KUP: When I saw you a few days ago I expressed my chagrin and shock that Mr. Truman was permitted to make these unwarranted charges against America's most beloved soldier-statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, without being challenged by you or others present. I told you then that this false accusation must be answered. I stated that if General MacArthur would have been permitted to conclude the war to the final victorious end there would have been no cold war and the entire Far East would look different today.

That Mr. Truman waited so long to come on your program and explode his own atomic fairy tale bomb is unforgivable. At the time when he dismissed General MacArthur he stated his reasons, but it was not this fairy tale. Everybody knew that it was the Pentagon and State Department that motivated this action and that Downing Street had a hand in it. If Truman's charges were true he surely would have used them a long time ago. What makes me so sad is that again you permitted a one-sided presentation of historical facts. I watched you often when a Republican said something not to your liking that you immediately challenged him. I wish you would have asked Mr. Truman why he dismissed Secretary Louis Johnson, who was a MacArthur supporter, and why he dismissed Attorney General Howard McGrath. Both men were more responsible for Truman's reelection than anyone else as they were the only party leaders who believed that Truman would be reelected in 1948. You remember that I was liquidated by Stevenson at the same time when MacArthur was fired by Truman. Therefore, I know the facts from A to Z, and I can tell you that I have a right to speak in the name of millions of GI's and those who cannot be with us any more, when I express our resentment not only to what former President Truman said, but that you remained silent.

I have too much respect for the high office of the president and my former commander and chief in really using Mr. Truman's language, but I agree with today's Chicago Tribune's headline "MacArthur Gives Lie to Truman."

All I can say in this Christmas spirit is, may the good Lord forgive Mr. Truman and may he protect the great General MacArthur,

and may the good Lord bless us with a man of equal stature in times to come to remedy what the Nation under the leadership of Truman lost as far as the Far East is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JULIUS KLEIN.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, further judgment on the Truman-MacArthur controversy is briefly but pointedly expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on December 27, 1960. I also ask unanimous consent to insert this piece in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAC AND TRUMAN

Former President Truman and General MacArthur are again embroiled in controversy. This time it is over Mr. Truman's assertion that General MacArthur wanted to use atomic bombs in the Korean war. The general says it isn't so.

Mr. Truman dismisses the controversy in this way: "I have no documentation. I've had my say and the general has had his, and you can believe anything you want to." What Mr. Truman originally said was that MacArthur "wanted to bomb China and Russia and everything else."

There aren't many guides for judging an argument of this kind, but we think future historians acquainted with the MacArthur style would be justified in doubting that the general ever said to Mr. Truman, "Let's bomb China and Russia and everything else."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to round out this entire picture there is still another interesting article on General MacArthur and the Korean war which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on September 10, 1960. This is the report by the two Tribune staff writers, Wayne Thomis and Percy Wood. Had General MacArthur been permitted to conclude the Korean war victoriously, as this article sets forth, the world today would look far different. I ask unanimous consent also to insert this story in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 10, 1960]

INCHON STORY: HOW STRATEGY TURNED TIDE OF KOREAN WAR—TRIBUNE MEN DESCRIBE FEAT OF MACARTHUR—A DECADE LATER, IT IS MILITARY CLASSIC

(By Wayne Thomis and Percy Wood)

Future wars, if fought full scale, will employ catastrophic weapons and new techniques, military people say. It may be, then, that the last great amphibious landing—a massive strategic operation developed during World War II—occurred at Inchon, Korea, on September 15, 1950—10 years ago next Thursday—under command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

This account of that battle, which turned the early tide of war in America's favor, is a collaboration by two Chicago Tribune reporters who covered it, one on Navy air strikes, the other aboard MacArthur's command ship in Inchon Harbor.

MASTERPIECE OF STRATEGY

The landing accomplished just what the general predicted it would: It split North Korean Communist forces and made possible the quick capture of the best airport in South Korea, Kimpo, and the adjoining capital of Seoul.

Most supplies for the Red divisions in the south had funneled through Seoul's rail yards; the victories thus denied support to troops which were giving a desperate time to the makeshift U.S. 8th Army of Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker.

Walker held [only to die a few weeks later in a road accident] and the spectacular landing enabled American forces to drive the Communists back across the 38th parallel they had violated June 25.

The North Korean Army, one U.S. officer wrote, "suddenly dissolved like a wet cube of sugar."

COULD HAVE BEEN DECISIVE

This did not win the war, which was to continue to a stalemate in 1953 after 33,629 Americans had been killed and 103,284 wounded, but it remains a classic military feat and MacArthur's detractors have been unable to dim its luster. And it would have decided the conflict in his favor had not Chinese "volunteers" intervened.

Not that MacArthur's plan to force the enemy from the south by a large amphibious landing on the coast of the Yellow Sea won easy acceptance among the brass hats in the Pentagon. When he conceived it early in July—and it was wholly his idea—even some of his senior lieutenants in the Far East command were quite cool and comment from Washington was derogatory.

OBSTACLES FORMIDABLE

The coolest reception came from Navy and Marine officers, whose services would have to make the landing, but opposition rumbled also in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the overall military command, for these reasons:

The physical obstacles were formidable. The tide at Inchon averages 29 feet with a peak of 36 feet and twice daily it changes the harbor from a landscape of islands to a noisome stretch of mud flats. A heavily fortified island, Wolmi-do, guarded the city, connected with it by a 700-yard concrete causeway.

The channel from the Yellow Sea is narrow, shallow and tortuous, making ship handling difficult enough in daylight, dangerous at night. And it had to be a daylight landing since the first high tide on September 15 would occur at 6:30 a.m., so that was the hour to take Wolmi-do.

DURING TYPHOON SEASON

The next tide was at 5:30 p.m. when the marines, for the first time, would be forced to land directly in the heart of a city—Inchon—provided Wolmi-do had been taken that morning.

Moreover, it was the typhoon season and, as it turned out, part of the invasion fleet did bang around the Yellow Sea on the tail of one of those terrific storms—this one named Kezia and the 11th of the season—for several days. Poor sailors aboard were acutely miserable.

The late Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, then Chief of Naval Operations, said that nature itself was the most powerful ally of the Communists in Inchon.

GREAT LOGISTIC PROBLEMS

Logistic problems were frightening in view of the shortness of time. Some of the marines to make the landing had to come from the Mediterranean. The necessary ships were scattered here and there. Where would the Navy find qualified skippers for the landing craft? The invasion would be staged from Japan with its coterie of Red spies. Would Red Chinese and Soviet Russian air fleets, within easy range of Inchon, intervene?

MacArthur stood firm against all opposition. His troops in the 30-mile Pusan perimeter were heavily engaged by stronger forces—143,000 to 120,000—and many of the Americans among them had been on soft occupation duty in Japan. They were not trained combat soldiers but were in bloody combat now and might well be driven from the peninsula. Pressure on them had to be lifted and their role reversed.

A CALCULATED RISK

MacArthur continued to work on the high brass, meeting all arguments, and finally swung them over. He said he felt the landing could be made with small losses. He pointed to the prestige which would accompany the recapture of Seoul. He stressed the necessity of possessing Kimpo Airport for his air units. He was convinced the Communists would think that a landing at Inchon was such a cockeyed, risky military venture that he would never undertake it.

Finally, the necessary orders were given. It took a year to plan the invasion of Normandy in 1944; the landing at Inchon was made just 3 weeks after its final approval.

This in the face of bad security. These writers heard the date, September 15, mentioned while covering action in the Pusan perimeter days beforehand. It was common talk that an amphibious operation was planned.

A veritable armada was required. As finally assembled, the fleet numbered 261 vessels, 194 of them American. This country also leased 32 Japanese ships and the remainder was composed as follows: Republic of Korea, 15; Great Britain, 12; Canada, 3; Australia, 2; New Zealand, 2; France, 1.

The fleet put to sea. Some ships had sailed from the U.S. west coast; others from Japan and Pusan. Aboard were the 1st Marine Division [Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commanding] and the X Army Corps [Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond]. Reports were that Inchon Harbor was being mined; typhoon Kezia had swept Japan and was slamming around in the Yellow Sea.

WOOD ABOARD "MOUNT M'KINLEY"

The *Mount McKinley*, a communications vessel designated MacArthur's command ship, sailed from Kobe, Japan, with seven reporters aboard (Percy Wood of the Chicago Tribune among them).

Now the Navy and Marine air arms began to function. The Tribune's Wayne Thomis, a Navy flier during World War II, boarded the carrier *Philippine Sea* at Sasebo.

The *Mount McKinley* also docked at Sasebo to take aboard MacArthur and his staff. The landing was 3 days distant.

Bombing of the island, Wolmi-do, started. It is a spot of land with two prongs and an eminence 370 feet high called Radio Hill. Although heavily fortified and with deep caves, Wolmi-do was garrisoned, as it turned out, by only a few more than 300 men—North Korean Marines and the 2d Battalion, 918th Coast Artillery Regiment.

CRUISERS OPEN FIRE

They had had a rather easy time of it those first months of the war, with only occasional air raids and not very heavy ones at that—until American pilots began plastering their half-square mile sanctuary in earnest.

The first raid lasted 6 hours and the island shook. A day of respite, then another pasting, augmented by fire from four cruisers and six destroyers. The latter steamed to 800 yards off shore before opening up. The softening was well in progress.

September 14 brought only more of the same and Wolmi-do looked a shambles on the eve of D-day. But the shaken garrison was resupplied that night via the causeway to Inchon. Guns and ammunition were brought over and oddly enough the artillery commander failed to position some of the new pieces.

SHELLS FROM "MIGHTY MO"

Not that it would have made much difference next morning for then the most concentrated bombing of all thundered down on the small stronghold.

Probably because of the extremely short programing time, the MacArthur plan called only for Navy and Marine air support at Inchon, the Air Force being committed to assist on several of the east coast feints carried out as part of the main show.

One of these diversionary tactics was the shelling of Samchok by the U.S.S. *Missouri*—the Mighty Mo on whose deck the Japanese surrender took place in 1945.

The preinvasion air tactics involved not only softening Wolmi-do and parts of Inchon—save for installations to be useful in the landing—but also fighter sweeps over enemy airfields, harbors, and railroad yards from coast to coast and from the Manchurian border to below Seoul.

MANIFOLD PURPOSES

The purposes were manifold: To observe any possible troop or war material movements toward Seoul which might indicate enemy awareness of the coming thrust; to knock out, on the ground if possible, any air buildup near the target area; and to watch for civilian evacuations that might also signal anticipatory planning by enemy ground commanders.

Thomis sat aboard the *Philippine Sea* with Rear Adm. E. C. (Eddie) Ewen, tactical air commander for the invasion, as returning pilots gave slangy but careful reports on what they had seen and done. The sum of them was that the enemy seemed unaware that something big was coming.

A perceptive commander might have learned pretty much what was in MacArthur's mind by the fact that the bombing of Inchon did not touch the tidal basin locks, nor the mole and causeway, for these were to aid the marines when they came ashore.

ENEMY SPREAD THIN

Espionage and intelligence sources indicated that there were fewer than 10,000 enemy troops in the entire Inchon area, which augured well for the superior striking force—if the tides could be beaten and no new typhoon wandered by. Kezia had subsided, after shaking up the carrier *Boxer*.

Came D-day morning and the bombardment of Wolmi-do was resumed on the grand scale by ships that now crowded the harbor, and from the air.

(Wood was with MacArthur and staff on the bridge of the *Mount McKinley* as the ship quivered from the shock of explosions. A lone enemy plane showed up and dropped a bomb which damaged a crane on the stern of a British cruiser anchored nearby.)

(The early air strike was at 5:45 a.m. and Thomis flew in an attack bomber which had a mission to proceed 20 miles inland to see if highways carried any traffic indicating that either withdrawal from or reinforcement of Inchon was in progress. The roads were almost empty.)

Simultaneous with the air strike, the U.S. cruisers *Toledo* and *Rochester* opened up on Wolmi-do and the British cruisers *Kenya* and *Jamaica* joined their guns.

DESTROYERS MOVE CLOSE

Destroyers went in close again, hurling steel, and Marine and Navy fighters struck both the island and Inchon. This pandemonium continued until 6:15 and now the marines in landing craft began the short journey to shore. It seemed impossible that there could be any life left on the island.

The 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, had been picked to make the assault and its 289 men were jammed into the landing craft. Some were professionals from World War II and before; others had been blooded in the Pusan perimeter; a few were green as grass, fresh from the States.

FIRST RATE COMMANDER

The 5th Regiment had a first-rate commander—Lt. Col. Raymond W. Murray, a big, tough Californian who was to add to his combat decorations in Korea. Correspondents had watched Murray around Pusan and admired him. He looked after his men and he knew how to fight.

(Murray recently wrote Wood, following his promotion to brigadier general, that his 5th Marines was "the greatest regiment in our Nation's history" and should war unfortunately strike again, he would want "to get the same gang together and we'd take on anybody." Marine gas? Sure, but the kind of talk those people love, and the kind that makes the corps great.)

The 3d Battalion, under Lt. Col. Robert D. Taplett, crouched in its boats as rocket ships fired thousands of missiles on the denuded, smoking island and this went on for 15 minutes.

TANKS LURCH ASHORE

At 6:33 a.m., the landing craft beached and H and G Companies tumbled ashore. Some headed for Radio Hill; others drove toward the causeway leading to Inchon. Marine fighter planes came in low and sprayed the ground with machineguns 50 yards ahead of the plunging troops.

Opposition fire rang out and a few men fell, but 13 minutes after the landing 10 tanks lurched ashore and roared off in support. By 6:50, the Stars and Stripes flew from Radio Hill and H Company had reached the causeway.

When he saw the flag on the hill, MacArthur rose from his chair on the command ship's bridge.

"That's it," he said crisply. "Let's get a cup of coffee."

In effect it was "it" although the island was not secured for another hour, resistance by the remains of the garrison being of a fanatic nature.

Capt. Robert A. McMullen's I Company, which came ashore at 6:59, ran into an example of it. Hand grenades began falling on the company and through the smoke McMullen saw a platoon of North Koreans rising intermittently from foxholes, heaving their grenades, then dropping back into concealment. The company's interpreter crawled toward them, shouting that they didn't have a chance and called on them to surrender.

More grenades met this advice so McMullen signaled a bulldozer tank which clattered to the pockets and buried the grenade throwers with its big blade.

THIRTY IN CAVE SURRENDER

Another tank fired two rounds into a cave where excited voices were heard. This flushed 30 men who reeled out with hands held high.

By 7:45 a.m., Lieutenant Colonel Taplett had virtual control of Wolmi-do and messaged the *Mount McKinley*: "Captured 45 prisoners. Meeting light resistance." By 8 o'clock the island was in American hands.

Success of the 90-minute action was exultantly announced over the command ship's loudspeaker and MacArthur radioed Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble aboard the *Rochester:* "The Navy and Marines have never shone more brightly than this morning."

Casualties during this initial move to take Inchon were light, as MacArthur had predicted. The Navy lost one man and eight were wounded. The Marines sustained 17 wounded; none dead.

ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-SIX ENEMY PRISONERS

The enemy lost 108 counted dead plus those entombed in their caves. Prisoners taken totaled 136.

Three more marines were wounded later in the morning in taking a lighthouse station called Sowolmi-do, connected with the main island by a second causeway, this one 750 yards long. Another band of fanatics chose to shoot it out there and 19 were killed, 19 others surrendered and 8 hid out until nightfall when they were seen escaping to the mainland.

Thus the way to Inchon was opened.

Wolmi-do was the key and the Marines were happy that it was taken with so few casualties but they were not cheerful at the prospect they faced that evening—landing directly in the heart of a city.

TWO BEACHES CHOSEN

This was to be a first such assault by the corps, with obvious perils. Major General Smith would have preferred to have sent his men ashore south of Inchon but because of mudflats beneath a 15-foot seawall there, the area wouldn't support a full-scale landing. So two beaches, Red and Blue, had been chosen bordering on the city.

The 5th Regiment, less those elements holding Wolmi-do, was ticketed for Red beach, a waterfront area of the city of 300,000, while the 1st Regiment was assigned to Blue, in an industrial section. The beaches were 3 miles apart.

The 1st hadn't been in action that morning but it was ready, under a legendary Marine hero—Col. Lewis "Chesty" Puller, holder of four Navy Crosses and destined to win a fifth in Korea. He is a strutting bantam with a barrel chest and a resounding, parade-ground voice who recently retired as a lieutenant general, covered with honors.

FIVE HUNDRED LANDING CRAFT

As the marines waited in their ships, the phenomenal Inchon Harbor tide slid back from the morning high of 36 feet and Wolmi-do was surrounded by mudflats. In subsequent days the invaders were to get used to the incongruous sight of giant LST's and other craft stranded on these flats for hours at a time, sitting ducks for any enemy planes that might be about.

The marines waited but the Navy kept busy during the afternoon, its air strikes continuing to blast Inchon as four cruisers and six destroyers also poured shells into the city.

This was a big show, compared with the Wolmi-do action, and as the sun started down more than 500 landing craft of various sizes and designations gathered around the transports to take the marines to the beaches.

"Almost before anyone wanted it, it was H-hour" Thomis reported from the carrier *Philippine Sea*.

As the invasion craft started for the beaches, to arrive at 5:30 p.m., rocket ships poured missiles into the landing areas, as they had done at Wolmi-do 11 hours earlier. About 6,000 rockets were fired in the next 20 minutes and Marine guns on Wolmi-do also cut loose.

The high tide returned and was cramming water into the harbor but when the first boats hit Red beach they found the seawall there was 4 feet higher than the landing craft ramps. The marines had ladders, however, and scrambled up them after thoughtfully heaving grenades over the wall to clear the way—if it needed clearing.

A few shots did greet these platoons as they moved to cover without casualties. Worse luck attended the landing at another sector of Red where several men were shot down by fire from a bunker.

One objective was Cemetery Hill and this was captured in about 10 minutes with no losses on the hill, an entire Communist mortar company surrendering without a fight. But in the first half hour, the Red beach invaders lost 8 killed and 28 wounded.

VICTORY BY MIDNIGHT

Observatory Hill, another objective, was 200 feet high, and there was resistance on it. The marines lost a few more men but they finally gained the summit and by midnight the mission of the 5th Regiment on Red beach had been, in large measure, accomplished.

An overcast hampered the landings on Blue beach by the 1st Regiment, and there were other troubles there. Some of the metal ladders for scaling the seaway buckled under the weight of clambering men which delayed troop debarkation. Tractors bogged down in the mud.

A machinegun fired from a tower took a few casualties but it was silenced and the troops dashed through a maze of smoky streets and buildings afire.

TIME FOR BIG RISK

There was confusion offshore and some of the landing craft were misdirected but not as much disorder as Colonel Puller had anticipated in view of the necessity of landing the regiment without any sort of rehearsal, as he wrote later.

At this point, a big risk had to be taken. The troops already ashore had to be reinforced and supplies and ammunition landed so it had been decided to ground 8 LST's on Red beach, each carrying troops, 50 tons of water, 30 tons of rations, 15 tons of water, and 5 tons of fuel. The vessels would be easy targets for the North Koreans, crowded as they would be, no matter how poor shots the enemy gunners were.

IGNORE SNIPER FIRE

But it had to be done and the LST's, fighting currents, finally were grounded. Several of them were immediately fired upon, one sailor was killed and others wounded. But 450 vehicles came off the big "cigar boxes" and the unloading of stores continued through the night since other vessels were to take their places next morning.

The beach was jammed with supplies and the unloaders worked under floodlights, ignoring fire from snipers which went on until dawn.

Meanwhile, the troops had accomplished the objectives of the initial assault; capture of the city was assured. Casualties for the day were remarkably low—perhaps even lower than MacArthur had anticipated when he told the Joint Chiefs of Staff that he felt the difficult landing could be made with small losses.

Killed in action were 21 men, 1 was missing, and 174 wounded. Another 14 were injured but not in battle.

Speedily, in succeeding days, the Americans proceeded to do what MacArthur predicted they would once ashore at Inchon: They split the North Korean Communist forces and captured Kimpo, the airport of Seoul, and the capital itself. MacArthur, the strategist, was once again proven right.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we are indeed proud that the city of Norfolk, Va., will house the MacArthur Shrine—a lasting tribute to the general. I predict that visitors from all over the United States will make pilgrimages to the MacArthur Shrine as they now do to the Washington and Lincoln memorials. Gen. Douglas MacArthur will rank with these two great Americans in the history of our Nation.

USE OF SURPLUS FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is noteworthy that President John F. Kennedy's first Executive order has the effect of doubling the amount of surplus foods made available to undernourished and poverty-stricken men, women, and children in our Nation's areas of chronic unemployment and distress.

This humane act is an excellent beginning to his administration and presages future action to help our millions of needy, undernourished, ill-clad, and poorly housed Americans.

Mr. President, every day of the year American taxpayers are paying over $1½ million rent—or over $1,000 a minute—to store our surplus food products even as they spoil. Last year it was $612 million; this year $700 million.

Rats are the principal beneficiaries, while human beings both at home and abroad go hungry. At the present time we have over $7 billion of food in storage throughout the Nation. For the first time in history a nation is faced with the problem of how to dispose of its food while millions throughout the world are starving and millions here at home are subsisting on substandard diets.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans living in economically depressed areas are existing on "mollygrub"—the term given to the monthly food ration from Federal surplus commodities. In reality, it stands for a life little better than slow starvation.

At present, these surplus food commodities are being distributed in 1,100 economically hard-hit counties throughout the Nation. In my home State of Ohio there are thousands of unemployed in Cleveland, Lorain, Youngstown, and other industrial areas who want work but for whom work is not available. The same is true of the other States, especially Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Massachusetts. In our neighboring State of West Virginia over 300,000 people are on this shameful dole which amounted to 5 cents a day per person until President Kennedy took action.

It is a great moral wrong that so many worthy and industrious men and women in our country are jobless. There can be no excuse for involuntary unemployment in this land of plenty.

President Kennedy has rightly said that our food surpluses should be regarded as an asset rather than a liability. They belong on the tables of hungry unemployed Americans rather than in warehouses as food for rats.

The President has taken an admirable and forthright step toward alleviating this nagging problem. Should this problem become more serious and should legislation be required to enable the President to distribute more of our surplus foods to our needy citizens, I would strongly support any bills designed to accomplish that end.

In theory the past program cost taxpayers 5 cents a day per person and President Kennedy's Executive order will double that amount. However, in practice the American taxpayers are actually saving money. By distributing this food they no longer have to pay the fantastic storage charges which now amount to over $1,000 a minute. So, in reality, taxpayers' dollars are being saved while, at the same time, the lives of millions of Americans are being bettered.

At long last something is being done to help those millions of Americans who have been neglected for the past 8 years. I join with millions of my countrymen in applauding this timely and sorely needed action.

DRUG PRODUCTION—FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, among the many important problems to which this Congress will direct its attention are those concerning the quality and availability of medical care in this country. Not many months ago some problems of medical care were brought forcefully—indeed, very forcefully—before the public by the investigation of the prescription drug industry conducted by my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Tennessee. As a Pennsylvanian, I had a particular interest in this investigation. Pennsylvania is one of the great centers of the drug industry. In fact, my home city alone, Philadelphia, produces 20 percent of the Nation's prescription drugs. Philadelphia's drug firms pay an annual national payroll of about $90 million and employ some 8,000 people who live in or near Philadelphia. Last year they spent $35 million on research. From their research laboratories have come several significant contributions to medical science. Philadelphia's awareness of the services performed by the drug industry was recently evidenced when Mayor Richardson Dilworth proclaimed the week of January 22 as Drug Progress Week, a week which coincides with the centennial celebration of the Philadelphia Drug Exchange.

I feel certain that during this week many Philadelphians will pause and reflect on the role pharmaceutical research has played in bringing about the astounding amount of medical progress achieved in this century or, for that matter, in the last few decades. I would like to talk briefly about what that progress means to Philadelphia and the Nation, and then I would like to point out that in some of its actions—though they may have been motivated by its concern for the common good—the Federal Government has taken steps which might well have detrimental effects on our Nation's health and economy.

In proclaiming Drug Progress Week, Philadelphia showed its grateful awareness of the contribution pharmaceutical research has made not only to Philadelphians, but to all Americans. I think all Americans should be aware of it. We have become so accustomed to the so-called miracle drugs that we forget just how miraculous today's treatments would once have seemed. For example, according to the Philadelphia Board of Health, in 1934, 5,301 Philadelphia children got whooping cough—58 died. Twenty-five years later, in 1959, 369 got whooping cough—none died. In 1934, 206 Philadelphians got diphtheria—22 died. In 1959, 10 got diphtheria—none died. The board has compiled just as impressive statistics for other infectious diseases which, thanks to drugs, are now relatively innocuous, but which not long ago killed a great many of our city's citizens. As a matter of fact, if today's death rate were the same as 1934's death rate, 45,000 Philadelphians who are now alive would be dead.

Philadelphia's health story is only one of many similar stories. It could be re-

peated in just about every city, every town, every community in this country. Millions of Americans who are now leading productive lives would be dead or crippled if it were not for drugs, many of which were unavailable as few as 10 or 15 years ago. The emptying of TB sanitoriums; the decline in the population of our mental hospitals; the alleviation of crippling diseases such as arthritis; the successful treatment of pneumonia, scarlet fever, syphilis, meningitis, and other virulent diseases—all this represents a scientific achievement just as remarkable as, and perhaps even more important than, man's breakthrough into space. Amazingly enough, medical science has advanced more rapidly in the last two decades than in the preceding two centuries.

I do not want to imply, of course, that drug progress is alone responsible for all our progress in medicine. Medical progress is the result of the close cooperation of many scientists of many different skills.

Neither, however, am I unaware of the fact that American medicine could not have progressed as rapidly and as magnificently as it has were it not for the lifesaving achievements of pharmaceutical research. And I am pleased that in proclaiming Drug Progress Week, the city of Philadelphia has paid tribute to its outstanding pharmaceutical companies whose laboratories have contributed so significantly to this progress. Among other contributions, Philadelphia companies have been leaders in the research and development of drugs to treat cardiovascular disease, cancer, arthritis, and mental illness—today's most challenging medical problems. From laboratory and clinical research conducted by Philadelphia companies have come drugs to treat heart failure; drugs to treat certain types of cancer; the first potent drug to treat crippling arthritis; and the first drug to provide a specific treatment for mental illness. This is only a partial list of contributions made by pharmaceutical research conducted by six firms located in one city. It lists, then, only a fraction of the contributions made to our Nation's health by the extensive research efforts of the many firms located throughout our country.

I think one could safely say that the pharmaceutical industry has not exactly been free of criticism lately. But I think it only fair to point out that—whatever its faults—few of even its most severe critics would deny that through its research and development activities it has made a singular contribution to our Nation's health. I am concerned, then, as I think all Americans should be concerned, when the Government acts in a way that threatens to hamper the productivity of this research. I am even more concerned, however, when this Government activity signals a threat to all American industrial research, when it adversely affects our economy, and when it appears to violate individual rights guaranteed by law. Unfortunately, though perhaps guided by the best intentions, the Military Medical Supply Agency and the Veterans' Administration have acted in a way that can cause all these undesirable results. I refer to these agencies having sent millions of the taxpayers' dollars overseas to purchase cheap, pirated versions of powerful drugs discovered by U.S. companies and presumably protected by U.S. patents.

Recently, this practice was deservedly denounced by American labor when the Oil, Chemical, Atomic Workers International Union passed a resolution strongly condemning it. Not all Americans, however, are as alert to the dangers inherent in this Government boycott of American companies. Because it has not gotten the publicity it deserved, most people are either unaware of it or, if aware, fail to recognize the threat it may pose to the Nation's physical and fiscal well-being.

From December 1959 to the summer of 1960 the U.S. Government spent nearly $2 million importing drugs from abroad. Included in these imports were over 57,000 bottles of a pirated Italian version of the potent antibiotic, tetracycline—a drug discovered and patented by an American firm. This purchase was made by the Military Medical Supply Agency which later, in behalf of the VA, bought many thousands of bottles of a Danish version of the tranquilizer, meprobamate—another American discovery patented in this country.

The MMSA defended its buying abroad on the grounds that by buying the cheap foreign drugs it could help drive down what it considered too high American prices. It justified its disregard of American patent rights by claiming that what it was doing was perfectly legal because the American firms had a right to sue the Government afterward.

I am disturbed by the kind of reasoning behind this practice, for I see in it not only a potential threat to all American industry, but also an immediate threat to our economy. At a time when we have an imbalance of payments amounting to some $4 billion, it seems rather shortsighted for a Government agency to substantially increase it. I understand that foreign drug purchases to date amount to about $3½ million. I do not think it very probable that American companies who pay a multimillion-dollar bill for the discovery and development of an original invention can ever meet the price charged by companies who are free to pirate the fruits of their research.

For example, thanks to a 1939 decree handed down by Benito Mussolini, Italy recognizes no patents on drug products.

Italian companies are thus spared from paying the money which in most countries of the free world would go to the inventor. Then, too, the average Italian worker gets only one-fifth the salary received by his American counterpart. So it is safe to assume that the Italian firm's labor costs were lower—5 times lower. Even so, there are good reasons to believe that the extremely low prices—about $6 to $8 a bottle—our Government paid for Italian tetracycline were somewhat suspiciously low. The same firm charged the Italian Government from about $16 to $19 a bottle—very close to the about $17 a bottle an American firm asked of the United States. The MMSA, then, may well be encouraging the dumping of foreign goods, a practice which Congress has passed clear-cut resolutions against.

There are other reasons which would suggest that although the foreign drugs bought by the MMSA were cheap, they were far from being a bargain. But to me the most important and disturbing things about this practice is that the willful disregard of patent rights the Government countenanced in these purchases can, if continued and extended, throw a formidable roadblock in the path of all scientific progress—not merely drug progress alone. I would strongly suggest that the Government agencies involved seriously reconsider their buying abroad policies.

When the Government goes shopping, the taxpayer has a right to expect that it will spend his money wisely, for a good purpose and for the general welfare of the country. He has a right to expect that, in its business transactions, the Government will protect our basic economy, our labor force, and our incentives for advancement in technological research and development. He has a right to expect that the Government will not act to circumvent patent laws, tariff laws, tax laws, or any other legal and moral principles established by the Government and to which the Government asks his allegiance. To sum up, he has a right, Mr. President, to expect the Government to protect the individual rights that characterize our free Nation in a world growing much smaller for freedom than we care to think about.

POSITION ON RACE PROBLEM BY CLERGY OF EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Conference of Clergy of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania recently adopted findings with regard to the duty of the church in race relations.

The action of the diocese is an important step forward in the growing recognition of the clergy that its part in the problems arising from racial tensions cannot be purely passive. The church is challenged to recognize its Christian duty.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the January issue of the Church News of the Episcopal diocese of Pennsylvania which reports these findings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLERGY TAKE POSITION ON RACE PROBLEM

A group of clergy in the diocese are determined to let their stand be known in relation to the problem of racial understanding. Findings of a conference held last fall at Seabury House at the invitation of Bishop Hart have now been published. The findings include such paragraphs as these:

Confessing that, by our acquiescence in racially determined patterns of life, we have

failed to bear witness to the fullness of Christ, failed to exhibit the oneness and universality of His Church, and failed to bring the full emancipation of His Gospel to our fellowmen, we call on the proper authorities of the diocese of Pennsylvania to consider the following principles for a strategy in human relations:

Since the diocese is the unit for dealing with areawide problems and for setting missionary policy, we call on the bishop and executive departments of the diocese for clear, authoritative statements and leadership in defining and carrying out the church's witness in human relations.

Since the church must carry on its work within the Greater Philadelphia area in which an unjustly segregated residential pattern almost universally prevails, we urge that the church not willingly adapt its life to this pattern, but rather lodge vigorous and tangible protest against this pattern—a pattern that renders the community less than fully human and the church less than fully Christian.

We suggest that this protest be made by:

A prophetic witness against the racially discriminatory practices in housing, employment, etc., and the effort to perpetuate them.

Letting judgment begin at the house of God by effecting the will of convention in integrating all diocesan agencies and by insisting that all institutions using the church's name and constituency drop any racially restrictive aspects remaining in their operations.

Not beginning new work in racially restricted areas without appropriate protest against the nature of the community being created. When such work must be begun the new church should have preparation for the human relations aspect of its work in an essentially unwholesome and potentially explosive community.

Urging as a matter of publicly understood policy that all parishes and missions are expected to be at least as integrated in worship, fellowship, and evangelism as the neighborhoods in which they are located.

Initiating or assisting in programs which will tend to break down the existing pattern of segregated housing—either by encouraging and assisting nonwhite persons to move to the suburbs or by encouraging and assisting white persons to move into integrated neighborhoods of the city.

Lending church support to fair housing legislation.

Another paragraph of the findings says:

"Since we desire, as Christian brothers, to show our solidarity in racial issues,

We commit ourselves to prayer and support for those priests and parishes in parochial or community situations in which a racial witness calls for unusual Christian courage. And we pledge ourselves to give whatever help we are able—as may be requested by our brothers—in crisis situations. (Recognizing that in times of stress we all may do and say—or leave undone and unsaid—things for which we must seek forgiveness of God and man, we desire to express this essential acceptance of and trust in one another in this issue without necessarily endorsing all of the tactics or statements of anyone else.)

"We further call on other clergy to join us in this commitment. And we request that this same attitude of support be adopted by the bishops and representatives of the diocese. This issue is the concern of the whole body, the mind of the church has been declared by our representative assemblies, and it should not be necessary for anyone to struggle with it in isolation.

"Since we work as only a part of divided Christendom and since we work in the human community in which some of God's creative, reconciling work is done outside the ecclesiastical institutions, we urge that the mission of the Episcopal Church be carried out as largely as possible in cooperation with and using the resources of those human relations agencies of the church and community also at work in this field."

The following clergy attending the conference which adopted the findings unanimously signed the conference statements:

The Reverend William J. Alberts, the Reverend James T. Alves, the Reverend Jesse F. Anderson, the Reverend Arthur C. Barnhart, the Reverend Edwin G. Bennett, the Reverend Cecil H. Cowan, the Reverend J. Aubrey Cragg, the Reverend Matthew W. Davis, the Reverend George W. Davison, the Reverend Robert C. S. Deacon, the Reverend Donald L. Farrow, the Reverend John F. Hardwick, the Reverend Robert S. Harris, the Reverend Oscar E. Holder, the Reverend William H. Jeffreys, Jr., the Reverend John F. Leser, the Reverend John R. Logan, Jr., the Reverend Thomas W. S. Logan, the Reverend Richard T. Lyford, D.D., the Reverend James R. MacColl III, the Reverend James R. McDowell, the Reverend T. Norman Mason, the Reverend Emmett P. Paige, the Reverend Edward P. Rementer, the Reverend Elbert K. St. Claire, the Reverend Daniel B. Stevick, the Reverend Philemon F. Sturges, the Reverend William D. Turner, the Reverend Paul M. Washington, the Reverend Joe B. P. White, the Reverend Bruce P. Williamson, the Reverend Layton B. Zimmer.

FAREWELL TO THE CHIEF

Mr. SCOTT. When the new President took office on January 20, he assumed the reins of Government from one of the very great men of this century. Dwight Eisenhower is the first President in 100 years to leave office as deeply lodged in the Nation's heart as when he entered upon his duties.

Many eloquent statements have been written recently about his departure. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two of such statements: an article by David Lawrence which appeared in U.S. News & World Report of January 23, 1961, and a portion of an article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the Hearst newspapers of January 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 23, 1961]

FAREWELL TO THE "FAITHFUL SERVANT"

(By David Lawrence)

As Dwight David Eisenhower ends a notable career of a half century in the Government of the United States, it becomes appropriate to view his public service in the perspective of history.

The world will always remember his outstanding record as commander of the victorious forces of the Allies in Europe in World War II. His significant contribution thereafter in organizing the North Atlantic Treaty forces for the future defense of Western Europe is universally recognized.

The American people, by electing and then reelecting Mr. Eisenhower—by overwhelming votes each time—to the highest office in the land, showed their confidence in his ability and his integrity. The latest public-opinion polls indicate that his popularity has continued at a very high rate to the end of his term.

What is the secret of this popular strength?

It has not been attained through the skillful maneuvers of politics, for Dwight Eisenhower is admittedly not a politician.

It has not been attained through any power of eloquence or erudite expression, for he is not endowed with the talents of a stump speaker.

Nor has it been due merely to the adulation bestowed upon a military hero. For past history has taught us that military heroes who blunder vanish overnight from the high altars of public esteem.

Dwight Eisenhower's popularity has developed largely from his commonsense and ability to size up the main desires of the American people.

It is pertinent perhaps to recall an interview with General Eisenhower at Columbia University in January 1950, which was published in this magazine in March 1952. This writer had mentioned that perhaps the Presidency was getting to be too big for one man and that much depended on an intuitive ability to recognize sound advice. The general said:

"I agree that experience in handling men may possibly be the key. It may well be that the Presidency is too big a job for one man, but there again—as in any post of responsibility—all depends upon the kind of men he gathers around him. It depends, too, upon the spirit with which controversial questions are approached.

"Anyone who had to deal with the varying viewpoints of the allied governments, of the several services, and of many dominating personalities in the last war was face to face with some real challenges. But my experience in Europe convinces me that the settlement of controversy is largely a matter of knowing how to work with people, convincing them of your own sincerity, and developing in them the good will and spirit of cooperation."

It was a prophetic utterance. For this, indeed, has been Dwight Eisenhower's guiding philosophy as President. He has had to work with the leaders in Congress of an opposite party which has held a majority for 6 out of the 8 years. His personal friendship with the leaders of the Western governments has been invaluable in dealing with the problems of our partners in the alliance.

In that same interview, General Eisenhower said:

"As a military man, I don't want to see any more war. There must be a way someday for us to see that we can't live happily in a world governed by fear, and that the price of peace is not really high if we sincerely want it."

Dwight Eisenhower, as President of the most powerful country in the world, has consistently endeavored to maintain peace, despite the never-ending threats of war in various countries in both hemispheres. He has spared no effort, day or night, to keep this Nation out of war. Though the insults and aggravations coming from the Communist regimes have been highly provocative, he has allowed no considerations of false pride or sensitiveness to divert him from his basic purpose—the avoidance of bloodshed.

Whether in domestic or in foreign policy, Mr. Eisenhower has tried to do what he thought would be best for all the people. He has been a true leader—a faithful interpreter of the public will. He would be the first to admit that sometimes inadequate advice or his own misjudgment led to errors. But more often the reverses he encountered were due to circumstances beyond the control of our own Government.

When all is said and done, the verdict must be one of signal praise for the humble man who did his duty—rising above politics and above the intrigues and manipulations of the partisans. He didn't, of course, satisfy the impatient or the hysterical—the militant in our midst or the appeasers. He didn't altogether satisfy the "liberals" or the "conservatives." In making his decisions, he considered only what was best for America—and then applied his God-given talents of commonsense, honesty and sincerity.

Dwight David Eisenhower has fully earned the tribute written in the Scriptures:

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

EDITOR'S REPORT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

President Eisenhower has held office during one of the most trying periods on record—the time of the simultaneous drive of the Communist nations for world domination and the emergence of newly independent nations from the ashes of colonialism.

In that period he has managed without sacrifice of past social gains at home and with the expansion of some of them, notably civil rights—to stem the Communist tide which had rolled far and wide during the previous administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

Above all, he has done it while keeping the United States out of war and in fact keeping the world from major conflict. I like Ike and always have liked him, so to reinforce the perhaps partiality of my judgment let me quote from the respected Times of London, often a severe critic of both the President and the United States:

"When the 8 years are reviewed as a whole, the supreme achievement, never to be forgotten, is that President Eisenhower has kept the peace at the same time, he has looked to the defenses of the free world. It is no mean record."

What is remarkable is that the retrospective look over the 8 years present a picture which has led even some of his partisan critics at home to eat their words about U.S. decline in power and prestige.

Fact is that Ike leaves office with the Nation in a stronger position in defense and diplomacy than he found it in 1953.

Under the Democratic administration of Harry Truman, a complacency developed over our military power. We have always had such a big edge on the Soviet in the manned bomber department, and had such a head start on stockpiling nuclear weapons, that we fell into the trap of ignoring the importance of rockets.

The Soviet sputnik woke us up with a jolt. It became the task of the Eisenhower administration to pull up to the Soviet lead in missiles.

How well has it been done? Well, we haven't yet come up with the big bang—the moon shot or the man-in-space coup—but the last check of satellites in orbit shows we have successfully launched 23 and still have 16 going, while the Russians have two or three up (depending on whether you take their word for a doubtful one) out of nine successes.

You can measure the huge strides of the United States in rocketry by the very fact that a space task force reported to President-elect Kennedy this week that it is unlikely that we can beat the Russians to putting a man into orbit.

Only 3 years ago in the sputnik panic the U.S. scientists wouldn't have been worried that our beating the Russians was unlikely. They would have been sure the Russians would beat us—and nothing unlikely about it.

Let's remember, too, that the insistence of Ike's administration on giving the Polaris missile the right of way has been the big item in overcoming the Soviet's military missile lead. Now with hindsight everyone admits the submarine-fired Polaris, giving us a missile arm with no fixed bases for the enemy to destroy, is a mighty deterrent.

But as recently as a year ago, there was criticism of too much emphasis on the Polaris.

One of the most important aspects of the rocket development has been that, while catching up to the Russians on the military side, we have advanced so far on the purely scientific side that President Eisenhower was able in his state of the Union message Thursday to declare we are unquestionably preeminent in space exploration.

The philosophy which has guided Ike in office is the belief that the Nation benefits most when there is a broad advance along the middle of the road for everybody—not just for one or another sector of our population.

Except in rare exceptions—as for instance where it was vital to favor the military's need for missiles—he has succeeded through 8 trying years in spreading the benefits of our progress widely.

Just look at economic questions like inflation, wages, prices, etc. Ike checked the inflation that boosted living costs 36 percent between 1946 and 1952.

The average American family's income rose 15 percent during his administration. Factory workers' wages rose 26 percent, a comfortable margin over the 11 percent rise in prices in the same period.

Farm ownership and values have reached a record high.

The most reliable measure of a nation's economic strength, the gross national product, passed the half-trillion-dollar mark last year, long before economists expected that it could happen.

That makes an impressive chapter in our national history. What's more, Ike accomplished this difficult tightrope act of building our defense power and our civilian economy at the same time, without resort to unsound financial policies.

It would suit the Communists just fine to have the United States flounder on the rocks of financial disaster. It would save them all the trouble of trying to bury us, as Nikita Khrushchev puts it.

INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL NUTRITION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of all Members of Congress to a thoughtful and significant address made recently at the Fifth International Congress on Nutrition by Mr. H. J. Heinz II, chairman of the board of the H. J. Heinz Co., of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Heinz, a distinguished citizen of Pennsylvania, who is known for his deep interest in the public welfare, makes five proposals which are worthy of consideration by all Americans:

1. The creation of scholarships rather than a fund to bring students from all over the world to this country in order to train them in nutritional sciences, technology and related fields.

2. The creation of grants and endowments to universities to encourage the scope of nutritional study.

3 The sponsorship of a nutrition education program to disseminate nutritional information to the general public.

4. Multilingual publication of notable advances in the nutrition sciences from many lands.

5. The sharing of appropriate food industry knowledge with our Government and international agencies working in this field.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Heinz address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL NUTRITION

(An address by H. J. Heinz II at the Fifth International Congress on Nutrition, September 6, 1960, Washington, D.C.)

("We must never forget that there are hundreds of millions of people particularly in the less developed parts of the world, suffering from hunger and malnutrition, even though a number of countries, my own included, are producing food in surplus. This paradox should not continue."—Dwight D. Eisenhower, addressing the 15th session of the United Nations Assembly, September 22, 1960.)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests from abroad, ladies and gentlemen, some time ago, when Dr. King invited me to speak at this dinner tonight, I felt not only greatly honored, but I accepted the invitation with a genuine feeling of pleasure, because the subject of food and nutrition has been close to my family for many years. It has also been a rewarding experience to be part of a great industry—one that links agriculture and human nutrition, the farmer and the consumer, research and agriculture, food technology and nutrition—one that is part of our way of life. Furthermore, many of us have worldwide interest of many years standing, so it is only natural that our industry should be especially interested in this conference.

Since food is the basis, the very sustenance of living, no one can talk about the food industry without considering the broader aspects of man's continuing struggle to survive.

May I, therefore, talk to you tonight about mankind's long struggle to master his environment. There have been many conquests, many triumphs. Diseases that have scourged and plagued mankind for centuries have been conquered. Traveling around the globe in 48 hours has become commonplace. Our voice and image can be transmitted mechanically not only to any part of this earth, but also to outer space in a matter of seconds. Manmade satellites are circling the globe like so many moons—and the proverbial trip to the moon is almost within our grasp. Man and science are racing to the farthest reaches of space to stagger the imagination.

Our thoughts are becoming more and more preoccupied with what we will find and do on other planets, but right here on this planet, right here and now, a basic problem, the most fundamental one of all, continues to haunt us. Man is still suffering and, in some places, even dying of hunger. The dread twin spectres of hunger and serious malnutrition constantly stalk over half the population on this planet.

Food is the staff of life. Nevertheless, it is estimated that more than a billion people in the underdeveloped countries of the world are not getting enough food for proper physical development, for adequate resistance to disease, for the day-to-day requirement of living. Only less than a quarter of the population of this world is adequately fed.

The problem is therefore self-evident. In simple terms, it is to extend the techniques which have brought freedom from want to the few—to all of mankind.

Much has been accomplished, much more remains to be accomplished.

What has been the food industry's contribution?

Within the short span of one generation, there has been a literal revolution in food technology. May I offer some concrete illustrations:

In America, with the help of applied research, it has provided in many areas a 12-month market for a 1-month crop. Food technology has now made it possible to deliver an extraordinary variety of inexpensive and nutritious processed foods almost anywhere in the world. The most isolated community anywhere can have food just as nutritious and flavorsome as the great cities.

Of outstanding significance are the over 125 different fruits, vegetables, or meat and vegetable combination for infants and juniors of special nutritive formulation and texture, convenient of course and highly palatable to adults as well. Dietetic foods, too,

have been developed for persons who must restrict their intake of certain substances.

Processed citrus products, with their vital vitamin C, are now abundant in areas where they were either nonexistent or priced out of reach.

Through one of the century's major accomplishments in food technology, dehydrated "instant" skim milk is now a reality, thus making possible the dehydration processes of a wide variety of foods and food products.

Through new techniques in packaging, shipping, handling, and refrigeration, it is now possible to protect fresh as well as processed foods and give them longer life. Precooling, for example, quickly lowers temperatures so that spoilage is lessened. Milk is quick-chilled to 50° shortly after milking. Dressed poultry and newly slaughtered beef are chilled to slow down bacteriological contamination. Cellophane packaging of meat in retail quantities is now common practice, and already about one-fourth of all fruits and vegetables is prepackaged before reaching retail levels. Thus moisture loss is retarded, keeping the products fresh and attractive.

The number of items on the shelves of the large supermarkets has grown from about 4,000 in 1946 to 8,000 today. At least two-thirds of these are new and improved items. Besides fresh fruits and vegetables, the vast majority are now processed in one form or another. They are canned, waxed and dried. They are frozen, bottled, and pickled. They are wrapped, packaged, and baked. One way or another, the food industry stabilizes its products to slow down or prevent the chemical and bacteriological changes that cause spoilage.

These "convenience" products often save the consumer money. For instance, a pound of shelled peas, frozen or canned, costs about 32 cents. Bought fresh, the same quantity of peas costs about 70 cents. Citrus juices made from frozen concentrate costs about half as much as the same amount squeezed from fresh fruits.

In assessing the contribution of our industry, it seems to me that years and years of applied research have resulted in making available to the housewife a vast variety of better products more uniformly good and more cheaply without sacrifice of quality.

A bottle of ketchup today costs the same at retail as it did in 1923. Let us, however, not forget that while these cost reductions represent great advantages in food processing technology, millions of people throughout the world cannot even begin to afford such "convenience" products.

The food industry is the world's largest, with total consumer spending of about $76 billion for food in 1960. These food dollars employ directly and indirectly about one-quarter of the world's working population—in agriculture, in food manufacturing, transportation, distribution and supplier industries.

These are some of the remarkable advances we have seen, but the food industry has actually only started its forward march. Continuing research is pointing the way.

We fully realize that fundamental as well as applied research is an essential ingredient in the growth of our food technology. Today, the research scientist has come into his own. He works in specially designed centers, has costly apparatus at his elbow, and he is an important member of industry. The food manufacturers of the world, with their many-faceted technological programs, are helping to upgrade the nutritional levels of their own populations, as well as many other places in the world. The American food industry annually invests a total of $100 million in research. By 1965, it is expected that this amount will increase by 40 percent, a rise far greater than the average for all manufacturing industries combined. In addition, I should also like to point out that another $400 million is being spent by National and State Governments in this country on farm research, and this is double the figure expended only 10 years ago. During this time, of course, other governments as well as the United Nations have also contributed huge sums of money to research.

We, of the food processing industry, promise to continue to support vigorously all phases of sound research in the nutritional sciences, which are now in progress or will be developed in the future.

Work is proceeding at a stepped-up rate in industry centers, university laboratories, and through unique organizations such as the Nutrition Foundation, about which I should like to make brief but very special mention, so proud are we in the industry of its accomplishments.

This scientific research organization, spearheaded by my good friend, Dr. King, as executive director, is totally supported by the United States and Canadian food and related industries. The foundation was organized as a sincere expression of their interest in scientific progress and the health of humanity.

Starting with 15 members 19 years ago, foundation membership has now grown to nearly 60 companies. The foundation provides grants to universities and medical schools in support of basic nutrition studies. While the funds originate from contributions made by the food industry, the assignment to specific research projects is under the full and independent control of a special scientific advisory committee to which the trustees of the foundation give only final ratification.

Over the years, many millions of dollars in grants have been made to university and medical centers in the United States, Canada, and Central America.

These projects have contributed enormously to our knowledge. The recipients of foundation grants have made—and are continuing to make—significant contributions to the science of nutrition with respect to proteins, fats, carbohydrates, minerals, vitamins, infant and maternal nutrition, dental caries, anemia, diabetes and nutritive factors affecting heart and vascular disease.

May I cite just two examples of many:

A foundation grant extending over 10 years has made possible the classic work of Dr. William C. Rose at the University of Illinois in identifying the amino acids that proteins must furnish to protect health in young adults.

The foundation was further privileged to assist the work of the Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama, in Guatemala City—the well-known "INCAP." It helped INCAP to formulate a cheap dietary supplement for the undernourished people of the area. The new food—called "Incaparina"—is high in protein, essential minerals and vitamins. It is made from a blend of locally available foods, including corn, sorghum and cottonseed flour, plus yeast and vitamin A. The Central Americans have found it to be tasty; what's more, it is cheap, costing only 3 cents for a day's ration.

These facts are impressive enough, and yet, even knowing them, it is hard to grasp the profound overall significance—economically and historically—of the Incaparina development. At one blow, Incaparina has overcome two basic difficulties in dealing with the problem of undernourished people in underdeveloped countries.

The first difficulty has been trying to change dietary habits that were bound up with differing religious beliefs. Incaparina can be combined with cornmeal which is, and long has been, the principal food of the people in the area.

The second difficulty is that the underdeveloped countries which most need a dietary upgrading cannot afford to import foods. Incaparina is not only low in cost, but it is produced from indigenous agricultural materials.

We of the food industry pledge that with the passage of time, the foundation will continue to grow and that the scope of its work will broaden even further. In addition, we will, of course, continue to work closely with and through all organizations such as FAO, UNICEF, Pan American Health Organization, ICA and others, dedicated to the betterment of nutritional and feeding standards throughout the world.

In 1954, the 83d Congress of the United States passed the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, better known as Public Law 480. This act calls for the expansion of international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor.

When the act was passed, it was believed it would serve the purpose but time and changing conditions brought a change of sentiment as expressed in the 1959 amendment, with which I heartily agree. This amendment is known as "The International Food for Peace Act of 1959." In it, the Congress declares, and I quote: "In view of the abundant agricultural production of the American farmer made possible by the advances of science and technology, and the continued hunger and want of clothing in many areas of the world, the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States, in cooperation with other friendly nations, to put its abundance of supplies, as effectively and rapidly as possible in the service of human need. The Congress further declares it to be the policy of the United States to utilize our growing stocks of agricultural goods to aid in all possible ways those peoples who are in revolt against poverty, illiteracy, and disease, and who are determined to achieve that economic and social development necessary to national dignity and individual well-being."

If I may, I should now like to turn to the challenges of the future. All the accomplishments that we have made pale into insignificance when confronted with the challenge that could easily sweep away the progress we have made so far. We are faced with a population explosion. Modern medical science and technology, with its triumphs in death control, have created a problem that staggers the imagination. Since the world population is expanding by more than 50 million people annually, it will take only 35 years to double our numbers. If today we are having trouble in producing adequate supplies of food for the present world population of 3,000 million people, what will be the food problems of 1995?

Certainly, if civilization on this earth is to continue, international political tensions and disagreements must be resolved. But the problem of population and food supplies cuts across any and all political boundaries and must also be solved.

We, in the food industry, pledge our support to the fruition of the noble purposes and lofty ideals of this act. I point with satisfaction to the fact that, even under the original act, out of $27 billion in agricultural products that were exported by this country, more than $8 billion were

dispatched to friendly peoples under special humanitarian programs.

Under all aid programs the United States has sent nearly 6,500 shiploads of farm products to more than 100 foreign countries. Such programs are designed to meet the needs of these countries within limits under which they can be physically transported and distributed. These projects must and will continue to grow in scope and depth at an ever-increasing pace. In this effort we urge the increased cooperation of other favored nations.

Food production, in its race with the population growth, has barely managed to hold its own—2 percent against 1.6 percent on the world average. Unfortunately, however, the most spectacular increases in food productions have been made mostly in countries which already have an overbundance of food. Yet, large areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are falling behind in the race and have actually lost ground. This is true in spite of much good work by government and technical assistance for various United Nations agencies. I emphasize the fact because I sincerely believe we must intensify our efforts and do some new things as well.

The experience of industrially and agriculturally advanced countries shows that, by the application of scientific methods and proper management of the economy, productivity of agriculture can be increased to limits hitherto believed unattainable. In the United States, the phenomenal success of intensive cultivation seems seriously to challenge the validity of diminishing returns. Improved agricultural tools and machinery, rational use of fertilizers, farm credit and marketing arrangements can bring about a radical change in the present low-yielding agricultural practices of many countries. It is the duty, indeed the obligation, of the more industrially advanced countries to help.

I submit to you that this is the great problem and challenge of our time. We in the food industry must play our part. I know I can speak for my colleagues in the food industries throughout the United States when I say we will play our part and we will welcome the challenge. Furthermore, I believe that the food industry throughout the world must also feel this way.

How can we do our part?

As I see it, the problem must be attacked boldly on a broad front. The food industry knows full well that foods and nutrition are interrelated concepts which cannot be divorced and that it is up to industry to shoulder an ever-increasing responsibility in the field of nutrition. This responsibility can be expressed in manifold practical ways, I, therefore, submit to you a Five Point Program.

Point 1: There is a serious shortage of trained personnel in the underdeveloped countries with sufficient basic experience in the nutrition science to enable them to explore and identify the nature of the nutrition problem of their own country and propose feasible solution. To meet this need, I propose that there be established nutrition scholarships for the development countries, to be financed by the food industry and Government, as well as interested foundations and world organizations, and created immediately in order to bring students from all over the world to this country—to train these students in nutritional sciences, nutrition education, and related fields. I suggest that the criteria of selection of such individuals be set at practical levels, recognizing the education and the kind of problem existing in each country. I would think that a qualified committee of men like Dr. King and Dr. Sen might be asked to determine the feasibility of this project, the necessary criteria and the kind of study curriculum that would be useful.

Furthermore, I would like to say that in order to get this program going, the H. J. Heinz Co. will offer the first three such scholarships to qualified individuals, which will include transport, tuition, and living expenses.

Point 2: There is an increasing recognition of the importance of nutrition and nutritional factors to the maintenance. Nevertheless, still too few medical schools devote more than a token minimum of time to the teaching of normal and clinical nutrition to the future physicians. I propose that it would be a step in the right direction if the food industry, either acting as individual units, or in concert, would endow chairs of nutrition in interested medical schools. Similar concrete encouragement should be offered to selected university graduate schools and schools of public health—to facilitate the research and teaching in the science of nutrition and to extend to the specialists in nutrition the support and stature he deserves.

Point 3: At a time of increasing public awareness of the significant relationship between nutrition and health, there exist few sources of reliable information to the layman. In default, the field is exploited by assorted charlatans who rush in to capitalize on public ignorance and anxiety. Thus the public is at the receiving end of a wide spectrum of rather dubious nutrition information. True—an increasing effort for better nutrition education is made by Government agencies, public health departments and schools, but I feel that additional education is needed to reach larger segments of the population.

I propose, therefore, that the food industry at large should sponsor a nutrition education program, possibly within the framework of the nutrition foundation, or perhaps closely allied to it, whose aim would be the dissemination through all mass media of communication of authoritative, reliable, nutritional information. Such an organization, cooperating seriously with all agencies and centers conducting nutrition research and coordinating its efforts with other existing sources of legitimate nutrition information, could contribute greatly to public nutrition education, and perhaps to improved eating habits.

Point 4: I propose that the food industry leadership in other countries take the initiative in collating and distributing objective records of advances in the nutrition sciences in their respective languages so that bona fide progress can be made more quickly and effectively in the public interest. I believe that the U.S. food industry would be glad to cooperate with them if invited.

Point 5: There is a real opportunity to share more fully our knowledge with the people of the underfed countries to improve their food and nutrition. The long-range solution lies in helping the underfed countries to produce and process ample food for themselves. We of the food industry who are fortunate in having this knowledge and the means of continuing basic and applied research have a special responsibility to share it and to put it in actual work all over the world in preparing more food and better food. In the field of agriculture, the food processor can and does supplement and cooperate with the scientific agriculturist and experimental work of the Government's Department of Agriculture. For example, right now my own company is working to improve the yield per acre and the quality of the crop and at the same time lower the cost of growing tomatoes in Italy. During the past 4 years, our senior agronomist and his staff have been advising the Italian farmers on the adoption and adaptation of tomato culture practices that have been so productive in this country. In the State of Ohio for instance, crop protection technique (antiblight spraying) has doubled the yield per acre of Heinz contract farmers in the last 10 years.

In Venezuela our company is working with the local department of agriculture to improve varietal strains of all vegetables and to improve crop protection techniques that will stabilize the yield per acre.

Back in 1935 I journeyed to Australia, purchased a local piano factory that had seen better days, and started a facility for producing the "57 Varieties." We are particularly proud of the fact that we introduced strained baby foods to the Australian market and by doing so made a significant contribution to the nutrition of the baby population of that country.

Other fellow members of the food-processing industry have made similar and significant contributions to the world.

The success of these individual contributions serve only to point up the desperate and ever-increasing need for a more concerted and centralized effort. Therefore, I propose that the food industry explore the possibility and means of making available such knowledge in both food processing and nutritional science as may be useful and applicable to those underdeveloped countries or areas with critical food problems. This knowledge might or should be made available to our Government and through appropriate channels to UNICEF, WHO, FAO, etc., who are now doing such splendid work.

To repeat, this is how I propose the challenge can be met and how the food industries of the world can assist. To recapitulate—Point 1: The creation of scholarships rather than a fund to bring students from all over the world to this country in order to train them in nutritional sciences, technology and related fields. Point 2: The creation of grants and endowments to universities to encourage the scope of nutritional study. Point 3: The sponsorship of a nutrition education program to disseminate nutritional information to the general public. Point 4: Multilingual publication of notable advances in the nutrition sciences from many lands. Point 5: The sharing of appropriate food industry knowledge with our Government and international agencies working in this field.

In brief, the goal of our industry is the practical contribution toward the betterment of man's nutrition. Whatever it be, the task will call for an open mind and a large measure of enlightened thinking.

Mankind has conquered many problems that, at first, seemed insurmountable. Through research, man is rapidly mastering all the elements of nature. But in that race, let us not overlook the dignity of man. Man has a right to grow to his full capacity, regardless of who he is or where he was born. The entire civilized world must come to grips with this problem. We who have knowledge must give of that knowledge. We who have substance must give of that substance. The food industry must continue to contribute to the fight to banish hunger from the face of this earth. It will continue until we can truly say that no one walks the face of this earth in want of food.

AMERICANISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a penetrating article written by our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, which appeared in the Washington Star on January 22. Dr. Harris' articles are always worth reading, but this one, published in the Star, seems to me to be truly remarkable. I call it to the attention of Senators and Representatives as well, and I ask unanimous

consent that the column entitled "Americanism" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT: AMERICANISM

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Americanism, the dictionary tells us, is loyalty to American ideals. It follows that to be un-American is to be disloyal to the principles which have made America "the torch of the world."

Opposed to Americanism in today's world is a sinister system whose fitting symbol, as it hovers over the earth's misery, is a vulture. The one force totalitarianism most hates and fears is the United States of America. To accomplish its avowed world-wide goals, atheistic communism knows that the bulwark of freedom which Lincoln called "humanity's last best hope" must ultimately be destroyed. Its liberties must be infiltrated by this diabolical conspiracy which, wherever it prevails and whatever else it brings, strips the individual of his God-given dignity.

Materialistic regimentation with its slavish fetters is the opposite of Americanism, which is founded on the spiritual verities which communism blasphemes and derides.

The first thing that America needs to be told as a new administration takes the helm is that we are at war. That is the grim reality. All the precious things of which spires are symbols are imperiled. We are in war up to the hilt now. It is significant that the National Planning Association in its report urges that the American people ought to be told "the stark, the unvarnished truth about the national emergency" created by the challenge of Soviet communism. The Great Galilean could not have described our own time more exactly when 2,000 years ago he declared: "While men slept the enemy sowed tares."

The enemy vowing to destroy us is here, entrenched and maneuvering with his espionage cohorts within this Sweet Land of Liberty. The foe's strategy of subversion is invading every phase of American life.

Words which are worthy to be written on the doorposts of our homes, our schools, and our churches have been penned by Dorothy L. Sayers, as she senses the issues of this raging conflict: "Christendom and heathendom now stand face to face as they have not done since the days of Charlemagne. The people who say that this is a war of economics, or of power politics, are only dabbling about on the surface of things. At bottom it is a violent and irreconcilable quarrel about the nature of God and the nature of man, and the ultimate nature of the universe; it is a war of dogma." With such issues of life and death at stake there are coward souls even under the Stars and Stripes who quakingly whine "better Red than dead." Shame on them. They are a disgrace to Americanism.

Let it be made crystal clear that we are not at war against the great Russian and Chinese people. Always there is a waiting reservoir of good will for them and a belief in their ultimate emancipation from the fetters by which they are bound by tyrants.

The religious institutions of America and the Nation's youth are two of the most vital and vulnerable targets of those who would destroy us. Sincere but gullible citizens, especially immature students, are being deceived by the plausible sophistries of wolfish cheerleaders in sheep's clothing who train them to chant "Peace, peace," when there is no peace, and to "demonstrate" against the Paul Reveres of Americanism. The sacred word peace in the perverted vocabulary of communism means nothing except their victory.

In so decisive a struggle the searchlight of Americanism pure and undefiled sends out its piercing beams to uncover the lurking saboteurs who, at the bidding of the foreign foe, engage in nefarious un-American activities. Yet, in such a time, there are those among us who seem more concerned, lest some innocent bystander might be hurt and unduly embarrassed than they are that our liberties shall be safeguarded. So, for the sake of those who may be undeservedly injured they would actually abolish the searchlight. Could an argument be more specious? It would be just as logical to close the courts because inevitably, in trapping evildoers, some innocent people are bound to be hurt. In any war many innocent people are hurt. The battle now raging in America is the same struggle in which millions have been tragically hurt behind the Iron Curtain. The present onslaught against our liberties is plotted by the same blustering tyrant who with perfidy stabbed the brave Hungarian fighters.

The clamor of a tiny minority to turn off the revealing light of Government investigation, which sends infiltraters scurrying to the cowardly refuge of the fifth amendment, makes one question the appraisals of otherwise reputable Americans. Certainly, those who are cognizant of the facts of the present day, when communism is winning in most of the world, wonder, in the name of Americanism, why there are those willing to add their names to those of known Judas Americans instead of taking the honored word of J. Edgar Hoover who, to all the invisible battalions of subversion, is as terrible as an army with banners. Instead of extinguishing the light under the white dome, more rays ought to be turned on in every section of our Nation now under attack.

There can be no compromise with this godless system whose victory would bring in an ethical and moral ice age. One of these systems is going down. The world cannot remain half slave and half free. We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord with a sword bathed in heaven.

While this foul system, to keep its subjects in the darkness of ignorance, may jam the "Voice of America," it cannot finally jam the voice of God's truth.

God pity any American who in some future day of victory for divine verities against the Devil's falsehood shall deserve the blistering scorn of that historic sentence in a letter of Henry IV to a supposed supporter who was not in sight when the crucial battle was fought. Said the King to the absentee, "Hang yourself, brave Crillon. We fought at Arques, and you were not there."

COUNTERFEIT DRUG TRAFFIC IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on January 17, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and I introduced Senate Resolution 42, calling for a complete and thorough investigation of the counterfeit drug traffic in the United States. This resolution is now pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and I am sure that the Senate as a whole will agree with Senator GOLDWATER and me that immediate action should be taken by the Senate Labor Committee pursuant to this resolution. Since introduction of this resolution, numerous groups and individuals have contacted me concerning it. Among these is the American Pharmaceutical Association, which in a letter of January 19 strongly emphasized its concern over the counterfeit drug traffic and of the strong desire of its members to support adoption of adequate State and Federal laws and regulatory policies to cope with this problem. May I at this time urge the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to give this problem the earliest possible consideration. I am confident that American druggists and drug manufacturers will cooperate wholeheartedly in a thorough review of the counterfeit drug traffic and assist in the framing of any appropriate legislation which this study suggests.

Further, I must again emphasize the danger to the health of the American people. Effective action against counterfeit drugs must be taken before tragic circumstances result from the activities of those unscrupulous persons who place their own financial gain over the welfare of their fellow citizens.

As part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by the American Pharmaceutical Association on this subject be included in the RECORD, together with an article from the August 1960 issue of the American Pharmaceutical Association Journal entitled "Adulteration, Misbranding, and Illicit Drug Traffic," a resolution adopted by the association concerning counterfeit drugs and finally, a copy of a news release issued by the association on this same subject, dated October 13, 1960.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN
PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
January 19, 1961.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The American Pharmaceutical Association has for 109 years aided in establishing drug standards and preventing adulteration and misbranding of drugs. Alert to all new threats of drug adulteration, the American Pharmaceutical Association at a special meeting in January 1960, as well as of its house of delegates meeting last March, focused the attention of the health professions and governmental agencies on unorthodox drug operations. Subsequently, at its annual meeting in August 1960, the association adopted a resolution (copy enclosed) asking Federal and State authorities to "increase their efforts to detect and eliminate counterfeit drug operations."

In August 1960 the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association presented the first pictorial report about an actual counterfeit operation (tear sheet enclosed). In its news release of October 13 (copy enclosed) the association emphasized the Federal Food and Drug Administration's alert to pharmacists across the country to report suspicious drug marketing practices which may indicate the distribution of counterfeit drugs. Consistent with its policy, the association pledged cooperation to the fullest extent with agencies of the U.S. Government and similar agencies of the States in detecting and eliminating drug counterfeiting.

As one facet of unorthodox drug operations, the problem of drug counterfeiting requires an objective reporting of facts, a critical analysis of those facts, and after careful deliberation, implementation of specific remedial measures. Unfortunately, because the drug counterfeiting problem offers an opportunity for journalistic sensationalism, certain ill-conceived publicity gimmicks have already developed.

In this connection, the American Pharmaceutical Association recently refused to endorse or participate in what has been described to pharmacists by its creators as "a multimillion-dollar public relations program which will benefit your profession and help your business." This program offered by a self-appointed three-man committee (National Committee Against Counterfeit Drugs) promises new safeguards against a multimillion-dollar racket that now threatens the health of every American. The American Pharmaceutical Association rejected the program and the free publicity which would have brought the association to the attention of an estimated 11 million readers. The association's position on this matter was epitomized in a release dated December 27.

Among the reasons for the association's decision not to endorse this commercial program are the following:

The license issued by a pharmacy board to a pharmacist is certification of that individual's professional competency and integrity.

In many areas, use of a certification seal could be construed as an assertion of professional superiority, an unethical method of soliciting business, or an inference that pharmacists who do not possess the seal either engage in or are indifferent to objectionable pharmaceutical practices.

Any agreement and pledge entered into under such a certification plan in which a participant agrees not to break the law by engaging in counterfeiting adds nothing since the individual is already charged to obey the law. Persons engaging in counterfeit drug activities violate numerous Federal and State criminal and civil laws.

Those interested in promoting public health should work for adequate pharmacy laws. In this way, the public may be protected against the lack of pharmaceutical standards and against all types of economic deceptions. For continuous supervision and control, it is to the enactment of laws which give power, personnel and permanence to State and Federal regulatory boards that we must give our attention.

We recognize that you are concerned with the possibility that some person in this country may fail to follow his doctor's orders or neglect to take prescribed medication as a result of questionable, untimely, and wasteful publicity efforts of the type rejected by the American Pharmaceutical Association. You can depend on our continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. APPLE,
Secretary.

ADULTERATION, MISBRANDING AND ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC

Imagine, if you can, pharmaceutical houses using the following procedures in manufacturing drugs for the protection of public health.

Imagine enterprising men renting the top floors of a condemned building (away from the public eye), furnishing the area with tableting presses and producing a few drugs by generic name.

But, in addition to these drugs, picture these men producing many other drug articles. Their idea is to make them look exactly like items manufactured by reputable firms.

If you can project your imagination far enough you will realize that the least of this organization's worries are sanitary conditions, quality controls or actual content of the resulting bogus products. Then picture the hiring of "jobbers" to sell these products as "discount" priced repackaged samples.

An important element of this operation is a manually operated elevator. This can be easily lowered to admit friends to the field of operation. (If someone looks unfriendly, the elevator stays where it is.)

This whole fantastic scheme actually worked (reaping a reported $50,000 monthly) in New Jersey. Presumably, no State drug inspector could possibly gain entrance.

But one day in June, the nightmarish operation ended when New Jersey drug inspectors and representatives of firms whose drugs were being counterfeited watched their chance and managed to get on the elevator belonging to the General Pharmacal Co., of Hoboken, N.J.

Access was achieved when a familiar individual rang for the elevator. When it reached the ground floor, a host of detectives swarmed into the elevator.

The undoing of the scheme actually began several months ago when personnel of the New Jersey Bureau of Food and Drugs learned from complaints filed by reputable companies that counterfeit drug products were apparently emanating from a source in New Jersey and were appearing in New York, Missouri, Illinois, Florida, and other parts of the United States. They bore the same name and trademark as the legitimate products but the ingredients were not identical.

Because the offense involved more than drug adulteration and misbranding, Roscoe P. Kandle, State commissioner of health, notified Attorney General David D. Furman. State police were assigned to investigate.

Investigators said New Jersey was chosen for the operation because the State does not require the licensing of wholesale drug manufacturers as many other States do.

"A drug manufacturer who has to get a license would have to live up to much more stringent requirements and he would expect periodic examinations of his premises," one official of the State said.

Companies whose products were being counterfeited were Ciba Pharmaceuticals Corp., Schering Corp., Warner-Chilcott, Wallace Laboratories, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Smith Kline & French, and Wyeth Laboratories.

These companies have made every effort to assure the public and pharmacy that drugs purchased through legitimate and reputable pharmacy channels in regular sealed packages are genuine products.

For example, Schering Corp. has sent a letter to pharmacists throughout the country explaining the situation. The Schering letter warns that "even though the General Pharmacal Co. has been padlocked, there still may be substantial quantities of counterfeit tablets being peddled around the country in various bulk, unlabeled packages, often under the guise of 'repacked samples' or 'distress merchandise'."

It asks pharmacists to help locate bootleg merchandise by contacting the corporation if anyone offers to sell unlabeled tablets as genuine products.

To this request Apha adds its own emphasis. It urges pharmacists to continue to protect the public health by exposing such illicit drug distribution methods.

The association also reminds each pharmacist that regardless of his personal knowledge and intent, or responsibility of others, each pharmacist is independently liable under law for using any adulterated or misbranded product. This fact underscores the important professional task placed upon the pharmacist as purchasing agent for any pharmacy and its personnel. Apha urges the employment of only orthodox systems of drug procurement and cautions against bargain offerings.

RESOLUTION ON COUNTERFEIT DRUGS

Whereas reports indicate that there are quantities of counterfeit drugs being manufactured in this country under the most deplorable insanitary conditions and with little or no quality and production controls; and

Whereas such practices represent a most serious threat to public health, since such products are finding their way into channels of distribution; and

Whereas such practices seriously damage the reputation of responsible pharmaceutical manufacturers whose procedures are rigidly controlled by their own high exacting standards: Be it

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association condemn such illegal and dangerous counterfeiting practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association strongly urge all appropriate Federal and State authorities to increase their efforts to detect and eliminate these operations, which are definitely threats to the health of our Nation.

[From the American Pharmaceutical Association News]

APHA-FDA ALERT PHARMACISTS ON MARKETING OF COUNTERFEIT DRUGS

The Food and Drug Administration today warned pharmacists across the country to be alert for suspicious drug marketing practices which may indicate the distribution of counterfeit drugs. FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick suggests that the community pharmacist should "insist upon receiving his drugs only in original, sealed manufacturer's packaging," and asked for "immediate communication with the nearest FDA district office when a pharmacist suspects that he has been offered counterfeit merchandise."

In August, the American Pharmaceutical Association urged the employment of only orthodox systems of drug procurement and cautioned against bargain offerings in revealing the inside, pictorial story of the raid on the General Pharmacal Co. in Hoboken, N.J.

Both Apha and FDA have emphasized the serious threat to the public health by such illicit drug traffic. Larrick observed that "even though a particular batch of a counterfeit drug may have the same strength and purity of the drug it counterfeits, the counterfeiting of drugs is contrary to the public interest and is in violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act." Furthermore Larrick noted, "it could undermine the fundamental control over the safety and efficacy of drugs."

Apha Secretary William S. Apple had previously reminded pharmacists that regardless of the pharmacists personal knowledge and intent, each pharmacist is independently liable under law for using any counterfeit drug.

The FDA warning resulted from an intensive survey which has been going on for several weeks to probe the extent of the counterfeiting practice. FDA observes that while drug counterfeiting has existed for some years, the survey now nearing completion indicates that it may be on the increase. Thus far a seizure of counterfeit drugs in possession of Discount Drugs in Washington, D.C., had resulted, and there is evidence that drugs from the same counterfeiter have been sold in other cities in the East, South, and Midwest.

The American Pharmaceutical Association has pledged full cooperation to the Food and Drug Administration in detecting and eliminating drug counterfeiting, and many State and local pharmaceutical associations are giving wide distribution to the reprint of the Apha warnings which were first published in the August 1960 issue of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition. Copies of the attached reprint are available from Apha at $12.50 per thousand.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on January 22 "Meet the Press" had as its guest Dean James M. Landis who, as we all

know, possesses both information and opinions about the Federal regulatory process.

Dean Landis speaks and writes colorfully and vigorously on matters that inevitably will be coming to us for legislative attention. His appearance on "Meet the Press" inspired a probing discussion of regulatory reform which can usefully be read by all of us who did not happen to see the program.

The particular exchange should go far to quiet the fears of those who think Dean Landis, as special assistant to the President, might upset or erode the independence of the independent agencies. One of the reporters asked him:

Mr. VANOCUR. Mr. Landis, if you in the office you are going to have in the White House, call up a regulatory agency and say "I am interested in dispatching this case, why hasn't it been dispatched?" how is this different from what Sherman Adams did on behalf of Bernard Goldfine? Just the fact of your calling?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I wouldn't call about a particular case. I would certainly take up a problem and say, "This problem is not being handled." There are too much in the way of backlogs here, but to deal with an individual case I think would be treacherous and I think I would completely lose any influence I might have if I ever did a thing of that nature.

In short, independence of decision is fine, but general slothfulness and disorganization is not—and I think that is what Dean Landis will be getting at.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Landis' remarks on "Meet the Press" be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE PRESS

(Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak)

Moderator: Ned Brooks.

Guest: James M. Landis, special assistant to the President.

Panel: Anthony Lewis, New York Times; Sander Vanocur, NBC news; David Wise, New York Herald Tribune; and Lawrence E. Spivak, regular panel member.

Mr. BROOKS. This is Ned Brooks inviting you to "Meet the Press."

Our guest today is Mr. James M. Landis, recently appointed by President Kennedy to supervise the reorganization of the Government's regulatory agencies. Asking the questions today on "Meet the Press" are Anthony Lewis of the New York Times, Sander Vanocur of NBC news, Davis Wise of the New York Herald Tribune, and Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

* * * * *

Mr. BROOKS. One of President Kennedy's first moves after his election was to start a far-reaching examination of the Government's regulatory agencies. The activities of these agencies reach into a great segment of private industry such as the fixing of railroad fares, the licensing of television, safety in the air. To conduct this study, Mr. Kennedy appointed Mr. James M. Landis, a man of long experience in this field of Government.

Soon after Mr. Landis submitted his report sharply criticizing a number of the agencies, he was appointed by Mr. Kennedy to direct a vast reorganization. Mr. Landis' experience with these agencies began in 1933 when he became a member of the Federal Trade Commission. He later served as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. For 9 years he was the dean of the Harvard Law School.

We will start the questions today with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Landis, I believe you said recently the reorganization of the regulatory agencies might be the key to the national growth problem. In what way could it be the key to the national growth problem in your judgment?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I think as Mr. Brooks pointed out, that they move into almost every phase of our economic life and their ability efficiently to dispatch their business is, I would say, vital to our economic growth.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, would your plan to reorganize the agencies increase or decrease freedom in our free enterprise system?

Mr. LANDIS. I wouldn't say that I would have one objective or the other in mind. It is rather the efficient dispatch and if they need a little power here maybe you would give it to them. Or if they don't need some power, you might take it away from them, but there is no desire to increase regulation for the sake of regulation.

Mr. SPIVAK. There is no desire or intent to increase paperwork or increase regulations in any way?

Mr. LANDIS. No, I wouldn't say so. Quite to the contrary.

Mr. SPIVAK. One question on one specific agency: During the campaign President Kennedy said "I think the policies of the Federal Reserve Board have been partly responsible for the economic slowdown."

Now is the Federal Reserve Board one of the independent agencies which you are planning to reorganize in any way?

Mr. LANDIS. No, I wouldn't say the Federal Reserve Board was within the scope of, shall I say, my mandate, because that is a matter of fiscal policy more than anything else that is involved there.

Mr. SPIVAK. However, if you get for the President a general right to reorganize, would he also be able to reorganize the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes, he would.

Mr. SPIVAK. So that if you got a certain kind of law he would have that power?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. WISE. Well, Mr. Landis, one of the problems in these agencies as your report points out is the question of White House interference. Now you have proposed to set up an office in the White House to watch these agencies. Wouldn't that be giving official approval to the very sort of meddling and interference that your report deplores and which Congress has investigated?

Mr. LANDIS. That is not an easy question to answer.

Mr. WISE. It wasn't meant to be easy.

Mr. LANDIS. Because as you know I pointed out in the report over and over again that White House interference in the disposition of cases before these agencies was a very bad thing. But White House influence in trying to see that they dispatch their business is a duty of the President under the Constitution.

Mr. WISE. Well, how would you be able to draw a line between interfering in the disposition of cases and simply urging them to hurry up and dispose of them?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I think you could easily draw that line, if the White House doesn't say "Dispose of them in this manner." It is not like, say, what happened in the Dixon-Yates matter or something of that nature. It is simply a desire to get them disposed of and move along. For example, take the field of natural gas regulation. You have tremendous backlogs there. The important thing is that something should be done to clear up these backlogs and to get regulation working in that field.

Mr. VANOCUR. Mr. Landis, if you in the office you are going to have in the White House, call up a regulatory agency and say "I am interested in dispatching this case, why hasn't it been dispatched?" how is this different from what Sherman Adams did on behalf of Bernard Goldfine? Just the fact of your calling?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I wouldn't call about a particular case. I would certainly take up a problem and say "This problem is not being handled." There are too much in the way of backlogs here, but to deal with an individual case I think would be treacherous, and I think I would completely lose any influence I might have if I ever did a thing of that nature.

Mr. VANOCUR. Mr. Landis, knowing the way I——

Mr. LANDIS. Incidentally, my office is not going to be in the White House. It is in the Executive Office of the President, which is across the street.

Mr. VANOCUR. That is a short walk.

Mr. Landis, knowing the way our society is constructed politically, what is so bad about political influence in the regulatory agencies? If you have a case that is not being dispatched with the quickness you would like it to be, what would be wrong as a private citizen going to your Representative or going to your Senator and saying "I want action on this case. I have been hamstrung for 4 years now"?

Mr. LANDIS. I don't think that is too bad. I think if the Representative interfered and would say "Look, favor this man in the disposition of that case," then I think you are crossing the line.

Mr. VANOCUR. Yes, but a chairman of an important Senate committee calls a regulatory agency chairman and says "I am interested in this case." Doesn't that create an undue political——

Mr. LANDIS. Well, if he says "I am interested in the disposition of this case and it seems to me you have been neglectful in handling the business," I can't see anything too wrong about that.

Mr. VANOCUR. But aren't commission chairmen and members responsive, perhaps, to calls from important Senators and Congressmen?

Mr. LANDIS. I don't think so, too much. Of course a weak man is always responsive to a thing of that nature. But I think a strong man is not responsive to that. On the other hand, I think he can be criticized if he doesn't see that the business for which he is responsible is being dispatched.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Landis, isn't there more involved here really than merely clearing up backlogs? Aren't there policy questions? You mentioned the natural gas situation, for example, and your report is really scorching on that and suggests as I read it that some of the present members of the Federal Power Commission should have been removed from office.

But suppose a Federal Power Commissioner sincerely feels that gas prices are too low and that the Commission should not act. And in your view of the agencies he is independent. What can or should the President be able to do with a theoretically independent member who feels that way?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, do you take the position that he feels there should be no regulation?

Mr. LEWIS. That he feels the slow pace of existing regulation is correct and that gas prices are too low and should be allowed to go up.

Mr. LANDIS. Then he is not doing his duty under the Natural Gas Act. It is his function under the Natural Gas Act to place a maximum on prices in particular fields.

Now if he believes he shouldn't be doing that, he should resign.

Mr. LEWIS. Of course I have given an extreme example, but isn't it true again and again there are going to be questions of policy in which the President or you may feel that wisdom suggests one course and

the agency members sincerely feel that another course is desirable and aren't you then going to be breaking down their independence if you tell them "Gentlemen, you are not doing your duty, and unless you do it, I shall have to remove you"?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, of course you can hit a hypothetical situation of that nature, but it is the function of the agencies to dispose of the business according to their conceptions, not according to the President's conceptions, and certainly not according to mine.

They have an adjudicatory function like a judge in a situation of this nature. But I have never heard that, for example, the administrative office of the United States Courts, because it sort of rides herd on the disposition of business by U.S. judges, influences their decisions.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Landis, some of your reform program is going to have to be acted on by Congress. Do you have any idea what proportion of your entire overall program will require congressional action?

Mr. LANDIS. I wouldn't be able to estimate that at this time. I think quite a bit of it will. For example, I have suggested that the Federal Trade Commission should be strengthened by having the power to issue interlocutory cease-and-desist orders. Now that can't be done except by congressional action. And just how the Congress would react to a proposal of that nature, I wouldn't know.

Mr. BROOKS. Do you anticipate any resistance by Congress to measures which might interfere with some of the powers that Congress now exercises over these agencies?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes, I do. I do. I think if it can be established that it is wise to do this in the public interest, that that resistance would tend to vanish.

The trouble is that neither the Congress—and in the last few years I don't think the Office of the President—has been too conscious of what the deficiencies are. I think if the deficiencies are established that then the congressional resistance that might otherwise be in existence will tend to disappear.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Landis, can you make any major changes by Presidential order in the agencies?

Mr. LANDIS. If what is known as the General Reorganization Act is passed—and a bill to that effect is already in the Senate sponsored by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Organizations—if that bill is passed then the President has authority to file reorganization plans which have the effect of law provided they are not vetoed by either House of Congress within 30 or 60 days before they are filed. I forget whether it is 30 days or 60 days.

Mr. SPIVAK. Suppose you get no law at all, though, what can you do now on Presidential order; can you do much in the way of reorganizing?

Mr. LANDIS. No, you can't do much, especially with the independent agencies. You could, of course, in the executive departments, but not otherwise.

Mr. SPIVAK. Even if Congress gives you the law that you want, do you think you can do much of the job if some of the present Chairmen and some of the present Commissioners remain in their jobs?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I think you can. You will always have the infiltration of new blood in there and it may be that for a time you will have some of the old blood which is not too fertile, but one man can spark an agency. One good man can spark an entire agency. If you have two good men, why it is easier to spark that agency.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you be able under your reorganization plan if Congress allows it to go through, would you be able to get rid of any of your Chairmen and any of your Commissioners?

Mr. LANDIS. No. You can't do that. You can move their functions from one agency to another, or you can transfer the functions of—some of the functions, we will say of the Commission, to the Chairman. That can be done, but you can't get rid of men who have tenure.

Mr. WISE. Well, Mr. Landis, your report does not favor, if I interpret it correctly, the disclosure by regulatory agency Commissioners of secret contacts made with them.

Now do you really feel that it would be too much of a burden for the Commissioners, if such a contact is made, to place a record of that contact in the public file, and do you feel that the public has the right to know what is going on?

Mr. LANDIS. I feel that the public has a right to know, but the procedure in doing that, nobody has yet discovered a wise procedure. Suppose you make a contact with me, or I think you make a contact with me. Shall I in an ex parte manner describe that contact and place it in the public files? That is really ex parte presentation.

Mr. WISE. Well, if you don't have any provision for disclosure, how will the public know that I have gone to you, or that anyone has gone to you?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, the public would have to trust me as a public official. That either you have gone to me and it is negligible, it has no influence whatever—that is what happens today. It happens in courts. It happens elsewhere. This theory that there must be a disclosure of every kind of little contact, I don't think it sits too well. Especially if you allow me to actually defame your character by giving an ex parte presentation of what I allege you said to me.

Mr. VANOCUR. Judge Landis, the agencies now have a majority of the power of the party that is in power. The Democrats, I take it, go into a majority when they come into power. Now you talked about one good man sparking an agency. Since these agencies do control vast sectors of our society, and since a President comes into office with what he conceives to be a mandate from the people to advance the programs which his party has put before the electorate in the election, why not abolish this rule and just go ahead and appoint completely the membership from a party that is in power, wouldn't you expedite things?

Mr. LANDIS. I don't think so. I think you get a sort of a bipartisan viewpoint still in the agencies. They are in a sense agencies less of the executive branch than they are of the legislative branch, and your legislature is divided in a bipartisan way, the majority controls, and the theory of the commissions, especially of the independent commissions, is to carry out that concept.

I think it is very good to have dissent every now and then, even on political grounds.

Mr. VANOCUR. You use the word "independent agencies." They are not independent of anyone, really. They are not independent of Congress, they are not independent of the executive. There are enormous pressures on these people.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, the theory of the independent agency is that there is a tenure—each of the members of that agency has a definite tenure—5 years, 7 years, 9 years, or even 14 years in the case of the Federal Reserve Board. That is the theory of the independent agency.

I quite agree with you that they are not not fully independent. They depend for their appropriations on Congress, they depend for their legislation on Congress. Their appointments are made by the President. The Bureau of the Budget controls their budgets, so they are not fully independent in that sense, but they are supposed to be independent in the sense that the Commissioners are to decide things as they think wise and not as some member of the executive branch may tell them.

Mr. VANOCUR. On this subject of pressure, do you deem it as right in this political society for a man to be involved in an industry which has some connection with a Senate committee or a congressional committee that has great influence over the sector of the economy?

Mr. LANDIS. I have been disturbed by some instances of that that have happened on the national scene. It is very difficult to say to a man that you must give up your industrial connections if you want to serve, we'll say, on the Communications Subcommittee of the House, and let's say he has a radio station or a television station—things like that have occurred. But some of these committees have such a large jurisdiction that it is hard to put down any flat rule.

Mr. LEWIS. On this question of the independence of the agencies, Mr. Landis, as you know there is a viewpoint in conflict with yours, expressed by Mr. Hector, the former Civil Aeronautics Board member, that this independence is a bad idea and that the President should run these matters and have responsibility for them just as he does the vast operations of the Defense or Agriculture Departments or anything of that kind.

You mention in your report, for example, the inability of the Communications Commission to arrange a system for more television channels in more cities.

What hope do you have under the present system of a board of many members who can not agree, that that will ever be solved? Shouldn't it be transferred to the President, that kind of decision?

Mr. LANDIS. I don't think so. I simply disagree on that because I don't know what decisions would fall within the category of those that the Executive should decide on his own and those that are also policymaking which the Commissioners as a Commission should decide. I can't draw that line.

Now Mr. Hector thinks there is a line there, but I would suggest that he might write it into a bill and see if he can discover the line.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Landis, it is pretty commonly accepted that the Food and Drug Administration has done a good job in protecting the consumer against mislabeling and misbranding of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Why do you want to transfer its authority to the Federal Trade Commission which hasn't done quite so good a job in handling the advertising end of it?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I didn't say it should be transferred to the Federal Trade Commission except and unless there was proof that the Federal Trade Commission could do that job.

Some people have thought that what I had in mind was that the personnel of the Federal Trade Commission would be utilized to handle the work now handled by the Food and Drug Administration. Quite the contrary is true. You have an overlapping jurisdiction.

Now you take the Food and Drug Administration, for example. Up until 1953 it was in the Department of Agriculture. It was moved over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But that didn't mean that the functions were destroyed or the powers destroyed or even the personnel changed to a great degree. But it fitted in better with the work of that Department than it did with the work of the Agriculture Department, and I think this existence of this overlapping jurisdiction between the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration is an unfortunate thing—it is a case of overregulation, in my judgment.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, would you say though that the Federal Trade Commission has done a good enough job today of policing false

advertising claims on food, drugs and cosmetics to give it this other jurisdiction? Why not move it the other way?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, either way. I don't think I can be definitive and say—but the trouble with moving the work of the Federal Trade Commission into the Food and Drug Administration is that there is so much of the deceptive advertising that is outside the Pure Food and Drugs Act that could not be handled elsewhere that you would have to leave the Federal Trade Commission with that jurisdiction which still would be somewhat overlapping.

Mr. SPIVAK. But wouldn't it be a mistake though to take it from an agency now that has done a very good job of protecting the consumer and risk that protection by switching it the other way? Which is what you proposed.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, I should think if you have an adequate Federal Trade Commission, the work of the Pure Food and Drug Administration could be done there, and more cheaply there than keeping it apart.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Landis, you said before you don't want regulation for the sake of regulation, but don't we really have a good deal of that now? The ICC has to give its approval to anybody who wants to run an interstate truck. Don't we really have a great deal too much small detailed regulation?

Mr. LANDIS. I think we do. As I pointed out in the natural gas field, for example, you might get rid of hundreds of those cases, even thousands of those cases by simply tossing aside the necessity for trying to regulate the production costs of small wells, where the law of supply and demand is perfectly sufficient to control that.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Landis, I would like to get back to this question of why backdoor contacts with Commissioners can't be placed in the record.

Now in October during the campaign, Mr. Kennedy in Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio, made a speech in which he urged that there be no political pressure or requests originating within the executive branch or the legislative branch—and now I am quoting him—"unless that communication is made a part of the record and every party at interest is given a chance to reply."

Now apparently the President is for disclosure of such communications and you are not, is that correct?

Mr. LANDIS. No, I wouldn't say that. I am for it, but I haven't yet quite seen anybody develop a procedure that is safe in this connection. And I, for example, might regard a communication of yours as being an effort to influence me, where, on the other hand, you would have no such idea.

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, we have about a minute and a half.

Mr. Vanocur——

Mr. VANOCUR. Judge Landis, do you intend, in this office that you are going to assume or have assumed now, to interest yourself in the affairs of the Federal Aviation Agency which is a noncommercial agency?

Mr. LANDIS. I would be interested in the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency because the FAA and the CAB are very close together and if you are trying to deal with transportation policy as a whole, the FAA is a very, very important agency in that connection.

Mr. VANOCUR. Well, you are exercising, then, political control over an agency.

Mr. LANDIS. With the FAA?

Mr. VANOCUR. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, the FAA is an agency which theoretically is not an independent agency.

As you know, General Quesada is leaving now and Najeeb Hallaby is the new FAA Administrator. That is a natural thing. That happens in the FAA. It doesn't necessarily happen in other agencies.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Landis, you were recently quoted as saying that Government regulation is so important today because if regulation fails, there is only one answer: socialism or Government ownership.

Now most of us think it is just the other way around. If you get too much regulation you move toward socialism.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, of course there are socialistic trends in our life. Today it is quite a different economy that we have than we had 25 years ago, but I still believe that we must make regulation work as well as we can in order to avoid the necessity for a sort of a dictatorship on the part of the Government.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, gentlemen, I am sorry to interrupt but I see that our time is up.

Thank you very much, Mr. Landis, for being with us. I will be back with you in just a moment. First, this message.

* * * * *

The ANNOUNCER. For a printed copy of today's discussion send 10 cents in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Merkle Press, 809 Channing Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Mr. BROOKS. Next week "Meet the Press" will have as its guest another headline figure in the news. And now this is Ned Brooks saying goodby for Mr. James M. Landis and "Meet the Press."

RABBI LANDMAN

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the clergyman who offered the prayer in the Senate this morning, Rabbi Max M. Landman, of Temple Beth El, West Palm Beach, Fla., was formerly a resident of Evansville, Ind., and Rabbi of Temple Adath Israel of that city.

Rabbi Landman has devoted many years of faithful service in the field of Jewish religious teachings. I wish to call particular attention to the great sacrifice his family has made to the world. His brother, Hermann Landman, was a resident of Germany. Rabbi Max M. Landman, who offered the prayer in the Senate this morning, came to the United States at the age of 12. His brother decided to stay in Germany. While he was there he wrote a book entitled "Gegen Kampf." He wrote the book in opposition to "Mein Kampf," the author of which book was Adolf Hitler, of course. Hermann Landman thought Hitler would be a passing phase in Germany and that he would soon leave the scene. Much to his dismay, that did not occur. The rabbi attempted to flee from Germany, but was apprehended at the Czechoslovak border and was sent to a concentration camp, where he was kept for many years.

In 1944, Rabbi Hermann Landman's brother was cremated alive under orders of Eichmann.

It is appropriate that in this day and age all of us note the great sacrifices being made by many people, that human misery still exists in the world, and that the blessings of Almighty God certainly must be looked to every day.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate very much the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We in Florida are proud to have as one of our leading citizens and churchmen Rabbi Landman. There could not be a clearer illustration of the differences between our country and countries dominated by totalitarian philosophy than the difference between the treatment given to these brothers, one in totalitarian Nazi Germany of years ago, and the other our distinguished and revered Rabbi Landman, who was with us this morning at the opening of the session.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Florida has made very appropriate remarks, and I thank him very much.

LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCES AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the New Frontier, and I have been somewhat disturbed by some aspects of it. With the two distinguished leaders of the majority present in the Chamber, I wish to say that I have a very deep feeling of frustration as a result of reading an article in the Evening Star of last Tuesday. The headline reads: "Kennedy Renders Senators Speechless."

If the New Frontier has that effect on my friend HUBERT HUMPHREY, who is well known for his ability to speak on any subject, at any time, and on my friend MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader, I am a little disturbed. I quote from the article:

> Eight unnaturally quiet Democrats filed out of the White House this morning after their first legislative meeting with their new leader.
>
> There was no happy chat about how nice it was to be back. The new order on the New Frontier, it appears, will be no comment from the President's Tuesday morning visitors.

When the Republicans had an occupant in the White House, each morning, after the legislative conference, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, came out of the White House and made a report, and we received reports here in the Senate. Therefore, I am a little disturbed to read that these two able and distinguished Members of the Senate have been rendered speechless. I do not know the names of their other associates at the conference. The news article does not list all of them. Apparently there is secrecy about even the persons attending. I am disturbed that all eight should be rendered completely speechless on the first morning of a legislative conference at the White House.

It is of concern to the Senate, I am sure. Certainly it is of concern to me. I express the hope that just a little information on these legislative conferences will trickle through to us in the future.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether the new slogan will be "Clear With Pierre."

Mr. BRIDGES. Well, I believe from what happened he will make the announcements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the regular order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased that I have this opportunity to make a casual observation upon the profound thoughts of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I believe it is only fitting and proper that we should make some explanation.

First of all, the New Frontier is characterized by what are called frontiersmen. When one is a frontiersman, he is a man of action.

We have just come out of the era of public relations. We have had 8 years of that era, characterized by words and words, and images and images. Most of us are somewhat conformists, so we fitted into the pattern.

We are now entering a period which we call the New Frontier. This will be an era of achievement, not an era of public relations. The era of achievement will be characterized by action, action, and action.

When we met at the White House, I want my esteemed colleague from New Hampshire to know, the leadership qualities of the President were so manifest and so obvious that there was really no need for comment from those of us who shared his views. We walked away fully assured that all was well; that the state of the Union was good.

This will be the period of wonders. Already, consider what has happened. Why say too much? First of all, the strike in New York was settled. The fliers have been released from the Soviet Union. The hungry people are being fed. We even talk in the spirit of New Frontiersmen. We have piracy on the high seas, taking us back to those days when men were men, and women were proud of it. [Laughter.]

There was one further wonder. The Senator from Minnesota was quiet. I thought the Senator from New Hampshire would be most happy about that. [Laughter.]

I try to be considerate. I want to do whatever I can, in a bipartisan spirit, to accommodate not only the President of the United States, but also the worthy, honorable, and loyal opposition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has not the Senator forgotten one thing: That people from Minnesota, when they come to Boston, look so well to do and look so encouraging that their names are used to sign a lot of worthless checks by fraudulent people, who are aware of the confidence in which gentlemen from Minnesota are held?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is a delightful and wonderful statement on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts. The people of Boston accept a man from Minnesota even if he is not, in fact, from Minnesota, but says he is from Minnesota. That is a bond; it is a gold certificate of acceptance.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is one problem which confronts all of us who represent States which have large urban centers.

That problem is one of urban deterioration and slums which are a blight upon our large communities. It is a problem which must be solved if we are to realize the potentials of our cities.

Some of our States have begun to tackle this problem in earnest. One of them is Connecticut, whose senior Senator [Mr. BUSH], has taken an active role in attacking this problem.

Mr. President, one of the major tasks first undertaken by Senator BUSH when he entered the Senate was that of urban renewal and slum clearance. His interest has never flagged.

Recently Senator BUSH made a comprehensive address on this subject at a luncheon before the Conference on Economic Development and Urban Renewal in Connecticut, sponsored by the Connecticut Urban Renewal Association, Yale Law School. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL—THE ROAD AHEAD

(Remarks prepared by U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH for delivery at a luncheon of the conference on "Economic Development and Urban Renewal in Connecticut," sponsored by the Connecticut Urban Renewal Association, Yale Law School, Tuesday, December 20, 1960)

I regard it a distinct privilege to have this opportunity to talk with friends of urban renewal in Connecticut, and especially with those active workers in the field who perform the difficult, often trying day-to-day tasks involved in translating urban renewal plans into reality in communities throughout our State.

I have had a deep interest in the success of the national urban renewal program ever since I entered the Senate, and have been anxious that the towns and cities of Connecticut, large and small, have full opportunity to share in its benefits to the maximum extent.

One of the first major tasks undertaken by the Senate's Committee on Banking and Currency, to which I was assigned when I entered the Senate, was to take a close, hard look at the slum clearance program of the Housing Act of 1949.

This resulted in extensive revision of the law in the Housing Act of 1954 which introduced the concept of urban renewal and redevelopment and injected new vitality into the national effort to eradicate slums and make our urban communities better places in which to live, work, and play.

As some of you may recall, early in 1955, Governor Ribicoff, at my request, convened an urban renewal conference at our State Capitol at which Federal officials explained the slum clearance and urban renewal provisions of the 1954 act to municipal planning and administrative officers of communities in all parts of our State.

At that meeting, I said of the 1954 act:

"It seeks to stimulate local initiative, relies on local initiative, and offers a strong helping hand to those communities who want to help themselves in creating better living conditions."

It is as true today, as it was 5 years ago, that the success of an urban renewal program in a community depends, primarily, upon the dedicated, devoted efforts of those who, at the local level, undertake the detailed work involved. And I salute you who are engaged in that work, for I know of the frustrations which are frequently encountered, as well as the satisfactions which come from seeing a new, clean area of a community replace squalid slums.

How far have we come since the Housing Act of 1954 gave Connecticut communities a new opportunity to tackle the job of slum clearance and urban renewal?

A look at the statistics are illuminating. A total of 25 Connecticut communities—ranging in size from East Granby, with about 1,700 inhabitants, to all our major population centers—have urban renewal and redevelopment projects underway. The Federal Government has committed almost $100 million in grants to make these projects possible. Our State government has committed close to $20 million more.

When one considers that approximately $10 in private capital may be invested for each government dollar involved, it is apparent that we have a tremendous undertaking started here in Connecticut, and one which has enormous significance in terms of our economic growth.

But I do not wish to dwell on the past; instead, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on what needs to be done in the future, not only in our own State, but throughout the Nation, if urban renewal is to realize our ambitions for it.

The first point I would like to make is that State governments, generally, must take a much more active interest in the welfare of their communities.

I am proud of the pioneering work our own State of Connecticut has done in this respect. From what I have observed, we have a well-rounded program of assistance to our towns and cities in urban renewal and development—assistance in terms of dollars as well as in advice. Our Connecticut Development Commission does excellent work in planning for our smaller towns, and our general assembly has provided legislation which enables the State to share in the costs which our communities, large and small, incur in clearing land for redevelopment.

Unfortunately, only a few other States—New York and Pennsylvania are the only ones which come to mind—have similarly recognized their responsibilities in this field.

I hope that our general assembly, when it meets in January, will expand and improve upon our State programs for redevelopment.

On the national level, I am preparing legislation which I hope will give other States practical incentives to follow Connecticut's example. Looking at urban renewal and redevelopment from the national standpoint, it is essential that we see clearly where we now stand and the pitfalls we have encountered so that we may avoid them in the future. What progress do we see and where have we failed?

No one can deny that the program is a success as viewed from the standpoint of public interest and the initiation of projects. The Federal allocation of grant funds approaches $2 billion, and requests for additional assistance are being made by cities throughout the country; at present some 826 projects are underway in 464 communities.

It is natural to consider the scope and effectiveness of a program in terms of the dollar amounts involved. This is also the easiest approach and is typical of the manner in which all Federal-aid programs are publicly discussed. However, it is regrettable that so many informed people directly involved in the programs are prone to place primary emphasis on the amounts of money. This blinds our concern for problems needing our attention. When we take a more objective, businesslike, and realistic view of the urban renewal program, the need for improvement is evident.

Although the execution stage of an urban renewal project is necessarily time consuming, we cannot ignore the fact that after 11 years of the program only 40 projects have

been completed. Delays in disposition of property by the local agency form a bottleneck of increasing importance. Although the number of projects started is steadily increasing, a review of the cumulative inventory of acquired properties, compared to the volume disposed of each year, shows the delay. So does the land remaining vacant for months or even years in some urban renewal areas. During the last fiscal year, local agencies acquired 3,006 acres and disposed of 776. These delays have brought perhaps the greatest criticism of the program. And rightly so, for the vacant land reveals loss of tax revenue through the removal of the value of buildings from the tax rolls. Forcing projects into the execution stage at too rapid a rate only aggravates the problem. Land standing vacant also reveals delay in the construction of improvements which would vastly increase the tax revenue of the city. I am informed that a recent survey of 12 urban renewal projects, where improvements had been completed, showed that tax revenues are now more than four times as great as tax revenues from the same sites prior to clearance.

The relocation of displaced business and families was recognized in our original 1949 enactment as one of the major problems in urban redevelopment. It continues to be so, in spite of the admirable efforts of most communities to handle the problem with efficiency and understanding. Substantial hardship results to many of those displaced, especially businesses. Undue haste in initiating or forcing projects tends to increase these hardships.

Finally, we have witnessed failure to undertake rehabilitation or conservation or areas, on anything like the scale needed to approach real success in the entire urban renewal effort.

In looking to the future, what do these and other major problems in the program suggest to us as Members of the Congress, or to you as citizens or officials interested in improving our cities?

To me, they mean that we have neglected at the national level to undertake the basic research needed to keep abreast of the program and help find solutions when needed. This is not the fault of the executive branch. Those responsible for appropriating money in the Congress have failed to respond to requests for necessary funds to undertake basic research in housing and urban renewal matters.

I strongly urge that a portion of grant funds be made available for this research. In my opinion, the relatively small amount spent for this purpose would many times exceed in benefit its use as simply additional grant funds. I will list now questions which I believe should have priority in such a research program:

1. What are the overall urban renewal requirements of the cities of this country, in terms of Federal grants needed and the physical job to be done? Assuming all necessary Federal funds are available, how fast can cities undertake and complete the job?

Some cities have much more information on their total urban renewal needs than others, and the 1959 authorization for Federal grants for communitywide urban renewal planning should help many to develop data. But, on a national basis, information is wholly inadequate for the roughest kind of long-term planning. Even if we knew the total job, we could not determine the time it would take to complete it unless we knew the rate at which cities could effectively plan, undertake, and complete projects. This involves much more than the availability of Federal and local grant funds. It involves decisions as to areas to be cleared, and areas to be rehabilitated; it involves information as to possible ways of providing relocation housing; it involves judgments as to the possibilities of successful rehabilitation and, as to the rate at which the market can absorb land which has been cleared.

The data we have is based almost entirely upon present program operations. My good friend, Urban Renewal Commissioner David M. Walker, estimates that perhaps $300 to $350 million a year in Federal grant funds could be used effectively by communities in the years immediately ahead.

The mayors of America, through their associations, put the need at $600 million a year. Who is right? We simply don't have a solid basis for judgment.

We know that some 340 projects were in the planning stage in 1960, bringing the total approved for planning to about 1,000. However, we have little basis for determining what part of the total picture these figures represent, or how fast cities can complete the projects they are planning.

I suggest that this dilemma may be solved by authorizing a Federal capital grant level of $300 or $350 million a year for a 6-year period, but, additionally, providing flexibility by giving the President a $200 million discretionary fund which he may use as conditions require. This is another feature of the bill I now have under consideration.

2. A second question of major importance is—how can we ease the burden on displaced persons and still expedite relocation?

We have not removed all hardship to persons displaced by urban renewal, especially businesses. The $3,000 maximum authorized by Federal law for payment to a business required to move from an area may pay for only a fraction of its moving expenses. This in turn may be only a small part of the uncompensated loss of good will resulting from the customers of the business being scattered throughout the city.

Relocation is still one of the major obstacles to expediting urban renewal. The urban renewal program simply cannot move forward unless adequate provision is made for the relocation of people displaced. Displacement may occur not only when residences are demolished, but also when overcrowding is reduced or eliminated, or when substantial improvements bring the monthly rental or debt services to a higher level than the displaced persons can afford.

This involves the whole question of providing new or existing housing for these people, including FHA section 221 housing, and housing under the public housing program. We do not even have a reasonably good estimate of the number of families which we can expect to see displaced in the immediate future by urban renewal, and other Government activities. It is thought to be in the neighborhood of 90,000 families for this fiscal year, but almost no data are available on displacement by some activities such as highway construction, which may cause as much as a third of total displacement.

The section 221 program is still relatively small in comparison to the need, but it is steadily increasing in size and under it over 26,000 dwellings for displaced families have been provided, or are under construction. The new housing under this program is largely in the Southeast, as the cost of it impedes the program in other areas. There is an annual turnover in public housing of about 120,000 units, and many of these are available for eligible displaced families in cities where urban renewal is underway. However, only about half of the displaced families are eligible for public housing, and large portions of those, of course, prefer private housing.

3. A third major question which I suggest for study is this: What is the potential role of conservation and rehabilitation in our urban renewal program?

So far, we have failed to make real progress in rehabilitating or conserving existing neighborhoods which are blighted or threatened with blight, but which are definitely worth saving. This problem area is intertwined with all other problem areas in the field of urban renewal. Accelerated progress here would help in almost every other aspect of the struggle to renew our cities.

For example, to the extent that we improve existing homes instead of demolishing them, we contribute to reducing the relocation problem. Similarly, our concern over expenditures for urban renewal is lessened in that the urban renewal dollar stretches much further when used to prevent the spread of blight than it does where clearance and reconstruction have become necessary. Furthermore, the success of slum clearance and redevelopment projects will often depend on the success of conservation and rehabilitation projects in adjacent areas. It is far easier to dispose of slum-cleared land quickly and at a minimum loss when blight in surrounding areas is being arrested or eliminated.

Although many recognize that rehabilitation and conservation are essential parts of the urban renewal process, very little is in fact being done in this field.

Still there is good reason to believe that progress can be made in developing a well-organized home-rehabilitation industry. As we make concerted attempts to upgrade entire neighborhoods, we will be creating a larger scale market for the services of home rehabilitation experts.

A strengthened rehabilitation industry should be able to command better construction financing. More important, the owners should be able to command better long-term mortgage financing when entire neighborhoods are upgraded. This is so because lenders will be assured that their mortgage loan is secured by a sound structure in a sound neighborhood.

These various benefits are within reach, but they will not be attained unless much thought and study is given to the perfection, adoption, and enforcement of citywide housing codes; to the planning of neighborhoodwide conservation and rehabilitation projects; to perfecting the techniques of rehabilitating older homes; and to finding adequate sources of long-term, moderate-interest-rate mortgage credit.

A recent proposal that would be helpful in this field was incorporated in the housing bill of 1960 as reported by the Senate committee, but it did not become law. The proposal is a part of the bill I am currently drafting, and I am confident that this provision will be enacted by the incoming Congress. It would amend existing law to enable local public agencies to undertake pilot rehabilitation efforts in urban renewal projects. The local public agency would be permitted to acquire a few buildings, to rehabilitate them at project expense, and sell them to private owners. In any one project the number of buildings involved would be limited to 50 dwelling units and would be limited to 2 percent of the total dwelling units in the project area. Thus, the local public agency would in effect be undertaking experimental or demonstration projects for the benefit of owners of other properties in the area. The net cost would be shared by the Federal Government and the locality under the same two-thirds or one-third cost-sharing formula as applies to other urban renewal project costs.

4. A fourth important question which I believe warrants thorough study is: How can we speed the disposal and reuse of cleared land in urban renewal areas?

I have already referred to the long delays which have taken place in many of our cities in rebuilding slum-cleared areas. So often land has been cleared, and remains vacant for months and even years before reconstruction starts. Some of the delay may be in the sale of the land, and some may be in finding financing for the new construction.

The resulting losses are both tangible and intangible, and it is difficult to say which is the greater. The loss of tax revenues from the buildings which were torn down is measurable. It is far less easy to measure the human suffering which occurs when entire neighborhoods are prematurely demolished. Furthermore, delay tends to breed still more delay, because land remaining vacant for long periods in one project tends to discourage potential purchasers from acquiring cleared land in another project.

Better coordination among the various Federal and municipal agencies involved, and better land sales methods are important parts of the answer. However, it is even more essential that everyone concerned with urban renewal bear in mind that the tearing down process is only an incidental part of the reconstruction of our cities. From the very beginning, urban redevelopment planning should look to the market which exists for cleared land. This market in turn is determined by the market which exists for the various types of improvements which may be built on the cleared land. It is at this point that urban renewal planning merges into long-range urban and economic planning. It is also at this point that realistic project planning serves to enlarge the market for cleared land.

In the time at my disposal, I have been able to touch upon only a few of the problems I see ahead in this whole fascinating field of urban renewal and redevelopment.

When the 87th Congress convenes next month, I anticipate that much of my time will be occupied by these matters. As in former years, I will welcome any suggestions from you who, at the working level, see the need for improvements in the basic law. And I assure you that you will continue to have my full cooperation in dealing with problems which may arise in connection with your local projects.

I have enjoyed working with you in the past. I look forward to working with you in the future in building a better Connecticut.

PROHIBITION OF LOCAL PUBLIC UTILITY STRIKES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have noted, among others, three excellent editorials relating to the settlement of the New York Harbor strike. These editorials were published in the January 24 editions of the Washington Evening Star, the Tampa Tribune, and the Miami Herald. The Star editorial entitled "The Public Be Damned," well expresses the point that strikes of this type are really not labor-management disputes, but are instead strikes against the public. The Tribune editorial, entitled "Sacrifice the Bludgeon," shows how unfair such work stoppages are to the public. The Herald editorial, entitled "For a Handful of Jobs," points out that the strike issue was "a handful of jobs made unnecessary by technological progress." I believe it is obvious that the settlement which has just been reached is temporary only and gives no final relief.

Three recent public utility strikes in Florida have dramatized for our people the need for legislation to settle such disputes without suspending services vital to the average citizen. These were the bus strikes in Jacksonville and Miami and the power strike in Pensacola. In each of these, the people who suffered most were the working people, for whose benefit such extreme measures are allegedly taken.

I have introduced two bills which if enacted would protect the public against paralyzing abuses of labor power in somewhat similar cases. S. 87 would amend the National Labor Relations Act to prevent its overriding State laws regulating or prohibiting local public utility strikes. Some States, like my own, provide for the compulsory arbitration of such controversies. Other States prefer other solutions. S. 88 would provide for the compulsory arbitration of commercial airline disputes which substantially interrupt interstate commerce.

I believe the time is long past due when Congress should enact these bills and other legislation to protect the American public from such incidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 24, 1961]

THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED

If Labor Secretary Goldberg really was a "tower of strength" in settling New York's harbor strike, as claimed by his fellow Democrat, Mayor Wagner, we say more power to Mr. Goldberg. If the latter was right, however, when he said that the settlement was "fair, decent, and honorable," we have a question to ask.

If the combined Herculean efforts of Secretary Goldberg, Republican Governor Rockefeller, and Mayor Wagner were able to produce a fair settlement of this strike 2 weeks after it had begun, why was not this dispute settled at the outset? Why should 100,000 commuters be stranded and put through the wringer because 664 strikers and their employers couldn't agree on whether a tugboat should be manned by 5 crewmen?

The answer is that the public interest is being trampled on in disputes of this kind, disputes which can shut down a facility or service of vital importance to the public. It is a latter-day version of the old public-be-damned attitude. And we see nothing in the reported versions of the New York settlement which really gets down to this problem. For all the settlement does, if the news reports are right, is to postpone the issue and the fight until next December. After that, we suppose, the commuters can sweat it out all over again.

What is needed is recognition that strikes in public utilities or related industries are not really clashes between labor and management. Actually, they are strikes against the public—strikes which inflict so much punishment on the public that something finally has to give. We think that such strikes ought to be forbidden by law, and that it should be obligatory to submit such disputes to binding arbitration. The New York experience suggests, if Mr. Goldberg is right, that it is not necessary to convert the public into a whipping boy before a reasonable settlement can be reached.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Jan. 24, 1961]

SACRIFICE THE BLUDGEON

The Nation is now being treated to another sorry spectacle in which a band of willful men has been able to halt railroad traffic and virtually paralyze the economy of New York City.

Oddly enough the strikers—all 660 of them—do not work on the railroads. They are members of the Seafarers International Union and operate railroad-owned tugs, ferryboats, carfloats, and barges in New York Harbor.

Not satisfied with halting the operation of their own vessels, the strikers have thrown up picket lines around railroad terminals in New York City and Buffalo and have been able to tie up railroad traffic as far west as Cleveland and as far north as Boston. The movement of essential food and fuel for the New York metropolitan area has come to a halt and 100,000 commuters have been denied service.

Thus the economic life of a city of 8 million grinds toward a halt because of 660 men, who are arguing not over wages, but about who will have the authority to say how many workers shall be employed on each vessel.

The railroads contend that the vessels are overmanned and insist on their right to wipe out unnecessary jobs. They have, however, given assurance that no jobs will be eliminated for at least 16 months and then only if they can convince an arbitrator that the jobs are unnecessary.

But whatever the virtues of the controversy may be, we see an obvious imbalance of power when 660 men can threaten the economic lives of millions who are not a party to the dispute. Perhaps the issue has been best clarified by New York Supreme Court Justice Hamilton Ward, who ruled he had no power to halt picketing of railroad terminals in Buffalo. In appealing to President Kennedy to take a hand in halting the tieup, Justice Ward said:

"I cannot help but remark that labor-management laws have reached a sorry state in this land when a handful of union members could bring economic paralysis to the greatest city in the world, deprive its millions of railroad transportation, cut off its food and other supplies, and even interfere with the movement of the U.S. mails."

We agree. President Kennedy, who has told the American people to ask not what the country can do for them but what they can do for the country, might well ask organized labor to sacrifice the privilege of using this kind of bludgeon on the millions for the benefit of the few.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 24, 1961]

A SENSELESS STRIKE AGAINST PROGRESS—FOR A HANDFUL OF JOBS

Should tugboats operated by railroads carry crews of five men or of four men?

Believe it or not, that was the main issue in the strike against 12 eastern railroads which apparently has ended in a truce at the prodding of the Kennedy administration. The tugboats will continue to carry five men pending a report next December from a Presidential study commission.

The strike is over. We're all happy for that. Its consequences, however, are fairly frightening in a mature industrial society.

For less than a hundred jobs 664 unionized tugboat workers and flying squads of pickets threw 8,000 railroadmen out of work.

Traffic on the New York Central, the Nation's largest railroad, was suspended at once and the strike spread to other carriers. More than 100,000 commuters were stranded. New York saw its food and fuel supplies diminish as the railroad was forced to embargo freight as far off as Chicago. The first numbing signs of economic paralysis became apparent in a city already besieged by cold and snow.

All for a handful of jobs made unnecessary by technological advances.

It's futile, of course, to denounce such strikes as illegal—which we think they are—for labor laws rarely are enforced to the letter. But certainly it was a strike that lacked all logic at a time when the best minds of the Nation, labor's and management's alike, ought to be directed toward reviving a sick industry.

When a few men can tie up rail transportation over an issue of pure "featherbedding" the industry is heading for self-destruction.

We hope, therefore, that informal hearings on this subject by a commission headed by former Labor Secretary Mitchell will bring the economic peril of made-work into proper focus for both labor and management.

Mr. Mitchell's successor, Arthur J. Goldberg, was active in the strike settlement in some contradiction of the Eisenhower administration policy which discouraged Federal involvement.

Whether this was wise or not, time and the full terms of the settlement will tell.

It strikes us now that Secretary Goldberg's greatest service might come in persuading organized labor to take a less emotional attitude toward automation—which "featherbedding" tries to counteract—and realize that strikes against technological progress are senseless and costly.

This is really the great labor-management issue of the 1960's. It can be resolved for the good of labor, management, and private enterprise through patient study and thoughtful application.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ABOLISHES THE DOUBLE STANDARD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, has issued a memorandum on foreign aid which contains some recommendations which appear to me thoroughly sound.

For instance, it states that—

> The results of our present foreign aid policy indicate the futility of winning friends through indiscriminate handouts.

And, it adds:

> Indeed, the practice of trying to convert anti-U.S. regimes anad leaders through financial largess creates a perfect setup for blackmail, without the prospect of winning respect or appreciation abroad.

While the memorandum states its belief that foreign aid should and must continue, it qualifies this by saying that "it must be anchored to a new basis," and that—

> All programs of foreign aid should be controlled by a cardinal principal, viz, that recipient governments must demonstrate responsibility, and reciprocate our friendship and good will.

Mr. President, one of several reasons why I felt in conscience bound to vote against foreign aid in the 86th Congress was the dual standard which the Eisenhower administration adopted in regard to the needs of the American people and what it considered to be the requirements of foreign countries. Under that dual standard, measures presented in the Congress for housing, for education, for resource development, for aid to depressed areas, for pollution control, for medical care for our aged, and for much else were killed by veto or were watered down to inadequacy by threat of veto, whereas virtually identical projects to achieve these ends, if in foreign countries, so the Congress was told by the then occupant of the White House, were indispensable and must not be reduced by a nickel. I could not accept that philosophy, and I felt obligated to register my protest by voting against foreign aid.

Now, however, in the first week of the Kennedy administration we see a striking repudiation of the dual standard. Almost the first move by President Kennedy was to double the food allocations to American needy families, and to increase these food distributions, not merely in quantity, but also in variety.

Thereafter, President Kennedy also ordered increased food supplies to be flown to the Congo, to take care of the famine resulting there from the chaos incidental to the premature granting of independence to that wholly unprepared people. President Kennedy's concern was for the hungry men, women, and children there. But it is to be noted that President Kennedy's first move was in behalf of the people of America.

I rejoice at this evidence, by deed, that the people of the United States will henceforth, under this administration, receive at least as much consideration as will those of over 100 foreign countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to point out that the authority to move was available, and President Kennedy did move; and it is a shame that that was not done before, by his predecessor.

Mr. GRUENING. Quite so.

While there are many other conditions besides these, Mr. President, that should be attached to future foreign aid, in order to make it effective and far less wasteful than it has been in the past, much in the memorandum to which I have referred is worthy of attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum on foreign aid, prepared by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
New York, N.Y., December 21, 1960.

MEMO ON FOREIGN AID

For the past 8 years, America's position in world affairs has been trapped in the doldrums. That is why Americans are anxiously awaiting the opening of the new frontiers under the leadership of President-elect John F. Kennedy.

The challenges of the 1960's must be met with the conviction of firm belief, embodied in bold and realistic action. The main scene of the struggle is shifting to the uncommitted and newly created States of Asia and Africa. The stakes are mounting as the Soviet bid takes on new power and thrust.

The worldwide political and economic upheavals, made more complicated and dangerous by the unremitting pressure of the Communist forces, necessitate a reexamination of U.S. policies and the assumptions upon which they are based.

America can strengthen democracy in the world both through political and economic policies, but we should always act to spread freedom, and to build better lives for people—not merely to react against totalitarianism.

We need to extend foreign aid to the new countries of Africa and Asia, in a way which will encourage the development of stable, free institutions. We need to help Latin America to build a more secure economy and a better educated society. We must assist India and other neutralist countries, to the end that they may not fall prey to communism.

We must, however, avoid the errors in the foreign-aid policies of the Eisenhower administration.

The old way of reacting to every Soviet move has proven to be an albatross—limiting the possibilities of U.S. action and committing our country to essentially sterile programs. This is particularly evident in the field of foreign aid.

The results of our present foreign-aid policy indicate the futility of winning friends through indiscriminate handouts. Indeed, the practice of trying to convert anti-U.S. regimes and leaders through financial largess creates a perfect setup for blackmail, without the prospect of winning respect or appreciation abroad.

Thus, instead of gaining allies, we become more vulnerable to those who are bereft of principle and reliability. Our range for positive and effective action through foreign aid is narrowed as we become entangled in the fruitless game of outbidding our Communist adversaries for the favor of unscrupulous and untrustworthy regimes.

When we appease avowed enemies, we fool ourselves, for we only increase the intransigence and blackmailing potential of these regimes which feel assured of a steady flow of dollars, come what may.

When we appease, we tempt the waverers to emulate those who feed upon our fears and gullibility, and we demoralize the ranks of our genuine friends, thereby weakening our common front and our common cause.

The time is now ripe for an ideological switch from the defensive to the offensive. The United States must now make history instead of submitting to blind and fickle forces of world events.

The principles and practices of foreign aid, as conceived by the Eisenhower administration, will no longer do. While we must not "attach strings" to our assistance, we must defend our dignity and take a forthright stand against hate inciting propaganda, vilification, and blackmail.

Foreign aid should and must continue. However, it must be anchored to a new basis. All programs of foreign aid should be controlled by a cardinal principle, viz, that recipient governments must demonstrate responsibility, and reciprocate our friendship and good will.

We shall ony extricate ourselves from the present impasse when we learn how to distinguish between friends and implacable enemies.

By adopting and implementing this principle, we shall not only put an end to the squandering of the taxpayers' money, but we shall also rebuild our prestige and influence, and win the respect of friend and foe alike.

This principle which spells out friendship grounded on mutual good will, should be embodied in a special message to Congress by the new President. Such decisive action will electrify the world and reinvigorate the forces of freedom.

JOHN F. FITZPATRICK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several items pertaining to the death, during the congressional recess, of a man whom I regard as a truly great American, John F. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. Fitzpatrick was one of the most influential civic and business leaders in the Western United States, and I think it is fitting to call the attention of the

Senate to some of the comments made on the occasion of his passing.

Despite his great influence as publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune and as an officer of a number of companies in the mining, broadcasting, and railroad fields, he was an unusually modest man who always avoided the limelight. Time magazine noted that—

On Fitzpatrick's death the Tribune, in open defiance of the old man's longstanding order, ran his picture on page 1, thereby providing many subscribers with their first glimpse of the ungregarious Irishman who had greatly altered and immeasurably improved Utah's journalistic landscape.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's death brought forth, throughout the country, expressions of appreciation for his life and his contributions to the newspaper industry and to the West. In the words of Frank H. Bartholomew, President of United Press International:

The newspaper business has lost a strong and kindly figure and I have lost a friend of 30 years.

And in the words of Alan J. Gould, executive editor of the Associated Press:

All his many friends of the Associated Press deeply regret the death of one of our best liked and most resourceful and cooperative members. His contributions to the leadership and enterprise of American journalism were outstanding.

Throughout his life, Mr. Fitzpatrick was a lay leader of his church; and he received a papal appointment as a Knight of St. Gregory, one of the highest honors a lay member can receive from the Catholic Church. On his death, the Most Reverend Joseph Lennox Federal, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Salt Lake City, said:

The death of John F. Fitzpatrick leaves us sorrowful and filled with a sense of profound loss. All his life he had been a loyal Catholic and for a great many years he has been a strong influence for good in the diocese of Salt Lake City.

The warm feeling of friendship for Mr. Fitzpatrick held by leaders of other churches is exemplified in the following statements issued by them.

The first presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints:

It is difficult to go back far enough into the past to pick up the beginning of our relationship with Mr. John F. Fitzpatrick. Through the years, our association has ripened into a most affectionate friendship which we have every reason to believe was mutual.

The Reverend Neale E. Nelson, pastor of Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church and president of the Salt Lake Ministerial Association, said:

In the death of John F. Fitzpatrick, Salt Lake City, the State of Utah, and the Nation have suffered a grievous loss. Mr. Fitzpatrick was more than a leader of industry and publisher of a great newspaper. He was a living representative of the love of freedom upon which our Nation was founded.

In his life he demonstrated that freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion are more than phrases in the bill of rights. They were, to him, the guiding principles for his everyday relationships as a leader of this community.

Rabbi Mordecai Podet, of Temple B'nai Israel, speaking for the Jewish community of Salt Lake, said:

Salt Lake Jewry will learn with shock and regret of Mr. Fitzpatrick's passing. His fairmindedness and enterprise brought many benefits to the people of this area. These benefits survive him as a continuous and living reminder of his qualities of mind and spirit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the account of Mr. Fitzpatrick's death from the Salt Lake Tribune of September 12, 1960, together with editorials from the Salt Lake Tribune and the Deseret News of September 13, 1960. I hope Mr. Fitzpatrick's many friends in the Senate will take advantage of this opportunity to read the tributes which have been paid to him.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 12, 1960]

DEATH CLAIMS PUBLISHER OF SALT LAKE TRIBUNE—JOHN FRANCIS FITZPATRICK, 72, DIES AFTER HEART ATTACK

John Francis Fitzpatrick, 72, publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune for 36 years and a dedicated, though unpublicized, contributor to the advancement and development of the area served by the newspaper, died Sunday at 5:30 p.m. of a coronary occlusion.

Death came soon after he returned to his home at 2782 St. Mary's Way from the Salt Lake Country Club where he had been watching the Utah open golf tournament.

A publisher who regarded a newspaper as both a business and a public responsibility, he applied his talents and energies to both phases of his life's work with extraordinary concentration and effectiveness.

The depth and breadth of his activities to make Salt Lake City, Utah, and the intermountain West a better place in which to live was obscured from the public by his aversion to personal publicity.

But in the newspaper business locally and nationally, and among public and civic leaders with whom he worked, he was recognized as one of the outstanding publishers of the Nation.

His characteristic shunning of the public limelight and personal acclaim was concisely summed up in a citation for an honorary university degree:

"So carefully has he pursued anonymity, so effectively has he merged himself into groups with which he has served, that his great achievements have gone largely unheralded and unpublicized. * * * This characteristic can be attributed both to his fine sense of modesty and to his conviction that much can be accomplished if work is uninterrupted by applause."

In the Tribune organization, which he molded and which he had directed since 1924, he was both the leader and a fellow worker.

He inspired loyalty in the staff by giving a dedicated loyalty surpassing that of any of his colleagues.

His innate modesty and persistent avoidance of public recognition did not obscure his great contributions from those who worked closely with him.

His advice and counsel, objectively and conscientiously given, was frequently sought by fellow publishers, public officials, businessmen, civic leaders, and friends of all stations in life.

In his dedication to the Salt Lake Tribune, he was a zealot in the finest sense of the word. He recognized that a privately owned newspaper must succeed financially, and he made the Tribune a success.

But his overriding interest was in the newspaper as a medium of information and a constructive influence in its area of circulation.

He zealously guarded its reputation for public responsibility and fairness and just as zealously guarded against its misuse as an organ for any interest other than the public interest.

One of the most prominent lay members of the Catholic Church in the intermountain area, he was recognized for his many contributions as a churchman by papal appointment as a Knight of St. Gregory in 1948.

This is one of the highest honors a lay member can receive from the church.

A native of Pottsville, Pa., he was born January 18, 1888, a son of James Henry and Mary (Goulden) Fitzpatrick. He was graduated from the Burlington, Iowa, high school and first came to Utah in 1910 as an employee of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad.

He went to Chicago the following year to work for the Pere Marquette Railroad (now the Chesapeake & Ohio) and returned to Salt Lake City in 1913 to become secretary to the late U.S. Senator Thomas Kearns. A year later he married Eleanor F. Crawford, who survives.

Funeral services for Mr. Fitzpatrick will be conducted Wednesday at 10 a.m. in the Cathedral of the Madeleine with interment in Mount Calvary Cemetery. The family has asked that flowers be omitted.

From the time he joined Senator Kearns' staff until his death his career was one of constantly increasing responsibilities, influence, and achievement in business and community service.

He became secretary and general manager of the Kearns Corp. (now the Kearns-Tribune Corp.) in 1918, publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune in 1924, publisher of the Salt Lake Telegram in 1930 when it was acquired by the Tribune, and president of the Kearns-Tribune Corp. in 1952.

He was president of Newspaper Agency Corp. from the time it was organized in 1952 until his death.

Mr. Fitzpatrick was a stockholder in the Kearns-Tribune Corp., the balance of which is owned by the grandchildren of the late Senator Kearns.

In addition to his publishing positions, he had served as a director of various mining companies, including the Silver King Coalition Mines Co., which is now a part of United Park City Mines; a director of Radio Service Corp. (KSL); escrow trustee of the D. & R.G.W. Railroad; vice president of the Inland Daily Press Association.

At the time of his death he was a director of the D. & R.G.W. Railroad, the Hotel Utah, the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, and president of the Silver King Western Mining & Milling Co.

He was a member of the executive committee of the 1947 Utah Centennial and served on several major committees related to the war effort during World War II. He also served on the Salt Lake Recovery Committee and Utah Reemployment Committee during the depression of the thirties.

His interests were broad and varied—encompassing education, economic development of the area, government at all levels, encouragement of arts and sciences, and community betterment generally.

One of the few recreations he found time to indulge in was golf, a game he thoroughly enjoyed and stanchly supported.

A former president of the Salt Lake Country Club, he was honored for his contributions to that club and golf with a special Red and Blue Tournament September 19, 1953.

In recognition of his interest in and devoted support of higher education, he was

awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by the University of Utah in 1949 and an honorary degree of doctor of public service by Brigham Young University in 1956.

He played a leading role in planning and building the University of Utah football stadium and was one of the original trustees of the stadium trust, the organization through which the project was carried out. He was made an honorary member of the U. Men's Club of the University of Utah, and a A Men's Club of Utah State University in appreciation of his support of athletics.

He was an influential supporter of the University of Utah College of Medicine since it was founded.

A consistent advocate of improving the public and private school systems, he supported numerous programs seeking this objective, both personally and through the newspaper he published.

Only persons who worked closely with him in promoting the economic development of Utah and the intermountain area were aware of his many contributions in this field.

One example was the establishment in the State of a basic steel industry during World War II and its subsequent conversion to peacetime operation by private industry.

Another of his many public interests was the promotion of good hospital facilities for the area. One of his personal activities in this area was in the capacity of a charter member of the Lay Advisory Board of the Holy Cross Hospital.

He was a fourth degree member of the Knights of Columbus and a member of Salt Lake Country Club, Salt Lake Rotary Club, Alta Club, and Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, and an honorary colonel in the Utah National Guard.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 13, 1960]

JOHN F. FITZPATRICK—PATRIOT, PUBLISHER

This editorial, like the news story of John F. Fitzpatrick's death, violates his wishes—the first time that has happened in the many years he was publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune.

Mr. Fitzpatrick shunned personal attention and public recognition. He had, indeed, a passion for anonymity. As was once so eloquently said in the citation accompanying the award of an honorary degree, "This characteristic can be attributed both to his fine sense of modesty and to his conviction that much can be accomplished if work is uninterrupted by applause."

Yet there comes a time when rules must be broken.

And though the task is undertaken with a heavy heart, tribute from those who worked with him demands expression.

Civil, political, and religious leaders have already voiced their grief at the death of John F. Fitzpatrick. They have praised his great interest in the welfare of the community and State—his accomplishments in many fields—the value of his wise and generous counsel—his keen mind, his magnificent spirit, his patriotic devotion, his Christian gentility.

We of the Tribune organization remember him best of all as a newspaperman. For although he was active and successful in many fields, the Tribune was his abiding interest.

As a businessman, he saw to it that the newspaper remained strong and prosperous; otherwise its voice would not be heard. As publisher, he kept the Tribune in step with the times; a good newspaper must have the best and latest methods of production and distribution. And as the man who made policy, he saw to it that the Tribune was fair and factual—that its opinions were soundly grounded—that it provided leadership in the interest of everyone, not just a favored few.

If one department could be called distinctly Mr. Fitzpatrick's own, it was the editorial page. He discussed the editorials before they were written. He read them carefully after they were ready for publication, sometimes providing a phrase that gave an editorial life and meaning.

But the editorials were not the voice of an individual: they were the voice of the Tribune. Editorial writing is and should be an anonymous profession.

We members of the Tribune staff are weighed down with a sense of loss. Last week the chief was on the job; today he is gone. And it seems that things never will be quite the same again.

Yet in this time of sorrow, one bright fact shines forth.

John F. Fitzpatrick believed in planning ahead—far ahead.

Foresight was one of his great strengths. So he made full provision for orderly succession when the time came—as unhappily it did come—that he was no longer on the scene.

There is no reason to believe that the Tribune as an institution will be any different in the future than it has been for the past 36 years. John F. Fitzpatrick was guided by fundamentals—by idealism founded on commonsense. And, God willing, the Tribune will continue on the course he set.

[From the Deseret News, Sept. 13, 1960]

A GREAT NEWSPAPERMAN, LEADER

A saddened community and the newspaper industry say a last farewell this week to one of their own—John Francis Fitzpatrick, 72, the late publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune.

His death Sunday night brought to the front pages the name of a man who had long shunned personal publicity in a wise belief in the adage that: "Much can be accomplished if work is uninterrupted by applause."

To many persons reading of his death, it was their first knowledge that, as a newspaper publisher for 36 years, Mr. Fitzpatrick had been instrumental in bringing many industrial, civic, and cultural improvements to Utah. For example, he was a moving spirit behind the establishment of a basic steel industry in Utah after the end of World War II, and in working for construction of the University of Utah football stadium, to mention only two of many such projects.

The response to the news of Mr. Fitzpatrick's death by civic, church, and business leaders who knew him was unanimous in voicing the sadness caused by his passing and in acknowledging his accomplishments as a skillful newspaperman, devout churchman, loving father, devoted friend, and thorough gentleman.

Words alone cannot tell the full worth of any man. But for what words can tell, the expressions of regret that sprang spontaneously from the minds and hearts of so many tell much about John Francis Fitzpatrick.

He was lauded as a great editor and publisher * * * a wonderful, fine citizen of Utah * * * a man of the highest integrity, honest through and through, fair in his dealings and just in his decisions * * * few men will ever leave as enviable a record of integrity * * * he regarded his newspaper as both a business and a public responsibility * * * he was a living representative of the love of freedom upon which our nation was founded * * * a strong influence for good.

These are only a few of the heartfelt expressions that came from Mr. Fitzpatrick's many friends who knew him as well as one man can know another.

Perhaps the measure of the man can be found in some degree at least, in the citation Mr. Fitzpatrick received in 1956 when he was awarded an honorary doctor of public service degree from Brigham Young University.

It read in part: "Through his unpublicized interests and efforts, so vitally has he contributed to the growth and development of the mountain West that it would be difficult to find any major progressive step taken here during the past third of a century in which he has not played a significant role."

Mr. Fitzpatrick leaves behind more than just 13 lines of print in "Who's Who," more than a vacancy in the hearts of his loved ones, more than a fond memory in the minds of his many friends and fellow newspapermen. He leaves behind a record of selflessness and solid accomplishment that provides a proud mark for which others may aim.

Though the general public knew little of John Francis Fitzpatrick during his lifetime, it has much for which to remember him and to be grateful.

The staff of the Deseret News joins his many friends and admirers in expressing our heartfelt sympathies to Mrs. Fitzpatrick and to her fine family. We also express our grateful appreciation to them for having shared this great man with us for the benefit and betterment of our community.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR SALTONSTALL TO SERVE AS RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be temporarily listed as the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The Senator from Massachusetts is presently the second ranking minority member of that committee. I also ask that this in no way affect my seniority rights as to any subcommittee or as to any special committee which may be established by the Armed Services Committee; that it not affect my seniority rights or present status as the ranking minority member of that committee; and that at the end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I resume my correct position as ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee.

I realize this is an unusual procedure, but this privilege was granted during the past three Congresses, and it is my desire to extend to Senator SALTONSTALL, my colleague and my neighbor from New England, this courtesy and to have the same procedure followed during the current session of the 87th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I stated to the Senator from New Hampshire in past years and during past sessions, I appreciate very much his courtesy in granting me this opportunity for service on the Armed Services Committee. I realize that his seniority is superior to mine; and I also realize that this arrangement is on an annual basis, and does not affect his rights on

any subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I hope that by giving me this greater opportunity, I shall be able to help him and to help all the other members of the Armed Services Committee and all the other members of the Appropriations Committee in carrying out the work which concerns both those committees. I certainly shall cooperate with him in every way, on the Appropriations Committee and on the Armed Services Committee, in the best interests of the armed services and of our country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am about to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule is that during the morning hour only 3 minutes can be used on any subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let us have the rule clearly understood, for it has been applied quite differently in the past. Let the Chair apply it fairly.

I have risen again, and I wish to be treated in the same manner that other Senators are treated. I do not appreciate being treated any differently.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire had taken his seat, and has risen again, seeking recognition in his own right. Unless some other Senator rose before he did, he is certainly entitled to the privilege of recognition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Had the Senator exhausted the time available to him?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss another subject. I have been in the Senate for 25 years, and the ruling made a moment ago is one of the few poor rulings I have encountered in all those years. I do not intend to have this practice continued. If I am prohibited from speaking now, many Senators will be required to take their seats in the future in strict adherence to the rule—at least during those times when I am on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire had taken his seat; and my understanding is that the rule is that the Presiding Officer shall recognize Senators in the order which he sees them address the Chair. It is the rule, is it not, that during the morning hour, when a Senator addresses the Chair and is recognized, he is permitted to speak for 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if the Senator takes his seat, and thus removes himself from active participation in the proceedings, and thereafter rises again, it is as if he were seeking recognition on a second occasion. Is that not the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no other Senator desires recognition at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not within the discretion of the Presiding Officer to recognize such a Senator if he then wishes to obtain recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no discretion is permitted the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to see that procedure followed from now on; namely, that any Senator who speaks for 3 minutes during the morning hour can say not another word nor rise and be recognized again, until every other Senator on the floor has been called on. If that is the ruling, I am perfectly willing to abide by it; but I want it applied in the future to all Senators, whether Republican or Democratic, in this Chamber; and when I am present, I am going to see that this ruling is followed to the letter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire be permitted to speak at this time for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

RELEASE OF AMERICAN AVIATORS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with President Kennedy's announcement of yesterday, concerning the release of the two RB–47 aviators, who since last summer have been held captive by the Russians, all of us rejoice in their release. At the same time, our sympathies go to the families of those crew members who will never return because they were killed by the Russians.

Last night the President—and I observed this very closely—did not make clear whether anything was offered to Communist Russia in return for releasing these men. I hope the President of the United States will clarify that point because, even though we rejoice in the return of these two flyers, we want to be certain that the conditions surrounding the release of these men will not adversely affect the other 180 million people of the United States.

I hope the President of the United States will clarify this matter, because I think it vitally concerns the country and the whole free world and certainly seriously concerns the Senator from New Hampshire who feels deeply on this matter.

OAK RIDGE, TENN., BECOMES A CITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on June 1, 1960, an event of major significance took place in Oak Ridge, Tenn. The Atomic Energy Commission completed its withdrawal from all municipal functions and responsibilities there, and the city of Oak Ridge came into being as a self-governing Tennessee municipality.

This transition, the fruition of many years of study and work by many people, was made possible under the Community Disposition Act of 1955, affecting Oak Ridge and other so-called atomic cities in our Nation. I was pleased, and I am certain that other members of the Tennessee congressional delegation were pleased, to have had a part in obtaining passage of this measure.

Mr. Richard Smyser, the very able editor of the Oak Ridger, a daily newspaper at Oak Ridge, has written a highly interesting article about the long but successful effort to obtain home rule for Oak Ridge. This article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of September 6, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OAK RIDGE BECOMES A CITY

(By Dick Smyser)

Oak Ridge homeowners got their June utility bills and blinked. The charges weren't out of line. But the bills came from the city of Oak Ridge. The familiar "make checks payable to Management Services, Inc.," was missing.

This should have startled no one. However, despite wide knowledge that the city had assumed full responsibility for municipal facilities on June 1, the habits of years are hard to break. More than one check was written, then torn up and rewritten.

Management Services is the firm that had operated the city electric and water works, police and fire departments—all normal city functions—for the Atomic Energy Commission. It had 10,000 employees at one time. Now it has less than 100. Many of the staff are now working for City Manager Fred Weisbrod.

A huge and revolutionary transition has now been completed here in the city built on quiet pastureland and wooded ridges in 1943 to house workers in the vast and secret World War II nuclear plants.

Actually, the city's government was formed a year ago. On May 5, 1959, citizens voted by a 14 to 1 margin, 5,552 to 395, to incorporate. (Technically, the margin was 14.0556962 to 1. Just to make it very scientific, someone figured it on a slide rule.) On June 2, 1959, a 12-man city council was elected. It took office June 16, 1959.

SWITCH MADE JUNE 1

On June 1 this year the switch was really made effective as the AEC turned over title to all of the municipal buildings and equipment—and the responsibility with it.

Oak Ridge celebrated its own independence day a month before the national observance. On Saturday, June 4, a festive program was arranged to hail the climax of more than a decade of work toward homeownership and self-government.

Senators ESTES KEFAUVER and ALBERT GORE and Representative HOWARD BAKER were present. Gov. Buford Ellington was the principal speaker. There were fireworks.

It was most appropriate that the Congressmen were in attendance. They had worked for years with citizens to devise a plan by which Oak Ridge could accomplish its unprecedented metamorphosis with a minimum of confusion and disruption.

The plan finally evolved into the Community Disposition Act passed in August 1955. Within 4 years it accomplished its purpose with amazing smoothness.

ONCE RENTED FROM UNITED STATES

At the beginning of 1956 virtually all Oak Ridgers still rented their homes from the Federal Government. In January 1958, Senator GORE boasted from the floor of the Senate that Oak Ridge had the highest percentage of homeownership of any city in the country.

Sales of all of the city's 7,000 single and duplex homes preceded the establishment of a city government. The prices were reasonable and the law provided a priority system of sales so that occupants had first option to buy. Virtually every occupant did.

In Oak Ridge disposal doesn't mean garbage collection. This was the word used to

identify the home sale and self-government plans when they were first talked about in 1948 and 1949.

On January 1, 1947, the AEC, a civilian agency, took over the Nation's atomic program from the wartime military Manhattan Engineering District. Almost immediately, the AEC decided it wanted to get out of the business of operating communities—Oak Ridge, Richland, Wash., and Los Alamos, N. Mex.

After 13 years, it has finally done this in Oak Ridge and Richland, which formed its own government 6 months prior to its older and larger east Tennessee counterpart. The first disposal moves are just now beginning in Los Alamos.

WHY 13 YEARS?

Why 13 years?

"Disposal" was a dirty word for the first years it was discussed.

"No one will ever buy these houses," was the common bridge club and car pool comment. It was usually followed by, "Why, if the city tries to run itself, taxes will be so high no one will be able to afford them."

The houses were mostly quick, wartime construction. Would they even last until sales began?

And taxes? The only industry is Federal industry—nontaxable. Who could the city tax but homeowners and at what outrageous rate to make up for the lack of an industrial tax base

Gradually, support for disposal grew. The AEC agreed that it would have to continue some sort of payment to the city to make up for the abnormal lack of tax source. Sample home appraisals indicated prices would take into consideration the unusual nature of home construction. And, perhaps most important, the AEC made it clear that it was going to get out of the community business one way or another and citizens might just as well accept this and make do.

This is not to say that there was not some early citizen support for disposal, both for practical and principled reasons. Many groups and individuals felt sincerely that the city could not long morally refuse to accept normal municipal responsibilities. And, they argued also, freed of restrictive Federal community policies, the city could grow on its own.

CHURCHES LED WAY

Churches were the first breakthrough. By special arrangements land was leased to impatient congregations that had been holding services in schools, theaters and a few small Army-base-type chapels.

By 1950, the first church buildings were going up. These were the first solid sign that, regardless of bridge club and car pool smalltalk, Oak Ridgers intended to make their town permanent. Oak Ridge has no old families to make big church bequests. Funds came from hard work by individual members at fundraising drives, bazaars and volunteer labor.

By 1953 citizen homebuilding fever was of sufficient temperature to convince the AEC that it should offer some lots on a lease basis, well in advance of congressional action to allow sales. Citizens bid up a storm. By 1954 the first "own homes" were rising on leased land.

Once the sale of existing Government-built houses got underway, a widespread remodeling and enlarging program began. A 3-bedroom "cemesto" (so-called because of the prefabricated board of which it was constructed) could be bought for $5,000 to $7,000. Adding that much more in improvements, the houses could be made into quite livable permanent homes.

TAXES ON HIGH SIDE

Some residents purchased smaller units for $3,000 to $4,000 and added $20,000 in improvements to practically build a new house around the old. Construction men and realtors scratched their heads. But the tenants liked their large wooded lots, their mountain views, and their neighbors. They preferred remodeling to building from the ground up elsewhere.

Taxes by the new city government are on the high side for comparable Tennessee cities. However, they are far from outrageous and Oak Ridge can boast city services on the high side for comparable Tennessee cities too.

This is because the AEC has agreed, as provided by law, to pay the city an annual sum in lieu of taxes for at least 10 years.

The AEC preferred that citizens incorporate only the area of the Government reservation in which the town proper is presently located. The plants are many miles away. However, citizens chose instead to incorporate the whole works—90 square miles including all of the plants. Oak Ridge, consequently, is second only to Memphis in Tennessee in area within the city limits. It has prodigious room to grow and shouldn't have annexation problems for centuries.

And Oak Ridge feels confident it will grow. Preliminary figures for the 1960 census set the population at 27,009. That's down about 3,000 from 1950.

Growth?

The years of arranging and adjusting to the disposal program brought some unusual situations. The AEC removed thousands of substandard housing units. Many tenants left town when they were dispossessed. Little other housing was available. Also, many residents grew impatient for sales to begin and built homes in surrounding communities.

BASIS FOR GROWTH

Oak Ridge points to 27,000 homeowning citizens of today as a considerably more solid base for growth than 30,000 tenants of 1950. And it also points to the large numbers of new houses being built in eight new residential subdivisions.

This fall the Linden Elementary School reopens. It was closed when the area around it became vacant as temporary houses were removed. Now virtually every lot has a new home upon it.

(This is the school building occupied for the past two years by Clinton High School. The Clinton school moved here after its building was dynamited in October 1958, as an outgrowth of integration troubles. Clinton's rebuilt building will be ready this fall. Clinton is 6 miles from Oak Ridge.)

There are evidences everywhere that the city is prospering.

Nearly $100 million in plant construction is either underway or planned, including the $31 million experimental gas-cooled reactor.

As a parting gift the AEC built a $2,900,000 hospital. It is operated by the Methodist Church.

SHOPPING CENTER OPEN

There is a multimillion-dollar shopping center, named Downtown. It is in the geographical center of the city and yet has all advantages of a suburban commercial area.

A swank 100-room motel has recently opened.

A group of natural scientists purchased large tracts suitable for industry. They hope to attract new plants.

The city draws an increasing number of tourists, lured to east Tennessee by Great Smoky Mountain National Park and Tennessee Valley Authority lakes and drawn to Oak Ridge by a desire to see the famous and unusual city and its plants and the American Museum of Atomic Energy.

A new post office is to built by Christmas.

And, by this fall, construction is expected to begin on Melton Hill Dam, a new TVA installation on the Clinch River that will surround Oak Ridge with a navigable lake connecting with all of the Tennessee River system and providing wonderful recreation.

Problems?

City councilmen met virtually every evening during their first year in office working on a mountain of preparations for full takeover. There was a city manager to be hired and that produced the first big fuss. City Manager Welsorod was finally agreed upon. He came to Oak Ridge from Painesville, Ohio.

Scores of ordinances had to be adopted before the city was ready to operate its police force, run a city court, and operate utilities.

Oak Ridge, as a Federal community, was the first in Tennessee to integrate its schools. Its swimming pool has had some Negro patrons for the past 4 summers. However, the council has become involved in the efforts to integrate eating places and has formed a special mayor's committee to work out a solution. Sit-in demonstrators had been avoided until July 6 when one eating place was picketed. The mayor's committee is headed by Dr. William G. Pollard, natural scientist and also Episcopal priest (and former member of the city's unofficial advisory preincorporation council).

The city's first mayor is A. K. Bissell, a bald, rotund native east Tennessean. It has been said that he has just the right combination of personality—appealing to both hillbilly and egghead—to get along with Oak Ridge's cosmopolitan population.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there seems to be no more morning business, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Murat W. Williams to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador.

I do that because of the fact that there is a revolution in progress in that country at the present time, and the State Department states it is quite important that the nomination of the Foreign Service officer be confirmed so he can be dispatched to that country as soon as possible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the sense of urgency expressed by the distinguished majority leader. I trust we can take immediate action, so that the Ambassador can undertake his duties in the country to which he is being sent in a rather anxious period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

NOMINATION OF MURAT W. WILLIAMS TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY TO EL SALVADOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to say a word today about the selection of Murat Williams to be Ambassador to El Salvador. There could not have been a finer selection. He served with distinction in Israel as the second in command at the American Embassy. He ably conducted the affairs of this office during the necessary absence of the Ambassador during a recent trip which he made to the United States.

Mr. Williams' gracious wife is a fellow townsman of mine. I have known her family for a long time.

Mr. President, I know that Mr. and Mrs. Williams will perform creditably in El Salvador, one of our truly "hot" Latin American posts. He is a cool-headed career man, who has already made a great record. He has a great future ahead of him, and I wish him well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported several resolutions to provide funds for the operation of various committees and subcommittees of the Congress.

I wish to announce, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, that it is the hope of the leadership that the Senate will consider these resolutions, as well as other pertinent nominations, on Monday.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEE AND COMMISSIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the following appointments:

To the Joint Economic Committee: Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, and Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island.

To the Civil War Centennial Commission: Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

To the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Vice President on the selections which he has just announced. The responsibility for making these assignments to the Joint Economic Committee, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and the Civil War Centennial Commission rests with the Vice President and he has exercised it with impartial and wise judgment. Speaking for the Democratic selectees, I know that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] brings a wide acquaintance with domestic economic affairs to the deliberations of the Joint Economic Committee and, similarly, the new Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] will be able to interject his highly pertinent and extensive experience abroad into the international economic problems with which this most important committee under the chairmanship of the learned Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] concerns itself.

As for the selection of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I know of no one with a greater awareness of the problems of conservation in all of its aspects. My distinguished colleague from Montana not only understands these problems of preserving our natural heritage of wildlife, but also he has the knowledge and dedication which will enable him to act purposefully on his understanding.

Finally, Mr. President, I should point out that the able Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is a most modern-minded man, has nevertheless retained a passionate interest in our national history, particularly of the Civil War period, and I know that he will see to it that the part played by Texas and other trans-Mississippi regions in that conflict is duly recognized and commemorated by the Civil War Centennial Commission.

Once again, then, Mr. President, I should like to compliment and to thank the Vice President for these four selections. They are excellent selections and will be most helpful in every respect.

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with a sense of profound admiration and respect that I listened to the simultaneous transmission yesterday of the President's press conference. This event was in every sense a great historic occasion. It was historic not simply because the people of the United States, and even the people of Britain, for the first time, were informed of the policies of the United States at the precise moment they were being enunciated. Even more significant was the wise and powerful content of the President's responses to the pointed questions of the press. In all my years of public life, I cannot remember any instance in which a new President has spoken more competently, candidly, and courageously to the Nation and to the world than did Mr. Kennedy last evening.

His answers to such complex questions as those involving the release of the RB–47 crewmen and the U–2 incident, Laos, Communist China, and many other subjects, constituted an expression of statesmanship of the highest order. That the President has already been fully informed on the essential details of these and other international questions speaks well for the patriotic cooperation which was extended by Mr. Eisenhower, former Secretary Herter, and others during the transition of administrations. That the President was able to articulate his position on these questions with a surpassing lucidity is a most hopeful indication. It was evidence that the purposeful and energetic leadership which the Nation sought in electing Mr. Kennedy will most assuredly be forthcoming in the days, months, and years ahead.

The President has spoken directly on the major issues and directly to the people of the United States. It was a great moment in our history, as well as a major advance in public communication. In order that the details of this moment may be remembered for a long time to come, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of this first simultaneous broadcast of a Presidential press conference, as it appears in the Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEWS CONFERENCE

TEST-BAN TALKS

I have several announcements to make first. I have a statement about the Geneva negotiations for an atomic test ban. These negotiations, as you know, are scheduled to begin early in February. They are of great importance, and we will need more time to prepare a clear American position. So we are consulting with other governments, and are asking to have it put off until late March.

As you know, Mr. John McCloy is my principal adviser in this field, and he has organized a distinguished panel of experts headed by Dr. James Pierce of the Bell Laboratories. Mr. Salinger (Press Secretary Pierre Salinger) will have a list of the names at the end of the conference who are going to study previous dispositions that were taken in this field, and also recommend to Mr. McCloy for my guidance what our position will be in late March when we hope the talks will continue.

FAMINE IN CONGO

Secondly, the U.S. Government has decided to increase substantially its contribution toward relieving the famine in the Congo. This will be done by increasing the supply of cornmeal and dry milk, by adding contributions of rice, and by airlifting a thousand tons of food supplies, seeds, and hospital supplies from a number of African nations to the Congo.

It is the intention of the U.S. Government to meet fully the emergency requirements of the Congo. The rice, corn, dry milk and other foodstuffs are from our surplus stocks.

Assurances have been received from the United Nations that with the help of this program the flow of supplies will be adequate to relieve distress. The U.S. Government will cooperate fully to help the United Nations to prevent famine in the Congo.

RELEASE OF FLIERS

Third, I am happy to be able to announce that Capt. Freeman B. Olmstead and Capt. J. R. McKone, members of the crew of the U.S. Air Force RB–47 aircraft detained by Soviet Union authorities since July 1, 1960, have been released by the Soviet Government and are now en route to the United States.

The U.S. Government is gratified by this decision of the Soviet Union and considers

that this action of the Soviet Government removes a serious obstacle to the improvement of Soviet-American relations. Our deepest sympathy and understanding goes to the families of the members of the RB–47 who gave their lives in the service of their country.

At the same time, I am sure that all Americans join me in rejoicing with the Olmstead and the McKone families. The families as well as the men comported themselves in these trying times in a way which is truly in the best traditions of the military service of the United States. Restraint in these conditions obviously was not easy, but they can be assured that they have contributed in large measure to the final achievement of the objective which we all sought, the release of the men.

Yes?

FLIGHT POLICY

Question. This RB–47 was claimed by the Russians as an overflight, although we took a different position. In the light of the announcements, what will be your general policy on overflights and on such things as the U–2 flights? Do you conceive of circumstances which might warrant resumption of such things as the U–2 flights?

Answer. The Soviet Government is fully aware of the U.S. Government's views with respect to the distinction between the question of the U.S. Air Force RB–47 and the incident which occurred over Soviet territory on May 1, 1960, involving an American U–2 type aircraft. Flights of American aircraft penetrating the airspace of the Soviet Union have been suspended since May 1960. I have ordered that they not be resumed.

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Question. There have been reports that Mr. Khrushchev might come to the United Nations General Assembly for the resumption of the disarmament debate sometime in March. If this were to happen, would you welcome a visit by him to Washington for a get-acquainted meeting?

Answer. I have not heard officially of any proposal by Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States. I have merely seen newspaper reports, and I feel that it would be more appropriate to wait until we had some indication when Mr. Khrushchev is planning to come to the United Nations.

ROLE IN RELEASE

Question. Mr. President, can you tell us something about what your role, if you had one, in the release of these fliers? Did that come about as a result of some action you took?

Answer. This matter has been under discussion by the American Ambassador and Mr. Khrushchev on one occasion and representatives of the Soviet Foreign Ministry since this weekend. The fliers were released as of 2 a.m. yesterday morning, but in the plane taking off there was a tire that was blown, and, therefore, the plane did not take off.

Our last information is that it took off at 5 o'clock our time this afternoon. It will fly to Amsterdam, and then we expect the fliers to be brought to the United States tomorrow afternoon.

DISARMAMENT

Question. Mr. President, one of your task force has recommended that you resist any early move toward general disarmament negotiations until a firm and fixed U.S. policy could be worked out. What is your reaction to that report and how much time do you think it might take to get a firm fixed U.S. position?

Answer. Well, Mr. McCloy has the responsibility over the area of disarmament as well as nuclear testing. He has, as I have said, set up this committee, advisory committee, on nuclear testing. We expect to also get the American position clearer on general disarmament.

There is not the same deadline that we have been facing on the nuclear testing, where we were supposed to resume in early February, resume in early February [sic—presumably the President meant "test ban talks"—Ed.], but I can state that this was a matter which was discussed early this week by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State and Mr. McCloy, and we are preparing a clarification of America's position on disarmament.

THOMPSON-KHRUSHCHEV TALKS

Question. Mr. President, what more can you tell us about the long conversation that Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson had with Mr. Khrushchev, including whether the tone of that conversation was anywhere near as friendly as that of the messages that Khrushchev has sent you?

Answer. I will say the tone was friendly, and as a result of the conversations, as I have said, the decision was made to release the fliers, but the conversations were conducted in an atmosphere of civility.

Question. Could you give us any indication at all as to what other subjects were taken up in addition to the release of the RB–47 fliers?

Answer. No. I think that I will have to stand on my previous position.

EVICTIONS

Question. Does your administration plan to take steps to solve the problems of the people in Tennessee who were evicted from their homes because they voted last November and must now live in tents?

Answer. The Congress, of course, enacted legislation which placed very clear responsibility on the executive branch to protect the rights of voting. I am extremely—I supported that legislation. I am extremely interested in making sure that every American is given the right to cast his vote without prejudice to his rights as a citizen, and, therefore, I can state that this administration will pursue the problem of providing that protection with all vigor.

FOOD FOR JOBLESS

Question. Sir, would you please tell up how it was possible for you to do by Executive order what Mr. Benson always told us was impossible for him to do without more legislation. I refer to the order expanding the distribution of food to unemployed and giving them more variety.

Answer. Well, I would not attempt to comment on Mr. Benson. I don't think there is any question of our right to issue the Executive order under the authority given to us by the Constitution and by legislative action.

I think we are within our rights. It is a judgment as to what is the best use to make of the funds that are available. The funds are quite limited. The diet which is being provided for the people unemployed is still inadequate. We have used the funds that are available to the maximum, and I don't think there is any question that we were within our rights.

ON FLIERS' RELEASE

Question. Could you tell us how and when you learned that these fliers were going to be released?

Answer. I learned as a result of the conversations which Ambassador Thompson had with the Soviet officials, and we were informed as to the date that they would be released, the time, yesterday.

NEWS CONFERENCES

Question. Mr. President there has been some apprehension about the instantaneous broadcast of a Presidential conference such as this one, the contentions being that a statement no longer is considered privileged as in the old days, possibly could cause some grave consequences. Do you feel there is any risk or could you give us some thought on that a little bit?

Answer. It was my understanding that the statements made by President Eisenhower were on the record. There may have been a clarification that could have been issued afterward, but it still would have been on the record as a clarification. So that I don't think that the interests of our country are—it seems to me they are well protected under this system as they were under the system followed by President Eisenhower, and this system has the advantage of providing more direct communication.

CUBA RELATIONS

Question. Under what conditions would you consider opening diplomatic relations with Cuba, and are you considering such a step now?

Answer. Well, to take the last part first, we are not considering such a step at the present time.

I may say that the United States is interested, and I think that this administration is extremely interested in movements in Latin America or in Central America or the Caribbean which provide a better life for the people, and if all interests are—may be damaged by those movements or revolution or whatever term you want to use, we feel that this should be a matter that should be negotiated, but what we are, of course, concerned about is when these movements are seized by external forces and directed not to improve the welfare of the people involved, but toward imposing an ideology which is alien to this hemisphere, that is a matter of concern, particularly when that intervention takes the form of military support which threatens the security and the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

Now I am hopeful that governments will be established throughout all of Latin America, and governments which are established will, and I think nearly all of them do, share the same view that we have to provide in this hemisphere a better life for the people involved, that we are interested in that, that we are concerned about it, that American policy will be directed toward that end.

But we are also concerned that in the name of that peaceful revolution, when it is seized by aliens for their purposes, it is very difficult for us to carry on happy relations with those countries.

So, in answer to your question, we have no plan at present to resume diplomatic relations with Soviet Russ—I mean Cuba, because of the factors which are involved on that island.

RULES CONTEST

Question. Mr. President, you said in answer to something that the President should be in the thick of the political battle. I wonder what part you are playing in the effort to expand the Rules Committee and whether you feel your domestic program, whether the success of your domestic program in part depends upon expanding the Rules Committee?

Answer. Well, the Constitution states that each House shall be the judge of its own rules, and, therefore, the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, has been extremely anxious that the House be permitted to settle this matter in its own way.

But it is no secret that I would strongly believe that the Members of the House should have an opportunity to vote themselves on the programs which we will present. That, I think, is the reason the people selected them to go to the House of Representatives and to the Senate and selected me as President, so that we could present programs and consider programs and vote on programs which are put forward for the benefit of the country.

Now, I feel that it would be—I am hopeful that whatever judgment is made by the Members of the House that it will permit the Members to vote on these bills.

This is a very difficult time in the life of our country, many controversial measures will be presented which will be in controversy and will be debated and in the end the majority of the Members of the House, the majority of the Members of the Senate, I hope, will have a chance to exercise their will and a small group of men will not attempt to prevent the Members from finally letting our judgments be known.

For example, we have a housing bill which is going to come before the Congress this year, we have an aid-to-education bill, we have legislation which will affect the income of farmers.

Shouldn't the Members of the House themselves and not merely the members of the Rules Committee have a chance to vote on those measures? But the responsibility rests with the Members of the House and I would not attempt in any way to infringe upon that responsibility. I merely give my view as an interested citizen.

CUBAN REFUGEES

Question. Are any plans being made to implement the recommendations of the Voorhees report on the Cuban refugee problem and, secondly, do you plan to appoint somebody to continue Mr. Voorhees' work?

Answer. We are considering the recommendations of Mr. Voorhees and the whole problem of the Cuban refugees, but I wouldn't have any statement to make on it at this time.

PORTUGUESE SHIP

Question. Mr. President, what is the official Government position in regard to the Portuguese ship? Can the Navy board it if and when it makes contact?

Answer. Well, I believe that the location of the ship has been determined and perhaps we can give the location of it.

At the present time, the instructions are for the Navy to continue its accompaniment of the ship. The *Santa Maria* has been located by Navy P–2–V aircraft and the position is approximately 600 miles north of the mouth of the Amazon River.

It is headed on a course of 117—speed of 15 knots and the exact position at 10 minutes after 4 was 10–35 north, 45–42 west, to be trailed by aircraft and to be picked up by the destroyers of our African task force.

Now, there are Americans involved, and their lives are involved, but there is—we do not—we have not given any—not given any instructions to the Navy to carry out any boarding operations though, of course, we are concerned about the lives of the Americans involved and also because we are concerned—because the ship belongs to a country with which the United States has friendly relations.

ON FLIERS' RELEASE

Question. Mr. President, in consequence of Mr. Khrushchev's apparent indication last weekend of willingness to release the American fliers, have you sent communication to him through Ambassador Thompson or otherwise?

Answer. Well, have I sent a message since the release of fliers?

Question. Since his communication to us through Ambassador Thompson?

Answer. Well, we have had several communications with the Soviet authorities. I do not believe that one has taken place since the release of the prisoners, but that is partially because there has been this delay about their leaving Moscow.

TRADE RESTRAINTS

Question. Mr. President, there is meeting here now a nationwide group of labor, agriculture, and industry which wants to abolish all restraint, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They say it robs us of gold, robs American workers of jobs. What is your position on such a proposal?

Answer. Well, I think that their meeting here is well within their rights as citizens of the United States and I think that we should listen to their views. This is a matter of great concern.

I do think we should be conscious of the fact, of course, that the balance of trade has been substantially in our favor in the last year, but we are continually concerned about those imports which adversely affect an entire industry or adversely affect the employment of a substantial number of our citizens.

The present laws—peril points and escape clause, of course, all take those matters into consideration, but I am glad to have them here. I am glad to have them express their views. I think the Congress should consider their views carefully, and I hope that in their consideration they will consider the whole problem of trade, and I do think we should realize that the balance of trade has been in our favor and the gold flow would have been substantially worse if we had not had this favorable balance of trade.

DEPENDENTS CUT

Question. Mr. President, in relation to our gold flow problem, the outgoing administration has ordered a cutback in the number of military and civilian dependents stationed abroad.

The day before the inauguration the outgoing Defense Secretary stated to the incoming Defense Secretary that this is a matter of urgency, that relief should be sought as soon as possible because of what the outgoing Defense Secretary termed as an adverse effect on the morale of our Armed Forces.

Have you had a chance to make up your——

Answer. Mr. McNamara and Mr. Dillon have discussed the effect of this order on military morale, on military strength, the rate of reenlistment. It is really a question determining what alternative steps can be secured which would be less harmful, which would protect the flow of gold. I do expect to make some reference to this matter of gold outflow in the state of the Union address.

I will send within a 2-week period after the state of the Union address a message to the Congress dealing with the gold outflow and our recommendations for meeting it, and we will at that time come to some judgment as to whether a more satisfactory method of protecting our gold could be secured than providing for the return of the families of the Americans serving abroad in the military.

I will say that our study so far has convinced us that the dollar must be protected, that the dollar can be protected in its present value, that exchange controls are not essential, but it is a most serious problem and it will be the subject of a message to the Congress.

DEMOCRATIC RIFT

Question. The State of New York gave you one of your handsomest majorities in the 1960 election campaign but now the Democrats of New York are rather bitterly divided over leadership. As the Democratic leader of the Nation are you going to take some steps to try to heal the split in New York?

Answer. Well, the people in New York, the Democratic organizations in New York who are interested in the success of the Democratic Party, they have to make their judgments as to what kind of a party they want to build there. I have asked Mr. (John) Bailey, the new chairman of the Democratic Party, to lend a helping hand in attempting to alleviate some of the distress.

JOBLESS AID

Question. Mr. President, Sir, do you have any plans for quick Federal aid for the unemployed?

Answer. We are going to send a message to the Congress right after the state of the Union address on what steps we think the Government could profitably take to provide the protection for the unemployed and also to stimulate the economy. On the immediate question, I will discuss that in the state of the Union address on Monday.

SUMMIT TALK

Question Mr. President, now that the Soviets have released the RB–47 fliers would you estimate for us the chances of you meeting with Khrushchev?

Answer. Yes. There is no relationship nor has there been in the discussions between the two matters and therefore I have no—there has been no change in my previous statement that there are no plans at the present time for meeting with Mr. Khrushchev.

EXECUTIVE SECRECY

Question. Mr. President, will you tolerate the continued abuse of executive privilege to suppress information which is needed by Congress? Now that you are President will you direct the USIA to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee those prestige polls which you urged the previous administration to make available during the campaign?

Answer. Well, let me say that I would have no objection at all to the polls or the results of the polls being made available and I will be delighted to check and to see what we can do to make it available to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the House Foreign Relations Committee if they would like them.

Question. Mr. President, about the use of the executive privilege to suppress all sorts of information, what is your position on that?

Answer. Well, that is a statement really, not completely a question.

Question. You yourself agreed——

Answer. Well, that is why I stated that I thought it would be well to release these polls and that is why I said I'd be glad to release these polls.

Now, if other matters come up we will have to make a judgment whether it is an abuse or whether it is within the constitutional protection given to the Executive and I would hope that we can within the limits of national security make available information to the press and to the people and I do think that it would be helpful to release the polls which were discussed last fall.

SECURITY DATA

Question. Mr. President, Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said—indicated today there might be a need for a tightening of information on national security. Doesn't the policy of deterrence require that the enemy have knowledge of our strength and our plans and our ability to carry them out rather than involve a risk of miscalculation by tightening up information.

Answer. Well, I think the enemy is informed of our strength. I think Mr. Salinger in his statement today at lunch indicated his judgment based on his experience so far that there had been very ample information given so that the enemy can make a determination as to our strength.

I am anxious that we have a maximum flow of information but there quite obviously are some matters which involve the security of the United States and it is a matter in which the press and the Executive should attempt to reach a responsible decision. I could not make a prediction about what these matters would be but I think that all of us here are aware that there are some matters which it would not be well

to discuss at particular times. So that we will just have to wait and try to work together and see if we can provide as much information as we can within the limits of national security.

I do not believe that the stamp "national security" should be put on statements which do not involve the national security and this administration would welcome at any time that any member of the press feels that we are artificially invoking that cover, but I must say that I do not hold the view that all matters and all information which is available to the Executive should be made available at all times and I don't think any member of the press does. So it is a question of trying to work out a solution to a sensitive matter.

SECRET DIPLOMACY

Question. Mr. President, in the past 2 days the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has issued statements, one with your name on it, to the effect that this country wants a return to quiet and private diplomacy. Would you give us some idea of the meaning behind this, Mr. President? Are you trying to suggest that Khrushchev should like to resort to this for the time being without offending him or making him go off the cordial path he is on at the present time?

Answer. Would you—the last part of that?

Question. Are you trying to suggest to Mr. Khrushchev by the tone, by what you are saying, these statements, that you don't want a summit meeting, you would like it to go through private channels and trying to do this without offending him or getting him off the cordial path he is on now?

Answer. Well, I would just say, without accepting the question completely as a premise, I would say that the Secretary of State is anxious to explore with interested countries what chance we have of lessening world tension, which is in some areas of the world quite high tonight.

Therefore, there are occasions when traditional exchanges between diplomats in the countries involved are in the national interest and that, I think, was what Mr. Rusk was directing his attention to. I am hopeful from those more traditional exchanges that we can perhaps find a greater common ground.

Question. Sir, do you favor Senator HUMPHREY's suggestion that we send surplus food to Red China, the U.N. or CARE or a similar organization?

SURPLUS FOOD AID

Answer. Well, I will say two things. First, Red China, the Chinese Communists, are exporting food at the present time, some of it to Africa, some of it has gone, I think, to Cuba, and therefore that is a factor in their needs for foods from abroad.

Secondly, we have had no indication from the Chinese Communists that they would welcome any offer of food. I am not anxious to offer food if it is regarded merely as a propaganda effort by the United States. If there is a desire for food and a need for food, the United States would be glad to consider that need, regardless of the source. If people's lives are involved and there is a desire for food, the United States will consider it carefully.

I do say that in this case, however, there are these examples of foods being exported during this present time or recent history, and, secondly, there has been a rather belligerent attitude expressed toward us in recent days by the Chinese Communists, and there is no indication, direct or indirect, private or public, that they would respond favorably to any action by the United States.

SPACE REPORT

Question. Mr. President, the NASA report has been criticized as part opinion. There also has been criticism that the report was made without any contact with NASA officials, without any attempt at liaison during the transition period, and there is concern that no one has so far been named to head the agency. Could you comment on these charges, sir?

Answer. Well, I don't—the task force was free to make the kind of report that in their best judgment the event called for. The task force was made up of men of broad experience in their fields. I think it was really a blue-ribbon panel. They presented their views. I don't think anyone is suggesting that their views are necessarily in every case the right views. I am hopeful—we have appointed an Acting Director, and I am hopeful before the week is out we will have a Director of NASA.

BUDGET REVISION

Question. Mr. President, you have stated that you will take a new look at the Eisenhower budget. I wonder what indications you may have that you may have some partial revisions of that budget. Can you now say whether you hope or expect to live within the $80.9 billion spending figure which your predecessor laid down?

Answer. I would—that study of the budget is now going on, and I couldn't give you an answer yet. We haven't yet finished our study.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Question. Mr. President, your inaugural address was unusual in that you dealt only with America's position in the world; why, Mr. President, did you limit yourself to this global theme?

Answer. Well, because the issue of war and peace is involved, and the survival of the planet, possibly our system, and, therefore, this is a matter of primary concern to the people of the world.

Secondly, I represent a new administration. I think the views of this administration are quite well known to the American people, and will become better known in the next month. I think that we are new, however, on the world scene, and, therefore, I felt that there would be some use in informing countries around the world of our general views on the questions which face the world and divide the world.

LAOS

Question. Mr. President, you have spoken of the situation where there are crises in the world now; one of these places is Laos. Do you have any hope that a political settlement can be negotiated there?

Answer. Well, as you know, the British Government has presented to the Soviet Union and to the best of my information an answer has not been received by the British of a proposal to reestablish the international control commission. We ought to know shortly whether there is any hope that this commission can be reestablished.

As to the general view on Laos, this matter is of great concern to us. The United States is anxious that there be established in Laos a peaceful country, an independent country not dominated by either side, but concerned with the life of the people within the country.

We are anxious that that situation come forward, and the United States is using its influence to see if an independent country, peaceful country, uncommitted country, can be established under the present very difficult circumstances.

MISSING FLIERS

Question. In discussing with the Soviet Union the release of the RB–47 fliers, Mr. President, did we also take up with Mr. Khrushchev the fate of Gary Powers, the U–2 pilot, and the 11 fliers that were missing from the C–130 that was shot down inside Armenia in 1958?

Answer. The matter of the 11 fliers was discussed, and the Russians have stated that their previous public statements on these fliers represent their views on the matter, that the newspaper magazine story, which was written by an eastern German, did not represent the facts.

So on the matter of Mr. Powers, we have not discussed it at this time because he is in a different category than the fliers that were released. One was an overflight and the other was not.

CONCESSIONS

Question. Mr. President, did the Russians ask any quid pro quo or did we make any concessions to them in exchange for the release of these fliers?

Answer. We did not——

Question. If they did not, how do you account for this remarkable turnabout in their relations with us?

Answer. We did not. The statement which I have made is a statement which the U.S. Government put forward on this matter, which I read to you earlier in regard to overflights. I would not attempt to make a judgment as to why the Soviet Union chose to release them at this time.

I did say in my statement to Mr. Arrowsmith that this had removed a serious obstacle in the way of peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and I would judge that they desired to remove that serious obstacle.

Question. Does that mean, sir, that they accepted a reassurance of no more overflights as an exchange?

Answer. It is a fact that I have ordered that the flights not be resumed, which is a continuation of the order given by President Eisenhower in May of last year.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Question. Mr. President, your own election has stimulated renewed proposals for electoral reform. Do you have any objection to changing the present method of electing President, or do you favor any of the proposals?

Answer. Well, I do have some thought on it. One is that, in the first place, having been through the experience in 1956, I think it was, of an attempt to substantially change the electoral college, it is my judgment that no such change can secure the necessary support in the House, the Senate, and in the States of the Union.

The area where I do think we perhaps could get some improvements would be in providing that the electors would be bound by the results of the State elections. I think that that would be a useful step forward.

The electors, after all, when the people vote, they assume the votes are going to be cast in the way which reflects the judgments of a majority of the people in the States.

Therefore, I think it would be useful to have that automatic, and not set up this independent group who could vote for the candidate who carried the State or not, depending on their own personal views. That would be the first.

Secondly, I am hopeful that the Congress will consider the suggestions made, I think, first by President Theodore Roosevelt and later by Senator Richard Neuberger, of having the National Government participate in the financing of national campaigns, because the present system is not satisfactory.

Perhaps it would be useful to go into that in more detail later, because I do think it a most important subject. But I would say for the present that this matter of the electors would be an area where I think it would be useful.

SUCCESSION

Question. Mr. President, on a related subject, without being morbid, have you given any consideration to the problem which President Eisenhower resolved with his Vice President, that is the problem of succession in the case of injury, illness, or some incapacitation? Have you thought of some

agreement with the Vice President, such as your predecessor had or some other?

Answer. Well, I have not developed that at this present time, though I think that President Eisenhower's decision was a good one, and I think it would be a good precedent. Nothing has been done on it as yet, but I think it would be a good matter.

Question. Thank you, Mr. President.

Answer. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIC AND RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAMS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on rural electric and rural telephone programs, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 508(b) OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANNUAL APPROPRIATION TO REIMBURSE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR CERTAIN NET REALIZED LOSSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SIMPLIFICATION, CONSOLIDATION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO LOANS TO FARMERS AND RANCHERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONTRIBUTION BY STATE GOVERNMENTS TO COST OF FEED OR SEED FURNISHED TO FARMERS, RANCHERS, OR STOCKMEN IN DISASTER AREAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SOIL BANK CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1960 soil bank conservation reserve program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AS OFFICERS NOT RESTRICTED IN THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY IN THE MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNIFORMITY IN CERTAIN CONDITIONS OF ENTITLEMENT TO REENLISTMENT BONUSES UNDER CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT WITH RESPECT TO SPECIAL PAY FOR DIVING DUTY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PLACEMENT OF NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS GRADUATES (REGULARS) IN STATUS COMPARABLE WITH U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), reporting, pursuant to law, on the flight pay of certain naval officers, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, as relates to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by that Department without formal advertising, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SHELTER CONSTRUCTION AND INCENTIVES ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for examples and appropriate assistance by the Federal Government in shelter construction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STUDY OF COMPETITIVE FACTORS IN THE PURCHASE OF PETROLEUM FOR DEFENSE USES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a study of competitive factors in the purchase of petroleum for defense uses, under the Defense Production Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to the mints and assay offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ASSISTANCE TO AREAS TO DEVELOP DIVERSIFIED ECONOMICS BY A PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 15th semianual report of that Administration for the period July 1, 1960, and December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IMPROVEMENTS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guarantee program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION OF LAWS PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE RATES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TWO ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MORE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and Managing Trustee of the Trust Funds, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commissioner of Social Security and Secretary, Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

COMBINED OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE-INCOME TAX REPORTING AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act to consolidate the reporting of wages by employers for income tax withholding and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF USE OF IDENTIFYING NUMBERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to improve tax administration by providing for extension of the use of identifying numbers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCING OF FOREST HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 in order to provide for the financing of forest highways and public lands highways from the highway trust fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPEAL OF PROHIBITION OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN FEES BY CONSULAR OFFICERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

USE OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY BY STATE DISTRIBUTION AGENCIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORITY FOR AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT TO PAY IN ADVANCE FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RELATIVE TO DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense relative to the disposition of certain foreign excess personal property located in areas outside the United States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROVISION OF CERTAIN SERVICES FOR CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REDUCTION OF FREQUENCY OF CERTAIN REPORTS REQUIRED OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Atomic Energy Commission contracts AT (05-1)-709 and AT (05-1)-765 with the Western Nuclear Corp., Rawlins, Wyo., for the procurement of uranium concentrates, dated June 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROGRAMING AND FINANCING OF CERTAIN SELECTED MILITARY CONSTRUCTED FACILITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of programing and financing of selected facilities constructed at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations, Department of Defense, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICES PAID FOR CERTAIN JET ENGINE COMPONENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the prices paid for certain jet engine components purchased from the Bendix Aviation Corp., South Bend, Ind., by General Electric Co., Aircraft Gas Turbine Division, Cincinnati, Ohio, under Department of the Air Force contracts, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp., supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal home loan banks, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SHORT-FORM AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form audit report on the Panama Canal Company, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF SMALL TRACT ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended by the act of June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 239; 43 U.S.C. 682b) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING-TYPE FUNDS IN THE TREASURY FOR SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION AND SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish revolving-type funds in the Treasury for the Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES AND CHANGE OF NAME OF CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF BONNEVILLE PROJECT ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bonneville Project Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF LAND TO CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF SECTION OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY TO SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLASSIFICATION, SEGREGATION, AND DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LANDS CHIEFLY VALUABLE FOR URBAN AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the classification, segregation, and disposal of public lands chiefly valuable for urban and business purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF SCOTTS BLUFF NATIONAL MONUMENT, NEBR.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN UNSCRUPULOUS ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate certain unscrupulous activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF FORT RALEIGH NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in North Carolina, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION PAYMENTS DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT (NEBR.), FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE IRRIGATION DISTRICT (NEBR.), AND KANSAS-BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 2 (KANS.), MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the determinations relating to the 1962 and 1963 construction payments due the United States from the Bostwick Irrigation District (Nebr.), Frenchman-Cambridge Irrigation District (Nebr.), and Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2 (Kans.), Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PARKWAY CONNECTION BETWEEN MOUNT VERNON AND WOODLAWN PLANTATION, VIRGINIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantation, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PART II, PROJECT TWENTY-TWELVE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, part II of Project Twenty-Twelve, a long-range program for our public lands, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC LAND TOWNSITE ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR VIRGIN ISLANDS AND GUAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2455 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEASING OF MINERAL DEPOSITS IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES OWNS A PARTIAL OR FUTURE INTEREST

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913) with respect to the leasing of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE OF LAND AND INTERESTS ON BLUE RIDGE AND NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAYS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DAMAGE TO INDIANS ON CROW CREEK AND LOWER BRULE RESERVATIONS, S. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on damage to Indians on Crow Creek and Lower Brule Reservations from the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project, South Dakota (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT TO PREVENT UNDESIRABLE DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS LEASEHOLDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 30(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C., sec. 187a), to prevent the undesirable division of oil and gas leaseholds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF ACT OF OCTOBER 22, 1919, AND ACT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1922, AND REQUIREMENT FOR ENTRYMEN OF CERTAIN LANDS TO BE RESIDENT CITIZENS OF NEVADA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C., secs. 351–355, 357–360), and the act of September 22, 1922 (c. 400, 42 Stat. 1012; 43 U.S.C., sec. 356), and to require that entrymen of lands in Nevada under the Desert Land Act be resident citizens of Nevada (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO INDIAN TRIBES AND TO MAKE SUCH LANDS PARTS OF RESERVATIONS INVOLVED

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to donate to certain Indian tribes some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTATION AND AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1948, RELATING TO THE FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the

Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS IN MAJOR DISASTERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES AND CHANGE OF NAME OF FORT VANCOUVER NATIONAL MONUMENT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries and to change the name of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 4, 1953, TO CONVEY CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR PUBLIC AGENCIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR UNINCORPORATED TERRITORIES OF VIRGIN ISLANDS AND GUAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF AUGUST 3, 1956, RELATING TO ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), relating to adult Indian vocational training (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES RELATING TO FAIR MARKET VALUE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

A letter from the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on the negotiations jointly on behalf of the United States with the tribal councils of the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Sioux Indian Tribes, concerning the fair market value of certain property, the relocation of cemeteries, and so forth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES COMMISSIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and others for the purpose of providing for coordinated planning for the development of the Nation's water and related land resources through the establishment of water resources commissions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6(a) OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ACT

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors, Virgin Islands Corporation, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INTERIM REPORT OF CROW CREEK SIOUX TRIBE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

A letter from the attorney for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law on the activities of that tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERMISSION FOR DOCUMENTATION OF VESSELS SOLD OR TRANSFERRED ABROAD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL BOATING ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO PROCURE SERVICES OF EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FLEXIBLE RATE OF INTEREST FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCING UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 116 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONFIRMATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE RANGE, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to confirm the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN PROCEDURES OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES REGARDING PASSENGER TICKET SALES AND RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 407 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958 TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF CERTAIN RATES AND PRACTICES OF AIR CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958 TO PROVIDE FOR SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY AND AIRMAIL RATES

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission as of November 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STRENGTHENING OF LAWS AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting six drafts of proposed legislation to strengthen the laws against organized crime (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

1. To prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communications facilities.

2. To provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

3. To amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act.

4. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures.

5. To amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith.

6. To amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3238 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses not committed in any district (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT BY REQUIRING PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF CORPORATE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY MATERIAL REQUIRED IN CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary material required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to modernize and liberalize the quota system and provide for the admission of persecuted peoples, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESCAPE OR ATTEMPTED ESCAPE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES WITHIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROVISION OF CONVENTION OF PARIS FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PROVIDE FOR REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADEMARKS USED IN COMMERCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with relation to the importation of trademarked articles and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR WITHIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS NOT COGNIZABLE UNDER THE LAW

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3054, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise section 3054, title 18 of the United States Code, concerning the enforcement of certain provisions of such Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

WORK HOURS ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT UNDER FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report under the Fair Labor Standards Act, dated 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SALARIES OF SUPERINTENDENT, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, AND FIRST ASSISTANT PHYSICIAN OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and first assistant physician of the hospital, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FACTORY INSPECTION AND DRUG AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority thereunder; require manufacturers of new drugs to keep records of, and make reports on, clinical experience and other relevant data bearing on the permissibility of such drugs; require that drugs be prepared or packed under adequate controls to insure proper identity, strength, purity, and quality, and otherwise insure their compliance with the act; and extend to all antibiotics the certification provisions of the act now limited to certain antibiotics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its various units to perform their functions more efficiently and effectively by providing them with certain administrative authority, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FOOD ADDITIVES TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS AMENDMENT OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HEALTH FACILITIES AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act, authorizing grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, providing for Federal guaranty of loans for construction of group practice medical or dental care facilities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ORGANIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide greater flexibility in the organization of the Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTABLISHING OF A TEACHING HOSPITAL FOR HOWARD UNIVERSITY

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the University, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ASSISTANCE IN COSTS OF CERTAIN SERVICES NEEDED IN CARRYING OUT PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAMS

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist in meeting the costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EMERGENCY REPATRIATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM FOR KOREAN CONFLICT VETERANS AND EARLIER TERMINATION DATE FOR WORLD WAR II LOAN GUARANTY AND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAMS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the direct loan program for Korean conflict veterans and provide an earlier termination date for the World War II loan guarantee and direct loan programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESERVATION OF BASIC COMPENSATION IN DOWNGRADING ACTIONS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEA TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Defense Department Oversea Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS ON PLACEMENT IN CERTAIN GRADES UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on positions which were placed in grades GS–18, GS–17, and GS–16, respectively, under authority of Public Law 626, 86th Congress, entitled "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the placement in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 of certain employees (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific and professional positions established in that Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, concerning positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Treasury Department on grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the General Accounting Office, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITION IN GRADE GS–18, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the establishment of a position in grade GS–18, during the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO COMPUTATION OF INTEREST EARNINGS OF SPECIAL TREASURY ISSUES HELD BY CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, to provide for permanent indefinite appropriation to said fund, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERMANENCY OF CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAW

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to

strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION OR ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

INTERIM REPORT OF JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, James Madison Memorial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF ACT AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1, MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO EXTEND THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED, AND TO ENACT CERTAIN LEGISLATION IN REGARD TO THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

"Whereas the present U.S. sugar program has been in existence since 1934, and the legislation entitled 'The Sugar Act of 1948, as amended', has provided great stability to the sugar beet growers of Colorado and to sugar beet growers throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas in addition to giving stability to the domestic producer of sugar, the legislation has provided adequate sugar supplies to the consumers of the United States at reasonable prices; and

"Whereas the deterioration of relations with the present Government of Cuba, and other international questions prevented the 86th Congress of the United States from taking the necessary action in extending the Sugar Act for a term of years; and

"Whereas the Sugar Act is scheduled to expire March 31, 1961, two steps must be taken by the Congress of the United States if continuity of the legislation is to be achieved, and if serious disruption in supplies of sugar is to be avoided: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Colorado hereby memorializes the 87th Congress to take the following steps with respect to sugar legislation:

"(1) Immediately extend the present legislation through December 31, 1961.

"(2) Prior to recess of the first session enact legislation for a sufficient term of years to provide a basis for sound economic planning on the part of the sugar industry of the Nation and recognize the increasing importance of the sugar beet industry and the added reliance this Nation is placing on increased domestic sugar production; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

"SAM T. TAYLOR,
"President of the Senate.
"ALBERT J. TOMSIC,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"GENE MANZANARIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Rhode Island AFL–CIO, relating to a limitation of debate under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture, relating to purchase of milk by agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the sugar beet industry is a vital and integral part of the economy of the State of Idaho and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the production of sugar beets in the continental United States, as well as in Idaho, is geared to the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, and particularly to the stabilization of prices and control of imports from foreign countries which are effected by its provisions relating to the processing tax and Sugar Act compliance payments; and

"Whereas unless its effectiveness is extended, the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, will expire on March 31, 1961, thereby forthwith depriving the sugar industry and the consumers of the customary controls and supplies and necessitating drastic economic adjustments within the industry, the State of Idaho, and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, in order to avoid any lapse in the effectiveness of the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation extending the effectiveness of this act to and including the 31st day of December 1961; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution extending congratulations and good wishes to the President-elect of the United States of America

"Whereas on the 20th day of January 1961, our President-elect, the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will be inaugurated as the 35th President of these United States of America; and

"Whereas the citizens of Idaho, in company with the citizens of all other States of our Union, have traditionally bridged and are now bridging the gap between the polling places and the White House by rallying in support of the successful candidate, regardless of party affiliation; and

"Whereas the people of Idaho feel confident that the President-elect will show himself to be a man of forthrightness, integrity, and a great deal more than a profile of courage; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the people of Idaho, through the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho to convey to the President-elect their congratulations and good wishes; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring herein), That the people of the State of Idaho do hereby extend to the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy their heartiest and most sincere congratulations upon his election and inauguration as the 35th President of these United States of America, as well as their wholehearted support and good wishes for a successful administration, and for continued peace, prosperity and progress during the four years ahead; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward, by air mail, copies of this resolution to the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at (1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1961:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Kermit Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 26: 4: *Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, whose daily blessings we frequently receive with so little of gratitude and cherish with so little of care, make us more acutely conscious of Thy divine providence.

Show us how we may guard ourselves against those specters of anxiety and apprehension which seek to find lodgment in our minds as we face the adventures of an unknown future.

Help us to feel Thy nearness in the varied experiences of life, giving us guidance and courage for the demands and duties of each new day.

Grant that we may be faithful and loyal partners with all who are champions of the rights of man and may none of our decisions and actions run counter to that which is just and reasonable.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 30

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESSES IN ORDER ON JANUARY 30

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, January 30, 1961, the Speaker may declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION TO CHAMBER ON JANUARY 30

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on Monday, January 30, 1961, the date set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS BY DISTRICTS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution which I hope will be favorably acted upon at this session of the 87th Congress, because it proposes for ratification by the States, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would require and provide a fairer method of choosing the electors from each State who elect the President and the Vice President of our country.

This proposed amendment, embodied in the resolution which I have introduced, does not attempt to deal with all of the objections which have been raised by many earnest and thoughtful people, about what they consider to be faults, injustices, and even potential dangers to the continuity of our Government that they regard as existent in the present procedure for electing our President and Vice President.

Frankly, I did not intend this to be an omnibus amendment. I do not strive to legislate by constitutional amendment to seek to solve all problems in one sweep. Frankly, too, I think that, as many times before in our history, the more we think and talk about improving our procedures for electing the President and Vice President, the more certain that we are to conclude that nothing should be done.

The change which I propose, however, is a simple change. It is one that without complication would provide a fairer method of choosing electors for President and Vice President. My studies do not conclusively show that the results of any presidential election in the past would have been different; but it is apparent that if my amendment is enacted and ratified, future elections of a President and a Vice President would more directly reflect the desires of the people, than under the present procedures.

The essence of the electoral method of electing our President and Vice President is that the electors shall correspond to the representation which the people of each State have in the Congress.

Each State is allotted electoral votes which exactly total to the number which is the sum of the Members that State has in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

If, in the reapportionment of the House of Representatives, the population of a State has increased sufficiently, the number of Representatives to which it is entitled is increased; and the number of electoral votes to which that State is entitled is increased by exactly that many.

The present procedure, however, is unfair, in that if one political party has a plurality of even one vote, that plurality is as good as a million, for it takes for that party all of the electors to which that State is entitled.

The amendment which I propose provides that in every State, electors corresponding to the two Senators from that State, and to the Representative at Large, if there be such a Member, as in the case of Connecticut, shall be elected by the people of the entire State. The remaining electors shall be nominated in and for the respective congressional districts, as the Representatives now are elected.

I have not been able to obtain the complete returns of the last election by congressional districts as well as by States, so that I am unable to give a complete nationwide illustration of how my proposed amendment would have operated in the last election. However, it is apparent that the total of electoral votes of President Kennedy would have been less, and the electoral votes of Richard M. Nixon would have been more than those recorded under the existing electoral system.

In my own State, Kennedy received the eight electoral votes cast for Connecticut. Under my proposed amendment, Kennedy would have received seven and Nixon would have received one.

In some of the larger States, Illinois and Pennsylvania, for example, the electoral vote between the two candidates would have been more equally divided. In California, on the other hand, Kennedy would have received some electoral votes, although under the system now applied, he received none from that State.

One other change that my amendment proposes applies in the event that no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes cast. At present, the decision would be thrown into the House of Representatives, to elect the President, and into the Senate, to elect the Vice President.

I propose to have both the President and the Vice President, in such an eventuality, elected by the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session, with each State having one vote. This would relieve the problem that could exist under the present system, in States in which the membership of the House of Representatives is equally divided between the parties, as it has been on occasion in my own State.

I submit this resolution for the consideration of the Congress, so that a proposed amendment may be submitted for ratification by the States, to provide a fairer procedure for the electing of our President and our Vice President.

THE LATE WILLIAM B. McKINLEY

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to address the House

today and commemorate the birthday of William McKinley, who served as a Member of Congress, as Governor of Ohio, and as President of the United States. Our great American poet, Longfellow, wrote these lines which so fit this occasion:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

It is fitting that we take a few moments from our legislative day to recall the life and work of this great Ohioan whose life was truly sublime and who truly left his footprints on the sands of time. I deem it a great privilege to be able to speak on behalf of my colleagues from Ohio concerning our 25th President. He was a great patriot, a farseeing statesman, a good, kindly, godly man endowed with a calmness and dedication which made him a great leader. He was a man of deep and sincere religious faith. We are pleased this afternoon to be wearing the red carnation, not only the State flower of Ohio but also the favorite flower of the late President McKinley.

Speaking as one who has labored earnestly in the past decade to encourage young people to identify themselves with a political party, I find great satisfaction in the fact that he chose at a very early age to associate with the Republican Party and became a champion of its doctrines. He noted on many occasions that he could lead a more useful life by alinement with a party and felt there was little place for an independent in political life. Then, as now, our soldiers voted, William McKinley cast his very first ballot for Abraham Lincoln while he was on the march.

Among the many noted sons and daughters that the Buckeye State has given to the service of the Nation and the world, none reflected any greater credit on his people than this fine man. Born January 29, 1843, of humble origin, he gained honor as a soldier and statesman. He enlisted in the Union Army as a private and rose to the rank of major. He distinguished himself in the Civil War, seeing his first combat at Antietam where he assisted in supplying the frontlines during the bloodiest day of the entire war.

After this great struggle he studied law and was admitted to the bar at Warren, Ohio, in March 1867. With a combination of courage, integrity, and thoroughness, he made his mark. One incident stands out. In 1876, he defended principle at the risk of political oblivion. A strike at the Tuscarawas Valley coal mines had evoked a bitter battle. The pay of the men had been cut and many unfortunate incidents brought tensions to the breaking point. Twenty-three miners were indicted by the grand jury and public sentiment was so inflamed that no lawyer cared to defend them. With courage and compassion, McKinley represented the miners and obtained the acquittal of all except one.

He served over a decade in these Halls and is regarded as one of its most illustrious graduates. First elected to Congress in 1876, he was acclaimed during his seven terms here as a leading authority on world trade. He was an advocate of a protective tariff in the days when our infant industries needed special protection. As chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, he authored the McKinley tariff bill. In addition, he was a strong advocate of sound money and is usually characterized as being a friend of business. However, he had a deep-seated confidence in the workingman and of his right for self-assertion and the expression of grievances. He was, in fact, a stanch friend of both business and labor. As Governor of Ohio, one of his many accomplishments was the establishment of a State board of arbitration to amicably settle disputes between employers and employees.

McKinley served during robust years when the problems of America were much like those at the present. In the postwar years, the challenges of growth and industrial expansion, the twin problems of panics and unemployment and the controversy which raged over a solvent currency, read much like a page of our legislative agenda of today. Then as now, the potential threat of loss of individual freedom loomed as men chose between solutions to meet the urgencies of the day. Through all of this, from the Halls of Congress to the White House, McKinley had a deep and abiding faith in the soundness of the free enterprise system and never compromised this principle by seeking to adopt solutions from political philosophies alien to the great American ideals.

His two terms as Governor witnessed an improvement of Ohio's canals, roads, and institutions. In 1897, he became the 25th President of the United States. In his inaugural address he cited this belief which we should well contemplate today:

> The Government should not be permitted to run behind or increase its debts in times like the present. * * * The best way for a government to maintain its credit is to pay as it goes.

In the nineties, the country was in the throes of financial and economic desperation. The National Treasury was being depleted and revenue was falling behind expenditures. Good men were being torn between anarchy and revolution. McKinley bade the Congress to put the affairs of the country in order by the establishment of a dollar of such a quality that its ring would be acknowledged genuine in every market in the world. In this he succeeded in an era marked by slogans of "full dinnerpail," "sound money," and "16 to 1."

It is reassuring for us to realize that our present Commander in Chief, unlike William McKinley, has at his command a modern defensive arsenal capable of defending America from its enemies. When President McKinley issued the first call for volunteers for the Spanish-American War, our country had an Army and Navy of 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men. Spain had one of the largest navies in the world and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone. In addition, with the exception of Great Britain, all of Europe was solidly behind Spain which enjoyed the prestige of being one of the great powers in the world. Nonetheless, he led this fledging Nation to victory and international eminence.

Far ahead of his time, he realized that our period of exclusiveness was past. He championed our manifest destiny—America as a world power. In truth, our history as a world power dates from the Spanish-American War and his administration.

His one, absorbing goal was the assertion of the influence of the United States for good—above all, for peace—in the world. At the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 5, 1901, the day before his assassination, he epitomized this belief with these words which we might well pause to reflect in these trying times:

> Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. May all who are represented here be moved to higher and nobler efforts for their own and the world's good. * * *
>
> Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of the earth.
>
> God and man have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. * * * Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. * * * We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing.

The greatest factor of all in his life, however, was the spiritual. Never did a man in public life walk more uprightly. Like President Eisenhower, his spiritual faith found its application in everyday practice and protocol. In an era when we seem to have drifted from this sure rudder which has set our course throughout history, we should recall these words of the 25th President of the United States:

> The men who established this great Government had faith in God and sublimely trusted Him. They besought counsel and advice in every step of their progress. And so it has been ever since; American history abounds in instances of this trait of piety, this sincere reliance on a higher power in all great trials of our national affairs.

Cardinal Gibbons, speaking at Baltimore at the time of his death, said:

> He would have adorned any court in Christendom by his civil virtues. No court in Europe or in the world was more conspicuous for moral rectitude and purity or more free from the breath of scandal than the official home of President McKinley.

Rabbi Joseph Silverman, speaking at the time of his funeral in New York City, said:

> The supremely religious life made him an ideal President of the Nation, on a plane with Washington and Lincoln. Speaking epigrammatically, we might say that Washington created the Union, Lincoln preserved the Union, and McKinley expanded the Union. He wisely brought harmony out of

political chaos, shattered the financial heresies of his opponents, and conserved the stability of the Nation's credit. He always felt that he was doing God's work, that he was an humble servant of the Lord in His vineyard on earth.

On a monument erected at Canton, Ohio, to honor the martyred President are these words which I feel attest more adequately than I can the virtuous life of this great Ohioan:

In memory of William McKinley: A good citizen, brave soldier, wise executive, helper and leader of men, exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the State, society, and the home.

At a time when there is a tendency as a richly endowed people to consider the frittering away of our national resources, turning our backs on the established virtues of industry, self-reliance, and thrift and following the siren song of the something-for-nothing cult, it is appropriate that we examine our stewardship of the ideals and heritage which has been transmitted to us. Men like President McKinley represent our heritage and have handed to us a country incomparable in all history. They have given us the priceless legacy of freedom and material welfare which we enjoy in this year of our Lord, 1961. Above all of this, McKinley, like Washington and Lincoln, represented a spiritual example that might make us wonder whether we have kept our material prosperity of the sixties within proper perspective.

Mr. Speaker, we might well ask, "Will future decades honor us as we solemnly honor our 25th President today?" Permit me as one of the youngest Members of this august body to suggest that if we nurture the same love for country, if we emulate the honesty, integrity, the religious conviction and strength of purpose which was the hallmark of our beloved Ohioan, it is possible that history will record that we carried the torch well and were worthy heirs to this great tradition:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for the very excellent address he has made on the life and accomplishments of William McKinley. It is my great honor to represent the congressional district that was once represented in this Chamber by William McKinley. Mr. McKinley served in this House for six terms. He served for three terms, and then after an interruption of one term, came back for an additional period of three terms.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McKinley had a great love and admiration for the House of Representatives. Some of his happiest days were spent here in this Chamber. He told many of his friends and acquaintances in Canton that it was here that he spent the happiest days of his public service.

At one time he contested for the speakership of the House of Representatives against Speaker Reed. Later he found himself again in a contest with Speaker Reed, but at that time it was for the nomination for the Presidency of the United States. He lost the speakership, but he won the Presidency.

Mr. McKinley's great contributions to legislation were in these Halls. So again I say that it is a great honor to represent his district here in Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] represents an adjoining district. Again, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for the excellent address which he has made here today.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is well to pause on the birthday anniversary of a President of the United States. I am glad to join in these ceremonies to pay respect to the memory of the late President William McKinley as a President of the United States; not as a Republican, because he was the President of all of the people of America. The man who occupies the White House may be the leader of his party, but as President he is the Chief Executive of our country and represents all of our people.

The history of America shows that every one of our Presidents has served the people ably and well from his viewpoint and in accordance with his philosophy of the conduct of Government.

William McKinley served as President during a most important period in the history of our country. I am pleased, speaking as a Member of the House on the Democratic side, to join with my friends on the Republican side in honoring the memory of this great man who in his lifetime was honored by the people of our country by election not only to the greatest office within the gift of the people of America, but the greatest office in the world.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and accomplishments of President McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days 26 Members of this House have joined with me in introducing a newly written bill to create a National Peace Agency.

That bill would mobilize the creative power of American ideas to solve the great problems of disarmament and of reducing international tensions. It would involve physical and social scientists, teachers, public officials, and private citizens in an attempt to bring imagination and thought to bear on the problems of achieving peace. These problems are many and complex. For instance, can we work out a way to detect tests of chemical and bacteriological weapons? We do not know. What kinds of rearrangement of our national economy could we undertake, if the armaments burden upon our budget were to be reduced? We do not know. Are there any new ideas for reducing the tensions that plague our international life? We do not know.

We could try to answer these questions if an independent agency to explore new approaches to peace were to be created. Such an agency could also train the experts whom we will need to man the inspection posts in any international disarmament agreement. Such an agency is necessary to discover the hard facts upon which our State Department can build a sensible policy in negotiating with other nations.

For all these reasons, 26 Members have joined in introducing peace agency bills identical to H.R. 3186. Those Members are the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentlemen from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER and Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI], the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. KARTH], the gentlemen from New York [Mr. PIKE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CELLER, Mr. MULTER, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. ZELENKO], the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES, Mr. NIX, and Mr. TOLL], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. LANE], the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA and Mr. SHIPLEY], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

We hope to discuss the provisions of our bill before the House, during the next few weeks.

METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENTS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a proposal that a commission be formed to study our method of electing Presidents in this country. I do not endorse the view that the electoral college should be cast aside without the most careful consideration of the

longrun results of such action. Clearly, some revision is necessary. It is my opinion that all electors in a given State should be automatically bound to vote for the presidential candidate receiving the most votes in that State. Last fall, we came shockingly close to having a ridiculous spectacle presented to the world of presidential candidates having to make deals with a few independent electors in order to attain enough electoral votes to become President.

I think any commission appointed to study this matter would give deliberate attention to the fact that our Nation was never intended to be a pure democracy, but rather a Republic. Our Founding Fathers were fearful not only of the tyranny of a demagog but also fearful of the tyranny of majorities. Accordingly, our system has built-in protections against ill-considered, moblike action by a temporary majority.

In introducing this bill establishing a study commission, I have provided that the commission shall report back to the Congress and the President not later than the beginning of our next session of Congress. This would give ample opportunity for public discussion and a thorough airing of proposals before the Congress.

I think it should be pointed out that our system of electing Presidents, with all its faults, has worked remarkably well in transferring power from one party to another. Certainly, a pure popular vote for President would have created temporary uncertainty in the last presidential election. None of us would have known for 4 or 5 weeks, at least, after the election, who was elected President. The electoral college reduced somewhat the uncertainty involved, although it, of course, did not eliminate all uncertainty. It would appear that no system could avoid all shortcomings, but I think improvements can be made without any question.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced an omnibus bill on the subject of conflict of interest in the executive branch of the Government. At a time when the new administration is faced with the difficult problem of staffing the executive establishment with both full- and part-time personnel, this legislation becomes especially appropriate. This bill is the work product of a special committee on the Federal conflict-of-interest laws of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. I was honored to serve as a member of this committee from its inception, which was prior to my election to Congress. The committee spent over 2 years in researching and developing an approach to this difficult problem. It met in New York City as a regular matter for 2 full days and 1 evening every month. The committee's book "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," was recently published by Harvard University Press.

The bipartisan committee was composed of distinguished lawyers representing many years of Government service. Speaking personally, I am pleased and honored to have worked as a colleague with these gentlemen and I should like to mention each of them briefly. Roswell B. Perkins, of New York, former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was our chairman. Members of the committee were Howard F. Burns, of Cleveland, Ohio; member of the Council of the American Law Institute; Charles A. Coolidge, of Boston, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for legal and legislative affairs; Paul M. Herzog, of New York, former Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; Alexander C. Hoagland, Jr., of New York, distinguished lawyer, former fellow, the Association of the Bar, City of New York; Everett L. Hollis, former General Counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission; Charles A. Horsky, former assistant prosecutor at Nuremburg with the Chief Counsel for War Crimes; John E. Lockwood, of New York, former General Counsel for the Office of Inter-American Affairs; and Samuel I. Rosenman, of New York, former special counsel to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

The committee staff included Prof. Bayles Manning, of the Yale Law School, as staff director, and Prof. Marver H. Bernstein, of the department of politics of Princeton University, as associate staff director. I am pleased to note that Professor Manning was recently appointed as one of the three special advisers to the President on Federal conflict-of-interest laws.

When I introduced this bill in the 86th Congress, I spoke at length on the floor regarding its importance. Hearings were held thereafter before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and also in the other body.

My proposed legislation adopts a new approach to this critical subject—it is geared to the necessity of creating statutory standards that will insist upon exemplary conduct in office and the removal of the possibility of conflicts of personal and public interests. At the same time it gives due recognition to the need of the Government in this day and age for the services of expert consultants, scientists, educators, and other highly trained and knowledgeable individuals.

This legislation seeks to pull together the scattered, ambiguous, and misunderstood statutes in existence now. Since the last Congress I have made a few changes in the bill which are designed to perfect it.

Recently, Fortune magazine ran an excellent article by Herbert Solow entitled "Conflict of Interest: A Legal Nightmare." In discussing the bill that I have introduced Mr. Solow affirms that the immediate practical issue is to reduce the incidence of conflict without debilitating the public service and he suggests that the bill, as well as the study by the special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, will constitute important steps toward this end. At this point, I include Mr. Solow's article in my remarks:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: A LEGAL NIGHTMARE

(By Herbert Solow)

The Senate will soon be asked for its advice and consent on several hundred nominations to high posts in the new administration. One of the tests sometimes applied to a nominee is whether there exists any conflict between his private interests and the performance of his Government job. The ordeal of General Motors' Charles E. Wilson is probably the best remembered case, but there have been many others, ranging from the discovery of clear and outrageous conflicts to cases where a nominee—and indirectly the public interest—was victimized by a badly drawn law or a strained interpretation of the law. The cases that the public hears about are probably less important than those that remain unknown. And while some real conflicts of interest are not covered by present laws, legal ambiguities keep many valuable men from entering public service.

The whole subject is due for a major overhaul, and the basis for a new approach has been laid in a study called "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," made by a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (Harvard University Press, $5.50). The study's research staff director is Bayless Manning, a professor of law. His associate, Marver H. Bernstein, a professor of politics, brought to the study a helpful nonlegalistic knowledge of the real operations and problems that arise in Federal service.

The book describes the present laws and rules, analyzes their defects, and presents a draft of a proposed new law. This draft has been submitted to Congress as H.R. 10575 by Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, a New York Republican and a member of the bar association committee, who will also be in the 87th Congress. The bill's aim is to facilitate (a) Government recruiting of specialized personnel and (b) honest law enforcement rather than Government connivance at evasion of conflict-of-interest laws and regulations.

Federal statutes on conflict of interest are mostly about a century old and show the effects of age. They are largely directed at the conduct of a class of low-rank political appointees who, for the most part, disappeared with the rise of the civil service system. Likewise, they deal largely with a limited class of cases—prosecution by Government employees of other people's monetary claims against the United States. Today this kind of case has little importance compared to problems arising out of vast new areas of public interest such as Government regulation of industry and the contracting out of research.

Not only are the conflict-of-interest laws out of date, but most of them were badly drawn in the first place. They sometimes treat comparable employees differently, sometimes treat differentiated employees identically. They are riddled with haphazard exemptions. Some are so vague that the bar committee's book calls them a nightmare. Four laws forbid Federal employees from assisting outsiders in prosecuting claims against the Government, but what "assist" means is quite uncertain. One law bars an employee from doing certain things

for 2 years after leaving his Government job, so that a man who consults intermittently for, say, 5 years may be barred until the seventh year. But what if his only seemingly relevant action for the Government was in the first year? Nobody can be sure that he is not barred anyway.

Section 1914 of United States Code 18 forbids a former employer from making up the difference between a man's former business pay and his Government pay. But can a Government employee receive compensation in any form from his erstwhile employer? Can an employee, by picking up the payments, retain his eligibility in long-range and preexisting stock options or retirement and pension plans?

Then there is the problem of the WOC's, persons who serve without compensation and are sometimes said to be exempt from the conflict-of-interest laws. Many are, in fact, exempt only in part, and the exemptions are highly technical and erratic. There are also the more numerous WAE's, persons paid only when actually employed. Section 281 makes all WAE work dangerous because no Government employee may legally take pay from anybody else for performing services "in relation" to any matter that is in a forum of the executive branch. But at all times a consultant, his company, and the Government are occupied with related matters. What does 281 mean?

Again, under section 1914, should a privately employed scientist acting as a WAE have his employer dock him for a day's pay because he was in Washington? As the bar committee puts it, "He could have taken that day off to play golf. Does it make any difference that he worked at his regular office all the following Sunday? [How can] his stock option, retirement, and insurance pay * * * be adjusted to take account of one day a month?"

HOW CAN WASHINGTON USE SCIENTISTS?

In 1960 the Federal Government spent about $5.5 billion for research, engineering, and development, more than half in laboratories of profitmaking organizations and universities. And latterly, scientists have discovered that they can make money, and many are doing it, as executives, investors, consultants. (See "The Egghead Millionaires," Fortune, September 1960.) The conflict-of-interest situation of scientists, increasingly important for its own sake, is also illustrative of many general problems.

The bar committee shows that the statutes are too strict and at the same time too lax. They are ineffective in curbing real risks and they are crippling when strictly enforced. "The many scientists who work on a contract basis, or on Government-financed projects in universities or other institutions, are not [legally] 'employees,' and are not covered by the statutes at all. Full-time civil servant scientists are as little affected as other civil servants." Section 434, calling for disqualification, "has an impact on regular employees in operational positions, but those employees are not apt to have significant outside commitments, while the scientist serving as consultant * * * is seldom in the kind of business-transacting situation to which section 434 applies." The problems of applying section 1914 "have special force for the scientific consultant, typically a corporate or institutional employee" who "works in a field most dramatically illustrating the unique mixed private-public economy of contemporary America, and often cannot be classified either as a Government 'employe' or a 'nonemployee.' He demonstrates in a modern and complex form the exposure of Government employees to potential and real conflicts of interest * * *.

"In the case of the consultant, one of the major potentials for risk lies in the commercial usefulness of information acquired out of the consultancy. Yet it is an administrative and psychological impossibility to enforce a rule that technical information learned in one place be forgotten in another; and the interacting flow of ideas and information from many sources is exactly what is called for from scientific consultants * * *. It is futile to try to draw a sharp line separating decisions on policy matters (whether the rocket program should emphasize liquid or solid propellants, for example), where personal disqualification is presumably unnecessary, from decisions on immediate operating questions (whether an award for propellant research should go to company X or company Y), where any official interested in either company must disqualify himself * * *. Must the Government, under this logic, hear no word of counsel from any industry scientist on * * * fuels?"

Until recently, the scientific community was not much aware of the conflict-of-interest statutes, but its attention was caught in November 1959, when a Congressman loudly criticized the Secretary of Defense for proposing that Convair's research director, Charles L. Critchfield, be named Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency. Convair is a big Pentagon supplier, and Critchfield was to be 1 of 10 WOC's permitted under a 1951 law. Critchfield—or Convair—decided that he could not take the heat and he got out of the kitchen. Thus the principle that underlies section 1914 was made effective in a case to which the section itself was not properly applicable, and the precedent may do more and more damage to recruiting efforts.

UNDER THE RUG

Anyone who takes a job in Washington may be relying on a lawyer's bad guess and, since half a dozen of the conflict-of-interest statutes are criminal in character, he may end up in the penitentiary—at least in theory. One leading corporation lawyer has said that, because of the conflict-of-interest laws, he does not as a general rule advise his clients to join up, at least in time of peace. And before a House committee last year the representatives of many executive agencies complained of the deterrent effect of the conflict statutes on recruiting. For one example, Assistant Attorney General Robert Kramer testified that "agencies such as the AEC, which must depend upon the part-time services of scientific or other technical advisers," have serious difficulties because of the conflict-of-interest laws, and that even his own department has a related problem. Moreover, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON has identified distributing difficulties in securing first-rate talent [for] Government service, due to the fear of honest prospective appointees of getting caught in some technical violation. (See also "The Businessman in Government," Fortune, July 1954.)

Of course, the situation might be worse were it not for a pattern of ignoring or evading the law. The bar association committee found that in day-to-day administration the intermittent Government employee and his agency sometimes choose a sensible interpretation of the unclear law so that it can be quietly swept under the rug. Some examples:

"A specialist who is unwilling to accept appointment as an employee because of conflict-of-interest restraints enters instead into a contract with the agency to turn out a work product as an independent contractor—the work product being the report he would have written had he accepted the appointment as a WAE. The holder of stock that might have to be sold upon his appointment, transfers it to his wife before accepting the appointment. * * * During the 2 years of postemployment decontamination * * * the former official does not formally join a private concern dealing with the Government but, through a variety of independent contracting and accounting arrangements, offices with the concern and draws his income from it. * * * In an effort to comply with section 1914 and simultaneously to maintain the appointee's eligibility under * * * security plans, subtly differing degrees of quasi-resignation, or leave of absence are devised."

The bar committee recognizes that the civil service must be supplemented not only by high political appointees but also by many lower rank temporary or intermittent employees, and advocates aggressive action to insure that these be men of the highest skills available. It is willing, therefore, to gamble with financial temptation. Its bill retains the essential principles embodied in existing laws, but recasts their form and language. Its basic idea is to broaden and strengthen public protections without drowning in moralism the practical staffing requirements of modern government. This novel approach would broaden the scope of restraints to cover the widened spectrum of Government activities. It would generalize the spot distinction already made between bans on outside pay prescribed for regular and for intermittent employees, and thus accommodate old law to new reality. It would strengthen restraints in general but remove from the area of uncertainty the right of Government employees to retain accumulated economic values, particularly benefits in outside pension plans.

The bill also would turn agency regulation into law in an effort to tighten restraints on gift taking and coercive use of Federal office for private profit. It would not abandon criminal penalties for purposeful and knowing violations, but it would emphasize suspension, firing, and civil damage actions. It would apply sanctions such as cancellation of contracts to persons outside Government who induce or participate in breaches of the law.

The committee's bill would also mandatorily centralize responsibility for administration in the Office of the President. This idea has some promise. Agency conflict-of-interest codes vary widely in quality, with the poorer tending to undermine the better. So the bar committee suggests the creation in the Executive Office of the President of a small central coordinating office to help the President promulgate minimal standards, applicable to the entire executive branch. The coordinator would help individual agencies formulate special regulations, follow up on White House directives, and assist agency heads in answering preventive questions as to proprieties.

GAMBLE ON MEDIOCRITY?

At hearings before a Senate subcommittee last year, one witness was Roswell B. Perkins, chairman of the bar committee and former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He pointed out to the Senate that achieving statutory revision may be hard, since at least half a dozen congressional standing committees claim authority. Perkins suggested that the revision job go to a special joint committee of both Houses.

In any case, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, New York Democrat and chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, is likely to play a big role. In 1958 he filed a bill now known as H.R. 2156, his own blueprint for a revision of the statutes. There is an important difference between the Celler and the bar committee approaches. In general, CELLER would discourage consultants and temporary employees, and emphasize reliance on full-time workers without income sources except their Federal pay. His bill, as epitomized by Assistant Attorney General Kramer, "attempts to clarify, tighten, and extend existing laws,

continuing the emphasis of those laws upon criminal penalties and retaining a single standard of conduct for all Government employees, subject to various exemptive enactments." CELLER would eliminate financial temptation by all means and gamble on mediocrity. His bill gives little comfort to those, including Senator JACKSON, who fear that present laws act as an unnecessary deterrent on recruitment of qualified men in Federal service.

Whatever happens, the problem of conflicts of interest will probably never be fully solved, but the immediate, practical issue is to reduce the incidence of conflicts without debilitating the public service. The present study and draft bill are important steps toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, the principal points in the legislation that I have proposed are as follows:

First. Consolidate all of the fragmentary, discordant, and confusing provisions of conflict-of-interest law into one unified statute with comprehensive coverage, common definitions, and consistent standards.

Second. Reinforce present laws by expanding current offenses beyond the classical area of prosecution of claims.

Third. Add to the present law new offenses against the giving and receipt of corrupt gifts and the use of office as a club to exact favors from others.

Fourth. Differentiate between regular and intermittent employees of the Government and would provide appropriate rules of conduct for each. This basic change would go far to help assure the flow of information and advice which our modern Government seeks daily from knowledgeable private citizens.

Fifth. Recognize certain uniquely modern forms of interest in property acquired in private life, specifically those designed to achieve personal and family economic security arrangements. With solid protections and specific limitations, the act would sanction retention of these rights while in Government service.

Sixth. Supplement the present criminal penalties with more flexible and easily enforceable administrative remedies, while preserving the criminal penalties for willful violations.

Seventh. Provide the framework of an active and effective administrative structure for continuous application of the laws, with ultimate responsibility clearly vested in the President and agency heads.

The omnibus legislation I have proposed would leave the existing statutes covering the judicial and legislative branches unchanged. However, I am also introducing a measure which will focus attention on the legislative branch and that will be entirely separate from my omnibus bill, H.R. 3050. The rules applicable for the legislative branch would, by their very nature, have to be entirely distinct from those for employees of the executive branch. The legislative branch must reappraise the laws applicable to its own House and appropriate study is necessary.

Companion legislation will be introduced in the other body today by Senators JAVITS and KEATING.

I am hopeful that the partially completed work on these measures accomplished in the last Congress, along with the added necessity to solve these problems in the early days of a new administration, will prompt the Judiciary Committee and this House to act early in the current session.

The Nation's conflict-of-interest laws should be keystones for honest and impartial government. Subtle forms of modern corruption and the obsolescence and inadequacies of existing law prompt action. I hope we will have it.

THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, whenever an issue which strikes at the very heart of our legislative processes is considered, emotions and irresponsibility seem to take over. Whenever issues that may severely affect the Nation and all of her citizens are considered, reason, unfortunately, sometimes gives way to demagoguery.

Should the Rules Committee be packed? Of course it should not.

No case has been made against the present Rules Committee or its membership. Charges against it just are not supported by fact.

It is regrettable that Mr. Kennedy has added to the confusion, although he said he was speaking as a private citizen. He rightfully said:

> This responsibility rests with the Members of the House.

This being the fact, then why did he, on a televised political news conference, endorse the packing of the Rules Committee?

He further said:

> Members of the House should have an opportunity to vote themselves on the programs which we will present. That, I think, is the reason the people selected * * * me as President.

Citizen Kennedy spent too many years on Capitol Hill not to know the fallacy of this statement. It should be recalled that President Eisenhower, in his messages to the Congress, submitted many programs to the Congress which the Members did not have an opportunity to vote upon. May I just remind you, my colleagues, of a few: The Eisenhower depressed areas bills, which would have given $50 million to the depressed areas of this Nation; a minimum wage bill, which would have been beneficial to many of those who are underpaid; the Eisenhower Federal aid to education bill; the various farm bills; postal increases; the transferring of many of the functions now carried on by the Federal Government back to the States; and many other items of constructive legislation recommended by the President which were not voted upon by the Members of the Congress, which President Kennedy said should be the procedure.

I think it is well to ask, "Were these blocked because of the Rules Committee?" The answer is obviously, "No." They were blocked by the Democratic leadership of the Congress.

So, the responsibility as to what legislation will eventually be voted upon by the membership of the House of Representatives lies with the Democratic leadership—not with the Rules Committee. It is unfortunate we do not keep the record straight.

May I further point out that in the same televised news conference to which I referred, President Kennedy said further:

> The Constitution states that each House shall be the judge of its own rules and, therefore, the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, has been extremely anxious that the House be permitted to settle this matter in its own way.

The President injected himself into this controversy, violating this constitutional precept, but even more serious in my mind is the fact that one of the President's Cabinet officers has called upon Members of Congress, urging them to vote to pack the Rules Committee, and these calls have contained veiled threats of retribution. This not only is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution, but a serious threat to our Republic.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board. The purpose of this bill is to promote and encourage a significant increase in the now very small flow of foreign visitors to the United States.

Legislation of this nature was enacted in the last Congress by the other body but failed of action in the House during the final weeks before adjournment.

The bill which I propose would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to develop, plan, and implement a comprehensive program for the stimulation and encouragement of foreign travel to the United States. The bill provides for the establishment in the Department of Commerce of a greatly enhanced Office of International Travel authorized to expend up to $5 million a year on travel advertising and promotion. The new Office of International Travel would be headed by a Presidentially appointed director who would also represent the Secretary of Commerce on any interagency travel committee that might be set up within the executive branch. The bill also calls for the establishment of travel offices in foreign countries as the

Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may deem advisable. The bill provides further for the establishment of a Travel Advisory Board of 12 members, at least 6 of whom would be representatives of the various enterprises which constitute the travel industry. The Travel Advisory Board would advise and consult with the Director of the Office of International Travel and submit reports, at least once a year, to the Secretary of Commerce and to the Congress.

There are compelling reasons for the prompt enactment of this bill. The most urgent of these reasons is the necessity for positive action to help mitigate the alarming disequilibrium in our balance of payments, of which the travel gap—the difference between the amount spent by American travelers abroad and the amount expended by foreign visitors to the United States—is the largest single element. Spending by American tourists abroad has exactly doubled since 1953 while the increase in the volume of foreign travel to the United States, and the amount spent on American goods and services by foreign tourists, has expanded only very modestly. Despite the phenomenal growth in the prosperity of our friends in Western Europe, the travel dollar gap continues to mount precipitately. Indeed, the travel deficit, which accounted for one-fourth of our total balance-of-payments deficit in 1959, jumped to $1,150 million in 1960, or almost one-third of our total payments imbalance.

At least as important as the significance of foreign tourism for our balance-of-payments position is the need to open new and vitally needed channels of communication between the American people and our friends all over the world, especially the democratic peoples of the nascent North Atlantic community. The ignorance and misconceptions of America that prevail in many parts of the world constitute an appalling obstacle to the advancement of our foreign policy objectives and, consequently, a positive asset to our Communist adversaries.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker—economic, political, cultural, and educational—a vigorous new effort is required to encourage foreign travel to the United States. Foreign countries have long since recognized the advantages of advertising and promotion of tourism and their efforts have yielded handsome dividends. The bill which I have introduced purports to achieve the same objectives for the United States. It is my earnest hope that the House will act promptly and favorably on this bill. It is needed as a positive instrument for the advancement of our national interests.

MINERALS POLICY FOR LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, several of us are today introducing legislation to establish a minerals policy for the entire lead-zinc industry. The legislation, involving an adequate tariff arrangement, is to be cited as the "Lead and Zinc Act of 1961," and was developed by the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee. The purpose of the legislation is to restore the industry to a sound and stable condition and promote a reasonable balance between foreign and domestic supplies of lead and zinc ores, concentrates, and metal. It includes provisions for all segments of this diverse industry that range in size from the small independent miner to large integrated mining, milling, and refining companies.

Efforts in the past to solve the problems of this industry have not been successful. The programs of buying and bartering for national stockpiles have proved themselves only temporary palliatives, injurious to the long-range welfare of the industry, because rather than getting at the root of the problem of surplus foreign lead and zinc mine production, they encourage the creation of greater surpluses. Tariff Commission recommendations were never placed in effect and the effectiveness of a quota plan as a long-range solution is very questionable.

The factors considered by the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee in the formulation of adequate tariff legislation included first, the market price required by the domestic miner for profitable operation and continued development of domestic mines; second, a fair and stable price to the consumer assuring continued sales of lead and zinc and encouraging the expansion of the industry through new uses of these products, and, third, proposed rates for a tariff—fair to the importer—on the quantities of lead and zinc imports needed in the United States.

The legislation can be summarized by discussing briefly the three phases included.

First. It provides for a limited subsidy to be paid to domestic producers from tariff receipts on imported lead and zinc. This would give immediate help to domestic lead-zinc mines during periods of low metal prices and would guarantee continued production, exploration, development, and elimination of permanent loss of ore reserves through mine closure. The subsidy payment is limited to sales of new production of domestic ores and concentrates up to 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc in any 12-month period. The payment is based on the difference between 16 cents per pound for each metal and the actual market price. Any company or any individual miner may receive only one subsidy on production up to a maximum of 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc per year regardless of the number of mines he may own, lease, or operate.

Second. It provides for an import tax on lead and zinc concentrates and metal consisting of first, a permanent tax of 2 cents per pound on lead and zinc metal and 1.4 cents per pound on ores and concentrates to assure minimum required domestic prices; and, second, a removable tax of the same amount on both metals which is applied if the domestic market price of either metal goes below 13½ cents per pound and is removed when the market prices rise above 14½ cents per pound. This removable tax would protect the domestic industry from severely depressed prices abroad which permit such an invasion of the domestic market that home production is wiped out of existence.

Third. The legislation provides for a compensatory tax on the lead and zinc content of imported manufactured goods. This is 2 cents per pound in addition to present levies with an increased amount on two zinc items. This would control excessive imports of these products that displace uses of domestic metal.

All three phases of this legislation are needed to assure exploration, development, production, and continued growth of the domestic lead-zinc mines. A combination of market prices stabilized at a moderate level by the tariff plus a limited subsidy will maintain the domestic miner. Stable prices of approximately 14 cents per pound assure the consumer of long-term supply at a price attractive to use in domestic manufacturing. The United States needs to import approximately 50 percent of the newly mined lead and zinc ores and concentrates consumed each year. If this need is observed by importers and foreign producers and if our markets are not flooded with an unneeded supply, the removable tariff will not be applied, and the importer will receive a much better price for his product than he otherwise would.

I am confident that this program of limited subsidy and removable tariff is a practical solution to the continuing problems of the lead-zinc industry and I believe the legislation should be enacted to provide a long-term and long-awaited minerals policy.

KOWALSKI BILL FOR HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide health care insurance for our older citizens. The bill establishes an insurance program for persons entitled to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. It will also provide this insurance for persons with coverage under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act and for persons electing voluntary coverage.

My bill differs in some important respects from the Forand bill, of which I was a sponsor in the 86th Congress.

This new bill sets up a much broader coverage under a social security approach to health insurance. Coverage has been extended to railroad and civil service retirees. Further, the bill provides immediate coverage for all persons

not covered by other provisions of the bill whereby all uncovered persons now of retirement age, or reaching retirement age before January 1, 1964, will be insured, with financing out of general funds. Coverage for those reaching retirement age after January 1, 1964, and not otherwise covered, may be provided on a voluntary basis to those persons who elect coverage by paying a tax into the Federal Health Care Trust Fund.

The inclusion of Railroad Retirement and Civil Service Act retirees is a relatively simple matter, and in the interest of establishing broad coverage it seems reasonable to tax these employees and include them in the health care insurance program. The need for this program in general for senior citizens has been reported frequently, and President Kennedy has emphasized the necessity for legislation of this nature. The need exists not only for those now covered by social security, but all others as well.

In justice, persons not covered by the Social Security Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, or the Civil Service Retirement Act should have coverage available. Therefore, my bill makes coverage automatic to those retired before January 1, 1964, and extends it on a voluntary basis to those uncovered individuals reaching retirement age after January 1, 1964. General funds will provide financing for those receiving coverage automatically.

There is also provision that the Secretary of Health, Welfare, and Education may, at the request of any State, enter into agreements to provide coverage to the employees of that State or any unit within that State.

Thus, with the provision for voluntary enrollment, coverage is broadened greatly with only a limited expense to general funds. This arrangement is an attempt to provide the broadest coverage while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

To assure fiscal responsibility, the level of wages taxable for payments to the health fund is raised from $4,800 to $6,000.

Another major difference between this bill and preceding ones is its approach to the question of payments to hospitals. At the hearings on the Forand bill, Dr. Groner, of the American Hospital Association, pointed out that the Forand bill provided for payments on a reasonable cost basis. Hospitals today are suffering from serious deficits between cost for care of welfare patients and funds provided by State welfare agencies. Government must not add to the financial burdens of hospitals by requiring the hospitals to accept payments for patients which do not cover the hospitals' costs of treatment. If the hospitals incur deficits because of a Government program, the costs of the deficit will only be shifted to other segments of the population. Accordingly, the basis for payments to the hospitals is to be a full cost basis, and the bill enumerates some of the factors to be considered in establishing a formula. This is a very important change.

Also, the bill provides some latitude to surgeons who are to receive payment for services under this legislation. Fee schedules are to be set by regulation, and the surgeons are to accept these fees as full payment in the case of patients whose annual income is $3,000 or under in the case of a single person, or $4,000 or under in the case of a married individual. Above these income levels the surgeon's fee may be above the fee schedule set, and the patient is responsible for payment of the difference.

Another difference in this legislation is in the approach to admission to nursing homes. Previous legislation provided that such admission must be preceded by treatment in a hospital, and this meant that the hospital becomes a way station to a nursing home, thus perhaps causing some unnecessary admissions to hospitals. The legislation proposes a solution to this difficulty by providing that an individual may be admitted to a nursing home without previously receiving hospital services upon recommendation of a physician with the concurrence of a hospital administrator.

These are the major differences between this legislation and health care bills proposed in the past. The necessity for health insurance for the aging under the Social Security System seems clear. It is our responsibility to insure that the coverage is as broad as possible, and that the legislation have no unfavorable effects either on the practice of medicine or on the administration of hospitals.

THE ALMIGHTY WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker. I always have believed and do now believe in a Supreme Being, in the 10 Commandments, the Golden Rule, but when individuals here on earth attempt to assume absolute and arbitrary power, seem to think themselves infallible, I still cling to my childhood conviction that there is but one Supreme Being, though there may be many faiths and forms of worship.

True, scientists have made realities of some of our wildest imaginative creations.

Today's "Darius Green and his flying machine," which ignominiously always landed in the barnyard filth, travels thousands of miles beyond the earth, incredible distances at greater than the speed of sound or light. It is indeed a bold individual who today will say of any proposal "it cannot be done."

But to date no one of the vast majority has seemed to have a monopoly on knowledge or wisdom. Apparently the Post appears to harbor the conviction that it is the "glory hole" of all virtue. In the Washington Post's editorial of this morning supporting a minority's spending and sometimes socialistic program, we find this:

> Far more is involved than the prejudices of Mr. SMITH or the partisan concerns of Minority Leader HALLECK. If the Republicans in the House should gang up to force retention of a flagrantly undemocratic procedure, they would convict their party of cynical obstructionism.

Being interpreted, that means the Post knows it all, that Mr. SMITH is motivated by prejudices, Minority Leader HALLECK by partisan concerns. Did the Post ever credit an individual who did not accept its dictation with any worthy purpose or motive? The Post triumphantly admits—in fact, asserts—that it knows it all, that its motives are always pure.

One thing it is my privilege to know—and it came from the Post's own news stories and editorials. At least since 1935, the Post has advocated socialism, a form of communism, accused those who refused to accept its dictation of being either ignorant, dishonest, or unpatriotic—sometimes all three.

Once or twice, as when one of its reporters and its editorial columns endeavored, by fraud and deception, to make a hero out of a special U.S. district attorney, whose conduct was condemned by a U.S. district court and at last—twice—by a U.S. appellate court, and who later was convicted of a drunken assault on a Chinaman, the Post has been forced to editorially apologize for its misconduct.

A publication further to the left, of a deeper shade of pink, more conceited, more arrogant in its editorials, it would be difficult to find.

We should be thankful we still have the privilege of refusing to accept the Washington Post's political philosophy, comply with its programs which would eventually and quite quickly lead us to accept many of the Communists' views and programs.

Thank God, we still have the privilege of believing in Him, the 10 Commandments, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution, even though apparently, in the Post's opinion, He made many mistakes when He created the universe.

ACTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT NEEDED NOW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as President John F. Kennedy begins the first days of a new administration, he faces an array of serious problems bequeathed to him by the outgoing Republican administration. Perhaps the most harsh and pressing legacy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration to the Nation in mid-January 1961 is the fact of nearly 6 million Americans unemployed.

Repeatedly during the 1960 presidential campaign, Mr. Kennedy warned that the Nation was in economic trouble. Repeatedly Mr. Kennedy declared,

"We have got to get this country moving again." Repeatedly the GOP campaigners replied that "the American people have never had it so good."

The people spoke in November of last year. The facts are clear. We are now in the third recession in the past 7 years, and potentially the most severe. But in comparison with the past, there is now a cheering difference. The Kennedy administration is determined to attack the recession with effective economic countermeasures rather than with talk, inaction, and delay.

Delay in meeting the problem of widespread unemployment means not only continuing hardship for millions of American families who have known hardship too long. Failure to act now means a weakening of our national economy at a time when we should be building up our strength to meet the challenge of the Communist world.

Last month President Kennedy received the report of a special Task Force on Area Redevelopment, the chairman of which was the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS. The report dealt with problems of areas of chronic unemployment. In receiving the report, Mr. Kennedy said:

> It would be a mistake to consider the problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment solely in the context of the areas directly affected. The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality. This problem is especially critical today, for 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States lives in an area that now feels the impact of chronic unemployment or underemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES HIGH

Mr. Speaker, in my own congressional district, the Third of Indiana, as well as throughout the Nation, the latest unemployment statistics indicate an extremely serious situation.

Last month, December 1960, unemployment nationwide totaled 4.5 million, which is 6.8 percent of the total labor force, and the situation now is far worse. Conservative estimates place current unemployment throughout the Nation at 5.5 million, and this figure is expected to grow.

In my district, there are nearly 20,000 persons out of work right now. Today I talked with the director of the Indiana Employment Security division office in Indianapolis who expressed to me his own grave concern about the unemployment situation in Indiana and in the Third District, which happens to be his home district.

These figures show that, as of January 21, 1961, 9.5 percent of the labor force, or 10,500 persons, in St. Joseph County—South Bend-Mishawaka—are unemployed; that 8.3 percent of the labor force, or some 4,000 persons are jobless in Elkhart County; and 12.5 percent, or 4,500 persons, are out of work in La Porte County.

St. Joseph County, which contains roughly half the population of the congressional district, has now been placed by the Department of Labor in the "E" category of labor surplus areas, one category from the bottom.

Some 10,000 persons in the Third Indiana District are now eligible to receive surplus food.

LETTERS FROM UNEMPLOYED TELL STORY

Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks I have received hundreds of letters from unemployed persons in my district, letters which even more vividly than statistics dramatize the meaning of unemployment. For example, one man wrote:

> If something isn't done about the unemployment situation in South Bend, this town will turn into a ghost town.

Said another man:

> In the last 3 years, I have been unemployed a total of 13 months. * * * My age being 40, it seems difficult to seek another company.

Another unemployed worker told me:

> I am a fully competent, capable tool and die maker with a skill acquired through long experience, and instead of being able to put my talents to a useful purpose, I find myself chasing around the community begging for a job or standing in long lines of people to sign up for unemployment benefits.

Again:

> I am unemployed and am repeatedly told 51 is too old for a job.

Yet another:

> I've been out of work 3 years. * * * We get a small amount of powdered milk, yellow corn meal, no beans, no cheese, no butter. * * * We can't keep holding things together.

BRADEMAS INTRODUCES UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BILL

Mr. Speaker, we need both long- and short-term measures if we are effectively to attack unemployment.

I am today introducing two bills, one of which is designed to help in the short run and the other over a longer period.

The first bill would establish minimum standards for unemployment compensation payments and extend the period for benefits to a maximum of 39 weeks.

At the present time, unemployment compensation benefits in many States are inadequate to provide the worker and his family with the basic necessities of life. Many unemployed workers are, moreover, not covered for such benefits. There are great disparities among the States with respect to the terms and conditions under which workers may become eligible for unemployment compensation, as well as with respect to the amount of such compensation and the length of time for which it is paid.

I have therefore introduced a bill, which was also introduced by the then Senator Kennedy in the 86th Congress, to provide a long overdue improvement in the Federal-State unemployment insurance program.

This bill sets weekly benefit allowances at one-half the worker's weekly wage or two-thirds of the average weekly wage in the State, whichever is lower. In addition, the bill provides benefits for up to 39 weeks. The maximum period for receiving payments in Indiana now is 26 weeks.

No Federal appropriation is needed to put this improvement into effect. What is called for is the adoption of minimum State standards providing at least these benefits for qualified unemployed workers. The benefits could be higher, if a State should choose, but they could not be lower.

In 1958 these minimum standards would have meant an additional $11 a week for each unemployed worker in Indiana; in 1959, the absence of these standards cost the average unemployed worker in my State over $1,000. This additional purchasing power would have been a shot in the arm for the economy of the State.

It is quite likely that our present economic troubles would be considerably less severe if the people who were unemployed last year and the year before had had these added insurance benefits.

Improved unemployment compensation demands precedence as the first order of business, but there is a great deal more to be done to make certain that jobs are available for all Americans willing and able to work.

THE TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW

As Senator DOUGLAS said recently at Charleston, W. Va.:

> There is a time for study and contemplation, and there is a time for action. I believe strongly that the time for action is now. Conditions of chronic unemployment have been studied at great length and at considerable depth, especially in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, in undertaking action, I think we should be aware of the significant observation of Senator DOUGLAS that "a distinction must be made between areas of chronic, long-term unemployment, and areas of temporary, short-term unemployment." This distinction is important because it means we must use not one but a variety of methods. The task force on area redevelopment headed by Senator DOUGLAS offers several recommendations to deal with the problem of chronic unemployment.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ENDORSES AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

One of the most important of these recommendations is the area redevelopment bill, which I am also today introducing. My bill is basically similar to the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator DOUGLAS. The chief difference between the two bills is that mine would qualify additional areas, such as St. Joseph and La Porte Counties, for redevelopment assistance.

Only yesterday, in a letter to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, President Kennedy called for prompt passage of this legislation.

President Kennedy's task force had urged congressional action "to provide technical assistance, loans for private projects, loans and grants for public facilities, and training and retraining to provide new industry, new jobs, and new growth."

> I recommend the enactment of legislation containing provisions along these lines—

President Kennedy wrote in his letter. He said there were nearly 100 areas with substantial and persistent unemployment in addition to "many places where

chronic underemployment is predominant."

The President warned that it was impossible for private groups to achieve a permanent solution by themselves, while State and local governments no longer could carry the full burden.

I believe—

President Kennedy concluded—

there must be a cooperative effort in which the Federal Government joins with private industry and local and State governments in a maximum effort to strengthen and improve the economic climate of the communities affected.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing the area redevelopment bill, let me first reiterate that its purpose is to attract and develop new industry and new job opportunities in areas of chronic unemployment.

Second, let me express my complete agreement with President Kennedy that this problem is not one for the Federal Government alone but that the Federal Government and private enterprise must work together, in close cooperation with local and State governments, if we are to make headway.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Under the provisions of the area redevelopment bill, loans totaling $300 million would be provided for industrial and commercial buildings as well as for the construction of public facilities necessary for a thriving economy. In this last category are access roads, industrial water supplies, industrial parks, and public utilities, all of which make an area more attractive for businessmen looking for profitable locations.

In addition, the bill provides $10 million to help workmen obtain vocational retraining that will give them new skills. It also provides grants totaling $75 million for areas too depressed to bear the cost of loans for redevelopment, and $4.5 million for technical assistance in planning new projects.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY WILL ACT

Mr. Speaker, it was most unfortunate that twice during the 86th Congress of 1959–60, President Eisenhower vetoed area redevelopment bills passed by a majority of the Senate and the House of Representatives. These two vetoes added fuel to the fires of unemployment which are now mounting steadily higher.

I am confident that if Congress again passes this legislation, President Kennedy will immediately sign it into law and we can at last make a start in attacking one aspect of the problem of unemployment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress will speedily consider and act favorably upon the bill I, along with other Members of Congress, have introduced to improve the unemployment compensation program which so directly affects the lives of so many of our unemployed fellow citizens.

VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an address recently delivered by Admiral Rickover.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great Americans of all time is Admiral Rickover. In the course of the last year he has been able to continue his duties only by Executive consent. The Navy claims they cannot guarantee that he will be continued in his work for more than a year. Then they will assemble a board to decide whether to recommend that he continue for more than a year. I understand they claim they are prevented by law from taking more forward action.

This great American, great naval officer, has had an outstanding career. He is the best qualified man to fill the position he occupies. Certainly he should be continued in service because the national interest of our country calls for his leadership in the important field in which he is engaged.

Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, head of the Navy's nuclear ship program, recently spoke at the 15th anniversary dinner of the American Nobel Anniversary Committee honoring Alfred Nobel and the Nobel laureates in New York City. His address, as is usual with him, ascended the intellectual heights, and is appropriately entitled "Intellect in a Democracy." Since I believe that all Members of Congress, and indeed all serious-minded Americans, will appreciate this literary contribution to our great democracy, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Admiral Rickover has again demonstrated the working of a mind which is an essential national asset. In the years ahead the Nation needs this mind directing our naval nuclear propulsion program and the Shippingport Atomic Power Station. These two programs are the prime showpieces in our national atomic power effort, and it is no coincidence that these two successful programs are led by the same man.

But Admiral Rickover is able to continue his duties only by Executive consent—the Navy claims they cannot guarantee that he will be permitted to continue his vital work for more than a year. Then they will assemble a board and decide whether to recommend that he be held on another year. I understand they claim they are prevented by law from taking any more straightforward action.

Let us make clear to the Navy that the law of this land is not forcing them to retire Admiral Rickover. Let this record show that it is the will of the people that Admiral Rickover continue his present work for the United States for many years to come. If legislative action is needed to promote him to the rank of full admiral and to keep him in the service of his country, I will be honored to sponsor whatever legislation is required. I feel so strongly about this matter that I propose that he not only be promoted to full admiral, but that he be given the title of "Admiral of the Nuclear Navy." Without him, there would not be today a nuclear navy. Without him the nuclear navy cannot continue to expand, either in types of ships or in numbers of ships.

We must not wait for the Navy to make up its mind. We must clear up this uncertainty as to future leadership of the invaluable work conceived and undertaken by Admiral Rickover. The good of the Nation must not be made subject to the whim of a board of admirals assembled by the Navy each year to make this decision of far-reaching consequence. I hope that the Secretary of the Navy will recommend that the President send to the Senate Vice Admiral Rickover's promotion to the rank of full admiral, with the title of "Admiral of the Nuclear Navy."

The address follows:

INTELLECT IN A DEMOCRACY

(Remarks by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary dinner of the American Nobel Anniversary Committee honoring Alfred Nobel and the Nobel laureates at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, Jan. 8, 1961)

I should like to begin by thanking you for your invitation to come here tonight and to address this distinguished audience. In casting about for a suitable subject to discuss with you, it occurred to me that I might examine the perennial problem of intellect in a democracy from the specific point of view of its bearing on modern weaponry. There is no need to dwell on the fact that today, unfortunately, we depend for our very survival upon ability to come up with new ideas and to cut short the leadtime between idea and finished military item. Intellect is the key factor in developing new weapons systems, as it is in all large-scale engineering projects designed to move us ahead technologically. National attitudes toward the man of intellect are therefore of crucial importance to the future of this country.

From de Tocqueville onward, thoughtful observers of the American scene have been struck with the paradox of anti-intellectualism in a nation which is the embodiment of pure 18th century rationalist thought. The Founding Fathers produced a Constitution suffused with the light of reason; the Nation they called into being incorporates the best thought of the most illustrious political theorists of the age of reason; democracy itself, as the term indicates, means rule (kratein) of the people (demos), hence presupposes the ability of all men to exercise statecraft, that is to be intelligent enough to decide who is to govern them and how they are to be governed. There is no inherent antithesis between intellect and democracy; respect for the one is inherent in belief in the other.

Apart from exclusion of unfree members of the community who by reason of bondage cannot bring their intellect to bear on public issues, the real or alleged reason for excluding any citizen or group of citizens from participation in self-government has always been absence of intellect. It justifies the permanent exclusion of the mentally deficient; the temporary exclusion of the immature, that is the minor. Women's alleged intellectual inferiority has traditionally been a favorite argument for denying them the vote.

Far from being antagonistic to intellect, democracy depends upon it. Moreover, as civilization advances and life and government become more complex, native intelligence will no longer suffice, and educated intellect becomes the sine qua non for responsible discharge of duties of democratic citizenship. All modern democracies have

therefore made education free and compulsory for increasingly longer periods of time. (For other reasons, namely the need for literate soldiers and industrial workers—nondemocratic nations have done likewise.)

It is evident when one reads the Federalist that nothing was furthest from the minds of the Founding Fathers than our present-day cult of the common man. They were conscious of the risk they took in making the people the Nation's sovereign but they hoped these would choose men of superior capacity to be their representatives in government; they also incorporated in the Constitution certain safeguards to protect the Ship of State from hasty and ill-conceived popular actions. They were fully aware of the basic problem in democratic government: how to obtain capable leaders without infringing on the right of all citizens to participate in government. As Jefferson wrote Adams, the success of the American experiment depended wholly on the ability of the citizen to discover who, among several candidates, is best qualified for public office. Mill wrote later—for an English audience—of the necessity "to obtain, in the greatest measure possible, for the function of government the benefits of superior intellect trained by long meditation and practical discipline to that special task." To elect such men to public office was in general the purpose of the American voter until the election of Jackson in 1828. But Jacksonian egalitarianism introduced the new idea that not only are the needs of average men the only valid considerations in a democracy, but that any man of average ability and without requisite training can fill any public office or exercise any profession.

The 1958 Rockefeller Report on Education speaks of the "tug of war between equality and excellence in a democracy." This war would seem to be more pronounced in this country than in other democracies, perhaps because of the indelible imprint on American society of the continuation of pioneer life almost to the turn of the 20th century. Turner first brought out that the existence of free land in the West meant that succeeding generations of Americans turned their backs on the civilized parts of this country and returned to more primitive ways of life—as when New Englanders left the settled eastern seaboard and homesteaded in the wilderness beyond the Alleghenies. Each wave of settlers thus started once more to move up the ladder of civilization but, as it were, from a lower rung. Such respect for learning as had developed in the older communities was given up in favor of respect for physical prowess—the indispensable requirement for survival on the frontier.

Consider, for instance, that of the 55 men who sat in Philadelphia in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention 31 had attended college while several others had become first-rate scholars and scientists by self-education. In contrast, 100 years later, pioneers in Washington territory dubbed the spot where a common school had been built "fool's prairie." Merle Curti, whose "American Paradox" documents American anti-intellectualism, past and present, tells of a highly educated western Governor who found it politically expedient to pretend he abhorred books. "In order to be thought one of the people, this man made speeches that were not only homespun in idiom but often pathetically ludicrous." The frontier perpetuated the antipathy to superior intellect and education that is to be found in many primitive societies. When pioneering ceased, the basic conflict in our attitude toward the man of thought as opposed to the man of action did not change; the man of action merely ceased to be a pioneer and became a businessman. As Bryce noted, much of our best ability, "both for thought and for action, for planning and for executing, rushes into a field which is comparatively narrow in Europe, the business of developing the material resources of the country."

Jacksonian egalitarianism lingers on in the present-day notion that democracy cannot rise above mediocrity; we not only assure the common man his fair share of whatever wealth is created in this country; we make the average, the median, and the mediocre the norm of human behavior. As Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., says, We do not merely reject hero worship but heroes as well; we dislike greatness per se. De Tocqueville, in writing that in this country the power of the majority was "so absolute and irresistible that one must give up one's rights as a citizen if one intends to stray from the track which it prescribes," accurately describes modern pressures to conform to group judgment. Bryce who wrote a whole chapter on "Why great men are not chosen President," devotes much space to discussion of American anti-intellectualism in politics. By that he meant that men of superior intellect were handicapped in the race for public office. He poses a question which today takes on ominous significance: "Will not a nation ruled by its average men in reliance on their own average wisdom be overtaken in the race of prosperity or overpowered in a warlike struggle by a nation of equal resources which is guided by its most capable minds?" He has no valid answer except to say "that America has hitherto been able to afford to squander her resources, and that no other state threatens her. With her wealth and in her position she can with impunity commit errors which might be fatal to the nations of Western Europe."

My own concern is not with anti-intellectualism in politics but with the effect which hostility to superior intellect has on our technological progress. I believe we can no longer afford to squander our intellectual resources, nor continue to commit errors that result in overlong leadtimes in weaponry and other important new developments. It is no longer true that no other state threatens us. My thesis is that hostility to superior intellect is a national idiosyncracy rather than a necessary consequence of our devotion to the democratic ideal. To alter our attitude toward men of high intellect does not run counter to democratic principles; it would, in fact, merely reestablish the respect for learning that existed here when this Nation came into being.

Pari passu it must be said that engineering projects designed to come up with wholly novel weapons systems are but one of a number of projects of comparable difficulty and magnitude that we must undertake in order to progress technologically. We have little choice in this matter. The challenge of the totalitarians forces us to move forward on a broad technological front. We have seen the propaganda effect of sputnik; progress in space has become a criterion of national status, and so has progress in any other sphere that in some manner enhances a nation's position. Moreover, even if the cold war ceased tomorrow, we should have to carry through similar large-scale projects in order to meet the needs of our own and the world's exploding population on a planet that is being rapidly denuded of natural resources indispensable to human life. Thus we must in the near future come up with economic procedures to produce artificial sweet water out of the oceans, with synthetic power derived from nuclear fission and hydrogen fusion or through utilization of solar energy. In all these tasks intellect is the key factor. Continued anti-intellectualism is a luxury we can no longer afford.

If one had to pinpoint the major reasons for present-day hostility to superior intellect, two would stand out; first, the popular tendency to look upon democracy as something more than a political system where every citizen is equal before the law, has an equal vote, and is equal in his relations with all branches of government; second, the rapidly increasing bureaucratization of private and public life.

As to the first, John Adams, signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote "that all men are born to equal rights is clear. Every being has a right to his own, as moral, as sacred, as any other has * * * but to teach that all men are born to equal powers and faculties * * * is as gross a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of people, as ever was practiced * * * for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it." Even so, the confusion of political equality with total equality in all things continues. It is easily forgotten that while rights can be portioned out equally as long as the recipient is able to enjoy them passively, this cannot be done when enjoyment of a right involves ability and effort, for in these respects men are unequal. Thus workers can be given an equal share in increased productivity even though they may have contributed nothing whatever to this increase; but one cannot give an equal share in education, for here enjoyment depends upon ability and desire to make use of educational opportunity. Many Americans cannot come to terms with the fact of unequal human powers and faculties. To them anything irrevocably setting one type of man or group of men against the majority is undemocratic, therefore unacceptable.

Nowhere is this resistance to the fact of human inequality of intellect more clearly seen than in the reaction of most professional educators to anyone who suggests that a bright child needs a tougher, more challenging education than a less able child and ought to receive it within our publicly supported system of education. So great is this hostility to the idea of different schooling for talented youth that otherwise decent people have no scruple to misquote those who urge such schooling; to accuse them of wanting "to train the best and shoot the rest." Of course this is deliberate falsification of the case made by many critics of American education. Nobody has ever suggested that we should diminish the education of the less intelligent in order to serve the needs of the talented; quite the contrary.

But, as the Council for Basic Education put it succinctly, the chief obstacle to acceptance of the educational rights of the gifted is that "the professionals can't seem to conquer their own mythology of the common man and their grotesque fear that special attention to the gifted will create a special social class. The literature of the subject is filled with such unexamined assumptions. For instance, the term 'intellectual elite,' inevitably makes its appearance wherever gifted children (one must never call them superior) are discussed. Education is plagued with shibboleths like this one." Witness the curious habit among American professional educators of listing the unusually gifted child along with the lame, the halt, the deaf, blind, and mentally subnormal under the generic term of "exceptional children"—a term which itself has lost its original meaning and acquired an epithetical tinge.

Of course, it cannot be denied that superior intellect makes for the most intractable kind of human inequality. Intellect goes to the whole of a man's personality and for this reason differs from special talents in such fields as athletics, music, art, which men may possess who have but average intelligence. Nothing is inherently so aristocratic as superior intelligence, the more so when it has

been sharpened by a rigorous education. And no amount of legislating can democratize, that is, universalize high intelligence.

Before IQ tests were invented, believers in democracy deprecated the intellectual gulf between people that was manifest to the naked eye, and attributed it solely to artificial barriers preventing the poor from acquiring the education available to the rich. Discovery that the IQ of normal citizens ranges from 90 to 200 was perhaps the greatest disappointment ever suffered by sincere believers in democracy. (I assume you agree that geniuses are normal citizens and only the mentally deficient should be classed as abnormal.)

So potentially dangerous to the democratic process is this gap in intelligence that we can do nothing more important to strengthen democracy than put concentrated thought and effort into a search for ways to narrow it. Obviously, handing out unmerited academic diplomas or herding all students into the same classroom will not bring this about; it merely camouflages the gap. There is only one way to narrow it and that is to motivate the less intelligent to greater effort.

All of us have unused inner resources—intellectual no less than moral and physical—with which we could vastly surpass our normal achievements. Men have proved this time and time again in emergencies. Today, we live in a continuous state of emergency where our fate depends on the ability of average citizens to think clearly and act wisely. To do this, they must be convinced of the necessity of making greater mental effort. Average citizens need more application to learning than the above average, so they will absorb sufficient knowledge and wisdom to govern this Nation; they must be better instructed in the subjects basic to a good education. To shunt them into vocational subjects or life-adjustment courses, as happens too often in our schools, is to aggravate intellectual inequality. Other Western democracies—notably Switzerland and the Scandinavias—have done much better in raising the scholastic standard of their less intelligent children. In these countries not only the talented, but also the average and below-average youth, achieve higher scholastic levels than here. Though our educationists deprecate European education, it actually succeeds better than ours in narrowing the intellectual gap between people. So much so that some Europeans wonder whether there could actually be a wider IQ spread in the United States than abroad—a suggestion I cannot accept. Our poor showing is simply the result of poor schooling.

Life-adjustment education is mainly responsible for mediocre schooling. It fails to stimulate the less able to make the extra effort to catch up with the rest; it nourishes in them a false sense of intellectual equality; it prevents them from realizing how rare is high intellect, how hard the road that must be taken to bring it to fruition, how enormously beneficial the contributions it makes to the individual, to community, to Nation. By carefully protecting the average, the dullard, the lazybones against intellectual competition from children with better minds and stronger motivation, we foster in the less able a blindness to excellence; they never realize it is the work of superior minds that has created the high material standard of living all Americans enjoy today. They have been taught to believe our industrial productivity, our widespread high standard of living, is the work of men who push buttons; they forget the enormous contributions of those who conceived, designed and built the whole intricate machinery which reduces man's labor to simple manipulation and floods the market with consumer goods.

Keeping all children together in one classroom is said to develop the virtues of democratic citizenship; this is hardly borne out by our present political behavior compared to earlier periods of our history. What it does develop in less able children is a disrespect for—a hostility to—high intellect. How could it be otherwise?

Conditioned by schooling that never challenges me and never lets me fail; bombarded by flattery from those who desire my custom or my vote, what is my reaction going to be when I discover I have a modest and poorly developed mind, you have a towering intellect sharpened by mental exertion? Obviously my sense of equality leads me to look upon this as an undemocratic abomination, and so I will proceed to pull you down to my own level. At the very least I will consider you a freak—not to be trusted with practical affairs. Pursued to extremes, this type of thinking led the French revolutionary tribunal to guillotine the great chemist Lavoisier, the judges being reported as saying coldly: "The Republic has no need of savants."

Yet in truth such anti-intellectualism goes counter to respect for the individual—which is the pivot of democracy, as it is of Western civilization. Virtually all the constitutional restraints making ours a government of limited powers, "of laws not men," have the purpose to protect the individual in his right to be undisturbed by the demos, except when national necessity or the conflicting rights of others render this unavoidable. Western civilization, since it centers on the worth and sovereignty of the individual, requires democracy for its fulfillment. One reason non-Western societies have difficulty creating viable democratic States is that most of them are centered on the group, not on the individual. This is particularly so in the case of primitive societies. Writes Derek Stanford: "Anthropologists are agreed that the primitive psyche was powerfully collective; that it was, in fact, preindividual. Primitive man had a limited and painful sense of self-identity. He found it difficult, and rather fearful, to conceive of himself in spatial isolation, as a separate being distinct from the environing communal body." So too does the unformed immature human being seek security in his "peer" group. To center schooling on life—and group—adjustment prevents development of the sense of self-identity that must be achieved to reach maturity. Without mature citizens democracy cannot be made to function properly.

Democracy is a difficult system even for Western man. What begins as a democracy may end up as a species of authoritarian government. This can be brought about not only by the desire of the strong to exercise unrestrained political power but also by the desire of the weak to escape the awful loneliness of intellectual independence and the heavy personal responsibility which are the price of liberty, and to seek refuge in the security of collectivism. Our glorification of conformity, of the group, the team, the organization could in fact destroy democracy though its forms might be preserved.

The second factor contributing to hostility toward superior intellect is the bureaucratization of life. Bureaucracies are hierarchical in structure, routine in operation. In course of time they tend to put the survival and smooth functioning of the organization itself above its intended purpose. They elevate to leadership men who have adapted themselves to work in circumscribed conditions, who readily accept direction from above, even in matters where they are more competent than their administrative superiors. Men of high intellect and professional expertise cannot easily accept organizational routines and leader-follower relationships based on rank, not competence; in the eyes of the "organization man" this makes them disruptive, divisive. Yet without their contributions, organizations stagnate. All progress comes through individual creativity by men of superior intellect. How to fit such men into our overorganized life is a problem of paramount importance.

Our admiration for so-called practical men and dislike for eggheads incline us to overvalue the manipulator of men, money and words—the administrator; and to undervalue the man of superior intellect, the creative innovator—the professional man. Whatever the original purpose of an organization, be it private or public, be it commercial, spiritual, cultural or educational, it inevitably becomes a bureaucracy unless we clearly define the activities of those who administer and those who create and produce. Progress is hampered by unintelligent administrative meddling, by insistence on routine. Clear definition is most important when an organization must combine novel developmental projects alongside routine activities.

The military is such an organization. Its main activity is operational and emergency in nature, requiring clear channels of command and spelled-out routines. But to carry out its operational task, the military must also be capable of continuous innovation in weapons and in ways to use these weapons effectively. Such innovations do not flow from command channels or routines. They are brought forth through the efforts of men of high intellect and professional competence. Technology is relentlessly shifting the criterion of military strength from the operational to the materiél side; the best military qualities avail naught unless equipment is up to date.

This change is not yet reflected in our military structure. We still operate on the principle that officers are interchangeable men; that they can perform any task assigned them. Included among such military tasks is direction of complex technical projects for new weapons systems. Here the actual productive work is performed by qualified technical experts but the direction is by officers who rarely possess the necessary technical knowledge to understand the work. Moreover, they are rotated in and out of assignments for short periods of duty, usually 2 to 3 years. Officers thus exercise management control without having the requisite technical competence which today can only be acquired by a long and arduous professional education. Their term of office is so brief they do not have time to become familiar with the work they direct. We could not have devised a more ineffectual system had we deliberately set out to do so.

The Military Establishment is our national life insurance. Respect for tradition must yield where the country's survival is involved. We must not continue practices resulting in ever longer leadtimes while the Russians keep on cutting theirs. Were I asked to identify the principal cause of this dangerous state of affairs, I should unhesitatingly give it as the unwillingness of the military to make room for the men who alone can produce new weapons—the technical professionals. We shall continue to lose the few capable men of this kind we now have, and certainly fail to attract others, unless we reverse present practices which hamstring them and render them unproductive. Parenthetically, I may say that another bureaucratic weakness—excessive loyalty to one's own organization—runs a close second. A recent Life article states that "debilitating, inclusive rivalry between all three services was among the factors that blinded both military and civilian officialdom to the importance of space development before the Russians enlightened the world with their sputniks."

In this country large-scale developmental projects of military significance—such as

missiles, space vehicles, nuclear propulsion—all suffer grievously from overadministration. Technically, unqualified officers do not hesitate to decide complex scientific and engineering problems; to overrule their technical subordinates; to meddle in their day-to-day activities. In my own group, at least two-thirds of my own time, and that of the top scientists and engineers, is wasted by administrative fiat. Time and again everyone must stop regular work and exhaust his energies in combating administrative errors. Thousands of hours are lost dealing with the avalanche of memorandums descending from higher administrative levels. A short while ago, every senior technical man in the group was doing paperwork ordered from above; we had difficulty releasing one of them from his writing chores to deal with an urgent technical problem. We were scribbling instead of building nuclear ships; the Russians were forging ahead with new weapons, widening the leadtimes between the two countries.

Russia carries complicated technical projects through more efficiently than we, chiefly because she does not subscribe to our quaint notion that top management of projects is a part-time chore for technical amateurs. Her long-range developmental projects proceed on schedule, ours flounder in a tangle of redtape produced by legions of committees and layers of supervisory administrators—all with great power but little personal responsibility for ultimate success of the work. Even when we ostensibly vest responsibility in a czar, he will long since have moved on to a new assignment by the time the smokescreen of organizational public relations has been dissipated and the truth about his performance has become public.

Let me repeat: Today a nation's strength depends more on the scientific and technical competence of those who conceive, design and build military equipment and who devise new strategies for their optimum use than on the men who operate these new weapons. Technical experts ought not, in their professional fields, be subjugated to officers unless these are technically competent and stay in their managerial posts long enough to acquire understanding of the work they direct. Our present system, appropriate in a simpler age when weapons were uncomplicated and change was slow, is unsuitable to an age of rapidly spiraling technological progress. Progress now depends on men of superior intellect. Democracies cannot survive unless such men are properly fitted into the huge organizations now dominating life, most particularly into the military bureaucracy.

To speed military technology and reduce leadtimes I suggest the following simple reforms; in order of importance:

First. Make power coincide with competence; recognize that pure administrative ability alone does not fit a man to direct complex technical work performed by highly trained professionals; that even a technically trained manager needs time to familiarize himself with the work; short assignments must therefore be avoided.

Second. Make power coincide with responsibility; hold men all along the line responsible for the directions they give; keep managers of technical projects in office long enough so they can be judged by their success or failure.

Third. Recognize that routines do not give rise to new ideas and technical developments; therefore creative workers should be freed from unnecessary routines; recognize that such freedom is essential if they are to do their work and does not constitute a pampering of eggheads.

Fourth. Change the administrative structure to permit technical experts the right to their own professional judgment; unless this professional right is preserved, such men are degraded to the status of mere technicians and technicians will not win us the race with the Russians.

Above all, in this period of danger to our country, let not devotion to the ways of the organization hold back capable professional men with creative ability. Superior intellect is essential to all organizations, none more than to a democratic state.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. KNOX), until February 6, 1961, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday, January 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BONNER.

Mr. POFF.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3411. A bill to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCULLOCH:

H.R. 3412. A bill to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 3413. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to make permanent the authority of the Small Business Administration to make secured loans to State and local development companies for plant construction, conversion, or expansion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3414. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3415. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the marketing of livestock, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3416. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 3417. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3418. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for the anatomical loss, or loss of use, of a procreative organ as a result of a personal injury sustained by a Federal employee while in the performance of his duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3419. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3420. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern administration and office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 3421. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for the disposition for historical site purposes of certain real property acquired in urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3422. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3423. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 3424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall not apply to any transportation which begins outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3425. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3426. A bill to authorize an increase in the annual immigration quota for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3427. A bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954 for 3 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend section 661 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the punishment for larceny of livestock shall be the same as the punishment for larceny of property of a value exceeding $100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3429. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3430. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to pro-

mote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through a program for the recognition and commemoration of those who have made such progress and achievement possible, and in particular through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3432. A bill to provide for nonveteran Federal employees the same appeal rights as are provided by law for veteran Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3433. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3434. A bill to amend section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to prescribe regulations prohibiting the takeoff of aircraft having more than one engine from any airport under certain weather conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount of exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3436. A bill to declare a national policy on conservaton, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 3437. A bill to amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to extend until June 30, 1961, the period within which applications for payments thereunder may be made by former enlisted members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide Federal assistance to States which award scholarships to students of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3439. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3440. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3441. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 3442. A bill to establish a commission to study and propose improvements in the methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3443. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $4,404,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3444. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3445. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3446. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Bridge Canyon project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 3447. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 3448. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide health care insurance for persons entitled to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, for persons having service covered by the Railroad Retirement and Civil Service Retirement Acts, and for persons electing voluntary coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3449. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3450. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3451. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 3452. A bill to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 3453. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 3454. A bill to permit an individual who retired before September 1954 under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program to have his benefit amount recomputed, without acquiring any additional coverage, to take advantage of the "drop-out" provisions in title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3455. A bill to provide that active military or naval service performed during the period beginning on November 12, 1918, and ending on July 2, 1921, by any individual who served in Germany or Russia during that period shall be deemed to be World War I service for the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3456. A bill to provide that Government plants and facilities for the conduct of newly developed processes and operations shall to the extent practicable be located in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3457. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 3458. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals aged 65 or over to earn an additional $300 a year without diminishing their retirement income credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3459. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3460. A bill to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 3461. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3462. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3463. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3464. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3465. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes, approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C. title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes' ", and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 3466. A bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3468. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide pensions, and wartime rates of disability or death compensation, in the case of veterans of Mexican border service in 1916 or 1917; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 3470. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 3471. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3472. A bill to clarify the authority of the Commissioner of Patents to compile, publish, and disseminate certain information relating to patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3473. A bill to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances and complaints of all Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3474. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining retirement age excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3475. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to establish a "University of Free Cuba" to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the Legislative Branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 3476. A bill for the relief of Anastacio de Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3477. A bill to authorize the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Comdr. William B. Cushing of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3478. A bill for the relief of Anna Mastoraki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3479. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Saito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3480. A bill for the relief of Michael Pascu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 3481. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Stassinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3482. A bill for the relief of Dr. Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng), and his wife Yu-Ih Chuang Chang, and their two minor daughters, Jean Li and Jean Ih Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite de Soepkez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3484. A bill for the relief of Jan Michal Dien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3485. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Jacobus Overbeeke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3486. A bill for the relief of Stefano Buccellato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3487. A bill for the relief of Louis C. Wheeler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 3488. A bill for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3489. A bill for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stephanie Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3491. A bill for the relief of Lufti Guneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3492. A bill for the relief of Sebastian Hermosilla Sanches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 3493. A bill for the relief of Nubar Hadidian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3494. A bill for the relief of Pablo Rendaje Cava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nouritza Kodjabahian and her minor children, Berj, Sona, Ara, and Zaven Kodjabahian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. S. Jeannette Senno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3498. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Orlando V. Jamandre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Francine Middelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hasmik Arzoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3503. A bill for the relief of Primitiva F. Torres, and daughter, Virginia F. Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 3504. A bill for the relief of William Sim and his wife, Marina Ting Sim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Emanuel and Antonina Gagliano and their children, Salvatore and Agostino Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 3506. A bill for the relief of William Fu (also known as Foo Mow Son); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Reverend Oscar Creech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to pay tribute to one of the truly great men of my State. The Reverend Oscar Creech, of Murfreesboro, N.C., is retiring on February 1 of this year after 53 years of service to his church, his State, and to the people of northeastern North Carolina. As an educator, an ordained minister, and as a member of the staff of one of North Carolina's oldest junior colleges, Mr. Creech has always served in the interests and welfare of others. I am proud that I can say that Mr. Creech is from the First Congressional District of North Carolina, which I serve.

Mr. Creech's record is long and full. It includes several years' service in the public schools of North Carolina, followed by a quarter of a century as pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Ahoskie, N.C. Perhaps the greatest of his undertakings was his effort to reopen Chowan College in Murfreesboro, N.C., after World War II. We of North Carolina pride ourselves on our educational institutions, and Mr. Creech's efforts to raise funds to reopen Chowan College are exemplary of this pride. Northeastern North Carolina was in need of this school, so Mr. Creech set about to see that that need was met; and in 1949 that institution reopened its doors and he saw his dream come true.

Perhaps the best expression of the statewide feeling for Mr. Creech is found in a letter from Dr. Harold Tribble, president of Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, N.C. In it, Dr. Tribble says, "He has worked in a quiet and unselfish manner, always putting the cause of Christ first and the welfare of his fellow man above his own interest. As he has had many fruitful years in active service, it

is my prayer that he may also now have many happy and fruitful years in the kind of service for which he is so richly qualified as he enters now upon the joys of retirement." Such is the prayer of all who know and love Mr. Creech.

Tax Credit for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress, I have consistently and steadfastly opposed in principle the several Federal aid to education bills which the Congress has considered, under the earnest conviction that aid means control and control should remain with the States and localities. I recognize the deficiencies and urgent needs of education in general and science in particular, but I have not changed my convictions. The States still can, and I believe will, meet the challenge and do the job. The only help they need is a tax source to finance the job. The Federal Government can make that tax source available to the States in a very simple and uncomplicated way.

On January 3, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 530, to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for additional State and local taxes imposed for school purposes. Under my bill, a Federal taxpayer will be authorized to subtract from his total income tax liability any new school tax hereafter imposed by any State legislature, provided that the revenue from this new tax is used solely for school construction, maintenance or operation or for the payment of interest on, or the repayment of the principal of, indebtedness incurred for any such school purposes, and provided further that such new tax does not replace any other tax in effect at the time of the passage of the bill.

So far as I know, this is an entirely original approach to the school aid problem. To my mind the idea, which doubtless will need some technical refinement in legislative draftsmanship, has several important virtues:

First. Simplicity: Not a single additional Federal employee would have to be hired to administer the program.

Second. Independence: The Federal Government would have no control whatever over either substantive or procedural educational policies. The individual States and localities would decide how much tax would be imposed and how every revenue dollar would be spent for school purposes.

Third. Flexibility: Each local school district would receive additional school revenue suited to its particular needs as distinguished from the needs of another district in another State.

Fourth. Economy: The total cost of educational assistance to the Federal Treasury—measured in revenue lost on the tax credits—would be a realistic minimum. Obviously, no State would impose a tax higher than necessary for vital school needs. Moreover, this plan would contain none of the customary costs of administration incidental to Federal programs.

Fifth. Local incentive: State and local taxing authorities would be able to "sell" the new school tax to the people, because there would be no net increase in the taxpayer's total annual tax liability. Whatever he pays under the new local school tax he would be able to recapture as a credit when he pays his Federal income tax.

Another consideration is of prime importance. In Federal-aid grant programs, whether educational or otherwise, the individual taxpayer, whose tax payments are commingled with taxes paid by his fellow citizens throughout the United States, loses sight of the many courses his tax dollar follows after it leaves Uncle Sam's hands. Stated differently, he has no personal identification with the ultimate achievement of the program. However, when a taxpayer pays a State or local school tax, he recognizes his own personal tax dollar in the brick and mortar of the new school building erected in his community. From that he takes a certain intangible but nonetheless actual pride in the school and in the cause which it symbolizes. To him it is a concrete object lesson in government by the people which he can see and understand. Since, in a democracy, all strength and all resources originate with the people, we must, if we expect to meet the national education crisis, go to the people at the local level and inspire in them the spirit of self-help and the pride of personal achievement.

Federal Aid To Provide Scholarships for Students of Medicine, Osteopathy, and Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year I am introducing legislation proposing that the Federal Government assist top-quality young people to obtain the medical education which will equip them to serve the Nation's health needs.

This legislation is designed to complement the bills I introduced previously, providing for Federal assistance to renovate and modernize existing health teaching facilities and to stimulate the construction of new schools.

The bill I am introducing today would authorize Federal funds, to be matched by State funds, to provide scholarships for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, which would be awarded on the basis of ability and need.

All of these bills are aimed at one of the Nation's genuinely critical health needs of the immediate future—the swiftly developing shortage of physicians and other professionals who care for the health of our people.

Innumerable studies over the past few years, culminating in the thorough and comprehensive study, "Physicians for a Growing America," have come forth with the same basic conclusions. We have barely enough doctors now. As our population inexorably grows, our corps of physicians will be spread thinner and thinner. If we are to have enough physicians at the end of the next 5, or 10, or 15 years, we must recruit them, house them, and train them now.

The time for studies is past. The need for action is immediate. And our past experience makes it plain that action initiated here in this Congress is the only sure course.

The critical physician shortage has recently been called to our attnetion in a very dramatic way. More than 7,000 foreign-trained doctors are serving as interns and residents in hospitals in this country. A substantial number of these young physicians failed to pass a professional examination given last year by the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates. In the view of many hospital administrators, the prospective loss of these interns and residents will cause a serious crisis in hospital medical care, especially in our large cities. Only a short time ago Governor Rockefeller, of New York, met with leaders of the American Medical Association to try to avert or, at least, postpone a desperate situation.

This is not the time to discuss the arguments which have been voiced over the use of foreign-trained doctors in this country. I would suggest, however, that this is but a symptom of a deeper ill. We are simply not training enough doctors in the United States to meet our growing demands for medical services. Young doctors from foreign lands, ostensibly here for further professional training, are quite frankly being used to plug the gaping holes. Without them, many large city hospitals would have to curtail their emergency services, reduce their ambulance services to the danger level, perhaps even close up rooms and wings.

We cannot permit this to happen. And the only solution is to expand our own educational opportunities, to bring more young people into the medical profession. We cannot be content with halfway measures or patchwork remedies.

It comes as a surprise to many people—as it did to me—that a medical career no longer attracts as high a proportion of the brightest young people as it used to. Yet a few hard, cold statistics make such a conclusion inescapable.

The total number of applicants for medical school has declined by about one-third in the last 10 years. As a result, the medical schools are no longer in a position to accept only the cream of the crop. To f ll their first-year classes, they must dig deeper into the ranks of applicants whose work is acceptable but not of the very top quality. In 1950, 4 out of every 10 students accepted by medical schools carried an A average through their undergraduate work. Just

8 years later, only 18 percent of those accepted had an average undergraduate grade of A.

The reasons for this decline in the attracting power of medicine are not difficult to understand if you look at the practical situation confronting an A student at the moment of selecting his career. Unless he is lucky enough to be backed by almost unlimited financial resources, the road to a medical career looks long and rocky.

He can look ahead to medical school, followed by additional years of internship and residency training—8 years or more of increasing indebtedness before he can begin to pay his way in his profession.

Almost one-third of all graduates are more than $2,000 in debt when they finish the 4 years of medical school; 17 percent have debts of $5,000 or more, at this point, with years as interns and residents still ahead of them.

Many of the married medical students—and three out of five of them marry before they graduate—owe their medical education largely to their wives, who must work to support the family throughout the long training period.

Contrast this prospect, as seen through the eyes of the outstanding student choosing a career, with the outlook as he considers a scientific field such as physics, chemistry, or electronics. In perhaps 4 years—less than half the full educational period for an emerging physician—he can earn a Ph. D. degree in science, with a fellowship which may well carry him through debt free. At that point he is prepared to embark immediately as a full-fledged professional in a well-paid and prestige-filled field of science.

Obviously, I do not mean to suggest that our national policy of recruiting more and better young people to the physical sciences, which we have implemented through congressional appropriations to the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies for the awarding of generous fellowships, has been unwise. I do wish to point out, however, that comparable assistance has not been made available for medical and dental students, and that the health of the American people is likely to suffer if this situation is not remedied.

I do not believe that we wish to restrict entrance into the medical profession to sons and daughters of families wealthy enough to support their long and costly education. I do not believe we want the medical profession to take what is left after the other sciences have skimmed off the cream.

The legislation that I am introducing today proposes constructive Federal action to place medical and dental education on a parallel plane with the other scientific disciplines deemed to be of high priority for our national interest. Specifically,

First. It provides for scholarships of $2,500 per academic year to students in schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry.

Second. The students would be selected by State commissions established for this purpose, on the basis of ability and need. These commissions would also be responsible for determining students' eligibility to continue receiving funds, by reviewing their performance annually.

Third. One-half the cost of the scholarships would be borne by the States. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service would be authorized to pay one-half the cost of the scholarships to those States which have submitted to him an acceptable plan for administering these funds.

Fourth. An initial appropriation of $10 million would be authorized for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961. These funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of their populations between the ages of 20 and 24, inclusive.

Fifth. This Federal appropriation, plus the matching State funds, would permit a maximum of 8,000 scholarships per year, at $2,500 each.

It should be clearly understood that the $2,500 scholarship is not intended to cover the full cost of a medical education. According to the best figures available, minimum expenditures by medical students are in the range of $3,000 per year, and the figure for married students is substantially higher.

Even with the scholarships proposed, the attainment of a medical degree would still be a strenuous and testing task, demanding the highest order of dedication on the part of the student. Nothing can be done to shorten or simplify the course of study required to equip a young man or woman for competency in the medical profession, a profession whose practice becomes increasingly complex and challenging as its lifesaving miracles multiply. But something can and should be done to lighten the overwhelming financial burden which is superimposed upon these young people.

A scholarship plan of this nature was unanimously recommended as one of the fundamental needs in meeting our shortage of well-qualified physicians by the non-Federal leaders of medicine, medical education and related disciplines who made up the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Medical Education. Such a plan has been repeatedly advanced, and the need demonstrated in study after study.

It is of the utmost urgency that the Federal Government suit action to these many words, and do it promptly. The first beneficiaries of such legislation, even now, would not emerge as fully qualified physicians before the threshold of the next decade. Further delay is unthinkable.